Guidance for faculty in reporting suspected GenAI misuse

Provost's Committee on Academic Integrity, Spring 2025

Drafted January 2025; circulated Spring 2025; presented to Senate Spring 2025

The evidence submitted in support of a violation report describing GenAI misuse is necessarily different than in cases involving traditional plagiarism in that the source of the unoriginal work included in a student's submission cannot be found and attached to the report. Confusing matters even more, text paraphrasers like Grammarly will, if used extensively (to alter a large amount of text) or intensively (to substantially rewrite portions of text), register as GenAI content in Turnitin's detector.

Students are increasingly well aware of the limitations of GenAI detectors and very quick to protest when reported, most often claiming that their AI use was incidental or that the detector has wrongly identified their writing as AI-generated (which Turnitin's detector has been shown to do in under 5% of submissions).

Students (and many faculty) also misunderstand the evidentiary standard necessary to sustain a violation report. In part, this is a consequence of the high degree of certainty in cases where a precise match to a student's assignment can be found elsewhere, for example in a Turnitin originality report. Please remember that Adelphi (like many universities) uses the "preponderance of the evidence" standard to sustain a violation report, not the higher standards used in certain legal settings.

The fact that students are likely to protest is not in itself grounds for imposing additional work on faculty in preparing a report, but it is the case that students have due process rights when facing an institutional sanction, and among those rights is a fair hearing and a chance to appeal the faculty member's decision.

With all this in mind, the CAI suggests the following guidelines for preparation of integrity violation reports of suspected GenAI misuse.

- Faculty should remember that a completed report is the record of an investigation initiated and concluded by the faculty member. A report should include a description of the behavior suspected to be a violation, the student's response to the initial inquiry, the faculty member's determination of responsibility, and all evidence gathered as part of that investigation. When submitted, a violation report should be sufficient to persuade a neutral third party that it is more likely than not that the behavior described in the report constitutes a violation of our academic integrity policy (the "preponderance" standard).
- Faculty should use only Turnitin's GenAI detector, which is consistently at or close to the top in studies of the effectiveness of such detectors, with a very low rate of false positives. Adelphi's license with Turnitin is sufficient to protect students' privacy rights under FERPA (many free AI detectors retain submissions and use them to train their GenAI models). A Turnitin AI report should be attached to every violation report of suspected GenAI misuse.

- <u>Faculty expertise is relevant as evidence of GenAI misuse but not sufficient</u>, even when combined with a Turnitin GenAI report. Both a faculty member's "gut" and a Turnitin AI score should be considered grounds for further investigation rather than sufficient evidence in themselves.
- Accordingly, faculty reporting suspected GenAI misuse should also describe those features of the student submission that confirmed the initial suspicions raised. These features most often include:
    - "Hallucinated" references, missing or flawed citations;
    - Similarity to AI output in the progression of the argument or the ideas presented (please also attach the GenAI output);
    - Terminology or concepts relevant to the question that have not been covered in class and are beyond the student's level of preparation.
    - Sophistication beyond the level the student has demonstrated in writing assignments of known originality (whether supervised or in-class writing done with pen and paper).