

## Regulations on the use of AI tools of the Faculty of Social and Cultural Sciences

The Faculty of Social and Cultural Sciences follows the guidelines for the use of AI tools<sup>1</sup>, which the Senate of the European University Viadrina adopted on 17 July 2024. The following rules apply at the Faculty of Social and Cultural Sciences:

### **I. Academic independence and rules of good academic practice also apply when using AI tools**

Academic texts must be written independently also when using AI tools. When assessing texts, it must be recognizable that students have independently produced a scientific text. A text is assessed as unsatisfactory if it consists to a significant extent of a compilation of AI-generated text passages (Section 23 (1) sentence 3 ASPO). No aids other than those specified may be used. The rules of good scientific practice<sup>2</sup> must be followed (for students in particular part A, §1, part B, §6, paragraph 4). The passages taken from other works in terms of wording or meaning must be identified in each individual case by stating the source, including the secondary literature or AI tools used. If text passages are taken directly, the page numbers of the source, if available, must be indicated.

### **II. Use of AI tools for the adoption of scientific content or facts**

- a) In the case of the adoption of scientific content or facts, the AI-generated outputs must be checked for correctness in the respective original sources. The selection, adoption and all results of the AI-generated output used are entirely the responsibility of the user and must therefore be checked independently. The adoption of incorrect content or the indication of non-existent sources ('hallucinations') may be considered an attempt at fraud and may therefore lead to failure.
- b) The direct citation of scientific content and facts must be indicated in quotation marks with the source at the relevant point in the text (as an in-text citation or footnote).<sup>3</sup>
- c) Text passages that students write on the basis of a draft text created by an AI tool (indirect adoption) are not to be placed in quotation marks, but must be linguistically marked as indirect adoption.<sup>4</sup> It must be indicated which AI tool wrote the text passage.

### **III. Use of AI tools for topic identification, literature research, language improvement, translation and improvement of own texts or for systematic research**

As a rule, the use of AI tools for topic identification, support in outlining, literature searches for linguistic review, translation and improvement of own texts or for systematic research is permitted. Such use is mentioned in relation to the entire text, not for individual text passages.

---

<sup>1</sup> AI tools within the meaning of this guideline are in particular Large Language Models (LLMs) such as Chat-GPT, which support text creation and editing in terms of content. Correction functions (spelling and grammar) and writing programs such as Grammarly and ProWritingAid, which only suggest linguistic and stylistic corrections, are not AI tools within the meaning of this guideline. On the other hand, translation tools such as DeepL are to be classified as AI tools and are covered by this guideline.

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.europa-uni.de/de/forschung/dokumente/richtlinie-gute-wissenschaftliche-praxis-2021.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Assistance with citing generative AI content can be found, for example, at <https://style.mla.org/citing-generative-ai/>

<sup>4</sup> Draft text ChatGPT (version ...), substantially modified.

After the bibliography, a separate section "Documentation of the use of AI tools" has to be included if AI tools were used. For each AI tool used, the documentation contains a description of the steps or parts of the work for which it was used. It must also be stated whether the output text of the AI tool was used directly or paraphrased in the work.

Examples:

- I used ChatGPT to formulate my introduction. For this, I entered my own text with the prompt "Improve my text.". I did not incorporate the results directly into my work, but merely used individual formulations as ideas for the further development of my introduction. [Note: No separate references are expected in the text itself].
- I used ChatGPT for the structure of my seminar paper. I have adopted the suggested structure; however, I have changed the headings. [Note: No separate references are expected in the text itself].
- I used ChatGPT for my analysis and adopted text. I have marked this as a citation at the appropriate places in the work. I have also verified ChatGPT's statements using the literature sources provided.

The comprehensive documentation of AI usage is recommended (see below).

#### **IV. Possibility of an additional reflection paper**

Examiners can request a reflection paper on the use and effects of AI in the submitted text.

#### **V. Possibility of an additional oral examination**

If the examiners have doubts about the correctness of the information provided on the use of AI tools or the appropriateness of this use, they can conduct an additional oral examination on the topic of the written work.

#### **VI. Plagiarism, cheating, own work**

If AI tools are used but not identified in accordance with these guidelines or the adapted specifications of the respective examiner, this constitutes cheating or plagiarism in accordance with Section 21 ASPO with the consequence that the examination performance is assessed with 5.0 and, in serious cases, exmatriculation is threatened.

Excerpt from Section 21 (1) sentences 3 and 4 ASPO: "Plagiarism occurs when the corresponding source is not cited in a written work when the wording, an illustration or the essential meaning of a document is copied. Plagiarism also exists if the work of another person is passed off in whole or in part as one's own, if another person's work is downloaded in whole or in part from the Internet or from an electronic data carrier and passed off as one's own, or if another person's work in a foreign language is translated in whole or in part and passed off as one's own."

Even if no cheating is detected, the work may be assessed as 5.0 due to insufficient own work.

#### **VII. Documentation of AI use**

In order to ensure maximum transparency, it is recommended that prompts, chat histories and the use of text passages from the chat histories are documented for personal documentation (e.g. by means of PDF copies or screenshots of the chat histories). Please note that neither copyrighted material nor data protection sensitive information of third parties (e.g. test persons) may be transferred to the software.

#### **VIII. Final provisions**

The examiner is obliged to inform students of the applicable guidelines for the use of AI tools in the context of home examinations when setting the task.