This abstract was not released in accordance with the timeline specified by the Students’ Association Constitution. One of the confronting parties consented and one confronting party did not consent to the release of the abstract. Two of the confronted parties consented and one confronted party did not consent to the release of the abstract.

**Key:**

**Confronted Parties:** Diego Hargreeves, Luther Hargreeves, and Klaus Hargreeves

**Confronting Parties:** Professor Allison Hargreeves and Professor Reginald Hargreeves

**Course:** Saving the World 111

**Summary/Pre-Trial:**

While taking his final in Saving the World 111, Diego used unauthorized resources and wrote information down in his notes. He then passed those notes to Luther, who brought those notes with him to the test, eventually using them. Finally, Luther passed these notes on to Klaus who also used them on his test, with permission from Diego. While grading the Saving the World 111 finals, Professor Allison Hargreeves noticed similarities between the finals, and asked other members of her department to inspect the finals; these department members concurred that the similarities were suspicious. When confronted, Diego, Luther, and Klaus immediately took responsibility for their actions.

**Fact Finding:**

Initially, the jury was concerned and confused over apparent similarities in the statements each student submitted, especially because the three confronted parties were members of the same, tightly-knit academy.

It became clear that each of the three, in the time intervening their confrontation and trial, had already begun to address the factors that contributed to their plagiarism, and felt similarly apologetic and responsive to the trial at hand.

**Jury Deliberations/Statement of Violation:**

The jury felt unanimously that a violation of the Honor Code had occurred, and that the confronted parties were well aware of it. The jury was also concerned about the potential presence of power dynamics especially with the parties being from different class years and in the same academy, but saved this deliberation for the next steps of the trial. After much
discussion in regards to each party’s violations, the jury arrived at separate statements for all three of them.

1. [Diego] violated the Honor Code by using disallowed online resources during the exam, discussing the nature of the exam, and providing exam material with answers to others.
2. [Luther] violated the Honor Code by discussing the nature of the exam with [Diego] and [Klaus], requesting exam material with answers from [Diego], using the aforementioned material during the exam, and providing exam material to [Klaus].
3. [Klaus] violated the Honor Code by discussing the nature of the exam with [Luther], requesting exam material with answers from [Luther], and using the aforementioned material during the exam.
   (10 jurors consent)

Circumstantial Portion:
The jury spoke to each confronted party individually. Klaus expressed that several personal factors led him to be confused and underperforming in the weeks preceding the test, but reflected on his own accountability nonetheless. He discussed his preemptive accountability measures, including apologies to Profesor Allison, and other personal initiatives of self-betterment. Diego noted that family issues at home had been weighing on him heavily. Considering that Diego was the youngest of the three, and connected to the other two by a tightly knit academy, the jury was concerned that power dynamics may have played into his decision. Diego responded that he hadn’t felt pressured, and simply hadn’t exercised his power to refuse sharing the scrap paper.

Jury Deliberations I:
During deliberations, the jury struggled to strike a balance between feeling sympathetic towards the parties’ extenuating personal circumstances while holding them accountable. They felt that mental health in all-male academies needed special attention and tried to come up with means to provide the parties outlets for releasing stress and support for mental health. Academy culture was also a huge theme of discussion, and Luther and Klaus’s willingness to create dialogue within the academy led the jury to think about recommending discussion topics from which academy culture could benefit. The jury did, however, struggle with determining the degree to which they wanted to mandate these discussions because they wanted to be mindful of how as current academy members, having these conversations might be hard for the parties. Eventually, the jury decided on encouraging Klaus and Luther’s desire to facilitate and organize these discussions (without mandating they do so) as well as encouraging Diego to attend them. The decision to affirm and not mandate stemmed from the jury’s struggle in wanting to provide mental health and emotional advice and support but lacking the expertise. More broadly, the jury also thought about implicating The Commission Department and making them aware of how
academy culture can be socially isolating or contribute to mental health deterioration.

Additionally, some jurors pointed out that some of the initiatives the parties had listed as community engagement measures were things that most Haverford students do on a normal basis. Hence, there should be some other form of engaging with and benefiting the community assigned to them for proper restoration. The jury felt pretty hopeful about restoration as a whole though, because of the measures that parties had already been taking and the changes they had been making. To provide an avenue for rebuilding trust with the community, the jury decided that each should write a letter to the community.

For accountability measures, the jury almost unanimously agreed upon a grade change and failing the class for all 3 parties because of the intentionality of the plagiarism. They also discussed it as the most likely situation if the parties hadn’t resorted to plagiarising and had done badly on their exam. The jury felt comfortable with this grade change in combination with their education and restoration measures. While the latter would offer support and help the parties move forward, the grade change made for an adequate accountability measure.

After much discussion, the jury arrived at a set of tentative resolutions, but didn’t consent due to some missing wording and an insufficient number of jurors.

**Jury Deliberation II:**

The jury met for deliberations again. The missing jurors were caught up on the resolutions and the rationale behind them. One juror who was absent for the last meeting expressed concerns regarding resolution 7 and asserted that the Commission Department already does a significant amount of outreach. After much discussion, the jury concluded that additional recommendations couldn’t hurt existing work or measures, but would instead identify to the department which support mechanisms were and were not working. Another juror brought up the associated confidentiality concerns and the potential lack of training of available support (agents, Commission staff, etc) in addressing mental health issues. The jury amended the resolution wording to address these concerns.

Other than this resolution, the jury brought up a few other concerns. One concern surrounded the intentionality of the plagiarism, and the jury ended up discussing power dynamics and the confronted parties’ academy’s insular nature as potential underlying reasons. They discussed how the resolutions seemed to be implicating one party more than the rest and adjusted them to address this concern. Lastly, the jury discussed how the resolutions seemed to be very time consuming, which would end up being counter-productive to what the jury was trying to do to help the parties manage their time more efficiently. With all these changes addressed, the jury felt satisfied with the resolutions.

Then, the statement on reporting was revisited. The split between the jury from last time prevailed. Some jurors wanted the violation to be reported to institutions of higher education because of the degree of pre-mediation that went in while some felt that the parties were already making amends and it seemed too punitive to let this violation follow them. The split was
expressed in the statement, with final deference to the Dean of the college.

**Tentative Resolutions:**

1. **The jury recommends that [Klaus, Diego, and Luther] each receive a 0.0 for the course.**
   (9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

2. **[Klaus, Diego, and Luther] will each write a letter to the community. The letter may be framed as one or more of the following:**
   a. Apology
   b. Reflection
   c. Explanation
   (9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

3. **[Klaus, Diego, and Luther] will each reach out to Professors [Allison Hargreeves] and [Reginald Hargreeves]. This may be done via a letter, email, or conversation (in-person or digital), if professors are willing.** (9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

4. **[Diego, Klaus, and Luther] will each create a working plan for their upcoming semesters in collaboration with their Deans, academic advisors, and the OAR. They will also share this plan with the Honor Council Staff Support person.** (9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

5. **[Diego, Klaus, and Luther] will each schedule weekly meetings with their Deans for the rest of the current semester. We recommend that they discuss their progress regarding Resolution 4 with their Deans. We additionally recommend that they continue this practice beyond the mandated time frame.** (9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

6. **The jury affirms [Luther, Diego, and Klaus’s] desires to engage in regularly scheduled activities for improving mental health, e.g. yoga, arts, and community service, respectively. We would like to remind [Luther, Diego, and Klaus] that existing resources including student clubs and classes are available on campus.** (9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

7. **The jury affirms [Luther and Klaus’s] desire to organize and potentially facilitate discussion regarding [academy] culture including mental health, class year and power dynamics, insulation from the rest of campus, and accessibility. We additionally recommend that [Diego] be a part of these discussions.** (9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

8. **The jury recommends that the [The Commission Department] and the related upcoming Task Force work to ensure the provision of adequate social and psychological support to [academies].** (9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

(On resolutions as a whole: 9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)
**Statement on Reporting:**

Four jurors feel that this violation should not be reported to institutions of higher learning. Five jurors feel that it should be reported. (9 consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

**Finalizing Resolutions:**

For this meeting, Klaus, Diego, and Luther were present. Professor Reginald Hargreeves sent in queries over email and wasn’t present in person. The parties asked some clarifying questions, and expressed an interest in being part of the task force discussed in resolution number 8. The jury suggested multiple avenues for engaging on campus and continuing to have dialogue about campus and academy climates even if the parties couldn’t join the task force. The parties also raised confidentiality concerns regarding resolution 8, and the jury clarified that no identifying details will be given to the Commission Department. There was a further discussion of how an academy may view these resolutions and be upset over the assignment of blame on academy culture etc, and the jury expressed how they had tried their best to mitigate any attacking language.

After making sure that the parties had expressed all they wanted, the Chair read out Professor Hargreeves’s email, which emphasized that the jury should discuss separation seriously because of the intentionality and pre-mediation that had gone into this violation. When discussed with the parties, they all discussed how they were on better academic trajectories, had made changes to ensure they wouldn’t repeat their mistake, and could better benefit the community and themselves by staying on-campus.

After the parties left, the jury discussed separation again and discussed how all trial goals seemed to have been met already/were on the way to being fulfilled. The jury voiced that separating them would be detrimental both to them and the community, while keeping on-campus here would be better for them. The statement on reporting was also revisited with two jurors debating institutional accountability vs. overly punitive measures. Since the jury continued to feel differently and remained split, this lack of consensus was expressed in the statement on reporting.

**Final Resolutions:**

1. The jury recommends that [Klaus, Diego, and Luther] each receive a 0.0 for the course.
   (10 jurors consent)
2. [Klaus, Diego, and Luther] will each write a letter to the community. The letter may be framed as one or more of the following:
   a. Apology
   b. Reflection
   c. Explanation
   (10 jurors consent)
3. [Klaus, Diego, and Luther] will each reach out to Professors [Allison Hargreeves] and [Reginald Hargreeves]. This may be done via a letter, email, or conversation (in-person or digital), if the professors are willing. (10 jurors consent)

4. [Diego, Klaus, and Luther] will each create a working plan for their upcoming semesters in collaboration with their Deans, academic advisors, and/or the OAR. They will also share this plan with the Honor Council Staff Support person. (10 jurors consent)

5. [Diego, Klaus, and Luther] will each schedule weekly meetings with their Deans for the rest of the current semester. We recommend that they discuss their progress regarding Resolution 4 with their Deans. We additionally recommend that they continue this practice beyond the mandated time frame. (10 jurors consent)

6. The jury affirms [Luther, Diego, and Klaus’s] desires to engage in regularly scheduled activities for improving mental health, e.g. yoga, arts, and community service, respectively. We would like to remind [Luther, Diego, and Klaus] that existing resources including student clubs and classes are available on campus. (10 jurors consent)

7. The jury affirms [Luther and Klaus’s] desire to organize and potentially facilitate discussions regarding [academy] culture including mental health, class year and power dynamics, insulation from the rest of campus, and accessibility. We additionally recommend that [Diego] be a part of these discussions. (10 jurors consent)

8. The jury recommends that [the Commission Department] and the Task Force on [Time Travel and Superhero] Community work to ensure the provision of adequate social and psychological support to [academies]. (9 jurors consent, 1 juror stands outside)

**On resolutions as a whole:** 10 jurors consent

**Post-Trial:**

Trial Resolutions were not appealed.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. Should departments have clear policies outlining the usage of scrap paper on exams?
2. Is reporting academic dishonesty to institutions of higher learning a measure of accountability for the college, or punishment for the student?
3. How does class year and membership in the same campus group influence power dynamics on campus and within the context of the Honor Code?
Letters to the Community:

Diego Hargreeves’ Letter to the Community

[Diego Hargreeves]
[Redacted date]
Letter to the Community

Dear Haverford Community,

I am writing this letter today to inform you of a breach of trust that I committed in our community. I am truly sorry for how my actions impacted the community as well as the trust placed in me by Professor [Allison Hargreeves] and the Honor Code. In the spring of [redacted year], I cheated on my [Saving the World 111] self-scheduled exam. I want to apologize to Professors [Allison Hargreeves], and [Reginald Hargreeves] for my actions as well as the community as a whole. The Haverford honor code is something truly unique and special to Haverford. My actions have taught me very important lessons about trust, honor, and work ethic. By cheating, I undermined my fellow classmates who took the exam honestly, as well as Professor [Allison Hargreeves] for preparing us for the exam. I found myself very stressed out heading into finals week, and allowed outside influences to affect my judgement. The circumstances that led to my actions included issues at home as well as mental issues. I have started placing importance on my mental health and began allocating time to work on myself as well as my obligations outside of school work. I also have put in a lot of work on my studying habits as well as time management skills to allow myself to stay on top of my work. After meeting with my dean and the OAR, I have developed healthy work habits that include using a planner to keep track of all obligations and work. I also understand that Haverford students have many obligations outside of school work and it's important to balance one's time to accommodate all obligations. I should have communicated with Professor [Allison Hargreeves] about my circumstances heading into the final and how I could have prepared myself better for the exam. As I reflect on my actions, I understand the importance of the honor code and how my actions violated the code.

The trial process was very restorative and focused on what steps I needed to take to repair my breach of trust in the community. Once again, I apologize for my actions and ask that the community can accept this apology as I move forward.
Klaus Hargreeves’ Letter to the Community

Dear Friends,

I want to take this opportunity to provide clarity and express my serious regrets about a breach of trust with the Haverford community that I’ve caused. At the end of last school year, I made the extremely short-sighted decision to cheat on my final exam for [Saving the World 111]. At the time, I did not consider the consequences of my decision, but more importantly, I didn’t think about the communal damage an action like this can cause. First, by cheating, I created a situation where my classmates’ hard and honest work in the class, and more specifically on this exam, was somewhat discounted by my decision to use restricted resources for an unfair advantage. Additionally, I recognize that by disregarding the requests of Professor [Allison Hargreeves] and the wider community to follow the honor code on the final exam I betrayed the trust given to me. Professor [Allison Hargreeves] worked hard to prepare us for the final exam, and by using resources disallowed for the exam, I let professor [Allison Hargreeves] down and disrespected her very profession.

But the most important aspect of this breach of trust is with the Haverford community itself. Being surrounded by incredibly gifted and hard-working peers has truly been the most intellectually and socially enriching experience to this point in my life. What I failed to fully recognize, until going through the honor council process, is just how special our community’s values are. Those values allow students to determine their academic experiences, learn far more broadly than simply through curricula, and most importantly build a community that aspires to respect and trust one another. By cheating, I’ve broken from those values. I’ve come to realize more every day how this decision is deleterious and antithetical to what I’ve realized are “Haverford values.” I deeply apologize from a more informed position than when I decided to cheat, and I’m confident that this process has both allowed me to better understand our campus’ core values and has motivated me to be more honest and true in my future academic endeavors.

With trust, concern and respect,

[Klaus Hargreeves]
Luther Hargreeves’ Letter to the Community

Apology, Reflection, and Growth -

I would like to begin this letter by apologizing to my peers, the faculty that work so hard to provide equitable educational opportunities and the honor council for being open and transparent through the resolution process. It was only through these aids that I am able to adequately reflect on my wrong-doing and set up actionable plans to ensure it does not happen again. I was able to work with my dean and the OAR to create scheduling habits that transcend education. I am able to be more consistent with my ability to keep up on work as opposed to falling behind and putting myself in impossible situations.

This ability to stay on top of my own work has ameliorated much of the mental anguish that put me in a position susceptible to breaking the honor code. When I do not feel like I am drowning in work, I can make clear decisions that abide by my own personal moral standards. I am able to reflect on my mistakes and realize where my growth opportunities lie. I need to keep getting better at managing my time but I am continuing to get better and having the ability to reflect on this mistake has allowed me to do this. I hope to continue to refine my ability to manage my time and avoid making mistakes like this one in the future. I have learned that managing my time/energy and my mental health go hand in hand. If I am spiraling mentally there is most likely a burden of workload that is negatively impacting me. By working to parse out workloads and get ahead of assignments I am not only saving myself from mental harm but also putting myself in a position to be more successful.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to voice this reflection and show that I have made growth. I apologize again for my actions and the impact it had on the community. I hope students can see this letter and use it as a moment of reflection on their own ability to manage time and use it to better themselves as it did for me.