

Utica University AI Task Force Final Report

Date of Submission: June 5th, 2026

Status: Final Report

Prepared For: The Office of the Provost and the Utica University Community

Task Force Membership

External Evidence Extraction, Utica University Mapping & Framing

- Angel Rivera, Ph.D.- Associate Professor of Computer Science
- Joshua White, Ph.D.– Assistant Professor of Management and Data Science
- Unnati Shah, Ph.D.- Associate Professor of Computer Science
- Philip King - Assistant Professor of Cybersecurity
- Shandeepa Wickramasinghe, Ph.D.- Assistant Professor of Mathematics
- Stephanie M Monahan, MSN, RN - Assistant Professor of Nursing
- Jing-Mao Ho, Ph.D.- Assistant Professor of Sociology and Data Science
- Rutal Mahajan, Ph.D.- Assistant Professor of Computer Science
- Kathleen M Savino – Director of Tutoring Services
- Elizabeth Threadgill, Ph.D.- Associate Professor of English
- Lisa M. Orr, Ph.D. - Professor of English
- Katie Spires, MLIS—Librarian II

Table of Contents

Task Force Membership	1
Table of Contents	1
Executive Summary	2
Core Policy Pillars	3
Institutional Mission & Vision Alignment	3
Values Alignment	4
Benchmarking and Summary of Findings	5
Methodology	5
The Dual Mandate: Workforce Preparedness & Learner Empowerment	5
Key Trends Identified	6
Observation on Policy Gaps	6
Strategic Alignment (Mission, Values, & Vision)	7
Our Human-Centered Commitment	7
Framework for Policy Development & Responsible Use Guidelines	7
1. Purpose & Scope	8
2. Core Definitions	8
3. Capacity Building & Professional Development.....	8
4. Academic Integrity & The "Normalizing Documentation and Disclosure" Model.....	9
5. Research Use & Ethics	9
6. Technology, Accessibility, and Governance	10
Implementation & Oversight	10
1. AI Advisory & Governance Committee	10
2. Faculty & Departmental Autonomy	10
3. Equity, Access, and the "Digital Divide"	11
Key Recommendations & Next Steps	11
1. Adoption of the "Traffic Light" Approach	11
2. Standardized Disclosure Language	12
4. Recommendation for Academic Standards	12

5. Timeline for Continuous Review.....	12
Conclusion: A Living Document.....	13
Task Force AI Disclosure.....	13
Appendix A: DoL TEN 07-25.....	14
Appendix B: Comparative Matrix: Peer Institution Summary.....	15
Appendix C: Full Data Extraction Per Institution	19
AI Policy Review & Extraction Form	20
1. Scope of the Policy	21
2. Allowed Uses of AI	21
3. Restricted or Discouraged Uses.....	22
4. Academic Integrity & Attribution	22
5. Research Use & Ethics.....	23
6. Oversight, Enforcement, or Governance.....	23
7. Language Worth Reusing (Important)	23
8. Key Takeaways for Utica University	24
AI Policy Review & Extraction Form	24
1. Scope of the Policy	25
2. Allowed Uses of AI	26
3. Restricted or Discouraged Uses.....	27
4. Academic Integrity & Attribution	27
5. Research Use & Ethics.....	28
6. Oversight, Enforcement, or Governance.....	28
7. Language Worth Reusing (Important)	28
8. Key Takeaways for Utica University	30
AI Policy Review & Extraction Form	31
1. Scope of the Policy	32
2. Allowed Uses of AI	32
3. Restricted or Discouraged Uses.....	33
4. Academic Integrity & Attribution	33

5. Research Use & Ethics	34
6. Oversight, Enforcement, or Governance	35
7. Language Worth Reusing (Important)	35
8. Key Takeaways for Utica University	36
AI Policy Review & Extraction Form	37
1. Scope of the Policy	38
2. Allowed Uses of AI	38
3. Restricted or Discouraged Uses.....	39
4. Academic Integrity & Attribution	39
5. Research Use & Ethics	40
6. Oversight, Enforcement, or Governance	40
7. Language Worth Reusing (Important)	41
8. Key Takeaways for Utica University	41
AI Policy Review & Extraction Form	42
1. Scope of the Policy	43
2. Allowed Uses of AI	45
3. Restricted or Discouraged Uses.....	45
4. Academic Integrity & Attribution	46
5. Research Use & Ethics	46
6. Oversight, Enforcement, or Governance	46
7. Language Worth Reusing (Important)	47
8. Key Takeaways for Utica University	47
AI Policy Review & Extraction Form	48
2. Allowed Uses of AI	49
3. Restricted or Discouraged Uses.....	49
4. Academic Integrity & Attribution	50
5. Research Use & Ethics	50
6. Oversight, Enforcement, or Governance.....	51
7. Language Worth Reusing (Important)	51

8. Key Takeaways for Utica University	51
AI Policy Review & Extraction Form	52
2. Allowed Uses of AI	53
3. Restricted or Discouraged Uses.....	53
4. Academic Integrity & Attribution	54
5. Research Use & Ethics	54
6. Oversight, Enforcement, or Governance.....	55
7. Language Worth Reusing (Important)	55
8. Key Takeaways for Utica University	55
Appendix D: AI Decision Tree/QuickStart Guide for Faculty.....	56

Executive Summary

Utica University recognizes that Generative AI is a transformative force that necessitates a proactive, mission-aligned response rather than a purely reactive or prohibitive stance. This report synthesizes extensive benchmarking of peer institutions with Utica's core values to propose a "Human-Centered" framework for AI integration. Our approach balances the mandate for workforce preparedness with a deep commitment to learner empowerment. While AI can serve as a powerful "co-pilot" for professional simulation and administrative efficiency, we maintain that the "essential spark" of creative and critical work must remain human. Final assessments and mentorship remain faculty-led to ensure that technology enhances, rather than replaces, the individual attention that defines the Utica experience.

To implement this vision, the Task Force recommends a flexible, guidance-based model that avoids the stigma of universal bans in favor of "Normalizing Disclosure." By adopting a standardized Traffic Light system for syllabi, that preserves accountability, assessment integrity, and meaningful learning, and establishing a permanent AI Advisory & Governance Committee in partnership with IITS, the university will ensure that all AI use is equitable, accessible, and transparent. This framework prioritizes the mitigation of algorithmic bias and the closure of the digital divide, providing all students with the literacy needed to lead in an AI-integrated economy. Ultimately, these guidelines empower our community to experiment with innovation while upholding the highest standards of academic and ethical integrity.

Core Policy Pillars

This report is built upon the five foundational pillars designed to align AI use with Utica University's mission and values:

- AI Literacy, Career Readiness & Innovation
- Human-Centered Mentorship & Community Engagement
- Academic Integrity & Ethical Use
- Equity, Inclusion & Bias Mitigation
- Continuous Review & Forward-Looking Governance

Institutional Mission & Vision Alignment

"Empowering learners to achieve their career and life goals through ethical, innovative, and human-centered AI application."

Mission Element	AI Policy Meaning	Implications / Notes / Sample Policy
M1. Empower learners	Learner-centered, not tool-centered	AI supports learning but does not replace critical thinking. Sample wording: "Depending on the learning goal we want students to achieve, AI may be used to support understanding, exploration, feedback, and accessibility, but not to replace the intellectual work students are expected to do."
M2. Achieve career & life goals	AI use should support professional readiness	Students should use AI ethically and transparently to simulate real-world professional tasks. Sample wording: "Graduates must learn to use AI competently, critically, ethically, and transparently, as AI will be part of their professional environments."
M3. Educational pathways	Contextual, flexible AI rules per course/program	Delegate authority to departments and instructors. Avoid blanket bans. Encourage informed, guided experimentation. Sample wording: "Departments may define specific AI rules tailored to learning objectives, balancing experimentation with academic integrity."

Values Alignment

To provide a clear structure for implementation, the Task Force has identified eight foundational pillars. These pillars balance the practical need for technical skill with the philosophical requirement of academic depth:

Value	AI Policy Meaning	Implications / Notes / Sample Policy
V1. Individual attention	Preserve human-to-human connection	AI must enhance, not replace faculty mentoring or feedback. Sample wording: "Personal mentorship and human connection should remain centered

		in all faculty-student interactions even if AI is used to scaffold student learning.”
V2. Intellectual growth, creativity, scholarship	Maintain accountability for original work	Define “original,” “ai-assisted,” “ai-aided,” “ai-generated,” and “misrepresented” work. Students responsible for verifying and defending AI-assisted work.
V3. Innovative teaching & learning	Encourage AI-integrated pedagogy	Pilot projects, new assessment forms, AI-enhanced learning. Policy should be reviewed regularly.
V4. Diversity, equity, inclusion	AI supports accessibility but must avoid bias	Ensure equitable access; monitor tools for bias; prioritize assistive purposes.
V5. Freedom of expression & civil discourse	Transparent AI use	Students document and disclose AI assistance; AI can be a tool for exploration to be used with care and healthy skepticism, not a source of truth.
V6. Community engagement & service	Ethical, socially responsible AI use	AI may be used in service-learning or applied projects; avoid harmful/exploitative applications.
V7. Ethical behavior & integrity	Academic honesty	Misrepresentation of AI-generated work is a misconduct. Applies to faculty and staff as well.
V8. Continuous pursuit of excellence	Evolving AI policy	Policy reviewed periodically; proposes standing AI governance/advisory group.

Benchmarking and Summary of Findings

Methodology

The Task Force conducted an extensive review of peer and aspirant institutions, including Columbia University, Boston University, MIT, and Princeton to identify national best practices and emerging policy structures. This external evidence ensures that Utica University’s framework is aligned with national standards while remaining adaptable to our specific institutional culture.

The Dual Mandate: Workforce Preparedness & Learner Empowerment

Our internal deliberations emphasized a critical balance between two equally weighted priorities:

1. **Workforce Preparedness:** Aligned with the **U.S. Department of Labor's AI Literacy Framework (TEN 07-25)**, we recognize the necessity of preparing students for an AI-integrated economy. This involves teaching "foundational content areas" such as directing AI effectively and evaluating its outputs to ensure career readiness in industries where AI is a standard professional tool.
2. **Learner Empowerment:** In coordination with faculty, the Task Force acknowledges that current generative AI often produces "average" or "formulaic" writing. Therefore, our guidelines treat AI not just as a productivity tool, but as a scaffold for intellectual growth. Empowerment means ensuring students develop their own unique voices and critical reasoning skills, rather than relying on the "mediocre middle" of AI-generated prose.

Key Trends Identified

Our benchmarking revealed several recurring strategies that inform our recommendations:

- **The "Traffic Light" Approach:** Many institutions are moving toward a tiered system to provide clarity for both faculty and students:
 - **Red (Prohibited):** AI use is not allowed for the task; focuses on original human production.
 - **Yellow (Conditional):** AI use is permitted for specific tasks (e.g., brainstorming or grammar checking) with mandatory citation.
 - **Green (Integrated):** AI use is encouraged as a primary tool for the assignment to simulate professional workflows.
- **Transparent Disclosure & Citation:** A universal standard is emerging where AI contributions must be cited and documented, similar to any other secondary source.
- **Data Security & Privacy Protocols:** There is a strict consensus against uploading sensitive institutional data, unpublished research, or PII (Personally Identifiable Information) into public, non-vetted models.
- **A Shift Toward "Harm Reduction":** Rather than universal bans, which are often unenforceable, institutions are adopting guidance-based policies that prioritize ethical decision-making and academic honesty.

Observation on Policy Gaps

Surprisingly, our research found that several prominent universities currently lack formal, central AI policies, instead they rely on ad-hoc guidance or departmental memos. This "wait-and-see" approach presents an opportunity for Utica University to lead by providing a clear, mission-aligned framework that offers stability for faculty and students during this period of rapid technological change.

Strategic Alignment (Mission, Values, & Vision)

The Utica University AI framework is not merely a set of rules but a strategic extension of our institutional identity. By grounding our approach in the university's core mission, we ensure that technological integration serves the community's long-term goals.

Our Human-Centered Commitment

A central theme of our task force discussions and a point of consensus between our technical and humanities-focused members is the formalization of the "Co-Pilot" Model. We explicitly define AI as a supplemental tool rather than a primary creator. We believe that true learner empowerment comes from a student's ability to transcend the machine's output. Therefore, Utica University commits to the following:

- **Faculty-Led Assessment:** No final grade or high-stakes academic assessment shall be determined solely by an automated system. The evaluation of a student's growth remains a human professional responsibility.
- **Mentorship First:** AI can be used to scaffold student learning, but the personal guidance and career mentorship that defines the Utica experience will remain human-led.
- **Empowered Voice:** We empower our learners to use AI to enhance their productivity while insisting they maintain a unique, critical, and independent voice.

Framework for Policy Development & Responsible Use Guidelines

The Task Force has determined that rather than issuing a static policy, our mission is better served by providing a foundational framework. This framework serves as a guide for

departments and administrative units to develop specific policies that are responsive to their unique disciplinary needs.

A central theme of our deliberations is Stigma Reduction: by accepting the potential of AI as a tool for scholarship and professional life, as long as it is used with the awareness of its limitations, we encourage a culture of honesty and transparency that traditional "prohibition" models fail to achieve.

1. Purpose & Scope

Guidelines developed from this framework should apply to all members of the Utica University community including students, faculty, and staff engaged in educational, research, and professional activities. The goal is to provide a consistent ethical North Star while allowing for "Educational Pathways" (Mission Element M3) that vary by department.

2. Core Definitions

To ensure clarity across campus, we recommend adopting the following terminology:

- **Generative AI:** Systems capable of creating new content (text, code, images, audio, video) based on patterns in training data with little or no human intervention.
- **AI-Assisted Work:** Human-led work where the human exercises full critical oversight, utilizing AI as a tool for specific discrete tasks (e.g., grammar checking, or data formatting) while the core creation and original thought remain human.
- **AI-Aided Work:** The human uses AI to supplement their own knowledge or decision-making abilities. The AI evaluates data, provides diagnostic insights, or runs complex calculations to equip the human to make the best choice. The human sets the parameters; the AI provides the support.
- **The "Co-Pilot" Model:** A philosophy where AI serves as a supplemental assistant, while the human user retains full accountability for the accuracy, ethics, and "essential spark" of the output.

3. Capacity Building & Professional Development

We recommend that the university shift from a "policing" mindset to a "capacity building" mindset by providing training so faculty, students, and staff can use AI tools effectively, safely, and ethically.

- **For Faculty** Focused on AI to support curriculum development, student engagement, and encouraging pedagogical innovation while prioritizing academic integrity and FERPA-compliant data handling.
- **For Students** - Focused on AI Literacy and Career Readiness. Students should be encouraged to use AI for high-level professional simulations such as medical case study analysis, complex coding error explanations, or market research to prepare for an AI-integrated workforce, while upholding strict ethical standards and personal accountability.
- **For Staff** – Focused on AI use for productivity and support for decision making, while ensuring strict compliance with privacy laws and institutional data regulations,

4. Academic Integrity & The "Normalizing Documentation and Disclosure" Model

The Task Force members have debated at length the feasibility of mandatory disclosure. While some argue that enforcement is difficult, the consensus is that disclosure is an ethical necessity, and documentation provides transparency.

- By removing the stigma associated with AI, we believe students will be more likely to disclose its use.
- AI assistance used in a submission must be documented and cited. We recommend departments provide clear templates for how to document and disclose (e.g., an "AI Contributions" section at the end of a paper, or "AI Prompt Logs").
- Presenting AI-generated content as purely original human work remains a violation of the Honor Code.
- Accountability lies with the student to critically evaluate all AI outputs, independently verify every claim made by the AI, and be prepared to explain their methodology.

5. Research Use & Ethics

Guidelines for research must prioritize the "Security, Classified Data, and Legal Implications" charge:

- Strict adherence to FERPA and HIPAA. Personal or institutional data must never be uploaded to non-vetted, public AI models.
- Protect original research as well as adhere to IRB guidelines and any AI policies in professional publications.

- Aligning with peer institutions (e.g., MIT, Princeton), AI cannot be listed as an author. Its role must be documented in the methodology or acknowledgments.
- Researchers must remain vigilant regarding the "mediocre middle" and inherent biases in AI training sets.

6. Technology, Accessibility, and Governance

The university should establish a formal process for vetting campus-adopted tools:

- Tools must be usable by all students, ensuring no digital divide is created.
- Tools used for admissions, advising, or grading must undergo a rigorous review to ensure accuracy, equity, and inclusion.
- We suggest the creation of a standing AI Advisory Committee to provide continuous review of these guidelines, ensuring they evolve as quickly as the technology itself.

Implementation & Oversight

To move from a framework to an operational reality, Utica University requires a governance structure that is as adaptive as the technology it oversees. This section outlines the mechanisms for ensuring the university remains both agile and equitable.

1. AI Advisory & Governance Committee

The Task Force proposes the establishment of a standing AI Advisory & Governance Committee. Rather than acting as a disciplinary body, this committee will serve as a resource for innovation and institutional safety.

- The committee will monitor global AI trends, emerging legal precedents (such as intellectual property shifts), and the effectiveness of current guidelines.
- Because AI capabilities can change significantly in a single semester, the committee will recommend annual or bi-annual updates to the university framework.
- Membership should include representatives from the Faculty Senate, IT, Library, Student Affairs, and Legal Counsel to ensure a holistic view of AI's impact on campus life.

2. Faculty & Departmental Autonomy

Recognizing that the needs of a computer science lab differ vastly from those of a creative writing workshop, we uphold the principle of contextual flexibility.

- While the university provides a general framework, individual instructors retain the right to define specific AI rules ranging from "full integration" to "complete prohibition" tailored to their specific learning objectives.
- Departments are encouraged to develop "AI Professional Standards" that reflect how the technology is being used in their respective industries, ensuring that M3: Educational Pathways remain relevant and robust.

3. Equity, Access, and the "Digital Divide"

A primary concern of the Task Force is the potential for a new socio-economic gap based on "Pro-tier" access. We must ensure that a student's success is not determined by their ability to pay for premium AI subscriptions.

- We recommend that faculty design assignments that can be completed using free, high-quality AI models to ensure all students start from the same baseline.
- The university should explore enterprise-level licenses for vetted AI tools, similar to how it provides Microsoft Office or Adobe Suite, to provide equitable access to "Pro" features for all enrolled students.
- If a specific paid AI tool is required for a course, it must be listed clearly in the syllabus as a "required material" (similar to a textbook) to allow for financial aid considerations.

Key Recommendations & Next Steps

To ensure the successful integration of this framework, the Task Force recommends a series of actionable steps centered on clarity, collaboration with IITS, and institutional agility.

1. Adoption of the "Traffic Light" Approach

To provide immediate clarity for students and faculty, we recommend implementing a "Traffic Light" system for all course syllabi that clearly defines the scope of AI use for different activities and the production of artifacts while preserving accountability,

assessment integrity, and meaningful learning. This provides a standardized visual cue for AI expectations.

2. Standardized Disclosure Language

Borrowing from best practices at institutions like Columbia and MIT, Utica University will adopt a "Harm Reduction" and "Transparency First" communication model.

- We recommend the creation of a standardized "AI Contribution Statement" for student submissions. This moves away from the stigma of "cheating" and toward the professional standard of "disclosure."

- **Sample Language:** *"I used [AI Tool Name] to [Reason for use: e.g., generate a draft outline/debug code]. I have verified the accuracy of all facts and take full responsibility for the final content."*

3. Collaborative Governance with IITS

The success of this framework relies on a robust partnership with the Office of Integrated Information Technology Services (IITS). IITS will be a primary partner in the following areas:

- IITS will lead the security and legal review of AI tools, ensuring they comply with FERPA, HIPAA, and university data privacy standards before they are "Green-Lit" for campus-wide use.
- IITS will ensure that any institutional AI licenses meet the highest standards of digital accessibility, preventing a divide in student capability.
- We recommend IITS explore "walled garden" AI environments where faculty and students can experiment with sensitive research data without it being used to train public models.

4. Recommendation for Academic Standards

The Task Force recommends that the Academic Standards Committee formally review the Honor Code to incorporate definitions of "AI Misrepresentation."

- Misconduct should not be defined as "using AI," but rather as "the failure to disclose AI use" or "submitting AI output as original human work."
- For first-time, low-level disclosure failures, we recommend an educational intervention focused on AI ethics rather than purely punitive measures.

5. Timeline for Continuous Review

Given the rapid evolution of generative models, a static policy is a failing policy. We recommend the following review cycle:

- The AI Advisory Committee will meet with IITS and Faculty Senate at the close of each term to identify "pain points" or new tool capabilities.
- Every year, the university framework will be updated to reflect the current technological landscape and professional requirements (e.g., updates to NY DOL workforce guidelines).

Conclusion: A Living Document

This report represents a starting point, not a final destination. By embracing a "Human-Centered" approach that prioritizes Learner Empowerment alongside Workforce Readiness, Utica University positions itself as a leader in the ethical integration of technology. Our goal is to foster an environment where AI is understood, respected, and utilized to enhance the unique human potential of every member of our community.

Task Force AI Disclosure

The Task Force is committed to the highest standards of academic and professional integrity, which includes transparency regarding the tools used in the preparation of this report.

This document represents **AI-assisted work**. The division of labor between the committee members and artificial intelligence tools is defined as follows:

- **Human Intellectual Leadership:** The core substance of this report is entirely the product of the Task Force committee members. Committee members independently established the research direction, defined strategic goals, and conducted a rigorous analysis of the university's mission, vision, and values to serve as the foundational framework for this project. All substantive findings, strategic insights, and final recommendations were conceived, debated, and formulated solely by the human members of the committee.
- **AI Technical Assistance:** Artificial intelligence tools were utilized strictly in a supportive, technical capacity during the final drafting stages. AI was leveraged for

copyediting, proofreading, and spell-checking to enhance the clarity, flow, and grammatical accuracy of the human-authored text.

The final content has been thoroughly reviewed and vetted by the Task Force, and the committee holds full accountability for the accuracy and integrity of the work presented herein.

Appendix A: DoL TEN 07-25

Subject: The U.S. Department of Labor's Artificial Intelligence Literacy Framework

URL: <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/eta/advisories/ten-07-25>

Appendix B: Comparative Matrix: Peer Institution Summary

The following matrix summarizes how key institutions are managing the integration of AI across their campuses:

University	Scope	Rules/Regulations	Academic Integrity	Enforcement/Notes
Columbia University	Entire campus community: faculty, students, researchers; student AI use is prohibited to complete assignments. However, tools are available for student, faculty, staff and researcher use.	Transparency/citing usage (<i>Disclosure statement</i>); language that guides students using a “harm reduction” approach that inform decisions; privacy/third party information to not violate contracts; avoid copyright issues through improper sharing of information with AI-do not share unpublished data (also overlaps with privacy/IAB); links to guidelines and specific AI tools that are in-house.	Filed under plagiarism, subject to review under Dean’s office.	Not directly stated that I saw, but it seems that someone would need to raise a flag of plagiarism, so likely a faculty member would be the one enforcing the AI use on the front line.
Boston University	Entire campus community: faculty, students, and staff; for teaching, learning, research, advising, HR, communication campaigns	Allows student use for summarizing, classification, and analysis (example: generating literature review), creative work, grammar help, and feedback on drafts; allows for faculty research and editing; allows for coding, tech support, and advising; allows HR use. Does not allow for “co-authorship” with AI for faculty or students; AI cannot assign grades; faculty may not upload exams or homework solutions; faculty should be wary of	AI detectors should be used only with caution. If faculty use detection tools, they must be “applied to all assignments of all students” and not used as sole determinant. Individual faculty must provide clear guidance on how AI may and may not be used in their courses. Students should document GenAI use.	Onus is on faculty, who are encouraged to “critically embrace” AI use. Report contradicts itself. For example, it both recommends generating literature reviews and states that such reviews are “not the best” use of AI and are prone to false references. Similarly, it recommends letting students use AI for feedback to revise drafts, but then states that “GenAI tools should not . . . supply feedback.”

		uploading papers under review; HR cannot upload personal information <i>Restriction and constraints</i>		
MIT	The entire MIT community: faculty, instructors, students, researchers, and staff. Applies to teaching and learning, academic research, administrative decision making, & use of external AI tools.	Users must consider data privacy (<i>Comply with federal regulations</i>), security, intellectual property, and academic integrity when using AI tools. MIT requires consultation with IS&T before adopting or purchasing AI tools. High risk uses (hiring, student evaluation, and decision making etc.) need additional review. AI tools cannot be used with high risk or confidential MIT data. Public AI tools that are not licensed by MIT are discouraged for research and educational use. All AI use must comply with federal and state laws and MIT policies.	AI use must be disclosed in academic, educational, and research work. Research that uses AI generated content must clearly state how AI was used. Users must verify AI outputs because they may be inaccurate, biased, or misleading. Students and faculty are expected to critically evaluate AI generated content.	Instructor policies for managing AI use in courses. IS&T, the IT Governance Committee, the Information Technology Policy Committee, and the Office of General Counsel manage the use of AI tools.
Princeton	Covers the entire campus community: students, faculty/researchers, staff. Includes a list of AI tools cleared for use by members of the campus community and instructions to	Includes a bullet point list of dos and don'ts that cover areas such as: • Data security and privacy, no inputting sensitive data into public AI tools • Accountability, all work must	Students are held to the standards of academic integrity outlined in the student code of conduct and required to disclose AI use, which must remain within the realm of what the professor permits. How	IT is responsible for evaluating suggested tools and clearing them for use at Princeton. Staff are encouraged to discuss use with their supervisors, and use in class is managed by faculty.

	request clearance for tools not listed.	be the author's own Awareness of the ethical implications and AI's shortcomings	much AI use is allowed is to be determined by individual departments and professors. The policy includes a detailed section on ways to make assignments AI-resilient	
East Tennessee State University	The policy applies across teaching, research, administration, and student use. It supports AI use in coursework, instructional materials, research workflows, and communications. External tools are permitted when privacy requirements are met. Instructors clarify course-level expectations; research use requires disclosure, IRB compliance where applicable, and protection of confidential or regulated data.	AI may support coursework, instructional design, reports, and administrative workflows. Users need to disclose substantial AI contributions and review outputs for accuracy. Submitting AI-generated work as original without permission and uploading confidential data to unsecured platforms are discouraged. The guidance emphasizes transparency, verification, and responsible handling rather than strict prohibitions.	Submitting fully AI-generated work without instructor approval is considered misconduct. Substantial AI contributions should be disclosed and cited appropriately. Students remain responsible for reviewing outputs before submission. In research contexts, AI cannot be listed as an author, and its role should be documented in methods or acknowledgments sections.	Oversight is coordinated through the AI advisory task force, office of the provost, and University Counsel. The policy functions primarily as guidance supported by training and transparency expectations. Misconduct is addressed through existing academic and research procedures, with regular review and opportunities for community feedback.
University of Minnesota	Covers all levels.	Use of enterprise AI tools. Teaching: focus on innovation and preparation for AI-rich work environments. Create course materials, create AI-proof assignments. AI vs Human Work Comparison, AI syllabus statement. Explore use in a particular context.	Prohibits students from using AI as a substitute for original work, only to "supplement" when allowed. Syllabi should include AI Use statement. Attribution statements of AI use for academic and scholarly work	Not directly stated. University-wide AI governance structure. Driven by unit-specific "roadmaps" and the Office of Community Standards for integrity.

		Research: focuses on scholarly and creative context while maintaining ethical standards. Admin/Staff: productivity, explore other potential use in operations Students: brainstorming, evaluation of tasks, use where allowed, career exploration. External/3rd party tools: recommend use of enterprise platforms over unapproved tools.	to ensure transparency. Students and researchers responsible for documenting use of AI and understanding the ethical implications.	
--	--	--	--	--

Appendix C: Full Data Extraction Per Institution

AI Policy Review & Extraction Form

University / Institution: **Princeton University:** [\[URL1\]](#) [\[URL2\]](#) [\[URL3\]](#)

1. Scope of the Policy

What areas does the policy explicitly cover?

Area	Covered? (Yes/No)	Notes / Examples
Teaching & Learning	Yes	Examples of syllabus language for different levels of AI use in class; suggestions for ways to create AI resilient assignments; suggestions for assignments that require students to use AI with thought and care.
Academic Research	Yes	Generative AI in Research Advisory Group, information on AI resources that can be used in research
Administrative / Staff Use	Yes	Noted possibility for AI to be used in similar ways to other industries: document summarizing, text analysis, creation of meeting minutes, etc. Nothing specifically encouraged at Princeton, just a list of the possibilities and potential pitfalls. Staff advised to speak with supervisors before using AI.
Student Use	Yes	List of questions to consider when using AI
External / Third-Party Tools	Yes	Microsoft Copilot, Adobe Creative Cloud Image Generation: Adobe Stock, Photoshop, and Illustrator

2. Allowed Uses of AI

What does the policy clearly allow? (Examples: brainstorming, grammar checking, coding assistance, lesson design, etc.)

- Brainstorming
- Outlining
- Analyzing past assignments

3. Restricted or Discouraged Uses

What does the policy warn against or prohibit? (Examples: submitting AI output as original work, using AI during exams, uploading sensitive data, etc.)

- Submitting documents with sensitive data to an AI tool
- Submitting AI output as original work
- Failure to disclose AI use

4. Academic Integrity & Attribution

How does the institution handle integrity issues?

Aspect	Policy Statement
Plagiarism definition	None stated; simply a set of expectations for academic integrity
Disclosure required?	“University policy requires that any use of generative AI be accompanied by an explicit disclosure”
Citation of AI tools	“If you use generative AI to help you think through a problem, you must disclose that you have used it. Generative AI is not a source, just as Google is not a source.”
Student responsibility	“Always observe Princeton’s honor code and remember to add “This paper represents my own work in accordance with University regulations” as well as your signature at the end of all written work.”

5. Research Use & Ethics

What guidance is given for research and scholarly work?

- Data privacy concerns: Acknowledgment of AI tools risks to sensitive information and reminders to follow the university data privacy/protection policies
- Authorship expectations: Links to relevant portions of the student code of conduct and reminders that all student work is expected to be their original product and AI assistance is only to be used when permitted. Permitted use must be acknowledged in the final product.
- Bias / fairness considerations: Outlining of the risk for bias when using AI tools, with an explanation regarding how they are trained and a few examples of biased output from them.

6. Oversight, Enforcement, or Governance

Who is responsible for monitoring or enforcing AI use?

- Office / Committee / Role: Office of Information Technology and Office of Information Security
- Enforcement approach (guidelines vs strict rules): Guidelines regarding use, rules for requesting a tool, rules for academic integrity in the student conduct code.
- Reporting or review process (if any): none outlined in any specific policy document

7. Language Worth Reusing (Important)

Copy **one short excerpt** Utica University *could adapt*

- Quoted text (page number/link): “[Cognitive offloading](#) involves delegating the mental demands of a task to a technology or tool, such as relying on a calculator or smartphone reminders instead of one’s own knowledge and abilities. People may offload a task when they think the technology is more capable, they have a high degree of trust in the tools, and the tools are easily

accessible. Offloading may improve a student's short-term performance (i.e., getting good grades on an assignment) but [diminish their long-term learning and cognition](https://mcgraw.princeton.edu/generative-ai-and-our-classrooms#tab-ethical-and-other-risks). We suggest that faculty encourage students to use AI to enhance their learning, not as a replacement for their own cognition.” (<https://mcgraw.princeton.edu/generative-ai-and-our-classrooms#tab-ethical-and-other-risks>)

- Why this language is useful: It's a good reminder of one of the pitfalls of AI, with a definition and clearly stated risks.

8. Key Takeaways for Utica University

Answer briefly (3–5 bullets total)

- One best practice Utica should adopt
 - Tailoring use to discipline needs and course goals
- One risk Utica should explicitly address
 - Data privacy concerns
- One gap or limitation you noticed
 - No formal definition of plagiarism

AI Policy Review & Extraction Form

University / Institution: **Columbia University** [PDF](#) [URL](#)

1. Scope of the Policy

What areas does the policy explicitly cover?

The website has general policies for all “community members” that apply broadly to various campus community members. These include: disclose use of AI tools in research/schoolwork/citations; confirm accuracy of any AI created materials; check AI assisted creations for potential bias; opt out of “training” option when using AI as to not train the model.

Note: Columbia has configured their own AI tool, only accessible to their users.

There are highly detailed breakdowns in their tools section that lay out what the tools do/how to use them. There’s a [library of prompts](#) among other resources. Interestingly, some of the accepted tools suggest using AI itself to test for bias.

Area	Covered? (Yes/No)	Notes / Examples
Teaching & Learning	X	Share expectations with students, and create clear policies around AI, potentially partnering with students to create policies; guides linked for faculty, along w/ offer of individual consultations on AI use. Recommendations are made that AI detection tools aren’t necessarily reliable; faculty encouraged to be transparent with students and engage in conversations with them. Faculty have links to AI tools to help lesson plan/ and do other tasks such as giving feedback on student writing.
Academic Research	X	Be transparent if using; information is given about AI hallucinations; recommends using caution if AI is used; follow journal policies; do not upload unpublished info into an AI

		tool to avoid privacy violations and copyright issues; See external 3 rd party violations section. Consult IRB to ensure compliance.
Administrative / Staff Use	X	Tools are given for staff to use for drafting emails/other admin tasks that are outlined such as drafting SOP, agendas, and event planning.
Student Use	X	Unless it is allowed by a professor, using AI tools are prohibited for completing assignments –unauthorized usage will be considered plagiarism. Students encouraged to speak w/ faculty. There’s a link to a page that offers some AI tools students can use along with many guides on how to use AI.
External / Third-Party Tools	X	Overlaps with library/research--states that community members should check with the library to ensure that they are not breaking a rule of one of the 3 rd party vendors, as some do not allow their material to engage with AI tools (specifically publishers). “Comply with third-party intellectual property rights.”

2. Allowed Uses of AI

What does the policy clearly allow? (*Examples: brainstorming, grammar checking, coding assistance, lesson design, etc.*)

- Allows only vetted tools (linked on website, accessible only to Columbia users). There are many links and guidelines on usage. CHAT (the vetted tool) is a customizable AI agent that can “offer effective AI solutions and can perform language tasks, such as writing emails, summarizing information, translating languages, and engaging in conversation.” ... Also the FAQ says that the AI chat can “assist with various academic tasks such as explaining concepts, brainstorming

ideas, and providing information on a wide range of topics. However, it should not be used as a substitute for original research or critical thinking.”

3. Restricted or Discouraged Uses

What does the policy warn against or prohibit? (*Examples: submitting AI output as original work, using AI during exams, uploading sensitive data, etc.*)

- Do not use to complete an assignment unless the professor allows it.
- Do not input any private information/information of anyone in the campus community, do not input original/unpublished research
- Comply with third party policies; only use vetted tools, which appear to be specifically configured to create guardrails around the Columbia community. To what degree that information is contained though, I’m unsure.

4. Academic Integrity & Attribution

How does the institution handle integrity issues?

Aspect	Policy Statement
Plagiarism definition	“The use of words, phrases, or ideas that do not belong to the student, without properly citing or acknowledging the source, is prohibited. This may include, but is not limited to, copying computer code for the purposes of completing assignments for submission.” There’s a link on one page that suggests the student will get an AI plagiarism definition, but when you go to the linked page, the information isn’t there.
Disclosure required?	Yes, though I wonder if this applies to faculty using the tool to create assignments, grade work, etc.
Citation of AI tools	Yes, one must cite AI tools and there is information about what can go wrong with using AI.

Student responsibility	Students and researchers will be held responsible if using uncited or unauthorized AI.
------------------------	--

5. Research Use & Ethics

What guidance is given for research and scholarly work?

- Data privacy concerns: see above, IRB issues, not inputting unpublished work and taking care when using AI to do analysis as privacy could be violated.
- Authorship expectations: any researchers or writers are held responsible for what they write, must cite/disclose AI use, and must take care that AI has not hallucinated results.
- Bias / fairness considerations: The human must check the AI output for bias, though there is at least one example of a recommendation to use AI to check bias.

6. Oversight, Enforcement, or Governance

Who is responsible for monitoring or enforcing AI use?

- Office / Committee / Role: dean
- Enforcement approach (guidelines vs strict rules): policy states AI abuse will be treated under plagiarism violations; the dean's office. It seems then that the faculty member will be the one escalating this potential violation.
- Reporting or review process (if any): Unsure. I didn't find this information. The many links beyond the main page make it a bit hard to find more nuanced information, despite being very thorough.

7. Language Worth Reusing (Important)

Copy **one short excerpt** Utica University *could adapt*

- Quoted text (page number/link): Under "how accurate are my answers" in the CHAT section: [CHAT | Columbia University Information Technology](#)
 - "Chat is designed to deliver accurate and reliable information by leveraging advanced language models trained on extensive datasets. However, while it can provide useful insights and

responses, it does not possess true comprehension or expertise in any field. This means that while many answers will be accurate, there can be instances where the information provided may be outdated, incomplete, or incorrect. Always verify critical information from authoritative sources.”

- Why this language is useful:

- ♣ I really like “...it does not possess true comprehension or expertise in any field.” --this approach stresses the importance of the student/scholar/human’s role and emphasizes how one should use this tool with great care. It also takes a “harm reduction” approach—more below.
- ♣ However, I will add a caveat that I think the language of Chat providing “insights” could be misleading, after all, can the machine really provide the insight? Therefore, I’d recommend revising the language to make it clear how the human might gain insights from any AI information, and give that human more responsibility and agency over evaluating the results from AI.
- ♣ [Cal Newport’s recent article in the NYT](#) is worth considering. He writes about how there has been a rise of “workslop” --a term coined that refers to work produced by AI that might look nice on a surface level, but is, ultimately, empty and ‘lacking substance.’ In advice like the above, everyone should consider what “workslop” is/how to avoid it.

8. Key Takeaways for Utica University

Answer briefly (3–5 bullets total)

- One best practice Utica should adopt

- o I think we covered many of the areas that are covered here, though perhaps we might take something from the sections on research. I also think the “harm reduction” style of approach in sections addressing students is a really helpful one. The guidelines in the tool sections explore what can go wrong using AI in a neutral informative tone.
- One risk Utica should explicitly address
 - o I’m not sure we missed anything here.
- One gap or limitation you noticed
 - o I’m concerned (in general more broadly as this applies to most schools, not just Columbia) about how an acceptable use seems to be brainstorming in writing. Peer tutors have told me they use AI to brainstorm. However, this stage of the writing or creation process involves deep critical thinking. And yet, Columbia’s policy states one should avoid using AI to do critical thinking—how can we address this possible discrepancy? Or am I missing something in the way students might be using AI? Is it that the user is using AI to provide information that they are using to brainstorm? This might be a hair worth splitting IMO.
 - o I also noticed that in my opinion there is a bit of a gap left the policy in two main areas: 1.) students aren’t allow to use AI to complete assignments and yet are given tools that outline tasks that suggest they could use them to complete assignments. 2.) the broad policy is helpful, but it isn’t clear to me if the faculty are being held to the same standard as students—does the broad policy to disclose use apply to faculty using AI to create assignments, provide feedback or other tasks?
 - o It is worth considering even more expansive harm reduction best practices. For example, do we really want students to use AI to summarize texts? I’ve worked with students for years and this isn’t actually as “simple” a task as one would think. There are also different types of summary that are contextualized for various audiences/disciplines. More than that though, when students don’t create summary themselves, they will be less likely to be able to recall the information or even potentially deeply understand that information. I have data points on this, but I’d have go and find them.
 - o Another question is, more generally, what do we do about students who have or are already using the systems where you give your whole digital self over to AI essentially [I’m looking for the name of this system, but it is meant to be almost like a digital doppelganger that you can talk to.]

Main take aways:

- Some guidelines are clear, especially those in regards to the general avoiding of plagiarism, protecting privacy/ original ideas; many guides given on use that help community members decide on appropriate use and seek out feedback (especially pertinent when recommending students talk to their professors about expectations).
- Informing students of choices/using harm reduction language that is neutral in at least some places seems helpful as it acknowledges that students are likely already using these technologies and empowers them to consider how they want to use them.
- Some consequences are clear, but other sections force the reader to consider how to interpret potential contradictions—do faculty have to disclose AI use to students? Is that part of the transparency?
- However, I think there are many cases where there isn't enough information given about the harm (some of this could also be because [the research on harms are continuously emerging](#)). For example, in the article I just linked, there is research cited from MIT that measured activity in student's brains as they either wrote without AI assistance vs with AI; the students writing with AI had lower brain activity.

AI Policy Review & Extraction Form

University / Institution: **MIT**: [\[URL 1\]](#) [\[URL 2\]](#)

1. Scope of the Policy

What areas does the policy explicitly cover?

Area	Covered? (Yes/No)	Notes / Examples
Teaching & Learning	Yes	Teaching and Learning Labs provide guidelines to faculty and instructors. Encouraged to clarify AI use policies, redesign assignments, and communicate clearly to students.
Academic Research	Yes	Do not recommend using publicly available GenAI tools not subject to an Institute licensing agreement for MIT research
Administrative / Staff Use	Yes	Information Systems and Technology (IS&T) must consult before purchasing or using AI tools. especially for high risk tasks like hiring or student evaluation, which need extra review.
Student Use	Yes	Students must follow their instructors' AI policies, as there is no universal rule for AI use at MIT. They should evaluate AI output carefully and maintain academic integrity.
External / Third-Party Tools	Yes	It prefer MIT licensed tools. Avoid public tools not included in Institute agreements for research and education. Governance committees will review vendor agreements.

2. Allowed Uses of AI

What does the policy clearly allow? (*Examples: brainstorming, grammar checking, coding assistance, lesson design, etc.*)

There is no clear, direct ‘statement’ about what uses are allowed. However,

- MIT allows the use of licensed AI tools if users follow data protection rules and policies.
- Faculty can use AI for lesson planning as long as they clearly explain their expectations.
- Students may use AI if their instructors allow it and they meet disclosure requirements.
- Researchers can use AI tools (licensed) if they keep confidential data safe and disclose their use of AI in their publications.
- AI can be used in coursework when instructors design assignments that require critical evaluation of AI output.

3. Restricted or Discouraged Uses

What does the policy warn against or prohibit? (*Examples: submitting AI output as original work, using AI during exams, uploading sensitive data, etc.*)

- Uploading high-risk, confidential MIT info into generative AI systems (including those licensed by IS&T) is not allowed.
- Using unlicensed MIT public AI tools for research or education is discouraged.
- AI for high-risk decisions like recruitment and hiring of employees, evaluating student academic performance, making investment decisions, and complaint and dispute resolution.
- Publishing AI-based research without disclosure is prohibited. Submitting AI content as original work without following policies may violate academic integrity.

4. Academic Integrity & Attribution

How does the institution handle integrity issues?

Aspect	Policy Statement
--------	------------------

Plagiarism definition	No explicit definition of plagiarism in the documents I reviewed
Disclosure required?	Yes. “You should disclose the use of generative AI tools for all academic, educational, and research-related uses.” “Be transparent about your use of AI tools”.
Citation of AI tools	“Note your AI documentation and citation requirements. This might include screenshots, transcripts, documents with ‘track changes’ enabled, and/or relevant citation or disclosure guidelines.”
Student responsibility	Students need to understand each instructor’s AI (class) policy. Students should evaluate AI output carefully and follow integrity standards. They are responsible for making sure that their submitted work is accurate and original.

5. Research Use & Ethics

What guidance is given for research and scholarly work?

- Data privacy concerns:
MIT has a section on “Protect MIT information and confidential data” and states:
 - 2) “Ensure that your use of generative AI tools and services complies with all applicable federal and state laws and orders including FERPA, HIPAA, Massachusetts Data Protection Standards, and export control laws.”
 - 2) “Examples of information inappropriate for generative AI tools include non-public research results and data, unpublished research papers, confidential information received from third parties, unpublished invention disclosures and patent applications, Institute financial and human resources information, personally identifiable information including student records and medical records.”
- Authorship expectations:
Researchers must disclose AI use when publishing. AI generated content cannot be presented as fully human authored work without clarification.

- Bias / fairness considerations:
MIT provides guidelines to “Ensure accuracy before publishing AI-generated information”.

“Be aware that information generated by AI may be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading, biased, fabricated, or may contain material subject to a third party’s intellectual property ownership.”

<https://mitsloanedtech.mit.edu/ai/basics/addressing-ai-hallucinations-and-bias/>

6. Oversight, Enforcement, or Governance

Who is responsible for monitoring or enforcing AI use?

- Office / Committee / Role:
Information Systems and Technology (IS&T) is working with
MIT IT Governance Committee, Information Technology Policy Committee,
Office of General Counsel
- Enforcement approach (guidelines vs strict rules):
The document mainly provides guidance and consultation requirements
- Reporting or review process (if any):
Consultation is needed before adopting new tools. Users can contact the Office of General Counsel for research related AI review.

7. Language Worth Reusing (Important)

Copy **one short excerpt** Utica University *could adapt*

- Quoted text (page number/link):
“You should disclose the use of generative AI tools for all academic, educational, and research-related uses. Do not publish research results that rely on content generated through the use of a generative AI tool without disclosing the nature of the use of such generative AI tool in producing the content. “

<https://ist.mit.edu/ai-guidance>

Section: 'Be transparent about your use of AI tools'

- Why this language is useful:

This statement is clear, friendly, and supports transparency without banning AI.

We need to maintain consistent disclosure in all courses, schools, and research to build trust and clarity.

This is something we could consider adding to our Utica document if needed, as a visual representation makes more sense.

<https://leonfurze.com/2024/08/28/updating-the-ai-assessment-scale/>

Additionally, for our faculty, the following GAI decision tree will be helpful when adopting AI into courses. Please follow the link below and refer to page 14 in the "SU25-GAI_PoliciesPractices" PDF file, which is also mentioned as "QuickStart Guide to Thinking about AI in your Course."

<https://tll.mit.edu/teaching-resources/course-design/gen-ai-your-course/>

8. Key Takeaways for Utica University

Answer briefly (3–5 bullets total)

- One best practice Utica should adopt
Require transparent disclosure of AI use in academic and research work, and offer citation guidance throughout the institution.
- One risk Utica should explicitly address
Avoid uploading sensitive institutional data, student records, or unpublished research to public AI tools.
- One gap or limitation you noticed
MIT does not have a single AI policy for all students, which can lead to confusion in different courses. Utica could benefit from having a baseline institutional policy that still allows instructors some flexibility.

AI Policy Review & Extraction Form

University / Institution: **Boston University**: [PDF](#)

1. Scope of the Policy

What areas does the policy explicitly cover?

Area	Covered? (Yes/No)	Notes / Examples
Teaching & Learning	Yes	Refers back to academic conduct (or in our terms Academic Honesty); focus on developing AI literacy among faculty and students; faculty autonomy in the use (or not) of AI for classwork; training in how tools like GenAI (or Guardrail) can be used to help students hide cheating/plagiarism/inappropriate use of AI
Academic Research	Yes	Focus on following field, journal, state, federal guidelines
Administrative / Staff Use	Yes	Admin responsibility to provide professional development; recommendation for AI chatbot use in advising; also for use in HR and other business aspects of the University; communication campaigns
Student Use	Yes	Ethics of use; authorship and citing; encouraged AI training for students, including student employees
External / Third-Party Tools	Yes	GenAI; also recommendation of a third-party chatbot to help with advising

Should we also consider tutor use?

2. Allowed Uses of AI

What does the policy clearly allow? (*Examples: brainstorming, grammar checking, coding assistance, lesson design, etc.*)

- HR solutions, Student advising
- Faculty research
- While individual faculty agency is stressed, examples were given of processing texts for summaries, classification, and analysis (which are three of the parts of Bloom's taxonomy, by the way) or generating a literature review (I highly disagree with this as an allowed use)
- Tech support
- Coding
- Language learning and grammar help

3. Restricted or Discouraged Uses

What does the policy warn against or prohibit? (*Examples: submitting AI output as original work, using AI during exams, uploading sensitive data, etc.*)

- Prohibits the uploading "personnel files, budget spreadsheets with identifying information, exams, homework papers and solutions, medical records, tenure letters, and any document that contains personal information"
- AI cannot assign grades

4. Academic Integrity & Attribution

How does the institution handle integrity issues?

Aspect	Policy Statement
Plagiarism definition	Refers back to BU's version of their academic honesty policy; BU cautions faculty against using AI detectors as sole evidence of cheating/plagiarism. There is a real emphasis on faculty not discouraging the use of AI by not applying policies fairly/uniformly. "those students who are digitally savvy are more likely to evade detection, and those who are less knowledgeable are more likely to end up in the dragnet. ...

	Focus on teaching students how to ethically and thoughtfully engage with GenAI, rather than only punishing misuse.” There is also a focus on faculty including more in-class assignments, including more scaffolding, and redesigning assignments. I got the feeling that the work is being put on faculty rather than students to avoid plagiarism in student work.
Disclosure required?	“be transparent on how exactly the tool has been used”
Citation of AI tools	“since a software tool cannot assume” authorship, AI “tools should not be listed as co-authors of documents and creative works” ... individual faculty should “guide students on how to credit”
Student responsibility	the responsibility does seem to rest on students to ethically use AI, with a strong emphasis on faculty guidance

5. Research Use & Ethics

What guidance is given for research and scholarly work?

- Data privacy concerns: “BU should adopt policies to prevent the inadvertent publicizing of sensitive or valuable information through uploading”; concern about privacy and security generally
- Authorship expectations: same as for student, AI should not be a co-author, and the use of AI should be transparent
- Bias / fairness considerations: low-paid or unpaid labor of AI content creators and disruption of jobs, copyright infringement, plagiarism, disinformation, climate impacts, inequities of access; biases of the content used to train AI
- Other: observe field and journal requirements; “follow guidelines set forth by federal agencies and regulators”; IRB should also reconsider/update policies

6. Oversight, Enforcement, or Governance

Who is responsible for monitoring or enforcing AI use?

- Office / Committee / Role: Individual are responsible for defining and enforcing use in the classroom. Also, there is a recommendation for a central office to acquire/license AI tools, oversee AI literacy training and “pedagogical reflection,” and use by staff/faculty. This office could look like BU’s “Office of Digital Learning & Innovation.”
- Enforcement approach (guidelines vs strict rules): “faculty and students should assume full ownership and ultimate responsibility for their work,” including AI. “the responsibility rests with the user to authenticate”
- Reporting or review process (if any): “quality of research and teaching” need to be “critically evaluated” by ? (perhaps the central office recommended?); evaluated for conformity; academic conduct process

7. Language Worth Reusing (Important)

Copy **one short excerpt** Utica University *could adapt*

- Quoted text (page number/link): “Consistent with academic freedom, individual instructors should be free to define policies suited to the learning goals of their courses, and every syllabus needs to state the instructor’s GenAI policy.” (p. 4, <https://www.bu.edu/hic/files/2024/04/BU-AI-Task-Force-Report.pdf>)
- Why this language is useful: This policy reiterates the academic freedom of faculty.

8. Key Takeaways for Utica University

Answer briefly (3–5 bullets total)

- One best practice Utica should adopt: BU recommends having AI faculty ambassadors, so that faculty support faculty and there is faculty buy-in and a real understanding of faculty needs.
- One risk Utica should explicitly address: The loss of critical thinking skills among our students.
- One gap or limitation you noticed: This is really a gap in our process rather than in the BU AI policy recommendations. BU involved students in their policy process, and that seems like a great idea for Utica as well. I also noticed that BU recommends a lot of resources on the University’s behalf in order to coordinate AI use, provide training, fund new positions, provide grants, etc., resources we may not have.

AI Policy Review & Extraction Form

University / Institution: **SUNY** [[Doc 1](#)] [[Doc 2](#)] [[Doc 3](#)][[Doc 4](#)][[Doc 5](#)]

1. Scope of the Policy

What areas does the policy explicitly cover?

Area	Covered? (Yes/No)	Notes / Examples
Teaching & Learning	Yes	The memorandum repeatedly references teaching, learning, pedagogy, and classroom use of AI. “support faculty in strengthening teaching and learning.” SUNY faculty are updating “courses and learning activities to incorporate AI literacy.” “AI policies relating to the use of pedagogic, student-facing applications in the classroom” should be developed through shared governance. It warns policies should “not limit creativity and experimentation in teaching, research, and learning.” The institutional requirements section specifically references “teaching and learning” as a governance domain.
Academic Research	Yes	The policy says responsible AI can “advance our research agenda and accelerate groundbreaking research and discovery.” The document then discusses initiatives within the SUNY system: “Center for AI Responsibility and Research”

		at SUNY Binghamton “Empire AI consortium.”
Administrative / Staff Use	Yes	The memorandum mentions AI across “academic, research, healthcare, and administrative missions.” The memorandum also discusses AI as supporting “administrative operations.” Staff responsibilities and training are specifically included: “Ensuring faculty, staff, and students receive the training necessary...”
Student Use	Yes	The memorandum mentions revising their General Education framework to ensure “all students will develop skills to evaluate information” and understand ethical AI use.
External / Third-Party Tools	Yes	The memorandum discusses governance and oversight of AI systems broadly, including systems embedded into tools and services used across SUNY. It also emphasizes “Data Privacy and Security” safeguards for sensitive information used in AI systems.

2. Allowed Uses of AI

The policy is written as an “enable responsible use” framework. The policy clearly allows the responsible use of AI across SUNY for teaching, research, operations, and student learning, provided there are safeguards and governance.

3. Restricted or Discouraged Uses

What does the policy warn against or prohibit? (*Examples: submitting AI output as original work, using AI during exams, uploading sensitive data, etc.*)

- High-stakes decision-making AI is restricted or heavily governed. The strongest restrictions apply to AI systems that influence important outcomes affecting people.

Some examples from the memorandum:

- o admissions screening,
 - o automated grading/evaluation,
 - o disciplinary decisions,
 - o hiring decisions,
 - o healthcare decisions,
 - o systems making consequential determinations about individuals.
- AI uses that introduce bias or discrimination: “understand, address, and mitigate” risks of “biased, unethical, or discriminatory outcomes.”
 - AI systems that threaten privacy or security: Institutions must implement “robust security measures to safeguard sensitive information.”
 - Fully autonomous AI decision-making: “The ultimate accountability for work completed and actions made by, or in conjunction with, AI systems must rest with human beings.”
 - Overly restrictive classroom AI policies: “should take care not to limit creativity and experimentation.”
 - Ungoverned or unreviewed AI deployment: Institutions must establish “clear guidelines and accountability frameworks.”

4. Academic Integrity & Attribution

How does the institution handle integrity issues?

The memorandum/policy pushes implementation down to individual campuses and shared governance. A particular quote that stood out to me regarding AI policies that are created going forward: “should take care not to limit creativity and experimentation in teaching, research, and learning.”

I got the general impression that SUNY expects ethical use: Institutions must address risks of “biased, unethical, or discriminatory outcomes.”

The policy explicitly rejects the idea that AI replaces human responsibility.

Aspect	Policy Statement
Plagiarism definition	N/A
Disclosure required?	N/A
Citation of AI tools	N/A
Student responsibility	N/A

5. Research Use & Ethics

What guidance is given for research and scholarly work?

The policy provides broad guidance for research and scholarly work, but it does not impose detailed restrictions or procedures.

6. Oversight, Enforcement, or Governance

Who is responsible for monitoring or enforcing AI use?

- Office / Committee / Role: The policy assigns responsibility for monitoring and enforcing AI use at multiple levels rather than creating a single centralized “AI enforcement office.” The policy emphasizes a shared governance approach in most cases.
- Enforcement approach (guidelines vs strict rules): The policy is clearly a set of guidelines for use by each SUNY school to use as a basis for their own policies.
- Reporting or review process (if any): N/A

7. Language Worth Reusing (Important)

Copy **one short excerpt** Utica University *could adapt*

- Quoted text (page number/link):
“The ultimate accountability for work completed and actions made by, or in conjunction with, AI systems must rest with human beings.” (State University of New York [SUNY], 2026, p. 3).

- Why this language is useful:

I believe that the quote really captures the idea that we as humans have to come first and that we must own this technology when and if we use it.

8. Key Takeaways for Utica University

Answer briefly (3–5 bullets total)

- One best practice Utica should adopt – I believe our institution would benefit from adopting a tiered responsibility model for AI governance. Under this approach, the university administration would establish an overarching institutional policy for staff use of AI. Each school could then develop and refine policies aligned with that university-wide framework to address the specific needs of its disciplines and programs. Finally, individual faculty members could create course-level AI policies that align with their school's guidance while preserving academic flexibility and instructional autonomy.
- One risk Utica should explicitly address – I believe our institution should really address the ethical use of AI.
- One gap or limitation you noticed - The major gap in this document is the lack of operational specifics. This document serves as well as a high-level governance philosophy and framework of AI adoption. It leaves all the nuts and bolts of implementation to each of the SUNY schools to figure out.

State University of New York. (2026, April 30). *SUNY systemwide artificial intelligence policy*. SUNY Board of Trustees.

AI Policy Review & Extraction Form

University / Institution: **American University**, Washington, DC

<https://www.american.edu/oit/security/responsible-use-of-ai.cfm>

What areas does the policy explicitly cover?

Area	Covered? (Yes/No)	Notes / Examples
Teaching & Learning	Yes	Course syllabi should clearly state policies and expectations about the use of AI, whether prohibited or permitted.
Academic Research	Yes	Track use, which tools used, ensure accuracy, protect data privacy, not to be used to human judgment (peer evals)
Administrative / Staff Use	Yes	Be consistent with guidelines and policies
Student Use	Yes	Must adhere to all AI policies,
External / Third-Party Tools	No	

2. Allowed Uses of AI

What does the policy clearly allow? (*Examples: brainstorming, grammar checking, coding assistance, lesson design, etc.*)

- Reviewing, understanding and adhering to AI policies in course syllabi

3. Restricted or Discouraged Uses

What does the policy warn against or prohibit? (*Examples: submitting AI output as original work, using AI during exams, uploading sensitive data, etc.*)

- Do not upload, input, or analyze university data in an AI tool that is not approved by the Office of Information

- Do not enter sensitive data, or Confidential or Official Use data

4. Academic Integrity & Attribution

How does the institution handle integrity issues?

If faculty view the case as honest mistake rather than purposeful dishonesty, the faculty member can educate the student about acceptable standards. The student could be made to redo the assignment.

If the faculty member view it to be purposeful dishonesty, it must be reported to Academic Integrity Committee.

Aspect	Policy Statement
Plagiarism definition	Plagiarism is the representation of someone else's words, ideas, or work as one's own without attribution. Plagiarism may involve using someone else's wording without using quotation marks-a distinctive name, a phrase, a sentence, or an entire passage or essay. Misrepresenting sources is another form of plagiarism. The issue of plagiarism applies to any type of work, including exams, papers, or other writing, computer programs, art, music, photography, video, and other media.
Disclosure required?	
Citation of AI tools	
Student responsibility	

5. Research Use & Ethics

What guidance is given for research and scholarly work?

- Data privacy concerns: Do not input sensitive or proprietary information into publicly available AI tools. Prioritize use of self-hosted AI systems or, if not available, AI systems that meet strict security standards (e.g., ISO 27001, SOC 2) and include opt-out options for data training or retention. If original data are shared

for reproducibility purposes, every effort should be made to ensure that human subjects cannot be re-identified by a third-party using AI.

- Authorship expectations:
- Bias / fairness considerations

6. Oversight, Enforcement, or Governance

Who is responsible for monitoring or enforcing AI use?

- Office / Committee / Role:
- Enforcement approach (guidelines vs strict rules):
- Reporting or review process (if any):

7. Language Worth Reusing (Important)

Copy **one short excerpt** Utica University *could adapt*

- Quoted text (page number/link): Students are responsible for reviewing, understanding and adhering to the AI policies listed in course syllabi as it relates to using AI in each course. Misuse of AI or use of AI without permission or disclosure may constitute a violation of the Academic Integrity Code.
- Why this language is useful: I think that it is useful as it is clear to the student what the expectations are and puts the responsibility on them to be sure that they are aware upfront. It also allows them to understand the consequences if they do violate or misuse AI.

8. Key Takeaways for Utica University

Answer briefly (3–5 bullets total)

- One best practice Utica should adopt:
- One risk Utica should explicitly address: The risks and capabilities of the tools students use and the need to have discussions on their understanding of said tools and how to best use them.
- One gap or limitation you noticed: This policy is very broad and leaves its interpretation on individual faculty members to incorporate the use of AI in their courses. Students could have different expectations in terms of AI in each of their course and it could lead to confusion.

AI Policy Review & Extraction Form

University / Institution: American University, Washington, DC

<https://www.american.edu/oit/security/responsible-use-of-ai.cfm>

What areas does the policy explicitly cover?

Area	Covered? (Yes/No)	Notes / Examples
Teaching & Learning	Yes	Course syllabi should clearly state policies and expectations about the use of AI, whether prohibited or permitted.
Academic Research	Yes	Track use, which tools used, ensure accuracy, protect data privacy, not to be used to human judgment (peer evals)
Administrative / Staff Use	Yes	Be consistent with guidelines and policies
Student Use	Yes	Must adhere to all AI policies,
External / Third-Party Tools	No	

2. Allowed Uses of AI

What does the policy clearly allow? (*Examples: brainstorming, grammar checking, coding assistance, lesson design, etc.*)

- Reviewing, understanding and adhering to AI policies in course syllabi

3. Restricted or Discouraged Uses

What does the policy warn against or prohibit? (*Examples: submitting AI output as original work, using AI during exams, uploading sensitive data, etc.*)

- Do not upload, input, or analyze university data in an AI tool that is not approved by the Office of Information
- Do not enter sensitive data, or Confidential or Official Use data

4. Academic Integrity & Attribution

How does the institution handle integrity issues?

If faculty view the case as honest mistake rather than purposeful dishonesty, the faculty member can educate the student about acceptable standards. The student could be made to redo the assignment.

If the faculty member view it to be purposeful dishonesty, it must be reported to Academic Integrity Committee.

Aspect	Policy Statement
Plagiarism definition	Plagiarism is the representation of someone else's words, ideas, or work as one's own without attribution. Plagiarism may involve using someone else's wording without using quotation marks-a distinctive name, a phrase, a sentence, or an entire passage or essay. Misrepresenting sources is another form of plagiarism. The issue of plagiarism applies to any type of work, including exams, papers, or other writing, computer programs, art, music, photography, video, and other media.
Disclosure required?	
Citation of AI tools	
Student responsibility	

5. Research Use & Ethics

What guidance is given for research and scholarly work?

- Data privacy concerns: Do not input sensitive or proprietary information into publicly available AI tools. Prioritize use of self-hosted AI systems or, if not available, AI systems that meet strict security standards (e.g., ISO 27001, SOC 2) and include opt-out options for data training or retention. If original data are shared

for reproducibility purposes, every effort should be made to ensure that human subjects cannot be re-identified by a third-party using AI.

- Authorship expectations:
- Bias / fairness considerations:

6. Oversight, Enforcement, or Governance

Who is responsible for monitoring or enforcing AI use?

- Office / Committee / Role:
- Enforcement approach (guidelines vs strict rules):
- Reporting or review process (if any):

7. Language Worth Reusing (Important)

Copy **one short excerpt** Utica University *could adapt*

- Quoted text (page number/link): Students are responsible for reviewing, understanding and adhering to the AI policies listed in course syllabi as it relates to using AI in each course. Misuse of AI or use of AI without permission or disclosure may constitute a violation of the Academic Integrity Code.
- Why this language is useful: I think that it is useful as it is clear to the student what the expectations are and puts the responsibility on them to be sure that they are aware upfront. It also allows them to understand the consequences if they do violate or misuse AI.

8. Key Takeaways for Utica University

Answer briefly (3–5 bullets total)

- One best practice Utica should adopt:

- One risk Utica should explicitly address: The risks and capabilities of the tools students use and the need to have discussions on their understanding of said tools and how to best use them.
- One gap or limitation you noticed: This policy is very broad and leaves its interpretation on individual faculty members to incorporate the use of AI in their courses. Students could have different expectations in terms of AI in each of their course and it could lead to confusion.

Appendix D: AI Decision Tree/QuickStart Guide for Faculty

GAI Decision Tree – MIT Teaching + Learning Lab

URL: https://tll.mit.edu/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/SP26-GAI_PoliciesPractices_5-29.pdf?page=14