

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 28, SP 2024
March 4th, 2024

Members Present:

James Cheng (presiding), Olivia Thom (clerk), Helena Song, Gerald Lu, Zach Zelman, Temilade Oluwasesin

Ombuds: Ammar Siddiqi

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of using unauthorized AI resources on a midterm paper for an Upper-level PHIL course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Course syllabus
- Student submitted evidence (AI reliability external arguments,
- AI detection checks (split up)
- AI software running of paper question
- Student's essay planning notes
- Midterm Paper questions
- Student Essay

Plea:

Student A pled "Not in Violation"

Testimony:

The student gave a brief introduction and context to their choice in course, as well as their position as a non-native English speaker. The student highlighted that the accuser solely used AI detection software to accuse this assignment. Furthermore, this was the first essay and major assignment of this course. The student also contended that AI detection software should not be the sole factor to find assignments in violation, because they are likely biased, and the multiple checks submitted by the accuser made it difficult to interpret. They called attention to the set of evidence they gathered from external sources and their own evidence gathering per detection software, attesting to the liabilities of AI detection. The evidence gathered by the student also claimed that AI detection software are biased against non-native English speakers. The student also claims that their writing style was influenced by standardized testing in high school outside of the US, which a study showed that AI detector software consistently find false positives for essays written during this standardized test. The student contended that the ideas in the essays came from their own ideas, current course materials, and prior

materials from other courses. The student also pointed to the similar nature to the accused essay and their essays from prior courses. The student attributed the lack of citations to the tendency of Philosophy courses to not compel citations if the material was in discussed in class. The student also noted their good performance on in-class writing quizzes on the class readings. They also acknowledged that they have a disadvantage in proving their innocence because they had deleted their editing progress before they were accused. However, they argued that they should not be penalized for a habitual action, as well as the instructor of the course never compelled students to keep their editing history.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence did not support that a violation occurred because of the liable nature of using AI detection sources as the sole factor for determining AI written work. While the Council did note that the lack of citations, the accuser did not submit the assignment for this violation nor does this lack of citations always prove that an AI machine was used. Furthermore, the Council drew on the student's past work which had a similar style to the accused paper; the presence of typos also may be an indicator that AI was not utilized. The Council also discussed evidence that AI detection software is biased against native English speakers and found that in conjunction with the rest of the evidence, this holds true in this case. The Council further found that the essay planning, structure, and style did not have the typical correlation to AI writing from case precedent.

Vote #1: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?

Yes: 0

No: 6

Abstentions: 0

Decision:

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

Time of testimony and deliberations: 2 hours and 35 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Olivia Thom
Clerk