

Artificial Intelligence Use and Academic Integrity

Use of GenAI is authorized (with attribution) for most tasks and assignments unless I indicate otherwise.

If you use GenAI at any point in your composing process, you must:

1. Write a 2-3 sentences that explains HOW you used the tool
2. Write 2-3 sentences explaining WHY you used the tool
3. Include a screenshot of or links to the prompts you used
4. Put 1-3 together as an appendix that you attach to your work

Example of Appendix explanation:

“I used GenAI during the revision stage of my assignment. I gave Claude AI my draft and I asked it to suggest options for how I can improve the structure of the writing. I read the output and tried to do what it suggested by strengthening my topic sentences and making them connect to the ideas before and after. I asked it to do this because I knew that something was missing from my structure, and I tried the techniques we learned in class, but I needed another set of ideas for how to improve my work. It gave me some ideas for what to change.
[LINK or SCREENSHOT of PROMPTS]”

Academic misconduct is present in academic work wherever AI assistance has been used when unauthorized, or when authorized, has not been disclosed as required. In the context of my class, **this means that you have engaged in academic misconduct if you use AI for an assignment but fail to include screenshots of the prompts and/or the HOW AND WHY explanations.** Such behavior is considered deceit and a violation of UAB’s shared commitment to truth and 14 academic integrity. Deceit constitutes academic misconduct and is subject to review according to UAB’s Academic Integrity Code.

Furthermore, if the writing you turn in has any of the following features, you may lose between 10-50 points on drafts and final projects:

1. includes content that is clearly false (describes events, ideas, concepts, falsely, attributes fake quotes to real people, etc.)
2. demonstrates a level of understanding of some topic that **far exceeds** what the student demonstrated previously
3. uses an authorial voice that deviates from the student’s prior writing
4. employs a rigidly formulaic structure akin to the tripartite formula that basic ChatGPT prompting yields
5. has incredibly generic content/lacks specificity
6. includes excessively flowery or unnecessary jargon

Expect changes

The developments around generative AI are in flux and the rules that are expressed in this syllabus may need to change on short notice. This may affect the contents of assignments, as well as their evaluation.