Butterflies:
An Honor Council Academic Trial
Released Fall 2018

This abstract was not released in accordance to the timeline specified by the Students’ Association Constitution. The confronting party consented to the release of the abstract. The confronted party consented to the release of the abstract.

Key:
Confronting Party: Professor Monarch
Confronted Parties: Glasswig and Brimstone
Course: Pollination 325

Summary/Pre-Trial:
Glasswig and Brimstone contacted Honor Council regarding a potential violation in their course Pollination 325. Honor Council consented to send the case to an academic trial, but because of the caseload at the time, the trial was run at the start of the next semester. Since Brimstone was on leave, Glasswig’s trial was run separately from Brimstone’s.

Fact Finding:
Glasswig and Professor Monarch each gave their version of the events. They were largely on the same page about what happened--that Glasswig did not read the course’s collaboration guidelines, and as a result, he and Brimstone ended up [pollinating the same flower] together and not separately as the policy required. Professor Monarch noted that he felt it was clear the violation was not a nefarious one, as it was quite obvious what they had done. He also expressed that it was in part his fault for not confronting the students sooner that the issue went on for as long as it did. They both agreed that about 4 [flowers] had issues, with about half of the [petals] on each involving violations of the policy.

Jury Deliberations/Statement of Violation:

The jury also spent some time discussing with Professor Monarch the fact that he believes Honor Code violations are somewhat widespread in [pollination] and what might be contributing to that issue.
After the parties left, the jury deliberated and felt unanimously that a violation had occurred. They consented to the statement of violation below.

**Statement of Violation**

[**Glasswig**] violated the Honor Code by failing to fully follow the collaboration guidelines for the course on multiple assignments (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia).

**Circumstantial Portion:**

Professor Monarch sent some thoughts to the chair before the meeting, which she shared with the jury. He felt that a range of grade changes would be appropriate spanning from a 0 on the [flowers] in question, to partial credit on the assignments. Glasswig did not have much to add and expressed that perhaps partial to no credit on the [petals] in question seemed appropriate.

Glasswig left, and the jury deliberated. One juror proposed that it might be useful for Glasswig and Professor Monarch to discuss the level of collaboration more deeply and determine which [petals] should receive no credit and which should receive partial credit. Other jurors liked this idea, noting that it could serve as a good educational tool as well.

The jury felt that Glasswig’s and Professor Monarch’s relationship seemed to be in a good place and that more education beyond the conversation around grade changes with Glasswig was necessary, as Glasswig seemed now to be fully aware of what led to his violation and how to prevent it. They moved to discussion of restoration with the community. One juror raised that reflecting on some of the systemic issues with the Honor Code, particularly in the Pollination department could be a good exercise for both parties. Talking about their ideas could lead to new ways of presenting course guidelines and the Honor Code to classes on Professor Monarch’s part and allow Glasswig to reflect on what he could do as a student to prevent violations on his part and the part of other students. Further, the jury felt that Glasswig addressing the outcomes of the meeting in a letter to the community might lead to broader reflection and action throughout campus.

On the issue of reporting to graduate schools, Professor Monarch’s recommendation that the trial not be reported felt to the jury like strong enough reason against reporting, and no jurors felt compelled personally to report. They consented to the following tentative resolutions and statement.

**Jury Deliberations and Tentative Resolutions:**
1. If Professor [Monarch] is willing, he and [Glasswig] will meet to discuss the [petals] in question. In this meeting they will discuss the level of collaboration in each case and Professor [Monarch] will determine a grade in the range of 0 to half of the original credit on each [petal]. (9 jurors consent, 1 juror stands outside in absentia)

2. We encourage [Glasswig] and Professor [Monarch] to think critically about the widespread nature of Honor Code violations in [Pollination] and discuss steps professors and students can take to address this. [Glasswig] will write a brief letter to the community reflecting on this process and the outcomes of his meeting with Professor [Monarch]. This letter should be done by the end of [semester]. (9 jurors consent, 1 juror stands outside in absentia)

Statement on reporting

We recommend that this not be reported to other institutions of higher learning. (10 jurors consent)

Finalizing Resolutions:

Glasswig had no concerns with the resolutions. Professor Monarch expressed via email that it might be better to have the conversation about the grades on a [flower] level rather than an [petal-by-petal] level. The jury discussed this with Glasswig and decided that the two of the them could structure the conversation in a way that made the most sense for them, which might mean discussing some [petals] in a more detailed way and in other cases discussing only the [flowers]. The jury changed the wording of the first resolution slightly and the chair relayed those thoughts more fully in an email to Professor Monarch.

Final Resolutions

1. If Professor [Monarch] is willing, he and [Glasswig] will meet to discuss the [petals] in question. In this meeting they will discuss the level of collaboration in each case and Professor [Monarch] will determine a grade in the range of 0 to half of the original credit on each [petal]. (10 jurors consent)

2. We encourage [Glasswig] and Professor [Monarch] to think critically about the widespread nature of Honor Code violations in [Pollination] and discuss steps professors and students can take to address this. [Glasswig] will write a brief letter to the community reflecting on this process and the outcomes of his meeting with
Professor [Monarch]. This letter should be done by the end of [semester]. (10 jurors consent)

Post-Trial:
This trial was not appealed.

Discussion Questions:
1. How can students and professors work collaboratively to address collaboration discrepancies in the classroom? In specific departments?
2. What can professors do to be more clear about how they want students to work together on different assignments? Is the syllabus enough?