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Key:
Confronted Party: Sunset Blush
Confronting Party: Professor Moscato
Course: History of the Boxed Vintage

Summary/Pre-Trial:
This trial centered around plagiarism and improper citation by a student, Sunset Blush, in a group project proposal in Professor Moscato’s class, History of the Boxed Vintage. Honor Council consented to send the case to an academic trial.

Fact Finding:
Professor Moscato opted not to participate in the trial process, but emphasized over email that he wanted the trial to focus on education and restoration. In his statement to Honor Council, Professor Moscato stated that while reading the project proposal of one group in his History of the Boxed Vintage class, he noticed that one section contained passages that resembled language from a different source that was not properly cited. Professor Moscato reached out to the group, asking to meet. In the following meeting, Sunset Blush accepted ownership over the section of the paper, but denied that any plagiarism had occurred. Professor Moscato recalled that Sunset Blush felt that no plagiarism had occurred because he had followed the citation style guide provided by Professor Moscato for the course, but Professor Moscato felt that the handout was irrelevant, as it did not provide examples for citing verbatim or near-verbatim quotes from previous studies and made no reference to plagiarism.

In Sunset Blush’s statement to Honor Council, he confirmed that when he and his group met with Professor Moscato, he was frustrated, as he felt that he had followed Professor Moscato’s citation guidelines correctly. He stated that after the meeting, his groupmates confronted him
about his behavior during the meeting, particularly how he raised his voice in frustration at Professor Moscato. In his statement, Sunset Blush expressed remorse for his behavior during the meeting, adding that he tried to meet with Professor Moscato to apologize, but was unable to meet with him in person.

During the Fact Finding portion of the trial, the jury met with Sunset Blush via Skype, who explained that while he felt that plagiarism had “technically” occurred, the discrepancy was more an issue of incorrect citations and formatting than any intent to cheat or claim ownership of someone else’s work. Therefore, he did not believe that a violation of the Honor Code had occurred. He felt that the error was minor and reflected his lack of familiarity with the IPA citation style at the time of his enrollment in the course.

**Jury Deliberations**

Though the jury felt that Sunset Blush did not intentionally plagiarize, the jury unanimously felt that a violation had occurred. The jury believed that Sunset Blush did not understand why his error had constituted plagiarism, and took Professor Moscato’s suggestion that the resolutions should be aimed at education rather than punishment. The jury ultimately consented to a statement of violation that incorporated language from Professor Moscato’s plagiarism policy for the course in order to provide specific guidelines for where the violation of the Academic Code occurred.

**Statement of Violation:**

*While the jury believes that the violation was unintentional, [Sunset Blush] violated [Professor Moscato’s] plagiarism policy by including passages that were “nearly identical to text that appears in a pre-existing document, without crediting the original source of the wording by using quotation marks and providing appropriate in-text and bibliographic citations”, which constitutes a violation of the Honor Code (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia).*

**Circumstantial Portion:**

Sunset Blush was unable to attend the circumstantial meeting, but emailed the jury with his thoughts. He emphasized that he was ready and willing to take educational measures to prevent this sort of violation from happening again, but also expressed serious concern about how trial resolutions may impact his final grade in the course. He proposed rereading and writing a reflection on Professor Moscato’s plagiarism policy as a potential resolution.

**Jury Deliberations and Tentative Resolutions:**

After the chair shared these thoughts from Sunset Blush, the jury began deliberating. The jury unanimously shared Professor Moscato’s sentiment that the resolutions should focus on
education and restoration. Ultimately, they came to a set of tentative resolutions that met their desire for strong educational measures and personal growth for Sunset Blush. The jury expressed concern that Sunset Blush did not understand the nature of his violation and that he believed he had only violated Professor Moscato’s policy, and that he did not understand the effects of plagiarism on the greater academic community at Haverford. The resolutions were written to reflect the jury’s desire for Sunset Blush to educate himself on plagiarism beyond Professor Moscato’s plagiarism policy.

For the statement on reporting to graduate schools, the jury unanimously felt this incident should not be reported, and several jurors felt personally uncomfortable with having the incident reported. However, the weight of the jury wanted to include a resolution addressing the jury of a second trial concerning plagiarism, should Sunset Blush find himself in a similar situation. One juror felt very uncomfortable with this resolution, but multiple other jurors felt the set of resolutions would be incomplete without it. Ultimately, due to extenuating circumstances, the jury proceeded with seven jurors consenting on this resolution with the understanding that eight would need to consent in finalizing.

1. The jury recommends that [Sunset Blush] reread and re-familiarize himself with [Professor Moscato’s] plagiarism policy as well as citation guidelines across disciplines (with a particular focus on [Wine History]), and write a reflection on how he can apply these ideas to his future writing. The jury hopes that this reflection will give [Sunset Blush] the chance to consider the impact of plagiarism on a larger scale than just one professor’s expectations (8 jurors consent; 2 stand outside in absentia)

2. [Sunset Blush] will meet with the Writing Center at least twice in the [next] semester: once to discuss his first major writing assignment, and once leading up to finals week. The jury recommend that [Sunset Blush] continue these meetings throughout and beyond the [next] semester if he finds them helpful (8 jurors consent; 2 stand outside in absentia)

3. If [Sunset Blush] is involved in another Honor Council trial concerning plagiarism, we feel that the jury of the second trial should be aware of this proceeding (7 consent, 1 stands outside, 2 stand outside in absentia)

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

Statement on Reporting:
The jury recommends that this proceeding not be reported to other institutions of higher learning. (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia)
Finalizing:
Sunset Blush was away at the time of the finalizing meeting, but emailed the jury with his thoughts. He expressed comfort with the resolutions and asked for clarification on the timeline for resolution 1. The jury consented to a set of final resolutions that was identical to the tentative list with the exception of this clarifying clause in resolution 1. The jury expressed concern that Sunset Blush did not view the issue as plagiarism.

Finalizing Resolutions:
1. The jury recommends that [Sunset Blush] reread and re-familiarize himself with [Professor Moscato’s] plagiarism policy as well as citation guidelines across disciplines (with a particular focus on [Wine History]), and write a reflection on how he can apply these ideas to his future writing. The jury hopes that this reflection will give [Sunset Blush] the chance to consider the impact of plagiarism on a larger scale than just one professor’s expectations. This reflection should be completed prior to the start of the [next] semester. (8 jurors consent; 2 stand outside in absentia)
2. [Sunset Blush] will meet with the Writing Center at least twice in the [next] semester: once to discuss his first major writing assignment, and once leading up to finals week. The jury recommend that [Sunset Blush] continue these meetings throughout and beyond the [next] semester if he finds them helpful (8 jurors consent; 2 stand outside in absentia)
3. If [Sunset Blush] is involved in another Honor Council trial concerning plagiarism, we feel that the jury of the second trial should be aware of this proceeding (8 consent, 2 stand outside in absentia)

Resolutions as a whole: (8 jurors consent, 2 stands outside in absentia)

Statement on Reporting:
The jury recommends that this proceeding not be reported to other institutions of higher learning. (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia)

Post-Trial:
The resolutions were not appealed.

Discussion Questions:
- How should the confrontation process be considered when juries evaluate a violation?
- How does restoration occur when the confronted and confronting parties are not on the same page with regards to the gravity of a violation?
- How should malicious intent to cheat vs lack of plagiarism education be weighed differently when developing resolutions for a confronted party that has plagiarized?
- When should future Honor Council juries be notified of a party’s previous violations?