

## **Table Topic Institutional Policy and Academic Integrity –**

**Facilitated by Iryna Pavlova**

1. What gaps exist in your current institutional policy that need to be addressed, particularly in light of emerging technologies like AI?
  2. What institutional supports (training, resources, etc.) are in place to help faculty and students uphold the academic integrity policy?
  3. What additional resources or policy changes are needed to better support faculty in addressing and preventing misconduct?
  4. How should academic integrity policies evolve to address challenges posed by AI, contract cheating, and new assessment methods?
- 
- York - new policy since Sep 2024. New technologies keep emerging, so we might need to update again. Our policy leaves it up to the instructor to determine what constitutes unauthorized use of AI tools.
  - Similar policy - recognizing that AI can be used as a learning aid. Our policy hasn't been formally updated yet. AI is labeled as an unauthorized aid. The biggest debate for us is whether it is unauthorized aid or plagiarism. Officially we have landed on AI being unauthorized aid.
  - Unauthorized aid is under cheating at York.
  - We are being careful about using the word "cheating". Contract cheating is labeled as impersonation.
  - Faculty don't know how to handle translation tools. Students use AI and then say they used a translation tool.
  - A student asked for a translator at the tribunal and the school said at an institution with English medium of instruction, you don't need a translator.
  - Defining originality is one of the main challenges.
  - New emerging technologies make it difficult for institutional policies to keep up.
  - Financial resources need to be available to support faculty with extra admin load addressing integrity issues.
  - Faculty have different views of academic integrity and it's hard to align.
  - Faculty want an AI detector to make their investigation easier.
  - Acknowledging the changing landscape and keeping the policy broad and principle-driven rather than tool-driven.
  - It would be helpful to have a policy on proper use of technology.
  - A policy on how to use AI tools ethically for faculty and staff, and administrators.
  - Difficulty proving unauthorized use of AI despite it being in the policy.
  - Similar gaps, like Grammarly. AI-powered Grammarly. Clear instructions. Students use AI-plugins. Emerging gaps.
  - AI plug-ins attached to LMS.

- Policy hasn't been updated in 7-8 years. General principles of Academic Integrity cover AI under unauthorized use of resources and aids. We can still penalize unauthorized use of AI tools. We expect to review the policy. We developed guides and resources for faculty members around the use of AI. We allow Turnitin AI detection tool. Faculty cannot rely on AI score as evidence. AI tools keep emerging and it's hard to identify AI-generated text. Guidelines are hard to develop due to constant changes in the field. Many institutions are waiting to make any updates their policies due to constant changes.
- Our policy hasn't been updates since 2013. Due to AI, this process got pushed. We put AI use with cheating. There was a discussion why it's not plagiarism. We didn't name platforms and focused on behavior. The gap for me is telling students what not to do and we don't have support for institutional stakeholders.
- The issue of classifying AI use - cheating, plagiarism, unauthorized aid? It's different across institutions.
- Unauthorized content generation.
- Having no definition for the use of AI tools also skews breach data collection.
- Our policy categorizes GenAI as unauthorized aid. Students don't want to admit the use of AI tools. Our policy is quite vague and there is hesitancy to update the policy.
- Concoction - is the word we use to address GenAI and to start a conversation with students.
- It's becoming very difficult to determine the use of AI tools. There are new tools that write like a human. At some point we'll have to assess how well students can use AI.
- Faculty burnout to address the use of AI tools and a call for institutions to write a clearly defined policy.
- Most institutions leave it up to the instructor to determine and define what constitutes unauthorized use of AI tools.
- Courses heavily focused on writing and language skills struggle with allowing AI tools.
- UofT reviewing the policy. AI tools fall under unauthorized aid but we can sanction under concoction. We haven't been able to pull data on unauthorized use of AI tools.
- It's challenging to collect data on the use of AI tools because it's used in so many different ways.
- TMU has AI under misrepresentation of knowledge and performance.
- The policy should describe the behavior as opposed to the tool.
- AT UBC, we have a school-wide policy. We define GenAI as getting an unfair advantage.
- It's interesting to see how faculty enforce the policy. Syllabus language is not streamlined. Students are often confused about the rules as a result.
- Interactive syllabus with guiding questions to consider the use of technology.
- No policies on AI use for employees in most institutions.
- TMU updated the policy in 2024 as misrepresentation of knowledge and performance.

- At UBC, our policy hasn't been updated since 2012. It's very general. Students who read it wouldn't have much understanding. In our faculty we track cases, so we include AI use as a specific breach type.
- It's hard to have one definition. Definition depends on how AI was used.
- Niagara College had specific examples in the policy.
- UofT doesn't have guidelines on AI use by employees. They offer sessions to faculty together with CTL.
- Departments don't want to own the AI use policy.