A. Abstract Discussion: Friends

1. Moment of Silence:
2. David: surprised by the idea of inappropriate collaboration before a test, surprised by professor accepting the resolution
3. Naji: Jury thought they cheated on the test itself, but was not confident enough to make such a statement of violation. Group studying is a valid way to learn. One student had only memorized, not understood the concepts. Nothing in academia is fully understood, some things must be taken for granted, to some degree. Is this really a moral problem?
4. David: Why can’t you memorize and regurgitate information on a test? That is the way tests typically work. Saying that original information is required on a test is necessary is ridiculous
5. Katie: The confronted parties were allowed to study together, not take it together. The Professor clearly thought, they had taken it together, and did not think it was possible to memorize and regurgitate answers for this test due to complexity.
6. David: The resolutions of the jury implies that the problem was the level of reproduction. Jury was unwilling to make the leap to collaboration on test.
7. Naji: Since jury was not confident, they should have just minimized resolutions. It is uncomfortable, that this idea of studying together too closely should lead to such harsh resolutions. They should recommend a change in study habits instead, there is a discrepancy between the statement of violation and resolutions
8. Irene: the solutions should always be your own, we usually see this on problem sets, not exams, but the idea still applies.
9. David: That’s true for problem sets, but how does it work for exams. What about the call logs that were entered as evidence? Should text messages not also have been entered. It seems unfair that he got to choose what information the jury saw more clearly.
10. Kyle: Juries don’t usually go looking for information.
11. Bri: I would have liked to hear how the jury took that information. It is very likely that they disregarded this information.
12. Naji: Whose job is it to collect evidence?
13. Irene/Kyle: The parties bring us information they think is relevant, and the jury asks them questions. No one seeks out evidence beyond what was presented.
14. David: Is the question about International students appropriate?
15. Katie: I think it was because the parties brought it up as a reason, I think customs could do more to help International students.
16. David: I think there are a lot of international students don’t appreciate being targeted by the Haverford administration for extra education, since it seems to imply they are deficient in some way.
17. Kyle: I was interested by the third question, why did they include this question
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when it never appears in the abstract?
18. Bri: It's not like we know who said what in the trial. Important things may have come from them, but it would not be clear.
19. David: What happens when a jury is deadlocked?
20. Kyle: We continue discussion, sometimes for a very long time.
21. James: a recent example of this was Parks and Recreation.
22. Irene: That's brought up a lot because we can see that the jury was divided, but I think it happens a lot more and the jury talks for a long time and eventually reaches agreement.
23. Naji: It's strange that the jury gave them resolutions for something they weren't willing to say.
24. Bri: These resolutions seem very different from what we would have if they thought the student took the exam together. They would get a lot more otherwise
25. Discussion of what the resolutions may have looked like.
26. Irene: If it was open notes, then maybe sharing notes would have been inappropriate.
27. David: But in several classes notes are not discussed.
28. Discussion on whether or not the test could have been open notes.
29. James: In the student's constitution, it says we need to be beyond a reasonable doubt, which might have something to do with it. I think I agree with the jury's decision here.
30. Bri: How do we proceed without admitted guilt, when it seems clear that it happened. I've never seen it handled perfectly.
31. David: I think it depends on the composition of the jury.
32. James: It's a tough situation. Honor Council process is restorative, so what are they getting out of the trial process if there is a statement of non-violation.
33. David: Do you think the professor didn't care what the grade change was, since he didn't think they would pass the class either way? Could be a major deciding point on whether or not he supports the resolutions
34. Bri: do you think the jury should consider whether or not a student passes the class when deciding on a grade change?
35. Katie: They should recommend a grade change that seems fair based on the understanding of the violation, but it should not be punitive.
36. Kyle: something that leads to failing the course could be seen as more punitive.
37. ?: what is the purpose of the grade change? A tangible impact, or upholding a principle of not receiving credit for work not done honestly? If second, the jury should not consider the overall grade. Juries probably fall somewhere in between.
38. David: If you plagiarize a paper, you get a zero on the paper, you don't just subtract the paragraph its in. Should they be treated differently because they are in a different discipline.
39. Bri: To me, this is why it seems they were considering inappropriate collaboration instead of collaborating on a test.
40. Kyle: how can you memorize material for the questions as described by the professor
41. Bri: there is probably some piece we can't see, but to the jury it may have made more sense.
42. David: situations like these make the job very hard for jurors, they should not be the ones the most frustrated by the process
43. ?: we don't want anyone frustrated or upset by the process.
44. James: could we view this as a sort of plagiarism? Where are they memorizing these answers from? A textbook?
45. Bri: I think the part they kept credit for was memorized from a textbook, which is
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46. James: I would be hesitant to call it plagiarism, but I think that’s part of what is going on.
47. Kyle: I think that’s why the SOV is so vague.
48. Naji: One of the parties expressed regret about memorizing, not about working with friend.
49. We aren’t sure what happened to the second letter, but we think the one that is there is from Phoebe.
50. Naji: There is always a risk that someone is just trying to please the jury with what they write, and they sometimes feel stilted.
51. Bri: It’s also interesting, even if they are faking it, to see what they choose to fake.
52. Katie: What does “Topics in Central Perk” mean?
53. Irene: It’s the class; the coffee shop in which the Friends hang out.
54. James: there are two parts of the Honor Pledge, we always hold them to the specific actions, but are our ideas not sometimes in violation of the concepts of personal and collective responsibility?
55. Naji: But what does responsibility mean? Is it not also the jury’s responsibility to be clear and helpful? Or is it solely our responsibility to take action
56. James: a party who takes responsibility for their violation might be less in violation than someone who does not.
57. Katie: I think in abstracts, the parties who take responsibility get stronger resolutions, the ones who do not get middle ground
58. Kyle: Our system assumes that students who violate the code say they violated the code.
59. Katie: In some trials where the party is very forthright, they still get a lot happening to them.
60. Naji: You can’t assume that just because something goes to trial, the code has been violated. Shouldn’t it be innocent until proven guilty? If they are adamant that they haven’t violated the code, the general conclusion, in the absence of strong evidence, they should not reach a statement of violation.
61. James: when the jury comes to a statement of violation, they should not water down the resolutions, since they have already committed to the idea that a violation has occurred. A secondary violation occurs when they fail to take responsibility.
62. Moment of silence