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Summary/Pre-Trial:
This case concerned plagiarism. A Bryn Mawr student, [Suzy Bishop], said she had attached the wrong draft in an email submission of an essay to her professor, [Professor Sam Shakusky]. According to Suzy, since it was an early draft, it contained quotes without citations or with incorrect citations. After Professor Shakusky confronted her in a meeting, Suzy sent Professor Shakusky the correct version, which was free of mistakes. However, the jury felt that she still had submitted plagiarized work initially. In addition, Professor Shakusky suspected that Suzy had only changed the essay after he had confronted her. Due to the timing of the trial, a BiCo liaison could not be present. However, Suzy consented to run the trial without a BiCo liaison1.

Fact Finding:
The meeting began with Suzy and Professor Shakusky each explaining their perspectives of what had happened. Suzy said that English not being her first language affects the way she writes essays. She also noted that she usually writes all of her research papers by selecting quotes and passages of interest, organizing them based on her outline, and then going through and rewriting

Guidelines for the BiCo Liaison position can be found here: http://honorcouncil.haverford.edu/guidelines/bico-liaison/
things in her own words and adding her own ideas. She explained that when she submitted the paper, the Tuesday before the end of finals, she accidentally sent an earlier draft of her paper, which included substantial plagiarism. She received an email from Professor Shakusky, which noted that he had concerns with her paper and wanted to meet with her on Friday, the final day of the finals period. During their meeting on that Friday, Suzy said she’d realized her mistake, so she immediately sent Professor Shakusky the final copy of her work, which she originally intended to send him. Professor Shakusky told her that he felt that the issue was best resolved through Honor Council. Professor Shakusky agreed with Suzy’s account of the situation and described to the jury the forms of plagiarism in the paper. He said that the first half of the paper contained some minor issues (e.g. quotes without citations or the occasional plagiarized line), while the second half contained whole paragraphs that had been copied from other sources. He told the jury, once again, that he felt unsure of whether Suzy had been honest about whether this incident was actually accidental, or if she had used the time between Tuesday and their meeting to revise her paper. The jury then questioned both parties, most of which served to clarify the timeline, due date, and other logistical details.

**Jury Deliberations/Statement of Violation:**

After the parties left, the jury discussed their thoughts regarding whether a violation had occurred. While everyone agreed that the first submission was plagiarized, there was some discussion on whether or not the existence of the second draft, which was still submitted before the deadline of the paper—albeit during Suzy and Professor Shakusky’s meeting—mitigated a potential violation. After some discussion about this and the role of Suzy’s original intention in emailing her paper, the jury came to the decision that the fact that a plagiarized draft was submitted and claimed as the student’s own work was enough to constitute a violation of the Honor Code. Most jurors felt unclear about the severity of the violation, given that Suzy claimed she had readied her final draft all along, but felt that that could best be dealt with through the circumstantial portion of the trial, as well as the resolutions. One juror had left before they wrote a statement. They consented to the following statement of violation:

*Suzy violated the Honor Code by submitting a final paper that presents other authors’ work as her own and including some authors’ work without adequate citation (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia).*
Circumstantial Portion:
Professor Shakusky was not present for this meeting, but he sent his thoughts in an email to the trial chair. He continued to express concern that Suzy was being dishonest about what happened, and that this needed to be addressed. He also felt that Suzy could benefit from some education on Haverford’s Honor Code and academic support services, given that she is a student at Bryn Mawr. He recommended she receive a 0 on the paper.

In the meeting, Suzy explained to the jury that she found the class difficult, particularly as an international student who wasn’t familiar with some of the [hiking paths and methodologies] relevant to the course material. She also confided that her relationship with Professor Shakusky was negative, and that she struggled to get help from him. The only time she had expressed this frustration was during the mid-semester evaluations. She also noted that during finals week she had three papers to write, and pulled an all-nighter before submitting the paper to Professor Shakusky on Tuesday. Suzy also mentioned that, as a Bryn Mawr student, she was not especially familiar with Haverford’s Honor Code. She felt that her working habits were probably the biggest factor in causing the violation, noting as well that this was the longest research paper she’d ever written, and agreed that regularly meeting with a writing tutor would help her. In response to Professor Shakusky’s suggestion of receiving a 0 on the paper, she acknowledged that she would reluctantly accept it.

Jury Deliberations I:
The jury filled in one juror who had arrived late and missed most of the circumstantial portion. One juror suggested discussing the merits surrounding Suzy’s honesty as it seemed to be a major concern of the professor’s. Most jurors felt that they had no evidence to suggest that Suzy was lying, and that practically, there was little that they could do differently if they felt she was, given the information they had—they didn’t feel that it was the jury’s responsibility to search for time stamps and the like on any of Suzy’s documents. Some jurors did express a concern about holding Suzy accountable; as well, they were a tad disconcerted by the way they perceived Suzy to not fully understand that her actions did, indeed, constitute a breakage of the Honor Code, nor did she appear to fully understand the gravity of the situation. Some jurors wondered whether the professor’s suspicions came from her lack of understanding of the Honor Code and the culture around it at Haverford, particularly given Suzy’s discomfort with him throughout the semester.

They then moved to talk about specific resolutions. They started with the idea of separation.
After talking briefly about what separation means, and the proper role of Suzy being a Bryn Mawr, not Haverford, student, the jury quickly came to the conclusion that they would be uncomfortable separating her. In particular, the jury felt that this was an honest mistake, with many jurors noting that their own writing styles make them prone to this exact sort of mistake, as well. The jury also discussed having Suzy attend the writing center, read the Haverford Honor Code, take the academic integrity tutorial, and have a mediated discussion with Professor Shakusky. The jury then set up a time the following week to finish their discussion.

**Jury Deliberations II and Tentative Resolutions:**
One juror did not attend this meeting. The jury began by discussing the grade change resolution. Most of the jury expressed interest in giving some credit for the work that Suzy had done on the revised final paper, with half credit seeming to be the most popular option. One juror felt very uncomfortable giving any credit for the paper, as he felt that accountability would not be sufficiently addressed without giving Suzy a 0 for the paper. He noted that he would be more comfortable if the other resolutions addressed accountability. At that point, the jury turned to developing a more complete list of resolutions, with the idea of returning to the grade change after having a better sense of what the other resolutions would be.

The jury worked out the specifics of the resolutions they had discussed in their last meeting, deciding that Suzy should read the Honor Code and Maud McInerney’s essay *Plagiarism and How to Avoid it*, take the Academic Integrity tutorial, and write an essay on them before returning for the Fall semester. During the semester, they decided that she should meet with a Writing Center tutor weekly throughout the semester and have a mediated meeting with Professor Shakusky. They decided that Suzy should write a letter at the end of the semester to give her a chance to reflect on the experience of both the trial and the completion of all of the resolutions.

The jury also discussed how this case exemplified the greater problem of a high proportion of Bryn Mawr international students being involved in Honor Council trials relating to academic dishonesty\(^2\). They decided that they would ask Suzy to address some portion of her letter to the Bryn Mawr community and write about this issue from her perspective. The jury also recommended that Honor Council and Honor Board co-host an event to help address this issue.

The jury then returned to the issue of a grade change. Each juror gave a brief summary on their thoughts. Almost everyone preferred giving some credit (with half credit continuing to be the most popular option) and a few jurors were uncomfortable assigning a 0. One juror continued to express deep discomfort with giving credit for the paper unless more of the other resolutions presented solutions for providing Suzy a sense of accountability for the greater community. There was some discussion of having Suzy create a guide for Bryn Mawr students on Haverford Honor Council code and trials. Since it was getting late and few people had ideas for more accountability (and others questioned if more accountability was even necessary), the jury decided to write a resolution that mentioned their two lines of thinking, with the plan to take some time to reflect, brainstorm, and hear from the two parties before coming to a final recommendation.

The jury turned to the issue of reporting to institutions of higher learning. Some jurors felt that the case should be reported simply because plagiarism occurred, and others noted that at some other schools papers are turned directly into an online plagiarism-checker, such as turnitin, and that Suzy would not have had the chance to turn in the final draft. That being said, most jurors felt that the accidental nature of the infringement could also be an argument against reporting, and almost no one felt strongly one way or another. They wrote a statement that encompassed these thoughts.

Before the jury moved to consensus, one juror raised the issue that there was no Bi-Co Liaison for this trial and expressed concern that this speaks to the larger issue about the relationship between Bryn Mawr and Haverford’s Honor Codes. He also worried that the forum in resolution 9 could easily turn to criticism of Bryn Mawr’s relationship with Haverford’s Honor Code, which was neither the goal, nor a productive use of time. While the jury resolved that there was little to be done about the issue in the span of the trial, the issues were important ones that should be noted in the abstract and raised for discussion by Honor Council.

Tentative Resolutions

1. The jury feels that either a 0 or half credit on the paper are appropriate options for a grade (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia).

2. Suzy will meet with a writing center tutor weekly throughout the [semester] (9 jurors consent,
3. Suzy will read the Haverford Honor Code before the start of the [semester] (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia).

4. Suzy will take the Academic Integrity Tutorial before the start of the [semester]. We recommend that all students taking Haverford classes do the same (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia).

5. Suzy will read Maud McInerney's essay "Plagiarism and how to Avoid it" before the start of the [semester] (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia).

6. Suzy will write a 750-1000 word essay reflecting on her trial and what she learned in resolutions 3, 4, and 5 (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia).

7. The jury recommends that Suzy have a mediated meeting with Professor Shakusky before [date] (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia).

8. Suzy will write a letter to be released to the Bi-Co community by [date] (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia).

9. The jury recommends that Haverford's Honor Council and Bryn Mawr's Honor Board co-host a forum for the Bi-Co community to educate both communities on their respective Honor Codes (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia).

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

Statement on Reporting
While there is a sense among the jury that this incident should be reported to other institutions of higher learning because plagiarism was involved, we feel that intent is an important consideration in making the final decision on reporting (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia).

Finalizing Resolutions:
Only eight jurors were able to attend this meeting due to scheduling issues, and Professor Shakusky also did not attend. Professor Shakusky and one of the jurors who could not attend expressed their thoughts on the resolutions via email. Professor Shakusky agreed with all of the resolutions, but as far as a grade change, he felt that half credit was too lenient. He suggested that he might give Suzy credit for the preliminary parts of the final, but a zero for the paper. The juror similarly expressed that he felt uncomfortable with Suzy receiving credit for the paper unless more accountability was added to the resolutions. During the meeting, Suzy raised a few concerns about the resolutions, particularly the meeting with Professor Shakusky, which she felt...
was unnecessary. A few jurors explained how they felt it could help with her restoration both into the community, but also regarding her relationship with her professor, and Suzy seemed more understanding. She also asked about the frequency of the Writing Center meetings, noting that she wouldn’t have a paper to work on every week. Some members of the jury expressed that she might use the meetings to work on writing skills generally when she didn’t have a writing assignment due.

The jury began by discussing the grade change and decided to go with the Professor’s suggestion, feeling that it best encompassed the feelings of the whole group on the grade change. They also discussed the meeting and whether they felt it was necessary. Most jurors felt that it was important for restoration and even accountability—that it was important for Suzy to finalize the process and find closure with Professor Shakusky. They decided to leave all of the resolutions, aside from the one regarding the grade change, unaltered. They agreed that the statement still captured their sentiments, as well. They consented to the following final resolutions:

1. The jury recommends that Suzy receive a 0.0 on the final paper, but receive full credit on the preliminary parts of the assignment (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia).
2. Suzy will meet with a writing center tutor weekly throughout the [semester] (8 jurors consent, 2 stands outside in absentia).
3. Suzy will read the Haverford Honor Code before the start of the [semester] (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia).
4. Suzy will take the Academic Integrity Tutorial before the start of the [semester]. We recommend that all students taking Haverford classes do the same (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia).
5. Suzy will read Maud McInerney's essay "Plagiarism and how to Avoid it" before the start of the [semester] (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia).
6. Suzy will write a 750-1000 word essay reflecting on her trial and what she learned in resolutions 3, 4, and 5 (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia).
7. If Professor Shakusky is willing, Suzy will have a mediated meeting with him before [date] (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia).
8. Suzy will write a letter to be released to the bi-co community by [date] (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia).
9. The jury recommends that Haverford's Honor Council and Bryn Mawr's Honor Board co-host a forum for the bi-co community to educate both communities on each other's Honor Codes (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia).

Resolutions as a whole: 8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia

Statement on reporting:

While there is a sense among the jury that this incident be reported to other institutions of higher learning because plagiarism was involved, we feel that intent is an important consideration in making the final decision on reporting (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia).

Post-Trial:
The trial was not appealed.

Discussion Questions:

1. How should Haverford's policies on plagiarism interact with Honor Council cases where the confronted party claims the plagiarism was accidental? Should it affect the resolutions?
2. How do cultural differences play into how people interact with the code? How did Suzy’s identity as an international student affect this trial?
3. What do you think of the jury's decisions in this case?
4. One juror brought up a concern about the lack of the Bi-Co liaison in this trial. How important is it for a BiCo liaison to be present for a trial involving a Bryn Mawr student? What purpose does the bico liaison serve in an Honor Council trial?