MRS Journal of Arts, Humanities and Literature
Abbreviate Title- MRS J Arts humanit Liter
ISSN *(Online) 3049-1444*
Vol-2, Iss-11 (November-2025)

OPEN ACCESS

From Prohibition to Preparation: Reframing Academic Integrity in the Age of AI

James Hutson*

Lindenwood University, USA

Corresponding Author: **James Hutson** (Lindenwood University, USA)

Article History: Received: 11 / 08 / 2025:, Accepted: 19 / 11 / 2025:, Published: 29 / 11 / 2025

Abstract: This study analyzes how U.S. universities reconfigure academic integrity during the 2024–2025 cycle in response to widespread generative AI adoption. The analysis foregrounds three loci: student ignorance and metacognitive blind spots; the expanded remit of Academic Integrity Officers prioritizing education over punishment; and deliberate AI-enabled misconduct that exposes the evidentiary limits of detection technologies. A mixed-methods design integrates a multi-site review at Arizona State University, Montclair State University, and Cornell University with synthesis of surveys, policies, and faculty development guidance. Findings show that detector outputs function as conversational prompts rather than adjudicative proof, necessitating dialogic resolution standards, process evidence, and due-process safeguards to reduce false positives and bias. Institutions that center syllabus clarity, assignment-level AI permissions, and transparent attribution norms report fewer gray-area violations and higher student comprehension of expectations. Pedagogical redesign—personalized, context-bound prompts; scaffolded drafting with reflections; in-class writing and oral defenses; and structured "AI-in-the-open" tasks that demand critique and verification—reduces incentives to outsource cognition while strengthening targeted learning outcomes. The study maps integrity work to labor-market demands for AI fluency, arguing for frameworks that cultivate ethical AI competence rather than prohibitions that suppress skill formation. Attention to accessibility and neurodiversity remains pivotal; integrity regimes that ignore assistive use cases risk exacerbating inequities and chilling legitimate accommodations. The article proposes a sustainable governance model coupling principled authorization and attribution with evidence-based adjudication, faculty training aligned to curricular cycles, and continuous assessment improvement. Collectively, these strategies reposition academic integrity as a design problem aligned with AI literacy and graduate employability.

Keywords: *Academic integrity, Generative AI, Assessment design, AI detection and adjudication, AI literacy and workforce alignment.*

Cite this article: Hutson, J. (2025). From Prohibition to Preparation: Reframing Academic Integrity in the Age of AI. *MRS Journal of Arts, Humanities and Literature. 2 (11), 54-65.*

Introduction

The acceleration of generative artificial intelligence adoption across U.S. higher education has reshaped the terrain of academic integrity and instructional design. Within two years of ChatGPT's release, national scans documented a rapidly expanding product ecosystem oriented to teaching and learning, and multi-institution initiatives reported widespread use among instructors and students (Baytas & Ruediger, 2024; Ithaka S+R, 2024). Simultaneously, labor-market signals privilege AI aptitude: the 2024 Work Trend Index found that 66% of business leaders would not hire candidates lacking AI skills, while formal upskilling lags within organizations (Microsoft & LinkedIn, 2024). Survey research suggests an adoption-preparedness gap among students, with high rates of tool use coexisting with reported deficits in AI literacy and workplace readiness (Campus Technology, 2024). Teaching and learning centers increasingly frame this gap as a curricular challenge requiring explicit outcomes, clear permissions, and faculty development rather than as a narrow compliance problem (JHUCTEI, 2024; MSUOFE, 2024, 2025). These sectoral dynamics embed academic integrity within a broader digital literacy agenda in which misalignment between classroom practice and employer expectations threatens equity and employability (Baytas & Ruediger, 2024; Microsoft & LinkedIn, 2024). The consequences are not merely theoretical: institutions must reconcile integrity enforcement with instruction that equips graduates for AI-mediated work. Against that backdrop, the present study examines the 2024–2025 Academic Integrity Office (AIO) reporting cycle to analyze how AI-related cases emerge and are resolved.

The evidentiary environment for adjudicating AI-related misconduct remains unstable because AI-text detectors exhibit variable accuracy, fairness concerns, and inconsistent interpretability. Peer-reviewed evaluations report suboptimal detection accuracy and vulnerability to paraphrase-based evasion, raising doubts about high-stakes uses (Weber-Wulff et al., 2023; Perkins et al., 2024). Additional studies document systematic false positives for non-native English writers, creating disparate impact risks for international and multilingual students (Liang et al., 2023). Reflecting these concerns, universities have de-emphasized detectors in favor of conversation-based review; several centers explicitly discourage detector use as evidence in misconduct processes (Vanderbilt University, 2023; UACTL, 2024). Even vendors caution that the AI-writing indicator is non-deterministic and suppresses low-percentage scores—e.g., not displaying percentages below 20%—to minimize overinterpretation by instructors (Turnitin, 2025). Such design choices, while prudent, place a hermeneutic burden on faculty tasked with distinguishing permissible support from intentional misconduct without definitive machine signals (Turnitin, 2025; ASU, n.d.). The equity implications are nontrivial, particularly for neurodiverse learners and English learners, and they underscore the need for training in interpretive judgment and dialogic resolution (Liang et al., 2023; UACTL, 2024). Accordingly, detectors are best situated as diagnostic prompts within a multimodal integrity workflow rather than dispositive arbiters of authorship.

The most recent AIO reporting cycle analyzed here reveals three interrelated categories—ignorance, pedagogy-dependent ambiguity, and willful evasion—that strain conventional protocols and demand differentiated responses. First, students frequently conflate allowable proofreading with generative rewriting when using ubiquitous tools whose feature sets now include sentence-level recomposition and full-text drafting, thereby blurring policy boundaries unless syllabi specify permissible use (Grammarly, 2024, 2025). Second, policy implementation remains uneven in the absence of a dedicated AIO who can orchestrate case classification, student-facing education, and faculty consultation; the gap is magnified by inconsistent syllabus language and assignment design (MSUOFE, 2024, 2025; CUCTI, 2025). Third, a smaller cohort of deliberate violators exploits automation and adversarial tactics to obfuscate authorship, a pattern consistent with recent evaluations of detector evasion and faculty over-reliance on thresholds (Perkins et al., 2024). Ambiguity intensifies when open-book or resource-permissive tasks lack explicit citation and AI-use parameters, encouraging copy-paste practices or tacit AI reliance rather than reflective engagement (JHUCTEI, 2024; ASU, n.d.). In this configuration, gray-zone cases—not extreme ones—dominate caseloads and require explanatory feedback loops, timely communication, and scaffolded opportunities for repair (Ithaka S+R, 2024). Faculty uncertainty in interpreting AI indicators and calibrating proportionate responses corroborates calls for structured professional development outside standard contract periods (Turnitin, 2025). Consequently, the central issue is the design of an equitable, instructionally aligned integrity framework that distinguishes ignorance from intent while integrating authentic assessment and student well-being. To address this problem, the article advances a design-oriented, multimodal model that reframes integrity as an institutional literacy project anchored in policy clarity, assessment redesign, and targeted training. The analysis synthesizes sector guidance and empirical studies from 2023–2025 and operationalizes three levers: (a) syllabus and policy standardization using explicit AI-use iconography and tiered sanctions; (b) assessment shifts toward reflective, oral, and process-verified tasks aligned to course learning outcomes; and, most importantly, (c) technology adoption positioned as formative support rather than surveillance. The model treats detector outputs—when used at all—as conversation starters within a documented workflow that includes student interviews, process evidence (e.g., drafts), and escalation from education-first remedies to academic penalties upon repeated violations. Faculty capability-building is scoped beyond contract windows and aligned to program outcomes, with resources curated from national projects tracking the rapidly shifting AI tool landscape. Equity auditing is embedded throughout, with safeguards for multilingual and neurodiverse students given documented false-positive risks and broader concerns about algorithmic fairness in educational evaluation. Finally, the model links integrity to employability by integrating AI literacy outcomes responsive to hiring preferences and training deficits, thereby narrowing the policy–practice gap that destabilizes classrooms **(Table 1)**. Subsequent sections formalize methodological choices, codify a decision tree for case classification, and provide templates for assignment language and formative AI-feedback workflows using platforms that emphasize actionable critique over ghostwriting.

Table 1. Workforce-Aligned AI Literacy Outcomes

AI Literacy Outcome	How Assessed	Example Rubric Criteria	Relevance for Employers
Attribution & Provenance	Require students to cite AI tools used (e.g., prompts, edits, references) in assignments.	- Clear citation of AI tool and role in task - Distinction between student work and AI output	Employers may expect transparency in tool usage and accountability for sources in professional outputs.
Verification & Fact-Checking	Ask students to validate AI outputs against peer-reviewed sources, databases, or class materials.	- Accuracy of verified information - Documentation of fact-checking process - Identification of hallucinations	Critical for roles in research, journalism, business, and policy where unverified outputs can have high costs.
Prompting Skills	Evaluate students on ability to design effective, ethical prompts and refine outputs iteratively.	- Clarity and appropriateness of prompts- Evidence of iterative refinement - Reflection on prompt effectiveness	Employers value workers who can use AI efficiently, turning vague ideas into actionable, accurate results.
Ethical Reflection & Decision-Making	Assign reflective essays or oral defenses on when AI should/should not be used.	- Awareness of ethical risks (bias, plagiarism, privacy) - Justification of choices- Integration of institutional values	Demonstrates judgment, a core competency for leadership and professional trust in AI-mediated workplaces.

Literature Review

The current literature on generative artificial intelligence in higher education depicts accelerating adoption coupled with uneven institutional preparedness, creating fertile conditions for integrity ambiguities. National surveys document that students outpace faculty and administrators in regular use of generative AI, while institutional licensing and formal training lag markedly (Tyton Partners, 2024). Workforce reports simultaneously register an external pressure gradient: leaders increasingly require AI fluency for employability, even as few organizations provide structured training, thereby shifting upskilling burdens onto individuals (Microsoft & LinkedIn, 2024). Pew Research Center (2025) trend analyses further show heterogeneous workplace uptake, suggesting that graduates will confront sector-specific expectations and uneven organizational scaffolding for responsible AI use. These macroconditions intersect with classroom practice, where policy clarity often trails usage realities and where students interpret "permissible assistance" variably across courses and instructors (Inside Higher Ed, 2024). Resulting gaps amplify the likelihood that well-intended study behaviors collide with ambiguous integrity norms, particularly in first-year and transfer cohorts without shared curricular acculturation (Tyton Partners, 2024). The convergence of rising adoption, limited training, and diffuse norms sets a backdrop in which ignorance, opportunism, and design flaws can coexist in the same assessment ecosystem (Microsoft & LinkedIn, 2024; Tyton Partners, 2024). Consequently, the research agenda emphasizes institutionally aligned literacies and transparent assessment regimes calibrated to the sociotechnical moment rather than to pre-AI routines.

Scholarly and practice guidance converges on the proposition that academic integrity in the AI era must be proactively taught, explicitly codified, and dialogically enforced. Centers for teaching and faculty excellence stress the necessity of articulating course-level allowances, attribution expectations, and boundaries for generative support within syllabi and assignment prompts (CCTI, 2025). Vanderbilt University's Academic Affairs guidance foregrounds triangulated evidence of misconduct—such as fake or dead-end links and abrupt style shifts—while cautioning against overreliance on any single indicator or detector readout (Vanderbilt University, 2023/2024). Montclair State University's Office for Faculty Excellence (2024) underscores that no available software can guarantee accurate AI detection, urging instructors to combine contextual red flags with conversation-based process checks. Emerging institutional exemplars recommend making generative tools teachable objects—clarifying when and how tools can scaffold learning—while maintaining core principles that submitted work must reflect student understanding (Cornell Engineering, 2025). This does not preclude the use of the tools, but instead the understanding that students (as employees) are responsible for the output. Such guidance reflects a maturation from prohibition to conditional integration, situating AI as an object of literacy and judgement rather than a categorical threat (JISC National Centre for AI, 2024). The literature therefore reframes integrity as a function of explicit norms, assessment transparency, and instructional design rather than as a technological "arms race." This normative shift seeks to reduce the gray zone that arises when students misread expectations about grammar assistance, rephrasing, or brainstorming.

Empirical and technical analyses consistently problematize automated detection as a definitive adjudication mechanism, identifying bias, adversarial brittleness, and interpretive opacity. Vendor documentation describes probabilistic thresholds and color codes that indicate varying degrees of suspected AI involvement rather than categorical proof, with low-percentage matches often suppressed or asterisked to avoid overinterpretation (Turnitin, 2024). Independent evaluations highlight elevated false positive risks for non-native English writers, whose lexical and syntactic patterns can be misclassified by detectors trained on narrow distributions of "human" prose (Liang et al., 2023). University case studies and teaching-center briefs report detector vulnerability to paraphrasing pipelines and to "style smoothing," which decrease perplexity without degrading readability, thereby collapsing precision and recall (Dixon & Clements, 2024). Scholarly syntheses in assessment and learning underscore that detector outputs, even when helpful as heuristics, should never function as sole evidence, given shifting model baselines and domain drift (Ardito, 2024). Faculty-facing resources at multiple institutions now advise triangulation: compare tool readouts with assignment alignment, citation plausibility, and sample comparisons to prior writing (MSU, 2024; Vanderbilt University, 2023/2024). Journalistic analyses and sector commentary, while not peer-reviewed, further document harm cascades from false accusations, including stress, disengagement, and attrition risks—patterns echoed in academic studies on integrity and well-being (The Guardian, 2024; Eaton, 2023). The preponderance of evidence thus positions detectors as preliminary signals for conversation, not conclusive verdicts.

Process-based evidence—particularly document version histories and drafting telemetry—has emerged as a more pedagogically aligned alternative to binary detection. Google's support documentation specifies granular version histories, author attributions, and timestamped changes that can substantiate an iterative writing process (Google, 2025a; Google, 2025b). Chat histories can also be submitted to demonstrate how students used LLMs. Pedagogical commentary suggests then that abrupt paste events, minimal editing trajectories, or compressed temporal signatures may warrant conversation but still require student explanation and contextualization (UMBC DIT, 2025). Higher-education reporting debates the ethics of requiring version histories, balancing process transparency against privacy and surveillance concerns in learning analytics (EdSurge, 2024). Teaching-center guidance therefore recommends dialogic review—inviting students to narrate drafting decisions, source integration, and tool usage—before any formal allegation proceeds (MSU, 2024). Scholars of assessment argue that such process artifacts can be folded into formative routines, including annotated drafts, reflective memos, and oral check-ins, thereby shifting evidence from policing toward mentoring (JHU CTEI 2024). Practical resources caution that platform limitations, collaborative editing, and offline workflows can complicate interpretation, again reinforcing the need for triangulation with assignment design and prior work samples (Google, 2025a). Given these constraints, the literature endorses process evidence as a superior—but still fallible—basis for adjudication and learning.

Assessment design has become the principal lever for reducing incentives to "misuse" AI, as defined by each instructor, while enhancing authenticity and metacognitive engagement. Teaching centers emphasize transparent criteria, scaffolded drafting, and reflective rationales that require students to externalize decision processes rather than merely present polished prose (JHU CTEI, 2024). Practical frameworks for so-called "AI-resilient" assignments recommend personalization, data or artifact specificity, local context, and multi-modal deliverables that exceed current generative capabilities (University of Chicago, 2025; MIT Sloan EdTech, 2025). However, it should be noted that no assignment is nor should be "AI-proof"; in fact, assignments should self-consciously integrate the tools to prepare students for use in the field.

As such, scholarly analyses advocate authentic assessment—situating tasks in real-world constraints, stakeholder perspectives, and iterative feedback loops—to invoke judgment and ethical reasoning alongside knowledge application (Picasso, 2024). Emerging studies with educators in diverse contexts report that deliberately integrating LLM use within assessed processes can foster critical comparison, source evaluation, and citation discipline, provided expectations are explicit (Alkouk, 2024). Sector journalism and teaching blogs corroborate these findings and add pragmatic tactics—oral defenses, in-class writing, and commonplacing—to diversify evidence of learning while maintaining accessibility (Vox, 2025; Faculty Focus, 2025). Nonetheless, cautionary notes warn that reverting wholesale to blue books may privilege handwriting fluency over higher-order outcomes and can introduce equity issues, suggesting blended designs tied to course learning outcomes (KQED, 2024; Center for Engaged Learning, 2025). The literature coalesces around design thinking: align modality with objective, declare parameters, and assess process even more than product.

Institutional policy and faculty development literature emphasizes governance, capacity building, and iterative documentation to sustain cultures of integrity, though these also need to be redefined. EDUCAUSE (2025) analyses recommend cross-functional policy "rooms" that include students, disability services, IRB, legal counsel, and IT security to anticipate governance and equity implications. Policy resource trackers curate exemplars across U.S. states and systems, enabling benchmarking and rapid policy prototyping with attention to privacy, transparency, and accountability (TeachAI, 2025). Local guidance at research universities encourages department-level statements that specify disclosure and attribution practices, while delegating modality choices to instructors for disciplinary fit (Cornell Engineering, 2025; Vanderbilt University, 2023/2024). Faculty development offerings increasingly foreground assessment redesign studios, AI literacy workshops, and case-based adjudication practice to cultivate interpretive skill rather than detector dependence (MSU, 2025). Commentaries from Inside Higher Ed urge institutions to complement national surveys with local "corner" data—program-specific adoption, student profiles, advising capacity—to underpin pragmatic policy calibration (Inside Higher Ed, 2024). Such governance ecosystems require attention to workload, timing, and compensation, as many syllabi finalize before training cycles, a recurrent friction highlighted in practice reports (MSU, 2024, 2025). The policy scholarship therefore treats integrity as a living system dependent on shared governance and ongoing professional learning. At the same time, the academic cycle is moving too slowly to keep up with advances in technology. This reality must be accounted for in building in flexibility for both students and faculty.

On the other hand, equity-centered research interrogates how detectors and uneven AI access intersect with language background, disability, and neurodiversity. Studies from Stanford HAI and allied labs show detectors' disproportionate false positives for non-native English writers, raising procedural justice concerns when such outputs are treated as determinative (Liang et al., 2023). Accessibility reports emphasize the dual reality that AI can remove barriers in composition and planning while simultaneously introducing new risks related to data privacy, cost, and unequal tool availability (Every Learner Everywhere, 2025). Disability studies scholarship and teaching-center communications argue for universal-design approaches that normalize assistive affordances, encourage disclosure without penalty, and delineate how generative support differs from prohibited outsourcing (University of Pittsburgh, 2024). Early empirical work on students with disabilities indicates widespread use of chatbots and rewriting tools for access, suggesting that categorical bans are, in fact, counterproductive without viable alternatives (Zhao, Li, & Shao, 2025). Sector journalism and law-practice white papers add that detector-driven false positives may cluster among neurodivergent students, intensifying stigma and eroding trust; these sources call for dialogic review and multi-source evidence (The Guardian, 2024; K. Altman Law, 2024). Collectively, this literature presses institutions to pair integrity enforcement with accommodations literacy and to audit policy effects across student subgroups. Equity considerations consequently become constitutive of academic integrity rather than ancillary to it. Moreover, the simple solution would be to require use of LLMs in coursework, therefore, no one would be singled out and a new norming could occur.

A complementary stream connects integrity regimes to student well-being, advising capacity, and early-alert infrastructures. A rapid review of academic integrity and mental health identifies tensions among punitive framings, definitional inconsistencies, and external stressors—financial, familial, and immigration-related—that shape misconduct risk (Eaton, 2023). NASPA reports and session materials document the rising prominence of AI in student-support ecosystems, including predictive analytics and chatbots, while warning of governance and privacy considerations though unconstituted (NASPA, 2024a, 2024b). Practice notes and case studies associate timely advisor notifications, retention-oriented interventions, and compassionate communication with improved outcomes, arguing for integrated case management that links integrity adjudication to support pathways (NASPA, 2024b; EAB Starfish, n.d.). Contemporary mental-health syntheses underscore the cumulative effects of academic pressure, suggesting that poorly designed adjudication processes may compound risk rather than mitigate it (Wu et al., 2024). Although not specific to integrity cases, early-alert research and vendor reports illustrate mechanisms—flag triage, nudge communications, and coordinated care teams—that could be retooled for integrity-adjacent interventions (Hanover Research, 2014; Enflux, 2025). Journalism on student crises and institutional responses further situates integrity work within a broader duty-of-care debate, highlighting the need for clarity, timeliness, and staff training (The Guardian, 2025). The cumulative implication is that humane, rapid, and coordinated responses are integral to just integrity systems.

While best practices have yet to be established in academia, labor-market facing scholarship and market reports provide a consequential rationale for integrating AI literacy into curricula as part of integrity by design. Microsoft and LinkedIn's 2024 Work Trend Index reports that two-thirds of leaders would not hire candidates lacking AI skills, and that leaders increasingly prefer less-experienced applicants who possess such skills over more-experienced candidates without them. LinkedIn's Workplace

Learning Report (2024) complements this with evidence of employer demand for structured AI upskilling in "power user" competencies beyond basic prompting. Tyton Partners' Time for Class 2024 demonstrates that students remain ahead of faculty in AI use frequency, a gap that complicates integrity enforcement when curricular guidance lags usage realities. Pew's 2025 data confirm that substantial segments of the workforce still report low AI use, indicating that universities must teach students how to use the tools for employability purposes. Sector news analyses observe that organizations struggle to convert individual productivity gains into institutional capability, implying that higher education must teach collaborative AI practices aligned with professional norms (Financial Times, 2025). The literature thus frames AI literacy not as a bolt-on skill but as an epistemic competence that reduces integrity ambiguities by making expectations explicit. In this view, literacy, assessment design, and employability form a coherent policy triad rather than competing priorities. Students must use these tools while in school.

Another research vein evaluates formative feedback technologies and AI-mediated writing support as levers for learning-aligned integrity. Systematic reviews find that generative feedback tools can extend beyond corrective comments to signal gaps, scaffold revision planning, and promote self-regulation when embedded within iterative drafting cycles (Lee & Moore, 2024). Open peer-reviewed discussion papers propose criteria for integrating AI feedback to maintain authorship while leveraging analytic affordances (Tay, 2024). White papers and tool documentation for research-writing assistants describe formative, criterion-referenced feedback on rhetorical moves and literature synthesis, positioning such tools as complements to, not substitutes for, academic authorship (Becker, 2024). Teaching resources recommend that when AI support is permitted, students disclose tool roles, reflect on acceptance or rejection of suggestions, and cite models consulted—practices that make intellectual labor visible (Stanford Teaching Commons, 2024). At the same time, given that these skills will be inextricably interwoven into daily work, such tedious disclosure should be confined to underclass activities and then transition to focus on the output in capstones. Institutional guides have encouraged faculty to incorporate AI-generated artifacts into assignments for critique and comparison in the hopes of externalizing evaluation criteria and reducing unreflective copying (University of Illinois Chicago, 2024). Early classroom studies report that pairing AI and peer feedback can diversify perspectives and increase engagement with revision, though effects vary with prompt specificity and rubric design (Moltudal et al., 2025). Collectively, this research recasts automated assistance as a site for literacy development when structured within multi-draft pedagogy.

Also, scholarship underscores that single-modality answers—whether purely technological or purely punitive—cannot resolve the integrity challenges of an AI-pervasive academy. Policy articles and institutional guides converge on multi-modal adjudication: probabilistic detector outputs, process artifacts, oral explanation, and contextual writing comparisons should be synthesized within a fair hearing framework (Vanderbilt University, 2023/2024; Montclair State University, 2024; Cornell CTI, 2025). Research on assessment diversification recommends targeted uses of in-class writing and oral defenses to evidence understanding while warning against romanticizing blue books or retreating wholesale to proctoring regimes (Mariano, 2024; KQED, 2024; Center for Engaged Learning, 2025). The approach is especially untenable given the fact that most U.S. college students take coursework online. As such, global policy and governance syntheses call for shared standards, stakeholder engagement, and periodic auditing of policy effects on equity and learning outcomes (EDUCAUSE, 2025; TeachAI, 2025). Sector journalism and cross-national commentary emphasize uncertainty rather than conspiracy, urging analytics-informed iteration rather than moral panic (The Guardian, 2025; Financial Times, 2025). Across these sources, the literature recommends a design-centric, dialogic, and data-informed model that aligns integrity with learning, equity, and employability. Such a model treats AI literacy as both preventive and developmental, decreasing the gray zone by replacing ambiguity with practiced judgement.

Academic Integrity Officers: From Enforcement to Education

Given the nuanced environment, AIOs have shifted from primarily adjudicative functions toward a hybrid portfolio that couples due-process enforcement with proactive education, policy translation, and faculty development. Evidence from U.S. institutions during 2024–2025 shows formalized referral pathways to AIOs for AI-related questions, explicit cautions against detector-only evidence, and guidance for aligning course policies with institutional codes—an infrastructure that recasts integrity as an ongoing literacy project rather than a sporadic compliance event **(Table 2)** (ASU, n.d.; Vanderbilt University, 2024; UACTL, 2025). At Arizona State University's College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Senior Director of Student Academic Affairs is designated as the College's AIO and is the first point of contact for suspected AI-related violations—signaling that handling AI misconduct now requires specialized expertise. Vanderbilt's university guidance (2024) similarly positions instructors to set course-level rules within the Honor Code while discouraging detector reliance and encouraging dialogic review—an approach that foregrounds interpretation over automation. Parallel teaching-center resources at UMass Amherst urge faculty to craft explicit syllabus language on permissions, attribution, and disclosure, while reminding instructors that detection tools remain unreliable for adjudication (UACTL, 2025). These developments collectively indicate that AIOs must curate policy templates, consult on assignment design, and provide faculty clinics on evidentiary standards in AI cases. The workload is nontrivial: communication protocols, instructor consults, and student outreach now occupy significant fractions of the AIO calendar. Consequently, the office's mandate expands from case management to institution-wide capacity building that links integrity practices to instructional design and student learning outcomes.

Table 2. Types of Academic Integrity Events and Responses

Category	Typical Indicators	Recommended Response	Sanction Tier	Primary Responsibility
Ignorance / Unintentional Use	Reliance on Grammarly or MS Editor rewriting features; casual use of AI translators; citing AI outputs without realizing it is misconduct.	Educative response: conversation with student, clarify policy, provide resources on proper AI use and attribution.	First offense → Educational intervention (no record on conduct file).	Instructor with consultation from AIO.
Ambiguity / Assignment-Dependent Cases	Copy-pasting from open-book exams or textbooks without citation; vague assignment rules on AI use; student insists they believed tool use was allowed.	Clarify policy expectations, redesign assignment if needed, and require student reflection on boundaries.	First offense → Educational sanction; repeat offense → Formal warning or grade penalty.	Instructor + Academic Integrity Office.
Deliberate Misuse / Evasion	Submitting fully AI-generated essays; fabricated references; refusal to engage in dialogue; multiple prior violations.	Formal adjudication: collect evidence (drafts, version history), escalate to hearing or integrity board.	First offense → Grade penalty and record; repeated offense → Stronger sanctions (probation, suspension).	Academic Integrity Officer + Conduct Committee.

Preventive education and culture-building have become defining features of contemporary AIO practice, emphasizing the cultivation of norms before disputes arise. Vanderbilt's guidance operationalizes this shift by recommending that instructors articulate course-specific expectations, discuss the rationale with students, and frame academic integrity as a shared tradition that underwrites degree credibility—an honor-code framing that AIOs can amplify in orientations, workshops, and class visits (Vanderbilt University, 2024). UMass Amherst's Center for Teaching and Learning (2025) extends this orientation by offering model statements that span "prohibited," "allowed with attribution," and "encouraged with guardrails," thereby normalizing explicit permissioning and disclosure rather than tacit, inconsistent expectations **(Table 3)**. However, such "stoplight" approaches to AI use have met with confusion from students as a level of use may be allowed, but the instructor rarely follows up to specify when or how LLMs should be used. As such, Montclair State University's Office for Faculty Excellence (2025) adds a cautionary counterpoint: no detector is fully reliable, and both false negatives and false positives are common, which strengthens the case for designing clarity and dialogue into courses from the outset. Within such ecosystems, AIOs coordinate with teaching centers to align integrity messaging with universal-design considerations and to route students toward academic support services that reduce temptation to outsource cognitive labor. Messaging increasingly highlights why integrity matters for learning with AI—namely, that indiscriminate automation undermines transfer, judgment, and disciplinary voice. This values-forward approach seeks to transform integrity from a rule set into a professional identity shaped by transparency, attribution, and accountability. The cultural objective is durable: students internaliz AI use as part of becoming credible practitioners, not merely compliant test-takers. As institutions expand this programming, AIOs function as translators between university policy, instructional realities, and student developmental needs.

Table 3. Comparison of Institutional Strategies for ASU, Montclair State, and Cornell

Dimension	Arizona State University (ASU)	Montclair State University	Cornell University
Policy Stance on AI	Decentralized: faculty set course-level rules; AI use falls under integrity code if unauthorized.	Code explicitly updated: AI = "unauthorized material" unless allowed; requires citation if used.	Principles-based: emphasizes honor code and course-level rules; AI icons signal policy.
Syllabus Guidance	Provides model language and "Generative AI Principles"; stresses clarity in stating permissions.	Offers detailed syllabus templates; encourages explanation of hallucinations and disclosure.	CTI provides sample statements from "AI Prohibited" to "AI Allowed with Attribution."
Faculty Training	Partnered with OpenAI; workshops and innovation challenge; AIO available for consultations.	Faculty Excellence office hosts sessions on assignment design, detection red flags, and citing AI.	Provost Fellows on AI lead workshops; advisory council develops core principles.

Use of Detectors	No endorsed tool; warns against relying on detectors; results only as conversation starters.	Advises faculty: detectors unreliable; lists red flags instead of tools.	No campus-wide detectors; faculty urged to use drafts and oral checks for confirmation.
Student Education	Encourages citation of AI use; promotes AI literacy and responsibility rather than punishment.	Requires acknowledgment of AI use; library guides on citing AI; campaigns on integrity.	Offers educational diversion program ("Accepting Responsibility") for first offenses.
Assessment Design	Recommends AI-resilient tasks: oral exams, personalized assignments, in-class writing.	Promotes reflective prompts, course-specific data, multi-stage assignments, and universal design.	Encourages oral defenses and reflective use/critique of AI outputs in assignments.

Adjudication procedures are also evolving in ways that reveal the educational turn in integrity governance, with AIOs facilitating alternatives to adversarial hearings when pedagogically appropriate. Cornell University's 2024 pilot, "Accepting Responsibility," provides a salient example: for first-time, low-level offenses, students may opt into a workshop-based pathway that centers values, habits, and decision-making; caps grade penalties at the assignment level; and records the event as a non-reportable warning—thus preserving accountability while minimizing collateral harms. The program explicitly supplements, rather than replaces, the standard Academic Integrity process, preserving the right of either party to pursue a primary hearing when warranted. Early institutional rationales emphasize mental-health considerations, timeliness, and learning gains from reflective practice, all of which AIOs are positioned to coordinate through case triage and workshop logistics (Cornell University, 2025). Such alternatives are not leniency by another name; they are structured educational sanctions designed to reduce recidivism by clarifying expectations and strengthening academic habits. Importantly, this model coheres with parallel university guidance that detector scores are not dispositive and that conversation, process evidence, and course-policy alignment should guide resolution pathways (Vanderbilt University, 2024; ASU, n.d.). AIOs, in turn, codify decision trees that distinguish ignorance from intent, set thresholds for educational diversion, and document proportionality across repeated offenses. The resultant system preserves due process while reclaiming adjudication as a learning opportunity. In doing so, AIOs help institutions move beyond an "AI arms race" toward principled, student-centered accountability.

The reconfigured AIO portfolio also entails building institutional muscle for evidence gathering, documentation, and training that is responsive to the peculiarities of AI-mediated work. ASU's guidance exemplifies this stance by discouraging AI-detector-only allegations, urging early documentation of expectations, and recommending open dialogue with students—guidelines that require AIOs to coach faculty in interpretive judgment and process-based verification. Vanderbilt's policy ecosystem goes further by barring detector-only reports to the Undergraduate Honor Council and enumerating red-flag heuristics (e.g., fabricated references, style discontinuities) that—while never conclusive—can guide conversations and documentation. UMass Amherst complements these policies with design-first recommendations—scaffolded drafting, attribution and disclosure requirements, and localized prompts—that reduce gray-zone cases before they reach the AIO's desk. From a governance perspective, AIOs are therefore charged with convening cross-functional partners—teaching centers, libraries, disability services, and academic advising—to synchronize policy, pedagogy, and student support. Professional learning must extend beyond contract windows, with AIO-authored micro-modules, office hours, and consultation protocols that fit faculty calendars and address emergent tools. Finally, AIOs can institute routine equity audits of integrity outcomes (e.g., who opts into educational diversion; who receives escalated sanctions) to ensure that procedures remain fair as AI practices evolve. The shift from enforcement only to enforcement-plus-education is thus not rhetorical; it is an organizational redesign that equips universities to govern learning in an AI-saturated era.

Bridging Policy Clarity and Student Metacognition

Clear, explicit communication of course and institutional policies on generative AI has become indispensable, yet clarity remains remarkably difficult to achieve in practice. Institutions have begun to operationalize clarity through concrete artifacts—syllabus statements, modular policy language, and even pictographic icon sets that denote permitted, limited, or prohibited use at the course and assignment levels—so that expectations are legible to students at a glance (CTI, 2025). Complementary resources at Montclair State University urge instructors to align policy language with assignment purposes and to acknowledge prevalence of LLMs, thereby reducing ambiguity that invites unintentional violations. When instructors not only state policies but also justify them in relation to course learning outcomes—for example, prohibiting AI to cultivate an authorial voice or permitting AI for ideation while requiring human synthesis—students are better positioned to comply. Teaching centers advise introducing policy norms and rationales in the opening weeks, with time for questions and scenario-based discussion to defuse misconceptions before they calcify. Such front-loading of expectations dovetails with broader AI literacy initiatives that frame policy talk within a scaffolded understanding of what AI is, what it can and cannot do, and why evaluative boundaries exist (Hibbert et al., 2024). In short, policy communication functions best when it is multimodal (visual icons, sample statements, in-class dialogue) and pedagogically motivated rather than merely prohibitive. This approach recasts "rules" as design decisions in service of learning, not as opaque constraints.

Developing student metacognitive awareness about AI—how, when, and why to use or avoid it—emerges as the necessary partner to policy clarity. Universities increasingly require brief process reflections that prompt students to disclose whether and how AI was consulted, to explain their purpose for doing so, and to evaluate the trustworthiness of outputs in light of course readings and disciplinary norms. Cornell's (2025) guidance goes further by asking students to verify AI-generated references and be prepared to orally articulate their research and writing processes, transforming disclosure into epistemic accountability. To cultivate critical stance-taking, several teaching centers recommend explicit instruction on "hallucinations," prompting students to practice corroboration and to document fact-checking moves alongside drafts. ASU's College-level guidance similarly emphasizes citing use, validating or correcting AI-produced citations, and treating detection readouts—given their previous unreliability—as conversation starters rather than definitive evidence. Metacognitive routines such as plan–monitor–evaluate checklists can be adapted to AI contexts: students plan whether AI aligns with the task's aims, monitor for drift or fabrication, and evaluate outcomes against the assignment's stated human-authored competencies. Critically, these routines should be low-stakes early and then embedded in graded work to habituate reflective practice. The result is a shift from policy compliance as mere rule-following to policy coherence as part of students' self-regulation and professional formation.

Aligning clarity with metacognition also requires assessment design that makes the human learning target explicit and calibrates AI permissions accordingly. Frameworks such as the AI Assessment Scale (AIAS) provide levelled options—from "No AI" to "Full AI"—that instructors can map to course learning outcomes, thereby eliminating the grey zones that fuel both confusion and opportunistic misuse (Perkins et al., 2024). When such frameworks are paired with iconography on syllabi and assignments, students encounter a consistent semiotic environment: they can see at a glance what forms of help are sanctioned and why (Cornell University CTI, 2025). Teaching centers recommend aligning grading criteria with the declared AI level—for instance, weighting personal voice, source integration, or method demonstration more heavily when AI is restricted—and requiring artifacts of process (notes, drafts, prompt logs) to make learning visible. Montclair's syllabus guidance explicitly advocates explaining AI's benefits and limits in relation to a task, then articulating what students must do unaided so that assessment remains valid to the stated objectives. UMass CTL synthesizes these moves as a triad: communicate boundaries, justify them in relation to outcomes, and build students' skills to act within them. Such constructive alignment reduces the incentive to outsource cognition while legitimizing appropriate, transparent uses of AI where they enrich learning. In practice, design-forward clarity complements metacognitive routines by making "why this boundary now" as salient as "what the boundary is." Together, the two attempt to reduce adjudication burdens by preempting avoidable misunderstandings at their source.

A persistent challenge, however, involves students least receptive to policy messaging—those under acute performance pressures or confident they can evade detection—where culture and relationships may matter more than surveillance. Teaching centers warn that, given the limitations and equity concerns of automated detectors, punitive strategies alone neither deter determined misuse nor cultivate the dispositions that sustain integrity (MSU OFE, 2024). Honor-code framing and faculty–student rapport, by contrast, position integrity as a communal value and a personal ethic rather than a compliance exercise (Vanderbilt University, n.d.). Public commentary from academic leaders captures the pivot: policing cannot, by itself, secure the educational goods at stake; small-class mentoring and human accountability better align with the aims of higher learning (Tsai, 2024). Against this backdrop, the most defensible posture is "prevention through design and discourse": design assignments whose human elements are indispensable, teach students how to reason about the affordances and limits of the technology, and use policy instruments to clarify—not replace—those pedagogical ends. Institutions that embed this philosophy in first-year orientations, gateway courses, and capstones progressively normalize reflective AI use as part of disciplinary identity. Over time, the combination of consistent symbols, transparent rationales, and practiced self-regulation can shift campus norms away from adversarial dynamics. In that reoriented culture, the integrity conversation becomes less about catching violators and more about cultivating judgment commensurate with professional standards. Again, the realities of higher education need be addressed here. Most students do not come in as first-years now and are "completers." Additionally, most classes are taken online, therefore, the small cohort and mentoring model does not scale. As such, the reality of use need be assumed and built in from the outset.

Discussion

The evidence assembled across institutional guidance, empirical studies, and emerging practice converges on a central claim: the sustainable path for academic integrity in the generative-AI era runs through policy clarity joined to pedagogy rather than surveillance. Clear, course-level rules—ideally reinforced by visual signposting such as Cornell's AI policy icons and complemented by explicit rationale—reduce ambiguity and invite student questions before high-stakes assessment (CTI, 2024a, 2024b). Faculty-facing pages at Vanderbilt similarly recommend beginning-of-term conversations that explain when, why, and how generative tools are permitted or prohibited, emphasizing disclosure and attribution where use is allowed. Montclair State's resources go further by enumerating characteristic "red flags" of AI-shaped prose and by recommending assessment adjustments that reduce incentive structures for misuse. Taken together, these materials reframe integrity as a communicative contract that assumes: instructors state purposes and boundaries; students practice judgment and disclose tool use; both parties share responsibility for the learning conditions under which AI can legitimately assist or must be set aside. This reframing is not merely rhetorical, because it shifts effort upstream into design and metacognitive orientation, which is where student choices are actually shaped. In this view, the "gray zone" of ignorance and confusion shrinks as expectations are codified and rationalized in accessible forms. The approach also acknowledges disciplinary heterogeneity and faculty expertise, allowing local variations while securing institutional coherence through common principles (CTI, 2023–2024). Consequently, institutional clarity functions as an enabling constraint: it protects core outcomes without foreclosing the productive, transparent use of AI where pedagogically justified (Vanderbilt University, 2023–2024; CTI, 2024b).

A second throughline is the professionalization of AIOs and related offices as campus advisers, trainers, and culture-builders rather than as case processors alone. Arizona State University's guidance explicitly positions the AIO as a consultative point of contact for suspected AI-related violations while also instructing faculty to treat any detector output as a starting point for dialogue, not a verdict. Cornell's "Accepting Responsibility" program exemplifies a parallel shift on the adjudication side: for first-time, low-level offenses, the institution channels students toward reflective workshops that develop decision-making and study habits while capping penalties and avoiding formal conduct records. These structures make integrity education a campus-wide responsibility rather than an episodic sanction, and they appear to reduce adversarial hearings where evidence is ambiguous. Their design also signals to faculty that prevention and education are institutionally valued outcomes, thereby legitimizing time spent on proactive communication and assignment redesign. In effect, AIOs become stewards of a broader ecosystem—policy language, faculty development, student-facing resources, and restorative interventions—that together cultivate AI literacy. This model is adaptive: it has the potential to scale with evolving tools, supports departments with different epistemic cultures, and supplies due-process guardrails where detection remains uncertain. The administrative lesson is straightforward: concentrated expertise and coordinated messaging reduce inconsistency, diffuse panic, and protect both students and instructors. Over the last academic cycle, these offices thus emerged as key organizational nodes in balancing liberty with learning, and discretion with fairness.

The third finding concerns detection: current AI-writing detectors are neither accurate enough for high-stakes decisions nor equitable across student populations. The most-cited empirical result demonstrates that several widely used detectors misclassify non-native English writing at alarming rates (false positives averaging ≈61%), raising substantive due-process and bias concerns (Liang et al., 2023). Consistent with these risks, Turnitin's own documentation (2025) cautions that scores should never be the sole basis for adverse actions and—following July 2024 changes—suppresses or asterisk-marks sub-20% indications to mitigate misinterpretations. Institutional responses have tracked these reservations: teaching centers and integrity offices (e.g., ASU; UMass Amherst) advise that detector outputs initiate conversation and further inquiry rather than trigger formal investigations on their own. A number of universities have paused or declined detector use altogether, reflecting a conservative stance on evidentiary sufficiency and fairness (DiploFoundation, 2023). The pragmatic consequence is a "managed uncertainty" regime: faculty triangulate circumstantial indicators (e.g., fabricated references, impersonal voice, off-prompt answers), course context, and student process evidence (drafts, version histories) before reaching judgments. While this standard almost certainly allows some misconduct to go undetected, it materially reduces false accusations and associated harms, which is ethically preferable in educational contexts. The research agenda is therefore twofold: improve measurement where possible, and, meanwhile, optimize prevention through design and mentoring.

Prevention, in turn, is largely a function of assessment architecture and metacognitive scaffolding. Resources at Cornell and Vanderbilt urge instructors to specify assignment-level AI permissions, require disclosure and attribution where appropriate, and prioritize tasks that elicit process evidence (e.g., proposals, annotated drafts, method explanations) over end-product performance alone. Montclair's red-flag guidance can be repurposed as design heuristics: if "voiceless," generic prose and hallucinated citations are common in misuse, then reflective prompts, course-specific anchoring, oral defenses, and source-verification checkpoints are natural countermeasures. UMass CTL recommends explicit boundaries, exemplars of authorized versus prohibited practices, and routine use/non-use statements, thereby making integrity a habitual part of the workflow. Importantly, these strategies can be implemented without blanket bans: where AI is permitted to support brainstorming, outlining, or feedback, students disclose usage and evaluate outputs critically, preserving the locus of learning in human judgment. The resultant "explain your process" norm both deters deceptive outsourcing and creates documentation that can exonerate students falsely suspected of misuse. Such designs also accommodate equity by offering varied demonstrations of competence, which is beneficial for ESL and neurodiverse learners who may be disproportionately exposed to detector error. Finally, explicit conversations about hallucination risk and verification routines align academic practice with real-world professional norms in AI-mediated knowledge work. The upshot is a shift from "catching" to "coaching," which is where durable gains in integrity are most likely.

A final integrative theme links integrity work to employability: graduates now need AI fluency. Microsoft's 2024 Work Trend Index reports a sizable share of leaders who prefer or require candidates with AI skills, while many students perceive preparation gaps, a finding echoed by Pew Research's 2025 analysis of worker exposure and training (Microsoft, 2024; Lin & Parker, 2025). Curricular models therefore increasingly grade not the mere presence or absence of AI, but the quality of its documented, attributed use and the student's capacity to critique outputs—an approach mirrored by emerging platforms (e.g., Moxie) that emphasize formative feedback and auditable interactions with AI assistance (MoxieLearn, 2024–2025). Framed this way, integrity policy stops being an obstacle to innovation and becomes a charter for it: institutions authorize informed use that preserves learning outcomes and makes provenance legible. This alignment mitigates the false dichotomy between "teaching integrity" and "teaching AI," since contemporary professionalism requires both. It also creates a coherent narrative for students: ethical competence is not a compliance add-on but a central, assessed learning goal. Programmatically, AIOs, teaching centers, and departments can co-develop rubrics that reward disclosure, critique, and source-checking as integral skills. Over time, such rubrics should reduce opportunistic misuse by making honest AI use both easier and academically advantageous. The broader societal dividend is a workforce that handles intelligent tools with discernment and accountability.

Conclusion

The 2024–2025 reporting cycle indicates that U.S. higher education is transitioning from an enforcement-centric posture to a prevention-and-education paradigm calibrated for generative AI. The animating insight is that clarity plus justification plus skill-building outperforms prohibition alone: students adhere more faithfully when course policies are unambiguous, pedagogically motivated, and enacted through metacognitive routines that cultivate tool discernment. Integrity offices have become pivotal in this reorientation by coordinating policy language, advising on due-process standards, and piloting restorative responses—such as Cornell's educational workshop pathway for first-time, low-level offenses—that treat missteps as teachable moments rather than simply as recordable violations. At the same time, institutions have adopted a cautious evidentiary stance toward detectors in light of reliability limits and equity risks, following vendor caveats and external studies demonstrating bias, especially for non-native writers. The preferred alternative invests in assignment design, reflective documentation, and oral or in-class verifications that make authentic learning legible without over-policing. This is not a retreat from integrity; it is an insistence that integrity be achieved through design and dialogue rather than through brittle automation.

As this model matures, campuses can expect fewer ambiguous cases, fewer false accusations, and a healthier classroom climate aligned with academic values. The integrity "problem" thus becomes a design "opportunity"—to build courses that teach students how to think with and about AI.

Looking forward, the strategic horizon includes three mutually reinforcing commitments: continuous faculty and student development, assessment innovation that privileges process and provenance, and a stronger bridge to workforce expectations for AI practice. Teaching centers and AIOs should continue to iterate policy exemplars and training grounded in the latest findings and to harmonize expectations across departments without erasing disciplinary nuance. Courses should normalize widespread use, verification of AI outputs, and reflective rationales for tool use, thereby producing students who can demonstrate both mastery and method. Institutions should also experiment with auditable platforms that capture AI interactions for formative feedback, converting opaque assistance into assessable learning artifacts. Finally, program outcomes should explicitly name AI literacy as a graduate competency, informed by labor-market evidence and public attitudes about training and use. If universities sustain this trajectory—clarity with rationale, culture with care, and creativity—they will not merely contain "misconduct"; they will graduate professionals capable of using powerful models responsibly in ways that honor the mission of higher education.

Data Availability

Data available upon request.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

Funding Statement

NA

References

1. Alkouk, W. A. (2024). AI-resistant assessments in higher education: Practical insights from faculty training workshops. *Frontiers in Education, 9*, 1499495. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1499495
2. Ardito, C. G. (2024). Generative AI detection in higher education assessments. In *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 2024, Issue 177, Article e20624). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20624
3. Arizona State University, The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. (n.d.). *Using generative AI ethically: Guidance for faculty.*
4. Arizona State University. (n.d.). *Artificial intelligence (AI) resources and guidelines*. Instruction Junction at The College. https://instruction.thecollege.asu.edu/AIguidelines instruction.thecollege.asu.edu
5. Baytas, C., & Ruediger, D. (2024). *Generative AI in higher education: The product landscape*. Ithaka S+R. https://sr.ithaka.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/SR-Issue-Brief-Generative-AI-in-Higher-Education-03082024.pdf Ithaka S+R
6. Becker, D., Parker, A., & Richter, C. (2024). *Preparing students for AI in the workplace: The AI literacy imperative in higher education* (White paper). Moxie. https://moxiehq.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/Moxie-The-AI-Literacy-Imperative-in-Higher-Ed-White-Paper-2024-05.pdf Zenodo
7. Becker, K. P. (2024). *Framework for the future: Building AI literacy in higher education (White paper).* Moxie AI. https://moxielearn.ai/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Ai-literacies-white-paper.docx.pdf
8. Campus Technology. (2024, August 28). *Survey: 86% of students already use AI in their studies*. https://campustechnology.com/articles/2024/08/28/survey-86-of-students-already-use-ai-in-their-studies.aspx Campus Technology
9. Center for Engaged Learning. (2025, August 19). *Blue books and in-class writing are not a panacea.* https://www.centerforengagedlearning.org/blue-books-and-in-class-writing-are-not-a-panacea/
10. Cornell Center for Teaching Innovation. (2025). *AI & academic integrity*. https://teaching.cornell.edu/generative-artificial-intelligence/ai-academic-integrity
11. Cornell Engineering, McCormick Teaching Excellence Institute. (2025, August 16). *Guidance on generative AI in instruction in the College of Engineering.* https://mtei.engineering.cornell.edu/tips-updates/guidance-on-generative-ai-in-instruction-in-the-college-of-engineering/
12. Cornell University Center for Teaching Innovation. (2023–2024). *Generative artificial intelligence—Center for Teaching Innovation.*
13. Cornell University Center for Teaching Innovation. (2024a). *AI course policy icons.*
14. Cornell University Center for Teaching Innovation. (2024b). *AI & academic integrity (sample syllabus language).*
15. Cornell University Center for Teaching Innovation. (2024c). *AI in assignment design.*
16. Cornell University Center for Teaching Innovation. (2025). *AI & academic integrity*.
17. Cornell University Center for Teaching Innovation. (2025). *AI course policy icons*.
18. Cornell University Center for Teaching Innovation. (2025). *Generative AI: Policy icons*. https://teaching.cornell.edu/resource/generative-ai-course-policy-icons Montclair State University
19. Cornell University. (2024). *Accepting responsibility.*
20. Cornell University. (2024, January 9). *Launch of Accepting Responsibility*. Accepting Responsibility. https://acceptingresponsibility.cis.cornell.edu/announcement/launch/ Accepting Responsibility
21. Cornell University. (2025). *About Accepting Responsibility*. Accepting Responsibility. https://acceptingresponsibility.cis.cornell.edu/about/ Accepting Responsibility
22. DiploFoundation. (2023). *Universities stop using AI detection tool such as Turnitin.*
23. Dixon, H., & Clements, R. (2024). *The failures of LLM-generated text detection: False positives dilute the efficacy of AI detection.* University of San Francisco Center for AI and Data Ethics. https://www.usfca.edu/sites/default/files/2024-05/ai_detection_case_study.pdf

24. Eaton, S. E. (2023). Academic integrity and student mental well-being: A rapid review. *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity, 6*(2), 1–16. https://journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/index.php/ai/article/view/73748
25. EDUCAUSE. (2025, May 29). In the room where it happens: Generative AI policy creation in higher education. *EDUCAUSE Review*. https://er.educause.edu/articles/2025/5/in-the-room-where-it-happens-generative-ai-policy-creation-in-higher-education
26. Enflux. (2025, July). *Early alert systems in higher education: Proactive strategies for student success.* https://enflux.com/blog/early-alert-systems-in-higher-education/
27. Financial Times. (2025, March — September). Companies are failing to convince staff of AI benefits; *Chatbots in the classroom: How AI is reshaping higher education*. https://www.ft.com/
28. Google. (2025a). *Find what's changed in a file — Google Docs editors help.* https://support.google.com/docs/answer/190843
29. Google. (2025b). *Check activity & file versions — Google Drive help.* https://support.google.com/drive/answer/2409045
30. Grammarly. (2024). *Generative AI that enhances your writing.* https://www.grammarly.com/ai/generative-ai Grammarly
31. Grammarly. (2025, April 22). *Is using AI cheating? How to use it responsibly for school.* https://www.grammarly.com/blog/ai/using-ai-without-cheating/
32. Hibbert, M., Altman, E., Shippen, T., & Wright, M. (2024, June 3). *A framework for AI literacy*. *EDUCAUSE Review*.
33. Inside Higher Ed. (2024, June 28; 2024, August 6). *One-third of college instructors are using GenAI. Here's why.; How to get actionable AI data at your institution.* https://www.insidehighered.com/
34. Ithaka S+R. (2024). *Making AI generative for higher education: Adoption and challenges among instructors and researchers*. https://sr.ithaka.org/publications/making-ai-generative-for-higher-education/ Ithaka S+R
35. JHU Center for Teaching Excellence & Innovation. (2024, September 5). *Assessment strategies in the age of generative AI.* https://teaching.jhu.edu/university-teaching-policies/generative-ai/assessment-strategies/
36. JISC National Centre for AI. (2024, August 14). *Embracing generative AI in assessments: A guided approach.* https://nationalcentreforai.jiscinvolve.org/wp/2024/08/14/embracing-generative-ai-in-assessments-a-guided-approach/
37. Johns Hopkins University Center for Teaching Excellence & Innovation. (2024). *Assessment strategies in the age of generative AI*. https://ctei.jhu.edu/teaching-resources/assessment/assessment-strategies-age-generative-ai Teaching at JHU
38. K. Altman Law. (2024). *The flawed promise of AI detectors in academia.* https://www.kaltmanlaw.com/post/ai-detectors-academic-integrity-bias
39. KQED MindShift. (2024, November 21). *Taking exams in blue books? They're back to help curb AI use and rampant cheating.* https://www.kqed.org/mindshift/64992/taking-exams-in-blue-books-its-back-to-help-curb-ai-use-and-rampant-cheating
40. Lee, S. S., & Moore, R. L. (2024). Harnessing generative AI for automated feedback in higher education: A systematic review. *Online Learning, 28*(3), 82–104. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1446868.pdf
41. Liang, W., Yuksekgonul, M., Mao, Y., Wu, E., & Zou, J. (2023). GPT detectors are biased against non-native English writers. *Patterns*. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10382961/ PMC
42. Lin, L., & Parker, K. (2025). *Workers' exposure to AI* (Pew Research Center Report).
43. LinkedIn. (2024). *Workplace Learning Report 2024.* https://learning.linkedin.com/resources/workplace-learning-report-2024
44. Mariano, G. J. (2024). Reintroducing the oral exam: Finding out what students actually know. *Currents in Teaching and Learning, 16*(1), 1–10. https://webcdn.worcester.edu/currents-in-teaching-and-learning/wp-content/uploads/sites/65/2024/09/Reintroducing-the-Oral-Exam.pdf
45. Microsoft & LinkedIn. (2024). *2024 Work Trend Index annual report: AI at work is here. Now comes the hard part.* https://assets-c4akfrf5b4d3f4b7.z01.azurefd.net/assets/2024/05/2024_Work_Trend_Index_Annual_Report_Executive_Summary_663b2135860a9.pdf
46. Microsoft, & LinkedIn. (2024, May 8). *AI at work is here. Now comes the hard part* (2024 Work Trend Index). https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/worklab/work-trend-index/ai-at-work-is-here-now-comes-the-hard-part Microsoft
47. Microsoft. (2024). *The 2024 Work Trend Index: Copilot is here. Now comes the hard part.*
48. Montclair State University Office for Faculty Excellence. (2024). *AI course policies and assignment guidelines*. https://www.montclair.edu/office-for-faculty-excellence/generative-ai/ Montclair State University
49. Montclair State University Office for Faculty Excellence. (2025). *The Montclair syllabus.* https://www.montclair.edu/office-for-faculty-excellence/the-montclair-syllabus/ Montclair State University
50. Montclair State University Office for Faculty Excellence. (2025, August 17). *Practical responses to ChatGPT* (AI resource hub, including detection cautions). https://www.montclair.edu/faculty-excellence/ofe-teaching-principles/clear-course-design/practical-responses-to-chat-gpt/
51. Montclair State University, Office for Faculty Excellence. (2024, July 8). *AI writing detection: Tools*.
52. Montclair State University, Office for Faculty Excellence. (2024, September 2). *AI course policies and assignment guidelines*.

53. Montclair State University, Office for Faculty Excellence. (2024, July 8). *AI writing detection: Tools.* https://www.montclair.edu/faculty-excellence/ofe-teaching-principles/clear-course-design/practical-responses-to-chat-gpt/ai-writing-detection/
54. Montclair State University, Office for Faculty Excellence. (2025). *Detecting generative AI: Red flags.*
55. Montclair State University, Office for Faculty Excellence. (2025, April 23). *Resources on generative AI—Finals week edition.* https://www.montclair.edu/faculty-excellence/2025/04/23/generative-ai-101/
56. Montclair State University, Office for Faculty Excellence. (n.d.). *AI writing detection: Red flags*.
57. NASPA. (2024a, December 4). *NASPA releases new report on artificial intelligence in student affairs.* https://www.naspa.org/press/naspa-releases-new-report-on-artificial-intelligence-in-student-affairs
58. NASPA. (2024b). *The transformative potential of AI in student affairs.* https://www.naspa.org/report/the-transformative-potential-of-ai-in-student-affairs-recommendations-for-student-affairs-leaders
59. Perkins, M., Furze, L., Roe, J., & MacVaugh, J. (2024). The AI Assessment Scale (AIAS): A framework for ethical integration of generative AI in educational assessment. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, 21*(6).
60. Perkins, M., Roe, J., Vu, B. H., Postma, D., Hickerson, D., McGaughran, J., & Khuat, H. Q. (2024). *GenAI detection tools, adversarial techniques and implications for inclusivity in higher education* (Preprint). arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.19148 arXiv
61. Pew Research Center. (2025, February 25). *Workers' exposure to AI and workplace use.* https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2025/02/25/workers-exposure-to-ai/
62. Picasso, F., Zubieta, J., & Díaz, P. (2024). Advancing critical data and AI literacies through authentic assessment. *Open Praxis, 16*(3), 181–196. https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.16.3.667
63. Stanford Teaching Commons. (2024). *Understanding AI literacy.* https://teachingcommons.stanford.edu/teaching-guides/artificial-intelligence-teaching-guide/understanding-ai-literacy
64. Tay, H. Y., Sweeney, T., & Dawson, P. (2024). AI feedback: Moving beyond the hype to integrating it into a pedagogy of feedback. *Routledge Open Research, 3*, 26. https://doi.org/10.12688/routledgeopenres.13589.1
65. TeachAI. (2025). *AI in education guidance and policy resources.* https://www.teachai.org/policy-resources
66. The Guardian. (2024, December 15; 2025, June 23). *Inside the university AI cheating crisis*; *There's no simple solution to universities' AI worries.* https://www.theguardian.com/
67. Tsai, S. (2024, January 29). Universities consider academic integrity in approach to evolving AI-filled future. *Fox Business*.
68. Turnitin. (2024). *Understanding AI writing detection.* https://www.turnitin.com/blog/understanding-ai-writing-detection
69. Turnitin. (2025, August 28). *AI writing detection model: Frequently asked questions*. https://help.turnitin.com/ai-writing/ai-writing-detection-model-faq.htm Turnitin Guides
70. Tyton Partners. (2024). *Time for Class 2024.* https://tytonpartners.com/time-for-class-2024/
71. UMass Amherst Center for Teaching and Learning. (2024). *How do I consider the impact of AI tools in my courses?* https://www.umass.edu/ctl/how-do-i-consider-impact-ai-tools-my-courses UMass Amherst
72. UMass Amherst Center for Teaching and Learning. (2025). *How do I consider the impact of AI tools in my courses?* https://www.umass.edu/ctl/how-do-i-consider-impact-ai-tools-my-courses UMass Amherst
73. University of Illinois Chicago, College of Applied Health Sciences. (2024, April). *Assessment and generative artificial intelligence in higher education.* https://cms.ahs.uic.edu/inside-ahs/wp-content/uploads/sites/12/2024/04/Assessment-and-Generative-Artificial-Intelligence-in-Higher-Education.pdf
74. University of Massachusetts Amherst, Center for Teaching & Learning. (2024a). *Addressing suspected misuse of generative AI by students: Guidance for faculty.*
75. University of Massachusetts Amherst, Center for Teaching & Learning. (2024b). *How do I consider the impact of AI tools in my courses?*
76. University of Massachusetts Amherst, Center for Teaching & Learning. (n.d.). *Addressing suspected misuse of generative AI by students: Guidance for faculty*.
77. University of Pittsburgh. (2024, January 12). *Teaching at Pitt: Using generative AI to create more accessible courses.* https://www.utimes.pitt.edu/news/teaching-pitt-using
78. Vanderbilt University. (2023). *Academic integrity and generative AI.* https://www.vanderbilt.edu/generative-ai/academic-integrity/ Vanderbilt University
79. Vanderbilt University. (2023/2024). *Academic affairs guidance for artificial intelligence; Academic integrity and generative AI.* https://www.vanderbilt.edu/generative-ai/academic-integrity/
80. Vanderbilt University. (2023–2024). *Teaching with generative AI; Incorporating generative AI in course design.*
81. Vanderbilt University. (2024). *Academic integrity and generative AI.* https://www.vanderbilt.edu/generative-ai/academic-integrity/ Vanderbilt University
82. Weber-Wulff, D., Anohina-Naumeca, A., Bjelobaba, S., Foltýnek, T., Guerrero-Dib, J., Popoola, O., Šigut, P., & Waddington, L. (2023). *Testing of detection tools for AI-generated text* (Preprint). arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.15666 arXiv
83. Zhao, X., Li, J., & Shao, L. (2025). The use of generative AI by students with disabilities in higher education: Benefits, challenges, and ethical considerations. *The Internet and Higher Education, 66*, 100944. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2025.100944