A. Abstract Discussion: Great Gatsby and 30 Rock
   1. Michelle: any interesting discussion points in 30 Rock?
   2. Brianna: what purpose does a trial serve if party not returning/should that affect resolutions
   3. Michelle: do we know if party intends to return?
   4. Michelle: got impression jury knew she was returning
   5. Ari: juror on trial; did know party was coming back
   6. Michelle: were there difficulties with trial taking so long to start?
   7. Ari: troubles with communication; trial over skype, and english not first language
      i. biggest issues with party understanding what she did, not timeline of events
   8. Ari: agreed to help her with letter, but never heard anything about it from council
      i. Dela: mentions this in abstract
   9. Ari: seniors on trial; expecting them to participate further after graduation probably not effective
   10. Chris: seems having resolutions requiring jury to be committed to process months/years after conclusion of trial seems counterproductive
      i. Ari: spent a lot of time with her; wanted to make sure she fully understood violation; seemed feasible at time to ask jurors to help with letter
   11. Dela: did it seem party was on same page by end of trial
      i. Ari: seemed like party said what jury wanted to hear; seemed like there was more of a fear than a feeling of restoration
   12. Dela: wonders if feelings toward Code differs between Bryn Mawr international/domestic students
   13. Chris: BMC students do not have same level of plagiarism education as Haverford students do
   14. Ari: mom works with international students at another school; similar issues arise; very hard for some international students to adjust
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15. Dela: interesting that Haverford international students are not overrepresented in trials, while BMC international students are
   i. James: BMC international students not overrepresented at Bryn Mawr, just Haverford
16. Ari: thinks we do a better job of incorporating international students into the community through Customs, as opposed to BMC
17. Michelle: do people think party should have been asked to repair breach of trust with person she copied off up?
   i. Kyle: if person did not know they were copied, it might be weird
   ii. James: breach of trust still present
18. Brianna: initial thought reading letter was that party was saying what community wanted to hear, although language barrier may be a contributing factor
   i. letter has discrepancies with abstract
   ii. Ari: abstract written long time after trial; may be a factor
19. Dela: why did resolutions include meetings with GAs (graduate assistants)?
   i. Ari: idea that jury wanted party to talk to someone who knew about stress/stress management, but did not want to mandate CAPS
   ii. Ari: did not want resolution to be scary; counseling could be seen as more harsh
20. James: letter seems to focus on relationship with professor alone, rather than also mentioning larger breach of trust with community
21. Ari: trial goals (education, restoration, accountability) difficult when party does not seem to understand them
   i. Ari: still not convinced that party sees her actions as violation
22. Brianna: wonders whether letter would have been approved if jurors had reviewed it
   i. Ari: maybe not, but various factors caused jury review to be impossible
   ii. Ari: good letter; what is tipping point from good to great? I don’t think we are able to judge
23. Chris: is there any sort of program at Bryn Mawr that would have stopped this from happening?
   i. Ari: more training has been happening lately, especially in response to high numbers of BMC international students violating Haverford Code
   ii. Ari: wishes there was more discussion about Code in classes
24. Michelle: any initial thoughts on Gatsby
25. Chris: really likes the way trial went; almost ideal
   i. party took himself to Council; talked with Prof before trial; admitted what he did; letter seems genuine
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26. Dela: interesting when party talks in letter about how warm/welcoming jurors were; I think a lot about parties I am on a jury for; I worry that this does not always come across
27. Michelle: what do people think of jury’s decision not to separate?
   i. Chris: does seem lenient, as party so intentionally plagiarized
   ii. Dela: interesting case when jury decides not to separate when party seems contrite and understanding; brings into question purpose of separation
   iii. Chris: separation plays into accountability part
   iv. Brianna: I feel sometimes people are far into being stressed; separation requires stepping back and looking at bigger picture; may be unnecessary if party can already do this
28. Brianna: interesting wording for grad school reporting
   i. Michelle: first trial I chaired; guidelines for reporting said to give a reason
29. James: going back to separation; I see it more as a restorative thing; for some, can be a time for reflection; for others, can be seen as a rejection
30. Michelle: part of what went into decision for separation was that party was already off-campus for reasons outside of trial; should this be considered?
   i. Dela: yes; could be seen as punishment otherwise; goals of separation may already be accomplished
31. James: for this case, separation should be seen more of a restorative tool; does not really work with accountability here
32. Chris: separation as an accountability tool seems almost wrong
33. James: If we only do separation for restoration, and doesn’t undo damage, then why do we call it accountability?
   i. Dela: need to take time to learn how to do things differently, which can be part of undoing damage
34. Dela: people conflate restoration and accountability in terms of separation
35. Melissa: disagrees with idea that separation only restorative; the restoration comes from the accountability being carried out by the act of separation
36. Dela: on trials, always attempts to look at systemic causes of violations; maybe we are moving in that direction as a community/Council
37. Chris: blame can’t entirely be placed on confronted party
38. James: Melissa, what do you think accountability is?
39. Melissa: preserves a sense of compassionate fairness in the community; allows professors and students to trust in our system
40. James: I agree. Why should separation serve that purpose?
41. Melissa: Professors and community feel there is consequence and distance; it really is tied to restoration
42. Chris: seems like a big part of accountability is preserving faith professors have in our system; people assume that if no punishment, more people will violate in future
   i. Melissa: also brings us slightly closer to level of consequences at other institutions; equalizes the process; without consequences, our system would be even less credible from an outside perspective
43. Discussion about whether Honor Council members should be paid and time commitment
44. Long discussion about Parks and Rec (the abstract)