Shutter Island:
An Honor Council Academic Trial
Released Spring 2019

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

Key:
Confronted Party: Edward “Teddy” Daniels
Confronting Party: Professor Chuck Aule
Course: Island Mysteries 321

Pre-Trial:
Teddy emailed Honor Council and Professor Chuck after a conversation with Professor Chuck about plagiarism in an article synopsis for his Island Mysteries 321 class. Teddy attached the article synopsis in his email to Council, however, it was discovered that the file he sent was an edited version, and not the original version of his submission. Professor Chuck responded that this was not the original synopsis and that while he had been sympathetic beforehand, he was now feeling frustrated by the deceptive nature of Teddy’s behavior. Teddy apologized and said that he had merely attached the wrong document by mistake and resent the original unedited file. Honor Council offered to mediate between the two parties while the case was waiting to be sent to trial. While Teddy was interested in this offer, Professor Chuck declined, citing a lack of time and a desire to settle things through the trial process.

Fact Finding:
Professor Chuck noticed that the writing in Teddy’s synopsis assignment did not seem like it was Teddy’s. When he looked at the article that Teddy had been summarizing, he found that much of the synopsis had been lifted directly from the article itself, and the majority of the assignment was not Teddy’s work. He said that when he initially met with Teddy, Teddy attempted to deny what had happened and said that it was just a case of missing quotation marks. However, Teddy later admitted he had plagiarized.

Teddy began by acknowledging the plagiarism as a violation of the Honor Code, saying that he would like to take responsibility and move forward. He said that in the original document he had used the author’s work without proper citation. After receiving Professor Chuck’s email about
the synopsis, he edited the paper to try and correct these issues to demonstrate to the professor and his dean that he was able to cite correctly, which was the document he initially sent to Honor Council. Teddy talked about how in his meeting with Professor Chuck, he found Professor Chuck very supportive and helpful in dealing with the stress of the situation, and that Professor Chuck had encouraged him to be sincere and honest as he moved forward in the case. He explained that his friends had been so worried about him that they had contacted Safety and Security about him. He also needed to pass this semester of the class in order to graduate. Teddy talked about how he felt intense pressure from his family and friends from home, and that leaving school would have negative repercussions for his financial aid. He said that he did not know how to move on positively from the violation.

One juror brought up the plagiarism education assignment that Professor Chuck had mentioned in his statement that Teddy was supposed to have completed as part of the class, and asked if this included information about how to quote large parts of text. Teddy said that he hadn’t taken the synopsis seriously as an assignment. He had also thought that because he cited the article at the beginning of the assignment, he didn’t need to cite it elsewhere. He acknowledged that he needed to be more careful in the future.

A juror asked Professor Chuck what percentage of the class grade this assignment was worth and how much the synopses were worth as a whole. Professor Chuck explained that the 10-12 synopsis assignments submitted over the course of a semester were worth 5% of the grade. A juror asked Teddy if he’d encountered issues with plagiarism before, and Teddy said he hadn’t.

At this point, Teddy and his support person left the room so the jury could speak with Professor Chuck separately. Professor Chuck reiterated that much of the synopsis was plagiarized and that he had contacted the Bryn Mawr Writing Center and Teddy had been seeing a tutor at the Writing Center since the violation. Professor Chuck noted that Teddy seemed to have an issue with taking whole phrases out of the original text without citation, and that though the original document was clearly worse, the other document was not completely properly cited, and he was worried that Teddy needed to continue learning about plagiarism. He acknowledged that it was good that Teddy had taken responsibility and agreed that he wanted to move forward, but he was not sure how to do so at this point.

A juror asked if he felt that the initial submission of the edited file was on purpose. Professor Chuck answered that he was honestly unsure. He said that he wanted to give Teddy the benefit of the doubt, but the two had specifically discussed sending the original draft to Honor Council. Professor Chuck explained that he had not asked Teddy to edit or revise the assignment. A juror noted that Teddy had explained that he had revised it to show his Dean. Professor Chuck said he was pretty sure that Teddy’s Dean had not said to revise the paper in that initial meeting. Later a
Juror asked Teddy about his submission of the edited file. Teddy explained that he had responded this way because he had been so nervous, and he now recognized that it was wrong. He said that when he submitted the synopsis there was plagiarism in it. He had felt that the paper was pretty long and he was running out of time with an already late synopsis.

**Jury Deliberations / Statement of Violation:**
The jury noted that the parties seemed to be on the same page. A juror said that since Teddy knew that the summary contained plagiarism, this was an instance of intentional plagiarism. Another juror disagreed, saying that while Teddy did not understand the fine points of proper citation, he had known he was being careless but had been unaware that not including in-text citations is plagiarism. They noted that Teddy now knew that he had been plagiarizing. The jury considered Teddy’s violation in three parts: the initial plagiarism in the synopsis he had turned in; lying to Professor Chuck in the initial email; and sending Honor Council the edited document. The jury was less sure whether the last two constituted violations of the Honor Code. The jury decided to ask Teddy’s dean about their meeting to determine his intention in creating the edited document. The jury continued to debate whether or not Teddy’s submission of the edited file to Honor Council was intentional, and whether or not this should factor into the statement of violation. Ultimately, the jury decided to address this issue by stating that Teddy had misrepresented his plagiarism.

**Statement of Violation:**
[Teddy] violated the Honor Code by plagiarizing throughout the assignment and by then misrepresenting his plagiarism. (10 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)

**Circumstantial Portion:**
Before this meeting, Teddy met with the Honor Council Librarian to discuss a previous Honor Council trial (*Apples*) in which Teddy had been the confronted party. Teddy did not wish for this previous trial to be discussed by the jury, but, although *Apples* did not explicitly involve plagiarism, Honor Council Executive Board felt it was important for the jury to consider in drafting their resolutions.

Teddy began by elaborating about how the plagiarism had happened and how he felt about it. He explained that every week, they had to turn in two synopses. At first, he had felt like these were helpful and necessary assignments, but as time went on, he felt he reached a point where any literature he turned in was accepted and it was just a summary rather than an exercise. A juror asked Teddy to share anything he felt comfortable sharing about the situation where his friends had called Campus Safety about him. Teddy said that he had been acting very negatively about the situation and had worried his friends. The jury then asked Teddy about his relationship with Professor Chuck. Teddy explained that there was not a lot of communication between the two of
them. He said that Professor Chuck had initially been very supportive and understanding during their first meeting.

When a juror asked Teddy about any experience with plagiarism and cheating he’d had prior to attending Haverford, Teddy explained that he didn’t have a lot of knowledge about plagiarism, but that he had learned more about the issue during his time in the Bi-Co. A juror asked Teddy to elaborate on his fear of separation. Teddy responded by saying that separation would disrupt his academic career. He felt that he would lose his financial aid, and that without it his family might not be able to continue sending him to school. When asked about potential resolutions, Teddy said that he felt there should be restoration with his professor. Teddy also explained that he had already contacted the Writing Center about reviewing all his future submissions for the course.

**Jury Deliberations Part 1:**

After Teddy left the room, the trial chair told the jury about the previous case in which Teddy had been involved. As Teddy did not wish to be present for this discussion, the jury read through the abstract for *Apples* without Teddy present. A juror asked how much they should consider the past trial, and the trial chair said that was something they could decide individually and as a group. A juror indicated new suspicion about Teddy’s claim that he had sent the edited file to Honor Council because he was panicked, knowing now that Teddy had gone through a trial before. The juror said they had been starting to give Teddy the benefit of the doubt, but now it seemed he had a history of making excuses. A juror said they felt like the jury should consider the resolutions from *Apples* to prevent redundancies. The jury also discussed Professor Chuck’s trust in Teddy. The trial chair read an email from Professor Chuck talking about suggested resolutions, which were mostly focused on restoration and education. They said they felt that it had to be acknowledged, but that Teddy has already shown steps towards restoration and wanting to restore that breach, and going beyond that to meet with the appropriate parties. A juror voiced the opinion that Teddy didn’t understand the point of the original assignment, which was to practice summary. They believed there was a disconnect between Teddy and Professor Chuck’s respective understanding of the goals of the assignment and its importance to the course overall.

**Jury Deliberations Part 2:**

The jury discussed Teddy’s meeting with Professor Chuck. A juror wondered if they wanted to leave the meetings open for discussion or direct them to specifically discuss Teddy’s thesis and thesis planning. A different juror felt that it could be communicated to them privately to suggest thesis outlining as a topic of these meetings. The jury then talked about having Teddy write a letter and wondered if it should be addressed to a specific group of people. A juror felt it would be useful to have Teddy write a letter specific to the BiCo community, so he could speak to the breaking of trust between Bryn Mawr students and Haverford and vice versa. The jury also
wanted Teddy to restore trust with the Island Mysteries department, and a juror suggested his writing a letter to the department. A different juror suggested having him just send it to the department head and the other professors cc’d in the email.

During their discussion on separation, a juror said they felt separation would be a measure of direct accountability. Another juror said that they did not want to separate Teddy because, even though it might hold him accountable, he was a senior, and it would delay his ability to graduate, possibly limiting his ability to reflect because he might be resentful. They also reminded the rest of the jury about the potential threat separation would pose to his financial situation and emotional and physical well-being. One juror suggested conditional separation, where Teddy would have tasks to complete or would be separated as a way to indicate that if circumstances were different, separation would be considered, and to help restore his to the community. Another juror shared that they had a strong moral opposition to separation and would block consensus on it in this case due to the personal circumstances Teddy had described.

A different juror said they would consider separation based on the previous offense (Apples) and wondered if Teddy took the Honor Code into consideration or if he was just going through the motions. They said they wondered if he would learn from the resolutions or if he’d just do what was necessary to graduate. They thought separation could be good for understanding the Honor Code and restoration process, but understood the concerns about the effects on Teddy’s mental health. The Bi-Co Liaison spoke and gave Honor Board’s perspective, saying that they would probably try to find solutions not involving separation. Jurors who had been on cases where separation had occurred previously spoke, one saying that they had done so in a case where the violation was really severe and the student had showed a lack of awareness and engagement, and that though there had been similar concerns about the family’s response, they couldn’t see the party being a part of the community without a time for reflection. Another juror spoke about times when they had separated which was when the violation was egregious, either extensive plagiarism or lying to the jury. Another juror spoke about a time when they had not separated someone for extensive plagiarism because of very extreme personal circumstances. A juror suggested that they look at what resolutions from Apples Teddy had fulfilled or was in the process of fulfilling in order to determine his engagement with the Honor Code.

The jury then moved on to discussing a grade change. The jury discussed a multitude of options for a grade change, noting that if they were unable to consent to separation, a grade change might be the only way to have direct accountability. However, the jury also talked about how because it was a thesis track course, they would need to consider a non-failing grade. The jury agreed that they felt it should be stronger than just a 0 on the assignment but that needed to return to this discussion later, thinking about the violation as a whole, including the misrepresentation. The jury briefly ran through the various networks of academic and personal support available at Bryn
Mawr College, and whether or not they felt that Teddy had taken advantage of them. They additionally discussed potentially requiring Teddy to make use of them as part of a resolution. Next, they discussed having Teddy write reflections in a way that was different from those he had been mandated to write during *Apples*, and that were specific to his experience. They wanted the reflections to be more guided so he would be more likely to get what the jury thought was important out of them.

**Jury Deliberations Part 3 / Tentative Resolutions:**

The jury discussed whether or not they felt it should be communicated to Teddy that they had discussed separation. The jury felt that ultimately it hadn’t been discussed in enough detail to warrant bringing it up with Teddy. The jury discussed alternative ways to address the trial goal of accountability, since separation was no longer being considered. They talked about requiring him to perform community service, but some members of the jury had concerns about how they could make this service directly related to the violation, and others felt that this was addressing something which was already being addressed in other resolutions, including the letter to the community. The jury discussed possible ways of making a resolution about reflections more meaningful than the ones Teddy had been assigned as a result of *Apples*. They felt that, as long as the guidelines and prompts for their reflections were less vague than those from *Apples*, they might be more useful to Teddy. The jury also discussed a letter to the jury of *Apples* as a way for Teddy to think through what didn’t work in terms of education and restoration the first time. The jury wanted someone to be able to read it, but didn’t want to breach Teddy’s confidentiality about his involvement in a second trial. Since there was a member of Executive Board who had been on *Apples* who knew the details of this trial as well, they decided that this letter would be sent to the member of Executive Board after completion to help Teddy address not only restoration and education, but also personal accountability. The jury hoped that even if Teddy believed that he had not committed a violation in *Apples*, he would have the chance to discuss the breach of trust that had occurred between himself and the jury.

The jury then extensively discussed what they should do for a grade change. They reiterated that they felt it would be important to make sure that Teddy received at minimum the lowest possible passing grade because otherwise it would result in de facto separation. The jury struggled with how to quantify what they felt was a substantial violation of the Honor Code with differing views of how intentional the violation had been. The jury thought about the idea of a grade drop of one full point but not below the lowest possible passing grade (2.0), or just assigning the lowest possible passing grade. One issue that was raised about the one point drop was that it still left the possibility for Teddy to receive a 3.0 in the class, which many jurors felt would be too high of a grade to receive in a class where plagiarism had occurred. However, the jury ultimately discussed how it was not their purview to decide what constituted a “good” or “bad” grade as
this was very subjective and individual, and ultimately decided that a point drop was more tailored to the subjective opinions about the grade.

The jury then moved to discussing whether there needed to be additional resolutions to address the part of Teddy’s violation about misrepresenting his assignment in his email to Honor Council. After some discussion they ultimately decided that the misrepresentation violation could be best addressed by adjusting other resolutions to include reflection about this part of the violation, especially in regards to the letter to the professors in the department. The jury then consented to the following set of tentative resolutions:

**Tentative Resolutions:**

1. The jury recommends that [Teddy] receives a zero on this assignment. (10 jurors consent, BiCo liaison approves)
2. The jury recommends that [Teddy] receive a course grade change of one point lower than what he would have received, no lower than the lowest possible passing grade. (9 jurors consent and 1 juror stands outside, BiCo liaison approves)
3. [Teddy] will continue to consult with the BMC Writing Center on all written assignments for this class through the end of the [next] semester. (10 jurors consent, BiCo liaison approves)
4. [Teddy] will meet with [Professor Chuck] (if the professor is willing). They will meet at least once before the end of the current semester and again within the first month of next semester. The jury recommends that the first meeting includes a conversation about the importance of the synopsis assignments. (10 jurors consent, BiCo liaison approves)
5. [Teddy] will write a letter to the BiCo community on his violation of the Honor Code and how it affects the community. (10 jurors consent, BiCo liaison approves)
6. [Teddy] will write a letter to the other professors co-teaching this course and the head of the department. In this letter, he will address both of his violations. (10 jurors consent, BiCo liaison approves)
7. [Teddy] will meet with the Bryn Mawr Academic Support and Learning Resource Specialist at least once before finals this semester and twice next semester. (10 jurors consent, BiCo liaison approves)
8. The jury encourages [Teddy] to take advantage of the peer mentor program among other support resources. (10 jurors consent, BiCo liaison approves)
9. [Teddy] will write three reflections of at least 500 words:
   a. The first will occur after reading Maud McInerney’s essay, “Plagiarism and How to Avoid It”, and will be completed by the end of the [current] semester;
   b. The second will occur after reading the Haverford Honor Code and will address how his plagiarism affected the community as a whole and will be completed over [the following] break;
c. The last will occur after completing a written assignment for a class next semester and will address how he’s incorporated what he’s learned into his writing process which will be completed by [the mid-semester] break of the [next] semester. (10 jurors consent, BiCo liaison approves)

10. [Teddy] will write a letter comparing the restoration process of the first trial with that of this trial. This letter will be written after completing all other resolutions and will be sent to the current jury as well as to any members of the previous jury for whom [Teddy]’s confidentiality is not a concern. The letter will be written before submitting the final draft of his thesis. (10 jurors consent, BiCo liaison approves)

On resolutions as a whole: (9 jurors consent and 1 stands outside, BiCo liaison approves)

Statement on Reporting:
The jury unanimously believes this trial should be considered a disciplinary proceeding for the sake of reporting to other institutions of higher learning. This is based on the seriousness and extent of the plagiarism, in addition to this being [Teddy]’s second serious breach of trust with the community. (10 jurors consent, BiCo liaison approves)

Finalizing Resolutions:
Teddy asked about the amount of writing the resolutions entailed, which he felt might lead to some redundancy, and the grade change, which he felt was overly punitive and did not deal with the goals of education and restoration. The jury discussed with him their reasoning behind the grade change, and how they hoped that it would still give him motivation to do well in the class while also holding him accountable for the fact that there was a violation committed.

After Teddy left, the jury expressed general disappointment that he had not seemed to fully understand the importance of accountability alongside the other trial goals, and that they were worried about his ability to properly reflect. The jury generally felt that they did not wish to re-consider separation, but wanted to give him another opportunity to discuss the resolutions with someone who could hopefully help him better understand their purpose. For that reason, they added a resolution about meeting with two jurors to give Teddy time to recover from reading the resolutions and be able to discuss them after beginning to complete them. With this, the jury decided they were happy with their resolutions and consented to the final set of resolutions with minor changes.

Final Resolutions:

1. The jury recommends that [Teddy] receives a zero on this assignment. (10 jurors consent, BiCo Liaison approves)
2. The jury recommends that [Teddy] receive a course grade change of one point lower than what he would have received, no lower than the lowest possible passing grade. (9 jurors consent and 1 juror stands outside, BiCo Liaison approves)

3. [Teddy] will meet with two jurors to follow up on the trial process by the end of the [current] semester. (10 jurors consent, BiCo Liaison approves)

4. [Teddy] will continue to consult with the BMC Writing Center on all written assignments for this class through the end of the [next] semester. (10 jurors consent, BiCo Liaison approves)

5. [Teddy] will meet with the Bryn Mawr Academic Support and Learning Resource Specialist at least once before finals this semester and twice next semester. (10 jurors consent, BiCo Liaison approves)

6. The jury encourages [Teddy] to take advantage of the peer mentor program among other support resources. (10 jurors consent, BiCo Liaison approves)

7. [Teddy] will meet with Professor [Chuck] (if the professor is willing). They will meet at least once before the end of the current semester and again within the first month of next semester. The jury recommends that the first meeting includes a conversation about the importance of the synopsis assignments. (10 jurors consent, BiCo Liaison approves)

8. [Teddy] will write a letter to the other professors co-teaching this course and the head of the department. In this letter, he will address both of his violations in this trial. This letter will be completed by the start of the [next] semester. (10 jurors consent, BiCo Liaison approves)

9. [Teddy] will write a letter to the BiCo community on his violation of the Honor Code and how it affects the community. This letter will be completed by [date]. (10 jurors consent, BiCo Liaison approves)

10. [Teddy] will create three reflections. Each may take the form of a written response of at least 300 words or a video of at least 3 minutes:

a. The first will occur after reading Maud McInerney’s essay, “Plagiarism and How to Avoid It’, and will be completed by the end of [the following] break;

b. The second will occur after reading the Haverford Honor Code and will address how his plagiarism affected the community as a whole and will be completed by the end of [the following] break, but after the completion of the first reflection;
c. The last will occur after completing a written assignment for a class next semester and will address how he’s incorporated what he’s learned into his writing process, which will be completed by [the mid-semester] break of the [next] semester. (10 jurors consent, BiCo Liaison approves)

11. [Teddy] will write a letter comparing the restoration process of the first trial with that of this trial. This letter will be written after completing all other resolutions and will be sent to the current jury as well as to any members of the previous jury for whom [Teddy]’s confidentiality is not a concern. The letter will be completed before submitting the final draft of his thesis. (10 jurors consent, BiCo Liaison approves)

On resolutions as a whole: (9 jurors consent and 1 stands outside, BiCo Liaison approves)

**Statement on reporting:**

The jury unanimously believes this trial should be considered a disciplinary proceeding for the sake of reporting to other institutions of higher learning. This is based on the seriousness and extent of the plagiarism, in addition to this being [Teddy]’s second serious breach of trust with the community. (10 jurors consent, BiCo Liaison approves)

**Post-Trial:**

This trial was not appealed. Teddy was later involved in another Honor Council trial, *Lady Bird*, in which he was separated from the community because of plagiarism in a draft of his senior thesis.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. To what extent should juries consider past trials?
2. How much, if at all, should a jury consider a party’s apparent disengagement with the process with the three goals of the trial (accountability, education, and restoration)?
Letter to the Community:

Dear the BiCo community,

Last semester, I made the biggest mistake of my academic life, which affected my whole life in general as well. I plagiarized in an assignment of one of my class and there is no excuse for it. It is still difficult for me to believe that this happened and the feelings after this incident is still vivid in me.

I want to apologize for the mistake I have done and its negative impact to my beloved community. Violation the honor code is a bad action, which reduces the value of education and the fairness between scholars. The Honor Code was found to protect the value of education as it aims at provide students with useful knowledge and experience. The pressure from homework and time shortage can be a great temptation for these actions. Taking the credit of other scholars’ work without citation is not fair to all the effort and the knowledge of the author and this is an action of stealing. It pulls down the spirit of others when looking at the unfairness and lose all the effort of real researching. The violation also poses a threat to the way people value the true meaning of education and the products of education. There will be no meaningful for an education if the output of it is stealing from someone else. And that product of education by violating the Honor Code was nothing but waste of money and time. My wrong doing, therefore, creates negative impact on the community by attacking on the fairness that we so respect and the core values of education.

Although I am ashamed of my violation of the Honor Code and its deterioration to my relationship with the community, I am also grateful for this event because I learnt more than what I have lost: I learnt that this community is a loving and supportive community, my friends and family are always by my side through ups and downs, and I must be strong even in the worst moments in life to deserve to the love I received and to myself.

There will be no second time that I have the thought of repeating my mistake, not to mention making it happen. There will be no second time that I need to warn myself not doing the same thing for I say no right away. I hope that this letter to the community will help me express my feeling about my mistake and an apology letter to anyone who was impacted by it. In additional, I want to remind all of us about my story so that none of us has to through this ever again.

Best Wishes to all of us in our career and life,

[Teddy Daniels]