A. Abstract Discussion: Lion King, Good Will Hunting, Sound of Music, and Great Expectations
   1. Moment of Silence
   2. Jack: found Good Will Hunting interesting, because it was an academic case involving two deans (joint panel)
   3. Confusion about why 10 students were not available over the summer
   4. Jack: can see why it could be logistically challenging; called to serve on jury one summer but trial could not be scheduled
   5. Erin: interesting that confronted party thought that having deans on panel was helpful
   6. Irene: he was probably not on trial before; did not have anything else to compare it to
   7. Jack: party might be more responsive to deans with a certain mindset
   8. Rebecca: interesting that he wanted trial during summer; seems like odd timing
   9. Erin: semester of separation probably changed logistics a lot
  10. Franklin: happy that trial had deans only because Council was respecting party’s wishes of holding trial during summer
  11. Michelle: do you think it was appropriate to send trial to a joint panel?
  12. Irene: not inappropriate, but a better solution probably could have been found (extenuating circumstances did not exist at the time)
  13. Jack: appreciate Council bringing resolutions to plenary concerning procedural improvements, but always feels Council has right intentions when modifying procedure on the fly
  14. Irene: explains extenuating circumstances clause-Council can modify trial procedures with consent of parties if necessary to complete trial in a timely manner, out of fairness to parties (only used if normal procedures impossible to follow)
  15. Brianna: good to err on side of caution in this case, because extenuating circumstances did not exist
16. Erin: explains joint panel—usually used for cases involving harassment and discrimination and other legal issues; usually not used for academic cases
17. Rebecca: interesting how early in semester plagiarism seemed to start, without it being noticed until the end of the semester
18. Jack: issue of timing interesting; one semester of separation can really throw off schedules
19. Brianna: maybe professor suspected cheating on midterm, and then noticed it again in the final and went back
20. Irene: plagiarism might be overlooked if not blatant, but once found professors might look back at people’s earlier assignments
21. Discussion of Great Expectations
22. Irene: for Great Expectations letter was very strongly worded; what do people think about that?
23. Erin: party might have used this tone to frame issue in a certain way
24. Michelle: first discussion question interesting; asks if professors should remove temptations to cheat
25. Rebecca: I have had professors ask class to move around (especially in Stokes Aud), but that it more because Stokes can get cramped and make it hard not to see someone else’s paper
26. Jack: had classes where student’s self-graded their own exams; is it worth it to trust students to do this?
27. Irene: that is why Code is great; allows professors to do things like that
28. Irene: Code asks students not to cheat and consider temptations; also professors should design tests so that students can succeed without cheating
29. Irene: may be against spirit of Code for professors to remove temptations (such as by proctoring)
30. Franklin: confronted party took exam in separate room; this was probably a large temptation
31. Erin: interesting how confrontation happened; professor happened to walk in at right time; also interesting how professor allowed student to continue taking test (although he chose not to)
32. Irene: I like how professor did that; reflects idea of innocent until proven guilty
33. Michelle: also liked how it showed Professor was willing to trust judgement of jury regarding grade changes on exam
34. Jack: if student thought it through beforehand, striking that student chose such an obvious way to cheat; wonders if student felt guilty while doing it
35. Erin: way he cheated suggested desperation
36. Jack: last resolution regarding reviewing steps for when to report to grad schools interesting; these recommendations in older abstracts especially seem somewhat arbitrary
37. Erin: newer wording frames it in an interesting light; more recent
abstracts mention whether or not the jury considers the trial in question a disciplinary proceeding (and thus if incident should be reported)

38. Erin: in some ways this seems contradictory to goals of trial, as grad school reporting does not conform to “blank slate” idea of restoration; but on the other hand I do think it is important for juries to make this recommendation

39. Jack: talking with Dan Weiss at Donuts with Dan today; he expressed that Honor Council resolutions sometimes seem harsher than other schools (short of expulsion); especially due to long list of resolutions parties have to complete

40. Irene: in some ways we are more lenient and in other ways we are more harsh; we hold trials for cases which would never make it to a hearing at larger schools; on the other hand for bigger violations we do not automatically separate people

41. [Discussion of plagiarism vs. violation of exam instructions]

42. Michelle: reporting to grad schools often depends on ideologies of jurors

43. Irene: we have new guidelines for this, but they are still very interpretable; also feel that juries often base recommendation on attitudes of parties during trial

44. Erin: somewhat surprised that this case was reported

45. Irene: for me, intentionality plays in strongly for this, and this case was intentional

46. Brianna: for me, intentionality plays in more to separation

47. Chris: on a jury for a plagiarism case; not convinced that it was intentional, so why tell grad schools if she will probably never plagiarize again? (now that she has been through the trial process and is more educated about what plagiarism is)

48. Irene: grad school resolutions are recommendations to the Dean of the College; not sure how much explanation occurs

49. Jack: there is a box on student’s application to grad schools asking about plagiarism, with chance to explain (though answer box is small)

50. Jack: Haverford is an accredited institution, so every 7 years an outside group comes in and makes sure the College is being credible

51. Chris: curious why some abstracts missing information

52. Michelle: for all three of these (LK, SOM, GWH) chair’s report never finished; notes were lost; chairs could not be contacted (we tried a lot)

53. Erin: one thing we have been doing recently is taking computerized notes during trials, for better record keeping (though at a cost; some people disagree with this)

54. Irene: person taking notes often never speaks during trial, but is still a full consenting member of jury

55. [discussion of how best to take notes during trial]
56. Melissa, Olivia, and Natalie walk in
57. Melissa interested in talking about Sound of Music
58. Melissa: confronted party didn’t participate in person because of “serious mental health condition” - brings up potential problem with system; trial process can be too intense or emotionally difficult for some people
59. Jack: For such major violation (50% plagiarized), resolutions seem pretty light
60. Irene: think there’s fluctuation in number of resolutions; some older abstracts have much fewer resolutions
61. Irene: when confronted party not in room, hard to tailor resolutions to specific circumstances
62. Brianna: people take responsiveness into account when thinking or resolutions - wonder how Liesl’s absence was interpreted by the jury in this case
63. Jack: if someone not going to participate in trial, why proceed with the trial? Bothered that Liesl did not show up
64. Irene: various anxiety disorders, or depression, may have been preventing her from showing up; trial may have been triggering
65. Jack: maybe a middle point could have been reached, between coming to trial and not coming; maybe chair could have met individually with Liesl; also written words aren’t necessarily as genuine as spoken
66. Irene: also with written statement, jury can’t ask clarifying questions, jury can misinterpret the tone
67. Melissa: Remember though that Liesl did have a phone conversation with chair
68. Olivia: but then trial chair has a perspective that the rest of the jury does not
69. Erin: example of how trial process privileges certain type of personality and background; influences the jury’s view of the violation
70. Michelle: should changes be made to the trial process to make it more equitable?
71. Melissa: Yes, but not sure how
72. Irene: think you would lose a lot of important aspects of trial; for example, if people only presented prepared statement, lose ability to ask questions, etc.
73. Jack: sometimes circumstantial portion can be place to gain insight into how trial process affecting confronting party
74. Olivia: Fine line between efficiency and trying to create the most fair trial process
75. Natalie: more about having ability to adapt than about having set of guidelines
76. Melissa: Not every juror has received training on cultural differences and taking language differences into account; unfortunately hard to count on people taking these things into
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consideration
77. Irene: sometimes nervous, shy party doesn’t come off as well as someone who is readily engaging; bias created by something like this may not be easily recognized by the jury
78. Jack: At some point, being more and more accommodating ends up being less fair for certain people
79. Discussion about fact that jury didn’t come to unified decision regarding reporting to institutions of higher learning
80. Move on to discussion of Lion King
81. Michelle: Grade change recommendation seems harsh, considering that Simba didn’t think he had gained any unfair advantage
82. Erin: But it was probably very clear that what he did was not allowed
83. Erin: Pointed out that professor did not implement recommended grade change; Brianna says she agrees with this decision - thought recommended grade change was harsh
84. Melissa: regardless of unfair advantage, she supports the “Guggenheimer Approach”: someone who violated the Code shouldn’t be given same grade as someone who didn’t violate the Code; important to accountability and restoration
85. Melissa: interesting that jury recommended a 0.0 or 1.0
86. Olivia: a 1.0 is passing
87. Melissa: maybe juries should consider recommending 1.0 more often, because can make a huge difference, especially if the grade in question is the grade for the course
88. Brianna: feel this case would go a lot differently if happened today
89. Erin: could even see it being dropped by Council
90. Melissa: if confronted party had talked to professor and able to resolve it, could maybe see Council dropping it
91. Olivia: also, with dropping vs. go to trial, how much does professor’s say in the matter weigh Council’s decision
92. Melissa: in past, certain cases have been dropped that have upset professors a lot
93. Olivia: wonder if whether how apologetic person is in statement influences whether or not Council drops a case