Abstract discussion will be held on Thursday, April 11, 2013 at 7:30 PM in Ryan Gym.

Atticus Finch and Boo Radley:
An Honor Council Abstract
Released Spring 2013

This abstract was released in accordance to the timeline specified by the Students’ Association Constitution. Both the confronted and confronting parties consented to the release of this abstract. (The addition of this disclaimer began in Spring 2010).

Case Summary: Atticus Finch, a student in Professor Boo Radley’s Mockingbirds 200 class, used tools that Professor Radley had prohibited in the exam instructions. Honor Council reviewed the case and agreed that because of the way the situation had been handled before it came to Honor Council, the goals of a trial had already been met.

Summary of Statements:

Atticus Finch was a member of Professor Boo Radley’s Mockingbirds 200 class. The evening before an exam in that class, Radley emailed out the exam instructions. Among other things, the instructions clarified explicitly what tools could be used.

Soon after the exam, Atticus Finch sent an email to Professor Radley. It said that Finch had read over the instruction email again and realized that he had used a prohibited tool. He was apologetic and explained his mistake.

Radley asked to meet with Finch and explained how the the use of that extra tool gave him an advantage over other students and saved him time that other students did not have on the test. Radley noted that even though the mistake was an accident, it could have been prevented by carefully looking over the instructions ahead of time. The professor asked that Finch turn himself in to Honor Council because though the grade change and breach of trust between the professor and student was small, a greater issue of community trust presented itself.

After the conversation between Finch and Radley, the Professor felt that his trust in Finch was restored. He did change Finch’s grade on the exam to more accurately reflect what it should have been without the prohibited tool. This case was then brought to Honor Council to open the possibility of taking further action if deemed necessary.
**Honor Council’s Role:** Honor Council decided to take no further action on this case because all trial goals had already been met prior to the case’s review. Every trial has three goals: accountability, education, and restoration. If a case is brought to trial, the jury decides whether or not a violation of the Honor Code has occurred. If the jury decides that a violation of the Honor Code occurred, it is their responsibility to work with the confronting and confronted parties to write resolutions that address accountability, education, and restoration. When violations of the Honor Code occur, juries are meant to make sure that a student is held responsible for the violation. Further, a jury is meant to ensure that a party that commits a violation has the necessary knowledge to prevent mistakes in the future. Finally, the jury finds ways to mend any breaches of trust between parties and the community at large. The trial resolutions should restore the confronted party such that they are a full, trustworthy member of the community.

Honor Council felt that all three of the trial goals above had been met by the time it saw the case. Finch’s grade change held him accountable. Professor Radley had made clear how to avoid this mistake in the future, and Honor Council agreed that it was unlikely to happen again. Most of Council also felt that much of the breach of trust had been restored by the conversation between Radley and Finch as well as Finch’s ownership over his actions. However, Honor Council recognized its responsibility to inform the Haverford community of breaches in community trust, and how they are handled. Therefore, Honor Council consented to releasing an abstract detailing this case, despite the fact that it did not result in a trial.

**Discussion Questions:**

1) Should Honor Council have sent this case to an Academic Trial? Should any case with potential for a grade change go to trial?
2) Professor Radley said that even though the grade change would be small, the breach in trust was not negligible. Do you agree? Is there any more that should have been done to restore the breach of trust with the Professor and/or community?