

 S P Jain London School of Management	Generative AI Statement Principles and Guidance
Document Type	Policy
Administering Entity	Dean, Registrar, Student Services staff, Programme Directors
Latest Approval/ Amendment Date	17 January 2024
Last Approval/ Amendment Date	New policy
Approval Authority	Academic Board
Indicative Time of Review	January 2029

Generative AI Statement, Principles and Guidance

Generative AI Statement:

SP Jain chooses to positively embrace the adoption of AI across the School within a boundary of academic, administrative and professional integrity and AI should be used responsibly and ethically. The School encourages all staff to use AI across all their work roles of teaching, research and service where its use will prove value enhancing to different stakeholders without compromising professional integrity.

It considers that when used appropriately, AI can enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of teaching, research and service. If used efficiently and effectively, AI can augment and enhance administrative processes and procedures.

The School strongly believes in the ‘human-AI-loop’ meaning that AI may assist humans in the generation of creative content, but AI outputs should never be used without human intervention and continual revision. The role of AI across the entire student experience from beginning to end needs to be carefully crafted and monitored.

The School values academic freedom and therefore staff are encouraged to experiment and adopt Generative AI tools where and how they see fit according to their own specific needs and requirements

subject to the Principles below. Similarly AI can be used across disciplinary areas according to the needs and requirements of different subjects. This will likely vary from subject to subject.

The School will provide on-going professional development training about AI to ensure Faculty are aware of and can adopt latest practices. Faculty are encouraged to pro-actively attend such opportunities and apply the learning.

Through the integration of AI across teaching, research and service, and administration, the School will consequently help students prepare for the future of work within an increasingly technology enabled world.

AI Principles:

- AI should be strictly adopted through never compromising human well-being, safety, security and privacy for all the School's stakeholders.
- The use of AI in research including supervision must be done within the boundary of the highest and rigorous ethical standards.
- Any use of AI should augment the student experience.
- AI should be used to augment but not fully replace the vital human relationship between Faculty, administrative staff and students or within groups of peer learners. The 'human-AI-loop' will be paramount throughout the entire student experience.
- If AI is used to provide Faculty with summative assessment feedback, Faculty must still maintain the primary role of 'ownership' in the assessment of the students' learning process, behaviours and outcomes.
- AI should never be used as a substitute for students' higher-order learning skills such as critical thinking including the skills of application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation.

Use of AI for teaching

The School considers that AI may be particularly beneficial to students for the development of their lower-order learning skills such as knowledge and comprehension. It can also be usefully utilised to 'brainstorm' a topic and 'spark' creativity. However, AI should never be used as a substitute for students' higher-order learning skills such as critical thinking including the skills of application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation (as per Bloom's Taxonomy of Skills). Students will need to demonstrate and prove these higher-order skills within the 'ownership' of their learning including submitted work. Where AI is used, it will always need to be appropriately referenced for checking and authentication purposes.

As mentioned earlier, the School values academic freedom and therefore staff are encouraged to experiment and adopt Generative AI tools where and how they see fit according to their own specific needs and requirements. This will likely vary with each Faculty. Faculty should decide whether, when and how AI should be used within their teaching and clearly communicate these boundaries to students at the start of the course. If adopted, staff are encouraged to generate and communicate an 'Acceptable AI Use' policy statement to students relating to their course, if they deem this useful. This can be highlighted within the Introduction part of the course outline. It is the responsibility of students to adhere to these guidelines.

If Generative AI is used to provide summative feedback about student assessment(s), Faculty must always ensure to 'customise' this feedback to maintain their key and primary role within the feedback evaluation process.

Faculty and staff are encouraged to share their experiences about AI with their colleagues to help build up a network and agglomeration of compounding experiences.

Guidance

Experimenting with different AI tools may provide an opportunity for you to consider what you teach and how you teach. More generally, it may help you to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of your teaching, research and service.

- A 'litmus test' for you to always ask yourself is: *'Will this particular use of AI enhance the student experience and improve the unit learning outcomes?'*
- Decide at the outset, whether, when and how, AI is permissible within your course.
- Clearly communicate your decision to the students at the start of the course along with your supporting rationale. This should ideally be done through open dialogue and discussion with the students.
- You will need to consider whether to include an 'Acceptable AI Use' policy statement within the Introduction part of your course outline. This should usefully articulate what is the acceptable use of AI within the boundary of academic integrity and ethical practice. Conversely, it could contain what would be considered a breach of academic integrity. Specific examples can usefully be given in this regard to help provide clarity to the students.
- Faculty are recommended to demonstrate the 'power' of AI within their classroom activities. This will also help demonstrate to the students its appropriate use and provide further clarity. In short, Faculty should 'oversee' and monitor the use of AI within classroom activities as part of the 'human-AI-loop'.
- Students must appropriately reference the use of AI using APA referencing style. Faculty can also request students to include the sequence of their AI tool(s) prompts search, say within an Appendix, should they wish.
- Students should be required to specifically refer to course materials e.g. case studies and articles and classroom activities when completing assessments including the End Term Exam. They also need to express ideas verbally and in writing in their own words. 'Red flags' in this regard might be:
 - The submission of 'generic' answers which bares vague resemblance to the course content and/or the assessment question(s) asked.
 - The writing does not sound/read like it was written by the student.
 - The absence of expected concepts, theories, or references, etc. (i.e., those discussed in course readings and lectures).
 - The presence of unexpected concepts, theories, references, etc. (i.e., those not discussed in course readings and lectures).
 - There are factual errors in the writing consistent with those found in/made by Generative AI tools.
 - The general lack of 'substance' within the submitted work.
 - Work which includes 'flowery' English, no typos or even any basic grammar errors.
 - The amount of writing produced exceeds a reasonably expected amount given time constraints (e.g., time-limited exams).

- Etc.
- All the above will require you to exercise judgment when evaluating students' work. The Turnitin Report now generates an AI (Artificial Intelligence generated text) index score. However, this may not provide a definitive conclusion in this regard.
- In accordance with the Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures students must be informed that academic misconduct regarding the inappropriate use of AI (as well as other forms of cheating and plagiarism) will be treated seriously and may incur penalties that have severe negative implications for marks, grades and ultimately, scholarships. If students have any doubts about its use, they should be encouraged to seek guidance from you.
- Share your experiences about AI with your colleagues and seek advice from your Dean, Associate Dean/ Assistant Dean/ Deputy Director and Director of Examinations, as and when needed. Read the materials as well as the Notes circulated by the ChatGPT Working Party about the different Faculty experiences with ChatGPT. Regularly attend Harvard Business Publishing Webinars and School Workshops.
- Always remember, AI is a tool to help your teaching, research and service, but it will never be a substitute for it. It will likely never ever contend and substitute for your experience and wisdom.
- Information for students – students should be informed that
: *'Presenting assignments that have been created or improved through the use of digital aids (e.g., translators, digital assistants, or artificial intelligence tools like ChatGPT, Bard, Bing, etc.) to an extent where the submitted work no longer reasonably reflects the students' abilities or cannot be deemed an authentic product of the student, unless expressly allowed by the assessment specifications.'*