

University Artificial Intelligence Policy & Guidance

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 holds the potential 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. Employers may also expect Loyola graduates to be fully conversant with generative AI and to know how to use it responsibly.

At the same time, it is important to acknowledge the challenges of and ethical concerns with AI that have been expressed by Loyola community members, including students and faculty, by global experts, and by Pope Leo XIV¹. Generative AI tools may convey information that is not accurate, and it may be difficult to ascertain immediately the accuracy of information generated by AI. The underlying training data may include copyrighted material, sometimes used without the consent of original creators, resulting in outputs that closely resemble copyrighted works. AI corporations may also use the data that users submit to AI tools beyond the immediate academic milieu, threatening the privacy of individuals whose information is shared with an AI platform, and the security of institutional data, both of which everyone in the university is legally and ethically obligated to protect.

¹ Pope Leo XIV, "Magnifica Humanitas: On Safeguarding the Human Person in a Time of Artificial Intelligence," Encyclical letter (May 15, 2026), <http://www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiv/en/encyclicals/documents/20260515-magnifica-humanitas.html>. See also, Pope Leo XIV, "Message of His Holiness Pope Leo XIV for the 60th World Day of Social Communications" (January 24, 2026), <http://www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiv/en/messages/communications/documents/20260124-messaggio-comunicazioni-sociali.html>.

While recognizing that AI technologies may have potential benefits (i.e., personalized learning support and increased workplace efficiency), AI technologies can affect the integrity of the learning process and academic achievement. Undiscerning use or excessive reliance on generative AI may contribute to cognitive offloading^{2,3,4}, reduced critical thinking skills^{3,4,5}, and potential impacts on faculty and student well-being².

Finally, the material infrastructure and labor practices associated with some AI providers may cause environmental and social harms in our local communities and across the globe, potentially activating our Jesuit apostolic preferences to walk with the excluded and to care for our common home. The data centers and computational infrastructure needed to operate most generative AI tools consume energy, water, and mineral resources at a massive scale and generate emissions that may contribute to global climate change⁶. This infrastructure may be located in close proximity to marginalized communities whose residents bear the most immediate health and environmental costs. In addition, the sometimes harmful labor of data labeling and content moderation required to protect end users from harmful or illegal AI-generated content may be outsourced to workers in the Global South, creating an unjust distribution of the benefits and burdens of AI technologies².

This policy is designed to equip faculty, staff, and students with the tools to engage in learning, scholarship/research/creative activities, and service given the ongoing development of AI technologies. We urge the Loyola community to be mindful of the effects, both positive and negative, of AI, at Loyola and beyond.

² Ni, W. & Li, J. (2026). [Mapping the impact of generative AI and in higher education](#). *Frontiers in Psychology*, 17.

³ Cong-Lem, N., & Thuy-Dung, N. T. (2026). [Towards a framework for understanding and assessing critical thinking in generative AI-enhanced learning environments: a scoping review](#). *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 41(2).

⁴ Si, S., Qi, Y., Xu, J., & Qi, X. (2026). [When thinking is outsourced: Cognitive offloading and the heterogeneity of critical thinking among Chinese university students using generative artificial intelligence](#). *Journal of Intelligence*, 14(7).

⁵ Roy, B. K., & Jony, M. S. (2026). [Generative AI and critical thinking in higher education: Students' narratives of cognitive offloading](#). *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education*, 15(3).

⁶ Aczel, M., Chamanara, S., Matin, M., et al., (2026). [Environmental Cost of AI's Energy Use: Carbon, Water and Land Footprints](#). United Nations University Institute for Water, Environment and Health (UNU-INWEH).

2. 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 on Generative AI and Agentic AI. Generative AI 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...). Agentic AI takes action on behalf of the user to achieve certain goals or to complete tasks.
2. This policy applies to all University faculty, staff, students and other University stakeholders when acting for, at, or on behalf of the University..

C. Policy Review

1. Every spring, the Provost's Office will task the committee 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. AI use outside of classwork may include activities such as student employment on campus (see policy for staff), student organization activities and leadership roles, and independent scholarly or creative activities.
- B. AI Use in Coursework:** The use of AI as a reference tool, for ideation, research assistance, translation and tutoring purposes is permitted only with faculty approval and provided it is clearly acknowledged and appropriate citations are included in any work submitted. Students must check their course syllabus and with the faculty member about the use of AI in specific courses and whether use is permitted
- 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, 2026"). 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 faculty 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 AI:** Access to AI may be impacted by the financial status of students. To the extent that coursework requires use of AI technologies, Loyola will ensure *reasonable and equitable access* through institutionally supported tools or alternatives, but does not guarantee access to commercial platforms. All students, faculty and staff have access to Microsoft's CoPilot AI tool via single sign-on as part of the University's Microsoft license and Google's Gemini tool as part of the University's Google Suite.

III. **Guidance for Faculty: Courses:** This section provides *guidance* rather than mandatory requirements unless explicitly stated.

- A. **Course Design and Instruction:** 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 is not) acceptable. As models for ethical practice, faculty should be transparent about their own use of AI to generate substantive course content. Reciprocity is the norm: exceptions may be needed in certain disciplines. Such disclosure may be a general statement in the course syllabus, on an assignment, or both.
 - 1. Faculty may not use AI to deliver or teach an entire course without meaningful and ongoing interaction and engagement. AI-produced content should be used as supplements, not replacements, for faculty expertise and instruction. Faculty remain responsible for course design, instructional delivery, and academic judgment.
- B. **Student Use Within Course:** Faculty have the discretion to define how, if, and when generative AI may be used in their courses based upon their learning outcomes. Faculty are encouraged 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. Faculty and staff never upload or share any student information covered under FERPA or HIPAA (where applicable). Should private information be provided by students in email it should be removed before using AI to reply.

- C. **Use of AI Detection Tools:** The AI detection tools presently available are imperfect, may produce false positives, and may be 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).
- D. **Faculty who Prohibit AI in Courses:** Faculty who prohibit AI in their courses are encouraged 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).
- E. **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. Faculty should change the tools listed, as needed.
 - 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 would be considered a violation of Loyola’s Academic Honor Code.”

IV. Policy for Staff (including faculty where appropriate):

- A. **Scope and Purpose:** Staff play a critical role in advancing mission and delivering , administrative, operational, and student facing functions of the University. Staff may use artificial intelligence tools to enhance efficiency, support communication, and assist with routine tasks, provided such use aligns with University values, legal obligations, privacy guidelines, and this policy. Staff use of AI must always adhere to supervisory expectations and institutional responsibilities.

B. Permissible Uses of AI for Staff:

1. Staff may use AI tools for appropriate professional purposes, including but not limited to:
 - a) Drafting or editing routine internal documents or communications
 - b) Summarizing publicly available information
 - c) Brainstorming ideas or workflows
 - d) Improving clarity, tone, or accessibility of non-confidential materials
2. All AI-generated content must be reviewed by the staff member for accuracy, appropriateness, and alignment with University standards prior to use or dissemination.
3. External/public disclosure is required when AI assistance is used for major public-facing institutional statements, webpages, reports, policy manuals, or compliance documentation; or for AI-generated images/audio/video used in marketing or public communications. No

disclosure is required for routine AI assistance such as the uses noted in part IV.B.1, unless the work is high-stakes or public-facing and required by leadership.

C. Content Generation and Communications

1. Staff may not represent AI-generated content as an official University position without appropriate review and approval, including for communications which convey legal, financial, academic, or disciplinary decisions affecting students, employees, or other external parties including but not limited to vendors, donors, and community partners.
2. AI tools should not substitute for professional judgment in decisions or communications involving students, employees, or external stakeholders.
3. When AI tools are used to assist with external communications, staff should ensure that messaging remains accurate, professional, and consistent with institutional voice and policy.

D. Data Privacy, Confidentiality, and Security

1. Staff must not enter restricted, confidential, or sensitive information into AI tools, including data protected by FERPA, HIPAA, employment records, or other private institutional data, unless explicitly approved by appropriate administrative authorities.
2. Staff should assume that data entered into AI systems may be retained or used by third-party vendors and should exercise caution accordingly.
3. When AI tools are used to assist with drafting responses to emails or documents containing sensitive information, such information must be removed prior to use.

E. Transparency and Supervisory Oversight

1. Staff are encouraged to consult with their supervisors regarding appropriate AI use within their roles and units. Supervisors may establish additional expectations or limitations based on functional responsibilities, regulatory requirements, or unit-specific risk considerations.
2. AI-generated content intended for external audiences or wide institutional use may require review by the Office of Marketing and Communications, and staff should consider engaging the Office of Marketing and Communications prior to developing such content using AI tools.

V. Responsible Handling and Storage of Data in AI Models for Research

- A. High risk data (see prohibited uses point VIII.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 Loyola's Information Technology team to align data handling protocols with overall cybersecurity measures. Ensure that data security is an integral part of Loyola's broader cybersecurity strategy.

VI. AI Use in Research, Scholarship and Publication

- A. **Faculty Use of AI for Research or Publication:** AI software is available that purports to assist in conducting peer reviews of research manuscripts, 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 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 who use AI in research should follow discipline-specific best practices for AI citation and acknowledgement.
- B. **Use of AI For Peer Review:** 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.

VII. 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 or to fill vacant positions 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.

VIII. 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](#) and the [University's Title IX and Sexual Misconduct Policy](#).
- 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 the database or management system is already vetted by and/or in use by the university for this purpose, or if given proper administrative approval 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) 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. Users should also be aware of the policies of the AI company regarding data security.
- 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.

IX. 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.

Edited and reviewed by AI Committee on: March 27, 2026

Endorsed by University Faculty Senate on: April 16, 2026

Endorsed by University Staff Senate on: May 1, 2026

Cabinet Approval: July 21, 2026

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

**Portions of this policy were drafted and/or reviewed by ChatGPT. This included sections VII and VIII.*