

Case Inquiries and Updates 1/2/2024

Concerns were expressed regarding Exhibit 9 and the affidavit of Jude Collins.

Response: The sentence in Jude Collins' affidavit that starts with "Exhibit 9" and ends with "T/A" will be deleted.

Concerns were expressed regarding Exhibit 1.

Response: Exhibit One has been modified.

Concerns were raised regarding the wording of the trial overview on page 2.

Response: Regarding the Trial Overview, the content under Opening and Closing has been modified for consistency to Rule 4.17.

A concern was raised regarding the use of he instead of he/she in some of the affidavits.

Response: The gender specific "he" will be changed to "s/he" in the updated version of the case materials. Until then, assume that the witnesses are gender neutral.

Exhibit 5 contains many [INSERT AI WEBSITE NAME] entries.

Response: The website in Exhibit 5 should be "ChatAI". This change has been reflected in an updated version of the case materials.

The circuit court case number is a 2022 number but Ross was not expelled from the school until 2023? Is this accurate?

Response: The case number will be changed to 2023 in the next revised edition.

We currently see the following:

Academic Advisory Board (Collins' affidavit)

Academic Advisory Committee (Ross' affidavit)

Academic Integrity Board (Exhibit 2)

Are all of these the same thing? If so, can we make sure it is consistent to limit confusion? All of these are the same entity and can be used interchangeably.

Academic Integrity Hearing - Is this the same hearing that confirmed the 8-1 vote? Yes

I wanted to contact you to ask about two conflicting affidavit claims. The testimony of Cameron Grey and Jamie Bossa both refer to a previous paper written by Alex Ross.

In line 72 Cameron states: "...they (Alex) used in another paper I was provided written in 2018."

In line 78 Jamie states: "...When I ran Alex Ross's 2017 paper..."

My question is are there 3 papers that we should be aware of or 2? I assume the 2017/18 discrepancy is just a typo, but if there is a third paper that is being brought up, I wanted to make sure we had more information about it. **Line 78 should say 2018. There is only one prior paper.**

Also, Alex still says in the affidavit that they are familiar with exhibit 9, which makes no sense to me. The exhibit 9 seems flawed and a distractor already. It isn't written by any party involved, and it seems to just be a website about AI. Why would Alex have specific knowledge of this and not one of the expert witnesses in this case? **The case is correct as written**

Finally, Cameron, in line 58, references the complexity score as being 15%, but throughout the rest of their testimony, they use 10%. **The case is correct as written**

When looking at exhibit 8, the bottom of the page says, "showing 1 to 15 of 15 entries". We just want to verify that the top row is counted as an entry and there is no data missing. **The exhibit should indicate "showing 1 to 14 entries. All other parts of the Exhibit is correct as written.**

In Jude Collins' affidavit, he states he has not read Alex's paper (pg. 47, line 46), yet he is familiar with Exhibit 4, which is the essay? **The case materials are correct as written.**

I would like to confirm that for the purposes of this case, students may only argue the counts of breach of contract and specific performance and NOT monetary damages. **Specific monetary damages should not be discussed, but the adequacy of monetary damages may be discussed.**

I would like to confirm students do not have to admit Exhibit 4 into evidence in order to bring it up during cross or direct due to rule 22. (pg. 17) **Any information regarding this would be in the Rules or Stipulations. Please refer to the same for this question.**

Exhibit 1 was changed from Palm Coast University Board of Trustees to reflect Dean Jude Collins as the authority with the final say over the dismissal of a student. Would this mean that Exhibit 2, rule number #5 would also have to change as well because it states that the decision made by the Palm Coast University Board of Trustees is final. This would be a contradiction between what the Student Contract says and what the Plagiarism policy states. Furthermore, in Alex Ross' affidavit, she states that the contract she signed gave the Dean the final authority (line 97) but later on says that the board of trustees had the final word on the matter, but the Dean "somehow" found a way to destroy her future (line 102). To me, this sounds like an inconsistency considering that the Board of Trustees seems to be the Dean. **Answer: The case materials are correct as written.**

Alex Ross states that they are an engineering major (lines 6-7). With the verbiage that was added to the new Exhibit 1 (*Any final decision regarding dismissal of a student due to academic reasons shall be made by the Dean of the School of that student's major course of study*), are we to assume that engineering is under the College of Arts and Science? It is never explicitly stated anywhere in the case packet, but most universities have their own College of Engineering meaning Jude Collins would not be the Dean over Alex's major.

Answer: engineering majors in this matter are in the college of Arts and Sciences

In the Affidavit of Jude Collins, line 23 states September 30th, 2022, and then in line 44, it mentions May 18, 2022. Is May referring to the following year (2023)? **Answer: Yes, line 44 should read May 18, 2023.**

In Jude Collins statement lines 52 and 53, the dean states that he/she is aware of Alex Ross having plagiarized in high school, however, at the end of the statement, it does not state that he/she is familiar with exhibit 6. How then would the dean know that Alex Ross plagiarized in high school? **Answer: Jude Collins is familiar with Exhibit 6. The case will be amended to include familiarity with this exhibit**

We will add to line 80 of Jude Collin's affidavit: " I am familiar with Exhibit 6, as it is part of Alex Ross's admission file."

Question: Which of the witnesses is familiar with exhibit 10 (text message from ActNow)? More specifically, is Dean Jude Collins familiar with it because s/he mentions s/he has seen it in her/his affidavit? **For clarification these texts were from Alex's Ross phone. We will clarify that Jude Collins is familiar with Exhibit 10**

We will revise line 84 of Jude Collins statement to include he is familiar with Exhibit 10. Also, Exhibit 10 should be titled "Texts from Alex Ross to ActNow Members" as this is not clear on the names of the exhibits on the Exhibit list.

My team has a question concerning the case materials.

In the complaint, is 17 supposed to be "Admitted." Is that correct? **Answer: The case materials are correct as written**

In Grey's affidavit lines 5-8 suggest that he had read and knows about Boss AI's report, but it does not say that they reviewed it. Are we to assume that he has read it? **Answer: Each expert has read and reviewed the other's reports. We will add to stipulation 17: Both experts have read and reviewed the other's affidavit/report and is familiar with the same."**

Within Exhibit 4, there is MLA text citations but there is no work cited included. Are we to assume that Alex Ross did not turn in a work cited page? **Answer: Please review the stipulations and pretrial matters in the case materials.**

A previous case question highlighted the discrepancy between Grey's statement and Bossa's statement regarding the year of the previous paper of Alex Ross. Line 72 of Grey's statement refers to the statement being written in 2018 while Bossa's statement refers to the same paper being written in 2017.

The answer to the previous question, says that this paper is the same and should be dated 2018, not 2017.

However, there is also a discrepancy in Exhibit 6, the letter from the principal is dated from 2017, not 2018. Therefore, does Exhibit 6 also need to be changed to 2018?. **Answer. Yes, the letter in Exhibit 6 should be dated March 15, 2018.**

Did Alex go again and appeal a second time? Was this wording intentional? Was it poorly worded? But I think it is duplicative and not a second appeal since it almost tracks exactly the same as 80 to 84. Lines 95-103 seem to be the same testimony as 85 to 90.

Answer: In reality, only one word needs to be changed on line 91, but for the sake of clarity and to avoid confusion, we should delete lines 91-94 as they somewhat duplicative from the prior paragraph. This does not in any way affect the substance of Alex Ross' testimony.

Cut off date for submission of questions is December 22, 2023. Please review all of the questions and answers submitted to date. The case will be updated in early January with these updates.

Thank you!