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**Summary/Pre-Trial:**

The trial involved two Haverford students, [Gene] and [Louise], inappropriately collaborating on the self-scheduled final exam for [Gym 101]. When confronted by [Coach Blevins], Louise contacted Gene and convinced him to lie and deny the allegations made by Coach Blevins. Before the trial began, however, both Louise and Gene decided to tell the truth about the incident, and expressed a desire to rebuild trust between Coach Blevins and the Haverford community. Some of the discussion in the trial centered around Gene and Louise’s experiences at home and how resolutions could benefit other international students.

**Fact Finding:**

While taking the final exam for Gym 101 in the same room, Gene and Louise started to gradually discuss the exam and eventually collaborate. The final, worth 25% of their overall grade, was much more difficult than either had prepared for, and each student felt that they would not have done as well as they had wanted to without collaborating. The students began by discussing how much of the exam they had completed. Eventually they began collaborating on some of the more difficult questions. These more difficult questions included one near the beginning of the exam that required a prose answer, which the students worded together.

As he was grading the final exams, Coach Blevins noticed identically worded answers both at the beginning and end of Gene’s and Louise’s exams. Suspicious of inappropriate
collaboration, Coach Blevins checked with a colleague in the [Department of Physical Education], who agreed that the similarities were troubling. Coach Blevins proceeded to email Gene and Louise separately, indicating his concern. Louise, afraid of coming forward with the truth, contacted Gene and convinced him to lie about what had occurred. Coach Blevins was not satisfied with their responses, and asked both Gene and Louise to contact Honor Council.

In their first statements to Honor Council, both Gene and Louise said that they did not know how the similarities had occurred, and that they had followed the Honor Code regulations when taking the exam. However, before the trial began, Louise decided to talk to her dean about the incident, who then encouraged her to speak with Coach Blevins about what had taken place. Louise also spoke with her parents about the matter. Separately, Gene also decided to be honest about the collaboration after a period of reflection about his actions. Once both students had notified Coach Blevins about what had happened, they met with him individually, and then sent new statements to Honor Council.

Both students discussed how they felt pressure from their families to do well academically, and cited separate instances of family stress that influenced their motivation to collaborate on the exam. Additionally, they each mentioned feeling disconnected from the community for different reasons, and how this played into their actions to cheat.

In terms of moving forward, both Gene and Louise felt a lot of respect towards Coach Blevins, and wished to focus on restoring their relationship with him. Not only did Gene feel very guilty about cheating, but he also felt that it had been an act of disrespect towards Coach Blevins. Louise talked about how in her meeting with Coach Blevins, he had suggested that she help him find ways to avoid situations where students could possibly collaborate in the future, and that she wanted to continue meeting with him. Both students expressed how their feelings about the purpose of the test had changed, and no longer felt so focused on grades, but rather saw the tests as a way of showing what you had learned.

**Jury Deliberations/Statement of Violation:**

The jury felt unanimously that the collaboration on the exam was a violation of the Honor Code. They also believed the students had honestly represented the extent of their collaboration on the exam, which they felt covered most of the exam and particularly the later sections.

The discussion then focused on whether or not the fact that both Gene and Louise had lied should also be included in the statement of violation. Some jurors felt that it was important to acknowledge that the lying had been a separate incident from the collaboration. Other jurors felt more that the lying was a direct result and continuation of the dishonest behavior on the test, and should not be included in the statement, as students who commit violations rarely turn themselves in with full honesty directly following the event.

In the end, the jury decided that the extent of their dishonesty in lying to Honor Council and Coach Blevins, as well as how long they lied for, warranted the inclusion of lying in the statement of violation. The jury consented to the following statement of violation:
Louise and Gene violated the Honor Code by inappropriately collaborating on their final exam and by initially being dishonest about this collaboration. (10 jurors consent)

Circumstantial Portion:

In this meeting, the jury discussed in more detail how the collaboration had taken place, how the students had decided to lie about the collaboration, and what was happening in their lives at the time.

Neither student was sure who initiated collaboration in the exam room, but thought that Gene had been first to speak, while Louise was first to ask how to approach a question. Gene noted that he felt some pressure to answer Louise and help her, as he thought it would be disrespectful not to and because of their friendship. He included that part of this pressure came from the fact that they were among the few [students from Ocean City] at Haverford. Gene stated that this same pressure also influenced his decision to go along with Louise in lying to Coach Blevins.

Other factors that Gene felt contributed to his cheating extended to academic pressures, family stress, and a lack of sense of belonging in the Haverford community. He expressed to the jury how important academics were to his family and the pressure to get high grades was normal in [Ocean City]. He discussed how he felt additional pressure from his family, as his brother had just dropped out of college and his family’s hopes were now pinned on him alone. He mentioned how this was part of the motivation for him to lie, as he was afraid that his family would be disappointed. Since returning to Haverford’s campus, however, Gene shared how he had reevaluated his ideas about community and belonging. Now, he considers Haverford another home and said that “a home deserves respect”. He felt that by inappropriately collaborating, he had disrespected not only his coach but also the community as a whole, and wished to repair this. This contributed to his decision to come forward with the truth. He added that his ideas about grades and tests had also changed, and he now felt that a good result on a test had no meaning if it was achieved in ways not in line with the values of the Haverford community.

Louise expressed how she felt pressure to do well on the exam because of how much it was worth, and said that she was not used to taking exams worth this much of her final class grade. She shared how she was feeling additional pressure from her family because of the competitive academic environment at home in [Ocean City]. During finals week, she found out that her parents might be getting divorced, which added to the stress she already felt coming from home. Louise also discussed how she felt very disconnected from the community during her first semester at Haverford. After returning to campus, however, she met more people and took more time to try to be part of the community, and realized “what this community values”. She felt that she had let down her community, especially by lying to Coach Blevins when confronted with this violation, but that this trial was an important first step towards resolution.

Louise proposed having more meetings with Coach Blevins, going to the OAR for time management help, and helping other international students by sending them an email early in the
semester to help them feel less alone in the community as possible resolutions. Both Gene and Louise felt that they should receive 0s on the exam, rewrite their Honor Code essays, and write letters to the community. Gene also wanted to help Coach Blevins in some way to show the coach that it was not his fault that Gene had decided to cheat and that this action did not reflect on him as a coach.

Coach Blevins, who was not at this meeting, sent an email that reflected his thoughts about the circumstances of the violation. This included a suggested class grade change of 0.0 for Gene and Louise. While the students felt that a 0 on the exam would be more fair, they wanted to show respect for their coach and were prepared to accept whatever he felt was reasonable.

**Jury Deliberations Part I:**

The jury briefly discussed their thoughts immediately following the circumstantial meeting. Many jurors expressed their discomfort that Coach Blevins wanted the students to receive a 0 in the class, as they felt that the students’ suggestion of a 0 on the exam was more appropriate. However, they did recognize the seriousness of this violation. One juror mentioned that they would have felt the violation would be more excusable if the students had been struggling in the class, rather than just feeling stressed out about meeting their own expectations, so that a 0 in the class would be appropriate.

The jury also discussed how the Haverford community had failed to integrate these students and make them feel welcome. One juror mentioned that this issue needed to be part of a broader conversation within the community. The jury wanted Gene to feel comfortable talking to his family about the violation, as he hadn’t felt able to tell them about the situation yet, so that his family understood it wasn’t an irreparable action. The jury additionally felt that this needed to be addressed through the trial. Finally, the jury was encouraged that both students seemed very engaged with the process, and that this was very promising in terms of their restoration.

**Jury Deliberations Part II:**

The jury discussed a number of possibilities to help Gene and Louise repair their relationships with Coach Blevins and restore them to the community. The jury agreed that meetings between Coach Blevins and the students would be beneficial and the best way to repair the breach of trust between them. The jury also agreed that letters to the community would be an important resolution, especially if these were released during finals week to help other students think about the Honor Code at that time. This discussion included one juror mentioning that it would be good if HCOs also reminded their first-years about the Code around finals weeks. Additionally, having Gene and Louise rewrite their Honor Code essays over the summer break would be a good way to continue their reflection about the Code and help to restore them to the community as a whole.

In terms of education, the jury felt that it would be beneficial for Louise to visit the OAR to help her with her time management and stress, as she had mentioned these had influenced her
violating the Code. As this did not seem as much as a factor for Gene, the jury decided not to include him in this recommended resolution. For Gene, the jury felt that he could work with Honor Council to set up a discussion to help educate students about how to deal with feeling disconnected and provide a space to talk about community values. To protect her confidentiality, the jury felt that Louise should not email international students, but instead suggested that she help plan the Honor Code training that was run during ISO, as this is already planned by the Honor Council co-chairs who are in on confidentiality. The jury discussed how supporting the students using CAPS as a resource could help them in the future in dealing with the issues they had shared with the jury. The jury also wanted to make sure that Gene was able to tell his family about the trial, if he so wished, as they felt this would be very restorative for him.

The jury then discussed accountability in terms of separation and grade changes. The jury agreed that separation would not be beneficial. Regarding the grade change, many jurors felt that a 0 on the exam alone was appropriate; other jurors pointed out how, if the students had not taken the exam they also would had received a 0, and since what they did was worse, there should be an additional grade change. There was a sense that in order to be held accountable in the eyes of the rest of the students in the Gym 101 class, Gene and Louise should not be able to get a better grade than a struggling student who had done all their work honestly. However, many jurors felt that more than a 0 on the exam would feel harsh to Gene and Louise, and that they did not want them to feel the resolutions were punitive or devalue the learning in the class. In addition, some jurors felt some responsibility for the violation lay with the Haverford community itself, in failing to fully welcome the students during their first semester. Ultimately, the jury proceeded with recommending a 0 only on the exam, with the understanding that at least one juror felt strongly that this was insufficient accountability.

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

The jury discussed whether this incident should be considered disciplinary for the purposes of reporting to other institutions. The jurors were varied in their views, as there was a sense that the resolutions were not particularly disciplinary, but that the violation itself was serious and would have been considered disciplinary at another school. Some jurors did not feel the violation itself was disciplinary, and there was uncertainty as to how other schools would have reacted to it. Additionally, some jurors felt that the fact that the students were first-years should be taken into account, and others mentioned they were confident these students would not cheat again. However, a few jurors were not confident of this. Ultimately, the jury summed up these thoughts in a brief statement, as their thoughts about the disciplinary description of the violation at other schools were incomplete and further discussion would not be useful.

At this point, one juror had to leave, but felt comfortable with all the resolutions and the statement, except for resolution 1 which they wished to stand outside on. The remaining jurors then consented to the following set of tentative resolutions, and a tentative statement reporting:
1. The jury recommends that Louise and Gene receive a 0.0 on the final exam. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

2. Louise and Gene will each write letters to the community by [the last day of classes]. These will be released to the community by the start of finals week, in addition to being appended to the abstract. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

3. Louise and Gene will each meet twice with Coach Blevins, if he is willing. These meetings will take place by the end of the [semester]. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

4. Louise and Gene will each rewrite their Honor Code essay by the start of the [following semester]. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

5. The jury supports Louise and Gene using CAPS as a resource. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

6. Louise will meet with the OAR twice by the end of the [semester], to discuss time and stress management. One of these meetings will take place in the two weeks preceding finals week. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

7. Louise will collaborate with Honor Council to design a training about the Honor Code for International Student Orientation (ISO). This will take place by the start of ISO for [the following academic year]. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

8. Gene will collaborate with Honor Council to design a community discussion relating to international students and the Honor Code. This will take place by the end of the [following semester]. (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 feels that this violation would lead to a disciplinary proceeding at other schools. Some, but not all, jurors feel confident that this will not be a reoccurring problem and think that Louise and Gene’s engagement with the process should be considered. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

Finalizing Resolutions:

Both students expressed their satisfaction with the tentative resolutions, and felt they would be helpful in restoring themselves to the community. The jury explained each resolution and discussed them with Gene and Louise. The jury also spoke with Gene about what they could do to help him tell his parents about the cheating and subsequent trial, if he ever wanted to discuss the proceeding with them. In the end, Gene and the jury seemed most comfortable with the jury writing a letter to his parents that he could give to them if he wanted to, explaining what
the process really meant and that the goal is for Gene to be fully restored to the Haverford community.

The jury, Gene, and Louise heard from an email from Coach Blevins that he had thought more about the grade change and was now comfortable with what the jury had recommended in tentative resolutions, and agreed to meeting with Louise and Gene.

The jury also discussed each of the resolutions again with the students, making sure they felt comfortable with them and understood the motivations of the jury in making them. The jury then consented to the following final resolutions and statement about reporting:

1. **The jury recommends that Louise and Gene receive a 0.0 on the final exam.** (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside)
2. **Louise and Gene will each write letters to the community [before the last day of classes]. These will be released to the community by the start of finals week, in addition to being appended to the abstract.** (10 jurors consent)
3. **Louise and Gene will each meet twice with Coach Blevins, if he is willing. These meetings will take place by the end of the [semester].** (10 jurors consent)
4. **Louise and Gene will each rewrite their Honor Code essay by the start of the [following semester].** (10 jurors consent)
5. **The jury supports Louise and Gene using CAPS as a resource.** (10 jurors consent)
6. **Louise will meet with the OAR twice by the end of the [semester], to discuss time and stress management. One of these meetings will take place in the two weeks preceding finals week.** (10 jurors consent)
7. **Louise will collaborate with Honor Council to design a training about the Honor Code for International Student Orientation (ISO). This will take place by the start of ISO for [the following academic year].** (10 jurors consent)
8. **Gene will collaborate with Honor Council to design a community discussion on a topic of his choice. This will take place by the end of the [semester].** (10 jurors consent)

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

Statement on reporting:

*The jury feels that this violation would lead to a disciplinary proceeding at other schools. Some, but not all, jurors feel confident that this will not be a reoccurring problem and think that Louise and Gene’s engagement with the process should be considered. (10 jurors consent)*

**Post-Trial:**

The resolutions were not appealed.
Discussion Questions:
1. How much does a sense of inclusion in the Haverford community affect conduct surrounding the Honor Code?
2. How can the Honor Code be best presented during customs week and ISO?
3. To what degree is it the community's responsibility to integrate students into the community?
4. Should dishonesty be included in a statement of violation?
5. What should students do when the desire to help out a friend conflicts with the Honor Code?

Louise’s Letter to the Community:

Dear Haverford Community,

[During a semester], I broke the honor code by inappropriately collaborating on an exam with another student. I am extremely ashamed of the poor judgement I had made while completing the exam and taking advantage of the trust this community has given me. The moment I broke the honor code, I have given up on the privilege I have as a Haverford student. Although I will never be able to forgive myself on my actions, I would like to use this opportunity to grow as a better individual and help others who may be struggling in similar situations.

Throughout the final exams week, I was stressed and depressed. I think it was a combination of having multiple exams and dealing with difficult family situation that was happening back home. Thinking back, I highly regret not reaching out to the resources that Haverford provided. Ever since, I felt terrible for letting down my professor and for letting myself down. With my irresponsible actions, I had an unfair advantage over my fellow classmates, and most importantly, I felt even more embarrassed for denying my wrongdoing and not telling the truth in the first place.

After the experience, I am glad that I had taken responsibility for my actions and had owned up to my mistakes. I am also thankful to the members of the honor council, who have supported me throughout the process. The constructive discussions I had with them throughout the trial had certainly helped me better understand why Honor Code exists in Haverford community and how I should behave accordingly in order to be part of this community. To the Haverford community, I would like to sincerely apologize for my actions. In the future, I intend to use this incident to become a responsible individual and put my best effort into rebuilding the trust of the community and helping others to not make the same mistake that I have made.

Sincerely,

[Louise]

Gene’s Letter to the Community:
Dear Haverford Community,

I write this letter to show my remorse for my actions in the [semester]. [During that semester], I breached the Haverford Honor Code by inappropriately collaborating with a classmate on the final exam for [class]. While no rationale can justify my actions, I would like to discuss what led to my breaching of the Honor Code and what I have learned from this experience. Due to events occurring back home and the reasons behind my decision to study [at Haverford], I’ve always placed a burden upon myself to excel academically. Throughout the semester, I found myself struggling to meet my personal expectations in [the class]. Nearing the end of the semester, I was in a mindset of defeat, lacking confidence in my academic proficiency and feeling great uncertainty of my ability to chase after my goals. Upon receiving the final exam, the self-doubt in my head multiplied, and I made the inexcusable error of approaching a fellow classmate in the room to work together with me on finishing the exam. A few days after taking the exam, I was given the opportunity to come clean with my actions by [professor], the instructor for the course. Fearing the consequences and dreading the possibility of having to leave Haverford, I did not inform the professor of what I had done. Throughout the entire [break], I subjected myself to shame over both my inability to achieve success on my own and my dishonesty. After returning to the Haverford community, I’ve been given the chance to contemplate the true implications of my actions. Now aware of my own shortcomings, I began seeing the level of respect within the Haverford community among those who adhere to the Honor Code and noticing the pride each member of the community has in regards to honesty and dignity. I realized that regardless of my tenure at Haverford, I will never be a true member of the community unless I meet its ethical standards. I finally understood that the aforementioned pride and sense of integrity are the most valuable possessions my experience at Haverford could offer. In order to set myself on the path to attain those values, I decided to inform both the professor and the Honor Council of my deceit. I disrespected my fellow classmates by getting an unfair advantage that undermines their hard work. I disrespected my professor by lacking consideration for the time and effort he invested in teaching the course. Moreover, I disrespected the Haverford Community by going against many of its most cherished values. I apologize for my offenses, and promise those that I have wronged that I will do everything in my power to redeem myself. I vow to spend the remainder of my time at Haverford on becoming the person that the Haverford Community deserves.