Version: 25 November 2024

Approved by TU/e Program Directors and adopted by the Educational Board: 25 & 26 November 2024

TU/e Most Urgent Rules for AI Use in Education

We extend our gratitude to our colleagues from the Groningen University. With their approval, we have adapted their Policy on AI in Education (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, 2023) to align with the specific situation at TU/e and to match the ongoing AI developments within TU/e departments.

Leading Principle

TU/e aims to educate students within the context of their studies to become competent and responsible users of GenAI tools, aligning with academic practices, attitudes, and core principles.

Working Agreement for AI-use in TU/e Education

1. **The use of AI tools is allowed as an aid for general functionalities** (teaching and study tool/assistant/input for own work) unless explicitly forbidden by the examiner (see point 3). General functionalities include brainstorming, gaining inspiration, summarizing general information, refining one's own work (e.g., language correction, language assistant), translation, and self-study/sparring partner (e.g., generating practice exam questions and answers). AI tools are not reliable scientific sources and the output must always be evaluated critically according to academic practices (e.g., as stated in the TU/e Code of Scientific Conduct; TU/e, 2019). Staff is always responsible for the educational activities they design and/or perform. Students are always responsible for the work they submit.

2. **When using GenAI functionalities (creation of new content, replacement of own work), complete statements about the use are required.** The important distinction with the functionalities as mentioned under rule 1 is when GenAI partially replaces or outsources the student's own work and learning process. If a student uses GenAI in a manner other than meant under rule 1, it must be explicitly stated. This way, the teacher can provide more targeted feedback on the acquisition of academic practices and responsible use of tools. Standard scientific referencing methods (e.g., IEEE, APA, ACM) are taught and applied. Otherwise, a complete statement must at least include:

   2.1. The name and version of the tool

   2.2. Purpose and method of use

   The generation of quantitative and qualitative research data with GenAI is fundamentally prohibited, unless explicit consent is given by the examiner (see point 3).

Note: People responsible for educational programs and courses may impose, additional requirements on the form and content of the statement, such as a more detailed statement of use, examples of entered prompts, reflection on reliability and bias, and verification of information.

3. **If, in addition to rules 1 and 2, there are supplementary rules regarding the use of GenAI functionalities, this will be communicated before the start of the course.** In case of doubt, the teacher will provide clarity and improve communication if necessary. The use of tools for functionalities other than those mentioned under rule 1 may be entirely allowed, not allowed at all, or partially allowed. Or the use may be mandatory. This all can vary by program and course, as it depends on the learning outcomes. Students will be informed about the supplementary rules in a timely manner (prior to the course). The supplementary rules regarding the use of GenAI functionalities, should be available on the Canvas homepage of every course (Appendix IV can be used for that). If no supplementary rules are provided, these working agreements apply.

4. **Using AI tools counts as fraud if any of the following conditions are satisfied**:

   4.1. The submitted work is no longer sufficiently the student's own, in the sense that knowledge, insight, and skills as described in the learning outcomes cannot be assessed and tested. Delegating work to tools (or to someone else) to this degree is not allowed because it affects the core of academic practices (TU/e Regulations Examination Committee, 2024). The student must always take responsibility for verifying and analyzing information and for their own scientific substantiation. Teachers guide students in the education to understand this connection.

   4.2. The student has not included a correct statement about the AI use.

   4.3. The student used AI tools when the teacher had communicated that it was not allowed or only partially allowed. A correct statement of tool use does not change this.

   The definitions of fraud/plagiarism as described in the Regulations Examination Committee of the program apply here. In case of suspected fraud, the Examination Committee must always determine on a case-by-case basis whether fraud has actually occurred. Scores from AI detection tools do not count as sufficient evidence of fraud. In case of suspected fraud, an additional investigation may be conducted through an oral check. This is not an additional assessment moment. However, students must be informed of this possibility in advance. Check – if applicable - the department’s policy on AI and AI detection tool use.

5. **Take advantage of the positive functionalities of AI tools, but remain aware of risks and be a critical user.** It is your own responsibility to use AI tools consciously, critically, and responsibly. AI tools offer many wonderful opportunities. However, the use of tools also comes with risks regarding the reliability of output (e.g., factual inaccuracies, biases, non-existent references), environment (e.g., energy consumption and cooling water usage), and data processing (e.g., violation of copyrights, NDA, intellectual property, and privacy, security, and storage of personal, corporate, and research data). Therefore, do not enter sensitive information or data. Follow the GDPR.

6. **When the use of tools is mandatory in education, the processing and storage of personal data and information must be well regulated.** When the TU/e tools do

not suffice, a suitable alternative must be provided to students. For example, an open-source LLM that is hosted on a local server. Or a department may obtain a tool, and TU/e central negotiates a processing agreement with the supplier. Students may never be required to purchase a tool (or version with more functionalities) by their own means.

7. **Teachers remain responsible for the assessment of students and the content of the education.** Teachers are encouraged to use tools in teaching and assessment, such as automated grading of multiple-choice exams based on pre-determined answers. However, automated decision-making/grading based on a GenAI model without human oversight over the assessment process is not permitted. The Examiner is legally responsible for conducting exams and determining the results.

8. **For theses/final projects/Internship reports, regular interim checks are conducted.** The thesis or final project is an important part of the program in which many of the learning outcomes are assessed. Therefore, there are always regular interim checks to safeguard that AI is not improperly used in the project (for example, through a discussion, intermediate product, through coaching, a mid-term or other means) on the authenticity of the work and the development process. Checks do not need to contribute to the final assessment, but they may if this has been communicated to the student at the start of the thesis/final project.

The guiding principle and the eight most urgent rules together constitute the agreements on GenAI use approved by the program directors and adopted by the educational board. Evaluation of these agreements and their implementation will take place by order of OO/OGS and the Board of Education after 6 months (summer 2025).

Besides these initial agreements, program directors are working on *Route 2* in which focuses on further required development of GenAI in TU/e education.