

## **Statement on use of Generative AI tools**

Student work should showcase their individual intellectual abilities and exhibit their skills in critical thinking and problem-solving. Using generative AI without authorization to help produce a student's work undermines the core intellectual objectives of the University and fails to show the student's own achievements. It is essential for graduate students to maintain the highest standards of academic excellence and integrity in their scholarly endeavors.

Students intending to incorporate generative AI tools into their graduate thesis research or writing need to obtain clear, written consent from their supervisor(s) for their proposed uses beforehand. Students must clearly and fully disclose and cite any use of generative AI tools in all scholarly outputs, including assignments, published papers, comprehensive/qualifying exams, proposals, and thesis writing. Unauthorized use of generative AI tools and any failure to cite non-original, externally sourced work can result in a violation of Carleton's academic integrity policy. Students must give proper citations and descriptions of any generative AI tool used during the research or writing stages, including designing, outlining, drafting, writing, editing, or creating audio or visual content, statistical analysis or other potential applications. Even with authorized use of generative AI (for instance, when writing a thesis about generative AI, it would be necessary to use generative AI), students should remain cognizant of the potential risks associated with these tools, which include not just academic integrity issues, but also legal and reliability issues.

The legal landscape regarding the use of generative AI tools in relation to copyright remains unresolved. This field is continuously evolving, and our comprehension of it will grow as new policies, regulations, and legal precedents emerge. A key issue in the intersection of generative AI and copyright law includes the legality of the data used to train AI models, which is currently under several lawsuits internationally. There is also ambiguity about how current copyright exceptions, like fair dealing, apply to the use of these tools. The authorship and ownership of AI-generated works are not yet clearly defined. Under traditional Canadian law, an author is considered to be a human who applies skill and judgment in creating a work. Given the varying levels of human involvement in AI-generated content, it's uncertain how Canada will determine the rightful author and owner of such works, which has implications for publications. Major scientific publishers including ACM, Science, Elsevier and Nature have updated their publishing policies, stating that ChatGPT cannot be listed as an author on an academic paper. Some publishers have outright bans on use of generative AI tools, and violation of the policies can have significant repercussions for both the student and their co-authors' careers.

The reliability issue of generative AI tools is known as the "hallucinations problem", and refers to the problem that generative text systems will confidently make statements about "facts" that are entirely made up by the generator. As a result, the outputs of generative text systems should not be trusted as being true.

The current lack of highly accurate tools to detect the use of generative AI does not preclude the development of such tools in the future. It is important to be diligent in citing all sources of assistance in your work, as failure to do so could potentially lead to the revocation of degrees at

a later date. If you are uncertain about the appropriate use of these tools, it is advisable to consult with your supervisor. As a general principle, exercise caution and avoid using any resource if you have doubts about its appropriateness.