Academic and Scientific Integrity Policy

UNIVERSIDADE CATÓLICA PORTUGUESA

CHARTER OF PRINCIPLES ON THE USE OF AI

INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has a significant impact for humanity in many areas, including education and scientific research. It is crucial to understand its potential, to take ownership of its tools, to keep up with its fast-paced evolution, to recognize its purposes and to integrate its limits. Users must be empowered to employ it appropriately.

AI should be a tool at the service of individuals, a means to help each person develop their potential, optimize their time and the quality of their work, and to safeguard their rights, autonomy, and human dignity. Because the social importance and power of AI has grown swiftly, UCP deems it essential that key institutions coordinate a well-reasoned ethical framework and a set of shared values that may lead to a morally responsible and beneficial use and application of AI.

UCP aims to foster an environment of trust as regards AI, and to stimulate individual and collective awareness of its proper use and application within the academic and scientific community. To this end, the university has drawn up the following guidelines.

They are aimed at:

- emphasising and promoting the **centrality of human beings** in all academic and scientific policies;
- foster greater **awareness** of issues of integrity within the academic community, including a greater **visibility for tools** already in existence at UCP (Statutes, Code, Ombudsmen, Reporting Channels);
- promoting **continuous reflection** on ways of transmitting the value of intellectual honesty and academic integrity within the academic community;
- continuously promoting **debate** and a critical perspective on the evolution of AI and its implications, according to context, that involves the entire academic community;
- **developing and training of students and faculty** on the proper use of AI, ethics and integrity, including new forms of teaching and learning, to achieve a responsible, critical and intelligent use by students and lecturers, and to offer suggestions on how it may be used to stimulate more dynamic and personalized ways of teaching and learning.

AI must not be used to replace the **critical intelligence**, insight, and creative ability of humans, but rather to amplify and reinforce these human intellectual capacities.

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE USE OF GENERATIVE AI TOOLS AT UCP

Multiple papers have been published on the ethical issues of generative AI and AI in general. We would highlight, given their scope and applicability to the national, European and global context, the *White Paper on Artificial Intelligence: A European approach focused on excellence and trust*, of February 2020, by the European Commission; the UNESCO Recommendations on the *Ethics of Artificial Intelligence* of 23 November 2021, the *Global Agreement on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence* (AI) adopted by the 193 UNESCO Member States at the 41st Session of the General Conference on 25 November 2021; the Holy Father's message for the celebration of the World Day of Peace, on 1 January 2024, on *Artificial Intelligence and Peace*, and the recommendations of the National Ethics Council for the Life Sciences (CNECV), from May 2024, *Artificial Intelligence (AI): Social concerns, ethical proposals and political guidance*. Among other binding documents we would also emphasize the importance of the *Artificial Intelligence Act – Regulation* (EU 2024/1689) and the *European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity* by All European Academies ALLEA (2023, 2nd ed.).

Thus, and because of the need to establish a culture of scientific and academic integrity, safety and well-being around the use and application of AI, in line with UCP's *Code of Ethics and Conduct* and the documents listed above, the university shall maintain and reinforce good practices of integrity within its academic and scientific community, especially those itemized below:

- **Transparency** in the use of AI. Lecturers, students and researchers have the duty to be transparent about their use of generative AI in the production of academic work, for example, in work submitted for academic assessment and progression such as coursework, essays, presentations, undergraduate theses, dissertations, book chapters, and academic research papers, among others.

- **Verification** of the results generated, and correct identification of sources. Lecturers, students and researchers are responsible for the materials they produce using AI tools and therefore have an obligation to verify that the information and sources used in their materials are reliable and truthful. AI systems can produce biased, false, or even toxic or slanderous content.

- **Respect** for copyrighted material, personal data and confidential information (intellectual property not protected by copyright), by not exporting it to platforms managed by external entities (servers and cloud services not licensed by UCP).

- **Responsibility** for the correct use of AI (mainly as help and support) and for the results to be published (in the case of research) or submitted by students (in the case of teaching).

SPECIFIC GUIDELINES FOR THE USE OF GENERATIVE TOOLS IN ACADEMIC WRITING[1]

Documents (theses, essays or other) submitted for assessment or discussion must result from personal work, putting forward the author's ideas, arguments and points of view. Documents should be prepared taking into account the following guidelines for the use of generative AI tools:

1. Authorship: Students and researchers must be the authors of their work. It is clear that a text entirely produced by AI following a simple series of instructions cannot be considered a person's own work. Attempting to pass it off as one's own thinking and writing does not meet the basic standards of academic and scientific integrity. Legitimate authorship of a piece of work may be attributed only when (1) the student or researcher has contributed substantially to the content ("created") and form of the work (using available tools, possibly including AI), (2) the student or researcher understands and can converse on the meaning of the work prepared, (3) the student or researcher can list, describe, and express the steps taken and his or her involvement in the preparation and drafting of the work.

2. Responsibility: Automatic tools, such as AI tools, are devoid of personal responsibility, so they cannot be cited (or used) directly as intellectual sources. They can only be accepted as tools, not as a source; as do also statistical software, search engines, translators, proofreaders and other aids.

3. Accountability: The work created must therefore be a reflection of the author's own intellect and voice, regardless of whether generative AI tools are used in the research and writing process. Consequently, students and researchers using generative AI in their work must be prepared to explain the content and logical structure of their work and be transparent about where, how and why they have used AI. Failing to do so suggests an excessive and improper use of AI, incompatible with academic and scientific integrity – and potentially a form of plagiarism with resort to AI.

4. Explainability: Authors must be able to explain the process that gave rise to each section and each instance of production of the text submitted. As regards teaching, students should, in an appendix to their piece of written work, explain the process that originated the elements or reasoning induced by AI. If this explanation is not included in the text itself, an oral discussion of the text is recommended, as an additional element of assessment. Holding students accountable is a way to prevent direct transcriptions of AI-generated texts.

Any questions or concerns regarding the use of AI tools should be put to the lecturer in charge who, if necessary, may raise the issue with the course coordinators or the Board of Directors of

---

[1] These guidelines are based on an adaptation of a document prepared by CLSBE, entitled "CATÓLICA-LISBON Code for use of Gen AI", from July 2024.

the academic unit. Any shortcomings in the application of the principles listed here shall have disciplinary consequences.