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Key:
Confronting Party: Zeta Alpha Rick, on behalf of the Haverford Community
Confronted Party: Morty Smith
Concerned Party: Birdperson
Citadel of Ricks: Haverford group of which Zeta Alpha Rick is a member
Other members of the Citadel of Ricks: Rick Prime, Quantum Rick, Maximums Rickimus

Summary:
Birdperson and Morty Smith both use RickBook, a platform intended for use by members of the Haverford Community. After Birdperson was quoted in a RickNews article disagreeing with the way RickBook was being used, Morty changed his RickBook username in order to make fun of Birdperson. Morty disagreed with Birdperson’s statement, as he believed that RickBook should be a public forum, and some of the accounts that Birdperson had called out in his quote were friends of Morty’s. When he read the quote, Morty was in a room with a group of friends, one of whom, who was not a member of the Haverford Community, had Morty’s phone, and made jokes about posting things from Morty’s account. Morty was unsure as to whether or not things had actually been posted, but afterwards he found out that the friend had posted a series of memes making fun of Birdperson’s quote, under a username that parodied Birdperson’s—Birdperson’s username at the time being ‘Birdperson137’—Morty’s friend changed Morty’s name to ‘TurdPerson137’. Birdperson saw the post and commented, stating that this account was not his, to which Morty concurred, stating that ‘TurdPerson137’ is not Birdperson, but an evolution of him. After a few hours, Morty realized that the posts were disrespectful, and removed them, and attempted to reach out to Birdperson and the others who had seen the posts.

Rick Prime, who oversees Rickbook usage, became aware of the situation and informed the other members of The Citadel of Ricks: Quantum Rick, Maximums Rickimus, and Zeta
Alpha Rick. The Citadel of Ricks confronted Morty Smith about this situation. The Citadel of Ricks stated that Morty’s actions were not okay and violated the impersonation clause of the IITS policy. Morty expressed that he was not willing to reveal the identity of the friend who posted on Morty’s phone. Zeta Alpha Rick found this both admirable and troublesome, and believed that either way Morty should be expected to “take the rap” for the friend if he did not reveal their identity. The Citadel of Ricks had spoken to Birdperson, who was distressed about the situation but did not want to be involved with any of Honor Council’s trial, as he was very busy, and planning to depart the Haverford community soon.

After his meeting with the Citadel of Ricks, Morty was able to set up a meeting with Birdperson. Morty apologized, and Birdperson expressed that if Morty learned from this, then that was good enough for him. Morty did not reach out to Honor Council, and thus Honor Council reached out to him at the end of that week. Both parties wrote statements, which Honor Council deliberated on for two hours.

**Pre-Trial:**

The first hour, Honor Council discussed whether they felt a procedure was necessary or if they felt the case should be dropped. In particular, they focused on the portion of the code that detailed: “In the case of social concerns, conflicts can ideally be resolved through this initial stage of respectful communication and dialogue; Honor Council should become involved only in situations where the trust of the community as a whole may have been violated or where the perceived breach defies the parties’ abilities to resolve the situation on their own” (Article 3.06, Confrontation, Haverford Students’ Constitution). Many felt that they were not particularly concerned that the violation of the IITS policy constituted a breach of the Honor Code, but were more suspicious that the lack of respectful communication constituted a violation. They ultimately noted that while the breach between Morty and Birdperson seemed to be resolved, the public nature of the violation meant that there was a potential breach with the community which was yet to be addressed.

The second hour of Honor Council deliberations discussed which procedure the case should be sent to. Some felt that the case should be sent to a Joint Panel because of the administrative nature of the IITS policy. However, ultimately Honor Council felt that they were more concerned with the dialogue-between-students side of violation and that anonymity and the Honor Code was a hot-button issue which they wanted as much student input on as possible, and thus they sent it to a social trial.

Honor Council met again to discuss extenuating circumstances. In particular, Honor Council had a heavy caseload at this time and so could only run the trial with four Honor Council jurors, with the approval of the parties. Honor Council could either consent to run the case with 4 Honor Council jurors and 6 community jurors, or with 4 Honor Council jurors and 5 community jurors. The constitution tasks Honor Council with making the “minimum necessary modifications to move the proceedings forward. Such modifications must preserve the substance
of universal trial procedures and uphold the spirit of the Honor Code” (Students’ Constitution Article 7.03g). There was debate as to whether having 10 jurors total or having a more even Honor Council—community juror ratio was more necessary to upholding the spirit of the trial. Ultimately, given the fact that this was a social case that Honor Council in particular had wanted community input on, and given that the 4-5 solution is usually done and the 4-6 solution is worth a try, Honor Council consented to run it with the 4-6 solution.

Fact Finding:

The jurors asked Morty questions to find out the sequence of events, as described earlier in the abstract. The trial chair explained that there would be no separate circumstantial portion. Morty could add in any circumstances he felt were relevant.

Jury Deliberations/Statement of Violation:

The jury felt similarly to Honor Council that they were not very concerned with the IITS policy, most particularly because they did not feel strongly that impersonation had occurred, given that “TurdPerson137” was clearly meant to make fun of, rather than directly impersonate Birdperson’s username. Additionally, Zeta Alpha Rick had referenced that IITS would prescribe their own resolutions if they were not satisfied with the jury’s, making the jury feel that it would be better to deal with this from an Honor Code perspective, given that IITS had their own procedures they could enact.

The jury definitely felt that a violation had occurred, but had difficulty with where the violation lay. Though the jury felt that there was an interpersonal violation between Morty and Birdperson, it did not feel comfortable proceeding with this violation because Birdperson had not been a confronting party and had not expressed that he wanted someone to confront on his behalf. Additionally, they noted that social conflicts between students can be dealt with through confrontation, which seems to have occurred in Morty’s conversation with Birdperson.

The jury considered whether the changing of the name itself was the violation, or if allowing his friend to post the posts under the username had been the violation. The jury felt that it was a combination of the two—in particular, they were not sure if either thing by itself constituted a violation, but felt that it was the two together that created the violation.

The jury reached the following Statement of Violation. One juror stood outside out of uncertainty as to how actively Morty "allowed for" his friend's posts, and felt that the trust in our community depended on being able to trust our fellow community members (i.e. that leaving your phone out, for example, is not a violation of the code but an example of trust). This juror still believed that a violation had occurred, but preferred the statement of violation to be focused on the creation of the username.

Statement of Violation:

[Morty] violated the Honor Code by creating the username “[TurdPerson137]” and allowing
for subsequent disrespectful communication in a public setting, thus breaching the trust of the community. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside)

Jury Deliberations and Tentative Resolutions:

The juror that stood outside was able to get more clarification about the situation in which the friend was posting. Morty said that they were all in the same room together, and they knew things were being posted under the username, but not exactly what was being posted. This made the juror more comfortable with the statement of violation.

The discussion of tentative resolutions was very collaborative, and took place over the course of two meetings. In the first meeting, Morty was present, and the jury came to resolutions 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 (though with one fewer reflection on resolution 2 than was ultimately decided on). Together with Morty providing feedback, the jury brainstormed resolutions that met each of the trial goals.

In the second meeting, in which the jury deliberated by themselves, a few changes were made. In particular, a juror started out by expressing frustration with the fact that the jury did not have access to copies of the posts, and wondering if more accountability was necessary in the case. The jury made a few changes to the resolutions.

The first change was the addition of a third reflection over the summer, which addressed the impact on the community, helping to alleviate the juror’s concerns about accountability.

Additionally, resolution 3 was added. One of the jurors voiced a feeling that there was something not being addressed about the relationship between Morty and his friend who posted the comments. Additionally, the jury felt like there was an interesting level to the case in that the friend isn't a member of the Haverford community, so an additional reflection about that after the meeting could be useful.

Lastly, one resolution was removed. In the jury’s conversations with Morty, they began discussing the IITS policy and came up with an idea for a resolution which encouraged IITS to have students sign the IITS acceptable use policy and allow students to provide feedback on the policy at this time (so as to encourage student involvement and responsibility in relation to the IITS policy). During the discussion of this resolution, someone brought up that the whole idea of not including the IITS policy in our statement of violation was that they felt that their jurisdiction was more over the Honor Code and less over the IITS policy. While many of the jurors did feel it could be useful for there to be reading, re-signing, and feedback of the acceptable use policy each year, they ultimately felt like it wasn't their position as a jury to make that recommendation.

The jury discussed their statement on reporting, and the majority of the jury felt that this conflict was very specific to the Haverford community (other institutions would have either ignored it or gone through a very different sort of procedure), and that the procedure did not feel disciplinary. Thus, the jury reached a recommendation that this not be reported as disciplinary.

Tentative Resolutions
1. [Morty] will reach out to [Rick Prime] and, if [Rick Prime] is willing, they will work together to prepare materials to educate future [RickBook] users on proper use, with respect to the Honor Code and the IITS Acceptable Use Policy. This will occur during or prior to the [following] semester. (10 jurors consent)

2. [Morty] will create the following reflections:
   a. The first reflection will discuss community impact through online posting. This reflection will be completed by [date].
   b. The second reflection will occur after re-reading the Honor Code and will discuss confrontation and the Social Code. This reflection will be completed by [date].
   c. The third reflection will occur after re-reading the IITS Policy. This will be completed before the start of the [following] semester. (10 jurors consent)

3. [Morty] will meet with [Birdperson], if [Birdperson] is willing, to discuss the violation and its impact on the community. Following this meeting, Morty will complete a reflection discussing the impact of outside members’ actions on the Haverford community by the end of the [following] semester. (10 jurors consent)

4. [Morty] will write a letter to the community by [date]. (10 jurors consent)

5. Two jurors will meet with representatives of the [Citadel of Ricks] and IITS, if they are willing, to discuss the jury’s thought process behind the resolutions. This meeting will occur before the end of the [following] semester. (10 jurors consent)

6. The jury recommends that Honor Council hold a forum concerning anonymity and respectful communication in online forums during the [following] semester. (10 jurors consent)

On resolutions as a whole: (10 jurors consent)

Statement on Reporting to Other Institutions of Higher Learning:
The jury recommends that this not be reported as a disciplinary proceeding to other institutions of higher learning. (10 jurors consent)

Finalizing Resolutions:
Morty asked for clarification on a few of the changed resolutions during finalizing, but did not express any concerns except a small timeline switch. Zeta Alpha Rick noted that he felt it would be good to address Morty’s refusal to report his friend. The jury changed the wording on resolution 3 to address this, and consented to final resolutions.

Final Resolutions
1. [Morty] will reach out to [Rick Prime] and, if [Rick Prime] is willing, they will work together to prepare materials to educate future [Rickbook] users on proper use, with
respect to the Honor Code and the IITS Acceptable Use Policy. This will occur during or prior to the [following] semester. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

2. [Morty] will create the following reflections:
   a. The first reflection will discuss community impact through online posting. This reflection will be completed by [date].
   b. The second reflection will occur after re-reading the Honor Code and will discuss confrontation and the Social Code. This reflection will be completed by [date].
   c. The third reflection will occur after re-reading the IITS Policy. This reflection will be completed before the start of the [following] semester. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

3. [Morty] will meet with [Birdperson], if [Birdperson] is willing, to discuss the violation and its impact on the community. Following this meeting, [Morty] will complete a reflection discussing the impact of outside people’s actions on the Haverford community and taking responsibility for those people’s actions. This meeting and this reflection will occur by the end of the [following] semester. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

4. [Morty] will write a letter to the community by [date]. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

5. Two jurors will meet with representatives of the [Citadel of Ricks] and IITS, if they are willing, to discuss the jury’s thought process behind the resolutions. This meeting will occur before the end of the [following] semester. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

6. The jury recommends that Honor Council hold a forum concerning anonymity and respectful communication in online forums during the [following] semester. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

On resolutions as a whole: (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

**Statement on Reporting to Other Institutions of Higher Learning:**
The jury recommends that this not be reported as a disciplinary proceeding to other institutions of higher learning. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

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

**Discussion Questions:**
1. How does the IITS Acceptable Use Policy relate to the Haverford Honor Code?
2. How do questions of jurisdiction come into play with this case? In other words, how was
the online nature of this violation treated compared to in-person violations of the Code?

3. How can accountability, restoration, and education best be achieved in a social trial like this one?