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Key:
Arete: Confronted party, a Bryn Mawr student
Professor Odysseus: Confronting party
Dean Athena: Arete’s dean at Bryn Mawr
Sea Voyages: Department
Mapmaking: Course
Ithaca: Arete’s home country

Summary/Pre-Trial:
[Arete], A Bryn Mawr Student, contacted Honor Council after being confronted by her 300-level [Mapmaking] professor, Professor Odysseus. He confronted her regarding suspicious answers on an exam that incorporated more sophisticated techniques that were found on the internet but had not been discussed in class. In her statement to Honor Council, Arete stated that she had used the textbook, a permitted source, on the exam, and that she had supplemented her knowledge with an online source concerning that topic before taking the exam, but during the exam had used only her textbook\(^1\) and her memory of the outside source. She did not admit to violating the Honor Code in her statement, although Professor Odysseus noted that she later sent him an apology email.

Honor Council consented to send the case to an academic trial. Before the trial began, Professor Odysseus sent Honor Council an update, because he had reason to believe that two of the [navigation charts] on a homework assignment that Arete turned in before the exam were not

\(^1\) The textbook that [Arete] refers to was actually a compilation of online resources that [Arete] had assembled, and thus her use of these resources during the exam violated exam instructions. This is clarified later in the trial.
her own work. He explained that while the use of outside sources was not explicitly forbidden for homework assignments, students had been told in class and on the syllabus that their solutions must represent their own work and be written individually. After reporting this new potential violation to Honor Council, Professor Odysseus informed Arete of this new potential violation via email. Professor Odysseus’s update to his initial statement was presented to the jury along with his initial statement. Bryn Mawr’s Honor Board provided a Bi-Co Liaison for the trial. Although Arete later admitted to plagiarizing, a significant gap in her understanding of academic integrity was apparent throughout the trial. The jury came to several resolutions addressing education and attempting to restore the relationship between Arete and Professor Odysseus, as well as addressing accountability by including separation from both Haverford and Bryn Mawr.

**Fact Finding:**

Professor Odysseus began with his account of the incident. On the take-home exam in question, Professor Odysseus noticed that Arete’s answers contained sophisticated material that had not been covered in class and that was covered differently in the textbook, which was a permitted source on the exam. After searching the internet, he found a navigation chart online that was nearly identical to one provided by Arete on the exam. Upon further reviewing the exam and searching more thoroughly on the internet, Professor Odysseus realized that several other of Arete’s charts were very similar to charts he found online. He explained that while people may take similar approaches to [designing a chart], Arete’s navigation charts were abnormally similar to those found online, and he thought it was almost impossible that she produced them without copying from other sources.

Professor Odysseus continued his account by reporting that after his initial confrontation with Arete, he had found that one of Arete’s charts on a homework assignment was identical to one he found online. He finally noted that he had found out from Arete’s dean, Dean [Athena], that she was considering dropping his course. Arete and Dean Athena decided together that any such decision could not be made until the trial was complete.

Arete then gave her statement, stating that there were two questions on the exam for which she consulted the internet, which she acknowledged was an unauthorized source. She stated that these were the only two questions that she did not figure out on her own. Regarding the homework assignment in question, Arete explained that she used the internet to double-check her work, for she thought it was important to learn the concepts even when she was not sure of how to [make a chart]. She said she didn’t know that the internet was a forbidden resource on homework assignments, but also stated that she never copied and pasted answers from the internet.

Professor Odysseus wanted to clarify that use of the internet was not strictly forbidden for homework assignments; rather, his concern with Arete’s assignment was that her navigation chart was so similar to the one he found online that he thought that a citation was warranted.
Arete added that for homework assignments, if she found an answer online that was better than the answer she came up with on her own, she would change her answer to reflect the online answer.

A juror asked Arete if she had used the internet to answer two additional questions on the exam that she had not mentioned. Professor Odysseus had noted in his initial statement that he found her answers to these two questions similar to navigation charts he found online. Arete responded that her charts for these two questions reflected her own work. A juror then pointed out that the details of Arete’s chart designs for these two questions were verbatim matches to the navigation charts that Professor Odysseus found online, showing Arete both her exam and the online resources and asking her to clarify whether she had used the resources. Arete responded that she had not seen the online resources before, then said that she thought she had seen one of the navigation charts in the notes she used to study, but from a different source than the source that Professor Odysseus had given the jury. She elaborated that she had used practice questions and solutions to study for the course from various online sources, including course notes from similar courses at other universities. Arete said that it was possible that she had seen some of the problems of Professor Odysseus’s exam while studying these materials, and that she usually remembers the navigation charts that she studies, but not necessarily the exact details.

The trial chair then asked Arete again to explain the similarities between one of her charts and the online navigation chart. Arete responded that she did not look up anything while making this chart on the exam, and that she thought this problem was in her own textbook. Upon questioning, it became clear that what Arete was referring to as her “textbook” was a compilation of online practice questions and solutions from various sources that she had printed out and studied from throughout the course. She said that she had not purchased the assigned course textbook because it was too expensive. She also said that she used her “textbook” to answer most of the questions on the exam, stating that the only two questions she searched for online while taking the exam were the two she had initially admitted to looking up. Professor Odysseus noted that this was not an allowed source, showing that the exam instructions explicitly stated that only the textbook that he assigned could be used as a resource during the exam. A juror asked Arete if she thought it was okay to use her own “textbook” while taking the exam. Arete answered that she had thought it was okay. She said that she should have asked, but that she didn’t have the required textbook so she didn’t feel that she had a choice. A juror asked Arete whether she had copied charts directly from her “textbook” onto the exam if she found an exam question in her “textbook.” Arete said that she did.

A juror then pointed out to Arete that in her initial statement to Honor Council, she said that the only source she used while taking the exam was “our textbook.” Arete admitted that this wasn’t true. She said that she hadn’t had the courage to acknowledge her mistakes in her statement, but that she had apologized to Professor Odysseus before coming to the trial. A juror asked Professor Odysseus whether he considered Arete’s actions to constitute plagiarism, and he answered that he did. Professor Odysseus and Arete then left the jury to deliberate.
Jury Deliberations/Statement of Violation:

The jury felt that Arete had violated the Honor Code in several ways, namely, using disallowed sources on the exam, plagiarizing on the exam, and lying to Honor Council in her initial statement. The jury realized, however, that they were not entirely sure of the extent to which Arete had violated the Honor Code with regards to her homework assignments. It was evident that she had plagiarized on the homework assignment that Professor Odysseus had brought into question, but the jury wasn’t sure how many homework assignments this had happened on. The jury felt that it seemed likely that this behavior extended beyond just one homework assignment, but at this point, they had no hard evidence to support this. The jury decided to craft a statement of violation with wording that wouldn’t have to be modified if evidence of additional violations became apparent.

Statement of Violation:
The jury consented on the following statement of violation:

[Arete] violated the Honor Code by using disallowed sources on her take-home exam, plagiarizing on multiple assignments, and lying in her initial statement to Honor Council. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia, Bi-Co Liaison supports)

Circumstantial Portion:

Before hearing from Arete about the circumstances surrounding the violations, the jury wanted to address the additional questions that came up at the end of deliberations regarding the extent to which Arete used outside sources on previous homework assignments. Arete responded that she would use outside sources to check her work because she believed the purpose of the homework was to understand the material, but when pressed further Arete admitted that she would completely change her answers if she found she was wrong. The extent to which she did this depended on the difficulty of the homework, and Arete said the specific homework brought forward by Professor Odysseus had been particularly difficult. At this point, the question of whether or not Arete was committing plagiarism by turning in homework with navigation charts copied from the internet was raised. An email from Professor Odysseus addressing this question was read aloud. In the email, Professor Odysseus stated that although students were allowed to reference outside sources when completing homework assignments, he considered Arete to have plagiarized because she had lifted ideas from another source and presented them as her own when it was explicitly stated in the syllabus that students should only present their own ideas.

At this point, the jury had no further questions regarding Arete’s homework assignments, and moved on to circumstantial questions. Arete explained she had two other exams to prepare for the weekend during which she completed the Mapmaking exam, which was the weekend before a mid-semester break. She recounted that her studying was interrupted by a message from
her family informing her that something had happened and that she would need to go back to her home country of [Ithaca] as soon as possible. Arete needed to leave campus on Wednesday, which added to her worries regarding her exams. In order to study for her other two exams, she left some questions blank on her Mapmaking exam to return to later. She continued by explaining that it took her longer than she had expected to study for the other two midterms, and as a result, she still had a lot of work left to do on her Mapmaking exam the night before she had to turn it in. She worked on this exam for several more hours, but then felt as though she could not afford to spend any more time on it. She then googled two exam questions and copied down the answers, presenting them as her own. She turned in her Mapmaking exam the next day, completed her other midterms, and left for Ithaca on Wednesday. She added that at the time that she cheated she realized that she was breaking the Honor Code but not the extent of the potential consequences of her actions. She said that she had felt that she had to finish the task she was working on.

Upon further questioning, it became clear that while Arete knew she had violated the Honor Code, she was not clear on the reasons or the extent of her violation. Arete was aware the textbook she was using was not the one assigned, but said she did not really think about it at the time of the exam. She also stated that she didn’t consider her plagiarism on the homework assignments a violation of the Honor Code because she had written down the answers herself, and because she was not aware of the need to cite outside work on homework assignments in general. After the jury explained to Arete why her actions constituted violations, she responded that she understood she had violated the Honor Code because she had not cited her sources on the homework. However the jury was still not convinced that Arete understood her responsibilities under the Honor Code.

In regards to the circumstances surrounding the violations, Arete said that she had not thought to seek outside help or ask for an extension on any of her assignments, and that her family circumstances were completely unexpected but she was not able to talk about it. Arete talked about her relationship with Professor Odysseus at length, and said that before the exam she had a good relationship with him but was worried that now he would not trust her or forgive her for what happened. It was clear that Arete was concerned about their relationship and was convinced that it could not be repaired. The jury next discussed the Haverford and Bryn Mawr Honor Codes with Arete, who admitted that she would have liked to have more knowledge about the Haverford Code before taking a class at Haverford. However, the Bi-Co Liaison pointed out that Arete’s conduct on her homework assignments would have also been a violation of Bryn Mawr’s Honor Code had this violation occurred at Bryn Mawr. When asked why she didn’t realize that copying from outside sources on her homework was a violation, she said that she didn’t hear anyone say that it was. Later, when asked if she thought that Bryn Mawr could have done a better job educating her about plagiarism or the Haverford Honor Code, she said that it was her responsibility to educate herself, but admitted that Bryn Mawr had not done much to educate her on these matters.
The jury next questioned Arete about her request to drop Mapmaking, and her struggle to understand the material in the class. Arete said her dean had advised her to drop the class because failing it would prevent Arete from completing the major in Sea Voyages, as Mapmaking was a required class for the major. Arete and the jurors were unclear if Arete would be able to retake Mapmaking at Bryn Mawr if she received a 0.0 in the class, or whether Arete would be required to switch majors. In addition, Arete felt constrained by financial aid, which required her to complete her degree in eight semesters, and her student visa, which was in danger of being retracted if she was separated from Bryn Mawr. Arete also talked about how she felt part of her struggle in the class had to do with being unable to discuss her work or the material with anyone because she did not know any of the other students in the class (none of whom were from Bryn Mawr). Arete was also uncomfortable with the fact that there was no TA for the class, and felt that Professor Odysseus was unhelpful when answering her questions.

Regarding her initial statement to Honor Council, Arete said that she had confessed what she had done immediately to Professor Odysseus, but she didn’t know what would happen if she confessed to Council, so she lied in an email she sent five minutes after receiving Honor Council’s request for a statement. Arete later regretted this action, but decided to wait until she got to the trial room so she could explain herself, at which time she admitted she did not know how Council or a trial worked and had been very afraid.

At this point, the trial chair asked Arete to share with the jury her suggested resolutions. Initially, under the assumption that she could both fail and withdraw from Mapmaking, Arete suggested that she receive a 0.0 in the course because she didn’t complete the assignments. When it was explained to her that these were mutually exclusive, she said that she did not want to receive a 0.0 in the course and that she definitely did not want to change her major. Arete also asked not to be separated from Haverford. Through the trial process she now felt prepared to take classes at Haverford and wished to be accepted by the Haverford community. To complicate matters, in addition to Mapmaking, Arete was currently taking another class at Haverford that semester, and she planned to take a class at Haverford the following semester as well.

Professor Odysseus, via email, suggested that Arete receive a 0.0 in the course and that separation from Haverford College was necessary due to the breach of trust between Arete and her professors. His email described his extreme frustration and negative feelings after the Fact Finding meeting, including a perception that Arete had just been saying what she thought he wanted to hear, as her story changed during Fact Finding. He described the extent to which he felt his trust had been violated, described Arete as having blatantly disregarded the Honor Code, and stated that if he was not bound by confidentiality, he would want to ask Arete’s current and past professors to check whether her work matched online sources. Professor Odysseus’s comments seemed to confirm Arete’s fears that he would never trust her again, and she reiterated several times that she didn’t know that Professor Odysseus thought that poorly of her and was really upset that he hadn’t told any of this to her face when she had tried to communicate with him so many times. A juror asked Arete whether she felt that some kind of mediated dialogue
with Professor Odysseus would be helpful so that they could come to a place of understanding. She answered that she had been trying to talk to him but that it wasn’t working, and so she didn’t feel that a mediation would help.

Jury Deliberations Part I:

Jurors began by suggesting several possible resolutions, including having Arete write a letter to the community, a mediation between Arete and Professor Odysseus, and some form of plagiarism education for Arete. The jury then discussed their apprehension about deciding on a recommended grade change before knowing how receiving a 0.0 would affect Arete’s future in her Sea Voyages major and as a student at Bryn Mawr. They felt that part of their job, and the job of her dean, was to help her figure out what her options would be, and that it was their responsibility to know what the implications from their resolutions would be before they could agree to them. The jury agreed that the trial chair would contact Dean Athena with their questions. In this email, the trial chair asked Dean Athena whether Arete would be able to continue in the Sea Voyages major if she were to receive a 0.0 in this class, whether she would be able to retake Mapmaking at either Haverford or at Bryn Mawr for credit, and whether there were any alternative majors that Arete could pursue at this point in her college career if she would be unable to continue in the Sea Voyages major.

The jury then began to discuss separation. Most jurors expressed that Arete should be academically separated from Haverford until the completion of her resolutions, especially the mediation with Professor Odysseus and plagiarism education. One juror felt strongly that one semester of separation would be restorative, regardless of when Arete completed her resolutions. The jury then discussed what the impact of separation from Haverford would be beyond the impact of the resolutions themselves. No decision on separation was reached, but the jury was concerned that additional separation beyond the time required to complete the resolutions might limit Arete’s options if she had to change her major. Many jurors felt that if Arete was required to complete a significant number of education and restorative resolutions before taking another class at Haverford, that the shorter separation would be sufficient. The jury then decided to adjourn until they had received a response from Dean Athena.

Jury Deliberations Part II

The jury began by discussing the answers to the questions they had posed to Dean Athena. The dean said that she was almost sure that the Sea Voyages department would allow Arete to continue in the major, and she suggested that Arete retake Mapmaking at Bryn Mawr. She did add that if Arete didn’t want to continue in the major after earning a zero in this course, she could continue with a [Sailing] major, since she had taken a significant number of courses in the Sailing department. The jury now felt that if receiving a zero in Mapmaking wouldn’t prevent Arete from continuing in her major, then it made sense for her not to earn credit for the course given the extent to which she violated the professor’s instructions on homework and exams.
The jury then went on to discuss possible resolutions to address plagiarism education, such as having Arete take the Haverford academic integrity tutorial, assigning her an essay to read on plagiarism, having Arete review the Sea Voyages department’s guidelines on academic integrity, and/or having Arete work with the OAR or a dean. More specifically, the jury discussed having Arete read something about plagiarism and then produce an essay in response that was related to plagiarism in Sea Voyages, which would be especially educational for her if she decided to continue with the major. The jury also thought that this would be useful because they were not convinced that Arete completely knew that what she had done was wrong, especially in not citing the sources she used on her homework. To help her develop a better understanding of this, the jury suggested that she could write an essay about why what she did was plagiarism, why it was problematic, and how the same situation could be better approached in the future.

The discussion then turned towards accountability and separation. The trial chair reminded the jury that in addition to considering separation from Haverford, the jury could also make a recommendation to separate Arete from Bryn Mawr if they saw fit. One juror asked whether it is a violation of Bryn Mawr’s Honor Code to violate Bryn Mawr’s Honor Code in a Haverford course, as is true of the Haverford Honor Code. The Bi-Co Liaison clarified that Bryn Mawr’s Honor Code does not apply at Haverford, but states that Bryn Mawr students are “expected to adhere to the Code of the campus one is on.” The Liaison went on the explain that when a Haverford Honor Council trial of a Bryn Mawr student results in recommended resolutions that involve Bryn Mawr, an inquiry is made by the head of Bryn Mawr’s Honor Board to decide whether Bryn Mawr will accept, modify, or reject what Haverford has recommended.

The jury ultimately concluded that if they felt that there was justification for separation from Haverford, then it also would make sense to separate Arete from Bryn Mawr, considering what it means to be part of the Bi-College community, and considering that she seemed to have had a long-term lack of understanding of the Honor Codes of both schools. The jury did not yet make a decision on separation other than that the two colleges should be treated the same in terms of separation. The jury felt that it made sense to consider this a disciplinary proceeding for the purpose of reporting to other institutions of higher learning due to the size and intentionality of the violation.

The jury then returned to the discussion of separation. During the last meeting, the jury had discussed potentially allowing Arete to return to Haverford next semester if she completed all of her resolutions before then. The jury now questioned whether the break preceding the following semester would be enough time for Arete to be fully restored. Returning to separation from Bryn Mawr, one juror pointed out that it was the jury’s duty to consider separation from Bryn Mawr, since Bryn Mawr trusted Haverford’s Honor Council to restore Arete to the Bi-Co. The Bi-Co Liaison agreed that it was appropriate for the jury to be discussing separation from Bryn Mawr. Jurors noted that they wanted to check to make sure that separation from Bryn
Mawr would not affect Arete’s visa or her ability to graduate under her financial aid package, but that they could come to a tentative resolution regarding separation before receiving answers to these questions. One juror mentioned that he felt uncomfortable with separation from Bryn Mawr, but wasn’t sure what would be a better solution. One juror asked the Bi-Co Liaison whether Arete’s violations would likely result in separation if this had occurred on Bryn Mawr’s campus, and the Liaison said she thought it was likely.

The jury then discussed the length of separation. They concluded that separation for longer than one semester seemed excessive, for it seemed as though all the resolutions could be accomplished during one semester of separation, plus the following break. The jury decided that the trial chair should email Dean Athena again to ask whether separation would impact the completion of Arete’s major, her financial aid, or her visa status.

**Tentative Resolutions**

The jury consented on the following tentative resolutions:

1. The jury recommends that [Arete] receive a 0.0 in [Mapmaking]. (10 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison supports)
2. [Arete] will read Maud McInerney’s essay “Plagiarism and How to Avoid It” and the Haverford [Sea Voyages] Department’s guidelines on academic integrity. She will then write a response addressing her violation, why it occurred, and how it could have been avoided. [Arete]’s response will be read and approved by three jurors. The jury recommends that Professor [Odysseus] participate in this process of approval. (10 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison supports)
3. [Arete] will complete Haverford’s Academic Integrity Tutorial. (10 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison supports)
4. [Arete] will meet with the Bryn Mawr Academic Support and Learning Specialist once every two weeks for the remainder of this semester and for the entirety of her next semester at Bryn Mawr. (10 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison supports)
5. The jury recommends that [Arete] and Professor [Odysseus] meet for a mediation before the end of this semester. (10 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison supports)
6. [Arete] will write a letter to the community to be included in the abstract. (10 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison supports)
7. [Arete] will be academically separated from the Haverford community for the [upcoming] semester. Her return to the Haverford community in the [following] semester is contingent on completion of resolutions 2-6. (10 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison supports)
8. The jury recommends that [Arete] be academically separated from the Bryn Mawr community for the [upcoming] semester. Her return to the Bryn Mawr community in the [following] semester would be contingent on completion of resolutions 2-6. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside, Bi-Co Liaison supports)
9. The jury recommends that this process be considered a disciplinary proceeding for the purposes of reporting to institutions of higher learning. (10 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison supports)

Resolutions as a whole: 10 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison supports
Finalizing Resolutions:

In response to the resolutions, Arete said that she wasn’t expecting that she would be recommended to be separated from Bryn Mawr, and she wanted the jury to explain. A juror explained that the jury didn’t feel that the time between now and the beginning of the upcoming semester would be enough time for her to become restored to the community. This juror explained that the jury had further concluded that what is needed to be restored to Haverford is also needed to be restored to the whole Bi-Co community, and that a violation of Haverford’s Honor Code is essentially a violation of Bryn Mawr’s Honor Code, since the two Codes are the same in spirit. Arete then asked what the goal of separation was, and what the jury meant by restoration. A juror explained that separation would serve the purposes of both accountability and restoration, and it would give her time to complete the other resolutions and think about what happened. The juror explained that since this class was in Arete’s major and because she didn’t seem to understand what plagiarism meant in Sea Voyages, separation would give her time to come to this understanding.

Arete then informed the jury that she was planning to do research under the supervision of a Bryn Mawr Sailing professor who was leaving after the upcoming semester, and if she were to be separated, she would no longer be able to do this. She also said that she was thinking of not being a Sea Voyages major anymore because she felt it was inappropriate to have a zero in her major and because she felt she was losing confidence in her performance in the major.

Arete asked whether all jurors agreed that separation was necessary. The trial chair responded that this was a tentative resolution that the jury still wanted to discuss more, and that one juror stood outside of consensus on this resolution. Arete then asked whether she would be able to come back to the US if she were to be separated. The trial chair read Dean Athena’s answer to this question: she said that she was told by Bryn Mawr’s international student advisor that separation would “not necessarily” impact her visa, but that she would need a new SEVIS record and a new visa, which had not been a problem for students in similar situations in the past. Arete was still very concerned that she might be denied a new visa.

Arete said that the jury’s reasons for recommending separation were not persuading her, and that she wanted to hear more. A juror explained that she was expected to follow both the Haverford and Bryn Mawr Honor Codes, and that she violated both of them. This juror added that it would be doing an injustice to the community to separate her only from the college where she happened to be taking the course. The Bi-Co Liaison added that separation from Bryn Mawr and from Haverford for this extent of plagiarism seemed appropriate to her, as a member of the Bryn Mawr community.

At this point, the floor was open for jurors’ questions. One juror asked Arete if she had comments on any other resolutions, such as the one involving the mediation. Arete asked what the goal of the mediation was, and a juror responded that it seemed that there were a lot of misunderstandings between Arete and Professor Odysseus, and that since Arete felt that he didn’t
understand her, it would be beneficial to repair that trust. Arete asked what would happen if neither of them spoke or if the trust could not be repaired, and a juror responded that hopefully with the help of the mediator, they would be able to talk. Arete then asked what was the purpose of the meetings with the Academic Support and Learning Specialist. The Bi-Co Liaison explained that this person would help Arete with managing stress and time and could serve as a support person.

Jury Deliberations

The trial chair reminded the jury that Professor Odysseus had said via email that he supported all of the tentative resolutions. A juror asked whether anyone felt that any resolutions should be changed. Some jurors felt that separation seemed harsh, and some jurors had reservations, but they agreed that they did not see any other way. While it appeared very unfortunate that Arete would not be able to do research with the Sailing professor, the jury agreed that there are always inconveniences with separation. One juror said that it made sense that Arete wouldn’t see why separation would be beneficial, but the jury hoped that she would be able to feel that way in time. Another juror added that even if Arete didn’t need separation, they felt that the community needed it in order to feel that she had been held accountable.

The trial chair asked the two jurors who had expressed reservations about the separation, including the juror who stood outside of this tentative resolution, how they felt. One said that he was concerned about what Arete’s family would think when she came home and what her home life would be like. Another juror responded that even though he could see those concerns, it seemed inappropriate to choose not to separate for those reasons alone.

Final Resolutions

The jury consented on the following final resolutions:

1. The jury recommends that [Arete] receive a 0.0 in [Mapmaking]. (9 jurors consent, 1 juror stands outside due to absence, Bi-Co Liaison supports)
2. [Arete] will read Maud McInerney’s essay “Plagiarism and How to Avoid It” and the Haverford [Sea Voyages] Department’s guidelines on academic integrity. She will then write a response addressing her violation, why it occurred, and how it could have been avoided, and submit this before [date]. [Arete]’s response will be read and approved by three jurors. The jury recommends that Professor [Odysseus] participate in this process of approval. (9 jurors consent, 1 juror stands outside due to absence, Bi-Co Liaison supports)
3. [Arete] will complete Haverford’s Academic Integrity Tutorial before [date]. (9 jurors consent, 1 juror stands outside due to absence, Bi-Co Liaison supports)
4. [Arete] will meet with the Bryn Mawr Academic Support and Learning Specialist once every two weeks for the remainder of this semester and for the entirety of her next semester at Bryn Mawr. (9 jurors consent, 1 juror stands outside due to absence, Bi-Co Liaison supports)
5. The jury recommends that [Arete] and Professor [Odysseus] meet for a mediation before the end of this semester. (9 jurors consent, 1 juror stands outside due to absence, Bi-Co Liaison supports)

6. [Arete] will write a letter to the community to be included in the abstract. She will submit this letter before [date]. (9 jurors consent, 1 juror stands outside due to absence, Bi-Co Liaison supports)

7. [Arete] will be academically separated from the Haverford community for the [upcoming] semester. Her return to the Haverford community following this separation is contingent on completion of resolutions 2-6. (9 jurors consent, 1 juror stands outside due to absence, Bi-Co Liaison supports)

8. The jury recommends that [Arete] be academically separated from the Bryn Mawr community for the [upcoming] semester. Her return to the Bryn Mawr community following this separation would be contingent on completion of resolutions 2-6. (9 jurors consent, 1 juror stands outside due to absence, Bi-Co Liaison supports)

9. The jury recommends that this process be considered a disciplinary proceeding for the purposes of reporting to institutions of higher learning. (9 jurors consent, 1 juror stands outside due to absence, Bi-Co Liaison supports)

Resolutions as a whole: 9 jurors consent, 1 juror stands outside due to absence, Bi-Co Liaison supports.

Post-Trial:

Bryn Mawr’s Honor Board decided to uphold the resolution pertaining to Bryn Mawr, and thus Arete was separated from Bryn Mawr for one semester.

[Arete]’s Letter:

Dear Bi-Co Community,

Everybody has an unforgettable lesson in his life. A lesson that makes him a better man. I had mine in my four-year college life. In this letter, I want to share with you what I experienced and what I learned. I hope the community can accept a brand-new me.

As stated in the abstract, I made a mistake in my college life. I violated the honor code of Bi-Co community by obtaining published materials from the web and using them in my assignments and exam without acknowledging it. I went through the honor code trial because of my misconduct. Words cannot express how much I regret it.

At the moment my professor approached me, saying that he found one of the answers in my midterm exam was not my work, my mind went blank. I felt an unprecedented fear swallowing me. I held my answer sheet. Strength faded away. I knew what I did. My mouth opened, but I did not know what to say. I was not ready to take this. It was not a moment that I had even imagined going through.

I wish I have never done it. I was told to approach the honor board myself, which I did. I was so scared. I struggled and I did not even have the courage to admit what I had done to the honor board at the beginning. It was the first time I felt so hopeless. I felt my future ruined. I
hated that I did the wrong thing and went astray on my academic path. My dream was to go to graduate school, but it became so distant from me. I knew my misconduct would remain an indelible stain on my academic life. There was no way back.

I thought about my life, me as a student, me as a child, me as part of the Bi-Co community. Growing up in a family thinking highly of education, I have high standard for myself. I have been trying hard to be a good student. This time, my unrealistic goal drove me to do something a good man would not do. How would my parents think if they know that I cheated? They must be really disappointed not because I did not study well but because I failed to be honest and be responsible for my own behavior. I failed to be a good child. And how would my classmates think of me if they knew that I cheated to get a good grade? I failed to be a responsible member in Bi-Co community. Was this what I wanted to get out of college? Was this why I was here? No. These were not the reason why I chose to be in college. I did not come here for a perfect grade. I did not come here to be a dishonest person and disappoint people who love me. I am here to be educated to be a better man. My desire for a good grade made me gone astray.

But I am the lucky one. Although I feel shameful about what I have done, I also feel lucky that someone pointed it out and stopped me before I go further on the wrong path. I am grateful that I have gone through the honor code trial, the special education that Bi-Co gave me. I feel grown-up. Not only that I learned a lot, I am also getting closer to myself, to the person that I want to be. Because of this mistake, I have a chance to self-examine on who I am, why I choose to be in college, what I want to get out of the college, why I got lost on this path and how I can change it. I know myself better. I feel reborn.

This is the true meaning of education. I want to thank every single one who helped me going through this process and encouraged me to look forward. I hope my mistake would not be made again. I hope the community to take me as an example to remind all students of the essence of education.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. When is it appropriate for a Haverford jury to recommend separation from Bryn Mawr?
2. Would it ever be appropriate to ask a student’s past professors to look for violations in their old work based on a current violation? Is it ever helpful or necessary to do this?
3. How much weight should juries give to individual circumstances that would make separation particularly hard for a confronted party?