Dragon Tales:
An Honor Council Academic Trial
Released Spring 2022

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

Key:
Confronted Parties: Emmy and Cassie
Confronting Party: Professor Quetzal
Course: Flying 186

Summary/Pre-Trial:
This case dealt with two students who inappropriately collaborated on a final exam. The Chair’s Report and trial notes of this case are not in Council records, and it is likely that the Chair’s Report was never completed. A Council member who served on the jury of this case retroactively wrote a report of the events of this trial to the best of their memory, which was used as the basis of this abstract. There are still details missing, however, particularly in the “Jury Deliberations and Tentative Resolutions” and “Finalizing Resolutions” sections. This trial was run with a jury that did not meet the diversity requirements specified in the Students’ Constitution.

Professor Quetzal became suspicious of Emmy and Cassie’s exams when he noticed an unusual method resulting in a similar error across the two exams. After reviewing both exams in their entirety, Professor Quetzal concluded that much of it had to be copied or worked on collaboratively, which was a violation of his exam policy. Professor Quetzal emailed Emmy and Cassie to inquire about these similarities. Both Emmy and Cassie emphatically denied having violated the code, explaining that their exams were similar because they had studied for the exam together. Unsatisfied by this explanation, Professor Quetzal emailed them again, advising the students to admit to a violation early in the process. At this point Emmy and Cassie confessed that they had worked on the exam together in violation of the exam policy.

Fact Finding:
Emmy and Cassie admitted that they had exchanged “cheat sheets” during the exam for several of the questions. While Professor Quetzal allowed each student to create and bring a “cheat sheet” into the test, he explicitly prohibited students from sharing their sheets with one
another or otherwise receiving outside aid during the test.

The jury then asked Emmy and Cassie about their use of [a dragon scale] during the exam. Emmy and Cassie explained that they had shared use of a scale on some of the exam. Emmy stated that she didn’t clear her work from the scale before passing it to Cassie, while Cassie stated that she always cleared hers before passing it to Emmy. Additionally, while they were allowed to use basic features of the scale, the exam specifically prohibited using advanced scale functions, which Professor Quetzal suspected that Emmy and Cassie had used. Emmy and Cassie admitted to using advanced scale functions but said that they hadn’t realized that those functions were prohibited during the exam.

Professor Quetzal also believed that Emmy and Cassie copied off of each other’s exams. When Emmy and Cassie told the jury that they had not, Professor Quetzal explained he was willing to believe them since he felt the act of copying itself should not affect the resolutions. Towards the end of his conversation with the jury, Professor Quetzal shared that he didn’t feel like the jury was getting the full story. He expressed concern about several inconsistencies and contradictions in Emmy and Cassie’s stories.

Jury Deliberations/Statement of Violation:

During Fact Finding, Emmy and Cassie admitted to exchanging the cheat sheets, using disallowed scale functions, and sharing the scale. Because of what Professor Quetzal said at the end of his conversation with the jury, however, members of the jury felt frustrated and believed that there was more to the violation than what Emmy and Cassie had told them. They felt that Emmy and Cassie’s story had evolved over the course of the meeting, especially when talking about their use of the scale. Before the jury directly asked about it, neither Emmy nor Cassie acknowledged that they had shared a scale or used advanced functions, and the jury felt that this was dishonest. There was disagreement among the members of the jury about how to address this potential dishonesty. Some members of the jury felt disrespected by this dishonesty, and believed that the parties may have withheld additional information; others, however, felt that the jury couldn’t include anything in their statement about potential dishonesty because it was speculative and could make the parties uncomfortable. In the end, the jury decided not to include anything about dishonesty or lying in their statement, and consented to the following statement of violation.

Statement of Violation

[Emmy] and [Cassie] violated the honor code through inappropriate collaboration and prohibited use of technology on their final exam. (10 jurors consent)

Circumstantial Portion:

At the circumstantial meeting, Emmy and Cassie told the jury that they didn’t think there was anything going on in their lives at the time of the exam that contributed to the violation. The
violation occurred because they were confused by the questions and felt that they were running out of time. They knew that using the advanced functions on their shared scale was wrong and that passing information on the cheat sheet was wrong, but they did it anyway because they panicked in the moment. When asked what they would do differently next time to prevent future situations where they felt they needed to cheat, Emmy and Cassie said they wouldn’t take their final exams at the same time and in the same room with a close friend again.

The jury then moved to the question of dishonesty. When asked why she had initially lied to Professor Quetzal when he reached out about the similarities in their exams, Emmy explained that she initially saw the email late at night and was very panicked. She was home with her family and didn’t want them to find out about the violation, so she decided to put off the problem by lying in the moment. Emmy and Cassie said that they communicated over break about the emails from Professor Quetzal.

Emmy expressed that, while she was willing to work with whatever resolutions Council created, she was very concerned about her parents or her friends at Haverford finding out about this violation and trial. She was also concerned about how the trial might impact her visa status. Emmy asked if there was a way for her to work with other international students involved in Honor Council trials. She wanted to help make the trial process be less intimidating so that it could be more meaningful to international students. Emmy felt that receiving 0.0 on the final was fair to both parties, and noted that she would accept any resolutions regarding a grade change. Emmy and Cassie both raised concerns about their visa status in the event that they were separated. They were worried that if they were separated they wouldn’t be able to secure visas to return. Despite these serious concerns, the jury decided that they felt that separation was warranted in this case.

**Tentative Resolutions:**

1. *[Cassie] and [Emmy] will be separated from the college for the [redacted] semester.* (8 jurors consent, 1 stands outside, 1 stands outside in absentia)
2. *[Cassie] and [Emmy] will receive a 0.0 on the final.* (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)
3. *[Cassie] and [Emmy] will meet with [Professor Quetzal], if he is willing, in the first two months of the [redacted] semester.* (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)
4. *[Cassie] and [Emmy] will each write a letter to the community before returning for the [redacted] semester.* (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)
5. *[Cassie] and [Emmy] will write reflections due at the end of [month], [month], and [month].* (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)
6. *[Cassie] and [Emmy] will meet with a juror before the end of the [redacted] semester, once a month during the [redacted] semester, and at least once in the first month of the [redacted] semester.* (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)
7. [Cassie] and [Emmy] will meet with a representative from the OAR to plan their finals week within the week leading up to finals of [redacted]. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)
8. [Cassie] and [Emmy] will attend at least two abstract discussions in the [redacted] semester. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside in absentia)

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

Statement on Reporting:
The jury feels that this proceeding would be considered disciplinary at other institutions of higher learning. However, it should be considered that the violation occurred on the parties’ first ever final exam and the parties will have undergone an extensive set of resolutions. (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside in absentia)

Finalizing Resolutions:
In finalizing, it became clear that separation for Emmy and Cassie could be quite traumatic, since both students were gay and Haverford was the place in which they felt safest being themselves. Additionally, both students had serious concerns about how their parents would react to separation and whether they would be able to return to Haverford. Ultimately, the jury upheld their previous decision regarding separation. The rest of the information regarding the finalizing meeting has been lost from Council records.

Final Resolutions:
1. [Cassie] and [Emmy] will be separated from the college for the [redacted] semester. (8 jurors consent and 2 stand outside)
2. [Cassie] and [Emmy] will receive a 0.0 on the final. (10 jurors consent)
3. [Cassie] and [Emmy] will meet with [Professor Quetzal], if he is willing, in the first two months of the [redacted] semester. (10 jurors consent)
4. [Cassie] and [Emmy] will each write a letter to the community before returning for the [redacted] semester. (10 jurors consent)
5. [Cassie] and [Emmy] will each write reflections due at the end of [month], [month], and [month]. (10 jurors consent)
6. [Cassie] and [Emmy] will each meet with a juror before the end of the [redacted] semester, once a month during the [redacted] semester, and at least once in the first month of the [redacted] semester. (10 jurors consent)
7. [Cassie] and [Emmy] will each meet with a representative from the OAR to plan their finals week within the week leading up to finals of [redacted semester]. (10 jurors consent)
8. [Cassie] and [Emmy] will attend at least two abstract discussions in the [redacted]
semester. (10 jurors consent)

9. The jury will write [Cassie] and [Emmy] a letter explaining its thinking about separation by the end of the month. The jury also invites [Cassie] and [Emmy] to meet with the jury to discuss this further if they wish. (10 jurors consent)

10. The jury encourages [Cassie] and [Emmy] to meet with members of the Honor Council Executive Board to discuss their experience with the trial process. (10 jurors consent)

On resolutions as a whole: (8 jurors consent and 2 stand outside)

Statement on Reporting:
The jury considers this an egregious violation of the Honor Code and feels that this proceeding would be considered disciplinary at other institutions of higher learning. However, it should be considered that the violation occurred on the parties’ first ever final exam and the parties will have undergone an extensive set of resolutions. (10 jurors consent)

Post-Trial:
Both confronted parties appealed Resolution 1, but the resolution was upheld by the President of the College. In order to return to Haverford, both Cassie and Emmy had to apply for new F-1 visas. Luckily, their Honor Code violation did not prevent either of them from returning, but it was extensively scrutinized during Cassie’s application process. Emmy decided to take an additional semester off after her separation to further reflect and be better prepared to rejoin the community. The jury never completed their letter to Emmy and Cassie per Resolution 9.

Discussion Questions:
1. To what extent should visa status be taken into account when considering separation?
2. What does it mean for jurors to stand outside? How should the jury proceed when a controversial resolution, such as separation, is not consented to unanimously?
3. Do you agree with the jury’s decision to separate Emmy and Cassie?
4. How could the trial process be restructured to make it less intimidating?
5. In this case, the trial chair failed to write a Chair’s Report and the Honor Council Co-Secretaries failed to assemble a jury in line with the Constitution. How can Co-Chairs and Co-Secretaries be held accountable for completing their constitutionally required tasks?
6. How can juries be held accountable for completing resolutions that they wrote for themselves?