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Confronted Party: Lily Aldrin  
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Case Summary:
This case involves [Lily Aldrin], a student taking a [200-level Architecture] course with Professor [Ted Mosby]. [Professor Mosby] confronted [Lily] after he noticed that several sentences in a paper she had written were copied verbatim from her sources with parenthetical citation, but no direct quotation marks. [Lily] had copied text from her sources into her handwritten notes – notes which she then used to write her paper later on. [Lily] noted that she had had limited experience with conducting analytical research and citing sources. The jury agreed that [Lily] had violated the Honor Code by committing plagiarism and failing to adequately attribute information in her paper to her sources.

This trial was conducted with a reduced jury (9 jurors instead of the usual 10) with the consent of all parties involved, due to the lack of availability of an extra Honor Council juror. The jury consented to allow up to two members to stand outside of consensus.

Fact-Finding:
[Lily] began Fact-Finding by explaining that she typically writes a paper by handwriting notes from her sources, citing on top of the notes what source the information comes from, and cross-referencing where information overlaps. For this particular assignment, she noted that her notes were very detailed, and that there was a long window of time between her taking notes on her sources and writing her papers. [Lily] stated that she did not think she had done anything differently from her usual method for writing papers.
[Lily] said that she usually writes notes in her own words, but overlooked it in this case. She said she used to take notes in the document that would become her paper, but had a previous incident with [Ted] in which she accidentally turned in an unfinished copy of a paper that included uncited, direct quotes from her notes. [Ted] explained that they resolved the problem themselves and that [Lily] turned in the correct, properly cited version of her paper later that evening. [Lily] says that she has since avoided the practice of taking notes and writing her paper in the same document.

The jury noted that many sentences in [Lily]’s assignment were copied verbatim (with parenthetical citations but no quotation marks) from an [architecture] article, and asked [Lily] if it was possible that she had copied and pasted the text directly from the source. [Lily] said she didn’t think that was possible, and that she had simply copied down the information verbatim in her notes and forgotten to reword it in her paper.

In [Lily]’s original statement, she expressed surprise that what she had done was plagiarism, given that the sentences that she had copied were somewhat common knowledge. The jury asked [Lily] if she still felt this way, to which [Lily] replied that she currently had a different view upon seeing the full extent of the copying she did. The jury asked both parties if what [Lily] did constitutes plagiarism. [Lily] said she believed she committed accidental plagiarism, while [Ted] said that [Lily] had simply performed sloppy research and writing and was more concerned about [Lily], and all students at Haverford, learning how to perform these tasks correctly in the future.

The jury asked [Lily] if she had learned about plagiarism in her freshman writing seminar. [Lily] said that she had not, and that the last time she had learned about citations in research was in high school. [Lily] noted that this was her first class in which she was expected to perform this level of independent research. [Ted], [Lily], and the jury discussed how the freshman writing program might provide an opportunity to offer consistent training to incoming students on how to research and cite properly. [Ted] noted that professors of upper level classes have an expectation that their students have been taught how to conduct research and write papers with appropriate attribution. [Ted] emphasized the importance of [Lily] learning how to perform research and writing analysis in her own words and to attribute outside information.

The jury asked [Lily] if she had taken the Moodle online academic integrity tutorial. [Lily] said that she had, but that the questions on the academic integrity tutorial, while helpful, were not instructive on how to take notes on sources effectively and what habits one needs while performing research. [Lily] said that since being confronted, she had taken steps to re-read the standard protocol for citations, but still needed help on how to conduct research and use that research.

**Statement of Violation:**

The jury consented to the following statement of violation:
The jury feels that [Lily] violated the Honor Code by plagiarizing portions of text in an assignment and failing to adequately attribute information to her sources. (8 jurors consent, 1 juror stood outside due to absence)

Circumstantial:

The jury convened with [Lily] to discuss the circumstances surrounding her violation of the Honor Code. [Lily] described feeling very rushed on the assignment, especially given that it was the end of the semester and because she was already very busy with other commitments. Much of her focus was dedicated to other classes at the time, and so she neglected to give her paper its due diligence. When asked if she felt like she struggled with time management, [Lily] said that she was usually on top of things, but had taken steps to cut back on some of her other commitments this semester to make more time for schoolwork. The jury asked if [Lily] ever asked for extensions. [Lily] replied that she was definitely comfortable doing so and, on this particular paper, didn’t realize that she needed more time to read it over. The jury asked [Lily] if she felt like she was so overburdened that she might make the same mistake again. [Lily] said she believed that this was an isolated incident, and that if she had given the assignment more time, she would have caught her mistake in copying from her sources.

[Lily] was invited to suggest potential resolutions to address education, accountability, and restoration. [Ted] sent in his suggestions via email. Both emphasized the importance of [Lily] learning proper note-taking techniques and strategies for writing research papers to successfully incorporate outside sources and avoid plagiarism. Given that [Lily] had already received a 0 on her paper and that the paper represented only a small portion of her overall grade in her class, [Ted] said that he was uncomfortable changing [Lily]’s grade any further. The jury discussed the potential benefits of [Lily] meeting with the Writing Center and OAR to fill in the gaps in her understanding about research and citation. The jury also discussed the idea of [Lily] creating a guide, based on what she learned from the Writing Center and OAR, for other students on how to avoid the mistakes that she made while writing. The jury asked if [Lily] felt she had addressed the breach of trust between her and [Ted]. [Lily] said that they talked together after the Fact-Finding meeting and that she felt that they were on good terms.

Tentative Resolutions:

The jury consented upon the following tentative resolutions, with one member standing outside due to absence:

1. In order to learn how to effectively perform research and attribute information to outside sources, [Lily] will meet with the Writing Center and OAR as well as read Maud McInerney’s essay on plagiarism. (8 jurors consent, 1 stands outside consensus)

2. [Lily] will create a user-friendly guide on how to avoid plagiarism and
effectively perform research based on her experience addressing resolution 1. The jury recommends that [Lily] include a note to be presented with the guide about her violation and how it could have been avoided. The jury further recommends that the Writing Center make this guide available online and that the Freshman Writing Program make the guide available to students in freshman writing seminars. [Lily] will complete this guide before the end of the [redacted] semester. (8 jurors consent, 1 stands outside consensus)

3. The jury recommends that the Freshman Writing Program standardize plagiarism education in writing seminars, and provide information to freshmen on research strategies to avoid plagiarism. (8 jurors consent, 1 stands outside consensus)

4. The jury recommends that [Professor Mosby] make no further grade changes to [Lily]’s assignment, given that she has already been held accountable for her violation by receiving a 0 on the paper. (8 jurors consent, 1 stands outside consensus)

5. The jury recommends that [Lily] not be separated from Haverford College. (8 jurors consent, 1 stands outside consensus)

6. The jury recommends that this incident not be reported to institutions of higher learning. (8 jurors consent, 1 stands outside consensus)

7. [Lily] is invited, but not obligated, to write a letter to the community about her experience with plagiarism and her trial, to be included in the abstract. (8 jurors consent, 1 stands outside consensus)

Resolutions as a whole: (8 jurors consent, 1 stands outside consensus due to absence)

Finalizing Resolutions:

The jury convened with [Lily] to finalize resolutions. [Professor Mosby] sent his response to the jury by email, saying that he felt the resolutions were fair and educational. [Lily] approved all of the resolutions.

The jury consented upon the resolutions without any further changes:

1. In order to learn how to effectively perform research and attribute information to outside sources, [Lily] will meet with the Writing Center and OAR as well as read Maud McInerney’s essay on plagiarism. (7 jurors consent, 2 stand outside)

2. [Lily] will create a user-friendly guide on how to avoid plagiarism and effectively perform research based on her experience addressing resolution 1. The jury recommends that [Lily] include a note to be presented with the guide about her violation and how it could have been avoided. The jury further recommends that the Writing Center make this guide available online and that the Freshman Writing Program make the guide available to students in freshman
writing seminars. [Lily] will complete this guide before the end of the [redacted] semester. (7 jurors consent, 2 stand outside)

3. The jury recommends that the Freshman Writing Program standardize plagiarism education in writing seminars, and provide information to freshmen on research strategies to avoid plagiarism. (7 jurors consent, 2 stand outside)

4. The jury recommends that [Professor Mosby] make no further grade changes to [Lily]’s assignment, given that she has already been held accountable for her violation by receiving a 0 on the paper. (7 jurors consent, 2 stand outside)

5. The jury recommends that [Lily] not be separated from Haverford College. (7 jurors consent, 2 stand outside)

6. The jury recommends that this incident not be reported to institutions of higher learning. (7 jurors consent, 2 stand outside)

7. [Lily] is invited, but not obligated, to write a letter to the community about her experience with plagiarism and her trial, to be included in the abstract. (7 jurors consent, 2 stand outside)

Resolutions as a whole: (7 jurors consent, 2 stand outside consensus due to absence)

Post-Trial:

[Lily] opted not to write a letter to the community.

Discussion Questions:

1. Do you agree with the jury’s decision to not require [Lily] to write a letter to the community about her experience with plagiarism?

2. How can Haverford make sure that freshmen learn to avoid plagiarism, when everyone comes to Haverford with different levels of experience with analytical research and writing?

3. Taking directly from class notes can be an easy way to fill up a portion of a paper, but in this case the need to cite was overlooked. What are other easy but potentially problematic situations like this? What are some effective practices for being aware of how to stay on the right track when you are pressed for time and pages?