Draft interim SU guidelines on allowable AI use and academic integrity in assessment

Executive summary

These institutional guidelines describe Stellenbosch University's interim approach to the ethical and responsible use of AI tools in assessment practices. The guidelines aim to support transformative learning and achievement of sought after graduate attributes. It sees assessment as an integrated part of the teaching-learning-assessment at SU. With respect to summative assessment, it offers two perspectives: a) guidance to lecturers to help direct their practices towards enabling student learning in an AI-enabled world, and b) guidance to students to use AI tools and systems in a responsible manner that supports their shorter and longer-term learning. Although relevant to all teaching-learning-assessment practices at SU, these guidelines have a specific bearing on all uninvigilated, summative assessment activities, both during and at the end of the module,

It is necessary to distinguish between: (1) the ethical and responsible utilization of AI tools in generating products to be presented as one's own, and (2) the innovative integration of AI tools into TLA practices. This document focuses on the former aspect. The latter is addressed through professional learning opportunities and resources available at SU. The same holds for (re)considering TLA practices which, though important, is not the focus here.

This document will focus on the use of generative AI, or GenAI, systems such as ChatGPT, Bing, Bard and Midjourney, which are capable of generating images, text, or music. The guidelines start from the perspective that ongoing technological advances will increasingly require graduates to develop a working knowledge of how to use generative AI systems responsibly and with integrity. It suggests that the most responsible approach to this would be a focus on cultivating academic integrity.

The guidelines are underpinned by various SU policies, depicting SU's teaching-learning-assessment aspirations[1]. Key amongst these is the SU strategy for Teaching and Learning's description of desired graduate attributes, the draft SU Teaching-Learning policy, which focuses on a learning-centred approach, and the institutional values described in the Code 2040 Integrated Ethics Code. The guidelines also draw on the SU Assessment policy's calls for transparent and fair assessments that produce valid conclusions about student progress and achievement, the SU Plagiarism policy, and the Procedure for the investigation and management of allegations of plagiarism.

The guidelines envision three possible AI use scenarios:
1. Allow/encourage responsible use.
2. Disallow the use of AI, based on sound pedagogical reasoning.
3. Require AI use, also with appropriate declarations, and alternatives offered.

It recommends that AI use be declared, both by lecturers and students, and that AI use guidelines be clearly communicated. Permissible use guidelines as well as lecture-use declarations should be communicated in the module framework. Finally, the guidelines include a student declaration form that requires an indication of the AI tools used, as well as where and what they were used for, and a justification for claims that the work is the student's own,

Table of Contents

Introduction

These institutional guidelines offer Stellenbosch University's interim approach to the responsible use of AI tools. Where faculty-specific guidelines have been published, these are subject to the overarching SU-suggested principles as outlined below. Given the rapid pace at which the AI landscape is developing these guidelines will have to be reviewed annually, at least.

The guidelines offer two perspectives: A) guidance to lecturers to change practice that will enable student learning in an AI world, and B) guidance to students to use AI in a responsible manner that supports their shorter and longer-term learning. The document starts from the perspective that graduates will need to continuously develop a working knowledge on how to use generative AI systems responsibly. Rooted in a **learning-centred** approach, in which learning is conceptualised as a partnership, and where students are seen as co-creators of knowledge and learning environments, the guidelines are offered to **cultivating integrity**. It suggests key principles that can be used to guide responsible AI use, for both lecturers and students. Although these guidelines include reference to the SU Student Disciplinary Code and handling of misconduct, we suggest that it should not be taken as the starting point.

Key terms and definitions used in this document:
- **Declaration**: a descriptive document signed by users to a) declare their use of AI tools and systems, and b) acknowledge their understanding of what such use implies within the SU environment.
- **Reference/citation**: applying appropriate referencing and citation conventions to acknowledge the sources of information and the ideas of other researchers included in the content.
- **Individual-created content**: this refers to any created work, content, and output that is produced by an individual. The individual takes responsibility for the created output, whether that be text, structures, systems, tools, music, and images.
- **AI-generated content**: this refers to any work, content, and output that is created with the primary use of AI tools. The user takes responsibility for created output, whether that be text, structures, systems, tools, music, and images.

1. SU policy landscape

Higher Education contexts, as well as the world our graduates will enter after their studies, changed substantially at the end of 2022 when generative AI systems became accessible to a global audience. These ongoing technological advances will increasingly require graduates to act with integrity. SU has various policies which help to create a framework for cultivating academic integrity. These include the SU strategy for Teaching and Learning, the draft SU Teaching-Learning policy, SU Integrated Values framework, the SU Assessment policy, the SU Plagiarism policy, the Procedure for the investigation and management of allegations of plagiarism and the Disciplinary code for students of Stellenbosch University.

The **SU strategy for Teaching and Learning** (p. 4)[2] describes student success as "achieving the level of preparation—in terms of knowledge, capabilities, and personal qualities—that will enable [students] to both thrive and contribute in a fast-changing economy and in turbulent, highly demanding global, societal and often personal contexts". To this end, the draft **SU Teaching-Learning policy[3]** adds the need for graduates who "can contribute to a complex society" (p. 3) while the SU Teaching and Learning Strategy holds that "knowing and learning", for lecturers and students, is inevitably accompanied by "responsibility and accountability" (p. 8). The strategy also emphasises the idea of "cultivating skills, values and ideas that enhance [the graduate's] own humanity".

Importantly, the SU Integrated Values framework, as found in the **Code 2040 Integrated Ethics Code[4]**, describes SU's institutional values as excellence, respect, equity, compassion, and *accountability*, with accountability formulated as: SU staff, students and stakeholders "be[ing] accountable for the execution and consequences of all our actions" (p. 4). These values are included in the SU Student Disciplinary code as well. In addition, the **SU Assessment policy[5]** calls for transparent and fair assessments that produce valid conclusions about student progress and achievement, while the **SU Plagiarism policy[6]** emphasizes the importance of students submitting work that is authentically their own and supported by proper acknowledgement and referencing. This policy highlights honesty and transparency as "two core values that must be upheld when participating in the academic activities of the University. The plagiarism policy also states that "all cases of plagiarism must be handled consistently according to established processes, either at department, faculty, or central management level. These processes must comply with both this Policy and the **Procedure for the investigation and management of allegations of plagiarism**"[7] (p. 3).

In this context, **academic integrity**, in terms of teaching-learning-assessment (TLA) and research, is defined as "foster[ing] and defend[ing] intellectual honesty by not committing plagiarism, self-plagiarism, or any other form of academic fraud" (Code of ethics, p. 5). **Plagiarism**, in turn. is defined as "[t]he use of the ideas or material of others without acknowledgement, or the re-use of one's own previously evaluated or published material without acknowledgement (self-plagiarism)" (SU Policy on Plagiarism, p. 2) while **academic misconduct** (Disciplinary code for students of Stellenbosch University p. 3)[8] is taken to mean "a breach of academic integrity" through, amongst others plagiarism, cheating, collusion or fabrication. This also refers to AI-assisted plagiarism, sometimes referred to as aigiarism[9]. It is

---

[2] Citing Kuh 2008, cited in Framework for Institutional Quality Enhancement in the Second Period of Quality Assurance, January 2013, SU T&L Strategy
[3] Draft revised SU Teaching and Learning policy
[4] SU Code 2040 Integrated Ethics code
[5] SU Assessment policy
[6] SU Policy on Plagiarism
[7] SU Procedure for handling allegations of plagiarism
[8] SU Disciplinary code
[9] Aigiarism explained

within these broad ideals that our thinking about the use of AI technologies for TLA should be guided.

2. Principles for practice

The SU policy documents create a framework underpinned by various principles of which the following are key to maintaining our position as a learning-centred institution, defined by integrity: accountability (including the ideas of acknowledgement and attribution), authenticity, fairness, and transparency. (including the ideas of acknowledgement and attribution). With the lines between authentic human work and AI output becoming increasingly blurred, these principles operate as a framework for guiding TLA practice. For this document, these principles will be defined as follows:

Accountability

1. Our ideas are informed by others. We recognise this through acknowledgement and referencing (SU Plagiarism policy).
2. It is the responsibility of the author or creator of a piece or product to ensure that their work is factually correct and not likely to cause harm, i.e., through spreading false information, misappropriation or sharing of personal information. AI tools don't have accountability.
3. AI tools don't have unique ideas of their own, as they make use of existing datasets to generate their information/responses. Therefore, AI tools can not be referenced as the content author or creator. Instead, it is the user's responsibility to a) analyse and verify the AI-generated content and b) cite the original authors, as per the referencing convention. It needs to be noted that while some AI tools (i.e. Bard) can offer sources, these sources still need to be verified to ensure accuracy, quality and relevance (i.e. not all websites are acceptable as sources in the academic context).

Lecturer	Student
Familiarise students with the principles underpinning responsible AI use. This includes instances where AI use is not permitted, and why that is the case. Model accountable AI use, i.e., through transparency about own use of AI tools. Encourage critical conversation about ethical considerations as well as possible sources of bias, and the implications thereof. Ensure that AI output used in teaching is factually correct and not likely to cause harm.	You are responsible for what you create and how it impacts others and society. AI tools don't have accountability. It is thus your responsibility to ensure that work submitted under your name is factually correct and not likely to cause harm, i.e., through spreading false information, misappropriation or sharing of personal information.

Authenticity

1. To validly determine whether students have learned and achieved the outcomes of a module or programme, lecturers need to know that the work they are assessing is a student's own (SU Assessment policy).
2. The original contribution to work presented by a person as part of an academic activity can only be evaluated if it can be distinguished clearly from the contributions of others or the author's own earlier work.
3. Where AI tools have been used, it should be declared what tools were used and how and where they were used. The student should also indicate why the work still qualifies as their own, especially if AI systems were used in drafting.

Lecturer	Student
Take note of AI and its capabilities in their context, so as to create assessments where the use of AI is of less value, or is difficult.	It is your responsibility to ensure that you know the requirements (i.e., whether AI use is allowed) for each assessment task. The

Carefully consider how we can ensure that work remains a student's own.

Create concrete guidelines on AI use during assessment

SU offers various resources (DLTE website)[10], a webinar series, a Community of Practice[11] (headed by Dr Albert Strever) and a short course[12] on AI literacies for teaching-learning-assessment. | default assumption should be that it is not allowed.

When allowed, you need to guard against outsourcing your learning to AI. You **may potentially use** AI tools to assist **where relevant and where permitted by your lecturer**, but *not* to complete the assessment on your behalf. When using AI, critically engage with AI-generated output, ensuring that any output you retain accurately presents your position and voice. Consider how you will make a case for the work being authentically yours, i.e., can you answer detailed questions or explain why you chose a certain direction, referred to a certain author, drew a specific conclusion e.g., in an oral or interview? Do you understand the content, and can you explain it in your own words? Can you summarise key ideas from the content? |

Transparency

1. The SU Assessment policy advocates for transparency, with "students receive clear information about the assessment requirements against which their performance will be measured for the various assessment opportunities and assessment methods".
2. In the submission of assessment tasks, detailing the process of using AI can help to safeguard students against unintentional wrongdoing, and aid in suspected cases of wrongdoing (plagiarism or aigiarism).

Lecturer	**Student**
Clearly communicate guidelines for permissible AI use by students as well as the reasons for these guidelines.
Clearly communicate how AI tools will be used in assessment, i.e. what it will be used for and how.
In line with POPIA, no confidential or personal student information should be fed to AI systems.
Remember that, even with chat history disabled, these systems still collect meta data (about your interaction with the platform, your device etc) without necessarily indicating how this will be used or who might have access to it.
Where AI use is allowed or required (which needs to be carefully considered), students need to be made aware of these precautions and facts as well. | You should clearly and honestly declare the use of AI tools and their outputs as well as the extent of the use, i.e., refer to the 'search strategy' and rationale that informed this. Consider questions such as: why was this the most appropriate approach or option, what are the limitations, etc.?

Review the privacy settings of your AI application account/s with the provider/s to ensure you are aware of what data is being collected and how it is being used (in the Terms and Conditions when registering). |

---

[10] DLTE website content on AI literacies
[11] Form to indicate interest in being part of this community of practice
[12] More information the short course, starting on 1 June 2023

Fairness

2. An assessment system is only fair if all students have an equal chance of success. Fairness requires that suspected irregularities be handled carefully and responsibly, given the lack of verifiability in such cases.
3. Students submitting work that is not their own gain an unfair advantage over other students that can influence admission, support and reward processes.

Lecturer	Student
Design assessments to minimize the chance of students submitting work that is not their own, as their own. As far as possible, uses multiple sources of information during decisions about e.g., admission to further study. Consider fairness, equity, and access issues that may result from disparities in digital skills as well as the affordability and accessibility of AI tools. Provide alternatives where AI use is required or strongly recommended. Not all students might be comfortable signing up to tools that require registration. No student can be forced to use GenAI tools that require signing up.	Your use of AI tools/ systems should be ethical and responsible and should comply with academic integrity standards. Be cautious of misusing AI-generated output, since this output could be false and could also result in misrepresenting your own abilities. You should always be able to provide evidence of your understanding and the process/methodology you followed to reaching an answer. The use the AI may also limit your preparedness for subsequent assessments.

3. General guidelines

Gimpel et. al. (2023: 33)[13] strongly suggest that universities develop **declarations** "that explicitly address the usage of generative AI tools". They add that such declarations should not be "binary … (e.g., "I used ChatGPT")" but "should highlight which steps in the research and writing process ChatGPT and other tools were used for (e.g., developing an outline or proofreading). It is further advised that students are asked to keep a record of their interaction (prompts and outputs) with AI tools. i.e., by taking screenshots of the conversations, to submit with their work. Further, such declarations should include a statement of student responsibility regarding potential errors, copyright violations, or plagiarism that technical tools inserted in their work."

Overreliance on generative AI will be to the detriment of the student's learning process, but it is, unfortunately not easy to monitor the use of AI systems, especially since these are increasingly incorporated in digital workspaces. SU thus recommends cultivating academic integrity rather than an outright banning of the use of AI tools where a declaration pre-empts possible problems through transparency, with misconduct or irregularities in the declaration handled through existing means (i.e., the Procedure for the investigation and management of allegations of plagiarism).

3.1 Possibilities with respect to the use of AI tools at SU

    i. Allow/encourage the responsible use with appropriate declarations, described later in this document.

    ii. Disallow the use of AI. The preferred consideration would be to safeguard the assessment against AI use. It is, however, the prerogative of the environment or lecturer to decide to disallow the

---

[13] Gimpel, H., et. al. (2023). Unlocking the power of generative AI models and systems such asGPT-4 and ChatGPT for higher education.

use of certain tools for certain tasks. If this option is chosen, it should be noted that we do not currently have fully reliable digital methods of ensuring this, e.g. monitoring or detecting AI use. Current AI detection tools can thus not be used as a basis for penalising anyone. The choice to disallow AI use should not be based on assumptions related to the familiarity of this approach of disallowing outside help. This point raises concerns about the authenticity of student work beyond AI use, i.e., we also do not really have reliable means to identity work produced by essay mills or other paid for parties. Furthermore, given the difficulty in monitoring AI use, banning it without additional measures to ensure authenticity (i.e. oral exams), could simply mean that some students continue to use it, thereby gaining an unfair advantage in terms of places for post graduate studies, funding etc. This could not only lead to unfair discrimination against students who choose honesty, but could erode the academic project.

iii. Require AI use, also with appropriate declarations, described later in this document. In such cases, alternatives should be considered for cases where students opt out of signing up for a tool requiring registration.

3.2 Permissible AI use

These guidelines follow the approach used by various publishing houses and journals. We all consult various sources and often use tools when producing knowledge work. We already have rules and guidelines to ensure that we do this ethically, i.e., take responsibility for our production/s (accountability), ensuring that what we produce is our own work (authenticity) and mentioning our sources and tools according to a generally agreed upon set of rules (transparency). The principle of accountability applies across contexts to include outputs such as, but not limited to, tools, structures, systems, texts and artwork.

The availability of generative AI, and the introduction of various AI co-pilots into digital workspaces, means that the lines between human and AI-generated outputs (writing, art, coding, etc) are becoming increasingly blurred. necessitating the need for new approaches to ethical knowledge production.

The tables below offer suggestions in this regard while the AI and cultivating academic integrity draft infographic[14] helps students consider the implications of different scenarios, as well as methods for acknowledging and attributing help, in the form of AI tools and human input. This approach is aimed at encouraging students to take ownership of and responsibility for their work, whilst promoting the key skill of considered, responsible AI use. Table 1 offers a framework for mentioning the use of generative AI, such as large language models (LLMs).

Table 1: AI-use in student work quick guide

Authorship	"Any attribution of authorship carries with it accountability for the work, and AI tools cannot take such responsibility."[15] In the context of these guidelines, the recommendation is that all AI-generated outputs be checked for accuracy, bias, etc., since you, as an individual content creator, are accountable for the product you created.

---

14 AI and cultivating academic integrity.
15 From [Nature's guidelines](#)

Referencing and citation (in-text and reference list)	"The purpose of the reference list is to allow your sources to be found by your reader. It also gives credit to authors you have consulted for their ideas. All references cited in the text must appear in the reference list, except for personal communications (such as conversations or emails) *which cannot be retrieved.*"[16] Since the ideas of AI tools, such as ChatGPT, BING, Bard, etc, originally belong to other authors, and often cannot be retrieved (similar to personal communications). We do not suggest citing these tools in in-text references or the reference list. As far as possible, the work of the original authors should be sought out and fact-checking should be carried out. These original authors and sources of facts should be referenced.
Declaring	Many journals ask that authors disclose or declare their use of AI and AI-assisted technologies, such as Large Language Models (not spelling or grammar checkers and reference managers), see for example Elsevier[17], (in a separate section, and possibly also in methodology and methods), and Nature, (in methods or acknowledgements). To this end, it is advisable to also document the interaction with the AI through screenshots, etc. We recommend an AI Use Disclosure Statement, similar to various other universities.

4. Student use of generative AI tools

The Draft revised SU Teaching- Learning policy positions SU as a learning-centred institution. The key principles for students translate to being accountable for what you produce through critically engaging with AI-generated output, being transparent, accurately attributing ideas and ensuring that the work is still authentic (and not an uncritical submission of AI output as your own).

Table 2 below, that can be offered to students, offers ways of making sense of the impact of various forms of AI use on student learning. To this end, it relates eight qualitatively different AI-use activities to more familiar activities and then suggests key responses to ensure learning and/or responsible AI use in each case.

Table 2: AI-use guidance

AI use for	This use is similar to	Be aware of
Ideation phase of an assignment		
brainstorming ideas, i.e., a topic or approach.	Discussing the idea with a friend, tutor or teacher	It might be a good idea to keep a record of the prompts you used and the outputs you received.
creating an outline or a plan	Google search or checking Wikipedia	It is your responsibility to critically engage with the output of the AI tool and check the accuracy of the output.
Drafting phase		
learning about a particular topic	Google search or checking Wikipedia	You need to (1) find the original owner of the idea and (2) ensure that all content is factually correct

---

[16] From APA's guidelines
17 From Elsevier's guidelines

		and not likely to harm anyone through spreading untruths or sharing personal information.
searching for literature on a topic	SU Library and database or a google scholar search.	Always check that references are real, suitably academic and include the key works. Include URLs of all references. Also check for similarity; some research tools offer near direct quotes without indicating it as such.
generating or drafting a coherent output, i.e. using AI to complete the assessment on your behalf	enlisting someone else to write your paper or complete your project for you.	Indicate how you interacted, i.e. improved the output. It should still be you own work. You should be able to answer detailed questions, i.e. why you chose a certain direction, referred to a certain author, drew a specific conclusion during an oral or interview? Using paraphrasing or translation software tools on texts you did not personally write or make a substantial input to, and did not reference, cover up plagiarism is deemed as academic misconduct.
Revising phase		
language editing	similar to using a spelling checker	Language enhancement tools are increasingly available in word processing software (such as MS Word) and tools such as Grammarly are also increasingly popular. Always save a draft of your original text as backup and remember to check the accuracy of the suggestions made by language editing software. Make sure that the authenticity of your text is not compromised.
Soliciting feedback	asking a friend or tutor or teacher to read you work and offer you feedback.	You may be asked to provide evidence of your learning process, i.e. a copy of the feedback on how you responded to it. Remember that you are ultimately accountable for your work and that you should feel comfortable with the improvements you ultimately incorporate.
revising a piece of work	asking someone else to improve your work.	Ensure that the work is still your own, captures your voice and that you can defend it. Also check the accuracy of the output; AI revisions can introduce factual errors during paraphrasing.

It is recommended that students complete the declaration and checklist below, together with the plagiarism declaration when submitting work:

4.1 AI use declaration

Table 3: AI use declaration

AI system used	What was it used for?	Where in the work was it used/what was it used for?
To what extent did you use AI and why do you consider the work as your own?		

4.2 AI use checklist

4.2.1 I am convinced and can support my claim that my assessment product is an indication of my own learning, knowledge, skills, and understanding.

4.2.2 Where I have used AI tools for enhancing my own creation of ideas and words, I acknowledge that I have to declare it.

4.2.3 Where I have used AI tools for generating new ideas, words, code, image-prompts for other AI Image-generating tools, or structure and even presentations (or other AI tools that can be used as assistants to the knowledge building and representing process), I have declared and documented the use of such tools and I am prepared to talk about the process I used and what it contributed to my learning and insights.

4.2.4 I am aware that the lecturer can ask me to demonstrate my learning, for example through explaining the choices I made in terms of approach, content used, literature selected, conclusions drawn, etc. through an additional assessment like an oral (for example).

4.2.5 Where the use of AI tools was explicitly not allowed, I can say with integrity and honesty that I did not use any such tools.

4.2.6 I understand that if I am not able to agree to the above points, there is a chance that my academic behaviour will be deemed unethical and might lead to a disciplinary case being brought against me on the grounds of cheating or plagiarism and that the standard procedures for such behaviour will be followed.

4.2.7 As per the Disciplinary Code of SU (par. 10.2.1 and 10.2.2) I understand that I take responsibility for the integrity of my work, which includes the obligation to ask for clarification from an academic member of staff if I am unsure of anything, and that I strictly adhered to all instructions received in the course of the academic assessment by relevant and authorised staff (whether the instruction is in oral or written format).

4.2.8 I understand that when AI-tools were not allowed in the assessment, or where I am not able to document and declare my use of such tools, this behaviour will be deemed as cheating in examinations and assessments (Disciplinary Code 1.1 c.) as I referred to "unauthorized notes, books, electronic devices or other reference material".

5. Lecturer use and response to the use of generative AI tools.

Lecturer use can refer to both how the lecturer is using AI tools in their own teaching-learning-assessment practices and what they are encouraging and allowing in terms of student use. The recommendations below apply to both scenarios, and is taken from Anders (2023: 44-45 and 47)[18]:

5.1 General guidelines for lecturer use

5.1.1 The use of AI tools must be fairly and consistently applied and equitable access to such tools is crucial.

5.1.2 Ensure that there is no ambiguity regarding what is allowed and what isn't, when AI can be used, when it can't, and what constitutes academic integrity misconduct.

5.1.2.1 This can be done through discussion in the classroom and including specific information in the module framework, assignment instructions, and even assessment rubrics.

5.1.3 Ensure that policies and procedures are clear, fully accessible and continuously expressed to students and that consequences/ramifications are known to students.

---

[18] Anders Brent. The AI Literacy Imperative: Empowering Instructors & Students (pp. 44-45). Kindle Edition.

5.1.4 Where used in assessment of student work, the following conditions hold:

5.1.4.I SU allows the use of AI tools such as ChatGPT and Quillbot to assist the lecturer with reviewing the assessment, e.g., finding themes or weaknesses in student work, but on condition that the assessment is not fully outsourced to machines. The tools can assist, to minimize potential bias (e.g. related to language skills), but their output should be verified to ensure that you agree with it. No confidential (e.g. personal reflections) or personal student information should be shared with these kinds of AI systems. Final accountability, as with writing, lies with the lecturer (AI systems are not fool proof and cannot be held accountable).

5.1.4.II The lecturer, just as with students using these tools, should check the results for accuracy.

5.1.4.III Declare which tools will be used as well as how they will be used and how student queries and AI output will be verified and/or moderated, both for AI-generated text detection, and for assessing student work, in the module framework (open to internal and external moderation).

5.1.4.IV No personal student information or sensitive information, i.e., reflections sharing personal experiences should be uploaded to platforms outside the SU digital firewall.

5.1.4.V Be aware that there are no detection systems that are 100% reliable, they can be easily circumvented, and some systems can create different levels of false-positives (saying text is AI-generated or plagiarized when it isn't).

5.2 AI Lecturer AI use Checklist

5.2.1 I am familiar with the implications that the existence of generative AI technologies can have on how my planned assessment will be done.

5.2.2 I have given thought to how to redesign my assessment accordingly.

5.2.3 I have decided to either allow the responsible use of Ai tools, but with the clear understanding that students should declare their use or prohibit the use of AI tools for a given assessment altogether.

5.2.4 I have clearly communicated my decision in terms of SU's overarching approach and guidelines to my students.

5.2.5 Where I plan to use AI tools to assist me in assessing students' work, I have also communicated that to my students.

5.2.6 When students submit long-form English language text through Turnitin, I understand that the AI-generated percentage score is not immediate proof of plagiarism (or "aigiarism"), but an important a caution as to possible use of generative AI tools to create text that is not the student's own words, or where the student did not acknowledge, declare, cite or explain their process in using the AI-generated outputs. I understand that, as indicated in point 5.3.4 below, students currently cannot see the % of AI-generated text and that penalising them for it, can be deemed unfair.[i]

5.3 Turnitin guidelines[19]

There are several concerns with the use of AI text detectors, including the functionality in Turnitin, which needs to be considered.

> 5.3.1   Although Turnitin states that it identifies long-form English language AI-generated text with 98% certainty it is not determinative[20]. Whilst it can be used as a form of evidence, it cannot be used exclusively and determinatively to prove academic misconduct.
>
> 5.3.2   According to Turnitin's website, they state that "[they] will likely miss up to 15% of text written by AI". That is fair scope for wrongdoing. This means in a text suggested to be 20% written by AI, the real AI contribution could be 35% and higher, which is substantial, given that only longform text is considered.
>
> 5.3.3   Turnitin states that they currently have a 1% false positive rate (i.e., incorrectly identifying fully human-written text as AI-generated). The challenge with this is that there is no way of verifying the result, unlike with the Turnitin similarity report.
>
> 5.3.4   The AI text % is not currently shared with students, so there is no formative value in it. This also means that we are now using the tool differently than we have for the past years, and if we choose to do this, it should be communicated with our students clearly.
>
> 5.3.5   If this approach is chosen, how will an acceptable AI text % be determined?
>
> 5.3.6   What will be indicated as AI-generated text: can it indicate where AI has been used to improve or edit text as opposed to AI-generated content. What about tools such as Grammarly and Quillbot?

6 Procedure to follow in cases of suspected irregularities

According to the student disciplinary code academic activity at the University is based on the values of academic rigour, honesty and trust which together form the bedrock of academic integrity. Academic Misconduct undermines the value of academic integrity and is prohibited. Section 10.2 in this disciplinary code further unpacks this and thus applies here.

The **procedure for the investigation and management of allegations of plagiarism[21]** states that "5.1.2 Less serious cases, as determined in accordance with the factors set out in the Policy, are dealt with at department or faculty level, where appropriate and according to internal faculty processes which must be approved by the Dean or Faculty Board and documented in writing for reporting purposes. Such processes must be fair and, in accordance with the developmental and remedial approach described in the Policy and should ideally provide an opportunity for discussion with the student prior to finalising the case and determining an outcome" (p. 6).

---

[19] Although there are other tools aimed at detecting AI-generated text, we only include Turnitin here, since it is in common use at SU.
[20] AI-generated text detection by Turnitin - FAQs
[21] SU Procedure for handling allegations of plagiarism

The SU procedure for the investigation and management of allegations of plagiarism or of cheating according to the Disciplinary code is followed. As with plagiarism allegations, it is suggested that:

6.1 The student be contacted via email and asked to a discussion of the concern

6.2 The student should also be supplied with

      6.2.1   The allegation/s

      6.2.2   Details of the work that will be discussed

      6.2.3   A mark-up of the work

6.3 If this is the first time that the student has been suspected of this kind of irregularity, the discussion should be seen as mostly formative. The student can be advised to bring

      6.3.1   Their declaration of AI use

      6.3.2   Evidence such as relevant AI chat history

6.4 During the discussion, the student will be given the opportunity to

      6.4.1   Explain how they used AI, why they used it as well as what they used

      6.4.2   Answer questions related to the content of the submitted work

---