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Key:
Class: Salad Making 389
Confronted Party: Arugula
Confronting Party: Professor Kale
Other Professors: Professor Watercress and Professor Spinach

Summary/Pre-Trial:
This trial involved Arugula, a student in Professors Kale, Watercress, and Spinach’s class Salad Making 389. Professor Kale noticed that one of the assignments Arugula had submitted contained large amounts of text copied from an article he had read for the class. She confronted Arugula, who claimed to have no idea that he had violated the Honor Code but said he now understood his mistake and was willing to go to Honor Council. Arugula reported himself to Honor Council, who sent the case to an academic trial.

Fact Finding:
During fact finding, Arugula explained that he did not intend to plagiarize, but after speaking with Professor Kale, he realized that unintentional plagiarism is still unacceptable. He mentioned that he had intended to cite the portion of the reading that he had copied and pasted into his summary, but ran out of time while completing the assignment and forgot to include a citation.

Professor Kale explained that the class had previously done a similar summary assignment in class. She also said that a previous class period had been dedicated to understanding plagiarism because so many instances of plagiarism had occurred in the class in previous years. While the jury struggled with whether or not this incident was intentional, Professor Kale said that she did not feel that Arugula was actively deceiving her.

Jury Deliberations/Statement of Violation:
The jury felt confident that a violation had occurred, and felt comfortable immediately
beginning to craft a statement of violation. To begin brainstorming, the jury took stock of where they saw different elements of the violation taking place. Many jurors remained suspicious that Arugula must have had some intentionality of passing off his small wording changes as sufficient alterations to not constitute plagiarism. However, the jury felt that since they were disinterested in intentionality, they should consider the “where” of the plagiarism and violation, rather than whether or not Arugula was being less than honest with the jury.

They saw the main issues occurring with Arugula copying and pasting a paragraph from the summary of the article, and then making small word changes, not citing any of the words, and then submitting the paragraph in his assignment. The jury wrestled with whether or not they felt the statement of violation should simply identify Arugula committing plagiarism, or if it should specify the ways in which the violation had been executed.

One juror raised concern with the fact that Arugula had plagiarized from a summary, which this juror believed was like an extra form of plagiarism because Arugula was not condensing the information by himself.

The chair of the trial felt that, although the jury felt largely comfortable with the statement as it stood, she worried that consenting at this point would be rushing into a consensus process when the jury needed a bit more time to digest the statement. Therefore, she called the end of the meeting and declared that the jury would meet up later for final discussions.

The jury took the day and reconvened in the evening to finalize the statement. The discussion focused primarily on the addition of a few additional clauses/words to portions of the statement. Ultimately, the jury decided that these extra pieces were only detracting from the statement, and consented to it in its original form.

[Arugula] violated the Honor Code by plagiarizing an author's words, paragraph structure, and ideas, through 1) copying & pasting, 2) including nominal word changes, and 3) excluding citation.

(8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia)

Circumstantial Portion:

When the jury met for the first time to discuss resolutions, the chair of the trial began by announcing that one of the members of the jury was taking dean’s leave, effective immediately, so the jury would be proceeding with one juror in absentia for the rest of the trial.

The jury decided to begin by discussing Professor Kale’s suggestion for a 1.5 letter-grade reduction. She expressed that she did not want to fail Arugula in the class, but felt that this deduction would be sufficiently appropriate. The jury first established that they agreed with Professor Kale that they did not want to fail Arugula, however, many jurors had concerns about putting Arugula in a position where he would have to get a 4.0 to pass the class with the grade reduction. The jury worried that this would wind up being an effective failure if Arugula was put on too thin a grade margin for the rest of the semester. The jury was also confused about what a
1.5 letter-grade deduction entailed, since the 4.0 system does not allow for course grades ending in 0.5. The jury decided to email Professor Kale to inquire 1) what she meant by a 1.5 letter-grade deduction and 2) what impact that deduction would have on Arugula’s grade.

The jury then moved on to discussing other resolutions. They felt that the goal of education most needed to be addressed, and so they wrote two resolutions that would let Arugula learn more about plagiarism and how to prevent it. The jury felt that these resolutions also addressed restoration, so after a little more discussion, they consented to the following set of tentative resolutions.

**Tentative Resolutions:**

1. [Arugula] will receive a 1.0 grade reduction in the course and a 0.0 on the plagiarized assignment. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

2. [Arugula] will research 2 incidents of plagiarism in the field of [Salad Making]. He will write a 1-2 page report on each case, summarizing the nature of the plagiarism and its consequences. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

3. [Arugula] will write a letter to future [Salad Making 389] students recounting his experiences with plagiarism and its impact on his academic experience, classmates, and professors. The intent of this letter is not for Arugula to make excuses, but rather to reflect on the necessity of remaining conscientious during stressful times. He will consult with [Professor Kale], [Professor Watercress], and [Professor Spinach] to whatever extent they are willing. The jury hopes that if [Professor Kale], [Professor Watercress], and [Professor Spinach] are willing, they will share an anonymized version of this letter with future [Salad Making 389] classes. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

**On Resolutions As a Whole:** (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

**Statement on Reporting:**

Some members of the jury believe that this violation should be reported to other institutions of higher learning due to the seriousness of the issue and a desire to be transparent with other institutions about [Arugula's] restorative journey. Other members of the jury think that this case would not have been considered disciplinary at other institutions and that it should not follow [Arugula] beyond Haverford College.

**Finalizing:**

Neither Arugula nor Professor Kale proposed any changes to the tentative resolutions.

**Finalized Resolutions:**

1. [Arugula] will receive a 1.0 grade reduction in the course and a 0.0 on the plagiarized assignment. (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia)
2. [Arugula] will research 2 incidents of plagiarism in the field of [Salad Making]. He will write a 1-2 page report on each case, summarizing the nature of the plagiarism and its consequences. One of these reports will be completed by the end of the [semester] and the other will be completed by the end of [a break]. (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia)

3. [Arugula] will write a letter to future [Salad Making 389] students recounting his experiences with plagiarism and its impact on his academic experience, classmates, and professors. The intent of this letter is not for [Arugula] to make excuses, but rather to reflect on the necessity of remaining conscientious during stressful times. He will consult with [Professor Kale], [Professor Watercress], and [Professor Spinach] to whatever extent they are willing. The jury hopes that if [Professor Kale], [Professor Watercress], and [Professor Spinach] are willing, they will share an anonymized version of this letter with future [Salad Making 389] classes. The letter will be due by the end of [the semester]. (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia)

On Resolutions As a Whole: (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia)

Statement on Reporting:
Some members of the jury believe that this violation should be reported to other institutions of higher learning due to the seriousness of the issue and a desire to be transparent with other institutions about [Arugula's] restorative journey. Other members of the jury think that this case would not have been considered disciplinary at other institutions and that it should not follow [Arugula] beyond Haverford College. (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia)

Post-Trial:
The resolutions were not appealed.

Discussion Questions:
1. What kind of miscommunications might make a class more likely to have Honor Council violations?
2. Which kinds of Honor Code violations are caught and which are not? Why do you think this is? How do you think we could combat this?