

Recommendation for the use of generative AI at the Faculty of Economic and Social Sciences (GTK)

1. General principles

The use of artificial intelligence (AI) is omnipresent in our everyday lives. With technological development, AI tools have appeared in most intellectual activities, in some cases significantly improving productivity. Generative AI¹ can provide effective support to university education and students' learning processes in countless ways. At the same time, university students may, from time to time, feel the need to reduce their academic workload by means that undermine the very purpose of their studies. This dual potential in the use of AI tools highlights the importance of transparent control rather than prohibition of AI usage. In the long run, students capable of skillfully using AI tools can gain advantage on the labour market: their competencies are enriched by being able to solve complex tasks that their peers unexperienced in AI tools cannot. At the same time, we must also ensure that even without AI assistance our students are not helpless and can develop other competencies during their studies.

GTK is committed to providing its students with an advantage both in the labour market and in other areas of life by developing their competence in the use of AI. This approach, however, requires a revision and redevelopment not only of learning processes but also of education and performance evaluation methods.

2. Referencing AI use, transparency

Referencing rules comply with international standards that require the use of AI to be transparent. This means that the use of artificial intelligence must be properly indicated in all evaluated parts of the work (body of the thesis, tables, excerpts, etc.). AI use must be referenced by providing the commonly known name of the algorithm/tool, and the prompts used must be retained in a verifiable manner and produced upon request. In addition, the research documentation must mark the beginning and the end of text(s) generated by artificial intelligence.²

¹ Recital 99 of the EU AI Act: “Large generative AI models are a typical example for a general-purpose AI model, given that they allow for flexible generation of content, such as in the form of text, audio, images or video, that can readily accommodate a wide range of distinctive tasks.”

² For other best practices see: European Research Area Stakeholders Forum, *Living Guidelines on the responsible use of generative AI in research*

3. Appropriate uses of generative AI

An easier way to verify the use of generative artificial intelligence is when the author of the thesis prepares a well-defined part of the text (a certain sub-topic or sub-task of the thesis) using artificial intelligence. A generally applied principle is that the more important parts of the thesis that require discretion and decision such as the research question, discussion, empirical part and conclusions may not, under any circumstances, be prepared using artificial intelligence. A more precise limitation on the use of AI is only possible and desirable with regards to the specific academic programme. The student is responsible for verifying any and all content generated by AI because they will assume the same liability as if it was prepared without AI. It is equally unacceptable from students to use AI for translating literature and presenting the target-language content as their own.

4. Detecting the use of generative AI

The use of generative AI cannot be identified or can only be identified in an incidental manner using the currently available technology. The ratio of false positives is too high and there is no mathematical detection principle that is reliable in the long term. Therefore, lecturers performing assessment are not recommended to use AI detection tools when verifying students' work. Classic plagiarism detection tools were not designed to do this.

When verifying authenticity, the lecturer's professional expertise, their perspective of the student's work and abilities must be employed primarily, and assessment must be carried out by frequently monitoring students' progress. Instead of automatic screening with a detection tool, teaching professionals can be more effective in their efforts in identifying unauthorised practices by relying on their roles as lecturers and thesis advisors and by monitoring students' progress via consultations.

5. Amendment to the plagiarism statement

Similar to the plagiarism statement relevant to the use of other authors' works, student must also make a liability statement about the use of AI, acknowledging that unauthorised use may have similar consequences to plagiarism.

(the previous plagiarism statement is amended as follows:)

I have reviewed all AI-generated content, verified the truthfulness of the generated outcome and appropriately marked all instances of AI use.

6. Lecturers' duties and responsibilities

Pursuant to the rules of the BME currently in effect, the authenticity of the outcome of various text-based tasks created in connection with lecturer consultation must be primarily verified by students; however, in certain justified cases, the lecturer's responsibility may also be examined.

In the interest of carrying out the duties of lecturer and thesis advisor in a responsible manner, we recommend that

- You discuss with the student the possibilities of using artificial intelligence and, if necessary, test AI use in a protected/controlled/closed environment.
- Familiarity with (and, if necessary, documentation of) the current outline of the thesis and the texts prepared in the progress should be a standalone requirement for the acceptance of consultation.
- The lecturer should continuously verify the thesis writing process, closely monitor the creation of the individual text versions in conjunction with the consultation sessions that the Faculty requires to be documented.
- Reviews and assessments must not be prepared using AI tools, which would constitute a violation of scientific ethics.