This abstract will be discussed on Wednesday, November 6, 2013 at 7:30 in Ryan Gym and at the community forum on Thursday, November 7, 2013 at 7:00pm on the first floor of the Campus Center, outside the Cantor Fitzgerald gallery.

The Tempest:
An Honor Council Academic Trial

This abstract was not released in accordance to the timeline specified by the Students’ Association Constitution. The confronted and confronting parties consented to the release of this abstract. (The addition of this disclaimer began in Spring 2010).

Key
Prospero - Confronted Party
Professor Ferdinand - Confronting Party, professor of Storm Survival 128
Gonzalo - Confronting Party, senior administrator at IITS
Sycorax - The TA in Storm Survival 128. He also served as Prospero’s support person.
Storm Survival 128 - class

Summary
This case involves a professor who discovered that one of his students modified several grades, both his own and other students in the class, through the Moodle account of a Teacher’s Assistant. The jury came to a statement of violation and eventually a set of resolutions that included permanent separation from the community. Because permanent separation is unusual in Honor Council cases, the jury included a letter to the community explaining why they chose this course of action.

*Note: This abstract references the “Amelia Earhart” Honor Council academic trial. See footnote.¹

Pre-Trial
Over winter break, Professor Ferdinand became aware that the final exam grades recorded on Moodle of several students in his Storm Survival 128 class were not correct. Ferdinand first talked to a member of IITS about the incorrect grades. He then asked Sycorax, the grader whose account had been used to change these grades, if he knew what had happened. He said he did not. Ferdinand then went to Gonzalo, senior administrator at IITS, who traced the changes to Prospero, a student in Storm Survival 128 who had apparently used Sycorax’s Moodle credentials to change grades. Professor Ferdinand and Gonzalo confronted Prospero and contacted Honor Council. Honor Council then reviewed statements from all involved parties before consenting to a suspicion of violation and sending the case to an academic trial.

The Trial Chair held a preliminary meeting with the jury to review trial procedure and read

¹ "Amelia Earhart" was an Honor Council abstract released prior to this case. It dealt with a student who plagiarized and cheated in many of her courses over several years. Amelia was separated from Haverford for a number of years, and her return would involve her going through a number of different processes, including reassembling part of her original jury and reapplying through the admissions office.
statements related to the case. In his statement, Professor Ferdinand had mentioned Amelia Earhart, a past academic Honor Council case which had resulted in a long period of separation with many conditions for Amelia’s return to Haverford. The jury discussed Amelia Earhart and whether or not it was relevant to the current case.

**Fact Finding**

The jury, Prospero, Professor Ferdinand, and Sycorax, who would be serving as Prospero’s support person, met for the fact finding portion of the trial. Professor Ferdinand reiterated his account of determining who had changed the grades. Ferdinand referenced the statement from IITS, which showed that Prospero had used Sycorax’s account twice during the semester to raise his midterm grades and on three separate occasions during Winter break. Ferdinand pointed out that according to the account activity, Prospero had lowered the final exam grades of five students, then logged back in minutes later to raise his final exam grade and the grades of two other students.

Professor Ferdinand’s account conflicted with Prospero’s version of events. Prospero described his changing the final exam grades as a moment of weakness. He said that during winter break, he was surprised to find that Sycorax’s Moodle account had the capacity to change students’ Storm Survival 128 grades. He said he had changed the grades and then, ashamed, closed his browser. This statement conflicted with the evidence from IITS showing that Prospero had previously changed his two midterm grades, and that he had lowered the final exam grades of others before raising his own. When Professor Ferdinand showed him that the timestamps on the Moodle log did not match up with his timeline, Prospero said he must have misremembered the sequence of events.

A juror then asked Prospero how he had managed to access Sycorax’s Moodle account in the first place. Prospero explained that he and Sycorax were friends, and that he had one point turned in an assignment directly to Sycorax, the grader, with Professor Ferdinand’s approval. He had watched Sycorax grade his homework and then access Moodle to record the score. When asked why he didn’t tell Sycorax that he had accidentally seen his Moodle password, Prospero said that he hadn’t intended to commit to memory Sycorax’s password. Prospero then raised the question of why student graders have the ability to modify students’ exam grades on Moodle, but several jurors pointed out that they did not see the issue as relevant to the case. Professor Ferdinand reiterated that he had not suspected Sycorax of any wrongdoing.

Another juror asked about the midterm grades and why he hadn’t mentioned them in his explanation of events. Prospero said that he had changed his exam grades because he wanted them to be higher than they were.

**Fact Finding Deliberations**

The jury discussed the information presented to them during fact finding and largely agreed that Prospero’s actions had breached the trust of the professor, the TA, the other students in the course, and the community at large. While changing one’s own grades would have been a very serious offense of the Honor Code, the jury saw Prospero’s attempts to lower the grades of his classmates and therefore lower the value of their work to be an even more severe violation. The jury felt that the statement of violation should encompass both the academic and social nature of Prospero’s actions, as well as the fact that he altered grades on Moodle multiple times.

**Statement of Violation**

*Prospero violated the Honor Code’s tenets of academic and social integrity by using a*
grader’s identity to repeatedly change his and others’ exam marks. (All jurors consented)

Circumstantial

The Trial Chair reminded the jury, Prospero, and Professor Ferdinand to keep in mind the trial goals of education, accountability, and restoration. Prospero then explained the potentially mitigating circumstances surrounding his violation. He mentioned that he was an international student. The system in his home country, he stressed, focuses on grades and rankings and less on learning. While he had been told that Haverford embraces a different set of values, he found it hard to convert to the Haverford mentality and found himself focusing too much on class rank. He also said that he was under additional pressure because he had been confronted by the professor of another of his classes for potentially cheating on the final exam. This confrontation occurred before he changed the final exam grades but after he had changed the grades from his midterms.

When asked about the logistics of his study in the U.S., Prospero said that he was attending Haverford on a student visa. He also expressed a hope that international students could learn from his mistake and understand that learning is more important than grades. One juror asked Prospero to explain what effect he thought the release of his case abstract would have on the community. Prospero replied that he thought that the effect would be minimal since Professor Ferdinand had already submitted the corrected grades to the Registrar, but that he could help educate international students if he broke his own confidentiality in the abstract.

The Trial Chair then asked Prospero and Professor Ferdinand for their proposed resolutions. Ferdinand first proposed that Prospero receive a grade of 0.0 in Storm Survival 128, explaining that because of Prospero’s actions he didn’t know how much of his grade system he could trust. He also felt that Prospero had removed himself so far from the learning community of his class that no credit was warranted. Prospero agreed that this resolution was fair.

Second, Ferdinand proposed that Prospero be permanently separated from Haverford. He explained that he, like many students, came to Haverford because of the Honor Code and was very shaken when he realized what Prospero had done. In his own educational experience, he saw how many other schools’ Honor Codes served as vehicles to facilitate cheating. An avid reader of abstracts, Ferdinand said that this case was the worst case he had ever seen, and that Prospero’s actions were so far beyond Haverford’s expectations that the only option was for him to leave the community permanently. He said that “Haverford students just don’t try to change others’ grades.”

He also conveyed his feelings that “watering down” this case’s resolutions would be detrimental to the health of the Honor Code and to the community as a whole, especially in light of what he viewed to be a high number of severe cases. To him, “restoration,” in this case, meant saving the Code. Professor Ferdinand also disagreed with Prospero that this case would not have an impact on the community. The only academic case he could think of that came close to the severity of this one was Amelia Earhart. While the violation in that case was more extensive, he said, this one was more severe.

Prospero disagreed with Professor Ferdinand about his proposed resolution of permanent separation. While he agreed that a period of separation would be beneficial, he felt that permanent separation would not be restorative. He explained that if he were expelled from Haverford, he would have to leave the country because of the terms of his visa. He felt it was unfair because this was the first case in which he had cheated. When asked, he said that any period of separation longer than one year was not appropriate. He also explained that he would continue to seek higher education regardless of the outcome of the case. If allowed to come back to Haverford, he would spend his separation studying or participating in an internship. If he were permanently separated, he would probably apply to colleges
that would not require Haverford’s recommendation.

One juror asked Prospero why he would want to return to Haverford. He replied, “I love Haverford, I know people here, I did well in other classes, I do things on campus. Haverford is part of my life. I’d want to come back.” Another juror asked Prospero if he would be willing to break his own confidentiality in the abstract. Prospero said that his dean had warned against breaking his confidentiality but that he was willing to, explaining that without his name attached, his trial would just be another extreme case with no major community impact. With his name, his abstract would increase awareness and community education. He also trusted the community to accept him back even if they knew about his violation of the Honor Code.2

The jury then talked about what resolutions could address education. Prospero and Sycorax agreed to write letters to the International Students Organization suggesting ways to better educate incoming Haverford students from other countries.

**Deliberations and Tentative Resolutions**

Prospero and Professor Ferdinand left the room. The Trial Chair then clarified Prospero’s mention of his involvement in a previous Honor Council trial. This was Prospero’s third Honor Council trial. His first trial had involved the plagiarism of a sentence in a small writing assignment in another class. In the second trial, a professor was concerned that Prospero had cheated on a final exam. The first trial had concluded before Prospero changed his grade on the first midterm, while the confrontation over the final exam occurred before he changed the final grades.

The jury was concerned that Prospero did not seem to have learned from these trials. The jury eventually decided to adjourn and continue deliberations in a second meeting. Between these two meetings, Prospero submitted an additional supplement to the jury. This supplement focused on how to change Moodle so that it was more secure, including restricting graders’ access to Moodle. The jury felt that this issue was not relevant to the trial because it was Prospero’s actions, not Moodle’s settings, that were the violation in question. In this supplement, Prospero also explained his view of Haverford as a family in which he and the other students are the children. He argued that a family would never give up a child because of a mistake the child made. The jury was concerned that Prospero saw himself as a child, not a full member of the community, and also recognized that his English communication skills were not perfect.

The jury agreed that Prospero should receive a grade of 0.0 for the course, and that the incident be reported to institutions of higher learning to which Prospero applied in the future. The decision of separation caused much debate; some jurors felt that permanent separation was appropriate but did not want to force Prospero to leave the country, a consequence which domestic students would not face if they had committed the same violation. Other jurors felt that as an international student, Prospero understood the risks associated with violating the Honor Code when he was in the U.S. on a student visa. After a long period of deliberation, the jury decided to include permanent separation from Haverford in their tentative resolutions but to discuss the matter further during the finalizing portion of the trial.

The jury then consented to the following tentative resolutions.

**Tentative Resolutions**

2 Later on in the trial, Prospero changed his mind about breaking his own confidentiality on the abstract when he realized that his connection to this abstract might spread beyond the Haverford community.
1. The jury recommends that Prospero receive a 0.0 in Storm Survival 128. (All jurors consented)
2. Prospero will be permanently separated from Haverford College. (All jurors consented)
3. The jury will compose a letter explaining to the community its decision of permanent separation, to be released with the abstract. (All jurors consented)
4. The jury supports Prospero writing letters to Professor Ferdinand, Gonzalo, Sycorax, and the community reflecting on his experience. (All jurors consented)
5. A member of the jury will meet with the Director of the International Student Orientation program (ISO) and the Director of the Student Activities Office to discuss potential changes to ISO and Customs respectively. These changes will focus on how Haverford’s academic culture emphasizes learning rather than grades. (All jurors consented)
6. The jury requests that Professor Ferdinand write a letter to the community to be released with the abstract detailing his feelings on permanent separation in this case. (All jurors consented)
7. The jury recommends that this incident be reported on applications to institutions of higher learning. (All jurors consented)

Resolutions as a whole: All jurors consented.

Finalizing Resolutions

The trial parties and the jury reconvened to discuss the tentative resolutions. Professor Ferdinand agreed with the resolutions, but Prospero had some concerns. Prospero said that if he were permanently separated from Haverford, he would be unable to apply to any other schools in the United States or get another United States student visa. He suggested that the jury adopt resolutions similar to the Amelia Earhart case, including a condition that for him to return to Haverford, he would need to reapply with admissions having full knowledge of the case.

Prospero also asked for an explanation of resolution #7, that the incident be reported to graduate schools. The Trial Chair explained that juries have to decide whether or not they consider a trial to be a “disciplinary action,” which is reported to other schools on their applications. The Chair also explained that while Haverford would not seek out schools to which Prospero was applying to tell them about the trial, it would compromise the College’s integrity if it did not report the case if asked by other schools if he had been the subject of disciplinary action. The Chair added that the resolution was a suggestion to the Dean of the College, who would make the final decision.

Prospero also expressed an interest in apologizing to the students whose grades he had changed. Some jurors said that while such an apology would make Prospero feel better, it would probably hurt the other students unnecessarily, since they were unaware of the changes made to their grades. Instead, the jury suggested that he address them anonymously in a letter to the community.

A juror asked Prospero why he did not seem to object to effectively permanent separation. Prospero replied that anything beyond a year or two of separation would be basically permanent so he did not feel it was worth fighting for less.

The jury asked Professor Ferdinand how he felt about effectively permanent separation versus permanent separation. Professor Ferdinand said that he did not feel particularly strongly. He said that he would like the jury to think about the Code’s compassion and to weigh that against what is necessary for restoring the trust of the community. He indicated that the jury could effectively permanently separate Prospero and explain to the community in the abstract that the separation was meant to be permanent.

Prospero brought up his supplement regarding potential changes to Moodle. He asked the jury
to include a resolution regarding the system. Members of the jury explained that they did not feel that Moodle was the issue in this situation. Haverford does not seek to remove all temptations, one juror said. Instead, it trusts in the students to adhere to the Honor Code and to resist temptations.

**Deliberations**

After Prospero and Professor Ferdinand left, the jury began its deliberations, focusing almost exclusively on the issue of permanent separation. The jury was deeply concerned about the effect that permanent separation would have on Prospero’s visa and his immigration status. The Trial Chair decided to schedule a meeting with the Coordinator of International Students Programs who could provide more information on the visa situation to help the jury make its decision.

After meeting with the International Students Office, the Chair explained that in Prospero’s situation, effectively permanent and overtly permanent separation would likely mean the same thing to the visa office. While expulsion and long-term suspension were separate things, either option would leave little room for Prospero to return to the U.S. Some jurors felt that they should leave a loophole for Prospero to return to Haverford, while others felt that a seven- or ten-year period of separation would be unfair to Prospero because it would require him to put his life on hold for years rather than continuing his education elsewhere.

Professor Ferdinand had also submitted an additional letter to the jury, clarifying his thoughts on permanent versus effectively permanent separation. He explained that he still thought that permanent separation was an appropriate solution, but understood that the jury might be more comfortable with “Amelia-type” resolutions. While he preferred permanent separation, he felt comfortable with effective permanent separation, provided that the jury made it clear that the separation was intended as permanent. After further debate, all but one jury member decided to consent to permanent separation. While he agreed that the effect of the resolutions would be nearly identical, this juror stood in favor of leaving a loophole open for Prospero, incredibly tiny though it might be.

The jury consented to the following resolutions:

**Final Resolutions**

1. *The jury recommends that Prospero receive a 0.0 in Storm Survival 128.* (All jurors consented)
2. *Prospero will be permanently separated from Haverford College.* (One juror stood outside consensus)
3. *The jury will compose a letter explaining to the community its decision of permanent separation, to be released with the abstract.* (All jurors consented)
4. *The jury supports Prospero writing letters to Professor Ferdinand, Gonzalo, Sycorax, and the community reflecting on his experience.* (All jurors consented)
5. *A member of the jury will meet with the Director of the International Student Orientation program (ISO) and the Director of the Student Activities Office to discuss potential changes to ISO and Customs respectively. These potential changes would focus on how Haverford’s academic culture emphasizes learning rather than grades.* (All jurors consented)
6. *The jury requests that Professor Ferdinand write a letter to the community to be released with the abstract detailing his feelings on permanent separation in this case.* (All jurors consented)
7. *The jury recommends that this incident be reported on applications to institutions of higher learning.* (All jurors consented)
8. The case abstract will be released twice in successive academic years. (All jurors consented)
Resolutions as a whole: All jurors consented.

Post-Trial
Prospero appealed the jury’s decision on procedural and substantive grounds. In his appeal, he asked the President of the College to modify resolution #2. He proposed that the resolution be changed to “Haverford strongly recommends that the student withdraw himself from the school before the beginning of next semester and not reapply to the college.” The appeal was denied. Prospero was separated from the college at the end of the semester.

The jury’s letter to the community
Dear Haverford community members,

We would like to take this letter as an opportunity to explain our decision to permanently separate Prospero. We understand that the resolution of permanent separation is uncharacteristic of Honor Council trials, and may be a shock and source of disagreement in the community. This decision did not come easily. During Prospero’s trial, we sought a solution that would achieve accountability, education, and restoration for both Prospero and the Haverford community. However, we all agreed that the egregiousness of Prospero’s actions required long-term, even permanent, separation from Haverford. Our only two options were therefore permanent separation or effectively permanent separation.

This letter is comprised of roughly three sections. We first clarify the difference between permanent separation and effectively permanent separation. Then, we explain why we felt these were our only two choices. Finally, we explain why we decided to permanently separate Prospero.

Permanent separation is, as the name suggests, permanent and is reflected in our second resolution: “Prospero will be permanently separated from Haverford College.” In contrast, a resolution of effectively permanent separation is written such that it is nearly impossible for a student to return to Haverford, but without explicitly stating the separation as permanent. Examples of resolutions contributing to effectively permanent separation include ones requiring years of separation, future reassembly of the jury, and reapplication to the College. We should reiterate that both options would have permanently separated Prospero, either by name or by intent.

We all agreed that Prospero’s actions were so flagrant that permanent separation and effectively permanent separation were our only two choices. We explain in the following paragraphs why we felt this way. Keep in mind that one of us did stand outside of consensus for this resolution but only because he also favored effectively permanently separating over a resolution of permanent separation so strongly. Also remember that each of us has slightly different reasons for why we consider this violation so disconcerting: many of the following opinions are common to all of us but we do not all subscribe to every one.

Prospero’s offense was uniquely calculated. It was not committed accidentally during a single moment of distraction or extreme stress. It was not a “normal” case of cheating, committed for the exclusive benefit of the confronted party. Instead, it involved devaluing the work of other students in order to make the student in question appear better in comparison. The confronted party also violated the Honor Code multiple times: when he looked at his friend's password, when he changed his two midterm grades, when he altered final exam grades of classmates, and when he did not come forward to
his professor.

It also troubled us that Prospero did not know any of the students whose grades he lowered personally. Lowering someone else's grade is obviously never acceptable, but if Prospero had done what he did out of anger or blame or contempt, we might have seen the grade change as the product of another issue, which could be identified and treated through confrontation and maybe an Honor Council proceeding. Prospero did not have any personal relationship with those students, however, and that makes his actions an assault on the student body as a whole. In effect, by selecting students at random, he was selecting the entire student population.

Our decisions were also affected by the fact that Prospero had gone through a full trial and had been confronted by a professor on another matter before he changed the grades of other students. We felt that the fact that these incidents, as well as changing his grades in December and then again in early January, demonstrates that merely giving Prospero resolutions to complete would not necessarily solicit the internalization, as opposed to simply appreciation, of the values the Honor Code holds. Moreover, the educational measures undertaken in the first trial and having the Honor Code right in front of him so often had not dissuaded him from his final, more egregious actions. We felt that if he did not learn from his previous trials and still felt that he had not done something worthy of long term separation, he simply did not understand what it means to be a part of the Haverford community and the breach of trust was probably too great to mend in the next few years. Also, because Prospero has had two previous experiences with Honor Council, some of us felt that he may be obsessed with attaining a grade at any cost, a characteristic that is not respected or tolerated in the Haverford community.

We similarly found Prospero’s attempts to make Moodle the underlying problem unacceptable. He kept referring to himself as a child at this institution and said that the grader, whose password he appropriated, should not have had access to the grades on Moodle. We kept thinking that if that was how he felt, then what kept him from cheating on take-home exams or any other unsupervised academic work? Haverford’s system is based on the idea that we are not “children” who need to have restrictions all over the place to keep us in line, but that we are adults who should be able to control our actions and not give into temptation even when our notes are in our bag and there is no one else watching us take an exam.

During the trial we realized fairly quickly that we all understood that permanent separation and effectively permanent separation were our only options. However, it was not always obvious that permanent separation was the appropriate outcome for this case. We did initially agree to a tentative resolution of permanent separation. But we did so only with the understanding that we could modify the resolutions after hearing more about the particular circumstances of the case. After hearing for a second time from the confronted and confronting party, we spent many hours debating our two choices and ultimately decided on permanent separation. Here, we summarize the arguments against permanent separation and then explain why we came to our decision.

We truly believed that Prospero was sorry for his actions. We also agreed that everyone deserves a second chance. Moreover, Prospero had more to lose than most Haverford students, given he was a foreign student and had an F-1 visa. Relatedly, we felt uncomfortable with potentially shutting Prospero out of the United States, in terms of education and employment. We were also concerned about balancing personal accountability with personal restoration. Finally, we knew that permanent separation is unacceptable to some community members.

We believe that the breach of trust, concern, and respect between the community and Prospero was very deep. Many of us felt that we would feel uncomfortable taking classes with Prospero. Haverford is just not the place for Prospero and would not become that place before effectively
permanent separation would expire, and by that time he should have found another institution of higher education to go to. We do, however, encourage Prospero to continue to get his education somewhere else and we do not want to get in the way of that. We were also impressed during the trial by his commitment to educating himself further, regardless of our final decision.

When we realized that our resolution of permanent separation could potentially make it impossible for Prospero to ever get a visa to return to the US for anything other than vacations, it really took its toll on us. None of us truly wanted to limit his educational or work possibilities any more than we had to. Many different arguments were brought up concerning whether it was our decision to make, and whether we should take it into account at all. Some of us still feel that it is unnecessarily harsh for him to never be able to study or work in the US again, but we also realize that Prospero has many other doors open to him in other countries. He made his decisions under his own free will, understanding the possible consequences. If he cannot return to the United States for college, he will be able to meet his educational goals in another country.

For a long time many of us looked for a way, any way, that Prospero could still have a chance to study elsewhere in the US, but it eventually became clear that if we watered down our resolution to make them more like “effective” permanent separation, especially if we only separated him for a few years, Prospero could still possibly return to Haverford, and our resolutions might seem disingenuous to the community. Many jurors felt strongly that effective permanent separation be a weak response from the jury to the community, including members of the faculty, who would be looking at this trial as a way to gauge the effectiveness of the Honor Code and Honor Trials. It was also brought up that if Prospero was American we would not have had nearly so much trouble permanently separating him, and it seemed like a double standard to say that because he is an international student we could not do so.

Partway through our deliberations, we learned that separation for a number of years would essentially have the same effect as permanent separation. This knowledge, combined with other countries’ open doors, helped lead us to our decision. Prospero had the great opportunity to try his hand at education in another country, and while fully understanding the risks, he violated his privilege to remain here. We hope that Prospero will come to terms with the loss of his visa, and we want him to have the utmost courage in trying to go to a new country, if that is what he wants.

We definitely took the faculty into consideration when coming to our decision. However, we did so in the same way that we took the rest of us students into consideration. Our professors are part of our community, same as us, and their opinions matter just as much our own. They also care about the state of our community and its Honor Code just as much as we do. That said, we were particularly struck by how much Prospero’s violation had affected Professor Ferdinand. His reaction, which can only be described as dumbfounded and dismayed, resonated with our own reactions to hearing the details of the case. The students whose grades were changed were not notified, as it would only cause them unnecessary grief, but it is easy to imagine that their reactions would have been similar.

We also believe that the permanent separation was the only way for both Prospero and the Haverford community to heal. Permanent separation was necessary for Prospero so that he could move on with his life. Due to the extreme offensive nature of the violations, permanent separation was also the only way for the community to heal: it is impossible to create respect and trust in a community containing someone willing to harm peoples' academics in the way that happened in this case. It is unfortunate, but the repeated number of offenses and severity of the final one revealed that Haverford’s ideals and culture were not the right type of learning environment for Prospero.

Part of our motivation stemmed from our fear that watered-down resolutions would create a dangerous precedent. Prospero’s actions were inexcusable and needed to be treated as such. Some of
us worried, for a time, that permanent separation would make it appear that Haverford was like any other school out there, where expulsion is commonplace. We hope that the community will understand that in our community permanent separation is anything but conventional.

Restorative justice is an integral part of the Haverford community and we feel that the principles of restorative justice were applied in this case. However, the principles of restorative justice in the greater sense differ from how restorative justice is typically applied to Haverford. We had never considered the possibility that such a case involving such an egregious academic and social violation of the Honor Code, especially not with a previous history of cases, could happen at Haverford. For this reason, we felt that it was appropriate for us to use the principles of restorative justice in a way that was outside the norm. We see restorative justice as being different from traditional, punitively-oriented, justice in that it encourages community and interpersonal dialogue on the issue rather than communication merely between the trial parties and the jury. This trial encouraged this dialogue to occur, and therefore we see it as following restorative justice.

Permanent separation was a difficult step to take and every member of the jury struggled with this decision. We hope the Haverford community can respect that the jury wanted to be as compassionate as possible and thoroughly considered alternatives to Resolution 2. However, after many hours of discussion and reflection, the jury found that it could not consent to any other option but permanent separation.

That is not to say that the jury felt comfortable in consenting to Prospero’s expulsion from Haverford. Most jurors, in fact, were extremely uncomfortable in making this decision. Still, despite the logical gymnastics we endured throughout the course of the trial, permanent separation - without loopholes, caveats, or extraneous verbiage to soften the blow to the community - remained the only fair and morally right resolution for the Haverford community and both parties.

We wish Prospero luck in continuing with his education at another institution and hope that he will maintain Haverford values of trust, concern, and respect in the future. We do not want to split the Haverford community with this resolution of permanent separation, so we also hope that everyone will take the time to discuss this case and to learn from it. Extensive discussion may be necessary to rebuild our trust in the Honor Code and in each other, but we believe that such restoration will be possible in the end.

Sincerely,
Members of the jury

**Professor Ferdinand’s letter to the community**

Dear Community,

Given the severity of the violation and the unusual character of the resolution of permanent separation, the jury asked me to include my thoughts on why I suggested permanent separation in this case. Before doing so, however, I would like to say how impressed I was by the gravity with which the jury treated their deliberations, their collective willingness to consider a variety of perspectives and options, and their individual integrity in arguing for their positions.
To set the context for my proposal for permanent separation, let me begin by saying that I have been at Haverford for quite a while now. Until very recently, I had not had a single honor code case. I am a consistent reader of academic honor code abstracts, and I cannot remember reading about a case this egregious in my time here (though there are examples of other cases, such as the recent "Amelia Earhart" and "James Bond", that constituted more extensive violations in terms of time span, number of classes, etc.). No other case -- none -- that I can remember involved a student attempting to directly lower the grade of another student, and this appears to be a new low in the history of the Honor Code.

Given that the accepted purposes of trial resolutions are accountability, education, and restoration, it seems to me that permanent separation more than adequately addresses accountability, while education has been addressed through the other trial resolutions. The most controversial aspect of permanent separation, then, is its relation to the idea of restoration. On its face, permanent separation appears to short-circuit restoration. "Restoration", however, can also mean restoring the community itself, not just restoring the individual to the community (this idea has been enshrined in the current version of the Code: "Such proceedings should also take into account the needs of the community" (see 3.07(2), paragraph 2). In this particular situation, mostly because of its severity, but also because of the context of record numbers of Honor Code cases in which it occurred, I firmly believe that the need to restore the health of the community outweighs the desire to restore the individual to the community. I understand that some will disagree with this framework, and if so, I trust that this disagreement will inspire honest debate.

I firmly believe that the vast majority of the student body upholds and is worthy of the Honor Code, but I am growing concerned that those few who do not respect it -- in fact, who, with forethought and malice, take advantage of it -- are growing more brazen and are bringing the Code closer to crisis. The community needs to confront this reality and its implications for the continued health of the Code. Quite simply, permanent separation in this case is a declaration that this case represents a level of dishonesty -- a level of premeditation and viciousness -- that the community cannot reabsorb without damaging the trust that binds it together. I, personally, cannot imagine a circumstance in which the breach of trust caused by [Prospero’s] actions can possibly be repaired; to let him return to the community is to allow the fox back into the henhouse.

My impression is that the past few years have brought the community closer to a point where students can feel that they are at a disadvantage if they follow the Code, and faculty cannot trust that the Code is being followed. Even if the Code does not reach a crisis state, in the absence of firm community action, incidents like the present case can cause the Code to erode bit-by-bit as professors defensively chip away at the freedoms they allow. I, for example, will make much more limited use of the Moodle gradebook, thus denying my students the opportunity to keep tabs on their progress. One can also take a quick survey of how many introductory natural science classes have in-class exams nowadays. I imagine that there are other examples.
The stakes are higher than just take-home exams, however. What perhaps not enough students realize is how deeply the academic Code is embedded into their educational experience. It does not just govern the way in which evaluations are conducted (though that is, indeed, convenient for all involved and allows for more appropriate assessments), but is part of the foundation on which professors construct their pedagogy. The atmosphere of trust and respect that the Code engenders lowers barriers between professor and student, allowing for a free flow of ideas at an early point in the semester and enabling unobstructed assessments of a student's progress, which can then be turned into more effective and individualized teaching. One of the reasons that I came to Haverford (yes, the faculty make such choices, too!) was to be able to teach in such an environment, and I hope that I can continue to teach under the ideals of the Code for years to come.

[Professor Ferdinand]

Discussion Questions

1. Do you agree with the jury’s decision to separate Prospero permanently from Haverford? Do you think the Honor Code allows for permanent separation?
2. To what extent, if any, should the jury have taken into account Prospero’s unique visa situation?
3. To what extent should the jury take into account the professor’s wishes in cases of academic dishonesty?
4. Should Prospero have personally apologized to the students whose grades he changed?
5. The Tempest and Amelia Earhart are both serious academic cases in which technology plays a large role. How has technology changed the way in which we view academic integrity?
6. In situations where the confronted party has been involved in multiple academic trials, how much information should the jury receive about these proceedings? Do you think the jury should take them into account when making resolutions?
7. Would the case be different if Prospero had raised other students’ grades instead of lowering them? What if he had only changed his own grades?
8. Do you think this abstract will have an effect on how professors use technology in their classes? Should it?
9. How can the community better educate incoming freshmen on Haverford’s standards of academic integrity? What, if any, specific steps should be taken to educate international students?