

**Abstract Discussions: Monday, September 26th at 6PM and Wednesday,
September 28th at 1PM in Sunken Lounge of the Dining Center.**

Zack and Professor Bliss

An Honor Council Academic Trial

Released Fall 2005

Introduction:

Zack was a freshman in Professor Bliss' English class. After receiving Zack's six-page paper, Professor Bliss became concerned that some sentences may have been plagiarized. Professor Bliss "googled" the sentences and found that they appeared word for word on a website called "essaycrawler.com: free essays for students." Professor Bliss contacted Zack who assured her the plagiarism was unintentional; however, Professor Bliss instructed Zack to contact Honor Council. Both parties submitted formal statements.

Fact Finding:

Professor Bliss' Statement:

Professor Bliss explained to the jury that Zack was expected to submit a rough, middle, and final draft of a six-page paper. Although based on certain readings, the specific essay topic was somewhat open. In order to facilitate the formulation of a thesis, Professor Bliss said she held individual conferences with her students. Zack had signed up for one but then emailed to cancel. In addition, Zack had asked for an extension due to personal circumstances and had been granted one. When Zack handed in the paper two days after the original deadline, he had only the final draft (the rough and middle drafts were missing). Professor Bliss said that as she read Zack's work, she noticed inconsistent language—some polished sentences among rougher ones. She commented on the paper but after returning to her computer, "googled" the sentences and found them word for word on "essaycrawler: free essays for students." There were three plagiarized sentences which amounted to about 12 lines of text.

Professor Bliss said that she emailed Zack requesting a meeting, making no mention of the alleged plagiarism. Presumably, recognizing why Professor Bliss wanted to meet with him, Zack emailed her back explaining that the essaycrawler essay has been downloaded for research purpose only and that he had no intention of leaving the plagiarized sentences in the essay. Zack came to her office and explained again that the plagiarism was unintentional. Professor Bliss said that she was not convinced by Zack's explanation, stating his "demeanor was contrite; he muttered an explanation that was fragmented and unconvincing." Professor Bliss told Zack she would fail him in the course and that he should contact his dean and Honor Council.

Zack's Statement:

Zack explained to the jury that he had no intention of plagiarizing his paper. He used essaycrawler.com only to gather ideas which could be used as a starting block for his own, unique thesis. Zack said that he believed that he had used his own ideas but in his rush to hand the essay in, forgot to remove the three copied sentences. Zack emphasized that the paper reads well without the plagiarized sentences, and the sentences only remained in the paper because he did not have time to proofread. Zack said that he knew his actions were very serious and he had violated Professor Bliss' trust. Zack told the jury that he only realized that the paper included plagiarized sentences after receiving an email from Professor Bliss. Upon

receiving her email, he looked back at his paper and realized what he had done. At their meeting, he told her that he had made a huge mistake. Nevertheless, Professor Bliss told Zack that he would fail the class and that he should contact Honor Council which he did.

Jury Questions:

The jury made inquiries regarding the following issues:

On the Issue of Citing

- Zack explained that he had not cited the essaycrawler website in his paper.
- Professor Bliss said that she did not focus any class sessions specifically on “how to cite” but that citations had been discussed throughout the semester. She added that this paper did not involve outside research.
- Zack also said that he knew that citing is necessary when using outside sources.

On Zack’s Writing Process and the Extension he Requested

- Zack confirmed that he “copied and pasted” the three sentences in question from the website to his paper.
- Zack explained that he did not create a rough or middle draft and went straight to the final draft.
- Zack said he rushed to write the paper and had carelessly left the plagiarized sentences in. He was in a rush because Professor Bliss had never responded to his email requesting an extension so he assumed he had to get it by the next class meeting (two days after the original deadline).
- Professor Bliss confirmed that she didn’t respond to Zack’s email regarding the extension but stated that she had been flexible with Zack (and all her students) and that Zack had received extensions before. She thought Zack understood that he had been granted an extension of how ever long he needed.

Regarding the Essaycrawler Site

- One jury member noticed that the essaycrawler website offers only a condensed version of the essay Zack used and that in order to access the entire essay, the user has to enter a credit card number and pay \$25 dollars. When questioned, Zack told the jury that he did indeed pay the \$25 fee and used the full copy. Zack then provided the jury with a copy of the full essay from essaycrawler.com. Zack had put it onto a word document and highlighted the sentences in question so the jury could see the extent of his plagiarism.
- Another jury member noticed that the essaycrawler website used page number citations referring to the original text of the book on which the essay was based. Several of the plagiarized sentences in Zack’s paper also had page number citations. In the essaycrawler version, the page numbers referred to the original text of the story (i.e. pg. 20). The book Zack was using for class, however, was in an anthology and the page numbers were much higher (i.e. pg. 2000). In the paper Zack handed in to Professor Bliss, the page numbers used to cite the plagiarized sentences were changed to reflect the page numbers in Zack’s anthology copy of the text. At some point in the writing process, Zack must have consciously changed the citations within the plagiarized sentences to reflect his version of the text. Zack said he couldn’t explain how the page numbers got changed but stated that he may have changed them for consistency purposes while still intending to remove the sentences later.

Regarding Extent of Plagiarism

- The jury asked Professor Bliss whether she felt that the three obviously plagiarized sentences were the extent of the plagiarism or whether Zack had also based his essay off a plagiarized idea. Professor Bliss said that the best parts of the paper were plagiarized (she said she wrote positive

comments next to the plagiarized parts before she realized Zack had plagiarized). She added that most of the essay, aside from the plagiarized parts, was plot summary.

-Professor Bliss also explained that, for the most part, Zack's thesis statement was taken from the website.

Deliberations:

The jury spent the bulk of deliberations attempting to discern the extent of plagiarism. The following writing samples were analyzed. Deliberations took at least three hours.

- 1) The copy of Zack's paper which he handed into Professor Bliss (containing at least three undisputed plagiarized sentences which amounted to about 12 lines of the paper).
- 2) The copy of the essaycrawler essay which Zack provided the jury.
- 3) A copy of the essaycrawler essay which the jury obtained independently of Zack by visiting essaycrawler.com. and buying it for \$25 dollars¹
- 4) A "revised" paper Zack created before the trial to show the jury that the paper would still "flow" well without the plagiarized sentences.

The jury first compared the essay Zack had handed into to Professor Bliss with the full version of the essaycrawler paper obtained by the jury for \$25. Reading them out loud, side-by-side, the jury realized that in addition to the plagiarized words, Zack had taken many of the ideas in his essay from the website, confirming Professor Bliss' contention. Although Zack had somewhat expanded upon the thesis statement provided by the essaycrawler site (as he said in his statement), the jury agreed that the thesis was largely derived from essaycrawler.

After several hours of analyzing the writing samples, the jury, for the most part, agreed that the plagiarism was both intentional and large in amount. The jury decided to avoid classifying it as "gross" plagiarism (a term used in the Honor Code, Section III, Part A: A **gross** act of plagiarism constitutes a student's withdrawal from the commitment to the academic honesty required by the Honor Code, and will normally result in separation from the community"). Although the jury felt the plagiarism was serious in nature, they were reluctant to use the term "gross" because of its link with separation. The jury did not want to consider possible resolutions until partaking in the circumstantial portion of the trial. Nevertheless, the jury felt that Zack had intentionally plagiarized for the following reasons:

- 1) The jury noticed that Zack, in his paper had actually completed several fragmented sentences from the essaycrawler essay. The completion of the sentence suggested that they were consciously incorporated into the paper rather than haphazardly left there.

¹ Some jury members wanted to obtain the essay from essaycrawler.com independently of Zack because they were concerned that Zack had not provided the jury with the entire essay (whether unintentionally or intentionally). Some juror, however, were uncomfortable with obtaining a copy of the essay because they felt it suggested a lack of trust in Zack. The jury spent a significant amount of time debating issues of trust, referring to the Constitution (Section II, part 3) which reads: "It is the duty of jury members to balance their trust of community members with their obligation to determine what has happened before they can arrive at any resolutions." After some debate, the jury decided to purchase the essay. Upon purchasing the essay, the jury discovered that Zack had failed to provide the jury with the final paragraph of the essaycrawler.com paper. It seemed that Zack had based his concluding paragraph off of the omitted paragraph from [essaycrawler](http://essaycrawler.com). The jury agreed to ask Zack about this omission and thought that the omission could have been unintentional in nature.

2) In examining the “revised paper” Zack had created for the jury to demonstrate that his final paper would flow well without the plagiarized sentences, the jury realized that Zack removed not only the undisputed plagiarized sentences but several sentences of idea content. Zack’s removal of these plagiarized ideas without any prompting indicated to the jury that Zack understood that taking ideas is also considered plagiarism. Although it was possible to believe that Zack could unintentionally included three plagiarized sentences, the jury found it harder to believe that the inclusion of ideas (which Zack acknowledged were plagiarism in his revised paper) could have been unintentional.

3) Zack had changed the page number citations of the original text which appeared on the essaycrawler paper to reflect the much higher page numbers in his anthology text. This suggested to the jury that Zack consciously sought out the section in his own text—a feat which would require deliberate effort.

4) Instead of using any number of scholarly sources available for free online, Zack went to essaycrawler and spent \$25 to purchase an essay intended for dishonest students.

Based on this information, the jury concluded that Zack was not being completely truthful and had intentionally plagiarized his paper.

Statement of Violation:

"The student violated the Honor Code by intentionally representing another's words and concepts as his own."

Circumstantial:

The entire jury and Zack reconvened the next day to discuss the circumstances surrounding the plagiarism. Professor Bliss could not attend but submitted a statement. Zack was encouraged to describe any mitigating circumstances that he would like the jury to consider.

Professor Bliss' Statement:

Professor Bliss wrote in her email statement that she was dismayed by Zack’s intent to plagiarize. She felt that the fact-finding portion of the trial had proved effective because she had not realized that Zack purchased the entire essaycrawler paper or that he had changed the page numbers to reflect the passages in his own text. She suggested that Zack fail the paper and the class, be separated for one semester, write a letter to the community, review information related to plagiarism avoidance, and visit the writing center upon his return to Haverford.

Zack's Statement:

Zack explained that he got an extension on his paper because he was attending a funeral the day the paper was due. His attention was diverted because he was supporting the family of the deceased. Zack said that upon learning of the death, he emailed Professor Bliss asking for an extension and she had never responded to his email. Due to her lack of response, he assumed that the paper had to be turned in the next time the class met two days later. He reiterated that he was rushed and he did not intend to plagiarize. He proposed that he fail the class and the paper, work to repair the breach of trust with Professor Bliss, write a letter to the community, and re-write the paper for no credit. Zack did not feel his offense warranted separation.

Jury Questions:

Regarding Intent:

-Based on a set of emails between Professor Bliss and Zack, it seemed as if Zack had suggested to Professor Bliss that there existed a second copy of the paper which was not plagiarized and he had inadvertently sent her the wrong copy. Zack clarified that the paper he handed to Professor Bliss was indeed the paper he meant to hand in.

-Zack said that he didn't consider taking ideas to be plagiarism until this trial.

-Zack admitted that when he copied and pasted the plagiarized sentences, he did realize he was doing something wrong, and that essaycrawler.com seemed dishonest.

-When asked again about the page number citations being changed, Zack reiterated that he could not remember but thought he might have changed them as part of the writing process.

-When asked why Zack did not provide the jury with last paragraph of the essaycrawler essay (the paragraph off of which he based his own final paragraph), Zack said it must have been an unintentional error.

Regarding Honor Code Experience:

-Zack said that he could not remember talking about plagiarism with his HCOs and that Customs Week was a blur.

-Zack said that he did not have an Honor Code in high school but that he never cheated.

-Zack said that he felt a lot of pressure at Haverford compared to high school, and that he really struggled in Professor Bliss's class.

Regarding the Writing Process:

-Zack said that he created notes for himself but had not started writing the paper until about an hour before he handed it in. He reminded the jury that he thought the paper had to be turned in the next time class met (two days after the funeral). He felt bad asking for yet another extension and had procrastinated until the last minute.

-An hour before class, Zack sat in the library and wrote the paper. He printed it out and then handed it in.

-Zack said that he never used essaycrawler.com before and even though he had a subscription (after paying the \$25), he did not plan to use it in the future.

Regarding Separation:

-When asked if he would return after a possible separation, Zack stated that he likely would not. He said that his father might not pay his tuition and would be very angry with him.

Jury Deliberation:

The jury spent two days deliberating. **Day one** was dedicated to hashing out possible resolutions and attempting to reconcile inconsistencies between Zack's statement and the writing samples which had been analyzed. **Day two** consisted of coming to consensus on final resolutions. In total, the jury spent about nine hours deliberating after the circumstantial portion of the trial.

Day One: Several members of the jury felt upset and frustrated, convinced that Zack had been continually trying to deceive them. The jury felt as if Zack was deceiving them because as they asked him questions, they continued to notice more and more inconsistencies in his story. They wondered why Zack didn't come clean, and take responsibility for what he had done. Although some things were still unclear, one jury member made this possible time line.

Day 1: 10:45am: Email to Professor Bliss asking for an extension

Day 1: Afternoon: Goes to funeral out of town and returns late at night

Day 2: Nothing of significance to the trial

Day 3: Morning: Emails notes for papers to himself at library

Day 3: Afternoon: Goes to library, writes paper for one hour before class and prints it out.

Day 3: One Hour Later that Afternoon: Hands paper in.

Day 6: 2pm: Professor Bliss emails Zack asking him to come in to meet with her

Day 7: 5:30am: Zack emails Professor Bliss acknowledging plagiarism but stating it was unintentional.

Regarding Truth:

One juror opened up deliberations stating that he believed Zack had lied to the jury during circumstantial, suggesting that Zack bought into a “culture of lies.” Several jurors agreed while other jurors thought that Zack was just trying to protect himself and wasn’t intending to be dishonest.

At this point, juror Kelly, distressed by this situation, brought up the issue of truth and trust. Kelly felt Zack was deceiving the jury because he didn’t have any trust in the process and the jury itself. She was also concerned that the jury didn’t seem to trust Zack. Kelly believed that Zack would benefit from taking responsibility for his actions through honesty. Kelly referred to the Truth and Reconciliation Commissions in South Africa which were used to expose the truth about crimes perpetrated during Apartheid. Rather than legally punishing perpetrators of crimes, the aim of these Truth Commissions was to allow communities to heal through truth and eventual forgiveness. Kelly suggested that instead of punishing Zack, the jury could consider having a dialogue with him using a format similar to that of a Truth Commission. These series of Truth Commission meetings would involve both the jury and Zack and could take place after the trial was over. Kelly maintained that punishment or separation would not help repair the breach of trust and that she wanted to design a Truth Commission which would allow Zack to trust the jury and the jury to trust Zack.

Several jurors were very enthusiastic about the suggestion while other raised some concerns. A few jurors were concerned with the practicality of Truth Commissions as far as scheduling. Additionally, some jurors were concerned that they would be compelling Zack to do something that perhaps he did not want to do. They felt that Truth Commission might subject Zack to a set of morals to which he did not necessarily prescribe. Another juror raised the issue that a Truth Commission could repair the breach of trust between the jury and Zack but felt such a commission would do little if anything for the breach of trust between Zack and the larger community. Despite reservations, many members of the jury were interested in further pursuing this option in some form.

Regarding Separation:

The jurors were fairly certain that Zack would fail the paper and the class because the plagiarism was fairly serious (and perhaps gross). Additionally, both Zack and Professor Bliss had suggested failure in the course. Several members of the jury suggested separation as a resolution but most said they needed to discuss it for a long time before they could really consider it. One juror felt that the jury had responsibility to the community and that in order to hold Zack accountable, separation had to be considered.

The jury realized that they could not come to consensus at this point in deliberations. It was already late, and so the chair of the trial suggested the jury reconvene the next day. During the break, the chair asked that the jury think about possible, concrete resolutions. Over the break, the chair said he would email Zack to ask him about his financial situation –a factor which the jury felt might be important (i.e. to make sure his loans wouldn’t come due while separated if separation was ultimately a resolution).

Day Two: Deliberations began as the chair of the trial asked each jury member to state his/her thoughts. Several members of the jury felt separation might be appropriate but most were still largely uncertain. Kelly, who still wished to pursue a Truth Commission, felt that separation would be inappropriate. She believed separation wouldn’t teach Zack anything about trust. Kelly said that the jury needs to believe the best in people, and she wanted to believe the best in Zack. Another member

of the jury strongly agreed with Kelly and felt that there could be a productive way to deal with the concept of truth through repeated dialogues with Zack. Although several jurors were reluctant to force Zack to engage in dialogue, they thought that perhaps he could write an extended paper about truth and reconciliation. The jury discussed a possible “conditional separation” in which Zack either had to write an extensive paper about truth or else he would be separated. Some jurors worried about the practicality of this resolution.

After each member of the jury expressed his/her opinion, the chair presented a new piece of information. Over the break, the chair had asked the appointed contact person to email Zack asking whether or not he was on financial aid. The email also asked Zack to feel free to convey any additional information he would like the jury to know. The email Zack sent back contained the following excerpts of concern.

“My dad has confirmed the fact that he will no longer pay my college tuition if I am separated from Haverford College...What I am saying is: my life is in your hands. If I get separated, it is very likely that I will not continue my college education. I will have nothing to live for and do not see any future for myself upon separation...My entire life is on the line here. Please. Please. Please.”

Several sentiments regarding the email were expressed:

- Many jury members were concerned for Zack’s emotional well-being, and were afraid he might try to harm himself if separated.
- Some jury members were angry that Zack would send an email which they perceived to be very manipulative. One juror was particularly angry that Zack would try to instill fear and guilt to “get out of separation.”
- Several jury members expressed anger that the chair of the trial did not forward this email to the jurors sooner (either before deliberations began or at least at the beginning of deliberations before everyone stated their opinions). The chair apologized but said that it was a conscious effort to allow the jury to share their feelings before and after learning of this email.
- Kelly felt that the email did not change her perceptions of Zack. She still believed he needed a second chance and in order to get that chance, he needed to be part of the community.
- One member of the jury said that perhaps the jury could write a letter to Zack’s father explaining that if Zack was separated, the community would want him to return.

Regarding Gross Plagiarism:

Section III, Part A of the Honor Code suggests that gross plagiarism “normally” results in separation. Because separation was being seriously considered, one jury member wanted to return to the issue of gross plagiarism and asked each jury member to state whether or not the plagiarism was “gross” in nature. Everyone on the jury with the exception of two or three jurors characterized the plagiarism as gross. The members who did not call it gross instead referred to it as “most severe” or “intentional.” These jurors felt generally uncomfortable with the ambiguous nature of the word “gross.” After the jury agreed that plagiarism was very serious (and/or gross), they decided to let each person express his/her opinion on separation.

Regarding Separation:

All but one jury member, Kelly, thought separation might be appropriate. Kelly felt that Zack would not receive the support he needed during his separation. Many jury members said they would only separate Zack providing that he was not completely cut off from the community and would receive support during his semester away from Haverford. Kelly said that she would stand outside of consensus (rather than block) only if the resolutions included an attempt to help Zack grow while separated. Concerns were expressed about whether or not Zack could still receive financial aid after separation, and it was ultimately determined (after correspondence with a dean) that he would.

The jury discussed whether the fact that Zack had stated that he could not return to Haverford if separated should play a role in the decision. After much debate, the jury ultimately decided that it should not. Concluding that Zack did not really “get Haverford” or understand what it meant to be a member of the community, the jury (with only Kelly standing outside) tentatively agreed to separation.

The jury was reluctant to use separation and the final deliberations on this resolution took hours. In the end many jury members felt that Zack’s attempt to continually deceive the jury, his inability to accept responsibility for his actions, and effort to cover up his intent to plagiarize suggested that he could not be a productive member of the Haverford community. Many jury members felt that had Zack been more forthcoming and aware of how his actions affected the Haverford community, separation may not have been included in the resolutions. Unfortunately, however, Zack seemed to learn nothing from his confrontation with Professor Bliss and the trial process. Separation, however, was contingent on the fact that the jury create other resolutions serving both to help Zack grow and to help him maintain a connection to Haverford during separation.

Regarding the Truth and Reconciliation Paper or Study:

The jury felt that there were still a multitude of inconsistencies—both large and small—in Zack’s story, and the jury believed that Zack was perpetually misleading them. In order to get Zack thinking about the importance of trust and truth in communities, the jury wanted to give Zack the opportunity to take an independent study class focusing on Truth and Reconciliation Commissions during his separation for credit. The course would serve the dual purposes of broadening Zack’s perspective and allowing him to stay connected to the community while away. Through this course, he would also be able to make up the credit that he lost when he failed Professor Bliss’ class. The 25-page paper served as an alternative assignment in case Zack decided to return to Haverford last minute or if he did not wish to partake in the independent study.

Regarding the Letter to the Community:

Several members of the jury were concerned that most letters to the community are full of fluff and don’t honestly provide a voice to the confronted party. The jury discussed eliminating the letter to the community but felt strongly that Zack should have a voice in the abstract. Therefore, the jury decided that Zack should be asked to write a statement expressing whatever sentiments he wished. In explaining the letter to Zack, the jury decided they would say that they wanted him to have a voice in the abstract, and they wanted him to be perfectly honest about his feelings.

Regarding Concerns about Zack’s Reaction to Resolutions:

Remembering the email, some jury members were concerned that Zack might attempt to harm himself upon hearing the resolutions. Care was taken to inform Zack of the resolutions in a sensitive and personal way. A dean was on call during the presentation of resolutions. The jury also decided to recommend that Zack receive counseling during separation to address his distress.

Tentative Resolutions:

- 1) The student will receive a 0.0 for the paper and the course.**
- 2) The student will be separated from the community for one semester. (Kelly standing outside on this resolution only).**
- 3) The student will re-sign the Honor Code upon his return to Haverford. His signature will be verified by the Honor Council Chair(s).**
- 4) The student and the professor will engage in a dialogue with the dual purpose of repairing the breach of trust and educating the student about avoiding plagiarism.**

5) The student will do one of the following in order to re-enter the Haverford community:

- a) Complete an independent study for credit under the supervision of a faculty member.
- b) Complete a 25 -page research paper, to be reviewed by a faculty member.

The study or the paper must concern the use of Truth and Reconciliation Commissions in restoring communities abroad. Some aspect of this independent study/paper should relate to his experience.

- 6) The student will write a statement to be released with the abstract.²**
- 7) The jury recommends that the student meet with a counselor to address his emotional well-being.**
- 8) The jury recommends that the student keep in touch with a member of the administration, staff, faculty, or the jury during his separation.**

Presentation of Resolutions:

The jury, Zack, and Professor Bliss reconvened for the presentation of resolutions. Before the presentation began, the chair explained information learned from the deans during the break.

- 1) Separation would not jeopardize Zack's financial aid situation.
- 2) Separation appears on a transcript as simply College Leave. Because the information on the transcript does not reflect the nature of the leave, it would be up to Zack to explain the situation to anyone reading his transcript. Only if a school or employer called to inquire about that nature of the time off, would it be revealed that Zack had been separated for academic dishonesty.

Professor Bliss' Reaction:

Professor Bliss was content with the resolutions but was unclear about the purpose of the Truth and reconciliation commission paper/study. The jury took a few minutes to explain the role that truth and trust plays at Haverford. The jury explained that they thought using a concrete example of how trust has been restored in communities abroad might help Zack understand the importance of trust at Haverford. Additionally, the paper/study had to somehow relate back to Haverford so that Zack could apply what he learned to the Haverford community. Professor Bliss was also concerned because she realized she would be unavailable for a period of time and didn't know how she could engage in dialogue with Zack. Zack and the Professor agreed to a short dialogue period, hoping to repair the breach in that way.

Zack's Reaction:

Zack did not have any statement but answered some of the jury's questions. Zack reiterated the fact that he could not return to Haverford if separated. He told the jury that he had begun applying to transfer and that the choice to do so was not his—his father would not let him miss a semester of college. Contrary to his email to the jury, Zack explained he would be continuing his education but it would be elsewhere. In response to the jury's offer to write Zack's father a letter, Zack declined. When asked if Zack would consider returning to Haverford after separation if it were not for his father, Zack said he wasn't sure.

Jury Statements:

The jury explained to Zack the purpose of his statement to go with the abstract and encouraged him to say what he really thought instead of "fluffy bullshit" (as stated by one juror). At least three jury members emphasized that they did not wish to exile Zack from the community, and truly wanted him to come back after separation—they simply felt he needed this semester away to consider the weight

² Zack never submitted his statement for release with this abstract despite repeated requests on the part of Honor Council Co-Chairs.

of his actions as well his relationship to the Haverford community. Zack responded saying that he could not return.

Post-presentation Deliberations:

The jury was concerned that they had spent a great deal of time working on resolutions contingent on Zack's return, and yet Zack was not planning on returning to Haverford. Some members of the jury pointed out that it is difficult to transfer, especially after failing a class. One member of the jury thought it might be a good idea to pass Zack in the class so that he could at least successfully transfer. Several members of the jury strongly disagreed with this sentiment while others simply pointed out that Professor Bliss had already decided to fail Zack regardless of the jury's decision (the jury can only make recommendations about grades). The jury concluded that Zack might return to Haverford and that the resolutions should stand. Kelly made a closing statement expressing some discomfort with the process. She felt that the decision to separate may have been made out of anger, and she felt the resolutions were punitive instead of helpful. She said that the process made her uncomfortable at times. Despite her sentiments, she agreed to stand outside the decision to separate and the resolutions were finalized as stated above.

Discussion Questions:

1. What role does trust play in a trial? Should the jury have trusted Zack more?
2. Should the fact that a student will not or cannot come back to Haverford if separated play a role in the decision?
3. Separation in academic trials is a highly contentious issue on this campus. Do you feel that this situation warranted separation? If not, what academic situations, if any, warrant separation?
4. Does separation actually provide an opportunity for growth or does it simply cause the confronted party to become bitter and angry?
5. Do you think the paper/study on trust was an appropriate resolution in this trial? If not, why?
6. How should the jury respond to a situation in which a confronted party threatens his/her life?