

Guidance on Generative AI | Teaching and Learning

Dobrin (2023)¹ defines generative AI as a ‘set of algorithms that can generate seemingly new, realistic content, including text, images or audio’. The publicity and accessibility of free generative AI tools has led to widespread use of AI in academia.

This document provides guidance for LAU faculty on acceptable management of generative AI in the teaching and learning space with a focus on academic integrity. This document serves as guidance for course instructors, course coordinators, and department chairs to present non-binding suggestions for course policies that are binding relative to the LAU Student Code of Conduct.

Faculty at LAU are welcome to decide on the right level of generative AI use in their courses. However, when teaching a multi-section course, all sections should be delivered at the same level with common course policies concerning the level of generative AI use allowed or prohibited. What level of generative AI use is right for my course? **Section 1** of this document provides some tips to help you decide on what the right level of generative AI might be for your course.

Faculty should clearly communicate the level of generative AI use allowed in their course through the course syllabus. This may be done by using one of the syllabus templates for a course generative AI policy provided in **Section 2**. The adopted course policy should be discussed in class with the students in the spirit of academic integrity.

Important Note: In the absence of any specific course/program policy on the syllabus, then Section 2.2.2 from the student code of conduct applies².

When establishing the overall grade breakdown for a course, faculty must consider the percentage of grades that can be achieved in part or entirely through the use of AI (if allowed as per the syllabus). In order to ensure a robust mix of assessment tools, no more than 30% of the grade in any one course should be doable in part or in its entirety through the use of AI. **Section 3** contains advice on assignments that are resistant to AI use by students.

When a faculty member suspects unauthorized use of generative AI, the violation should be handled in the same manner that a violation of Student Code of Conduct section 2.2.2 would be handled. Specifically, sanctions may be applied as follows: “The first sanction under 2.2.2 results in a zero on the deliverable with a warning and the second sanction results in a suspension,

¹ Dobrin, S. I. (2023). Talking about generative AI: A guide for educators.

<https://files.broadviewpress.com/sites/uploads/sites/173/2023/05/Talking-about-Generative-AI-Sidney-I.-Dobrin-Version-1.0.pdf>

² Section 2.2.2. Cheating, copying, collaborating with, or aiding another Student in a manner not permitted by the instructor on an examination, project, or other graded assignment. If a student, graduate or undergraduate, requires additional assistance on any assignment, beyond what LAU provides (including but not limited to: the instructor’s help during office hours, the tutoring sessions of the University’s Academic Success Center, and/or the help of the University’s Writing Center), the student must notify the class instructor and get his/her approval to do so. The student must specify the name of the help provider (be it a peer LAU student, a friend, a parent, a sibling, an alumna (us), external outsourcing, etc.), in addition to the nature and the scope of the assistance that will be provided.

regardless whether the violation has taken place in the same course or a different one, within the same semester or not."

Section 4 provides tips on when it is reasonable to suspect generative AI use. **Sections 5 and 6** provide guidelines for citing generative AI use and grading, respectively.

The Center for Innovative Learning is always available to support faculty who may have questions on the appropriate use of generative AI or the design and grading of course work that requires generative AI. The CIL provides this support through both one-on-one meetings and as part of scheduled seminar/workshop events announced through <https://cil.lau.edu.lb>.

Section 1. What level of generative AI use is right for my course?

Before deciding to allow the use of generative AI tools in your course, it is important to determine the relevant learning outcome(s) and the added value provided by the tool being considered. We recommend answering the following questions before selecting the level of generative AI tool use that's right for your course.

- What are my course learning outcomes (CLOs)?
- What is the purpose of this specific task?
- How can AI or generative AI tools support this learning process?
- Where will it be used -- in class, in a lab, etc. or in a flipped format?
- Will all students have equal access to the AI tool? Will the student need to bear any costs to use the selected generative AI tool?
- Does the selected generative AI tool have a privacy policy that is consistent with LAU's policies?
- Has generative AI been used before for a similar activity? If so, reflect, assess, and/or seek student feedback on the use of generative AI and whether the CLOs were achieved.

If the answers to these questions point to allowing generative AI use, then the degree to which generative AI usage is allowed for each specific assignment should be clearly stated in the assignment/activity instructions and discussed with the students in the spirit of academic integrity. One clear way to classify generative AI usage is based on Bill Barnum's³ spectrum:

- Low: Spell/Grammar check (writing), information/resource gathering (research), brainstorming (critical thinking)
- Medium: sentence revision (writing), summary/synthesis (research), argument analysis/critique (critical thinking)
- High: paragraph generation (writing), argument development/data analysis (research), idea development/insights (critical thinking)

For assignments/activities using generative AI, it is highly recommended that students read the privacy and usage policies of generative AI platforms. The instructor and students should discuss the possible concerns and implications of having their data collected.

Section 2. Syllabus Templates for Generative AI Course Policies

One of the following generative AI use policies may be directly "copy-pasted" into your syllabus or copied with modifications depending on the level of generative AI use you choose to adopt. Even when generative AI use is allowed, students must provide proper citations to the use of generative AI. Examples of best practices in citing generative AI can be found in Section 5.

Strict No-use Course Policy

Faculty seeking to disallow generative AI use can use/edit the following text:

LAU instructors may have different rules and expectations for using generative AI tools. Should one instructor approve the use of generative AI, this does not mean it will be permitted by others.

³ Barnum, B. (2023). AI assistance in student assignments. <https://bit.ly/ai4teachers>

In this course, students are **not allowed** to use generative AI tools for any assignment or activity. Several times throughout the semester, you will be asked to produce assignments in class. These in-class assignments will be a measure to assess your assignments produced outside of class.

WARNING: Unauthorized use of AI tools to help you produce any assignment is a form of cheating and has consequences under the LAU Student Code of Conduct (see 2.2.2).

Note that you are encouraged to book an appointment with the Writing Center for your assignments written outside of class. Simply bring your draft assignment and the instructions to your appointment. You can book an appointment online: <https://soas.lau.edu.lb/academics/centers-institutes/writing-center/index.php>

You are encouraged to seek support from the Academic Success Center at LAU in order to receive instructor approved tutoring support for this course.

Course Policy allowing Some AI Use for Specific Pre-approved Assignments

Faculty seeking to allow generative AI use can use/edit the following text:

LAU instructors may have different rules and expectations for using generative AI tools. Should one instructor approve the use of generative AI, this does not mean it will be permitted by others.

In this course, students will be allowed to use generative AI for specific course tasks and only after receiving prior approval from the instructor. It is important to note that any approved AI assistance should prioritize your individual learning and critical thinking skills. You are strongly encouraged to primarily rely on your knowledge, research, and problem-solving abilities to complete assignments.

If you choose to utilize AI tools or resources, ensure that you clearly follow the allowed usage level in previously approved assignments:

Course Assignment/Assessment Point	AI Usage Allowed
Tests/Quizzes/Exams	None: No AI usage allowed
Class Discussion	Low: Brainstorming (critical thinking)
Presentation	Medium: summary/synthesis (research); creation of visuals
Formal Debate	High: idea development/insights (critical thinking)
Research Paper	Low: Spell/Grammar check (writing); information/resource gathering (research)

[Note for course instructors: This table is just an example. The amount of detail to be included and the level of AI usage depends on the instructor/course/program requirements. If you choose to include a similar table in your syllabi, we highly recommend going through each assignment and acceptable AI usage with students. This link maybe useful to facilitate a discussion with your students on academic integrity and use of AI in teaching and learning: <https://cteresources.bc.edu/documentation/artificial-intelligence-in-teaching-and-learning/>]

Remember, academic integrity and originality are fundamental values in this course, and any use of AI assistance should be in accordance with the course guidelines and with prior approval from the instructor.

Any use of AI needs to be documented based on the guidelines below [insert documentation process here. You can use some of the ideas mentioned in the guidelines above].

WARNING: *Unauthorized use of AI tools to help you produce any assignment is a form of cheating and has consequences under the LAU Student Code of Conduct (see 2.2.2).*

Note that you are encouraged to book an appointment with the Writing Center for your assignments written outside of class. Simply bring your draft assignment and the instructions to your appointment. You can book an appointment online: <https://soas.lau.edu.lb/academics/centers-institutes/writing-center/index.php>

You are encouraged to seek support from the Academic Success Center at LAU in order to receive instructor approved tutoring support for this course.

Course Policy Allowing use upon Request Only

Faculty seeking to allow generative AI use by permission only can use/edit the following text:

Any unassigned use of generative AI requires students to seek prior approval according to LAU's Student Code of Conduct section 2.2.2. You may only use generative AI tools after consulting with and receiving approval from the instructor. You are advised to make any request by email at least one-week prior to the assignment due date. The instructor will communicate approval/disapproval by email. If approved, the email reply will state clearly how you are allowed to use generative AI.

Section 3. Suggestions for AI Resistant Assessments

Assessments that are considered resistant to AI use by students include, but are not limited to:

- Online exams with Respondus lockdown turned-on
- Online exams hosted with restrictions in the computer labs
- Oral exams
- In-class presentations without slides
- Reflection papers written in-class
- Reflection papers that require the students to write about their personal opinion, view, and experience
- In-class debate
- Written critique and analysis of a discussion/debate held in-class; require at least three quotes made during the class session.
- Whiteboard work and concept maps
- Put grades for the process, not the final product

Still not sure if your assessment is AI-proof? Check out the risk evaluator at this site: <https://tlc.uva.nl/en/article/risk-evaluation-for-ai-and-assessment/?faculty=55>

Section 4. Detecting generative AI Use

To date, no AI detection tool is accurate enough to be trusted to provide evidence of AI use. We urge faculty to avoid putting student work into free, online, AI detection tools as this violates confidentiality relative to student work. Turn It In does have an AI detection tool which faculty can use as the student work is already uploaded for plagiarism detection and protected as per our existing relationship with Turn It In. However, after some testing, even this tool is not 100% accurate. Even without an AI driven tool to detect AI use, there are some signs that AI might have been used. These are:

- A flat, generic style – AI is good at mimicry, not originality;
- Unusual language, strange mistakes, etc.;
- Statements that strongly diverge from the course material;
- Incorrect or missing referencing or made-up references;
- Unexplained discrepancies in text length;
- Inconsistent tone or style;
- Lack of personal opinion or reflection;
- Similarities between your own AI-generated text and the student's text. You can also check for plagiarism by uploading both texts to Turnitin;
- When the student can't answer simple questions about their own text;
- When text deviates from the topics discussed in class.

(Source: <https://tlc.uva.nl/en/article/how-to-make-your-assessment-more-ai-proof/>)

Note, these points might raise suspicion, but they are not evidence of AI use. For faculty who suspect unauthorized AI use, they should follow the same procedure for approaching the student and applying sanctions as they would normally when they suspect unauthorized outside help (eg purchasing assignments, copying from other students' papers, etc) in line with student code of conduct section 2.2.2.

Section 5. Citing generative AI Use

When usage of generative AI platforms is approved or instructed, students should be required to produce proper attribution and documentation of any generative AI content used. Attribution and documentation should be part of grading rubrics for assignments/activities using generative AI. This can include:

- Proper APA citation protocols for in-text citations and references would be, for example: Open AI (2023). ChatGPT (Mar 14 version) [Large language model]. <https://openai.com/chatgpt>
- A brief description in an endnote or footnote of how generative AI was used (e.g. platform and prompts used, classification of usage into low/medium/high or other description, etc.).
- Screenshots of all content cited from generative AI are highly recommended. This is the only means to confirm content cited is not plagiarized or improperly cited from generative AI.

Section 6. Grading

This section covers both best practices for grading assignments/activities in which generative AI was allowed and the use of generative AI for grading by faculty. When it comes to grading activities created through generative AI, the bulk of the grade percentage should be put on the process rather than the product. This includes scoring students on the prompts used and for verifying any content developed with generative AI. Verification should be part of grading rubrics for assignments/activities using generative AI. This is because generative AI can make up facts, generate false references, and provide incorrect information.

As faculty members, it is important that we lead by example. In that regard, we must also reflect critically on the tasks we use AI for and whether that use is ethical. Using AI to grade papers is on one hand very attractive as a time-savings tool, on the other hand there are multiple ethical issues associated with AI for grading. Specifically, by uploading student work to generative AI sites for grading the student work may become part of the data-assets of that company depending on their data use and privacy policies. As such, you might inadvertently violate the student's rights. Thus, any faculty seeking to use generative AI for grading outside of approved LAU platforms (eg Turn It In) should seek prior approval through their Department Chair and Dean.