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Key:
Professor Ira Glass - Confronting party
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Melissa Block - A second confronted party, whose case was not sent to trial
Pledge Drive Fundraising 200 - Professor Ira Glass’s course
Jad Abumrad - Pledge Drive Fundraising 200 student who brought this case to Council

Summary:
Melissa Block and Terry Gross, students in Professor Ira Glass’ class on Pledge Drive Fundraising, separately took extra time on a test with a 70 minute deadline. Honor Council decided that Melissa and Professor Glass had effectively worked out education, accountability and restoration\(^1\) on their own, but that Terry Gross’ case needed to go to trial to achieve those goals. There were a number of conflicts and disagreements during the trial process, including who the confronting party was, how to keep the trial restorative and not punitive, an initial resolution academically separating Terry from Haverford which was later removed, and the rights of juries and faculties with respect to one another. In the end the finalized resolutions and the trial process left the jury and Terry Gross feeling as though the proper education, accountability, and restoration were back on track, though Professor Glass was left with some frustrations with the trial process.

Pre-Trial:
Jad Abumrad contacted Honor Council because he noticed that a number of students had taken extra time on a Pledge Drive Fundraising 200 exam. He wanted advice on how to proceed,

\(^1\) These are the three areas on which a trial would normally focus.
because he and many of his friends in the course agreed that they would have done significantly better on the test had they had the extra time the other students did. Council recommended that he should speak to Professor Glass personally in order to determine the best way to proceed.

Incidentally, Professor Ira Glass had noticed two particular students had taken extra time: Terry Gross and Melissa Block. Professor Glass then separated their late exams from the pile, and (prior to Honor Council proceedings) reduced their grades to the scores he believed that they would have earned had they turned the exam in on time, and then reduced them one grade point further as a penalty.

One week later, Professor Glass emailed Terry, a Bryn Mawr international student in the class, asking her to meet with him about the late exam. She replied that she had taken extra time because she had been struggling with a problem. Terry was absent from class that day, so they did not meet until two weeks later because of Fall Break. When they did meet, Terry was defensive and argued that Professor Glass should have announced the potential lateness penalty to the class before the exam, and that the grade penalty was too severe. While her original test grade had been a 4.0, Professor Glass had estimated that she would have had a 3.0 without the extra time, and then reduced it further to a 2.0 as a penalty. Professor Glass also met with Melissa, a Haverford student, who said that she had been confused about the time instructions on the test, and had lost track of time while working. Melissa said that she understood that she had not followed exam instructions, and understood and accepted that she would be subjected to a grade penalty.

Unaware that Professor Glass had already contacted Terry and Melissa, Honor Council informed him that a student had alerted Council to a potential violation of the Honor Code in his class. Professor Glass then emailed Terry and Melissa separately, informing them that he had been notified by Honor Council that their late submission of the test may have been an Honor Code violation, and asking them to each contact Honor Council.

The next day, Honor Council contacted Jad and informed him that, while Council was unaware as to whether or not he had spoken with Professor Glass, the matter was being handled. Jad replied that he no longer felt that action was necessary, since he did not know exactly who it had been and did not want to cause trouble for students who had taken only an appropriate amount of time.

After being confronted, a party has one week to contact Honor Council. Melissa contacted Honor Council within one week of being emailed by Professor Glass, but Terry did not. After one week elapsed, an Honor Council Co-Chair contacted both Professor Glass and Terry to ask that they send statements to Council. Professor Glass sent a statement, while Terry did not respond. Honor Council sent four reminder emails, cc-ing Terry’s dean on the last few. After one month of reminder emails and a meeting with her dean, Terry sent in a statement.

Professor Glass contacted Honor Council seeking clarification as to whether he or Jad was the confronting party. One of the Honor Council Co-Chairs clarified that because Jad had generally contacted Council without names, because Jad no longer felt comfortable proceeding
with Honor Council action, and because it was Professor Glass who had formally confronted Melissa and Terry, Professor Glass would be the confronting party. However, it was decided that Jad could be included in the event of a trial to help facilitate an understanding of the breach of trust with the community.

**Statements and Honor Council Deliberations**

After receiving statements from Professor Glass, Melissa, and Terry, Honor Council met to discuss whether or not to send either student to trial.

In her brief statement, Melissa said that she felt that the problem had been addressed by the actions Professor Glass had taken to adjust their grades. Melissa explained that she “completely agreed with” the decision Professor Glass had made to adjust her grade to reflect the fact that she had had an additional 20 minutes to complete the test, as well as the decision to assess an additional penalty.

Terry, in her statement, said that she was rushing to fix several answers at the end of the exam. Seeing other students taking their time handing the exam in, she continued writing as fast as she could. It took longer than she expected to finish writing, and she estimated that she handed the exam in 8-10 minutes late. Looking back, Terry said that what she did was unfair to other students, but that she had taken too much time by accident under the stress of time pressure. She said her instinct to take more time was driven by a motivation to get a better grade and demonstrate her hard work in the class, as well as seeing other students handing in their exams gradually. Terry said that she would not have continued writing had she known that there would be a grade penalty or an Honor Code violation, and that such a penalty should have been mentioned either by the Professor or the Honor Code. Terry argued that the time she wasted (30-40 minutes) incorrectly solving one of the problems would more than compensate for the 8-10 minutes of extra time she took on the exam. While she understood that it would be unfair were she not to be penalized, Terry expressed frustration that her exam grade was reduced from a 4.0 to a “ridiculously low” 2.0. She emphasized that she respected the Honor Code and intended to cooperate with whatever decision Honor Council came to.

In his statement, Professor Glass elaborated on the timeline of the violation. He also described his meeting with Terry, and said that she “took the position that she was entitled to devote the time she found necessary to perfect her test answers” and that she “argued that [he] had unfairly punished her twice” and should have announced the possibility and the extent of the penalty beforehand. Professor Glass countered that students should know the Honor Code’s rules about exam instructions, and that not doing so could result in a penalty at the professor’s discretion. Terry had claimed not to know of that provision in the Code, but Professor Glass “rejected that claim and responded that by enrolling at Bryn Mawr College and by taking a course at Haverford College she was subject to, and responsible for knowing, the provisions of the Honor Code.”

Over the course of three meetings, Honor Council deliberated over what to do with
Melissa's and Terry’s cases. Melissa and Terry had clearly failed to follow the exam instructions, and Honor Council quickly consented to a suspicion of violation for both cases. Much of the deliberation was spent discussing whether or not Melissa and Terry should have the same outcome, given that they had both violated exam instructions. The conversation was redirected to address one case at a time, so as not to get bogged down in comparing them.

In reading Terry’s statement, several Council members felt like her statement was trying to justify her actions, that she was primarily concerned about the grade change, and that she didn’t seem to understand the Honor Code. One person expressed that Terry’s reaction to her grade change represented a disconnect between her and the community, as well as between her and Professor Glass. The weight of the room felt that a trial could be empowering and restorative for her. Ultimately, Council came to consensus to send Terry’s case to a trial, with two members standing outside consensus.

Regarding Melissa, several Council members felt that education, restoration, and accountability had already been taken care of, and that a trial would not accomplish anything. Others were concerned that a trial would be helpful to repair the breach of trust with the community, as professors trust students daily to not make the mistake that Melissa (and Terry) had. One Council member argued that a trial is a large investment of time and energy, and would be counterproductive, if not punitive in and of itself, for a case like Melissa’s. One Council member pointed out that it seemed like Melissa and Professor Glass had already come to a mutual understanding. In the same vein, another person expressed concern that sending Melissa’s case to a trial would indicate a mistrust for the community to resolve matters on their own. Several Council members expressed that were Melissa’s case not to be sent to trial, they would want the community to be informed about it nevertheless. Ultimately, Council unanimously consented to drop Melissa’s case, with the proviso that she be asked to consider writing a letter to the community, that her case be made public, and that she meet with one of the Honor Council co-chairs to discuss this outcome.

**Interim:**

One of the Co-Heads of Honor Council met with Melissa. They discussed the contents and form of the possible letter to the community, but Melissa decided not to write the letter.

Due to procedural delays, Terry’s trial convened about a month later (approximately two months after the incident had taken place). Invoking the Extenuating Circumstances clause of the Students’ Constitution, with the consent of Honor Council and the confronting and confronted parties, the trial was convened with a jury of four Honor Council jurors and five community jurors. The diversity requirements for this jury were unchanged. Because of the many demands being made of the Honor Council Co-Chairs at the time, this trial was chaired by another experienced member of Honor Council.

**Preliminary Meeting for Terry Gross’s Trial:**
Because of the atypical jury composition, it was procedurally unclear how many jurors could stand outside of consensus on a decision before the decision would be blocked. The jury consented unanimously to allow up to two jurors to stand outside of consensus. The jury also agreed that, while the Bi-Co liaison is procedurally not a consenting member of the jury, her approval/disapproval of the resolutions would be officially noted during consensus.

The jury was particularly concerned with the fact that many students in the class had witnessed the potential violation and that it seemed from Jad’s statement that more students than just Terry had taken extra time. While the jury agreed that this trial should focus on Terry’s case, it was also decided that, should the trial reach Circumstantial Portion, Jad would be brought in to help address some of these concerns in person.

Fact Finding:

Professor Glass began Fact-Finding by noting that he felt that Jad, not Professor Glass, was the true confronting party in this case.

Professor Glass then explained that when he handed out the test, he explicitly told the students that they had 70 minutes to take the test and pointed out the clock in the room. He then spent the duration of the test period in the hallway, available for students to ask him questions. He re-entered the classroom twice: once to clarify a point and once to give a ten-minute warning before the end of the exam. When time was up, he asked students to hand in their tests. He then announced a ten-minute break before proceeding into the day’s lecture. Approximately ten minutes into the lecture (twenty minutes after time was called) Terry came to the front of the room and turned in her test. Professor Glass stated that he believed there was no Honor Code violation because there had been no dishonesty, deception or attempt to deceive, and therefore he had no obligation to confront Terry. He considered turning in the “open-book, open-notes, no collaboration” test after the time when it was due like a situation in which a student turns in an “open-book, open notes, no collaboration” homework assignment after the time when it is due. He devised what he thought was an appropriate course of action based on the method he used to penalize late homework. He added that when he later asked Terry why she had taken extra time, she said it was because she was stuck. He also clarified that, as of her meeting with him, she was not aware of the provisions of the Honor Code regarding following instructions.

Reading directly from her statement, Terry gave her side of the story. It began with a disagreement as to Professor Glass’s estimate of the extra time she had taken; Terry believed it to be in the range of 8-10 minutes and stated that she turned in her exam before Professor Glass commenced the lecture. She also reiterated that her classmates got up gradually to turn their tests in, leading her to believe that the time limit was casual. She clarified that a number of her other college classes had casual time limits, though time limits in her high school classes were always very strict. Terry told the jury that she was not aware until Professor Glass told her so that her action was a potential Honor Code violation. Terry also stated that she believed that the two-month delay between the incident and the trial clouded her and others’ memory, and as a
result, it was inappropriate for a trial to be convened at this point.

A juror asked why, if multiple students had turned in their tests late, Terry was the only one being singled out for trial. The Trial Chair clarified that if other incidents had arisen out of this situation, they would be handled separately by Honor Council, and would be outside the purview of this jury and Terry.

**Jury Deliberations and Statement of Violation:**

After the parties left, the jury proceeded immediately into deliberations. Because the guidelines for the Bi-Co Liaison were unclear as to what the Bi-Co Liaison’s role in this stage was, the jury consented unanimously to permit the Bi-Co Liaison to answer questions and make points of clarification but not independently to bring up her own original ideas.

The jury felt that taking extra time on a test was not within the bounds of what is permitted by the Code. Some jurors believed that it constituted a violation of community standards, but others were unclear on what those standards were, particularly with regards to differences between taking extra time on exams and turning homework assignments in late. Those jurors felt it would be unfair to hold Terry to an undefined set of standards. The jury agreed that taking extra time constituted not following the professor’s instructions to ask for a time limit.

Since much of the discussion centered around Terry being unaware that the time limit was a strict rather than casual deadline, the jury discussed whether or not she should have asked for clarification. Most jurors agreed that she should have asked for clarification if confused, and that failure to do so was likely a violation of the Code. However, it also seemed unreasonable to expect her, while under time pressure, to ask a question along the lines of “Will I be penalized for turning this in late?” and therefore chose to leave it out of the Statement of Violation.

The jury also discussed Terry’s delay in contacting Honor Council. The jury was displeased with the amount of time and number of reminders required before Terry replied to Honor Council. They were concerned that Terry had argued against a trial due to the delay, when a significant portion of that delay was her fault. When asked, the Bi-Co liaison explained that at Bryn Mawr, confronted parties have an explicit timetable for communicating with Honor Board (ex. 48 hours to send in Statement, etc.). Recognizing that such requirements are not written into the Haverford Honor Code, nor consequences for failing to do so, the jury felt uncomfortable explicitly declaring this to be a violation of the Honor Code in their Statement, but they thought it was still worth including.

Ultimately, the jury consented to the following Statement of Violation:

*Terry violated the Honor Code by not following the instructions of the professor in exceeding the time allotted for the test. Additionally, Terry did not actively report herself to Honor Council after being confronted.* (All jurors consented; Bi-Co liaison approved)
Circumstantial Portion:

Although Jad intended to come to Circumstantial, last-minute circumstances prevented him from attending. The Bi-Co liaison was also unable to attend. Professor Glass chose to attend. Terry also attended, and again referred to her written statement throughout the meeting.

Terry opened Circumstantial Portion by telling the jury that the delay between the incident and the trial meant that she did not remember much. She also said that she was not thinking perfectly when she took extra time because of the time pressure. Finally, she reminded the jury that in her experience in the Bi-Co, time limits had generally been casual.

Professor Glass told the jury that he at first thought it was “audacious” of Terry to turn her in exam late, but later realized that it was not personal. He said that he saw the issue as resolved academically, and felt that the trial was sufficient to educate her. He told the jury that, otherwise, Terry was doing well in the class.

To further explain the grade change, Professor Glass said that he was tempted to give Terry a 0.0, but when he contacted Terry’s dean to ask if there were any extenuating circumstances in Terry’s life, he received information that persuaded him to reduce her grade to where he thought it would have been had she not taken extra time, and then the additional penalty of one grade level. Professor Glass also clarified that he did not think of the incident in terms of the Honor Code until after the Co-Chair contacted him, because he did not view Terry’s behavior as dishonest or as an attempt to deceive. When prompted, Terry chose not to elaborate on the “circumstances” that Professor Glass mentioned.

Terry explained that she had been caught up on a question that she needed to answer in order to work on other questions, and that the extra time she took was to make up for the time she wasted while stuck on that question. Had she been aware that Professor Glass graded on the process and not strictly on the answer, she said, she probably would not have taken extra time. Professor Glass had told the students to show their work, but had not given a specific outline of how the exam would be graded.

Terry told the jury that she did not try to hide the fact that she continued to work after time was called. She believed that she might get a grade reduction, but she wanted to turn in her best work. Furthermore, she saw at least a few other students around her continuing to work after time was called. Professor Glass said that he was speaking to students during the break, therefore was unaware that Terry had continued to work on her exam until she handed it in.

When asked why it took so long for her to contact Honor Council, Terry stated that she was taking 6 classes at the time, including courses at Swarthmore and Penn, so she had lengthy commutes during the day and did not have Internet access during those commutes. She also stated that she was entirely unfamiliar with the Honor Council process; while she knew that Bryn Mawr had an Honor Code, her familiarity with it was limited to a feeling. She had no knowledge of the Haverford Honor Code or Honor Council process. She had been shocked when she heard that she might of violated the Honor Code. In response, she read the portions of the Haverford Code that she thought were relevant. While she realized that she may have violated the Code, she
didn’t know she needed to do anything and had no idea what she would write in an email to Honor Council, so she chose not to contact Council.

Terry told the jury that she respects the Honor Code for giving order, but that one cannot always expect everyone to follow it and that one cannot expect all violators of the Code to be caught. She also said that she was unsure of what it meant for a trial to be restorative.

When asked about the grade, Professor Glass said he would give a grade no higher than the one that he had assigned. Terry said that she felt it was too low and wanted to defend herself, but recognized that there was nothing to do but accept it.

Both parties said that any breach of trust between them was resolved. As a result, neither had any resolutions to recommend; Terry believed that the matter was resolved entirely, and Professor Glass believed that the matter was resolved in terms of accountability and education, and that it was not his place to judge restoration.

**Jury Deliberations and Tentative Resolutions:**

After the parties left, the jury proceeded immediately into deliberations. The jury felt that Terry Gross was not engaging with the trial. Jurors saw the fact that she was reading off of her computer and looking for answers in her statement as a sign that she was not trying to participate in the trial process. The jury believed that Terry was making excuses for her actions instead of trying to hold herself accountable, and that she seemed to feel a sense of entitlement. Finally, she appeared to be using the delay between the incident and the trial, which had been due in part to her inaction, as an excuse not to participate and as a reason why the trial should not be held in the first place.

Even though Terry and Professor Glass believed the matter was resolved, the jury disagreed. The jury was not pleased with the manner in which Professor Glass had dealt with Terry’s grade because it seemed arbitrary, and felt that the new grade signified not a resolution of the breach of trust between Terry, Professor Glass, and the community but rather a punitive judgement by Professor Glass that led to a forced compromise between him and Terry.

More importantly, the jury felt that the educational aspect of the trial had not been sufficiently resolved. While jurors agreed that Terry was likely not to take extra time on an exam again, jurors feared that she did not understand the Honor Code, and wanted to emphasize that the functioning of the Honor Code requires active engagement. Jurors voiced concern that Terry read the Code looking for rules and consequences, and felt that since the first time Professor Glass contacted her, Terry seemed to be hiding from rather than engaging with the process.

At this point, the jury consented to adjourn for the night.

**Tentative Resolutions II:**

One juror was unable to attend this meeting due to illness. The remainder of the jury consented unanimously to consider her to be standing outside consensus on all decisions consented to at this meeting. The Bi-Co liaison did attend.
The jury remained concerned about Terry’s exam grade, but chose not to recommend a different grade in the resolutions because many jurors expressed discomfort at the thought of repeating the circumstances of *Toy Story*, in which a jury disregarded the agreement of the confronted and confronting parties. Because the jury still did not approve of the manner in which Professor Glass decided on the new grade, the jury chose not to include a resolution endorsing the grade either.

Because of concern with the way Professor Glass handled this case outside of Honor Council, the jury felt it necessary to remind him and other faculty members that it is their responsibility to refer suspected violations of the Honor Code to Honor Council. The Bi-Co liaison mentioned that standard practice at Bryn Mawr College is for professors to leave questionable assignments ungraded until the Honor Board can give feedback. The jury thought that this was a worthwhile procedure and decided to recommend it to Haverford’s faculty.

The jury briefly discussed a recommendation to report the incident to graduate schools, but because the issue felt internal to the Bi-Co, and because the major problem was not academic dishonesty but Terry’s attitude towards the Honor Code, deemed it irrelevant to graduate school applications.

The jury had a lengthy discussion about separation. One juror expressed the opinion that having violated the Honor Code already separates Terry from the community; having a period of formal academic separation would make that circumstance explicit and provide a period during which she could take action to restore herself to the community. Other jurors felt that separation from Haverford would be punitive, and that it would be inappropriate because it felt like the principal purpose was not to restore Terry to the community but to protect the Haverford community from her. The jury agreed that recommending separation from Bryn Mawr was extreme, but many jurors felt that a period of academic separation from Haverford, accompanied by a number of resolutions designed to help Terry Gross educate herself about and reflect on the Haverford Honor Code, would be beneficial. Though some jurors were afraid that separation might alienate Terry from Haverford instead of leading her to reflect on Haverford’s Honor Code, others believed that the best the jury could do would be to invite her to reflect through resolutions. Ultimately, the jury agreed to include a semester of academic separation in the tentative resolutions, with the understanding that Terry’s feedback at Finalizing may influence the jury to amend the resolution.

The jury consented to the following tentative resolutions, with the absent juror standing outside consensus on all resolutions:

1. *Terry Gross will read a relevant abstract and both the Haverford College and Bryn Mawr College Honor Codes in preparation for a discussion with two jury members (one non-honor council, one honor council) that reflects on the spirit of the codes. This discussion will take place within the first month of Semester II classes.* (One juror stood outside of consensus; Bi-Co Liaison approved.)

2. *By [date], Terry Gross will write a letter to the community to be released with the*
abstract focusing on the role of personal responsibility in both codes and what it means to hold oneself accountable. (One juror stood outside of consensus; Bi-Co Liaison approved.)

3. Terry Gross will be academically separated from Haverford College for one semester. (Two jurors stood outside of consensus; Bi-Co Liaison approved.)

4. The jury recommends that this incident not be reported on applications to other institutions of higher learning. (One juror stood outside of consensus; Bi-Co Liaison approved.)

5. The jury would like to remind the faculty to refer issues of academic non-integrity (as specified in the Honor Code) to Honor Council as per the guidelines in the Faculty Handbook. Moreover, in cases of academic non-integrity, the jury recommends that the professor leave the assignment in question ungraded until discussed with Honor Council. (One juror stood outside of consensus; Bi-Co Liaison approved.)

6. This abstract will be released to the Bryn Mawr community as per the abstract release procedures in the Bryn Mawr College Honor Code. (One juror stood outside of consensus; Bi-Co Liaison approved.)

Resolutions as a whole. (One juror stood outside of consensus; Bi-Co Liaison approved.)

The jury agreed to ask Jad Abumrad to attend Finalizing Resolutions. Following the meeting, the Trial Chair emailed both parties, outlining the resolutions. The Chair explained to both parties that academic separation meant that Terry would not be permitted to take classes at Haverford during that semester but otherwise would be allowed on campus, and that the separation would not prevent her from taking classes elsewhere in the Quaker Consortium for that semester.

Finalizing Resolutions:

Jad Abumrad was present at Finalizing, as was Professor Glass. The Bi-Co liaison and the ill juror were unable to attend. The Trial Chair met with Jad Abumrad before the meeting to explain to him everything that had happened up to this point.

Terry told the jury that she saw a semester of academic separation as harsh because she had planned to take Haverford classes in the coming semester that were likely to influence her major declaration. She requested that if she were to be separated from Haverford, the separation be delayed at least one semester.

Terry also said that she felt that she had been held accountable through the grade change; she had originally seen it as harsh, but after undergoing a lengthy period of reflection, she accepted it. Moreover, Terry said that the trial process itself had been highly educational, but that she believed that the logistical challenges inherent in attending late night and weekend trial meetings at Haverford, as well as the delay between the incident and the trial, made the trial punitive.
Professor Glass told the jury that the resolutions were inequitably harsh in comparison to other Honor Council processes that he had been part of. He believed that the severity of the resolutions rose not out of the violation itself but rather Terry’s actions after the violation, which he saw as inappropriate. In particular, Professor Glass saw separation as punitive, and told the jury that Terry’s cooperative conduct and good attitude in trial meetings were a sign that she had been educated and restored. A juror responded that Terry’s actions demonstrated her misunderstanding of the Honor Code, and that it is the jury’s mission to address such circumstances.

Professor Glass also objected strongly to the resolution directed to the faculty. First, he argued that it was inappropriate for a jury of students to remind the faculty of the provisions of their Faculty Handbook. When asked if he would prefer the resolution be directed solely at him, Professor Glass declined to answer the question. Additionally, Professor Glass said that grades are not under a jury’s jurisdiction, and that a professor has much more information than a jury about the circumstances of grades; for that reason, he believes that even making a recommendation regarding grades, in this case and others, infringes on the faculty’s rights.

Jad Abumrad stated that having been part of the trial process gives Terry the best education on the Honor Code that she could possibly have. He believed that Terry had been “scared straight” as a result of the trial process, and he compared the trial process to videos of the aftermath of car crashes shown in Driver’s Ed classes to warn teens of the risks of reckless driving. When a juror asked Terry if she was scared during the process, she replied that she had been very scared when the process began but had been made to feel comfortable by this point.

Jad told the jury that he had found it disrespectful when Terry turned her test in late and would think it unfair if Terry’s original grade had affected the curve for students who turned their tests in on time. He now acknowledged that he should have confronted Terry or at least spoken to Professor Glass about the matter, but felt that the case had been sufficiently resolved and that separation from Haverford would be punitive.

Professor Glass reiterated his belief that the resolutions were inequitable given other Honor Council cases in which he had been involved. A juror replied that Honor Council cases are not precedent-based precisely so that they can consider the particular circumstances of each case, and for this reason it would be inappropriate to take other cases into account.

**Interim:**

Professor Glass asked to meet with the Trial Chair before the jury deliberated on the final resolutions. He told the Trial Chair that he was not pleased with how Honor Council had handled the trial procedurally, including but not limited to his designation as the confronting party. Professor Glass asked to meet with Honor Council, and asked the Trial Chair to remind the jury at deliberations that he believed that the resolution regarding the faculty as written was inappropriate.

Professor Glass also told the Trial Chair that he believed that this case was an extreme
form of culture shock for Terry as an international student; he said that, in accordance with the values in the country in which she was raised and educated, she always tries to conform and blend in, never raising her hand in class to ask questions. In his opinion, simply having been singled out for the trial would suffice to hold Terry accountable, so there was absolutely no way she had not been scared straight.

**Finalizing Deliberations:**

The jury explained to the Bi-Co liaison and the juror who had missed the previous two meetings what had happened in their absence. The Trial Chair also updated the jury on his meeting with Professor Glass.

The jury was very concerned about offending faculty members, and wanted to avoid coming across as impertinent in resolutions. The jury considered writing a resolution for Professor Glass specifically, but decided that all members of the community (faculty and students) should be reminded of the procedures for academic cases, and that it was inappropriate to single out only the faculty. The jury intended that this resolution would address Jad, Terry, Professor Glass, and anyone else who might find themselves in a similar situation to one of those three.

The jury also discussed the suggestion for faculty members to avoid changing grades before consultation with Honor Council, and decided that it would be more appropriate as a Plenary resolution than as a recommendation in a trial resolution. While the jury disagreed with Professor Glass’s assertion that it was out of place for a jury to make recommendations regarding grades, the jury felt that no such recommendation was appropriate in this case.

Terry was much more actively engaged in the Finalizing meeting than she had been in any of the previous two meetings, convincing the jury that the education and restoration processes had begun. While the jury believed that further measures for education and restoration remained necessary, it felt that it would be more punitive than educational to require Terry to meet with two jurors if she felt it would be unnecessary given her earlier comments regarding traveling to Haverford. The jury did feel that jurors could be a valuable resource for Terry and therefore included an optional meeting. In consideration of the concerns that Terry had expressed regarding the logistical difficulties inherent in coming to Haverford for trial meetings, two jurors volunteered to meet with her at Bryn Mawr. This, the jury felt, would remove an aspect of trial meetings that Terry saw as heavily punitive and make this meeting, should it occur, as restorative as possible.

While one juror expressed a belief that things that are optional rarely happen, other jurors responded that the goal at this point was to encourage Terry to pursue her own restoration. A forced meeting was liable to look like the Fact-Finding and Circumstantial portions of the trial, in which Terry did not seem to be engaged. Furthermore, the jury felt that encouraging Terry to initiate communication on her own would reduce culture shock.

The jury agreed that, given Terry’s academic circumstances and engagement in
Finalizing, separation would be punitive and unnecessary. The jury consented to the following final resolutions:

1. **Terry Gross will read the Haverford College and Bryn Mawr College Honor Codes and a relevant abstract, then write a letter to the community to be released with the abstract. The letter will address holding oneself accountable and the spirit of the codes. If she has any questions or concerns, Terry Gross is encouraged to reach out to members of the jury who will be available to discuss them with her at Bryn Mawr College.** (All jurors consent; Bi-Co liaison approves)

2. **The jury recommends that this incident not be reported on applications to other institutions of higher learning.** (All jurors consent; Bi-Co liaison approves)

3. **The jury would like to remind students to first turn to the Honor Code and faculty to first turn to the Faculty Handbook, which will direct them to the Honor Code, when deciding how to proceed in issues concerning academic integrity. Community members are encouraged to refer to Honor Council if unclear about the provisions of the Honor Code.** (All jurors consent; Bi-Co liaison approves)

4. **This abstract will be released to the Bryn Mawr College community as per the abstract release procedures in the Bryn Mawr College Honor Code.** (All jurors consent; Bi-Co liaison approves)

*Resolutions as a whole. (All jurors consent; Bi-Co liaison approves)*

**Post-Trial:**

Honor Council as a whole was unavailable to meet with Professor Glass as he had requested in his meeting with the Trial Chair, but an uninvolved Honor Council Co-Chair and one other Council member did meet with him. Professor Glass informed the Honor Council that he did not intend to appeal the resolutions adopted by the jury “because no benefit can come from it; the harm has already been done and cannot be undone or mitigated.” He felt that throughout the process he had been obligated to stand up for Terry, as he believed that the jury was persecuting her. He also objected to what he saw as a number of procedural violations in the conduct of the trial. To that end he requested that the following statement be included in the abstract:

"The Honor Council acknowledges that certain procedural provisions of the Honor Code were not complied with in connection with the trial. The Honor Council reminds itself and its successors to first consult with the procedural requirements of the Honor Code when conducting trials."

Neither the Trial Chair nor the Honor Council members who met with Professor Glass agreed with Professor Glass’s statement.
Neither party appealed the resolutions.

Terry Gross’s Letter to the Community:
Going through the trial process last semester, I’ve learned a lot more about the honor code and honor council. Personally, honor code is one of the reasons that I chose to come to Bryn Mawr College. However, I was a little bit disappointed when I arrived: food and stuff were stolen, and upperclassmen told me to lock the dorm room door. The trial I’ve been through rebuilt the trust of honor code in me and makes me feel that people are actually taking these codes seriously even if violations still happen. But we all are working on it. Therefore, I shouldn’t have given up the hope for it. Regarding my case, I still consider it different from other similar cases since I received punishment after the violation and long before the trial of my violation. The overall experience was quite overwhelming at the time, but benefiting as well. I consider my biggest flaw the lack of knowledge of the code and bad coping skills under stress and anxiety. Although the construction of the teacher could have been clearer, if I have better knowledge of the code, I would have been able to recognize action of violation and prevent it from happening. I admit my mistake as much as I heartbreakingly accepted the very low score I received as a punishment. I regret what I did not because of the punishment I received but because of the education I’ve learned through the trials. There were obviously better alternatives that I could have chosen so that not only I wouldn’t have violated the code, but also would have ended up with a higher score. Thus what I did is not only a stupid thing to the community but also to myself at all dimensions. However, as much as I admit my mistake, I have to insist that I’m a person with integrity and I honestly do value that over most of the other things. I won’t let myself do anything like that if I know it’s unfair to others even if honor code doesn’t say so. I’m always trying to do the right thing. I felt sorry about any negative effects resulted from my violation. But I do insist that my failure of avoiding the violation has nothing to do with my moral integrity, which I always have and always will value highly. I’ve never wanted to earn a good score more than a score that I deserve. So I have to disagree when one of the jury members confronted me and associated the violation with my moral integrity. That’s not true. I still consider the violation is resulted at least 60 percent due to external situational factor and less dispositional internal factor. But I do admit that I could have done better. Going through the trial is very hard for me because I felt that I’ve admitted my mistake at the beginning of the trial but some jurors were still doubtful about my sincerity of that. That hurts me. I know I did something wrong. But I never intended to make it unfair for anyone because I’m not the kind of the person that will take advantage of others and justice is really a big thing for me. I don’t like to be misunderstood or mistaken for someone I am not. If I could have known better, I wouldn’t want the violation to happen. If we measure the violation according to attribution theories, the consistency of my disintegrate behavior is extremely low. I don’t like cheating and I won’t do something that I hate. When I violated the code, I didn’t even consider myself cheating. I don’t have the intention to cheat and I don’t want it to be unfair. So I still consider it a mistake that wasn’t meant but rather
one that is inattentive. Nevertheless, I still need to apologize for the trouble I caused to the community and making others feel unfair or unsafe and seek for understanding from the community and forgiveness from both the community and myself. I feel thankful for those trial members who contributed their personal time to the trials and being supportive, mindful and patient during the whole process. Besides the discussion about the case, they helped me better understand the code and understand my responsibility of abiding the code. It is of great importance that each of the community members respect, understand and abide by the code. After the process, I felt that not only I know much better about honor code and its processes but also feel honored that as a community member, I am able to take responsibility of it and to contribute to maintaining the code with the whole community body. Thanks to the honor code and wonderful peoples who work to make it our pride, we can feel safe, trust each other and do what is just.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. Do you believe that Honor Council and juries have a right to involve themselves in cases in which both the confronted and confronting parties believe there is no breach of trust with the community?
2. Do you believe that, in cases of academic integrity, a professor has the obligation to be a confronting party even if he or she does not believe a violation has taken place?
3. Which of the jury’s decisions do you agree with? Which do you disagree with?
4. Do you agree with Honor Council's decision to handle Melissa and Terry’s cases differently based on differences in statements and confrontation?