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. The confronted party consented to the release of the abstract.

Key:
**Confronted Party:** Princess Carolyn  
**Confronted Party:** Diane Nguyen  
**Confronting Party:** Professor Todd Chavez  
**Class:** Hollywood Stars and Celebrities 309  
**Other student in the class:** Neal McBeal, the Navy Seal

**Summary/Pre-Trial:**
Honor Council was contacted by [Neal] about suspicious behavior during the midterm for [Hollywood Stars and Celebrities 309]. The student had reported that throughout the test, a few students in the back had been whispering amongst themselves, and that at one point appeared to be gesturing to items on the exam sheet. Honor Council suggested that because Neal wasn’t sure of the names of the students involved, Neal should contact Professor [Chavez] about the suspected violation. After hearing from Neal about the exam and reviewing the tests of potentially involved students, Professor Chavez felt that there was sufficient questionable material in the tests of [Diane Nguyen] and [Princess Carolyn] to take the case to Honor Council. Honor Council then reviewed statements from the parties and sent the case to an Academic Trial.

During the Fact-Finding portion of the ensuing trial, the jury found that there was not sufficient evidence to say beyond a reasonable doubt that Carolyn and/or Diane violated the Honor Code, and came to a statement of non-violation.

**Fact Finding:**
The jury met with Carolyn and Diane. A support person for each member of the confronted parties, Professor Chavez, and a Bi-Co liaison were present. One juror was not present and could not be contacted, so the jury decided to proceed with nine jurors.

Professor Chavez explained his concerns about three questions on the two students’ tests: on one question, where they had arrived at the same correct answer in the same way as much of the class, but the way they presented their work was similar to each other; question 2, where they had used similar and unique terminology and had a similar spelling error, writing “[Hollywood]” as opposed to “[Hollywood]”; and question 4, where they had arrived at the same incorrect answer although neither had work that supported getting that answer. Professor Chavez explained that another student sitting near the pair also had that answer, but after examining that student’s test, he was not suspicious of a violation on the part of that student.

The students corroborated the story, explaining that they had not been able to reproduce the work that gave them the matching incorrect answer on question 4, and that they had been sharing a calculator for that problem as Carolyn’s calculator did not have a function that was needed, which also explained why the two had been talking during the exam. Professor Chavez noted that sharing calculators was not expressly forbidden, but he would have discouraged the practice had he been asked about it beforehand. Carolyn and Diane explained their other answers by saying that the first answer was obvious and their steps to it were common among the class (confirmed by Professor Chavez), and that the terminology in question 2 may have been similar because the two had studied together. They revealed that in their native language, the words for “[Hollywood]” and “[Hollywoo]” are not distinct, and it was a simple translational error to make when writing in English. When asked about any steps they had taken to make sure the other had not seen their work on the shared calculator in question 4, Diane noted she had cleared the calculator before passing it to Carolyn, while Carolyn was not sure if she had done anything or not.

The jury then spoke to the parties separately, beginning with Professor Chavez. He said that after looking at Carolyn’s scratch paper from the test that she had brought to the meeting that it appeared that they had attempted to solve question 4 separately. He said that it was extremely rare for multiple students to have the same wrong answer that he could not recreate, as was the case in question 4, but noted that they had reported the wrong answer to different decimal places. He said that he was not able to objectively evaluate the truth of the students’ statements, and did not think he could make a call about whether or not they had collaborated.

Diane and Carolyn separately said that they thought it was possible that the other had copied off of them as it would have been easy to do, but did not know or think that this was the case. Carolyn in particular spoke of how upsetting the original confrontation had been to her, and how she had ultimately decided to place her trust in the Haverford community and Honor Council system to determine that she had done nothing wrong. She also said that she felt her relationships with Professor Chavez and Diane had become more strained due to the situation.
Jury Deliberations/Statement of Non-Violation:

The sense of the jury immediately following the fact-finding session was that the similar answers on questions one and two could easily be explained. Similar spelling errors could be a factor of English being both students’ second language, and the similarity of question one was not significant enough (in Professor Chavez’ opinion) to raise suspicion independent of the other similarities, since other students had gotten the same answer. However, many jurors felt that their suspicions regarding question four had not been satisfactorily allayed. The first potential explanation the jury explored was the possibility that Carolyn had seen the calculations in the history of Diane’s graphing calculator. After discussion, the jury felt that there was not enough evidence to suggest such a thing had transpired, and that it was not productive to speculate on potential explanations which could not be proven. Furthermore, the jury reminded themselves of the fact that another student sitting nearby who had not used the calculator also arrived at the same answer. While the jury found it suspicious that all three students had arrived at the same incorrect answer, they were not convinced that this fact alone was indicative of a violation, as such an event happening randomly is not impossible in a large class.

Although the jury could imagine any number of ways in which the students could have committed a violation, they did not feel as if there was evidence to conclude anything “beyond a reasonable doubt.” With this as the sense of the jury, the members moved on to discussing a statement of non-violation. They briefly considered a resolution reminding students to bring their own exam materials in order to avoid confusion, but thought that this might seem too authoritative on the jury’s part, and also considered the fact that in the spirit of the Honor Code, students should be able to do things such as borrow a calculator in a pinch, which might be categorically prohibited at schools without a comprehensive Honor Code. One juror mentioned that it was still important for the abstract to mention the risk of such sharing of materials, as a graphing calculator’s answers can be easily accessed, which was agreed to by the other jurors. Following this, the jury consented to the following statement:

The jury does not feel that there is sufficient evidence to say that [Carolyn] or [Diane Nguyen] violated the Honor Code. (9 jurors consent, 1 juror stands outside in absentia, Bi-Co liaison supports).

Post-Trial:

There is no relevant post-trial information to report.

Discussion Questions:

1. How much should the idea of “reasonable doubt” play into a jury’s decisions?

1 Haverford College Students’ Constitution, § 7.02(c)
2. As Bi-Co students, we are afforded freedom to act in ways that might be viewed as suspicious at other institutions and be trusted that we are not breaking the Honor Code. Is there a limit of how far we can or should take this trust?

3. How much information are professors obligated to tell the class about what behavior are appropriate during an exam? How much should be left to “common sense”?

4. What role do other students have in academic cases? Should [Neal] have been a confronting party?