



## Artificial Intelligence Policy & Guidance

Finalized Draft by

The Artificial Intelligence Task Force on: February 19, 2024

Reviewed and Revised by

The University Faculty Handbook Revision Committee on: March 5, 2024

Endorsed by

The University Faculty Senate on: April 18, 2024

Approved by

The Provost's Council on: May 6, 2024

---

### I. Introduction and General Overview

#### A. Purpose

1. This policy is designed to promote ethical and educational use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies and foster learning and innovation while protecting against certain risks that AI poses to Loyola and its educational mission. Generative AI has the promise to revolutionize learning in the classroom, virtual or physical, and to facilitate research protocols and scholarship in ways that are not fully comprehended or anticipated. At the same time, generative AI systems are not perfect; they may convey information that is not accurate or that is protected by copyright. It may be difficult to ascertain immediately the accuracy of information generated by AI. Notwithstanding, employers may expect Loyola graduates to be fully conversant with generative AI and to know how to use it responsibly. In addition, AI technologies can impact the integrity of academic achievements, the privacy of individuals whose information is shared with an AI platform, and the security of institutional data, which everyone in the university is legally and ethically obligated to protect. This policy is designed to equip faculty, staff, and students with the tools to engage in learning, scholarship/research/creative activities, and service activities given the ongoing development of AI technologies. Ownership of AI-created material is governed by Loyola's Intellectual Property Rights policy and is not addressed here.

#### B. Applicability

1. This policy focuses mainly on Generative AI which refers to artificial intelligence capable of creating new content—whether text, images, or other data—based on patterns and structures learned from existing training data (such as but not limited to ChatGPT, Scribe, Bard, Dall-E, Synthesia, Copilot, Lexis-Nexis, Westlaw, etc...). Users should be provided

clear and transparent information when AI has been used to generate content.

2. This policy applies to all University faculty, staff, students and affiliates.

**C. Policy Review**

1. Every two years the Provost's Office will convene a task force to review and update Loyola's AI policies to stay up-to-date with technological advancements and evolving ethical standards.

**II. Policy for Students: Courses**

**A. AI Use Outside of Coursework** In accordance with Loyola's commitment to academic excellence and producing graduates who are ready for the workplace, Loyola recognizes that AI can be used in appropriate ways that facilitate innovation and creativity. When not explicitly used within a course (at which time AI policies fall under faculty discretion), students should consult with their supervisor, department chair, or associate dean about appropriate use.

**B. AI Use in Coursework** The use of AI as a reference tool, for ideation, research assistance, translation and tutoring purposes is permitted, at faculty discretion, provided it is clearly acknowledged and cited in any work submitted. Students are strongly encouraged to check their course syllabus and with their instructor about the use of AI in specific courses.

**C. Prohibited AI Use** In accordance with Loyola's commitment to academic integrity, students are strictly prohibited from using AI tools to engage in academically dishonest practices, including but not limited to submitting work generated by AI as their own without appropriate citation (for example, "ChatGPT, 2024"). Students who engage in unauthorized or prohibited use of generative AI are subject to the University's [academic honor code](#) (and/or their college's honor code, when applicable), including the section on potential violations of the code. By default, students will violate the [academic honor code](#) if they use AI without citation (as this constitutes plagiarism) or without instructor permission. Students will also violate academic integrity if they fail to verify that AI has provided correct and factual information, when applicable. Note, Law faculty and students should refer to their college's [academic policies](#) for further guidance.

**D. AI Use in Research or Scholarship** Students conducting research involving AI should collaborate with their faculty advisor or relevant supervisor to ensure that best practices involving AI in their particular field are followed and should document methodology, data sources, and algorithms. Researchers should also adhere to section IV of this AI policy. Students conducting human subjects research that involves AI should familiarize themselves with the policies of the [Institutional Review Board](#). Students should also take note of the data falsification sections of the above-referenced academic honor code.

- E. **Student Access to Generative AI** Access to generative AI may be impacted by the financial status of students. To the extent that coursework requires use of generative AI, Loyola will ensure that all students have equal access to the relevant AI products.

### III. **Guidance for Faculty: Courses**

- A. **Faculty Discretion and Responsibility** As with any pedagogical tool, faculty who elect to incorporate AI in their courses should ensure that any parameters for use are clearly stated in the course syllabus, announcements, and assignment instructions. Faculty should discuss academic integrity in their classroom expectations and should set clear expectations about what is (and isn't) acceptable. You have the discretion to define how, if, and when generative AI may be used in your courses based upon your learning outcomes. We encourage faculty to thoughtfully consider their stance on AI and to share their rationale with their students. Faculty and students should be aware that data entered into AI software may become part of the software's training and may be used later by that software without attribution. As a result, conversations about what data should be entered into AI software should take place early in the course. It's also important that you never upload or share any student information covered under FERPA.
- B. **Use of AI Detection Tools** The AI detection tools presently available are imperfect and may produce false positives, may be biased against non-native speakers, and are currently unable to keep up with rapidly changing AI. Establishing clear expectations, building relationships with students, and designing authentic assessments will likely be far more effective than policing students with AI detection. If AI detection tools are used and suggest a student's work is suspect, that should be the start of data gathering and not the end decision making tool. Data gathering could include: obvious mistakes in the written work, references that are made-up or are not actually relevant to the content, writing that is not responsive to the prompt, writing that is not in keeping with past writing from the student, etc... (these are all common issues with the use of generative AI tools). A conversation with the student should take place when additional evidence is presented. Faculty who find that a student has violated their course AI policy should follow all University bulletin procedures for [processing a violation](#) (or their own college procedures).
- C. **Faculty who Prohibit AI in Courses** Loyola also encourages faculty who prohibit AI in their courses to revise assignments that lend themselves to easily using AI generated content (for example, consider more application-based writing, writing that requires citation, or longer writing that goes beyond the parameters of many AI systems).
- D. **Faculty Guidance re AI In Syllabi** Faculty are strongly encouraged to include language in their syllabus regarding AI. The examples below provide guidance

regarding *sample language* which might be posted in a course syllabus and discussed with students on the first day of class and with the introduction of each new assignment.

1. Cited Use Language: Generative AI is a technology that automates part or all the writing/content creation process for users. Popular examples of such technologies include ChatGPT (OpenAI), Google Bard (Google), Claude (Anthropic), Wordtune (AI21 Labs), and a growing number of other tools. In this course, you may use generative AI technologies *provided* that you attribute text to the creator of the generative AI tool used (e.g., ChatGPT when directly quoting ChatGPT). This attribution should be used for both in-text citations and your reference list. If you have questions about how to use generative AI to complete your assignments effectively and responsibly, please schedule a meeting with me during office hours and I will be happy to address them.
2. Guided Use Language: Generative AI is a technology that automates part or all the writing/content creation process for users. Popular examples of such technologies include ChatGPT (OpenAI), Google Bard (Google), Claude (Anthropic), Wordtune (AI21 Labs), and a growing number of other tools. In this course, you may only use generative AI technologies as directed by me. In this course, we will use generative AI technologies in a guided manner to ensure that we are meeting the learning outcomes and pedagogy that structure this course.
3. Unauthorized Use Language: Generative AI is a technology that automates part or all the writing/content creation process for users. Popular examples of such technologies include ChatGPT (OpenAI), Google Bard (Google), Claude (Anthropic), Wordtune (AI21 Labs), and a growing number of other tools. In this course, you must refrain from using generative AI tools. I understand that generative AI technologies can help you compose assignments more efficiently, but in this course, we will not use generative AI technologies in order to ensure that we are meeting the learning outcomes and pedagogy that structure this course. Use of AI tools in this class is considered a violation of Loyola's Academic Honor Code.

#### IV. **Responsible Handling and Storage of Data in AI Models for Research**

- A. High risk data (see prohibited uses point VII.C) should not be entered into any AI tool.
- B. Human subjects research (HSR) should always be reviewed by the [Institutional Review Board](#). All IRB policies and procedures must be followed when data is collected from human participants. The use of data to train AI models may be considered HSR and should follow proper IRB procedures. Before using

de-identified data, individuals should confer with Loyola's IRB to ensure the data follows HSR guidelines.

- C. Collect and retain only the minimum amount of data necessary for the intended AI project. Avoid unnecessary data collection to minimize privacy risks.
- D. Implement robust encryption protocols for both data in transit and data at rest. This ensures that even if unauthorized access occurs, the data remains secure and unreadable.
- E. Collaborate closely with university or college IT security teams to align data handling protocols with overall cybersecurity measures. Ensure that data security is an integral part of the University's broader cybersecurity strategy.

**V. Generative AI Use in Research, Scholarship and Publication**

- A. **Faculty Peer Reviews and Research or Publication** AI software is available that purports to assist in conducting peer reviews, identifying problematic sections of scholarly or research articles, and identifying relevant missing research in scholarly works. Faculty are strongly encouraged to familiarize themselves with the generative AI products available. The AI tools presently available are imperfect and may produce false or incomplete results, may be biased against non-native scholars, and may be unable to keep up with rapidly changing AI. Faculty, faculty committees, and University units (colleges, schools, departments, etc.) should continue with traditional methods of peer review and use AI tools only as supplements that need to be independently verified. Use of generative AI for faculty evaluation or peer review purposes without independently verifying any results or conclusions is a violation of this policy.

**VI. Replacement of Employees with AI**

- A. Loyola University recognizes the increasing integration of AI technologies in various aspects of operations, including administrative tasks, research, and teaching. While AI can offer efficiency gains and innovative solutions, it is essential to approach its implementation ethically and responsibly. One area of consideration is the potential replacement of human workers with AI systems.
- B. **Ethical Considerations:** Any decision to replace workers with AI technologies will be guided by ethical principles, ensuring the fair treatment of all individuals affected by such transitions. The University will prioritize the well-being of its employees and strive to minimize any adverse impacts on their livelihoods.
- C. **Assessment and Justification:** Before considering the replacement of employees with AI systems, departments or units must conduct a comprehensive assessment. This assessment should include an analysis of the tasks involved, the potential impact on affected employees, and the expected benefits and risks of AI integration.
- D. **Transparency:** Employees will be informed about the rationale behind adopting AI technologies and the potential implications for their roles within the institution. Employees will be given opportunities to engage in discussions and

provide feedback throughout the decision-making process. Input from relevant stakeholders, including staff and faculty, will be sought to inform decision-making processes regarding the deployment of AI. Collaboration and dialogue will be encouraged to ensure that diverse perspectives are considered. Measures will be taken to ensure that the benefits of AI adoption are distributed equitably among employees and that no individual or group is disproportionately disadvantaged by the implementation of these technologies.

## **VII. Prohibited Uses for All University Community Members**

- A.** Using AI tools or services to intentionally generate content that constitutes discrimination, sexual harassment, stalking, or sexual exploitation is prohibited. See the [University Policy on Discrimination and Harassment](#).
- B.** The use of AI to create fake academic credentials, fraudulent research, or any other activities that may harm individuals or institutions is prohibited, unless such use is pursued as an educational experience under faculty direction and guidance.
- C.** Entering any restricted data into any generative AI tool or service is prohibited unless given proper administrative approval such as from the Provost or the Office of Government & Legal Affairs. This includes data protected by FERPA, HIPAA, other private client data, private information related to employees, material under confidential review and not written by the AI user (such as funding proposals, manuscripts, or funding proposals), and possibly intellectual property not publicly available (see the [University IPPR policy](#)). Users should be aware of the guidance and prohibitions instituted by their own programmatic governing and accreditation bodies.
- D.** The use of AI tools or services to generate content that helps others break federal, state or local laws; the use of AI to intentionally violate institutional policies, rules or guidelines; or licensing agreements or contracts is prohibited.

## **VIII. Reporting Inappropriate Uses of AI**

- A.** If you suspect that a faculty member has inappropriately used AI, please report this issue to the Vice Provost for Teaching, Research, and Learning. Research misuse should be directly reported to the research integrity officer (see relevant policies and contact information [here](#)). Student misuse should be handled according to the appropriate bulletin procedures or by contacting the relevant associate dean. Staff misuse should be reported to the immediate supervisor or to the Director of Human Resources.

## **IX. Members of the AI Task Force**

- A.** AI Task Force as of February 19, 2024:
  - 1. Erin Dupuis, Vice Provost for Teaching, Research, and Learning
  - 2. Omar EL Khatib, Faculty, Computer Science Department
  - 3. Dan Guo, Associate Director of the Center for Teaching, Research, and Learning

4. Adam Mills, Faculty, College of Business
5. Landyn Rookard, Faculty, College of Law
6. Alan Schomaker, Chief Information Officer
7. Tracey Watts, Faculty, English Department