

Abstract Discussions: Wednesday, April 20th at 5 PM and Thursday, April 21st at 1 PM in the Sunken Lounge of the Dining Center.

Doug and Professor Wingo

An Honor Council Academic Trial

Released Spring 2005

Confronted Party: Doug, **Confronting Party:** Professor Wingo, **Jurors:** Porkchop (chair), Skeeter, Patti, Fentruck, Quailman, Ned, Judy, Elaine, Beebe, Boomer, Dale, and Connie

Introduction:

Doug was a senior in Professor Wingo's class entitled "Journaling: Psychology and Analysis." Professor Wingo suspected Doug of submitting a plagiarized paper. The professor confronted Doug via email and later received an e-mail back from Doug that contained a confession of plagiarism along with a new, legitimate, paper. Professor Wingo explained the situation to Doug's Dean. Prompted by the Dean's Office and Professor Wingo, Doug contacted Honor Council, and both the confronted and confronting parties were asked to submit formal statements. Based on these statements, and with one absent member standing outside, Council came to consensus on a suspicion of violation.

Fact Finding:

Professor Wingo's Statement:

Professor Wingo read Doug's paper, and it seemed very good at first glance; however, upon closer inspection she noticed that the paper sounded a lot like an article she had previously read. Professor Wingo felt that Doug's hard work and superior performance throughout the semester showed that his plagiarism was not a product of habitual laziness or dishonesty. She was convinced that Doug was hard pressed by the end-of-the-semester workload. She mentioned that Doug could have asked her for an extension or even temporarily taken an incomplete.

Doug's Statement:

Doug stated that he had had three assignments due on the same Monday at the end of the semester. In addition to his 12-page paper for Journaling, Doug had a 15-page paper for his class "Subcultures of Middle Schools," and one half of a take-home examination for his class, "Case Studies in Architecture: Bluffington." On top of those assignments, he had to make time to study for the in-class portion of the Architecture exam.

Over the weekend, he had spent much more time on his 15-page Subcultures paper than he had originally intended. Therefore, on Sunday night, he had yet to complete the take-home portion of his Architecture exam as well as the paper for Professor Wingo's Journaling class. Doug said that he had never asked for an extension before and the professor for "Subcultures of Middle Schools" had said that she would not grant any extensions. On Sunday night, Doug wrote five pages of the Journaling paper but then "made a mistake." Doug said that Professor Wingo had asked him to rewrite the paper over email while classes were no longer in session and he did so.

Jury Questions:

The jury members asked questions to clarify the statements of both parties:

Regarding the extent of the plagiarism: The jury asked Doug to clarify what he meant when he said that he had, "made a mistake." Doug said that he plagiarized by searching on the Internet for an article to use. He said that he tried to put the article in his own words, but it was the author's ideas and largely the author's words. Doug said that he "copied and pasted" the article from the web browser into a word document, and did not cite the article. He had

re-written the introduction and had reworded some sentences throughout the article. Doug also stated that he had started the paper legitimately, stopped after about five pages in a panic, discarded the five pages, and then copied the source from the internet, creating a final paper around 12 pages.

Regarding the use of citations: Professor Wingo said that she expected students to use four or five outside sources, but she stressed that citations were required. A juror asked Doug if he had included a list of sources for the paper in question, and he said that he copied and pasted the author's sources into his own reference section without having ever obtained them himself.

Regarding Doug's rewritten paper: Professor Wingo said that she confronted Doug first (over email), and then asked him to write a new paper. She said that Doug's prior work in the class had been very good, and this made her feel as though Doug deserved a second chance. Although she wanted to give Doug a second chance by allowing him to write a new paper, she felt it was her obligation to bring this case before Honor Council. Finally, she stated that she had not read Doug's second paper yet and would not do so until after the trial.

Regarding the email confrontation: Doug reiterated that he had made "a stupid mistake," and that he was very distressed after handing in the paper. He also explained he did not respond to Professor Wingo's email confrontation for well over a week because he did not want to respond to the professor until he could provide her with a legitimate rewritten paper. As soon as he got Wingo's e-mail, he reserved research materials online, received them three to four days later, wrote his paper, and responded to Professor Wingo's confrontation, providing her with a new paper. *At this point, Doug also revealed that he needed this credit to graduate. Doug explained that, with his current schedule, he wouldn't have enough cumulative credits to graduate without credit for this class. He said that he also needed the course for his minor.*

Deliberations:

Regarding Gross Plagiarism: In the initial discussion, everyone on the jury agreed that an act of plagiarism had occurred. However, some members of the jury were hesitant to apply the term "gross plagiarism" to what Doug did. Juror Skeeter believed that the violation seemed like gross plagiarism, while Fentruck disagreed with the use of the word "gross." Patti noted that "gross plagiarism" isn't defined in the Honor Code, and although she is often hesitant to use the term "gross," she felt gross plagiarism applied in this case. Porkchop, the trial chair, added that Doug didn't just steal the author's words, but he stole his scholarship as well by appropriating his sources as if he had found them on his own. Beebe noted that Doug had admitted that the entire paper was plagiarized intentionally, and that plagiarism can't get much worse than that.

The jury decided to create an approximate timeline of events to clarify what happened and at which time. They came up with the following schedule:

Day 1 – plagiarism occurs
Day 2 – plagiarized paper handed in
Day 16 (approx.) – Professor Wingo confronts Doug by e-mail
Soon thereafter - Doug orders research materials
3-4 days later – research materials arrive
Day 23 – Professor Wingo gives Doug a 0.0 for the class
Day 24 – Doug starts to write new paper
Day 26 – Professor Wingo sends Doug second e-mail
Day 27 – Doug e-mails new paper to Professor Wingo

The jury spent a great deal of time hashing out the definition of gross plagiarism. One major concern was that with the term "gross" came strong implications for the type of resolutions the jury would be obligated to make. The Honor Code reads: "A gross act of plagiarism ... will normally result in separation from the community." After much debate, the jury agreed that they would not necessarily have to separate Doug because the word "normally" in the Honor Code allows the jury to consider extenuating circumstances. The jury, with Fentruck standing outside, agreed to call the plagiarism "gross" as long as there was some qualifier explaining it did not mean the jury was obligated to separate Doug.

Statement of Violation:

Considering only the facts of the case and not any extenuating circumstances, the jury came to consensus on the following statement:

"We the jury find that the confronted party committed a gross act of plagiarism in violation of the Honor Code. We considered the act to be gross plagiarism because the paper was intentionally and almost entirely plagiarized."

Fentruck stood outside of consensus because he disagreed with the word "gross." Although juror Dale chose to not stand outside, he felt the case warranted a simpler statement of violation.

Circumstantial:

The jury reconvened for the circumstantial portion. All twelve jurors and Doug were present. Professor Wingo was not able to attend.

Doug's Statement:

Doug had already explained a lot of the circumstances surrounding the violation during his statements in fact-finding. However, he related several circumstances of his general situation, particularly in regards to his financial situation. He said that he was and is working multiple on-campus jobs, that his parents both work hard for very little money, and that he is mostly financing his own education. He said that people look up to him, and expect him to graduate. Doug conveyed that had not told anyone about his violation because he felt he would lose all respect for himself upon disclosing what he had done. He explained that he is currently taking five classes, and also reiterated that he needs this credit to graduate and fulfill his minor.

Doug also suggested several resolutions for the jury to consider:

- Writing a fifteen- to twenty-page reflection paper
- Scheduling bi-weekly meetings with Professor Wingo to repair the breach of trust
- Participating in on- or off-campus community service
- Getting a 0.0 for the paper
- Receiving the lowest passing grade for the class (thus allowing him to graduate on time)

Jury Questions:

The jury asked several questions to gather more information about the circumstances. In response to jury questions the following information was revealed:

- Doug did not start writing the new paper until Professor Wingo had confronted him via email.
- Doug said he had no concrete plans for graduation but that he needed to find a job to help support his family.
- Doug explained why he would not have enough credits to graduate if he failed this course. Midway through the first semester of his senior year (the semester in which the plagiarism occurred), Doug had to drop one of his four classes due to circumstances outside of his control. Doug had discussed the issue with his Dean who supported his decision to take five classes during his last semester at Haverford to make up for the dropped class. He was not taking any of these classes pass/fail.
- Doug said that he had not considered asking for an extension on any of his assignments due during that first Monday of finals period.
- When asked about his stress level/work load during the time of the plagiarism, Doug said that the fact that he was taking fewer than four credits at the time gave him a false sense of confidence.
- Doug said that the two papers he was assigned were on the syllabi, but that he waited until the last week to start them.
- Doug revealed that he was not sure if he could pass if he received a 0.0 on the paper but said he had done good work up until that point so passing might be possible.
- Doug had not experienced problems with academic dishonesty until this incident.

Jury Deliberation on Tentative Resolutions I:

The jury discussed the following issues:

Whether there were extenuating circumstances: Juror Quailman felt there were many extenuating circumstances, but Skeeter disagreed, noting that the only real circumstance leading up to the event was poor planning.

Whether his family/financial circumstances should be heavily weighed: Juror Judy wondered if it was fair to put a lot of weight on his family/financial circumstances. The jury considered that if Doug failed, he would have to take another credit as his Haverford loans came due—a possibly large financial burden. The jury worried that he might be unable to afford his final credit (at Haverford or elsewhere) and that he might not receive his diploma for a long period of time. Doug was also under a lot of pressure due to his financial problems, and the jury debated whether this should be taken into account in making resolutions. Elaine responded that Doug was fully aware of his financial situation, which was all the more reason not to cheat. Several jurors said that they wanted some clarification on Doug's financial situation.

Whether separation is appropriate: Juror Fentruck brought up the fact that separation isn't the same for everyone, and that the jury should take into account the fact that Doug may not have had access to AP classes for extra credits before coming to Haverford. Boomer noted that it wasn't just that Doug had turned in a plagiarized paper, but that he tried to get away with it. He was also concerned that Doug's first instinct was to plagiarize, not to ask for an extension. Boomer also said that the "outside world" trusts that students graduating from Haverford have honestly completed their courses.

Ned presented a different perspective, stating that the fear of consequences alone (and not the punishment itself) can be a reforming force. Ned felt Doug wouldn't do anything like this again even if the jury did not separate him, suggesting that separation should not be included in the resolutions. Ned felt that some jury members were seeking "blood lust" or revenge in considering separation and the assignment of a failing grade. Patti disagreed with Ned, saying that the resolutions being considered were perfectly reasonable. Boomer said that any other college would be considering expulsion, but the jury was giving him a chance to redeem himself

Should the Jury decide Doug's grade at all? Beebe was the first to bring up the idea that it might be best to just leave the grade for the class up to Professor Wingo. Patti said that she did not agree, citing the fact that if he had not been caught, Doug might have received a 4.0 for the class completely dishonestly—his actions were not to be taken lightly. Skeeter echoed this sentiment, saying that it was very possible that he could have "gotten away" with it, and, if he passes the class, he still will. The jury decided to return to this issue later.

Porkchop said that he would use the upcoming recess time to get some more information about the financial repercussions Doug might face if he fails.

Jury Deliberation on Tentative Resolutions II:

After speaking with a Dean during the recess, Porkchop reported that some summer credits cost as little as \$150-200 at local colleges. Porkchop also reported that Haverford doesn't charge any fee for the transfer of credits. This meant that if Doug failed the course, he would not face a large financial burden in making up the credit over the summer.

The jury seemed to agree that Doug should fail the paper but the following resolutions were debated:

1) Failing the class: The jury returned to two issues: First, should the jury assign a grade for the class at all? And second, if a grade is assigned, should Doug fail the class? Boomer said that he was now comfortable failing Doug for the course because he felt Doug could afford to pay for a summer course. Beebe still disagreed and said that she believed that grade should be left up to Professor Wingo because the breach of trust started with her and so should end with her. Patti said that she believed that Professor Wingo would simply pass Doug if it were left up to her. Fentruck and Quailman disagreed with Patti and said that they thought Professor Wingo would fail Doug if the jury recommended it. Beebe reminded the jury that technically the final grading decision is always left to the

professor—the jury can only make a recommendation. Porkchop informed the jury that each situation is unique but that professors usually follow the recommendations of the jury.

Patti said that the jury needed to make a recommendation of some sort and not just leave it up to the professor. By contrast, Ned said that he refused to recommend a grade for personal reasons. He wondered why juries had the grade setting powers they did. Fentruck agreed with Ned, saying that he wasn't comfortable failing Doug because it removed Professor Wingo from the process. Connie said she also agreed with this sentiment. After speaking with the jury for some time, however, Connie said that she could agree to assigning a failing grade but wasn't sure how she felt about it. Quailman said that he had been swayed by the discussion and was now leaning towards failing Doug.

2) *Separation from diploma:* Beebe said that although the issue of the grade is ultimately up to the professor, the jury has (nearly) final say on the issue of separation. Because Doug was a second semester senior already leaving the community, separation from the community would have no real consequences. Even though it was not realistic to literally separate Doug, a student can be separated from his/her diploma (meaning he/she could not receive the diploma for a period of time despite having completed all credits). The jury then had a discussion regarding whether it might be appropriate to separate Doug from his diploma instead of failing him. Patti said that the community, in reading the abstract, would need a strong justification as to why the jury did not fail Doug but only chose to separate him from his diploma. Patti expressed reservations about separating Doug from his diploma at all, stating that having him “wait for his diploma” would be a very passive process. She felt that Doug did not yet earn his degree and that he needed to take another class to earn it.

3) *Failure and Separation from Diploma:* Skeeter said that the jury could both separate Doug from his diploma and fail him in the class. This way, even if Professor Wingo chose to override the resolutions passed by the jury regarding Doug's grade, Doug would still have to wait for his diploma.

After much debate, Porkchop stated that he felt that the weight of the group was that Doug should fail the class but not be separated from his diploma because if Doug failed, he would likely not be receiving a diploma anyway that year. The jury seemed to feel that it was unnecessary to separate Doug from his diploma and wanted him to receive the diploma as soon as he made up the credit. The jury came to consensus, with Fentruck and Ned standing outside, on the following tentative resolutions:

Tentative Resolutions:

- 1. The jury recommends that the student receive a 0.0 for the paper.**
- 2. The jury recommends that the student receive a 0.0 for the class.** (Fentruck and Ned stood outside of consensus on this resolution.)
- 3. The student will write a letter to the community reflecting on his situation and what the community can learn from it.**
- 4. The student will write a letter to the faculty reflecting on his situation and stressing the importance of good communication between professors and students.**
- 5. The student will meet at least bi-weekly with a professor, Dean, or Psych Services counselor of his choosing for academic and emotional support purposes.**

Presentation of Resolutions I:

The jury reconvened with Doug and all twelve jurors present. The jury was concerned that Professor Wingo was not present and had not sent the jury a response to the tentative resolutions. The following points were discussed:

- Doug was very concerned about not graduating because he felt he couldn't explain the situation to his parents. Doug asked if it would be possible for him to take a 6th credit this semester. Porkchop said that Doug would have to check with his Dean, but that he thought it was unlikely.
- Porkchop expressed to Doug the jury's concern for his current academic situation (taking five classes) and recommended that he take one of his classes for this semester Pass/Fail if possible.
- Judy asked Doug if he would walk at graduation next year if he didn't graduate this year. Doug said that he wasn't sure but dreaded having to explain such a scenario to his parents.

- Doug said that he understood that there are consequences to his actions.

Jury Deliberations on Final Resolutions I:

After presenting the resolutions to Doug, the following issues were discussed:

Walking at Graduation: Because Doug's major concern was not walking at graduation, Fentruck wondered if there was any way that the jury could make a resolution allowing Doug to walk at graduation despite not completing all his credits. Porkchop informed the jury that the Faculty would not let Doug walk without thirty-two credits (which, if he failed the class, he would not have). Doug could, however, walk if he passed the class but was separated from his diploma. A dialogue ensued as to whether it was too punitive to create resolutions that would prohibit Doug from walking at graduation. Fentruck said that he still wanted to allow Doug to walk, and that Doug should only be separated from his diploma, leaving the decision about the grade in Professor Wingo's hands. The jury debated this issue extensively. Ned stated that resolutions could not and should not be passed with the sole intent of keeping Doug happy. Dale agreed and said that he didn't think any changes to the resolutions were warranted.

Some jurors were concerned that Professor Wingo had not had a chance to respond to the tentative resolutions. Most jurors wanted to know whether or not Professor Wingo was going to follow the jury's recommendations before coming to a final consensus. The Jury decided to recess for the night and see if they could get in touch with Professor Wingo.

Contact with Professor Wingo:

The next day, Professor Wingo contacted Porkchop after receiving a voice mail message. She told Porkchop that she had been out of town for a few days and that she had just read the e-mail with the tentative resolutions. At first she thought that Doug was definitely going to receive a 0.0 for the class, but then Porkchop explained that the final grade was still up to her—the jury could only make “recommendations.” After hearing that, Professor Wingo said that she would prefer to grade Doug's second paper and give him a grade for the class, taking into account the fact that he submitted a plagiarized paper. Porkchop told Professor Wingo that he would communicate these thoughts to the jury and let her know what the jury decided to do next. Porkchop conveyed Professor Wingo's sentiments to the jury via email, and several jury members said they needed to meet with the Professor face to face.

Presentation of Resolutions II:

The jury met for a second presentation of resolutions. All twelve jurors, Doug, and Professor Wingo were present.

The following sentiments were expressed:

- Professor Wingo said that Doug had put a lot of work into the course and that the grade should reflect the effort that he put into it before the plagiarism. She felt that Doug's grade should also reflect the fact that he plagiarized, but that didn't necessarily mean failing the class. She said that she wanted to come to a compromise with the jury if possible—one that would allow Doug to get some credit for the class (and thus allow him to graduate).
- Ned again voiced his opinion that Professor Wingo should decide the grade; not the jury. In contrast, Boomer said that he thought Doug should fail the class because he did not meet the class's minimum requirements in regards to maintaining his academic honesty throughout the course.
- Professor Wingo asked if there was any precedent that the jury was relying on. Porkchop said that there were two abstracts that the jury hadn't discussed but that dealt with similar situations in terms of the plagiarism itself. In "Will and Grace" (Spring 2000), a student committed gross plagiarism, and the jury resolved that the student should not only fail the class but also be separated from the community. In "Sydney" (Spring 1998), the jury did not use the word "gross" to describe the plagiarism but the student still failed the class (though the jury included a way to make up the credit with the professor the next semester). Fentruck added that it's hard for the jury to rely on precedent because oftentimes abstracts don't reveal all the mitigating circumstances of the case.
- Professor Wingo said that she understood that there was a consensus on the resolutions and thanked the jury for involving her in the process. Doug reiterated that he couldn't image explaining to his parents why he didn't graduate, but that he understood that his actions have consequences. Professor Wingo said that she would consult a Dean before making her final decision on the grade. Boomer affirmed that it was Professor Wingo's decision.

Boomer emphasized to Professor Wingo that the jury's decision was one that ten of the jurors had agreed upon and that two of the jurors had expressed reservations with.

- Skeeter said that he felt Doug's action was a deep violation of the Honor Code and of the community's trust. He also said that another jury might have recommended separation, and that it was discussed, but that this jury felt that a 0.0 for the class would suffice. He believed that any other resolutions would be too lenient.
- Professor Wingo said that she felt that she understood the complete situation now. She said that she would talk to a Dean, would enact an appropriate penalty, and would ensure that the Honor Code would be maintained.

Jury Deliberations on Final Resolutions II:

After the professor and Doug had left the room, Fentruck expressed some discontent with statements some jurors had made to the professor. He felt it was inappropriate of Porkchop to show the professor two abstracts that reinforced the outcome that Porkchop had supported throughout the trial. Porkchop said that he had not intended to be biased and that he chose these two abstracts because they involved very similar circumstances. Fentruck also said that he didn't it was appropriate for Skeeter to present the Jury's discussion of separation to Professor Wingo as if everyone agreed that separation would be an option if Doug were not a second semester senior. Skeeter said that he only stated his perception of the jury's deliberations. He said that he didn't mean for it to be seen as a scare tactic to get Professor Wingo to agree with the jury's decision.

The jury then discussed if they should change the resolutions. After some debate, the jury decided to maintain the spirit of the current resolutions with a few wording clarifications.

The jury then came to consensus, with Fentruck and Ned standing outside, on the following final resolutions (statements in brackets were altered to protect confidentiality):

Final Resolutions:

- 1. The jury recommends that the student receive a 0.0 for the paper.**
- 2. The jury recommends that the student receive a 0.0 for the class.** (Fentruck and Ned stood outside of consensus on this resolution.)
- 3. By [date], the student will write a letter to the community reflecting on his situation and what the community can learn from it.**
- 4. By [date], the student will write a letter to the faculty reflecting on his situation and stressing the importance of good communication between professors and students.**
- 5. The student will meet at least every other week with a professor, Dean, or Psych Services counselor of his choosing for academic and emotional support purposes.**

Doug did not appeal the jury's decision. The jury later learned that, after talking to a Dean, Professor Wingo did accept the jury's recommendation and gave Doug a 0.0 for the class.

Discussion Questions:

1. Should Honor Council have the power to determine grades? Or should this power lie in the hands of professors and deans?
2. What should a jury do if a professor disagrees with the resolutions? Should the jury compromise or should they let the professor take matters into her own hands?
3. Does it make a difference that Doug is a senior? How can seniors who are brought to Honor Council be held accountable for their actions? If Doug did not need this credit to graduate, how could he have been held accountable?
4. Is it possible to define gross plagiarism?
5. Did you think that the level of detail in the jury deliberations in this abstract was helpful, or should Honor Council stick to the shorter, more summarized format?

Honor Council welcomes any and all opinions on this or any abstract. Please tell us what you think by coming to the abstract discussions, talking to an Honor Council representative, or e-mailing code@haverford.edu.

Juror Statements:

Dear Haverford Community,

I feel that the Haverford community as a whole is changing, and the way we look at the code, as well as the way we look at the Honor Council, is being altered with time. I want to take the responsibility for representing the jury's feeling towards this trial. This trial was a strain on all of us and really exemplified how difficult, but important, coming to consensus can be on an important decision. We took in the facts as they were presented and tried to act in a manner that would benefit Doug, and the community as a whole.

With that said, I feel, speaking now for myself, that the Honor Code as written at the time of this trial presents a problem for juries when dealing with academic trials. The mentioning of the term "gross" and the implications of what "normally" should happen if a jury were to consent on stating that a student's action was gross plagiarism is problematic. This trial, as well as many others, has been marred with hours of debate on semantics. This jury did not want to be forced under an ultimatum to blindly separate a student if we felt that separation was not the best idea. Juries want to decide what the best decision is, without fearing the opinion of the community immediately after. These juries of peers are, as Haverfordian as anyone else, and want to do what is right before what is popular. We feel we are giving the right to decide on this issue through the Code, and we desire to continue to make decision as members of the same community. We hope that the important tenant of Trust can still exist as the community changes. I ask that you please trust the juries that convene, the members of our community, and the students that make up our governmental organizations that help us get through these four years. I also encourage members of the community, in the spirit of change, to stand up and change the Honor Code to have it reflect the feelings of the community, but still remain as workable as possible and logistically effective.

Sincerely,
Dale

Juror Statements (continued):

Dear Haverford Community,

This trial was extremely difficult for me and for everyone involved. We were charged with deciding how to best resolve a fellow student's gross violation of the Honor Code given the unique set of circumstances he was under. I stand by the decision the jury made 100%. However, I would like to discuss some issues that this trial raised for me.

First, I want to clarify why the jury created the resolutions we did. We felt that, by having confessed to plagiarism and written another paper, the student had adequately repaired the breach of trust with the professor. The letter to the community was meant to repair it with the larger community. The letter to the faculty was meant to educate him and them about the issue and to repair the breach of trust with that group. The meetings were just meant to serve as a check-in to ensure that the student would not suffer a further academic crisis. The resolutions that were the most debated, as you can see from the abstract, were about the "accountability" resolutions – assigning a grade for the paper and class.

Because the student involved was a senior, I felt very limited as to how I could hold him accountable. The extent of the plagiarism could not have been more "gross" (which, as defined by the Merriam-Webster Dictionary of Law, means "flagrant or extreme esp. in badness or offensiveness"), and it merited separation, in my opinion. If this student had been a freshman in his first semester at Haverford and had never been exposed to college writing before, I would have more easily considered leniency. However, as a senior who has been at Haverford for at least three years, this student should have known better. Yet, because of his senior status, separation would have been purely symbolic and not held the student accountable at all.

From this and other recent abstracts, the question of seniors and their relationship to the Honor Code has been mentioned again and again. Because fulfilling trial resolutions is not a graduation requirement and because seniors are already considering how they are going to leave this place, the resolutions of a jury can sometimes have little to no effect. That is not to say that the trial itself does not impact a student; it clearly did in this case. However, what do we do afterwards? I don't have the answer.

In addition, the other large debate during our deliberations was on the use of the word "gross" in the Statement of Violation. As I said above, if there was ever a case where the phrase "gross plagiarism" applied, it is this one. However, the perceived consequences of us using such a phrase made us question whether or not we should, as Dale put it during the trial, "call it what it is." We stressed to the student afterwards that we had not made any sort of judgement on the appropriateness of separation when we came to consensus on the statement of violation. However, the fact that our deliberations were extensively prolonged because of this question of semantics frustrated me slightly. I believe that this community needs to deeply consider changing the Code to remove this sticking point. Let juries come to the decisions that they think are right once they know all the facts; don't force them into needless debates on semantics or mandatory minimum sentences for certain types of violations.

I sincerely hope that this abstract raises questions for the entire community and is not dismissed as "just another plagiarism abstract." Twelve members of this community sacrificed many hours of their time to resolve this issue, and I think the least that you can do is to give this abstract of their work the attention and respect that it deserves.

Sincerely,
Porkchop

Juror Statements (continued):

To the Faculty:

If you re-read the abstract, you'll see that I, "Juror Patti," was among the harshest of the jurors. That being said, I hope you see this letter not as a justification of Doug's actions but rather as an examination of his situation and an opportunity to learn something about faculty-student relationships.

Even though Mrs. Professor Wingo said she would have offered Doug an extension had he asked, Doug perceived only two choices: failing or cheating. There's no doubt in my mind Doug made the wrong choice but before writing him off as a "bad egg," I think it's important to consider his situation. Why did he perceive no extension option? Certainly Doug had problems managing his time but the real lingering questions in my mind are these:

- 1) Why did Doug have three assignments due during the first day of finals period?
- 2) Why did Doug fail to consider asking for an extension?

1) During finals, many professors circumvent the registrar in order to impose early deadlines. I certainly understand the desire to grade papers early (or even bust out of the Haverbubble early), but I cannot image a justifiable rationale for imposing deadlines that do not allow students to take full advantage of finals week(s). Self scheduled exams were meant to give students independence and decrease stress levels; however, these exams/papers can become a great disadvantage to students when professors take advantage of the flexibility inherent in the system to impose early deadlines—deadlines which may create more stress than a traditional testing environment.

2) I completely believed Doug when he said he didn't consider an extension. Haverford promotes (in my opinion) an unhealthy environment that suggests to students that stress is inherent in the learning process. I beg to differ. Professors often remark in handing out assignments, "Unless there are extreme extenuating personal circumstances, no extensions will be granted." Some professors respond to requests for extensions with a loud and emphatic, "no." Even those professors who are open to extensions often fail to make this known to their students.

Despite my concerns, there are professors who do an excellent job of mitigating the stress of exams. One professor I know offers one "no-questioned-asked" extension. I encourage more professors to display flexibility in dealing with students, especially during high stress periods such as finals period. I ask you to do this, not to prevent cheating (as no one should ever cheat), but to encourage the environment that Haverford self-scheduled exams were meant to promote in the first place.

Respectfully,
Patti