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

Key:
Confronted Parties: Galleria, Chanel, and Aqua
Confronting Party: Professor Dorinda
Course: Songwriting 201

Summary:
This case was reviewed and dropped by Honor Council instead of being sent to trial. Although Honor Council believed that Galleria, Chanel, and Aqua violated the Honor Code, they decided that the trial goals of education, restoration, and accountability had already been met and a trial was therefore unnecessary. This being said, they also thought that a set of recommendations would benefit the confronted parties going forward.

This case concerns improper collaboration on the final exam for Prof. Dorinda’s Songwriting 201 course. Composed of multiple choice, short answer, and empirical problems, the exam was open book, open note, and students were allowed to use anything on the class Moodle page and in the course textbook. One of the instructions given was that students could not communicate or collaborate with peers during the exam.

Upon grading the final exams submitted by Aqua and Chanel, Prof. Dorinda noticed that they had answers to one problem that were very similar. Because the exam was open book, the language may have been paraphrased from the textbook, but upon checking, Prof. Dorinda could not find such a source. She therefore emailed Aqua and Chanel asking if they came up with the language on their own or took it from the textbook or another source, to which Aqua replied that she had come up with the language herself.

According to Prof. Dorinda, the language of Aqua’s and Chanel’s solutions were too similar to be written independently, so she therefore decided to re-analyze the other problems. Through this process, she realized that Aqua, Chanel, and Galleria had the same completely or partially wrong solutions to seven of the twenty problems on the exam, solutions which were given by no other
students in the class. Prof. Dorinda also noticed that the wording and formatting of the solution to a problem was the same for these three students and unlike the solutions given by any other student, and she grew to believe that the three students had collaborated on the exam.

Prof. Dorinda then sent an email to Aqua, Chanel, and Galleria explaining why she thought they had collaborated on the exam and asking if they had any information that would persuade her that they had not collaborated on the exam. Very shortly after, each of the three responded, admitted that they had collaborated on the exam, and apologised for their actions. Prof. Dorinda and Aqua also had a Zoom meeting to discuss the matter. She then asked Aqua, Chanel, and Galleria to report themselves to Honor Council, which they did shortly after.

Following the submission of all statements to Honor Council, Prof. Dorinda reached out to the Honor Council Co-Chairs and relayed that she had had a series of email exchanges with Aqua, Galleria, and Chanel about their collaboration, and at least one Zoom meeting with each of them and four Zoom meetings with one of them in which they discussed their actions regarding the final exam. There was no dispute about the facts of the case. Prof. Dorinda stated that as a result of the email exchanges and Zoom meetings, she had established a new relationship with each of them even though they received failing grades. She would be willing to have them in other courses she teaches, and believed that, as between her and the students, the matter was resolved without a trial. Aqua, Galleria, and Chanel also communicated that they believed they were on the same page as Prof. Dorinda.

**Council Deliberations:**

During Council Deliberations, Honor Council decided that while an academic violation of the Honor Code had surely occurred, a trial was not necessary – there would be no additional information found through a trial and the trial goals had already been met. However, there may be value in adding recommendations, particularly in relation to the trial goals of education and restoration. Honor Council therefore consented to drop the case (12 consenting, 4 standing outside in absentia) with the following recommendations (12 consenting, 4 standing outside in absentia):

1. **Honor Council recommends that [Galleria, Chanel, and Aqua] each write a letter to the community by the end of the semester with the ultimate goal of restoration between the confronted parties and the Haverford community as a whole. These letters should be sent to the Honor Council Support Person.**

2. **Honor Council supports and encourages [Galleria, Chanel, and Aqua] to meet with an advisor at the OAR at least twice regarding academic time management and studying practices.**

3. **Honor Council recommends that [Galleria, Chanel, and Aqua] each write up a plan of how they will strive towards the goals of accountability, education, and restoration to**
guide them through their time at Haverford. This plan should be shared with the Honor Council Staff Support Person.

Discussion Questions:
1. Is it appropriate for the Honor Council to drop a case if they believe a violation has occurred? What if the three trial goals of education, accountability, and restoration have already been met?
2. Was a letter to the community necessary in a case such as this where everyone appeared to be on the same page?