

University of Manitoba
Faculty of Social Work
Bachelor of Social Work Program

Guidelines for the Ethical and Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence in Academic Work

This policy is a set of statements of principles, values and intent that outlines the Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) program expectations for using any artificial intelligence (AI) technologies academically. The purpose of this policy is to outline the importance of academic integrity and to foster an environment where students feel motivated to learn and develop. The Faculty of Social Work ensures that BSW graduates are qualified professionals by providing a rigorous, accredited program that equips students with the values, knowledge, and skills necessary for competent and ethical social work practice

AI cannot replace human judgment or critical thinking and requires careful review due to potential biases, lack of personalization, and unverifiable sources. These challenges raise ethical concerns around privacy, transparency, and bias. Students are responsible for developing their AI literacy, understanding the appropriate, ethical, and responsible use of AI in their academic work. Students are required to uphold academic integrity and contribute to a culture of honest learning, with original work, critical thinking, and analysis as the foundation of academic and personal success. While this policy outlines Faculty expectations, students must also adhere to all relevant statutes, the CASW Code of Ethics, Technology Standards, and University policies, when considering the use of AI technologies.

Exploring AI tools critically is essential, as they lack human judgment and critical thinking skills. Students should use these tools thoughtfully and judiciously, while prioritizing their own learning and development. It is the students' responsibility to review the syllabus, assignment guidelines, and rubrics to understand AI use policies for each course and assignment.

The University of Manitoba does not endorse the use of AI-detection software for evaluating student work due to concerns about reliability, accuracy, and potential privacy violations. These tools have not been vetted through IST or the Access and Privacy Office and may contravene FIPPA and other institutional privacy policies. Instructors are instead encouraged to assess the legitimacy of student work using standard academic integrity measures, including evaluating writing consistency, citations, and alignment with assignment instructions, such as detecting abrupt shifts in writing style, identifying overly generic or vague responses, verifying sources for accuracy, assessing the appropriateness of citations, checking for repetitive phrasing or unnatural fluency, and engaging students in brief discussions or written reflections to assess their understanding and ability to articulate key concepts independently. Faculty members should rely on multiple sources of evidence and professional judgment when addressing concerns about academic misconduct.

Policy

1. Students may use AI technology to gather and organize ideas, as well as refine writing for grammar, provided their final work includes original analysis, synthesis, and critical thinking, with proper citation and acknowledgment of AI use.
2. AI-generated content cannot be presented as a student's original work, just as copying from any source is not considered original.
3. Students must not use AI to complete assigned tasks in Field Education without explicit permission from both their field agency and field instructor.
4. Students must not submit confidential, restricted, copyrighted, or proprietary content to AI tools and should verify whether AI-related tools require agreements that could compromise confidential information.
5. Students must be transparent about AI use and disclose it in advance to their instructors. Students are responsible for ensuring compliance with University policies, copyright laws, and intellectual property rights.
6. Students are required to keep all research notes, draft versions, and a record of AI interactions. If requested, they must submit this portfolio for auditing, demonstrating the development of their final work and providing evidence of original thought and authorship.
7. Students may use AI to summarize their personal lecture notes (excluding confidential content) to support learning and productivity. However, AI should not be used to process or summarize any confidential, restricted, copyrighted, or proprietary course content.
8. Violations of this policy, including unauthorized AI use (i.e., using AI in ways not permitted by course policies, instructor, or University regulations), misrepresentation of AI-generated work as original, failure to disclose AI use, or submitting restricted content to AI tools, may result in academic penalties under the [University's Academic Integrity Policy](#). Consequences may include grade deductions, course failure, or further disciplinary action.

Resources

University of Manitoba. (n.d.). *Academic integrity*. Retrieved from <https://umanitoba.ca/student-supports/academic-supports/academic-integrity>

University of Manitoba. (n.d.). *Artificial intelligence and academic integrity*. Retrieved from <https://umanitoba.ca/centre-advancement-teaching-learning/integrity/artificial-intelligence>

National Association of Social Workers, Association of Social Work Boards, Council on Social Work Education, & Clinical Social Work Association. (2017). *Standards for technology in social work practice*. Retrieved from <https://www.socialworkers.org/Practice/NASW-Practice-Standards-Guidelines/Standards-for-Technology-in-Social-Work-Practice>

International Federation of Social Workers. (n.d.). *Ethical guidelines for social workers and artificial intelligence*. Retrieved from <https://jswve.org/volume-20/issue-2/item-05/#:~:text=Social%20workers%20who%20use%20or,abandonment%3B%20client%20surveillance%3B%20plagiarism%2C>

Reamer, F. G. (2023). Artificial intelligence in social work: Emerging ethical issues. *International Journal of Social Work Values and Ethics*, 20(2). Retrieved from <https://jswve.org/volume-20/issue-2/>

Rubin, A., Lynch, M., Sage, T., & Sage, M. (2024). *Embracing AI chatbots in social work education: A guide for social work practicum educators*. Figshare. Retrieved from https://figshare.com/articles/online_resource/Embracing_AI_Chatbots_in_Social_Work_Education_A_Guide_for_Social_Work_Practicum_Educators/25374337

Eaton, S. (2023). The Use of AI-Detection Tools in the Assessment of Student Work <https://drsaraheaton.wordpress.com/2023/05/06/the-use-of-ai-detection-tools-in-the-assessment-ofstudent-work/>

Lian, W., Yuksekgonul, M., Mao, Y., Wu, E., & Zou, J. (2023). GPT detectors are biased against non-native English writers. [https://www.cell.com/patterns/fulltext/S2666-3899\(23\)00130-7](https://www.cell.com/patterns/fulltext/S2666-3899(23)00130-7)

Webb, M. (2023). AI Detection - Latest Recommendations. <https://nationalcentreforai.jiscinvolve.org/wp/2023/09/18/ai-detection-latest-recommendations>