

BUILDING A STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

APRIL 2026

Artificial Intelligence Task Force Report



KANSAS STATE
UNIVERSITY®

Building a Strategic Framework for Artificial Intelligence Task Force Report

Kansas State University

April 2026

Prepared by the
University Task Force on Responsible Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Submitted to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President

For Internal Use Only – Please Do Not Share Outside Kansas State University

Kansas State University, the nation's first operational land-grant institution, has been advancing the people of Kansas and the world since 1863. As a next-generation land-grant university, K-State delivers an exceptional, accessible student experience across three physical campuses and online. Rooted in purpose and growing for tomorrow, we drive teaching, research and service that strengthen communities, spark innovation with integrity and fuel shared economic prosperity.

Task Force Leadership and Membership

Co-Chairs

- Melanie Derby, Professor and Dr. Charles E. Wilson Chair in Engineering, Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering, Carl R. Ice College of Engineering
- James Wiser, Dean, K-State Libraries

Task Force Steering Committee

- Daniel Andresen, Professor and Department Head, Computer Science, Carl R. Ice College of Engineering
- Nita Awatramani, Assistant Vice President and Chief Information Security Officer, Division of Information Technology
- Christopher Brandt, Associate Vice President, Kansas State University Research Foundation
- Logan Britton, Associate Professor, Agricultural Economics, College of Agriculture
- Jason Coleman, Professor and Academic Services Librarian, K-State Libraries
- Prayas Gautam, K-State Graduate Student in Computer Science
- Keith Hohn, Associate Dean for Academic and Administrative Affairs, Carl R. Ice College of Engineering
- Bryce Huschka, Global Business and Product Manager, ExxonMobil
- Demmy Idowu, Sophomore in Computer Science and Technology Director, K-State Student Governing Association
- Kim LeCompte, Assistant Vice President for HR Talent Strategy and Engagement, Human Resources
- Margaret Mohr-Schroeder, Vice Provost, Academic Affairs and Innovation, Office of the Provost
- Bin Ning, Associate Provost and Chief Data Officer, Data, Assessment and Institutional Research, Office of the Provost
- Alysia Starkey, CEO and Dean, K-State Salina
- Nick Wallace, Associate Dean for Research and Associate Professor, College of Health and Human Sciences

Working Groups

AI for Instruction, Design and Education (A.I.D.E.)

- Logan Britton, College of Agriculture, Co-Lead
- Margaret Mohr-Schroeder, Academic Affairs and Innovation, Co-Lead
- Cydney Alexis, College of Arts and Sciences

- Alice Anderson, K-State Libraries
- Denver Brown, College of Health and Human Sciences
- Jason Coleman, K-State Libraries
- Tom Hallaq, College of Arts and Sciences
- Raelynne Hale, College of Arts and Sciences
- Bryce Huschka, ExxonMobil
- Demmy Idowu, Student Governing Association
- Bob Larson, College of Veterinary Medicine
- Camilla Roberts, Honor and Integrity System
- Brandon Savage, College of Business Administration
- Aleksan Shanoyan, College of Agriculture
- Jo Lynne Stalnaker, College of Business Administration
- Jorge Valenzuela, Carl R. Ice College of Engineering
- Bill Watts, Division of Academic Success and Student Affairs

Institutional Excellence

- Bin Ning, Office of Data, Assessment and Institutional Research, Co-Lead
- Kim LeCompte, Division of Human Resources, Co-Lead
- Nita Awatramani, Division of Information Technology
- Kirsten Conrad, K-State Extension
- Scott Finkeldei, Division of Information Technology
- Danielle Hall, K-State Libraries
- Ryan Leimkuehler, K-State Libraries
- Brandon Savage, College of Business Administration

Research and Intellectual Property

- Dan Andresen, Carl R. Ice College of Engineering, Lead
- Chris Brandt, KSU Research Foundation
- Lisa Duer, Office of Sponsored Programs
- Prayas Gautam, Graduate Student Council
- Sarah Nolting, KSU Research Foundation
- Michael Pritchard, K-State Salina
- Daniel Rolles, College of Arts and Sciences
- Ajay Sharda, Carl R. Ice College of Engineering
- Brian Spiesman, College of Agriculture
- Eugene Vasserman, Carl R. Ice College of Engineering

Curriculum

- Keith Hohn, Carl R. Ice College of Engineering, Co-Lead
- Alysia Starkey, K-State Salina, Co-Lead
- Balaji Balasubramaniam, K-State Salina
- Theresa Merrick, College of Arts and Sciences
- Safia Malallah, Carl R. Ice College of Engineering
- Kutay Guler, College of Architecture, Planning & Design
- Thomas Vontz, College of Education
- Ben Ward, College of Business Administration
- Anna Zemlyanova, College of Arts and Sciences

AI in Medicine and Healthcare

- Nicholas Wallace, College of Health and Human Sciences, Lead
- Michael Campbell, Lafene Health Center
- Amy Fitzgerald, College of Health and Human Sciences
- Shane Lyon, College of Veterinary Medicine
- Brad Rea, College of Veterinary Medicine
- Peter Stoepker, College of Health and Human Sciences

Across all five working groups, a set of shared values emerged as the foundation for every recommendation in this report.

Guiding Values

- **Humans remain accountable.** AI should augment, not replace, human judgment across teaching, research, clinical care, and administration.
- **Transparency is non-negotiable.** Disclosure of AI use — to students, in manuscripts, in grant reports, and in institutional processes — is a baseline requirement.
- **Governance must be sustainable.** New oversight structures should integrate into existing institutional processes wherever possible rather than create parallel bureaucracies.
- **Equity and access matter.** Policies must account for unequal access to AI tools and the potential for algorithmic bias to affect students, faculty, and staff differentially.
- **K-State's mission comes first.** Every recommendation should be evaluated against K-State's identity as a land-grant institution with a commitment to access, service to Kansas, and research excellence.

Key Recommendations by Working Group

Working Group 1: A.I.D.E. (AI for Instruction, Design and Education)

- Develop a K-State AI Literacy Framework, posted on ksu.edu/AI, defining key terms and concepts for safe and effective AI use.
- License and adopt Boodlebox as the campus-wide AI platform for instruction, with FERPA, HIPAA, and GDPR compliance.
- Require all syllabi to include an AI Use Expectations Statement; AI tool use by faculty is never required.
- Address suspected AI misuse through evidence, conversation, and due process — not assumptions or AI detector scores alone.
- Establish a centralized resource hub in the Teaching and Learning Center; use the [K-State AI Symposium](#) as the primary mechanism for collecting and sharing faculty use cases.
- Launch a tiered AI training and micro-credential ecosystem (Lean/Standard/Robust); strongly encourage participation by job profile rather than universally mandate it.
- Establish an AI Consultation Service, piloted through K-State Libraries and the Department of Computer Science, with pathways for both teaching and research questions.
- Restrict student-facing AI use to university-approved tools; require student consent when AI tools are used in advising interactions.

Working Group 2: Institutional Excellence and Governance

- Establish a University AI Stewardship Committee with a two-tier structure (steering committee plus operational subcommittees for cybersecurity, data governance, training, research, and administrative workflows).
- Maintain an approved tool registry with permissible use cases, data sensitivity levels, and retention requirements; establish a formal tool request and review process.
- Prohibit entry of protected data (FERPA, HIPAA, GDPR, personnel, and financial) into unapproved tools; require vendors to contractually prohibit training models on university data.

- Treat AI-generated and AI-assisted content as potential university records; apply data classification, retention schedules, and records-handling protocols accordingly.
- Maintain a central AI inventory of all institutional deployments; conduct periodic audits with standardized metrics and a close-the-loop issue resolution process.
- Prioritize AI adoption in high-volume, text-heavy administrative functions (e.g., student services, HR, IT help desk, enrollment, facilities); require structured cost-benefit-risk evaluation before scaling any tool.

Working Group 3: AI Curriculum

- Task the newly appointed AI Stewardship Committee, in collaboration with Faculty Senate, to develop a scalable approach to ensure AI literacy for all undergraduates; the mechanism and timeline are to be determined through shared governance.
- Support faculty AI development through established channels (e.g., Libraries, Teaching and Learning Center); adjust annual evaluation and tenure/promotion documents to recognize AI professional development.
- Appoint AI Fellows or college representatives to coordinate AI curricular integration across units and prevent duplication of new courses and programs.
- Develop graduate-level AI guidance addressing disclosure in theses and dissertations, AI use when serving as instructor of record, and research co-investigator roles.
- Develop a standard AI course template with learning objectives tied to K-State's AI literacy definition to ensure equitable student experience and enable university-wide assessment.

Working Group 4: Research and Intellectual Property

- Require disclosure of AI use in manuscripts, proposals, and reports, including tool names, versions, and dates of processing; AI cannot be listed as an author.
- Update Invention Disclosure Forms to include AI involvement; IP from AI-assisted work remains with the university provided sufficient human creative contribution is documented.
- Prohibit entry of Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI), unpublished research, proprietary methodologies, or confidential sponsor data into public

AI tools; provide enterprise or locally hosted AI models for sensitive research use.

- Establish a data classification framework for AI use (public / internal / restricted / regulated), complementing existing IRB processes and CITI training requirements.
- Build a compliance checklist for investigators covering funder rules, publisher requirements, export controls, and IRB obligations; establish a central advisory service for AI compliance questions.
- Integrate AI oversight into existing IRB, IACUC, export control, and data management review structures rather than creating parallel processes.

Working Group 5: AI in Healthcare

- Establish a standing AI in Healthcare Oversight Committee reporting directly to the Provost or cabinet-level designee, operating largely autonomously as the university's primary body of clinical AI expertise.
 - Committee membership should require experience and expertise in healthcare, but IT and legal experts should be available for consultation.
- Prohibit entry of protected health information (PHI) or identifiable student data into any AI tool not institutionally approved and contractually HIPAA/FERPA compliant.
- Require AI to function as assistive technology only; final clinical, research, and educational decisions must remain with qualified human professionals.
- Require validated clinical AI tools with documented testing, known limitations, and distinction between exploratory research use and clinical implementation.
- Develop onboarding AI modules for health-science faculty, students, and clinicians; require annual refresher training.

About This Report

Kansas State University convened the Responsible Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence Task Force to develop policy, guidance, and institutional infrastructure enabling K-State students, faculty, researchers, and staff to use AI tools responsibly, ethically, and effectively. The Task Force organized five working groups, each charged with a distinct domain: A.I.D.E. (academic integrity, syllabus policy, AI literacy, teaching tools, training, and student success advising); Institutional Excellence (governance structure, cybersecurity, operational AI adoption, audit, and platform selection); AI Curriculum (undergraduate requirements, faculty preparedness, graduate guidance, and the existing course and credential

landscape); Research and Intellectual Property (transparency and reproducibility, IP ownership, sensitive data protection, and funder compliance); and AI in Healthcare (clinical governance, privacy, validation, and health science education). Each working group's full report appears in Sections II through VI. An implementation timeline spanning May 2026 through Spring 2028 appears in Section VII. Supporting materials appear in the appendices.

Table of Contents

Building a Strategic Framework for Artificial Intelligence	1
Task Force Leadership and Membership	1
Guiding Values.....	4
Key Recommendations by Working Group.....	5
Working Group 1: A.I.D.E. (AI for Instruction, Design and Education).....	5
Working Group 2: Institutional Excellence and Governance	5
Working Group 3: AI Curriculum.....	6
Working Group 4: Research and Intellectual Property	6
Working Group 5: AI in Healthcare.....	7
About This Report.....	7
Table of Contents	8
Section II: Working Group 1 — A.I.D.E. (AI for Instruction, Design and Education)	9
1. AI Literacy Framework and Terminology	10
Defining AI Literacy	10
Recommended Terminology.....	11
Recommendations	12
2. Syllabus Requirements and Course-Level AI Policy	13
2.1 Proposed Policy: Syllabus Statement Requirement for AI Use Expectations...	13
2.2 Sample Syllabus Statement Language	16
2.3 Course AI Policy Template and Assignment-Level Statements.....	17
3. Academic Integrity — Recognizing and Responding to AI Misuse	18
3.1 Identifying Possible AI-Generated Work	18
3.2 Understanding and Using AI Detection Tools	19
3.3 Conducting the Student Conversation	19
3.4 Deciding How to Proceed	20
4. Teaching Tools, Resources, and Faculty Incentives	21
4.1 Recommendation of a General-Use Platform	21
4.2 Centralized Resource Hub and Knowledge-Sharing System.....	21
4.3 Recognition, Incentives, and Faculty Flexibility	22
4.4 Technology Wish List.....	23
5. Training, Certification, and Community Building.....	23
5.1 University-Wide Access to AI Training	23
5.2 Expansion of the K-State AI Symposium	24

5.3 AI-in-the-Field Event Grants (Discipline Ownership Model)	25
5.4 AI Consultation and Faculty Transformation Services.....	25
6. AI in Support of Student Success and Advising	26
6.1 Background and Context	26
6.2 Principles for AI Use in Student Success.....	27
6.3 Guidelines for Implementation.....	27
6.4 Best Practices for Student Success Professionals	28
Question 1: Governance Structure, Oversight, and Accountability.....	28
Question 2: Cybersecurity, Privacy, Data Governance, and Bias Safeguards.....	29
1. Cybersecurity Safeguards	29
2. Privacy Safeguards.....	30
3. Records and Data Governance Safeguards	30
4. Bias, Fairness, and Human Oversight Safeguards.....	31
5. Transparency and Accountability Safeguards	31
6. Legal and Branding Safeguards (with OGC input)	31
Implementation Essentials.....	31
Question 3: Operational AI Adoption — Areas, Evaluation, and Risk	32
1. Operational Areas Ripe for Responsible AI Adoption.....	32
2. Required Evaluation Framework for Cost, Benefit, and Risk	33
3. Governance, Contracts, and Vendor Review.....	33
4. Training and Change Management.....	33
Question 4: Monitoring and Audit of AI Deployments.....	33
Question 5: Site License — Platform Selection	34
Section IV: Working Group 3 — AI Curriculum	35
1. Establish an Undergraduate AI Degree Requirement.....	36
2. Faculty Preparedness and Curriculum Development.....	37
3. Guidance on AI for Master's and Doctoral Work	38
4. Existing and Proposed AI-Related Courses and Credentials	38
Section V: Working Group 4 — Research and Intellectual Property	38
Question 1: AI in Research Workflows — Transparency, Reproducibility, and Authorship	39
Question 2: AI-Generated Content and University Intellectual Property.....	40
Question 3: Protection of Sensitive Data	41
Question 4: Compliance with External Requirements	43
Section VI: Working Group 5 — AI in Healthcare.....	44

1. Establish a Standing AI in Healthcare Oversight Committee	45
2. Privacy, Security, and Regulatory Compliance	46
3. Ethical Standards and Human Oversight.....	46
4. Accountability and Liability	46
5. Validation Standards for Clinical and Research AI	46
6. Education and Training.....	47
7. Strategic Partnerships and External Alignment	47
Section VII: Implementation Timeline	47
Courses	51
Credit Credentials	54
Non-Credit Credentials	55
Instructional Platform Recommendation	56
Additional Tools Under Consideration.....	57
Academic Integrity and Syllabus Policy	57
AI Literacy and Training.....	58
Undergraduate Curriculum	58
Graduate Policy	58
Healthcare AI	58
Governance.....	59
Research and IP	59
Appendix E: Accreditation Reference — ABET Curriculum Criteria for AI/ML	59
Appendix F: Graduate Student Research Guidelines for Responsible GenAI Use	61
The Four Ground Rules for GenAI in K-State Research	61
The L0–L4 Scale for GenAI Use	62
Research-Stage GenAI Matrix (Default Guidelines).....	62
Minimum Documentation Standards for Reproducibility	63
Verified Benchmark Policies and Reference Links	63

Section II: Working Group 1 — A.I.D.E. (AI for Instruction, Design and Education)

Members: Cydney Alexis, Tom Hallaq, Jo Lynne Stalnaker (AI Literacy/Fluency Subgroup); Brandon Savage (lead), Camilla Roberts (co-lead), Margaret Mohr-Schroeder, Bill Watts (Student and Faculty Policy Subgroup); Logan Britton (lead), Aleksan Shanoyan, Bryce Huschka, Denver Brown, Jorge Valenzuela (Teaching Tools and Resources Subgroup); Alice Anderson and Jason Coleman (leads), Demmy Idowu, Raelynne Hale (Training and Certification Subgroup)

The A.I.D.E. Working Group was convened in December 2025. Over five meetings, four subgroups developed practical, actionable recommendations across six interconnected areas. All members of the Working Group are willing to serve as point people for the recommendations in their respective areas.

The Working Group's recommendations rest on a shared set of principles:

- AI integration at K-State should be transparent, equitable, and pedagogically grounded.
- Faculty should retain autonomy over how they engage with AI in their courses.
- Students should have clear, consistent expectations.
- Staff supporting student success should have the tools and guidance they need to act responsibly.
- The broader K-State community — students, faculty, staff, Extension agents, and regional partners — should be equipped with a foundational level of AI literacy that evolves as the technology does.

1. AI Literacy Framework and Terminology

Developed by the AI Literacy/Fluency Subgroup (Cydney Alexis, Tom Hallaq, Jo Lynne Stalnaker).

Defining AI Literacy

AI literacy refers to the knowledge, skills, and critical dispositions needed to understand, evaluate, and effectively use AI systems. It is the ability to comprehend, at a foundational level, what AI systems are, how they work, and how to evaluate

and use them thoughtfully across different contexts, with concerns such as privacy, copyright, and data protection in mind. It includes recognizing what AI's strengths and limitations are, how to effectively communicate with AI, and how to assess output.

There is an achievable baseline of shared core knowledge, and also a recognized need for intermediate and advanced learning that is more specialized and contextualized within each discipline. Many definitions of AI literacy emphasize both technical comprehension and critical awareness — recognizing how AI shapes and is shaped by social, ethical, and cultural contexts.

Recommended Terminology

A shared vocabulary is a prerequisite for coherent institution-wide AI policy. The subgroup recommends that K-State adopt standard definitions for the following categories of terms:

FOUNDATIONAL TERMS

Algorithm, GPT, bot, custom GPT, hallucination, machine learning, deep learning, iteration, neural network, natural language processing (NLP), large language model (LLM), generative AI, prompt engineering, training data, model, conversational AI.

HOW AI WORKS / AI SYSTEMS

AI agent, agentic AI, API, input/output, parameters, fine-tuning, reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF), tokens, inference.

CRITICAL AND ETHICAL CONCEPTS

Bias, hallucination, black box, explainability/interpretability, transparency, accountability, algorithmic bias, data privacy, consent, intellectual property.

EVALUATIVE CONCEPTS

Accuracy, reliability, validity, benchmark, evaluation, uncertainty.

SOCIAL AND CONTEXTUAL CONCEPTS

AI agency, human-in-the-loop, augmentation vs. automation, digital divide, AI governance, surveillance.

Recommendations

1.1 Develop a K-State AI Literacy Framework

K-State should develop its own AI literacy framework tailored to its unique educational, geographic, and student body context. While existing frameworks (such as the AILiteracy.org 1-page Framework, the Florida K-12 AI Literacy Framework, the DEC AI Literacy Framework, and the AAC&U Student Guide to Artificial Intelligence) provide useful models, K-State's framework should reflect local context and values.

The framework should define key terms and concepts critical to safe, mindful, effective, and intelligent use of AI tools in academic and professional environments. It should be posted on the ksu.edu/AI page and could serve as one component of a broader AI literacy module or course.

A team of twelve K-State faculty have already attended the inaugural AAC&U Institute on AI, Pedagogy, and the Curriculum, and a subgroup has begun conceptualizing and mapping a literacy module and landing page. Cydney Alexis and Theresa Merrick Cassidy have already developed a "Writing with AI" microcredential whose first module, "Fundamentals of AI Literacy," can be adapted for this purpose.

Potential contributors: Computer Science, College of Business, Libraries, Education, Honor & Integrity, Provost's Office, Teaching and Learning Center, Legal.

Recommended tool: The Task Force recommends the University adopt Boodlebox as its campus-wide AI platform. Boodlebox offers a suite of tools and LLMs/GPTs (visual and textual) relevant across disciplines and has received FERPA, HIPAA, and GDPR approvals as well as congressional clearance — making it well-suited to K-State's regulatory obligations across instruction, research, and administration. This recommendation is shared by the Teaching Tools and Resources Subgroup and is the Task Force's unified institutional recommendation. (See Section 4.)

Resources needed: Use of the ksu.edu/AI page; labor to consult resources and develop the framework; if embedded in Canvas, consultation with instructional designers.

1.2 Bridge AI in the Disciplines

While a campus-wide framework is essential, individual disciplines must also be engaged to identify how AI is being employed, regulated, and distributed within

their fields. AI literacy requires understanding tools and capabilities that extend beyond a single disciplinary context — making faculty and staff better equipped to use AI effectively, responsibly, and confidently.

Communities served: Faculty, staff, Extension, alumni, and regional workplaces. As AI literacy instruction is developed for K-State constituents, the subgroup recommends extending programming across all invested stakeholders, including extension agents and communities across Kansas.

Potential contributors: Student Access Center, all schools and colleges, Career Services, Libraries, Teaching and Learning Center, Extension.

Resources needed: Accessibility tools, generative AI platforms, and discipline-specific tools appropriate to each field.

1.3 Establish a Workplace Information Pipeline

Research consistently shows a gap between graduate AI knowledge and skills needed in the workplace, and many companies do not provide extensive AI training. Industry partners can help shape K-State's foundational AI literacy framework and communicate what specific skills graduates need. K-State students are already experiencing conflicts between university, course, and workplace AI policies at their jobs and internships.

K-State should also consult K-12 educational leaders to understand what AI literacy skills students are developing before matriculation.

Recommendation: K-State should reach out to local, regional, and statewide partners and businesses to assess what AI literacy skills graduates need to be successful in the workforce.

Potential contributors: Alumni Center, College of Business, Career Center, K-12 educational leaders, industry partners, local businesses and organizations, state offices.

Resources needed: Labor to perform outreach and assess results.

2. Syllabus Requirements and Course-Level AI Policy

Developed by the Student and Faculty Policy Subgroup (lead: Brandon Savage, co-lead: Camilla Roberts, contributors: Margaret Mohr-Schroeder, Bill Watts).

2.1 Proposed Policy: Syllabus Statement Requirement for AI Use Expectations

Policy Title: Syllabus Statement Requirement — Artificial Intelligence (AI) Use Expectations

Purpose

Kansas State University is committed to academic integrity, transparent learning expectations, and equitable student success. Because generative AI and related tools may affect coursework, feedback, and assessment, students must be informed — clearly and consistently — about expectations for AI use in each course.

Scope

This policy applies to all credit-bearing courses (undergraduate, graduate, and professional) offered by Kansas State University in all modalities (in-person, hybrid, online), including courses taught by tenure-track, tenured, non-tenure track, and graduate instructors of record.

Requirement

Each course syllabus must include an AI Use Expectations Statement that communicates either:

- The instructor's overall position on student AI use in the course; and/or
- How AI expectations will be communicated for each assignment or assessment when expectations differ by task.

This policy does not prescribe a single university-wide stance on AI use (e.g., "allowed" or "prohibited"). It requires clarity and consistency in how expectations are communicated to students.

Minimum Elements of the AI Use Expectations Statement

The syllabus statement must, at minimum, address the following:

A. APPLICABILITY

- Whether AI tools may be used in the course and in what general ways (if any), or that assignment-specific rules will be provided.

B. ASSIGNMENT-LEVEL COMMUNICATION

- A clear method for how students will learn the rule for each assignment (e.g., written instructions in Canvas, rubric language, assignment header, in-class directions).
- If expectations vary by assignment, the syllabus must state that assignment directions control and will specify what is permitted.

C. DOCUMENTATION AND ATTRIBUTION (WHEN AI USE IS ALLOWED)

- Whether students must disclose AI assistance, and how (e.g., brief statement, citation, appendix of prompts, or other instructor-defined method).
- Instructors may define disclosure expectations appropriate to the course and discipline.

D. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY ALIGNMENT

- A statement that students remain responsible for the accuracy, originality, and compliance of submitted work, and that misuse of AI may be handled under applicable university academic integrity processes and course policies.

Instructor Discretion

Instructors retain authority to set AI expectations appropriate to course learning outcomes, discipline norms, accreditation requirements, and assessment design. Expectations may range from prohibition to unrestricted use, provided they are clearly communicated as required above.

Accessibility and Equity Considerations

Instructors should consider equitable access, privacy, and accessibility when referencing AI tools. If an instructor recommends or requires use of a specific tool, the instructor should provide an alternative pathway for students who cannot access that tool due to cost, accessibility needs, or privacy concerns, unless a documented exception applies.

Implementation and Compliance

- **Effective Term:** This policy is proposed to take effect beginning Fall 2026 (or as designated by the Provost's Office).
- **Compliance Expectation:** Units may incorporate this requirement into routine syllabus review practices, as applicable.
- **Good Faith Standard:** The requirement is satisfied when the syllabus includes an AI Use Expectations Statement meeting the minimum elements above.

Support and Resources

The University will maintain a centralized resource page containing example syllabus language, assignment-level templates, and faculty guidance on AI and academic integrity. The Center for the Advancement of Digital Scholarship, the Teaching & Learning Center, and academic units may provide consultation and sample language.

2.2 Sample Syllabus Statement Language

The following sample statements are offered as ready-to-paste options representing a range of positions. Instructors may adapt any of these to their course context.

Minimum Compliance Example

AI Use Expectations: This course includes assignments with varying expectations for the use of AI tools (e.g., generative AI). For each assignment, the instructions will specify whether AI tools are permitted, limited, or not permitted, and whether disclosure is required. Unless an assignment explicitly allows AI assistance, students should assume AI use is not permitted. Students are responsible for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of all submitted work.

Restrictive Example

AI Use Expectations: In this course, the use of generative AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT and similar) is not permitted unless an assignment explicitly states otherwise. When AI use is permitted for a specific task, the assignment instructions will define what is allowed and what disclosure is required. Submitting AI-generated or AI-assisted work when it is not permitted, or failing to follow an assignment's disclosure rules, may be treated as a violation of course policies and applicable academic integrity

standards. Students remain responsible for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of all submitted work.

Balanced Example

AI Use Expectations: Expectations for AI use will vary by assignment in this course. Each assignment's written instructions (posted in Canvas and/or provided with the rubric) will specify whether AI tools are allowed, limited, or not allowed, and what documentation is required. If AI assistance is allowed, you must disclose how you used it (e.g., a brief note describing the tool and purpose, and any required prompt/output appendix if stated). Using AI in ways that conflict with assignment instructions may be handled under course policies and applicable academic integrity standards. You are responsible for the accuracy and integrity of your submitted work, including verifying any AI-assisted content.

Permissive Example

AI Use Expectations: Students may use AI tools in this course to support learning and productivity (e.g., brainstorming, outlining, editing, practice questions), unless an assignment explicitly restricts AI use. Each assignment will identify any limits and whether disclosure is required. When disclosure is required, include a brief statement describing the tool used and what it contributed. Students are responsible for ensuring that submitted work meets course requirements, reflects their own understanding, and is accurate and properly attributed where required.

2.3 Course AI Policy Template and Assignment-Level Statements

All major assignments should have an assignment-level AI policy clearly articulated either in the syllabus or in the Canvas assignment description. The subgroup recommends a one-page fill-in template where an instructor checks boxes for:

- Allowed tools (e.g., specific AI platforms approved for use)
- Allowed tasks: brainstorming, outlining, editing, coding, tutoring
- Prohibited tasks: final writing, calculations, citations
- Disclosure rules and citation expectations

For individual assignment instructions, instructors may use short paste-in statement snippets, such as: "AI may be used for brainstorming only; do not use it to generate the final response; include a 3–5 sentence disclosure..."

The subgroup also recommends K-State consider adopting the AI Assessment Scale (aiassessmentscale.com) as a shared reference framework for categorizing levels of permitted AI use across assignment types.

Peer Institution References: The subgroup identified existing AI syllabus statement repositories at University of Washington, NC State, University of Iowa, Stanford, and University of Texas. K-State may draw on these resources when building its centralized resource page.

3. Academic Integrity — Recognizing and Responding to AI Misuse

Developed by the Student and Faculty Policy Subgroup.

Core Principle: Suspected AI misuse should be addressed through evidence, conversation, and fairness — not assumptions. No single indicator or AI detector score proves misconduct. The goal is consistency, learning, and due process.

3.1 Identifying Possible AI-Generated Work

Identifying AI-generated content with certainty is difficult. Generative AI can mimic a wide range of writing styles, tones, and audiences, and with basic editing, AI-generated content can evade many detection tools. There is no simple or foolproof method for identifying AI-generated work.

When concerns arise, instructors should look for patterns or clusters of indicators rather than relying on any single sign. The following are common indicators that may warrant closer review:

- Inconsistent writing style: Noticeable differences in tone, vocabulary, or quality compared to the student's previous work.
- Overly polished or overly generic writing: Work that seems unusually refined or, conversely, lacks depth and specificity.
- Language that feels mismatched: Text that is unusually complex, excessively simplistic, formulaic, or emotionally flat; or language that relies on vague generalities rather than personal insight.
- Failure to address the prompt: Submissions that read smoothly but miss key assignment requirements or rely on filler content.
- Factual errors or fabricated content: Confident assertions that are incorrect, references to sources that do not exist, or "hallucinated" citations.

- Unexpected sources or concepts: References to materials not introduced in the course.
- Highly formulaic structure: Uniform paragraph lengths, repetitive transitions, heavy use of headings and lists, or predictable introduction–body–conclusion patterns.
- Unusual formatting: Sudden font changes, inconsistent spacing, or text that appears copied directly from an AI interface. Phrases such as "Sure! Here's an updated version..." are particularly strong indicators.
- High AI detection scores: Detection results may prompt closer review but should be treated as one data point among others — never as sole evidence of misconduct.

3.2 Understanding and Using AI Detection Tools

Several AI detection tools are available, including Copyleaks, Turnitin, GPTZero, Pangram, and others. These tools estimate the likelihood that text was AI-generated based on statistical patterns — they do not determine this with certainty. Both false positives and false negatives are possible, and accuracy decreases with shorter texts.

K-State does not currently employ a university-wide AI detector or similarity-checking system. AI detection tools should be used with extreme caution and never as the sole basis for an academic integrity allegation.

When reviewing a flagged submission, consider whether:

- The submission is under 400 words (too short for reliable detection).
- The assignment includes prompts followed by short responses, resulting in formulaic structure.
- The file uses a template or PDF format that affects text appearance.
- The document combines work from multiple authors.
- The student is an English language learner whose writing style is consistently structured.

If none of these factors are present, examine the text more closely and, if uncertainty remains, proceed to a student conversation.

3.3 Conducting the Student Conversation

When concerns persist, schedule a private meeting focused on understanding rather than accusation. Begin from a position of curiosity and transparency. Before

the meeting, gather the course syllabus, assignment instructions, any verbal guidance given, and the student's submission and prior work.

Sample conversation starters:

- "Can you walk me through how you completed this assignment?"
- "Some parts of this submission feel different from your earlier work. Can you help me understand that?"
- "There are sources here we haven't discussed in class. How did you find and use them?"
- "Let's review our course expectations around AI use."

Allow space for the student to speak. Open-ended questions and purposeful silence often encourage fuller explanations and reduce defensiveness. A third party (e.g., department head or administrator) may be included. Documenting the meeting is strongly recommended. A student's signature on a meeting record indicates acknowledgment, not admission of responsibility.

3.4 Deciding How to Proceed

Process Flow:

- Step 1: Concern arises. Instructor observes indicators. Gather materials and review the submission carefully.
- Step 2: Student conversation. Meet privately. Use open-ended questions. Document the meeting.
- Step 3: Assessment. Did the student demonstrate misunderstanding or minor misuse with no grade penalty? Address internally. Did the concern not hold up? Grade normally and clarify future expectations.
- Step 4: If any grade penalty or formal sanction is imposed — you must file a report with the K-State Honor & Integrity System.

Sanctions

Sanctions should reflect intent, truthfulness, severity, and context. Possible sanctions include:

- Warning
- Reduced or no credit for the assignment
- Required completion of the Development and Integrity course
- XF for the course (most severe faculty-assigned sanction)

Even when intent is unclear, a violation may still have occurred. Before assigning any grade penalty for academic dishonesty, instructors must submit an Honor Pledge Violation Report to protect student rights and ensure consistency.

Contact: K-State Honor & Integrity System — honor@ksu.edu — 785-532-6432

4. Teaching Tools, Resources, and Faculty Incentives

Developed by the Teaching Tools and Resources Subgroup (lead: Logan Britton, contributors: Aleksan Shanoyan, Bryce Huschka, Denver Brown, Jorge Valenzuela).

Core Principle: Rather than expanding the number of tools, this proposal emphasizes clarity and usability by identifying a common starting point for faculty while building a sustainable structure to support its use.

4.1 Recommendation of a General-Use Platform

The Task Force recommends the adoption of Boodlebox as K-State's campus-wide general-use AI platform, to serve as a shared foundation for faculty, staff, and students. This is the Task Force's unified institutional recommendation. Boodlebox supports a wide range of instructional needs across disciplines and has received FERPA, HIPAA, and GDPR approvals as well as congressional clearance, providing the compliance assurances that K-State's obligations across instruction, research, and administration require.

Rationale:

- Serves as a flexible tool adaptable across disciplines and course levels
- Reduces time spent identifying and comparing tools
- Creates consistency for students who encounter the tool in multiple courses
- Allows for more efficient training and support
- Provides a safe space for users and their data

The intent is not to limit innovation, but to provide a reliable baseline tool that can be used broadly, particularly for common instructional tasks. AI tool use by faculty is never required. Faculty who prefer other tools, or who choose not to use AI tools at all, are not required to use Boodlebox and should not be disadvantaged in any evaluation process for that choice.

4.2 Centralized Resource Hub and Knowledge-Sharing System

To support adoption and ongoing professional learning, the subgroup proposes a coordinated system that integrates a centralized resource hub with existing activities, particularly the K-State AI Symposium, to avoid duplicating processes or creating ongoing administrative burdens. The Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) is recommended as the home for this centralized resource hub, serving as the primary point of access for faculty seeking AI teaching support, examples, and guidance.

The hub should include:

- Practical, faculty-generated examples of how AI is used in courses
- Short guides or templates organized by instructional purpose (e.g., assignments, discussions, content development)
- Recordings or summaries from workshops and training sessions
- Materials derived from the K-State AI Symposium and related events

The K-State AI Symposium as the primary collection mechanism:

- Faculty presentations and demonstrations serve as the main source of new use cases
- Recognized or highlighted examples are documented and added to the hub
- The hub is updated periodically (e.g., annually or following the symposium), not continuously

Supplemental engagement:

- Occasional workshops to demonstrate specific applications or respond to emerging needs
- Small-group discussions to facilitate exchange across similar teaching contexts

4.3 Recognition, Incentives, and Faculty Flexibility

To encourage faculty to explore and share AI applications, the subgroup proposes a modest recognition structure tied to instructional use. AI tool use by faculty is never required. Faculty who choose not to use AI tools should not be disadvantaged in evaluation processes in any way. However, all instructors are expected to include an AI Use Expectations Statement in their syllabus, regardless of whether they

permit or prohibit AI use in their course — the statement itself is the requirement, not a particular posture toward AI.

Recognition structure:

- Annual recognition and awards to faculty who effectively integrate AI into their courses
- Distinctions by career stage to encourage broad participation
- Recognition of discipline-specific applications
- Clear guidance that instructional innovation may be included, where appropriate, in promotion and tenure materials

4.4 Technology Wish List

The subgroup identified the following specific tools as high-priority candidates for institutional licensing, beyond the recommended general platform:

- Undermind.ai (undermind.ai): AI-powered scholarly article discovery, especially for STEM fields. Estimated annual cost: \$20,000–\$40,000.
- Keenious (keenious.com): Discovery of scholarly articles and book chapters across all disciplines. Estimated annual cost: ~\$25,000.
- NotebookLM (notebooklm.google.com): Document analysis and learning support; useful for both faculty and students. Bundled with Google Workspace for Education (estimated several million/year).

5. Training, Certification, and Community Building

Developed by the Training and Certification Framework Subgroup (lead: Alice Anderson & Jason Coleman, contributors: Demmy Idowu, Raelynne Hale).

Each recommendation includes a Lean (pilot-level), Standard (sustainable), and Robust (flagship) implementation option. K-State can begin at any tier and expand over time. The tiers are additive: Standard includes everything in Lean, and Robust includes everything in Standard.

5.1 University-Wide Access to AI Training

This recommendation ensures baseline AI fluency for all members of the K-State community, with optional pathways for deeper specialization. It aligns directly with the AI Literacy Subgroup's call for a K-State AI Literacy Framework.

Lean: Develop a foundational AI literacy micro-credential: a series of short (15-minute) modules covering what generative AI is, how to use it effectively, and how to minimize risks. Revised annually. K-State recognizes that many significant demands are already made on faculty and staff time, and accordingly this micro-credential is strongly encouraged rather than mandated. Departments are encouraged to define an expected level of AI literacy appropriate to job profile and function — for example, identifying a standard literacy baseline that aligns with how AI tools are likely to be used in a given role. Completion should be recognized and supported but not enforced as a compliance requirement. Estimated annual cost: \$5,000 in stipends for a research/update team.

Standard: In addition to Lean — make all K-State AI-related micro-credentials free for all K-State students, staff, and faculty. Create a broader micro-credential ecosystem focused on specific audiences and use cases. Estimated annual cost: \$75,000–\$200,000 for faculty development and delivery.

Robust: In addition to Lean and Standard — set aside a fund (estimated \$100,000/year) for faculty and staff to complete courses through Coursera's AI catalog, supporting approximately 2,000 course completions per year.

Peer institution examples: Georgetown, Indiana University (GenAI 101), San Jose State University, San Diego State University, University of Michigan, University of Nebraska-Omaha; Maine's Public Universities, University of Texas System, Louisiana Public Universities (micro-credential incentive programs).

5.2 Expansion of the K-State AI Symposium

The AI Symposium serves as K-State's primary community-building event for AI literacy and innovation. Expanding the Symposium increases its impact across both goals.

Lean: Add discipline-based AI tracks to the existing Symposium. Each college sends a designated reviewer to help evaluate proposals for discipline-specific sessions. Small funding for track coordinators.

Standard: In addition to Lean — add hands-on workshops on applying AI in specific disciplines. Create regional partnerships with peer universities (KU, UNL, OSU, etc.) to share AI applications in higher ed. Fund 25 tool subscriptions per workshop.

Robust: In addition to Lean and Standard — invite national and/or international experts to provide keynotes, workshops, and full tracks. K-State dedicates annual funds and begins charging registration fees for external participants to offset costs.

5.3 AI-in-the-Field Event Grants (Discipline Ownership Model)

This recommendation moves AI engagement directly into colleges and departments, meeting faculty and students within their disciplinary context.

Lean: Colleges apply for small competitive grants to host: one speaker (regional, virtual, or internal), one structured student forum or panel, and one applied faculty roundtable. Required outputs: 1 public-facing event, 1 student engagement session, 1 short discipline-specific implications report, and documentation for the university AI resource website.

Standard: In addition to Lean — competitive mini-grants for additional discipline-specific sessions using a shared playbook, led by a mix of external and internal experts. Must include at least one employer or community partner and demonstrate clear workforce alignment.

Robust: In addition to Lean and Standard — fund each academic college to host an annual AI-in-the-discipline anchor program featuring nationally recognized speakers, a faculty panel, student forum, and hands-on clinics. Strong reporting built in. 2-year renewable model.

Dependencies: Central Provost Fund and shared implementation playbook; Career Center leverage for industry partnerships and job market trend data; Landon Lecture Series coordination for speaker logistics; Communications & Marketing support.

5.4 AI Consultation and Faculty Transformation Services

This recommendation provides ongoing, just-in-time support for teaching, research, and operational AI integration.

Lean: Establish a centralized AI Consultation Service with two branches: general AI literacy questions (prompting, tool selection, responsible use, risk mitigation) and technical research application questions (model fine-tuning, LLM selection for research). Delivered via scheduled consultations, drop-in virtual office hours, online request portal, and curated knowledge base. Pilot involving K-State Libraries faculty/staff and Computer Science faculty/graduate students.

Standard: In addition to Lean — add AI Teaching Fellows to the consultation service. Fellows are current teaching faculty who have demonstrated effective AI integration. They serve limited terms (1–2 years), provide peer consultations, host discipline-based workshops, share exemplar assignments, and mentor colleagues in course redesign. 6–12 fellows annually; stipend or course buy-out; 0.25–0.5 FTE coordination support.

Robust: In addition to Lean and Standard — fund the Teaching and Learning Center to develop a 5–7 day AI Summer Institute for faculty and graduate instructors to redesign one course or research workflow, integrate AI responsibly, revise assessment strategies, and build applied learning components. Cohort of 20–30 participants per year, with stipends and departmental chair endorsement required.

Dependencies for all consultation services: Clear AI policy framework; tool access and licensing decisions; defined AI literacy competencies (from Section 1); central funding commitment and service governance structure.

6. AI in Support of Student Success and Advising

Developed by the Student Success Subgroup (contributor: Bill Watts).

Core Principle: AI should be used to augment, not replace, human interaction. It should increase efficiency for administrative and transactional tasks while prioritizing student privacy and data security. Ethical use, bias awareness, and transparency are essential throughout.

6.1 Background and Context

Data stewards and student success professionals have expressed uncertainty about when and how AI tools can responsibly be used with student data. IT Security concerns related to data entered in AI tools have added caution. Clear guidelines are needed to enable staff to leverage AI effectively while protecting student privacy and complying with FERPA and other applicable regulations.

6.2 Principles for AI Use in Student Success

- Obtaining student consent before using AI tools in student-facing interactions
- Maintaining human oversight of all AI-generated content
- Providing non-AI alternatives for students who prefer or require them
- Adhering to FERPA and any other applicable regulations

6.3 Guidelines for Implementation

Human in the Loop

AI should support rather than replace human judgment. Success professionals must review, edit, and take responsibility for AI-generated content such as meeting summaries, degree plans, or recommendations.

Data Privacy and Security

AI tools must comply with FERPA and any other relevant regulations (e.g., GDPR) in protecting student data. Users should never feed personally identifiable information (PII) of students into public, non-University-approved AI tools.

Consent and Transparency

Students should be informed when AI tools (e.g., meeting transcribers) are in use and should have the option to opt out.

Bias Mitigation

K-State must prioritize bias mitigation in AI vendor selection and monitor AI algorithms to ensure fair and equitable student outcomes.

Efficiency and Personalization

AI should be used for administrative tasks such as — but not limited to — summarizing meeting notes, tracking academic progress, identifying risk factors, building draft graduation and registration plans, and summarizing individual student case files. This frees success professionals for high-impact, high-touch interactions with students.

6.4 Best Practices for Student Success Professionals

- Use only University-approved tools: Open/public or individually purchased AI should not be used for student-facing support initiatives.
- Verify information: AI-generated degree or graduation plans should always be reviewed with students and run against degree audit tools to ensure accuracy.
- Use as augmentation: Leverage AI to summarize student case files, draft briefs and reports, and enable productivity that enhances 1:1 conversations with students.

Staff using AI tools in student success roles should receive targeted training on FERPA compliance, approved tool selection, and responsible use. This training should be coordinated with the AI literacy and consultation services described in Sections 1 and 5.

Section III: Working Group 2 — Institutional Excellence and Governance

Submitted by the AI and Institutional Excellence Work Group

Question 1: Governance Structure, Oversight, and Accountability

Establish a University AI Stewardship Committee composed of members of the current AI Strategy Group and representatives from key institutional units, including Information Technology, Human Resources, Libraries, the Office of General Counsel, Records Management, Data Analytics, Institutional Research, the Office of the Vice President for Research, the Provost's Office, and the Division of Communications and Marketing. Membership may be adjusted as needed. Appoint a chair to convene the appropriate committee members and lead the evaluation of AI tools requested by university employees.

The committee's scope should include:

1. Implementing a two-tier governance structure consisting of a steering committee responsible for oversight and several operational subcommittees dedicated to cybersecurity, data governance, training, research applications, and administrative workflows. This steering committee would be separate from the Medicine/Healthcare oversight committee.
2. Developing standardized procedures for reviewing AI tool requests, evaluating pilot programs, and approving or denying institutional use, including mechanisms for transparency and community notification.
3. Creating an institutional AI stewardship policy defining accountability, terminology, threat-management expectations, and requirements for pilot projects involving sensitive or institutional data. This policy should also have a decision flow chart.

Examples of what to include in a policy for using AI:

- Nondisclosure agreements (NDAs)
- Data storage and access requirements, including whether data must remain within K-State cloud environments
- Removal of personally identifiable information (PII) prior to using AI tools
- Data-destruction procedures following completion of an AI-assisted research project

Question 2: Cybersecurity, Privacy, Data Governance, and Bias Safeguards

1. Cybersecurity Safeguards

- **Approved Tools Only:** Restrict AI use to university-approved, secure AI tools; and prohibit public or unvetted tools that pose risks related to malware or data-exfiltration.
- **Security Controls:** Enforce encryption in transit/at rest, strong authentication and role-based access, network segmentation, and logging/monitoring aligned with existing IT standards.
- **Procurement & Vendor Risk:** Require vendors to disclose AI capabilities, data flows, model training practices, and security certifications before purchase/renewal; include security addenda and audit rights.

- **Change Management:** Update purchasing and IT review processes to continuously assess AI risk; define approved use cases and usage scope for each tool.
- **Training:** Implement annual training covering the secure use of AI tools, phishing/social engineering risks, prompt hygiene, and incident reporting. Departments should designate this training as a strong expectation for roles with significant AI tool exposure, with the understanding that different job profiles carry different levels of AI literacy need.

2. Privacy Safeguards

- **Sensitive Data Controls:** Prohibit entry of protected data (FERPA, HIPAA, GDPR, personnel, financial, etc.) into unapproved tools; apply least-data, least-privilege principles.
- **Legal Compliance:** Ensure all AI use aligns with FERPA, HIPAA, GDPR, and Kansas Open Records Act (KORA), plus relevant university policies.
- **Contractual Protections:** Require explicit data-protection clauses; prohibit vendors from training models on university data unless expressly approved and protected with safeguards.
- **Discoverability Awareness:** Treat prompts, drafts, outputs, and conversations as potentially discoverable and subject to legal processes. Train staff to follow appropriate records-handling protocols.

3. Records and Data Governance Safeguards

- **Governance Review:** Require data governance committee review/approval before institutional data is used in AI systems.
- **Record Status:** Treat AI-generated and AI-assisted content as potential university records regardless of medium (chat, docs, email, platform).
- **Classification & Retention:** Apply university data-classification standards and retention schedules to all AI inputs, outputs, and logs.
- **Lifecycle Protocols:** Establish procedures for the storage, transition, and destruction of AI projects using institutional materials (e.g., datasets and research).
- **Ownership & Location:** Clearly define ownership of data/records ingested by AI; require system visibility to ensure the university knows where records reside.

- **Export & Discovery:** Ensure the feasibility of exporting prompts, outputs, and logs from vendor platforms; maintain the ability to retrieve records to fulfill KORA requests.
- **Archival Content:** Require disclosure and review when AI tools interact with university-owned archival or historical records.

4. Bias, Fairness, and Human Oversight Safeguards

- **Human-in-the-Loop:** Require human review before using AI outputs in decisions; AI must not be the final decision-maker for high-impact outcomes.
- **Quality & Legality Checks:** Evaluate outputs for accuracy, legality, appropriateness, and potential bias; prohibit discriminatory or defamatory content.
- **Impact Assessments:** Conduct bias testing, monitor error rates, and perform model-change impact reviews for decision-support systems; document all mitigation steps.
- **Academic/Research Requirements:** Align AI use with accreditation standards and federal research compliance and reporting requirements.

5. Transparency and Accountability Safeguards

- **Use Disclosure:** Require disclosure when AI is used to create or assist with documents, videos, marketing or promotional materials, summaries, or decision-support analyses.
- **User Accountability:** Hold employees responsible for misuse (e.g., using unapproved tools, accepting click-through terms without authorization).
- **Vendor Accountability:** Require vendors and contractors to document their AI use and obtain pre-approval when handling university data.

6. Legal and Branding Safeguards (with OGC input)

- **IP Compliance:** Address copyright, trademark, and licensing in AI workflows; prohibit uploading copyrighted and trademarked content into unapproved tools.
- **Brand Use:** Establish best practices for image metadata and protection of K-State marks (e.g., Powercat, wordmarks); consider peer benchmarks and adoptable standards.

- Policy Integration: Coordinate with the Office of General Counsel to align AI usage with existing legal risk frameworks and discovery obligations.

Implementation Essentials

- Annual AI Training for all employees, strongly encouraged with role-specific modules for data stewards, procurement, IT security, research, and marketing. Departments are encouraged to set literacy expectations appropriate to job profiles.
- Approved Tool Registry outlining permissible use cases, data sensitivity levels, and retention requirements.
- Standard Contract Clauses covering data use, training restrictions, audit rights, breach-notification timelines, exportability, and model explainability.
- Documentation & Auditing: Maintain usage logs, model-version notes, bias-test results, and governance approvals; conduct periodic audits.
- Incident Response Updates incorporating AI-related misuse or exposure scenarios, as well as vendor platform incidents.

Question 3: Operational AI Adoption — Areas, Evaluation, and Risk

1. Operational Areas Ripe for Responsible AI Adoption

AI should first be deployed in high-volume, text-heavy, repeatable administrative work where it supports, rather than replaces, human judgment. Priority areas include:

- Student Services & Advising: FAQ chat, drafting routine emails, summarizing policies, and appointment reminders.
- HR and Administrative Operations: Drafting job ads, summarizing survey comments, identifying trends in HR metrics, resume screening, job matching, interview scheduling, identifying recommended learning pathways, chatbots to answer standard general HR questions, streamlining day-to-day processes, and preparing routine communications.
- IT Help Desk: Ticket triage, knowledge-base suggestions, automated resolution pathways.
- Enrollment and Communications: Drafting outreach content, segmenting messages, and summarizing student inquiries.

- Facilities Operations: Predictive maintenance alerts, work-order summarization, energy-usage insights.

A parallel priority is monitoring AI features embedded in existing enterprise systems — especially Finance, HR, and Student Information Systems. Vendors will introduce AI rapidly through product roadmaps, making governance, training, and contract review essential.

2. Required Evaluation Framework for Cost, Benefit, and Risk

Cost Evaluation: Licensing fees and subscription tiers; integration or configuration needs; necessary support and training time; long-term maintenance obligations.

Benefit Evaluation: Time saved on repetitive tasks; increased service speed and clarity; improved student, staff, or faculty experience; reduced administrative burden for frontline teams. Only scale AI tools where the benefits clearly outweigh costs and risks.

Risk Evaluation: Data sensitivity (whether institutional, HR, student, or protected data is involved); bias and fairness (potential for inequitable recommendations or outputs); error risk (consequences of incorrect or misleading AI suggestions); reputational harm (possibility of inappropriate or inaccurate AI-generated content); accountability (identification of a responsible owner for oversight and monitoring); vendor practices (data ownership, retention, model-training policies, exportability).

3. Governance, Contracts, and Vendor Review

- Review all vendor contracts to determine how vendors use institutional data for AI features.
- Confirm data ownership, retention policies, export capabilities, and training restrictions.
- Require documentation of embedded AI capabilities before enabling or activating them.

4. Training and Change Management

- Implement unified, campus-wide AI training for staff.
- Focus training on practical use, data protection expectations, risk awareness, and guardrails.
- Emphasize that AI tools augment — not replace — human oversight.

Question 4: Monitoring and Audit of AI Deployments

- **Establish Clear Governance and Ownership:** Assign a designated unit (or cross-unit group) to monitor and audit AI performance. Define institutional owners for each AI tool and clarify associated data sources and responsible data stewards. Determine whether state requirements mandate regular AI audits and incorporate those requirements when applicable.
- **Maintain a Central AI Inventory:** Track all institutional AI deployments in a single inventory, including tool purpose, responsible owner, risk level, and approved data types and storage locations. Treat AI systems as ongoing programs requiring continuous oversight.
- **Use Standardized Metrics for Evaluation:** For each AI system, define a concise set of success metrics (e.g., accuracy, service quality, user satisfaction) and risk indicators (e.g., errors, appeals, equity gaps). Review these metrics periodically to determine whether the tool should be adjusted, expanded, or retired.
- **Conduct Regular Contract and Model Reviews:** Reassess vendor contracts, licensing terms, and AI model updates to ensure ongoing compliance with policy and data-governance standards. Monitor AI features embedded within enterprise systems and document any changes introduced through vendor roadmaps.
- **Require Approval for Sensitive Data Use:** Prohibit the use of protected or sensitive data in AI systems without formal approval from the AI Stewardship Committee and the relevant data steward.
- **Build Simple Feedback and Reporting Channels:** Provide students, faculty, and staff with easy ways to report errors, bias, or inappropriate outcomes. Feed this input into regular audits and use it to update training, procurement criteria, and institutional AI principles.
- **Implement a Close-the-Loop Issue Resolution Process:** Define clear steps for how issues are reported, who investigates them, how fixes are implemented, and how resolutions are documented.

Question 5: Site License — Platform Selection

The Task Force recommends that K-State adopt Boodlebox as its campus-wide general-use AI platform. Boodlebox provides equitable access, strong data security, consistent training support, and alignment with FERPA, HIPAA, GDPR, and records-

management obligations including KORA compliance. This recommendation reflects the unified position of the Task Force and supersedes earlier working group language suggesting a structured evaluation among competing platforms.

Boodlebox is recommended as that platform. It should be accessible to every university employee and student, with clear documentation and compliance requirements. Some units (e.g., APDesign, VetMed, specialized research programs) may require discipline-specific or domain-specialized tools in addition; a governed review pathway should exist for approving such tools. The recommendation is not to impose restrictions on which tools can be used beyond Boodlebox, but to ensure that every member of the K-State community has access to at least one compliant, supported tool.

Selection of a primary platform should follow a structured evaluation that considers:

- Privacy and security posture
- Data-ownership and retention capabilities
- Integration with the LMS and productivity systems
- Accessibility and usability for students and employees
- Cost, licensing model, and long-term sustainability
- Ability to export, retain, and retrieve AI-generated records for KORA compliance

The university should also assess the comparative value of commercial tools versus developing internal models, similar to approaches taken at some R1 institutions exploring home-grown solutions.

Resource Stewardship Questions for Consideration:

- Does our current investment in AI advance the core mission and deliver measurable efficiency, or does it simply signal prestige in specific areas? How can we be intentional in our deployments and expectations of what AI will meaningfully do at K-State?
- Are we building architectures grounded in financial and operational reality, or are we designing for "innovation theater" that relies on unlimited capital and patience? How can we ensure that the AI efforts we undertake have the buy-in and funding to reach their outcomes?

- When the inevitable cycle turns and the current desire to invest immediately in AI fades, do we have the stewardship models in place to sustain these tools with reduced operational funds?

Section IV: Working Group 3 — AI Curriculum

Submitted by Keith Hohn (Co-Chair), Alysia Starkey (Co-Chair), Anna Zemlyanova, Balaji Balasubramaniam, Kutay Guler, Safia Malallah, Tom Vontz, Ben Ward, and Theresa Merrick

1. Establish an Undergraduate AI Degree Requirement

Kansas State University is committed to producing career-ready undergraduates capable of navigating rapidly changing work and industry environments. It is critical that graduates develop the ability to effectively use and evaluate AI technologies that will drive decision making and productivity in their chosen disciplines. This can be accomplished in several ways:

4. An undergraduate AI degree requirement like the ALE proposed graduation requirement
5. A required AI competency element embedded into approved general education courses
6. A 0 or 1 credit hour required course that incorporates foundational AI competency learning components
7. Embedded into the university orientation experience required for all new students

Regardless of implementation, it is strongly recommended that the focus remain on the demonstration of competency in AI literacy and that colleges and departments have the flexibility to implement the requirement in a manner reflective of their specific disciplinary context.

Peer institutions that have implemented similar requirements include Purdue University (AI Working Competency integrated into existing coursework), Ohio State University (AI Fluency Training embedded into required General Education Launch Seminar), SUNY (AI as a core competency within the general education framework), and the University of Florida (AI Across the Curriculum Initiative).

Additional considerations for implementation:

- Be mindful of the capacity of the institutions referenced above relative to Kansas State University.
- When selecting AI tools, be mindful of FERPA and HIPAA compliance concerns.

- Any AI tool or resource should only be implemented if assurances to data security and student/faculty privacy can be met.
- Advantages/disadvantages of web-based or cloud-based tools vs desktop applications should be fully considered.
- Give faculty/students several options for tools and rubrics related to generative AI.
- Be cognizant of AI fluency development in K-12 districts and state education departments because it will impact expectations of future students.
- Ensure learning outcomes associated with AI remain human-centered.

2. Faculty Preparedness and Curriculum Development

The following recommendations are derived from best practices other institutions have implemented as cross-disciplinary mechanisms to support faculty growth and development regarding AI implementation. It is highly recommended that any AI development opportunities are not mandatory but based on faculty interest and willingness to adopt.

- Encourage faculty participation in established training opportunities, such as through Hale Library or the Teaching & Learning Center
- Educate and inform faculty on the reliability and legal concerns around the use of AI
- Educate faculty on how to articulate "appropriate use of AI" on their syllabus to protect against cheating and the advantages, disadvantages, and legal concerns around the use of AI detectors when evaluating student work
- Provide training to help faculty integrate AI into assignments as a tool to be leveraged, but still maintain expectations related to human judgment and analysis
- Adjust annual evaluation, tenure and promotion documents to recognize professional development in AI

In addition, it is recommended that the university appoint one or more people who can provide coordination and leadership related to AI development in colleges and at the university (e.g. AI Fellows). This could include representatives from each college who meet monthly to discuss activities related to AI within their units. Another option might include a program like the Coffman Teaching Scholars Program that engages early adopting AI faculty in a years-long project related to AI curricular integration at the university.

3. Guidance on AI for Master's and Doctoral Work

The committee recommends that the issue of AI guidelines for incorporation at the graduate level be given further exploration. Our external scan of other institutions found limited best practices for this area as most emphasis is placed on undergraduate requirements. However, integration at the master's/doctoral level requires crucial consideration as the primary goal of graduate studies is to demonstrate mastery of a specific discipline as an independent scholar through the demonstration of original thought. Policies should be developed that support student success and guidelines for ethical/responsible use of AI in this context and articulate requirements to disclose/cite the use of AI in theses/dissertations. The School of Graduate Studies at the University of Toronto has developed Guidance on the Appropriate Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence for Graduate Academic Milestones, which might serve as a reference for considerations moving forward.

4. Existing and Proposed AI-Related Courses and Credentials

A working list of AI-related courses and credentials currently being offered across the university is presented in Appendix A. It is anticipated that this portfolio will continue to expand as the integration of this technology continues to evolve. To limit duplication of effort, it is critical that departments adhere to the expectation that they will discuss new course/program proposals with other areas of potential impact.

The committee also recommends that a template be developed to assist faculty with new course creation when AI-related components are included. This template should include references to standardized AI course learning objectives based on how the university ultimately defines AI fluency/literacy. An example of this concept is provided in Appendix A.

Of equal importance will be ensuring new AI-related degrees or credentials meet expectations of program-specific accreditation requirements. ABET recently released their criteria for any new AI/ML related curriculum (see Appendix E).

Section V: Working Group 4 — Research and Intellectual Property

Submitted by the Research and IP Working Group

This working group addressed four core questions:

1. How should the university address the use of generative AI in research workflows with respect to transparency, reproducibility, and authorship?
2. What policies or frameworks do we need around AI-generated content and university intellectual property (e.g., ownership, licensing, disclosure)?
3. How should confidential/clinical/restricted data ("sensitive data") be protected when using or developing AI models at K-State (including partner/collaborator ecosystems)?
4. What processes will ensure compliance with external (funder, publisher, regulatory) requirements when AI is used or outputs are produced?

Question 1: AI in Research Workflows — Transparency, Reproducibility, and Authorship

The researcher is fundamentally responsible for their research products. Transparency is a foremost requirement for workflows involving machine learning, especially large language models (LLMs). The fact and scope of their use, as well as model version, date(s) of processing, and the prompts should be prominently disclosed, or at least retained for the purposes of auditing.

Generative AI in research workflows should be thoroughly documented at each step as other research tools/methods are documented. This is especially important for data gathering and generation. Specific model names and versions, how models are used, and how model output is verified by humans should be reported at all steps in the research workflow. This might include generated labels used for downstream processes and automated cleaning/checking of large datasets. AI-generated labels and synthetic data should be clearly documented as such. This is critical for transparency and reproducibility as well as for the general quality of the research so that biases can be documented/understood and hallucinations can be exposed. Coding assistants should be disclosed in addition to the extent to which they were used to generate code. Generated code should be well-documented with annotations that explain both the "what" and the "why." Authorship is reserved for human researchers, who are responsible for all aspects of their research products.

Specific recommendations:

- 1.1 Require disclosure of AI use in manuscripts, proposals, and reports (what tools, what steps).
- 1.2 Define authorship rules: AI cannot be listed as an author; humans remain accountable for all content.
- 1.3 Encourage human-in-the-loop validation for reproducibility; mandate retention of original data and intermediate steps.
- 1.4 Provide discipline-specific guidance for acceptable AI-assisted analysis and writing.

Question 2: AI-Generated Content and University Intellectual Property

As of writing this document, machine-generated content is copyrightable by the user and not the model, so the issues of intellectual property retention may be fairly clear-cut (except in cases of misuse by the model vendor/provider). Contractual controls should include an unambiguous assignment of all IP rights to the user/researcher and/or KSU.

Specific recommendations:

- 2.1 Have a statement saying who owns AI outputs created by university personnel using university resources.
- 2.2 Require disclosure of AI-generated content in sponsored research and publications.
- 2.3 Address licensing of AI tools and ensure terms do not conflict with IP obligations.
- 2.4 Prohibit inputting pre-disclosure inventions or sponsor-protected data into public AI systems.

Mandatory Disclosure of "Significant Use"

Invention Disclosure Forms (IDF) must be updated to include a specific section on AI involvement. Faculty and students must disclose whether AI was used in the conception or reduction to practice of the invention. A patent requires a "significant human contribution." If KSURF doesn't know AI was used, they cannot accurately assess if the invention is even patentable. Copyrightable material created with AI

assistance should remain university IP, provided the human creator performed "sufficient creative editing" of the output. Disclosure must address:

- Which AI model/tool was used?
- What specific prompts or data sets were provided to the AI?
- How was the AI output modified, verified, or built upon by the human researcher?

Prohibiting Confidential Data Input

Researchers should be prohibited from inputting unpublished research data, methodologies, proprietary algorithms, or "secret sauce" descriptions into consumer-grade (public) AI tools. The university should provide "Enterprise" or "Local" instances of AI models where data is contractually protected and not used for model training.

Record-Keeping

To survive a patent challenge, the "chain of creation" must be clear. Researchers should maintain a "Prompt Log" or a version-controlled repository (like a private GitHub or Lab Archives) that shows the evolution of the idea from AI prompt to final discovery. This proves that the human researcher "steered" the AI, providing the necessary "significant contribution" required by law.

Licensing and Commercialization — AI-Specific Licensing Terms

- Licensee acknowledges AI involvement as disclosed.
- No training back clause: Prohibit licensee from using university IP to train competing AI models (unless expressly allowed).
- Model retraining rights: Define whether licensee can retrain or fine-tune models using the licensed technology.
- Indemnity alignment: Shift infringement risk tied to licensee's AI use back to licensee.
- Audit rights: Limited rights to confirm compliance with AI-use restrictions.

Question 3: Protection of Sensitive Data

Technological controls should be used. Best practice would be a combination of data deidentification, cryptographic anonymization (e.g., differential privacy), and

the use of local (on-device or KSU-hosted) models. This may be a question that ultimately needs to be decided on a case-by-case basis by the Research Security team or Institutional Review Board (IRB), or both. Particular attention should be paid to the management of Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI), with the input needed from OVPR and IT to ensure compliance with the 110 data controls needed to manage such data.

A clear, all-inclusive definition of "sensitive data" is required when establishing policy statements. Proposal project descriptions, including any embedded data, internal non-public proprietary information, as well as that received from an external sponsor/restricted data repository, or other such source, along with pre-competitive and unpublished datasets, results, discoveries, and preliminary analyses, should all be treated as sensitive data.

Specific recommendations:

- 3.1 Mandate use of cryptographic data protection, controlled unclassified information (CUI), and/or closed-loop or enterprise-approved AI platforms for any confidential, clinical, or export-controlled data.
- 3.2 Provide a data classification framework for AI use (public, internal, restricted, regulated). Note that the use of sensitive data in research contexts is already partially governed by existing IRB processes and CITI training requirements; the data classification framework for AI should be designed to complement and reference these existing structures rather than duplicate them.
- 3.3 Require security reviews before deploying custom AI models that handle sensitive data.
- 3.4 Include partner/collaborator compliance clauses in agreements.

Privacy and security controls fall into two broad categories:

- Technological controls: cryptographic protection of data, local and on-premises machine models, etc.
- Contractual controls: legal instruments such as service-level agreements (SLA), privacy and security promises explicitly made to KSU by a provider of machine learning services, etc.

Ideally, privacy and security would be enforced by a combination of both. It would make sense to disallow the use of any service/vendor which does not provide either technological or contractual controls for data protection.

Question 4: Compliance with External Requirements

There is nothing that can ensure compliance, but KSU can take steps to make it easy for users/researchers to comply, and to verify that they are in compliance. KSU should provide a searchable, easily referenceable list of suggested AI/ML tools broken down by use case (e.g., the recently-announced partnership with Dimensions.ai). KSU should also provide researchers with a curated list of appropriate tools to apply technological controls like data deidentification and cryptographic anonymization. Moreover, KSU should encourage the development and maintenance of shared resources that ease compliance, such as machine models hosted on premises for research use (e.g., using a funding model similar to Beocat but for special-purpose AI/ML use).

Specific recommendations:

- 4.1 Require AI usage statements in data analysis steps, grant proposals (private), and publications (public) when funders/publishers demand disclosure; require keeping an internal audit log of AI usage even when disclosure is not required.
- 4.2 Build a compliance checklist for investigators: covers at least rules for specific funding agencies, popular journals and conferences, export controls, and IRB requirements.
- 4.3 Establish a central advisory service for quick guidance on AI compliance questions (possibly through University Libraries as they have AI and copyright expertise already).
- 4.4 Maintain audit trails for AI-assisted outputs to demonstrate reproducibility and compliance; these should be audited on a regular and/or random basis.

To support graduate student implementation of these compliance principles, the Research and IP Working Group has developed a practical stage-by-stage reference guide, including the L0–L4 GenAI use scale, a research-stage matrix of default guidelines, and minimum documentation standards. This resource is included as **Appendix F** and is intended to serve as a living baseline handout for graduate researchers, adaptable as funder and publisher requirements continue to evolve.

To ensure compliance with federal sponsors such as the NSF, NIH, and DOE, K-State will implement structured disclosure and documentation requirements.

Researchers will be required to utilize standardized reporting templates in all proposals, progress reports, and final technical summaries. These reports must explicitly detail the specific AI tools and versions used, the exact purpose of their application, and the specific degree of human oversight applied to the output.

AI oversight will be integrated into existing institutional review structures:

- IRB and IACUC: Protocol applications will include specific prompts to evaluate AI's role in human or animal subject research, particularly regarding data privacy and ethical methodology.
- Export Control and Data Management: AI use cases will be reviewed against Export Administration Regulations (EAR) and International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) to prevent the unauthorized transfer of sensitive technology.
- Security & Compliance: Researchers dealing with restricted data (e.g., HIPAA or CUI) must use university-approved, secure computational environments.

Section VI: Working Group 5 — AI in Healthcare

Submitted by the AI in Healthcare Working Group

1. Establish a Standing AI in Healthcare Oversight Committee

K-State should establish a standing “AI in Healthcare Oversight Committee” analogous to IRB/IACUC/IBC and with a mandate to provide clear, rapid review that avoids stifling innovation. This committee should operate largely autonomously and is expected to be the primary body on campus with deep clinical expertise in AI applications. It should report directly to the Provost or a cabinet-level designee of the Provost, rather than to the University AI Stewardship Committee. The relationship between the Healthcare Committee and the Stewardship Committee is one of coordination and communication, not hierarchy; the Healthcare Committee is the authoritative voice on matters of clinical AI governance at K-State. It is recommended that at least one member of the University AI Stewardship Committee have a clinical background, to ensure adequate communication between the two bodies.

Scope: AI in clinical care (human and veterinary), clinical education, health research, and related support systems.

Committee composition:

- Human healthcare expert
- Veterinary healthcare expert
- Health professions educator
- Health research expert
- Compliance representative

Advisors (non-voting):

- Legal: non-voting external advisor, consulted as needed
- IT: non-voting internal advisor, primary role is to consult on data security
- Advisors should default to federal guidance (HIPAA, FDA, FERPA) and the domain experts on the committee

The committee should be empowered to consult external subject-matter experts as needed and to make independent determinations within its scope without requiring approval from non-clinical administrative bodies. On matters that are

exclusively clinical in nature, the Healthcare Committee has final authority. On matters that involve both clinical protocols and institutional data governance, the Healthcare Committee's clinical judgment should be primary, with IT and data governance bodies in a supporting and advisory role.

2. Privacy, Security, and Regulatory Compliance

- No PHI or identifiable student data should be entered into generative AI tools unless they are institutionally approved and contractually HIPAA/FERPA compliant.
- Vendors should disclose validation processes, training data sources, and data storage/retention policies.
- Consider FDA oversight and Joint Commission/Coalition for Health AI guidance.
- AI-related errors considered in quality assurance and risk management systems.

3. Ethical Standards and Human Oversight

- AI should function as an assistive technology, not autonomous decision-maker.
- Final decisions should remain with qualified human professionals.
- Require independent verification of AI-informed diagnoses, treatment plans, research outputs, and assessments.
- Require disclosure if AI materially informs clinical, research, or educational decisions.
- Regularly evaluate systems for algorithmic bias, hallucinations, and fabricated sources.

4. Accountability and Liability

- Responsibility for AI-assisted decisions should remain with the human user.
- AI-related misconduct must be included in existing professional, research integrity, and academic integrity processes.
- Well-defined documentation expectations for AI-assisted activities should be developed.

5. Validation Standards for Clinical and Research AI

- Documented validation studies, testing environment, and known limitations should be required.
- Distinguish exploratory research use from clinical implementation with higher vetting standards for clinical use.

6. Education and Training

- Develop onboarding AI module for health-science faculty, students, and clinicians.
- Require annual refresher training with updated content.
- Encourage undergraduate and graduate/professional courses in AI in Healthcare.
- Use oral assessments and case-based formats to preserve critical thinking skills.

7. Strategic Partnerships and External Alignment

- Monitor guidance from FDA, Joint Commission, MGMA, HIMSS, AAAHC, and AAMC.
- Explore KBOR-level coordination while preserving institutional agility.

Section VII: Implementation Timeline

The following timeline identifies key milestones for developing and implementing K-State's integrated set of AI-related policies and practices. Phase 1 begins in May 2026. The timeline extends approximately two years, to Spring 2028.

Period	Key Actions	Lead(s)
May – July 2026 (Phase 1: Foundation)	Formally constitute the University AI Stewardship Committee; appoint chair; define charter and meeting cadence.	<i>Provost / Pres.</i>
	Publish interim policy: required syllabus AI statement for all Fall 2026 courses. Distribute sample language and templates.	<i>Provost / TLC</i>
	Publish ksu.edu/AI landing page with terminology glossary, policy summaries, and resource hub.	<i>Libraries / IT / TLC</i>
	Launch Lean tier AI literacy micro-credential (15-min modules). Strongly encouraged for all faculty and staff; departments set expectations by job profile.	<i>TLC / Libraries</i>
	Issue interim sensitive-data guidance for researchers; distribute to all college research offices.	<i>VPR / Research</i>
	Execute Boodlebox campus license; establish onboarding and support resources.	<i>IT / Provost</i>
	Stand up AI Compliance Working Group within Research office to draft IP and data disclosure procedures.	<i>VPR / OGC</i>
Aug – Dec 2026 (Phase 2: Policy Launch)	Syllabus AI policy takes effect (Fall 2026). Collect compliance data through syllabus review process.	<i>Deans / Chairs</i>
	Publish formal AI governance policy (stewardship committee charter, two-tier structure, tool-approval workflow).	<i>AI Stewardship Comm.</i>

Period	Key Actions	Lead(s)
	Open Approved Tool Registry; establish tool-request submission and review process.	<i>IT / Stewardship Comm.</i>
	Launch K-State AI Symposium (expanded, with discipline-based tracks, Standard tier).	<i>TLC / Libraries</i>
	Stand up AI in Healthcare Oversight Committee; publish scope, composition, and initial protocols.	<i>VetMed / Health Sci.</i>
	Issue Research AI Disclosure requirements; update Invention Disclosure Forms (IDF) to include AI involvement section.	<i>VPR / KSURF</i>
	Issue updated Standard Contract Clauses for AI vendor agreements; train procurement staff.	<i>OGC / Procurement</i>
	Update IRB and IACUC protocol templates to include AI-use prompts.	<i>Research Compliance</i>
	Publish data classification framework for AI use (public / internal / restricted / regulated).	<i>IT / Data Governance</i>
Jan – May 2027 (Phase 3: Scale)	Undergraduate AI literacy: AI Stewardship Committee and Provost’s Office begin collaboration with Faculty Senate to develop a scalable approach that ensures AI literacy for all undergraduates. Specific mechanism and timeline to be determined through shared governance.	<i>Provost / Curriculum</i>
	Launch AI Faculty Awards Program	<i>Provost</i>
	Launch Standard tier AI micro-credential ecosystem (free for all K-State students, staff, faculty).	<i>TLC / Libraries</i>
	Launch first cohort of AI Teaching Fellows (6–12 fellows, Standard tier).	<i>TLC / Provost</i>

Period	Key Actions	Lead(s)
	Pilot AI-in-the-Field Event Grants; first cohort of college-level AI events (Lean tier).	<i>Provost Fund / Colleges</i>
	Conduct first annual AI Stewardship audit; publish public-facing summary of findings.	<i>Stewardship Comm.</i>
	Graduate-level AI policy: publish guidance on AI disclosure in theses and dissertations.	<i>Graduate School</i>
	Publish on-premises AI model hosting proposal (Beocat-model for AI/ML); seek funding.	<i>IT / Research / VPR</i>
Aug 2027 – Spring 2028 (Phase 4: Maturation)	Evaluate undergraduate AI requirement proposal outcome; begin implementation if approved.	<i>Provost / Registrar</i>
	Launch Robust tier consultation services: AI Summer Institute for faculty (20–30 participants).	<i>TLC</i>
	Complete first two-year cycle of AI policy review; update based on technology changes and audit findings.	<i>Stewardship Comm.</i>
	Evaluate Boodlebox and other platform licenses; determine renewals and expansions.	<i>IT / Stewardship Comm.</i>
	Expand AI Symposium to regional/national scope if Robust-tier funding secured.	<i>TLC / Libraries</i>
	KBOR-level coordination: share K-State model with Kansas system peers; explore consortium opportunities.	<i>Provost / President</i>

Current Course Possibilities for Meeting AI Literacy for Graduation

The following is a working list of AI-related courses and credentials currently being offered across Kansas State University. This list is not exhaustive; it is anticipated that this portfolio will continue to expand

Courses

- Architecture, Planning and Design — IARC 605: AI in Business, Research, and Design
- Arts and Sciences / English — ENGL 312: Fundamentals of AI Literacy
- Arts and Sciences / English — ENGL 412: Intermediate GenAI Skills
- Arts and Sciences / English — ENGL 512: Writing Creatively and Collaboratively with AI
- Arts and Sciences / Geography — GEOG 705: Thematic Remote Sensing
- Arts and Sciences / Mathematics — MATH 620: Convex Optimization for Data Science
- Arts and Sciences / Mathematics — MATH 625 (proposed): Mathematical Principles of Artificial Intelligence
- Arts and Sciences / Mathematics — MATH 725: The Mathematics of Data and Networks I
- Arts and Sciences / Mathematics — MATH 726: The Mathematics of Data and Networks II
- Arts and Sciences / Mathematics — MATH 7?? (proposed): Python for Mathematics and Applications
- Arts and Sciences / Mathematics — MATH 751 (proposed): Linear Algebra for Data Science
- Arts and Sciences / Philosophy — PHILO 386: Philosophy of Computer Science and Software Engineering
- Arts and Sciences / Statistics — STAT 713: Applied Linear Statistical Models
- Arts and Sciences / Statistics — STAT 725: Introduction to SAS Computing
- Arts and Sciences / Statistics — STAT 728: Python for Statistics and Data Science
- Arts and Sciences / Statistics — STAT 730: Multivariate Methods
- Arts and Sciences / Statistics — STAT 760: Optimization for Data Science
- Arts and Sciences / Statistics — STAT 761: Discrete Optimization and Scalability for Data Science

- Arts and Sciences / Statistics — STAT 764: Applied Spatio-Temporal Statistics
- Arts and Sciences / Statistics — STAT 766: Applied Data Mining/Machine Learning and Predictive Analytics
- Arts and Sciences / Statistics — STAT 768: Applied Bayesian Modeling and Prediction
- Business Administration / Finance — FINAN 623: Financial Modeling
- Business Administration / Management — MANGT 421: Introduction to Operations and Supply Chain Management
- Business Administration / Management — MANGT 553: Project Management
- Business Administration / Management — MANGT 623: Compensation and Performance Management
- Business Administration / Management — MANGT 810: Advanced Operations and Supply Chain Management
- Business Administration / Management — MIS 665: Business Analytics and Data Mining
- Business Administration / Management — MIS 670: Social Media Analytics and Web Mining
- Business Administration / Management — MIS 797: Topic-AI: Presentations and Techniques in Business
- Business Administration / Management — MIS 830: Business Intelligence and Storytelling in Cloud Environments
- Business Administration / Marketing — MKTG 650: Digital Marketing Analysis and Strategy
- Business Administration / Finance — MKTG 880: Applied Marketing Analytics
- Business Administration / Finance — MKTG 881: Advanced Marketing Analytics
- Education — EDACE 886: Adult Learners and AI: Practice and Responsibility
- Engineering / Chemical Engineering — CHE 636 and 836 (proposed): Advanced AI Applications in Chemical and Bioengineering
- Engineering / Computer Science — CC 140: Elements of Artificial Intelligence
- Engineering / Computer Science — CC 141: Privacy and Artificial Intelligence
- Engineering / Computer Science — CIS 530: Introduction to Artificial Intelligence
- Engineering / Computer Science — CIS 532: Introduction to Deep Learning
- Engineering / Computer Science — CIS 732: Machine Learning and Pattern Recognition

- Engineering / Computer Science — CIS 738 (proposed): Ethics in Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning
- Engineering / Computer Science — CIS 830: Current Topics in Artificial Intelligence
- Engineering / Computer Science — CIS 831: Deep Learning
- Engineering / Computer Science — CIS 835: Neuro-Symbolic Artificial Intelligence: Deep Learning and Knowledge Representation
- Salina / Integrated Studies — MLAS 100: Survey of Machine Learning and Autonomous Systems
- Salina / Integrated Studies — MLAS 200: Introduction to Automata and Cybernetic Systems Theory
- Salina / Integrated Studies — MLAS 350: Data Structures for Machine Learning
- Salina / Integrated Studies — MLAS 390: Unsupervised Learning in Autonomous Systems
- Salina / Integrated Studies — MLAS 400: Supervised Learning in Autonomous Systems
- Salina / Integrated Studies — MLAS 410: Natural Language Processing
- Salina / Integrated Studies — MLAS 412: Deep Learning
- Salina / Integrated Studies — MLAS 500: Reinforcement Learning in Autonomous Systems
- Salina / Integrated Studies — MLAS 501: Artificial Intelligence Studio
- Salina / Integrated Studies — MLAS 502: Autonomous Systems Senior Capstone
- Salina / Integrated Studies — MLAS 650: Autonomous Systems Architecture Studio
- Salina / Integrated Studies — MLAS 700: Advanced Cybernetic Systems Development
- Salina / Integrated Studies — MLAS 750: Autonomous Networking with Cyber-Physical Systems
- Salina / Integrated Studies — MLAS 800: Integrated Machine Learning and Autonomous Systems
- Salina / Integrated Studies — CYBR 357: Computer Vision for Immersive Systems
- Salina / Integrated Studies — CYBR 457: Intelligent Spatial Computing Systems
- Salina / Integrated Studies — CYBR 795: Machine Learning for Simulations

- Salina / Integrated Studies — CMST 290: Scientific Programming and Machine Learning
- Veterinary Medicine — VCS 868: Artificial Intelligence in Veterinary Medicine

Credit Credentials

- Arts and Sciences / English — Writing with AI (Microcredential)
- Arts and Sciences / Math/Statistics — Math and Statistics Foundations for AI and Data Science (Graduate Certificate, proposed)
- Arts and Sciences / Math/Statistics — Statistical Methods and Software for AI and Machine Learning (Graduate Certificate, proposed)
- Arts and Sciences / Math/Statistics — Statistical and Mathematical Artificial Intelligence and Learning (Master's, proposed)
- Arts and Sciences / Math/Statistics — Optimization for Data Science (Microcredential, proposed)
- Arts and Sciences / Math/Statistics — Math and Statistics Foundations for AI and Data Science (Microcredential, proposed)
- Arts and Sciences / Math/Statistics — Software and Data Science (Microcredential, proposed)
- Arts and Sciences / Math/Statistics — Statistical Methods for AI and ML (Microcredential, proposed)
- Arts and Sciences / Math/Statistics — Linear Models and Methods (Microcredential, proposed)
- Arts and Sciences / Math/Statistics — Mathematics of Data and Networks (Microcredential, proposed)
- Engineering / Computer Science — Artificial Intelligent Systems and Their Applications (Master's, proposed)
- Engineering / Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering — Nuclear Engineering and AI Fundamentals (Microcredential)
- Salina / Integrated Studies — Autonomous Robotics and Machine Learning (Undergraduate Certificate)
- Salina / Integrated Studies — Cyber-Systems Design & Dynamics: Machine Learning and Autonomous Systems (Bachelor's)
- Salina / Integrated Studies — Artificial Intelligence and Autonomous Systems (Master's)
- Salina / Integrated Studies — Artificial Intelligence & Autonomous Systems (Bachelor's, 3-Year Degree, proposed)

Non-Credit Credentials

- Business Administration / Management — AI Driven Strategic Decision-Making: Leveraging SWOT Analysis (Microcredential)
- Business Administration / Management — Artificial Intelligence and Human Resource Management: Leveraging AI for the Modern Workforce (Microcredential)
- Business Administration / Management — Developing a Business Plan for Entrepreneurs with Artificial Intelligence (Microcredential)
- Business Administration / Management — Prompt Engineering in Generative AI for Data Science (Microcredential)
- Business Administration / Management — Research Methods in the Age of Artificial Intelligence (AI) (Microcredential)
- Business Administration / Management — Understanding Neural Networks and Their Applications (Microcredential)

Full sample syllabus statement language is provided in Section II, subsection 2.2 of this report. The A.I.D.E. Working Group recommends that K-State maintain a centralized, living repository of these templates on the ksu.edu/AI page. Templates should be:

- Available in ready-to-paste format for each major AI policy posture (restrictive, balanced, permissive, minimum compliance)
- Accompanied by assignment-level statement snippets for common assignment types
- Supported by a one-page course AI policy template (fill-in format, checkboxes) for instructors who wish to specify tool permissions and prohibited tasks at the assignment level
- Referenced against the AI Assessment Scale (aiassessmentscale.com)

The Working Group also recommends consulting existing repositories at University of Washington, NC State, University of Iowa, Stanford, and University of Texas when building K-State's centralized page.

Instructional Platform Recommendation

The Task Force recommends Boodlebox as K-State's campus-wide general-use AI platform, providing equitable access, strong data security, consistent training, and compliance with FERPA, HIPAA, GDPR, and records-management obligations. Boodlebox should serve as the default institutional tool, with clear documentation, compliance requirements, and a structured exception process for units requiring specialized tools. The university should not lock itself into any single tool indefinitely; the AI Stewardship Committee should conduct periodic reviews of the platform and maintain a governed pathway for approving specialized tools when justified.

All platform selections should be evaluated against: privacy and security posture; data-ownership and retention capabilities; integration with Canvas and productivity systems; accessibility and usability; cost, licensing model, and long-term sustainability; and ability to export and retrieve AI-generated records for KORA compliance.

Additional Tools Under Consideration

- Undermind.ai — AI-powered scholarly article discovery (STEM focus). Estimated cost: \$20,000–\$40,000/year.
- Keenious — Scholarly article and book chapter discovery (all disciplines). Estimated cost: ~\$25,000/year.
- NotebookLM — Document analysis and learning support. Bundled with Google Workspace for Education.
- Dimensions.ai — Research intelligence platform; K-State partnership (Wildcat Scholar) recently announced.
- On-premises AI model hosting — Beocat-style shared resource for AI/ML research use. Cost and funding model to be determined.
- Coursera AI catalog — Robust tier professional development. Estimated \$100,000/year for ~2,000 course completions.

Academic Integrity and Syllabus Policy

- University of Washington, NC State, University of Iowa, Stanford, University of Texas — AI syllabus statement repositories
- Oklahoma State University — "Level of AI Use" rating scale (Levels 0–4)
- University of Nebraska-Lincoln — AI disclosure and audit trail requirements

AI Literacy and Training

- Georgetown, Indiana University (GenAI 101), San Jose State University, San Diego State University, University of Michigan, University of Nebraska-Omaha — foundational AI literacy programs
- Maine's Public Universities, University of Texas System, Louisiana Public Universities — micro-credential incentive programs
- AAC&U Student Guide to Artificial Intelligence; AILiteracy.org Framework; Florida K-12 AI Literacy Framework; DEC AI Literacy Framework

Undergraduate Curriculum

- Purdue University — AI Working Competency requirement integrated into existing coursework
- Ohio State University — AI Fluency Training embedded in required General Education Launch Seminar
- SUNY — AI as core competency within general education framework
- University of Florida — AI Across the Curriculum Initiative

Graduate Policy

- University of Toronto, School of Graduate Studies — Guidance on the Appropriate Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence for Graduate Academic Milestones

Healthcare AI

- FDA — Regulation of AI as Software as a Medical Device (SaMD): <https://www.fda.gov/>
- The Joint Commission — Safety, governance, and risk management in healthcare AI: <https://www.jointcommission.org/>

- Coalition for Health AI — Validation, bias mitigation, trustworthy AI: <https://www.chai.org/>
- AAMC — Principles for AI Use in Medical Education: <https://www.aamc.org/>
- Harvard Medical School — Institutional transparency on approved tools and training: <https://it.hms.harvard.edu/>
- NC State — AI integration in IRB applications
- Colorado State University — PATH Framework; CSU-GPT approved tools

Governance

- University of Michigan AI governance model
- University of California AI Council
- Wayne State University
- University of Kansas AI Policy: <https://ai.ku.edu/>

Research and IP

- Clemson University, University of Cincinnati, Utah State University, Belmont University, St. John's University — sensitive data AI policies

Appendix E: Accreditation Reference — ABET Curriculum Criteria for AI/ML

ABET recently released criteria for any new AI/ML-related curriculum. The AI Curriculum Working Group recommends that all new AI-related degrees and credentials be evaluated against these criteria at the point of curricular proposal. The complete ABET criteria documentation is available through the ABET website and should be obtained directly by the Office of Academic Affairs. Proposers for new AI-related courses and programs are encouraged to clearly articulate the contribution of their discipline in the course proposal so that students and faculty can easily distinguish the content from existing courses and programs. This supports both accreditation readiness and cross-departmental coordination to limit duplication of effort.

[Full ABET AI/ML curriculum criteria available at [abet.org](https://www.abet.org) — consult directly for current version]

Appendix F: Graduate Student Research Guidelines for Responsible GenAI Use

Prepared by the Research and IP Working Group | April 2026

After discussions with graduate students across disciplines, a clear consensus emerged: students want to use GenAI responsibly but are uncertain about where the line falls between helpful assistance and academic or IP violation. This appendix pairs student feedback with K-State's official guidance, verified peer university standards, and local department guidelines to provide practical, stage-by-stage guardrails for the research lifecycle. It is intended as a baseline reference for graduate researchers and as a template for future refinement as GenAI capabilities and norms continue to evolve.

The Four Ground Rules for GenAI in K-State Research

Before using GenAI for any research task, graduate students must adhere to these baselines.

- 1. Advisor and Funder Rules Override Defaults.** Local department rules and PI expectations always supersede these general guidelines. External funder and publisher policies (e.g., NIH peer review prohibitions) must also be strictly followed.
- 2. Data Security Is Paramount.** K-State distinguishes between Approved Contracted Tools and Public Tools. Microsoft M365 Copilot, for example, is approved only when accessed via K-State Single Sign-On (SSO), which ensures university data protections apply and that inputs are not used to train public AI models. Never enter unpublished IP, human-subject data (PII), or confidential survey data into public tools such as free ChatGPT or Gemini where no contractual protection exists.
- 3. AI Cannot Be an Author, and You Own the Output.** Major publishers strictly prohibit listing AI as a co-author. You are responsible for verifying the accuracy of all AI outputs. AI tools hallucinate citations, introduce bias, and can generate plagiarized code or text.
- 4. Radical Transparency.** If AI materially shaped your code, data transformations, or text, the tool must be cited, and prompts and data should be retained for replication.

Departmental Spotlight: Agricultural Economics PhD Policy

The K-State Department of Agricultural Economics has produced a benchmark standard for clear, practical graduate guidance. Key principles all researchers

should consider: students are wholly responsible for any errors or bias generated by AI and must ensure all information is accurate and properly cited; nothing should be submitted to an instructor, advisor, or collaborator that was copy-pasted from AI without clear indication; AI may be used to generate programming code and analyze data, but users are responsible for correct prompting and maintaining data integrity; and prompts and data used must be retained and offered for replication of results.

The L0–L4 Scale for GenAI Use

Adapted from benchmark standards at peer research institutions, this scale provides a shared vocabulary for graduate students and their Principal Investigators (PIs) to define acceptable AI use for specific projects.

5. **L0 — No GenAI Use.** All work is exclusively human-generated.
6. **L1 — Planning and Ideation.** Brainstorming, outlining, creating checklists. No AI-generated text or code appears in the final deliverable.
7. **L2 — Editing and Formatting.** Proofreading for clarity, grammar, structure, or LaTeX formatting. The AI does not add new research claims or concepts.
8. **L3 — Task Assistance (Requires Validation).** Literature triage, code generation and scaffolding, debugging, or data-cleaning scripts. Requires explicit documentation, human validation, and retention of prompts.
9. **L4 — Substantive Generation.** AI drafts full manuscript sections, generates synthetic analysis or labels, or creates figures. High restriction burden; prohibited by many departments and journals without explicit prior approval.

Research-Stage GenAI Matrix (Default Guidelines)

This matrix assumes the use of K-State approved tools accessed securely via SSO. If using public consumer tools, data inputs must be strictly limited to publicly available, non-sensitive information.

- **Topic Scoping and Literature Review (L1–L3):** Summarize abstracts; cluster themes; generate database search keywords. Verify all citations. Do not rely on AI for comprehensive literature searches, as models frequently fabricate references.
- **Compliance (L1–L2):** Clarify requirements; create internal protocol checklists. Prohibited: uploading draft protocols, participant info, or sensitive biological or animal data into any unapproved platform.

- **Data Cleaning and Coding (L2–L3):** Generating parsing scripts (Python/R); code refactoring; debugging. Must use version control. Retain prompts used to generate code to ensure reproducibility.
- **Modeling and Analysis (L1–L2):** Diagnostic check suggestions; brainstorming alternate statistical methods. Human-run validation is required. Do not use AI to generate analytical claims. You must be able to correctly describe the analysis yourself.
- **Writing (L2):** Grammar and tone editing; structural organization; translating to academic English. Prohibited: copy-pasting AI text as your own (L4 drafting) unless explicitly permitted by your advisor and publisher.
- **Figures and Visuals (L1–L2):** Caption assistance; aesthetic layout suggestions. Prohibited: presenting AI-generated visuals as real experimental output. Top journals explicitly ban AI-generated scientific figures.
- **IP and Patentable Work (L0–L1):** Organizing non-sensitive background summaries only. Prohibited: entering novel methods, unpublished inventions, or sponsor data into public AI tools, which legally compromises the IP.

Minimum Documentation Standards for Reproducibility

A. Lab Notebook / Code Repository Log

When GenAI is used at levels L2–L4, record the following in your lab notebook, README, or commit messages: (1) **Tool and Access** — specify the tool and access method to prove data security (e.g., Microsoft M365 Copilot via K-State SSO vs. ChatGPT public web interface); (2) **Task Purpose** — e.g., “Used to generate Python regex script for cleaning timestamps”; (3) **Prompt Retention** — save the specific prompts used so collaborators or reviewers can replicate results; (4) **Validation Step** — e.g., “Ran unit tests; manually verified output against 50 raw data rows.”

B. Manuscript Disclosure Template

Use the following template when submitting theses or manuscripts, aligned with ICMJE disclosure recommendations:

“During the preparation of this work, the author(s) used [Name of Tool/Version] in order to [edit for clarity / assist with code generation]. After using this tool/service, the author(s) reviewed and edited the content as needed and take(s) full responsibility for the accuracy of the publication. No restricted or identifiable data were processed through public AI tools. Prompts and AI-generated code snippets are available in the supplementary replication package.”

Verified Benchmark Policies and Reference Links

The guardrails in this appendix were synthesized from K-State's baseline guidance, local departmental standards (AgEcon), and the following verified benchmark policies from peer institutions and major research entities: K-State Baseline AI Guidance (k-state.edu/arm); National Institutes of Health, prohibition on AI in peer review (grants.nih.gov); Nature Portfolio AI Policy, banning AI-generated scientific imagery; Elsevier Generative AI Policy, requiring author oversight and prohibiting AI authorship; ICMJE AI Use by Authors, standardizing disclosure and accountability; Oregon State University, model for data classification and approved tool charts; and Colorado State University, model for limiting sensitive data to enterprise-approved tools.