The trial began with the Chairperson reading parts of the Honor Code focusing on trial procedures. The Chairperson then told us that the trial involved an academic infraction concerning Ashley's final exam in Calculus. It had been an open-book, take home exam. Ashley, a Bryn Mawr student, was suspected of copying from her boyfriend Ian's exam.

Professor Smith began by telling the jury of a problem that he had had with Ashley previously in the semester. In the middle of the semester, Ashley had turned in an assignment late which had resembled the posted answer key. Smith spoke with her about this, but she denied using the key while doing the work. Smith also said that Ashley had handed in two other late assignments which were also almost exact replicas of the answer key. He debated whether to bring this possible infraction to the Honor Council's attention but decided to hold off instead, figuring that the implied lack of knowledge would show up on Ashley's final exam anyway.

Smith then told us about Ashley's final exam. The final was a take home and due in the secretary's office by 5:00 Friday. He picked up the exams at around 5:15 and neither Ashley's nor Ian's were there. In fact, their exams were the only two missing. Smith left his office at 5:30, and the exams had not arrived. On Saturday afternoon, he discovered Ashley's neatly stapled exam under his office door. Ian's exam had been placed under the secretary's door in an interdepartmental office envelope. Smith proceeded to grade the two exams and upon examining them began to suspect an infraction.

Smith told the jury that exams in this subject are like "snowflakes," that no two are ever alike and that the "parallels [between the exams] jump out at you." He told the jury that problems done incorrectly, but identically incorrectly, never occur. He showed the jury identical wrong problems. Smith said the answers to the essay questions looked as if they "were written together" and then arranged." Smith surmised that Ashley's exam was based on Ian's, since Ashley's exam was more organized and had been improved upon in certain ways.

Ashley first addressed the last two late assignments. She said that she had handed the assignments in late during class. When Smith later returned the homework, hers was not there. When Smith told her that he had no record of her homework, she did not press him. She did the assignment again and admitted using the posted answer key. Ashley said that she had checked, but did not copy, the answer key.

Ashley said that she had taken the exam at 1:30. Immediately
after finishing the exam, Ashley met Ian and drove him to the train station. Ian gave Ashley his exam to hand in. Ashley got gas and then rushed over to Haverford. Ashley stated that she placed Ian's exam under the secretary's door at 5:05 and then put hers under Smith's door. She said she put them in two different places because hers did not have an envelope and Ian's did.

The jury then began to question the facts of the case. Smith said that the secretary told him that she had been in the office until 5:30 on Friday, probably until 6:00, and perhaps as late as 7:00 because it was the last day of exams. A jury member pointed out that there had been a donut and cider party in the lobby in honor of the close of exam period.

The jury then asked Ashley why she turned in both exams. She said that Ian had called her at lunch and asked her to take his exam to Haverford for him. He told her that he was taking the exam from 1:00 until 4:00. She told him that she would pick up the exam around 4:30 when she finished taking her exam in the library. The jury then asked Ashley to carefully describe her actions, including times and places. She said that at 4:30 she left the library and walked to Ian's room to pick him up as had been arranged earlier. She thought she got there around 4:35. She and Ian then picked up her car and got to the train station by 4:40. She then went to get gas and was slowed by traffic. Ashley said she arrived at Haverford at 5:05. She said the secretary's office was locked and the light off. Ashley said she put Ian's exam under the door and went to Smith's office. He was not there. She said she had met a friend by 5:15 and had a letter from this friend confirming that she had been with him until midnight.

The jury then discussed the fact that Ashley had used a posted answer key while doing an assignment, even after Smith had cautioned her about this. A jury member asked Ashley if what she did was a violation. She answered "Yes, it could be." When pressed by the jury, she agreed that her action concerning the homework was a violation of the Honor Code.

Upon going through the problems on the exam, the jury found numerous similarities between the two exams. In one particular place, Ashley had written down a wrong hypothesis where Ian had a correct one. However, the rest of Ashley's problem was based on the correct hypothesis and done in the exact manner as Ian's. One jury member described Ashley's incorrect hypothesis as "a copying error." In addition, they observed: question 1 had four identical mistakes; problems 2-10 were correct summations of Ian's; in problem 11, Ashley miscopied the same number from a wrong chart and had the variables confused in the same manner as Ian's; problem 14 contained a graph used only on these two exams.

The jury then decided that Ashley had committed a violation in the taking of her Calculus exam. This concluded the factual
portion of the exam. Since Ashley still claimed that she had not copied the exam, the circumstantial portion of the trial was brief since in her mind there were no circumstances surrounding the violation.

The jury then began the resolution portion of the trial. Ashley offered no resolution of her own, since she claimed that she had done nothing wrong. Because Ashley had already failed the course, the jury's discussion centered on separation. The jury felt this was the only appropriate resolution because of the seriousness of cheating on homeworks, a final exam, and the denial to the jury of these actions. The jury discussed at great length the appropriate length of time for separation and the process of readmission.

The unanimous final resolution was that Ashley would be separated from both the Haverford and Bryn Mawr communities. Reapplication would be through the Admissions Office, Honor Council, and the remaining jurors. This reapplication could take place as soon as Ashley felt ready. This reapplication process hopefully would insure that Ashley would return only after she had gained a thorough understanding of the Code.

When Ashley heard the resolution, she was upset. The Chairperson explained the appeals process to her. Ashley did appeal the case to the Dean of the College who was hearing appeals in place of the President. The Dean upheld Ashley's separation from Haverford and forwarded the recommendation to Bryn Mawr College that she be separated from Bryn Mawr. Ashley then appealed to the Bryn Mawr College Dean's Office. They did not uphold the recommendation of separation from Bryn Mawr.
CHRIS

Giles approached an Honor Council member with a problem which he thought was an infraction of the Social Honor Code. Giles revealed that Chris, who was off the meal plan, had been "stealing" meals from the dining center. The matter was brought to Council who consensed to a trial.

The trial began with Giles discussing what he thought was the infraction. Giles had gone to dinner one night with Chris, Chris's girlfriend, and several other people. Giles saw Chris enter without paying for the meal. Chris's action disturbed Giles, but, when Giles mentioned it to his other friends, they did not seem concerned. After mentioning to Chris that he was disturbed, Giles went to the card checker and paid for Chris's meal. He also realized that Chris had been eating Continental Breakfasts without paying for them. Giles and Chris later discussed their differences of opinion and concluded that the matter should be brought to Honor Council.

After Giles had spoken Chris began to discuss what he had done. He said that he had "stolen" meals for two reasons: he often had had his girlfriend over for dinner so she was not always eating meals in the Dining Center, therefore, why could he not eat these meals? It did not cost anybody anything, and he did not eat $4.50 worth of food; and, it was so easy to walk through and get a free meal.

The jury spent a lot of time discussing why his actions constituted stealing and thus broke the Social Honor Code. It was stressed that he was stealing from the community because he was causing the student body to pay for meals that they should not have to pay for. Chris also admitted to eating a lot more than the one dinner and two or three breakfasts. He estimated that he had stolen approximately eight breakfasts and three dinners. He did inform the jury that at various times he had bought meals and only occasionally had he stolen them.
(Note: DAKA charges the school for the food it serves and this fee is then divided amongst the students to pay. Both DAKA and the administration realize that not everyone is going to eat every meal and the preparation of the food and the cost of the meal plan reflect this realization.)

The resolution of the trial was that Chris would pay for the meals that he had stolen, write a letter to the community about his case, and write a letter to the incoming freshmen.