An Economics professor suggested that Jim turn himself in to Honor Council for a potential violation of the academic portion of the Honor Code. Jim came to Honor Council, and an inquiry was convened to address the situation.

After the Chairperson read the relevant portions of the Code, the factual portion of the inquiry began, as the professor recounted what he had seen occur. He explained that in his course he gave unannounced quizzes. The quizzes were on only the readings in the course. At the beginning of the year the students were given a printed sheet of rules, on which the professor had explained which of the sources could actually be used while taking a quiz. The professor explained that he had given a quiz on one of the sources that was not allowed to be used during the quiz, and had noticed that while taking the quiz Jim was using this particular source. The professor asked Jim to close the book which he did. After the class was over, the professor asked Jim to talk to Honor Council which he did. After the professor had explained to the jury the relevant facts of the case, Jim concurred with what the professor had said. Jim explained that he had been studying for a midterm in another course and had failed to realize that the text in question was not one of the sources which could be used on the quiz. Jim stated that he was not intentionally trying to cheat.

At this point the factual portion of the inquiry ended. Jim and the professor left the room, and the jury consented that a violation had occurred.

Jim returned for the circumstantial portion of the inquiry, which began with Jim asserting that he had not intentionally cheated. He explained that while doing the reading for the course, he had read this text as if it were one that could be used in class. He further explained that he had been quite worried about the midterm that he was studying for, and admitted that he had not taken enough care while doing his Economics homework. He explained that he had done the Economics reading just to get it over with, and was not thinking about whether or not there would be a quiz in the class. Jim also stated that not until about five minutes after the professor had asked him to close his book did Jim realize that he was using an unallowed source; it was then that Jim realized he had been cheating.

The jury felt that Jim’s action seemed so obvious as to appear unintentional; also it believed Jim to be telling the truth. Thus, it discarded
the possibility of an extreme response to the violation. The resolution portion of the inquiry began by asking Jim what he felt was an appropriate resolution. Jim felt that he should receive a zero on the quiz on which he had cheated. Jim left the room and the jury continued discussing resolutions. The jury had three concerns that it wanted to address in the Resolution. First, while the jury believed that the violation had been committed unconsciously, they also felt that a huge amount of neglect had occurred since the professor had made it clear which sources could be used on quizzes at the beginning of the semester. Thus, this neglect had to be addressed. Secondly, because the course was still in progress, the jury did not want the resolution to make it impossible for Jim to still do well in the course, and thus damage his incentive to work for it believed that Jim was fairly honest. Finally, the jury felt that Jim was unaware of how he had violated the community's trust by breaking the rules of the class. The jury tentatively consented upon a two part-resolution. The first part directly addressed the violation, while the second part was designed to make Jim more aware of the Honor Code's importance to the community as a whole. The jury decided that Jim should receive a zero on the quiz on which he had cheated. They also felt that the entire quiz average which counts 40% of the semester grade should be lowered by one full grade point. The second part of the resolution consisted of setting up a mini-course in which two Jury members, one from Honor Council and the other a random member, would meet once a week for approximately three weeks to discuss the context of the Honor Code in the life of the community. Such topics would include the issues of community trust, academic and community responsibility, and the meaning and importance of negligence. At the end of the “course,” Jim would be required to produce a letter addressed to Honor Council explaining the importance of the Honor Code in community life. Honor Council would reserve the right to ask Jim to rewrite the letter if it felt that the letter did not demonstrate increased understanding of the Honor Code.

The jury met the following day to discuss the proposed resolution. Upon hearing the resolution, the professor explained that because of his method of grading, the zero on the quiz plus one full grade point drop in the overall quiz average would make it difficult for Jim to pass the course. This had not been the jury's intention. The jury amended the academic portion of the resolution. Because the professor explained that in figuring out a quiz average he converted quiz grades to a scale of one to one hundred, the jury decided that a fairer resolution would be to drop the quiz average by five points on this scale as well as including the zero in the average. This would mean that while the quiz average would be significantly lowered, Jim would have a chance to do reasonably well in the course, thus accomplishing the jury's original intention. The jury consented to both parts of the resolution.