

MANAV RACHNA UNIVERSITY

Estd. vide Haryana Act No. 26 of 2014
(Formerly Manav Rachna College of Engineering)
Sec-43, Aravali Hills, Faridabad

F.NO MRU/OM-OO/Vol. V/2023/1946

Dated: 11.10.2023

Notification

It is hereby notified that the Competent Authority of the University has approved the **Policy & Guidelines on AI-Based writing Tools** for the faculty members and the students of the University. This includes ChatGPT and other similar AI-tools. It has come in force with immediate effect.

A copy of the Policy is enclosed herewith for your information to all concerned.

Encl : as above


(Dr. K. Singh)
Registrar

To;

1. ES to Chancellor for kind information to Hon'ble Chancellor
2. PS to VP for kind information of Hon'ble Vice President
3. PS to VC for kind information to Hon'ble Vice Chancellor
4. PVC for information
5. All the Deans/Assoc. Deans/Directors/HoDs with the request to kindly circulate it among all the concern faculty and students of the Department
6. DR (Acad)/Dy. CoE/AR

AI-Based Writing Tools Guidance and Policy

Facts about AI Usage in Academics:

- Please note that the Manav Rachna Centre for Advanced Learning (CAL) is in the process of creating some basic informational for faculty on ChatGPT, including some specific approaches to the tool that may be incorporated into classrooms. It is expected that these shall soon become ubiquitous in the years to come so we need to prepare ourselves so that we handle it effectively as and when required.
- The CAL concurs that there is room for AI tools in the writing and educational experience, but that decisions about these tools must be made by the individual faculty member for achieving the course outcomes.
- Some institutions have rejected these technologies outrightly and consider them as plagiarism, while some consider that these play a useful and productive pedagogical role in the academic exercise. They argue that it keeps students abreast of latest developments in the technology and thus helps them to acquire a useful skill set in writing process.
- While it is important for individual faculty to review AI tools critically before deciding whether and how to adopt them, it is too early to expect definitive answers on the impact of tools like ChatGPT etc. on various learning outcomes.
- As faculty at research institutions some faculty members have a special interest in promoting scholarly investigation of AI domain, understanding its limitations including its ethical implications.
- As the faculty has to make decisions about the extent of AI use, they should keep in mind that AI shares the biases of its creators. Some AI based Large Language Models (like ChatGPT), do have some serious problem of reducing the creative writing which has shown growth and needs attention. These tools have a linguistic and literacy bias, though some argue that these can be used as productive learning activity as well.
- Writing is a process of communication between human subjects, with social and emotional components. AI can be used to augment some of these processes in more formal writing and can serve as a template for a human writer but it should never be used to replace creative human writing because good writing requires human input like emotional, social aspects.
- The students drafting needs feedback, and revision, and thus a student's work should have originality. Further learning objectives focus on developing skills and practices and use of such tools can reduce the desired incentives to use tools. The incentives to plagiarize and cheat (with or without AI) increase when students perceive that performance in a final submission is the only thing being rewarded in grading.
- It has been argued that ChatGPT can convincingly mimic student writing, and thus outcome is often underdeveloped, poor internal cohesion, and displays a lack of nuance in its deployment of vocabulary, spelling etc. Instructors should avoid overreacting to fears about ChatGPT and

not penalize students for “sounding like ChatGPT,” or accuse students of academic dishonesty merely because their prose sounds awkward and artificial.

- Machines cannot take responsibility for what they write, but academic writers are obliged to do so. Scholarly journals are already setting standards for the use of AI in published work—for example, that ChatGPT cannot be listed as an “author,” and that any use of the tool in the writing process must be fully disclosed. A similar approach needs to be adopted in the classroom.
- While AI tools can be a productive learning activity in some of the courses, every instructor need not re-structure their courses or assignments around these products. Creating new assignments and activities that incorporate ChatGPT taxes instructors’ already limited time and energy. Furthermore, ChatGPT (like many similar products) requires users to provide personal information before they receive access to it. Forcing students to divulge their information to a third party may not be safe or ethical.
- Finally, it is noted that students in large class may be tempted to use such tools as they feel their instructors do not sufficient time to address each student. In such situations Faculty members should use products like “plagiarism detection services“ when they lack the time or energy to read students’ writing carefully. Programs coordinators should ensure that writing-intensive classes are appropriately staffed to allow the individualized feedback and revision processes that promote learning and discourage the misuse of AI.

Due to the capabilities and accessibility of Online tools like ChatGPT, Magic Write, and similar other tools, many students have started using it to complete their assignments in various fields of study, including composition to computer programming. These Online tools that are AI based are quite powerful language software and are currently being used to generate texts etc. Manav Rachna University has reviewed Online tools like ChatGPT, Magic Write, and similar other tools in light of writing-related such as grammar checkers, plagiarism detection services, and automated citation systems etc. These tools are being used to write assignments, conduct research, synthesize course materials and other content, and produce coherent writing. Decisions about whether and how AI may be incorporated into a class must be made on a careful, case-by-case basis, and should be revisited frequently as the technology continues to evolve. Students and faculty should critically engage and use AI with accountability to standards of scholarly and academic integrity. As these tools are constantly evolving and students may use their text in different ways, it is challenging to accurately identify AI-generated student submissions. AI writing detectors are easily subverted by light editing of the text, so it is recommended to focus on the strategies outlined above to build assignments and assessment approaches that emphasize academic honesty. It is expected that these shall soon become ubiquitous in the years to come. The university has deliberated on this issue at the policy level and has decided to make some guidelines for instructors and students related to these emerging technologies in the following areas:

- **Communication:** Every teacher should clearly communicate and establish his/her rules regarding the use of AI-generated text in the course & assignment and specify the steps to be taken in case of suspected academic misconduct involving AI tools. The use of such tools by the students may act as a shortcut to such learning but can undermine their goals of becoming informed, critical thinkers, skills that are essential in 21st century. Instructors need to encourage critical thinking about

digital literacy, sources of evidence, writing style, tone, and what constitutes effective written communication.

- **Writing as Process:** Where use of AI based such tools can/may deprive students from achieving the expected learning outcomes it should not be encouraged.
- **Intentional Assignment Design:** Instructors should design assignments that require students to connect in novel ways to course content, class discussions, and personal experience need to be adopted in the pedagogy, making it more challenging for AI tools to generate appropriate responses.
- **Assessing Process:** The faculty must use formative assessment of the learning process more frequent in the class to encourage students to build their skills, and using in-class writing to establish benchmarks.
- **Incorporate AI:** The faculty should consider productive and innovative ways to incorporate AI-based tools into teaching to prepare students for the use of technology in their future personal and professional lives without sacrificing the aim of learning objectives.

Research using AI:

In research it is the novelty of the ideas that faculty/students create and present that helps them to have copyright. AI based texts and content do not have your copyright and cannot be considered as your work, so to be discouraged completely. In order to create awareness among faculty student researchers etc. associated with use of AI and the associated risks, the university after due deliberations has come up with the following guidelines on academic integrity. As per UGC norms “the core work carried out by any author shall be based on the original idea and shall be covered by Zero Tolerance Policy on Plagiarism”

- No work assessed by any form of AI should be included in the “per cent of grade” criterion. A class must offer students grades and revision-oriented feedback from a human reader (the faculty or TA). For this each instructor must create do’s and don’ts for his/her course.
- Automated plagiarism detection tools should not be used without a full understanding of their limitations.
- All faculty members should provide the individualized, revision-oriented human feedback to the student for better learning.

Violations of Academic Integrity

The following AI-specific guidance is being proposed to meet the issue of Academic Integrity:

1. Manav Rachna University takes violations of academic integrity very seriously as they are not based on the atmosphere of trust, fairness, and respect which are essential to learning and the dissemination of knowledge.
2. Authors are expected to be aware of it and abide by the university’s Academic Integrity Policy.
3. Claiming the work of others as your own, whether created by another human or an artificial intelligence, is regarded as plagiarism, and as such is a violation of academic integrity.
4. Authors are required to cite the material written with the help of any AI writing tools.

5. Human input and human feedback are essential parts of the writing process that AI cannot and should not replace. AI may assist students and instructors as they engage in the writing process, but it should not be used as a replacement.
6. It is also brought to the knowledge of authors that in case of writing using AI writing tools, the contents if found more than 10 % in aggregate during plagiarism detection, the work shall be considered to be against the University Academic Integrity policy and shall not be given any credit and not processed further.
7. Authors shall be required to submit a declaration to the effect that the plagiarism content shall not be more than 10% even after using AI writing tools.
8. The university strongly encourage instructors to be aware of the consequences if found involved in it which will be treated as violation of academic integrity.
9. Each matter violating the mentioned policy on academic integrity shall be dealt with by the Research Ethical Committee who shall after preparing the report on the matter submit the same to the Vice Chancellor for approval.
10. In case of any grievance on part of the affected person (Faculty/Student) the university authority may constitute a committee (on a case to case basis) to look into the grievance who may review the case and submit their recommendations to Vice Chancellor for final decision.
11. In case of any inconsistency or controversy or interpretation of these guidelines the matter shall be referred to Vice Chancellor whose decision shall be final.

Registrar, MRU