

# Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Use Policy

This policy is effective from 15 November 2023

**Approval body** Academic Council **Approval date** 15 November 2023

**Owner** David Crowley, Head of Visual Culture **Next review date** December 2024

## 1 Purpose

- 1.1 This policy guides NCAD staff in the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) when setting assignments on academic programmes, and NCAD students when undertaking those tasks. This policy is designed to support the creativity, transparency and originality to which the teaching and learning at NCAD is committed while upholding the highest principles of academic integrity. This policy should be understood as operating in conjunction with NCAD's Plagiarism Policy.
- 1.2 This policy concerns the use of specific forms of AI, namely those which can be understood as Generative AI. These are systems that are capable of generating texts, code, sounds, music and images in response to prompts or other instructions from the user. These outputs will be new and unique. Typical examples of Generative AI tools include CHAT GPT, Dall-E-2, MidJourney and Github Co-pilot.
- 1.3 This policy does not address the use of AI-powered tools designed to correct or improve visual or written expression (such as photo editors or grammar checkers) or to conduct online research (e.g. image search engines). In such cases, and as currently required, the student using such AI-powered tools should be able to make an unequivocal declaration of their authorship of any piece of work conducted during their studies. Similarly, this policy does not address the training of a student's own AI model through machine learning, data sets, etc.
- 1.4 This policy is guided by the understanding that Generative AI has the potential to act as a valuable aid to learning, research and creativity, and that, if used, students should do so in critical and informed ways. This means that they should be guided to understand how Generative AI functions; what kind of data it draws on; and the implications of its use for copyright and Intellectual Property (both that of the student's and of others'). In particular, students need to be equipped to understand the limitations of any Generative AI that they use, as well as the tendency for these tools to exploit the creativity and research of human authors, artists and other creators without acknowledgment.
- 1.5 Our approach to the use of Generative AI at NCAD requires transparency. Students should make their own practices as learners evident to those who teach and assess them. In this way, teaching staff are able to provide valuable and effective feedback.
- 1.6 While there is much public discussion about the likely negative impact of Generative AI on academic integrity and creativity, it is clear that AI Generative tools will continue to develop and be a feature of many future applications of technology. They will be employed in many workplace and professional settings. At the same time, the core skills and understanding that we seek to develop in our students remain of central importance. Accordingly, our approach is to support NCAD teaching staff to set appropriate limits on the uses of Generative AI tools,

<i>Doc version</i>	<i>Approval date</i>	<i>Modified by</i>	<i>Summary of modifications</i>
V1		N/A	N/A

balancing their utility against the learning needs of our students. Without such declared limits, students will reasonably make use of freely available and highly purposeful AI Generative tools. It is incumbent on staff to communicate clearly the limits and potential of Generative AI tools in relation to any task being set.

## **2 Policy**

- 2.1 Teaching staff have the right to prohibit the use of an AI Generator by a student when undertaking an assignment. Typically, this will be when the Learning Outcomes of a module require that the student develop and apply particular skills. The development of research skills in the library or sketching skills are incompatible with the use of Generative AI, for instance. In such cases, the teaching staff will make it clear in any published course documentation - such as a brief - that use of an AI Generator is not permitted.
- 2.2 Teaching staff may allow limited use of an AI Generator to undertake a specified task which forms part of the work to be undertaken on the course. For instance, an AI Generator might be used in an early phase of a project to support ideation or as a critical investigation of particular AI tools. Limited use may also include the use of Generative AI to check or improve content which has been created by the student. In such cases, the teaching staff will specify the nature and extent of permitted usage of an AI tool. This limited usage will be specified in any published documentation provided to students on the course. Staff may require students to declare in written form the nature and the extent of the use of an AI Generator when presenting / submitting work for assessment. This may, for instance, take the form of a declaration on a cover sheet, a citation or a caption for images, as required by the teaching staff.
- 2.3 Teaching staff may allow uninhibited use of an AI Generator to undertake any task which forms part of the work to be undertaken on a course. Again, this should be declared in course documentation. And as above, the student will be required to make a full declaration about the way in which the AI Generator has been used.
- 2.4 Teaching staff have the right to use AI detection tools to test or confirm their use in the production of work by NCAD students. Staff should not, however, rely on such tools while they have yet to prove their complete accuracy.
- 2.5 In the case where staff have reason to believe that an AI Generator has been used in ways that contravene the permitted uses outlined above, the following approach should be taken:
  - 2.5.1 The student should be required to explain their work processes concerning the use of AI tools by the module coordinator or a nominee. This will typically take the form of an in-person meeting with the student;
  - 2.5.2 If the student admits to having breached this policy, a judgement should be made - by the module coordinator and the head of programme - about the scale and nature of the offence;
  - 2.5.3 'First offences' or minor breaches of the policy will typically result in the student re-submitting the work and a grade penalty can be considered at the point of assessment of the module. If the timing of this assessment point does not permit the

resubmission of work, first offences or minor breaches may result in a requirement that the student resits the assessment task;

- 2.5.4 More substantial breaches of the policy can be considered a fail and a recommendation be made to the Examination Board that the student be required to repeat the module;
- 2.5.5 If a student denies using an AI Generator despite evidence to the contrary or engages in an act of deception, the module coordinator and head of programme may decide that the student is guilty of serious academic misconduct (defined as 'any action or attempted action that may result in creating an unfair academic advantage'). In such cases they should request that the Head of Academic Affairs invoke the Student Discipline Procedure as outlined in the NCAD Student Code of Conduct.