CHAIRPERSON'S NOTE CONCERNING THE TRIAL OF

This trial was held with a six person jury consisting of the Honor Council Chairperson, an Honor Council member and four members of the community at large. The reasons for such a unique arrangement, although not prescribed in the Honor Code or constitution, were 1) the student being tried was very nervous and upset, a pre-trial meeting between and the entire Honor Council discussed the effects that a larger jury would have on and Honor Council decided that it would be more effective and in the spirit of the code to convene a smaller, more intimate jury for 2) the trial took place just before Thanksgiving break, at the request of Jon and several members of Honor Council, and council felt it would be difficult to find the necessary 12 people for a normal trial.

Council realized in later discussions that this authority to trim the number of people on a jury was an authority not mentioned in the student constitution but felt that the action was in the spirit of the code in that it provided a more helpful atmosphere for and his understanding of the code. It does not recommend that this be a common practice, because of its constitutional ambiguity, and urges all future councils to hold trials in the fashion already described in the code.
Honor Council Chairperson's Report of an Academic Trial

A jury was convened at 7:00 PM on November 24 to discuss the academic violation of X. A friend of X, X was present and contributed to the discussion throughout the trial. Ken Baclawski, the professor for X Math 113 course was present to discuss the case. Prof. Baclawski explained the circumstances under which he discovered X's violation: after each exam in his class, students are allowed and encouraged to question the grading in case the professor made a mistake in grading or the student believed he should receive more credit for the work done. On the second exam of the course Jon came to Prof. Baclawski with questions concerning problems 4 and 6. X claimed both problems had been incorrectly graded. Prof. Baclawski had graded #4 and another professor had graded #6. When X presented the exam to the professor both problems were correct but had been graded as being partially incorrect. The professor's suspicions were raised. X brought the exam back a second time with questions about the grading on two other problems. At this point Prof. Baclawski decided to keep the exam and ask the grader of #6 some questions since there had been such a difference between the little credit given and the correct answer which now appeared on the exam. It took the professor a few days to get a hold of the other professor. They consulted and decided that question #6 could not have been so obvious misgraded and the must have changed it. Professor Baclawski also felt uneasy about problem #4 as well. He contacted X who then contacted the Honor Council Chairperson and an Honor Council representative.

X admitted to changing the answer to question #6 after it had been graded (a change which involved massive erasing and several added lines), but maintained that he had done nothing to #4. Prof. Baclawski stated that it was possible the mistake was his. He also stated that the exam had been graded very harshly and was intended to be more difficult than the first. Prof. Baclawski's story, as presented above, was revealed by his own statements and the answers to questions from members of the jury. At this point Prof. Baclawski left the room.

The jury first examined the question of whether a violation
had occurred. It decided that due to \( X \)'s own admission a violation had occurred with problem #6 but, due to \( X \)'s claim that he had not adjusted anything on problem #4 and Prof. Baclawski's admission that it was possible and feasible that he had misgraded #4, no impropriety had occurred with that or any problem other than #6.

The jury then examined the conditions under which the violation had occurred. The following paragraphs are the synthesis of the questions asked by the jury to \( X \) and the discussion which followed his answers. When asked why he had changed his answer \( X \) gave a number of reasons: the exam had been difficult as a whole, he felt he had known the answer but just was not able to produce it on the exam, the wrong answer was caused by a "stupid" mistake, the exam was important to his so he was worried when he got a lower grade than expected. Further questioning revealed that cheating had been somewhat common at \( X \)'s high school but that he did not really need to cheat to get the work done there. His exposure to the philosophy of the code had been Customs Week presentations about it. When asked about whether he realized he was violating the code when he did this \( X \) answered, "yes". When asked why he did it then he replied that at the time the grade was more important to his than thinking about the code. Jon said he had been pre-med when he started but that, before all this happened, he was beginning to change his mind.

When asked about the non-academic environment \( X \) replied that he had been having some problems with his roommate but that everything had been fine at home and there seemed to be very little pressure from his parents to get outstanding grades. He said basically he enjoyed being at Haverford.

\( X \) was then asked whether he had thought about what he had done since the violation occurred. He said it had bothered him very much. Roger confirmed that \( X \) had been noticeably nervous and depressed since the violation. \( \ldots \), a member of council on the jury, with whom \( X \), had discussed the violation several times, also stated that it was his impression that had put a lot of thought into the matter and was very guilt-ridden over the violation. Many members of the jury concurred that even their brief encounter with \( X \) during the trial gave them the impression that \( X \) was a very sensitive person who had put much constructive thought into his consideration of the violation.
The jury now turned to the matter of what would be the best resolution of the violation. The Chairperson led off this part of the trial with remarks concerning the severity of the violation. He stated that he saw this as being a very severe violation because it was not done in the panic of the taking of the exam but in the aftermath and was an obviously calculated attempt to better a grade through changing the answer. X's testimony showed that the decision to cheat was based not on pressures from home or his expectations for the med-school but merely on his belief that he "deserved" the better grade. However, since the violation, it was obvious that X had put much thought into what he had done and had begun to examine the nature of his wrongdoings. His answers in the trial had shown that he now had a much clearer commitment to the code than he had had before. For that reason separation was not necessary but a failure in the course was recommended.

The other five members of the jury thought this to be too harsh. Many cited their belief that X had been greatly affected by the process and agreed that separation was not necessary. Seeing as how the code was not a punitive system, such change in attitudes showed that the code had worked and that X took its responsibilities and expectations seriously. X did commit a calculated violation however and the jury did not believe that a failing on #6 was appropriate because X had done so badly on it in the first place. A failure on the exam was recommended as a sign that such violations do bear consequences not only on the question itself but on the whole exam as well. Many also pointed out that Jon was first semester freshman, who had not had that much experience with the code and whose experience with it now would keep him from committing further violations. The Chairperson felt these were valid points so:

THE JURY RECOMMENDS that X, receive a failure on his second exam in Math 113. Prof. Baclawski has agreed with this recommendation.

Respectfully submitted on December 31, 1981

Chairperson, Honor Council