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Introduction

Amelia Earhart was a student in Professor Amsterdam’s Senior Research in European Studies class, Professor London’s Backroads of Europe class, and Professor Barcelona’s European Mapmaking class. Professors Amsterdam, London, and Barcelona suspected that Amelia had solicited paid help in an online forum for multiple assignments in multiple classes. These assignments were primarily ones where work was meant to be done on one's own without help, though this fact was withheld from the tutors. When they confronted Amelia, she denied these allegations. The professors contacted Honor Council to see if the student had reported herself and to ask how to pursue potential violations in other classes and a summer program.
listed under what they believed to be Amelia's account on the online forum. The professors inquired how they should approach the other professors and handle potential issues that occurred off-campus over the summer. They were advised by the Honor Council Co-Chairs to contact the involved professors and the summer program directly for statements. After not receiving confirmation from Honor Council about Amelia reporting herself, Professor Amsterdam formally brought Amelia to Council. However, before the Co-Chairs could request a statement from Amelia, she contacted Honor Council herself. The European Studies professors and Amelia were asked to submit statements.

Additionally, Professor Brasilia contacted Honor Council about a suspected case of plagiarism by the same student in her South American Population Studies course. Professor Brasilia cc'd the code email address on a confrontation formally bringing Amelia Earhart to Honor Council as Amelia had not brought herself within the allotted timeframe. Both Professor Brasilia and Amelia were asked to submit statements.

Honor Council discussed the two issues in the same meeting. Council first received statements concerning only the issue in Professor Brasilia's class and consented to a suspicion of violation. Council then received statements concerning the European Studies professors and consented to a separate suspicion of violation. Council then discussed whether these issues should be sent to the same proceeding or separate proceedings. Members saw the benefits of having the same jury hear both cases and be able to take both into account, but were worried that hearing the European Studies issue would bias the jury against Amelia in the issue in Professor Brasilia’s class, which seemed less extensive. Some members brought up that while these currently seemed like two separate issues, with more information, a jury may realize that they were actually connected.

After some discussion, Council decided the best approach would be to modify trial procedures. The case would include two initial meetings where the jury would be able to review statements separately for each issue, two fact-finding portions, and two potential statements of violation, but one circumstantial portion and one set of proposed resolutions that could address both issues. They felt that while the jury should be told that there would be a second set of statements and fact-finding portion at the first initial meeting, they should not be told the nature of the second issue. Council consented on this course of action.

Council then discussed briefly whether the case should be sent to an academic trial or to a joint panel, and ultimately consented that it should be sent to an academic trial. Before the trial began, Dean Montreal informed the Co-Chairs that Amelia had withdrawn from the college.

Fact-Finding Portion I: Case Concerning Professor Brasilia

Professor Brasilia was present for Fact-Finding I. The Chair offered Amelia the opportunity to participate in person, on Skype, on the phone, or just over email. Amelia told the Chair via email that she would prefer to supplement her emailed statements and gave the Chair an alternative email address to contact her, as her school email would soon be discontinued.

Professor Brasilia’s Statement:

The directions for the South American Populations take-home exam allowed students to use lecture slides and any notes they had taken in class when taking the exam. Students were
given 3 hours to take the exam, and were explicitly instructed not to use other outside sources, including the textbook and Internet. Professor Brasilia believed that Amelia had inappropriately used the Internet on two questions, directly violating the exam instructions. Amelia had asked for an extension due to a family illness and kept requesting further extensions. When Amelia finally turned in her exam by scanning and emailing it, she was missing an answer and a figure.

Professor Brasilia noted that some of the work did not seem to fit what she knew as Amelia’s style of writing. Additionally, two of Amelia’s answers contained information not included in the textbook or in lecture. Amelia gave two answers to a question about Chilean communities – one fit the information given in class, the other did not. In the second answer, Amelia noted that she had learned that information about Chilean communities in another class. When Professor Brasilia asked about the class, Amelia first said it was a lab class and then a lab in which she had worked over the summer. Professor Brasilia took a chunk of the text that Amelia had written for another question, regarding the Argentine city plan, and put it into Google. The first hit was the abstract for a paper on the Database of South American Studies that discussed Argentine city roads. Professor Brasilia said the paper had used the same terminology as Amelia.

Amelia Earhart’s Statement:

Since Amelia did not attend the meeting, the jurors were given Amelia’s printed statement. Amelia noted that Professor Brasilia’s assertions about her exam were to some extent accurate; throughout the semester, Amelia supplemented her notes with other textbooks and websites, copying into her notebook any information she found helpful or interesting. Additionally, Amelia copied parts of the textbook directly into her. She did not cite the sources within her notebook, and, as almost every exam she had taken had been closed notes, she did not find this to be an issue. When taking Professor Brasilia’s open-note exam, Amelia did not consider that using her notes might equate to using outside sources.

In the fact-finding portion, Professor Brasilia recapped much of her statement, focusing on her specific concern about a question on the Argentine city plan. Professor Brasilia said that often in her tests, she took figures from papers the class had not previously seen and asked the students to interpret the data. One such figure included on this test concerned an Argentine city plan which had not been previously mentioned in class. The question only gave the name of the city. In her answer, Amelia had made a reference to a specific road in the city. This was the first red flag for Professor Brasilia, as there was no way Amelia could have known the name of the road as it was not mentioned in lecture or in the textbook.

The jury asked for further clarification about the two answers Amelia gave about the Chilean communities. Professor Brasilia said that while neither answer was incorrect, Amelia would have needed a Ph.D. to understand the answer that did not include information from the course. Professor Brasilia clarified that she first approached Amelia before looking up any of Amelia’s answers; she did a Google search only after her initial conversation with Amelia in which Amelia denied any questionable actions.

Professor Brasilia said this was the first exam in this class. Professor Brasilia also said that she had had Amelia in a previous class, but that it was more of a seminar style class that did
not have an exam. In the previous class, Amelia had asked for an extension on her presentation due to family illness and had also asked for an extension on the final paper.

The jury asked if using only outside sources that had been copied into notes prior to the exam would constitute a violation of the Honor Code in Professor Brasilia’s eyes. Professor Brasilia said that if that was the case, then there was no violation. However, Professor Brasilia said that she did not even consider the possibility that someone would augment notes with obscure external sources to such an extent. The Chilean communities and the method Amelia suggested using to test her hypothesis was never discussed in class or given as supplementary reading. To take the time to obtain such information, in addition to taking notes on every paper mentioned in the class (about 6-10 per class) and doing the already intensive class work, would be what Professor Brasilia deemed “unnecessary.”

**Jury Deliberations: Statement of Violation I**

After Professor Brasilia left, the jury discussed the issue and consented unanimously to the following statement of violation:

**Statement of Violation I**

*Amelia violated the Honor Code by not following her professor's instructions on the exam in misusing outside information.*

**Fact-Finding Portion II: Case Concerning Profs. Amsterdam, London and Barcelona**

*The European Studies Professors' Statement:*

The professors’ statement included a detailed appendix of printouts from the globe_trotter account on MapDesigner.com, which advertised work for assignments, and their chronicling of the evidence linking Amelia to globe_trotter. They also provided the jury with a list of the classes Amelia had taken in her time at Haverford.

In the fact-finding portion, the professors detailed their evidence that Amelia was globe_trotter. Professor Barcelona said the professors first heard about globe_trotter from an email Professor Barcelona received from someone who identified as a paid online tutor. The tutor, travel_agent, had been hired by globe_trotter for help with a “Comprehensive Question Set” on MapDesigner.com. Travel_agent asked Professor Barcelona if several questions she had received from a client were actually portions of an exam. Professor Barcelona said they were, and said he had only handed out the exams in his class in hardcopy, so someone in the class would have had to type the text into a computer. An email exchange between Professor Barcelona and travel_agent followed: the tutor explained how MapDesigner.com worked, and Professor Amsterdam and Professor Barcelona set up an account so they could see all of the jobs that globe_trotter had posted. The listings were mainly for courses in the European Studies

---

1 During the third Fact-Finding portion, the jury received more information pertinent to this violation; however, the jury decided to let this statement of violation stand. Please refer to Fact Finding III for specific details concerning this violation.
department and included parts of syllabi for the classes in question. There were two listings for Bryn Mawr classes and many for Haverford classes. Professor Barcelona said that the professors quickly narrowed the possibilities of who globe_trotter could be down to one person: Amelia.

Professor Amsterdam said that Professor Barcelona came to see her and told her that globe_trotter was one of her thesis students, based off of a thesis topic posting that globe_trotter had made on MapDesigner.com. Professor Amsterdam gave Professor Barcelona a list of her thesis students, and by looking at globe_trotter's other postings and comparing them to the students' schedules, Professor Amsterdam and Professor Barcelona were able to connect globe_trotter to Amelia. Professor Amsterdam said globe_trotter had posted the title of a PowerPoint and paper that she worked on over the summer. Professor Amsterdam entered the title into Google, and found a program for Travel Together Symposium, which gave research opportunities to students. The title was listed as the title of a presentation that had been delivered by Amelia Earhart.

Professor London said that Amelia had taken a course from him last semester and had submitted the final paper to him electronically. He saw the course name among the list of jobs globe_trotter had posted, and contacted the tutor, cities_expert, who had been hired for the job. The tutor confirmed that the paper Amelia had turned in was the paper the tutor had worked on.

Professor Barcelona said travel_agent sent him the answers he had written to help Amelia thus far. Professor Barcelona said he could match the answers directly to Amelia's exam. Some of the answers were written by travel_agent, and some were written by Amelia and sent to travel_agent to look at and edit.

Professor Amsterdam said that travel_agent had found Professor Barcelona. Globe_trotter had removed the name “Haverford College” from all of the documents posted online, but travel_agent used IP tracking on globe_trotter's emails to trace the network to Haverford. Professor Amsterdam said that the professors had sent the IP address travel_agent provided to academic computing, who told them that the address was registered to Amelia. Professor Barcelona said that globe_trotter had provided travel_agent with audiotapes of all of Professor Barcelona's lectures, and something in one of the tapes – perhaps a mention of Professor Barcelona's name or an allusion to the exam – had led the tutor to finally contact Haverford.

Amelia Earhart’s Statement

At this point, the jury and the professors read Amelia's written statement, as Amelia was not participating live in the proceeding. In her statement, Amelia denied any involvement in this case or with the globe_trotter account, writing that a hacker was responsible. She wrote that her “personal email account had been hacked and spam and disturbing emails were sent from her account to her family and friends over the course of several months.” These reported emails were deemed by her family as “offensive, inappropriate, disrespectful and out of character.” Amelia and her family “assumed her account had obviously been compromised regardless of password changes.” She wrote, “details were given suggesting that credit card information was extracted from saved emails and unauthorized charges were occasionally found in billing statements.” She wrote, “the hacker had access to personal and private emails to family and friends,” and Amelia “noticed a distressing email to a friend and cousin about the Honor Code confrontation.”

Amelia wrote that the hacker was an ex-boyfriend and had access to and permission to use her personal computer due to an agreement made with her family. His need and limited
access to a computer to complete important applications, among other things, was why her parents had offered hers. Amelia mentioned that she was unsure whether he was able to keep guessing her password, hacked the account, or simply because her password may have been saved by the operating system. The ex-boyfriend was permitted access to her personal computer since the last part of the previous semester until about two weeks before the professors' confrontation. She wrote that he would have had access to any personal files in folders for coursework including course syllabi, scans of textbook chapter pages for different classes, notes recorded in files and in memo pads uploaded onto her personal computer concerning assignments and their requirements. All of this information was readily available via her personal computer or emails sent to herself and saved email drafts due to much traveling back and forth throughout the weeks.

Amelia wrote that she had taken her European Mapmaking exam in the middle of the week around 3-5 PM. She did not print her exam from her email until the end of the week around 5 PM. Her computer was at the IT department from the beginning until the middle of the week so she used a friend’s who did not have MS office and typed up her answers in an email. After the time of completion, the hacker was lucky to find the material for the posting just uploaded onto her email. He sent her answers to the hired person, asking for revisions, so that he would replace new answers into her original work. Two questions from the exam, with a combined total of five sentences, had apparently been incorporated into her original responses printed and submitted. These new responses were re-emailed to herself on her account at the end of the week. Had she printed out her exam earlier, no problems would have existed as the work done by the hired person would not have been what she had turned in.

Amelia also mentioned the issue with the Travel Together Symposium, noting that she never went to this symposium due to a family member's failing health, and also neither made a power point, nor presented and submitted an abstract.

Upon reading the statement, Professor Barcelona said that Amelia had written on the exam that she had taken it from 3-5 p.m. at the end of the week. However, in her statement, Amelia had written that she completed the exam from 3-5 p.m. in the middle of the week. Professor Barcelona called Amelia's statement “convoluted” and “far-fetched.”

Professor Amsterdam brought up more evidence linking Amelia to globe_trotter: she said that Famous European Travelers, one of the classes advertised last spring, had a more elaborate advertisement with links to documents and other printouts with handwriting, so materials posted on the website were not just in email form. Professor London said that when confronted, Amelia said she wasn't recording lectures, and questioned who could have been if Amelia's statement was true. Professor Amsterdam said that if someone was actually impersonating Amelia and wanted to bring her down, why wouldn't they use her name?

Professor Barcelona voiced a concern that perhaps Amelia did not have enough information about the nature of the allegations. He said that because Honor Council did not usually show the parties each other’s whole statements and the professors felt their statement would be “brutal” for her to receive, they had decided it wouldn't be appropriate to show Amelia their whole statement. Therefore, Amelia didn't know “the extent of our evidence.” Professor Amsterdam said it felt “unbalanced” that Amelia hadn't seen their whole statement. She said that when the professors confronted her, they showed her the printout of the globe_trotter account
and told her, “We have a reason to believe this is you.” Professor Amsterdam said that when she had pointed to the title of the senior thesis on the printout, Amelia hadn't said anything, and had tried to distance herself. Professor Barcelona said that he told Amelia he was emailed by someone regarding the account. However, the professors had found more detailed evidence after the confrontation, which Professor Amsterdam said that Amelia had not necessarily heard. However, while she didn't know the evidence, she “knew what she had been confronted for.”

The jury and the professors discussed the classes in which Amelia was accused of violating the Honor Code one by one.

*European Mapmaking, Professor Barcelona*

Barcelona said that travel_agent had been contacted at the beginning of the semester to do work for the class and that globe_trotter had changed the exam names on the syllabus so the tutor wouldn't know she was helping on exams. Barcelona said the tutor got the exam questions the day the exams were handed out, but travel_agent quickly became uncomfortable with the work and no longer wanted to help. She then emailed Barcelona. When Amelia handed in her exam, it matched travel_agent's answers. Barcelona explained that Amelia wrote different times that she had taken the exam in her statement than in her actual exam, and that globe_trotter had been in communication with travel_agent for four days, going way over the time limit of the exam.

*Backroads of Europe, Professor London, Previous Semester*

London said that Amelia had turned in the final paper for his class late. London noticed something strange in Amelia’s analysis. However, he said that because the procedure was not incorrect for the data, he did not pursue the issue at the time.

When London saw his class listed on MapDesigner.com, he tracked down cities_expert, who was listed as the tutor, and asked what work she had done on the paper. She said she had edited it, fixed the formatting, and done the references. Because learning proper formatting style was one of the goals of the paper, London believed the tutor’s help was an Honor Code violation. London said that he had also found homework problems from his class on a different website, StudyHelp.com, that globe_trotter had posted.

The jury and the confronting parties read the portions of Amelia's statement regarding Backroads of Europe and the Chair read Amelia’s explanation of how she had learned the strange analysis procedure. Amelia denied that she had posted on MapDesigner.com for help with that paper or any other work. She explained she had learned the procedure from another lab she had worked in.

*Senior Thesis, Professor Amsterdam*

Amsterdam said that an excerpt from an email about thesis ideas from another senior thesis student to Amelia had been posted on MapDesigner.com the day after Amelia received the email. In the post, Amelia had asked for future help on the subject. Amsterdam said the post was a “violation of professional ethics,” as globe_trotter had posted an unpublished idea for original research. Barcelona commented that globe_trotter had displayed a casual attitude towards the intellectual property of her professors.
Amelia’s statement denied posting the research on MapDesigner.com, blaming her ex-boyfriend for the post in an attempt to incriminate her.

*European Mapmaking Laboratory, Professor Barcelona*

Barcelona explained that no online tutor had explicitly been hired for Mapmaking Lab. The advertised project was a group project where students gathered data and analyzed it together in lab. Barcelona said that the only thing students were supposed to do alone was write the report. Thus, the information on MapDesigner.com had to have been written by someone in the class. He was especially concerned that the post publicized that globe_trotter would distribute confidential data to a hired tutor.

In her statement, Amelia denied requiring any outside help. She said she had a memo with the project information in her email, which her ex-boyfriend must have posted online. Barcelona acknowledged that Amelia effectively explained how someone not in the class could have accessed the necessary information. Barcelona said that Amelia never turned in the project. London said that it was possible globe_trotter could have gone back to a tutor she had used previously rather than hiring a new one for this project.

*Famous European Travelers, Professor Tuscany, Previous Semester, Bryn Mawr College*

Professor Tuscany's class had a timed, take-home exam for which students could not use outside help, and a final report for an experiment from lab. Amsterdam said there were two old posts on MapDesigner.com regarding the class. The first post was for the topic of the last question on the take-home exam and had been paid for. The second post requested someone to interpret lab data and write about it. All the documents that aided students' work were posted online, but no tutor had been explicitly hired.

*Great South American Cities, Professor Santiago, Bryn Mawr College*

The European Studies professors requested a statement from Professor Santiago about the MapDesigner.com posting for his class. Professor Santiago said that the post corresponded to an assignment in his class but did not have an issue with it. As no tutor had been hired, Amsterdam said that there was no reason to believe that Amelia did not do the assignment herself, but the post established a pattern. In her statement, Amelia denied hiring outside help and wrote that she understood the material and had not been pressed for time on the assignment.

*South American Population Studies, Professor Brasilia*

Amsterdam said there was information about the class posted on MapDesigner.com but there were no specific assignments for the course, and no tutors were explicitly hired.

*Summer Research at the Australia School of Travel*

Amsterdam said that the professors found a poster that Amelia had presented at the Australia School of Travel over the summer on MapDesigner.com. Amelia’s supervisor at the program, Dr. Canberra, confirmed that she did not actually present the poster as intended. Dr. Canberra said that Dr. Sydney, the director of the lab, thought the situation was strange, but did not have any concerns. The work was handed in with the title advertised on MapDesigner.com.
Barcelona said the research program was the first instance in which the professors had connected the username globe_trotter to Amelia Earhart. London said that he was not as concerned about this issue as an Honor Code violation, but that it was important to tie the identity of globe_trotter to Amelia.

_African River Travel – Bryn Mawr Course_

Amsterdam said globe_trotter had posted African River Travel homework questions on StudyHelp.com. However, the questions were not dated, and as Amelia had taken African River Travel at Bryn Mawr, which has many African River Travel professors, they decided it was not worth it to contact specific professors about the questions.

_Asian Village Studies, Professor Tokyo, previous semester_

Amsterdam found Asian Village Studies questions that someone with the username globe_trotter had posted online on a different homework help website. The questions were dated at the same time Amelia took Asian Village Studies, so Amsterdam sent the questions to the relevant professors, Tokyo and Seoul. Professor Tokyo said the exchange globe_trotter had on the homework website was the kind of exchange she encouraged in class, but not online. Professor Tokyo added that she considered posting questions for her class online a violation of the Honor Code.

Barcelona said that the postings showed a pattern of escalation: globe_trotter asked for help in one class several semesters ago, two classes in the previous semester and this semester, all of Amelia's classes were referenced online. Barcelona added that it had taken him a while to absorb the nature of Amelia's argument. He said she was still confused by Amelia’s explanation for how her exam matched the tutor’s. Barcelona was puzzled that Amelia would have extensive conversations with her ex-boyfriend about how he impersonated her if he hadn't apologized for his actions. Barcelona emphasized the general deception surrounding Amelia's actions. Amsterdam agreed, and said that they had never seen anything like this. Barcelona was shocked and disheartened by the situation, but was relieved that all of the evidence could be tied to one person, as he first thought that a group of students was responsible.

The Chair asked if the professors would allow the jury to send Amelia their complete statement, as she had not been able to read it, and the professors agreed.

_Jury Deliberations_

The jury discussed if it would be appropriate to send Amelia the professors' full statement. They thought it was appropriate, but several jurors did not want Amelia to keep the statement, as the professors had not been able to keep hers. Several jurors were concerned about sending her the statement because in response to the jury’s emailed questions after the preliminary meeting, Amelia implied that she may take legal action against the jury or Haverford. After speaking to Dean Montreal, the jury consented to send Amelia the professors' statement, as Amelia would get the statement anyway if she decided to take legal action.

Along with their emailed questions, the jury had also asked Amelia to speak to them live and produce her ex-boyfriend – something she had offered to do in an earlier email. However,
Amelia had ignored these requests in her response to the jury's questions. The jury now discussed if they should give Amelia more time to respond to their request, to speak to them, and produce her ex-boyfriend before coming to a statement of violation or non-violation. The jury consented to give Amelia until 4 p.m. the following day to tell the jury if either she or her ex-boyfriend was willing to talk to the jury.

**Jury Deliberations: Statement of Violation II**

Amelia had not responded to the jury’s email by the time they met the next day. However, some jury members still felt uncomfortable coming to a statement of violation or non-violation without talking to her. One juror suggested coming to a provisional statement of violation, and consenting before the circumstantial portion if the jury still hadn't heard from Amelia. Other jury members said they had given Amelia plenty of time, and many chances to respond. One juror said that Amelia would not suddenly begin to answer the jury’s requests quickly, and giving her more time would be working into Amelia's “pattern of disregard for deadlines.” The jury consented to move forward with a statement.

The jury unanimously consented that a violation of the Honor Code had occurred and discussed each issue in turn.

**Whether or not Amelia is globe_trotter**

The Chair shared new information received from Amsterdam who said that questions posted by globe_trotter on StudyHelp.com and the Asian Village Studies discussion board had been removed and covered up after the professors' confrontation. Given this information and prior information, the jury unanimously consented that Amelia's improper use of the account globe_trotter on MapDesigner.com and StudyHelp.com constituted a violation of the Honor Code.

**European Mapmaking, Professor Barcelona**

The jury thought it was clear that Amelia had violated exam instructions, and clarified that she had used someone else's work as her own and exceeded the time limit. The jury felt strongly that Amelia's distribution of Professor Barcelona's intellectual property constituted a violation of the Code. No jurors stood outside.

**Backroads of Europe, Professor London, Previous Semester**

The jury extensively discussed Amelia's actions in Backroads of Europe. Though London had said that cities_expert confirmed that she had edited Amelia's paper, and the jury agreed that help with formatting and references constituted a violation due to the fact that formatting was a large part of the assignment, the jurors were not sure they could say that Amelia had used the tutor’s work in her paper. As formatting is standard, Amelia's formatted paper would have looked the same as the tutor's, and she could have used the tutor's paper as reference. The jury consented that Amelia had violated the Honor Code by neglecting to ask for clarification of instructions with regards to online help. No jurors stood outside of consensus.

**Senior Thesis, Professor Amsterdam**
Globe_trotter had posted for thesis help on MapDesigner.com, but it was unclear whether a tutor had been hired. The jury decided that Amelia clearly violated the Honor Code by distributing intellectual property in the form of research ideas and unpublished data, but could not agree on whether the actual solicitation was a violation, especially given that Amelia's posting could be interpreted as asking for someone to bounce ideas off of.

The jury extensively debated whether or not intent to violate the Honor Code was a violation. They discussed how far back intent to cheat could be traced if an individual did not go through with it. Many jurors thought that because the solicitation was vague, there was not enough evidence to incorporate it into the statement of violation. Other jurors thought that the assignment was important enough that intent was a violation here. One juror said that there were enough other violations that this one didn't really matter. Another juror asked if the jury could write letters to the community regarding intent. The jury decided to proceed and return to the discussion of the travel log violation later.

European Mapmaking Laboratory, Professor Barcelona
The jury consented that Amelia had violated the trust of survey participants and other students in the lab by posting private data online. Although it was unclear if someone had been hired for the class, the jury thought the post counted as a violation because globe_trotter's request was specific enough that if fulfilled, the work would be in violation of the Code.

Famous European Travelers, Professor Tuscany, Previous Semester, Bryn Mawr College
Several jurors were concerned that because Famous European Travelers was a Bryn Mawr course, Honor Board should see the issue. Other jurors thought that because Professor Tuscany had entrusted Amsterdam, London, and Barcelona to deal with the issue, they had jurisdiction. Some jurors also commented on the logistical difficulty of giving just this piece of the case to Bryn Mawr. In the end, the jury decided they could discuss the issue. The jurors consented that Amelia had used inappropriate help on an exam, violated the time limit, and solicited help on the report. One juror stood outside of consensus.

Great South American Cities, Professor Santiago, Bryn Mawr College
As there was no evidence that someone had done the class work for Amelia, and as Professor Santiago did not feel that Amelia's solicitation constituted a breach of trust or a violation of the Honor Code, the jury did not come to a statement of violation.

South American Population Studies, Professor Brasilia
The solicitation on MapDesigner.com was vague and did not correspond to specific assignments. There was no indication that someone had been hired for help with the course, so the jury did not come to a statement of violation.

Summer Research at the Australia School of Travel
The jury focused on the fact that this work had occurred during the summer, and that the Code did not explicitly apply over the summer. Some jurors said the Code could be interpreted to apply over the summer, but others disagreed, as the Code was explicit about the Quaker Consortium and study abroad. The jury was not comfortable saying that Amelia had violated the
Honor Code academically. The jurors discussed at length whether Amelia violated the social Hono
Honor Code by misrepresenting Haverford and potentially damaging the school’s and Haverford
students’, reputation, by putting other Haverford students under suspicion.

After extensively discussing what it meant to represent Haverford in an academic and
social sense, the jurors decided that Amelia had violated the social aspect of the Honor Code.
The jurors decided that as Amelia had attended an undergraduate research symposium where she
explicitly acted as a representative of Haverford and misrepresented someone else's work as her
own, Amelia had violated the spirit of the social Honor Code. Two jurors stood outside.

African River Travel

The jury talked briefly about globe_trotter's posting of African River Travel problems on
StudyHelp.com, but decided that situation was too vague to pursue, especially as Amsterdam,
London, and Barcelona had not contacted the professors.

Asian Village Studies, Professor Tokyo, Several Semesters Prior

The jury discussed if there was a clear violation regarding globe_trotter’s posting of Asian Village Studies questions online. One juror said that he was not completely sure they
could say this globe_trotter was the same as MapDesigner's globe_trotter. However, the jury felt
they could connect the two, especially because the dates of the postings matched the time when
Amelia had taken the course. In the end, because Professor Tokyo had said that this kind of help
would constitute a violation, the jury decided Amelia had violated the Honor Code. One juror
stood outside.

Senior Thesis, Professor Amsterdam

The jury returned to this issue, and discussed whether there was enough evidence to say
that Amelia had intended to buy her travel log from a tutor, and if intent was enough to constitute
a violation. Two jurors said that because a travel log by definition requires close, collaborative
work, soliciting help was even worse. Two jurors thought there was a violation, but that it wasn't
clear enough to include in the statement. Two jurors felt there was clear intent to violate the
Code, and the violation should be included. Two jurors said their decisions depended on if the
intent to cheat was proven. One juror was not comfortable saying that Amelia had intended to
cheat. The jurors decided to try to come up with wording that addressed the issue of the thesis as
close, collaborative work with a professor but was vague about whether or not the solicitation
itself was a violation of the Code. After a long discussion, they consented to acknowledge
Amelia’s solicitation for help without directly stating it as a violation. Two jurors stood outside.

The jury discussed if they should consider Amelia's behavior throughout the trial in the
statement, including lying to the professors and the jury, but decided against it. The jury first
consented to the statement of violation in parts and then as a whole, deciding that even if a juror
disagreed with portions of it, they could still consider the statement of violation as a whole
appropriate. This kind of consensus is frequently used for resolutions. The jurors unanimously
consented on the statement of violation as a whole.

Statement of Violation II
Amelia violated the Honor Code by improperly using the account “globe_trotter” on MapDesigner.com and StudyHelp.com (0 jurors stood outside of consensus). Specifically:

1. In European Mapmaking, taught by Professor Barcelona, Amelia violated exam instructions by seeking outside help and represented an online tutor's work as her own on an exam. In order to receive this help, Amelia egregiously exceeded the time limits of the exam. Additionally, Amelia violated her professor's trust by distributing his intellectual property – in the form of recorded lectures – without his consent. (0 jurors stood outside of consensus)

2. In Backroads of Europe, taught by Professor London, Amelia neglected to ask for clarification of her professor’s instructions regarding online help in formatting her paper. (0 jurors stood outside of consensus)

3. In her thesis, advised by Professor Amsterdam, Amelia violated the trust of her professor and her travel group by inappropriately distributing unpublished data and research ideas in soliciting online help on her thesis. (Two jurors stood outside of consensus)

4. In European Mapmaking Laboratory, taught by Professor Barcelona, Amelia violated the trust of her fellow students by offering private data to online tutors. Amelia also solicited help in writing her report for the course. (0 jurors stood outside of consensus)

5. In Famous European Travelers, taught by Professor Tuscany at Bryn Mawr College, Amelia used someone else's help on an exam, represented someone else's work as her own, and violated the time limit on a timed exam. Additionally, Amelia solicited help from an online tutor in writing a report for the laboratory portion of this course. (One juror stood outside of consensus)

6. As a summer research student at the Australia School of Travel, when acting as an explicit representative of Haverford College, Amelia violated the trust of the Haverford community by submitting someone else's work as her own. (Two jurors stood outside of consensus)

7. In Asian Village Studies, taught by Professor Tokyo, Amelia solicited inappropriate online help for graded homework questions. (One juror stood outside of consensus)

Between Meetings

The Chair sent Amelia the statement of violation, asking for her response to the statement and for proposed resolutions. Amelia answered that she had not received any of the Chair’s emails – including the full statement from the confronting parties – until then. She explained that she was “very lost at the moment and feeling intensely overwhelmed with all of the information at hand since everything was received all at once.”

Amelia declined to participate in the circumstantial portion via Skype and said she would write out responses to the confronting parties, but did not propose resolutions. She also said that her ex-boyfriend refused to participate in the trial.

Circumstantial Portion I with Professors Amsterdam, London, Barcelona, and Brasilia

Before the group could begin the circumstantial portion, Brasilia told the Chair that new evidence had surfaced, which she shared with the jury.
New Evidence

Brasilia said that a person named Angel Falls, who worked as an online tutor, had contacted her to ask if she taught South American Population Studies at Haverford College. He wrote that he had received all course materials for the class, and was being paid to help an “overburdened professor” with his course. However, Angel Falls was never paid for the work he did on the class. Angel Falls emailed Brasilia to ask if the “professor” could have been a student who was trying to cheat, and agreed to share the information he had.

Brasilia said she believed that if Amelia had impersonated her, or another professor, this issue constituted “a whole other level of violation.” Brasilia said Amelia did not turn in the final exam for her class, as the final was due after the professors' confrontation. The Chair explained that the jury would have to discuss if they should go back and include this in the statement of violation, and said they would wait for more evidence from Angel Falls.

Circumstantial Portion

Barcelona said that the case had “shaken [him] deeply.” He said that he “believe[s] so strongly in the culture of the Honor Code” and that for the first time he started thinking that he should give students in-class exams. However, Barcelona said he had mostly worked through his initial reaction and now trusted students. Amsterdam said that it was “heartening” to see how the jury had responded to the case, and their indignation made him feel better about Haverford students after his confidence was shaken by Amelia.

Barcelona said students could record lectures, but that distributing those recordings was unacceptable. He also said students should ask before recording lectures. London said that in some states, recording someone without his permission was illegal. London added that online cheating was on the rise, and asked if there was a way that a community discussion or teaching moment could come out of the trial.

Brasilia was embarrassed because she had first felt awful for being suspicious and then stupid when she found out about MapDesigner.com. She said when she searched for Amelia's answers she wondered why she was suspicious. She could envision a student cheating accidentally, but it was the deception in this case that upset her. London said that it was “sucky” to “know your initial negative snap judgment is right.” He wanted to give students the benefit of the doubt. He said that although he got a bad impression while reading Amelia's paper for his class, he didn't want to think of people that way. Barcelona mentioned, “How difficult it is to confront someone without evidence.” She said that if travel agent hadn't come forward, she would have read Amelia's work, thought it was weird, and dismissed it. Amsterdam agreed that it was hard for a professor to act on a feeling.

Barcelona returned to the issue of intellectual property. He said sharing any course material on the web was inappropriate. London agreed, and wondered if professors would keep posting those things online. He said professors wanted students to have access to materials, and taking them down would hurt all students. Barcelona said he put all of his PowerPoints online, but if he knew that sharing was happening, he would stop.

A juror asked if the professors wanted to see Amelia’s lying mentioned in the statement of violation. Barcelona said that the lying made the case “egregious and premeditated.”
Amsterdam added that she wanted Amelia to take responsibility and admit to her actions, and if Amelia did, then she would feel very differently.

In the circumstantial portion of her written statement, which the group now read, Amelia denied seeking online help and blamed her ex-boyfriend for framing her. He said the confrontation was extremely upsetting, especially as it came when she had been considering withdrawing from Haverford because of unrelated psychological distress. Amelia explained that not being allowed to do her thesis had been especially upsetting, as it had been her reason for staying at Haverford, and that she was dismayed that the “good rapport” she had with her professors would be “tarnished.” She concluded by maintaining that her “honor is all [she] has and it won’t be destroyed by this unfortunate situation.”

Amsterdam said that reading Amelia's statement made her “very sad.” Brasilia was concerned for Amelia’s mental health. London said he had no reason to trust Amelia and that Amelia's comments about “good rapport” were false, as such a rapport had never existed. The others agreed. Barcelona said Amelia never talked to her professors until she needed extensions. Amsterdam said that she believed Amelia “has deluded herself” into thinking “that she hasn't done anything wrong.”

**Proposed Resolutions**

Amsterdam thought Amelia should be separated and felt strongly that it should be permanent. She pointed out that if Amelia returned, she would be a senior without a major because she had failed so many of her classes. Amsterdam couldn't see a way for Amelia to return, and explained, “Everything she has done is so antithetical to what this community stands for.” Barcelona clarified that the European Studies Department had a right to refuse her back into the major. Amsterdam said it would have to be very difficult for Amelia to return and that the department couldn’t take her back. She also said, “[It] would make me uncomfortable knowing that she was in some of my colleagues' classes.”

Brasilia wasn't sure what to think of the new information she had received from Angel Falls, but thought Amelia should fail the exam in her class. London wanted Amelia to re-write her paper for his course and he wanted to re-grade it.

The Chair asked if the professors had considered resolutions besides grade changes and permanent separation. London suggested counseling, and Brasilia agreed. The Chair suggested a community discussion about the abstract. The professors liked the idea, and the group discussed a joint faculty/Honor Council-facilitated community discussion about cyber-cheating. A juror also suggested talking about cyber-cheating during Customs. The jury decided that because Customs Week was packed with so many issues to discuss, it wouldn't be the most effective time.

The Chair asked if the professors wanted resolutions to address intellectual property. London suggested including a paragraph in syllabi about intellectual property in courses. Amsterdam said it could be discussed at new faculty orientation. The group also discussed what could be done about students recording lectures. A juror asked if it would be problematic for students with a disability to be required to ask professors before recording. London said it would not be an issue and Amsterdam said students had previously asked all of them to record lectures, and they had said yes.
They next discussed the abstract release. Amsterdam said it would be difficult to have a productive discussion without something to react to, so, “The sooner, the better.” Barcelona thought Honor Council should wait to release the abstract, but that the discussion should happen when the abstract was released. London said that they could talk to the faculty about this issue soon, either themselves or through the deans. A juror said, “If the professors are talking, then the students should be talking.”

Barcelona said that he felt “brought down to earth” by the whole experience. She said that students and faculty at Haverford tended to feel they were “above it all,” and that was a “Haverfordian problem.” Amsterdam said she had, “reevaluated my ability to be shocked by students,” and she never guessed this would happen. Barcelona wondered about temptation and the ease with which students could cheat at Haverford. A juror responded that the Code was largely based on trust, and professors had to trust students in order for students to be honest about their work. Amsterdam agreed. However, she said that she would be more explicit in the future about what constituted an Honor Code violation and would attempt to remove any sense of ambiguity. Amsterdam said that her first reaction to this case was that one person who blatantly violated the Code devalued the Haverford degree.

**Between Meetings**

The Chair received an email from Amelia that sought to acknowledge the nature and frequency of Amelia's communications with the Chair and the jury. Amelia had also attached her response to the professors' initial statement and to the jury's statement of violation. The Chair responded and told Amelia that the jury would be meeting the next day as they were awaiting more information from one of the professors.

After receiving these emails from Amelia and reading her fourth statement, where Amelia continued to deny any wrongdoing, the Chair became concerned that the jury was not being forthcoming enough with Amelia about why they did not believe her. She felt that while Amelia's lack of “live” participation in the trial process meant that the jury couldn't ask Amelia the questions they wanted, it also meant that Amelia didn't have the opportunity to fully understand why the jury was, at this point, so fully in line with the professors. In preparation for the next meeting, the Chair drafted a detailed letter from the jury to Amelia which explained point by point why the jury did not believe her and presented inconsistencies in her arguments.

**Jury Deliberations: Discussion of New Information from Professor Brasilia**

The jury began the meeting by reading the letter the Chair had prepared. They agreed it helped put both parties on the same page and was worthwhile to send. The jury made several minor changes to the document, but quickly and unanimously consented to sending it to Amelia. Next, the Chair read Professor Brasilia's statement to the jury and summarized the remaining information. The new information suggested that Amelia had solicited help via MapDesigner.com from one tutor, Angel Falls, for completing assignments and tests in South American Population Studies. In the course of this solicitation, Amelia had presented herself as Globe Trotter, an overburdened professor at Antarctica College (an existing but unrelated
school), and sent Brasilia's PowerPoint files, recorded lectures, and other course materials to Angel Falls.

The jury was concerned that the new information implied possible identity theft of Professor Brasilia, Globe Trotter (who happened to be a real professor in a similar department at another school), and an unspecified Antarctica College professor. The jury did not feel comfortable addressing the issues of impersonation, but felt that they were the appropriate body to discuss the potential academic violations presented in this new information.

Jurors suggested forming a separate Joint Panel to deal with the issues of impersonation, and felt strongly that the students on the panel should come from this jury. After some discussion, the jury decided that they would continue to discuss the academic aspects of the new information. The jury decided that the Chair should suggest to Professor Brasilia that she could confront Amelia separately about the issue of impersonation. If she chose to do so, statements from Amelia and Professor Brasilia would be read by Honor Council, then likely sent to a Joint Panel. The jury unanimously consented to this course of action.

The jury decided to continue with a third Fact-Finding Portion with Professor Brasilia. After that meeting, the jury would discuss tentative and final resolutions for the trial as a whole. The jury consented to this course of action.

Between Meetings

Following the meeting, the Chair forwarded the letter from the jury to Amelia and sent Professor Brasilia an update on the discussion. She asked Professor Brasilia to confirm that it would be okay to forward her most recent statement to Amelia. Following Professor Brasilia's confirmation, the Chair sent an email to Amelia with the statement, asking her to respond to the new allegations. Amelia responded with two separate statements, responding to Professor Brasilia and to the jury. In both statements Amelia continued to deny any wrongdoing.

Fact-Finding Portion III: Case Concerning Professor Brasilia

Professor Brasilia’s statement:

She was contacted by a tutor, Angel Falls, who said he had been helping Professor Globe Trotter, a professor teaching a South American Population Studies course. The tutor attached a powerpoint lecture to his email which Professor Brasilia recognized from her class. The tutor wrote that he had been hired by the “professor” to help him with his course, but when he had tried to contact the individual for payment, globe_trotter had not responded. Upon confirmation from Professor Brasilia, Angel Falls sent her a screenshot of a directory containing all of the files he had received in the process of working on the class. He had approximately 30 files, including audio files of the lectures, all of the powerpoints Professor Brasilia had posted online, all class documents and pdfs, and numerous images associated with the class. Angel Falls also sent the word files and jpegs that he had exchanged with globe_trotter, as well as their email exchanges.

Professor Brasilia told the jury that in the emails, globe_trotter had presented themselves as an Antarctica College professor and the emails clearly displayed evidence of impersonation. Professor Brasilia said that globe_trotter had even offered to transcribe audio files of lectures that were difficult to hear. Globe_trotter had asked Angel Falls to complete example writing
assignments for the class, asking for 4.0-quality work. Professor Brasilia confirmed that the example writing assignment Angel Falls sent was the same one Amelia had turned in. Globe_trotter had also asked Angel Falls to prepare the answer key for a Comprehensive Question Set – which was, in fact, the class's first take-home exam. Angel Falls's work for globe_trotter matched Amelia's first exam and numerous other assignments, including hand-drawn diagrams. Professor Brasilia received numerous drafts from Angel Falls, indicating that Amelia had worked closely back-and-forth with the tutor.

In reference to Professor Brasilia's initial concerns regarding Amelia (detailed in the Fact-Finding Portion I), Professor Brasilia told the jury that on the take-home exam, Angel Falls had suggested an alternate technique for the question regarding the Argentine city plan. The technique was the basis of Amelia's later plagiarized answer.

Angel Falls wrote that in his quest to find out who was behind the globe_trotter account, he had first contacted a real Professor Globe Trotter, a professor who teaches South American Studies at another university. Falls told Professor Brasilia that the real Mr. Globe Trotter was not pleased to learn that someone had been using his name. Then, Falls Googled the course title and found a class with the same name at Haverford College, taught by Professor Brasilia. Falls also sent Professor Brasilia the original job posting, which matched globe_trotter's vague job posting for the class on MapDesigner.com.

Professor Brasilia said some of the class documents Angel Falls had, such as the exam, had not been posted on BlackBoard, so globe_trotter had to be physically in the class. Professor Brasilia said globe_trotter had commented on, revised, and sent back drafts from Angel Falls. The drawings Amelia turned in had the same file names as the ones Angel Falls had sent. The page of her exam that Amelia had submitted late matched the page Angel Falls had.

Professor Brasilia noted a pattern of requests for extensions from Amelia, centering on family illnesses and deaths. To Falls, Amelia's excuses cited a TA who was late with work and computer issues. Professor Brasilia said that while she had not completely cross-referenced the timelines, she believed that the email exchange globe_trotter had with Angel Falls matched the timeline by which Amelia had turned in assignments to Professor Brasilia. Professor Brasilia said that she had gone through “logical gymnastics” to try to devise a reasonable explanation whereby Amelia could have still completed the assignments herself, but could not think of one.

Professor Brasilia commented that transcribing her lectures, as globe_trotter had offered to do, would take “a considerable amount of time and energy.” She was surprised and astounded that someone could transcribe the lectures and still “absorb nothing.” She said that the number of files Angel Falls had received was astounding. Professor Brasilia was also bothered by the fact that globe_trotter had passed along all of her course materials to a stranger.

The jury had no more questions and Professor Brasilia had nothing else to say, so the meeting ended. Professor Brasilia left and the jury moved into deliberations.

Jury Deliberations: Statement of Violation III

The jury unanimously consented to a violation of the Honor Code, with no discussion. The Chair gave the jury Amelia's response to the jury's letter. After they read it, one juror asked how Amelia would have not noticed that her allegedly replaced assignments were not her own work when she got them back from Professor Brasilia. After some brief discussion in which
none of the jurors grew more sympathetic to Amelia's claims, the jury decided to move into discussing the statement of violation.

The Chair asked the jury how they wanted to proceed, given that a statement of violation would concern the same class as their first statement. The jury discussed whether they would add an addendum to the first statement or write a new one. The jurors decided to write the new statement and add a footnote to the first statement. The jury unanimously consented to the following statement of violation:

Statement of Violation III

In South American Population Studies, taught by Professor Brasilia, Amelia violated the Honor Code by seeking inappropriate help on her exam and writing assignments, by violating exam instructions, and by representing another person's work as her own on most, if not all, assignments she handed in for the course. Additionally, she violated her professor's trust by distributing her professor's intellectual property – in the form of course materials (syllabus, power points, exams, images, writing assignments) and recorded lectures – without permission or attribution.

Between Meetings

Immediately following the meeting, the Chair sent an update with the statement of violation to Amelia, the European Studies professors, and Professor Brasilia. The next meeting was the circumstantial portion, and the Chair invited Amelia and Professor Brasilia to submit proposed resolutions to the jury. Amelia did not submit any proposed resolutions. Prior to the meeting, Professor Brasilia told the Chair that she would not be able to make it that night. However, she said she was okay with the jury proceeding without her, and recommended that Amelia receive a grade of 0.0 in South American Population Studies.

Circumstantial Portion II

The jury re-convened two days later for the second circumstantial portion of the trial. The confronting parties were unable to be present. The jury agreed unanimously with the Chair’s suggestion to, in both parties’ absence, reread the circumstantial portion of Amelia’s statements, and remind themselves of the professors’ suggested resolutions.

After reading, jurors commented on the repeated inconsistencies in Amelia’s statements and, in her physical absence, wondered at her mental state and continual failure to respond directly to questions. From her notes, the Chair summarized what the professors had told the jury during the previous circumstantial portion: nervousness and reluctance to trust students and post documents online, unease at the fact that they had only found out because of a whistleblower who wasn't even related to the Haverford community, and disbelief at Amelia's statements.

At the request of one juror, the jury read the Code aloud, with each juror taking a section as they went around the room. After they finished, the Chair reminded them about the importance of including education, restoration, and accountability in their resolutions. A juror
commented that he didn't know if restoration would be possible in this case. Another juror said that Amelia could only be restored to the community if she wanted to be restored.

The Chair reviewed the resolutions the professors had proposed earlier. She said that Professor Tuscany, who had taught Amelia's Famous European Travelers class, wanted Amelia to receive a 0.0. She told the jury that Professor Brasilia had suggested that Amelia receive a 0.0 for South American Population Studies.

The Chair also asked the jury to think about when this abstract should be released: if it should be delayed for the sake of confidentiality, or if the discussion was important enough that it should be released as soon as it was finished.

Jury Deliberations: Tentative Resolutions

Grades

The Chair suggested that the jury first discuss grade changes for Amelia, then other resolutions. The jurors agreed, and began from the assumption that Amelia would automatically receive zeroes in the remaining classes she had taken that semester, as she had withdrawn from the college mid-semester without a viable excuse.

In accordance with Professor Brasilia’s recommendation, the jury agreed that Amelia should receive a 0.0 in South American Population Studies. The jury then discussed Professor London’s Backroads of Europe class, where Amelia received help in formatting her final paper. The jury had previously agreed that because formatting was such a big part of the assignment, inappropriate help with formatting constituted an Honor Code violation in this case. Thus, the jury agreed that Amelia should receive a 0.0 on the paper. The jurors also agreed that Amelia should receive a 0.0 in Famous European Travelers, where she had received extensive help.

Finally, the jurors discussed Asian Village Studies, which had been taught by Professors Tokyo and Seoul, where Amelia received inappropriate online help on some homework questions. The Chair informed the jury that Professor Tokyo said receiving a zero on the affected problem sets wouldn’t change Amelia's overall course grade. However, the jury felt that for the sake of consistency, Amelia should receive a zero on the affected problem sets. The resolutions concerning classes stood as follows:

1. *Amelia will receive a 0.0 in South American Population Studies, taught by Professor Brasilia.*
2. *Amelia will receive a 0.0 on the final paper for Backroads of Europe, taught by Professor London.*
3. *Amelia will receive a 0.0 in Famous European Travelers, taught by Professor Tuscany at Bryn Mawr College.*
4. *Amelia will receive a 0.0 on the problem sets for Asian Village Studies, taught by Professor Tokyo.*

Should Amelia ever be allowed to return?

The jury discussed whether or not Amelia should ever be allowed to return to Haverford. Some suggested that the pathway for reentry must include an apology and acceptance of responsibility for past actions, but another juror argued that such an action could not be
mandated. A slight majority agreed that Amelia should be given the opportunity to return upon completion of certain tasks. The jury was unsure what such tasks would entail, and whether such actions could be overcome. Two voiced their discomfort with her potentially returning, feeling that her offense was past restoration. The Chair said that although the jury was divided, it seemed as though the jury was leaning towards potentially allowing Amelia to come back. She suggested that jurors should brainstorm what Amelia's potential return could depend on. She said the exercise might help jurors to make up their minds: either they could be persuaded that the mechanism the jury came up with was good enough to allow Amelia to return, or they would realize that the jury couldn't come up with something good enough, so more people would feel that she should not be allowed to come back. The jury largely agreed with this course of action.

The jurors brainstormed potential criteria for Amelia’s return. Jurors suggested that if she wanted to return, Amelia should first meet with the involved professors, who would have input to the jury, either in the form of a statement or a meeting. Amelia should then submit an affirmation from a psychologist that she was fit to return, pay Angel Falls, and write a letter to the jury. Then, Amelia would have to meet with the jury in person. The jurors could choose to confront her on the basis of her behavior during the trial, and go through an Honor Council proceeding with her participation. The jury would then have to consent whether or not Amelia was okay to return to Haverford. If the jury approved Amelia for return, she could reapply to Haverford through the admission office two years after the trial’s conclusion, for potential admittance in three years. The jury also felt they should note that Amelia would not be allowed to be a European Studies major unless the department changed their minds.

After the jury had laid out this potential plan, the Chair asked the jurors if it was enough, and if Amelia should be given an avenue for return. One juror was struck by Amelia’s continued rejection of the community, and argued that this trial should have been the moment that made her change. She considered Amelia’s actions intentional manipulation, and was uncomfortable with her attending Haverford. Another juror said they could not assume that Amelia would always be this person. The jury was still divided, and decided that they would discuss some of the other resolutions, then return to this issue.

Community Discussion

The Chair brought up the idea of a community discussion that the jury had talked about with the professors. The jury thought this discussion was a good idea, particularly if it involved both students and faculty, and occurred once the abstract was released. With the desire for the discussion to be well attended in mind, the Chair suggested that three jury members could work with the professors to heavily advertise the event. She also suggested that they could forgo abstract discussions to attract more people. The jury came up with the following resolution:

5. Immediately following the release of this abstract, Honor Council will host a community discussion with students and faculty about this issue. The discussion will be planned by at least three members of the jury and the involved professors. This discussion may be used in place of abstract discussions.

Intellectual Property

The jury briefly discussed and agreed on the following resolutions:
6. **We recommend that professors include a note in their syllabi about what they consider to be intellectual property in their class.** This note should address whether students may share class documents and lectures with individuals outside of the Haverford community and whether it is okay for students to record lectures in that class. The jury would like to note that it is still the students' responsibility to discuss this issue with their professors if the instructions are unclear or absent or if they feel their circumstances warrant an exemption.

7. **In the spirit of education, we recommend that the professors forward an article concerning intellectual property to the Chair to be sent to Amelia.**

**Summer Issues**

The jury discussed if they should say anything about Amelia's inappropriate representation of Haverford to the Australia School of Travel during her summer research program. The jury came up with the following resolution:

8. **We recommend that students keep in mind the fact that they may be perceived as representatives of the Haverford community in their words and actions even during the summer months or other breaks, particularly if they are called on to do academic work.**

**Communication with Other Schools**

The jury felt strongly that other schools should be informed about Amelia's academic violations and came up with the following resolution:

*If another institution contacts Haverford asking about Amelia's academic or disciplinary standing (e.g. in the event that she attempts to transfer somewhere else), Haverford should inform them that she has grossly violated standards of academic integrity and intellectual property over the course of a year and a half.*

**Should Amelia ever be allowed to return?**

The jury discussed what would be necessary for Amelia to be permitted to come back to Haverford. One juror asked what offenses could be considered more egregious than those she committed. The Chair said she believed it was more a matter of what was the best solution in any given instance, as opposed to a response to the magnitude of the issue.

A juror asked if they should believe in Amelia's ability to change. Another juror said that he believed she could change but wondered if putting her through hoops was practical. A juror suggested that in her letter to the jury she should display why she wished to return to Haverford versus another institution. While jurors agreed that this made them feel slightly better, it wasn't enough. The jury considered whether it would be productive to have her return as a freshman, but some considered this overkill. The jury went around in a circle to recap where they stood. Two jurors were strongly for not allowing Amelia to return, and two jurors were leaning in that direction. Three jurors were strongly for giving Amelia some way to come back, and two jurors were leaning in that direction. One juror was in the middle.
The juror who was firmly in the middle said he was very torn. He asked how the jury could right an “intentional, systematic wrong,” and asked if Amelia potentially changing was enough. He said that in this case, the incidents were not accidental and not isolated. When new students enter Haverford they are trusted implicitly, but because Amelia had violated that trust she would have to re-earn it. He said it wasn't about Amelia's words, but her “actions have been so far on one side of not adhering to [Haverford's] values,” that it should be “very, very hard” for her to come back. He said he would like to make the proposed criteria for her return work, but definitely wasn't okay with it as it stood.

The Chair asked the jury how they felt about inserting a clause that Amelia would have to prove to the jury, beyond a reasonable doubt, that she deserved to return. The jury was still divided, and decided to reconvene after a couple of days in which they could reflect and consider the resolutions. They consented to the other tentative resolutions.

Between Meetings

The Chair sent the tentative resolutions to Dean Montreal to check if there were any potential problems. The dean foresaw a potential issue only with the stipulation that Amelia get a recommendation from a psychologist to reapply. The dean also asked what would happen if Amelia were to reapply after the jury members had graduated or some of the involved professors had left the school. The dean consulted another administrator about requiring an affirmation from a psychologist for reapplication. The administrator suggested specific wording for the resolution. The Chair clarified that the jury wanted members from the original jury to approve Amelia's potential reapplication to Haverford, no matter how far in the future.

Jury Deliberations: Tentative Resolutions Continued, Part I

The group reread the tentative resolutions and went around the circle to discuss how they felt. Most wanted to give Amelia some sort of chance to return; only one juror favored permanent separation and two were unsure of which direction to take. Of the two jurors who were unsure, one leaned towards allowing Amelia to come back and the other said he was less comfortable with the proposed resolutions than with permanent separation. Among those who wanted to give Amelia some means of reapplying, some felt that certain things still needed to be clarified or added and some expressed concern with the timeline of the proposed resolutions, thinking it was either too short or too long.

The juror leaning toward permanent separation asked whether this instance of the Honor Code was so egregious as to not warrant a chance at redemption. He said that in this violation there were “unequivocal wrongs that can't be righted with an essay or a restitutory act.” Further, Haverford was a “self-selecting community, and not everyone in the world can or should be part of it, and there's value in that.” He asked why they should let Amelia back in. A juror opposed to permanent separation said they owed it to the community, not just to Amelia, to believe that someone could change and not to give up on them. The juror who was in favor of permanent separation responded that she didn’t see why the proposed resolutions would make Amelia change. She said that allowing her to return would be “a disservice to the community,” and that Amelia’s actions betrayed the values of the community in a way that could not be forgiven. At
this point, because the majority of jurors were against permanent separation, the discussion was postponed to continue deliberation as to what the terms of Amelia’s reapplication could be.

The Chair said the two issues that had been raised were the “prove” clause and the timing of Amelia’s return. One juror thought the time before Amelia would be allowed to reapply should be longer and suggested 4-5 years, thinking that would give her enough time to think about her actions and get over any issues. Another said he preferred not to specify any time, saying only she could know how much time she needed. A third juror expressed a liking of the concept but worried about the implications of it. Another wondered if Amelia might want to come back before she was actually ready. One juror thought a four- or five-year timeframe would be “a good chunk of time to see a difference,” while another thought that might “raise the stakes” for Amelia and cause her to be more reliant on Haverford. Someone else thought that four or five years were not enough; with most academic violations, the student was separated for a semester or a year, and this was far worse.

The jury realized that some jurors were speaking about the length of time before Amelia could come back and others about the time before she could reapply. After a clarifying diagram was drawn, most jurors seemed comfortable with Amelia being able to reapply in four years. Since some felt that Amelia should be doing something productive in her time away, two clauses were added asking her to reflect on her time away and demonstrate that she had done something productive. No one had significant objections to four years before Amelia could reapply, so the number was adopted.

The Chair then explained her conversation with Dean Montreal about the wording of the resolution that asked Amelia to submit an affirmation from a psychologist. The jury decided it was a good idea, and the new wording was adopted. A resolution that encouraged her to meet with a mental health professional during her time away was also added.

Everyone again went around in a circle to explain how they felt about the resolutions. Only two jurors said they were not comfortable with the resolutions. One of the two asked how Amelia’s breach of trust in relation to the whole community could possibly be addressed and if the community would even want her back. Another juror responded that she felt the breach of trust was addressed in the resolutions. The other juror was still not satisfied, but discussion was temporarily postponed. The two jurors who still did not feel comfortable with the resolutions were asked if they were comfortable standing outside of consensus or if they wished to block consensus. The first juror said it would depend on how his broader questions were answered. The second said she felt strongly enough to block consensus, but she felt that her concerns had been heard, so she would unhappyly stand outside.

The jury continued to discuss the first juror’s concerns. He felt that the jury had come up with several different parts of a resolution, but that those parts did not connect in any way, and he felt the overall breach of trust was not adequately addressed. He also asked if the Haverford community would want Amelia back. However, the meeting had to end due to scheduling, to be reconvened later that night.

Jury Deliberations: Tentative Resolutions Continued, Part II

Discussion continued. Most jurors felt the resolutions addressed the entire breach of trust, but agreed that what exactly the breach was could be more clearly stated. They decided to add
several sentences that acknowledged a larger breach of trust and stated that the resolutions were meant to address that breach.

The jury discussed whether the community would actually want Amelia back. One juror asked, “If she wants to come back and can live with the Code, then why not?” and proposed, “Anyone who can be a part of this community deserves the chance.” Others disagreed with the latter statement, as many applicants to Haverford are rejected. Another juror said that resolutions always sought a “return to normalcy,” and that this was no different than any other case. Another said, “For me, it's more: if we were to get you back, you have to have done this stuff first.”

One juror said he came to Haverford to learn, and that his education would have less value if the standards were compromised. Someone else replied that college was for not just academic but for all kinds of learning, and that if Amelia came back changed, she would clearly have learned a lot. The previous juror replied, “[Amelia] didn’t uphold our values and manipulated them. Why give it to her over someone who actually cares?” Another juror said that this logic could be applied to anyone who broke the Honor Code, saying that if Amelia came back changed, it would have a positive influence on the community. Others were skeptical of this statement. Another juror said, “Does someone else deserve that opportunity [to enroll]?” Another juror said that would ultimately be up to the Admissions Office: even if the jury later consented that Amelia could reapply, she would still have to go through them.

A juror said he would never agree to the idea of permanent separation. One juror said they were obligated to allow Amelia to come back, but another disagreed. The principles of restorative justice were brought up. Another juror thought Amelia should be allowed to make up for what she had done.

The Chair said that there would be a limit to how much everyone could be happy with the resolutions, but felt they were moving towards a solution. Discussion moved to the issue of responsibility. The juror who first raised the question said the jury was giving Amelia too much to do and setting her up to fail, “So that it won’t be our fault if and when she does come back.” Another said the resolutions were about helping Amelia own up to her mistakes.

The jury began to read over the tentative resolutions in the hopes that they were ready to consent. The jurors made it explicit that the jury’s review of Amelia's case could not happen prior to three years from now.

The juror who had initially raised several questions raised one more: was there value added in bringing Amelia back? The other jurors, except one, responded that giving Amelia a means to come back could potentially be a mechanism to restore the professors’ faith in both her and the Code. At this point, the Chair reviewed what it meant to consent, stand outside consensus, and block consensus, and stressed that one should only block consensus if they felt their voice hadn’t been heard.

The juror who raised questions earlier said his faith in the Honor Code had dropped and that it had “lost its spine” over the course of the trial. He accused the process of setting individuals up so that they were unable to make a decision and “say something unequivocally.” Another juror challenged him, asking how what they were doing wasn’t action. The first juror said other institutions had limits about what was acceptable and what wasn’t and took stances when they felt someone had crossed that line. He thought about what it would take for Amelia to be restored. Another juror responded that they should try and keep an open mind and give her a chance to return. He said, “I don't think we should ever give up on anyone, we owe it to her to
give her a chance, no matter how infinitesimal.” Another said that if Amelia underwent “A complete life change… then she should be able to come back.” The first juror responded that the actual values of Haverford were vague. Mentioning the “Phantom 500,” he said some came to Haverford to be left alone, not because of the Code. He said the resolutions couldn’t maintain the Haverbubble and would make Haverford students trust each other less. Someone else responded that the resolutions maintained the Haverbubble because they couldn’t happen anywhere else.

The Chair asked if they could move to consenting, seeing that the questions being raised were largely outside the scope of the trial. The jury consented to the resolution that would give Amelia the chance to come back, with two standing outside of consensus. A clause was added to the last resolution, stating that in the event Amelia was restored to the community, Haverford would follow current college policy in communications with other schools about her.

**Tentative Resolutions**

We acknowledge that the rest of the classes from the current semester were already given a grade of 0 because Amelia withdrew from the College. Therefore, the jury will not consider them further.

1. Amelia will receive a 0.0 in South American Population Studies, taught by Professor Brasilia.

2. Amelia will receive a 0.0 on the final paper for Backroads of Europe, taught by Professor London.

3. Amelia will receive a 0.0 in Famous European Travelers, taught by Professor Tuscany at Bryn Mawr College.

4. Amelia will receive a 0.0 on the problem sets for Asian Village Studies, taught by Professor Tokyo.

5. Immediately following the release of this abstract, Honor Council will host a community discussion with students and faculty about this issue. The discussion will be planned by at least three members of the jury and the involved professors. This discussion may be used in place of abstract discussions.

6. We recommend that professors include a note in their syllabi about what they consider to be intellectual property in their class. This note should address whether students may share class documents and lectures with individuals outside of the Haverford community and whether it is okay for students to record lectures in that class. The jury would like to note that it is still the students’ responsibility to discuss this issue with their professors if the instructions are unclear or absent or if they feel their circumstances warrant an exemption.
7. In the spirit of education, we recommend that the professors forward an article concerning intellectual property to the Chair to be sent to Amelia.

8. We recommend that students keep in mind the fact that they may be perceived as representatives of the Haverford community in their words and actions even during the summer months or other breaks, particularly if they are called on to do academic work.

9. The statements of violation and the circumstances of this case point to numerous incidents in which Amelia violated the trust of the Haverford community. The jury would like to acknowledge that these incidents, while separate, constitute a broader breach of trust with the whole community. The resolutions are meant to address this collective breach. We feel that in order to restore this breach and potentially return to the Haverford community, Amelia must repair the entire breach of trust.

i. In order to be able to reapply to Haverford College, Amelia must get approval by consensus of at least five assembled members from the jury (in the event that five members cannot assemble, up to two current and fully briefed Honor Council members may act as substitutes). At the very earliest, this meeting could occur three years from now.

ii. Prior to this meeting:
   a) The jury encourages Amelia to meet with a mental health professional during her time away.
   b) Amelia must meet with the involved professors (Amsterdam, London, Barcelona and Brasilia) to discuss the issues involved in this case. The professors should then either submit a statement or speak to the jury in person to give their input regarding Amelia's reapplication to Haverford.
   c) Amelia must meet personally with representatives from CAPS and the Dean's Office, who will make a recommendation regarding her readiness to return to Haverford, in keeping with the usual process of students returning after imposed leaves.
   d) Amelia must pay her MapDesigner tutor the owed $300 for completing her work for South American Population Studies.
   e) Amelia must write a letter to the jury about her experiences in this trial and reflect on why she wants to re-enter Haverford as opposed to any other school.

iii. At this meeting:
   a) Amelia must meet with the assembled jury members in person.
   b) The jury members will ask Amelia to reflect on her time away and show them that she has done something worthwhile that demonstrates her readiness to return.
   c) If the jury members deem it necessary, they can confront her and ask her to undergo an additional Honor Council proceeding concerning her behavior throughout this trial process.
d) If the jury members deem it necessary, they can ask Amelia to do additional things to prove that she is fit to re-enter.

e) Through the fulfillment of these resolutions, and through other actions she may take, Amelia must prove to the jury members that she is fit to re-enter and uphold the Haverford Honor Code.

iv. In the event that the jury consents that Amelia should be allowed to reapply:

a) Amelia must reapply to Haverford through the admission office. The earliest she can submit her application is four years from now, to be considered for readmission five years from now.

b) Amelia's admission essay should concern the Haverford Honor Code.

c) Amelia should know that even if admitted, she will not be allowed to be a European Studies major unless the department agrees to let her in.

10. If another institution contacts Haverford asking about Amelia's academic or disciplinary standing (e.g. in the event that she attempts to transfer somewhere else), Haverford should inform them that she has grossly violated standards of academic integrity and intellectual property over the course of two years. However, if the assembled jury members consent to her being allowed to reapply, as detailed in Resolution 9, Haverford's method of reporting this violation to other institutions should follow college policy at that time.

Between Meetings

Professor Barcelona emailed the Chair saying he and the other European Studies professors had discussed the resolutions and wanted more explicit wording asking Amelia to “take responsibility for her actions and admit to lying.” He also emailed an article on intellectual property to be forwarded to Amelia. Professor Brasilia also said she felt a more explicit admission of guilt was necessary from Amelia if she was to return. He also asked about proof of therapy and about current college policy for reporting violations to other institutions.

Amelia largely agreed with the resolutions in her response, but felt that the resolutions concerning grade changes, “Should be removed or revised thoroughly.” She agreed with the resolutions regarding a note about intellectual property and asking students to be more conscious of their behavior at other schools (6 and 8, respectively). She refrained from addressing the other resolutions.

The Chair conferred with an outside source regarding proof of therapy, and found out that it was not standard procedure for Haverford. Additionally, Dean Montreal suggested explicitly stating that Amelia would have to bring in any jurors to consider her case at her own expense.

Jury Deliberations: Finalizing Resolutions

The jury first discussed the professors’ concerns about the vagueness of Resolution 9, which stated that the jurors could ask Amelia to do something extra to prove she could come back. They felt the resolution was intentionally open-ended, which they decided to clarify. The
jury also discussed asking for an explicit apology. The jurors felt that if an apology were mandated, it would be less powerful. They ultimately decided to add a statement asking Amelia to acknowledge her actions. They also added a clause stating that the professors could confront Amelia about her behavior during the trial if they wished. The jury did not feel comfortable mandating therapy, so kept the wording encouraging it. The Chair explained that the policy regarding communicating academic violations to other institutions was under review. They agreed to pass that information along to Brasilia.

Since the college would not pay to assemble five jury members, it was discussed whether or not it should be made explicit that Amelia would have to pay. Some jurors were initially uncomfortable with this, knowing that the college would pay to assemble juries for summer trials. After some debate, they ultimately decided having Amelia pay was reasonable and adding a statement making that explicit. The jury also discussed Amelia’s concerns, and ultimately decided to email her a statement explaining the grade changes.

One juror raised concerns about using a pseudonym for the abstract, worrying it would “make light” of the incident. This led into discussion about Honor Council’s use of pseudonyms in general, with some jurors expressing concern and others feeling that they lent recognition to abstracts. Ultimately, the Chair explained that there wasn’t anything they could do about the pseudonym at this point, and that if they were really concerned about pseudonyms they could bring up a resolution at Plenary or discuss it with Honor Council.

The jury also briefly discussed broader issues of restorative justice. The Chair felt such discussions were really beyond the scope of the trial and that they would probably be better suited for abstract discussions. The idea of a jury reunion the following semester was also raised.

The Chair asked if the jurors felt comfortable consenting to the current resolutions. They did. After the jury consented to the individual resolutions, one juror mentioned that he felt odd not discussing more the individual resolutions regarding a potential return that two jurors still had issues with. One of the two said she did not want to discuss her concerns anymore, and the other said he stood behind the components the jury had come up with, but did not feel that they were “the necessary and sufficient components” or that discussing his concerns further would be productive. He said that while he would have come to a different solution, he respected the jury's decision and did not feel the others were “being cavalier.”

The jury consented to the following resolutions as a whole, with one standing outside:

**Final Resolutions**

*We acknowledge that Amelia automatically received a grade of 0.0 in classes she was currently taking when she withdrew from the College. Therefore, the jury will not consider grades in those classes further.*

1. *Amelia will receive a 0.0 in South American Population Studies taught by Professor Brasilia.* (No jurors stood outside of consensus)

2. *Amelia will receive a 0.0 on the final paper Backroads of Europe taught by Professor London.* (No jurors stood outside of consensus)
3. Amelia will receive a 0.0 in Famous European Travelers, taught by Professor Tuscany at Bryn Mawr College. (One juror stood outside of consensus)

4. Amelia will receive a 0.0 on the compromised problem sets Asian Village Studies taught by Professor Tokyo. (No jurors stood outside of consensus)

5. Immediately following the release of this abstract, Honor Council will host a community discussion with students and faculty about this issue. The discussion will be planned by at least three members of the jury and the involved professors. This discussion may be used in place of abstract discussions. (No jurors stood outside of consensus)

6. We recommend that professors include a note in their syllabi about what they consider to be intellectual property in their class. This note should address whether students may share class documents and lectures with individuals outside of the Haverford community and whether it is acceptable for students to record lectures in that class. The jury would like to note that it is still the students' responsibility to discuss this issue with their professors if the instructions are unclear or absent or if they feel their circumstances warrant an exemption. (No jurors stood outside of consensus)

7. In the spirit of education, we recommend that the professors forward an article concerning intellectual property to the Chair to be sent to Amelia. (No jurors stood outside of consensus)

8. We recommend that students keep in mind the fact that they may be perceived as representatives of the Haverford community in their words and actions even during the summer months or other breaks, particularly if they are called on to do academic work. (No jurors stood outside of consensus)

9. The statements of violation and the circumstances of this case point to numerous incidents in which Amelia violated the trust of the Haverford community. The jury would like to acknowledge that these incidents, while separate, constitute a broader breach of trust with the whole community. The following resolutions are meant to address this collective breach. We feel that in order to restore Amelia and potentially allow her to return to the Haverford community, Amelia must repair the entire breach of trust. (No jurors stood outside of consensus)

i. In order to be able to reapply to Haverford College, Amelia must get approval by consensus of at least five assembled members from the jury (in the event that five members cannot assemble, up to two current and fully briefed Honor Council members may act as substitutes). At the very earliest, this meeting could occur during the 2013-2014 school year. (Two jurors stood outside of consensus)

ii. Prior to this meeting:
a) The jury encourages Amelia to meet with a mental health professional during her time away. (One juror stood outside of consensus)

b) Amelia must meet with the involved professors (Amsterdam, London, Barcelona and Brasilia) to discuss the issues involved in this case and demonstrate that she fully recognizes the impact of her actions and takes responsibility for them. The professors should then either submit a statement or speak to the jury in person to give their input regarding Amelia's reapplication to Haverford. (Two jurors stood outside of consensus)

c) If any of the aforementioned professors deem it necessary, they can confront her and ask her to undergo an additional Honor Council proceeding concerning her behavior throughout her confrontation and the subsequent proceedings. (Two jurors stood outside of consensus)

d) Amelia must meet personally with representatives from CAPS and the Dean's Office, who will make a recommendation regarding her readiness to return to Haverford, in keeping with the usual process of students returning after imposed leaves. (Two jurors stood outside of consensus)

e) Amelia must pay her MapDesigner tutor the owed $300 for completing her work for South American Population Studies. (One juror stood outside of consensus)

f) Amelia must write a letter to the jury about her experiences in this trial and reflect on why she wants to re-enter Haverford as opposed to any other school. (One juror stood outside of consensus)

iii. At this meeting:

a) Amelia must meet with the assembled jury members in person and should be aware that she would have to assemble the jury members at her own expense, due to her no longer being a member of the Haverford community. The means of transportation and accommodations would have to be agreed upon by Amelia and the jurors. (Two jurors stood outside of consensus)

b) The jury members will ask Amelia to reflect on her time away and show them that she has done something worthwhile that demonstrates her readiness to return. (One juror stood outside of consensus)

c) If the jury members deem it necessary, they can confront her and ask her to undergo an additional Honor Council proceeding concerning her behavior throughout this trial process. (One juror stood outside of consensus)

d) If the jury members deem it necessary, they can ask Amelia to take additional actions to prove that she is fit to re-enter. (Two jurors stood outside of consensus)

e) Through the fulfillment of these resolutions, and through other actions she may take, Amelia must prove to the jury members that she acknowledges the impact of her actions and is fit to re-enter Haverford and uphold the Honor Code. This resolution is left open-ended in an attempt to encourage Amelia to come up with her own ways of proving this to the jury. (One juror stood outside of consensus)

iv. In the event that the jury consents that Amelia should be allowed to reapply:
a) *Amelia must reapply to Haverford through the admission office. The earliest she can submit her application is Fall 2014, to be considered for readmission in Fall 2015.* (Two jurors stood outside of consensus)

b) *Amelia's admission essay should concern the Haverford Honor Code.* (Two jurors stood outside of consensus)

c) *Amelia should know that even if admitted, she will not be allowed to be a European Studies major unless the department agrees to let her in.* (Two jurors stood outside of consensus)

10. *If another institution contacts Haverford asking about Amelia's academic or disciplinary standing (e.g. in the event that she attempts to transfer somewhere else), Haverford should inform them that she has grossly violated standards of academic integrity and intellectual property over the course of two years. However, if the assembled jury members consent to her being allowed to reapply, as detailed in Resolution 9, the jury would feel that Amelia had repaired her breach of trust with the community and would deem it appropriate to use current college policy when potentially reporting this violation to other institutions.* (Two jurors stood outside of consensus)

**Post-Trial**

Following the meeting, the Chair sent updates to the involved professors. She also sent an email to Amelia with the finalized resolutions and responses to her questions. Amelia asked how the appeals process worked at Haverford, and the Chair directed her to speak with the Dean’s Office. The Dean’s Office later contacted the Chair to say that Amelia had requested more information about an appeal. Though Amelia ultimately didn't appeal the decision, she continued to assert her innocence in communications with Honor Council even after the completion of the trial.

After the appeal window closed, the Chair emailed Professors Tuscany and Tokyo, whose classes had been affected by grade change resolutions, to inform them of the jury's decision.
Discussion Questions

1. How should Honor Council handle two (potentially separate) violations involving the same student? Is it appropriate to send such a case to a modified Academic Trial with the same jury, as was done here?
2. Should this case have gone to a different proceeding, such as a Joint Panel?
3. How should a trial proceed when the student has withdrawn from the College?
4. To what extent should a confronted party's participation or lack thereof in the trial process be considered?
5. Is the intent to get inappropriate help on an assignment, even if no help is actually received, a violation of the Honor Code?
6. Should a violation of or intent to violate the Honor Code be considered more serious when it concerns a student's thesis, given the close and collaborative nature of the project?
7. Is soliciting online help on assignments ever okay under the Honor Code? If so, under what circumstances?
8. How much should a student's pattern of classroom behavior, including chronic requests for extensions, be considered when discussing a potential Honor Code violation?
9. Are Haverford students bound by the Honor Code during the summer? What if they are representing Haverford as an academic institution?
10. Should juries have jurisdiction over grades for courses that have already been completed?
11. Given that this was an academic trial with a student jury, should this jury have considered Amelia's impersonation of a professor as a potential Honor Code violation?
12. Should this jury have considered potential violations in Bryn Mawr classes, given that violations by Haverford students in Bryn Mawr classes are generally under the jurisdiction of Bryn Mawr's Honor Board?
13. Can someone be restored to Haverford if s/he has withdrawn from the College? Should a jury give such a student an opportunity, no matter how slim, to be restored?
14. Can someone ever be restored to Haverford if s/he has violated the Honor Code as egregiously as Amelia did in this case?
15. Does access to electronic resources, such as the internet, change the dynamic of the Honor Code at Haverford?
16. What is the impact of an egregious violation such as this one on the larger Haverford community?