LSE Short-term Guidance for Teachers on Artificial Intelligence, Assessment and Academic Integrity in Preparation for the 2022-23 Assessment Period (Revised 15 March 2023)

In this paper, LSE's Working Group on Artificial Intelligence, Assessment and Academic Integrity (AI-A-AI) outlines:

- Ways to foster effective academic ethical practice on the part of your students
- Mitigations against academic misconduct, in view of the rapid evolution of generative AI tools.

LSE takes challenges to academic integrity and to the value of its degrees with the utmost seriousness. The School has detailed regulations and processes for ensuring academic integrity in summative work. Unless Departments provide otherwise in guidance on the authorised use of generative AI, its use in summative and formative assessment is *prohibited*. Departmental Teaching Committees are strongly encouraged to define what constitutes authorised use of generative AI tools (if any) for students taking modules in their Department. Where they do so they must clearly communicate this to colleagues, and to students.

Current School regulations will apply in cases where course leaders might suspect that generative AI tools have been used without authorisation in formative and summative work submitted during the 2022-23 assessment session. Given that there are no fully effective tools to detect the use of generative AI to date, this position underlines the importance of academic integrity and the ethical academic standards of behaviour that are expected of all members of our scholarly community, of which our students are an integral part.

The following short-term suggestions may help you with guidance and communications to your students in preparation for upcoming assessments. In the longer-term, LSE will share guidance and ideas about possible future changes/approaches to assessment on your courses and programmes. (N.B. This is a dynamic situation and further updates will be provided as appropriate).

- Agree your departmental position on the authorised uses of generative AI in both formative and summative assessments. This should include a statement of citation conventions in your discipline Possible authorised uses might include using tools for stylistic suggestions or for preparatory searches. (See Appendix 1 for the approach being taken by the Law School).

- In the case of specific assessments, course convenors need to specify to students exactly what is acceptable and how this should be acknowledged in the assessment submission. In those courses where a formative outline or similar precedes but informs a subsequent summative assessment, the course convenor should make clear whether any use of generative AI is acceptable in the development of both the formative and summative pieces.

- Underline and explain the importance of sound academic ethical practice to your students and their responsibility as members of our scholarly community. Signpost your students to current LSE Moodle guidance: Academic integrity (undergraduates) and Academic integrity (postgraduates)

- Inform your students that they must not try to pass off work created by generative AI tools as their own as this would constitute academic misconduct. Indicate that you have the right to conduct an

interview to confirm authorship.

- Acquaint yourself again with LSE Regulations on Assessment Offences and the processes that need to be followed by course convenors and sub-board chairs.

  - By the end of Lent Term, week 9, colleagues in ARD will provide more detailed guidance on: How to hold an interview with a student to check the authenticity of their work.
  - How to make a formal assessment offence allegation when the use of an AI tool is suspected.

  This will be published on the following staff guidance pages by Friday 17 March.

- Consider asking your students to submit an (updated) coversheet accompanying their assignments. (See proposed text below in Appendix 2. Further guidance in this regard will be provided by ARD by Friday 17 March)

- Try out a popular generative AI tool such as ChatGPT for yourself – enter a sample past summative assessment question (please do not use your questions for the current year as they may feed into the training of the algorithm) or writing task and see what it comes up with.

- If the timings are appropriate, amend department, programme and course assessment guidelines to communicate the current School position.

- Minor changes can be made to assessment questions for essays and examinations with the following caveats (see Appendix 3 for suggestions on how to tweak summative assessments for the current academic year).

  - Significant changes for the current academic year are not recommended given that students will have been preparing for their summative assessments through formative work and the use of past papers. Where substantive changes are made to question style or rubrics from one year to the next, departments are ordinarily required to provide students with sample questions, papers or mock assessments in the new format in good time to allow for adequate preparation.
  - Where possible, colleagues are encouraged to conduct internal assessment scrutiny processes in the normal fashion. In the case of minor adjustments, it is not necessary to inform External Examiners.
  - Where minor adjustments are made course leaders / internal examiners should follow their standard departmental process by seeking any necessary approval, for example via Department Teaching Committee or Sub-board Chairs.

- Reflect on your assessment practices and how you may need to adapt them in response to the capabilities of generative AI technologies in planning your assessment for next academic year. Further guidance will be forthcoming from the AI-A-AI working group and the Eden Centre by the end of week of Lent Term, week 10. This might involve a change in the assessment method or changes to the design of questions. Departments are encouraged to reach out to your Eden Centre

adviser to take forward discussions and book an assessment design workshop.

- All changes to assessment should be made with reference to the [LSE Principles of Assessment](). Changes to summative assessment information published to students in course guides for the academic year 2023-2024 should be communicated to TQARO via the annual course guide review process in CAPIS by May 8, 2023. Queries about making updates to assessment information in CAPIS should be directed to TQARO via [ard.capis@lse.ac.uk]().

Appendix 1: Approach of the Law School to the authorised and unauthorised use of generative AI tools

The Law School has generously agreed to share its position on the authorised and unauthorised use of generative AI tools with the LSE community as summarised below:

1. *Writing process*: The wording and product produced by any Generative AI system cannot be used in the planning or writing of any summative or formative assessment. This includes using the wording or product of the Generative AI search 'as is' and/or in amended form. This does not apply to programs the functionality of which is restricted to making purely stylistic suggestions, such as Grammarly or similar functionality currently built into Microsoft Word, whether or not these rely on machine learning/AI technology. To be clear: Summative and formative assessment must be planned, researched and written solely by the student.

2. *Sources*: The product of a Generative AI search cannot be quoted or relied upon in any summative or formative work as a source supporting statements and arguments made in the assessment (other than statements/arguments about such system itself, e.g., when writing an essay about ChatGPT). All sources used must be appropriately referenced as provided for in the School's referencing and plagiarism rules.

3. *Research tools*: Subject to the clear prohibitions in points 1 and 2 above, Generative AI may be used as a research tool, in the same way that internet and database searches may be used in preparation for producing the summative or formative assessment. For example, Generative AI may be used to identify research articles, to direct further research, or to explain terms. However, as with any research tool, students should apply scholarly judgment when relying on the results of any such tool.

4. Students may be asked to explain the writing and research process behind their formative and summative assessment and the School may use automated systems and other techniques to identify possible inappropriate use of Generative AI tools.

Appendix 2: Possible draft additional text for a cover sheet

The Academic Registrar's Division (ARD) will shortly be sharing a proposed template for you to use or adapt for summative assessments. We recommend the inclusion of the following text or a version thereof:

By submitting this work, you confirm that:

- You have not used any unauthorised form of generative artificial intelligence tool in working on this summative assessment.
- You have read and understood the Department regulations about appropriately referencing the work of other as well as you own.
- You have read and understood the School's Regulations on Assessment Offences.

Appendix 2: Possible short-term changes to assessment to limit risk of misconduct [1]

- Build in requirements for students to draw on specific case studies, lectures, field trips, references from readings lists (including, if appropriate, references to post-2021 literature/sources) or other LSE education-specific experiences, although it is worth noting that over time these specific features are likely to enter the training data of future AI systems.
- Require students to include page references, where appropriate, in their citations. Remind students that academics consider proper referencing when grading coursework. In addition to being integral to good scholarship, proper referencing, including appropriate page referencing, makes it easier to identify fake citations that AI tools often generate.
- Use higher level assessment activities (drawing on higher level critical thinking skills such as evaluate, reflect, synthesise, critique, apply, create, imagine) from Bigg's[2] taxonomy so it is harder to produce a standard answer.
- Include opportunities for students to reflect on their work including bringing in personal insights.
- In those cases where formative work links directly to summative work (E.g., a draft essay plan), consider asking students to make specific reference to relevant feedback they have responded to in their summative assignment.

---

[1] This appendix draws on the presentation by Simon Walker, The Future of Higher Education: Exploring the Implications of Generative AI, Deputy Heads of Department for Teaching/Education, LSE, 17 January 2023. Full presentation available on request.

[2] https://www.johnbiggs.com.au/academic/solo-taxonomy/