

# UNIVERSITY AI INTEGRATION REFERENCE DOCUMENT

Prepared for the Chancellor and Administrative Team

**Date:** September 2025

## INTRODUCTION

The rapid evolution of artificial intelligence (AI) is reshaping higher education, healthcare, and research. Recognizing the transformative potential and ethical responsibilities associated with AI, the University convened an AI Taskforce representing all seven health colleges. The Taskforce, structured into two subgroups, engaged stakeholders from across the university to develop a comprehensive framework for responsible and effective AI use and application. This unified document offers a cohesive reference for governance, curricular design, research policies, administrative operations, and infrastructure planning for all members of the University community. This document will be updated, as needed, by University Administration or its designee.

### 1. Guiding Principles of AI Use

#### Background:

It has become increasingly clear that the University must have a comprehensive AI adoption plan which both provides guidance on how AI can be utilized within the educational environment across all colleges and establishes an enduring ethical framework for AI, grounded in the four pillars of biomedical ethics (autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence, and justice), and supplemented with transparency, fairness, and human oversight. These principles ensure person-centered, mission-aligned use of AI in health sciences. The task force's goals for developing guiding documents centered around the following, mutually defined goals:

#### Mini-Summary of Recommendations:

- Adopt bioethical and AI-specific principles.

- Define scope across academic, clinical, operational, and research functions.
- Integrate compliance for legal and data privacy.
- Engage stakeholders.
- Establish regular review cycles.
- Affirm AI as a complement to, not a replacement for, human expertise.
- Resource needs: AI governance committee, ethics/legal advisors, training budgets, monitoring/auditing tools.

## **2. Curriculum and Pedagogy**

### Background:

AI is rapidly reshaping what it means to teach and learn in health professions education, necessitating a proactive approach to its integration in curriculum and instructional practice. This domain addresses the challenge of fostering AI literacy among students, preparing faculty to incorporate and manage AI responsibly in teaching, and updating assessment strategies to reflect an AI-enhanced learning environment. There is a critical need for clear institutional and course-level policies on acceptable and prohibited uses of AI, as well as updated academic integrity definitions that address authorship, plagiarism, and responsible collaboration. These changes aim to ensure that students not only acquire essential technical skills but also the capacity for ethical reasoning, critical thinking, and original thought amid a rapidly evolving digital landscape. Centralizing support and professional development for faculty is fundamental to balanced, equitable, and mission-aligned adoption of AI tools in education.

### Mini-Summary of Recommendations:

- Define acceptable and prohibited academic uses of AI at multiple levels.
- Update academic integrity policies.
- Encourage course-level AI use statements.
- Embed AI literacy and critical thinking within the curriculum.
- Support faculty through targeted professional development.

- Address algorithmic bias and equitable access.
- Redesign assessments to align with AI realities.
- Protect confidential data, ensuring FERPA and HIPAA compliance.
- Resource needs: Academic integrity officers, development funds, secure platforms, guideline templates.

### **3. Research and Scholarship**

#### **Background:**

The research environment within health sciences is being transformed by the emergence of advanced AI tools, creating new opportunities for scholarship, discovery, and interdisciplinary collaboration. This domain recognizes both the significant potential benefits and the complex ethical, legal, and compliance challenges that AI brings to research activities. Institutional priorities include maintaining academic integrity, protecting sensitive data, ensuring researcher literacy in responsible AI use, and safeguarding against bias and unreliable outputs in research. As researchers experiment with AI in literature review, data analysis, and manuscript preparation, the university must offer formal guidelines, support, and processes for tool evaluation and oversight, fostering a culture of transparency, innovation, and accountability. Proactive governance and clear authorship policies are paramount to ensure that AI enhances, rather than undermines or replaces, the quality and credibility of academic work. Students can and should retain full analytic authority and responsibility in their use of AI.

#### Mini-Summary of Recommendations:

- Develop clear guidelines for AI's use in research.
- Evaluate and approve AI tools for security and privacy protections through standardized processes.
- Provide ongoing professional development on AI ethics in research.
- Update institutional research policies for AI realities.
- Clarify authorship and intellectual property.
- Showcase positive use cases.

- Implement research AI governance.
- Resource needs: Research integrity officers, legal counsel, budget for tool evaluation, faculty development programs, and secure research platforms.

#### **4. Administrative Operations and Student Services**

Background:

The proliferation of AI-powered tools holds significant promise for improving the efficiency, responsiveness, and personalization of administrative operations and student services within the university. This domain explores the strategic use of AI—such as chatbots for 24/7 support, automated feedback, and digital onboarding—to elevate the student experience while supporting staff productivity. Implementation must be accompanied by robust ethical safeguards, clear data privacy protocols, and comprehensive training for both staff and students. Given the diverse needs of student affairs, registrars, and advising departments, the university must invest in centralized resources, change management support, and accessible platforms that ensure all users can engage with AI technologies safely and effectively. Proactive policy\* development and stakeholder engagement are essential to avoid reactive or fragmented adoption and to maximize the benefits across the institution.

Mini-Summary of Recommendations:

- Build a supportive AI training hub for students and staff.
- Provide robust training on ethical AI use in student services.
- Pilot AI chatbots for 24/7 student support.
- Develop “AI use warning” procedures.
- Resource needs: Centralized training, vendor vetting, readiness programming.

#### **5. Governance and Oversight**

Background:

Effective institutional governance and oversight are foundational to the responsible deployment of AI across all university domains. This section addresses the urgent need for unified leadership, standardized policies, and clear accountability structures. With enthusiasm for AI outpacing the development of consistent institutional policies, universities risk facing ambiguous definitions, compliance issues, and unequal adoption. Establishing a standing AI governance committee with diverse representation, combined with the formalization of policies regarding tool identification, permissible uses, procurement, and security, anchors the university's AI strategy in transparency and regulatory compliance. Robust governance mechanisms provide the backbone for ethical AI integration and ensure that all departments and colleges can navigate legal risks, data privacy concerns, and the evolving landscape of educational technology coherently and equitably.

#### Mini-Summary of Recommendations:

- Form a standing University AI Committee.
- Develop and adopt a university-wide AI policy\*, clarifying tool definitions, use cases, and procurement/security guidelines that are reviewed regularly to ensure they are aligned with current concepts and best practices in the AI domain.
- Communicate a strategic position that AI is a permanent, evolving fixture.
- Resource needs: Institutional backing, legal review resources, and change management planning.

## **6. Resource Allocation and Infrastructure**

### Background:

Sustainable and equitable AI integration depends not only on strong procedure and leadership but also on targeted resource allocation and technical infrastructure. This domain highlights the challenges of fragmented tool adoption, uneven funding, and technical disparity across departments—barriers that can undermine systemic AI benefits. Centralized investment strategies, infrastructure alignment, and transparent cost-benefit frameworks are vital for scaling AI adoption consistently and evaluating long-term return on investment. Institutional audits of current usage and spending, coupled with the establishment of innovation funds and cross-departmental collaboration, can help ensure all campuses and programs have access to necessary tools, support, and security

measures. Deliberate resource planning empowers the university to move beyond grassroots experimentation toward strategic, institution-wide impact.

Mini-Summary of Recommendations:

- Establish an AI Innovation Fund for pilots and acquisition.
- Develop a cost-benefit framework to evaluate AI investment.
- Align infrastructure planning across departments.
- Conduct regular audits of tools and spending.
- Resource needs: Dedicated AI budget, institutional support, IT, and data security involvement.

## SUMMARY

This consolidated document establishes a set of foundational policies\* and actionable recommendations to guide our university's AI strategies. Centering on bioethical principles, academic integrity, responsible research, robust governance, enhanced operational and student services, and equitable resource allocation, these strategies will empower responsible innovation, safeguard institutional values, and ensure alignment with the university's mission as AI technologies evolve. This document will be updated periodically as determined by the University administration.

It should be noted that there was ongoing discussion about the use of the word 'policy' throughout this document. The question left to be answered by the administration is whether 'policies' or 'guidelines' would be more appropriate as both carry different intent and consequences within the University lexicon. We have left the original wording of policy within the document with an asterisk (\*) next to usages that were still debated by the task force.

Prepared by the AI Taskforce Subgroups

- Subgroup 1-3: Erin Breitenbach, Rachel Geoghegan, Dean Maag, Kathleen Mathieson, Maud Mundava, Akshay Vij, Christina Weaver

- Subgroup 4-6: Jonny Brennan, Stephanie Elsea, Gregory Loeben, Dean Maag, Saroj Misra, Tammy Roehling, Michael Ryan, Quincy Conley

- Dates: May–July 2025