Henry turned himself in to Honor Council for a possible violation of the academic portion of the Honor Code. An inquiry was convened to address the situation.

After the Chairperson read the relevant portion of the Code, the factual portion of the inquiry began. Henry explained that last semester he had been given a take-home quiz in History. He had an hour to complete the quiz. Afterwards there was an unlimited amount of time to type it. When Henry had finished the quiz, he put it aside to type later that night. The instructions explicitly stated that no words could be changed in the recopying. In the recopying process Henry, without consciously thinking about what he was doing, rearranged some of his sentences to clarify their meaning. He felt, however, that he was not changing the meaning of what he had written. Everyone in the class did poorly on the quiz, the quiz was dropped, and a new quiz was given. Henry realized about a week later that he had probably violated the Code.

At this point the jury ended the factual portion of the inquiry. Henry left the room, and the jury reached consensus that a violation had occurred.

The circumstantial portion of the inquiry began. Henry discussed the thought process which had finally caused him to turn himself in. Henry said that the first question that he asked himself after he began to think that he had violated the Code was whether or not he was hurting the community. Henry rationalized that he was not really hurting the community since the quiz had been dropped. Also, Henry admitted to being scared as to the possible outcome of an inquiry. Because he was busy with other things, Henry did not often think about the violation during the rest of the year. When he did, he was able to justify his decision to remain silent. Over the summer Henry found himself thinking more and more about the History quiz. It became obvious that this problem was not going to disappear. Henry said that towards the end of the summer, he finally did away with the rationalization that he was not hurting the community and realized that he had actually broken the community's trust.

The resolution portion of the trial began by asking Henry what he felt
would be an appropriate resolution. Henry felt that he should write a letter to Honor Council, explaining the circumstances surrounding the violation, which would be used at Honor Council's discretion. Henry left the room and the jury discussed the proposed resolution.

The jury quickly agreed to Henry's proposed social resolution but spent much time discussing an academic portion to the resolution. Because Henry's violation was believed to be unconscious and because he had undergone the "self-reflection" process described in the Code, which eventually led to his turning himself in, about half of the jury believed that Henry had not completely broken the Code and therefore felt that there should be no academic action taken. The rest of the jury felt that some grade change was merited, because a violation of the Code had occurred.

Neither side was willing to change its position, and after some time it was agreed that a compromise solution would have to be reached. After more discussion, the jury decided to censure formally both Henry and his act of cheating. The jury recognized the seriousness of the violation and condoned neither Henry nor the act. The circumstances surrounding the violation were the only mitigating factors. Thus, it was only because of Henry's self-reflection and increasing awareness of the spirit of the Honor Code that no grade change was recommended. The jury also resolved that a letter be sent to Henry explaining the implications of the censure. A statement concerning censure is attached to this abstract. For this portion of the resolution, one member of the jury stood outside of consensus.
STATEMENT OF CENSURE

The fact that no grade change was recommended in Henry's case by no means implies that either we or Honor Council condones the degree of cheating, however initially unconscious, that occurred in this case. The discussion concerning a grade change lasted a very long time, because it was generally felt that Henry approached his violation in an admirable manner — refusing to give in to his feelings of rationalization and justification, and addressing the issues of personal and community trust well before the inquiry actually began.

In future or past cases, when such exceptional circumstances are not evident, a jury would even more strongly consider a grade change for such a violation. In this spirit, we, the jury, formally censure Henry's violation, and urge every student to take special care when completing a take-home, time limited quiz which allows copying, typing, or word processing for purposes of legibility. Haverford students should remain aware of these rules, since the Quiz System described herein is a common form of examination in this community. To alter any part of one's finished quiz constitutes an academic violation of the Honor Code, and will be addressed as such.