

Dear 5.1.2e & Adv Master Board of Examiners,

On behalf of myself as 5.1.2e and 5.1.2e with this email I am reporting five cases of 5.1.2e thesis submissions which triggered supervisors to inform the thesis coordinator and program board for further action. In some cases, this was due similarities in text as demonstrated by the Turnitin report, and others due to the suspicion of using generative AI.

We consulted and acted following the AdvM protocol for possible plagiarism (as attached).

Three cases were deemed to be minor, unintentional cases of improper attribution, while two of the cases were considered moderate—these involved the use of generative AI. The first moderate case involving generative AI we referred to the Board of Examiners, which we used as guidance in dealing with the second case.

Given this assessment, the limited availability of relevant colleagues in this 5.1.2e period, and the time pressure on handling the cases before registration of grades (necessary for graduation), we followed up immediately informing and hearing the students (4.1.2), and proposing a way of resolving their respective situations – which we set in motion immediately.

All students in question were required to resubmit their theses with the passages identified by the supervisor reworked. Additionally, for those that involved generative AI, these students needed to add a section to their methodology identifying how and where generative AI was used. The respective penalties are noted in the attached grading form for each student.

We would like to ask the exam commission for approval of the way these cases were handled and the proposed resolutions and sanctions (as per the protocol 4.1.3).