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Pre-trial

Honor Council received an email from Port saying that she had been physically assaulted by another student, Starboard, at a campus party and asked for Honor Council to confront Starboard on her behalf. An Honor Council Co-Chair met with Starboard, who said that she thought that Port was the person who had acted inappropriately. Starboard said she had wanted to bring the matter to Honor Council herself. Honor Council decided to send the case to a modified Joint Panel, in which Port and Starboard would serve as joint confronting and confronted parties, and the focus would be on understanding the event as a whole. Because the case involved the label of “assault” by one of the parties, Honor Council felt that an administrative presence on the panel would be helpful.

Both Starboard and Port had requested witnesses. Witnesses are not a standard part of Honor Council proceedings, but after discussion the jury consented to talking to witnesses individually. Starboard’s witness, Sculler, agreed to talk to the jury but declined when they told him he couldn’t remain anonymous. A second witness, Sweeper, submitted a written statement.

Fact-Finding Part 1

Starboard failed to show up to the first meeting. The Chair called her and she explained that she had gone off-campus to visit family but that she would be available that night. The jury decided to break and reconvene in the evening. The fact-finding portion had to be rescheduled for the following night.

Port began her statement. The incident in question happened during a party when Port and her friend Coxswain were dancing on stage. Over the course of the party, Starboard and her friends ended up closer to the stage. Port’s impression was that they were advancing toward the stage; Starboard denied this. Port expressed that she had felt threatened by Starboard’s friends. Port said she had made an obscene gesture towards Starboard’s friend group many times because she felt threatened. A juror asked Port why she did that if she felt threatened by them. Port said that she understood the gesture to mean, “go away”.

Over the course of the fact-finding, the jury learned that Port and Starboard were once romantically involved, but that Starboard had broken it off several months before the incident. There still seemed to be unresolved tension around the breakup.

A while after their confrontation near the stage, Starboard went to leave the party and unexpectedly ran into Port and her friend Coxswain in the stairwell. Starboard said that she’d opened the door and they’d started yelling. Port and Starboard had been surprised to see each other. A juror asked Starboard what they were yelling about in the stairwell. Starboard said that Port and her friends had called her a series of insulting names. Starboard also said Port had said to Starboard’s friends,
“She’s dead. You’ll never see her again” (referring to Starboard).

Port had reported that at one point, Starboard had slapped down Port’s hand. A juror asked Starboard why she had done that. Starboard acknowledged that it was a poor decision but came from built up annoyance. Both Port and Starboard agreed that Port put her arm out, giving the middle finger, and that Starboard slapped her arm down.

Port acknowledged that she’d used those insults but said that Starboard had said she was going to kill her. A juror asked Port whether she had taken this to be a viable threat, and Port said yes. In addition, she had filed a police report because there had been violence against her and a death threat. Starboard said that what she’d actually said was, “Port, I will kill you,” the implication being a warning to back off. Starboard clarified that it wasn’t a death threat but more of a warning to stay away. Jurors pointed out the similarity of the statements, “I’ll kill you,” and, “she’s dead” and commented that it may have just been a poor choice of words, not serious threats. Port acknowledged this but still felt threatened.

There was confusion about what had happened when Starboard went to exit. Port said that she and her friend had been standing to the side and Starboard had walked by and pushed them. Starboard said that there were three people on the stairs, and there wasn’t room to pass. Port had gotten into her face, and Port and Coxswain had both started yelling, so Starboard had pushed her way through them. Port and Starboard disagreed over the force of the push and whether there was room to pass on the stairs.

A juror asked Starboard what happened after she left the party. Starboard said that she came back in the front door for a bit. The juror asked Port what happened after Starboard left. She said that she and her friend kept dancing on stage and ignored the incident, not reporting it to the Quaker Bouncers. Port said she and Coxswain had filed police reports the next day after talking with Port’s dean.

A juror asked Port and Starboard whether they’d been drinking that night, to which they both said yes. Port said she’d had about five drinks, but that she had a high tolerance and was tipsy but not drunk. Starboard said she’d had two or three drinks but was not that drunk. A juror asked how much alcohol played a role in escalating the incident. Starboard said she wasn’t that drunk, and felt sober, saying perhaps it had only affected her a little bit. Port responded that she probably flipped off Starboard and her friends more than she would have otherwise, but said she dances really wildly anyway. A juror asked Port whether anything similar had ever happened, to which Port said no.

The jury had no more questions, and Starboard and Port left. It was agreed that they would return that night after the jury had talked to the witnesses.

Fact-Finding Part 2: Witnesses

After taking a break, the jury spoke with Port’s witness Coxswain. The Chair asked Coxswain to start off by talking about what had happened on the night in question. Coxswain’s version of the events was, for the most part, the same as the jury had heard from Port and Starboard. When asked whether she had filed a police report, Coxswain said no. When asked about the chain of events, Coxswain said that Port told her that her arm was still sore the next day. They had talked to Safety and Security that next day, who had told them that they could file a police report if they felt it was necessary. Coxswain served as a witness for Port’s police report, but did not file her own.

The jury asked Coxswain to describe what happened as Starboard came in the door to the staircase area. Coxswain claimed Starboard had initiated the argument, saying that Port was only saying, “What did I do?” When asked if Port was yelling, Coxswain said that she didn’t think so. A juror asked whether Coxswain was worried Starboard would come back, to which she said no. Coxswain said she hadn’t really felt threatened. She said she’d felt more threatened in the stairwell because fewer people were there. A juror asked Coxswain why she and Port hadn’t left the party.
Coxswain said she thought it might have been Port’s way of calming Coxswain down and not wanting to ruin Coxswain’s night. The jury had no further questions, and Coxswain left.

The jury then read the written statement from Sweeper, Starboard’s witness. The statement did not include any new information but contradicted much of what Coxswain had said. Afterwards, the jury talked about everything they had heard so far. Some jurors felt that Port and Starboard had been more forthcoming than the witnesses. A juror was bothered that Port had said that Coxswain filed a police report when Coxswain herself said that she had not. Coxswain had also said that Port did not yell back at all, when even Port had admitted that she had. The jury decided that instead of bringing Port and Starboard back together they would talk to the parties individually.

Fact-Finding Part 3
The jury talked with Port first. A juror asked Port whether Coxswain had filed a police report and Port said yes. The jury had no more questions, and Port left. The jury had no questions for Starboard.

Statements of Violation
The Chair reminded the jury that they would be coming to two separate statements of non-violation or violation since Starboard and Port were confronting each other. The jury agreed to talk generally first and then move into discussing separate statements of violation or non-violation for Starboard and Port.

The jury expressed concern with the way Port had treated the whole case and approached the situation. Many jury members felt that she was overplaying the degree to which she felt threatened. Another juror noted that Port might argue she really felt threatened by Starboard and that the jury couldn’t just dismiss that.

The conversation turned to Starboard. A juror noted that this situation of being provoked was different than if Starboard had just engaged Port. A juror asked what response Port had expected to get when she put an obscene gesture in someone’s face. A juror noted that Port’s behavior was aggressive as well. One juror expressed that the jury might really sympathize with Starboard and understand where she was coming from, but that she had still put her hands on someone, which is definitely not in line with the values expressed in the Honor Code. Some felt that the Code emphasized trust, respect, and concern to the extent of what’s possible, and pointed out that Starboard tried at first to act more constructively. A juror said that she thought they both violated the Code in terms of not showing trust, concern, and respect in the face of disrespectful conduct.

The jury talked about the application of the word “violence” to this situation. A juror expressed discomfort with applying to word violence to this case and said that she would be more comfortable saying something like “disrespectful physical communication.” Another juror noted that both Port and Starboard had behaved violently, in a way. He said that Port had behaved very socially inappropriately, and he was also really concerned about what Starboard did.

The jury then spent a great deal of time discussing the wording of the statements of violation for Starboard and Port, respectively. For Starboard, they wanted to make sure the statement of violation reflected the fact that she was provoked. The jury also explicitly did not want to use the word “violence.” The jury consented to the following statement of violation for Starboard, with one juror standing outside of consensus:

Starboard violated the Honor Code by failing to live up to the community standard of respectful conduct. She reacted in a physically aggressive manner when faced with disrespectful actions directed at her and her friends.
The jury then turned to a statement of violation for Port. In considering how Port violated the Code, several jurors expressed that she deliberately provoked Starboard and her friends in what seemed like a targeted attack. Some jurors expressed that they could not dismiss the fact that she may have felt threatened. Other jurors said they agreed, but that it seemed that the way Port had handled the case felt disingenuous. The jury was largely in agreement on this point. The jury also suspected that Port was trying to be punitive to Starboard in bringing this to Honor Council and was possibly seeking revenge. The jury consented to the following statement of violation, with no one standing outside of consensus:

Port violated the Honor Code by provoking others in using disrespectful language and repeatedly giving the finger to Starboard and her friends. Further, the manner in which Port pursued the confrontation was at times disingenuous and went against the spirit of confrontation.

Circumstantial Portion

The jury reconvened to discuss the circumstantial portion of the case with Port and Starboard. Both parties had a certain amount of hostility towards each other, so the jury decided to speak with each separately.

Circumstantial with Starboard

Starboard said that she agreed with the sentiment that she had been provoked and acknowledged that she had acted inappropriately. The jury asked Starboard about the need for her witnesses to remain anonymous. Starboard said that this was because the people she had considered asking were afraid of some sort of reprisal or confrontation from Port. She said that a few friends didn’t even want to talk to Safety and Security about the incident. Starboard also said that she didn’t think Port would ever approach someone sober and that during their friendship Port didn’t talk very much while sober.

Starboard said she didn’t mind Port’s presence on campus, especially since they had had no problems until Port had gotten drunk. She said she wouldn’t mind Port approaching her while sober but that she doesn’t want their relationship to be forced.

Circumstantial with Port

A juror asked if Port could envision any sort of cordial relationship with Starboard. Port said that she doesn’t see any point in talking or interacting. A juror asked her how much she normally drinks on weekends. She said 10 shots in 2 hours but that this was her maximum. She said the night she went out she’d had about five shots. A juror asked whether Port thought alcohol had had any role at all in her behavior. Port said she thought she would probably have flipped them off less if she hadn’t been drinking.

It was clarified that when Port flips people off she intends it to mean, “go away.” A juror asked Port how she thought other people interpreted it. Port said she doesn’t know; she can’t tell what the other person is thinking. A juror asked her whether she’d considered how it was interpreted, to which Port said she had no idea.

A juror asked whether she would still feel the same level of threat if she saw Starboard at a party. Port said she thought she would stick close to her friends. She said the thought of crossing paths with Starboard made her uncomfortable. A juror asked if that was because she would feel awkward or threatened. Port said threatened. At this point, Port brought up the idea that Starboard had “abused” her girlfriend. Port said that she hadn't thought Starboard would hit her, but that now that she had, there was the possibility that Starboard would do it again. Port had no proposed resolutions, so the chair thanked her for coming and told her she could leave.
Deliberations, Part 1

A juror mentioned the problem of Port not seeming to be taking accountability for her actions. A second juror said he understood where the first juror was coming from, but also thought there was some kernel of truth in Port feeling threatened.

The jury focused on Port’s claim that she felt threatened as a point of concern and some doubt. One juror was bothered by Port saying that she doesn’t consider the actions of others.

A juror brought up the idea of separation for Port. Another juror noted that Port seems to have trouble functioning in the community. Another juror agreed that she felt that Port was not a healthy presence on campus. Another juror pointed out that Port is struggling, and recognized that Haverford can give support in a way that the outside world can’t. A juror suggested some sort of resolution about no alcohol and/or talking with the alcohol counselor. One juror said there were three things she was feeling: 1) that Port has removed herself from the values of the community, 2) that it is a problem that Port isn’t acknowledging this, and 3) concern for her health/sanity

A juror proposed some sort of social separation. The juror felt like this would emphasize that the jury doesn’t think that Port is living up to the standards of respectful conduct. A juror commented that if any of them saw her breaking this resolution, they would have to confront her. The difficulty of enforcing social separation was recognized.

The jury returned to possible resolutions for Starboard. Writing a letter to the community was suggested. Another juror wanted to know why and several jurors explained that they thought it was an opportunity for self-reflection and mending the breach with the community.

Deliberations, Part 2

The jury met to resume its discussion of tentative resolutions. They began with resolutions for Starboard. The jury had previously discussed a letter to the community, and specifically thought about including guidelines for what the letter should be about. One juror hoped that the letter could include more productive ways to handle the situation, such as a “tips for others.”

The jury moved on to talk about Port. The jury’s main concern was that the resolutions address accountability for her inappropriate behavior. A juror commented that it seemed like Port doesn’t understand what it’s like to consider others’ reactions. It was suggested that Port could meet with her dean to have Port talk about the case. One juror suggested that these meetings should be weekly, and another suggested requiring 2-3 meetings total.

A juror suggested that Port meet with the alcohol counselor to talk about how drinking impacts the community, as well as her behavior more specifically. The issue of social separation came up again. This possibility would mean that Port would still be a full student on campus academically, but that her privileges regarding social life on campus would be limited in some way. Some jurors liked the idea of her taking time away from the social scene, to reflect. The jury was concerned about what would happen if jurors saw Port violating a resolution of social separation, noting that it would be awkward to confront her if they see her. This was discussed as a part of the larger problem of how to enforce something like social separation. The juror said that they would be relying on Port to honor the resolution.

The jury stopped deliberations, to be continued later in the week because of time constraints.

Deliberations, Part 3

The jury met again to more clearly articulate a set of tentative resolutions and consent to them. The jury began by discussing some scheduling issues that the Chair brought to their attention. The Chair felt that Port was being obstructionist by frequently rescheduling and not replying to emails promptly. A juror commented that it seemed like Port was that the resolutions will affect her. Another juror commented that it seemed like Port didn’t care. A number of jurors thought that Port was being
difficult and seemed not to be making this trial a priority. The Chair commented that she thought a lack of engagement in the trial process was a huge problem. Another juror commented that it made it more difficult to have any resolution asking to trust Port. The jury decided to send an email to Port saying that they felt she may not be prioritizing the trial and urging her to come speak with the jury about the resolutions on Saturday. The jury composed and then sent the following email:

Dear Port,

The jury is concerned that you are not making this trial a priority. While we understand that there may be logistical challenges, discussion and engagement are fundamental parts of the process and your presence is crucial to determine the resolutions at this stage. We want to remind you that you are also a confronted party, and we want to be forthcoming about the fact that we are talking about a number of resolutions that have the potential to shape your experience at Haverford. Your coming on Saturday will show the jury your commitment to restoration and the ideals of the community. Please let us know if there is a compelling reason you cannot be here on Saturday morning. Please reply as soon as possible.

Thanks,
The Jury

The jury then began to articulate its discussion from Tuesday into concrete resolutions and talked about a resolution expressing support for Port continuing to talk to CAPS. A juror said he was concerned that Port was not a functioning member of the community, and wanted to see her get there. He said that she needs to reflect on how her behavior impacts others and the community. The jury came up with a resolution about meetings with her Dean, including having two jurors meet with the Dean beforehand to talk about what the jury was hoping would be addressed and achieved through these conversations. The jury wondered how to verify that Port went and decided that Port will send a brief reflection to Honor Council within 48 hours of each meeting.

A juror commented that the resolution regarding drinking and social privileges was making a strong statement but had no control. The jury talked about including resolutions that were strong suggestions rather than mandates. The jury then agreed on wording for a resolution encouraging Port not to attend parties when under the influence of alcohol for the rest of the semester.

At this point one of the jurors had to leave, so the jury consented to him being able to consent to the tentative resolutions over email, since the resolutions had been essentially all worked out over the course of the conversation, and the juror was present for all of that. After that juror left, the jury revisited the resolutions they had come up with over the course of the conversation and agreed on final wording. They then consented to each resolution in turn and then to the set of resolutions as a whole. The jury consented to the following tentative resolutions, with no one standing outside:

Resolutions for Starboard

1. Starboard will write a letter to the community to be released with the abstract reflecting on the incident and addressing the effects of her behavior during this incident and advice for how anyone faced with a similar situation might react in a more productive way. This letter should be at least two pages.

Resolutions for Port

1. Port will write an essay reflecting on the Honor Code and her relationship to it coming out of this experience. She should include thoughts on how her actions affect others and the com-
munity at large. The essay should be at least two pages.

2. Port has the option to also write a letter to the community to be released with the abstract reflecting on the incident

3. Port will meet with the alcohol counselor for an evaluation regarding substances. Port will follow the alcohol counselor’s recommendations and will submit a statement to Honor Council by twi weeks before the end of the semester, verifying her participation.

4. The jury supports that Port continue to talk to CAPS.

5. Port will meet regularly with her dean for the remainder of the semester for both support and continued reflection. Two jurors will meet with Port’s dean prior to starting these meetings to fill him in on the trial and inform her dean about the jury’s hopes for these meetings. A component of these meetings should address how her behavior impacts others and the greater community. They will meet at minimum three times between the proceeding and the end of the semester.

6. The jury strongly recommends that Port not attend any on-campus parties under the influence of alcohol or any other substances for the remainder of the semester.

Before the jury left, they received an email from Port. Port said that she had commitments that prevented her from attending other meetings but didn’t elaborate. The jury felt frustrated because on one hand they didn’t want to pry into Port’s private life but on the other it seemed she was being obstructionist. This was magnified by Port’s previous actions over the course of the trial.

Interim

The Chair emailed the tentative resolutions to the juror who had had to leave, and he consented over email. The Chair then emailed the resolutions to the involved parties. She first received an email back from Port saying thank you for the resolutions, and that she would get started. Five minutes later, The Chair received another email from Port that expressed anger about the resolutions and attacked the process for being inefficient. The Chair emailed Port back saying that if she were unhappy, she should come discuss the resolutions on Saturday. Port emailed back to say she wasn’t sure she could be there. The Chair suggested Port attend the Saturday meeting and offered multiple alternatives including meeting with two jurors some time on Friday or Saturday or submitting a statement. Port declined and did not submit a statement.

Finalizing Resolutions

The jury met to finalize the resolutions. The Chair asked whether the jurors’ feelings had changed about anything after having time to reflect, and whether they felt any changes would be necessary. One juror said that he wanted to see more of a check-in to make sure the resolutions were followed. A juror suggested that perhaps separation from the community should be considered if Port didn’t follow through with the resolutions.

Starboard seemed largely fine with the resolutions. The jury asked Starboard how she felt about the resolutions for Port. She responded that she thinks the resolutions can help her, and that she hopes Port follows them. Starboard left and the jury returned to its deliberations.

The jury talked about their disappointment that Port had not shown up, nor emailed a response to the resolutions as The Chair had asked. One juror commented on how the trial really hadn’t gone the way Port might have expected, given that she originally confronted Starboard. Some jurors agreed that Port not making an effort to communicate with the jury showed disrespect for the process and the work of the jury. Jurors agreed that Port’s behavior and lack of engagement was frustrating overall.

The jury felt that changing the resolutions so that there would be more check-ins might be appropriate. The jury felt that Port’s lack of engagement made it much harder to trust that she would
take the resolutions seriously and harder to trust her to carry them out. A juror asked what would happen if Port didn’t complete some or all of the resolutions. A concern throughout the trial had been that Port had withdrawn from the values of the community through her behavior, and this formed the basis of the previous discussions about potential separation or social separation. Her unwillingness to engage at this stage was not making the jury feel any more confident in her ability to uphold the values of the community now.

The jury decided that Honor Council review the case at the end of the semester to make sure that the resolutions had been followed. It was suggested that at this point Council could decide whether the resolutions had been fulfilled satisfactorily and whether any further action was needed. Several jurors wanted separation to be considered if Port truly did not carry out the resolutions. A juror commented on the problem of having this “threat of separation,” as it should not be used as a threatening device. Another juror said that including it in the resolutions was better than springing it on her. Several jurors expressed that they didn’t want to tie Honor Council to a certain course of action because of the language used in the resolution.

The jury also decided to appoint a point-person for Port so that Port could be in touch with this juror after the trial if she wanted to talk about anything or needed help fulfilling the resolutions. The jury consented to the following set of final resolutions, first to each in turn and then to the resolutions as a whole, with no one standing outside.

**Resolutions for Starboard**

1. Starboard will write a letter to the community to be released with the abstract reflecting on the incident and addressing the effects of her behavior during this incident and advice for how anyone faced with a similar situation might react in a more productive way. This letter should be at least two pages.

**Resolutions for Port**

1. Port will write an essay reflecting on the Honor Code and her relationship to it coming out of this experience. She should include thoughts on how her actions affect others and the community at large. The essay should be at least two pages.

2. Port will meet with the alcohol counselor for an evaluation regarding substances. Port will follow the alcohol counselor's recommendations and will submit a statement to Honor Council by two weeks before the end of the semester verifying this.

3. Port will meet regularly with her dean for the remainder of the semester for both support and continued reflection. Two jurors will meet with Port's dean prior to starting these meetings to fill the dean in on the trial and inform her dean about the jury's hopes for these meetings. A component of these meetings should address how her behavior impacts others and the greater community. They will meet at minimum three times between the proceeding and the end of classes, and Port will submit a paragraph-long reflection to Honor Council within 48 hours of each meeting (by emailing these to code@haverford.edu).

4. Port will submit materials for resolutions 1-3 by two weeks prior to the end of the semester (please note that paragraph reflections are to be submitted within 48 hours of each meeting with Port's dean). Honor Council will then review Port's case. If there is a failure to engage in the restorative process, as evidenced by a failure to complete resolutions 1-3, Honor Council will consider further action, including the possibility of separation, since such a failure to engage is a rejection of the community's fundamental values.

5. Port has the option to also write a letter to the community to be released with the abstract reflecting on the incident.

6. The jury supports that Port continue to talk to CAPS.
7. The jury strongly recommends that Port not attend any on-campus parties while under the influence of alcohol or any other substances for the remainder of the semester.

The jury consented to the above resolutions as a whole with no one standing outside.

Post-trial:

The Chair was in contact with Port regarding the meetings with her dean. Port had stopped submitting reflections, in violation of the resolutions, and although she did submit an essay for resolution 1, the essay was of such poor quality and didn’t adequately address her lack of respect for others that the resolution was deemed to be unfulfilled. As per resolution four, Honor Council met to discuss the case. They ultimately decided to separate her even though she had technically completed most of the resolutions. Port appealed the case to the President following this decision. The President overturned the separation. Port was instead socially separating, meaning that she would come to Haverford only to attend class, living off campus and not taking part in any on-campus activities.

Following a period of social separation, Port was again allowed to submit an essay in order to re-enter the community. Members of Honor Council reviewed the essay, and consented to allow Port to return as a full student.

Port’s Letter

I chose to attend Haverford College because I wanted to belong to a small community that had a strong sense of student government and that practiced certain Quaker values. Coming from a graduating class of one-hundred students, I was aware of the advantages of attending a small school, such as having small class sizes, close relationships with professors, security on campus, and being able to recognize and become acquainted with many of my peers. The idea of Quaker values was also appealing in the sense that the entire student body formed a contract in which they would uphold, respect, and live by. These qualities made Haverford an easy pick for me, and as I grew into the community, I came to help other students make the same decision to attend Haverford.

This past spring semester, I lost sight of the opportunities and advantages awarded to me as a member of the Haverford community. I deeply offended many members in the community both directly and indirectly through my actions. My excessive drinking and partying put the safety of myself and others at risk, to the point of a physical altercation with another student. In this essay, I hope to demonstrate the ways in which I have learned from this experience and gained insight during this semester on social separation. In doing so, I would like the opportunity to rejoin the community and regain entry into a place that I call home.

To begin, social separation was a difficult process to undertake. I lived off campus in Philadelphia and commuted to classes twice a week. My time on campus was strictly limited to academics, and so I missed out on attending clubs, singing with my a capella group, and most importantly, experiencing junior year with my close friends. I felt as though I had disappointed the people around me because I failed to take the appeal seriously. Primarily, I refused to acknowledge my role in the case and I prioritized other social events over attending meetings with my advisors and the Honor Council. My perspective was very limited because I was too focused on the physical altercation and how I had been violated.

During the summer and social separation this semester, I began to gain insight on how my actions played a role in the conflict. Due to my excessive drinking and partying at the time, I put myself in a dangerous situation and confrontational environment, while also placing the welfare of my friends in danger. I learned that my actions did not occur in a vacuum; my behavior directly affected the people around me. The fact that Haverford is a small community only further exemplifies this point. I should have taken full responsibility for my actions and not have played the victim.
Although I was placed on social separation, I was grateful for the opportunity to return to Haverford and take classes in the fall. I decided to take a course this fall on the History and Principles of Quakerism in an effort to learn more about Quaker values and how Honor Council took these principles into account. As a result, I came to understand what Quakerism was all about. Many Quakers stress the importance of inward light and how one’s actions should speak for what they believe. In doing so, it allows people to self-reflect and take time to acknowledge how their actions may affect the community of Friends. I was grateful for the opportunity to take this course and really come to understand Quakerism in a way that I can apply certain values to my own life.

I have gained a lot of insight and a whole new perspective during this semester on social separation relating to self-reflection, spiritual community, and respect. I have a newfound respect for the Haverford community and I owe members an apology for the way in which I behaved the previous semester. With this semester away, I have also come to value my education because my behavior nearly jeopardized my academic career at Haverford College. I would like to continue meeting with CAPS so that I can continually work on my progression at Haverford. I would also like to focus on the process of reconciliation, which I understand will take time. I need to work on rebuilding trust with other members in the community so that the social honor code will continue to be upheld, respected and lived out accordingly.

Sincerely,
Port

Starboard's Letter:

Although the resolutions dictated that Starboard write a letter to the community, she subsequently left the Haverford community permanently. When contacted, she was dismissive and said that writing her letter was not at all a priority for her. Because she was no longer a Haverford student, Honor Council had no way of pursuing the issue. As it seemed unlikely that Starboard would ever submit a letter, Honor Council consented to release this abstract without the letter from Starboard.

Questions for Discussion

1. Do you agree with Honor Council's decision to make both Port and Starboard joint confronting and confronted parties?
2. Should Honor Council trials include witnesses? Should they be allowed to remain anonymous, as Sculler asked to?
3. How should juries respond to parties that are not cooperating with the trial process?
4. How do you feel about Honor Council releasing the abstract without one of the letters?
5. How should Council respond in a situation where a party has left the community and does not fulfill the resolutions? Should they continue to pursue it?