

**KSU Institutional Artificial Intelligence Guidance Document
Related to the INSTITUTIONAL ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE
POLICY**

Kennesaw State University

May 18, 2026

.....	1
SECTION 1: Artificial Intelligence (AI) Enabled Tools.....	2
1.1 Glossary	3
Artificial Intelligence (AI).....	3
AI Systems	3
AI-Enabled Tools.....	3
Internal Stakeholders	3
Research Lead.....	3
1.2 Purpose	3
1.3 Scope	4
1.4 Review	4
AI-Enabled Tool Submission for Review	4
Approval may be conditional:.....	5
Ethical Use:.....	5
Exclusions:.....	5
Submission Requirements:.....	5
AI-Enabled Tool Use Case Inventory and Review.....	5
Review Cycle	6
Section 2: Ethical Principles and Guidelines	7
2.1 Fairness/Mitigation of Bias	7
2.2 Accountability for Hallucinations	7
2.3 Transparency	8
2.4 Human Oversight.....	8
2.5 Accessibility	8
2.6 Malicious Use / Prompt Injections	8
Section 3: Accountability and responsible use of AI-generated content	9
3.1 Institutional Commitment	9

3.2 Accountability for Use of AI-Enabled Tools and AI-Generated Content	9
3.3 Disclosure and Documentation in Research and Scholarship	9
3.4 Acceptable and Unacceptable Use	9
All stakeholders must abide by all laws, all USG policies, and KSU policies, including the Information Technology Acceptable Use Policy (linked in Addendum A). Further clarification on how this policy applies to AI includes:.....	10
3.5 Approved and Prohibited AI-Enabled Tools and Uses for Students	10
3.6 Monitoring and Validation.....	10
Section 4: Professional Development for faculty and staff, along with educational options for students	11
4.1 Compliance Training.....	11
4.2 Professional Development	11
4.3 Student Resources	12
Section 5: Privacy and Security of Student Information	12
5.1 Prohibited Use.....	12
Section 6: Human Oversight and Control of AI in Research Processes	13
6.1 Accountability and Responsible Use	13
6.2 Disclosure and Documentation Standards	13
6.3 Validation and Verification Procedures.....	14
6.4 Prohibited Practices and Ethical & Legal Considerations	14
6.5 Training and Support.....	15
Section 7: Responsible Use of AI in Scholarly Communications	15
7.1 Foundational Principles for Academic Discourse	15
7.2 AI in Research Articles and Publications	15
7.2.1 Disclosure Examples.....	16
7.3 Authenticity in Research Presentations	16
7.4 AI in Research Operations and Scholarly Workflows	17
7.5 Citation and Attribution Excellence	17
7.6 Federal Agency Disclosure Requirements.....	17
7.7 Publisher and Journal Standards.....	18

7.8 Peer Review Integrity 18

7.9 Policy Review and Governance for Emerging Technologies..... 18

8.0 Violations..... 18

ADDENDUM..... 20

- Associated Policies/Regulations 20
- Points of Contact 21

SECTION 1: Artificial Intelligence (AI) Enabled Tools

1.1 Glossary

The following terms are used throughout this document and are defined as follows:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to computational systems or algorithms capable of performing tasks that typically require human intelligence, such as understanding language, recognizing patterns, making decisions, or generating content. This includes, but is not limited to, machine learning models, natural language processing tools, generative AI systems, and predictive analytics tools.

AI Systems are any engineered or machine-based system that, for a given set of objectives, infers from the input it receives how to generate outputs — such as predictions, content, recommendations, or decisions — that can influence physical or virtual environments. AI Systems are designed to operate with varying levels of autonomy and may continue to learn or adapt after deployment.

AI-Enabled Tools refer to any software, platform, device, or cloud service — whether institutionally-licensed, open-source, embedded within another product, or publicly accessible on the web — whose core functionality relies on an AI System as defined above. This includes, but is not limited to:

- Generative models (e.g., large language models, image generators)
- Predictive/analytics models (e.g., early-alert or admissions-risk dashboards)
- Conversational agents or chatbots
- Intelligent tutoring / recommendation engines
- Embedded AI features inside mainstream products (e.g., “co-pilot” embedded in products, such as Office and Word; plagiarism detectors and writing assistants embedded in academic learning tools such as the Learning Management System; etc.)

Hallucinations refer to instances where an artificial intelligence system, such as a large language model or generative AI, produces outputs—text, images, or other content—that are factually incorrect, fabricated, or misleading while presenting them as accurate or truthful. These outputs may include false statements, fictitious data, non-existent references, or unsupported claims, even though the AI has no intentionality or awareness.

Internal Stakeholders means faculty, staff, students, researchers, contractors, volunteers, and non-paid affiliates. Each is responsible for their own ethical and appropriate use of AI.

Research Lead refers to the individual(s) responsible for directing a research project or team.

1.2 Purpose

Kennesaw State University is committed to advancing knowledge, fostering innovation, and supporting teaching and learning. We recognize that artificial intelligence (AI) presents new opportunities to enhance education, streamline workflows, and expand creative and scholarly work. These technologies can help us work smarter, teach, and learn more effectively. Additionally, AI tools are rapidly evolving and bring with them important considerations. These include potential risks to data privacy, security, academic integrity, and the quality and accuracy of information. There are also concerns about bias, misinformation, copyright, and the unintended sharing of confidential or sensitive data.

This document establishes a framework for the evaluation, responsible use, and governance of Artificial Intelligence (AI) enabled tools at Kennesaw State University (KSU or University). It aims to foster innovation and discovery while safeguarding institutional values, academic integrity, and regulatory compliance. This document also ensures AI-Enabled Tools are deployed transparently, ethically, and in alignment with institutional goals in teaching, learning, and research.

1.3 Scope

The scope of this document includes Internal Stakeholders using AI-Enabled Tools in institutional contexts, such as administrative, operational, instructional, learning, research, and service functions.

1.4 Review

AI-Enabled Tool Submission for Review

Requests to use AI-Enabled Tools that meet any of the following criteria must be submitted to the AI Governance Committee for review and approval before purchase or deployment:

1. They interact with institutional data (e.g., academic records, course materials, and administrative systems).
2. They interact with student data, including personally identifiable information (PII), educational records subject to FERPA, or student-generated content.
3. They interact with institutional proprietary knowledge.
4. They are used to generate course content/materials or make automated decisions that directly affect students without meaningful human review or oversight—for example, AI-driven grading, assessment scoring, automated generation of test questions administered to students, or academic advising decisions that are delivered without human evaluation.
5. They are used in research, particularly where human subjects, sensitive data, or automated analysis are involved.

Approval may be conditional: AI-Enabled Tools may be approved or denied for specific purposes or types and classifications of data, or otherwise subject to restrictions or limitations on use. They may not be used beyond the scope of approval.

Faculty and staff are not required to seek approval for use of AI tools that are already included in the institutional inventory if used in accordance with their approved scope.

Approval is only required when:

1. A tool meets the requirements for review and is not already in the inventory
2. A tool is used for a new or expanded purpose beyond its current approved scope

Ethical Use: All AI use must adhere to institutional policies, including those governing ethical conduct, data privacy, academic integrity, and acceptable technology use.

Exclusions: AI-Enabled Tools used solely for personal exploration, productivity, or experimentation, and that do not meet the criteria for review and approval set forth above, do not require formal review. The personal use of AI-Enabled Tools by students in coursework shall not alone constitute an “interaction” with “student data” or “student-generated content” for purposes of these criteria. However, students must comply with course-specific AI usage instructions, requirements, or limitations set by their instructors as communicated, e.g., in course syllabi.

Submission Requirements: Each tool must be separately approved. The following data must be provided for review:

- Tool name and version
- Vendor/developer (include URL & support contact)
- Stand-alone tool or integration into another platform or service
- Tool types (e.g., chatbot, generative LLM, predictive analytics, etc.)
- Description of institution data accessed or stored
- Description of student data accessed or stored (PII, FERPA, HIPAA, public, none)
- Primary use case/purpose and organizational benefit
- Sponsoring unit and point-of-contact

AI-Enabled Tool Use Case Inventory and Review

KSU’s AI Governance Committee is responsible for receiving and reviewing AI-Enabled Tool submissions, along with publishing an inventory of AI-Enabled Tools and their acceptable use in institutional contexts (Inventory). This inventory will be complementary to existing third-party supplier reviews conducted in alignment with the [USG Business Procedures Manual Section 3.4.4 “Supplier Contracts,”](#) [Section 12.6 “Data Privacy,”](#) and the [KSU Data Security Policy](#) which prohibits the sharing of sensitive, confidential, or protected data to uncontracted parties.

The AI Governance Committee is comprised of university stakeholders as follows:

- Academic Affairs (chair)
- Faculty
- Office of Legal Affairs
- Digital Learning Innovation
- Student Affairs
- Sustainability
- Data Governance
- Office of Internal Audit
- Data Privacy
- UITS Office of the CIO
- UITS Office of Cybersecurity
- Office of Research
- Office of Fiscal Services

The Inventory will provide a centralized, living record of AI-Enabled Tools used in institutional contexts and support responsible innovation through consistent oversight, evaluation, and policy compliance. All AI-Enabled Tools that meet requirements for review that will be used in institutional contexts must be approved and recorded in the Inventory before deployment or purchase.

In addition to the data elements collected on submission, these additional data elements will be recorded in the Inventory:

1. Underlying AI model provider.
2. Relationship with the institution (contracted, open source, in-house developed).
3. Date of first approval and next scheduled review.

The results of the AI Governance Committee review must be made available to Internal Stakeholders. The results must include which AI-Enabled Tools are approved or denied, and the scope(s) for which they are approved and/or denied.

Review Cycle

- AI-Enabled Tools in the Inventory will be reviewed annually, including vendor risk management revalidation and AI Governance Committee Review for use cases. Substantive changes to contracts, regulations, or underlying technology may trigger a reassessment of an approved AI-Enabled Tool within 90 days of the triggering event or at the time of contract renewal, in the case of contracted services. The sponsoring unit and designated point-of-contact must promptly notify the AI Governance Committee as soon as they become aware of a substantive change that could impact the approval status of an AI-Enabled Tool. Examples of substantive changes include, but are not limited to:

1. Major model updates.
2. Vendor acquisition or contract change.

Review may be necessary to respond to a new or changed state/federal regulation, institutional policy, strategy, or BOR/USG directive.

Section 2: Ethical Principles and Guidelines

KSU is committed to ensuring that AI-Enabled Tools used in the institutional context adhere to ethical principles such as fairness/mitigation of bias, accountability, freedom from hallucinations, transparency, human oversight, accessibility, and safeguards against prompt injections. Sections 2.1 through 2.3 will be addressed through standard contract language or equivalent terms provided by the contracted party.

The following guidelines must be adhered to by third-party vendors:

-All third-party vendors must provide documentation of ethical compliance during both the procurement and renewal processes. This includes:

Certification of adherence to ethical AI Principles

Documentation of bias testing and mitigation strategies

Transparency regarding data usage, storage, and retention practices

Evidence of compliance with applicable privacy laws and regulations

Internal Stakeholders must take necessary steps to ensure that agreements with AI-Enabled Tool suppliers contain provisions for addressing ethical considerations or seek alternative vendor/solutions. Suppliers, contractors, and providers of AI services should be appropriately vetted and provide, as necessary, a written philosophical and operational framework explaining the responsible use of AI for review and approval prior to the execution of any services that leverage AI.

The following guidelines must be adhered to by Internal Stakeholders:

2.1 Fairness/Mitigation of Bias

Internal Stakeholders must review and consider whether the data input into, and the output of, AI-Enabled Tools produce decisions that may result in a disparate impact to individuals based on their protected classifications under applicable law, such as race, ethnicity, national origin, age, sexual orientation, or disability status. Internal Stakeholders should not rely on any output that is indicative of a potential bias.

2.2 Accountability for Hallucinations

Internal Stakeholders are responsible for reviewing and verifying the accuracy of information generated by AI-Enabled Tools prior to relying on such information. AI-generated content may include hallucinations (misleading or inaccurate content or

content and materials from other authors and may be subject to one or more third-party copyrights.

2.3 Transparency

Internal Stakeholders who utilize AI-Enabled Tools to produce any written materials or other work products must disclose the scope of use of AI in accordance with instructor or supervisor instructions, legal or ethical obligations, or applicable scholarly norms. Even if not explicitly required, consideration is to be given to voluntary disclosure whenever practicable. For required disclosures and transparency in research activities, see Section 6.2, and in scholarly activities, see Section 7. These disclosure principles apply to instructional, research, and administrative or operational work products, with expectations calibrated to context, audience, and applicable legal, ethical, or supervisory requirements.

2.4 Human Oversight

As noted above in the Accountability for Hallucinations subsection, users are responsible for reviewing and verifying the accuracy of information generated by AI-Enabled Tools prior to relying on such information. Further, the University's Internal Audit Department will conduct routine audits as determined by the USG. Additional oversight, as noted in Section 1, includes the AI Governance Committee who will be responsible for receiving and reviewing AI-Enabled Tool submissions, along with publishing an inventory of AI-Enabled Tools and their acceptable use in institutional contexts.

2.5 Accessibility

It is important to ensure that basic accessibility principles and practices are applied when using generative AI Systems in the classroom. In cases where KSU students must use AI for an assignment, the AI-Enabled Tool must be accessible to assistive technologies as defined by applicable laws or regulations.

2.6 Malicious Use / Prompt Injections

Internal Stakeholders are prohibited from using AI-Enabled Tools to generate malicious content, such as malware, viruses, worms, and trojan horses that may have the ability to circumvent access control measures put in place by KSU, USG, or any other third-party entity, to prevent unauthorized access to their respective networks. Stakeholders may not implement prompt injections (the manipulation of input to influence or hijack the behavior of a language or system). Internal Stakeholders are also prohibited from using AI-Enabled Tools for generating non-technical malicious content and activities that are illegal, fraudulent, or violate any state or federal laws, or KSU or USG policies.

2.7 Compliance Reporting

A designated representative from the Office of Legal Affairs shall serve as a standing member of the AI Governance Committee. This representative will advise the Committee

on applicable legal, regulatory, and compliance considerations related to the use of AI and will report on emerging or identified legal and regulatory risks, obligations, or developments that may affect institutional AI activities.

KSU recognizes that an ethical, efficient, and effective work environment is essential to successfully accomplish the mission. As a result, the institution places a high priority on assuring each member of the university community has the opportunity and means to convey any matter that could comprise that environment. Ethical concerns can be reported via the KSU Compliance Ethics and Reporting Hotline. Responsible units across campus will maintain ethics and compliance records for audits and investigations.

Section 3: Accountability and responsible use of AI-generated content

3.1 Institutional Commitment

The University supports the thoughtful integration of AI technologies to enhance institutional activities. Use of AI must comply with the University's ethical standards, protect personal and institutional data, maintain academic rigor and intellectual honesty, and reflect principles of responsible use, including fairness, transparency, and accountability.

3.2 Accountability for Use of AI-Enabled Tools and AI-Generated Content

As noted in Section 2.2, Internal Stakeholders are responsible for reviewing and verifying the accuracy of information generated by AI-Enabled Tools prior to relying on such information. AI-generated content may be misleading, inaccurate, or contain content and materials from other authors, and may be subject to one or more third-party copyrights.

3.3 Disclosure and Documentation in Research and Scholarship

All Internal Stakeholders must disclose when AI-Enabled Tools are used in research, data analysis, or scholarly work as discussed in Section 6. Minimum documentation must include the name of the AI-Enabled Tool, the purpose and nature of its use, and an explanation within published research or reports. In research, Research Leads are responsible for ensuring that AI-Enabled Tool usage is consistent with federal, institutional, and funding agency guidelines. Records must be retained for audit or compliance purposes.

3.4 Acceptable and Unacceptable Use

All stakeholders must abide by all laws, all USG policies, and KSU [policies](#), including the Information Technology Acceptable Use Policy (linked in Addendum A). Further clarification on how this policy applies to AI includes:

Acceptable Use Includes:

- Enhancing instructional materials and presentations.
- Drafting communications or analyzing data with human review and oversight.
- Providing written disclosure to affected parties when AI is used in administrative, academic, or operational contexts to support human judgment or evaluation in ways that materially affect individuals.
- .
- Using University-approved AI-Enabled Tools for study support, idea generation, or peer learning when it does not conflict with other guidance or policies.
- Ensure AI tools comply with applicable laws, regulations, and industry standards.
- Ensure data used with AI tools is collected and processed in compliance with privacy laws (e.g., GDPR, CCPA).

Unacceptable Use Includes:

- Using AI-Enabled Tools without disclosure or citation in coursework, academic research, or administrative outputs.
- Using unauthorized AI-Enabled Tools.
- Using AI in ways that conflict with course-specific acceptable use guidelines.
- Unethical, misleading, or harmful use which violates the University's Student Codes of Conduct, institutional handbooks, or manuals.
- Users must not act on prompts that attempt to override safeguards or expose sensitive data.

3.5 Approved and Prohibited AI-Enabled Tools and Uses for Students

AI-Enabled Tools that promote plagiarism, knowingly or deliberately generate false citations, violate University policies, or bypass learning objectives are strictly prohibited.

All instructors must include in their syllabus a clear statement or class policy explaining how AI may and may not be used in the course. This should cover expectations for class activities, assignments, assessments, and attribution to promote transparency and prevent unintentional violations.

3.6 Monitoring and Validation

All users must validate the accuracy, completeness, and appropriateness of AI-generated outputs. Faculty and researchers must critically assess AI-assisted work before its use in academic or research settings. When AI-Enabled Tools are used in high-importance or sensitive contexts (e.g., decision-making, research dissemination, public communications), users must assess the potential for error, harm, or misrepresentation. Human review is required in all such cases.

KSU recognizes that validation of AI outputs represents a crucial intellectual responsibility that cannot be automated or delegated. This validation must be substantive and comprehensive, encompassing verification of all factual claims and evidence, critical assessment of reasoning and argumentation, confirmation of appropriate source attribution and citation, evaluation against disciplinary standards and conventions, and careful consideration of potential biases or distortions.

The validation process itself requires expertise—domain knowledge to recognize errors, methodological understanding to assess appropriateness, and ethical sensitivity to identify potential harms. Users must approach AI outputs with healthy skepticism, recognizing that plausibility does not equal accuracy, and that impressive form may mask substantive flaws. The ease of generating content must never diminish the rigor of quality control.

Periodic audits or content reviews will be conducted to ensure compliance with this document and to promote a culture of responsible innovation.

Section 4: Professional Development for faculty and staff, along with educational options for students

4.1 Compliance Training

The AI Governance Committee will promote the policy as part of Ethics Week. Policy changes will be promoted by the committee at the time of effectiveness through typical campus-wide announcement systems such as the *The Weekly Feed* newsletter.

Additionally, the committee maintains a brief training module for faculty and staff, which links to and explains the institutional AI policy. The training requires that faculty and staff acknowledge that they understand and will comply with the institutional AI policy. KSU requires all faculty and staff to review the training and renew the compliance statement annually.

The Digital Learning Innovations group will assemble faculty and staff training on the institutional AI policy, using materials and expertise provided by the AI Governance Committee.

4.2 Professional Development

KSU encourages and values the academic and support units that produce quality professional development resources for faculty and staff on AI ethics, responsible and effective use, and potential risks and benefits of AI. Documentation that a faculty or staff member has completed professional development can be included in performance reviews or professional portfolios.

The Digital Learning Innovations group will design, develop, and facilitate training to faculty about AI in the instructional context for pedagogy and classroom management.

4.3 Student Resources

The University maintains asynchronous training as a student web resource that educates students on allowed and prohibited AI resources as well as ethical and responsible uses and risks associated with AI. This resource emphasizes the [Academic Integrity Policy and Student Code of Conduct](#) and instructs students to always check course syllabi and/or consult with instructors before utilizing AI.

The Digital Learning Innovations group will assemble a student web resource using materials and expertise provided by Student Affairs.

Section 5: Privacy and Security of Student Information

KSU is committed to protecting the privacy and security of institutional data. All use of such data in AI systems must comply with applicable laws and regulations. KSU will ensure contracted AI-Enabled Tools meet institutional privacy, security, and data protection standards, and will issue guidance for the responsible use of uncontracted tools. Per USG and university policy, users must not input sensitive, confidential, or personally identifiable information of individuals into an AI tool, except when permitted by validated contract language and security controls, approved through the Vendor Risk Management process. Institutional data refers to information created, collected, maintained, transmitted, or recorded by or for the University in support of its operations.

5.1 Prohibited Use

Internal Stakeholders should always give preference to AI-Enabled Tools that are provided by the university and for which a contractual relationship is in place. When using uncontracted third-party tools, users are responsible for carefully reviewing and complying with each tool's data-sharing policies to avoid unintended exposure of confidential, sensitive, or protected information. Information submitted to many AI-Enabled Tools has the potential to become public and part of the AI-accessible knowledge base.

Uncontracted third-party tools must not be used to process, store, or analyze confidential or sensitive information.

Only publicly available data, data that has been deidentified, or data authorized by appropriate internal review for use by KSU's data governance process should be provided to the models.

Section 6: Human Oversight and Control of AI in Research Processes

This section establishes the principles and procedural requirements for human oversight, accountability, and responsible use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in all KSU-affiliated research activities, including data analysis and scholarly communications. It ensures that AI-generated content and results are subject to rigorous validation to uphold scholarly integrity, transparency, and trustworthiness.

This section applies to all Internal Stakeholders engaged in research activities at KSU that involve the use of AI-Enabled Tools at any stage, including but not limited to hypothesis generation, data collection, analysis, interpretation, writing, and dissemination of research findings. It applies to those utilizing AI-Enabled Tools as well as researchers striving to innovate AI tools and methodologies.

6.1 Accountability and Responsible Use

- Researchers retain full accountability for the use of AI in their research. AI-Enabled Tools are to be considered as assistive technologies, not substitutes for expert judgment.
- Users must ensure that AI-generated outputs are critically assessed, interpreted, and contextualized within the research framework by qualified humans. Blind acceptance of AI-generated results as factual or definitive is prohibited.
- Research Leads must provide clear guidance and oversight to ensure compliance with institutional AI policy by all team members.
- Researchers shall use adequate due diligence to ensure that any private, confidential, or otherwise controlled data or information is not compromised or consumed by AI in a reckless manner in violation of the requisite data security measures. Such data include institutional data, student information, or third-party data that is governed by a data use agreement or similar stipulations. (See Sections 3 & 5)
- Researchers shall comply with all USG and KSU guidance and policy directives regarding specific AI-Enabled Tools or products and shall not use AI to knowingly create malicious code or content. (See Section 3)
- This document does not supplant or replace any other oversight of research projects, such as that by the Institutional Review Board or the Data Governance Board. Research Leads need to ensure that projects still obtain the relevant approvals as required by University, local, state, or federal regulations.

• 6.2 Disclosure and Documentation Standards

- Any use of AI-Enabled Tools in research must be explicitly disclosed in all relevant research products and deliverables, including research proposals, methodology descriptions, data analysis reports, manuscripts, and publications.
- Disclosures must specify:
 - The name and version of the AI tool used
 - The purpose and scope of AI application (e.g., data cleaning, statistical analysis, language generation)
 - The nature and extent of human involvement in supervising, validating, or modifying AI-generated outputs
- Detailed usage logs must be maintained to enable reproducibility, transparency, and auditability of AI-assisted research processes, including input data, parameters and prompts, and the reasoning behind acceptance or rejection of AI outputs.
- Researchers must also disclose when AI is used to generate content or analyze data that may include sensitive, scraped, or proprietary information.

6.3 Validation and Verification Procedures

- Results and outputs generated by AI-Enabled Tools must undergo independent human validation by the research team to confirm accuracy, reliability, and appropriateness within the research context.
- Validation may include but is not limited to manual review, cross-verification with alternative methods or datasets, consultation with domain experts, or replication studies.
- Only results verified by research team members may be used as a basis for conclusions, scholarly communication, or publication.

6.4 Prohibited Practices and Ethical & Legal Considerations

- Researchers must not present AI-generated content or results as solely their original work without proper attribution and disclosure.
- Accepting AI outputs as fact without independent human scrutiny is strictly disallowed.
- Use of AI-Enabled Tools to fabricate, manipulate, or falsify research data or findings constitutes a violation of research ethics and KSU and Board of Regents policies (including the Scholarly Misconduct policy).
- Researchers will ensure that they do not use AI-Enabled Tools in violation of any other relevant entity's policies or regulations (e.g., NIH prohibition against use of AI-Enabled Tools in peer review).
- Reckless use of AI that leads to either deliberate or unintentional plagiarism, fabrication, or falsification will be subject to the [KSU Scholarly Misconduct Policy](#) as any such offenses would be without the involvement of AI.
- Understanding that technologies and governing regulations can change quickly, researchers shall keep themselves informed about any relevant policy or regulatory

changes that apply to AI use in their fields of study or within their respective professional associations and governing bodies.

6.5 Training and Support

- The University will provide ongoing training and resources to equip researchers with the knowledge and skills necessary for responsible AI use and human oversight.
- Guidance documents, case studies, and best practices will be made available to support compliance with the institutional AI policy.

Section 7: Responsible Use of AI in Scholarly Communications

7.1 Foundational Principles for Academic Discourse

Scholarly communication constitutes the vital circulatory system of academic knowledge, enabling the testing of ideas, the building of understanding, and the advancement of human knowledge. KSU approaches AI's role in scholarly communication with particular care, recognizing that these channels of academic exchange depend on trust, authenticity, and intellectual integrity. These principles ensure that AI enhances rather than undermines these essential qualities.

The fundamental principle guiding all AI use in scholarly communications is that technology must amplify human insight without obscuring human contribution. Every application (e.g., writing, presenting, or disseminating research) must maintain clear distinctions between human intellectual work and machine assistance. This clarity serves not bureaucratic purposes, but the essential academic need to understand and evaluate the source of ideas and insights.

7.2 AI in Research Articles and Publications

AI may be used to support technical tasks, such as:

- Formatting manuscripts
- Improving grammar or clarity
- Managing references
- Conducting literature searches
- Creating visualizations

A distinction exists between material and immaterial contributions from AI. Material changes requiring disclosure include AI-generated content that contributes substantive ideas, analysis, or interpretation; creates or revises text beyond surface-level corrections; generates data visualizations or artifacts; generates analytical outputs such as data products; or assist with literature synthesis or conceptual framing (see also 7.4). Immaterial

changes that do not require disclosure include (but are not limited to): spell-checking; grammar correction; formatting or style guide adjustments; punctuation correction; or word substitutions that do not alter meaning.

However, core academic contributions—such as conceptualizing research questions, interpreting data, and drawing conclusions—must remain under the full direction and responsibility of the author(s).

When AI-Enabled Tools are used in the creation of scholarly works, authors must:

- Disclose the tool’s name and version
- Describe the task(s) for which AI was used
- Explain how outputs were validated
- Note any limitations or risks introduced by AI use

AI must not be listed as an author on any scholarly work. Authorship implies human accountability, which AI systems cannot assume. Such transparency enables readers and reviewers to properly evaluate the work while maintaining the scholarly record's integrity. The University emphasizes that this transparency reflects intellectual honesty—a core academic value—rather than mere compliance with rules.

7.2.1 Disclosure Examples

Disclosure will vary by discipline, and norms may vary as time progresses. Here are some starting points that may be adapted to meet specific journal requirements of disciplinary conventions.

For research articles:

“Authors used [AI tool name] to [specific task such as improving language clarity]. All AI outputs were reviewed, validated, and revised when appropriate. The authors take full responsibility for that content.”

For conferences:

“Presentation visuals were enhanced using [AI tool name]. All research content and interpretations are the original work of the presenter.

Additional discipline-specific examples and extended guidance are available at:

<https://www.kennesaw.edu/research/ai-disclosure.php>

7.3 Authenticity in Research Presentations

Research presentations facilitate direct scholarly exchange through conferences, seminars, and symposia. These forums depend on authentic human engagement—the ability to think dynamically, respond to challenges, and explore ideas collaboratively.

Researchers may use AI to assist with the design of presentation materials (e.g., slide formatting or image generation). However, the intellectual content must be created and delivered by the presenter. All responses to questions and audience engagement must be based on personal expertise and direct knowledge of the research. If AI-Enabled Tools were used to support a presentation, presenters must acknowledge their use.

7.4 AI in Research Operations and Scholarly Workflows

The operational dimensions of research encompass numerous tasks where AI might provide efficiency gains while maintaining appropriate human oversight. AI may support administrative or logistical research tasks, such as:

- Reference and citation management
- Scheduling and project tracking
- Format compliance

Human oversight must remain central to decision-making. Tasks such as selecting collaborators, choosing publication venues, and setting research direction must not be delegated to AI systems. All team members should understand these distinctions and maintain capabilities to perform critical functions independently when necessary.

7.5 Citation and Attribution Excellence

Accurate attribution of ideas and evidence forms the foundation of scholarly integrity. When AI assists with citation management or literature synthesis, KSU researchers must ensure that every reference meets the highest standards of accuracy and relevance. This requires verifying that citations genuinely support claims, accurately represent source materials, reflect actual intellectual engagement, and maintain disciplinary comprehensiveness standards. AI-generated citation lists always require human curation to ensure they reflect genuine scholarship rather than pattern matching.

The University emphasizes categorically that AI systems cannot be listed as authors, as authorship implies both credit and responsibility. These capacities require human agency. While AI assistance must be transparently acknowledged, this differs fundamentally from authorship attribution. This distinction preserves authorship's meaning as signifying intellectual contribution and accountability.

7.6 Federal Agency Disclosure Requirements

The federal research landscape increasingly recognizes that AI use demands systematic transparency and accountability. KSU researchers must comply with evolving federal agency requirements related to AI use. For example:

- The National Science Foundation (NSF) requires disclosure of AI use in proposals.

- The National Institutes of Health (NIH) prohibits AI use in peer review.
- The Department of Defense (DoD) requires detailed documentation of AI-related data handling.

These federal requirements align with KSU's institutional commitment to research integrity. They reflect growing recognition that AI's power demands proportional accountability. Principal investigators at KSU bear responsibility for ensuring their teams understand and comply with all applicable standards, recognizing that institutional reputation depends on consistent adherence to these evolving requirements.

7.7 Publisher and Journal Standards

The global scholarly publishing community has responded to AI's emergence with clear standards reinforcing academic integrity principles. Researchers must adhere to publisher-specific policies regarding AI use. Most leading journals, including *Science*, *Nature*, and *JAMA*, require disclosure of AI involvement and prohibit listing AI systems as authors.

Authors should confirm and comply with submission guidelines prior to submitting work for publication.

7.8 Peer Review Integrity

Peer review represents a sacred trust—the mechanism through which the academic community ensures quality and advances knowledge. Peer review must be conducted by qualified human reviewers. AI may support administrative tasks (e.g., checking for plagiarism), but reviewers must not rely on AI for evaluating originality, methodology, or contribution.

Reviewers and editors must disclose any AI-Enabled Tool usage to journal staff. AI should not be used to write or generate substantive review content.

7.9 Policy Review and Governance for Emerging Technologies

KSU will regularly review this institutional AI policy to reflect changes in AI capabilities, regulatory standards, and scholarly practice. Updates will be informed by faculty feedback, national and international research policy, and developments in publishing and research ethics.

8.0 Violations

KSU reserves the right, at its sole discretion and without prior notice to a data user, to rescind a data user's access temporarily or permanently to university resources, including confidential and/or sensitive information, if it determines a breach of any provision of the

institutional AI policy has taken place. The data user understands and agrees that any unauthorized access or disclosure of confidential and/or sensitive information may subject the offender to disciplinary action by KSU, up to and including administrative or judicial review, termination, and/or legal action. AI tool usage complaints will follow existing investigative processes within Human Resources, Academic Affairs, and Student Conduct and Academic Integrity.

Violations of the institutional AI policy must be reported to the UITS Office of Cybersecurity at service@kennesaw.edu or (470) 578-6999.

ADDENDUM

- Associated Policies/Regulations

Data handling, across all technology tools, must meet integrity, security, and privacy requirements as codified by policies and procedures pertaining to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). Primary regulations, student data regulations, and expectations are outlined below, and links are provided.

- **Educational Records Protected Under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)**. This law protects the privacy of student education records at those institutions that receive funding from the US Department of Education.
- **EU General Data Protection Regulation Compliance Policy**. The European Union General Data Protection Regulation (EU GDPR) imposes obligations on entities that collect or process confidential personal data of individuals in the European Union.
- **GLBA (Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act)**. This law applies to how higher education institutions collect, store, and use student financial records.
- **HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act)**. This act governs the way certain health information is collected, maintained, used, and disclosed.
- **University System of Georgia (USG) Artificial Intelligence in Academic Contexts**. Directive for universities to develop and implement policies or procedures that govern the ethical, responsible, and secure use of artificial intelligence (AI) in academic contexts.
- **University System of Georgia (USG) Business Procedures Manual: Section 12**. Provides the data governance infrastructure and management practices that USG organizations must have in place to ensure data is secure, well documented, and accessible for use by authorized, trained personnel.
- **KSU Data Security Policy**. Defines data classifications (confidential, sensitive, and public). <https://campus.kennesaw.edu/policies-governance/institutional-policies/docs/policies/data-security-policy.pdf>
- Institutional Acceptable Use Policy: <https://campus.kennesaw.edu/policies-governance/institutional-policies/docs/policies/information-technology-acceptable-usage-policy.pdf>
- Student Codes of Conduct. The purpose of the Codes of Conduct is to provide students with notice and guidance of the rules of acceptable behavior and lessen the likelihood of disruption of campus life and academic misconduct so that an environment conducive to learning and individual growth can be maintained by the university. [Student Codes of Conduct Link](#)
- KSU's AI Policy and Guidance document are written to ensure institutional alignment with USG Academic and Student Affairs Handbook policy 02.06 and Board of Regents

Policy Manual 06.28: [USG Policy Stat Website](https://usg.policystat.com/policy/19843134/latest#autoid-y6dgdB) [USG Policy Stat Website](https://usg.policystat.com/policy/19843134/latest#autoid-y6dgdB) and <https://usg.policystat.com/policy/19843134/latest#autoid-y6dgdB>. AI Disclosure

The authors of this document performed internet discovery on AI policies related to academic research using OpenAI's o3 LLM (system card) and a news processing agent that enriched the metadata of raw news sources (from GDELT) to facilitate transformation into a knowledge graph. The authors reviewed the articles discovered to form a corpus of knowledge about the current standing of responsible AI frameworks. This corpus became the basis for an outline of first principles in this regard (i.e., human agency and authority is central to academic research and communications; human expertise and accountability are essential for the research endeavor; humans must commit to transparency around decision-making and be intentional about the incorporation of computational/cognitive tooling). These principles were then expanded according to a structured outline, and in the voice of scholar Virginia Dignum, Ph.D. to create prose in support of the drafting engine Claude 4 (system card). There were a few iterations to correct infelicities, and then the entire document was reviewed for precision, alignment, clarity, grammar, and accuracy by the authors. Finally, ChatGPT 4-o made suggestions to make section 7 more concise. This paragraph was authored without AI.

- **Points of Contact**

For general assistance regarding this policy and guidance document, contact Anissa Vega, Associate Vice Provost, avega4@kennesaw.edu

Students who have a grievance related to AI should pursue action by submitting a formal complaint as outlined in the Student Complaint Policy: [USG Policy Stat Website](#) [USG Policy Stat Website](#)

Employees who have a grievance related to AI should pursue action by submitting a formal complaint as outlined in the Employee Handbook:

<https://www.kennesaw.edu/radow/about/our-faculty-matters/docs/employee-handbook.pdf>

Offices across the university addressing complaints related to AI, both student and employee, may contact the AI Governance Committee for assistance through the Committee Chair.