Janet brought herself to a member of Honor Council and stated that she had cheated on a take-home quiz in Professor Hobbes' introductory political science course a year ago. An inquiry was convened to address the situation.

After the Chairperson read the relevant portions of the Code, Janet told the jury about the quiz in question. She was given a take-home quiz, the second of the semester, which had a 50-minute time limit. While taking the exam, she exceeded the limit by more than an hour and failed to indicate that to the professor. Between the time when she handed in this second quiz and was given the third one, Professor Hobbes informed the class that if students needed more time on future quizzes, they should take the necessary time as long as they indicated that on the quiz. When Janet took her third quiz, she did not exceed the time limit. However, she told Hobbes that she had exceeded it by ten minutes because she felt guilty about using so much time on the previous quiz.

At this point Janet left the room and the jury came to consensus that a violation had indeed occurred when Janet exceeded the specified time limit on the quiz. It was not a violation, however, to claim to have used extra time when she actually had not. Janet now returned and the jury asked her some circumstantial questions. She related the events which led her to speak to a member of Council about the violation. After the third quiz, Janet said she did not think about what she had done. She said that she had not taken the Code as seriously as she might have. When she returned to Haverford this semester, however, she found herself thinking about what she had done, partly because several of her classes were discussing justice. She began to feel that she could not rationalize what she had done. On September 26, she read the letter in the News from "Sonya" who was distraught over a similar action, and brought herself to Honor Council after three years. Reading this letter had an impact on Janet, and it was soon thereafter that she went to see a member of Honor Council. When asked what she thought would be a just resolution of the problem, she suggested a letter to the community and a failure of the quiz or course.

The jury came to consensus on the following resolution:

1) Janet should write a letter to the community through the News and as an addendum to the trial abstract. In the letter she should address the following: how the internalization process of the Code took place for her, stressing the way she felt about the Code at the time of the violation and the way she feels about it now. She should base her letter on the quiz/trial experience.

2) The jury recommended to Professor Hobbes that Janet's grade on the quiz be altered to whatever constitutes a failing grade for an exam in that particular course. It is up to the professor how the change will affect the final course grade, although the jury recommended that a drastic overall grade change was not necessary. Professor Hobbes will inform Janet of the final outcome.

3) Janet said that because she had breached the trust between herself and the professor, she was still uncomfortable with thinking or hearing about the professor and the course. For that reason, the jury decided that Janet should present the case
and the resolution to the professor herself. This would serve to reduce the anxiety she now feels and allow her to put the matter to rest in her own mind.

LETTER TO THE COMMUNITY

Coming to Haverford, the Honor Code was of interest to me but didn't receive the attention it deserved. I did not take the orientation process seriously, and thought that all would be fine if I acted responsibly in my dealings with others.

Very early in the first semester [of last year], on an open-book take home quiz with a specified time limit, I exceeded the allotted time by an hour. After beginning the quiz and using up virtually all of the time thinking and reviewing the text, I panicked after realizing there were only a few minutes left to write my answer. I didn't really contemplate my next move, but proceeded to take the quiz until I had written a satisfactory answer. The next week in class, the professor said for the first time that if you take extra time on the quizzes, just write that on the bottom of the page. On the next quiz, feeling guilty, I wrote that I had taken ten extra minutes, even though it wasn't true.

For the rest of the year, the incident did not surface in my mind and remained buried over the summer. However, back at the Ford [this semester], my courses that dealt with morality and the good life resurfaced the incident. In addition, I read an anonymous letter in the school newspaper that described a situation similar to mine. Someone had cheated on an exam and could not continue to live a lie; she had to confront herself and repair the damage to the community. Unable to concentrate on my work, constantly tortured by my violation, I told a close friend and went to someone on the Honor Council.

I now appreciate and live by the Honor Code and believe in its potential to build strong consciences and community harmony and trust. Strange as it may sound, this has been a positive experience, for I now believe that Haverford provides the opportunity for members of the community to stop and think about their actions. We are fortunate to be molded in such a way. Now when I hear other Fords speak of the unreality of the Honor Code, I concede that infractions do occur and the institution does not exemplify the ideal, but know that the Honor Code, if followed, is a sincere attempt to approximate ideals.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

Should Janet have failed the exam although she would be able to use extra time on future exams? Was asking Janet to speak to the professor suitable? Do you agree with the jury's decision that "inventing" 10 minutes on the following quiz was not a violation?