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This abstract was not released in accordance to the timeline specified by the Students’ Association Constitution. The confronting party consented to the release of the abstract. Two confronted parties consented to the release of the abstract, one did not.

Key:
Confronting party: Professor Murry
Confronted party: Charles Wallace
Confronted party: Calvin
Confronted party: Meg
Course: Tessering 244

Summary/Pre-Trial:
Three students, Meg, Charles Wallace, and Calvin, were confronted by their Tessering 244 professor, Professor Murry, about a potential violation he noticed after grading their exams. The jury initially came to a statement of violation for all three students. Throughout the trial, the jury believed that the students were being dishonest, but did not believe beyond a reasonable doubt that Charles had violated the Honor Code. Thus the jury moved forward with the trial for just Meg and Calvin, who admitted to lying. Only during finalizing did Calvin and Meg admit that Charles Wallace had cheated with them on the exam, and a subsequent trial was held for Charles Wallace, “A Wrinkle in Time Part 2”1. Calvin and Meg appealed the resolutions, including two semesters of separation and a 0.0 in the class, which were upheld by the President of the College.

Fact Finding:
One juror did not arrive to the Fact Finding meeting, so the trial proceeded with only nine jurors. Professor Murry described that he had noticed similarities between the midterm exams of

1 A Wrinkle in Time Part 2.
the three students. The exam in question was open book and open notes, and could be taken anywhere in the building it was administered. However, no collaboration was allowed, and students were not supposed to talk. The exams were also designed to be difficult to complete within the allotted time. Neither Calvin nor Meg had finished the previous midterm for this reason.

The students explained that they all took the exam in the same room, with just the three of them there. During the exam, the three shared Charles Wallace’s textbook because he was the only student in the group that had bought one. They also shared an extensive study guide made by Charles Wallace, who had shared it with Calvin and Meg prior to the exam to aid their studying. Each of them had gone through the guide and modified it to fit their specifications. Meg and Charles Wallace both viewed it on their laptops during the exam, while Calvin had printed the document out. When speaking with the students alone, Charles Wallace said that he was not aware that the other students were using his guide during the exam. However, the jury had a hard time believing that Charles Wallace would not have noticed Calvin’s printed study guide if it were on the table, since they were already passing a textbook around. Calvin and Meg also shared Meg’s phone which they used as a calculator, because Calvin’s had died. The two students said that they were careful to erase their calculations prior to passing the phone. The students also explained how they had sat along one side of a large table, with about a chair’s width between each of them. The order they sat in was: Charles Wallace, Meg, Calvin.

Professor Murry explained that when grading the exams, he had come across an unusual calculation error on Calvin’s exam for Problem 4. The next exam in his stack was Charles Wallace’s, and in correcting this, he also found the same unusual error. This made him suspicious, and he remembered an earlier incident in the semester where Charles Wallace, Calvin and Meg had handed in a problem set with identical cover pages. The students had explained that because Calvin and Meg were running late to class, Charles Wallace had printed all of their problem sets and attached identical versions of his own cover page to each, as a nice gesture. After hearing this, Professor Murry had not been concerned at all. However, in noticing these strange similarities between Calvin and Charles Wallace’s exams, he decided to look at Meg’s, and found the same mistake. No other students in the large class had made this error. The students’ exams were otherwise almost identical, and contained another unique error on a different question which only one other student had made; however, the other student used a very different method. These similarities, to Professor Murry, seemed very suspicious, and were unlike anything he had seen in his many years of teaching at Haverford. As a result, he decided to speak with the students.

During his conversations with the students, Professor Murry was convinced that a violation had occurred. Calvin had offered an explanation as to why he might have arrived at the wrong answer for Problem 4 - saying that a calculator input error would have created the error. The jury found this odd, as he had written down the individual products correctly, yet said he had used a different formula to save time. Charles Wallace had also offered the same explanation for
Problem 4, and said that he thought the other error came from copying a number out of the textbook, where a similar problem was used as a completed example. In Meg’s response to Problem 4, she had written out the correct formula to find the sum without writing out any of the products, but had reached the same answer as the other students.

The jury examined the three exams and noticed that the formatting of the students’ answers for almost all of the exam, and particular Charles Wallace’s and Calvin’s answers to Problem D, were identical.

In addition to discussing the exams, the jury spoke with the students about their relationship to each other. Calvin and Charles Wallace lived on the same floor, and Meg and Calvin had been close friends for some time. Meg spent a great deal of time in the dorm of Calvin and Charles Wallace, and Calvin often visited her at Bryn Mawr (Meg’s home institution). The jury then asked to talk to Meg and Charles Wallace, each individually. Meg mentioned that after they had found out Professor Murry wanted them to contact Honor Council, Charles Wallace had seemed “passive aggressive” for a while, which she said she did not understand. Charles Wallace mentioned that for a few weeks after this, Calvin and Meg had stayed solely at Bryn Mawr, and he had hardly seen them at all. Charles Wallace also explained that on many occasions during the semester, he had helped Calvin and Meg with things like printing problem sets, and that sending them his study guide had been similar to this. Charles Wallace also mentioned that although he did not wish to speculate, he thought that Calvin and Meg might have had a lot of trouble finishing the exam if they had been sharing a calculator.

Calvin and Charles Wallace’s explanations for how they might have gotten their answers for Problem 4 were plausible, but did not address the issue that all of them had the same answer. Charles Wallace had also explained that the other mistake was the result of his copying the incorrect value from the textbook rather than using the information from the test. Calvin and Meg seemed to indicate that this was probably how they came to their answers as well, but said that they honestly did not remember. In general, all the students said that they did not know how they had come to the same uniquely wrong answers, but that the test had been very rushed and Charles Wallace in particular mentioned that he was prone to small mistakes like math errors when under time pressure.

One other issue that was brought up during the meeting was that the exam instructions had said that students could use the textbook as well as any notes that they had taken themselves. The students said that they had not realized this, but could see how it might be a problem that they all used a joint study-guide. Professor Murry, however, said that this was not of much concern to him - the purpose of that rule was to encourage students to take their own notes, because he believed that this was better for their understanding, but that he would not have felt any need to involve Honor Council just because of them using the same study guide.

After the meeting ended, the jury briefly shared their reactions, which were largely feelings of confusion and suspicion. The jury then decided to meet at a later time to deliberate on whether they thought a violation of the Honor Code had occurred.
Jury Deliberations part I:

Before this meeting, the trial chair emailed the parties and received their consent in order to proceed with a nine-person jury. At the beginning of the meeting, most jurors shared their suspicion that something had happened but there was a general confusion pertaining to the details. Many jurors felt torn because the students seemed nice and genuine. One juror did not feel very suspicious, and felt that chance might explain the situation. The jury, after deliberation, decided that all three collaborating was more likely than all other scenarios.

Most of the jury felt that it was very difficult for them to imagine a scenario in which nothing dishonest occurred. On the other hand, some jurors felt that as members of the Haverford and Bryn Mawr communities, the students had a right to be trusted unless there was evidence that showed otherwise, and they were not sure that the existing evidence proved beyond a reasonable doubt that a violation had occurred.

As there were conflicting feelings, the jury decided to go over the facts and make a list of what made them suspicious or not suspicious. Under “suspicious” people listed the statistical improbability of three students - who took the test in the same room with no one else - having the same unique mistakes in a large class. Suspicions related to time pressures also figured in this list, particularly the fact that Calvin and Meg had shared a phone calculator and it seemed that having access to a calculator only half of the time would likely have made it impossible to finish the exam. Some jurors also felt that sharing the book would have increased the time pressure on the test.

Under “not suspicious” the jurors listed the fact that the students’ stories largely lined up with each other and that they all seemed very genuine. In addition, the use of the same study guide was also listed as a possible explanation for how they came to the same answers. The fact that they had all done well on the other exams, and the fact that they could show a way of coming to the incorrect answer on problem 4 also played into the jury's feelings of non-suspicion. After making this list, the jury decided to end the meeting, and continue deliberating at a later meeting.

Jury Deliberations part II/Statement of Violation:

Firstly, the jury discussed how they wished to treat consensus with only nine jurors, and decided to allow up to one person to stand outside on consensus decisions. The trial chair asked the jury to consider whether they were convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that a violation occurred. The jury discussed what “a reasonable doubt” meant, and decided that it applied to a situation where no plausible alternative could be imagined. They decided that in making their decisions, each of them would follow their own sense of what is plausible.

After summarizing the main points of the previous meeting, the jury shared individual thoughts about how suspicious they felt that something dishonest had happened. Almost all the jurors felt somewhat or very suspicious. The jury also discussed whether or not they could
amend a statement of violation at later stages in the trial, and concluded that they could.

At this point, the weight of the room was that most people were very suspicious that something had happened, and few people could think of any reasonable alternative scenarios. One juror felt suspicious but was also conflicted about saying that the students had done something wrong when there was no concrete proof. Another was unsure of their thoughts. However, since most people in the room were convinced some violation occurred, the jury discussed the pros and cons of coming to a statement of violation. A statement of violation would ensure that any breach of trust was hopefully resolved. Some jurors also expressed the feeling that, if the students really had done something dishonest, then it would leave a large breach of trust unresolved if the jury came to a statement of non-violation; conversely, if they had not done anything, but the jury came to a statement of violation, they could at least benefit from resolutions restoring trust, and there would be no breach in the community. As a result, there was a feeling that it would be better to be wrong by coming to a statement of violation than the other way around.

Finally, the jury decided that they would come to a statement of violation, in which they chose to directly say that each student had violated the Code. The wording of the statement was vague because while the juror was convinced something had happened, they did not have a good sense of what that was. Although jurors had previously brought up the fact that it was possible only two of the three students were actually involved, the jury felt that it was so much more likely that all three were at least aware of something going on that they felt it was beyond a reasonable doubt that all three were involved. One juror decided to stand outside on the statement, feeling that it would be wrong to unequivocally state that they had violated the Code without direct proof. The jury then consented to the following statement of violation:

Charles Wallace, Calvin and Meg violated the Honor Code in the taking of this exam. (8 jurors consent, 1 stands outside)

Circumstantial Meeting:

This was the first meeting attended by the bi-co liaison who was present for all remaining meetings. The meeting began with the students and Professor Murry asking for more detail about the jury’s statement of violation. The jury explained that they did not have a specific narrative of events but were convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that something had happened. The juror who stood outside explained why they had done so.

All three students maintained that nothing had happened, which made it difficult for the circumstances of the violation to be discussed. The jury also discussed some of the ways in which this situation had affected the students and the professor. The students all said that the process had been unpleasant for them and that they were all taking extra care to take exams separately and not study together. Professor Murry said that he was still suspicious of the students, and had considered changing his exam procedures so that students would all take the
exam in the same room and thus ‘proctor’ each other – something that he was reluctant to do.

The discussion also covered ideas for tentative resolutions. With all three students still maintaining that they had not done anything wrong, Professor Murry did not feel able to suggest any resolutions without a specific violation given to him by the jury. The students indicated that they would be happy to retake the exam, but Professor Murry did not think this would be fair to other students in the class who did not get a chance to retake the exam, nor would it give him a greater sense of trust in the students. Similarly, while Charles Wallace suggested that the exam be dropped entirely from the grading for the course, this did not seem helpful for the professor or for the community.

The trial chair suggested that all three students receive a 0 on the exam, since this would at least ensure that Professor Murry did not have to assign a grade to work that he did not trust. The students reacted very negatively to this, with Calvin stating that this resolution would unfairly impact his grade in the class and he would then become angry with the trial process. Professor Murry offered to meet with each student individually to show them what their grades would be with and without a 0 on the exam, but they declined, not seeing the point of it.

Since the discussion of tentative resolutions was largely unproductive, the jury decided to speak to each of the students individually again, to go into more detail about some of the facts of the case brought up at the Fact Finding meeting. Before speaking with the students, the jurors briefly discussed their thoughts about the meeting so far, with many feeling concerned that the students, and Calvin in particular, were worried about their grades more than anything else.

In speaking with the students individually, the jury asked how they were feeling both about the process and about the dynamic of their friendship. Meg and Calvin both explained that they were frustrated about being suspected of something they had not done. Charles Wallace was also frustrated about this, and described being extremely stressed to the point of hardly eating or sleeping for weeks. While Meg felt that the friendship between the three of them was as intact as it had been before the exam, Calvin said that he was not sure how Charles Wallace and Meg felt about each other, and Charles Wallace described the dynamic as strained, saying that there was definitely a breach of trust between them. However, he clarified that most of the tension was in academic settings rather than socially.

In terms of studying for the exam, the students all gave somewhat different accounts of when they received Charles Wallace’s study guide, and how long they studied for the exam. The jury was unsure whether these differences were meaningful or simply due to the amount of time between the exam and the trial. While studying in the room directly before taking the exam, the students described a somewhat disorganized situation with many papers on the table. It seems this was one reason Charles Wallace might not have realized that Calvin was using his study guide in its printed form.

The jury also asked about how the students were able to share materials – and, in Calvin and Meg’s case, a calculator – given the fast pace of the exam, yet were still able to finish on time. Meg and Calvin explained that they had rarely needed the calculator at the same time –
Calvin pointed out that he writes much more slowly than either Meg or Charles Wallace, so he was never on the same question as them, and Meg mentioned that none of them needed the book very often, as the study guide was so extensive. Charles Wallace, however, said that he had used his calculator a lot on the exam and did not know whether it would have been possible to finish if he had only had access to it half the time.

As for how the students had reached the same answers, Calvin and Meg said that they did not know, with Calvin explaining that a number of calculation errors could result in the answer they all got for question 4, as well as the fact that they had worked together so much during the semester, including in studying for the exam. Charles Wallace also said that he did not know, and said that he had been very focused on his own exam and had not noticed anything untoward throughout the 90 minutes.

Charles Wallace also talked about wanting very much to restore trust with Professor Murry, and feeling terrible that the professor was suspicious of him. He suggested perhaps that the students could work as TAs for Professor Murry to give them a chance to ‘prove themselves’ to him in an academic context after the trial process was over.

**Jury Deliberations Part I:**

After meeting with the students and Professor Murry, the jury felt that they had a clearer picture of what happened. Two jurors proposed a scenario, which the other jurors felt was likely, and fit with all the evidence they had. The scenario was that Meg – sitting in the middle – had copied answers from Charles Wallace, and then Meg and Calvin had shared answers by looking at each other’s exams and/or through the phone they were sharing as a calculator. While they were still unsure as to whether Charles Wallace had been aware of the copying or not, they felt this was the most likely scenario because given what Calvin had told them about writing slowly, it seemed very unlikely he could have finished a test that Charles Wallace (who was very prepared and writes fast) found difficult to finish in the allotted time, particularly if he only had access to a calculator half of the time. In addition, the jury was suspicious of the fact that Calvin and Meg had shared a phone given that Calvin could have asked to use Charles Wallace’s phone, which had been charging in the room before the exam. The fact that there seemed to have been a lot of tension between the three students after they were confronted by Professor Murry (with Calvin and Meg even temporarily moving out) and the fact that Calvin especially seemed motivated very much by grades seemed also to point to a scenario in which he and Meg (and possibly Charles Wallace) had been involved in some sort of cheating.

**Jury Deliberations Part II:**

During this meeting, the jury again went over all of the evidence that they had. After this, they were still suspicious that the scenario proposed at the end of the previous meeting was what had happened. However, all of the jurors were at this point very tired, and were finding the case to be taking a heavy toll on their lives outside of the trial meetings. As a result, the jury decided
to take a break before discussing if they wanted to change their initial statement of violation based on the new scenario that they were now fairly confident was correct.

**Jury Deliberations Part III and Revised Statement of Violation:**

At the beginning of this meeting, the jury discussed how it would be very difficult to know based on the evidence of the exams whether or not Charles Wallace was aware of any cheating that occurred. All jurors seemed to feel beyond a reasonable doubt that Calvin and Meg had cheated. Ultimately, a number of factors suggested that Charles Wallace might not have been involved – he had been much more prepared for the exam, he had seemed more genuine and much more forthcoming in trial meetings, he had seemed much more surprised to have been confronted by Professor Murry. The jury felt confident that the work on Charles Wallace’s exam was not copied from another test. Given these differences in what the jury felt prepared to say beyond a reasonable doubt, they decided to revise their initial statement of violation to the following:

*The jury revises its original statement of violation to two statements, one of non-violation and one of violation:*

*The jury believes that Charles Wallace produced his own work on this exam. Furthermore, the jury does not feel beyond a reasonable doubt that Charles Wallace was aware of a violation by Calvin and Meg. Consequently, the jury feels that a statement of non-violation for Charles Wallace is appropriate. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)*

*Calvin and Meg violated the Honor Code by intentionally collaborating and copying from Charles Wallace’s exam. They further violated the Code by continuously lying about their actions and by failing to show respect and concern for Charles Wallace. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)*

*Statement as a whole: 9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves*

The jury decided their next meeting would be to begin working on tentative resolutions, since they expected Calvin and Meg to continue to deny wrongdoing rendering a circumstantial meeting unproductive.

**Jury Deliberations on Tentative Resolutions Part I (including new information from confronted parties):**

Prior to this meeting, Calvin contacted the trial chair over Facebook to admit that in fact he and Meg had not been honest with the jury. He said that what had actually happened was that Meg had copied from Charles Wallace, and he had copied from Meg, each without the others’
knowledge. The chair asked if Calvin wanted to attend the meeting, but he said he didn’t feel ready to face the jury yet in person. At about the same time, Meg sent the trial chair a new statement which was similar to what Calvin had said. She also decided not to attend the meeting. At the beginning of the meeting, the jury heard what Calvin had said and read Meg’s statement in full. The jury felt suspicious that Calvin and Meg seemed to be claiming that they did not know that the other person cheated until after the trial had started.

The jury also did not believe that Calvin’s and Meg’s accounts of what had happened during the exam were entirely true – it seemed too unlikely that two students would separately decide to cheat on a test. In addition, Calvin and Charles Wallace had the same formatting for an answer that was not on Meg’s exam. Given this, and the fact that neither Calvin or Meg had seemed prepared to come to the meeting and confess in person, the jury was concerned that they were still not making a sincere effort to engage with the trial process. As such, they decided to proceed with crafting tentative resolutions despite having not met with Calvin or Meg for another circumstantial meeting.

In addition to admitting to cheating, Calvin and Meg’s messages had each contained a few suggestions for what they felt appropriate resolutions might be given the new information they had provided. These included letters to the community, meeting with Professor Murry, and in Meg’s case, seeking some sort of counselling. Calvin said he thought a zero on the exam would be an appropriate grade change. Meg said she would understand if that was what the jury decided, but that she would prefer to receive a zero only on the questions she had copied from Charles Wallace.

The jury began the process of crafting resolutions by thinking about the aspects of the violation that they wanted to address. They listed the cheating itself, lying about it, dragging Charles Wallace through the trial process despite him most likely not being involved, and only choosing to tell the jury about what (supposedly) happened after it had become very clear that the jury would be proceeding with a statement of violation. The jury felt that all these violations called for restoration on a lot of different levels – on an individual level, with Professor Murry, with the jury as a body (as opposed to as individuals or on a personal level), with the community, and with Charles Wallace.

The jury unanimously felt that a grade change was necessary, and the weight of the room was in favor of recommending a zero in the class. Jurors felt the scale of the violation and the repeated lying about their work tainted all of their work in the class, and it seemed unfair to recommend only a zero on the exam when this would have been the grade someone would have received if they had just not taken the test. Also, it was a very serious violation and the jury wanted to make sure that Calvin and Meg understood the severity of their actions.

The jury agreed with Calvin and Meg’s idea about writing letters to the community and supported the idea of Meg seeking counselling. They also felt that Calvin and Meg should go through mediations with Charles Wallace, separately and together, or as much as Charles Wallace was comfortable. The jury also felt that perhaps having both students get some help with
preparing for exams from the OAR (or the Bryn Mawr equivalent, in Meg’s case), or meeting with their deans on a regular basis could help them make sure they were on top of their work so that they would feel less stressed when they had exams. In addition to this, the jury wanted to help educate Calvin and Meg more about the Honor Code, and felt that having them read a selection of abstracts could be a good way to do this.

The jury also discussed the idea of having Meg and Calvin complete some sort of community service, as part of their restoration with the community and as a way to start to think about their actions as having an impact on that broader community. One juror suggested having them work with 8D on a project for a semester, while another mentioned that they could complete the requirements for the Rufus Jones Leadership Institute. These ideas were discussed in relatively little detail, as the jury seemed largely to agree on them and chose to figure out the details once they had a more complete set of resolution ideas.

The jury as a whole felt that a series of reflections (either written or some other sort of media) would be important to help guide them in thinking about what had happened. However, jurors disagreed about the number and length of the reflections. The jury then discussed the idea of separation. In general, most jurors felt that separation was warranted. They felt that it would address accountability, help the community heal from such a serious breach of trust, and would give Meg and Calvin a chance to reflect on their actions, among other things. However, jurors disagreed as to the specifics of separation and the length of separation. While some jurors felt that two semesters would be more appropriate in terms of accountability, giving them time to reflect, having them start school again from the same point and giving the community lots of time to heal, others felt that there was sufficient time in one semester for these things to take place, and that two semesters felt more punitive. Some of the concerns around the idea of separation included that there would be less access to counselling services away from Haverford, that the jury couldn’t be sure Calvin and Meg’s home lives would be conducive to reflection and restoration, and a number of issues involving both students’ plans to study abroad in the future. Calvin had told the trial chair that if he were not able to go then he would have to pay Haverford a fine because he had already confirmed that he would be going. To address this, the jury decided that the trial chair would talk to the Dean of the College about whether the fine could be waived.

Some jurors were concerned that Meg and Calvin would be very angry about being separated and feel resentful towards the jury. Some jurors felt that this meant two semesters of separation was more appropriate, because this would give them more time to get over that anger and begin the process of reflection. Others, however, felt that it might be better to have less or even no separation. The jury decided on another time to meet to further continue discussions on the resolutions.

**Jury Deliberations Part II:**

In this meeting, the jury discussed in further detail the resolutions that they wanted to see,
and discussed some of the main issues that they saw in achieving the trial goals of restoration, education and accountability. In particular, they were concerned that Calvin and Meg had not begun to hold themselves accountable for what they had done, and this was a crucial part of the restoration process. The jury felt that the students did not seem to feel that what they had done was particularly wrong, nor that they felt a sense of responsibility to the community or Professor Murry for breaking their trust. Separation, with periodic reflections during that time, therefore seemed to be an important part of the resolutions. As the jury discussed possible resolutions, they broke them into three main time frames – before, during, and after separation – without actually knowing the duration of the separation itself.

In terms of resolutions to be completed before separation (during the remaining part of that semester), the jury felt it would be beneficial for jurors (if they wanted to) to write letters to Calvin and Meg to help them understand why the jury felt on behalf of the community that what they had done was wrong and that they needed to be separated. They also wanted them to individually meet with Professor Murry as much as he wanted, although they recognized that Meg preferred expressing herself in writing and certainly were not opposed to the idea of the students writing apologies to their professor also. The idea of meeting with the jury was discussed but it was felt that they could see more if this felt necessary after the finalizing meeting. The jury also wanted Calvin and Meg to go through some sort of mediation with Charles Wallace, if he were willing, because it seemed that their relationship had been seriously damaged. They also felt that having the students read 4 abstracts which dealt with separation would help them see the potential benefits of it before actually being separated, and that doing some sort of community service for a few hours each week would help them start to understand themselves as having responsibilities to the community, and see that they had failed to uphold these by violating the community’s trust. With seven class weeks remaining in the semester, they decided that 14 hours (2 per week) would be a reasonable amount of service to ask for.

During separation, the jury felt that regular reflections of about 300 words or 3 minutes of video would be helpful in making sure that Meg and Calvin were frequently thinking about what they had done, but not constantly feeling guilty or punished for it. The jury eventually decided that reflections every 3 weeks would be best, after one juror suggested that having a more “strange” interval would make the reflections feel less routine or like a chore, and more genuine. In reference to the reflections, one juror pointed out that they felt a year of separation would be necessary to ensure the reflections were really engaged with, because with only one semester it would be possible to take a mindset of “sitting it out”. About halfway through separation, the jury wanted Calvin and Meg to write letters to Professor Murry, once they had had some more time to think about their actions. The jury also discussed having them write a new Honor Code essay (or in Meg’s case, write one for the first time), and re-sign the Honor Pledge, before reentering the community at the end of separation. Jurors saw this as an opportunity for Calvin and Meg to ‘start over’ in a sense, and come back into the community by making a new commitment to it. Finally, at the end of their separation, the jury wanted Meg and Calvin to write
letters to the community, and a letter to the jury.

After separation, the jury felt that Calvin and Meg could maybe meet with their professors of all their classes at the start of the semester, to establish a relationship and make it more likely they would treat that professor with respect. However, some jurors were uncomfortable with this idea, as they felt that a lack of respect for Professor Murry had not actually been a factor in the violation. The jury also discussed having the students meet with the OAR (or the Bryn Mawr equivalent) in order to make sure they were on track with schoolwork. There was some debate about this, because one juror pointed out that this could seem quite offensive if they felt the jury was suggesting they had time management problems when perhaps they were busy with many hours of paid work or something else which gave this impression. However, jurors eventually decided that it was most likely beneficial to visit the OAR at least once. Similarly, the jury felt that having each student meet with their dean on a regular basis after returning to the Bi-Co could be helpful as an academic check-in. The other thing discussed for when Calvin and Meg returned from separation was the possibility of completing more community service, or doing a leadership activity, such as the Rufus Jones Leadership Institute. Some jurors felt that this would be helpful in giving them a sense of being trusted and given responsibility again by the community, and that this would help them reintegrate after losing the community’s trust. Others did not feel this would be restorative, and there were concerns it could interfere with a need to have paid work on campus. The jury decided to ask the students what they thought would be best.

The jury also decided that in the following meeting they would ask Calvin and Meg to attend, since they had so many uncertainties and wanted to ask the parties about the details of community service and separation.

**Jury Deliberations Part III (including meeting with confronted parties):**

At the beginning of the meeting, the jury met with Calvin and Meg to get a better sense of what resolutions would be best to help address the violations. In terms of why they had decided to cheat, Calvin said it was because he was panicked about finishing in time due to his slow writing, and Meg said that she was just worried that she wasn’t prepared enough and that she had struggled on the previous exam in the class. They said they were still close to Charles Wallace, and that he did not seem to assign much blame to them. Calvin said that he would have been less likely to cheat if he had made use of the Office of Disability Services, and that through the trial experience he had learned more about his internal motivations and how mistakes have consequences – for example, he mentioned that he would most likely lose a private scholarship if he were separated. Meg said she had learnt about the importance of honesty, saying that she had felt so much better after sending the trial chair her revised statement. When asked about separation, both students said that they felt they could better reflect while in the Bi-Co, and that they did not want to be separated. Calvin also mentioned that he had been thinking a lot about what had happened and didn’t think he really had any more reflecting to do. Meg said that she
would more understand the jury’s desire to separate them if the violation had been a “repeated offense”, but that they had “come clean” and therefore she felt separation was unwarranted. Both Calvin and Meg very much wanted to graduate with their original class.

After Meg and Calvin left, the jury talked about what they had heard. The jury was even more split on separation—they were very uncomfortable with the idea that choosing to separate Calvin could result in him losing a scholarship. Some jurors felt that no separation would be best, while others felt that 1 semester was appropriate and some still felt that 2 semesters would be best. The jury felt that Calvin and Meg only felt bad for themselves and did not realize the impact of their actions on the community as a whole, and that separation was important for the jury, the professor, and the whole community. However, there was still significant uncertainty about whether they would get anything out of being at home, and many jurors were afraid of doing something too punitive.

Another thing that made the jury uncomfortable was that they did not want to take away Calvin and Meg’s opportunities to study abroad at some point, which seemed like it would probably happen if they were separated because the Bi-Co colleges only allow students in good academic standing to go abroad. However, the grade change alone might disqualify them from this, which only added to the sense of discomfort that many jurors had.

**Jury Deliberations Part IV (including suggested resolutions letter from confronted parties):**

At the beginning of this meeting the jury read a document written by Meg with some input from Calvin about what sorts of resolutions they thought would be appropriate for them given their actions. In particular, the document discussed the prospect of separation and argued that it would be more beneficial for them to reflect and restore themselves from within the Bi-Co community, rather than away from it. The jury felt that the document demonstrated how much more reflection Calvin and Meg needed to do, since it included a claim that they had clearly begun already to restore themselves, as evidenced by the fact that they had decided to start telling the jury the truth. After reading the document the jury seemed to be leaning more towards the idea that Calvin and Meg should be separated, as they displayed a serious lack of understanding of the severity of what they had done, and showed a sense of entitlement that the jury found concerning.

The remainder of the meeting was spent discussing the topic of separation. The jury listed the potential benefits that they thought separation could bring, and then the potential disadvantages, and then went through the disadvantages one by one to determine whether they individually or collectively outweighed the potential benefits. The benefits included the time it would give them for reflection on what they had done and more broadly on why they had chosen to be part of the Bi-Co, a sense from the jury that they did not feel comfortable having Calvin and Meg as part of the community at that time, the accountability it would force them to take as they would have to admit to their families and themselves what they had done and see the consequences of their actions, the potential for restoration both in terms of the students starting
to restore themselves but also in terms of giving the community time and space to heal, giving Calvin and Meg the time to get over any anger or resentment that they might feel as a result of the resolutions before beginning a serious process of reflection, and the possibility that during separation one or both of them might realise that they in fact wanted to attend a different institution and to apply there. The potential disadvantages included that on the small chance they had already done a lot of reflecting, separation might feel punitive to them, the impact that separation would have on Calvin’s scholarship, the anger and resentment separation could generate, the possibility of having a bad experience at home, the lack of resources such as counselling that they would have away from Haverford, the desire both students had to graduate on time and not delay post-grad plans, and that it might cause them to feel alienated from the community.

The jury discussed the scholarship at length, and ultimately decided that since Calvin should be aware that involvement in disciplinary action was grounds for losing the scholarship, then the jury should not take into consideration the impact of their decisions on Calvin’s scholarship when making said decisions. Furthermore, the jury felt it was important to distinguish a resolution of separation from the idea that they were ‘resolving’ to remove a scholarship, and did not feel that it made sense to combine the two. Ultimately, the jury decided that potential benefits of separation outweighed the potential disadvantages, making separation an appropriate resolution.

The jury then moved to discuss the length of separation. Overall, the jury felt that one year of separation seemed an appropriate amount, although a few jurors were still concerned that Calvin and Meg might have bad experiences away from Haverford and felt reluctant to have them be away for so long. Ultimately, the weight of the jury was that one semester would be too short, because the jury wanted them to complete periodic reflections every 3 weeks or so, which meant that in one semester they might complete as few as four reflections. Additionally, the jury felt that one full year meant they could not ‘wait it out’, and that they would have more time to get over any feelings of anger or resentment before beginning a long process of reflection.

A few jurors also brought up the possibility of conditional separation (separating them for a certain time period and then judging whether or not they were ready to come back), where the jury would evaluate the reflection and restoration that Calvin and Meg had done after one year. One juror in particular felt very strongly that they simply could not trust Calvin and Meg to behave with academic integrity, and that they would be very uncomfortable having them as part of the community again without having seen some evidence that they had seriously reflected and started to restore themselves. In response to this, one juror pointed out that having a condition for return after a year could incentivize the students to pretend to reflect more than they really had, and that this method would therefore not help to trust them any more. Another juror said that having a conditional return after one year would be pointless, because if they hadn’t reflected by then, they never would. The juror who felt very strongly about conditional separation still felt that a conditional separation would encourage the students to take the reflection process more
seriously, and also expressed feeling that perhaps even one year was not enough. At this point, one juror pointed out that while they also were finding it incredibly hard to conceive of ever trusting the students again, it was an important part of the process to give them a little bit of faith. As it was very late and the jury could not agree, the jury adjourned.

**Jury Deliberations Part V and Tentative Resolutions:**

At the beginning of this meeting, the jury discussed the importance of making sure they were separating their personal feelings from their decisions as a jury. In particular, the jurors’ concerns revolved around two ways in which they felt personally affected by the case. The first was that Calvin had broken at least one juror’s confidentiality to others in the community (as well as breaking his own on a number of occasions). The second was that all the jurors were finding the trial very stressful, and some had begun to feel unusually anxious around campus. The jury then worded all the resolutions that they felt comfortable with. In terms of the grade change, the jury decided on a 0 in the class. In addition, some jurors felt that while the students had clearly violated trust in the taking of the exam itself (warranting a 0 on the exam), they had also repeatedly lied to their professor about their completion of academic work in his class, and this represented a more general act of academic dishonesty that spanned the entire course.

The jury also included a resolution that ensured that if Calvin or Meg were ever to be found in violation of the Code in the future, the jury of that trial would be informed of this trial, since the procedures for informing juries of previous violations did not guarantee that this would happen. The jury felt this was important because Calvin and Meg had demonstrated an inclination to lie about their violation even after a jury had decided they had committed one.

Returning to the discussion of separation, in which previously one juror in particular had been very vocal about wanting conditional separation after a year, that juror explained that they did not want the students ever to be a part of the community again without knowing they had been restored. However, the juror also felt that they had been heard and understood, and that they could see why most other jurors were opposed to the idea of conditional separation, and decided not to stand outside on a resolution about non-conditional separation for one full year. The few jurors who did not feel strongly about having one year over one semester also felt that they understood the reasons for one year, and felt comfortable consenting to that resolution.

The jury then consented to the following set of tentative resolutions:

1. **The jury recommends that Calvin and Meg each receive a 0.0 in the class. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)**
2. **Each member of the jury has the option to write a letter to Calvin and Meg regarding the trial process before the end of the [current] semester. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)**
3. **Before the end of the [current] semester, Calvin and Meg will individually meet with Professor Murry, if he is willing, at least once or as many times as he feels necessary. (9
4. Before the end of the [current] semester, the jury asks Calvin and Meg to each participate in a mediation with Charles Wallace, if he is willing. The jury encourages them to each participate in any other mediations they feel are helpful. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)

5. Before the end of the [current] semester, Calvin and Meg will each participate in at least 14 hours of community service. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)

6. Before the end of the [current] semester, Calvin and Meg will each read four abstracts relating to separation, chosen by the Honor Council Librarian. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)

7. Calvin and Meg will be separated from the Haverford community for [two] semesters. The jury strongly recommends that Meg be separated from Bryn Mawr for these two semesters. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)

8. During separation, Calvin and Meg will each submit periodic reflections of at least 300 words or 90 seconds of video. These reflections will be submitted every 3 weeks, and copies will be sent to the jury. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)

9. Before [date], Calvin and Meg will each write a letter to Professor Murry, apologizing and reflecting on their experiences. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)

10. Before reentering the Bi-Co community, Calvin will rewrite his Honor Code essay and resign the Honor Pledge. Meg will write a Haverford Honor Code essay, and will sign the Haverford Honor Pledge. Copies of the Honor Code essays will be sent to the jury. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)

11. Before reentering the Bi-Co community, Calvin and Meg will each write a letter to the community, to be appended to the abstract. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)

12. Before reentering the Bi-Co community, Calvin and Meg will each write a letter to the jury. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)

13. In the first two weeks of the [semester following separation], Calvin will meet with the OAR to discuss time management strategies. In the first two weeks of the [semester following separation] semester, Meg will meet with the Academic Support Specialist, [name], to discuss time management strategies. The jury encourages Calvin and Meg to continue these meetings if they feel they are helpful. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)

14. In the first month of the [semester following separation], Calvin and Meg will individually meet with Professor Murry, if he is willing. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)

15. During the [semester following separation], Calvin and Meg will each have monthly meetings with their respective deans. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)

16. In the [year following separation], Calvin and Meg will each participate in at least 30 hours of community service. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)
17. If Calvin or Meg are found to be in violation of the Honor Code in a future proceeding, the jury of that trial will be notified of this trial. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)

18. The jury gives Professor Murry the option of writing a letter to the community. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)

Resolutions as a whole: 9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves

The jury also consented to the following statement about whether the trial should be considered a disciplinary proceeding, with a unanimous agreement that the trial was absolutely disciplinary:

*Given the nature and scale of the violation, the jury believes that this trial constitutes a disciplinary proceeding. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co Liaison approves)*

**Finalizing Resolutions:**

At the beginning of this meeting, Meg and Calvin told the jury and Professor Murry that they had not been honest all along, and that all three of them including Charles Wallace had collaborated on the exam. They said that Charles Wallace had told them that he would “kill” them if they told the jury the truth (Charles Wallace strongly denied this), but that at this point they didn’t want to be separated without coming completely clean. Professor Murry said that he believed this story more than what the jury’s revised statement had said, because it seemed more plausible overall. Some jurors were convinced that they were finally hearing the truth, others were suspicious that Calvin and Meg were simply trying to throw Charles Wallace under the bus in order to not be separated, and felt particularly suspicious that this information had only been brought up now. The jury ultimately decided that while their resolutions had been crafted in part on the understanding that the violation included dragging Charles Wallace through the trial process unfairly, all of the resolutions also addressed the more long-running issues of lying repeatedly to both the professor and the jury, and of course cheating on the test itself. They did not feel that they should convene a new process or significantly change the resolutions based on this uncertain evidence, so they decided to proceed with the finalizing meeting. Any issue involving Charles Wallace would be dealt with in a separate proceeding if that became appropriate.

Professor Murry, Meg, and Calvin said that they understood the resolutions and largely were satisfied with them. Meg and Calvin, had particular concerns about the grade change and separation resolutions. For Calvin, he was worried that the grade change would hurt his GPA, whereas Meg was more concerned that she would have to make up the lost credit by taking more classes in some other semester(s). The jury explained their reasoning for recommending a 0 in the class rather than just the exam, but the students still disagreed that this was the right resolution.

On separation, both Meg and Calvin said that two semesters felt like a lot, and that one
would be sufficient for them to fully reflect, in addition to wanting to graduate with their class and go abroad. After the jury explained their reasons for choosing two semesters, the students asked if the jury had considered conditional separation. The jury then explained that they had, and why they had decided against it, but that when they had been considering it, it would have meant coming back after two or three semesters, not one or two.

The jury also in this meeting asked Meg and Calvin about community service hours both before and after separation, to which they said that one hour a week for the rest of the semester would be fine, and two hours in the time after separation since they could plan it into their schedules ahead of time.

After Meg and Calvin left, the jury changed the number of community service hours to reflect the students’ thoughts, and decided to get rid of the resolution about mediation given the unresolved uncertainty about the situation with Charles Wallace. None of the jurors’ thoughts on separation had changed, so this remained as in the tentative resolutions. As for the grade change, one juror suggested having the class be graded as a fail on a pass/fail basis, which would help Calvin with his concern about his GPA (although it would not address Meg’s concern). Ultimately, however, they felt that it was up to the professor and that if he chose to assign a 0 in the class, that would be fair. The jury agreed that the trial chair would include the idea of the pass/fail grading option in the email to Professor Murry. At this point, the jury was comfortable with the final resolutions and consented to those as well as the statement about reporting.

1. The jury recommends that Calvin and Meg each receive a 0.0 in the class. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)
2. Each member of the jury has the option to write a letter to Calvin and Meg regarding the trial process before the end of the [current] semester. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)
3. Before the end of the [current] semester, Calvin and Meg will individually meet with Professor Murry, if he is willing, at least once or as many times as he feels necessary. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)
4. Before the end of the [current] semester, Calvin and Meg will each participate in at least 7 hours of community service. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)
5. Before the end of the [current] semester, Calvin and Meg will each read four abstracts relating to separation, chosen by the Honor Council Librarian. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)
6. Calvin and Meg will be separated from the Haverford community for [two] semesters. The jury strongly recommends that Meg be separated from Bryn Mawr for these two semesters. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)
7. During separation, Calvin and Meg will each submit periodic reflections of at least 300 words or 90 seconds of video. These reflections will be submitted every 3 weeks, and copies will be sent to the jury. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)
8. Before [date], Calvin and Meg will each write a letter to Professor Murry, apologizing and reflecting on their experiences. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)

9. Before reentering the Bi-Co community, Calvin will rewrite his Honor Code essay and resign the Honor Pledge. Meg will write a Haverford Honor Code essay, and will sign the Haverford Honor Pledge. Copies of the Honor Code essays will be sent to the jury. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)

10. Before reentering the Bi-Co community, Calvin and Meg will each write a letter to the community, to be appended to the abstract. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)

11. Before reentering the Bi-Co community, Calvin and Meg will each write a letter to the jury. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)

12. In the first two weeks of the [semester following separation], Calvin will meet with the OAR to discuss time management strategies. In the first two weeks of the [semester following separation], Meg will meet with the Academic Support Specialist, [name], to discuss time management strategies. The jury encourages Calvin and Meg to continue these meetings if they feel they are helpful. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)

13. In the first month of the [semester following separation], Calvin and Meg will individually meet with Professor Murry, if he is willing. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)

14. During the [semester following separation], Calvin and Meg will each have monthly meetings with their respective deans. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)

15. In the [year following separation], Calvin and Meg will each participate in at least 60 hours of community service. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)

16. If Calvin or Meg are found to be in violation of the Honor Code in a future proceeding, the jury of that trial will be notified of this trial. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)

17. The jury gives Professor Murry the option of writing a letter to the community. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)

Resolutions as a whole: 9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves

Statement on reporting:
Given the nature and scale of the violation, the jury believes that this trial constitutes a disciplinary proceeding. (9 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)

Post-Trial:
Meg and Calvin appealed resolutions 1 and 6 (the grade change and separation). Their reasons were that the grade change was too severe and that the jury’s reasoning for it was inadequate – instead, they recommended that they each receive a 2.0 in the class. As for separation, they felt that it was too long and again that reasons such as wanting to make it long
enough that they could not just ‘wait it out’ were not good ones. They suggested being separated for only one semester and continuing reflections in the semester they returned. Furthermore, they suggested that Meg meet with someone to help her with time management, and that the two of them work together to create a program or resource to ensure fewer students lied to juries in the future. Overall, they felt that during the trial their circumstances were not considered enough, particularly the fact that they had already taken steps to ensure a similar violation would not happen again (such as Calvin reaching out to disability services and Meg preparing for assignments and exams more in advance). In addition, they were concerned that the jury had not had the full information about the case until the finalizing meeting, and that therefore their decisions needed more consideration. They mentioned that in the finalizing meeting, it felt as though the jury simply wanted the trial to be over, rather than considering the new information properly. The President of the College ultimately upheld the jury’s resolutions.

A separate trial for Charles Wallace was later held in which he was found to have violated the Honor Code by participating in the collaboration and received a similar (though less extensive) list of resolutions, including two semesters of separation from the community. See a Wrinkle in Time Part II for a summary of this case.

Discussion Questions:

1. What does “beyond a reasonable doubt” mean and how can you reach a statement of violation when there is no hard proof? Should Honor Council define what “beyond a reasonable doubt” means in trial situations?
2. How does a jury balance overwhelming evidence with the accounts of the confronted parties?
3. What can and should be done when parties refuse to honestly engage with the trial process?
4. What should a jury do if they feel they are being lied to? Should parties lying throughout the trial process affect resolutions? Should parties lying throughout the trial process be considered a separate violation of the Code?
5. At what point is a jury unable to objectively come to resolutions due to their own emotions surrounding the case?
6. Would permanent separation have been appropriate in this case?
7. Should juries consider parties’ personal relationships in the trial process?
8. What should be done if a trial party breaks their own or another involved person’s confidentiality?
9. What can be done in order to make sure that members of the jury are taking care of themselves, especially in trials like this that take a lot of time and cause emotional turmoil?
10. How can juries address professors who want to change their exam policies after an experience with students violating the Honor Code?