

AI and Plagiarism Policy

Academic honesty is required in the submission of micro-credential artifacts. The use of artificial intelligence technology (e.g., ChatGPT) to generate narratives or fictionalize personal experience is strictly prohibited. Additionally, participant narratives that are substantially identical to another's work may be investigated for plagiarism.

Individuals who are determined to have violated this policy will be contacted in writing and given an opportunity to respond. All decisions of ELN are final and cannot be appealed. If it is determined that an individual used AI or submitted plagiarized work in violation of this policy, the individual will be removed from and must repurchase the Micro-Credential as well as resubmit acceptable work to receive credit. A second violation of this policy will result in an individual's inability to take Micro-Credentials for one year. A third violation will result in permanent removal from the Micro-Credential program.

If an individual is taking a Micro-Credential for university credit, ELN reserves the right to notify the individual's university of violations of this policy.

AI and Plagiarism Policy: FAQs

The following questions have been designed to offer the micro-credential earner artificial intelligence (AI) and plagiarism guidance.

Question: Can I use AI to create/modify an artifact?

Answer: YES, with caution

While personally developed artifacts are preferable, artifacts can be created or modified using AI as part of the leadership learning experience when actual artifacts are insufficient, represent poor examples or simply do not exist. However, AI-generated or modified artifacts must be supported by additional evidence that clearly demonstrates the thinking behind the artifact development (AI prompts, etc.) as well as how using the artifact contributes to your demonstration of skill proficiency. In no circumstance will a single AI-generated document or resource be accepted as the sole artifact submitted by an earner. Artifacts created or modified using AI must be properly cited.

Question: Can I use AI to create my narratives or explain how my artifact shows evidence of my experience and leadership skills?

Answer: NO

Narratives and reflections must be based on personal experience and should be written in the first person (e.g., "I," "me," "my," etc.) to ensure authenticity and academic integrity. Your writing should clearly demonstrate your "story" of skill development and proficiency. You should thoughtfully and clearly articulate how the submitted artifact(s) demonstrates skill proficiency.

Question: Can I use AI to sharpen my writing, check my spelling and grammar?

Answer: YES, with caution

Use of writing tools to ensure correct spelling and grammar are allowed. While AI may be used as part of your curation, it may not substitute for your own experience, expressed in your own words.

Question: Do I need to cite AI if I use it?

Answer: YES

If AI is used in any capacity, it must be cited. This ensures transparency and maintains academic integrity.

Question: Can I submit an artifact from past leadership experience?

Answer: YES

Artifacts that are from a previous educational leadership position that align with the MC and clearly demonstrate your proficiency is acceptable evidence.

Question: What If my artifact doesn't show my proficiency?

Answer: ELN assessors are practicing or retired educational professionals. They are looking specifically for the following in your submitted artifact and your analysis: a specific location in the artifact that you are citing as evidence; your personal contribution to the creation or utilization of the artifact; and how the evidence in the artifact reflects the MC skill detail and your proficiency in that skill.

Question: Can multiple MC earners use the same artifact?

Answer: YES, with caution

Multiple earners may use the same artifact; however, each participant must provide their own unique narrative describing their personal contribution to the creation or use of the artifact. Each participant must independently explain how the artifact demonstrates his or her leadership skill proficiency as well as make a personal connection between his or her experience and the MC detail. Narratives and reflections must be based on personal experience and should be written in the first person (e.g., "I," "me," "my," etc.) to ensure authenticity and academic integrity to the assessor.

Question: Can multiple earners use the same explanation as to how the artifact represents proficiency?

Answer: NO

Each participant must write his or her own unique reflection that demonstrates personal understanding and experience. Identical or highly similar responses may be flagged for plagiarism; therefore, it is essential that each reflection is original, thoughtful, and specific to the individual's leadership journey.

Question: If I collaborated or sought feedback on an artifact as part of my internship, do I need to acknowledge those contributions?

Answer: YES

As a leader, seeking feedback and collaborating with others are essential to success. While your submission must focus on your individual role, you should acknowledge collaboration and/or feedback in your answer as it will help provide the assessor with a clearer picture of the process that took place.

Question: May I create a scenario to demonstrate my skill if I have not had personal experience?

Answer for Experienced Leaders: No

Answer for Pre-Service Leaders: Yes, if your internship or school has not provided you with a chance to lead or participate in activities that would allow you to demonstrate your skill proficiency for a micro-credential (details, a sample, and a rubric are provided below to guide your work).

Micro-Credential Internship Scenario Criteria – School Administrator Candidates

How to Submit Your Scenario

In Step 2 of the *Precheck Artifact Upload and Self-Analysis process*, upload your completed scenario as Evidence 1. Then, provide your explanation (Evidence, Location, and Self-Analysis) based on the scenario for the Detail you selected in Step 1. You may also upload additional evidence that supports your proficiency with the selected Detail, if applicable.

Section 1: Overview

You must clearly begin with the statement that as a pre-service leader, you have created a scenario to demonstrate the skills in the MC detail.

You must include the following information:

1. Describe the steps you took to develop specific **detail** skills through hands-on experience during your internship.
2. Explain how you gained the content knowledge required for the micro-credential, such as through reading, observation, coursework (online or in person), or attending workshops.
3. Share why you selected this scenario to showcase your skill development.

Section 2: Scenario Development

To sufficiently demonstrate performance skills in a **fabricated work scenario**, the key is to make the scenario *plausible, detailed, and aligned with the core competencies* you're trying to showcase. An example of a scenario and a rubric is provided.

Consider the following 5 components as you develop your scenario.

Component	Questions to Consider
Clarity of the Skills Being Demonstrated	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are the exact performance skills contained in the details that you are trying to showcase: leadership, communication, conflict resolution, problem-solving, time management, etc.?• How does the scenario naturally lead to the use of that skill as a response to a challenge or opportunity?
Realistic Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How does the scenario mirror a real-world setting relevant to the role of a school administrator?• What is at stake in this scenario? Budget? Student Achievement? School Culture?
Clear Challenge and Resolution	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is the obstacle, challenge, or situation requiring action?• How is your response proactive and strategic, not just reactive?• What steps were taken, decisions made, and why did you do that that way?• What is the measurable or observable quantitative or qualitative outcome?
Inclusion of Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What stakeholder groups were involved (colleagues, parents, staff, students, community members)?• How did you interact with them? Did you influence, collaborate, mediate, persuade?
Reflection and Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How does this scenario demonstrate your <i>self-awareness</i> and <i>growth mindset</i>?

Use the STAR (Situation – Task – Action – Reflection) structure when developing your scenario.

Structure Part	Purpose	Instructions	Questions to Guide You
SITUATION: Set the scene	Provide context background.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe when and where this took place (e.g., beginning of the school year, during state testing, after a policy change). Identify the problem, challenge, or opportunity in the school setting (e.g., low attendance, staff turnover, academic decline). Set the scene with relevant school-related details, such as grade levels involved, stakeholders (teachers, parents, students), or community context. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What issue or situation was impacting your school? What made this an important or urgent issue to address? Who was affected—students, staff, families?
TASK: Define your role or responsibility	Clarify what your job or duty was in that situation as an administrator.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly state what your role was (e.g., principal, assistant principal, dean of students). Explain what you were responsible for doing in response to the situation. Include any goals you were expected to meet (e.g., improve test scores, reduce suspensions, increase parent engagement). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What was expected of you as the school leader? Were you leading a team, overseeing a new program, or managing communication? What specific outcome or improvement were you targeting?
ACTION: Detail what you did	Describe the specific actions you personally took to address the challenge.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on your leadership steps, decisions, and interventions. Explain how you engaged others—teachers, students, families, or district officials. Describe initiatives, strategies, tools, or practices you used (e.g., restorative practices, curriculum changes, community partnerships). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What steps did you take to solve the problem? How did you lead or coordinate with others? What data, tools, or frameworks did you use? What barriers did you overcome?
RESULT: Show the outcome with specifics	Show the impact of your leadership actions using results that matter in a school setting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share specific outcomes (e.g., improved student behavior, higher test scores, increased family participation). Use quantifiable data where possible (e.g., “Suspensions decreased by 30%”). Mention any positive feedback, recognition, or long-term changes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What changed because of your actions? How did your school or team benefit? Did the situation improve measurably? What did you or your school community learn?

Structure Part	Purpose	Instructions	Questions to Guide You
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If appropriate, reflect on how it affected your leadership growth. 	

Assemble Supporting Artifacts.

Artifacts are key for validating the scenario, especially when it's fabricated. Artifacts make the story feel tangible and real. Since you're working with a fictional scenario, your artifacts would be *hypothetical representations* of real materials that would naturally result from the described experience. You can also utilize actual artifacts you obtain in your internship experience. **Any sensitive information should be redacted in actual artifacts.**

Types of Possible Artifacts	Examples
Communications & Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Email communications (e.g., with stakeholders, staff, or administration) Written communications to stakeholders (e.g., newsletters, digital media screenshots, recognitions, awards) Stakeholder or colleague feedback Surveys Audio clips of interviews or verbal messaging scripts Copies of newspaper or online news stories, community or parent updates
Meeting & Planning Documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting notes or agendas Meeting agendas, minutes, and sign-in sheets Meeting schedules listing practitioners, goals, and protocols used Retrospective summaries or internal reports Event documents (e.g., flyers, presentation materials, notes, agendas, evaluation results) Executive summaries of school improvement plans, initiatives, or intervention plans
Project Management Tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project timelines or Gantt charts Task trackers Planning documents (e.g., unit/lesson planning templates, alignment tables, curriculum maps, scope and sequence documents, pacing guides)
Design & Visual Artifacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Before-and-after design mockups Video and/or PowerPoint presentations (note: permission required from participants)
Performance & Training Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance data or dashboards Training materials (e.g., slides, notes, presentation outlines, agendas, evaluations, assessments) Professional development materials Resources and professional materials provided to stakeholders

Micro-Credential Example Scenario – School Administrator Candidates

The following example and rubric have been designed to offer the micro-credential earner scenario development guidance.

Skill Focus: Instructional leadership, stakeholder collaboration, data-driven decision-making

Situation: As an assistant principal at a Title I middle school, I led a mid-year benchmark data review with our instructional leadership team. We uncovered a concerning trend: a consistent dip in reading comprehension scores across 6th and 7th grades, with students in the bottom quartile showing the steepest declines. This finding directly threatened our school's strategic goals for academic growth and equity. Teacher feedback confirmed a lack of differentiated instructional support for struggling readers during core ELA instruction, amplifying the urgency for intervention.

 [\[Attached: Mid-Year Reading Benchmark Dashboard – Grade 6 & 7\]](#)

Task: I was tasked with developing a swift, sustainable strategy to accelerate reading growth among our most vulnerable students. The solution needed to preserve instructional time, avoid increasing teacher workload, and produce measurable improvement before end-of-year state assessments. Additionally, the model had to integrate within existing structures and leverage available human resources creatively.

 [\[Attached: Teacher Needs Assessment Summary – Reading Interventions\]](#)

Action: I mobilized a cross-functional task force including ELA teachers, special education staff, RTI leads, and paraprofessionals. We co-designed a Tier 2 intervention called "Targeted Literacy Labs," delivered during advisory periods to protect core instruction. I collaborated with our literacy coach to train paraprofessionals and instructional aides in small group reading strategies using scaffolded texts and formative feedback techniques.

 [\[Attached: Intervention Planning Meeting Agenda\]](#)

 [\[Attached: Literacy Lab Implementation Plan & Staff Training Outline\]](#)


To ensure consistency, I developed a weekly progress monitoring system aligned to reading standards and led structured planning meetings to refine our approach based on student data. I also initiated a family engagement strategy, including personalized letters, opt-in support calls, and features in the school newsletter to build transparency and trust with parents.

 [\[Attached: Progress Monitoring Template – Weekly Literacy Check\]](#)

 [\[Attached: Parent Letter – Tier 2 Literacy Supports\]](#)

Result: Over six weeks, students in the Literacy Labs showed an average 18% increase in progress-monitoring assessments. Notably, English Learners and students with IEPs outpaced initial projections, demonstrating accelerated growth. ELA teachers reported improved classroom engagement and a noticeable shift in reading stamina among targeted students. The initiative drew district attention, and I was invited by the school board to present the model as a scalable intervention blueprint for other content areas, starting with math.

 [\[Attached: Literacy Lab Outcomes Slide – Data Snapshot\]](#)

 [\[Attached: Teacher Feedback Survey Summary – Program Effectiveness\]](#)

Reflection: This initiative solidified my understanding of how strategic leadership and systems thinking can drive urgent instructional improvement. I helped build an adaptable framework for Tier 2 support by leveraging existing assets and fostering cross-role collaboration. I learned the importance of ongoing stakeholder feedback and clear communication in scaling impactful practices. Moving forward, I plan to embed this model of responsive leadership into our broader MTSS practices to ensure equity and sustained student growth.

 [\[Attached: Reflection Memo – Leadership Takeaways & Scalability Notes\]](#)

Micro-Credential Example Scenario RUBRIC – School Administrator Candidates

Criteria	4 - Exemplary	3 - Proficient	2 - Developing	1 - Beginning
1. Clarity of Skills Demonstrated	The written scenario clearly identifies and intentionally demonstrates key performance skills (e.g., leadership, communication, conflict resolution, time management). Skills are seamlessly embedded as natural responses to the challenge.	Skills are present and relevant to the scenario. Their demonstration is generally clear, though not always integrated smoothly into the narrative.	Some relevant skills are hinted at, but the writing lacks clarity or consistency in demonstrating them. May feel forced or underdeveloped.	Skills are vague, difficult to identify, or absent from the written scenario.
2. Realistic Context	Scenario is highly realistic and aligned with school administrative roles. Describes a believable setting with meaningful stakes (e.g., student outcomes, school culture, budget implications).	Scenario is realistic and generally appropriate to a school setting, with some indication of stakes, though not strongly developed.	Scenario has elements of realism but lacks strong alignment to school leadership or has vague/low-impact stakes.	Scenario is generic, unclear, or not applicable to the context of school administration.
3. Clear Challenge and Resolution	A well-defined challenge is presented. The response is proactive and strategic, showing thoughtful decision-making. Steps taken are clearly explained with a measurable or meaningful outcome.	Challenge is present and response is appropriate. Some strategy is shown, though steps or outcomes may be underdeveloped or only loosely connected.	Challenge is weakly defined or response is reactive. Limited explanation of actions or unclear results.	Scenario lacks a clear challenge or the response is ineffective, off-topic, or unresolved.
4. Inclusion of Stakeholders	Stakeholders (e.g., staff, parents, students, community) are clearly involved. The writing highlights purposeful interactions such as collaboration, persuasion, or mediation.	Stakeholders are mentioned and interact in the scenario, but their roles or impact may not be strongly developed.	Stakeholders are briefly mentioned or passively included with limited engagement or relevance.	Stakeholders are not included, or their presence has no meaningful effect on the scenario.
5. Reflection and Learning	Concludes with a thoughtful reflection showing deep insight, learning, and specific future improvements. Clearly communicates growth and self-awareness.	Reflection is included and connects to the scenario. Shows learning or intent to improve, though may lack depth or specificity.	Reflection is brief or generic. Offers limited insight into learning or self-awareness.	No reflection is included, or it lacks relevance and depth.