

# Summary of Institutional Responses to the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence

## Australasian Academic Integrity Network

### Version 1.1, May 2023

This document has been prepared from information submitted by members of the Australasian Academic Integrity Network, and a desk audit of universities, undertaken initially by Kerry Johnson, University of South Australia and supplemented by Bernie Marshall, Deakin University. If an institution is not listed below, it generally means that either documentation was behind a firewall and needed staff log-in, or that their academic integrity policies did not mention use of artificial intelligence.

We have used the term **Gen-AI** throughout this document to refer to generative artificial intelligence, rather than AI, given we also use that latter acronym for ‘academic integrity’.

This is version 1.1. We will update this document regularly. Please send edits, corrections, and additions to Bernie Marshall at [bernie.marshall@deakin.edu.au](mailto:bernie.marshall@deakin.edu.au)

University	Notes and links
Australian Catholic University	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>Section 8 of the <a href="#">Student Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy</a> now has the unauthorised use of generative AI as a distinct category of academic misconduct, rather than as a sub-set of plagiarism or contract cheating, as some other universities have done: “(c) <b>Unauthorised or undisclosed use of artificial intelligence:</b> using generative (content production) artificial intelligence, paraphrasing and translation tools unless their use is authorised in the assessment requirements and is properly acknowledged.”</p> <p><b>ACADEMIC SKILLS AND SUPPORT</b></p> <p>The Library <a href="#">referencing guides</a> provide advice on the use of Gen-AI in general and has updated APA7 and ACLC4 referencing guides to cover use of AI tools.</p>
Australian National University	<p><b>SUPPORT FOR STAFF</b></p> <p><a href="#">ChatGPT: What ANU academics need to know</a>. Covers use of Gen-AI by students and staff, potential impacts on assessment design and academic integrity, steps ANU is taking in response to Gen-AI, and actions for course convenors and links to further readings and resources. Includes a <a href="#">6-page resource</a> for teachers and <a href="#">PPT slides</a> for use in class.</p> <p>ANU’s Responsible Innovation Lab has a <a href="#">blog</a> with a number of relevant posts.</p> <p>ANU Reporter <a href="#">article</a> <i>Should I be worried about ChatGPT?</i></p>
Avondale University	<p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>The library guide <i>Assignment Writing and Presentation Guide. APA Style 7<sup>th</sup> Edition</i> (<a href="#">link</a>), section 1.5, gives general advice in line with the</p>

University	Notes and links
	AAIN Guidelines published in March 2023 ( <a href="#">link</a> ) concerning authorised and ethical use of Gen-AI tools.
Bond University	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">Student Code of Conduct</a>, in the section on Academic Misconduct, and the <a href="#">Academic Integrity policy</a> categorise the unauthorised use of artificial intelligence tools as academic misconduct.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p><a href="#">Info page</a> and <a href="#">FAQ page</a> provide information on citing generative AI output, with links for students to both internal and external resources.</p>
Central Queensland University	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>CQU’s <a href="#">Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure</a> classifies the unauthorised use of artificial intelligence as contract cheating – see clause 3.19.</p>
Charles Darwin University	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>While the CDU <a href="#">Student Academic Integrity Policy</a> makes no specific mention of artificial intelligence, clause 13 has the following explanation of contract cheating, that would seem to encompass inappropriate use of Gen-AI: <i>Securing a person or computer program to complete part or all of your assessment, including using work prepared by another person.</i></p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>The Current Students <a href="#">webpage on Academic Integrity</a> provides useful information for students on how the university is approaching the appropriate and inappropriate use of artificial intelligence.</p>
Charles Sturt University	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>While the CSU <a href="#">Academic Integrity Policy</a> does not mention artificial intelligence, clause 33a iv states that ‘cheating’ covers situations of students “<i>using resources during the task that are not specifically permitted by the instructions for that task</i>”, which would cover the inappropriate use of Gen-AI. The <a href="#">Student Misconduct Rule 2020</a> expands on this, specifying ‘cheating’ includes “<i>using a resource or device during the task that is not specifically permitted by the instructions for the task, including but not limited to submitting work generated by an algorithm, computer generator or other artificial intelligence</i>” (see clause 27a iv).</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STAFF</b></p> <p>Information has been added to the staff <a href="#">Academic Integrity page</a> to cover the use of Gen-AI in learning and assessment: “<i>An academic may permit students to use generative AI tools to produce an assessment. This must be explicitly outlined in the relevant assessment item(s) criteria within the subject outline.</i>”</p>

University	Notes and links
Curtin College	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>The College has updated the key principles of its academic integrity policy to include this statement: <i>That students are assessed for work that is verifiably their own. While the use of technology such as translators and generative artificial intelligence (ChatGPT, Bard, Bing, etc.) may have appropriate use cases, students should seek feedback from their teachers when using such tools to ensure their use does not constitute academic misconduct such as Cheating.</i></p> <p>The definition of cheating has also been updated: <i>Submitting work that is generated and/or enhanced with the use of digital assistance (e.g. translators, digital assistants, or artificial intelligence tools such as ChatGPT, Bard, Bing, etc.) to the extent where the submitted work isn't a reasonable representation of the student's abilities and/or cannot be considered an original work of the student unless otherwise explicitly permitted by the assessment specification.</i></p>
Curtin University	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>Curtin have indicated that they felt that no changes were necessary for the <a href="#">Student Discipline statute</a> and the <a href="#">Academic Misconduct Rules 2021</a> to accommodate the unauthorised use of Gen-AI tools.</p> <p>One unusual aspect of their framework is the use of 'confirmation checks' when there is doubt about the authenticity of student work. The guidance document for staff on these checks is not available via the Curtin website (staff log-in required), but they are happy for the AAIN to distribute a copy. It is attached as Appendix 1 to this document.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>The Current Students <a href="#">Academic Integrity website</a> gives information on a number of aspects of integrity. Inappropriate use of artificial intelligence is mentioned under plagiarism, cheating and contract cheating. There is also detailed support in the section titled <i>Be informed about appropriate use of Gen-AI technologies</i></p> <p><u>The Curtin Library <a href="#">APA7 Referencing guide</a> has a section on Generative AI that provides clear advice some of the limitations of Gen-AI, and guidance on an appropriate declaration of how ChaptGPT has been used in the preparation of an assessment task and on how to cite its use.</u></p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STAFF</b></p> <p>The <i>Promoting Academic Integrity Staff Portal</i> requires staff login. But Curtin has provided the text from this site. It is attached to this document as Appendix 2.</p> <p>Curtin provides a template statement to go into unit outlines covering the use of Gen-AI: <i>Check your assessment instructions carefully before using any generative artificial intelligence (Gen-AI) software (e.g. Chat GPT, Midjourney, GitHub Copilot, etc.). You are not permitted to use Gen-AI software in any assessment task unless written permission is</i></p>

University	Notes and links
	<p><i>explicitly granted by the Unit Coordinator (e.g. within Blackboard or the assignment specifications). If the use of Gen-AI software has been approved, you must document its use, apply appropriate acknowledgement and attribution rules, and include a statement as to the nature and extent of the use when submitting the assessment. Unapproved, inappropriate, or undisclosed use may be dishonest or unfair behaviour, and thus considered misconduct. For further information on the use of Gen-AI software see the <a href="#">Academic Integrity Website</a>.</i></p>
Deakin University	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">Student Academic Integrity policy</a> categorises inappropriate use of artificial intelligence (clause 14b) as ‘contract cheating: a student requests another person or service (including artificial intelligence content production tools) to produce or complete all or part of an assessment task to submit as their own work.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS AND STAFF</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">Deakin University response to ChatGPT</a> summarises the university’s intentions in relation to incorporating artificial intelligence appropriately into teaching, learning and assessment, including some key questions and considerations for staff.</p> <p>The student academic integrity webpage has a section on ‘<a href="#">Academic integrity dos and don’ts</a>’ which includes detailed information for students on the use of artificial intelligence.</p> <p>The Library guide <a href="#">Using generative AI</a> provides detailed information on the nature and appropriate uses of Gen-AI, covering a range of different AI tools. It also provides links to a number of relevant publications, both general and for individual disciplines.</p>
Edith Cowan University	<p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>The Library guide <a href="#">Information Essentials: Generative AI</a> provides clear advice on when and how to use ChatGPT. The <a href="#">referencing guide</a> provides advice and examples for citing and referencing the use of ChatGPT in assignments.</p> <p>The Academic Skills unit has a <a href="#">webpage</a> on Using Generative AI for assignments.</p>
Federation University Australia	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">Academic Integrity Procedure</a> lists the ‘unauthorised use of artificial intelligence to create part thereof or all assessable content’ as a breach of academic integrity in its own right, separate from plagiarism and contract cheating, although it goes on to list unauthorised use of Gen-AI as an example of contract cheating.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>The Library provides advice on referencing Gen-AI at this <a href="#">website</a></p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STAFF</b></p>

University	Notes and links
	<p><a href="#">Slides</a> from a staff training program on the use of ChatGPT.</p>
Flinders University	<p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>The Library’s <a href="#">Using AI tools for study</a> has sections on: What is AI?; Appraising AI tools; Using AI for study; and Using ChatGPT</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STAFF</b></p> <p>The <i>Good practice guide - Designing assessment for Artificial Intelligence and academic integrity</i> (<a href="#">link</a>) is a step by step guide to assessment design in the age of Gen-AI, e.g. designing authentic assessment, design that discourages the use of artificial intelligence, and using AI in assessment design.</p>
Griffith University	<p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>Use of artificial Intelligence is mentioned in all library <a href="#">referencing guides</a></p>
International College of Management Sydney.	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>ICMS has updated its academic integrity <a href="#">policy</a> and <a href="#">procedures</a> to classify use of generative artificial intelligence as a breach of academic integrity as follows: <i>“Fabricating or falsifying information: intentional creation, and unauthorised alteration, of any information or citation. For example, the use of artificial intelligence platforms (such as Generative Pre-trained Transformers – GPTs) to fabricate information.”</i></p> <p><b>INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH</b></p> <p>This <a href="#">article</a> gives an overview of how ICMS has developed its institutional approach to Gen-AI.</p>
James Cook University	<p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>The Learning Centre provides comprehensive advice to students on the what, when, when not and how of using artificial intelligence in its <a href="#">Using Artificial Intelligence</a> webpage.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STAFF</b></p> <p>The Centre for Education and Enhancement has a comprehensive <a href="#">Artificial Intelligence (AI) site</a> that explains JCU’s stance on AI, assessment and AI, ethics and integrity, and inappropriate use. There are a number of clear pdf Information sheets available.</p>
La Trobe University	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">Student Academic Misconduct Policy</a> includes the need for students to cite use of ‘artificial content production tools’ (clause 6c), and the responsibility for the university to provide guidance and support for staff and students in the appropriate use of AI (clauses 10d iii, and 10e iv).</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p>

University	Notes and links
	<p>The <a href="#">Library Guide</a> has clear information for students in the when and how of using AI in their studies. There is also a clear <a href="#">Referencing guide</a> with instructions for a number of referencing styles: AGCL4, APA6, APA7, Harvard, Oxford (Footnote), and Other.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STAFF</b></p> <p>News item with a sensible coverage of '<a href="#">How to learn to work with AI and not avoid it</a>'.</p>
Macquarie University	<p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">AI Tools at Macquarie University</a> website provides information for students on the what, when and how of using Gen-AI. It includes a 4 minute video of students and staff talking about the use of this technology.</p> <p>The Library has referencing info on AI throughout their <a href="#">study guides</a>. The following statement runs throughout all the referencing advice:</p> <p><b>Referencing generative artificial intelligence (e.g. ChatGPT)</b></p> <p><i>For every unit you are studying, check whether you are allowed to use generative artificial intelligence tools to complete your assessments. You should acknowledge (reference) your use of these tools if and when you do so.</i></p> <p><i>You will find referencing strategies under each style in our referencing guides. We recommend checking back regularly for updates.</i></p> <p><b>OTHER</b></p> <p>MQ's overall response is described in their <a href="#">TECHE newsletter</a> (February). It includes institutional and faculty-level responses.</p>
Monash University	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>This <a href="#">page</a> gives links to Monash policies that refer to artificial intelligence: <i>Assessment and Academic Integrity Policy</i> (see clause 1.17); <i>Student Academic Integrity Procedure</i> (see section 4.7 for inappropriate use of Gen-AI as a separate category of academic breach); and <i>Assessment Regime Procedure</i> (the role of the chief examiner in determining how Gen-AI can be used, or not, in an assessment task (section 1.5); their role in informing students of this (sections 2.8.7 and 7.1); and the definition of Gen-AI).</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STAFF</b></p> <p><i>Generative artificial intelligence technologies and teaching and learning</i> (<a href="#">Link</a>) provides an overview of what these technologies are and how they are impacting on teaching and learning. There are further links on this page to a number of relevant areas, eg <i>Generative AI and assessment</i> (<a href="#">link</a>). This covers assessment design and assessment security/detection of AI. It also has a <a href="#">link</a> to recordings of Monash webinar series on AI. Also to policy and practice guidelines (<a href="#">link</a>) which covers a broad range of areas, including guidance for students.</p>

University	Notes and links
	<p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p><a href="#">Using Artificial Intelligence</a>, Students LearnHQ.</p>
Murdoch University	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>Clause 6.3 of the <a href="#">Student Academic Integrity Policy</a> lists use of artificial intelligence without authorisation as a separate category academic misconduct.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>The Library <a href="#">referencing guide</a> indicates Gen-AI output should be considered under the category of ‘personal communication’</p>
Open Universities Australia	<p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p><a href="#">Blog article</a> on how ChaptGPT should, and should not be used. Classifies inappropriate use as constituting plagiarism.</p>
Queensland University of Technology	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">Academic Integrity Policy</a> does not specifically mention the use of artificial intelligence, but its coverage of ‘contract cheating’ (clause 5.3.6 d) is probably broad enough to cover inappropriate/unauthorised use.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>A <a href="#">Library Guide provides</a> information on what ChatGPT is and how it can be used. It includes a YouTube video to show how to set up an OpenAI account and use ChatGPT, including its manual controls. This video has links to further tutorials.</p> <p>This <a href="#">QUT cite</a> site has APA referencing information for Gen-AI. It says that APA has not yet released guidance in this, but at the end of this document, there is a link to recent APA advice.</p>
RMIT University	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>The RMIT <a href="#">Academic Integrity Policy</a> and the <a href="#">Academic Integrity Procedure</a> do not make specific reference to generative artificial intelligence, although the broad statements of student and staff responsibilities are relevant.</p> <p>Section 5 of the <a href="#">Student Conduct Policy</a> provides a link to <a href="#">Student Conduct Policy Schedule 1 - Student Misconduct</a> where clause 2b (vi) categorises inappropriate use of artificial intelligence as contract cheating.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>RMIT’s student facing <a href="#">site</a> on Academic Integrity has a specific section on the use of AI tools by students.</p> <p>Their referencing <a href="#">guidelines</a> on artificial intelligence are comprehensive.</p> <p><b>OTHER</b></p>

University	Notes and links
	<p><a href="#">Media release</a> <i>ChatGPT – sentient AI or singularity. How close are we?</i></p> <p><a href="#">News article</a> <i>Embracing ChatGPT for Education</i></p>
Southern Cross University	<p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">Library referencing guides</a> for APA7, Harvard, and AGCL4 all contain information on how to cite and reference Gen-AI as personal communication.</p> <p>The student <a href="#">Academic Integrity and Turnitin</a> webpage has a brief description of using ChatGPT.</p>
TAFE NSW	<p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS AND STAFF</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">Researching and Referencing: Generative AI</a> webpage has a comprehensive coverage of issues and supports for staff and students.</p>
Universal Business School Sydney	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">Academic Misconduct Policy</a>, in Section 5, describes examples of plagiarism, and includes the submission of work from AI generative tools (without referencing)</p>
University of Adelaide	<p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS AND STAFF</b></p> <p>This <a href="#">Library Guide</a> has a detailed overview of AI, with sections on using AI tools in study and in research. It provides links to statements from a number of publishers on the use of AI in preparing publications.</p>
University of Melbourne	<p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p><a href="#">Statement</a> on the use of Artificial intelligence software in the preparation of material for assessment.</p> <p><a href="#">Referencing guide AP7</a> indicates to cite as software. Has a <a href="#">link</a> to the APA style blog listed at the bottom of this document.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STAFF</b></p> <p><a href="#">Padlet</a> for staff to share ideas, resources on ‘ChatGPT-proofing assessment design’. The Melbourne Centre for the Study of Higher Education provides a <a href="#">guide</a> to adapting assessment in response to the use of Gen-AI.</p>
University of New England	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">Student Coursework Academic Misconduct Procedures</a> does not mention Gen-AI specifically, but the Glossary at the end of the document indicates that plagiarism includes <i>...work substantially written by someone else (e.g. using a ghost writer, purchasing work from someone or an electronic site, or using work obtained freely from a person or an electronic site).</i></p> <p><b>OTHER</b></p> <p>Institutional <a href="#">news item</a> for staff and students on the UNE position on Gen-AI.</p>



University	Notes and links
University of New South Wales	<p><b>SUPPORT FOR STAFF</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">UNSW teaching site</a> has an introduction to Gen-AI, with links to resources accessible only to their staff. But there is a video of an expert panel discussion on the rise of ChatGPT. There are also links to a number of interesting articles on the arrival and impact of Gen-AI in education.</p>
University of Notre Dame Australia	<p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>The '<a href="#">Additional Student Information</a>' webpage mentions Gen-AI technologies in the 'Academic Integrity' section.</p>
University of Queensland	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>There appears to be no specific reference to artificial intelligence in the academic integrity policy area, but the <a href="#">Student Code of Conduct – Policy</a>, in defining plagiarism has the following as one of the categories: <i>paraphrasing a paper from a source text, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form (e.g. article spinning, text rewriting and content creation tools), without appropriate acknowledgement;</i></p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>The Library has a comprehensive <a href="#">Artificial Intelligence website</a> with relevant information, videos and quizzes.</p> <p>The Library guide <a href="#">ChatGPT and other generative AI tools</a> provides information on the uses and risks of using Gen-AI, and on referencing its use.</p> <p><b>OTHER</b></p> <p><a href="#">News article</a>: <i>Let's chat about ChatGPT: Is AI technology saving you time or taking your job?</i></p>
University of South Australia	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">Academic Integrity policy</a> classifies unauthorised use of Gen-AI as contract cheating.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>The student <a href="#">Academic Integrity Module</a> has a page on 'Using artificial intelligence' that has a link to the <a href="#">TEQSA student advice</a> page.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STAFF</b></p> <p>The Teaching and Learning Innovation site has a comprehensive section on <a href="#">Artificial intelligence</a> which is updated regularly.</p>
University of Sydney	<p><b>SUPPORT FOR TEACHERS</b></p> <p>Excellent <a href="#">article</a> <i>How AI can be used meaningfully by teachers and students in 2023.</i></p> <p>A number of relevant posts at the '<a href="#">Teaching@Sydney</a>' site. Some are:  - <i>Students answer your questions about generative AI – <a href="#">Part 1: assessments and their future</a>; <a href="#">Part 2: Ethics, integrity and the value of</a></i></p>

University	Notes and links
	<p><i>university;</i>  - <i>Staff-student forums on generative AI at Sydney;</i> (<a href="#">link</a>)  - <i>GPT-4 is here. What is it, and what does this mean for higher education?</i> (<a href="#">link</a>)</p> <p><b>OTHER</b></p> <p>Various news opinion posts from academics, such as <i>Your next colleague might be artificial intelligence</i> (<a href="#">link</a>)</p>
University of Technology Sydney	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p><a href="#">Section 16</a> of the Student Misconduct and Appeals Rule includes inappropriate use of generative AI as a form of cheating.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>Student information: <a href="#">Referencing ChaptGPT in assignments</a>.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STAFF</b></p> <p><a href="#">Quick-start guide for adapting to AI</a>. This webpage has a number of useful components and links.</p> <p>There are also blogs on the UTS site:  <a href="#">GenerativeAI@UTS: effective, ethical engagement</a>  <a href="#">In a nutshell: ChatGPT and other Generative AI</a></p>
University of Western Australia	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>Section 5.1 (9) of the UWA <a href="#">Academic Integrity policy</a> is a detailed coverage of the improper use of artificial intelligence. It is also mentioned in the sections on plagiarism and inappropriate editorial assistance.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS AND STAFF</b></p> <p>Guides for students on referencing artificial intelligence: <a href="#">APA 7<sup>th</sup></a> and <a href="#">AGLC4</a></p> <p>Guidelines for students on the use of AI Tools at UWA: <a href="#">link</a></p> <p>Guide on how to acknowledge use of ChatGPT in research publications: <a href="#">link</a></p>
Western Sydney University	<p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>This <a href="#">Library FAQ</a> section gives examples of how to cite Gen-AI tools in a variety of referencing styles.</p>
University of Wollongong	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">Academic Integrity policy</a> has broadened its definition of plagiarism to include, ‘...Using work (e.g. assignment, essay, exam paper, research paper, creative project, data) generated by an artificial intelligence (AI) tool in an assessment unless expressly permitted to do so and with proper acknowledgement.’</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</b></p> <p>This student-facing <a href="#">webpage</a> provides advice that AI tools may only be used where permitted, and notes that unauthorised use is considered</p>

University	Notes and links
	<p>academic misconduct. Where permitted, its use must be referenced, and it suggests referencing as ‘software and app’.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STAFF</b></p> <p>The UOW online Learning and Teaching Hub has a page devoted to <a href="#">The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Education</a>. It is a one-stop shop for university-supported resources and information for teaching staff.</p>
Victoria University	<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">Academic Integrity policy</a> identifies inappropriate use of generative artificial intelligence in assessment tasks as a separate category of breaching academic integrity (clause 18d) but also as an example of plagiarism (clauses 21 and 25). Clause 42 covers use of Gen-AI in examinations and tests.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT FOR STAFF AND STUDENTS</b></p> <p>Section 7 of VU’s <a href="#">Academic Integrity Guidelines</a> is their staff and student guidelines on the use of generative artificial intelligence.</p> <p>The <a href="#">Library Referencing Guides</a> each have a tab on the use of Gen-AI.</p> <p><b>OTHER</b></p> <p>Blog post from Dr John Weldon <i>Artificial Intelligence (AI) could well have terrified Socrates</i>. <a href="#">Link</a></p>

## Other resources

TEQSA: *Artificial intelligence guidance for students*. [Link](#)

TEQSA Webinars [Link](#)

AAIN Generative Intelligence Working Group, 2023, *AAIN Generative Artificial Intelligence Guidelines* [Link](#)

APA advice on how to reference ChatGPT as software. [Link](#)

Chicago Manual of Style Online. Advice on citation and documentation of sources re ChatGPT. [Link](#)

Committee on Publication Ethics, 2023, *Authorship and AI tools: COPE position statement*. [Link](#)

## APPENDIX 1. Curtin University Confirmation Checks

### Guidance on the use of Assessment Confirmation Checks

Issued by the Office of the Academic Registrar, Mar 2023.

Status: v6, Issued March 2023. (Replaces v5, issued 2020.)

This guidance note is intended to provide information on assessment 'confirmation checks', specifically when, why and how they should be used. Recommended processes are identified, and feedback on potential improvements is welcomed.

#### 1. What is an assessment confirmation check?

An assessment confirmation check is a process designed to provide confidence that a student is appropriately knowledgeable with respect to the work that they have submitted.

#### 2. Why would a confirmation check be used?

A confirmation check would be used in situations where the authenticity of submitted work is assured as part of routine practice for that unit, or where there is doubt over a particular student submission. This may occur:

1. As a result of [exceptional circumstances in assessment](#) situations. For example, some students located in China are unable to use Curtin's remote invigilation system. Therefore, in certain situations a staff member may choose to allow the student to sit a test without using the remote invigilation system. The staff member would then schedule an assessment confirmation check with the student to ask the student questions about their submitted assessment that allow the staff member to ensure that the test was completed by the student.
2. To provide assurance that a student did not use contract cheating, or assignment help website services to complete an assessment task.
3. To provide assurance that new technologies such as generative artificial intelligence (Gen-AI) tools were not inappropriately used in an assessment task.

The Assessing Student Work Procedure (ASPM p13) stipulates that:

2.7 The Unit Coordinator will identify potential threats to assessment integrity and security, and will implement any mitigating strategies required.

2.5 Staff will take reasonable steps to ensure the authenticity of students' work. Such steps may involve submission through Turnitin, use of TokenDiff, confirmation checks, or other similar processes consistent with the discipline.

#### 3. When can a confirmation check be used?

A Unit Coordinator can initiate a confirmation check on student work at any point they feel it is required. Full information about this can be found in the Assessing Student Work Procedure ASPM p13:

2.5.1 The Unit Coordinator may initiate a confirmation check on student(s) work at any point. The Course Coordinator/Lead, Head of School or relevant teaching area, Global Pro Vice-Chancellor or Academic Registrar may also require the Unit Coordinator to conduct a confirmation check(s) as necessary. Where the Global Pro Vice-Chancellor or Academic Registrar require the confirmation check, the relevant Head of School will be notified.

#### 4. What is the process for a confirmation check?

A confirmation check generally involves a member of staff discussing a student's work with them, to confirm that the student is conversant with their submission.

The recommended process is:

- i. Advise students in advance that confirmation checks may be used and explain what it is - and what it is not.
  - a. Ideally, information on the use of confirmation checks should be added to the unit outline to ensure that all students are aware that it may be used within the unit or for a particular assessment task. Clarify whether the process will be used for the whole cohort or a sampled selection.
  - b. Note that if this information has not been added to the unit outline, assessment confirmation checks can still be used as per the ASPM p.13 clause 2.5.1 which states "The Unit Coordinator may initiate a confirmation check on student(s) work at any point."
- ii. Ensure that the confirmation check happens as soon as possible after the assessment and ideally within 7 days of the assessment. Memory decays rapidly, and a confirmation check that occurs too long after the assessment will be unreliable.
- iii. Ensure that the student is advised of the material to be discussed beforehand and that they have a copy of the work at the start of the confirmation check. Reassure the student that the purpose is not to 'catch them out' and that it is fully expected that the student will not always be able to remember details of their responses (even if they got the question right!) Establish a friendly rapport and conduct the confirmation check with the minimum of formality.
- iv. Generally, a confirmation check would need no longer than 10 minutes. Ask questions sampled from across the assessment task. Open-ended questions focusing on process are helpful here: e.g. 'Why did you select this answer?' There is no need to go through the whole assessment task. You should conclude the check as soon as you are satisfied that it is the student's own work.
- v. If at any point during a confirmation check misconduct is suspected, the confirmation check should be stopped, and the processes set out in Statute 10 and the Academic Misconduct Rules should be followed.
- vi. Provide the results back to the student as soon as possible and ideally within 7 days. If there are no issues of concern, it is helpful to give that feedback immediately at the conclusion of the check. If you are unsure, contact the Office of the Academic Registrar for advice.

#### 5. When is an assessment confirmation check appropriate?

The use of a confirmation check may be appropriate for a range of different assessment situations including, but not limited to:

Example 1: Invigilated examination changed to an open book assessment completed over an extended period of time.

- Here, the mitigating strategy (invigilation) has been lost, and a confirmation check then becomes a method whereby academic integrity can be maintained.
- In this situation, an alternative method could be to use Curtin's IRIS remote invigilation system to invigilate the open book assessment. There is no need to use a confirmation check

if an assessment is invigilated.

Example 2: Suspicion of use of contract cheating services or inappropriate use of generative artificial intelligence (Gen-AI) tools.

- If a student submits work that is remarkably different to work that has previously been submitted or known capability level and you question the authenticity of the work, it may be appropriate to conduct a confirmation check.

## 6. What a confirmation check is NOT supposed to be:

A confirmation check is not an examination (or re-examination) of the student's work. A confirmation check seeks to only confirm that it is the student's own work. Confirmation checks are not part of the grading process and should not be used to vary a student's marks.

A confirmation check is not intended to be an alternative to the processes set out in Statute 10 and the Academic Misconduct Rules. Whenever there are reasonable grounds to suspect that misconduct has occurred, the correct response is to report the matter, not to initiate a confirmation check.

## 7. Why has Curtin adopted confirmation checks?

Confirmation checks are valuable because they allow Curtin to maintain academic integrity standards despite required changes to conventional assessment practices prompted by the widespread availability of contract cheating services, recent technological developments in Gen-AI, and the pandemic. Research reported by Deakin indicates the value of the confirmation check approach for maintaining academic integrity.<sup>1</sup>

## 8. What are the possible outcomes of a confirmation check?

A confirmation check yields a binary outcome – either the student is deemed to have completed the work, or the outcome is that the member of staff concludes that they now have reasonable grounds to suspect that it is not entirely the student's work. This would then trigger the usual processes under Statute 10 and the Academic Misconduct Rules.

## 9. What should I expect from students?

You can expect some students to occasionally appear to be nervous/defensive, especially if they have not had much contact with that member of staff beforehand. In itself, these behaviours should not be taken to indicate any lack of integrity on the student's part. Students WILL make mistakes during a check. Keep in mind that in multiple choice tests, a student:

- a) may have guessed what the answer was - and got it right.
- b) may have ruled out a couple of wrong options to guess from the remainder.
- c) may not be able to remember why/how they chose the answer.
- d) all of the above are expected normal behaviours in multiple choice tests!

## 10. What are grounds for concern?

Most students would normally be expected to complete the confirmation check without any major issues. However, given the discussion in the preceding Section 9, it should be clear that there are reasons why students will occasionally stumble or make mistakes.

Staff members should only take further action where there are reasonable grounds to believe that the student was not conversant with their submitted work. It would be reasonable to initiate a

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.deakin.edu.au/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0003/2091567/07-cradle\\_academic-integrity-online\\_PM.pdf](https://www.deakin.edu.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0003/2091567/07-cradle_academic-integrity-online_PM.pdf)

report under the Academic Misconduct Rules only where the process reveals that the student's understanding of their completed work displays a large inconsistency with their graded result.

#### 11. Can the confirmation check be done virtually?

Yes. It is perfectly acceptable to meet face to face or use an online medium such as Cisco Webex.

#### 12. Should the confirmation check involve 2 members of staff or be recorded?

Whilst it is possible to conduct confirmation checks with more than one member of staff, this is not recommended because it is likely to exacerbate student stress, and the process becomes too complex/resource-intensive. Instead, it is recommended that the confirmation check is audio recorded, or video recorded in the case of an online confirmation check. Note that this is a recommendation, not a requirement.

If a confirmation check is recorded, the video/audio artefact should be retained for a period of 7 days and disposed of within 12 months of the recording date – unless it is required to be used as part of a misconduct case. Generally, once the confirmation check has been passed the recording should be disposed of as soon as possible within the timeframes quoted.

#### 13. Can students bring a support person with them during the confirmation check?

Yes, if they wish. The support person is not permitted to answer on behalf of the student.

#### 14. Can students opt out of a confirmation check?

Normally, no. Exceptionally, an alternative means of demonstrating academic integrity could be sought, but only if supported by a reasonable justification, submitted prior to the assessment event. This might involve reverting the assessment to a traditional face to face examination or using Curtin's IRIS invigilation software. Contact the Office of the Academic Registrar for advice if needed.

However, an alternative means of demonstrating academic integrity would be entirely appropriate for some students who are supported by a CAP for whom an oral assessment is difficult or impossible. These situations should not be considered exceptional requests.

#### 15. Where can I get further information or help getting started?

Contact Jon Yorke or Lesley Sefcik from the Office of the Academic Registrar.

## **APPENDIX 2. Excerpt from Curtin University *Promoting Academic Integrity* Staff Portal**

### **What is generative artificial intelligence (Gen-AI) software?**

Gen-AI is software focused on creating new content, such as text, code, images, or music. It is attractive to use because it can assist with many tasks:

- answer questions, create first drafts, have human-like conversations, summarise concepts,
- generate examples (essays, poems, scripts, reflections, slides, outlines)
- fix grammatical errors, increase level of vocabulary
- is always available.

This technology is especially attractive for English as second language students to help formulate focused, grammatically accurate text (Kebble, 2023).

### **Can I ban the use of Gen-AI in my unit or assessment?**

**Yes.** The default position in the academic integrity section of Curtin’s unit outline is:

- “You are not permitted to use Gen-AI software in any assessment task unless written permission is explicitly granted by the Unit Coordinator (e.g. within Blackboard or the assignment specifications).”

Therefore, if you would like to disallow student use of Gen-AI, no further action would be needed (covered by the unit outline boilerplate text).

### **Can I use Gen-AI as part of my assessment task?**

**Yes.** If you approve the use of Gen-AI software as part of an assessment task:

- Talk to your students about how to foster ethical engagement with Gen-AI technologies
- Define what types of Gen-AI software students are/are not permitted to use
- Ensure that written permission is explicitly granted (e.g. within Blackboard or the assessment specifications) by the unit coordinator
- Require students to:
  - Document their use (screenshot/save all work e.g. prompts used, answers produced, how it was used – e.g. the output was altered in this way...)
  - Verify the accuracy of all output they use
    - Some Gen-AI software makes up information. If a student submits that false output as part of the assessment task, it may be considered falsification or fabrication, which is considered misconduct.
  - Include a declaration of use
    - A declaration must be included in the assignment after the reference list. It should detail which tools the student has used to generate content in the process of completing the assignment and how they have been employed. The declaration must include the prompts the student has used to generate information.
  - Apply appropriate acknowledgement and attribution rules.
    - For specific details on how to cite and declare student use of Gen-AI outputs, follow the advice for the referencing style used within your faculty:
      - [Australian Guide to Legal Citation \(AGLC\)](#)
      - [American Psychological Association \(APA\)](#)
      - [Chicago](#)
      - [Vancouver](#)



### Students should know that:

- If used inappropriately, Gen-AI use may prevent student learning/critical thinking
- Gen-AI systems contain bias
  - Lack of diversity in training data – output replicates those biases
  - Lack of transparency/accountability for output – no way to know how decisions were made
- Accuracy of output must be verified – e.g. it fabricates references and other information
- Acknowledgement and attribution rules apply
  - Unapproved, inappropriate, or undisclosed use may be dishonest or unfair behaviour, and therefore considered misconduct.
- Students are not permitted to upload work that does not belong to them. This includes, lecture slides, assessment questions and tutorial questions in which Curtin owns the copyright.
- Gen-AI detectors are available and improving – output may be checked (even retrospectively)

**The takeaway point for students:** when submitting any assessment, the final product must be the student's own work, not just output copied from Gen-AI software.

### How do I alter my assessment information to incorporate the use of Gen-AI?

- **Minor changes** in your assessment task that do not substantively change the assessment criteria can be managed by an explanatory message sent from the UC to all students.
- **Substantial changes** in assessment tasks can be managed using the 'exceptional circumstances' provisions within the [Assessment and Student Progression Manual](#) (p. 11).

### Can we detect AI generated content?

Turnitin now incorporates a Gen-AI detector into the Originality report. However, as this is new technology we are unsure about its reliability.

- In general, the more you direct/prompt (personalise) the tool – the less the detectors are able to identify output as AI based (Bakharia, 2023).

However, like contract cheating where we lack reliable technology to detect contracted work, staff can still detect Gen-AI output.

- Studies have shown that staff can greatly increase their ability to identify contracted work simply by looking for it. This can be done by knowing your topic well and knowing your student's work.

**Tip:** check your students' reference list.

- Gen-AI tends to fabricate references
- If there are fabricated references listed, this is a clue that undisclosed Gen-AI outputs may have been submitted.

### How should I mark a student assessment in which Turnitin is indicating that the text has been generated by artificial intelligence and students were not given permission to use it?

- Where inappropriate use of Gen-AI tools is suspected, stop the marking process.
- Given that the Turnitin software is so new, it is prudent to obtain a **supporting** piece of evidence to suggest that Gen-AI was inappropriately used. (We want to avoid a situation where we are singularly relying on the Turnitin Gen-AI score when investigating misconduct cases, because its capabilities whilst claimed, are unproven at this time.)

This means that in addition to the Turnitin Gen-AI score it would be sensible to have at least **one** of the following:

1. A [confirmation check](#)

2. Evidence of fabrication (review factual information and references as Chat GPT tends to make up false information and citations)
  3. Clear and substantial changes in style from other recently submitted assessment tasks.
- Note that this is not an exhaustive list and there may be other pieces of evidence to support the case.
  - This also may mean that you may have some students with low to medium Gen-AI writing scores that may not have a second piece of evidence to support a case of misconduct. In this situation the cases would not proceed and a reminder to students about the appropriate use of Gen-AI would be used.
  - **The take-home message for staff:** The Gen-AI similarity index should not be used as the *only* basis for raising a misconduct case.
  - Some staff have asked about allowing students to resubmit if misconduct related to Gen-AI use is suspected. If the only reason for allowing the resubmission is because misconduct is suspected, then this would be counter to the Academic Misconduct Rules, which state that staff are required to report suspected misconduct.

Bakharia A, 2023 *The AI (ChatGT) future: What do we do now?* Monash Panel, Thursday 2 February 2023.