Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 33, Spring 2023
May 4, 2023

Members Present:
Andrew Barber (presiding), Jae Kim (clerk), Dean Toumajian, McKenzie Jameson, Neha Kohli, Olivia Thom

Ombuds: Ammar Siddiqi; Saif Ganni

Letter of Accusation:
The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of using AI unauthorized aid on assignments for a lower-level ASIA course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:
- Letter of Accusation
- Google Doc edit history
- Student's rebuttal to Professor's comments on her assignment
- Student's notes
- Email regarding the student's interview with Professor
- The email exchange between student and Professor
- Student written statement
- Student's assignment with Professor's comments
- Course Syllabus

Plea:
Student A pled "Not in Violation."

Testimony:
Student A opened by stating that they had been ill for a significant amount of the course and that they did not understand how the quality of their work was indicative of plagiarism using Artificial Intelligence. The student claims that the content of their assignments is informed by not just the course material but their personal experiences as well, hence why the professor could've interpreted their assignments as off-topic. The student also claimed that they were attempting to address broader themes in their assignments.

Verdict Deliberations:
Some council members suggested that we did not have enough evidence to conclude that a chatbot was used in the assignment. The council members were also split on whether

the complete lack of edit history on google docs was indicative of a violation. Council members also considered the fact that in the Professor's email correspondence with an Honor Council investigator, the Professor indicated that the student's oral examination was drastically different content-wise than their assignments. The Council took into consideration the fact that the student's Google Doc assignment had remnants of copy and pasting from a chatbot.

Vote #1: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?
Yes: 6
No: 0
Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation.

Vote #2: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student A is "In Violation?" Yes: 6
No: 0
Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:
Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. Since evidence indicative of chatbot usage varied between the assignments in question, the council decided to mitigate. There were no aggravating circumstances.

Vote #3: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?
F in the course:
3 letter grade reduction:
2 letter grade reduction:
1 letter grade reduction: 6
Letter of Reprimand:
Abstentions:

The CPS severity starts at a baseline of severity level 2.

Vote #4: What is the appropriate severity level penalty for Student A?
Expulsion:
Suspension:
Reprimand: 6
Warning:
Abstentions:

Decision:
The Honor Council thus finds Student A "In Violation" of the Honor Code and recommends that they receive a 1 letter grade reduction in the course and a reprimand.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 1 hour and 41 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Jae Kim
Clerk