

Guidelines on Generative AI for AY24-2

As the world's preeminent leader development institution with the mission of educating, training, and inspiring commissioned leaders of character, it is imperative that we, the United States Military Academy, embrace technological advancements and prepare cadets to make responsible choices about the ways that we use them. Recent developments in artificial intelligence (AI), such as Chat Generative Pre-Trained Transformer (ChatGPT), have led to exciting new possibilities and challenges. With the ability to generate human-like text, computer code, and unique images, these programs will inevitably change the way humans interact with machines, and in fact, with each other. At the same time, certain uses of generative AI may shortcut students' development of essential critical thinking abilities and fundamental writing skills. Faculty and cadets must therefore be thoughtful users of the technology and commit to continual reflection and adaptation.

As we learn about and respond to this rapidly changing technology, the guidelines below should be followed by cadets and faculty as they explore and use various generative AI technologies in the context of their courses.

Cadets

1. **Caution.** Users and consumers of generative AI should be cognizant that it has limitations, and also that limitations vary widely from product to product and will change quickly. Information provided by generative AI today can be inaccurate, incomplete, and dated. For example, *it might produce citations that are made up or assert assumptions as facts*. It is important to cross-check information with trusted sources or consult with an instructor to verify the accuracy of the information produced. As always, providing correct information on an assignment is the responsibility of the cadet and using generative AI is not an acceptable excuse for providing inaccurate answers.

2. **Learning Process.** Learning requires actively engaging in material and thinking deeply and critically; similarly, writing is intrinsically a process of critical thinking and individual expression. Generative AI provides short-cuts in completing tasks and may inadvertently act as a substitute for learning and developing meaningful communication skills. Cadets must be cautious when using generative AI as it could stifle the development of critical thinking and writing skills for professional and academic audiences. They should use it only to enhance their development while continuing to actively engage in the learning and writing process. Cadets may experience an increasing variety of educational approaches. Some will seem very different than what they have been used to, intentionally preparing them to be critical thinkers in age where AI technologies are expanding.

3. **Writing Process.** Expectations for producing writing and other communications products with or without the assistance of generative AI will vary widely in different disciplines based on course learning goals. Cadets must realize that certain assignments specially focus on the development of their capacity for critical thinking,

individual expression, and meaningful communication. In these cases, continuing this full experience without the assistance of generative AI may lead to the best educational outcomes. Other courses might encourage cadets to fully leverage generative AI tools to revise, refine, and present communication products that professionally express a cadet's own contributions.

4. Academic Integrity. Users of generative AI should follow the policies provided by the individual course on each assignment whether and when the use of generative AI is allowed. *It is the cadet's responsibility to know the policy for the assignment*, and when it is unclear to them, they should ask their instructor. Additionally, use of generative AI should be acknowledged according to the procedures laid out in the Documentation and Acknowledgement of Academic Work (DAAW) to accurately reflect the author's work and how generative AI was used to support this work. Using content created by generative AI without proper attribution is considered plagiarism. For questions on when you need to cite, see the DAAW Sections III and VI.

5. Security. For security reasons, cadets are prohibited from inputting Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI), personally identifiable information (PII), classified information, or any otherwise restricted information into generative AI tools. See AR 380-5 for the classification, downgrading, declassification, transmission, transportation, and safeguarding of information requiring protection in the interests of national security.

Faculty

1. Course Assessment. Faculty must deliberately assess when and how the use of generative AI can support, or may be at odds, with course learning objectives and individual graded events. For example, generative AI might be beneficial for data analysis assignments, where it can help collect and synthesize large amounts of information. Conversely, it may not be suitable for assignments where students are expected to develop and present their own analysis and arguments, as in a final research paper. Clear statements conveying when and how generative AI can be used in support of course-specific learning will help set expectations.

2. Provide Guidance. Faculty must provide guidance to cadets on how generative AI can be used in the course. Rather than course-wide policies banning use, a course must state explicitly at the assignment level if there are restrictions on the use of generative AI based on learning objectives of the assignment. For example, the course syllabus or assignment description might say: "For the final research paper in this course, students are expected to critically engage with the course material and present their own analysis and interpretation. Therefore, the use of generative AI tools for writing or developing arguments in this assignment is not permitted. This assignment is designed to assess your ability to independently synthesize and articulate complex ideas, and the use of AI would compromise the evaluation of these skills." Alternatively, when allowed, the statement may say: "Generative AI is welcome for use but assistance must be documented according to the DAAW." *Faculty allowance of generative AI*

usage does not waive the cadet's requirement to acknowledge the usage and does not excuse the student from submitting false information, such as false citations.

3. Faculty Education. As a faculty, we need to examine whether our longstanding modes and methods of teaching and assessing must adapt given generative AI, and we should be open to innovation (e.g. oral exams). Because the technology is advancing so rapidly, it would be impossible to point to one resource for how generative AI can be used. The Center for Faculty Excellence and West Point Writing Program, among other directorate units, will provide resources for understanding the technology as well as ideas on how to enhance the classroom experience using it.

4. Caution with Detectors. Faculty must be cautious with the use of generative AI detectors. AI detectors have so far not proven to be particularly effective, returning both false-positive and false-negative responses. Instructors must therefore use caution when enlisting these tools, similar to how we employ plagiarism checkers: a balance must be struck between what the detector returns and the faculty member's own analysis. Any subsequent approach for clarification or formal inquiry that takes place, in view of potentially inappropriate or unacknowledged uses of generative AI, should be handled with care—allowing for open dialogues with cadets and ensuring that trust and fairness are maintained.