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Key:
[Indiana Jones (Indy)] - Confronted/confronting party  
[Archaeology] - Department of the three courses in question  
[Raiders of the Lost Ark 200] - Class taken by [Indy] (no violation)  
[Temples of Doom 250] - Class taken by [Indy] (1st violation)  
[Professor Brody] - Professor of [Temples of Doom 250]  
[The Last Crusade 300] - Class taken by [Indy] (2nd violation)  
[Professor Lindsey] - Professor of [The Last Crusade 300]

Summary/Pre-Trial:

[Indiana Jones (Indy)], a recent alumnus of Haverford, reported himself to Honor Council for three potential violations of the Honor Code that had taken place while he was a student at Haverford. Honor Council sent the case to an academic trial, in which the jury determined that two of the incidents that [Indy] reported constituted violations of the Honor Code. Throughout the trial the jury struggled with how to best restore [Indy] to the Haverford community as an alumnus rather than a current student. The final set of resolutions included a grade change in each of the courses in which a violation had occurred, as well as several resolutions directed towards community education and [Indy]'s restoration to the community.

Throughout the trial, [Indy] came from off campus and out of town to attend all of the trial meetings that he could attend. He was offered the opportunity to Skype in instead, but he refused that option in favor of getting to interact with the jury in person.

Because Honor Council was experiencing a heavy caseload when this trial was run, it was chaired by an experienced member of Council rather than by one of the co-chairs.
Fact Finding:

After offering some brief comments on the nature of his potential violations and his decision to come forward, [Indy] explained each of the three incidents to the jury. The first incident happened during his Freshman year at Haverford and involved taking 5 minutes extra to complete an unproctored, scheduled exam for [Raiders of the Lost Ark 200]. He said that he had not thought of this incident as a violation until he had gone to write his statement, but wanted to be completely honest with the jury. He also recalled to the jury that many of the other students taking the exam had stayed later than the given end time.

[Indy] then described the second incident. During the Fall of his Sophomore year, he had taken an extra 15 minutes on a take-home exam in [Temples of Doom 250]. He contextualized this incident, recalling that it had taken place during an extremely stressful semester in which [Indy] had been taking a heavy workload. He also described to the jury the increasingly tenuous relationship that he had had with Professor [Brody], the course professor, which had escalated throughout the semester and culminated in an incident during a class trip. [Indy] felt that the professor’s understanding of this (non-academic) incident was unfair and that, as a result, he and his grade had suffered without cause.

[Indy] felt that he had been treated unjustly, which pushed him to work even harder in the class. He said that he had taken the exam late at night and ended up going over time on it by about 15 minutes. Afterward, he felt that he had destroyed a semester’s worth of hard work and let his professor down in one single night. He continued by recalling that this feeling of unfairness and of being burned and stressed out all contributed to the violation. Despite all that had happened, [Indy] said that he still has a lot of respect for Professor [Brody] and reiterated that he wanted the jury to be respectful in any interactions with him.

[Indy] moved on to describing the third incident. During the spring of his Sophomore year, he had looked up a formula on an exam in [The Last Crusade 300]. [Indy] emphasized how stressful this semester had been for him as well. Throughout the semester, he had been dealing with the logistics of applying to study abroad, a process which had been fraught with complications and had necessitated that he change his schedule mid-semester. He said that his deans and professors were upset with how the situation ended up playing out, leaving [Indy] to feel as if he had to keep all his bases covered. He said that he had studied constantly as well as balanced his family pressures and own personal desire to be successful and be able to give back to his community.

He recalled that when he had taken the exam, there was one question for which he had forgotten a formula and felt that he had to go check to know for sure what the formula was. Afterwards, he said that, again, he felt that it was just an entire semester of work washed away and that he had made a terrible mistake.

After [Indy]’s statement, [Indy] answered the jury’s questions for clarification. For the first incident, [Indy] did not remember where the clock had been in the room, where the class
was taking the exam, and but did remember that the professor’s instructions had been to turn the exam in at his office after a certain amount of allotted time had elapsed.

[Indy] was asked whether he thought at all about the second incident at the time of the third incident, to which he replied that he didn’t think so. It was too much of a panicky moment. When asked how looking up the formula may have affected his exam grade, [Indy] said that it was a small part of the exam and that even without knowing the formula, he probably could have reconstructed an answer. He also clarified the timeline of the second and third incidents - both had happened during finals week of their respective semesters - and reiterated that both had come in the shadow of his stress throughout the year about the logistics of applying to study abroad, which among many factors was complicated by the fact that the class trip incident involving Professor [Brody] had ended up being discussed by the study abroad committee.

Finally, a juror asked at what point [Indy] had felt the need to come to Honor Council. [Indy] replied that it had been something that he had wanted to do, but there was a lot of fear involved in deciding not to at various moments. [Indy] also told the jury about a religious event that he had participated in after graduating, which had had a significant influence on him. After graduating, he had thought about the violation, but it didn’t really have the same weight until he had participated in the religious event. There was still fear after this event, but the desire to report himself to Honor Council had grown and grown until it finally was something that he felt he had to do.

Jury Deliberations/Statement of Violation:

The jury quickly agreed that the second and third incidents (taking the 15 extra minutes and looking up the formula) constituted violations of the Honor Code and moved on to discussing the more ambiguous first incident (taking 5 extra minutes on an in class exam).

Jurors agreed that [Indy]’s actions were not in the spirit of the code but disagreed over whether or not the constituted a violation. On one hand, [Indy] was not adhering exactly to exam instructions, but on the other hand, he was not trying to get ahead of the other students in taking extra time. The fact that he never saw the clock to confirm whether or not he was truly over time complicated the question.

The jury subsequently reconvened to word the statement of violation. All in the room agreed that the first incident did not constitute a violation beyond reasonable doubt, and thus drafted the following statement of violation:

[Indy] violated the Honor Code by taking extra time on an exam in [Temples of Doom 250] and by consulting disallowed sources on an exam in [The Last Crusade 300], thereby failing to follow exam instructions. [9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia].

3 of 11
Circumstantial Portion:

[Indy] began by discussing the first violation (taking extra time in [Temples of Doom 250]). He again recounted the pressures that had led to the violation and further elaborated upon the discomfort he’d felt about the professor’s behavior toward him throughout the semester. He added that during the exam, he had felt like he had wanted to finish the question he was working on, even if it meant going over time, and admitted that he had even tried to hide the fact that he’d gone overtime by copying and pasting the text into a new document to hide the timestamp.

As for the second violation, [Indy] reminded the jury of the continued stress that he had felt that semester, much of which came from the consequences of complications in his process of applying to study abroad. He had had to switch from a 200-level [Archaeology] class to a 300-level [Archaeology] class in order to be eligible, and also felt that he had to prove himself in light of the repercussions of his lingering misunderstanding with Professor [Brody] as it had become relevant to the application process. Despite his emphasis on the pressures that had engendered the violations, [Indy] expressed deep regret for his actions.

Finally, [Indy] elaborated on the circumstances surrounding him waiting so long to report the violations. He emphasized the fear that he had felt about the consequences of coming forward, the lack of feeling that he was a part of the Haverford community for the first part of his time at Haverford, and coming to care more about the Honor Code by moving towards a culture and friend group at Haverford where he felt more accepted. As he started to get more involved, he started to question how he could expect other people to respect the values he was promoting when he wasn’t respecting his own values. Most importantly, he emphasized the role that his faith had played in compelling him to come forward; he said that to deny an oath and to not fulfill a promise made is a huge burden to carry throughout one’s life, and he did not want to carry this burden with him. After participating in the religious event, he felt even more deeply compelled to admit what he had done.

When asked whether he would like to propose any resolutions, [Indy] suggested that he could retake the courses in question at a university near where he worked, or perhaps retake the exams (given sufficient time to study). He also wanted to write a letter to the community to speak to any individuals who are struggling in general or those who have violated the Honor Code in order to encourage them to come forward.

[Indy] expressed worry about a resolution involving reporting to graduate schools since he believed that it would have too profound an effect on his future. Similarly, he thought that a grade change in either class would not be appropriate because of the effort that he had put into the courses throughout the year. He reminded the jury that his grade had already been unfairly lowered by Professor [Brody], and added that when he had admitted the violation to Professor [Lindsey] (over the phone) before the trial, the Professor had commended [Indy] for coming forward and had not felt that any “punitive” measures, such as a grade change, would be necessary.

The jury began their questions by asking [Indy] what he thought he would gain from his
proposed resolution of retaking an equivalent course; [Indy] said he had thought of it in terms of putting in hard work to demonstrate that he could complete the class with integrity. The jury also asked [Indy] about his recent discussion with Professor [Lindsey]; [Indy] said that he had called to explain the incidents to Professor [Lindsey] himself and that Professor [Lindsey] had congratulated him on having achieved a level of academic integrity in turning himself in on this. The jury asked [Indy] why he had not talked to someone, perhaps his dean, about the problems he was having with Professor [Brody], which he admitted might have been helpful.

[Indy] was then asked whether reflecting on these two violations had affected how he completed his academic work during his remaining time at Haverford. He conveyed that his reflection on the violations had been minimal since thinking of them was troubling and made him question his integrity. When asked whether he had considered coming forward to Honor Council before this point, [Indy] said that it had definitely gone through his head. But he was afraid that the study abroad program could be put into jeopardy by him coming to Council. He feared for his relationships with the professors and deans who had helped him switch into new classes, as well as with the study abroad committee. He also pointed to fear of academic repercussions and being judged by others.

One juror wanted to know how he thought his trial experience would have been different had he gone through this process when he was still at Haverford. [Indy] said that he is a completely different person now than he was at the time of the violations since he had had time to reflect, and that he wouldn’t have shared as much back then. In terms of what he could have gotten out of the process, he thought that he probably could have gotten a lot of the same things out of it and would have had the opportunity to reflect earlier on what it means to take courses and take exams at Haverford.

Referring to [Indy]’s comments that the violations in a broad sense had come from failing to prioritize his integrity over his desire to excel academically, a juror asked what could be done to educate the Haverford community about the detriments of this mindset. [Indy] responded that he thought that his case was very representative of the massive burden, guilt, and insecurity that can act as a deterrent to anyone who might be coming close to falling into a similar moment of stress as he had. He thought that anyone looking at this case in the future will see someone coming forward after several years, clearly weighed down, and that it could help people to keep things in perspective in the moment.

[Indy] further commented that just going through this process was doing a lot to help him get rid of his guilt in terms of knowing that he’s been listened to and heard, even in ways that he didn’t expect. He added that since these were things that he didn’t get to share with anyone else, the trial had given him an opportunity to truly reflect on everything that had happened with a new perspective.

Jury Deliberations pt. 1:

After the jury reminded themselves of [Indy]’s proposed resolutions, they began by
discussing his desire to write a letter to the community. They agreed that [Indy] should write a letter to the community and discussed whether it should be released with the abstract or emailed out separately. One juror brought up the idea of a resolution allowing [Indy] to interact more directly with Haverford students as a means of restoration.

The jury then began to discuss the idea of a grade change, initially expressing a variety of opinions on whether or not a grade change was appropriate in this case, but agreeing that [Indy] should be held accountable for the violations, and perhaps for failing to come forward sooner. The jury brought up the idea of recommending that the violation be reported to institutions of higher learning, which they dismissed on the grounds that it seemed a consequence that would have a disproportionate effect on [Indy]’s life relative to the nature of the violation. As for other possibilities for resolutions addressing accountability, the jury discussed the possibility of conditionally withholding [Indy]’s transcript until he had completed certain resolutions, as well as [Indy]’s own suggestion to enroll in similar classes as a means of accountability.

The jury continued to discuss whether or not they could hold [Indy] accountable without permanently altering his transcript. One juror thought that a grade change was necessary to repair the imbalance in grades that the violations may have caused. Jurors also expressed the opinion that [Indy] coming forward of his own volition and then going through the trial process was a form of accountability in and of itself, but agreed that this was not sufficient to fully address accountability.

Generally agreeing at this point that a grade change may be necessary for accountability, the jury moved on to discuss the degree of grade change; they mostly agreed that ½ of a letter grade reduction in each class would be sufficient, although some jurors still worried that a larger grade change might be necessary to address accountability. The jury also recalled that [Indy] believed that his grade in [Temples of Doom 250] had already been lowered ½ a letter grade after the incident with Professor [Brody], but felt that it was not their job to remedy this based only on [Indy]’s account.

The jury moved on to discuss how best to address education and restoration\(^1\). They appreciated [Indy]’s suggestion of retaking the classes, but did not see this as necessary since they did not have any doubts about [Indy]’s ability to complete the coursework. One juror suggested that [Indy] could work towards restoration by instead putting his time towards tutoring at his local university; as a tutor in [Archaeology], [Indy] would have the chance to model his values of personal and academic integrity. The jury also thought it would be beneficial for [Indy] to have a conversation with Professor [Brody] to begin to restore any breaches of trust that had occurred both in light of and independently of the violation. They felt that restoration with Professor [Lindsey] had already been addressed through [Indy]’s phone call with him.

Finally, for the purpose of community education, the jury suggested that [Indy] should write an anonymous letter to the last three graduating classes. This would both allow him to

\(^1\) The three goals of any Honor Council trial are education, restoration, and accountability.
reach some of the classes that had been present at Haverford when the violations occurred, as well as to provide insight on what it means to be a Haverford graduate in light of his experiences.

The jury then attempted to consent on the grade change resolution, but ultimately was unable to consent to the resolution since three jurors chose to stand outside consensus. Two were uncomfortable with the idea of a grade change at all and the third worried that the jury had not properly distinguished between the nature of the two violations (taking 15 extra minutes as opposed to looking up a formula) in making this recommendation. The jury adjourned until they could further discuss the grade change resolution.

**Jury Deliberations pt. 2 and Tentative Resolutions.**

The jury continued at length to discuss whether or not the proposed grade change of $\frac{1}{2}$ a letter grade in each of the two classes was appropriate. Many jurors felt that such a grade change was necessary for [Indy]’s accountability and restoration to the community, but some were hesitant, feeling that it was overly punitive for the degree of the violations. The jury also pondered how the outcome of the trial might have been different had [Indy]’s violations been noticed several years ago when the incident had taken place. The jury respected [Indy] coming forward as an alumnus when he could have continued to let the violations go unnoticed, but also acknowledged that some degree of accountability may have been avoided in his waiting to come forward; they felt that if the trial had happened when [Indy] was a student, the resolutions would almost have certainly included a grade change.

Some jurors were hesitant about recommending a grade change; one felt that since the portions of the exams in question were relatively small, a grade change would unfairly invalidate the remainder of [Indy]’s work in the courses, while others still felt that there might be some other way of holding [Indy] accountable. Some jurors felt that the act of [Indy] coming forward and participating so actively in the trial process represented a great deal of accountability and restoration in and of itself. The jury also discussed at length the meaning of a Haverford degree and how the integrity of [Indy]’s degree would be affected by the presence or absence of a grade change recommendation. After much discussion, the jury felt comfortable including the grade change resolution in the tentative set of resolutions, with the intention of asking [Indy] about alternate possibilities for accountability at the finalizing meeting.

The jury consented to the following tentative resolutions:

1. *The jury recommends that [Indy]’s grade be lowered by half a letter grade in both [Temples of Doom 250] and [The Last Crusade 300]. (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside)*
2. *[Indy] will make every reasonable attempt to volunteer as a tutor at a local university for at least one academic semester. (10 jurors consent, 0 stand outside)*
3. *[Indy] will write a letter to the community to be released with the abstract and distributed directly to the current Haverford student body in an email. (10 jurors consent, 0 stand outside)*
4. [Indy] will write a letter reflecting on the meaning of a Haverford degree, which will be sent anonymously to the members of the last three graduating classes. (10 jurors consent, 0 stand outside)

5. The jury encourages [Indy] to contact [Professor Brody] to initiate a restorative dialogue. (10 jurors consent, 0 stand outside)

6. The jury recommends that these incidents not be reported to institutions of higher learning. (10 jurors consent, 0 stand outside)

Resolutions as a whole: 10 jurors consent, 0 stand outside

Finalizing Resolutions:

In response to the jury’s question regarding suggestions for avenues of accountability, [Indy] offered the information that he had received Honors when he graduated from Haverford and felt obligated to tell the jury so that they could consider that in coming formulating final resolutions. He also reiterated that he felt that having to retake the classes would serve as a form of accountability since it would require a commitment from him that would force him to work hard and further reflect on the violations.

Responding to the grade change resolution, [Indy] did not see a grade change in either of the classes as appropriate since he felt that they would invalidate a semester of work in each class for violations that had happen in the final moments of their respective semesters. Even so, [Indy] emphasized that he felt privileged to have earned the grades that he did with the help of professors, friends, and family, and respected the right of the jury to make the appropriate decision.

[Indy] added that he feared that the grade change could end up being punitive as it could affect his current employment. He felt that he would be obliged to submit an updated transcript to his employer, which could prompt suspicion and compromise his position. He offered the stripping of his Haverford honors as an equivalent avenue for accountability that did not have the same potential to jeopardize his employment.

One juror asked whether [Indy] felt that the current set of resolutions would be sufficient to alleviate his personal guilt. [Indy] responded that he would definitely feel satisfied and that he was taking all of the necessary steps. He clarified that this would not mean erasing his mistakes, but that he would feel satisfied in his working with representatives of the community to come to a resolution.

Jury Deliberations pt. 1:

The jury considered the possibility of recommending that [Indy]’s Haverford honors be revoked. Some jurors felt that this could serve an analogous role to the grade change without the same potentiality for unintended consequences; however, others felt a recommendation that [Indy]’s honors be revoked indicated a much broader judgement on his integrity as a Haverford
student than was appropriate, since the majority of his coursework over his Haverford career had been conducted in accordance with the Honor Code.

The jury was troubled by the possibility of the grade changes impacting [Indy]’s current employment status and attempted to speculate on how such an impact could play out. The jury spent time discussing the benefits and potential pitfalls of recommending the revoking of honors versus recommending grade changes, with some jurors still held the opinion that neither was necessary. They also briefly discussed the possibility of withholding [Indy]’s transcript until his resolutions had been completed as a means of accountability. Feeling that additional discussion was necessary before consensus, the jury adjourned.

**Jury Deliberations pt. 2 and Final Resolutions:**

With some jurors still uncomfortable with the idea that a grade change could affect [Indy]’s current employment, the jury considered how it might mitigate this possibility. Without wanting to be dishonest, the jury did not see a way of avoiding [Indy]’s employer noticing the grade change if a new transcript were to be requested or if [Indy] felt obliged to submit an updated transcript of his own volition. In the end, the jury decided that it would write a letter on [Indy]’s behalf explaining the significance of the grade change, which it would provide to [Indy] should he feel it would be helpful to submit with an updated transcript if he were ever required to do so. With this compromise, the jury was able to consent to a set of final resolutions that retained the grade change recommendation.

The jury consented to the following final resolutions:

1. **The jury recommends that [Indy]’s grade be lowered by half a letter grade in both [Temples of Doom 250] and [The Last Crusade 300]. The jury does not require that [Indiana Jones] report this grade change to his current employer. (9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)***

2. **The jury will write a letter explaining the context of the grade change which will be available to [Indiana Jones] if he ever finds that it is needed. The jury will write this letter by the end of the third quarter. (9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)***

3. **[Indiana Jones] will make every reasonable attempt to volunteer as a tutor at a local university for at least one academic semester. (9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)***

4. **[Indiana Jones] will write a letter to the community to be released with the abstract and distributed directly to the current Haverford student body in an email. The letter will be written by the end of the third quarter. (9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)***

5. **[Indiana Jones] will write a letter reflecting on the meaning of a Haverford degree, which will be sent anonymously to the members of the last three graduating classes. The letter will be written by the end of the third quarter. (9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)***

6. **The jury encourages [Indiana Jones] to contact [Professor Brody] to initiate a
resorative dialogue. (9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)
7. The jury recommends that these incidents not be reported to institutions of higher learning. (9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

Resolutions as a whole: 9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia

Post-Trial:
The resolutions were not appealed.

[Indiana Jones]’ Letter to the Community:

Peace to You All,

I wanted to take the opportunity to first apologize. Haverford was a community that granted me abundance unimaginable and my actions were disgustingly ungrateful for the mercy of such an experience. From my very core, I am deeply sorry. I pray that you may learn from the following reflections and labor to prevent anyone else from going through this painful experience, whether it might be you, your peers, or the larger community. First, this experience taught me about perspective. The underlying theme of my dishonesty was panic, pressure, and short-sightedness—while having spent an entire term producing quality work in highly demanding classes, I succumbed to dishonesty literally in the last moments. The pressure of excelling in a difficult class, along with my total course load and non-academic stress, compounded into horrible split second decisions that threw away an entire semester’s integrity. Had I taken a moment to gain perspective beyond my exams, I believe that these actions would never have taken place. I encourage you all to never forget the bigger picture, whether you are venturing into morally questionable ground or are overburdened by college life—it’s better to ‘break and reflect’ than to ‘crash and burn’.

Second, this experience taught me that in violating the Code, I laid upon myself a heavy moral burden. Violating the code left me with significant guilt, shame, and fear. I tried admitting my mistakes afterwards, but consistently worried about the penalties that lied ahead—I felt that admitting my guilt would destroy already strained relationships and that I would be shunned by my community. Well after graduation, this moral anguish followed me to the point that I feared losing all moral value from my life. While the Honor Council process restored me to the community, the emotional pain that I experienced prior to it was extremely distressing.

Third, I learned that establishing my identity and engaging in my community uplifted my sense of principle. Towards the end of my college career, I began to develop a sense of who I wanted to be in life, leading me to develop steadfast ethics and morals. Simultaneously, I began to participate in organizations that aimed to uphold these values alongside allies who felt similarly about social justice. These two movements, both the development of my morals alongside the development of my activism, led me to revisit my suppressed guilt: how was I
respecting these allies of mine when I violated the Code that we all agreed to; how could I advocate that others respect my values when I did not respect the values of the Code? I strongly encourage Haverford student to reflect upon the importance of affirming principles within themselves and then to find movements that engage those very ideals.

On this note, I wanted speak about the importance of diversity. While reclaiming my political ethics laid the groundwork to confronting myself, it did not bring me far enough. It was not until I found myself immersed in a thriving community of my own identity (outside of Haverford) that I felt confident enough to fully act upon my principles. It is truly indescribable to find yourself at home with those you immediately identify with—a space that naturally compels its members to strive for excellence. I hope that this example highlights the need for more than just blanket diversity at Haverford, but, rather, the intelligent development of distinct communities—communities whose members cannot survive without any companions of their own. May those struggling through their identities always find sizable cohorts to encourage them to moral commitment—so that they may not be as ethically ungrounded as I was.

Finally, I wanted to thank you for holding me through this process with compassion; it is more than I deserve. In addition to hoping that I personally remember this humbling experience, I hope that it also leaves a positive impact upon the Haverford community

Discussion Questions:

1. How does the significance of the three trial goals (education, restoration, and accountability) change when the confronted party is an alum?
2. What resources does a student have if they feel they are not being treated fairly by a professor?
3. What impact, if any, should the fact that [Indy] reported himself after graduation have had on the jury’s resolutions?