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PRE-TRIAL

At the beginning of the semester, James Bond met with one of the co-chairs to ascertain how he could go about confronting himself for numerous academic violations. In this meeting, Bond and the co-chair established that he could act as both confronting and confronted party in an academic confrontation.

Following this meeting, Bond brought himself to Honor Council for multiple academic violations. These included: looking up a term on an exam in Diversionary Tactics with Professor Jane Moneypenney; looking up answers on many assignments and exams in American Espionage with Professor Felix Leiter; disregarding exam instructions in International Spy Agencies with Professor Rene Mathis; looking up questions on some assignments and cheating on at least the final exam in Infiltration Operations with Professor Felix Leiter; looking up a term on an exam in a Smooth Talking class with Professor Rene Mathis; using online blueprints to create a gadget in Introduction to Spy Gizmos with Professor Q; looking up summaries for a Top Secret Info class with Professor M (though Bond was unsure whether this was cheating); and taking extra time on numerous exams throughout his freshman, sophomore, and junior years. He also mentioned that he considered cheating in Professor Jake Wade's Disguises & Aliases class, but did not because it was too difficult to do so.

Honor Council consented to send the case to an academic trial with Bond acting as both confronting and confronted party, and with the option to call in relevant professors as witnesses. The chair of the trial attempted to contact all of the relevant professors in order to obtain statements. Due to problems with assembling the jury, the case did not begin until well into the semester.

PRELIMINARY MEETING

One juror was missing for the preliminary meeting. After numerous attempts to contact her, the jury consented to have the meeting without her, since Bond was a senior and it was important that the trial conclude before graduation. The jury was given Bond's statement, along with statements from the professors that had responded from the chair. These professors were Rene Mathis, Felix Leiter, and Q. Because Professors Leiter and Q were no longer at the college, Professor Mathis was the only professor
available to speak with the jury personally. The jury consented to allow him to attend fact-finding as a witness.

**FACT-FINDING**

The jury gathered for the fact-finding portion of the trial. The jury first met with Bond alone.

**Bond's statement:**

Bond began by saying that he came from a high school where cheating was widespread. When he came to Haverford, this habit came with him, and manifested especially when Bond was under pressure. He again listed the classes he named in his statement, and said that when he needed to finish up a question on take-home exams, he would take the extra time needed. In other situations, he would look up answers he couldn't figure out, or a term that was on the tip of his tongue. However, Bond estimated that 90-95% of the work he had done at Haverford was his own. He emphasized that he was a very judgmental person, and he doesn't know why he did it, knowing how hard he is on himself.

**Questions from the jury:**

A juror asked about the inclusion of blueprints and summaries from the Introduction to Spy Gizmos and Top Secret Info classes. Bond replied that he wasn't sure if those counted as cheating, and had included them to be safe. Asked about when he first start cheating at Haverford, Bond said that he had thought about it freshman year, but had not done anything aside from maybe taking a little extra time on exams. The first acts of cheating he could remember specifically occurred first semester sophomore year. At this point Bond told the jury that he has a very bad memory, saying that he doesn't remember too much before around eighth grade, and that a lot of his recollections about academic dishonesty are fuzzy. A juror asked whether a professor had ever noticed anything to Bond's knowledge, and Bond replied that he didn't think so.

A juror asked if Bond had ever plagiarized within his major, 007 Status. Bond replied that he had. Specifically, he once looked up a term on an open-book take-home exam he was taking. Bond said his rationale at the time was that he was almost certainly not going to look up the correct answer when he received the exam back, so he might as well look it up and learn it now. He told the jury that he actually did end up learning from a lot of his cheating, and that he used that to justify it to himself. But he went on to say that it wasn't the “smart” or “right” way to learn. It was still unfair to his fellow students, and he should have gone to discussion sessions or the like in order to learn the material.

A juror noted that Bond had said he “regularly” took extra time on exam and asked him how often he had done so and how much extra time he generally took. Bond replied that it was usually just what he needed to finish a question. He explained that he used a little trick with his timepieces to justify himself. His watch was set slightly fast, and his clock slightly slow, and so he would record the starting time from his watch and the ending time from his clock. He said he did this to maybe try to convince himself that it was ok.

The jury then asked Bond to talk about how and when he decided to report himself. Bond said that he began thinking about it at the beginning of his second semester junior year. American Espionage had been a difficult class for him, and he was very pleased when he saw that his final grade was better than he had expected it to be. However, he immediately realized that his grade was not actually an honest
reflection of his performance in the class, since he had achieved it in part due to cheating. This made Bond feel extremely guilty. Bond informed the jury that he as had problems with obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), and he began to obsess over his academic dishonesty. He called his parents to discuss the idea of bringing himself to Honor Council. Their response was that this was a serious decision and that he should think carefully before doing so. However, Bond became more and more guilty and obsessive about his past academic dishonesty. He spoke to a professor he was close to as well as his dean and slowly realized that he needed to turn himself in or he would not be able to live with himself.

Following Bond's explanation, a juror asked whether he cheated any more following his realization second semester junior year. Bond replied that he had not and had actually become obsessive about not cheating. Discussing why he reported himself, Bond replied that he was most worried about living with himself, but also about his friends. He clarified that he was not afraid of his friends knowing he had cheated; rather, he was concerned that they had a false idea of his character and that the grades he earned dishonestly would give him an unfair advantage over them when looking for jobs or applying to graduate schools.

Professor Mathis's statement:
Following this, Professor Mathis joined the jury. He and Bond seemed to get along well, talking familiarly and often clarifying each other's statements. Professor Mathis stated that Bond had been in a number of his classes, but he did not notice anything suspicious while Bond was his student, nor did he suspect Bond of academic dishonesty until Bond told him. He said that Bond would come to office hours for help sometimes but was not there as frequently as others and that Bond's relative performance as a student seemed fine.

Questions from the jury:
A juror asked Professor Mathis what his relationship with Bond was outside of class. Professor Mathis replied that he was Bond's academic advisor and had given him some help with his thesis. A juror asked how much Bond's academic dishonesty was likely to affect other students in the class. Professor Mathis answered that it was unlikely to affect them very much, as he did not grade on a curve. A juror then asked Professor Mathis what his sense of Bond was as a student before finding out about his academic dishonesty. Professor Mathis said Bond sometimes struggled in class, but that he was “organized” and “focused.” He said that Bond was good at balancing asking questions with producing his own insights, and while he was not the quickest with these insights, he almost always got there in the end. He went on to say that recently he had thought more about Bond's character and concluded that while Bond's chronic academic dishonesty did show moral failing, he also showed moral strength in his decision to turn himself in. When asked how knowing about Bond's actions would affect his trust in other students, Professor Mathis stated that it had caused him to think a great deal about other students and the Code, but not in such a way that he felt Haverford should get rid of the system. Although some students might cheat, he said, the Honor Code was still overall a much better system than exists at most other schools.

The jury then asked Professor Mathis for any suggested resolutions, since he would not be present to do so following circumstantial portion. He was firm that Bond should not get credit for assignments on which he violated the Honor Code and stressed the importance of both repercussions and reconciliation for Bond. He stated that he personally did not believe Bond should be separated, and he wanted the
resolutions be fair while also leaving open the possibility for other students to come forward about their own academic dishonesty without fearing excessively harsh punishments. Asked whether the 007 Status department would have any hesitations continuing to work with Bond, Professor Mathis replied that they would not.

At this point, the jury had no further fact-finding questions for Professor Mathis or Bond, and the two left.

Professor Q's statement (via email):
Professor Q of Bryn Mawr was one of the three professors who replied to the trial chair's emails about Bond. Because he was no longer at the college, Professor Q was not able to communicate with the jury in person but instead communicated with the jury via email. His statement said that Bond was only in one class with him, but in looking at his grade sheet and from what he could recall, Bond “always came to class, participated in all activities, and turned in all assignments on time.” At the request of the jury, the chair emailed Professor Q again to clarify the nature of the gadget for which Bond mentioned using blueprints and to ask about any suggested resolutions. Professor Q had no suggested resolutions and said that the assignment consisted of both being familiar with the gadget as well as construction of a mockup.

Professor Leiter's statement (via email):
Professor Felix Leiter was the third professor that responded to the trial chair. Although no longer at Haverford, Professor Leiter taught multiple classes in which Bond had cheated. He stated that while he had never suspected Bond of academic dishonest, he had noticed that Bond had struggled with his classes and noted that this would provide motivation to cheat. He also stated that he felt it would have been very difficult to cheat on any of his exams without the help of another person and expressed skepticism at Bond's insistence that he had never cheated with any of his peers. He suggested that the jury meet with a member of the Mystery Studies department in order to examine this issue further. Professor Leiter did not offer any suggested resolutions.

STATEMENT OF VIOLATION
After Bond and Professor Mathis departed from the fact-finding portion, the jury consented on the following statement of violation:

Bond violated the Honor Code by not following exam instructions, taking extra time on exams, not citing outside sources, and representing others' work as his own.

CIRCUMSTANTIAL PORTION
Prior to Bond's arrival, the jury discussed Professor Leiter's suspicions that Bond had had help cheating. They concluded that they thought Bond was telling the truth, and so it did not seem that it would be helpful or necessary to meet with a member of the Mystery Studies department.

Bond then joined the jury. He told the jury that grades did not concern him as much as trying to do his personal best. However, he said that he did worry about falling behind others, especially in Mystery Studies. He also worried that his cheating would negatively impact others, whether in causing
them to have lower grades on a curve or by giving him an unearned advantage when applying to jobs or graduate schools, and that this would result in “taking someone else's spot.”

A juror brought up Bond's earlier statements about his poor memory and asked if it was likely that there were instances of cheating that he did not remember. He said that it was likely but that he hadn't cheated on anything since talking to his parents second semester junior year. Following that, his guilt and obsession about cheating had become more debilitating, to the point that over the summer he became paranoid, stopped trusting people, and had great difficulty just getting out of bed.

A juror noted that Bond seemed to care a great deal about how his actions had affected other people and asked if he had any thoughts about how to restore his trust with the community. Bond replied that he would not be surprised if the jury felt he shouldn't graduate. At the least, he thought there should be a grade change. He also very much wanted the community to know what he had done. Asked why it was so important that the community know his specific identity, rather than just that he was a Haverford student, Bond replied that people at Haverford presumed innocence and should know that their perceptions of him were incorrect. A juror asked if Bond was trying to see if the community would still accept him. He answered that if they didn't, it was ok. He fully understood why would not be able to accept him, but still felt that this was the best way to make it up. He stated that it was less important that his friends know than the wider community. He explained that academics weren't a personal matter that he discussed with his friends; the effects of his cheating were more relevant to the academic community as a whole, so it was more important that they know.

Responding to this last point, a juror asked how significant Bond's OCD was in his decisions to report himself. He answered that OCD pervaded all aspects of his life and had for essentially his whole life. Asked if it was part of the pressure to cheat, he said it was but that it shouldn't be an excuse. Because it was a part of everything in his life, he said, he should have taken greater steps towards “taking care of it;” maybe then he wouldn't have cheated.

A juror asked Bond how his view of the Honor Code had changed while at Haverford. Bond answered that he had come into Haverford feeling neutral but now took the academic code very seriously. However, he felt more ambivalent about the social honor code.

One of the jurors asked Bond how he thought he could be held accountable for both known and unknown violations. Bond said that he expected to receive a 0.0 in American Espionage, and for everything else, he recommended some sort of across-the-board grade reduction. In thinking about how much he thought his GPA should be reduced, he revised his estimate of what percentage of his work had been his own to say 70-80%. However, he recognized that for him it was a slippery slope and he was likely to continue lowering that percentage out of anxiety that he was being too easy on himself. Another juror asked Bond whether he felt he had earned his Haverford degree. After a moment of pause, Bond answered that he thought so, but it was for the community to decide and he had hoped the jury would tell him that.

The jury then brought up the subject of separation. Bond's opinion was that separation would not make a difference in terms of cheating again and it wasn’t necessary for restoration, so he didn't see the purpose. A juror asked whether he thought it would help him come to terms with what he did or manage his OCD. Bond said he wasn't worried he would cheat again, but he was worried that he would obsess over what he'd done. A juror asked Bond if he had ever been to see CAPS about his OCD. He answered that he saw someone outside of Haverford.
TENTATIVE RESOLUTIONS, PART 1

At the beginning of the meeting, the jurors discussed Bond's motives for bringing himself to Honor Council. One juror brought up that it didn't seem like Bond had reported himself because of the Code, per se. Instead, he seemed to be motivated by his own feelings that he should do what was right and/or follow the rules, which in this case were the academic code. After some debate about how to begin to create resolutions for a case of this magnitude, the jury decided that it would make the most sense to go through the classes Bond had mentioned one by one.

The first class they looked at was the Top Secret Info class with Professor M in which Bond had read online summaries of the class readings. One juror said that reading a summary for a class discussion did not seem like a violation of the Honor Code, since he had never tried to pass it off as his own work or use it as the basis of analysis. The rest of the jury agreed, and consented to create no resolutions regarding that class.

The jury next looked at the Disguises & Aliases class with Professor Jake Wade. In his initial statement, Bond wrote that he had considered cheating in that class, but had not. The jury agreed that just thinking about cheating was not a violation of the Code. The jury consented to create no resolutions regarding this class.

The jury next looked at American Espionage with Professor Leiter. This was the class in which Bond had committed the most egregious violations, cheating on multiple assignments and exams. Bond had suggested that he fail this particular class. Although some members of the jury agreed with Bond, others were hesitant. One juror pointed out that failing a class could potentially prevent Bond from graduating on time, regardless of whether the jury chose to separate him. The jury kept returning to how frequent and severe Bond's violations were in that class, however, and they consented to recommend that he receive a 0.0 grade in American Espionage. Because a juror had to leave, the meeting ended at this point.

TENTATIVE RESOLUTIONS, PART 2

In second tentative meeting resolution, the jury picked up with the Introduction to Spy Gizmos class taught by Professor Q in which Bond read online summaries of the readings, and used them to write an assignment for the class. A few jurors pointed out that Bond did not just read the summaries; he used them in creating a gadget and did not cite them. Additionally, the construction of the gadgets would be drawn from those of the summaries, rather than from Bond's own reading of the text. After some discussion, they consented that Bond should receive a 0.0 on the assignment in question.

Next, the jury looked at Professor Mathis's International Spy Agencies class, in which Bond did not follow exam instructions. The exam had four questions. Two were to be done first, closed-book, and the second two were to be done open-book. Bond did them out of order. A few jurors questioned whether Bond would have even benefited from that order reversal. Another juror pointed out that while doing the open-book section, he could have seen something that would help him on the closed-book section, especially if he already knew the questions. However, some felt that it didn't really didn't matter whether he benefited or not; the point was that he had not followed the exam instructions, thus violating the trust of the professor.
Some jurors felt that by violating the exam instructions, Bond had violated the integrity of the entire exam, and so should receive no credit. Others felt he should only lose partial credit. One juror suggested giving 50% on the exam to give Bond credit for the section he did first (open-book) and gained no advantage on, and gave him zero credit for the closed-book section. Although some jurors still felt that it would have been better for Bond to receive no credit, the jury was able to consent to giving him credit for half the exam.

TENTATIVE RESOLUTIONS, PART 3

Two jurors did not show up to this meeting, and the trial chair was unable to get in contact with them. Because it was getting very close to the end of the semester, the jury consented to discuss resolutions, with the provision that they would consent on any that came out of this meeting with the entire jury at the next.

Some jurors brought up the fact that looking at Bond's violations class by class did not entirely cover the breadth of his academic dishonesty. For example, it does not cover violations he could not remember, nor does it address the habitual nature of his cheating, which was arguably more concerning than the individual violations. The jury was unsure of how to address this. One juror pointed out that the jury was asking for a lot of grade changes, and felt that the cumulative severity of this was adequate. Another juror countered that the grade changes were only recommendations, and it was hard to know what would happen with the professors the trial far been unable to contact. However, at this point, they felt they should focus on the individual class, but hoped that later resolutions would cover this, as well as Bond's relationship with the Code itself.

The jury began discussing Professor Mathis's International Spy Agencies class, in which Bond looked up a term. The jury clarified that the term was not part of an answer, but the answer to an entire question by itself. Several jurors noted that this was very much the epitome of cheating, showing disregard for the purpose of an exam and the academic code itself. Several jurors felt strongly that Bond should fail the exam at the very least, and at least one juror thought he should fail the entire class. According to that juror, violating the exam instructions in that way did not just break the “contract” Bond had entered into in the exam, but in the entire class and, to some extent, his entire Haverford education. This led to speculation as to whether Bond should receive a Haverford degree at all. However, other jurors felt that cheating on one question on one exam should not nullify the entire class. Most of the jury felt that while the violation was severe enough that Bond should not receive credit on the exam, and they consented to this.

Next, the jury began to discuss Professor Jane Moneypenney's diversionary tactics exam in which he looked up a term. A juror brought up that vocabulary was a pretty major part of these exams, and said that Bond should fail the exam. Another juror thought that one vocabulary term was too small an infraction for Bond to fail, and said that he should only fail that section. In response, a juror asked why it was that this violation was any different from the one before. Some jurors felt that the degree of the violation made it different, and that this difference was part of the point of trials; otherwise Honor Council could just blindly mete out consequence. But others felt that cheating in this way should result in failure of the exam, regardless of the scale. The jury kept returning to the question of whether voiding the honor pledge on part of an assignment automatically voids the entire assignment.
A jury wondered why Bond had cheated on such a tiny part of the exam; there didn't seem to be much point to it. Other jurors brought up Bond's OCD as a reason. While some felt this was a valid mitigating factor, others pointed out that many Haverford students with similar challenges did not cheat. The jury decided that Bond should fail the Diversionary Tactics exam, with one juror standing outside consensus. Throughout the entire discussion of this class, the jury was very frustrated with the lack of input from the professor, who had not responded to any of the chair's emails.

The jury moved on to discussing Felix Leiter's Infiltration Operations class, in which Bond had cheated on a final exam and “probably” cheated on some of the assignments. One juror immediately said that Bond should fail the entire class, and another agreed. However, the jury was very evenly split on this issue. A juror again pointed out that it is permissible to look things up online, as Bond did, if you cite them, to which another juror responded that Bond hadn't cited them. Other jurors were uncomfortable hold Bond accountable for cheating he “probably” did. Over the course of the trial, Bond had become increasingly preoccupied with making sure he reported every possible incident to the jury, and some jurors worried that he may have been misremembering violations where none existed. The jury was able to compromise on Bond failing the exam and receiving 50% of his assignment grade for the class. They consented to this.

With the individual classes taken care of, the jury began to discuss broader resolutions. The jury agreed that Bond should write a letter to the community to be released with abstract. They consented on this letter, specifying that he should focus on why he brought himself to Honor Council, why he wanted to break confidentiality, and his relationship with the Honor Code.

The last resolution the jury discussed was separation, which had also occasionally been mentioned in previous conversations. Some jurors felt it would be useful in accounting for the violations that Bond could not remember. A juror brought up the point that had these been individual cases, Bond would have been separated for at least a few of them. Another said that by violating the Code this severely, Bond had already removed himself from the ideals of the community, and separation was a natural resolution. Others agreed with Bond, and felt there was no point, or thought it was extreme. Countering that, a few jurors brought up ways in which separation could be beneficial. Some seniors on the jury expressed discomfort with the idea that Bond would be able to walk with them.

Many jurors were especially concerned with when Bond would graduate. The jury clarified that it was only possible to for Bond to receive his diploma in the spring of any given year. Because it was very likely that Bond would have to make up some classes to graduate, they wanted to allow him a spring to do so. The jury consented that Bond would not graduate with the class of 2012; instead, he would be separated for Fall 2013, could return in Spring 2013 at the soonest, to graduate with the class of 2013.

TENTATIVE RESOLUTIONS, PART 4

With all jurors present, the jury again consented upon the resolutions from the previous meeting. The two absent jurors had no qualms with the resolutions, and consented to all of them. The jury discussed adding a resolution pertaining to Bond's OCD. Since it was so relevant to Bond's actions, some jurors felt there should be a resolution on it, even if it was only a statement of support that Bond continue to address it. However, other jurors felt it was not their place, and that it would come off as preachy. They also pointed out that he was already trying to address it.
The jury then agreed upon official wording of each of the resolutions they had discussed. The jury then consented to the following resolutions, first individually, and then all together (no jurors stood outside consensus on the resolutions as a whole):

1. The jury recommends that Bond will receive a 0.0 on the exam in question in Diversionary Tactics. (1 juror stood outside)
2. The jury recommends that Bond will receive 50% of his original grade on the exam in question in International Spy Agencies. (no jurors stood outside)
3. The jury recommends that Bond will receive a 0.0 on the exam in question in Smooth Talking. (no jurors stood outside)
4. The jury recommends that Bond will receive a 0.0 grade for the class American Espionage I. (no jurors stood outside)
5. The jury recommends that Bond will receive a 0.0 on the assignment in question in the Introduction to Spy Gizmos class. (no jurors stood outside)
6. The jury recommends that Bond will receive a 0.0 on the final exam of Infiltration Operations and will receive 50% of his overall grade for assignments in the class. (no jurors stood outside)
7. Bond will write an initial letter to the community to be released with the abstract. This letter should focus on why he chose to bring himself to Honor Council, as well as on his academic experience at Haverford. (no jurors stood outside)
8. Bond will be separated for the Fall 2012 semester. If he chooses, he may return to Haverford for classes no sooner than the Spring 2013 semester. Because of this separation, Bond will graduate no sooner than May 2013. (1 juror stood outside)
9. In order to return to Haverford, Bond will write a second letter to community, reflecting on his separation. The abstract will be re-released with this additional letter in the fall semester following Bond’s graduation. (no jurors stood outside)

**BETWEEN MEETINGS**

After receiving the tentative resolutions, Bond contacted the trial chair to asking about the lack of resolutions addressing the instances in which he took extra time that he could not specifically remember. The chair then forwarded these concerns to the jury to consider before the finalizing resolutions portion.

**FINALIZING RESOLUTIONS**

Before Bond arrived, the jury discussed his email. Many jurors expressed concerns similar to Bond. Some said that that was part of the point of the separation. Another said that the presence of these more nebulous violations caused him to always lean towards harsher resolutions throughout the trial process.

When Bond joined the jury, he reiterated his email. He went on to say that after the last meeting, he had been stuck on one juror's question about whether he had earned his degree. He had thought a lot about whether he “should” be a part of the community. He acknowledged that the jury was doing its best to reintegrate him into the community, but said that in the end, he thought they could only address him in
relation to other, not in relation to himself. Bond said that he hoped he could at some point get past what he had done, or at least get used to it.

The jury asked if Bond had only taken extra time in the classes he named, and Bond answered that he had almost certainly taken extra time in classes he hadn't named. When asked in how many semesters Bond had taken extra time, he said it had been about five. Looking at his transcript, he named five classes in which he would have taken extra time. A juror asked Bond to estimate the percentage of exams on which he took extra time, and how much time he took. Bond wasn't sure how often he did it, but said it was probably never more than ten minutes. A juror suggested that Bond maybe speak with the professors of the classes he had named in order to repair the breach of trust. Other jurors agreed.

A juror observed that it seemed like Bond was looking for finality with this process, and Bond agreed that he wanted as much finality as was possible. Another juror asked what would make Bond feel as though the “requirements” of the trial had been met. He responded that grade changes and resolutions of that sort would be most effective. He also said that he liked the idea of talking to the other professors, and that they could do what they wanted with grade changes. Reflecting on the number of grade changes, Bond said that he struggled with what he would tell any employer who asked about his grades. To answer the question about breaking confidentiality, Bond stated that he had already decided to tell his Poker Club, and was leaning in favor of breaking it in the abstract. A juror asked if that meant the abstract should come out before the end of the year. Bond said that this would be preferable, as he wanted to break confidentiality to his class, and also it would make logistics easier for the people he would have already told. A juror again asked why it was so important for him to break confidentiality. Bond answered that it was about “owning up.” A juror recommended that Bond speak with his friends and fellow club members before deciding whether to break confidentiality to the community at large. Bond agreed, and it was determined that he would email the chair of the trial with his decision within the next week, as releasing the abstract before graduation meant that the chair's report and abstract would have to be written in a very short time period.

The juror asked Bond what he thought of the resolutions in general. He said that he thought they were good for restoration and education. He raised the question of whether people can change. A juror pointed out that Haverford’s entire system of justice was predicated on the idea that people can change. Bond felt that he had to change himself. He classified himself as a “scheming” person, someone who was good at excuses and who cheated, but that was not who he wanted to be. Trust was very important, he said.

After Bond left, the jury reviewed the resolutions. The jury was very concerned with creating resolutions that would allow Bond to make peace with himself, but was not sure how to do that. Some jurors worried that if Bond spoke to the professors in other classes, he would give professors an inflated idea of how badly he had violated in their class. Others thought that allowing Bond to address these violations would put him more at ease. In the end, the jury consented to have Bond contact the professors in a facilitated manner.

The jury consented on the following final resolutions, with one juror standing outside consensus on the resolutions as a whole:

1. **The jury recommends that Bond will receive a 0.0 on the exam in question in Diversionary Tactics.** (1 juror stood outside)
2. The jury recommends that Bond will receive 50% of his original grade on the exam in question in *International Spy Agencies*. (no jurors stood outside)

3. The jury recommends that Bond will receive a 0.0 on the exam in question in *Smooth Talking*. (no jurors stood outside)

4. The jury recommends that Bond will receive a 0.0 grade for the class *American Espionage*. (no jurors stood outside)

5. The jury recommends that Bond will receive a 0.0 on the assignment in question in the *Introduction to Spy Gizmos* class. (no jurors stood outside)

6. The jury recommends that Bond will receive a 0.0 on the final exam of *Infiltration Operations* and will receive 50% of his overall grade for assignments in the class. (no jurors stood outside)

7. The chair will contact the professors of other relevant classes concerning the potential time violations in these classes, and will ask them to engage in a dialogue with Bond over this issue. (1 juror stood outside)

8. Bond will be separated for the Fall 2012 semester. If he chooses, he may return to Haverford for classes no sooner than the Spring 2013 semester. Because of this separation, Bond will graduate no sooner than May 2013. (1 juror stood outside)

9. In order to return to Haverford, Bond will write a letter to community, reflecting on his separation. The abstract will be released with this letter in the fall semester following Bond’s graduation. (no jurors stood outside)

10. If Bond chooses to break his confidentiality, he will write an initial letter to the community to be released with the abstract before May 13, 2012. This letter should focus on why he chose to bring himself to Honor Council, as well as on his academic experience at Haverford. In the event that he breaks his confidentiality, the abstract will be released twice; once with this initial letter at the end of Spring 2012 semester, and once upon his graduation from Haverford, along with both this letter and the letter reflecting on his separation. If he does not break his confidentiality, the themes of the first letter should be present in the letter he writes for his return. (no jurors stood outside)

11. The jury recommends that this be reported on applications to graduate schools. (no jurors stood outside)

**POST-TRIAL**

Following the trial, Bond wrote to the trial chair that he had decided to break confidentiality. Because of this, the chair’s report and abstract were expedited in order to be released before the graduation of Bond’s original class. Because it was not possible for Honor Council to meet during finals week, when the abstract would have to be written, they consented to review and consent on it via GoogleDoc. The abstract and original letter were released in accordance with the resolutions’ modified timeline.

**LETTER TO THE COMMUNITY**

Dear Haverford Community,
I do not really know how to begin. I really screwed up, and I do not know why I did not feel as bad about this before as I do now. Cheating is not in my character, or at least I do not intend it to be. I want to be an honorable person, and I am trying to make improvements to become who I want to be. I have never considered being a person who cheats with respect to other things in life. For instance, while drinking coffee before a cross country or track race to wake you up is legitimate (up to a certain point), I absolutely refuse to drink coffee because I do not think it is a reflection of my true performance, even though it may be completely by the books to do so. I am still trying to figure out why I cheated or committed so many infractions with respect to the Honor Code. Maybe it was my desire to keep my GPA high. It could have been numerous things. The main motive, I believe, is that I just could not see myself failing at something. This is contradictory, because if school were so important to me as a reflection of myself, then why would I want it to be a false reflection of my character? I think I was the only one holding myself to these standards, as no one else really cares what your grades are or what your GPA is as long as you are trying your best. Sure, everyone wants you to do well, but no one wants you to fake your way through school. Not to mention that having these false grades and marks can affect what your peers are able to do once they are out of Haverford and in the real world. I could not deal with that possibility, knowing that I am making someone else’s life harder unfairly. People are expecting you to be honest, and in a place like Haverford, it is even more so the case.

And this is why I am going public with this trial and information about my Honor Code infractions. I believe that people should know what I have done so that they can judge me properly. I really do not like the idea of me hurting other people without them knowing. When you do something wrong, oftentimes it is seen by the public, and so, with respect to character, people can properly judge you for the things you have done. But cheating is different. People cannot judge you properly because the cases of cheating are usually kept secret, and people assume that you are someone you are not, and, as a result, you gain allies that may not be allies had they known what you have done. I really, really do not like the idea of people thinking that I am someone I am not. These thoughts have been in my head for the past year, and as I grew socially, I became more and more aware of the idea that these people are my friends because they have a set of assumptions about me that may not be completely true. Sure, everyone has their secrets, but these instances are a reflection of deep character, properties of a person that other people rely on for trust and social growth. You need to be able to trust your friends, and I completely understand if you cannot trust me. I hope that you can trust me, but I want everyone to make that judgment for themselves, and I have absolutely no problem with people not being able to trust me anymore. I completely screwed up on one of the main things people are here for, the academic Honor Code. Sure, there are some things I still disagree with in the Honor Code, such as some of the social Honor Code (I tend to be more of a straightforward person when discussing issues with someone than Haverford may want me to be), but I disgraced the foundation of the Honor Code, one of the principles on which we are all here. I also think it is important to note that this whole process started more than a year ago, and that for much of that year or so my academic dishonesty tortured me. My parents and my friend, who attends Haverford, were discouraging me from turning myself in because of the possible implications of doing so (and they said that if I changed my ways, that is all that matters), but not doing anything about my academic dishonesty turned out to be too much to bear. My parents and my friend from Haverford ultimately just want me to do what I think is right for myself, so, please, do not judge them. Keeping my academic dishonesty a secret caused much more mental harm than it was worth, and it ended up affecting me so much that I started to think things that I am told are completely ludicrous. My guilt complex ate me
up, and I tried to settle it by making some strides to try to make up for my academic dishonesty. It worked for a while, but then I realized that the only path to truly feeling better was to bring myself forward so that the right thing, in the eyes of my peers and my professors, may be done so that people may trust me again and, maybe more importantly, I could live with myself again. I will never, ever be this dishonest again. Sometimes I catch myself thinking some things that are from my former self, and I am trying to overcome those thoughts to be the person I want to be. It is a growing process, and it has been very rewarding. I have told myself that I should want what the people want, and so turning myself in would allow the people to have what they want, and that is all I can do, because some of the effects of my academic dishonesty are completely irreversible. Hopefully I did the right thing in your eyes, and, if I did not, that is one of the reasons why I am breaking confidentiality about my academic dishonesty and trial process.

I hope I have covered everything I need to with this letter. If you need any more detail about what I have done not in the abstract or anything else, feel free to talk to me about it. I want this to be as transparent as possible, because I am trying to make everything right. Also, I hope I did everything right during this whole process; if anyone has any concerns about the way I went about this, please let me know, because I want to make sure I do as much as I can to try to make up for what I did. I know I have a few regrets of my own, but I have been told by numerous people that I have done my share of work to try to make this better. Nevertheless, I am open to anyone and everyone about anything.

Sincerely,
Benjamin Cutilli

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

1. If a student bring him- or herself to Honor Council, how much should that affect the jury's resolutions?
2. How much should a condition like Bond's OCD affect the jury's resolutions?
3. Do you agree with the emphasis Bond placed on breaking confidentiality? Do you think abstracts should be confidential?
4. Professor Mathis recommended that Bond not be separated, but the jury chose to do so despite that. How closely should juries follow recommended resolutions?
5. What should the jury do in cases where the violation(s) may be unclear, such as when Bond took extra time on exams?
6. Throughout the course of the trial, the jury was often frustrated by the unresponsiveness of professors. What should happen in cases where the professor(s) involved is(are) for some reason inaccessible? Is it right for the jury to act on limited information?
7. Throughout the trial, the jury discussed whether voiding the honor pledge on exam nullifies not just that exam or class, but the student's entire Haverford education. Do you agree with this? What is the breadth of the repercussions of an Honor Code violation?