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Summary:
This trial involved [Colonel Mustard], a senior in the [Mystery Solving] department, and took place near the end of his final semester at Haverford before graduating. His advisor, [Professor White], found significant problems with citation in multiple drafts of Colonel Mustard’s thesis, and throughout the trial he showed a lack of understanding of how to cite properly. There was also a significant lack of communication and trust between Professor White and Colonel Mustard throughout the thesis advising process, which was apparent in the trial. The resolutions from this trial included a significant grade reduction and recommendation to be reported to other institutions of higher learning. Some limitations were placed on the jury’s ability to make resolutions because this trial happened immediately before Colonel Mustard’s graduation. The trial was appealed, and this appeal led to a re-trial of this case, which is a separate abstract (Clue Part II).

Pre-Trial:
The course of events leading up to this trial began several months before the trial was convened, during the fall semester. The following course of events was described to Honor Council by Colonel Mustard and [Professor White] in their initial statements. At the end of the fall semester, students in [Mystery Solving 378] submitted a preliminary draft of their written thesis. This paper was not intended to include the full range of material presented in the final
thesis paper but rather was intended to serve as a representation of students’ progress on their thesis up until that point. Professor White identified multiple issues with the references section in Colonel Mustard’s preliminary draft. For example, she identified one article from which Colonel Mustard drew information that was not included in the reference list. She also noted that Colonel Mustard had failed to cite her for information that she had provided him with. Moreover, Professor White found that Colonel Mustard had failed to include any in-text citations for outside material that he used. She asked Colonel Mustard to fix these issues and send her a revised version of the paper.

Colonel Mustard submitted a second draft of his thesis several weeks before the final submission was due. After reading this second draft, Professor White emailed Colonel Mustard a list of revisions that he needed to make before submitting his final draft, one of which was to be sure to include page numbers when citing information from a book. Colonel Mustard subsequently submitted another draft and received corrections from Professor White to make before submitting the final draft. Colonel Mustard submitted his final draft, claiming that he did not have time to add page numbers when citing information from books. Colonel Mustard met with Professor White for their weekly meeting, during which Colonel Mustard told Professor White that he was in the process of addressing the lingering issues with his citations. Based on Professor White’s response, Colonel Mustard believed that Professor White responded positively to this remark. A few days later, however, Professor White informed Colonel Mustard via email that she was disappointed that he yet again “submitted a document for departmental review that does not give adequate citations,” and she told Colonel Mustard to speak with a member of Honor Council regarding his lack of proper citation in both his preliminary draft and final draft.

Upon reviewing statements from Professor White and Colonel Mustard, Honor Council consented to send this case to an academic trial.

Fact Finding:

Colonel Mustard began by speaking about his preliminary draft. He said that Professor White had supplied him with notes to a [clue finding method] that he included in his preliminary draft, but that he had forgotten to cite Professor White. His submission of this draft had also lacked in-text citations, and Professor White had let him re-submit the draft correcting this.

Regarding his thesis work in the Spring semester, Colonel Mustard said that in writing drafts subsequent to the preliminary draft, he tried to remember to uphold the citation guidelines put forth by the Mystery Solving department. He admitted that he was not very adept at doing research and that he had relied on web sources. He explained that he had not had enough time to do both content and citation revisions by the time his final draft was due and that he thought he could handle the remaining revisions during the revision period. Colonel Mustard admitted that his final draft consequently contained inadequate citations. He added that after he had turned himself in to Honor Council, he had worked on the remaining revisions and submitted a post-revision draft. Professor White told the jury that after reviewing Colonel Mustard’s
post-revisions submission, the department faculty deliberated and passed him on his thesis.

Professor White spoke to the jury next. She informed the jury that seniors were given a lot of guidance regarding citation and explained that the preliminary draft should include a thorough bibliography. Professor White then explained that the final draft was the main written submission of the senior project and that students were expected to meticulously cite any sources used in their work. The revisions period was a period during which students in danger of not passing on their thesis could revise their final draft.

Professor White recounted that the references in Colonel Mustard’s preliminary draft were vague to the point where she could not tell what type of sources they referred to. She also noticed an example (attributed to one of these sources) which was not in quotation marks but did not seem to be in Colonel Mustard’s own words. This example, which she later found was from a website, remained in the final version of Colonel Mustard’s thesis.

Professor White went on to add that the same imprecise citations that were present in the preliminary draft also showed up in the final submission. She became worried that Colonel Mustard was misattributing information that he had found in web sources to peer reviewed articles, trying to cover up his use of discouraged online sources. Professor White was worried that if the references for the web sources Colonel Mustard used were to be made precise, it would become evident that much of the thesis wasn’t actually Colonel Mustard’s own work. Professor White went on to say that the Mystery Solving department had discussed how much of the work in Colonel Mustard’s final draft had been directly lifted from web sources, but that they concluded that he had added enough of his own work to pass. Professor White admitted that she arguably should have contacted Honor Council when she received Colonel Mustard’s preliminary draft in the Fall semester. One juror asked for clarification on what the central issue with Colonel Mustard’s work was. Professor White responded that she was misled into believing that Colonel Mustard’s preliminary draft and final draft were his own work. Professor White clarified that the grade for the thesis was based on the final draft rather than the post-revision draft.”

Professor White then asked Colonel Mustard why, when asked via email whether a particular uncited example he presented was his own, he did not say that he had taken it from a web page. Colonel Mustard responded that he had not said anything at the time because he was afraid of Professor White’s reaction.

Jury Deliberations/Statement of Violation:

The jury spent a great deal of time sorting through the complex information that had just been presented to them. The jury focused its discussion on determining what, of all the information presented to them, constituted a violation and what simply constituted poor scholarship. The jury also discussed the possibility that Colonel Mustard had violated the Honor Code by showing a lack of scholarly integrity in trying to hide his sources from Professor White, but were not certain that he had actively tried to deceive her.
The jury agreed that Colonel Mustard had violated the Honor Code on all three submissions by failing to include proper in-text citations for outside material, using outside material without references, using outside material without quotations, and by failing to provide complete references. The jury considered Colonel Mustard’s lack of in-text citations, lack of references, and verbatim use of outside material without the use of quotations to constitute plagiarism, because by not citing properly, Colonel Mustard represented the work of others as his own, which constitutes plagiarism according to the Honor Code. Moreover, by not providing all the required information in a reference, he had not given the sources proper credit. The jury consented on the following statement of violation:

[Colonel Mustard] violated the Honor Code by plagiarizing on three iterations of his senior thesis. (10 jurors consent)

**Circumstantial Portion:**

Colonel Mustard began by speaking about the preliminary draft. He said that at the time when he was writing the preliminary draft, he was unaware of how to cite properly. He said that he had struggled with using [Detective Notebook], the citation program that was to be used for the thesis. He also said that he had not known that he had to cite class notes provided by Professor White and that he didn’t even know how to cite such a source. He added that he was not comfortable asking Professor White questions because she had stressed that students should figure things out on their own. Colonel Mustard said that when Professor White had asked him whether an uncited example provided in his preliminary draft was his own, he was not comfortable telling her that he had taken the example from a web page because Professor White had previously expressed distaste with the use of web sources. He told the jury that he had resorted to using non-peer reviewed sources like web pages because he had difficulty understanding the material he found when searching for literature.

Colonel Mustard explained that during the spring semester, he had attempted to use published work, but as a result of his confusion with this material, his work did not make a lot of sense. He added that Professor White was able to help him with this. Colonel Mustard said that when making revisions for his final draft, he had had a lot of critiques from Professor White to work through and thought that the content related corrections should take precedence over the citation related corrections. In fact, Colonel Mustard said that he chose not to learn how to correctly cite using [Detective Notebook] until he had completed the content related revisions.

Colonel Mustard went on to explain that he had had a very short amount of time between receiving feedback on his second draft and the submission date for his final draft. He had pulled an all-nighter trying to finish the revisions, but had not had time to address all of the citation related revisions. He went on to explain that he had had an assignment due every day that week in other classes, and he hadn’t felt comfortable asking for extensions. He told the jury that now, however, he felt that not asking for extensions had been a mistake.
Colonel Mustard told the jury that he had not intended to plagiarize. He added that he had worked really hard to progress from the final draft to the post-revision draft. Colonel Mustard said that he definitely had support from his dean and parents in regards to his thesis work, but he wished he had had a better relationship with Professor White. He added that he did wish to see reconciliation with Professor White, even if that was not Professor White’s priority.

When asked whether he had reached out to anyone regarding citation help since he was not comfortable asking Professor White, Colonel Mustard said that he had gotten thesis help from [Professor Plum], his second thesis reader throughout the Spring semester. He thought that the education given to seniors in the Mystery Solving department was slightly lacking, mentioning that they had been taught how to conduct research, but were not taught much about citations.

When asked about the example of the uncited verbatim quotation in his post-revision draft, Colonel Mustard said that he had not been aware that examples taken from sources needed to be put in quotation marks. A juror then asked Colonel Mustard about why he had not included any in-text citations in his preliminary draft. Colonel Mustard responded that he had only taken a few classes in the past at Haverford that had required him to write research papers, and that there had only been one time in the past when he had had to include in-text citations, although he was familiar with including bibliographies. When asked about the extent of plagiarism education he had received in his writing seminar, Colonel Mustard said that he didn’t really remember, but that he didn’t think that his writing seminar had much plagiarism education.

Regarding suggested resolutions, Professor White suggested specific grade reductions that Colonel Mustard should receive for both the Fall and Spring semesters (both reductions to above a 2.0), that any graduate programs should be made aware of the reasons for these grade changes, and that Colonel Mustard should be required to submit another version of his thesis with proper citations.

Colonel Mustard spoke about Professor White’s suggested grade changes, expressing that he thought the repercussions of these grade changes would be harsh. He said that he felt he already understood his issues with improper citation and had taken steps to rectify them. He also added that he had been awarded a full ride at the graduate school to which he had been admitted and feared that the school might revoke this scholarship as a result of learning of these grade changes, which would make it impossible for him to attend. He explained that his acceptance into the graduate program was conditional upon the rest of his college performance. Colonel Mustard also expressed concern regarding what this would do to his GPA and that he thought these resolutions would be counterproductive to what the goals of a trial should be.

Colonel Mustard’s suggested resolutions, which he presented to the jury in writing, included a letter to the community, submitting an updated draft of his thesis and meeting with his second reader to discuss the adequacy of citation in his updated draft. He also suggested that the Mystery Solving department take more time to discuss citation in its senior seminar and that the incident not be reported to other institutions of higher learning.
Jury Deliberations on Tentative Resolutions: Part 1

The jury supported Colonel Mustard’s suggestion that he correct the remaining citation issues in his post-revisions submission, and work with Professor Plum to make sure that everything was properly cited. Several jurors suggested that Colonel Mustard retake the Academic Integrity Tutorial and/or read Maud McInerney’s essay “Plagiarism and How to Avoid It,” since he did not remember having received a thorough education in plagiarism avoidance. Another juror suggested a discussion between Colonel Mustard and Professor White, mediated by a juror, to restore trust and serve as an educational opportunity to discuss the severity of plagiarism.

Jury Deliberations on Tentative Resolutions: Part 2

Some jurors felt that Colonel Mustard should receive a grade reduction for the citation issues in his preliminary draft, but others worried about the fairness of retroactively recommending a grade change for that paper. Jurors pointed out that Professor White had graded the paper with the knowledge that it lacked in-text citations but hadn’t brought the issue to Council back then. The jury ultimately decided that a grade change was warranted since Professor White had not been aware of the extent of the plagiarism when grading the draft.

The jury then moved on to discuss the final submission. The jury realized that they did not know whether or not Professor White took Colonel Mustard’s plagiarism on this paper into account when assigning it a grade, and they could not discuss a potential grade change until they received this information. The jury agreed that the trial chair would ask Professor White for this information before their next meeting.

Interim:

Professor White explained that she actually had not yet graded the final submission. She did say, however, that the three readers of Colonel Mustard’s thesis had discussed whether or not Colonel Mustard’s post-revisions submission should pass. She said that he had shown the other two readers that certain passages in Colonel Mustard’s paper were taken verbatim from outside sources without quotations, but that they had ultimately decided that the post-revisions submission met the department's minimum requirements for passing.

In her email, the trial chair also told Professor White that the jury had been struggling with recommending a grade for the final submission because they were not fully sure of the extent of plagiarism in the paper. In response, Professor White sent the trial chair an annotated copy of this submission, in which she made note of plagiarized portions.

Moreover, as the trial chair was examining the final submission and post-revisions submission, she noticed that in nine instances, Colonel Mustard attributed the same information to two different sources in different drafts. Upon realizing this, the trial chair emailed Colonel Mustard and asked him for an explanation. Colonel Mustard responded that he had been
disorganized in the first semester and had not been exactly sure which information came from which source. He had mainly based his citations on memory, and as a result, some of his citations were mixed up in the final submission. He said that before submitting the post-revisions submission, however, he made sure he knew where each piece of information came from so that he could attribute everything to the correct source.

**Jury Deliberations on Tentative Resolutions: Part 3**

The trial chair began this meeting by informing the jury of all the new information acquired in the interim. The jury discussed Colonel Mustard’s attribution of material to the wrong author. One juror expressed shock upon hearing that he had done this, and another thought that he was genuinely misleading by knowingly not crediting people whose work he used. Another juror said that she was really disturbed that Colonel Mustard included citations that he knew were possibly incorrect. Another juror said that it was worrying that Colonel Mustard did not inform the jury of these incorrect citations and that the jury may not have known about this had the trial chair not discovered it.

Most jurors were more comfortable with a grade reduction on the final submission than on the preliminary draft. Several jurors agreed that Colonel Mustard should receive a zero on the final submission and receive the minimum passing grade for the written thesis as a whole. Many jurors felt that it was inappropriate for a thesis containing plagiarized material to pass and considered recommending that the Mystery Solving department withhold passing Colonel Mustard until he submitted a thesis that was free of plagiarism. The jury was split on what grade Colonel Mustard should receive on the final thesis draft. Some jurors thought it should receive a 0.0, others were more comfortable with a lesser grade change, and one juror felt that no grade change was warranted.

**Jury Deliberations on Tentative Resolutions: Part 4**

The jury began by discussing whether Colonel Mustard’s work on his written thesis was worthy of the minimum passing grade. Jurors expressed that they wanted Colonel Mustard to pass but did not think his work was worthy of that grade. The jury then discussed a potential resolution recommending that a student’s thesis not pass if they were plagiarized in any way, as many jurors were disturbed by the fact that the Mystery Solving department had passed a thesis that contained plagiarized material.

The jury next talked about whether this trial should be considered disciplinary for the purpose of reporting to institutions of higher learning. All jurors agreed that considering the overwhelming number of instances of plagiarized material and the fact that Colonel Mustard had had many chances to correct issues with citation prior to this trial, the trial should be reported.

After much discussion surrounding these issues, the jury consented on the following tentative resolutions:
1. The jury recommends a grade change on [Colonel Mustard]'s [preliminary draft], the magnitude of which is left to [Professor White]'s discretion. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside)

2. The jury recommends that [Colonel Mustard] not pass his thesis until he revises it and it is free of plagiarism. (10 jurors consent)

3. The jury recommends that [Colonel Mustard] receive a 0.0 on the [final draft] of his thesis, but that he receive a minimum passing grade on his written thesis overall, pending revisions. (10 jurors consent)

4. [Colonel Mustard] will meet with his second thesis reader, if the reader is willing, to discuss the standard of citation in the newly revised thesis, along with detailing where exactly information that is cited is coming from. This will occur by [Colonel Mustard]'s graduation. (10 jurors consent)

5. [Colonel Mustard] will engage in a dialogue mediated by a juror, with [Professor White], if [Professor White] is willing. This dialogue should include both their experiences over the past year and a discussion of the nature and severity of plagiarism. This will occur by [Colonel Mustard]'s graduation. (10 jurors consent)

6. [Colonel Mustard] will take the Academic Integrity Tutorial by his graduation. (10 jurors consent)

7. [Colonel Mustard] will write a letter to the community, to be released with the abstract, detailing what he has taken away from this experience. This letter will be written by [Colonel Mustard]'s graduation. (10 jurors consent)

8. The jury recommends that this trial be considered a disciplinary proceeding for the purpose of reporting to other institutions of higher learning. (10 jurors consent)

9. The jury strongly recommends that theses containing plagiarized material not be considered passing. (10 jurors consent)

Resolutions as a whole: 9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside

Finalizing Resolutions:

Colonel Mustard expressed his support for the resolution regarding a mediated dialogue between him and Professor White. He said that he wanted to meet with Professor White in order to restore trust and help understand and learn from the year as a whole. He then said that he believed that some of the tentative resolutions would be harmful to his future. He also pointed out that the jury’s recommendation that he receive a 0.0 on the final submission did not make sense in the framework of how grades were assigned in the senior seminar.

He explained that the final submission itself did not receive a grade, but rather that he would be assigned a grade for the written portion of his senior thesis, which would largely be based on the final submission, but could also be influenced by revisions made during the revisions period. He also noted that grades were determined by a rubric, and based on this rubric,
he would already lose points due to his lack of citations, regardless of any recommendations by
the jury. Colonel Mustard also urged the jury to consider how the thesis is a progressive work,
which is why students are given a revisions period. He went on to say that if he were to receive a
zero on his thesis, he did not believe that he could receive a passing grade in the senior seminar.
He said that given his intent to restore himself to the community, this resolution seemed punitive.

Colonel Mustard expressed that he wished that Professor White had made clear to him the
importance of citation, and he said that the reason he acted the way he did was because of
Professor White. A juror pointed out to Colonel Mustard that considering that he was a senior, it
was not his professor’s responsibility to explain to him the importance of citation.

Colonel Mustard suggested that the jury not recommend a grade change on the
preliminary draft but rather that his grades in the two quarters of the Fall senior seminar be
adjusted such that the portion in which the preliminary draft played a major role would have a
lowered grade and the other quarter would have a raised grade, keeping the average grade the
same. Colonel Mustard also asked that the jury not recommend a grade of a zero on the written
part of his thesis. He finally urged the jury to be very clear about why they thought he deserved
to receive the minimum passing grade in the senior seminar.

One juror asked the other jurors why they had not wanted to leave the grade on the
written portion of the thesis to the discretion of the department. One juror said that she was
uncomfortable doing this given that the department did not seem to care as much about
plagiarism as the jury did. Indeed, the jury believed the department should not have passed the
thesis. Based on Colonel Mustard’s feedback, the jury decided to change tentative resolution #3
so that it would make more sense in the framework of how grades were assigned in the senior
seminar. Since no grade would be assigned to the final submission itself, the jury changed this
resolution to instead focus on recommending a grade on the written portion of the thesis. After
much discussion, the jury decided to recommend a 1.0 rather than a 0.0 on the written portion of
the thesis, considering that Colonel Mustard’s revisions made during revisions period should
influence this grade. The jury also wanted to ensure that their recommended grades would not
prevent Colonel Mustard from completing his major, so they agreed to include a clause to
address this.

The jury consented on the following final resolutions:

1. The jury recommends a grade change on [Colonel Mustard]’s [preliminary draft], the
magnitude of which is left to [Professor White]’s discretion. If this grade change in any
way prevents [Colonel Mustard] from completing the major, his course grade for any
section of [Mystery Solving Seminar] should be raised so that he can complete the major.
(8 jurors consent, 1 stands outside, 1 stands outside in absentia)
2. The jury recommends that [Colonel Mustard] not pass his thesis until he revises it and
it is free of plagiarism. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)
3. Keeping in mind that the [final submission] of [Colonel Mustard]’s thesis was
unacceptable, the jury recommends that the written portion of [Colonel Mustard]'s thesis receive a 1.0, pending revisions from Resolution 2. If receiving a 1.0 on the written portion of his thesis in any way prevents [Colonel Mustard] from completing the major, his course grade for any section of [Mystery Solving Seminar] should be raised so that he can complete the major. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

4. [Colonel Mustard] will meet with his second thesis reader, if the reader is willing, to discuss the standard of citation in the newly revised thesis, along with detailing where exactly information that is cited is coming from. This will occur by [Colonel Mustard]'s graduation. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

5. [Colonel Mustard] will engage in a dialogue mediated by a juror, with [Professor White], if [Professor White] is willing. This dialogue should include both their experiences over the past year and a discussion of the nature and severity of plagiarism. This will occur by [Colonel Mustard]'s graduation. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

6. [Colonel Mustard] will take the Academic Integrity Tutorial by his graduation. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

7. [Colonel Mustard] will write a letter to the community, to be released with the abstract, detailing what he has taken away from this experience. This letter will be written by [Colonel Mustard]'s graduation. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

8. The jury recommends that this trial be considered a disciplinary proceeding for the purpose of reporting to other institutions of higher learning. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

9. The jury strongly recommends that theses containing plagiarized material not be considered passing. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

Resolutions as a whole: 8 jurors consent, 1 stands outside, 1 stands outside in absentia

Post-Trial:

Professor White informed the trial chair that she assigned Colonel Mustard a grade of a 1.0 in both the fall and spring quarters of the senior seminar that are with the adviser, since these two quarters are, according to Professor White, “entirely about the written thesis and the oral presentation based on it.” She assigned Colonel Mustard a 2.7 in the departmental fall quarter. With all four quarters averaged together, Colonel Mustard received a 2.0, the minimum grade necessary for Colonel Mustard to complete the major. Professor White also informed the trial chair that the implementation of resolution 2 was at the hands of the Chair of the Mystery Solving department. Professor White forwarded to the trial chair an email from the Department Chair in which he stated that he would not implement resolution 2, which recommended that Colonel Mustard not pass his thesis until it was free of plagiarism, saying that he was not willing to rescind his decision to pass Colonel Mustard’s thesis “because the standard of ‘free from
mustard

plagiarism’ is too vague and I am not in a position to judge it.”

**Appeal:**

Colonel Mustard appealed the resolutions of this trial to the President of the College on both substantive and procedural claims. In his written appeal, he stated that the documents that the jury used to determine his violations were never made available to him, and as a result, he did not feel that he could properly defend himself. Further, Colonel Mustard stated that he was unaware of what definition of plagiarism the jury was following throughout the trial. He pointed out that the Honor Code cites a page in the Faculty Handbook for its definition of plagiarism, but that the page cited does not actually contain any definition of plagiarism. He said, however, that Professor White had provided him with a statement on plagiarism from the Faculty Handbook which defined plagiarism using different wording than the definition provided in the Honor Code. Moreover, Colonel Mustard argued that the resolutions were too punitive and “not reflective of unintentional mistakes.”

The trial chair and jury liaison explained that Colonel Mustard had never expressed interest at any point during the trial in viewing any of the documents that they used to determine his violations. The trial chair also pointed out that three of the documents they used were simply Colonel Mustard’s three submissions, which Colonel Mustard would have access to since they were his own submissions. The only other document used by the jury was a copy of the final submission which Professor White had annotated and highlighted to draw the jury’s attention to improperly cited material. The trial chair assured the President that had Colonel Mustard ever asked to see a copy of this document, she would have been more than happy to share it with him. Similarly, the trial chair and jury liaison also told the President that Colonel Mustard had never asked the jury how they defined plagiarism, and if he had, they would have told him that they were operating based on the definition provided in the Honor Code.

Although the trial chair and jury liaison informed the President of Colonel Mustard’s numerous instances of plagiarism, such as his verbatim use of outside material without quotations and his failure to cite the sources from which outside material was acquired, the President told the trial chair and jury liaison that he was not convinced that Colonel Mustard had plagiarized. The President of the College ultimately decided to grant Colonel Mustard’s appeal. Rather than change any of the jury’s resolutions, the President decided to grant Colonel Mustard a retrial by a new jury to occur as soon as possible, preferably during the summer. He said that this decision was based on Colonel Mustard’s “apparent inability...to offer a full and comprehensive account of what happened” as well as on the discrepancy in definitions of plagiarism offered in the Honor Code versus in the Faculty Handbook and the fact that it was unclear which definition the jury applied and why. The President also expressed his concern with the fact that the plagiarism definition in the Honor Code was not properly cited, and he wished for the new jury to consider this issue when drafting resolutions.
Colonel Mustard’s Letter to the Community:

Dear Haverford College Community:

I wish to share what I have taken away from the experience of my yearlong senior thesis and the issues regarding citation. I wish to state that in no way at any point during this year was my intention to use someone else’s work and attempt to convey it as my own. Indeed, my desire was never to misguide or dupe my advisor or anyone in the community. I feel that, although not to the degree that was charged in the trial, I was guilty of being sloppy with citations, in that I did not have a complete and correct database of which source each definition and theorem in my thesis was from. I wish to acknowledge this, because I feel that it is my duty to come clean and admit my wrongs to the community that embodies trust, concern and respect. I want to thank Haverford for enabling me to walk and receive my degree on [graduation date]; it is an accomplishment I am truly proud of.

I feel that one of the main lessons I have taken away from this is to be meticulous and detail-oriented, as well as focus on organization. Indeed, it is an important life lesson to take away in that taking on these characteristics will aid me in future studies and my career as well. Indeed, if I am to undertake any other research assignment in the future, I plan to keep documents dedicated solely to making sure my citations and sources are accurate, well defined, and easy to find. It is definitely important to do so, in order to ascertain that anyone reading my thesis knows where I am getting my information from and can know what exactly to consult should they wish to gain access to further information.

Another lesson that I have learned is to not be afraid to ask for clarification or help. All of this year, I was truly intimidated by my advisor, and afraid to ask for questions due to being afraid of having to hear more criticism from her. It upset me whenever I heard it, as I took it as a sign that she did not like the way I thought or took action to rectify mistakes, and I thought that something was wrong with me and my mental capacities several times in the year. It is true that I was afraid to ask my advisor to help me with several things, due to her wanting me to correct and focus on other things. I felt that asking her questions would upset her, and make her angry with me. I now am looking at what transpired with a different scope: What could I have done differently? Haverford is a wonderful community especially because of the number of resources available. My dean, CAPS, the OAR, other professors, and other resources are always available to me. I learned that, if I am uncomfortable with discussing a particular topic or question with someone, it should be my immediate course of action to look for alternate entities or people to consult, who may be able to aid me. I have learned to face my fears with strategy and alternate solutions, rather than remain quiet.

---

1 This letter was written immediately following this trial, before Colonel Mustard appealed the resolutions.
I would like to thank the Haverford Community for teaching me valuable life lessons that I will carry with me. I have learned a lot in my last four years here, in and out of the classroom. I believe I have been a valuable member of the community, displaying the values of trust, concern and respect to my peers and fellow community members. I want to make a promise to the community: I will continue to uphold these values to the best of my ability as I strive to pursue greater education and progress in my career and otherwise.

Discussion Questions:

1. Should the trial chair have investigated further into Colonel Mustard’s work regarding his misattributed sources? To what extent should Honor Council and juries be an investigative body rather than assuming the confronted party is being honest throughout the whole process?

2. How could Colonel Mustard have better dealt with his doubts about his use of the program, or about his ability to cite? If you were in his position, how would you have addressed your doubts?

3. Does it change anything that the plagiarism occurred on a thesis, and not on another submission?

4. Do we have a collective, comprehensive definition of plagiarism in the Haverford community? What about the Tri-Co?

5. How should the fact that there are conflicting definitions of plagiarism in the Honor Code be addressed?