University Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Academic Contexts

Introduction

In the event that any information contained within this policy conflicts with any Board of Regents (BOR) policy, the BOR policy controls.

1. Purpose and Scope

This policy establishes a framework for the responsible, ethical, and transparent use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in academic contexts. It applies to all faculty, staff, and students at the university and governs the use of AI in teaching, learning, research, and scholarly communication.

2. AI Tool Inventory and Classification
2.1 Inventory Requirements

All AI tools used in academic contexts must be documented in an institutional inventory that includes the following data elements:

(Note: Coordinate with the institutional Chief Information Officer on this inventory)
Tool Name
Vendor
AI Tool Type (e.g., chatbot, generative AI, embedded vendor AI agent)
AI Model Type (e.g., LLM, image generator, recommendation engine)
Description of Data Interaction (institutional and student data)
Data Storage (physical location where AI tool stores data or where data servers/centers are located)
Purpose/Organizational Benefit

2.2 Review Procedure for the AI Tool Inventory

To ensure the continued responsible use of AI and maintaining an up-to-date use of AI tools in academic contexts, the university will implement a structured review process for the institutional AI tool inventory. At a minimum, the institution's AI policy shall be updated when new AI tools are introduced into the academic environment.

2.2.1   Review Frequency

The AI tool inventory will be reviewed annually by the Office of Academic Affairs.
Additional reviews will be triggered immediately upon:

- Significant changes in AI technology or capabilities
- Updates to federal, state, or international regulations (e.g., FERPA, etc.)
- Revisions to institutional strategy or academic priorities
- New guidance or mandates from the Board of Regents (BOR) or the University System of Georgia (USG)

2.2.2 Review Scope

Each review will assess the following:

- Accuracy and completeness of inventory entries (e.g., tool name, vendor, AI type, model type, data interaction, purpose)
- Continued alignment with institutional goals and ethical standards
- Compliance with applicable laws and privacy regulations
- Performance and reliability of AI tools, including any reported issues or concerns
- Vendor assurances regarding ethical principles and data protection

2.2.3 Review Process

The AI Inventory Review Committee, chaired by the Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee), will coordinate the review process.

Each academic department will be responsible for submitting updates or changes to their AI tool usage.

The committee will consult with:

- Provost Office
- CIO/CISO Office
- Office of Legal Affairs
- Human Resources Office
- Student Government Association
- The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness
- Data privacy personnel and any already established institutional data governance committees
- Departmental AI Policy Coordinators
- Office of Internal Audit, Ethics, & Compliance

2.2.4 Documentation and Reporting

A formal review report will be generated after each cycle, summarizing findings, updates, and recommendations. The report will be submitted to the Faculty Senate and made available to the university community via the Academic Affairs website.

Any tools found to be non-compliant or obsolete will be flagged for remediation or removal.

3. Ethical Use of AI Tools

3.1 Supplier Agreements

The university is committed to ensuring that all AI tools used in academic contexts uphold the highest standards of ethical integrity. To this end, all AI tools must adhere to the following principles:

- Fairness and Mitigation of Bias: AI tools must be evaluated for potential biases in their design, training data, and outputs. The university will prioritize tools that demonstrate a commitment to reducing bias and promoting equitable outcomes for all users.
- Accountability: Clear lines of accountability must be established for the use of AI tools. Faculty, staff, and students are responsible for the ethical use of AI, and vendors must provide transparent documentation of how their tools function and are maintained.
- Prevention of Hallucinations: AI tools must be assessed for their reliability and factual accuracy. Tools known to generate false or misleading content ("hallucinations") will be subject to additional scrutiny and may be disallowed for academic use.
- Transparency: The functionality, limitations, and decision-making processes of AI tools must be clearly documented and communicated to users. This includes disclosure of AI-generated content in academic work and research.
- Human Oversight: AI tools must be used under appropriate human supervision. Users must retain final responsibility for decisions and outputs generated with the assistance of AI.
- Accessibility: AI tools must be accessible to all users, including those with disabilities. The university will prioritize tools that meet or exceed accessibility standards.
- Prevention of Prompt Injections: AI tools must be evaluated for vulnerabilities to prompt injection attacks or manipulations. Vendors must provide assurances that safeguards are in place to mitigate such risks.

3.2 Implementation Measures

To enforce these principles, the university will:

- Require all AI vendors to provide documentation and assurances of ethical compliance as part of procurement and renewal processes.
- Conduct periodic audits of AI tools to assess adherence to ethical standards.
- Establish an AI Committee to evaluate new tools and investigate concerns related to ethical violations.
- Provide training and resources to faculty, staff, and students on ethical AI use.
- Maintain a public-facing registry of approved AI tools, including ethical assessments and usage guidelines.

4. Acceptable Use and Disclosure

4.1 Faculty and Staff

Must use AI tools and AI-generated content in alignment with institutional goals and ethical standards.

Must disclose AI tools and AI-generated content used in research, data analysis, and scholarly publications.

See the ASU Policy for AI usage by Faculty and Staff: https://www.asurams.edu/academic-affairs/ai-resources/index.php

4.2 Students

See the ASU Policy for AI usage by students: https://www.asurams.edu/academic-affairs/ai-resources/index.php

4.3 Allowable Tools for Student Assignments

The institution will define and regularly update a list of allowable AI tools for student assignments. Prohibited tools will be clearly communicated to students.

4.4 Monitoring and Validation

While using ASU-approved AI tools in the course of their work, faculty and staff should remain attentive to any noticeable discrepancies, errors, or unexpected outcomes.

If such issues are identified, faculty and staff are expected to report them promptly to the Office of Information Technology or the AI Committee so that a review of the tool can be initiated. This process ensures that AI tools remain accurate, reliable, and appropriate for continued academic use.

4.5 Documentation Standards

All academic outputs involving AI must include the following elements:

- Disclosure of AI used
- Description of AI-generated content
- Human oversight and validation procedures

5. Training and Awareness

5.1 Training Requirements

The university shall provide comprehensive and continuous training to faculty, staff, and students on the responsible and ethical use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in academic contexts. This training will ensure that all members of the academic community understand the risks, responsibilities, and regulatory requirements associated with AI tools.

5.1.1 Training Objectives

- Educate users on the ethical principles that govern the use of AI, including fairness, accountability, transparency, and human oversight.
- Raise awareness of potential risks such as bias, hallucinations, data misuse, and prompt injection vulnerabilities.
- Clarify institutional expectations for responsible AI use in teaching, learning, research, and scholarly communication.
- Ensure compliance with applicable laws and university policies.

5.1.2   Training Requirements

Audience: All faculty, staff, and students
Frequency: Mandatory upon onboarding and annually thereafter
Format: Online modules, in-person workshops, and department-specific sessions
Tracking: Completion will be monitored by the Office of Academic Affairs, with non-compliance addressed through departmental leadership

5.2 Policy Awareness and Communication

To foster a culture of transparency and accountability, the university will actively promote awareness of its AI in Academic Contexts Policy and related procedures.

Awareness Strategies:
- Publish the full policy and supporting materials on the university's Academic Affairs website.
- Distribute policy summaries and updates through campus-wide communications, including newsletters and faculty meetings.
- Incorporate policy highlights into course syllabi, student orientation programs, and faculty development sessions.
- Designate departmental AI Policy Coordinators to serve as local points of contact and policy ambassadors.

These efforts will ensure that all members of the university community are informed, empowered, and equipped to engage with AI tools responsibly and ethically.

6.   Legal and Regulatory Compliance

6.1 Compliance with Laws and Industry Standards

The university is committed to ensuring that all AI tools used in academic contexts operate in full compliance with applicable federal, state, and international laws, as well as recognized industry standards. This includes, but is not limited to:
- Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
- General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)
- Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) (where applicable)
- National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) AI Risk Management Framework
- Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (GLBA)

In the event that the institution determines protected data will be shared, all AI tools must be vetted to ensure they meet these legal and regulatory requirements before being approved for academic use.

6.2 Data Privacy and Protection

Reference BPM 12.6 https://www.usg.edu/business_procedures_manual/section12/C3013 and coordinate with the USG data privacy policies at https://www.usg.edu/policies/dataprivacy

To protect institutional and student data:

- AI tools must only collect, process, and store data that is necessary for their academic function.
- Data must be handled in accordance with the university's data governance policies and applicable privacy laws.
- Personally identifiable information (PII) must be anonymized or encrypted where possible.
- Vendors must provide clear documentation on how data is collected, stored, used, and protected.

6.3 Vendor and Tool Evaluation

Before adoption, all AI tools must undergo a compliance review that includes:
- A Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) for tools processing sensitive or large-scale personal data
- A Security and Privacy Review conducted by the Office of Information Security
- A Legal Review by the Office of Legal Affairs to ensure contractual and regulatory compliance
- Vendors must provide:
  - Documentation of compliance with relevant laws and standards
  - A data processing agreement (DPA) outlining responsibilities and safeguards
  - Assurance that data will not be used for unauthorized purposes, including training unrelated AI models

6.4 Responsible Personnel

The Office of Legal Affairs will monitor regulatory developments and update institutional policies accordingly.

The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness will maintain records of compliance and documentation for audit or investigation purposes.

Departmental AI Policy Coordinators will ensure local compliance and report concerns to the Office of Academic Affairs

The CIO will review or delegate for review to the appropriate personnel for data privacy compliance. The Office of CIO/CISO will assess the AI Vendor/tool through the risk assessment process.

7. Governance and Oversight

7.1 Points of Contact

Points of contact shall be identified at both the institutional and departmental levels.
Institutional Lead: Vice President for Academic Affairs
Departmental Contacts: Appointed AI Policy Coordinators in each department/school

7.2 Complaint Resolution

Complaints regarding the misuse of AI tools will be adjudicated in coordination with the Office of Academic Affairs.

8. Policy Review and Updates

8.1 Review Requirement

Given the rapid evolution of artificial intelligence technologies and the associated risks, the university recognizes the necessity of maintaining a current and responsive AI in Academic Contexts Policy. To ensure continued relevance, effectiveness, and compliance, this policy shall be reviewed on a regular basis.

8.2 Definition of "Periodically"

For the purposes of this policy, "periodically" is defined as:
- At a minimum, annually.
- Immediately upon the occurrence of any of the following:
    - Significant advancements or changes in AI technologies
    - Updates to federal, state, or international laws and regulations
    - Revisions to institutional strategy or academic priorities
    - New guidance or mandates issued by the Board of Regents (BOR)

8.3 Responsible Personnel

The following offices and individuals are responsible for conducting the policy review:

- Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs – Leads the review process and coordinates input from all relevant stakeholders.
- Office of Legal Affairs – Assesses legal and regulatory changes that may impact the policy.
- Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness – Provides data and analysis to support evidence-based updates.
- AI Policy Coordinators in each department or school – Submit feedback and recommendations based on departmental experiences and needs.
- Office of CIO/CISO - Assess technology use and risks
- Office of Human Resources - Provide feedback on use cases in personnel situations
- Data privacy personnel and any already established institutional data governance committees - Assess compliance with the use of tools and protection of confidential information

8.4 Review Process

A formal review will be initiated each spring semester.

A draft of proposed revisions will be circulated to academic leadership and governance bodies for feedback.

Final updates will be approved by the Faculty Senate and through the institution's policy approval procedure, and published prior to the start of the following academic year.

V. Exceptions

None unless otherwise officially directed.

VI. Applicability

ASU Faculty and Staff
ASU Students

VII. Accountability

Office of Academic Affairs
Office of Information Security
Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness
Office of Legal Affairs

VIII. Contacts

Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs

Last Update:

June 2025