

Use of AI Detection Tools in Academic Integrity Investigations

Guidance & Recommendations for Instructors

from the Manager, Student Conduct & Case Management (2025-26)

While AI detection tools have come a long way in recent years, they still are far from perfect. It is widely known that these tools can produce misleading results and false positives, which can undermine the integrity and fairness of an academic misconduct investigation.

For this reason, the Student Conduct office strongly advises against the use of AI detection results as the sole source of evidence in academic integrity investigations. These tools, if used at all, should only serve to supplement other, more reliable evidence.

Focus on Other Evidence and the Student Interview

Academic integrity investigations should focus on the other evidence or “red flags” that initially caused the suspicion, and these concerns should be discussed during the student interview. The student interview provides a great opportunity for meaningful conversation between the instructor and student, and often serves as the “crux” of an investigation.

Can the student demonstrate an understanding of the work they submitted? Can they explain their workflow or research process? Can they answer basic questions about the subject matter? If not, then the student may have relied on some type of unauthorized assistance to complete work, such as using a GenAI tool in a way that was not permitted by the instructor. However, sometimes the conversation leads to a legitimate explanation, or reveals a misunderstanding and the allegations are dismissed.

All AI Detectors Are Not Created Equal

Instructors who are considering using the results of an AI detector as evidence in an investigation, should use "learning-based"-type AI detection tools (such as Pangram Labs or Turnitin) that have shown greater accuracy and reliability. Instructors should avoid using free/online, metric-based tools which are more error prone and come with other potential concerns.