UNIVERSITY OF SAINT JOSEPH

POLICY ON ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE FOR TEACHING, LEARNING, AND RESEARCH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SAINT JOSEPH

June 2024

1. PREAMBLE

1.1   This policy concerns the use of Artificial Intelligence (hereafter termed 'AI') for teaching, learning, and research at the University of Saint Joseph (hereafter USJ). This includes Generative AI.

1.2   USJ is committed to taking a positive, educational approach to the use of AI tools, and it supports staff and students in the use of AI ethically and appropriately in their work, and regarding using AI as important skills and broader digital literacy to be learned and practised, and for users to be AI-literate and ethical in their use of AI.

1.3   USJ recognises the significant, outstanding, and positive contributions that AI can make in developing scholarship, research, teaching, and learning, and their implications for society and community in very many fields and walks of life, that reach far beyond only matters of authorship. It recognises the benefits, opportunities, challenges, and risks of harm that AI brings in very many areas of everyday life,[1] that extend beyond matters of authorship to creativity, ethics, innovations, and opportunities. AI is both ambivalent and double-edged, and it is important for staff and students at USJ to know how and when to use it appropriately and ethically, for the promotion of the good.

---

[1] Benefits, opportunities, harms, and risks are set out clearly in Whittlestone, J., & Clarke, S. (2022). AI challenges for society and ethics. In J. B. Bullock (Ed.) et al. *Oxford handbook of AI governance* (pp. 45-64). Oxford. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197579329.013.3

1.4 Concerning authorship, AI has been used for decades, for searching and retrieval, for checking vocabulary and grammar, for teaching and learning for research and practice. For centuries, people have used other people to assist them, e.g. in editing, suggesting ideas, promoting further thinking and discussion, giving feedback on style, vocabulary register, working, grammar etc. Now, some of this can be done by AI, replacing humans. For example, it is commonplace for texts to be reviewed/copy-edited/proof-read; typically this has been done by humans. With AI it is done by non-humans. Teachers, learners, and researchers routinely use AI for search, retrieval, and production, and the questions of concern about the boundaries of the usage. AI raises questions of whose work it is, e.g.: the work of the author, or that of someone or something else. Authors regularly use software in writing, e.g. for synonyms, for vocabulary, and for editing. How far AI should be accepted for writing, rewriting, generating, creating writing and other outputs, needs ongoing clarification as new developments emerge in AI, so it is important to know the boundaries being applied here. The use of AI does not replace the author; it supports the author, in different ways, and these must be identified and disclosed. Assessed work produced by AI alone does not meet the central requirement for integrity of assessed work at USJ, and the voice of its authors, and authors must not pass off as their own work the ideas or text gleaned only from AI. This applies, similarly, to creating other outcomes, e.g. images, graphics, music etc.

1.5 This policy recognises that in and for university work, AI must be welcomed, used, and accommodated. The issues raised in so doing concern boundaries of usage of AI: what they are, where they are, what are the purposes of having them, what to support and what to censure, boundaries on what, why, how to justify these, how to make these concrete and clear, and how to enforce them.

1.6 USJ adheres to the 2023 UNESCO Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research, and its statement that 'AI must not usurp human intelligence. Rather, it invites us to reconsider our established understandings of knowledge and human learning' (p. 2). ... 'to ensure that GenAI becomes a tool that genuinely benefits and empowers teachers, learners and researchers. Building on UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, the Guidance is anchored in a human-centred approach that promotes human agency, inclusion, equity, gender equality, and cultural and linguistic diversity, as well as plural opinions and expressions' (p. 7).

1.7 USJ does not rule out automatically the use of AI in contributing to student assignments (e.g. assessed work, written assignments, presentations, papers, theses, dissertations), staff and student research, and preparation for teaching and learning. Rather, USJ holds with the proviso that the use of AI is disclosed, transparent, appropriate, acceptable, approved, transparent, ethical, and does not breach academic integrity and regulations of the University which include but are not limited to plagiarism, dishonesty, intellectual property theft, confidentiality, privacy, and breaches of legality and copyright.

1.8 AI should not do its users' thinking, creation, generation of writing, and it should not be a substitute for the author's own thinking. A final submitted assessment task, research output, teaching decision, and product must be the author's own work, creation, and analysis, and not simply copied from an AI generator. Staff and students must own their own work and ensure that it is their own authentic voice. Whilst AI can be a short-cut, it

must not replace individual or group effort that is needed to acquire and use the intellectual skills, behaviours, and actions required of university members.

1.9 Users of AI at USJ must understand AI's limitations and, where they use them, to do this is in conjunction with other sources, ensuring the validity, credibility, accuracy, and reliability of the information presented.

1.10 Disclosure: there is an ethical obligation for authors to disclose, where appropriate, the use of AI in their work, for the reader to see what software has been used, for what purpose, where it has been used, how it has been used, what it has done and produced, with what outcomes, and where this has led to AI-created/revised text, images, graphics, tables, music, etc. in their work, and in what form (see Appendix B for two examples of this).

1.11 USJ recognises that '[t]he appropriate uses of generative AI tools are likely to differ between academic disciplines', taking account of how AI 'might be applied appropriately for different student groups or those with specific learning needs' (Russell Group (2023). Principles on the Use of Generative AI Tools in Education, p. 2). USJ recognises that '[a]ppropriate adaptations to teaching and assessment methods will vary by university and discipline, and protecting this autonomy is vital. All staff who support student learning should be empowered to design teaching sessions, materials and assessments that incorporate the creative use of generative AI tools where appropriate' (ibid., p. 3).

1.12 Staff and students must be supported to develop critical AI literacy alongside other fundamental academic skills, and to ensure their use of generative AI tools effectively and ethically in their teaching, learning, and research.

1.13 Given the speed at which AI is moving, it is anticipated that ongoing staff and student development and training will need to be provided, together with revisions to this policy where appropriate.

2. DEFINITIONS

2.1 *Artificial Intelligence:* 'Computer systems designed to perform tasks usually reserved for human minds, such as text or speech recognition, decision-making, and translation' (University of Nottingham (2023) *ChatGPT and Generative AI: Guidance for students* (created by Libraries' Learning Development); Glossary of terms. 'Artificial intelligence (AI) broadly refers to computer systems designed to accomplish tasks typically requiring human intelligence' (Monash University, 2024, *Using Artificial Intelligence*. https://www.monash.edu/student-academic-success/build-digital-capabilities/create-online/using-artificial-intelligence).

2.2 *'Assessed work':* that work which has been set for assessment and/or research and its outcomes, output, and publication. This takes a broad view of 'assessment', including evaluation as well as grading, and moving beyond assignment to research and other output, assessed by internal and/or external parties.

2.3 *Authorship:* 'the state or fact of being the writer of a book, article, or document, or the creator of a work of art' (https://wordshake.com/definition/authorships). 'Authorship signifies that an individual has made a significant contribution to the work and is accountable for it. It also carries significant value for a researcher. It is therefore important

that authorship is attributed accurately and responsibly' (University of Queensland).[2] 'Authorship is generally limited to individuals who make significant contributions to the work that is reported' (Office of Research Integrity).[3] 'Authorship means only the identity of the creator, the period, culture and source or origin of the lot' (Law Insider).[4] Whilst authorship, typically, is confined to writing, this includes graphics, figures, tables, images etc. in the text in which it appears in that writing.

2.4 *Generative AI:* that form of AI which has the ability to generate new content which does not possess a novel idea of its own. 'Generative AI (GenAI) is an artificial intelligence (AI) technology that automatically generates content in response to prompts written in natural-language conversational interfaces. Rather than simply curating existing webpages, by drawing on existing content, GenAI actually produces new content' (UNESCO, 2023, *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research*, p. 8).[5]

2.5 *Voice:* the way in which people express themselves, their opinions, views, and attitudes.

3. PURPOSES

The purposes of this policy are:

3.1 To articulate the University's commitment to, and excellence in, the use of AI in its teaching, learning, and research, and to identify how this commitment operates in practice.

3.2 To promote a shared understanding of the University's key principles of, approaches to, and practices of AI in its teaching, learning, and research.

3.3 To promote continuous improvement, excellence and innovation in the University's use of AI in teaching, learning, and research.

3.4 To provide the University with an effective, efficient, efficacious, and impactful means of regulating, monitoring, reviewing, evaluating, developing, improving, enhancing and communicating the use of AI in its teaching, learning, and research work.

---

[2] https://research-support.uq.edu.au/resources-and-support/ethics-integrity-and-compliance/research-integrity/authorship#:~:text=Authorship%20signifies%20that%20an%20individual,is%20attributed%20accuratel y%20and%20responsibly

[3] https://ori.hhs.gov/content/Chapter-9-Authorship-and-Publication-Authorship.

[4] https://www.lawinsider.com/dictionary/authorship

[5] Examples of generative AI include, but are not limited to: ChatGPT, Bard, Midjourney, Chatsonic, DALL-E.

4. RATIONALE

4.1　USJ encourages and promotes the ethical, responsible, skilful, informed, appropriate, transparent, and fair use of AI in its teaching, learning, and research. In so doing, USJ seeks to provide appropriate training and development for broader digital literacy, along with monitoring and ensuring appropriate and ethical use of AI.

4.2　The role of AI is to support rather than replace the searching, thinking, generation, creation, production, revision, and work of the human user, and to preserve the user's academic integrity and ethical behaviour. AI must not be the author.

4.3　AI includes and moves beyond authorship. It is used for the positive, creative, and innovatory teaching, learning, research, development, and sustenance of all spheres of society, as appropriate and ethical.

4.4　Higher education staff and students must be encouraged to use AI where appropriate, must be prepared for using AI ethically, and supported to develop critical AI literacy alongside other fundamental academic skills, to ensure their use of AI tools effectively and ethically in their teaching, learning, and research.

4.5　The use of AI must be transparent, explainable, documented, and acknowledged.

5. SCOPE

5.1　This policy applies to: (a) research and development, products and projects at USJ; (b) the authorship of research outputs in different media, papers and books for publication, including those that have been put through a translator;[6] (c) teaching and learning using AI, and including, but not limited to, teaching and learning resources and activities as appropriate, assignments and assessed work, dissertations, theses, and presentations.

5.2　This policy applies to all members of USJ who are involved in teaching, learning, and research, including Visiting Academics at USJ.

5.3　This policy does not apply to other parties outside USJ. In the event of work that has been done jointly with parties inside and outside USJ, this policy applies to those parties inside USJ, and USJ will take steps to assure, where possible, that external parties comply with USJ practice here.

5.4　This policy does not apply to the USJ Nursery.

6. REQUIREMENTS

This policy requires all members of USJ to adhere to the following requirements in using AI:

6.1　Use AI positively, creatively, skilfully, appropriately, transparently, and ethically in teaching, learning, and research.

6.2　Use AI for promoting the understanding and advancement of, and benefit for, knowledge, society, ethics, moral living, quality of life, human agency and autonomy, creativity,

---

[6] For example, from Chinese to English.

decision making, tackling problems in and as a society and community, tackling world-level problems and challenges,[7] and promoting the good life.

6.3 Use AI for the promotion of higher order thinking, cooperation, and creativity.

6.4 Raise staff and student awareness of, and response to, the reach and impact of AI in all walks of life.

6.5 Ensure compliance with ethical principles in using and acknowledging the use of AI in teaching, learning, research, and authorship. This includes, but is not limited to:

    (i) Providing a clear and fair picture of the use of AI, its benefits, accomplishments, implications, opportunities, uses, harms, risks, challenges, and implications.

    (ii) Ensuring the use of appropriate AI in teaching, learning, research, and authorship.

    (iii) Compliance with academic integrity, transparency, disclosure, accountability, and fairness.

    (iv) Attribution of sources.

    (v) Acknowledgement of authorship.

    (vi) Compliance with intellectual property.

    (vii) Avoidance of plagiarism, cheating, dishonesty, and other unethical practice.

    (viii) Avoidance of harm and damage, negative risks, likelihood of negative conflicts, breaches of privacy and confidentiality, vulnerability to attacks and accidents, undermining society's ability to address challenges and solve problems.

    (ix) Avoidance of loss of control over AI.

    (x) Each Faculty/School/Institute/Department at USJ to specify and communicate to all its members its percentage tolerance level of detection of usage of AI, including generative AI in students' assignments.[8]

6.6 Provide development and training for staff and students in improving their skilful, appropriate, and ethical use of AI.

6.7 Each Faculty/School/Institute/Department to provide compulsory induction training in the ethical and practical uses of AI for all its staff and students, how to use and how not to use AI in teaching, learning, assessment, and research, its benefits, opportunities, harms, risks, practices, and requirements.

6.8 USJ staff must make clear to students, in writing, of what is permitted, not permitted, what is acceptable and what is not acceptable, and what is required concerning the purposes, uses, and disclosure of AI in teaching, learning, authorship, product output, research, and acknowledgments, why, how, and how to ensure that ethical processes and outcomes have been followed, and what sanctions operate for breaches of appropriate and ethical use of AI.

6.9 For each module, USJ staff must make clear to students, in writing, the limits of what is permitted and not permitted, and what is acceptable and what is not acceptable, in the uses of generative AI, for what purposes, and their disclosure.

6.10 Each Faculty/School/Institute/Department to decide, specify, and inform staff and students, in writing, of the procedures, sanctions, and implications that it operates for breaches of any of these requirements, and how these are addressed in practice. These

---

[7] For example, climate change, war, health, poverty, famine, equality, diversity, distribution of power, resources, governance, human rights,

[8] For example, 5% in Turnitin or other AI detection software.

sanctions should be communicated to students in writing in advance of the preparation and submission of submitted work, together with an indication of how this operates in practice for submitted work.

6.11 Sanctions and penalties for breaches of acceptable and ethical use of AI must be proportionate, depending on the nature, size, contents, severity, and significance of the breach, whether this is the first or repeated offence. Article 10.2 of the Regulations of the Academic Integrity Committee states that '[t]he severity of the penalty corresponds to the gravity of the breach of academic Regulations and integrity, within the procedures of the University and the laws of Macau. These can vary, for example, but not limited to:

> Article 10.1
>
> Within the Regulations of the University ... the Academic Integrity Committee has the power to:
>
> (a) Issue a 'warning letter';
> (b) Issue a 'serious warning letter';
> (c) Require 'under observation in the University';
> (d) Require a student 'to suspend study';
> (e) Require a student 'to withdraw from study';
> (f) Expel a student or staff member from the University;
> (g) Reduce the grade or mark awarded to a student;
> (h) Require a student to take one or more make-up examinations or assessments/ assignments;
> (i) Require a student to retake one or more courses/assessments/assignments;
> (j) Award a zero mark for an examination or course.
>
> For a staff member this can include:
>
> (k) Impose a penalty on the staff member, as it deems appropriate, and in accordance with the laws of Macau;
> (l) Suspend a staff member from working in the University for a fixed period of time, in accordance with the laws of Macau;
> (m) Initiate formal steps of terminating a staff member's contract in accordance with the terms of his/her contract, in accordance with the laws of Macau.

6.12 Plagiarism can lead to Disciplinary Procedures 'that may lead to the withdrawal of the respective student from the university, as well as to the loss of any credits or awards earned through the plagiarised work' (USJ document on plagiarism and the Regulations of the Academic Integrity Committee (2018)), e.g. Articles 10 and 13. Article 12 of these Regulations states this:

> 12.1 Students are required, where stipulated, to complete all their work from their own ideas and creative thinking, including coursework, research papers, dissertations, etc.
>
> 12.2 When staff and students quote other people's work or ideas, proper acknowledgement of the sources is required. Failure to do so will constitute plagiarism. In case of doubts about plagiarism, staff and students should take direct steps to ensure that they know what constitutes plagiarism and how to avoid it, including consulting with staff members about this. Plagiarism includes:
>
> (a) copying information that has or has not been published (including coursework and course notes of other staff and students) without using quotation marks;
> (b) paraphrasing or summarizing another person's creative work without proper acknowledgement;
> (c) quoting another person's ideas without proper acknowledgement;
> (d) quoting another person's research results without proper acknowledgement;
> (e) quoting another person's survey results without proper acknowledgement;
> (f) copying information from the internet without proper acknowledgement.

6.13 Each Faculty/School/Institute/Department to identify and report annually, in writing, the steps that it is taking on an ongoing basis to monitor, review, evaluate, and update its staff and students on its uses of AI in teaching, learning, and research, including changes and developments that impact on these.

7. AUTHORSHIP AND AI

7.1 This section indicates what is not allowed rather than what is allowed concerning authorship, taking cognizance of the ever-expanding field of AI and its applications. Examples of what might be allowed are indicated in Appendix A, though these are subject to change where deemed appropriate as the field of AI develops.

7.2 University staff must ensure that students are informed fully and formally (e.g. in writing) of the permitted AI uses, requirements, constraints, and consequences of breaching these, before any (assessed) work is submitted. Students must be informed of this in advance of submitting any work, and including what is required by way of disclosure of usage of AI, and the consequences of breaches of stated acceptability and disclosure. Appendix B provides two examples of disclosure documents from universities in the UK, indicating how to address acknowledgment, descriptions, and evidence.

7.3 University staff and students are bound by Regulations and procedures concerning Research Ethics, Academic Regulations, Academic Integrity, Plagiarism, Intellectual Property, and Graduate Attributes. References to these are made in Section 8.

7.4 Users must not simply 'cut and paste' text that has been generated by AI, in part or in whole, and pass it off as their own; where this is found, unacknowledged sources and uses of AI will be treated by the University as plagiarism. This includes, for example, but not limited to:
   (a) the AI creation of summaries of, conclusions to, abstracts for, documents or parts of documents originally created by the author.
   (b) the AI processing and creation of new text deriving from the input of text initially created by the original author.

7.5 False authorship occurs when a member of USJ has used unacknowledged AI to complete (assessed) work or research in whole or in part, without explicit permission by the relevant party at USJ. Unacknowledged AI is cheating and must not be done.

7.6 Unapproved usage of translation and paraphrasing (e.g. some of the functions of such software[9]) breaches USJ's commitment to honesty, and it is taken to be plagiarism and misconduct.

7.7 The University has practices for detecting uses of AI, how to evaluate it, and how to follow up on this, including but not limited to, suggested, non-prescriptive, non-compulsory examples:
   (i) receiving one or more drafts of assessed work with the use of AI fully indicated in them, e.g. from the very first version of the assessed work onwards.
   (ii) questioning the author on the meaning and contents of material submitted in assessed work, to check whether the author knows what it means, and on the

---

[9] For example 'Grammarly'.

usage of AI in the assessed work. USJ recognises that advances in AI software and detection of AI usage may be able to handle this on behalf of staff and students.

(iii) requiring full disclosure of the uses made of AI in the preparation and presentation of the assessed work, and which is approved by the appropriate member staff member of USJ, before the work is submitted. The use of AI must be documented and explainable. The author can be asked to explain it.

(iv) requiring the author to provide their statement that their assessed work is their own work, together with the disclosure of the use of AI.

(v) requiring the author to respond to concerns about AI detecting results in their work that indicate undisclosed AI usage.

7.8 University staff must take active steps to promote honesty, trust, and training in the acceptable and ethical use of AI by staff and students, writing and reporting on these for each module taught, where appropriate.

7.9 The SRTIs used at USJ and surveys of student life at USJ must include more on AI and generative AI usage.

7.10 USJ recognises that AI is changing very quickly, that AI usage detectors are constantly challenged by software that masks AI usage, and that many AI usage detectors cannot distinguish between what (a) has been generated *ab initio* and *in toto* by the AI (i.e. that the author has had little or no part in the output created) and (b) the processing of material provided by the author. A common, current response from the AI detector is simply to give a percentage of how much 'text is likely AI-generated'; this does not indicate if all the material is a new idea or a reworking of a given idea.

7.11 Researchers and those seeking publication should be alerted to publishers'/journals' policies, practices, and requirements concerning usage/non-usage of AI-created/ AI-modified text. Many journals reject articles which have used generative AI.

7.12 Examples of considerations in promoting and using A in authorship are set out in Appendix C.

8. REFERENCES

This policy should be read in conjunction with the University policies on: Teaching, Learning, and Assessment; Research Ethics; Academic Integrity; Plagiarism; Regulations for the Academic Integrity Committee; Terms of Reference for the Academic Integrity Committee; USJ Student Handbook – Bachelor; USJ Student Handbook – Master; USJ Student Handbook – PhD; Graduate Attributes.

9. POLICY RESPONSIBILITIES

9.1   Overall responsibility for oversight and implementation of this policy, its uptake and impact on practice in the University, its evaluation, monitoring, review and amendment, reside at all levels of the University, under the Executive Council, operating through: (a) the Rector and Vice-rectors; (b) the Executive Council and the Senate; (c) Deans and Heads of Departments; (d) Programme Coordinators and Research Coordinators.

9.2   All parties must ensure that the requirements of this policy (Section 6) are applied consistently, fully, and correctly, are monitored and reviewed, and that changes are made where appropriate as a consequence of such review.

9.3   This policy is subject to ongoing review and amendment as appropriate.

9.4   Amendments to this policy are made by the Executive Council in response to advice and recommendations from the Senate and Executive Council.

Author: Executive Council
Reviewed and confirmed by: Executive Council
Approved by: Senate
Approval date: 1 July 2024
Operational commencement date: 1 July 2024
Version number: USJ policy on Artificial Intelligence 001

APPENDIX A

EXAMPLES OF HOW AI SUPPORTS WORK AT THE UNIVERSITY

1. AI can support the creator/author of content in the following, though this does not imply that all of these can be used in the University:
    - (i) pre-writing: before content is created, writers can use AI to research topics, collect ideas, samples, etc.
    - (ii) helping authors to get started in writing.
    - (iii) searching, generating and extending ideas, identifying sources, synthesising text, and starting to know about and understand essential points about a topic.
    - (iv) provide translations of published articles and other published texts.
    - (v) providing inspiration, prompts, and guidance for users, as starting points.
    - (vi) assist with the organisation of work.
    - (vii) drafting: some AI tools support the generation of preparatory content.
    - (viii) assisting research and writing, but not replacing the author's ideas, creation, critical thinking, analysis, and voice.
    - (ix) revising: after content is generated, AI tools can aid writers in identifying and adjusting style/tone, register, spelling, punctuation, grammar, etc., particularly for those whose first language is not that of the writing, whilst recognising that university members should be adept at their own academic writing. This is an *aid*, not a replacement for the authors' own work.
    - (x) assisting international students with language challenges.
    - (xi) creating prompts for designing and making images and graphics.
    - (xii) assisting in making summaries or synopses of existing work.
    - (xiii) providing immediate answers to short questions as part of background research.
    - (xiv) sourcing definitions, identifying additional search keywords, formulating questions.
    - (xv) providing support for referencing conventions.
    - (xvi) comparing the author's own summary with that provided by AI.
    - (xvii) providing examples of writing in different registers, styles, and genres.
    - (xviii) suggesting ideas for images, graphics, designs, and visuals.
    - (xix) preparing lectures/teaching.
    - (xx) engaging with new and/or complex ideas.
2. AI tools can aid, but are not capable of providing, the following:
    - (i) Original and distinctive expressions
    - (ii) Demonstrating understanding and critical thinking
    - (iii) Creating, structuring, and refining an argument
    - (iv) Reflecting on the author's personal experience and practices
3. AI can create text which is then processed into a specific register then translated (where relevant) and run through 'humanising' software that conceals the use of AI in creating text. USJ does not permit this use.

APPENDIX B

TWO EXAMPLES OF GENERATIVE AI DOCUMENTS

EXAMPLE 1: GUIDANCE TO STUDENTS ON HOW TO ACKNOWLEDGE, DESCRIBE, AND REFERENCE THE USE OF GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TOOLS IN ASSESSED WORK

Loughborough University, UK, 2024

https://www.lboro.ac.uk/students/handbook/assessments/assessment-information/academic-misconduct/generative-ai/

"Step 1. You must acknowledge the use of Generative AI tools

If you have used Generative AI tools when producing your work for assessment, you must include a statement in your work, acknowledging their use by naming the tool(s) and how it was used, using the following statement:

'I acknowledge the use of (insert name of AI tool(s) and link) to generate materials for background research and independent study and/or that I have adapted to include within the work submitted for assessment. I confirm that all use of AI content is acknowledged and referenced appropriately.'

Step 2: Description of use

You must describe how the information or material (including images, computer code, video content etc.) was generated, including the prompts you used, what the output was and how the output was changed by you. You should use the following style of wording, depending on the nature of use:

The following prompts were input into (name of AI tool: [Provide details])

The output obtained was: (Paste the full output generated by the AI tool)

Full detail of how the output was adapted: (explain how you adapted the output for use in your work)

Step 3. You must reference the use of AI tools
As the content created in Generative AI tools cannot be replicated by another person and cannot be linked to, you must reference the outputs in the same way that you would a personal communication or correspondence."

EXAMPLE TWO: ACKNOWLEDGE, DESCRIBE, EVIDENCE

Sheffield University, UK, 2024

(https://docs.google.com/document/d/14F49nDGiaJAishcZQYXKp2vgYFcs2CPd31Jgg6gr5oI/edit#heading=h.q2nra3awbu8)

Acknowledge, Describe, Evidence template
Please include a completed version of this template as an appendix to any submitted work that has involved the use of generative AI technology.

Acknowledge I acknowledge the use of <insert AI system(s) and link> for the following purposes: to generate materials for background research and self-study in the drafting of this assessment. to generate materials that were included within my final assessment in modified form.
Describe Please provide a short summary of how you used generative AI in your assignment. You may wish to incl[ude the] following information: ● What prompts did you use? ● What outputs did you generate? ● How did you use/adapt/develop the outputs? Summary:
Evidence Please provide evidence of the outputs that you generated by copying and pasting below or by prov[iding a] screenshot. Generative AI system: Prompt: Output:
Declaration I confirm that no content created by generative AI technologies has been presented as my own [work]

APPENDIX C

CONSIDERATIONS IN PROMOTING AND USING AI

1. AI covers a wide gamut of AI, including Generative AI.
    (i) AI tools do not know the meaning of what they produce, nor can they be critical and evaluative.
    (ii) AI tools do not understand anything; they 'string words together in ways that are common on the internet' (UNESCO, 2023, *op cit*., p. 17).
    (iii) AI is susceptible to errors, including providing references that do not exist ('hallucinating').
    (iv) AI blurs the boundaries between 'proofreading' and 'writing', and its proofreading can be incorrect.
    (v) AI risks homogenising teaching, learning, and research rather than diversifying these.
    (vi) AI risks losing the authentic 'voice' of the authors to the template, inauthentic 'voice' and registers of AI.
    (vii) AI might not be able to distinguish between truth and falsehood.
    (viii) AI does not know right from wrong.
    (ix) AI can be biased and/or can amplify biases.
    (x) AI is not rational in the same way as humans, and it cannot understand the meaning(s), complexities, truth, morality, ethics, validity, and accuracy of its subject matter.
    (xi) AI can inhibit higher order thinking in humans.
    (xii) AI is unreliable for evaluation.
    (xiii) AI is selective on what it includes, e.g. by date, content, availability (e.g. firewalls), search potential. This can be biased and discriminatory.
    (xiv) AI learns how to respond, but how well it achieves this varies.
    (xv) AI can use work without attribution, accountability, completeness, context, ownership.
    (xvi) AI can increase risks of misinformation, fraud, fake content, risk to privacy, and information security risks, including its ability to mimic humans. Handling risk is a major task, e.g. (a) no data should be provided to generative AI if any part of those data should not be included in results produced by that system; (b) if multiple people are using the system, one person's data potentially may be revealed to someone else; (c) systems share data with other systems and platforms.
2. Authors should be alerted to frequently asked questions, e.g.:
    i. Have you used (generative) AI in writing your assessed work?
    ii. Where have you used (generative) AI for, and for what purposes: to create knowledge, or to submit your original text and have it upgraded into high level academic English?

14

iii. What software have you used in (generative) AI? ChatGPT, Grammarly, Bard, Bing, other software for turning low level English into high level academic English, and for creating/generating new text?

iv. Where have you disclosed what software you have used in writing the text, for what purposes, and where in the text? All the citations for software, and its uses, must be indicated.

v. Where and how have you used (generative) AI in compiling/revising, writing the text?

vi. If the (generative) AI was used to upgrade the register of the text, into high level academic English, then has this been approved by the appropriate USJ staff member, and has that staff member seen both the original text that you put into the software, and the outcome, and then seen what changes have been made to the outcome, to ensure that it is in an appropriate register?

vii. What standard for your own academic writing must you achieve and demonstrate?

viii. How close to your non-AI writing ability is the assessed work?

ix. If the (generative) AI was used to generate ideas, then has this been disclosed before any submission, for the relevant staff member to check whether this is acceptable, as the intention of the assessed work is for it to be the author's own work?

3. Existing software for creating and editing text is often identifiable by the kind of words used, grammar used, register, style, clichés used, stylistic repetition, and similarity throughout the text in question.