GenAI Practice Guide: Signals of and How to Assess Unacceptable Use of GenAI

At SCU, using Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) beyond the acceptable limit as defined in the Assessment Task, or using GenAI without appropriate acknowledgement may constitute an academic integrity breach.

This Practice Guide is supplementary to the Academic Integrity Guidelines and includes a checklist of signals of potential unacceptable use of GenAI and what evidence to collect.

Important information is also included below the checklist about breach classification and the distinction between the Turnitin AI Report vs the Turnitin Similarity Report, and interpreting those reports.

If you suspect GenAI has been used beyond the acceptable limit as defined in the Assessment Task, or the use of GenAI has NOT been appropriately acknowledged, you may complete the checklist below detailing the evidence BEFORE you submit or determine an Academic Integrity Breach in AIMS.

PROCEED to submit an Academic Integrity Breach in AIMS for **unacceptable use of GenAI** if one of the conditions below are met:

a) The student was informed, in writing prior to the submission of the assessment, that **GenAI was NOT** to be used in the assessment task **AND** you have supporting evidence (refer to checklist 1- 8 below); or

b) The student was informed, in writing prior to the submission of the assessment, that **GenAI MAY be used** in the assessment task **but** the assessment task was completed using GenAI **beyond the acceptable limit** as defined in the Assessment task **AND** you have supporting evidence (refer to checklist 1-8 below); or

c) The Turnitin AI Report (not the Turnitin Similarity Report) indicates a high *probability* (percentage) that the assessment task was generated by GenAI tools **AND** you have additional supporting evidence (refer to checklist 1-8 below); **AND** the assessment task was completed using GenAI beyond the acceptable limit as defined in the Assessment task.

GenAI Practice Guide Checklist - Signals of Potential Unacceptable Use of GenAI and the Evidence	
Signals to look for	**If Signals Present - What is the evidence**
The student used GenAI, when they were informed, in writing prior to the submission of the Assessment, that GenAI was **NOT** to be used for the Assessment Task	Include Assessment information where student was informed, they **must NOT** use GenAI for this assessment task (eg attach a copy of the Assessment task/information/booklet); using checklist 1 – 8 below show where/how they have used GenAI in the Assessment task
The student used GenAI **beyond the acceptable limit** as defined in the Assessment task. This is where they were informed, in writing prior to the submission of the Assessment, that GenAI **MAY** be used & the limits of that	Include assessment information where student was informed, they **MAY** use GenAI & **the limits of that** using checklist 1 – 8 below show where/how they have used GenAI beyond the acceptable limit as defined in the Assessment task.

The Artificial Intelligence Report (AI Report) in Turnitin indicates a *high *probability* (percentage) that the Assessment item was generated by GenAI tools **AND** you have sufficient additional evidence to support that. *The Tii AI Report probability % is not a reliable indicator that GenAI was used.	Include assessment information where student was informed whether they **may or may not use** GenAI & any limits. Attach all 3 versions of the **Turnitin Similarity Report** (originally submitted, PDF & Text only) Attach a screenshot of the Tii **Artificial Intelligence Report** that indicates a high probability (percentage) the work was generated by GenAI tools using checklist 1 – 8 below show where/how they have used GenAI beyond the acceptable limit as defined in the Assessment task.

Work through the additional evidence (1-8) below, and type the information required, under each number, or attach the evidence preferably in 1 word doc file.
List example/s in the assessment task (attach word doc or list here) where the student has **NOT** completed the assessment task that was set (e.g., the task asked for X and the student did Y).
List example/s in the assessment task where the student has **NOT** used the resources or ideas from the unit or modules (e.g., MyReadings, module topics etc.)
Were in-text citations and references required in this assessment task? YES | NO
Did the student use in-text citations and references in the assessment task, as required by the assessment task? YES | NO. Provide details
List example/s of references that are suspected of being fake or non-existent sources.
List example/s where the in-text citations did **NOT** match the contents of the article being referenced? (e.g., if an in-text citation is referring to X, does the article refer to X, or something else entirely?)
In this assessment task, is the student's writing unexpectedly different to their other writing? YES | NO. (if 'yes', attach copies of earlier writing eg email from student)
Other evidence. Include any other detail here and, or attach evidence of that. You might find other signals, such as document properties (author different/document creation and edit time is just minutes etc)

Is a GenAI AI Breach Minor, Moderate or Major?
Any unacceptable use of GenAI should be treated the same as all other types of academic integrity breaches. This means that any GenAI breach should be considered in terms of the particular circumstances of the breach and against our breach classification system. In the first instance we
principally take an educative approach to academic integrity in student work.

A GenAI breach may be classified as Minor, Moderate or Major, depending on the breach classification criteria, see [Academic Integrity Guidelines](#) and with consideration to how and to what extent the GenAI was used. For example:

- If GenAI was used for **only one element or some minor elements** of the submission this might reasonably be considered a Moderate breach (i.e., similar to our definition of moderate breach for plagiarism: "direct copying including close paraphrasing or copying from other sources without correct citation").

- If GenAI was used to generate the **entire assessment submission or significant parts of it**, this might reasonably be considered a Major breach (i.e., as with our definition of a major breach for contract cheating in the Guidelines: "when a student submits work that has been completed for them by a third party").

The following examples provide further guidance:

'Unacceptable use of GenAI' can relate to a breach where:

1. A student was prohibited from using GenAI in the Assessment Task, **or**

2. A student was permitted to use GenAI but has not appropriately acknowledged the use of such.

As a general guide, in regard to (1) above, *where a student was prohibited from using GenAI in the Assessment Task, but did so,* it would be appropriate to classify as a Moderate breach.

However, this would be dependent on the extent and how the GenAI was used. For example, if:

i. GenAI was prohibited but used to generate a minimal part of the assessment submission, a Moderate breach classification may be appropriate;

ii. GenAI was prohibited but used to generate the entire assessment submission or a significant part of it, a Major breach classification may be appropriate.

In contrast, in regard to (2) above, *where a student was permitted to use GenAI but has not appropriately acknowledged the use of such,* if it relates to a breach by a student who has not completed two study terms and has no prior confirmed breaches, it may be appropriate to classify as a Minor breach (again dependent on the extent and how the GenAI was used).

Distinction between the Artificial Intelligence Report (AI Report) versus the Turnitin Similarity Report

The *Artificial Intelligence Report (AI Report)* is not the *Turnitin Similarity Report that we are familiar with.* This AI Report is new within Turnitin, and it may (or may not) indicate a probability (%) the work was completed using artificial intelligence. *Turnitin acknowledge that false positives are rare but possible in the AI Report.* However, our experience at SCU is that the % listed in the AI Report is not reliable.

The *Turnitin Similarity Report* indicates an overall Similarity Index (%) regarding matched text and then a % by source, e.g., student papers, publications and internet. These matches must be interrogated to determine if they are problematic or not.

Interpreting the Turnitin AI Report and Turnitin Similarity Report
Refer to the Teaching and Learning Turnitin website for more information about interpreting the Turnitin Report.