Scenarios for Consideration
GenAI Workshop
March 6-7, 2025

Scenario #1

A history course has only the following syllabus policy about GenAI usage:

> "A*ny submission of work generated by generative AI will be disqualified upon discovery."*

The instructor did not say anything more about this policy in class. A student deeply interested in Haitian history used an AI tool to translate both primary and secondary sources for an assignment. The submitted assignment includes quotes from those translated texts and indicates the process used.

Questions

1. Should the instructor address the student's GenAI usage? If so, how?
2. If the student's work is accepted, should the instructor re-adjust the policy? If so, how?
3. Would it be different if the student did not indicate the process and the instructor found out later? How or why?

Scenario #2

A philosophy course includes this syllabus statement:

> "A*ssignments must reflect the student's independent intellectual engagement and critical thinking. The use of AI to generate or structure arguments is not allowed.*"

A student with a documented learning disability uses a GenAI tool to organize their ideas and generate an outline for an essay. They then write the essay independently, building on the AI-generated outline. When questioned, the student explains that the tool helped them overcome their organizational challenges, which are related to their disability.

Questions

1. Should the instructor accept the student's use of GenAI as a reasonable accommodation? Why or why not?
2. How might the instructor engage with the student and the institution's disability services to address this situation?
3. Should the syllabus policy be updated to consider equitable use of AI tools for students with specific needs? How can this be done without compromising academic integrity?

Scenario #3

In a marketing course, the syllabus states that

> *"Assignments created with AI should not exceed 25% of the work submitted and must identify the AI-generated portions."*

A student uses AI to organize substantial notes taken and organize it into a detailed outline of an assignment. They do add more elements to the assignment afterwards and submit it--they do not indicate any GenAI usage.   The instructor overhears the student discussing their method to peers. The instructor takes the student aside and asks why they didn't indicate AI usage. The student said they used an AI tool that only works with the content provided and does not draw upon other sources. Given that it used the student's notes, the student saw it as their work and therefore not necessary. Additionally, the student explained that it would be really hard to indicate what was their work and what was the GenAI's since it happened at the level of words, not sentences.

Questions

1. What is the appropriate response by the instructor?
2. Assuming the student didn't have the opportunity to talk the instructor in advance, what should have they have done differently?
3. How might the might this conversation change or challenge the given policy and what should the instructor do going forward?

Scenario #4

A math instructor has not given much thought about GenAI in the course because much of the work requires using tools that document the student's process. In fact, there is no policy in the syllabus. However, the instructor is hearing a lot of talk about GenAI and concerns by peers about students using it to cheat in other math courses. About 3/4 of the way through the semester, the instructor learns that a student's progress has dramatically improved. For the first half of the course, the student failed most of the formative assessments and barely passed the normative assessments. Yet now, the student is scoring nearly perfectly.

Questions

1. What are 5 reasonable explanations for this scenario?
2. If the instructor discovered that the student had been using GenAI to generate answers for the assessments, what might that mean for the student's performance and evaluation?
3. If the instructor discovered that the student had been using GenAI as a math tutor to support their learning, would that change anything?
4. What if the student was using it both for tutoring and generating answers?

Scenario #5

The syllabus for a nursing course includes this policy:

> "*All written case study analyses must reflect your independent critical thinking and understanding of patient care concepts. Use of generative AI tools to create or draft written content is prohibited. Supplemental resources must be cited.*"

A student submits an exceptionally detailed and well-written analysis of a complex patient case study. Upon review, the instructor notices sections of the analysis that contain advanced terminology and phrasing inconsistent with the student's previous work. When questioned, the student explains that they used a GenAI tool to help synthesize information from multiple journal articles they read, but insists that all interpretations and recommendations were their own. They argue that the AI tool served as a secondary source, not as the creator of their work. Upon engaging with the student with detailed questions, the instructor can tell the student knows the content of their submitted work quite well.

Questions

1. Does the student's explanation align with the intent of the policy? Should the submission be accepted? Why or why not?
2. Should the policy be revised to distinguish between AI tools for research assistance (e.g., summarizing articles) versus content generation? How might this distinction be clearly articulated?
3. Would the situation differ if the student was not able to articulate details and ideas within the work they had submitted?