Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 16,18, Fall 2023
2/22/2024

Members Present:
Pedro Ribeiro (presiding), Paige Sutter (clerk), Kofo Thomas, Neha Kohli, Anastasia Loiko, Gerald Lu

Ombuds: Jack Henry, Phillip Seo (Observing)

Letter of Accusation:
The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of using AI to generate essay responses for a lower level PHIL course and lower level ENGL course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:
- Letters of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Essays
- Canvas logs for one timed assignment
- Course Syllabi
- Previous essays from student's high school career and corresponding GPTZero scans
- Student's submitted papers from both courses suspected to be written with AI
- Unsuspected writing assignments from both courses
- Email correspondence between the student and one of the accusing professors
- GPTZero scans of assignments
- ChatGPT responses to essay prompts
- Assignment instructions
- Random samples of student responses for assignments

Plea:
Student A pled not in violation for both courses.

Testimony:
The student opened by stating that their writing tends to be flagged as AI-generated due to its curt, detail oriented style. The student cited their previous work from high school being flagged as AI generated (written before the existence of ChatGPT) as evidence of this style. The student then described the circumstances under which he wrote the assignments for both courses. The student wrote the PHIL assignments alone in his room. The student called in a witness to speak to how the ENGL assignments were completed. The witness said that they saw the student work for long periods of time on the essay but never saw their screen for more than a few seconds.

Verdict Deliberations:

The council first discussed the accusations in the PHIL course.

The student was accused of a violation for both a midterm and a paper. Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the structures and wording of the assignments had significant similarity to ChatGPT responses.

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. Given the similarities between the evidence and AI responses and the testimony, the council determined that Student A committed the violation for both the midterm and the paper.

Vote #2: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student A is "in Violation" for the midterm?
Yes: 6
No: 0
Abstention: 0

Vote #3: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student A is "in Violation" for the paper?
Yes: 6
No: 0
Abstention: 0

The council then discussed the accusation in the ENGL course.

The student was accused of a violation for a paper. The council noticed slight structural similarities between the paper and AI responses, but failed to see any major phrasing or word similarities to AI throughout the essay. Since the council could not find any evidence to meet the preponderance standard, most members chose to abstain.

Vote #4: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?
Yes: 0
No: 1
Abstention: 5

Penalty Deliberations:
Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. The council did not see any mitigating circumstances.

The council saw no aggravating factors.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is an F in the course.

Vote #5: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?

F in the course	6
3 letter grade reduction:	0
2 letter grade reduction:	0
1 letter grade reduction:	0
Letter of Reprimand	0
Abstentions:	0

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

Vote #6: What is the appropriate severity level for Student A?

Expulsion:	0
Suspension:	0
Reprimand:	6
Warning:	0
Abstentions:	0

Decision:
The Honor Council thus finds Student A "In Violation" of the Honor Code in the PHIL course and recommends that they receive an F in the course and a reprimand.

The Honor Council thus finds Student A "Not in Violation" of the Honor Code in the ENGL course.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 3 hours

Respectfully submitted,
Paige Sutter
Clerk