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Summary/Pre-Trial:
In A Wrinkle in Time Part 1, Professor Murry confronted Meg, Calvin, and Charles Wallace for suspected inappropriate collaboration on an exam. During the course of the trial, the jury decided that they were not sure that Charles Wallace violated the Honor Code, and dismissed him from the trial, but continued on with the trial for Meg and Calvin, resulting in their separation for one year. At the conclusion of A Wrinkle in Time Part 1 it was revealed that Charles Wallace, who had previously been dismissed, had in fact lied to the jury about his involvement in the inappropriate collaboration. Professor Murry and Charles Wallace provided new statements for a second trial only involving Charles Wallace. In his statement, Charles Wallace admitted that he had participated in the inappropriate collaboration. Honor Council sent the case to an academic trial comprised of members who had not been involved with the original trial.

Fact Finding:
Charles Wallace began by describing the format of the exam. It was an open-note,
open-book, in-class exam that could be taken anywhere in the building during the class period. Charles Wallace had reserved a room to take the exam in with his friends Meg and Calvin as they were planning to share a textbook. Charles Wallace said neither of them brought their own calculator and the only notes they brought was the 35-page study guide Charles Wallace had created. Although he had shared it with them to review, he was not expecting them to bring it as Professor Murry had specified that any notes should be students’ own. Charles Wallace said that Meg and Calvin began to say everything they and Charles Wallace were doing aloud, which he was not prepared for. Charles Wallace emphasized the stressfulness of the situation. Finally he admitted to having talked during the exam. He noted that after the three of them were originally confronted Meg and Calvin made it clear to Charles Wallace they were not going to admit to cheating.

Professor Murry then provided his perspective on the events. Professor Murry described that he noticed an unusual error on both Calvin and Charles Wallace’s exams, which stood out to him after an instance in which Meg, Calvin, and Charles Wallace turned in identical problem sets (which he determined was not an Honor Council violation) and he knew the three of them had taken the exam in the same room. He looked at Meg’s exam and saw the same mistake. When confronting the three of them individually, they all denied collaborating.

Charles Wallace explained that after the jury had come to tentative resolutions during the previous trial, Meg had sent Charles Wallace a message saying that she was going to come clean about cheating after initially denying it. Charles Wallace tried to talk to Meg about it, but Meg never responded to his calls and text messages, and they never spoke in person about it. Although Charles Wallace said there had been no dialogue between the three of them, he believed that Calvin and Meg had come forward without implicating him because they had been friends. He had wanted them to understand that he hadn’t turned them into the jury after the statement of non-violation, but they hadn’t been able to get on the same page. Charles Wallace felt that Calvin and Meg seemed to have a very different view of the situation from his.

Charles Wallace explained that he had a complicated relationship with Meg and Calvin and had not come clean during the first trial out of loyalty to them and self-preservation. He no longer felt this loyalty or that lying would continue to serve him. Charles Wallace noted that this had been a very stressful experience and made their living situation difficult—Charles Wallace had been spending a great deal of time off campus.

The jury then spoke to Professor Murry alone. During this discussion he explained that he wasn’t sure how to determine whether Charles Wallace was genuinely remorseful or just afraid of repercussions, and said he would leave that decision to the jury. He also shared that he was thinking of changing the way he administered the test as a result of this situation, and felt bad that his future students would be impacted in this way.

The jury then spoke to Charles Wallace alone, and he elaborated on how he had felt immediately after the exam: he had felt sure that he would be involved in an Honor Council trial, and was worried about whether he’d have to turn his friends in. He said that he had made a bad
decision, and if he were in a similar situation again he would leave the room and tell the professor. Charles Wallace also emphasized that while he had omitted his involvement during the past trial, he had said a lot of things to the previous jury that were factually true – he had wanted to tell them as much as possible without hurting his peers. He said that this experience made him very reluctant to collaborate with others and not to trust them, and that he would not panic again if in a similar situation.

Charles Wallace left and the jury spoke with Sandy, the chair of the previous trial. Sandy then explained what had happened during the Finalizing Resolutions portion of the previous trial – Calvin had sent her a message the night before the meeting saying that all three of them had collaborated, where previously he and Meg had maintained that Charles Wallace was not involved. At the finalizing meeting, he and Meg had explained to the jury that all three had been involved, and Professor Murry confirmed that he suspected this all along due to the format of their answers. Calvin and Meg said that they didn’t want to be separated from the community without telling the truth to the jury. Notably, they explained they originally denied Charles Wallace’s involvement due to a threat he gave them, “I’ll kill you if you tell,” which Professor Murry found very unsettling and mentioned to jury (Charles Wallace later denied saying this). Calvin and Meg said that Charles Wallace had asked them to delete any text messages that might corroborate their side of the story, so they were not able to provide much evidence.

Sandy explained to the jury that the previous jury had decided to separate Calvin and Meg for a year because they felt that reflected how much time they needed to reflect on how their actions had affected others. She said she wasn’t sure whether it would be helpful for the jury to meet with Calvin and/or Meg, because they had clearly lied repeatedly and it would be hard to know how to take anything they said. The jury and Sandy discussed how they were uncomfortable with the fact that either Calvin and Meg or Charles Wallace was lying significantly about the threat (as Charles Wallace had denied threatening Meg and Calvin when it was brought up during the jury’s meeting with him), and how they hoped to get more insight as to what had actually been said. The jury decided they’d like to try to meet with Calvin. Sandy also explained on behalf of the previous jury how unpleasant it had been to find out that Charles Wallace had been lying because of how earnest he had seemed during the previous trial, especially during a meeting they’d had with him following their statement of non-violation. During that meeting, Charles Wallace had spoken movingly about how awful it had been for him that his friends had “dragged him into” the trial process, and how much he appreciated the jury’s kindness. Finding out that he had been lying felt like a personal betrayal to Sandy and the rest of the jury. Sandy emphasized that many of her jurors would feel uncomfortable taking a class with Charles Wallace or even seeing him on campus.

The jury discussed how Charles Wallace had seemed more concerned with how everything affected him than how it affected the community. While he had not seemed like someone who is inherently a cheater or grossly disrespected the Honor Code, he had focused entirely on himself and hadn’t mentioned breaching the trust of the community at all. Sandy also
noted that he had seemed to be viewing the trial as a legal proceeding, and it seemed like he had chosen to lie because he suspected the jury couldn’t prove otherwise. One juror noted that he wasn’t sure it was appropriate to regard this as a negative, and that it was possible to view Charles Wallace’s statements about lying due to self-preservation as his being honest now and taking the process seriously. Sandy and the jury discussed how it seemed like Charles Wallace had almost convinced himself that he wasn’t as guilty as the others for a while. A juror pointed out that he felt Charles Wallace was using his stress as an excuse to an excessive extent, and that the Honor Code means that students won’t cheat even when exams are stressful. While the jury wanted to focus on Charles Wallace’s restoration and possible positive change, it was also difficult to separate themselves from identifying too much with the previous jury. After finishing their conversation with Sandy, the jury decided to adjourn and schedule another meeting where they could speak with Calvin and then deliberate further.

Fact Finding Part II:

All ten members of the jury were present for this meeting, and they started by meeting with Calvin. He said that it was difficult to remember what had happened during the exam, but that the three of them were very close and comfortable with each other, and felt comfortable talking during the exam, and then it “snowballed into cheating.” He and Meg brought their notes, old problem sets, Meg’s phone and computer, and copies of Charles Wallace’s study guide to the test. He explained that they were all frantic because the test was timed and that they started talking to each other nervously, such as saying that certain questions were hard or that they couldn’t remember particular things, and that this built up into asking each other for help on questions. He stated that as far as he knew, none of them went into the test planning to collaborate. To the best of his recollection, the flow of information between the three of them was fairly even and he couldn’t remember how they actually began discussing the test. Throughout the meeting, Calvin had trouble giving more specific information about what had happened during the exam beyond that all three of them had participated in the cheating and all three of them had benefited from it. He said he wasn’t thinking about it as an Honor Code violation at the time.

Calvin also told the jury that after Professor Murry confronted each of the three students, the three of them talked. He said that Charles Wallace led most of the conversation, and that he said he’d talked to his parents to try to make the problem go away. Calvin said that some of the conversation had happened over Facebook messenger, but that Charles Wallace had asked them to delete the messages before the trial. He said that he went along with his idea to lie because Charles Wallace was his friend, and he had made him feel like he would make his life very difficult if he did come clean, especially because they lived together. He explained that the three of them had also had a lunch meeting after the statement of non-violation for Charles Wallace during the previous trial, and had agreed that the worst case scenario would be the jury finding
out that all three of them worked together. However, he said that he eventually stopped believing that, and decided to tell the truth.

The jury asked Calvin about the threatening comments that Professor Murry had mentioned, which Charles Wallace adamantly denied. He said that Charles Wallace had been very angry at the end of the trial, when he and Meg had decided to tell the truth to the jury, and that he had confronted Meg via Facebook messenger and asked why they had decided to make ‘false accusations’ against him. Throughout the trial, Calvin thought that Charles Wallace was acting unusual but not necessarily trying to manipulate him, but during their lunch meeting, he had seemed manipulative. Calvin didn’t believe that Charles Wallace was literally threatening his life when he said something to the effect of “I’ll kill you if you do this,” but he had started locking his door since the comment and felt that Meg seemed more affected by the threat and manipulation than he was.

Calvin also explained that since Charles Wallace was confronted first, his decision to lie set a precedent and he and Meg were in the position of having to decide whether to betray him from their first conversations with Professor Murry. Calvin had talked to a few members of Honor Council after he was first confronted and they had told him that being honest was the best thing he could do, but Charles Wallace had been adamant that the worst thing that could happen would be the jury finding out the truth. He told the jury that he had mostly kept his feelings about telling the truth to himself, although it had definitely been brought up. He felt like the previous jury had been relatively careful with what they asked, as if they wanted to avoid provoking a false confession, and he wished they had “framed things differently.”

Calvin then left the room and the jury proceeded to discuss what they had heard. They felt like Calvin had contradicted himself several times, and they didn’t feel particularly inclined to believe either him or Charles Wallace. They did note that Calvin didn’t have as much to lose at this point, so he could be more credible, but their knowledge of the previous trial made them doubt him. The jury discussed the differences between Calvin’s and Charles Wallace’s stories that had stood out to them. Charles Wallace had said that Calvin and Meg came up with the idea of lying, while Calvin had said the opposite. The jury also felt that Calvin’s clarification about the threat made them feel more at ease with the discrepancies between Professor Murry’s and Charles Wallace’s discussions of it. They also noted that Charles Wallace and Calvin had talked about what happened in the testing room and the flow of information very differently, but that their stories may not have been incompatible. The way that Charles Wallace had discussed it didn’t completely preclude the possibility that he had received helpful information from Calvin and Meg during the test, although he hadn’t been forthcoming about it. The Honor Code also states explicitly that students should not give or receive aid, so they didn’t feel that it was essential to resolve this question.

**Jury Deliberations/Statement of Violation:**
At this point, the jury started to construct a statement of violation. They considered including both giving and receiving aid, as they felt it was likely that Charles Wallace had done both, and also lying repeatedly during the previous trial and to the professor. They also considered alluding to the threat that Charles Wallace had made because it had breached the trust of members of the community. Some jurors also wanted to decide whether they felt that Charles Wallace had lied to this jury as well as the previous one. While they all agreed that there were discrepancies between Charles Wallace’s and Calvin’s accounts of what had happened in the room, they did not have enough information to know whether either or both of them were lying and noted that it had been six months since the violation so it was possible that both of their stories had been influenced by the passage of time.

They discussed briefly whether they felt that Charles Wallace had still violated the Honor Code with his conduct on the exam if they completely believed his story that he had tried not to give or receive aid while Calvin and Meg discussed the exam, and came to the consensus that this would still represent a violation of the Code. They also felt quite sure that Charles Wallace had engaged in some form of inappropriate collaboration beyond silently sitting in the room, and decided there was enough evidence that he had given and received aid that they were comfortable consenting to include that in the statement. The jury also agreed that they didn’t know who had started the cheating or the lying, and they didn’t need to include that information in their statement. The jury consented to the following statement of violation:

Charles Wallace violated the Honor Code by giving and receiving aid on an exam, and by lying repeatedly to an Honor Council jury and to Professor Murry. (10 jurors consent)

Circumstantial Portion:

The jury met with Charles Wallace and Professor Murry to discuss the circumstances surrounding the violation. Charles Wallace began by explaining that he had gone into the exam very well prepared and hadn’t expected any of this to happen. Regarding the part of the statement of violation about lying, he said that his original motivation had been loyalty and “good intentions,” and that he had felt stuck in an uncomfortable situation after the initial lie. He reiterated his account that Calvin and Meg had made it clear that they did not want to tell the truth and that he had gone along with them out of loyalty. Charles Wallace said that the stress from the experience had affected every part of his life, including a major falling out with Calvin and Meg, his close friends, and creating a lot of anxiety about what the outcome would be. Looking back, he said he would have come forward immediately.

A juror told Charles Wallace that Calvin had said that Charles Wallace came up with the idea to lie, and asked him to elaborate on what had happened and what he had been thinking about around his initial confrontation with Professor Murry.

Charles Wallace explained that when they had initially decided not to come forward about the cheating, he had wanted to stay as close to the truth as possible without admitting to
cheating. It had been important to him to try to avoid untrue statements and simply omit incriminating information, but he explained that Calvin and Meg had seemed interested in more dramatic tactics such as getting a calculator and setting it up to look like it had been the one they used. Charles Wallace said he was sure that he had talked with Calvin and Meg in the time between the initial confrontations and the trial, but he didn’t remember specifically. He said they hadn’t come up with a specific plan or strategy beyond telling as much of the truth as possible without incriminating themselves, and that he had rejected a lot of ideas that Calvin came up with such as creating fake evidence and making up elaborate stories.

The trial chair asked Charles Wallace and Professor Murry to share what resolutions they thought might be helpful in achieving the trial goals of education, accountability, and restoration. Professor Murry said he would consider whatever recommendation the jury made as to a grade. He felt that restoration of trust would be very important, but also difficult and would take a long time and that one meeting between him and Charles Wallace would be unlikely to achieve it. He also mentioned that he was now worried about whether his policies for administering tests should change.

In terms of a grade, Charles Wallace said that he didn’t feel like he deserved credit on the exam. He said that he didn’t know what to say about his course grade, because he was biased by how important it was to him due to his application for the [Advanced Centaur Studies program]. He asked the jury whether they could ask the committee considering his application to weigh the course less than a normal course if Professor Murry gave him a zero. The trial chair explained that this wasn’t really within the jury’s purview, and that it was Charles Wallace’s responsibility to deal with the consequences of resolutions that came out of the trial. In terms of the trial goal of education, Charles Wallace said that the trials had been very informative for him, and that he had read every Honor Council abstract and made a spreadsheet of notes about them in order to feel prepared for the trial. He felt that he had a lot to share with the community and would be happy to do so in a letter to the community or by doing any kind of work that Honor Council might want him to do.

The jury and Charles Wallace discussed the possibility of separation. Charles Wallace explained that he had already missed a lot of school for medical reasons, and really hoped to avoid taking more time off of school. He asked whether he could take classes at another institution during his separation and transfer them to Haverford, and a juror explained that he could do so Charles Wallace also explained that he was considering transferring to another school if he was unable to pursue the Advanced Centaur Studies program, and he worried about how the outcome of the trial might impact his application for transfer admission. The trial chair explained that the jury only had the ability to recommend to the dean of the college whether or not the process should be considered a disciplinary proceeding.

Finally, the jury and Charles Wallace discussed the restoration of trust. Charles Wallace felt that any sort of restoration between him and Calvin and Meg was impossible, and that hearing that Meg said he had threatened them crossed a line for him. He did feel that there was a
breach of trust between him and the Haverford community, in that he had handled the situation poorly. Charles Wallace added that his ability to trust other students had also been impacted, and he felt that he never wanted to work with someone else on an assignment again.

Professor Murry left the room so that the jury could talk to Charles Wallace in private. He gave the jury some context on what his life at Haverford was like, saying that he loved Haverford and was extremely involved on campus. He explained that he had chosen to come to Haverford because he really wanted the community that Haverford offered, and shared that reflecting on the trial process with his support person had made him realize that as stressful as it had been it had also been amazing that something like Honor Council trials exist at Haverford.

A juror expressed that Charles Wallace seemed very hardworking and dedicated, and that he hoped that he was able to get support from resources such as CAPS. Other jurors agreed that they personally felt that CAPS was a helpful resource and expressed their hope that Charles Wallace was emotionally supported. Charles Wallace explained that he was a very private person and it was difficult to get support because of how much he didn’t want others to know about the trial. However, he said that he had seen a therapist in the past and would consider doing so again. Finally, he asked the jury to consider his hopes and plans for his life in making their resolutions, and emphasized how devastated he would be if he wasn’t able to pursue the Advanced Centaur Studies program he wanted to.

Charles Wallace left the room and Professor Murry returned to speak with the jury. He doubted he would ever be comfortable having him in a class again. He clarified that he didn’t have a problem with meeting with Charles Wallace or his writing reflections, but he didn’t know whether it would help him feel that trust had been restored. He felt that Charles Wallace’s decisions to lie from the initial confrontation through the entire first trial and the possibility that he was still not being entirely forthcoming had a large impact on his opinions. Unless Charles Wallace took another of his classes, he felt that it would be difficult to come to a place of trusting him again in the time he had left at Haverford.

Jury Deliberations Part I:

The jury spent a few minutes summarizing their feelings at the end of the circumstantial meeting. While Charles Wallace had acknowledged that he had violated the trust of the community, the jury felt that this acknowledgement was mostly because he knew that this was what the jury wanted. Several jurors also felt quite conflicted because they also felt quite concerned about Charles Wallace’s well-being after hearing how difficult things had been for him. One juror explained that he saw Charles Wallace as an action-oriented person whose self-worth was contingent on his actions, and that helped him understand that he did want to make amends with the community even though he was expressing it in terms of actions rather

---

1 Students’ Constitution, Section 7.02, part d) i) states that “[t]he confronted party may bring another community member to the proceedings for support.” Part d) also specifies that this support should be “emotional” in nature.
than emotions. While this insight was helpful to the jury, they also noted that Charles Wallace had been quite self-absorbed throughout the meeting, especially when he pointed out how difficult and time-consuming coming to trial meetings had been for him without seeming to notice that the jury was in the same position. They felt that this spoke to a lack of genuine concern for others that was pervasive in their conversations with Charles Wallace.

The jury also discussed Charles Wallace’s extreme level of preparedness, which was evident in both his schoolwork and the trial itself. They also noted how the way he had responded to their questions made it difficult to engage with him, one juror saying that he felt Charles Wallace was talking over them, saying things that were adjacent to what they had actually asked and seemed like what the jury might want to hear, and generally evading their questions until they moved on to asking about something else. Another juror felt that Charles Wallace had simply been focused on answering the questions they had asked, and perhaps they hadn’t given him enough of an opportunity to talk about how he had violated the trust of the community by not asking more directly about it. However, other jurors also pointed out that their questions had been open-ended enough that Charles Wallace easily could have chosen to talk more about the way his actions impacted others, and had instead chosen to respond with self-pitying or self-aggrandizing answers.

Before concluding the meeting, the jury briefly discussed separation as a potential resolution. They were generally in favor of it, partially because they were concerned about Charles Wallace’s stress level and felt that time off would be helpful to him. However, they also spent some time discussing whether the negative effects of forcing Charles Wallace to take more time off outweighed its benefits. They agreed to continue their conversation in a later meeting.

**Jury Deliberations Part II:**

The jury began by summarizing their concerns about resolutions at this point. For separation, they were generally in favor but were concerned that the fact that Charles Wallace had already taken time off and were concerned that separation would put him even more “behind”. They had also discussed recommendations about a grade change and whether the trial should be reported as a disciplinary proceeding to other institutions, including transfer schools, and how they were concerned about impacting his ability to transfer and ultimately to study what he wanted to study.

Several jurors pointed out that Charles Wallace seemed to have an exaggerated view of how much separation would put him “behind” in life, and they hoped that with more reflection he might feel differently. Some jurors hoped that separation would positively impact Charles Wallace’s mental health, while also being concerned that it would cause him to feel isolated and negatively impact him. The trial chair pointed out that separation could help to hold Charles Wallace accountable and restore the community’s trust in him, but that the jury might want to be wary of prescribing what they think would be best for Charles Wallace’s mental health. A juror also pointed out that the previous jury had separated Calvin and Meg for two semesters, which
could help to inform their decision. The trial chair summarized the reasons that the previous jury had had for deciding to separate Calvin and Meg for two semesters – they had wanted to give them enough time to be angry toward the process first and eventually get over their anger and still have time to reflect. They had also had a resolution about writing periodic reflections to encourage this, which the jury thought they might adapt for Charles Wallace by creating prompts for him to respond to. Hearing this reasoning, the jury agreed that two semesters of separation seemed appropriate in this case as well.

The jury discussed Charles Wallace’s potential transfer and how it might impact their resolutions. They didn’t want the trial to make it harder for him to study what he wanted, since they had all been impressed with how passionate he was about the subject. One juror suggested recommending that the trial not be reported as a disciplinary proceeding, but the several other jurors felt that this would be dishonest and it was Charles Wallace’s responsibility to deal with the consequences of his actions that had led to the trial.

One juror said that he hoped to see some improvement in Charles Wallace’s relationship with Calvin and Meg, and suggested mediated conversations to help facilitate this. They were a little uneasy about the mediation because they didn’t want to make Meg face Charles Wallace if she was truly afraid for her safety.

The jury talked about how they could educate Charles Wallace about the Honor Code. They wanted to have him write reflections during his separation. The jury was frustrated by how Charles Wallace seemed to have already been exposed to a lot of resources that might have educated him, such as reading all of the trial abstracts, and didn’t seem to think he needed to be educated further. They suggested having him attend abstract discussions, having him make some kind of guide for confronted parties as he had suggested, and having him rewrite the Honor Code essay.

The jury also felt frustrated with how they might restore trust between Charles Wallace and Professor Murry. The jury hoped that Charles Wallace and Professor Murry would be able to have a conversation where he was truthful and Professor Murry was candid about how Charles Wallace’s actions had affected him. The jury decided to ask Professor Murry whether he had any ideas.

They also wanted to restore trust between Charles Wallace and the previous jury, but felt that the previous jury likely would not want to meet with him. They suggested that some of his reflections could be focused on how his actions had impacted various parties, and they could have him write something to the previous jury at one point. A juror also suggested that communication in the other direction could be helpful, and perhaps Charles Wallace would benefit from reading letters from the current jury or the past jury.

One juror was uncomfortable with the number of resolution ideas that had been suggested, and felt that the jury was imposing too much on Charles Wallace’s life and he would feel resentful. He asked whether, in light of this, the jury would be comfortable writing a letter to the committee charged with reviewing Charles Wallace’s request for entrance to the Advanced
Centaur Studies program, regarding the trial, possibly recommending that Charles Wallace be allowed to pursue the Advanced Centaur Studies program. The juror felt that this letter might help Charles Wallace to feel that the jury wasn’t trying to be punitive. Others didn’t feel that they had an excessive number of resolutions, and felt that in practice it would not take Charles Wallace much time to complete them. Some jurors were also uncomfortable with writing a letter to the committee – some because they didn’t feel it was their business and some because they didn’t want to take a stance in support of Charles Wallace’s admittance to the Advanced Centaur Studies program. In addition, they didn’t want to soften the message of their resolutions because they wanted to see Charles Wallace accept that he would have to make sacrifices.

After listing all of these resolutions, the jury felt that they had expressed all the ideas they had about how to fulfill the trial goals. Some jurors were still concerned that none of the resolutions the jury had proposed would actually make them start trusting Charles Wallace. They wondered whether restoring Charles Wallace to the community was the same as restoring their own, and Professor Murry’s, trust in him. While the jury agreed that they might not all feel comfortable with Charles Wallace at the end of the trial, they should feel like they would trust him enough to be comfortable having a class with him. One juror said that he would be comfortable in a class with Charles Wallace now, under normal circumstances, but he didn’t know how he could come to feel like he would trust him in a situation where he was under pressure to protect himself.

The jury also took some time to discuss a recommended grade change. Several members of the jury felt uncomfortable making a recommendation, although they also felt that it was important to do so because the purpose of a trial was for the community to have input into disciplinary matters. They noted that Professor Murry had seemed to want to decide on Charles Wallace’s grade on his own. Some jurors also mentioned feeling influenced by the fact that Calvin and Meg’s jury had recommended that they receive a 0.0 in the class. The jury debated whether the fact that Charles Wallace may have given more aid than he received should be a factor, since giving aid was still prohibited on the exam. They debated for a while whether the grade should reflect Charles Wallace’s lying or just his conduct on the exam, and whether they felt that his violation should be treated the same way as Calvin and Meg’s. Some jurors were in favor of recommending that Charles Wallace receive the lowest passing grade in the class, a 1.0. The jury was not able to resolve this issue by the end of this meeting, and decided to discuss it more at their next meeting.

The jury decided to take advantage of the fact that they had tentative and final resolutions, and make some of their resolutions somewhat vague in their tentative form, especially the resolution about restoration with Professor Murry and the mediation with Calvin and Meg.

**Jury Deliberations Part III:**

The jury discussed a few issues that had not been resolved at the end of the last meeting.
They debated between recommending a grade of 1.0 and 0.0, mostly coming down to whether they wanted to separate out the academic and non-academic violations in terms of accountability resolutions. They also briefly discussed separation. While some jurors felt that one semester of separation might be equally effective to two semesters, most jurors felt more comfortable with two semesters because they hoped that would be more likely to encourage Charles Wallace to change his perspective.

They also talked about the periodic reflections that they would have Charles Wallace write approximately every month. Finally, the jury discussed the statement they would make about reporting the trial to other institutions of higher learning. They agreed that there was no strong argument that the trial did not fit the definition of a disciplinary proceeding, regardless of whether they hoped that this would not interfere with Charles Wallace’s transfer applications. They had a list of ideas about resolutions but had not completely come to consensus on them, so they decided to meet again to finish discussing their tentative resolutions.

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

The jury started by discussing the grade change resolution further. Most jurors were comfortable with either a 0.0 or 1.0, but preferred one or the other grade. Most of the jury viewed the decision as symbolic, acknowledging that the Professor Murry was likely to make his decision about the grade without giving much weight to the jury’s recommendation. Some jurors felt that recommending a passing grade of 1.0 would acknowledge Charles Wallace’s hard work and make him feel like they thought he belonged at Haverford. In the end, they decided to write a resolution that reflected all of their ideas on the subject, at least at the tentative stage.

The jury consented to the following set of tentative resolutions:

**Tentative Resolutions:**

1. *In assigning Charles Wallace a grade, we ask Professor Murry to consider the amount of work that Charles Wallace put into the class and the potential for his academic restoration as reason to assign the lowest passing grade and also to consider the severity and duration of his violation as reason to assign a 0.0.* (10 jurors consent)
2. *Charles Wallace will be separated from Haverford College for two semesters.* (10 jurors consent)
3. *Charles Wallace will write fifteen 300-500 word reflections, one every three weeks, with the first due on [date]. Some of these reflections will be in response to prompts from the jury, which will be sent to Charles Wallace three weeks before they are due. The others will be open-ended, and their topic will be at Charles Wallace’s discretion. For the penultimate reflection, Charles Wallace will write a letter to the community to be attached to the abstract. For the final reflection, Charles Wallace will rewrite the Honor Code essay.* (10 jurors consent)
4. By [date], Charles Wallace will create a guide for confronted parties participating in Honor Council trials. He should consult with the Honor Council Librarian in the completion of this guide. (10 jurors consent)

5. If Calvin and/or Meg is willing, the jury recommends that they engage in a dialogue with Charles Wallace mediated by a member of Honor Council when they return from their separation. (10 jurors consent)

6. During the [semester], Charles Wallace will attend three Honor Council events. (10 jurors consent)

7. If Professor Murry is willing, Charles Wallace will work on a volunteer basis with him in some capacity, in order to provide an opportunity to rebuild his trust following his separation. (10 jurors consent)

Resolutions as a whole: 10 jurors consent.

Statement on reporting:
The jury recommends that this proceeding be considered disciplinary. (10 jurors consent)

Finalizing Resolutions:
All ten jurors, Charles Wallace, and Professor Murry were at this meeting. A few jurors talked about their differing perspectives on how the grade change resolution held Charles Wallace accountable for his academic and social violations. Professor Murry asked the jury whether they had considered recommending a grade of zero on just the exam. A juror explained that they had thought it would be appropriate for Charles Wallace to receive a grade lower than if he had simply not taken the exam, and that some jurors also wanted to hold Charles Wallace accountable for lying to his professor with the grade change. Professor Murry noted that other institutions were more likely to give Charles Wallace the opportunity to explain his situation if his grade was a 1.0 or 0.0 rather than lowered by a 0 on the test, so perhaps a 1.0 was the best scenario for Charles Wallace. Professor Murry said that he saw the grade change as an academic issue rather than an issue of restoration, and he would want to keep in mind that Charles Wallace had done more work on the exam and would likely have done better on it than Calvin and Meg had they not cheated.

Regarding separation, the jury explained that they wanted to give Charles Wallace time to reflect and come to terms with what had happened and how he would move on from it. They hoped that two semesters was the right amount of time for this to happen without being punitive. Charles Wallace said that he felt that two semesters was too much, given how much the trial had affected him during the current semester. A juror said that he hoped the semesters of separation would be the opposite of the stressful and painful experience of the current semester for Charles Wallace. Other jurors pointed out that the stress caused by Charles Wallace’s cheating on the exam and subsequently lying about it didn’t represent accountability for his actions even if it was
a consequence.

He explained that he would take classes and work during his time off, not “sit at home and reflect,” and a juror explains that the separation was also so that the community would feel more comfortable that Charles Wallace wouldn’t do something similar again. Charles Wallace was more comfortable with that reasoning. The jury explained that they wanted to see Charles Wallace thinking more about how his actions had impacted others in the community. Charles Wallace said that he felt that Professor Murry reconsidering how he administers his exams was a significant impact. He also talked about the breach of trust between him and the original jury, because he had formed a relationship with them the last time he saw them that was based on the lie that he had not violated the Honor Code, and it was now awkward when he saw them. A few jurors pointed out that they didn’t feel like Charles Wallace was really taking responsibility for these breaches and that he seemed to be separating himself from events, and he said he was doing so intentionally to avoid becoming emotional.

The jury next explained their reasoning for the periodic reflections and guide for confronted parties, explaining that they were mostly for Charles Wallace’s benefit and not something he had to write with an audience in mind, particularly the reflections. Charles Wallace also stated that he was not interested in a mediated meeting with Calvin and Meg, and the jury responded that they just wanted to offer help if possible. A juror asked whether Charles Wallace would prefer to keep avoiding them for the rest of his college career, and he said that he appreciated their concern but was not interested in meeting with them.

Next, they discussed the resolution concerning working with Professor Murry. Professor Murry said while he didn’t object, he had trouble envisioning what it might be, and several jurors agreed that they were at a loss for how to implement their idea. They mentioned that they had considered community service as an alternative but felt that Charles Wallace was already very involved in serving the Haverford community.

Finally, the jury summarized their reasoning for recommending that the proceeding be considered disciplinary. They said that they weren’t trying to use this as a way to hold Charles Wallace accountable and simply felt that it was an objective decision. Charles Wallace said that he understood but didn’t feel that it was fair that the trial could have such a large impact on his studying what he wanted to study. The trial chair explained that this was a recommendation to the deans, and Charles Wallace was free to talk to the deans and make his own case. The jury also asked Charles Wallace whether there was something they could do outside of the recommendation itself to make him feel like they were taking his concerns into consideration, because they didn’t feel that they had leeway to change the recommendation. A juror also explained that making this recommendation accurately was a way of being honest as an institution, and they didn’t believe it was right to compromise that. After hearing all of this reasoning, Charles Wallace agreed that he couldn’t argue that the recommendation was objectively wrong, even if he was unhappy about it.

A juror also reminded Charles Wallace that he was free to break his confidentiality in his
had

However, other more three semesters felt others. or several jurors affected that able on to after Charles was Wallace hearing how reflect actions enough that starting briefly semesters two One discussed juror was feel he would the answer be Charles tell Charles program, that the chair trial agreed the but could recommend on justify changing she couldn’t report. The the program Studies affect transfer, Advanced he applied Charles and the to the jury but write couldn’t committee reporting. Jury the on the grade change. He had if the her would keep the jury’s recommendation in mind if the jury came to consensus on recommending one of those options. Professor Murry then left the jury to deliberate.

Several jurors began by expressing their frustration with the way Charles Wallace answered their question about how his actions had impacted the community. They felt he had been responding with his own self-interest in mind and had been manipulative. A juror drew attention to how Charles Wallace had said he was trying to avoid getting emotional, and said that she felt it was important to remember that Charles Wallace could be processing things in a way different from exactly what the jury wanted to see, but might still be processing. The jury agreed that they thought Charles Wallace would have to show more empathy for others before trust was restored, and that they felt separation might help with that. At this point, one juror had to leave, but said that he trusted the group to come to final resolutions and was comfortable with any decision on the grade change.

Discussing the grade change, many jurors were uncomfortable with Professor Murry’s idea of giving Charles Wallace a zero on just the exam. They felt that the violation went far beyond giving him the same grade as he would have gotten if he hadn’t showed up for the exam. Most of the jury felt that recommending a grade of 1.0 in the class was the best compromise between the different factors they had considered.

One juror brought up how she had spent a lot of time thinking about how the trial would affect Charles Wallace as he applied for the Advanced Centaur Studies program and to transfer, but that she couldn’t justify changing the jury’s recommendation on reporting. The jury decided that they didn’t feel that they could write a meaningful letter to the committee charged with admitting Charles Wallace to the program, but agreed that the trial chair could tell Charles Wallace that she would be happy to answer questions that the committee had. Finally, they briefly discussed separation. One juror said that he was starting to feel that two semesters was not long enough after hearing how little Charles Wallace was able to reflect on how his actions had affected others. However, several other jurors felt that three or more semesters of separation
would not be constructive and would push Charles Wallace away from Haverford.

The jury agreed that they should leave the resolution about restoring trust with Professor Murry vague, suggesting that the two meet following Charles Wallace’s separation to discuss ways of potentially restoring trust. The jury consented to the following final resolutions:

**Final Resolutions:**

1. *The jury recommends that Charles Wallace receive the lowest passing grade in the class.* (8 jurors consent, 1 stands outside, 1 stands outside in absentia)
2. *Charles Wallace will be separated from Haverford College for two semesters.* (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)
3. *Charles Wallace will write fifteen 300-500 word reflections, one every three weeks, with the first due on [date]. Some of these reflections will be in response to prompts from the jury, which will be sent to Charles Wallace three weeks before they are due. The others will be open-ended, and their topic will be at Charles Wallace’s discretion. For the penultimate reflection, Charles Wallace will write a letter to the community to be attached to the abstract. For the final reflection, Charles Wallace will rewrite the Honor Code essay.* (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)
4. *By [date], Charles Wallace will create a guide for confronted parties participating in Honor Council trials. He should consult with the Honor Council Librarian in the completion of this guide.* (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)
5. *If Calvin and/or Meg is willing, the jury recommends that they engage in a dialogue with Charles Wallace mediated by a member of Honor Council when they return from their separation.* (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)
6. *During the [semester], Charles Wallace will attend three Honor Council events.* (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)
7. *If Professor Murry is willing, Charles Wallace will meet with him during the [semester]. During this meeting, they will discuss possible work Charles Wallace could do for Professor Murry to help restore trust with him, and if they are able to come up with a plan, they will carry it out.* (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

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

**Statement on reporting:**
The jury recommends that this proceeding be considered disciplinary. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

**Post-Trial:**
The resolutions were not appealed.
Discussion Questions:

1. To what extent should juries consider the potential consequences of their resolutions when crafting them (i.e. to what extent should the jury have taken into account Charles Wallace’s desire to apply to the Advanced Centaur Studies program or transfer)?

2. Should the jury have considered the previous trial resolutions when crafting their new set? If so, to what extent?

3. How should juries approach parties who have lied in the past?

4. Is it possible to restore trust when a party does not feel that community trust has been broken?

5. Is restoring a confronted party to the community the same as restoring a jury’s and the confronting party’s trust in them? Should juries use their own predicted ability to trust the party as a benchmark for what restoration to the community means?

6. What are steps Haverford and Honor Council can take to support jurors on cases that especially difficult or emotionally challenging?

7. How can undergoing a trial process impact relations between parties? How should juries take this into account when drafting resolutions?