

**Principles Grounding the Policy Choices Made in this Proposal:**

- **Faculty autonomy to authorize or prohibit AI use in courses.** Faculty are in the best position to determine how/whether AI use might or might not be helpful in their courses. So, faculty may ban or broadly permit its use in courses and/or provide per-assignment guidance.
- **Disclosure of AI use is always required.** Students must disclose AI use, though instructors will determine what form and level of disclosure is appropriate (e.g., prompt logs, revision histories, acknowledgements, etc.).
- **Clarity for students. Instructors are required to provide a policy in their syllabi on the authorized uses (if any) of AI** in their courses (by separate resolution, AS-1011-26.). Best practice for instructors is to tune AI use permissions on a per-assignment level (e.g., permitted; limited to explicitly specified uses; prohibited).
- **Default of “opt in” for instructors to authorize AI use.** In the absence of any instructor direction or policy, **assistance from AI should be treated as analogous to assistance from another person.** (We hope such cases will be rare, since by recent AS-1011-26, instructors are required to provide a policy in syllabi.)
- **Evidence provided by AI detection tools insufficient alone.** AI detection tool results are not reliable enough to establish academic misconduct by a student, if there is no other evidence. (Evidence establishing preponderance of cheating/plagiarism is how OSRR interprets the existing standard.)
- **Fabrication** (of data, results, references, etc.) or **impersonation** (e.g. taking quizzes or exams or doing other work on the student’s behalf) using AI or other automated systems **are always violations.**

**Academic Integrity policies at peer and benchmark institutions, for comparison** (note: these were initially assembled with the assistance of ChatGPT, before editing and review by the author):

Theme	Cal Poly	UC schools (prioritized)	Other peers / top benchmarks
Core value	Cal Poly says the university does not condone cheating or plagiarism and expects the “highest academic standards.” ( <a href="#">Academic Programs and Planning</a> )	UCLA emphasizes the “highest standards of integrity”; UC Davis defines integrity as doing work “honestly and fairly”; UCI stresses “individual responsibility.” ( <a href="#">Office of Student Conduct</a> )	Harvard requires “accurate attribution of sources”; Stanford’s Honor Code exists to uphold a “culture of academic honesty.” ( <a href="#">Academic Integrity Office</a> )
No unfair advantage	Cheating is getting credit or better evaluation by “dishonest or deceptive means.” ( <a href="#">Student Rights Office</a> )	Berkeley defines cheating as “fraud, deceit, or dishonesty”; UCLA includes “facilitating academic misconduct.”	NC State defines misconduct as conduct that “unethically or fraudulently aids” a student; Harvard explicitly

Theme	Cal Poly	UC schools (prioritized)	Other peers / top benchmarks
		<a href="#">(Center for Student Conduct)</a>	includes “falsifying data.” <a href="#">(Office of Student Conduct)</a>
Original work and attribution	Plagiarism is using others’ ideas or work without “proper credit to the source.” <a href="#">(Student Rights Office)</a>	Berkeley bars use of others’ material “without acknowledging its source”; UCSB says submissions must represent a student’s “original work”; UCSC says academic work should be the student’s “sole effort.” <a href="#">(Center for Student Conduct)</a>	Harvard also requires “transparent acknowledgement” of others’ contributions; MIT requires “appropriate credit.” <a href="#">(Academic Integrity Office)</a>
Collaboration is conditional, and instructor rules matter	Cal Poly includes “Unauthorized collaboration” in its cheating examples, and cases are first handled by the instructor. <a href="#">(Student Rights Office)</a>	UCI requires compliance with the instructor’s “standards”; UCSD says the instructor “shall report all suspected” violations; UCSC says students and faculty must be “absolutely clear” about what counts as misconduct. <a href="#">(UCI Office of Academic Integrity)</a>	Stanford prohibits “unpermitted academic aid”; MIT says the “accepted level of collaboration” varies by class and is set by the instructor. <a href="#">(Office of Community Standards)</a>
Formal process and sanctions	Cal Poly treats misconduct “both as an academic issue and as a disciplinary incident,” with OSRR reviewing the broader conduct context. <a href="#">(Student Rights Office)</a>	UCLA’s conduct office reviews and adjudicates allegations; UCSD normally imposes “academic sanction, and administrative sanction(s)”; UCSC says violations bring both academic and disciplinary sanctions. <a href="#">(Office of Student Conduct)</a>	Rutgers says its policy defines violations, “potential penalties,” and the “process for adjudicating” them; ASU requires “notice and an opportunity to respond.” <a href="#">(Academic Integrity)</a>
AI / technology language where explicit	No explicit language.	UCSB explicitly lists “artificial-intelligence programs without prior approval” as plagiarism; UCI says the policy applies to “electronic and print media.” <a href="#">(Office of Student Conduct)</a>	Stanford says AI is treated as “assistance from another person” and may not “substantially complete an assignment” unless course policy allows it. <a href="#">(Teaching Commons)</a>
Fabrication / falsification	Cal Poly’s central language focuses on “cheating or plagiarism” and broad misconduct by “dishonest or deceptive means,” so fabrication is likely covered, but not named	UCLA includes “fabrication” among its offenses <a href="#">(Academic Integrity   Office of Student Conduct)</a> ; Berkeley is explicit: academic misconduct includes “fabricating or altering information” and	Harvard’s Honor Code emphasizes the “appropriate collection and use of data,” and forbids “falsifying data,” which supports treating fabricated data, citations, or quotations as a distinct integrity problem. <a href="#">(Academic Integrity Office)</a>

Theme	Cal Poly	UC schools (prioritized)	Other peers / top benchmarks
	as explicitly. ( <a href="#">Academic Programs and Planning</a> )	presenting it as legitimate. ( <a href="#">Center for Student Conduct</a> )	