**ISP** **190**

**Academic Honesty Policy**

**PURPOSE**

Defines academic honesty and lists options for instructors to consider when violations occur.

**SUMMARY**

Academic honesty requires students to generate work that is representative of their own personal abilities and original thinking. All students are expected to perform their academic work ethically and without plagiarism, cheating, unsanctioned use of Artifical Intelligence (AI) programs, or other dishonest behaviors.

Plagiarism occurs when a student submits work of another or work generated by AI as their own or fails to credit words, works or ideas borrowed from another source. This may be intentional or accidental.

Cheating occurs when a student uses unauthorized notes to complete an exam, takes an examination for another student, copies answers from other students’ examinations or engages in similar conduct intended to falsely represent, or that results in falsely representing, their academic capabilities. Students who knowingly provide material to another student for the purpose of committing (or assisting other students to commit) an offense against academic honesty are also subject to the provisions of this standard.

Unsanctioned use of an AI program to generate ideas, answers, or content is a false representation of a student's academic capabilities. Instructors should provide clear expectations for their students about when such tools are acceptable and when they will be considered a form of cheating.

**STANDARD**

1. In each course syllabus, instructors should define academic honesty and outline expectations and consequences for behavior. Some additional recommendations follow:
   1. Explicit conversations: Instructors and students can discuss the meaning of plagiarism and academic honesty within and across disciplines, as part of general class conversation and particularly when assignments are being explained.
   2. Assignment design: Instructors can design a class to include many lower-stakes assignments to assess student skills and learning. Instructors can also invite student contributions to prompts and tasks, replace tests with more interactive assessments, structure assignments to include drafts, check-ins, and/or revisions, and regularly update assignments between teaching sections of the same class. These steps have been shown to reduce the likelihood of plagiarism and cheating, which increase when a class grade depends on only a few tasks, with very high stakes.
   3. The honor pledge: Instructors can ask students to write a statement on their paper such as “On my honor, I have not given or received any unauthorized help on this [assessment]” before submitting their work. The pledge can be adapted for different forms of instruction, as well as for different classes or assignments (to invite student conversation and shared agreement). Such a pledge has been shown to reduce incidents of cheating and plagiarism. Faculty should discuss the concept and purpose of an honor pledge with students prior to implementation.
2. According to the Student Conduct and Disciplinary policy stated in Clackamas Community College’s Student Handbook, the instructor maintains the exclusive right and responsibility to determine grades.
3. In cases of cheating, plagiarism, or other violations, the instructor is responsible for discussing academic honesty with the student and deciding how to handle the situation. Among the instructor’s options are:
   1. Requiring that the assignment be redone;
   2. Issuing a failing grade for the assignment on which the cheating or plagiarism occurred;
   3. Issuing the student a failing grade for the class;
   4. Initiating a student conduct and discipline process.
4. If the instructor wishes to generate an external record of the event (if the infraction was particularly egregious and/or as a point of reference in the case of future violations of academic honesty), they may use the Academic Honesty Alert (AHA) Form. This form can also be used to initiate the Student Conduct and Discipline Process, as stated in the Student Handbook.

**REVIEW HISTORY**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ISP Committee |  |  |
| Presidents’ Council |  |  |
| College Council |  |  |
| ISP Committee | Adopted | March 11, 2022 |
| Presidents’ Council | Reviewed | March 1, 2022 |
| College Council | Reviewed | November 19, 2021 |
| ISP Committee | Reviewed | February 9, 2018 |
| College Council | Reviewed | February 2, 2018 |
| ISP Committee | Reviewed | January 26, 2018 |
| College Council | Reviewed | January 19, 2018 |
| ISP Committee | Updated Format | August 3, 2016 |
| College Council | Reviewed | May 16, 2014 |
| College Council | Reviewed | March 3, 2006 |
| ISP Committee | Reviewed/No changes | November 2, 1999 |
| Instructional Council | Adopted | August 19, 1994 |