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Summary

Daisy and Iris were two Bryn Mawr students taking a Haverford class, Professor Gardner’s 200 level April Showers class and lab. Professor Gardner assigned a take-home midterm exam to be completed in one 2 hour contiguous block of time. Half-way through the one-hour break between their class and lab, Daisy saw Iris take out the exam and work on it, before putting it away to go to lab. Believing that this meant Iris had not taken the exam in one sitting, Daisy brought her concerns to Professor Gardner. Professor Gardner informed Daisy that is was her responsibility under Haverford’s Honor Code to confront Iris, and urged her multiple times to do so. After multiple reminders from Professor Gardner, Daisy confronted Iris through email. Unsatisfied with Iris’s response, she asked that Iris bring herself to Honor Council, who consented to send the case to an Academic Trial.

Before the Trial

In her statement to Honor Council, Iris explained that she had completed the test during the full hour between her class and the accompanied lab, then typed up the already written essay portion later that night as she said Professor Gardner had allowed. Because she was “insecure about being misunderstood when describing how [she] had completed the typing portion later,” Iris had chosen an arbitrary time to write on her cover sheet, which she now saw as “incredibly stupid.”

When asked over email if she had said that students were allowed to type up their essays outside of the 2-hour block, Professor Gardner wrote: “I can't imagine anything that I would have said that would have led any reasonable person to construe [that] splitting the time in this way was an allowable course of action.”

Despite invitation from Honor Council and her considerable involvement in the confronting process, Professor Gardner declined to serve as a confronting party or be present at the trial.

Fact-Finding Portion
**Daisy’s Statement**

Daisy said that on the day the exam was handed out, the students in April Showers had an hour break between class and lab. About 30 minutes into the hour break, while sitting in the Gardner Lounge, she saw Iris open the midterm, take out a calculator, and start working on the exam. Daisy said she contacted Professor Gardner, who informed her that it was her obligation to confront Iris. She said she did not confront right away because she was unsure what was expected of her. When she finally emailed Iris, she got a short email back but wasn't satisfied with the response.

**Iris’s Statement**

Iris said that after class ended that day, she went to the Gardner Lounge and immediately started taking the midterm. She was initially sitting on the floor, but when a chair opened up she moved to it. She said she wrote the required essay by hand because she didn't have a laptop with her, finished the exam, and went to lab. After lab she went back to Bryn Mawr and typed up the essay she had written. She came back to Haverford later that night for her Arboretum planning session, printed the essay out, and turned it in before rehearsal.

**Questions From the Jury**

When asked to explain why she had written on the exam sheet that she took the exam in the evening when she had not, Iris said she had been worried that the professor would misinterpret if she wrote two different times (when she had hand-written and when she had typed it), so she just picked an arbitrary contiguous block of time. She said she had “messed up” on writing the time, and that she had slept, “an hour that week, tops.” She said she didn't think through her decision to write the incorrect time, and was upset that she had done something wrong.

Iris said that the week of the exam was the one-year anniversary of the murder of one of her best friends from home, and she had been a mess the whole week. She said she hadn't slept for a week and wasn't thinking clearly.

**Fact-Finding Part 2**

A juror asked Iris why she took the test after class when she only had an hour block of time to complete it, rather than waiting until she had a 2-hour block. Iris then explained that though this was her first year at college, she was accelerating to finish in three years because she was paying for college herself. Because of this, she was taking five classes and two labs that semester. She was also on the water skiing team and had a job. That week was increasingly busy with her other midterms and her plans to leave for home that Friday. As she knew she had to come back to Haverford that night for Arboretum planning session, she wanted to get the test done to turn it in so she wouldn't have to make a separate trip. She said the professor had mentioned that the exam shouldn't take more than an hour, and she knew she worked quickly, so she thought she would be fine. She said she finished the exam in the hour, but just barely. A detailed rundown of her day that she did upon request from the jury illustrated that she had no spare
Daisy reiterated that she had seen Iris take the exam out of its envelope halfway through the hour between class and lab. Iris said that when she moved from her spot on the floor to a chair, she packed everything up and then unpacked it. Daisy said she just saw Iris on the chair; she hadn't noticed her earlier.

A juror asked Iris if the professor had said that the typing time could be separate from the exam time. Iris said that the Professor had not said this, but that she had asked another student on her way out of class and he told her that was okay. At this point, the Chair shared the statement from Professor Gardner that this was not allowed. Iris was upset to learn that she had violated the rules on this, and shared in response to a juror’s question that she had not encountered restrictions on typing in the past.

When asked about the confronting process, Daisy commented that when she first told the professor about her suspicions, she didn't want to take the issue to Honor Council and felt it should be the professor's job to do so. She said she didn't confront Iris right away because she wasn't sure how.

At this point, the jury decided to speak to Iris and Daisy individually, speaking first to Daisy.

Daisy said she didn't believe that Iris had been working on her exam during the first part of the hour because she had seen her open the “sticky thing” on the exam envelope half an hour before lab. She said Iris was about 5-10 feet away, so she had a fairly clear view of her. She said she remembered Iris sitting down, and knew that she was working on the first page of the exam because of the distinctive layout of the first page. Daisy said that given how long various sections of the test were, Iris should not still have been on the first page after 30 minutes if she was able to finish in an hour. She said in addition that the Gardening Lounge wasn't busy at that time, and there were tables and couches open, so she found it implausible that Iris couldn't find a seat until half an hour in.

Daisy said she was bothered by Iris’s response to her initial confrontation email. She said she felt the natural response would be to offer an explanation. Rather, Iris had not said anything in the way of explanation, but just assured her that no violation had occurred and thanked her for confronting.

Daisy also said that the professor hadn't said in class that the exam would take an hour, and that in fact it had taken her the full two hours to complete.

The jury then spoke to Iris alone. A juror asked Iris if she had worked through the exam in order, or if she had skipped around. She said she didn't remember exactly where she was when she switched seats, but she was probably about halfway through the exam. When asked, she said she had gone back to the first page to look at a question at one point. A juror asked how long each portion took her. Iris said the first part was “pretty quick,” but reiterated that she had later gone back to it.

A juror asked if chairs were available when Iris first came into the Gardening Lounge, and if so, why she had waited a half an hour to move to a chair. Iris said that some chairs were available, but other students had spread out their stuff.

A juror asked Iris about her previous statement that the professor had said the exam would only take an hour to do. She said she had inferred this from the professor's statement that their one-hour class would be cancelled later that week so that they could
use that time to work on the exam. She also noted, when asked, that she didn’t do very well on the exam.

A juror asked why Iris didn't ask for an extension on the exam. She said she had already asked another professor for an extension, who said that they weren’t standard, so she felt uncomfortable asking Professor Gardener. Iris also said that it didn't seem fair for her to get an extension and not other students.

**Statement of Violation**

The jury was surprised at Iris’s packed schedule. Another juror said that Professor Gardener should have made it clear to the class whether typing time counted in the test-taking time.

A juror noted that there was a violation of the exam instructions regardless of whether the jury believed that Iris was telling the truth about the exam, which at least one juror was not certain of.

The jurors agreed that even if they believed Iris’s story, there was still a violation of the Honor Code. A juror who still had reservations about Iris’s account said she was content to continue with a statement of violation because the violation would still be very similar; either way Iris had split the time and misrepresented on her cover sheet when she completed the exam. Another juror agreed, saying, “Anything she might be lying to us about would fit under the umbrella of what we're saying [in the statement].” The jurors unanimously consented that there had been a violation of the Honor Code.

*Iris violated the Honor Code by returning to work on her exam after the end of the continuous two-hour time block allowed, thereby failing to follow her professor's instructions. She also violated the Honor Code by knowingly misrepresenting her test-taking time to her professor. Furthermore, when instructions were unclear to her, she did not ask her professor for clarification.*

The jury discussed whether they should update Professor Gardener. Some jurors were frustrated at the indirect involvement that the professor had had thus far, making judgments and accusations in her emails but declining to attend the trial. Some jurors expressed concern about the tone of Professor Gardener’s emails, and felt she would have taken a different tone had she been in the room with Daisy and Iris. The jury unanimously consented to let the professor know that they had come to a statement of violation and the trial would continue, but not inform her of the specifics.

**Circumstantial Portion**

Iris explained that during the week of the exam, her emotional state had been impacted by the anniversary of the death of a close friend of hers. She said that the memory of this event was hard to deal with: she slept little, and when she did, she had disturbing dreams. The whole week felt “nightmarish” to her; she felt isolated and unlike herself. For this reason, she wanted to be home for as much of the break as possible, and
leaving early made her midterms week incredibly busy. She explained that she had used the hour between class and lab to take the exam because she actually didn't have any other time. She emphasized that she felt extremely guilty about lying about the time she took and was now happy to have an opportunity to discuss the situation.

While Daisy sympathized with Iris’s personal situation, she said it was still hard to trust that Iris hadn't opened the exam later on and/or looked at her notes. She said that there were still significant trust issues between her and Iris.

Iris said she had made assumptions about the exam guidelines based on prior experiences, but she was now being more careful to be sure she understood each exam’s own guidelines. A juror asked about Iris’s relationship with Professor Gardener. Iris responded that they had not spoken before the incident, but she now had the sense the professor was angry with her. She said she wanted to speak with Professor Gardener again after the conclusion of the trial.

Another juror asked about Iris’s social experience in college. Iris explained that her Customs group was not especially close, though she had a good relationship with her roommate, and that she had joined the water skiing team to have a better support group. She felt she had found a close group there and was getting to know her teammates better this semester.

A juror asked Daisy how she felt about the Professor’s declining to be a confronting party in the case. Daisy said she felt Professor Gardener should have been a part of the trial, because she felt all the responsibility had instead been placed on her. Daisy said she didn’t like the Haverford Honor Code because of students' obligation to confront.

The jury then spoke with both parties individually. With Iris out of the room, Daisy reiterated her trust issues with Iris. She felt these were important to resolve since the two would be having classes together in the future. Responding to juror questions, Daisy said this was her first time confronting another student and that her dislike of Haverford's Honor Code would make her think twice about taking classes at Haverford in the future. She felt she had been pushed “very hard” throughout the confrontation process and did not want to risk having to go through it again.

Daisy left the room and Iris came back in. Iris wished to share some information about her family situation that she wanted as few people to hear as possible. She explained details of her parents’ lack of support of her being at Bryn Mawr, and said that she had been caught up in a good deal of family tension regarding her financial aid application during the week of the exam.

Iris said her parents hadn't been supportive about her friend's death, and she could not talk with them about what had happened. Iris said that when she went home, things were difficult with her family, but said she was happy she had gone, as she had gotten to be with her home friends who had been through the previous year’s events with her.

**Proposed Resolutions**

Both parties came into the room to discuss proposed resolutions. Daisy expressed uncertainty on what resolutions she would propose, but said she wanted to do what was fair. Since she felt Iris’s violation had devalued her own work in the class, a grade
penalty was appropriate. Iris agreed, and proposed getting no credit on the exam or no credit on the essay (as that was the only part of her exam that she had typed later in the day). Daisy said she didn't think Iris should get no credit on the exam, saying, “I don't want to ruin your life.” Iris said she was comfortable with getting a lower grade, or even a 0, in the class.

Iris felt she had learned a lot about both schools’ Honor Codes during this experience, and offered to write an essay on her feelings and potentially an article about the Honor Code for the newspaper.

A juror asked if Daisy wanted to discuss Professor Gardener’s involvement or lack thereof with the professor. Daisy said that she was “done with the situation, done with this, and [didn’t] want to talk about it more.” However, because Daisy remained concerned with Professor Gardener’s role in the process, a juror asked if Daisy would be okay with the jury conveying her concerns to Professor Gardener. Daisy said she would, but asked that this be done after grades were in. Iris said she was “more than willing” to talk to Professor Gardener to try to restore the trust between the two of them.

A juror asked if Iris was getting the support she needed and said she knew that Bryn Mawr's counseling services were not free. Iris responded that her Customs people weren't that helpful.

**Tentative Resolutions**

The jury began by making a list of issues they wanted to consider in the tentative resolutions including Iris's grade, Iris’s relationship with Daisy, Iris’s relationship with Professor Gardener, Daisy’s relationship with Professor Gardener, the test instructions, Iris’s emotional health, Daisy’s relationship with Haverford classes, and Professor Gardener’s relationship with the Honor Code and the trial process.

The jury decided to first discuss Iris’s grade. After expressing concerns over being too harsh or too lenient, the jury quickly decided that it would be fair for Iris to receive no credit on the essay portion of the midterm. However, some jurors were concerned about how this would affect her overall grade on the exam and wished to see the grade breakdown for the exam. The jury decided to keep this as a tentative resolution but come back to it during final resolutions.

The jury then discussed Iris and Daisy’s relationship. One juror said she didn’t know how much the jury could do. Another juror suggested that since Iris and Daisy only knew each other through the trial, the jury could ask them to spend time together outside the trial. Several jurors said they didn't feel like that was the jury's place. Feeling that further interaction would be beneficial but that the jury could not force it, the jury soon decided to drop this issue.

The jury discussed Iris’s relationship with Professor Gardener. A juror suggested that Iris should meet with the professor and explain the situation about her exam, as well as anything else she might feel comfortable discussing. Several jurors expressed a desire for a mediator to be present at this meeting, saying the presence of a mediator might put the student and professor on more equal footing. The jury agreed that having a mediator in the room would be worthwhile.

The jury moved on to Daisy’s relationship with Professor Gardener. Jurors quickly agreed Daisy shouldn’t have to talk to the professor, since she had already
invested so much time in this case. However, as Professor Gardener’s role in the trial had turned out to be a big issue in the proceeding, the jury decided it would be appropriate for two members of the jury to speak to Professor Gardener regarding this topic. They decided this meeting should happen after the end of the semester, to respect Daisy’s wishes about not sharing her concerns until after grades were in.

The jury discussed education about Haverford’s Honor Code at Bryn Mawr. A juror suggested that Daisy should have the option to write a letter about her experience to be released with the abstract, and others agreed. The jury attempted to brainstorm how to more effectively educate BMC students about the Haverford Code. A juror suggested that the Code should be emailed to every BMC student who registered for a Haverford course. However, the jury did not want to limit their resolution to just this suggestion, so they decided to speak more broadly on the subject, but name that course of action as a possibility. Another juror suggested that the abstract for this case could be released at Bryn Mawr as well as at Haverford, and others agreed.

Then jury then discussed Iris’s emotional health. Jurors were worried about her and the demands of her course of study, and sought to find a way to provide Iris with support that wouldn’t incur costs. One juror agreed to look into whether Iris might be able to take advantage of Bryn Mawr’s Graduate Assistants (GAs), and another juror would inquire about if there was any way they could get Iris access to CAPS at Haverford, since Bryn Mawr’s equivalent office charges students. The jury felt that they wanted to convey their concerns about her well-being to Iris, but that would be better done in person rather than through a written resolution. The jury decided to do this during the meeting to finalize resolutions.

The jury briefly discussed Daisy’s relationship with Haverford and the Honor Code. Jurors agreed that taking classes at Haverford was Daisy’s choice, and she would decide for herself whether or not she wanted to do so in the future. Several jurors reiterated their desire to ask Daisy to write a letter to be released with the abstract about her experiences in the trial process.

The jury finally discussed a professor’s role in confrontations between two students and potential resulting trials. Jurors found the language in the Code ambiguous, and several jurors noted that this issue had come up in the past. The jury ultimately decided to ask Council to discuss the role of the professor, as they generally felt it could be handled better than in this case.

The jury unanimously consented on the following tentative resolutions:

1. Iris will receive a zero on the essay portion of the midterm. *(One juror stood outside of consensus)*
2. Iris and one member of the jury will meet with Professor Gardener to discuss the circumstances surrounding Iris’s violation, the experience of the trial, and the current relationship between Iris and Professor Gardener. *(No jurors stood outside of consensus)*
3. Two members of the jury will meet with Professor Gardener after the end of the semester to discuss her role in the trial process. *(No jurors stood outside of consensus)*
4. Iris will write a letter to the community regarding her experiences with the trial process to be released with the abstract. *(No jurors stood outside of consensus)*
5. We encourage Daisy to write a letter to the community regarding her experiences with the trial process to be released with the abstract. (*No jurors stood outside of consensus*)

6. We suggest that Honor Council work with Bryn Mawr's Honor Board to educate Bryn Mawr students taking classes at Haverford about Haverford's Honor Code. One form this might take would be to email a copy of Haverford's Honor Code to all Bryn Mawr students registering for a Haverford class. (*No jurors stood outside of consensus*)

7. We suggest that this abstract be released to the Bryn Mawr community concurrent with its release to the Haverford community. (*No jurors stood outside of consensus*)

8. We suggest that Honor Council discuss the role of the professor in academic confrontations between students. (*No jurors stood outside of consensus*)

**Finalizing Resolutions**

The juror who looked into the GAs confirmed they were an option. The juror who had inquired about getting Iris access to CAPS said that was not an option. The jurors added a resolution urging Iris to seek support at Bryn Mawr, mentioning the GAs as a resource.

The jurors also added a phrase to clarify the timing of the meeting between Iris and Professor Gardener, specifying that it should occur before the end of the semester if possible. They also added a clause about Honor Board's discretion to the resolution about releasing this abstract to the Bryn Mawr community.

With new information on the course’s grade distribution, the jury ultimately felt they were comfortable with Iris getting no credit on the essay portion of the midterm, and that acting otherwise would be arbitrary. The jury felt this held Iris accountable for her actions.

Iris and Daisy entered the room. The parties did not have any issues with the resolutions. The timing of the meetings to be held with Professor Gardener was clarified. The jury told Iris that they purposely worded resolution two so she could choose to divulge circumstantial information to Professor Gardener if she wanted to, but could also stick just to the incident regarding the exam.

They jury asked Iris and Daisy about educating Bryn Mawr students about Haverford’s Honor Code. Daisy expressed doubts that many people would read the entire Haverford Code. Iris suggested that the document could be attached to an email summarizing the main differences between the two schools’ Honor Codes, including the obligation to confront at Haverford.

The jury asked to speak to Iris alone. As planned, they spoke about her emotional health and her support options. Iris said she was feeling much better about her relationship with Daisy; she felt they had a lot in common and were starting to see each other as people. Iris also said she was feeling good about her finals, and had even written an essay two weeks ahead of time.

Daisy returned to the room, and neither she nor Iris had any further comments. The jury then briefly discussed and unanimously consented to the final resolutions.

1. Iris will receive a zero on the essay portion of the midterm. (*No jurors stood outside of consensus*)
2. Iris and one member of the jury will meet with Professor Gardener to discuss the circumstances surrounding Iris’s violation, the experience of the trial, and the current relationship between Iris and Professor Garender. We suggest that this meeting should occur before the end of the semester, if possible. *(No jurors stood outside of consensus)*

3. Iris will write a letter to the community regarding her experiences with the trial process to be released with the abstract. *(No jurors stood outside of consensus)*

4. We suggest that Iris meet with a dean to discuss possible counseling options and resources at Bryn Mawr, possibly including the Bryn Mawr Graduate Assistants. *(No jurors stood outside of consensus)*

5. We encourage Daisy to write a letter to the community regarding her experiences with the trial process to be released with the abstract. *(No jurors stood outside of consensus)*

6. Two members of the jury will meet with Professor Gardener after the end of the semester to discuss her role in the trial process. *(No jurors stood outside of consensus)*

7. We suggest that this abstract be released to the Bryn Mawr community concurrent with its release to the Haverford community, at Honor Board's discretion. *(No jurors stood outside of consensus)*

8. We suggest that Honor Council work with Bryn Mawr's Honor Board to educate Bryn Mawr students taking classes at Haverford about Haverford's Honor Code. One form this might take would be to email a copy of Haverford's Honor Code, noting the differences between the two codes, to all Bryn Mawr students registering for a Haverford class. *(No jurors stood outside of consensus)*

9. We suggest that Honor Council discuss a professor's role in academic confrontations between students and in the trial process. *(No jurors stood outside of consensus)*

Post-Trial

Following a productive meeting with the professor in fulfillment of resolution six, one of the two jurors present at the meeting suggested that Honor Council discuss appropriate faculty involvement in trials and come up with guidelines of how to approach professors in similar situations in the future.

Letter to the Community

I have learned a tremendous amount about the Honor Code at Haverford this year. After spending so much time with the Honor Council, I am filled with an extreme sense of pride in our school and honor to be included in such a group. I am incredibly ashamed of myself, and I cannot believe that I did the worst thing possible to both our school and our community in violating the honor code. The honor code is the most unique, extraordinary part of the school, and everyone is responsible for maintaining the trust that it entails. I made the horrible mistake of allowing my personal issues to get in the way of my judgment and I betrayed this wonderful resource and sense of community by misrepresenting my time on my exam. Although I did not alter my exam answers in any way, and I did not take more than the allotted time, I lied about the time that I took the
exam. I have never regretted a decision more. I am incredibly grateful for the opportunity that I have had in being able to reflect on the honor code through this process, and this has given me an even greater appreciation for the honor code, and for the community that allows it to function as it does. I am very confident that I have learned a lot from my mistakes, and that I will be a much better person and community member in the future. I will never again allow my personal problems or difficulties distract me from my most important duty here at college: abiding by the honor code.