University of Sussex – Guidance for staff on use of AI/ ChatGPT in assessed work

Preamble

ChatGPT (Generative Pre-Trained Transformer) is a type of artificial intelligence (AI) created by <u>Open</u> <u>AI</u> which can generate unique human-like response answers, essays, or solve problems. Unlike plagiarised work, the use of ChatGPT, or other AI, will not be indicated through a similarity score on Turnitin. ChatGPT is free of charge and has over one million users.

Regulations

The use of AI is an attempt to gain unfair advantage by cheating. Cheating undermines the integrity of awards conferred by the university, is a risk to standards and the reputation of the institution. AI generated assessment submissions are strictly prohibited, unless the use of AI is explicitly stipulated as part of the assessment brief. The use of AI is encompassed in the university's definition of 'personation' within the <u>Academic Misconduct regulations</u> "personation in written submissions is where someone other than the student prepares the work, part of the work, or provides substantial assistance with work submitted for assessment".

Detection

It is not currently possible to provide absolute proof that AI has been used, but the following may rouse the suspicion of markers:

- Text does not answer the question as someone with familiarity with the subject area would, or is incorrect;
- The answer does not refer to texts in the reading list or other module materials/ contents;
- There is no strong argument, opinion or 'human voice', the structure is formulaic;
- The style and standard of the work differs significantly from the student's previous submissions;
- The student could not have reasonably produced the volume and standard of work within the time;
- Quotations and citations are absent or incorrect.

There are tools available which claim to detect AI, including <u>openai-detector</u> and GPTZero which give a predictive score based on machine learning. These have not been tested or endorsed by the University. Turnitin have stated that they are developing AI detection tools and OpenAI (the creators of ChatGPT) are developing watermark-like features to identify IA produced text.

Investigation

In cases where the use of AI is suspected, the usual personation procedure should be followed, as detailed in the Academic Misconduct regulations:

60. A suspected case of personation may be investigated by a School team, based on a paper based review of the students other written assessments (submissions and exams) to date in the stage of study. The School team should normally include the Head of School, the Course Convenor and must include the Investigating Officer. The School team would review the assessments and consider issues such as consistency of style, formatting, use of language/grammar as well as the student's academic performance in assessment. The School team may refer a case for consideration by the Panel or confirm a 'no case'. Where the case is referred to the Panel, the student will be invited to attend the

Panel to discuss the findings of the School team and to provide information on how the assessment was completed. A viva on the student's knowledge of the assessment or the discipline will not be conducted at the Panel, however, questions can be asked about how the assessment was prepared and why material was included or not included. The Investigating Officer can meet with the student before the Panel to discuss the concerns raised in broad terms.

An initial judgement is made by each school's Investigating Officer, who will collate evidence for consideration by the university Academic Misconduct Panel.

The Panel will determine an outcome based on review of the evidence file, and oral evidence from the Module Convenor. The student may attend the Panel and/ or submit a written statement for consideration. The Panel acts on 'the balance of probability', i.e., whether it is more likely than not that the work is wholly that of the student.

Penalty

If a student is found guilty of academic misconduct, the Panel will agree an appropriate penalty and notify the student, the PAB (via school office) and student records within 10 working days. Penalties follow a prescribed list detailed in sections 75 and 76 of the Academic Misconduct Regulations.

Monitoring

Cases of suspected and proven academic misconduct are recorded and reported in an anonymised format in an annual report to the Examination and Assessment Regulations Sub-Committee (EAR) and University Education Committee (UEC).

Further advice

Further advice on specific cases can be sought by contacting <u>academicmisconduct@sussex.ac.uk</u>.

Academic Regulations, January 2023