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Introduction:
Jon asked Professor Enloe to re-grade an in-class exam that had been returned, for he believed that she had made errors in the initial grading. The Professor confronted him several days later as she thought that Jon had changed some of his answers prior to giving her back his original test. The student immediately denied the accusations, and both parties contacted Honor Council. The Council came to consensus on a suspicion of violation in the case.

Note: After Fact-Finding had occurred, one jury member withdrew from the proceedings for personal reasons. Both the jury and Honor Council separately discussed the idea of bringing in a new jury member mid-way through the process, but decided that that would not be beneficial to either the parties or the jury members. Honor Council came to consensus allowing the trial to continue with the remaining 11 jury members. However, only one jury member would be able to stand outside consensus on all decisions to be made.

Fact-Finding:
Professor Enloe’s statement:
Professor Enloe told the jury that she returned the exams in class a few days after they were taken. She noted that she tends to check some students’ exams twice. Since Professor Enloe suspected that Jon would not be pleased with his grade, Professor Enloe checked his exam a second time. Jon approached the Professor immediately at the end of class, asking her to take a look at his test right away.

Professor Enloe did not have sufficient time to speak with Jon immediately after class. They met later to discuss some other work, but the issue of the exam was not brought up at that point. However, Professor Enloe spent time looking over Jon’s exam prior to their next meeting several days later. She suspected that three particular answers were changed out of the entire exam. Professor Enloe also spoke with the chair of her department, Professor Charles, in order to obtain a second opinion on her suspicions. Professor Charles pointed out that the ink used in parts of answers suspected of being changed looked newer than the ink in the remainder of the test. Professor Enloe left the original copy of Jon’s exam at the jury’s disposal, but discerning an ink difference with a naked eye was impossible by then, for considerable time had passed between the events in question and the trial proceedings.
Jon’s Statement:

Jon said that he looked over the exam as soon as he got it back for a brief amount of time, but he then put it away under his other things in order to take class notes. He approached Professor Enloe right after class so that she would not think that he changed anything on the exam. Jon denied the professor’s accusations when he was confronted, and he continued to do so before the jury. He stated that he had also spoken with his dean and his advisor in relation to the case and found both of them to be receptive. Jon’s parents also spoke with his dean and Professor Charles, the department chair, in order to obtain more information about the accusations and the trial process.

Jury Questions:

Jury members learned from Professor Enloe that she did not go over the exam in class the day it was returned. Jon was asked about his test taking methods in order for the jury to obtain more information concerning possible changes or cross outs he may have made while taking the test. He said that he usually goes over each page of the exam once he is done working on that page. On this particular test, he only had 2-3 minutes to look over the exam as a whole for time was almost up when he finished.

In the question and answer period, Jon told the jury that he was disappointed with his performance in the course this far, as he had not done well on the first exam either. He partially attributed the problems he faced to the professor’s teaching style, one he had not previously encountered in learning this particular subject. Jon felt that Professor Enloe accused him because he challenged her teaching style in previous meetings with her. In addition, Jon noted that if he were to change answers on a test during class, concealing the act from his classmates would be very difficult. Professor Enloe noted that Jon sat in the back of the classroom on the day the exam was returned.

Jury Deliberations Part 1:

The jury felt that it was important to research the possibility of performing an ink-dating test on Jon’s exam in order to find out whether parts of answers suspected of having been changed were indeed written later than the rest of the exam. However, after gaining expert opinions, members of the jury learned that ink tests would not be able to distinguish as short of a time difference as was being dealt with in this case, one of approximately two weeks.

Unable to obtain conclusive scientific data, jury members had to rely on their own judgment. They therefore carefully examined the three particular answers suspected of having been altered. In Question A, Professor Enloe disputed a portion of the answer that included the correct answer – this was apparently missing from the original response. Question B featured an allegedly added component to the apparent original answer that would have made Jon’s answer fully correct. Lastly, Question C featured a crossing out of the wrong answer right next to the correct answer. Jury members were startled by the fact that, on Question C, Professor Enloe wrote the correct answer next to the cross out. Hence, the correct answer to the question was written twice side-by-side in two different handwriting styles – one Jon’s and one Professor Enloe’s.
The latter fact represented a major turning point in deliberations for all jury members agreed that the professor could not have written a correct answer next to the student’s correct answer and thereby marked it wrong and withheld credit. The jurors noted that Questions A and B also included statements written by Professor Enloe that strongly contradicted Jon’s denials. After much discussion, two jury members were not absolutely sure that Jon changed his answer on Question A and one jury member was not positive in relation to Question B. However, all were in agreement that he had changed Question C. In the end, the jury came to the following statement of violation with one person standing outside.

**Statement of Violation:**

The student violated the Honor Code by presenting altered answers as his original work on an already-graded exam.

The one jury member who stood outside did so because he was in general agreement with the thought process of the jury as a whole, but he could not completely remove all reasonable doubt from his mind.

**Circumstantial Portion:**

*Jon’s Statement and Questions from the Jury:*

Jon continued to maintain his innocence and he did not propose any resolutions during the circumstantial portion. He felt that the professor lied and fabricated the case against him, and Jon said that he felt the Honor Code was not being used properly. Jon believed that Professor Enloe could not accept his challenges of her teaching style and authority in the class. Repairing the breach of trust would be difficult, he said, as meeting with the professor in the near term would not change anything.

*Professor Enloe’s Statement and Questions from the Jury:*

Professor Enloe expressed great shock and concern about Jon’s charges of unprofessionalism against her. She was also disappointed with his refusal to accept responsibility for his actions. Professor Enloe doubted that the breach of trust between her and Jon could be repaired if he were to continue denying her accusations. She proposed several resolutions in the case, the first being Jon failing the course. Professor Enloe felt that simply withdrawing from the class may actually become a false reward in this case, as Jon had not been attending class and his prospects of passing were bleak. The Professor brought up separation as a possible resolution because of the extensive damage to the trust between the student and the faculty member as well as Jon’s continuing refusal to take responsibility. Lastly, Professor Enloe proposed a letter to the community as a vehicle for Jon gaining some accountability.

**Jury Deliberations Part 2:**

The jury set out to create resolutions that would suitably address Jon’s education and accountability, as well as repairing the breach of trust between the professor and the student. First, jury members considered Jon failing the course taught by Professor Enloe. Most agreed this was appropriate, as Jon needed to be held accountable for his attempt to present changed answers for credit on an exam. Some, however, felt that this action
would be largely punitive, and, in the end, one jury member would stand outside consensus on the resolution addressing failure of the course.

Next, the jury began a discussion of separation and soon found convincing arguments on both sides of the issue. Jury members supporting a semester of separation in this case argued that the measure was necessary in order to hold up the weight of the statement of violation. Separation would force Jon to withdraw from the community and reflect on his relationship to the Honor Code and the Haverford community. In addition, it was pointed out that Jon continued to refuse to accept responsibility in front of the jury as well as the community. Opponents of separation argued that the measure would be too harsh and not achieve the goal of education for Jon. In fact, separation could potentially make him even angrier at the Honor Code and possibly encourage him to look into transferring to another institution. Some jury members argued that we must hold him accountable for his violation as opposed to his refusal to admit to his actions. Overall, the jury ended up almost evenly split on the question of separation, and, after much deliberation, members chose to move on to other possible resolutions.

Looking to come up with more creative resolutions, the jury kept in mind the potential impacts of separation and built resolutions around these goals. The jury members felt that keeping a biweekly journal and meeting with his dean throughout the following semester of school would go a long way toward educating Jon, for many felt that he had a somewhat misguided view of the Honor Code. Jon’s essay and letter to the community would educate him by stimulating thought about the Code while holding him accountable to the community, as both documents were to be released with the abstract of the trial. Finally, a mediated dialogue between Jon and Professor Enloe near the end of the following semester was aimed at repairing the breach of trust between the two, and jurors were hopeful that, after a relatively long break, the parties would be willing to discuss their differences and mutually benefit. The jury came to consensus on the following tentative resolutions.

**Resolutions:**

1) The jury recommends that the student receive a 0.0 for the course.

2) The student will meet with his dean every other week in the following semester.

3) The student will keep a journal in the following semester for the purpose of reflecting on his interactions with the Honor Code, making entries at least every other week.

4) The parties will engage in a mediated dialogue towards the end of the following semester.

5) The student will write an essay to be released with the abstract on a topic given to him by the jury.

6) The student will write a letter to the community to be released with the abstract that reflects on his experiences with the Honor Code.

One jury member stood outside consensus on resolution #1 only.
Presentation of Resolutions:

Jon agreed to comply with all the resolutions. At the presentation, jury members clarified their ways of thinking during deliberations and noted that separation was discussed very seriously. Professor Enloe notified the jury via e-mail that she supported all the resolutions as well. She expressed hesitancy at having a dialogue with Jon if he were to continue to maintain his charges against her, but she hoped that both sides would benefit in the end.

Not seeing a need to make any changes in the resolutions, the jury came to final consensus on all of them, with one member standing outside on resolution #1 once again.

Questions:

1) Would separation have been appropriate in this case?
2) How should the jury act when the professor and the student completely oppose each other?
3) What is the “burden of proof” for Honor Council cases, meaning, should technical evidence (like an ink test) play a role in a jury’s deliberations?