A jury was convened to discuss a possible infraction of the Honor Code which occurred during exam week. This was the first trial under the new revised Code and the eight-four jury system. Julie called her friend, Alice, in order to borrow the latter's car. This was a common occurrence, and Alice told Julie to come over and get the keys. When Julie got to the room, Alice was taking a study break by packing for the vacation in her room. During the discussion which took place in the bedroom and carried over into the living room, Alice began to relate information from their joint Physics exam. Julie had not yet taken the exam and did not try to stop her in any way. After the discussion, Julie left with the car to get groceries. During this interim, Julie realized that when she returned, Alice might ask her about their common History exam. She resolved, partly out of a sense of obligation that she felt out of friendship and after the first conversation, that she would respond with information to any such initiation. This second conversation was indeed initiated by Alice, and Julie told her appropriate topics to study for the exam. Julie was aware that they were committing infractions of the academic Honor Code. That same night, Alice casually told her roommate that she had received information on the History exam from Julie. The roommate told this to another friend, but at the time, they chose not to confront the people involved.

This confrontation did occur about three weeks after vacation. Up to that point, Julie had not reported herself because she had justified it to herself that she would never break the Code again. Upon being confronted, however, Julie openly admitted her infraction, and quickly sought her dean, the professors involved, and the Honor Council chairperson. In the several ensuing discussions, it should be noted, Julie was extremely helpful and impressed those she talked with as truly understanding her violation of the Code. The matter was then brought to trial. It was decided that due to the differing roles played in the incidence, Julie and Alice should have separate trials. This was Julie's trial.

Julie brought a friend to the trial for support, and Alice came for this portion of the trial to substantiate facts. The jury then set about learning the aforesaid facts. Having asked Alice, Julie and her friend to leave the room, the jury discussed whether they believed an infraction had occurred. Given Julie's admittance and the facts, the jury reached consensus that the Code had been violated. Julie then returned to discuss circumstances and a possible resolution. The jury learned that Julie was anxious to return home having been away for so long, but she did not expect this to be an excuse for her actions. Julie suggested that she do some sort of community service having learned a lot about the Code during the past few weeks, fail the Physics exam for which she had received information, and she wasn't sure what should be done with History. Julie decided that she did not want to be present during any further discussion of
sible resolutions, and she and her friend left.

The jury now had to come up with a temporary resolution given the facts, circumstances, and Julie's suggestions. Other ideas which were brought up were failing Physics, lowering the History grade, tutoring for History, making signs for and/or proctoring exams, and doing lab maintenance work. After a couple more hours of discussion, most of the jury agreed that Julie should fail Physics, have her grade lowered in History to somewhere between her original 3.7 and a 2.0, work with a freshman customs group as a Code advisor during freshman orientation, and work on the new Honor Code memorandum. Several factors were taken into account. The jury believed that the History infraction was more serious because it constituted some degree of premeditation. Yet, the jury wanted to consider her excellent attitude towards the process. Her superb attitude cannot be stressed enough. Therefore, despite an initial separation of the incidents, the jury dealt with the resolution as a whole and balanced out the penalties between Physics and History. Some discussion continued on the extent to which the History grade should be lowered. Finally, a compromise or 3.0 was consensed. Two members of the jury who felt that the grade should not be lowered below a 3.3 chose to stand outside of consensus.

The jury reconvened the next morning and after a continuation of the discussion, consensed again on the resolution of the preceding evening. Again, the same two members chose to stand outside of consensus. Julie and her friend then returned to hear the jury's decision. Julie was upset with the severity of the resolution, but true to her character, she understood the jury's reasoning and accepted the decision.