

Academic integrity and authorship

How should the institution handle concerns about AI-assisted work?

Clear expectations and fair inquiry are essential when authorship or permitted assistance is in question.

Recommended starting position

Define the relevant conduct, publish assistance and disclosure expectations, and investigate concerns through existing fair procedures. Treat automated detection as information requiring scrutiny, never as sufficient proof by itself. Use proportionate process evidence and give the student an opportunity to respond.

A vague suspicion can damage trust. Demanding every prompt, draft and personal account record can create new privacy burdens. A sound process identifies the rule, examines relevant evidence and distinguishes a learning-support need from established misconduct.

What the evidence supports

Carteret links unauthorized student AI use to its academic-integrity process. North Shore addresses authorship and instructor expectations. The specific evidence safeguards recommended here are HumanSkills recommendations, not a measured sector consensus.

Establish these foundations

- Specify the applicable rule and communicate it in advance.
- Examine evidence proportionately and protect privacy.
- Provide an opportunity to respond and the established review or appeal route.

The choices to make locally

Clarify and teach

Consider this when: The expectations were unclear or the concern can be addressed through learning support.

Tradeoff: Document the clarification and apply it consistently without converting uncertainty into an accusation.

Review the work and process

Consider this when: There is a specific concern requiring more information.

Tradeoff: Use relevant drafts, discussion or demonstration without demanding unnecessary personal records.

Use the conduct process

Consider this when: Evidence supports a potential violation of an established rule.

Tradeoff: Follow institutional procedures, evidence standards, accommodations and appeal rights.

Illustrative campus case

A detector flags a multilingual student's essay.

An instructor receives a high automated score and suspects prohibited assistance. The student disputes it.

The score cannot establish the student's conduct on its own.

1. Identify the course rule and the specific concern in the work.
2. Invite the student's explanation and review appropriate evidence of understanding or process.
3. Apply the established institutional procedure if the concern remains, documenting the evidence and available review route.

What the team produces: A reasoned institutional decision based on relevant evidence and a fair process.

Who is responsible

Board and trustees: Seek assurance that integrity processes are consistent, fair and open to review.

Institutional leaders: Align academic-integrity procedures, staff development and privacy safeguards.

AI task force: Clarify how AI-related concerns fit existing procedures without creating an unsupported shortcut.

Illustrative language to adapt

AI-related academic-integrity concerns must be addressed through established institutional procedures. Automated detection results must not be treated as conclusive evidence or the sole basis for an adverse finding. Review must consider relevant evidence, provide an opportunity to respond and protect applicable review and appeal rights.

Read alongside model policy sections 7, 8, 10. Reconcile local authority and requirements before adoption.

Evidence of implementation

- Published rules describing permitted assistance and disclosure.
- A documented evidence-based inquiry and response opportunity.
- A consistent review route and staff preparation for using it.

Reconsider when: Revisit inconsistent outcomes, excessive evidence requests, unclear rules or new assessment practices.

Supporting sources

[Carteret Community College / Artificial Intelligence Policy](#)

[North Shore Community College / Artificial Intelligence Principles and Policies](#)