**Generative AI Academic Dishonesty Reports (ADR’s)**

**Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ’s)**

**Is it a violation of MSU policies if students use artificial intelligence (AI) in a course?**

This answer depends on many factors:

* Is the use of generative AI permitted by the instructor?
* What was communicated to students about the use of AI in the classroom?
* Would using generative AI inhibit learning or completing required course material?

In short, if the instructor explicitly prohibits the use of artificial intelligence for an assignment/examination, then it is a violation of MSU policies (referenced below). If the use of AI is not explicitly prohibited, instructors and students should seek clarification about what is permissible in their courses prior to using AI. If conflict around acceptable use is still occurring, consider consulting with the [Ombudsperson’s Office](https://ombud.msu.edu/).

**How should instructors communicate with their class about the use of artificial intelligence in their courses?**

As Artificial Intelligence is largely unchartered territory for many of us, we encourage faculty to collaborate with colleagues, leaders, and CTLI to determine how to best use (or prevent) this new technology as a resource in your assessment of student learning. It is important to outline expectations with students through the course syllabus. In addition, instructors are encouraged to regularly and consistently communicate with students through email, in-class discussions, and lecture notes as well. Many students will have different understandings of AI use through each of their classes, it is important for instructors to communicate specific expectations for AI use in their course and use consistent language throughout the course.

**What detection software is available for detecting inappropriate generative artificial intelligence use?**

There will likely be multiple websites, apps, and embedded tools that claim to assist with detection. Empirical testing has shown the reliability of detection software is uncertain and may exhibit bias. As an example, MSU’s turnitin.com subscription includes a generative AI detection component that we are uncertain will be useful or reliable. As with any detection tool, it is important to use the detection report as a tool, think critically about the reliability of findings in the report, and not interpret the report as a definitive finding. Instructors are encouraged to consider other ways to test the veracity and originality of student writing. Instructors should speak with students, seeking to understand a student’s writing process through inquiry, and share the report as part of a more robust discussion about original work. Instructors are responsible for reaching their own conclusions, and for the ethics of their statements and actions, regardless of which tools they choose to use.

**Should faculty file an ADR if they believe a student used generative artificial intelligence for an assignment or examination?**

After investigating, if an instructor has determined through their own judgment that generative artificial intelligence was more likely than not used in a manner inappropriate to the assignment and communicated course guidelines, they should assign a penalty grade as outlined in their syllabus. As a result of the finding, faculty **must** also submit an ADR ([Integrity of Scholarship and Grades Policy](https://spartanexperiences.msu.edu/about/handbook/regulations/student-group-regs-rulings-policies-ordinances/integrity-of-scholarship-and-grades.html)).

**What if faculty are not sure about whether or not a student used artificial intelligence in their course?**

The best course of action is to discuss the concerns with the student. Instructorsshould ask students if they used unauthorized generative artificial intelligence to complete an assignment/examination. If after the discussion and the instructor is still unsure they are always welcome to contact their supervisor, the [Office of Student Support & Accountability](https://ossa.msu.edu/) or the [Ombudsperson’s Office](https://ombud.msu.edu/) for further guidance.

**If an instructor files an ADR for misuse of generative artificial intelligence, which** [**General Student Regulation**](https://spartanexperiences.msu.edu/about/handbook/regulations/general-student-regulations.html) **should be cited?**

As the complainant, it is the instructor’s discretion to determine which of the following regulations were violated. Most General Student Regulations are broad enough to encompass misuse of technology in the course.

Here are commonly selected policies for Generative Artificial Intelligence misuse:

**1.01** claim or submit the academic work of another as one’s own.

**1.02** procure, provide, accept or use any materials containing questions or answers to any examination or assignment without proper authorization.

**1.04** allow any examination or assignment to be completed for oneself, in part or in total, by another without proper authorization.

**1.05** alter, tamper with, appropriate, destroy or otherwise interfere with the research, resources, or other academic work of another person.

**1.06** fabricate or falsify data or results.

**How do faculty members submit an ADR?**

Submit an online [ADR form](https://msu-advocate.symplicity.com/public_report/index.php/pid821635) here. Reporters will be prompted to include documentation supporting the violation and the responsible student’s information. Reporters will receive a copy of the form for their records.

Students will also receive a copy of this form as they have a due process right to view any allegations. This form complies with MSU FERPA requirements.

**What happens when an ADR is submitted?**

The Office of Student Support & Accountability (OSSA) will process the report. If this is the student’s first ADR, they will be enrolled in the Scholarly Spartans intervention course which will require students to complete required modules about academic misconduct issues and learn about academic expectations at MSU. If the student successfully completes the course and receives no other ADR’s during their time at MSU, the report will be expunged upon their graduation.

If this ADR is considered egregious by the instructor, student’s college, or if this is the student’s second/third ADR on the student’s disciplinary record, the student’s college may request additional sanctions from the Office of Student Support & Accountability.

Regardless of next steps, OSSA will communicate with the faculty member (the complainant) and the student (the respondent) about everyone’s rights and responsibilities including the process to contest the ADR through an administrative or a board hearing as outlined in [Student Rights and Responsibilities Article 7](https://spartanexperiences.msu.edu/about/handbook/student-rights-responsibilities/article-seven-adjudication-of-academic-cases.html).

Additionally, if a student disagrees with the ADR, they have the right to contest the report formally through the academic integrity hearing board. All formal proceedings must exhaust informal resolution attempts to resolve the dispute with the instructor and their supervising administrator.