Abstract discussions will be held on Tuesday, October 12 at 7 PM and on Thursday, October 14, at 7:30 PM in Ryan Gym

Anastasia:
An Honor Council Academic Trial
Released Fall 2013

This abstract was not released in accordance to the timeline specified by the Students’ Association Constitution. (The addition of this disclaimer began in Spring 2010).

Confronting Party: Vladimir Vanya Voinitsky Vasilovich (Vladimir)
Confronted Party: Grand Duchess Anastasia Nikolaevna of Russia (Anastasia)
Course Name: Royalty 101

Case Summary: This case involved Anastasia Nikolaevna, a Bryn Mawr student who plagiarized and consulted outside sources when explicitly prohibited on her final exam for Royalty 101. When confronted by Professor Vladimir Vasilovich about her exam, Anastasia admitted to both consulting outside sources and plagiarizing on her exam, and apologetically brought herself to Honor Council. This case was sent to an academic trial in which the jury discussed the incident with the trial parties and came to a number of resolutions to address the goals of the trial.

Fact-Finding: Fact-finding portion began with Professor Vladimir’s explanation of his conviction that Anastasia’s exam was plagiarized. He explained that as he graded the exam it was clear that the writing was not in Anastasia’s voice. He confirmed his suspicions by plugging questionable phrases into Internet search engines. Professor Vladimir then confronted Anastasia about her exam and asked that she bring herself to Honor Council, which she then did.

At the trial, Anastasia echoed Professor Vladimir’s account, explaining to the jury in detail the events surrounding the exam. Anastasia explained that she received the exam on Monday at noon and was to turn it in by noon that Thursday. She began studying on Wednesday but started to feel unprepared and decided to download practice essays and articles from the Internet. Anastasia told the jury that she employed an unusual test taking strategy: in Professor Vladimir’s four question exam, she began by answering the fourth question first and working through the test in reverse. Anastasia started the exam at 10:00 PM the night before it was due, and encountered extreme difficulty with the fourth question, not finishing her response until 2:30 AM. When Anastasia moved onto the next question, she began to use one of the downloaded articles, which she felt contained all the information she needed to answer the question (directly violating the exam’s instructions). Anastasia copied phrases from a relevant article into her exam, rephrasing them slightly. She moved onto question 2, using her response paper from earlier in the term to help answer the question, which was not a violation of test rules. At 5:30, Anastasia moved onto the final question and found she was incapable of answering it, so she
began an Internet search for answers and copied phrases from various articles found on the web. Finishing around 6:43 AM, Anastasia went to sleep before turning in the test just prior to the noon deadline.

All trial parties and the jury agreed that large amounts of the exam had been copied without citation of online sources, and that exam rules had been clearly violated. As a result, the jury reached the following statement of violation:

Anastasia Nikolaevna violated the Honor Code by both representing another person’s ideas and writing as her own, and failing to follow exam instruction by accessing online material when prohibited.

Circumstantial Portion: When asked by the jury to explain some of the circumstances that may have led to this violation of the Honor Code, Anastasia explained that since this exam had been during her first semester of college, she managed her exam time poorly, leaving only one day to complete Professor Vladimir’s exam. As a foreign student, she also struggled with English, her second language. Anastasia also felt that her e-sem (Bryn Mawr’s equivalent of Haverford’s freshman writing seminars) did not stress academic integrity. She explained that her difficulty with the language of the Royalty 101 caused her to disengage.

Anastasia claimed that she wished she hadn’t plagiarized and knew it was wrong, but felt overwhelmed. However, she also explained to the jury that in the time that elapsed between the violation and the trial, she had made progress on preventing future violations. She learned to manage her time better and received help to improve her English. However, in Anastasia’s discussion with the jury it became clear that there was still room for improvement in these areas. The jury unanimously consented to the following tentative resolutions:

1. The jury recommends that Anastasia Nikolaevna receive a 0.0 on her final exam. (all jurors consented)
2. Anastasia Nikolaevna will write a letter to the bi-college community to be released with the abstract reflecting on the trial process. (all jurors consented)
3. The jury strongly recommends that Anastasia Nikolaevna use the writing partner program within the Writing Center at Bryn Mawr College. (all jurors consented)
4. Anastasia Nikolaevna will complete Haverford College’s Committee for Plagiarism Education’s online academic integrity tutorial. The jury also recommends that Anastasia discuss this tutorial with a Writing Center tutor after completing it. (all jurors consented)
5. The jury recommends that Professor Vladimir Vasilovich and Anastasia Nikolaevna meet to complete the restorative process. (all jurors consented)
6. The jury recommends that Bryn Mawr College’s Honor Board release this abstract to the Bryn Mawr College community. (all jurors consented)
7. Anastasia Nikolaevna will not be separated from Haverford College. (all jurors consented)
8. The jury recommends that this violation not be reported to institutions of higher education. (all jurors consented)

Finalizing resolutions: The resolutions were fully explained to Anastasia, and she agreed with all of them. Following her departure, the jury consented to finalize the tentative resolutions, only
changing one of them to clarify that she could write separate letters to Bryn Mawr and Haverford if she wished.

The finalized resolutions were:

1. **The jury recommends that Anastasia Nikolaevna receive a 0.0 on her final exam.** (all jurors consented)
2. **Anastasia Nikolaevna will write [a] letter(s) to the Haverford and Bryn Mawr communities to be released with the abstract reflecting on the trial process.** (all jurors consented)
3. **The jury strongly recommends that Anastasia Nikolaevna use the writing partner program within the Writing Center at Bryn Mawr College.** (all jurors consented)
4. **Anastasia Nikolaevna will complete the Haverford College's Committee for Plagiarism Education's online academic integrity tutorial. The jury also recommends that Anastasia discuss this tutorial with a Writing Center tutor after completing it.** (all jurors consented)
5. **The jury recommends that Professor Vladimir Vasilovich and Anastasia Nikolaevna meet to complete the restorative process.** (all jurors consented)
6. **The jury recommends that Bryn Mawr College's Honor Board release this abstract to the Bryn Mawr College community.** (all jurors consented)
7. **Anastasia Nikolaevna will not be separated from Haverford College.** (all jurors consented)
8. **The jury recommends that this violation not be reported to institutions of higher education.** (all jurors consented)

**Letter to the Community:**

Dear Haverford College and Bryn Mawr College community,

The first thing my parents taught me was to be honest, and I always cherish honesty as the most fundamental value of being a human being. However, as you have read in the abstract, I have broken my own article of faith and have broken the trust that both communities stored on me. I am really sorry for what I have done in the fall semester, which violated the Honor Code and made me feel deep remorse.

It was my first semester here and I was ignorant and reckless. When the professor first came to me for the confrontation, I was very upset, and even a bit humiliated. I was not ready for such thing to happen in life and did not know what to do. I could not imagine how disappointed my parents would be if they knew. Most importantly, I felt like the wall of integrity inside my heart collapsed into pieces. But I knew that I was wrong, and the only thing I could do then is to apologize to the whole community.

If things were ever happen again, I would never do the same. I regretted so deeply and refused to forgive myself for a long time. Thus, I decided to cooperate well with the trial, being there for every session, and trying my best to restore trust. During the trial, I was so glad that both the jurors and my professor had shown me with their support and patience. Every one seemed to be willing to give me a chance to repair the breach of trust with the community, and I also wanted to. The whole process was smooth and the final resolution was fair and proper.

I have learned so much from the trail and this whole process is not a punishment to me anymore. It is a lifetime lesson which helps me to improve myself. What I have gained from this trail is that it allows me to reflect upon what I have done and be able to take responsibilities. I feel myself once again a full member of the entire Bryn Mawr and Haverford community.
**Discussion Questions:**

1. What does it mean to restore a Bryn Mawr students to “the community?” In letters to the community, should Bryn Mawr students address both colleges?

2. What more can Haverford do to help educate Bryn Mawr students about academic integrity? To what extent is it Haverford’s responsibility to do this?

3. How do you feel about the resolution concerning non-separation in this case?

4. To what extent should the cooperation of the confronted party be taken into account when formulating resolutions?

5. What is your opinion on the length and content of this abstract?