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Summary/Pre-Trial:
This trial involved Dolores Abernathy, a student in Professor Bernard Lowe’s Plot Twist 101 class. During her self-scheduled final exam on [date redacted] from 9 AM to 12 PM, Dolores accessed her moodle account, which had practice tests from previous years and their solutions. She violated the Honor Code by looking at these documents and copying the answers to the questions from the practice tests that appeared on the final exam. For a substantial portion of the trial, Dolores denied that she violated the Honor Code, had a friend sign a letter that Dolores wrote asserting her innocence, and constantly lied to the jury throughout the process. The jury came to two statements of violation, and consented to give Dolores a 0.0 in the class, as well as to separate her from the community for a year, amongst several other resolutions.

Given the high amount of cases at the time, Honor Council consented to run four trials at once, each trial having 5 community jurors and only 4 honor council jurors. During the preliminary meeting the jury discussed the extenuating circumstances that Honor Council had consented to, and debated about how to proceed in terms of consensus. It was decided that if all jurors were present, one juror could stand outside and consensus could still happen; if 8 jurors were present and one juror was standing outside in absentia, one juror could still stand outside and consensus could still happen. However, consensus could not happen if less than 8 jurors were present at the meeting.
Fact Finding:

Everyone was present at the meeting, and Dolores brought a support person. Dolores started by saying her side of the story, which did not add much from her statement. She had studied for the test from the practice tests that were posted on Moodle, and took the exam in [building] on [date redacted] during the morning exam time-slot. She also said that she was surprised to find that a lot of the material was similar or exactly the same as the material in the practice tests, but also mentioned that Professor Lowe had recycled questions in the past. After Dolores finished with her statement, she gave the chair of the trial a letter from a friend, Teddy Flood, that explained why there may be a Moodle timestamp from her account at the same time that she was taking her final test. The letter explained that Teddy had been using Dolores’s computer because his had been broken, and that he had accessed Dolores’s moodle because they were both taking Plot Twist 101 and Dolores had her moodle password autosaved. The chair of the trial did not read the letter out loud and only skimmed it in silence at that moment.

After Dolores, Professor Lowe gave his statement, which also aligned with what he had said in his written statement. He noticed similarities in Dolores’s answers to questions that had been in the practice tests, to the extent that the coincidence seemed suspicious. Since this happened over [break], he decided to confront Dolores via email, and give her an incomplete for the course until the case could move to trial. Professor Lowe acknowledged that it was an oversight on his part to have so many of the same questions from the practice test in the final test, but that that did not invalidate the fact that many of the answers Dolores’s test were too similar to the answers given in the practice test. He also stated that, as a professor, he disliked very much being in this situation, and that if he was wrong about the suspicion, that he was sorry.

The jury went on to ask Dolores what her memorization process looked like. Dolores said that she tried to memorize exact sentence structure where possible, since she said Professor Lowe appreciated particular wordings for his answers. She said that she studied for about a week and a half, during the course of which she verbally went over answers with other members of the class, Maeve Millay (her HCO) and Teddy Flood, but given her additional obligations at the time, she couldn’t study as much as she would have liked.

Dolores and her support person left the room so the jury could ask Professor Lowe questions without the student present. Professor Lowe stated that he could not believe that Dolores could have memorized the 100 pages available from practice exams that could be on this exam, and that it would have been different had there only been one practice exam available and Dolores had memorized only one exam. He responded to Dolores’s statement of Professor Lowe liking particular wording, which he said was true. However, he said that the way Dolores had written her answers was still suspicious, as there were still mistakes in some sentence structure that made the answer nonsensical.

Professor Lowe left the room, and Dolores and her support person returned so that the jury could speak to Dolores without Professor Lowe present. Dolores did not have much to add,
but said that she was upset by the accusation, and that she felt the hard work she had put in the class had been diminished. The jury asked if the strategy of memorization had worked in the past. Dolores said that she had seen this done in the past, and that even on the final exam Professor Lowe had recycled problems from the first problem set, and so Dolores had been using this strategy all year. The jury also asked if such memorization had produced good results in previous exams, to which Dolores said she thought it had. The last question from a juror was why she had used this study method of pure memorization, and if she had understood everything that she had written. Dolores said that since she was pressed for time, it seemed that memorization was the best route. However, she couldn’t say that she understood all that she wrote, again due to being pressed for time.

Jury Deliberations/Statement of Violation:

The chair of the trial asked the jury if they were suspicious that a violation occurred. A couple of jurors said that they were slightly suspicious that a violation had occurred, but one of them said that they saw the possibility in memorizing all these things as a tactic. Another juror said that, since she had taken the class, she found it very difficult to believe that Dolores had memorized it if she did not even understand the material. Another juror said that, given that Dolores had not been the best student so far, it was unlikely for them to think that memorization had worked to such extent. Other jurors agreed with this.

Another juror said that, though they were also suspicious, that they felt the jury’s feelings were strongly influenced by the fact that Professor Lowe had presented the jury with Dolores’s previous midterm grades. Although this juror did not believe Professor Lowe was lying about the previous grades, they wanted something else that would support a Statement of Violation. A juror said that the answers were very similar, even word for word, and that there was enough change in some sentences, which the juror said happens when someone wants to copy answers.

The jury also asked the Chair of the trial to read the letter from Teddy Flood that Dolores had presented at the beginning of the meeting. The jury felt that there was a lot of suspicion given what was written in the statement. A juror said that there are contradictions that go beyond the reasonable doubt, especially the memorization of over 100 pages even though Dolores said she didn’t have time to study that much. The jury also felt very confused and wanted to know more about the letter, but acknowledged that Honor Council was not an investigative body. Nevertheless, the Chair saw that the weight of the room was leaning towards Statement of Violation.

The jury talked about what would be included in the Statement of Violation. A juror proposed that based on evidence, they would say Dolores violated the Honor Code by using disallowed resources in the test. Another juror said that whether or not Dolores had used disallowed resources, that there was a very clear similarity between the practice exams and the final test. Another juror said that saying ‘whether or not Dolores had used disallowed resources’ consequently meant that there is an equal chance of there being a Statement of Non-Violation.
However, everyone agreed that there were way too many similarities between the practice test and the final test, inconsistencies between her written and verbal statements, and that the letter had raised even more suspicion. The jury talked about whether they wanted to negate a Statement of Non-Violation or support a Statement of Violation. After some consideration, the jury felt more comfortable with the latter. The jury finally consented to the following Statement of Violation:

**Statement of Violation:**

*Given the high degree of inconsistency in [Dolores’s] statements (both the one presented to Honor Council and her verbal statement during Fact Finding) and the great number of similarities between the solutions given on the practice exam and her final exam, the jury believes beyond a reasonable doubt that [Dolores] stands in violation of the Honor Code. (9 jurors consent)*

**Between Fact Finding and Circumstantial:**

During a meeting between the Honor Council Executive Board and the Dean of the College, Dr. Robert Ford, the Chair of the trial mentioned the letter presented by Dolores. Since there was the potential for a second violation by Teddy, the author of the letter, for possibly covering up for Dolores, Dean Ford and the Honor Council Co-Chairs agreed to have Dean Ford contact IITS in regards of the Moodle timestamps. On Tuesday, Dean Ford contacted the Honor Council Co-Chairs with the following information:

There was a login from Dolores's Moodle account shortly after the start of the exam time-slot. At this time, the account accessed several documents, including the answers for the practice exam. The IP address was not from the school network (meaning that it was accessed from a device that did not use the School's wifi (e.g a phone)), therefore it was most likely not Teddy Flood on Dolores's computer. The next day, Dean Ford contacted the Co-Chairs, saying that Teddy had not written that letter, and that he had just signed it looking at a couple of statements that were true without reviewing the document in its entirety. He then sent a letter to Dean Ford, who forwarded it to the Co-Chairs. The Chair of the trial sent all this information, along with the new letter from Teddy to the rest of the jury.

**Circumstantial I:**

Eight of the nine jurors met with Dolores for Circumstantial. The Chair of the trial began by explaining what the jury had found out between Fact Finding, including the Moodle timestamps information, and the letter that Teddy sent Dean Ford. The Chair said that before Circumstantial began, the jury wanted to hear from Dolores. Dolores stated that Teddy told her she had been using her computer. She also said that she accessed Moodle from her phone, but that she did not use it during the exam—rather, that she opened it when waiting to get the exam in order to cram information, and Moodle might have been open on her phone, which is why there
might have been a timestamp. Dolores said that she wrote the letter that Teddy willingly signed, and that the reason why she had given the jury the letter is because she wanted to cover all bases in order for there to be no confusion, especially because she had used her phone before the exam and she was worried about it.

The jury went on to ask other questions in relations to the class and the incident. Dolores said she had been doing well in the class, and that she was not particularly stressed. She said that there were no other students from the Plot Twist class taking the test with her, except for a friend, and that there was another person in the room, whom she did not know.

After no further questions, Dolores went on and presented resolutions. She first said that she wanted a meeting with Dean Ford and Teddy, as well as a meeting with Professor Lowe. She also proposed a meeting with the OAR to determine more proactive ways for studying going forward, and after said meeting, she would write a letter to Professor Lowe to outline how her study habits have changed. After being asked, she said she was also keen on retaking the class, whether audited or for credit, given that she had enjoyed it. No other resolutions were presented on her part.

**Jury Deliberations I:**

One juror started by expressing their feelings before coming to Circumstantial and after speaking to Dolores. They said that coming into the meeting they were weighing separation, and at the time thought they would be able to consent to it, but after what she had said, without looking at anything else, it was very plausible for Dolores’s circumstance to have happened. Some jurors agreed that it was plausible, but they believed that Dolores was still being dishonest with them and had been giving the exact amount of information that might satisfy the jury. The jury felt strongly that Dolores had been disrespectful of both the process and the jury’s time, though some agreed with the first juror as well, since they saw the possibility of Dolores checking her phone before the exam.

The jury went on to review the information that they knew. They weighed what Dolores had told the jury since Fact Finding—having memorized a lot of the questions from the practice test answer keys, accessing Moodle before the exam to rapidly cram, and that the phone may have been on in her pocket during the exam. They also considered the time that Dolores logged into Moodle, and what folders were accessed (Problem Sets, Past Midterm Suggested Solutions, and Past Final Exam Suggested Solutions). The jury also considered Teddy’s second letter, but were also skeptical about its authenticity, and said they could not rely completely on it to make any decisions. The jury was very confused, but the weight of the room agreed that they were much more certain that Dolores had cheated on the exam, and that she had lied to Professor Lowe and the jury.

The Chair of the trial received an email from Dolores while the jury was deliberating, which asked if she could meet with them to say something on the record. The jury debated whether they were ready to meet with Dolores a second time or if they wanted to wait until that
night’s meeting. Though the jury was split, they saw the many more benefits of meeting with Dolores, and thus the Chair of the trial emailed Dolores to come back to the room. They also agreed that once their discussion with Dolores was done, they would also end the meeting so that they had time to think and process.

**Circumstantial II:**

Dolores came to the room and asked if they could talk more about the login times. The Chair of the trial explained in detail everything that they knew again. Dolores explained that her phone was on in her pocket, and that she did go to the bathroom at one point, but did not use it. She said that she did not know how Moodle works, and that maybe it was open in the background.

Dolores also wanted to know what Professor Lowe’s resolutions were. The Chair of the trial explained that Professor Lowe had proposed a 0.0 on the class and that the jury should at least discuss separation, given that he thought every academic case should discuss it and the jury come to consensus in each case what would have granted separation. Dolores said that a 0.0 on the class was ridiculous, and the Chair of the trial said that Professor Lowe’s reasoning behind it was that there was great suspicion of cheating on a majority of questions from the exam and the exam was the biggest assignment of the course, and such a violation invalidated the work done in the class. Dolores had several questions regarding separation, which the Chair of the trial and the rest of the jury explained, but in the end Dolores said that she did not see how separation would be beneficial.

**Jury Deliberations II:**

A juror started by stating that they were so shocked that Dolores had not confessed to anything, and thought that she was going to confess when she came back to the room. They expressed their anger, and how such feelings may affect how they built and consented to resolutions. Others agreed with them, saying that they were offended and saddened. One juror expressed that at a point between both meetings that day they had seriously doubted themselves in terms of doing the right thing—they thought that the jury had messed up from the very beginning, but that as they looked back at all the evidence, it was impossible that Dolores was telling the truth, and saw several violations aside from the cheating on the exam.

The juror who was not present at the previous meeting stated that, though they agreed a violation occurred, they were still uncomfortable with separation, given the power dynamics that the jury had as students. They wanted to believe that there was another way where Dolores is engaged with the community that did not entail separation. Other jurors agreed that they hated the idea of separation, and questioned how to restore someone whose version of reality was so different from what actually happened that did not entail separation, which seemed like an easy way out. Another juror pointed out that Honor Council jurors ran and were elected to make such decisions, and community jurors had also agreed to serve on a trial that may or may not include
separation. Though it is a tough thing to do, they said that Dolores’s breach of trust had now been much greater. A general feeling around the room, especially with jurors who had previously served on a trial, is that they had never felt this uncomfortable in a trial. The jury also talked about the effectiveness of having Dolores meet with people, and whether they should propose resolutions that Dolores was not going to engage with.

The Chair of the trial thought it best before going forward with writing resolutions to talk about whether they wanted to consent to another statement of violation. The jury talked about the previous statement of violation, and the fact that it was written in such way because the jury had doubts as to whether it had happened. However, the weight of the room had moved to be of great certainty that not only one but several violations had happened, both academic and social. The jury talked about adding more information to the first statement of violation, or just writing a second statement all together. The jury wanted Dolores to understand the severity of, not only cheating, but presenting the jury false information, and lying all together to both them and Professor Lowe.

The jury talked about sending Dolores to a Social Trial, and whether the Chair of the trial, all of the jury, or a third party should serve as the confronted party. While they saw benefits of having a second trial, they ultimately decided that it would be more beneficial if they were the ones creating resolutions that breached Dolores’s trust with them. The jury were more keen on having a second statement of violation that would also include violations of the social code that happened within the trial. They talked about what entailed the social violations, and how they wanted to phrase it in a way that their feelings were expressed without blurring the reality of what happened. After thorough discussion on what should be included and how it should be phrased, the jury consented to the following second statement of violation.

Second Statement of Violation:

[Dolores] violated the Honor Code by using disallowed resources and cheating on her [Plot Twist 101] final exam, and by continuously and intentionally lying to Professor [Lowe] and the rest of the jury, despite the jury having evidence proving the violation. Throughout the Academic Trial, the jury found violations of the Social Code, notably through [Dolores’s] introduction of evidence she knew to be false, ever-evolving statements when presented with new information, and general lack of concern for honest and open discussion. (8 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

The jury decided to end the meeting and meet with Dolores again for a Circumstantial meeting in which they would discuss the second statement of violation.

Between Jury Deliberations II and Circumstantial III:

The morning after the second statement of violation was sent to Dolores and Professor Lowe, Dolores emailed the Chair of the trial, sending an attached letter to the rest of the jury.
The letter included an apology from Dolores to the jury, as well as a confession that she had looked at her Moodle account several times during the test when she went to the bathroom. The Chair of the trial also received an email from Dolores’s HCO, Maeve Millay, (who was also the person Dolores studied with) who reported that Dolores had told her the night before that she had cheated, and that she was in the trial. The email stated that she explained to Dolores that she needed to report this to Honor Council, regardless of Dolores’s decision to report. The Chair of the trial made the jury aware of the new information, but decided not to meet beforehand to discuss the new information and also decided not to present this email to the jury until Jury Deliberations III.

**Circumstantial III:**

The jury met with Dolores for circumstantial about the second statement of violation. Dolores started by apologizing and acknowledging her breach of trust, not only by cheating, but also by lying to the jury. She restated many of the feelings expressed in the last letter that she sent. The floor was then opened for questions from the jury, which centered a lot on the cheating of the exam, as well as restating questions that the jury had asked during Fact-Finding that they hoped would now be answered truthfully. One juror asked why she had the desire to lie when presented with the trial and during the trial, to which Dolores answered that she just panicked and that her first response was to deny. She also admitted wanting to confess during Circumstantial II, but that she did not know how to articulate it. She expressed that apart from telling her HCO, she had told one other person, but didn’t give their identity, as well as people from home.

Dolores then went through the resolutions that she had proposed. She agreed that she should receive a 0.0 on the test, and though opposed, said that if a 0.0 on the class would restore her, that she would be okay with it. Dolores also proposed meeting with different resources on campus, attending Honor Council events, and meeting with Professor Lowe to restore the trust and express what steps she has done to grow since the breach. Lastly, she proposed to rewrite the Honor Code essay.

A juror asked Dolores about why she came to Haverford, to which she responded that she came *because* of the Honor Code, since it gives students a lot of freedom and is unique in relation to other colleges, but also noted that she had taken advantage of this freedom. Another juror asked her why the jury should trust her now, after days of dishonesty. Dolores stated that, while she knew she hadn’t earned the jury’s trust and respect, she hoped that they could find in themselves the mindset to give her a second chance.

The Chair of the trial asked Dolores about separation, and the fact that the jury would probably have to think about it to a greater extent. She said that, in all honesty, she thought that separation would only alienate her more, and it would punish her further for what she did.

**Jury Deliberations III:**
The jury decided to express how they felt after meeting with Dolores by speaking out of silence. Several jurors were skeptical about the sincerity of Dolores’s letter, as well as the purpose behind the resolutions. Other jurors, despite also being generally dismayed, expressed relief that she came forward, even if that meant writing a second Statement of Violation. Everyone agreed, to some point, that she was being very repetitive in her written and verbal apology, and that her proposed resolutions seemed to be a way to get off lightly with a severe violation.

The jury’s discussion started focusing more on separation. One juror pointed out that they thought there was no excuse for Dolores’s cheating and lying, and that Dolores’s strong opposition to separation only demonstrated how much separation might actually benefit Dolores. Others responded that it was a way to rebuild their own trust in Dolores, and while she may not see the benefits currently, that separation was intended to be just as restorative for the greater community as it was for Dolores. One juror said that they felt they needed separation at that point, and that they would block anything that wouldn’t include it. Another said that that they thought separation would be that effective, and thus were not sure about consenting to it. Another wanted to clarify that separation was being considered primarily due to dishonesty throughout the trial process, and not due to cheating on the final exam.

They said that Dolores was not really taking the trial process seriously, and that both she and the community needed to know that cases like these should be taken seriously. They agreed that separation is necessary for the community, and that it should be taken as a restorative measure, as opposed to accountability. The jury also wrote down resolutions they had discussed during the last deliberation, which included a varied range on education, restoration, and accountability resolutions. They started talking about what resolutions were significant, and if Dolores’s resolutions were significant. However, given the amount of time they had been deliberating, they decided to postpone the deliberations to another day.

**Jury Deliberations IV:**

The jury met again for deliberation, and started talking about separation, retaking the class, either for credit or not, and letters to the jury, Professor Lowe, and the community. There was still some uncertainty expressed by few jurors about separation, especially one year separation. As for retaking the class, the jury pondered whether to let her retake it would be the best decision. However, given Dolores’s stated interest in majoring in the subject, the jury recognized that she would have to eventually retake the introductory level class if the jury was going to consent to a 0.0 in the class. The jury also discussed to what extent was having Dolores write letters would be an effective way of restoration, and whether writing letters to Teddy, her support person, and her HCO was necessary, or if there was no substantive ground for the jury to dictate that there was a breach of trust in that regard.

The jury briefly went back to separation, as some jurors wanted to emphasize that separation was not something they wanted to do, but they felt it necessary in order to have
Dolores restored into the community. However, these jurors felt that more than a year would be punitive. The debate then was whether the jury would consent to no separation, one semester of separation, or one year of separation. Aside from that, they discussed what route for accountability they thought best. They read what Professor Lowe recommended, which was a 0.0 in the class, given that Dolores cheated on a big portion of the biggest assignment of the class. The jury also pondered about giving her no credit in the class, but noted that by doing that, Plot Twist 101 would not be averaged into her GPA, and the jury did not think that was right.

After discussing the grade change, the jury went back to separation, and what the restoration process for Dolores’s separation would look like. The jury agreed that she needed time away from the community to help herself and the community, and because of that there should be letters, reflections, or activities she should do during her separation to maintain a connection with the school and its values during separation. The jury decided to write down what they wanted Dolores to get out of separation: this included physical time and space away from the people involved, reflection on the real purpose of her attending to Haverford, reflection on what being “liberated” truly meant (within the context of the Honor Code), an opportunity to spend time in a “medium-stress” environment, and development of study habits. Furthermore, the jury hoped that separation would serve as a wake up call, so that Dolores could understand the severity of what she had done, as the jury still felt that she was not taking the initial breach or the trial process all that seriously. After thoroughly discussing separation, there was still uncertainty as to what the weight of the room was. The Chair of the trial decided to go around the room and let each juror share whether they would consent to any separation, and if so, how long of a separation would they be most comfortable with. While many raised their discomfort in having to consent to separation simply because of its drastic nature, all agreed that they would consent to it, and there was an almost unanimous weight of the room that preferred a year of separation, instead of a semester, though the concerns brought up about separation being harmful made it impossible for the jury to keep discussing other matters, and decided to adjourn the meeting.

Jury Deliberations V and VI:

The jury met again, already with the mindset that there would be a 0.0 in the class and some sort of separation, either a semester or a year. Jurors talked about how, especially if they were to consent to a year, that they wanted to emphasize their desire for separation to be seen as restorative, and not as accountability. They also expressed how this case would have resulted in expulsion in other institutions of higher learning, and that while transferring was always an option, they wanted Dolores to feel like she could come back. After discussing this the jury felt much more comfortable with the idea of a year (as opposed to a semester).

Once they decided about separation and the grade change, the jury decided to talk about the rest of the resolutions. The jury talked about what they wanted Dolores to do during her separation, both in terms of personal activities and reflections related to the trial. The jury liked
the idea of her practicing responsibility, as well as having bi-monthly reflections. In particular with reflections, the jury wanted to create an outline that did not seem as busy work but that would also make Dolores think critically about her position as a student at Haverford. They also wanted her to write letters to Professor Lowe, the jury, and the community, as they all had been harmed in different ways. The jury discussed whether to include her support person, Teddy, her HCO, and the rest of her first-year hall as part of the letters, but the weight of the room decided that, since they had not talked directly with any of these parties, the jury did not know to what extent Dolores’s breach of trust had been with them, and thus it seemed weird to propose letters specifically to them.

The jury also wanted Dolores to have the opportunity to pursue a Plot Twist degree, should she choose to do so, given that she had raised interest. Apart from that, the jury brought up all the possible meetings that would be effective for Dolores to have. While the jury was close to consenting, the meeting had to be adjourned to that night due to some jurors’ commitments.

That night, the jury deliberated on certain prompts that they were uneasy with, especially with prompts for the reflections that had been previously presented, as well as the way they wanted to phrase the resolution on practicing responsibility. The jury also talked about where they stood in terms of reporting to other institutions of higher learning, and there was a defined divide as to whether this should be reported or not, but all agreed that, should she violate the code again or transfer before the completion of the resolutions, that the trial should be reported in full.

After deliberation that took way longer than expected, the jury was able to come to consensus to the following set of tentative resolutions.

**Tentative Resolutions:**

1. Based on the severity of the violation and the significance of the final exam in relation to the whole class, the jury recommends that [Dolores] receives a 0.0 in her [Plot Twist 101] class. (9 jurors consent)

2. The jury supports [Dolores] in meeting with Professor [Lowe], if Professor [Lowe] is willing. before the end of the [date] semester. This meeting can be mediated by a member of the jury or the Honor Council Executive Board. (9 jurors consent)

3. [Dolores] will be separated from the community for one full academic year, starting [date]. (9 jurors consent)

4. The jury supports [Dolores] in seeking out opportunities for her to practice responsibility during her separation.
   a. This could include, but is not limited to, a part-time job, a full-time job, an internship, community service, or enrolling in a community college course.
   b. This statement was left deliberately vague so she can pursue such opportunities in whatever method speaks to her. Ultimately, the jury hopes that she re-enters the
community with the same values of trust, concern, and respect that we expect from every Haverford student. (9 jurors consent)

5. Due to [Dolores’s] interest in the field, the jury encourages [Dolores] to take an introductory [Plot Twist] course in a lower-stress environment during her separation. Pending departmental approval, this would earn [Dolores] transfer credit, allowing her to continue her study of [Plot Twist] at Haverford, should she choose to do so. (9 jurors consent)

6. During her separation, [Dolores] will write bi-monthly reflections, starting [date], and ending [date], for a total of eight reflections, each to be a minimum of 400 words.
   a. The first five reflections will be in the following order, and with the following prompts, all of which will be sent to the Staff Support Person for archiving:
      i. Summarize and reflect on the circumstances surrounding her breach of trust,
      ii. Elaborate on the freedoms she as a student has within the Honor Code, and what responsibilities she has to abide by the Code’s guidelines,
      iii. How has she grown since the last two reflections she wrote,
      iv. What steps she has taken to fulfill resolution 4,
      v. A reflection on a relevant topic of her choosing,
   b. The last three reflections will be, in no particular order, a letter to the community, a letter to the jury, and a letter to Professor [Lowe]. The letter to the community will be appended to the abstract, while the other two will only be sent to their intended recipients and to the Staff Support Person for archiving.
      i. The jury supports [Dolores] in amending whatever remaining breach of trust there may be with Teddy, her support person, her HCO, and the rest of her first-year hall within the letter to the community. (8 jurors consent, 1 juror stands outside)

7. [Dolores] will meet with the Honor Council librarian twice during her separation, once during the [redacted] semester and once during the [redacted] semester. This meeting can happen via Skype. (9 jurors consent)

8. Within the first month of the [redacted] semester, [Dolores] will meet with the remaining jurors, if they are available and willing, to amend whatever remaining breach of trust there may be. (9 jurors consent)

9. If [Dolores] plans to pursue a major or minor in [Plot Twist] upon her return to campus in the [redacted] semester, Dolores must meet with Professor [Lowe], so long as Professor [Lowe] is available and willing. (9 jurors consent)

10. The jury supports [Dolores] in seeking out advising from the different resources on campus, which include the OAR, peer tutoring, the Writing Center, CAPS, her dean, her academic advisor, and anything else she feels necessary. (9 jurors consent)

On the resolutions as a whole: (9 jurors consent)
Statement on Reporting:

Some jurors believe that this case should be reported to other institutions of higher learning. Others believe, granted that she completes her resolutions and comes back to Haverford after a year and that she does not violate the Honor Code again, that this case should not be reported to other institutions of higher learning. All jurors agree that, if [Dolores] chooses to transfer prior to the completion of her resolutions, this case should be reported in full.

If this case were to be reported in the instance of [Dolores] committing a second violation or her transferring prior to the completion of her resolutions, the jury wants to emphasize the frustrating nature of the trial before [Dolores] acknowledged her violations, as well as the jury’s expectation that the separation was intended to be restorative for her, which would then allow her to return to the community and successfully pursue all future academic endeavors to her fullest extent. (9 jurors consent)

Finalizing Meeting:

The jury was going to meet within 72 hours after they consented to the tentative resolutions, but, per request of Dolores, this meeting was postponed 48 hours later than that. About an hour before meeting, however, the Chair of the trial received an email from Dolores stating that she was not going to be able to come to the meeting due to her being sick. When the jury came together, the Chair of the trial explained this to them, and they decided to email Dolores to see if she could Skype in or send an email giving feedback. Dolores responded that she would email feedback, and the jury agreed to give her thirty minutes to do so.

The chair of the trial read Professor Lowe’s feedback as they waited for Dolores’s response. The jury talked about Professor Lowe’s thoughts, which emphasized his sentiment that the jury should trust the professors more when presented with the violation, and how this trial could have resulted in a Statement of Non Violation, had Dolores not presented Teddy’s letter. Some jurors felt opposed at some of the feelings expressed, and others expressed agreement with the general sentiment. Nonetheless, all agreed that adding a resolution for the jury to meet with Professor Lowe would be beneficial to express the jury’s thought process and how decisions came about.

After this discussion, Dolores sent her thoughts, which included opposition to separation, given that she feared she could not be reconnected to the community once she came back, both socially and academically. She added that the proposed year of separation was too much of a separation and she considered it to be punitive. She wrote that she would be okay with a semester of separation, given that it was only 8.5 months in comparison to the 15 month a year would present. She agreed with the rest of the resolutions, only if they were changed in the timeline so as to satisfy the semester separation, instead of the year separation. She also briefly mentioned that, while harsh, “the 0.0 in the class was the only thing that demonstrated full accountability for
the mistake [she] made.”

The jury considered her petition to decrease separation to a semester, and considered the outcomes of it. However, jurors explained that they felt as though they had spent a lot of energy into deliberating on separation and that, while they recognized Dolores’s fears, they felt that she would be able to reintegrate herself into the community even after a year, since some jurors had seen her with a lot of friends and being active on campus. Furthermore, the jury had already spent hours deliberating on the length of separation, and felt that they had already considered each of Dolores’s concerns at length while making their decision. The jury went around the room to see where they stood on separation, and while some jurors were comfortable consenting to a semester, they much preferred a year separation, and decided to keep it that way.

Finally, the jury wanted to meet with Dolores before the semester ended in order to explain the reasoning behind the resolutions, since they did not have a chance to do so in the current meeting. Some jurors felt hurt that Dolores did not come to the finalizing meeting. They also agreed to send a letter to Dolores, should they be unable to meet. The jury consented to the following finalizing resolutions.

**Final Resolutions:**

1. Based on the severity of the violation and the significance of the final exam in relation to the whole class, the jury recommends that [Dolores] receives a 0.0 in her [Plot Twist 101] class. (9 jurors consent)
2. The jury supports [Dolores] in meeting with Professor [Lowe], if Professor [Lowe] is willing, before the end of the [redacted] semester. This meeting can be mediated by a member of the jury or the Honor Council Executive Board. (9 jurors consent)
3. [Dolores] will be separated from the community for one full academic year, starting [date]. (9 jurors consent)
4. The Honor Council jurors on the trial will meet with Professor [Lowe], if he is willing, to talk about the jury’s decision-making process. The community jurors are also welcome to come if they are available and willing. (9 jurors consent)
5. The jury will meet with [Dolores] prior to the end of classes of the [redacted] semester in order to start the restoration process. Should this not be possible, the jury will write a letter to [Dolores] to explain the purpose behind the resolutions and start the restoration process. (9 jurors consent)
6. The jury supports [Dolores] in seeking out opportunities for her to practice responsibility during her separation as soon as she desires.
   a. This could include, but is not limited to, a part-time job, a full-time job, an internship, community service, an athletic activity or sport club, leisure activities, or enrollment in a community college course.
   b. This statement was left deliberately vague so she can pursue such opportunities in whatever method speaks to her. Ultimately, the jury hopes that she re-enters the
community with the same values of trust, concern, and respect that we expect from every Haverford student. (9 jurors consent)

7. Due to [Dolores’s] interest in the field, the jury encourages [Dolores] to take an introductory [Plot Twist] course in a lower-stress environment during her separation. Pending departmental approval, this would earn [Dolores] transfer credit, allowing her to continue her study of [Plot Twist] at Haverford, should she choose to do so. (9 jurors consent)

8. During her separation, [Dolores] will write bi-monthly reflections, starting [date] and ending [date], for a total of eight reflections, each to be a minimum of 400 words.
   a. The first five reflections will be in the following order, and with the following prompts, all of which will be sent to the Staff Support Person for archiving:
      i. Summarize and reflect on the circumstances surrounding her breach of trust,
      ii. Elaborate on the freedoms she as a student has within the Honor Code, and what responsibilities she has to abide by the Code’s guidelines,
      iii. How has she grown since the last two reflections she wrote,
      iv. What steps she has taken to fulfill resolution 6,
      v. A reflection on a relevant topic of her choosing.
   b. The last three reflections will be, in no particular order, a letter to the community, a letter to the jury, and a letter to Professor [Lowe]. The letter to the community will be appended to the abstract, while the other two will only be sent to their intended recipients and to the Staff Support Person for archiving.
      i. The jury supports [Dolores] in amending whatever remaining breach of trust there may be with [Teddy], her support person, her HCO, and the rest of her first-year hall within the letter to the community. (8 jurors consent, 1 juror stands outside)

9. [Dolores] will meet with the Honor Council librarian twice during her separation, once during the [redacted] semester and once during the [next] semester. This meeting can happen via Skype. (9 jurors consent)

10. Within the first month of the [redacted] semester, [Dolores] will meet with the remaining jurors, if they are available and willing, to amend whatever remaining breach of trust there may be. (9 jurors consent)

11. If [Dolores] plans to pursue a major or minor in [Plot Twist] upon her return to campus in the [redacted] semester, [Dolores] must meet with Professor [Lowe], so long as [Professor Lowe] is available and willing. (9 jurors consent)

12. The jury supports [Dolores] in seeking out advising from the different resources on campus, which include, but are not limited to, the OAR, peer tutoring, the Writing Center, CAPS, her dean, and her academic advisor. (9 jurors consent)

   On the resolutions as a whole: (9 jurors consent)
Statement on Reporting:

Some jurors believe that this case should be reported to other institutions of higher learning. Others believe, granted that she completes her resolutions and comes back to Haverford after a year and that she does not violate the Honor Code again, that this case should not be reported to other institutions of higher learning. All jurors agree that, if [Dolores] chooses to transfer prior to the completion of her resolutions, this case should be reported in full.

If this case were to be reported in the instance of [Dolores] committing a second violation or her transferring prior to the completion of her resolutions, the jury wants to emphasize the frustrating nature of the trial before [Dolores] acknowledged her violations, as well as the jury’s expectation that the separation was intended to be restorative for her, which would then allow her to return to the community and successfully pursue all future academic endeavors to her fullest extent. (9 jurors consent)

Post-Trial:
Dolores appealed Resolutions 1 and 3 on substantive grounds, but the resolutions were upheld by the president of the college after meeting with Dolores, the trial chair, and the appeals liaison of the trial.

Discussion Questions:
1. How reliant is the trial process on trusting the confronted party, and how does an inability to trust the confronted party affect the trial process?
2. How much more emphasis (if any) should we place on the testimony of professors over that of students in an academic trial?
3. When confronted parties are unwilling to cooperate in the trial process, what actions should the jury take?
4. Do you agree with the jury’s decision to separate for a year? What factors lead to a year long separation versus a semester long separation?
5. To what extent is it the jury’s responsibility to structure a student’s time away from campus?
6. Should Honor Council be more of an investigative body?
7. Should cases resulting in separation be always reported to institutions of higher learning?