October 2018

Dear Student,

“No member of the Caltech Community shall take unfair advantage of any other member of the community.” This simple statement is the guiding principle of Caltech’s Honor System, and is a fundamental value of the Institute.

The most exceptional feature of the honor code is how seriously it is respected by students and faculty alike. We all proudly believe in the Honor System. It provides the essential foundation for our trust and mutual respect. Ask any Caltech graduate what they found to be special about this place, and chances are that the Honor System will head the list.

I am pleased to welcome you as a full partner into our Honor System.

Sincerely,

Kevin Gilmartin
Dean of Undergraduate Students
Professor of English
Chapter 1: Philosophy of the Honor Code

The Honor System affords to each person within the Caltech community the trust and freedom that honesty merits. It states simply that “No member of the Caltech community shall take unfair advantage of any other member of the Caltech community.” Because of its nature, this principle applies to all of the community, everywhere within the community. It is not restricted to transactions of a purely academic nature between students and faculty, but also binds students in their non-academic relations with any other member of the community.

The Honor System is not an administrative creation intended to ease the enforcement of Institute regulations or marginally decrease the chance of student cheating. A fundamental aspect of the Honor System is that the responsibility students display in their conduct must be met by trust from others. An example of this is Caltech’s official position on proctoring, which is not only held unnecessary, but is strongly discouraged under current faculty regulations. The bodies which deal with violations of the Honor System, Institute policies, and federal and state laws are also committed to promoting an atmosphere of trust and confidence.

It must be stressed that responsibility for the maintenance of the Honor System lies with each student. In particular, this responsibility includes determining any possible consequences of our actions. We have accepted such responsibility in the belief that only by regulating our own conduct can we successfully promote a high standard of individual integrity.

Members of the community must always bear in mind that their actions and attitudes directly influence a proud and valuable trust which many generations of students have kept. The rewards of life under the Honor System are considerable. The responsibilities at times may be heavy and serious. The obligations have been met successfully in the past, and only we can ensure that they will continue to be met.

Chapter 2: Living Under the Honor Code

The Honor System is an agreement among members of the Caltech community, embodied in a single sentence:

No member of the Caltech community shall take unfair advantage of any other member of the Caltech community.

This principle is the sole basis of the Honor System. The key words are “unfair advantage.” To not take unfair advantage, it is often sufficient to simply employ common sense and show respect for others and their privacy. But there are times when distinguishing fair and unfair courses of action requires a considerable amount of thought. Failure to realize the consequences of a course of action does not justify it.

Stealing from another student is a violation, just as cheating on a Physics test is, as will be explained further in the following sections. However, the Honor System is not limited to examples such as these; any action which places a member of the Caltech community at an unfair disadvantage may result in an investigation. Honor System violations do not necessarily entail material disadvantage. Invasion of privacy and actions that cause others emotional distress are also examples.

The Honor System covers every aspect of our interactions with members of the Caltech community. In addition to undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty, the Caltech community also includes administrative and scientific support staff, campus maintenance and custodial staff, and in some instances
other companies or institutions which have relations with Caltech. Actions against people who are not direct members of the Caltech community may eventually become Honor System offenses if they result in action being taken against the Caltech community. They also may be treated as a policy violation. Consequently, it is impossible to give a set of comprehensive examples that displays every possible situation in which the Honor System must be carefully applied. Therefore, the purpose of the following discussion is to outline a few areas of life at Caltech and demonstrate how the principles of the Honor System should be considered.

I. Tests

Academic life at Caltech is very different from life at a high school or another college. The vast majority of quizzes and midterm or final examinations are take-home. Stapled-shut tests are picked up in class or at a professor’s office. Printed instructions on the cover of the test specify the conditions under which it must be taken, including the time limit, reference materials allowed, and the due date. The test may be taken at any time and at any place the student wishes, as long as the instructions are followed. If there is any confusion concerning allowed references or time limits, it is your responsibility as a student to seek clarification from the professor or a teaching assistant.

Violating an exam policy takes unfair advantage of other students in the class and compromises the trust of the instructor. In particular, a student working on a take-home exam should not consult students or sources other than those permitted by the instructor. This includes adding photocopies of other references to one’s course notes when the instructor allows only course notes during the exams.

Any work done after the time limit of an exam should be clearly designated as such by drawing a line beneath the work completed during the allowed time, labeling this line, and then continuing with the test, indicating the amount of extra time spent. Many professors will give some credit for this work. If you have a disability that needs to be accommodated with extra time on an exam, please make sure you are registered with Caltech Accessibility Services for Students (CASS).

II. Homework and Laboratory Assignments

Instructors should state their policies regarding collaboration and related concerns at the beginning of each academic term. It is your responsibility as a student to get this information. If the policy seems ambiguous, actively seek clarification from the instructor. Violating a collaboration policy takes unfair advantage of those who abide by the restrictions placed on them and compromises the trust of the instructor.

In general, both student and instructor share the responsibility for clarifying any rules governing a particular course. When in doubt, a student should consult the instructor before proceeding.

These principles also apply to laboratory course work and research. Falsification or theft of results (“drylabbing”) are serious acts of intellectual dishonesty, as is claiming undue credit for another’s work or ideas. The Research Misconduct policy is applicable to all researchers, including undergraduate students.

III. Papers and Reports

Students are also required to produce reports and research papers during their careers at Caltech. In collecting data and information, as well as in writing, students must actively avoid plagiarizing the work of others. Proper footnoting of source material and documentation of borrowed ideas are absolutely essential.
Many professors are willing to show students how to correctly document their papers. Plagiarism, whether inadvertent paraphrasing, or direct substitution, takes unfair advantage of any original authors, the instructor who incorrectly believes that the ideas are the plagiarist’s, and other students who correctly footnote all sources. The Hixon Writing Center is a good source of information on how to avoid plagiarism.

IV. Library Usage

The operation of all Institute libraries is governed by the Honor System. At Caltech, students are not subjected to having their backpacks and briefcases checked before leaving the library. This freedom has been maintained because the students respect the library rules and feel bound by the Honor System to do so. It is the student’s responsibility to see to it that he or she is aware of all the rules applying to any library material used. Further information regarding the library’s policies can be found on the [library’s website](#).

A person who keeps a three-hour reserve book for longer than the specified time takes advantage of others who need the book, particularly at critical times such as before a test. Anyone who removes a book without intending to return it, or who mutilates or defaces a book, is stealing from every library user in the community. Some students may also intend to return books but do not bother to check them out. Such students ignore the possibility that the library might decide the book is lost and replace it. It is also the case that another student might badly need a book and wants to contact the person who took it, and the library would thus be unable to locate the borrower.

V. Practical Jokes and Pranks

Pranks have long been a part of undergraduate life at Caltech. When planned with consideration for the rest of the community, they can be very enjoyable. However, badly thought out pranks can result in a reduction of student privileges, or may otherwise take unfair advantage of someone in the community. All pranks must be cleared by Tom Mannion, Senior Director of Student Activities and Programs.

When executing a prank, always keep in mind a number of issues. Will the receiver(s) of the joke think of it as humorous, or will they be upset? Will the joke possibly cause the destruction of property or the invasion of privacy? Could the prank cause a curtailment of student rights and privileges? Could it injure someone? Could it damage the position of the Institute, or cost the Institute money for reparations?

Whenever a prank is pulled, a note should be left informing the “victim” that he or she has been the object of a prank. The note should include the clear identity of the prankster(s) in case something goes wrong and the prankster needs to be contacted and in order to prevent misdirected retaliation. If no note is left, the person may misinterpret that situation and attribute the prank to theft or vandalism.

VI. Traditions

House traditions and Ditch Day stacks are valuable parts of student life.

When acting as a part of a group, always think as an individual. Ask yourself the same questions that are relevant to pranks: Will this be fun for the participants, or upsetting? Will this destroy someone else’s property, or invade someone’s privacy? Could this cause harm to other members of the community, even those who are not directly involved?
When planning a stack or tradition-related event, always keep others in mind. Check your plans against Caltech’s hazing policy or other relevant policies, consult with your RAs and RLC, and remember that those involved may react in unforeseen ways. (See the section on Laws and Institute Rules.) All Ditch Day Stacks must be cleared by Tom Mannion, Senior Director of Student Activities and Programs.

VII. Computer Usage

The use of computer resources is governed by the Honor System and the Institute’s Policy on Acceptable Use. Theft, damage (even minor damage, such as spilling water into a keyboard), or misuse of the equipment takes advantage of all the other users who will lose the use of the resources.

Use of computer accounts is also governed by the Honor System. Damaging system files or gaining unauthorized access to another user’s files places other users at a disadvantage. Having the ability to gain access to another user’s files does not imply having their permission to do so. Please review the information about file sharing software here: [https://www.ogc.caltech.edu/forms/dmca](https://www.ogc.caltech.edu/forms/dmca).

Many computers on campus have policies designed to allocate system resources (such as system disk space, memory, printers, modem lines) fairly and prevent unintentional damage to the system. Circumventing these policies may place other users at a disadvantage.

Because of the advances of networking it is very easy to communicate with other users on the computer system in a variety of ways. As with any interpersonal communications, it is important to think about how you are interacting with the person and whether you are using the computer to harass or victimize them, which, in addition to potentially being illegal, would be a serious violation of the Honor System as well as other Caltech policies.

Breaking into computers at remote sites could have serious repercussions for Caltech as an institute and could result in a serious reduction of some of the network computer resources available to us. Moreover, it is obviously illegal and a serious violation of the Honor System as well as other Caltech policies.

VIII. Companies Unaffiliated with Caltech

One might think that it is impossible for a Caltech student to transgress the Honor System while interacting with someone outside the community. However, this is not true if that person or organization offers a service to the community that might be jeopardized by the student’s actions. The behavior may also constitute a policy violation, or be illegal.

IX. Interpersonal Relations

Violations of the Honor System do not always involve material or tangible advantages. Clear examples of this are discrimination and invasion of another’s privacy. Actions which degrade an individual or group, promulgate damaging rumors, or place someone in a situation where he or she feels threatened, harassed, or victimized may also unfairly disadvantage members of the community.

In order to create a healthy living and studying environment for everyone, it is important to be aware of the effects one’s actions will have on others.
X. Nondiscrimination & Equal Opportunity, Unlawful Harassment and Sexual and Gender-Based Discrimination and Harassment and Sexual Misconduct

As described in the previous section, if a student’s actions place someone else in a situation where they feel threatened, harassed, or victimized, the student may be placing them at a disadvantage, and may also be a violation of the Nondiscrimination & Equal Opportunity policy, the Unlawful Harassment Policy and/or the Sexual and Gender-Based Discrimination and Harassment and Sexual Misconduct policy. Neither the Board of Control nor the Conduct Review Committee handle cases involving nondiscriminatory and equal opportunity, unlawful harassment or sexual misconduct. For more information and help please visit the Title IX Office’s website.

XI. Research Misconduct

Caltech’s Policy on Research Misconduct is applicable to all Caltech researchers. Research misconduct is defined as fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.

- Fabrication means making up data or results, and recording or reporting them.
- Falsification means manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.
- Plagiarism means the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results or words without giving appropriate credit.

Research misconduct does not include honest error or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of data.

For more information, visit the Office of Research Compliance website.

Chapter 3: Enforcing the Honor System

When students fail to follow the Honor System or violate Institute policy, measures must be taken to protect our community from their actions. The Deans, the Board of Control (BoC or Board) and the Conduct Review Committee (CRC), enforce the Honor System and/or Institute policy. Academic violations of the Honor Code are adjudicated by the BoC. Non-academic and policy violations are reviewed by the Dean’s office or the CRC. The Deans, at their discretion, may decide to directly handle a matter, and will do so consistent with the Involuntary Leave policy. In other instances, the ‘Routing Group” will determine whether a particular matter should be sent to the CRC or to the Deans. The Routing Group is comprised of the Dean of Students, the Associate Deans of Students, the AVP for Student Affairs and Residential Experience, the chair of the Board of Control, and the student co-chair of the CRC.

I. Reporting Suspected Violations

Every student shares responsibility for protecting the Caltech community and upholding the Honor System and Caltech policy. This is indeed a heavy obligation. It implies not only refraining from actions that may be violations, but also protecting our community from any who engage in such activities.
Unfortunately, this duty can cause a conflict of responsibility or divided loyalty, especially if you have seen a violation or strongly suspect that one has been committed. You are placed in the difficult situation of weighing your obligation to the community against your concern for the violator. You might be tempted to warn the suspected violator of the seriousness of his or her acts, thinking this to be a satisfactory solution to the dilemma. However, the suspected violator may be able to convince you that no violation has occurred when one may have. If you suggest that the person turn himself or herself in, you really have no way of verifying, nor are you likely to know, if the questionable action is repeated. If you are concerned that a possible Honor System violation may have occurred, but find it difficult to report the situation, please keep in mind that the primary goal when dealing with students who have committed Honor System violations is always to bring the violator to a place where they can live under the Honor System effectively. The decisions of the deans, the BoC and the CRC are motivated by concern for the respondent/defendant as well as for the community as a whole. Reporting suspected violations is one of the most difficult areas of the Honor System for most students; however, it is also one of the most important aspects of the Honor System.

In light of this, the deans, the BoC and the CRC have taken the position that it is the responsibility of every student to protect the community and the Honor System. A conscious failure to report suspected violations may itself be considered an Honor System violation.

If you suspect that a violation has been committed, but are unsure what to do, talk with your house Board representative, to any other member of the BoC, to a Dean, or speak to a member of the Routing Group. The Chair and Secretaries of the BoC can always be reached at boc@caltech.edu. The Dean of Students can be reached at campus extension x6351, and the Routing Group can be reached through the Dean or by email at routing@caltech.edu for non-academic violations.

In all cases, consider your personal responsibility to the Caltech community of which you are a vital part. It is far better to report a strong suspicion than to allow it to grow and compound.

II. Board of Control

The BoC, a committee of undergraduates, is chaired by a student elected by the student body. The duties and procedures of the Board are outlined in the Associated Students of the California Institute of Technology bylaws. The purpose and duties of the Board are to review all cases of alleged academic violations of the Honor Code and to make recommendations to the Dean of Students for action in those cases in which a violation is found to have been committed. Violations of the Honor System may be brought to the attention of the Board by any member of the Caltech community.

The BoC is comprised of the Chair and two Secretaries, (only one Secretary sits on each case), who do not vote; two representatives elected from each of the eight houses; one representative elected by the students who did not vote in a house election; and up to five representatives at large, appointed by the Board from the entire undergraduate student body. Determination about Bechtel representation has yet to be made. Procedures governing the selection of student representatives are set forth in the ASCIT bylaws.
Board of Control Investigation Flowchart

Conviction Decision: The Conviction Decision determines whether or not an Honor Code Violation took place.

Nullification Decision: The Nullification Decision determines how to remove the unfair advantage gained by the defendant. This is when the Board officially quantifies the scope of the violation. In some cases, credit is removed for the entire assignment being investigated. When there is convincing evidence that the defendant only violated the Honor Code while completing a portion of the assignment, credit for only that portion is nullified.

Protection Decision: The Protection Decision serves to protect the Caltech community by taking measures that prevent the defendant from committing a subsequent Honor Code Violation. The Board decides upon a protection decision by considering the severity of the violation and prior conviction, among other things.

Case Reopened: The Deans believe that a reinvestigation is necessary.

After the Hearing:
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A. Preliminary Investigation

When a suspected Honor System violation is reported to the Board of Control, a preliminary investigation is conducted by two members of the Board. The BoC bylaws set forth the Rules of Procedure for the preliminary investigation.

The Chair and Secretary have an initial meeting with the defendant, at which they will give the defendant notice of the allegations. The defendant will be given an opportunity to respond to the allegations, including providing evidence and witnesses. The Chair and Secretary will also explain the investigation process to the defendant, and answer any questions the defendant has about the process.

The Chair and Secretary will interview and/or review evidence provided by those directly involved in the matter reported. These may include teaching assistants, graders, professors, other witnesses, or defendants. The Board will request copies of all evidence that it deems relevant from any source, and the defendant may provide copies of all relevant evidence that the defendant wishes to provide. The defendant may also produce witnesses to testify on the defendant’s behalf.

After reviewing testimony and physical evidence, including testimony and physical evidence provided by the defendant, the Chair and Secretary will decide if the case will be considered by the full Board. If so, the Chair and Secretary will explain the procedures of a full case meeting to the witness(es) and defendant(s), and will respond to any questions by the defendant about the process. The information taken during the preliminary interviews and relevant physical evidence will then be passed along for the entire Board’s consideration. The defendant will be provided access to with evidence prior to the full hearing.

It is important to note that the preliminary investigators are not empowered to decide if the alleged offense actually constitutes a violation; this decision can only be made by the full Board. If the matter at hand lacks sufficient evidence or is clearly not an Honor System issue, then the case may be dismissed by the preliminary investigators. If they feel that the offense may constitute an Honor System violation but cannot be properly and expeditiously handled by the Board, then the investigation may be passed on to an appropriate organization such as the Office of the Dean of Students.

B. The Hearing

The Secretary will endeavor to schedule a time that minimizes conflicts for the Board members, defendants, and witnesses. Witnesses and defendants are told to respond immediately when contacted, in order to expedite scheduling. The BoC bylaws set forth the rules of procedure for the hearing. The Board will resolve whether or not an Honor System violation has occurred. The Board uses a preponderance of the evidence standard in making its decision.

Copies of evidence, such as examinations and homework, and witness testimony are considered by the full Board. The Board may ask questions of anyone who can provide useful information. Every relevant resource is considered.

The defendant may provide copies of all relevant evidence that the defendant wishes the Board to consider. The defendant may testify, and produce witnesses to testify on the defendant’s behalf.
C. Decisions

The BoC will make three decisions:

1. Conviction: Whether or not an Honor System violation has been committed.
2. Nullification: How to nullify the advantage that has been taken.
3. Protection: How to protect the Caltech Community from future violations.

The following three subsections describe, in order, further detail on these decisions that the full Board of Control considers in each case.

1. Determining the Violation

Deliberation continues until the members of the Board are satisfied. If the facts are clear-cut, discussion might last an hour. Sometimes, it can take days. A decision may be postponed for a few days if new evidence is forthcoming.

After discussion, a voting member of the Board may move to dismiss the case. Members of the Board may vote in favor of the dismissal if they find the evidence insufficient, or if they determine that a violation has not occurred. Otherwise, a voting member of the Board may move to convict a defendant of an Honor System violation. The specifics of the violation are included in the motion. The Board votes, and the results are recorded. If the motion passes, the Board discusses further convictions (if any) and ways to nullify any unfair advantage taken.

2. Nullification of Unfair Advantage

If a defendant is convicted of an Honor System violation, the Board will then determine what measures would best nullify any unfair advantage taken.

Decisions are made on a case-by-case basis, without pre-established penalties for specific violations. The decisions of the Board of Control are not intended as punishment, but to remove the unfair advantage gained. This may be accomplished through such actions as grade changes. In a case where there is no way to remove the unfair advantage, the Board may not recommend any steps for nullification, but this in no way diminishes the effects or seriousness of the violation.

For example, if a defendant has copied one isolated problem on an exam, the Board may decide to nullify the advantage by giving zero credit on that problem. However, if the copied problem allows the student to answer other questions or verify previous results, it is possible that credit will be removed for those problems as well.

3. Protection of the Community

After deciding on the measures necessary to nullify the unfair advantage, the Board will decide if measures to protect the community from further violations are necessary and what these might be. In many ways, this is the most difficult decision that the Board must make, because it has the most influence on the defendant’s career. At this point the Board is made aware of the conduct record of the defendant. It is important to note that records or prior convictions are only made known after the conviction decision has been made and nullification determined, and thus are not allowed to influence these first two decisions.
The title commonly given to the third decision is rather important: protection of the community. Again, this is not meant to be punitive. It is an attempt by the Board to establish whether or not the defendant is likely to commit an Honor System violation in the future, and if so, to take appropriate action to protect the community. The Board can decide on any number of courses of action (protection of the community decisions have been known to be quite creative at times).

The BoC typically requires that a defendant have one or more discussions with members of the Board about the Honor System. This is often done when the BoC feels that the defendant does not understand certain aspects of the Honor System.

The most serious recommendation the Board can make is to place a student on indefinite leave. The Board recommends indefinite leave in situations where it feels that the defendant needs time off to gain a better perspective on the Honor System and its advantages, and the community needs protection from future violations. This decision may or may not include a recommendation that the student be required to sever all ties with the Institute. A student wishing to return to Caltech from indefinite leave may apply to do so. They may be required to meet with a full Board, which can reject or support their application. This Board will include as many of the members from the original case as possible. Some decisions of indefinite leave will require a minimum number of terms away from Caltech.

The Board is not restricted to these courses of action. It must be stressed that the recommendation is made in consideration of the defendant’s demonstrated ability to abide by the Honor System. Although the gravity or magnitude of the violation committed as well as the existence of prior convictions are indicators of such ability, other factors are taken into account as well. Two defendants convicted of similar violations may receive different measures for protection of the community if the Board felt that the likelihood of their committing another violation differed.

D. Confidentiality

Defendants, witnesses and the BoC itself are expected to treat the BoC proceedings as confidential. The BoC bylaws set forth the specific procedures regarding confidentiality.

A defendant is cautioned not to discuss with others his or her individual case until after conclusion of the case. Witnesses may not disclose information concerning the investigation unless the defendant(s) initiate(s) discussion. Additionally, after all proceedings are concluded, with the defendant’s permission, a witness may disclose that they had been involved in a Board case, but may reveal no details beyond that simple fact. In all stages of the proceedings, the Board strives to maintain confidentiality.

However, this is not intended to, and does not, in any way limit the defendant’s ability to speak with witnesses or others who may be able to provide evidence or suggest witnesses or evidence or in any way interfere with their preparation of their defense. The defendant may also speak with individuals who provide emotional support, such as RLCs, RAs, counselors, attorneys, and family and friends (not affiliated with Caltech) who are not witnesses. In all stages of the investigation, the BoC strives to maintain the privacy of all those involved to the extent possible.

Retaliation by or against anyone involved in the process is strictly prohibited.
E. Review and Appeal

The BoC bylaws set forth the rules of procedure concerning the Dean’s decision and any review by the Vice President for Student Affairs. The Dean will make the final decision in all cases in which the BoC finds an honor code violation.

Upon completion of a hearing that results in a recommended conviction, the Chair and Secretary of the Board of Control will inform the Deans of the details of the investigation and their recommendation on three decisions.

It is the responsibility of the defendant to arrange a meeting with the Dean(s) to discuss the matter. At the meeting, the Dean will explain the three recommendations and discuss them with the student. The student may ask questions to clarify the implications of the recommendations. Finally, the Dean allows the student to voice any objections about the case or the final decision.

A decision to place a student on leave will automatically be reviewed by the Vice President for Student Affairs. The decision of the Vice President for Student Affairs or her/his designee is final.

F. Records

All records are maintained confidentially, consistent with the law, Caltech’s Access to Student Records policy and other applicable policies and procedures.

The Chair and the Secretaries are the only students who shall have the power to access the BoC records and will do so only on official business of the Board. A student’s transcript does not show any record of a Board of Control investigation, unless the student is permanently separated from the Institute. Some graduate institutions or federal offices will ask the Deans if an applying student has been convicted of an academic violation while at Caltech. After confirming that the student wishes to have this information shared, the Dean will answer truthfully.

G. If You Are a Defendant

You may select one member of the Caltech community who is approved by the Chair as a silent witness to accompany you during the preliminary investigation meetings at which you are present, and, if applicable, during any part of the full hearing where you are present. You may also be accompanied by an assistant representative, who must be selected from a list of current or former representatives or House presidents and be approved by the Chair. During the hearing, you may request an aside with the assistant representative and may speak with them at any time for clarification or explanation. The silent witness and the assistant representative must not disrupt or interfere with the proceedings in any way, and must maintain the confidentiality expected of all involved with the matter. The silent witness and the assistant representative will be immediately removed at the Chair’s discretion if any such disruption occurs. Attorneys may not serve as silent witnesses or assistant representatives. No legal representation is allowed to be present during the preliminary investigation meetings, the hearing, or to otherwise participate in the BoC process.
You will be requested to attend the preliminary investigation. At the interview, you will be informed of the reason for your presence; and will be provided with notice of the allegations. You will be asked for any information that you have pertaining to the case and be given the opportunity to respond to the allegations. Keep in mind that a conscious failure to answer questions asked of you may be considered an Honor System violation in itself.

You will be informed that you may identify witnesses and evidence in defense of your case. The Chair and Secretary will also explain the investigation process to you, and answer any questions you may have about the process.

At the conclusion of their investigation, the Chair and Secretary will either dismiss the case and inform you of your responsibilities, or describe the next stage of the investigation — the hearing. If you feel that the Chair or Secretary is unable to deliver an unbiased decision, then you can request to have either individual temporarily replaced.

During the Board hearing, you may periodically be asked to wait in another room while the Board deliberates in private. Defendants should read the ASCIT Bylaws for a description of the right to bring a silent witness to the hearing or for these periods of waiting. Please familiarize yourself with the pertinent bylaws and procedures of the full Board.

During the hearing, you will be asked to explain any circumstances concerning the event or action in question. For example, this may include such information as where and when a particular homework set or exam was completed, and what references were used. You may also need to explain your reasoning and thought processes on certain problems. It is very important to realize that it is in your best interests to tell the truth while involved in a Board of Control hearing, even if you contradict information you conveyed in the preliminary investigation or a prior meeting before the full Board.

**H. If You are a Witness.**

If you are a witness, you will be asked to provide all relevant facts at your disposal concerning the case. These may include dates, times, or testimony of any actions observed. Since as a witness you will not know the full details of the case, please do not withhold facts asked for by the Board on the basis of irrelevance. The Board will decide which facts are relevant. Remember that Board members are bound to confidentiality concerning all facts revealed during a hearing.

The Board will not inform any witnesses of its recommendations, unless they require action by that witness. For cases involving a class, the class instructor should always be informed of the outcome, even if no grade change is required. If you are a witness, you will not know the protection of the community decision unless the defendant chooses to tell you or if the Board determines that it is necessary that you be informed for the protection decision to be carried out. Remember that you are required to not divulge anything about the case (including its occurrence) unless the defendant permits discussion. Retaliation by or against anyone involved in the process is strictly prohibited.
III. Conduct Review Committee

The CRC, a committee of undergraduates, faculty, and staff, is co-chaired by an Associate Dean of Students and a student elected by the student body. Student representation is composed of one representative elected from each house, one representative elected by students who did not vote in the elections for any house representatives, and two at-large representatives appointed by the student co-chair.

As with the BoC, procedures governing the selection of student representatives are set forth in the ASCIT bylaws. Bechtel representation has yet to be determined.

The CRC handles a wide range of non-academic issues, and because it may deal with widely known incidents or situations involving groups of people, it may at times be forced to operate more publicly than the Board of Control. If the outcome of a case could potentially affect many students, it would be difficult to come to an appropriate decision while maintaining confidentiality. The Conduct Review Committee seeks to make decisions in the best interest of the entire Caltech community. The Conduct Review Committee is a body for joint decision-making. Representation of several constituencies on the committee is expected to bring about decisions that address the concerns of professors, students, and staff. The CRC makes recommendations to the Dean of Undergraduate Students who makes the final decision.
Flow Diagram for Non-Academic Honor Code or Policy Violations*
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The Deans’ office will adjudicate the matter, charge student with violation, and give student opportunity to respond. Dean meets with student and gives decision.
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The respondent is formally charged with a violation, and there is a hearing.

A violation is found to have occurred, and the student/s is held responsible. Recommendation is made in writing to the Dean. Dean meets with student, and gives final decision.

No violation is found to have occurred.

Appeals may be heard by the Vice President for Student Affairs within 10 days, based on grounds listed in CRC procedures.

*Any case that involves unlawful harassment or sexual violence will be managed according to Institute policy, and will not follow these processes. **According to their discretion, deans may also decide to directly handle a matter.
The Conduct Review Committee’s investigation procedures are as follows:

A. General Procedure

1. What Types of Cases does the CRC Handle?

   The Conduct Review Committee handles a wide range of non-academic issues involving undergraduate students.

2. How are Cases Brought?

   Matters may be brought to a Dean, or to either co-chair of the CRC. The Deans will decide whether to consult the Routing Group about whether a particular matter should be sent to the CRC or to the Deans; or the Deans may, at their discretion, decide to handle a matter.

3. Confidentiality

   Confidentiality is important during the CRC process, both to maintain the integrity of the process and the privacy of the respondents. In general, actions and proceedings of the CRC will only be shared with CRC committee members involved in the case, respondents, witnesses, affected parties and Institute officials with a need to know.

   This is not intended to, and does not, in any way limit the respondent’s ability to prepare their defense, including by speaking with witnesses or others who may be able to provide evidence or suggesting witnesses for the CRC to interview. The respondent may also speak with individuals who may provide them with emotional support such as RLCs, RAs, counselors, attorneys, and family and friends (not affiliated with Caltech) who are not witnesses. In all stages of the investigation, the CRC strives to maintain the privacy of all those involved to the extent possible.

   Retaliation by or against anyone involved in the process is strictly prohibited.

4. Membership

   The CRC, a committee of undergraduates, faculty, and staff, is co-chaired by an Associate Dean of Students and a student. Procedures for election of the student representatives are found in the ASCIT bylaws. Faculty and staff members will be selected from a pool nominated by the co-chairs.

5. Absence or Recusal of a Co-Chair

   In the case of absence or recusal of a co-chair, the CRC may replace a co-chair on a particular matter. The respondent may object to either or both of the co-chairs on the grounds that they have a conflict or cannot be impartial. Objections must be made in writing to the co-chairs within twenty-four (24) hours of being contacted.
If the co-chair being replaced is a staff member, another staff member will be appointed. The Associate Dean will be replaced by a staff or faculty member of the CRC, and the student co-chair will be replaced by a student member of the CRC.

6. Replacement or Recusal of CRC Members

The co-chairs will provide the respondent with a list of all CRC members who may sit on their case. Respondent may object to any member on the grounds that the member has a conflict or cannot be impartial. Objections must be made in writing to the co-chairs within twenty-four (24) hours after being provided with the names of the CRC members. If a CRC member believes they are unable to render an unbiased judgment in a particular case, that member shall disqualify themselves. No member of the CRC shall sit in judgment of their own case.

B. Preliminary Investigation

Typically, witness interviews and evidence collection will be done during the preliminary investigation phase conducted by the co-chairs. Summaries of witness interviews and copies of the evidence then will be presented to the CRC committee for their review at the full hearing, if applicable.

The co-chairs typically will review the initial report and/or interview the person who made the initial report (“reporting party”), and review any accompanying evidence. The co-chairs may also interview individuals identified in the initial report and/or identified in the accompanying evidence.

The co-chairs will interview the respondent and inform the respondent that they may provide their own testimony, identify witnesses, and provide any evidence they wish the CRC to consider. The co-chairs typically will interview those individuals identified by the respondent, and will review and consider all the evidence provided by the respondent. The co-chairs also may interview other individuals whom they deem able to provide information potentially useful to the investigation.

The co-chairs will decide if the matter should proceed to a full hearing. If the co-chairs decide that the matter should proceed to a full hearing, the procedures below will apply.

If the co-chairs determine that the matter does not require a full hearing, they may forward the matter to the Dean for handling. Should the co-chairs be unable to arrive at a decision whether to forward the matter to the full CRC, the co-chairs will send the matter to the Dean who will decide how to proceed.

1. Observer

The respondent may select one member of the Caltech community as an observer to accompany them during the preliminary investigation meetings at which the respondent is present, and, if applicable, during any part of the full hearing where the respondent is present. The observer must remain silent, and maintain the confidentiality expected of all others involved with the matter. The CRC reserves the right to disallow or eject an observer if they do not meet these criteria or requirements. Attorneys may not be observers. No legal representative is allowed to be present during the preliminary investigation meetings or the hearing, or to otherwise participate in the CRC process.
2. **Documentation of Preliminary Investigation if Proceeding to Full Hearing**

The co-chairs will provide the respondent with a short statement regarding the alleged policy or honor code violation; the factual bases of the allegations against the respondent; and the basis for the decision to proceed to the full hearing (“preliminary investigation statement”). The co-chairs also will provide the respondent with access to the summaries of witness testimony and other evidence that the co-chairs will provide to the CRC committee for the full hearing. Respondent will have a reasonable opportunity to provide a written response, including potential questions for witnesses.

**C. The Full Hearing**

1. **CRC Committee**

   Except as set forth above, the co-chairs will sit on every case. The co-chairs will choose four (4) other CRC members for a case. At least one (1) must be a staff or faculty member and one (1) must be a student. Together these six (6) individuals constitute the “CRC committee” for the specific matter. A separate CRC committee is convened for each case.

   Five (5) members of the CRC committee constitute a quorum.

2. **Hearing Procedures**

   The CRC committee will endeavor to complete the hearing and provide their recommendation to the Dean in a timely manner.

   Those appearing before the CRC committee will be reminded that they are expected to tell the truth. The co-chairs will be responsible for taking notes during the proceeding. Cases will proceed even without the cooperation of those requested to appear before the CRC committee.

   The respondent may present any new witnesses and additional evidence they wish. The respondent may provide the CRC committee with their own testimony in person and/or in writing.

   If new witness testimony or evidence is collected during the full hearing, the respondent will be provided with access to summaries of the witness testimony and the evidence to review, and will be given a reasonable opportunity to respond in person or in writing, before the CRC has finalized its recommendation to the Dean.

   The CRC committee will seek to make recommendations in the best interest of the Caltech community. A vote of no less than four (4) of the members present shall be necessary for any decision of the CRC committee. In the event of deadlock, the CRC committee will forward the details of its investigation to the Dean. The notes of the hearing will include the names of all parties and witnesses, the members of the CRC committee, copies of the evidence used in making the decisions, and the decisions reached by the CRC committee with corresponding vote tallies.
D. Final Report

The CRC committee will issue a final report to the Dean that summarizes relevant factual and credibility determinations made and includes a summary of witness testimony and evidence relied upon to make its decision and recommendations. The CRC committee will use the preponderance of the evidence standard in determining whether an Honor Code and/or policy violation occurred.

E. Recommendation and Decision

Upon completion of the final report, the co-chairs will provide the Dean with the report. Typically, the Dean will meet with one or both of the co-chairs. In the event the Dean asks the CRC co-chairs or CRC committee to conduct any follow up work, and new evidence is gathered, the respondent will be given an opportunity to respond to any new evidence gathered.

The Dean will provide the final report to the respondent and will set a date to meet with the respondent that allows the respondent a reasonable amount of time to review the report. The Dean will meet with the respondent prior to making his or her decision, unless the Respondent refuses or does not cooperate in setting and attending the meeting. Prior to or at the meeting, the student may ask for clarification on any point, or provide any written objections.

After considering the final report and written objections made by respondent, if any, the dean will make a final decision and will inform the respondent in writing of the decision.

F. Appeal

The Vice President for Student Affairs will hear appeals made in writing within ten (10) days of a final decision. After considering an appeal, the Vice President for Student Affairs can choose to uphold the decision, send the case back to the committee for reconsideration, or amend the decision.

G. Records

The Record of the case includes the preliminary investigation notes, preliminary investigation decision, notes of witness testimony at the full hearing, the evidence relied upon by the CRC in making its report of evidence, findings, and recommendations to the Dean, and the CRC’s report of evidence, findings and recommendations to the Dean.

All records are maintained confidentially, consistent with Caltech’s Access to Student Records policy and other applicable policies and procedures.
IV. Q&A about the Board of Control

Q: Who can be investigated by the Board of Control?
A: The Board is in charge of dealing with alleged academic Honor System violations by undergraduates. The Graduate Honor Council is responsible for cases involving graduate students. The Graduate Honor Council may be reached through the Dean of Graduate Students or through referral from the Board of Control. For situations involving both graduate and undergraduate defendants, the GHC and BoC will investigate the case together.

Q: What can a person be investigated for?
A: Academic cases in which the Honor System may have been violated by an undergraduate student are investigated by the Board of Control. Obvious examples include cheating on exams, breaking homework collaboration policies, and plagiarism. Examples of nonacademic violations that would be investigated by the Conduct Review Committee or the Deans are theft and vandalism.

Q: Why are the Board proceedings so confidential?
A: The Board of Control investigations and hearings are conducted confidentially to protect the individuals being investigated. In order to prevent the formation of an unfair bias or prejudice against those appearing before the Board, measures are taken to ensure that details about particular cases do not become known to the community. The results of Board votes are kept confidential to prevent any conflicts between defendants and individual Board members. The Board’s location and meeting times are also kept confidential to prevent speculation about people seen entering or leaving the meeting place.

Q: What can the Board do to a person?
A: If a person is convicted of committing an Honor System violation by the Board of Control, the responsibility of the Board is to nullify whatever advantages were taken by the individual. This would include actions such as giving no credit for homework or exam problems completed in violation of the Honor System. After nullification, the Board considers whether the person is capable of living under the Honor System in the future. Among actions that may result from this, are placing the student on probation, having the student take a leave of absence, or recommending the student for permanent leave.

Q: Are the Board’s decisions always carried out by the Dean?
A: The Board of Control acts as an advisory committee for the Dean, providing recommendations after investigating the case and coming to a decision. If the Dean feels that the Board’s decision is not justified then he or she may choose to not follow it. However, it is only in very rare circumstances that the Dean will overrule a Board’s decision. Slightly more often he or she may ask the Board to reconsider its decision, though this too is rare.
Q: Is it an Honor System offense not to report a suspected violation?
A: Strictly speaking, yes. The Honor System is only effective as long as the members of the community uphold it. However, cases where violations are not reported will have to be investigated for special circumstances.

Q: What records are kept of cases?
A: In the case of a conviction, the records will contain the names of the defendants and the decisions of the Board, minutes of proceedings connected with the case, and any physical evidence with bearing on the case. The minutes will also contain a summary of the ideas and concerns that were brought up during the investigation by Board members as well as testimonies of those interviewed. The records will only be consulted in the event of a future conviction of one of the defendants, or for purposes of preparing abstracts or computing statistics. If no conviction results, the evidence that accumulated during the investigation will be kept by the Board Secretary in case the investigation is re-opened.

V. Statistics

Board of Control Statistics
The following Board of Control statistics were compiled. As of September 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>11-12</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
<th>16-17</th>
<th>17-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading to Conviction</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upheld by Dean</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conduct Review Committee Statistics
The following Conduct Review Committee statistics were compiled. As of April 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
<th>16-17</th>
<th>17-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading to Conviction</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upheld by Dean</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Sample Investigation of the BoC

The abstract that follows is fictitious, the procedures, investigation methods, and items considered in arriving at a recommendation are drawn directly from Board of Control Meetings.

BoC Chair
April 1, 2017
BoC Secretary
Defendants: Defendant One, Defendant Two
Regarding: Math 1b Practical Sets 7 and 8

Board:
BoC Member A
BoC Member B
BoC Member C
BoC Member D
BoC Member E
BoC Member F
BoC Member G

Case Summary:
The reporting TA contacts the board by emailing the current chair and secretary at boc@caltech.edu. The chair and secretary will then meet with the TA to collect the evidence and the full report. If necessary, meetings will be held with the professor or any other important witnesses. In this case, the head TA has already contacted the professor and compiled a full report from the TAs, so we will only need to speak with the two students involved.

The concern involving Defendant One sets 7 and 8 were initially reported on March 15th by the head TA of Math 1b. The TA indicated that there was a high degree of similarity between Defendant One’s and Defendant Two’s sets, and he felt that these similarities were very concerning. In particular, both defendants made the same errors in calculation, and many of these errors were uncommon in the class. The TA noted that the errors in problem 3 and 4 of homework 7 are particularly unique, as they both involved a series of uncommon errors that were not found in any other student’s sets.

At this point both students are contacted separately by email. The email informs them that they are currently under investigation for an Honor System violation. They are asked for their availability so that the chair and secretary can arrange a preliminary meeting.

A preliminary meeting with Defendant One was held on March 30th. At this meeting Defendant One indicated that he did not know what might have caused the similarity. He had worked on the sets primarily alone in his room the night before they were due, only stopping intermittently to ask others for help. He noted that he typically asked some friends in his house for help on math sets, Student A and Defendant Two,
who were in the course with him. On set 8 he had also consulted with Student B, a sophomore who had already completed the course, but that they had only discussed one of the problems in general terms.

Defendant One said that they would discuss problems with each other, and that he had seen his friend’s sets in the process of explanation, but that he had written his solutions alone. He said that he had completed the sets late that night, and had submitted them around 3 AM on the Monday that they were due. He could not remember exactly when he began these two sets, but said that he typically begins math sets around 5 PM on Sunday afternoon. Defendant One said that he had submitted his set alone, but he did not remember clearly.

A preliminary meeting with Defendant Two was held on March 31st. Defendant Two also indicated that he had “no idea” why there would be similarity between his set and another student’s set. He said that he primarily worked on sets alone, though he would sometimes consult with a couple friends of his in the class, Student A and Defendant One. He noted that he had also consulted with several other students during office hours, but he did not know their names.

Defendant Two said that collaboration was mainly verbal, but that he would sometimes show his set to explain something, or look at another student’s set for the same purpose. He said that he generally began his sets early on Friday evening, and would go to a TA office hours on Saturday afternoon. He would then complete the majority of the set on Saturday evening. He could not remember exactly when he had worked on set 7, but remembered that he had started on set 8 on Friday night around 8 PM.

At each preliminary meeting the defendants are informed of the allegations against them. They are also informed that they may speak with others as needed in order to identify witnesses and evidence, and that this will not breach the BoC’s confidentiality guidelines. They are also told the procedure for a full board hearing and any questions they have are answered. They are given a list of current reps, past reps, and House presidents who may hear their case, and are asked to dismiss those who they feel would be unfairly biased in their case. They are also asked for their availability in the next week so that we can arrange a meeting with the board. They are told that prior to the full Board hearing, they will be provided access to the summaries of relevant information learned at preliminary interviews and the physical evidence for their review. The defendants are also told that they may provide the names of witnesses for the BoC to call, and to provide physical evidence. After seeing the relevant evidence, Defendant One provides the BoC leadership with a scanned page of notes relevant to homework 8. Furthermore,

Defendant One and Defendant Two dismiss all of the people who live in the same House.

A full board hearing was held on April 1, 2016. The board agreed that the most concerning portions of the sets was in problems 3 and 4 of homework 7, as the TA had indicated. Additionally there were a number of other concerning similarities, particularly in problem 2, 3, and 4 in homework 8, and there was a general similarity between the two sets overall.

The line-by-line similarity of the two student’s sets made it seem highly unlikely that they had been completed independently, especially in the case of problems 3 and 4 of both homework sets, in which both papers had nearly identical material. In these problems both defendants showed the same steps in algebraic manipulation, and there was no difference in notation or ordering. Problems 1 and 2 of homework 7 and problem 1 of homework 8 were less concerning despite their similarity, as these were simple problems with little possible variation between solutions.
The concerning similarity in problem 2 of homework 8 involved a mistake in integration, where both defendants had failed to change the bounds of the integral after using the same substitution. Though it was concerning to see the same mistake in both papers, this seemed like it might have been a fairly common mistake, so the main concern was in problems 3 and 4 of both homework sets.

*Defendant Two is informed that the board is ready to speak with him. He chooses not to appoint a silent witness and does not ask any current or former rep to accompany him. He has not provided any evidence or witnesses for the Board to consider.*

In the interview with Defendant Two, he maintained that he had worked on his set alone. He said that had started on both of the sets on the Friday and completed them late on Saturday night. He mentioned that he had given his sets to a friend, Defendant One, to turn in on Sunday afternoon. Defendant Two explained that he did not have a South Master, and had gone out to dinner on both of these nights with his girlfriend, so he let Defendant One turn his sets in for him. He said that he did not know whether Defendant One was done with his set at the time that he gave his sets to him, but that he suspected that Defendant One had not completed much of the set. Defendant Two also mentioned that Defendant One had offered on both weekends to submit his set for him.

While going over the evidence, Defendant Two agreed that the similarity between the two sets was very concerning. He seemed upset to find the similarity, and immediately recognized the handwriting of the other student as Defendant One’s. The board indicated the mistake substitution from a TA at office hours, and had simply forgotten to change the bounds of the integral accordingly. Defendant Two was able to provide the correct bounds after a few minutes of thought.

Defendant Two reiterated much of what he had said during the preliminary meeting. He mentioned that in both of these homework sets he had gone to the Saturday office hours for assistance. He said that he had also used his own notes and the class textbook while completing the sets, and that he had asked Student A for assistance with problem 3 of homework 8. He did not remember clearly who he had talked to on homework 7, but suspected that he might have talked to Student A or other students at office hours about problem 4, since he remembered having some trouble with that problem.

The board also indicated problems 3 and 4 on each of the sets as being very concerning. They mentioned that they found a number of small discrepancies in problem 4 of homework 7 and problems 3 and 4 of homework 8. In these discrepancies the other student would have made an error in one step, but would correct the error in the next step. Defendant Two took some time to look over the evidence, and expressed concern that the other student had copied his set. When asked if these sets could have arisen independently, Defendant Two indicated that it was possible but very unlikely.

*Defendant Two departs. Defendant One is informed that the board is ready to speak with him. He asks a former rep, to accompany him. He has not provided any additional evidence besides his relevant page of notes that had been earlier provided to the Chair. A copy of his evidence has been provided to the Board.*

In the interview with Defendant One, he also maintained that he had completed his sets on his own. He said that he had started both of the sets on Sunday afternoon before they were due; he started set 7 around 1 pm on Sunday and set 8 around 5 pm the following Sunday. When asked whether he picked up any other
students’ sets to turn in, Defendant One said that he had picked up Defendant Two’s set on Sunday evening. He said that he couldn’t remember clearly when he had received them, but he knew that it would have been around 5 pm, since he remembers receiving them before dinner. He said that he completed both of the sets around 1 AM and turned them in at night.

While going over the evidence, Defendant One agreed that the similarities were concerning, but felt that the similar mistakes were relatively common errors. The board indicated the mistake that they had found in problem 2 of homework 8. Defendant One remarked that he felt that an error in changing the bounds of the substitution would have been fairly common. When asked whether he could correct the mistake, Defendant One said that his memory of these problem sets was very poor, and that he could not remember this problem very well. He said that he had completed the set using only the textbook and his notes, and had not gone to office hours for either of these sets. In particular, he pointed out the similarity in topic between problem 2 of homework 8 and the notes that he had provided to the Board.

The board also indicated problems 3 and 4 on each of the sets as being very concerning. Defendant One noted a couple of differences in the problems, in which he had omitted one of the steps in Defendant Two’s work, and had written his algebraic manipulations out on one line, rather than vertically down the paper.

The board also mentioned that they found a number of small discrepancies in problem 4 of homework 7 and problems 3 and 4 of homework 8. In these discrepancies Defendant One would have made an error in one step, but would correct the error in the next step. Defendant One did not have an explanation for these mistakes, and did not remember very well how he had done these problems. He said that the mistakes were very strange but that he may have made a mistake in copying some steps from scratch work, though he did not remember specifically using scratch work. He seemed upset by the number of concerning similarities that the board had found.

*After meeting with the full board, each defendant is informed that their case is still open and that the board must deliberate before they reach a decision.*

Defendant One mentioned that he had been having quite a bit of trouble in the class, and had been worried that he was going to fail since he had done very poorly on the midterm exam. He said that the similarities might have come about when he asked Defendant Two for help on the problem sets, but that he had not referenced Defendant Two’s or any other student’s sets while completing his own.

**Conviction:**

Given the incredible similarity between the sets, the board felt that it was highly unlikely that these sets could have arisen independently. The board felt that there were also several instances in which Defendant One had made inexplicable transcription errors only to arrive at the same answer in the same form as Defendant Two. In addition, while the page of notes provided by Defendant One did match the topic of the concerning problem in Homework 8, the Board found that the transcription errors showed that the notes could not fully explain the concerns. Given the evidence, and the agreement over the general timeline in which Defendant One was in possession of Defendant Two’s sets for several hours, the board concluded by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant One improperly referenced Defendant Two’s sets while
completing his own. In addition, the board felt that Defendant One was not credible when stating that he did not reference Defendant Two’s sets when completing his own.

Therefore the board voted to convict Defendant One of an Honor System violation for improperly referencing another student’s sets 7 and 8 in Math 1b Practical, in clear violation of both course policy and the Honor Code, and for misleading the Board of Control. (7-0-0)

Votes are tallied as (yes-no-abstain), so (7-0-0) indicates a unanimous decision. The board also votes unanimously to dismiss Defendant Two. Defendant Two is immediately informed that his case has been dismissed.

Nullification:

The board felt that the extreme similarity in problems 3 and 4 of homeworks 7 and 8 indicated that all of Defendant One’s work for these problems was copied from Defendant Two’s set. In addition, the board agreed that the similarity in problem 2 of homework 8, given the other similarities, was sufficiently concerning such that they concluded this problem had been copied as well. The board noted that though problems 1 and 2 of homework 7 and problem 1 of homework 8 also showed strong similarity, they were relatively simple problems, so it was difficult to be sure whether the problems had been copied or completed independently. For this reason, the board voted to nullify the unfair advantage gained by removing credit for problems 3 and 4 of homework 7 and problems 2, 3, and 4 of homework 8. (7-0-0)

Protection:

The board was concerned about Defendant One’s actions in this case. In two separate instances he had offered to turn in his friend’s set, and had then used this set as a reference to complete his own. He also failed to acknowledge his violations, and did not seem to understand the serious nature of academic dishonesty.

The board felt that he had violated the trust placed in him by other members of the Caltech community by offering to turn in his friend’s sets and subsequently referencing them for his own work. Members of the board felt that he was likely to commit future violations unless serious actions were taken to impress upon him the significance of academic honesty within the Honor System.

The board felt that Defendant One had demonstrated an immature understanding of the Honor Code. The best way they felt we could address these concerns was through a period of indefinite leave. In this way, the defendant would be suspended from Caltech for a period of time, during which he would be encouraged to reflect on his violations and perhaps to pursue courses at other colleges. The board hoped that this suspension would give him a chance to appreciate the benefits and the responsibilities of living under the Honor Code.

Should he choose to return to Caltech after this period of leave, he will be asked to speak briefly with the board at a reinstatement hearing. In this hearing, the board will consider what he has done in his time away, and what further action, if any, is necessary.
Therefore the board voted that in order to protect the Caltech community the defendant, Defendant One, will be placed on indefinite leave effective immediately, eligible to apply for reinstatement for the Winter Term of 2015. In addition, his case will be reviewed by the Deans and records of the case will be stored in the permanent files of the Board of Control. (7-0-0)

Defendant One is contacted that the Board has reached a decision in his case. He is informed of the decision, and that he should contact the Deans to review the board’s report and subsequently to meet with them to discuss the case. Defendant One is also told that he may submit objections in writing along with any supplementary material to the Dean within 10 days. Since his case involves leave, there will be an additional automatic appeal through the Vice President of Student Affairs.