

Guidelines for Handling Generative AI in Study and Teaching at the Alice Salomon University of Applied Sciences Berlin (ASH Berlin) (As of January 2024)

Important note: Translation from the Original German Document: Please note that the original German text is considered the legally binding document.

Contents

I.	Basic Positioning
II.	AI Competency Development
III.	Didactics and the Use of AI in Teaching
IV.	Academic Work and Writing
V.	Examinations
VI.	Legal Framework
VII.	Recommendations for Further Organizational Development Process

I. Basic Positioning

The application of generative AI is already having a diverse impact on the design of study and teaching, and corresponding tools are becoming an integral part of academic workflows and teaching-learning processes. ASH Berlin values an open and critical approach to the use of generative AI in study and teaching. It is imperative to consider both the opportunities of applying generative AI models and the necessary competencies, as well as the emerging risks. Therefore, it is essential that all members of the university are enabled to handle generative AI responsibly in the contexts of study and teaching, and the university provides the necessary resources for this.

The use of generative AI affects different subjects and professional fields in various ways. For ASH Berlin, it is important to discuss the specific potentials and limits for and within the qualifying study programs of the SAGE professions - Social Work, Health, Education, and Training. The opportunities and challenges concern both the use in designing study and teaching as well as the teaching content, competency goals, and preparation for future professional practice. Particularly, potentials and limits regarding equal opportunities, educational equity, and accessibility need to be captured and reflected upon. Given the intense private-sector AI competition, critical questions also arise regarding the reinforcement of the Digital Divide (both within the student group and the target groups of the SAGE professions), exploitation and endangerment of people (e.g., involved in training and optimizing generative AI), and resource consumption and sustainability.

Handling generative AI in study and teaching at ASH Berlin encompasses more than just discussing impacts on examination situations. It requires creating spaces for discussion and enabling communication processes among all members of the university to open up comprehensive reflection on the diverse issues. Moreover, generative AI models are undergoing rapid and dynamic development processes, necessitating continuous critical discussion. Therefore, the recommendations presented here by the Commission for Teaching and Studies of ASH Berlin are seen as the start of a university-wide and sustained discussion and understanding process, requiring a sustainable structural framework and appropriate resource allocation.

The recommendations address key questions in dealing with generative AI in study and teaching at ASH Berlin. In the context of study and teaching, AI models for text generation are particularly relevant, and the following remarks primarily focus on these tools. Implications of generative AI models for research projects, administrative processes, publications, etc., are not addressed in the recommendations, but further discussion of these at the university is urgently necessary and advisable from the LSK's perspective.

II. AI Competency Development As a SAGE university, ASH Berlin's task is to professionalize and empower employees, teachers, and students for digital change and handling transformative technologies within the SAGE professions, enabling them to use the technologies in an empowerment- and practice-oriented manner for clients and target groups. Against this backdrop, the following guidelines emerge for AI competency development at the university:

1. The use and handling of generative AI models in study and teaching is a new and rapidly developing field. This requires a joint competency development among teachers, students, employees, and in the learning organization. The guiding premise is "We are all learners." However, this competency development should not focus solely on generative AI models but be integrated into an overall concept for promoting 'digital competencies' (digital literacy).
2. ASH Berlin should create enabling structures and offerings for the necessary competency development for all member groups. These should contribute to teachers, students, and employees learning, understanding, critically reflecting on, and responsibly using the user-based functionalities of generative AI models, as well as societal and social potentials and impacts of generative AI and technology impact assessment as part of Digital Literacy. This requires an open, learner- and error-friendly attitude and opportunities and appropriate spaces for testing, experimenting, and critical reflection.
3. Corresponding training and continuing education offers – possibly involving external expertise and cross-university networking – are necessary for all university members, as well as utilizing offerings of overarching didactic institutions like the Berlin Center for University Teaching (BZHL) for the teachers at ASH Berlin.
4. The ability to critically classify the creation process and products of generative AI processes should be a mandatory part of the study. Ideally, this is to be anchored for students already in the study entry phase and implemented in suitable courses in the curricula of the various study programs according to the SAGE profile of the university. In the context of learning and dealing with scientific methods and academic writing as part of the study (see Section IV), the critical-reflective handling of generative AI models becomes an integral part of competency development in the field of Digital Literacy. Extra-curricular and curricular offerings can complement each other.
5. Teachers should be supported or encouraged to exchange ideas in various discussion formats regarding good practice examples and examine their transferability for their own teaching. Within additional continuing education offerings provided by the university, competency development for the use of generative AI models in study and teaching in the ASH Berlin's study programs with their special SAGE profile should be ensured.
6. ASH Berlin should sensitize and educate all university members about data protection and copyright issues and challenges of generative AI models.
7. Clear and current information on generative AI models and the transparent naming of responsibilities in the context of generative AI models contribute to keeping current and future developments in focus and competently developing the ASH Berlin's measures according to the state of the art.

III. Didactics and the Use of AI in Teaching

The impacts, design possibilities, opportunities, and challenges of generative AI models in teaching/learning settings are currently not fully foreseeable. Therefore, it is even more important that these are regularly discussed within the university and respective study programs, and the approach is further developed. Currently, the following guidelines are proposed:

1. The possibilities and limits of the didactic application of generative AI models should be explored and tested at ASH Berlin according to the guiding principle of Learning and Teaching, considering three levels of didactics: 1) individual teaching/learning action at the micro level, 2) curricula at the meso level, 3) organizational structures and cultures at the macro level in the societal and educational policy context. The use of generative AI models in various study programs should be methodically and didactically developed and designed, specific to the teaching event according to the SAGE professions. This should address both the usage and functional and production methods and societal conditions and effects of generative AI models.
2. Reflection on existing and possibly the development of new competency-oriented didactic formats is particularly recommended in teaching/learning contexts where the use of generative AI models is technically appropriate.
3. The use of generative AI models requires defining learning objectives concerning AI models as tools for learning and writing processes and integrating them into teaching-learning settings.
4. When using AI in the context of study and teaching, aspects of educational equity, equal opportunities, accessibility, and inclusion must be considered.
5. If generative AI models are to be used at the university, this should be done considering the available resources of all participants and the organization. The relevant tools and access should be provided by the university.
6. The use in study and teaching at ASH Berlin must only be data protection compliant (see Section VI), which, depending on the software, requires the purchase of paid licenses. Licenses for the use of generative AI models are part of the university's equipment. They must be purchased by the university and made available to all university members in an appropriate extent. Given the generally higher performance of paid versions, this can also actively counteract different access opportunities and a digital divide among the university groups.

IV. Academic Work and Writing

The ability to perform academic work and, in particular, to write academic texts is a central qualification to be acquired during studies and practiced and developed for a scientifically-based practice. These study goals have high relevance, especially given the current spread of generative AI models. AI models can support scientific work processes but should be reflected in various respects and understood in their functionality. The following guidelines emerge for ASH Berlin:

1. Generative AI models will influence and change the diverse functions of academic work and writing processes. The university is challenged in its central task of enabling and ensuring the acquisition of the competency for scientific work for students to proactively address these changes.
2. It is necessary to test the use and application possibilities with generative AI models in the different learning spaces for academic work and writing at ASH Berlin - in the curricular context and in extracurricular offerings such as the services for promoting writing and study competencies and the university library - and to enable critical thinking in dealing with these

to ensure independent and responsible creation of academic works and the independent critical evaluation of the products of generative AI by students.

3. The use of generative AI models in guiding, accompanying, and critically appraising the academic work processes of students by ASH Berlin's teachers should be critically reflected and be subject to the individual decision of the teaching staff, considering the legal framework conditions (see Section VI). An obligation to include generative AI models, for example, for reasons of time efficiency, is to be rejected. There still needs to be adequate time and space for individual, personal exchange processes between students and teachers.

V. Examinations

The use of and dealing with generative AI models in study and teaching particularly require considerations regarding the selection and design of competency-oriented examination formats and reflection on the impacts on the learning and writing process and the performance of study and examination services by students. The following guidelines are formulated concerning this thematic area:

1. In addition to newly defining learning objectives and adapting didactic design of teaching (see Section III), a critical analysis of possible examination formats should be carried out for each module in the respective study programs at ASH Berlin.
2. The use of generative AI models for written exams, which require competencies in academic writing (see Section IV) and are taken independently and without immediate supervision by teachers, such as term papers, bachelor's and master's theses, is particularly significant. According to the examination regulations, the modalities of the performance of examination services must be communicated to students in text form by the examiner. For exams, it is thus crucial for the examining teacher to clearly define and announce which aids are allowed in exams and how these and the used sources are to be disclosed in written exam papers. This requires necessary sensitization of the teachers and the development of fundamental competencies concerning generative AI models to inform students about the use of AI models as tools in performing examination services within the respective teaching events.
3. To prevent unintended violations of the guidelines for exam creation (fraud prevention), students should also be given the opportunity to inform themselves about and seek advice on handling generative AI models as writing tools.
4. Reliable detection of AI-generated texts using 'plagiarism detection software' is not currently possible. The use of such software for detecting AI-generated texts is therefore not currently recommended.
5. Regarding the design of exams, the strengthening of competency-oriented exams is recommended. Exams should place even more emphasis on action-oriented formats, and tasks should be adapted so that the independence of an examination service can be traced. The competent and critical handling of generative AI models themselves could increasingly be part of examination services in the future (e.g., critical assessment of AI-generated texts concerning their strengths and weaknesses).
6. Furthermore, the adaptation of evaluation criteria is recommended. The aim here is to strengthen the evaluation criteria that indicate the student's own contribution, such as the critical handling of used aids and sources and the positioning in the academic discourse.
7. As part of a declaration of independence, it is mandatory to mark the use of generative AI models as tools in the creation of examination services, as the provision of all aids is prescribed in the framework regulations. The use of generative AI tools in written exam papers must be completely transparent. Non-disclosure of AI-generated texts is consequently to be considered deception.

VI. Legal Framework

Unlike the university's own IT offerings for study and teaching, the use of generative AI models usually occurs via web-based platforms of commercial companies with their own terms of use and data processing processes. Therefore, the use of such tools in the university context requires particular attention to data protection aspects. Furthermore, copyright issues appear significant. The following guidelines can be formulated concerning the data protection and copyright challenges of using generative AI models in study and teaching.

1. ASH Berlin should collaborate with other Berlin universities to explore the possibilities of anonymized, data protection-compliant use of generative AI models relevant to their study programs and provide appropriate access for teachers and students. Depending on the specific implementation of such offerings at the university, additional data protection information must be provided to the users.
2. ASH Berlin should create organizational structures to potentially provide open-source AI models via its own IT infrastructure and discuss their application possibilities for study and teaching.
3. Regulating the use of private accounts for generative AI services is not effective; however, it must be ensured within the departments or study programs that their use in studies is purely voluntary and the consent of the students is documented. If no anonymized, university-owned access exists, care must be taken that non-use of generative AI models from third-party providers does not disadvantage students.
4. When creating input prompts for generative AI models (also known as 'prompting'), data protection issues must be carefully considered to ensure no personal data (e.g., of students or clients) – or data that could lead to personal identification – is included (as these pieces of information may be processed by third-party providers in a way that violates data protection laws). If teachers include generative AI models from third-party providers in their teaching, they must additionally inform students about the data protection aspects of 'prompting'.
5. According to current legal interpretation, only a human can be the author of a work in the sense of German copyright law. Therefore, a text (or other output) generated by a generative AI cannot be understood as a work in the copyright sense nor as a source to be plagiarized. Consequently, the generated text (or image, audio product, etc.) is not a citable source, and there is no immediate citation obligation. However, this does not imply that there is no obligation to correctly indicate the use of generative AI in the processing of examination services (see Section V), as the use of generative AI is at least to be classified as a tool. Texts produced by generative AI can nevertheless contain passages from other sources without correctly naming the source or author. In this case, plagiarism occurs through the inclusion of the text (including the plagiarized content) in one's own academic work.

VII. Recommendations for Further Organizational Development Process

With these guidelines for dealing with generative AI models in study and teaching, the LSK initially presents a framework for orientation that requires further operationalization and, in some areas, framework guidelines/regulations for concrete implementation, such as in statutes and processes, as well as concrete work and orientation aids. Since there is necessarily still a need for concretization in the various areas of action, and the field, technologies, and associated challenges and opportunities are constantly evolving, it is recommended to continue working on the topic of dealing with generative AI models as a permanent development theme, to continuously follow and reflect on further developments, to build competencies in the sense of a learning organization, and to make appropriate concretizations as a contribution to further organizational development.

In doing so, the following aspects should be considered:

- Further organizational, reflective competency development for the use of generative AI models in study and teaching, e.g., through information events, discussion forums, and training also by external experts, and cross-university networking.
- Involvement of further actors and expertise within ASH Berlin, as well as clarification and naming of clear responsibilities for further work on the topic and the establishment of suitable work structures and processes (such as creating a road map with responsibilities).
- Provision of appropriate personnel resources for further scientific monitoring and steering of the university's handling of AI.
- Making available data protection-compliant tools.
- Integrating the topic into the process and quality management of ASH Berlin and creating work and orientation aids, as well as process descriptions, if necessary.
- Continuing to monitor and prepare for possible future developments regarding the legal framework for the application of AI in the university context.
- Clarification of the use of generative AI models in other fields of action of ASH Berlin, such as administration and research.
- Exchange with other universities and disciplines in respective discourses on generative AI and strengthening the perspective of the SAGE professions in professional discourses and in the public sphere.