

Institution & Resource	What faculty review	Why it may be useful
Daytona State College: AI-Generated Writing Detection Checklist (https://library.daytonastate.edu/GenerativeAI/checklist)	Tone and voice; style and structure; content and ideas; logic and coherence; factuality and citations; emotional authenticity	A short, document-level checklist explicitly intended for editing, grading, or authenticity review. Its companion page provides concrete examples such as generic restatement, weak specificity, fabricated references, and unnatural uniformity of style.
Eastern Illinois University: Artificial Intelligence Guidance(https://www.eiu.edu/academicsupportcenter/ai_guidance.php)	Formulaic language, uneven knowledge depth, vocabulary inconsistent with the student's demonstrated work, generic examples, course-content absence, citation problems, and unusual error patterns	The most complete option for a faculty workflow: indicators, recommended follow-up steps, evidence guidance, and a documentation checklist for a conduct process. It also directs faculty to compare prior work, retain specific examples, and talk with the student rather than rely on detection software.
Johnson & Wales University: AI Faculty Resource Hub (https://pvd.library.jwu.edu/ai_faculty_hub)	Assignment alignment, voice and writing style, analysis depth, sources/citations, integration of course content, and logical consistency	A printable, six-category checklist authored for faculty use. The hub states that the checklist is for evaluating student work without relying solely on automated detection; it identifies JWU Community Standards / Kristin Pendergast as its source.
Wofford College AI Working Group guidance (https://www.wofford.edu/about/ai-working-group)	Changes from earlier work in style, tone, grammar, argument development, sources/citations; student's account of research, drafting, and editing; credibility and quality of sources	A concise three-part "suspected AI use" decision aid. It is particularly useful as a conversation protocol after a concern arises.

Supplementary approaches

John Cabot University recommends creating a diagnostic comparison sample: run your assignment prompt through multiple models in advance, then compare a submitted response against those outputs. For open-ended assignments, it suggests asking students to provide their prompt afterward as a reflective practice. (<https://johncabot.libguides.com/ai-faculty/policies>)

Daytona State's companion "Common Indicators" page is useful as an annotation bank when documenting concerns: repetitive phrasing, polished-but-shallow claims, formulaic transitions, implausible citations, flat voice, and confident but inaccurate contextual detail. (<https://library.daytonastate.edu/GenerativeAI/indicators>)

A defensible faculty checklist

1. Assignment fit: Does the submission directly respond to the prompt and incorporate assigned readings, class discussion, local data, or required course concepts?
2. Student continuity: Is there a material, documented difference from the student's prior verified work in voice, vocabulary, reasoning, or citation practice?
3. Evidence quality: Are quotations accurate, sources real and retrievable, and citations genuinely supportive of the claims?
4. Reasoning quality: Are examples specific and discipline-appropriate, and does the analysis show understanding rather than fluent generalization?
5. Process evidence: Are drafts, notes, version history, research logs, peer-review artifacts, or an AI-use disclosure available and consistent?
6. Fair follow-up: Before reaching a conclusion, invite the student to explain their process and key choices or complete a short oral/written clarification.

Treat any checked item as a prompt to investigate, not a finding of AI authorship.