Spring 2025 report of the Special Committee for Artificial Intelligence

Submitted May 2, 2025

Affirmed unanimously by the committee members.

Context

Artificial intelligence (AI) is widespread in professional and personal settings; the use of generative AI has grown exponentially in education in recent years. Most of our committee's discussions this spring have evolved around uses of generative AI for everyday tasks and uses of large language models (LLMs) for research, which are the primary uses of AI at UNH so far. However, private-sector employers have already been delving into agentic AI and other autonomous AI solutions (with the public sector perhaps not far behind), for which higher education should also be prepared.

At UNH, the software we use for everyday tasks is managed by USNH Enterprise Technology & Services (ET&S). The software licenses include regular updates, and over the past several semesters, more and more AI-based functionalities have been introduced into these platforms, from AI-based notetaking in video communications platforms to AI-based crafting of messages and campaigns in EAB Navigate.[1] While AI is being thrown into platforms that we're already using at UNH, employees have had a range of responses, from strong resistance to jumping into the deep end with both feet.

Some faculty have reported feeling pressured to use AI without clear guidance and readily available training. Other faculty whose syllabi ban usage of AI tools have reported pushback from leadership on enforcing such restrictions. Students have complained about a lack of clarity overall, and this complaint is echoed by numerous faculty and staff we've spoken to. Some colleges have established initiatives to help with clarity, guidance, and training, but these efforts are individual (not coordinated across the university where needs may be common).

Overall, the biggest complaint was the struggle to discover what is being done with AI across UNH. Employees and students alike will benefit from easier access to relevant information, guidance, and training.

[1] myWildcat Success advising tool.

Summary & Recommendations

Our initial task was to inventory policies and initiatives[2] related to the use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools and large language models. Overall, while we found a great deal of interest in AI, we also found a desire for a more centralized access point from which to learn about the AI policies/guidelines/initiatives at UNH. We found confusion regarding AI tools and AI policies, and we noted a lack of widespread, common training customized to our university settings.

Based on our charges *[see Appendix B]*, the committee's primary recommendations are:

1. UNH should create a website/portal from which users (students, faculty, staff, administrators) can find and share the information relevant to their questions about AI tools and policies, best practices, resources, and cutting-edge AI work happening at UNH. *[See Appendices C, D, & E]*

2. Clear legal guidance should be shared regarding how our use of AI tools is (and is not) compliant with policies related to privacy, intellectual property, security, etc. Many users have common questions on these matters; easily accessible legal reassurance and guidance – including examples – will help facilitate appropriate AI usage across our UNH environments. Such guidance should include harmonization of the USNH AI Standard with the USNH Information Classification Policy and the USNH Intellectual Property Policy. *[See Appendix D.]*

3. Basic AI training should be offered based on users' roles (students, faculty, staff, administrators) and customized to our USNH enterprise-licensed programs that offer or incorporate AI tools. Staff should be dedicated to maintaining this training as our AI tools and offerings evolve. *[See Appendices C, D, & E.]*

    a. Such core training for faculty should include how to identify tools that include AI (e.g., citation generators, Grammarly, etc.) and clarify and communicate to students when AI usage is not appropriate for certain assignments, classes, or research tasks.

4. More specific training should be easily accessible to faculty who choose to use AI in their classes. Currently, each faculty member must individually reach out and investigate pedagogical resources (e.g., like those suggested by the Educational

[2] With approval from the Agenda Committee, "initiatives" was defined to include some sort of group-related effort (e.g., a college committee on the use of AI, an interdisciplinary working group on the use of AI, the creation of a commonly available hub/library on how to use AI, etc.) and did not include individual efforts of employees who may be teaching or researching with/about AI or may be using AI in their service activities.

Excellence and Effectiveness [E3]). However, given the diversity in how different disciplines are integrating/customizing AI learning, it would be more efficient to also offer training at the department or college level (depending on similarly/diversity of disciplines at the college). For example, there could be an "AI facilitator" assigned to a department/college, with set meeting times for faculty to learn together in a common-discipline group. *[See Appendices C, D, & E.]*

5. UNH should commit resources and roles to auditing the currency and accuracy of all AI guidance/training materials and policy. With our reliance on outsourced technologies that make changes to their AI offerings, this is a challenge. With the speed with which tools are integrating AI/LLM usage, and the speed of new technical innovation, it is even more important to make sure that all guidance/training stays up to date. And by centralizing guidance on tools such as Copilot,[3] it should be easier for the dedicated legal and training staff[4] to maintain currency and accuracy in all guidance/training materials and policy. *[See Appendices C, D, & E.]*

6. Our Discovery/Granite Core committees should consider how to indicate which courses will help students to better learn AI tools, such as adding an "attribute" for courses that introduce AI (e.g., for non-technical disciplines and for technical ones), courses that develop students' sophistication using AI tools, and courses that look at implications of future change/innovation; and how such an attribute may be integrated into our general education requirements.

7. Recognizing that employers want graduates to have a basic capability for using AI tools, colleges/programs should involve their advisory boards in professional discussions to understand how AI is impacting their industries and how curricula may be revised appropriately.

8. Based on these recommendations, there are various roles that Faculty Senate could consider. For example:

    a. To help support the initial adoption and integration of the above recommendations across UNH, Faculty Senate could maintain an AI Committee for several years (and then re-consider whether continuance is necessary as a standalone committee or whether—after establishment—the maintenance of these efforts is better allocated to standing committees).

    b. In a commitment to shared governance, Faculty Senate could require that ET&S notify the Senate whenever it is notified that new AI-based

[3] See recommendation #1 above.
[4] See recommendation #2 and #3 above.

functionalities are being integrated into our licensed software. Such notification should also come with a plan for (1) considering input from faculty and (2) updating (as necessary) any legal guidance and training materials.

c. Faculty Senate could work with the new portal facilitators and all other units (E3, ET&S, legal office, etc.) to help with information collection and dissemination (e.g., collection of faculty information and dissemination of portal information).

9. These recommendations should all embrace AI best practices in university settings (including ethics, transparency, data privacy and security, professional development support, and best practices related to AI in teaching and academic research). *[See Appendix F.]*

Appendices

A. Members of AI Committee

- *Chair*: Maeve Dion - CPS
- Kathrine Aydelott – Library
- David Benedetto – CEPS
- Ivaylo Nedyalkov - CEPS
- David Plachetzki - COLSA
- Cinthia Satornino - PAUL
- Amy Thompson – CPS
- Karen Van Gundy - COLA

B. Committee Charges

Established by UNH Faculty Senate motion # XXIX-M5, this committee's substantive charges were to:

- Prepare a comprehensive list and compilation of related policies and initiatives at UNH related to large language models and artificial intelligence programs (LLMs/AI), in order to avoid duplication of effort and understand different perspectives;
- Make suggestions for how different UNH units, faculty, and administrators can learn from each other's policies and initiatives around LLMs/AI;
- Suggest any campus-wide policies that the Senate might consider;
- Develop a plan for continuing Faculty Senate involvement and oversight in LLM/AI policy after this academic year. This could be a new shared governance Working Group, standing charges for an existing Faculty Senate, or other modes of engagement; and
- Develop a written report on these charges, to be submitted on May 2 and presented to Faculty Senate on May 5. Please include the vote by which your committee approved the report, including votes in favor, votes against, and abstentions.

The goal is NOT to write new policy. Instead, the goal is to review policies created by other units within UNH and associated with either faculty work or the academic mission of UNH

(in other words, those within the purview of the faculty senate). If there is a need for a policy, the committee can suggest that a policy be written.

C. AI Initiatives at UNH

Summary/Analysis: UNH has launched several initiatives to explore and support the use of generative AI in teaching and research, led primarily by the Educational Excellence and Effectiveness (E3) office and the Research Computing Center (RCC). E3 offers workshops, curated resources, and discussions that help faculty integrate AI into their courses, including sessions on ethics, academic honesty, and practical classroom use. UNH has also developed DeepThought, a customizable large language model platform built by RCC to support AI-driven research and potential teaching applications. The platform includes privacy protections and links to commercial models when needed. Additionally, several colleges and centers across UNH have started their own AI-related efforts, such as curated resource hubs, book clubs, policy discussions, and dedicated task forces. While some colleges have formal structures in place, others are still in early stages of adoption or information gathering.

Teaching

Findings: The committee's teaching subgroup scoured UNH webpages and reached out to various offices/units (e.g., E3, Provost's office, Deans of Academic Affairs, etc.) to assemble the following:

University-wide initiatives

E3 Resources, Guidance, and Programming on Generative AI

The E3 office has taken the lead in providing teaching-related AI resources through workshops, discussions, and curated resources.

E3 has organized several sessions focused on helping instructors think about the role of AI in their courses, such as:

- **Book Club: Teaching with AI** – A three-part discussion series based on *Teaching with AI: A Practical Guide to a New Era of Human Learning*, used as a starting point to consider how AI could be incorporated into teaching.

- **AI Basics for Instructors** – An introductory session that outlines how generative AI tools work, as well as key issues such as data privacy and bias.

- **Integrating AI in Small Bites** – A session where faculty shared examples of using AI in their classes in manageable ways.

- **Community Conversations Around AI** – Open discussions for faculty to exchange questions, experiences, and ideas related to teaching with AI.

- **Academic Honesty and AI Policy** – A session on approaches to setting expectations and policies about AI use in classwork, with an emphasis on consistent communication with students.

- **Faculty Institute on Teaching and Learning**. In August 2024, UNH included a session on AI in its annual Faculty Instructional Technology and Strategies Institute (FITSI). This included a keynote talk by José Antonio Bowen, followed by breakout sessions on practical applications of AI in teaching and related considerations. (This item is included in the E3 section since ET&S collaborates with E3 [as it did with the legacy Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning] on these kinds of offerings.)

E3 also provides links to policies, guides, and tools to help faculty make informed decisions, for example:

- **USNH Artificial Intelligence Standard** – A system-wide policy offering general guidance on AI use.

- **Syllabus and Policy Examples** – Sample syllabus language and course policies, including examples from other institutions.

- **AI Tools and Detection** – Information about platforms like Copilot and DeepThought AI.

- **Activity and Assignment Resources** – Examples of course activities involving AI from various universities, such as Harvard and University of Central Florida.

E3 employees and collaborators are presently preparing a Digital Ethics Canvas module with a badge to demonstrate achievement. Collaborators include E3, UNH Online, the Writing Center, and the Diamond Library.

It is not always clear how current the E3 resources are. Our committee has found at least one piece of E3 guidance that is not current: as of April 19, 2025, the E3 Teaching & Learning Resource Hub's section on Generative AI said that regarding the USNH license of Copilot, "You will have to paste your queries into the prompt" because this version "does not have upload capabilities." However, as of April 19, our USNH version of Copilot did allow for uploading up to 3 files per chat query.

Honors College

During the Spring 2025 semester, the Honors College sponsored a "Think Tank" on AI at the Durham campus. The overarching question was: how much should UNH invest in AI, and what role should AI play in the classroom?

College-level initiatives

Based on an email query to all colleges/schools' academic deans (with responses received from all) and Department Chairs, these initiatives include:

- The College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) does not have a college-wide committee or working group, but the CHHS Director of Faculty Development has curated resources for AI for faculty and shares these as appropriate. In addition to the Provost's syllabus guidance and E3 resources, CHHS has AI resources and best practices embedded in the Dean's office College SharePoint site (along with other teaching resources). Additionally, the Dean's office has made the book Teaching with AI (Bowen and Watson) available to all faculty who would like to read it. Within CHHS, the UNH Nursing program has an ad hoc committee on AI (their survey this year verified a lot of our AI Committee's findings).
- The Online division of the College of Professional Studies (CPS-O) has AI Lunch and Learn events; the Center for Educator Preparation has a dedicated faculty member who works with CEP colleagues on how to apply AI to course assignments; the Academic Center for Health Care, Human Services, & Behavioral Sciences (HHB) has established a Task Force on AI Literacy in HHB Education and Workforce Readiness (developed in partnership with their Center's HHB Advisory Council and includes practice and education partners from across New Hampshire); the Center for Engagement and Assessment has a committee that discusses AI policy at CPS-O (the committee blends faculty and instructional design staff); a CPS-O instructional designer has produced a PressBook on AI use in pedagogy that is shared as an open resource and includes a "rubric for AI use" that faculty can use as a reference when

communicating the level of AI use that is acceptable in a course or assignment; the CPS-O Online Learning Librarian spearheads conversations and work around AI for Liberal Arts, Communication, and General Education.

- The Peter T. Paul College of Business and Economics has a SharePoint repository of AI resources and Provost syllabus policies to share with all faculty; the college has established the Paul College AI Taskforce (including faculty, staff, and external stakeholders from the graduate school and New Hampshire Small Business Development Center), which is currently at nascent stages (trying to determine what the mission should be; understanding, acceptance, and experience vary wildly across their stakeholders, but the goal is to align the taskforce's strategic and tactical plans to that of the university) and is struggling to answer the tactical questions, such as providing training and resources for faculty, staff, and students. The College recently held a mini workshop for faculty and staff on ways to use AI tools in teaching, research, and administration.
- The Franklin Pierce School of Law has a Dean's Taskforce on AI, co-chaired by a faculty member and an Information Technology (IT) administrator, and with members from the school's registrar, faculty, and dean's office. The Task Force has been meeting throughout the spring semester to explore how AI can support teaching, research, and administration/operations. The Task Force has surveyed full-time and adjunct faculty as well as staff, held listening sessions with key departments, and is preparing to deploy Copilot to all Law faculty and staff. This spring's Taskforce efforts have, among other things, demonstrated a faculty/staff need for targeted training sessions and clear policy guidance.

Research

Findings: The committee's research subgroup scoured UNH webpages and reached out to various offices/units (e.g., Office of Research, Economic Engagement and Outreach [REEO], Library, etc.) to assemble the following initiatives related to research:

DeepThought

UNH Research and Computing Center (RCC) has coordinated AI research efforts at UNH for the past six months. Through the Technology Governance Committee, REEO, and meetings with other university leadership, the RCC has been building an AI platform that attempts to meet the initial needs of various academic/research/administrative efforts,

alongside the physical infrastructure, personnel, and organizations needed to support and sustain them going forward.

A centerpiece of these initiatives is the DeepThought platform, including UNH's own Large Language Model. DeepThought is a purpose-built platform developed by RCC that is tailored to UNH's needs based on feedback RCC has received from the UNH community. DeepThought provides a variety of AI services, including LLMs and chatbots. It also provides the capability of incorporating data sources such as real-time data, non-text AI use-cases (like image/audio analysis and generation), custom computational models, etc. RCC can help with proposals for developing custom Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) that provide an interface between existing programs for advanced computational needs. DeepThought was mostly conceived with research involving LLMs in mind. However, it could also be used to teach AI-based content.

DeepThought is built so that any USNH application can potentially tie into it to leverage its AI capabilities. This includes chatbots but could also include directing decision-making and other types of autonomous agents. DeepThought can also be configured to access information from any USNH service. For example, RCC uses DeepThought to import and integrate TeamDynamix knowledgebase articles.

The DeepThought platform can send requests to different targets depending on the use case and volume of the data. For example, requests can be sent to our local infrastructure to use existing open-source LLMs. This ensures that the data never leaves the network and there's less chance of it leaking, thus enhancing privacy. This method is used when a staff/faculty member goes to https://deepthought.usnh.edu and uses their individual chatbot. In addition, requests can also be sent by the platform to third-party providers. RCC currently maintains connectors for OpenAI (ChatGPT models), xAI (Grok models), and AWS Bedrock (Mistral, Claude, and others). This option is most suited for high-volume requests that don't have a privacy concern and would overwhelm our local hardware.

The RCC has also developed a chatbot service that ties into DeepThought. All staff/faculty will receive an individual chatbot automatically, and the RCC can create custom chatbots for groups/websites/departments/etc. Any of these chatbots can have different data sources, including information from files, website scrapes, real-time data sources, etc.

The RCC has developed a roadmap for many requested features.

Writing and Research resources

Various additional resources related to AI in scholarship include:

Link	Summary
UNH Faculty Resources: AI and Writing	PDF that discusses the role of AI in writing, offering insights into its capabilities and limitations, and provides strategies for faculty to address AI use in academic settings. References back to the E3 Teaching & Learning Resource Hub. Unclear when last updated, but article referenced is dated 2024.
UNH Simple Guide to Using Generative AI Writing Tools	Paper from UNH Research Integrity Services dated 2023. Assists researchers in understanding the implications of using generative AI writing tools, emphasizing research integrity and ethical considerations. Dated October 2023.
UNH Research Resources: US Department of Education AI Guidelines	REEO page provides links to the U.S. Department of Education's guidelines on the use of AI in grant applications and related processes. Unclear when this was last updated.
Spring 2025 Library Resources & Assistance (UNH Manchester): ChatGPT Resources	ChatGPT resources page of a research guide created by UNH Manchester Library.
Responsible Conduct of Research: Generative AI Writing Tools	Links and resources from the Office of Responsible Conduct of Research in a research guide sponsored by the UNH Library. Updated to 2025.
UNH Research Resources: National Science Foundation AI Policies	REEO page that offers information on the U.S. National Science Foundation's policies regarding the use of AI in research, including merit review and proposal preparation guidelines. References 2025 Federal Administration Transition Guidance, but last updated date could be clearer.

UNH Research Resources: National Institutes of Health AI Policies	REEO page that links to the U.S. National Institutes of Health's requirements and advice concerning AI, focusing on application and review processes. References submission dates in 2025.
Fall 2024 workshop on AI in Research	In Fall 2024, REEO sponsored a workshop on *Balancing Innovation and Integrity: Exploring the Ethics of Using Generative AI*.

D. AI Policies at UNH

Summary/Analysis: The committee found a significant degree of confusion and lack of understanding regarding the AI tools available to us and a lack of understanding of the policies that dictate our usage of these tools. For example:

- Many people were unaware of the USNH AI Standard. During the Summer 2024 Faculty Instructional Technology and Strategies Institute (FITSI), which focused on AI, no one with ET&S or E3 brought this policy into any of the sessions; also, the Provost's syllabus guidance for 2024-2025 emphasized addressing AI in syllabi but did not mention the existence of the AI Standard. Communications from the USNH policy offices did not highlight the existence of the AI Standard at the start of the academic year, even while more AI features were being integrated into our ET&S managed software. Thus, some faculty jumped into using AI tools this academic year without being aware of our AI Standard and how it relates to other USNH policies.
- Some people were unaware that we have an enterprise subscription to a generative AI tool (Copilot). For example, one Department Chair encouraged our committee to push UNH to adopt an institution-wide AI platform such as ChatGPT (thus revealing a lack of awareness of our USNH instantiation of Copilot). If employees are unaware of our enterprise Copilot subscription, they may be using "shadow AI" (unapproved AI applications) on their work or personal devices, thus losing the benefits and protections of the USNH-protected environment where our Copilot data should remain internal and should not be used for training the AI (per the technical configurations based on our enterprise license conditions/contracts). This lack of awareness and general feeling of a lack of clarity was widespread.

- Throughout our committee's work, we heard many questions related to legal implications of using AI-based tools in our everyday work. This includes how to properly use such tools for service activities such as work evaluations and promotion & tenure committee activities, as well as for general administrative tasks (e.g., how to make sure AI-generated minutes are "drafts" and not FOIA-able records). While our committee was able to get easy access to USNH General Counsel's office to discuss various legal aspects of AI usage, this information is not readily available to the thousands of users of our AI tools (faculty, staff, students, and administrators). There are also continuing concerns regarding the shifting legal landscape in using AI for university tasks (how legal rules may change, and how faculty, staff, students, and administrators should learn of and comply with such changes).

Findings: The committee's policy subgroup scoured UNH webpages and reached out to various offices/units (e.g., USNH ET&S, USNH General Counsel, Deans of Academic Affairs, Department Chairs, etc.) to assemble the following:

USNH Policies

The USNH AI Standard has existed since Summer 2023. It is a broad document that must be read in conjunction with other policies such as the USNH Information Classification Policy and the USNH Intellectual Property Policy.

Various questions arise as to how to interpret these policies together in an applied-AI university setting. For example, the USNH Information Classification Policy identifies "intellectual property" (IP) as an example of Tier 2 sensitive information. Under the USNH Intellectual Property policy, students typically retain IP ownership of their work (absent exceptions) and faculty typically retain IP ownership of scholarly work such as syllabi, course material, textbooks, exams, etc. (again, absent exceptions).

However, the USNH AI Standard mandates that "Users of AI tools or programs must not share or enter any data classified as non-public (Tier 2 data and above)." Does this mean, for example, that:

- Students should not be entering faculty-owned IP (e.g., course materials) into generative AI tools?
- Faculty should not be entering student-owned IP into AI tools?

- No one should be entering manuscripts authored by others (who own the IP) into AI tools?

Further, the USNH Knowledge Base guidelines on using AI indicate that Tier 2 data ("including non-public research data") should not be used in "publicly available generative AI tools"; does this mean that Tier 2 data can be used in our USNH Enterprise Copilot without violating the AI Standard?

As another example, the USNH AI Standard mandates that "Users of AI tools or programs must not share or enter any data classified as non-public (Tier 2 data and above) … including but not limited to Personally Identifiable information (PII) or non-public research data." Does this mean, for example, that: Employees in UNH Foundation should not be using AI tools together with non-public research data related to potential donors to help customize appeals?

Also, our committee was informed (as of the Spring 2025 period of this committee's work) that Enterprise Technology & Services (ET&S) does not maintain a comprehensive list of AI-embedded or integrated software products that are available to faculty, staff, and students across UNH.[5] So, this committee was unable to assess/inventory the degree of integration of AI features in our existing platforms.

USNH ET&S Guidance

In addition to policies, ET&S has developed other AI-related guidance, such as recommendations for the ethical and effective use of AI within the university settings, a Knowledge Base article on guidelines for the use and procurement of generative AI tools, and another Knowledge Base article on AI detection using Turnitin in Canvas.

Such guidance was not centralized (required searching and breadcrumb usage in the Knowledge Base).

[5] Some vendors and products have AI-enabled features that are automatically integrated into our platforms; others provide an option for ET&S to incorporate the AI-enabled feature or not. In those cases where there are options, ET&S's strategy is to review the content, evaluate security, and usability, and create or curate documentation on those features prior to enabling them and communicating they are available. But no list of such instantiations was available at the time of our committee's work.

UNH Provost Policies

Despite widespread belief that our "UNH AI Policy" ***is*** the Provost office's syllabus guidance on AI, much of what is in that guidance is aspirational and not mandatory (unless something is required for NECHE or program-level accreditation compliance). The AI-related guidance in this document is helpful in relation to syllabus language, but it is ***not*** intended to be a comprehensive AI Policy for the university.

UNH Academic Policies

There is limited discussion of AI in the UNH Academic Integrity policy (last checked April 28, 2025).

While faculty are encouraged to include AI statements in their syllabi, students are not provided general information regarding what to expect/ask of their teachers.

There should be clear guidance at the program/department level regarding expectations for AI usage in the discipline (and how to clarify the situation with your teacher).

College-level & Department-level Policies

Based on an email query to all colleges/schools' Academic Deans (with responses received from all), there are zero college-level AI policies that have been implemented as of April 29, 2025. At the Franklin Pierce School of Law, two faculty committees presented guidance that should go up for a vote soon.

Based on an email query to all Department Chairs (with incomplete responses), there are zero department-level AI policies that have been implemented (as of April 28, 2025).

This means that faculty, staff, and administrators may be using AI tools in service and administration activities such as annual evaluations, promotion and tenure practices, accreditation reviews, etc., without transparency or guidance at the department or college levels.

E. AI Training / Professional Development at UNH

Summary/Analysis: Except for ad-hoc special programming from E3 and REEO, our committee found ***no general training*** on AI itself, nor on how to responsibly use AI in everyday administrative tasks.

Findings: In addition to the initiatives listed in the Appendices above, our committee subgroups noted a few additional matters related to training and professional development:

- ET&S does not provide specific training on using AI-related tools within our various enterprise licenses, but ET&S does coordinate with other units, such as E3, on initiatives for training and professional development to help faculty, staff, and students effectively use AI tools and platforms.
- The Copilot Tutorial in the USNH Dashboard (under Technology Resources) is not customized to our university settings but instead redirects to a generic Microsoft tutorial (as of April 28, 2025).
- In discussions this semester, our committee faced numerous examples where employees believed they were using our enterprise-bounded Copilot platform even though they hadn't logged in/authenticated to USNH (they were using Copilot available to anyone, not our bounded instantiation of Copilot).
- Some fee-based AI training courses offered via UNH Professional Development and Training include:
    - A five-week, online **AI Prompting Certificate Course** offered in partnership with Ziplines Education. ($1,700 cost as of April 28, 2025)
    - An **AI Ethics & Compliance Course** [PDT-BusAI-06] (not currently available, but was listed as a $149 workshop fee as of April 28, 2025)
    - A **certificate in AI Essentials** that requires participation in six workshops. ($50 certificate fee, plus the cost of the chosen six workshops, as of April 28, 2025).

F. AI Best Practices in University Settings

Summary/Analysis: To better understand how other universities and colleges are managing the disruption from AI tools and usage, this committee subgroup conducted an audit of select top research and teaching institutions with respect to their AI best practices. Schools were selected for their excellence in teaching and/or research. The goal of the audit was to develop a set of general best practices to help guide the development of policies and procedures across all aspects of academic work.

Findings: Based on a review of AI policies and best practices from top research and teaching universities, this committee subgroup compiled and aggregated a list of best practices across three academic settings: in conducting academic research, in in-person class settings, and in online classrooms. The best practices, with a brief description and examples, are listed below.

General Best Practices

Cultivating a Culture of AI Ethics

Adhere to responsible research conduct principles—honesty, transparency, accountability, and social responsibility—when integrating AI tools. Incorporate lessons on AI ethics, responsible usage, and academic integrity. Provide workshops and opportunities to critically engage with AI tools. Teach stakeholders to use AI responsibly, distinguish between assistance and dishonesty, and understand the limitations of AI-generated content. Highlight AI's potential biases, inaccuracies, and responsibilities. Encourage verification and independent thinking.

> *Example:* A research team discloses their use of a generative AI model for literature summarization in a published article, clarifying that all final interpretations and conclusions were made by human authors to ensure accountability.
>
> *Example:* An instructor hosts a class debate on the ethical implications of AI in society, helping students think critically about when and how AI should be used.
>
> *Example:* A module in an online course walks students through examples of acceptable versus unacceptable uses of generative AI, followed by a short quiz on academic integrity.
>
> *Example:* Students in a virtual ethics seminar read case studies on AI misinformation, then use AI to simulate counterarguments, helping them understand its limitations.

Transparency

Transparency in the use of AI must be a core principle in all institutional settings: teaching, research, and administration. Universities should ensure that all stakeholders clearly communicate how AI tools are used, which tools are permitted, and the rationale behind their policies. This includes explicit documentation of AI use in scholarly work, clarity in classroom policies, and open channels for dialogue and accountability. Transparency builds trust, upholds academic integrity, and enables informed, ethical decision-making throughout the academic community.

Application Examples Across Roles and Settings

Faculty (Research Setting): A faculty researcher includes a methodology section in a publication specifying the use of an AI tool for coding qualitative data, along with a rationale for selecting that tool and a discussion of its limitations.

Faculty (Classroom Setting): An instructor outlines AI usage policies in the syllabus, stating that tools like AI tutors may be used for concept review but not for completing assignments. In the first week, time is devoted to explaining this policy and answering student questions.

Students: A student submitting a group project includes a brief AI usage declaration noting how generative AI was used for ideation but not for final drafting, in alignment with course expectations.

Staff and Academic Support Units: Librarians and instructional designers maintain a centralized resource page that lists institutionally approved AI tools, their intended academic uses, and instructions for ethical application.

Academic Leadership: A dean's office requires departments to document and review AI policies annually and hosts open forums where faculty and students can discuss evolving AI technologies and institutional guidelines.

Data Privacy and Security

All members of the academic community (faculty, staff, students, and administrators) must ensure that any use of AI tools complies with institutional data privacy policies and applicable regulations such as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA), and Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). Confidential, sensitive, or personally identifiable information must never be entered into unvetted or publicly available AI platforms. Only AI tools that have been formally approved through institutional review processes should be used in research, teaching, and administrative functions. Transparent communication about data

handling practices and clear expectations for ethical AI use should be established across all settings.

Application Examples Across Roles and Settings

Faculty (Research Setting): A professor conducting research with human subjects anonymizes data and uses an institution-approved AI platform for text analysis, ensuring no personally identifiable information is exposed.

Faculty (Classroom Setting): An instructor integrates an AI writing assistant into course assignments but confirms its compliance with FERPA before use and prohibits student data entry that could be stored externally.

Students: A student seeking help from an AI tool for thesis organization avoids uploading drafts containing identifiable research participant information, using only vetted tools approved by the university.

Information Technology (IT) and Administrative Staff: The university's IT department evaluates and approves AI tools based on institutional data security policies and ensures these tools are integrated into learning platforms with proper data encryption and user access controls.

Academic Leadership: A dean's office issues clear guidelines and training sessions on the secure use of AI tools, reinforcing compliance with legal and ethical standards across all academic and operational domains.

Professional Development Support

All university stakeholders (faculty, staff, students, and administrators) should engage in ongoing professional development to build the skills and knowledge necessary for understanding AI and for the ethical, responsible, and effective use of AI. Institutions must invest in accessible training opportunities that address both the technical and pedagogical aspects of AI, promote AI literacy, and align with academic integrity and equity goals. Training should be role-specific but coordinated institution-wide to ensure consistent standards and collaborative growth in AI proficiency.

Application Examples Across Roles and Settings

Faculty (Research Setting): A faculty member attends workshops on using AI for data analysis and citation management, gaining awareness of both the methodological benefits and the ethical limitations of AI in academic research.

Faculty (Classroom Setting): Instructors participate in interdisciplinary training sessions on designing AI-informed assignments and using AI-generated outputs to foster deeper critical thinking and student engagement.

Students: The university offers student-facing seminars on AI tools, focusing on digital literacy, ethical use, and how to critically assess AI-generated content in academic work.

Staff and Academic Support Units: Instructional designers and IT staff are trained to support AI integration in course platforms, ensuring they can assist faculty in selecting, implementing, and monitoring AI tools that meet pedagogical and privacy standards.

Academic Leadership: Department chairs and administrators complete strategic training on AI policy development and instructional oversight to guide their units in adopting AI responsibly and equitably.

Setting-Specific Best Practices

In addition to the general policies outlined above, the following are setting-specific best practices identified in the committee sub-group's review:

AI in Academic Research

Regular Monitoring and Evaluation: Continuously assess AI tools for reliability and bias. Choose tools aligning with ethical standards and appropriate for the task.

> *Example:* A research lab periodically assesses the output of a machine learning model used for predictive analytics to detect and correct bias against underrepresented groups in the data.

Interdisciplinary Collaboration: Work with faculty from different disciplines to ensure diverse perspectives guide AI integration in research, especially regarding ethics and methodology.

> *Example:* An AI development project includes ethicists, data scientists, and domain-specific experts to guide the responsible design and deployment of a new educational AI tool.

AI in Classrooms (in-person, online, hybrid)

Curricular Integration: Embed AI tools meaningfully into coursework to support—rather than replace—core skills like analysis, critical thinking, and creativity. Use AI creatively to

stimulate inquiry and imagination. Frame assignments to require deeper engagement beyond what AI can easily produce.

> *Example:* In a computer science course, students use a code-generating AI tool for initial drafts but must submit detailed annotations explaining how and why they modified the output.
>
> *Example:* A digital art class encourages students to experiment with AI image generators but requires a reflective essay on how they shaped the tool's output creatively and ethically.
>
> Example: Students in an online writing class use AI to brainstorm topics but must develop their own arguments and support them with credible sources.

Clear Objectives: Define specific learning goals for AI integration to guide the choice of tools and instructional design.

> *Example:* An online statistics course uses AI-based tutoring to provide real-time support, explicitly stating that the goal is to reinforce key concepts, not replace foundational learning.

Monitoring, Feedback, and Assessment: Evaluate the impact of AI on student learning, updating practices to ensure effectiveness and alignment with educational goals. Periodically review student-AI interaction and provide timely, individualized feedback to ensure effective learning and ethical usage.

> *Example:* A teacher tracks the quality of student presentations before and after introducing AI-generated topic outlines, adjusting the assignment based on whether AI enhanced or hindered student engagement.
>
> *Example:* Instructors review logs from AI tutoring tools and provide feedback via individualized comments, emphasizing where students relied too heavily on AI-generated suggestions.

Equity and Accessibility: Use AI to adapt materials for diverse learners, including those with disabilities and multilingual needs, to promote inclusive education.

> *Example:* An online biology course uses an AI system with text-to-speech and multilingual translation features, helping non-native English speakers and those with visual impairments better access content.

Methodology for Appendix F

AI Use Disclosure:

ChatGPT 4.0 was used to identify universities based on their standings of excellence in research and teaching and subsequently used to collect data on their AI policies. Not all universities identified have explicit AI policies or were detailed enough to be included in the audit. Human effort augmented the output and verified the data extracted. ChatGPT 4.0 was then used to aggregate the data and streamline definitions. Examples were generated in collaboration with ChatGPT 4.0. All output was reviewed by the members of our committee subgroup on best practices.

Universities included in this subgroup's review:

Carnegie Mellon University
Columbia University
Cornell University
Duke University
Harvard University
John Hopkins University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Northwestern University
Princeton University
Stanford University
University of Arizona
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, San Diego
University of Chicago
University of Florida
University of Illinois
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
University of Minnesota
University of North Carolina
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
University of Pennsylvania
University of Southern California
University of Texas at Austin

University of Washington
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Yale University

Additional Sources:

https://www.teachingchannel.com/

https://www.edutopia.org/article/laws-ai-education/

https://www.weforum.org/stories/2024/04/prepare-future-policy-ideas-ai-in-education/

https://www.nea.org/nea-today/all-news-articles/teaching-age-ai

Satornino, C. B., Du, S., & Grewal, D. (2024). Using artificial intelligence to advance sustainable development in industrial markets: A complex adaptive systems perspective. *Industrial Marketing Management, 116*, 145-157.

Grewal, D., Guha, A., Satornino, C. B., & Schweiger, E. B. (2021). Artificial intelligence: The light and the darkness. *Journal of Business Research*, *136*, 229-236.

Grewal, D., Guha, A., Satornino, C. B., & Becker, M. (2025). The future of marketing and marketing education. *Journal of Marketing Education*, *47*(1), 61-77.

Grewal, D., Satornino, C. B., Davenport, T., & Guha, A. (2024). How generative AI Is shaping the future of marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 1-21.