December 2, 2024

To the John Carroll University community:

After generative artificial intelligence became readily available to the general public in November 2022, a JCU faculty working group came together to draft a sample syllabus statement of suggested acceptable and unacceptable AI uses for faculty to adapt and use in their courses. This statement was reviewed by the University Committee on Educational Policies (UCEP) in spring 2023, disseminated for community comment and feedback in summer 2023, and distributed for faculty adaptation and use in fall 2023 and again in fall 2024. The syllabus statement is a model for instructors to use to create course-specific syllabus policy on AI to supplement their existing Academic Honesty statements. This semester, it is being re-reviewed for any needed updates by an expanded faculty subgroup.

The following proposed revisions to the University's *Academic Honesty* policy clarify parameters around acceptable and transparent use of AI. While course syllabi outline course-specific policies on academic honesty, this proposed revision to the university-wide policy functions both as a positional statement on academic honesty at JCU and outlines foundational requirements that both students and faculty should follow in their approach to academic honesty—both with AI and generally.

Currently, the undergraduate and graduate policies differ slightly with respect to the grounds for an appeal. If the proposed revisions are adopted, they would be made to both UG and GR policies— eliminating any incongruities between them:

- Current undergraduate policy: https://jcubulletin.coursedog.com/academic-policies-and-procedures/undergraduate-academic-policies-and-procedures/academic-honesty/academic-honesty
- Current graduate policy: https://jcubulletin.coursedog.com/academic-policies-and-procedures/graduate-academic-policies-and-procedures/academic-honesty/academic-honesty

The UG and GR policies on *Appeals of Charges of Academic Dishonesty* are currently under review, so are not part of this proposed policy revision. That is, at this time, UCEP is only asking the community to review and respond to the *Academic Honesty* policy revisions on the next pages.

The substantive revisions to this policy include: 1) specific references to AI, 2) codification of instructor use of a syllabus statement—including that instructors should self-disclose AI use in course grading and/or delivery, and 3) clarification on the general grounds for an appeal of academic dishonesty (though the Appeals policy, itself, is not yet posted for community comment).

After the conclusion of the community comment period, UCEP will review and discuss the comments, make any needed revisions, respond to signed comments, and the policy will be reviewed for final approval and implementation.

Questions on this proposed policy revision can be directed to the co-chairs of UCEP, Meghan Gibbons (mgibbons@jcu.edu) and Rebecca Drenovsky (rdrenovsky@jcu.edu).

Warm regards,

Meghan Gibbons, on behalf of the University Committee on Educational Policies

Academic Honesty

Academic honesty, expected of every student, is essential to the process of education and to upholding high ethical standards. Cheating–including plagiarism; inappropriate use of technology, including use of artificial intelligence (AI) when prohibited; or any other kind of unethical or dishonest behavior–may subject the student to severe academic penalties, including dismissal.

Instructors are responsible for including an Academic Honesty statement in their syllabi which is customized to the content and delivery method of each course. This statement should include an outline of acceptable uses of AI both by students and by themselves. Examples of instructor uses of AI may include AI detection tools, AI-generated exam questions, AI-assisted grading tools, and others. Students are responsible for understanding and abiding by acceptable use guidelines for each of their courses. If a student has a concern about the instructor's intended use of AI, the student must address and resolve the concern with the instructor before the add/drop deadline and, if it cannot be resolved, may drop the course before the add/drop deadline.

All work submitted for evaluation in a course, including tests, term papers, and computer programs, must represent the work of the student as generated within the guidelines of the respective courses' academic honesty syllabus policy. Material taken from the work of others must be acknowledged. Materials submitted to fulfill requirements in one course may not be submitted in another course without prior approval of the instructor(s) of each course (both past and present). If the past course instructor is no longer teaching at John Carroll, the permission of the course's department chair must be sought.

Concerns about the propriety of obtaining outside assistance, including the use of AI in assignment creation and completion, as well as how and when to acknowledge sources should be addressed to the instructor of the course before the work commences and as necessary as the work proceeds.

Instructors should indicate specific penalties for academic dishonesty in their course syllabi. Penalties, appropriate to the severity of the infraction, may include resubmission of the same or a modified assignment, reduced or zero credit for the assignment, or failure in the course. If a student withdraws from a course after academic dishonesty has taken place a course grade of F instead of W may be assigned at the faculty member's discretion. In egregious cases and/or cases of repeated dishonesty, additional penalties may be determined by the associate dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) or Boler College of Business (BCOB) or the dean of the College of Health (COH), such as suspension or dismissal from the University. In a case of dismissal, Academic Dismissal will be noted on the transcript.

Appealing a Charge of Academic Dishonesty
Any appeal of a charge of academic dishonesty by a student is to be made first to the instructor. Grounds for appeals may include:
- Continuing ambiguity in the events surrounding the appraisal of Dishonesty

- Contested accuracy of AI detection, when student AI usage is prohibited by syllabus policy
- Alternative interpretations of syllabus policy
- Delivery of a consequence inconsistent with the syllabus' policy

The Policy and Procedure for Appeal of a Charge of Academic Dishonesty will be followed if a student wishes to contest a faculty member's determination of academic dishonesty. Access the undergraduate and graduate policies.