Professor Angstrom confronted Fred and Barney for a possible violation of the academic Honor Code. The problem was presented to the Honor Council, which decided that an inquiry was necessary. A jury was convened to address the situation.

Professor Angstrom explained to the jury what led him to confront Fred and Barney. While grading one of several homework assignments involving computers, he noticed "similarities which were far too great to explain." He remarked that their assignments were essentially identical. After speaking with Fred and Barney, Professor Angstrom discovered that Fred had received help from Barney. Angstrom then explained his specific standards on receiving help. Briefly stated "homework must represent entirely your own work. No collaboration is permitted." He added, "in my view, I had a case of verbatim copying in front of me."

Fred then addressed the jury. He explained that on the night that the assignment was due, he and Barney had worked next to each other in the Computer Center. While working separately, he had asked Barney questions about all three of the problems on the assignment. Barney had clarified for him, using his completed work on the terminal as a guide. Understanding that his actions probably constituted a violation, he said, "I extracted information from Barney. I guess I went out of bounds." Barney explained that Fred had understood the work. He was unsure of the nature of the violation, but understood that given the course guidelines the jury could determine their actions to be an infraction of the Code.

Professor Angstrom felt that either Fred had copied straight off of Barney's screen or had memorized what he saw there. The professor felt that Barney's aiding Fred was admirable but should have been noted. He reiterated that students were allowed to help each other with the format but not the logic of the homework problems.

At this point Professor Angstrom, Barney and Fred all left the room. All twelve members of the jury reached consensus that a violation had occurred but the jury could not determine if the violation had been committed by one or both students. There was still some question as to whether Barney's actions constituted a violation according to the course guidelines. The jury hoped to clarify this in the circumstantial portion of the inquiry.

When Fred, Barney and Professor Angstrom returned, Barney pointed out that their discussion did refer specifically to the homework, but that he had difficulty seeing fault in that action (other than that it was contrary to Professor Angstrom's instructions.)

The jury then tried to determine if the similarities in the assignments stemmed solely from the discussion or if they resulted from verbatim copying. Professor Angstrom pointed to the unusual things on Fred and Barney's assignments which he felt would not appear merely from discussion, such as identical format and spacing. Barney and Fred explained that Fred never had a copy of Barney's assignment and that he never typed information straight off of Barney's screen. Fred explained the similarities by saying, "I guess the impressions stuck." He added that throughout the semester Barney had been his 'tutor'. Professor Angstrom stated that he was suspicious of Fred's homework in the entire course and left the past assignments with the jury. He also introduced the possibility that Fred might have electronically copied from Barney's work.

The jury then met alone and discussed the arguments for and against direct copying. The similarities in format, down to the spacing, puzzled many jurors, yet alone was not enough to convince the jury of verbatim cheating. The jury then reached consensus that both Fred and Barney had committed violations because their actions overstepped the bounds of the professor's specific instructions: Fred by receiving aid and Barney by giving it.
Barney and Fred were informed of the decision of the jury. Fred returned and discussed possible resolutions with the jury. (Barney would meet with the jury to present possible resolutions later because of a scheduling conflict.) Fred stated that he did not "steal" Barney's work, but would understand not receiving credit on that particular assignment. He did not feel that his other work in the course should be affected. Fred was also concerned about Professor Angstrom's ability to remain objective. Fred suggested writing a letter to the community might help him; he was also willing to do some sort of community service to repair the breach of trust. Fred left the room and the jury reached consensus on the following resolution:

1. Fred should receive no credit on the homework in question because he had overstepped the professor's outlines instructions about the completion of homeworks.
2. Fred would write a letter to the community via the News addressing the difficulty of helping a friend without overstepping the limits of the Code.
3. The jury would ask Fred to foster discussion of the Code within the Bi-college community.
4. The jury recommend that Fred work to repair the trust between himself and Professor Angstrom as well.

The confronted and confronting party were informed of the tentative resolution. Fred accepted the resolution but the Professor approached the chairperson with serious reservations about it. Professor Angstrom felt that Fred and Barney were not "totally open" about what had happened. He felt that Fred sat with Barney and copied his work or had electronically copied the assignment, changing it slightly. The professor felt that "lots of help" was actually verbatim copying. He suggested resolutions in which Barney would receive no grade change, because his violation was more of a community issue. However, he felt that Fred's entire homework thus far in the course was "suspect" and therefore should receive no credit. Because the jury had only been presented with the specific homework #3, they had based their resolution on this information. Professor Angstrom was told that if he wished the jury to consider the other assignments, he would have to confront Fred about those as well, and then present the other assignments to the jury. The professor said that he would do so after the next class. The jury decided that since the Code states "The jury will then convene {a day after the tentative resolution is reached} and either reaffirm its position or reach consensus on another action." (p. 7) it would consider this new part of the trial as another action.

When the jury reconvened, Professor Angstrom presented three new homework assignments for their consideration. One he felt was a result of "probable collusion: the second a result of "certain collusion" and the third was questionable in his mind. The jury spent a great deal of time trying to discern if a violation had occurred on any or all of these three assignments. Both Fred and Barney said that they had not discussed any of these homeworks specifically. Fred continued to point out that Barney had been his "tutor" throughout the course: helping him with concepts from the class discussion and readings. He said, "through Barney's teaching, I might have been influenced by his style." The professor suggested that the jury might want to present the assignments to someone more knowledgeable in the subject matter.

At this point, the jury decided to speak with Fred alone, hoping to get responses uninfluenced by the presence of Barney and the professor. Fred pointed out that his answers might have been quite similar to Barney's, but the methods were the only ones he saw as logical; he could not think of another logical way to respond to the questions. He again explained that he and Barney had gone over the sample problems together for most of the course. Fred said Barney had taught him a lot during the course. He also pointed out that of the more than 20 homework questions in the course of the semester, only 3 or 4 were this similar. Fred was asked
if he had ever accessed Barney's VAX account. He replied that he had not and could not because he did not know the password.

After Fred left the room, the jury discussed their feelings on the testimonies they had received thus far. They felt that there were definitely two sides to the problem, but that each made sense to some degree. One of the jurors agreed to present Fred's viewpoint to Professor Angstrom. He felt that Fred's explanations were "not impossible," but he was "still more than suspicious" with respect to one of the homework assignments.

Some of the jurors were not able to determine whether a violation had occurred without first exhausting every possible source of additional information. The jury first decided to compare Fred's and Barney's responses to those of the other members of the class. This comparison emphasized the similarities between the answers of Barney and Fred but was not enough to influence the jury in any further direction. Some jurors felt that no violation could be determined, while others could not make a stance yet. The jury reached consensus that the assignments in question would be sent to two professors that Angstrom had felt could analyze them fairly. One juror stood outside of consensus on this matter, feeling that no new information could be acquired from this process. This juror also felt that it could possibly make the decision more difficult and could further separate the parties involved. The assignments of the entire class were sent, along with the sample answers that the professor had provided to the class with the assignments.

The reactions of the two outside "graders" were quite similar to those of Professor Angstrom. They were both able to pick out Fred and Barney's assignments from within the entire class as very similar. Despite these outside opinions, no jury member felt that the evidence was enough to completely reject the explanations given by Fred and Barney. The jury did wish to present the new opinions to Fred and Barney, as well as to Professor Angstrom. Fred and Barney maintained a very cohesive story, continuing to say that the similarities in their work were due to their general discussions and to Barney's "tutoring" Fred throughout the semester. Over the course of the inquiry, however, their descriptions of the amount of help that Barney gave to Fred on the first homework that was presented indicated that this aid was extensive.

Professor Angstrom was also shown the responses and he felt that they sufficiently supported his argument. He stated that he was "absolutely certain" that there was collaboration on some of the problems. He felt certain that he had been lied to and that much of the trust which had existed between himself and his classes had now been lost.

The jury now came to consensus that a violation could not be determined for two of the assignments. The feeling was that there were arguments for both sides. Although the jury could not be entirely comfortable with excepting the explanations of Fred and Barney as the cause of the similarities, the evidence was not conclusive enough to completely reject these testimonies and determine that they were lying in any way.

The jury discussed at length the idea of lowering Fred's overall homework grade in addition to giving no credit for the homework which they were originally presented. Many jurors felt that Fred's work had been too greatly affected by Barney's logic and style in many cases. Most of the jury felt that something was lacking in the learning process for Fred. The jury came to consensus on the following resolution for Fred:

1. The jury recommends to Professor Angstrom that Fred receive no credit for the homework that was originally presented to them. His overall grade should then be lowered no less than .3 but no more than .7 on a 4.0 scale.
2. Fred should write a letter to the community via the News addressing the question "How do you develop independent logic and style while receiving aid?" also "what is the difficulty of receiving aid without overstepping
the bounds of the professor's instructions?" He should relate these questions to the concept of community trust.

3. Barney should write a letter to the community via the News addressing the question "What do you see as within and outside the bounds of academic help and how does overstepping these bounds affect the community?"

All twelve jurors stood inside consensus on the tentative resolution. Professor Angstrom waived his right to be present at the final meeting to present any objections. He was unsure if the grade change as presented by the jury would make any difference in his grading process.

The jury reconvened and reconfirmed the tentative resolution. Neither Barney or Fred had any objections when they returned. After they had left the room, the jury reached final consensus on the resolution.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION
What is your reaction to the jury's decision to "take another action" after reaching their first tentative resolution? Are letters to the News still affective? Was the resolution appropriate?