Guidance for Staff about Generative AI

AU Generative AI working group, updated 24/2/2023

Generative AI tools such as ChatGPT are having a significant impact on higher education because students can use them to generate content which is then submitted as the student’s own work. In response to this challenge, we have organised a Generative AI Working Group with representation from all three Faculties, the Learning & Teaching Enhancement Unit, and the AberSU. Here we provide ideas staff can use this semester to explain your existing assessments to students and to handle common red flags when marking. The AberSU is organising [**guidance for students**](https://www.abersu.co.uk/advice/university/unacceptableacademicpractice/).

Please note that there is no ‘one-size-fits-all’ solution. The list is not exhaustive and the landscape is rapidly changing as these tools develop. We encourage teaching staff to discuss your own teaching context with colleagues in your department and devise a consistent shared approach.

Please use this document in conjunction with [**QAA’s guidance on academic integrity and AI**](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/news-events/news/qaa-briefs-members-on-artificial-intelligence-threat-to-academic-integrity).

* Explaining existing assessments for students this semester:
	+ Make sure students know what support is available to them.
	+ Tell your students what you expect in their assignments in regard to AI.
	+ Reiterate the [**Regulation on UAP**](https://www.aber.ac.uk/en/academic-registry/handbook/regulations/uap/), which will be updated in March to accommodate AI.
	+ Shift the focus from the product (e.g. the essay or report etc) to the learning process. We want students to generate their own answers and demonstrate what they have learned.
	+ We want students to develop skills they will use in the future, whether in their careers or further study. The only way to develop such a skill is to investigate and practice it.
	+ Encourage students to use course materials from your Aspire reading list, etc.
	+ AI-generated answers often do not fit the module context or marking criteria. Generative AI doesn’t handle tasks such as critical evaluation or reflection very well.
	+ AI-generated text is often factually incorrect. Generative AI is essentially a sophisticated predictive text tool. These tools remix existing content, often converging on the most common, generic answer lacking originality.
* Things to keep in mind when marking:
	+ **Possible red flags**: As of this writing, staff marking AI-generated assignments may notice factually incorrect information, fake citations, inappropriate sources, lack of concrete examples, an overly-generic line of argument, lack of critical evaluation, or out-of-date sources. Note that generative AI tools are rapidly developing, so these red flags are subject to change.
	+ If you see inappropriate sources or suspicious citations, we encourage you to follow up on some of them. Fake or inappropriate sources could indicate use of AI or essay mills.
	+ Keep in mind that some ‘red flags’ may not be due to UAP but just indicate that the student didn’t have a good understanding of what is expected for that assignment.
	+ If you think the student has used an essay mill or AI to generate assignment content in an unethical way, university guidance is to hold a viva to ascertain if they’ve written the submitted work themselves or not.