DRAFT 10.14.2025

Georgia Institute of Technology

Guidance on the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Academic and Research Contexts

Table of Contents

Introduction

Georgia Tech recognizes AI's role in its mission to develop leaders who advance technology and improve the human condition, and the Institute is committed to ensuring its community members are supported in their responsible use of AI tools. The following Guidance was developed to support GT community members' use of AI in academic and research contexts in an ethical, responsible, and secure manner. This Guidance supports the operationalization of the AI in Academic and Research Contexts Policy and should be read in connection with that Policy.

Operationalizing Guiding Ethical Principles for the Use of AI

At Georgia Tech, ethical use of AI tools in the academic and research context is guided by eight principles. These include: (1) safeguarding protected data, (2) accountability, (3) transparency, (4) human oversight, (5) accessibility, (6) safeguards against hallucination, (7) prompt injection risk, and (8) fairness and bias mitigation. These principles are operationalized as described below:

- Safeguarding protected data means that GT community members must not submit any data (1) any data categorized by the Institute as Protected Data or (2) any data including personally identifiable information (including PII that can indirectly identify someone, like major, GPA, and academic term) into an AI tool not listed on the Institutional AI Register or the Local AI Registers. Even when using institutionally approved tools, GT Community Members must adequately safeguard this data from improper disclosure.
- Accountability means that the AI Governance Program, AI Governance Officer, AI Governance Committee, and the designees of the Executive Sponsors collaborate to (1) oversee, coordinate, and align Institute usage of AI in Academic and Research Contexts within the bounds of policy, (2) ensure proper responses to audit and investigation requests, and (3) coordinate the resolution of questions, complaints, and reports of noncompliance on AI usage in Academic and Research Contexts through existing Institute mechanisms.
- Transparency means that GT community members should not create the impression that output generated by AI tools is their own. GT community members should appropriately disclose AI usage in accordance with funder and publisher policies, discipline standards, legal requirements, or other ethical obligations. The magnitude of the AI use, significance of the work product, and discipline norms are factors to determine the necessity and appropriateness of a disclosure. GT community members should cite any quotations, paraphrasing, or ideas derived from AI tools. Failing to do so may be considered a violation of the Academic Honor Code or IP rights, or it may be considered scientific or scholarly misconduct.

- Human oversight means GT community members review and verify the accuracy of information generated by AI tools prior to relying on such information. It also means they accept responsibility for relying on or using any AI-generated content. Due to the risks associated with AI tools, GT community members should evaluate whether any AI tools are suitable for their specific tasks. Additionally, human oversight includes reviewing and approving AI tools for inclusion on the Institute AI Register or by the Local AI Point of Contact for addition to the Local Register.
- Accessibility means that basic accessibility principles and practices are applied when using AI tools for teaching, and the assurance that any AI tools required for student use are accessible to assistive technologies as defined by applicable laws or regulations.
- Safeguards against hallucination means reviewing and verifying the accuracy of AI-generated information because AI-generated content may include misleading or inaccurate content, content and materials from other authors, and/or others' Intellectual Property.
- Prompt injection risk means the assessment of the risk that inputs to AI tools can cause them to override intended instructions or controls and to then produce misleading outputs or to disclose information inappropriately.
- Fairness and bias mitigation means GT community members should (1) ensure AI-generated outputs do not lead to decisions that could disproportionately impact individuals or groups based on their protected classifications under applicable law or (2) avoid reliance on AI-generated results that may be indicative of potential bias based on protected classifications.

Operationalizations of the guiding ethical principles are provided to empower GT community members to use AI tools safely and productively in their academic and research work. These principles also support Local Points of Contact in assessing AI tools not listed on GT's AI Register of Institutionally Approved AI Tools.

Transparency and Ethical Use of AI

This section operationalizes the Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Academic and Research Contexts policy by providing guidance for GT community members involved in academic and research work, including but not limited to teaching, learning, coursework, assessment, laboratory or field research, research data analysis, and preparation of scholarly communications. It clarifies expectations for disclosure and content verification. Additionally, it addresses considerations for using AI tools in instruction, including the instructor's responsibility to communicate with students about whether AI tool usage is allowed in the course.

Disclosure and Guidance on AI Tool Use

GT community members may need to disclose the use of AI tools when creating academic, research, or scholarly products. The magnitude of the use and significance of the work product are factors to determine the necessity and appropriateness of a disclosure. At a minimum, disclosures should include the name of the AI tool(s) used and a clear explanation of the purpose and nature of their use.

In addition to disclosing the use of AI tools, GT community members should verify the accuracy of information generated by the tools before using or relying on it. Community members are responsible for the accuracy of any information they use or publish that includes AI-generated material.

A first step in verifying the accuracy of AI-generated content is to use credible, external sources and perform the following tasks: cross-reference any included facts, consult library databases, search referenced databases directly, and use fact-checking websites. Next, examine the AI-generated content for logical flaws by looking for inconsistencies, checking for outdated information, and considering the context. Never forget that AI is a tool, not an expert. For additional information on how to conduct accuracy verification, see the Office of Information Technology's AI Standards and Guidance.

All GT community members should recognize that failing to disclose the use of AI tools could be considered a violation of the Academic Honor Code, scientific or scholarly misconduct, or a violation of others' Intellectual Property (IP) rights.

Expectations for AI Use in Instruction

Instructors should provide students with clear guidance about permissible and impermissible uses of AI in their courses and assignments. Instructors should refer to Section VI.I.1 of the current Georgia Tech Catalog for requirements regarding syllabus content describing acceptable student conduct as it relates to the use of AI. Before instructors use AI outputs to inform grades, provide formal feedback, or create any official record, they should use Human Oversight to verify the appropriateness and correctness of

the use. Instructors are encouraged to consult the Center for Teaching and Learning's resource, "Developing Course Guidelines for Students' Use of Artificial Intelligence."

Numerous AI tools are available to assist in the instructional space. GT instructors will want to consider which tools provide meaningful contributions to the instructional space and justify any potential risks due to the use of the AI. Instructors should not use an AI tool in their instruction that has not been approved for Institute or local use by an AI Point of Contact. If an instructor identifies an AI tool that will meaningfully contribute to the success of students in their classes and is not on the Institute AI Register of Institutionally Approved AI Tools, they must consult with the Local AI Point of Contact prior to using the AI tool. The Local AI Point of Contact will assist the instructor in pursuing potential approval for Limited Use. Refer to the section on "Institutional Oversight of AI Use" later in this document for further information on this process.

GT community members should refer to the AI Register, maintained by the AI Governance Program, to review the list of Institutionally Approved AI tools. GT community members should also refer to the Local Register, maintained by the local AI Point of Contact, for those AI tools that have received approval for Limited Use in their unit.

Expectations for AI Use in Research

All GT community members are expected to adhere to ethical, legal, and professional guidelines that govern the conduct of research. This includes maintaining transparency regarding the use of AI tools in research, analysis, and scholarly activities. Failure to comply with these standards can result in significant and potentially damaging consequences for individuals, their teams, and the Institute.

AI can be reasonably used in various support tasks within the research context, including manuscript formatting, improving grammar and clarity, managing references, conducting literature searches, and creating visualizations. Disclosure is expected when the AI-generated content contributes substantive ideas or analysis, generates analytical outputs such as data analyses and write-ups, or generates a synthesis or conceptual framing of published work. Core scholarly and research contributions – including, but not limited to, conceptualizing research questions and projects, interpreting data, and drawing conclusions – are expected to remain under the full direction and responsibility of the GT community member and their team.

Disclosure Requirements for AI Tools

Transparency in research practices extends to the use of AI tools. GT community members should appropriately disclose when AI tools have contributed substantive ideas or analysis to their work, specifying at a minimum: the name of the tool(s), as well as the purpose and nature of the use. This expectation also applies to all members of a research team.

GT community members and their teams must ensure compliance with relevant funder and publisher policies. For example,

- The National Science Foundation requires disclosure of AI use in proposals,
- The National Institutes of Health prohibit AI use in peer review, and
- The Department of Defense requires detailed documentation of AI-generated content according to its Responsible AI (RAI) principles.

Failure to disclose the use of AI tools may be considered a violation of the Academic Honor Code, scientific or scholarly misconduct, or a violation of others' Intellectual Property (IP) rights. Such omissions can lead to serious consequences for both individuals and the Institute.

Example Disclosures of AI Use

Disclosure statements will vary by discipline and context, and in time, expectations may also change. At the writing of this guidance document, some example disclosure statements would include those listed below.

For research articles: "Authors used [AI tool] to [specific task such as improving language clarity]. All AI outputs were reviewed, validated, and revised when necessary. The authors take full responsibility for that content."

For conference presentations: "Presentation visuals were enhanced using [AI tool]. All research content and interpretations are the original work of the PI and research team."

For grant proposals: "Authors used [AI tool] to [specific task such as correcting grammar or conducting an initial literature search]. No AI tools were used for generating text, summarizing research, or formulating original project ideas. All AI outputs were reviewed, validated, and revised when necessary by [human]. The final content and intellectual contributions are entirely the work of the authors, who take full responsibility for the content of this proposal.

A more expansive template for an AI disclosure statement could take the following format: "This [article, conference proceedings, presentation, proposal, etc.] was created with the assistance of [AI tool]. The content has been reviewed, validated, and revised when necessary by [specific human]. The authors take full responsibility for the AI-generated content. For more information on the extent and nature of AI usage, please contact [author, presenter, submitter, etc.]."

Example Citations for AI Use

Several citation formats, including APA, MLA, Chicago, and IEEE, provide guidance on how to cite AI.

Research Misconduct and AI

Federal policy recognizes three primary forms of research misconduct: plagiarism, fabrication, and falsification. AI tools, if misused or undisclosed, can be implicated in any of these types of misconduct. Georgia Tech has established policies and procedures for investigating and addressing alleged incidents of research misconduct. In certain cases,

investigations may be conducted by government agencies, depending on the nature and severity of the allegation. For more information on research integrity, GT community members should refer to the Faculty Handbook provisions governing Scientific or Scholarly Misconduct and resources for the responsible conduct of research maintained by the Office of Research Integrity Assurance and the Office of Graduate and Postdoctoral Education.

Institutional Oversight of AI Use

This section covers how to choose Local AI Points of Contact, the ways to ask questions or file complaints about AI tool use, and the process for reviewing and updating the Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Academic and Research Contexts policy.

AI Points of Contact

Oversight and accountability for AI use begin at the local level to respect the specifics of discipline and context. Each Dean shall appoint a college-level or library AI Point of Contact. Other unit leaders – including, but not limited to, school chairs, vice provosts, and other unit leaders – may choose to designate their own AI Point of Contact for their specific unit. Alternatively, unit leaders may default to the AI Point of Contact within the unit to which they report.

The Executive Vice President for Research, the Executive Vice President for Administration and Finance, and the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs will each appoint an AI Point of Contact relevant to their respective areas.

The method and manner of AI Point of Contact designation are left to the unit leaders, but it is strongly recommended to include significant input and involvement from the unit faculty. For example, school chairs are advised to seek advice and input from their Faculty Advisory Councils or other advisory groups.

AI Tool Use Disputes

The AI Governance Program maintains a published process for receiving and routing questions and complaints related to AI use in Academic and Research Contexts, coordinating resolution through existing Institute mechanisms. GT community members can contact the AI Governance Officer for further information on submitting questions and complaints.

Institute mechanisms for dispute resolution can vary depending on whether the complaint is made by faculty, staff, affiliates, or students, and on the nature of the allegation. Useful information and an identification matrix are available on the Office of the Provost's Conflict Resolution & Advocacy page (provost.gatech.edu/reporting-units/advocacy). The Assistant Vice Provost for Advocacy and Conflict Resolution (AVP-ACR) provides consultation, mediation, training, and coaching services. GT faculty or community members wishing to report allegations against a faculty member may contact the AVP-ACR at advocacy@gatech.edu.

GT students with a grievance should refer to the Student Complaint Matrix. Students are further provided with a means of setting forth a complaint in the Students Complaint Policy.

GT community members can also reach out to the Office of the Ombuds (www.gatech.edu/ombuds), a confidential, informal, independent, and impartial resource for the Institute. The Ombuds offers consultation, mediation, education, and training when members of the community encounter a problem.

AI Policy Review and Update Process

Given the rapid evolution of AI technologies, it is essential that the AI Policy for Academic and Research Contexts, along with related documents, undergo a formal review and potential update on a regular basis. The responsibility for initiating this review lies with the AI Governance Committee. The AI Governance Committee shall be appointed annually by the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA), the Executive Vice President for Research (EVPR), and the Executive Vice President for Administration and Finance (EVPAF). The AI Governance Officer shall be appointed annually by the AI Governance Committee.

The AI Governance Committee – in collaboration with the Offices of the General Counsel, the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA), the Executive Vice President for Research (EVPR), the Executive Vice President for Administration and Finance (EVPAF), and other relevant bodies or their designees – will collectively review the current AI Policy in Academic and Research Contexts and its related documentation. This review will determine whether updates are necessary. If changes are warranted, the committee will oversee the process to ensure that revisions follow the Institute's established policy review and approval procedures.

In addition to the policy and document review, if there is a very significant development or shift in the field of AI that impacts the Institute's practices or obligations, the AI Governance Committee is charged with promptly initiating the same policy update and approval process outside of the regular review cycle. This ensures that the Institute's policies remain responsive and relevant in the face of profound technological changes.

AI Tool Review and Approval

This section explains how AI Tools are reviewed and recorded to support transparency in decision-making and tool availability. It operationalizes, and must remain consistent with, the Institute Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy in Academic and Research Contexts.

Institute review, approval, and inclusion in the Institute or a Local AI Registry are not required for a student's personal use of a free or personally licensed AI Tool. However, a student's use of free or personally licensed AI Tools in academic and research contexts must follow the Institute's Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy in Academic and Research Contexts and this accompanying Guidance.

GT Community Members may not purchase, deploy, or use an AI Tool for use in academic and research contexts until approval is granted using one of the methods explained below.

Routing to the Appropriate Review Path

Routing is based on a single question: **Is this Programmatic Use?**

Programmatic Use, as defined in Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy in Academic & Research Contexts, is:

> an AI Tool use that is operated or offered at scale in a course, lab, program or unit and (1) processes or stores student or institutional information beyond incidental or transient use, or (2) informs official academic or research decisions or records (e.g., grading workflows, formal feedback at scale, research data processing, or compliance-relevant tracking.

Programmatic uses implicate larger scale, regular, and/or critically important applications. These uses warrant the use of highly screened tools to mitigate risk. Consequently, institutionally approved tools are the only permissible tools for programmatic uses.

If Yes, the AI Tool for programmatic uses will follow the Institute review path. Institute reviews are conducted by the AI Governance Committee. These reviews include appropriate input and analysis from other Institute stakeholder offices, including but not limited to: Cybersecurity, Privacy, Data Governance, Procurement, and General Counsel. If approved, the tool becomes an Institutionally Approved AI Tool and is listed on the Institute AI Register. If not approved, the tool may not be used. Committee denial may be appealed and reviewed by the Executive Sponsors. Once an AI Tool is listed on the Institute AI Register, GT Community Members should feel comfortable using the tool.

If No, the AI Tool follows the local review path. Local reviews are conducted by the relevant unit's Local AI Point of Contact. If approved, the tool becomes a Limited Use AI Tool and should be listed on the unit's Local AI Register. In determining whether to approve an AI

tool for limited use, the Point of Contact must affirm alignment with the eight guiding ethical principles as defined in Institute policy (see Policy Section 2.1). If a local AI Point of Contact determines that an AI tool is inconsistent with any of the principles and the inconsistency cannot be mitigated, the Local AI Point of Contact must deny approved use. If not approved, GT Community Members may not use the tool in Academic and Research Contexts. Local denials may be appealed up the unit reporting chain. For example, the denial by a School AI Point of Contact may be appealed to the College AI Point of Contact, whose denial may be appealed to the Provost AI Point of Contact, whose denial may be appealed to the AI Governance Committee, whose denial may be appealed to the Executive Sponsors. Local AI Point of Contacts may refer a proposed AI Tool to the Institute path at their discretion when additional support may be needed.

Registers and Visibility

The Institute AI Register of Institutionally Approved Tools is maintained by the AI Governance Program. Local AI Registers are maintained by each unit's Local AI Point of Contact. The Institute AI Register maintains a link directory to each unit's Local AI Register, so Local AI Registers are discoverable by the Institute community. The Institute and Local Registers remain separate and are not combined.

Submission Information for Review and Registration

Each tool is reviewed on its own. The following information is required for review:

1. Tool name
2. Vendor
3. AI Tool Type(s) and AI Model Type(s) (use the categories below)
4. Brief description of any institution data and student data that interact with the tool
5. Primary purpose
6. Organizational benefit
7. Georgia Tech AI Tool Point of Contact for the AI Tool (name, department, email)

The following information will be added to the Register:

8. Decision outcome (Approved or Not Approved or Pending Approval)
9. Decision date
10. For approvals, include a short scope of approval note (for example, allowed for a course, lab, unit, or defined limited scope use)
11. Notes (optional)

AI Tool Types and Associated AI Model Types assist GT community members in better understanding the attributes of tools listed on the AI Register. The AI Register should provide information about a tool's capabilities and applications, including whether a tool contains any of the following:

- Predictive Analytics (ML; statistical models such as logistic regression, decision trees, ensembles)
- Chatbots or Virtual Assistants (NLP; LLMs, e.g., GPT-based; rule-based systems)
- Adaptive Learning and Tutoring (ML - reinforcement or supervised; NLP; recommendation systems)
- Generative AI for Content Creation (generative pre-trained transformers; diffusion models; LLMs)
- Automated Grading (NLP; ML classification models)
- Plagiarism Detection (NLP; similarity detection algorithms; ML)
- Proctoring and Security (computer vision; ML classification; behavioral analytics)
- Administrative Automation (ML; robotic process automation; NLP)

Periodic Review of the AI Tool Registers

This section explains how the Institute and Local AI Registers remain current. This procedure operationalizes, and must remain consistent with, the Institute Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy in Academic and Research Contexts.

The periodic review looks across the Institute AI Register and Local AI Registers to confirm that entries remain accurate, in-scope, and appropriate for continued use. The review does not replace case-by-case approvals or re-reviews triggered by specific changes; rather, it provides an inventory-wide check that complements those processes.

When a Review Occurs

- Scheduled: The AI Governance Program initiates a review at least once each year on a timeline approved by the AI Governance Committee and communicated to units.
- As needed: A review may be initiated when there are significant changes in AI Tool technologies, regulations, University System or Institute policies, or institutional strategy. The AI Governance Program may also initiate a review when patterns in incidents, risk assessments, or usage suggest that earlier attention is warranted.

Roles and Responsibilities

- The AI Governance Officer initiates the periodic review and prepares recommendations. The AI Governance Committee provides oversight and may endorse Institute-level actions arising from the review.
- The AI Governance Program and AI Tool Points of Contact confirm the status of tools on the Institute AI Register, update entries as needed, and provide clarifications requested by the AI Governance Committee.
- Local AI Points of Contact and AI Tool Points of Contact confirm the status of tools on their Local AI Registers, update entries as needed, and provide clarifications requested by the AI Governance Program or the AI Governance Committee.
- Approval authority does not change. Institute and Local approval bodies remain responsible for any new or revised decisions.

What the Review Considers

The review focuses on whether each listed tool remains accurate in the inventory and appropriate for its approved scope. Typical considerations include:

- Whether the tool's purpose and scope of approval still match current use.
- Whether there have been material changes to the tool, vendor, licensing terms, or data handling that would warrant re-review.
- Whether policy, regulatory, or strategic changes require adjustments to conditions of use.
- Whether duplicative tools can be rationalized to reduce risk and complexity.

Relationship to Re-Review

This section addresses inventory-wide periodic review. Separately, any individual tool must be submitted for re-review when events occur that would change its routing or conditions of approval (for example, significant contract changes, a vendor change, or changes that would alter the Programmatic Use determination). See the re-review guidance in the prior section.

Outcomes and Follow-Through

Periodic review may lead to one or more of the following outcomes, which are documented in the appropriate Register:

- Continue approval as-is.
- Continue approval with updated scope, conditions, or notes.
- Require a re-review through the appropriate path (Institute or Local).
- Sunset the tool with a transition plan.

The AI Governance Program communicates outcomes to affected units and updates the Institute AI Register accordingly. Local points of contact update their Local AI Registers.

Records and Transparency

- The AI Governance Program maintains a concise summary of the periodic review and any Institute-level actions taken. Units maintain their Local AI Registers so that the Institute community can see current approvals and scope.

When to Return for Re-Review

AI Tool Point of Contacts submit the tool for re-review if any of the following occur:

- Significant changes to contract language or terms that affect data, rights, or risk
- A vendor change or other material change to the tool or its provider
- Any change that would alter the Programmatic Use determination described above.

Periodic Review

Periodic review of the AI tool inventory is addressed in the next section of this Guide.

Third-Party AI Agreements: Ethical Principles and Safeguards

This section explains how the Institute ensures that third-party agreements for AI tools address ethical considerations and include safeguards against bias, hallucinations, and prompt injection, consistent with USG requirements. The Office of Procurement and Business Services leads contracting with suppliers, including for contracts that include or implicate AI. The Office of the General Counsel advises the Office of Procurement & Business Services on standard language and adjustments for such contracts. When an agreement is complex or poses high risk with respect to AI, the Office of Procurement and Business Services and the Office of the General Counsel should consult with the AI Governance Officer to align risk controls with Institute policy.

Scope and Ownership

This guidance applies to new purchases, renewals, and activations of AI features in third-party products and services, including embedded AI within tools and platforms.

Process Overview

Before purchase, deployment, or activation of AI capabilities in a supplier tool, the Office of Procurement and Business Services should confirm that the agreement addresses the ethical principles and safeguards listed below. The Office of General Counsel (OGC) advises on the appropriate contract language; for complex or high-risk agreements, OGC should co-draft terms with the Office of Procurement and Business Services. Any exception to the provisions below requires approval by the Office of Procurement and Business Services with OGC concurrence, and the decision is recorded.

Minimum Ethical Principles and Safeguards to be Addressed in Agreements

Supplier agreements must be consistent with, in terms appropriate to the tool and risk, the following principles:

- Safeguarding Protected Data: protect Institute and student data consistent with Institute policy and law; limit use of Institute data to providing the contracted service; do not train shared or foundation models on Institute data without express written permission; support return and deletion at termination; notify of incidents consistent with Institute standards.
- Accountability: define responsibilities for monitoring misuse, reporting issues, and remediating defects or harms; commit to timely corrective action when risks are identified.
- Transparency: provide user-facing disclosures or technical documentation about appropriate uses and known limitations; notify the Institute of material changes that could affect risk or approved scope.
- Human Oversight: retain meaningful human review for uses that inform official decisions or records and ensure the tool supports such review in practice.

- Accessibility: support accessibility requirements applicable to Institute users; cooperate in remediation where needed.
- Safeguards against hallucination: acknowledge the risk of inaccurate outputs and support controls that reduce this risk (for example, citations or configuration for human review where appropriate); commit to correction when defects materially affect outcomes.
- Prompt injection risk: implement reasonable, current protections against prompt injection, jailbreaks, and related adversarial inputs; isolate Institute context and maintain a patching program for emerging threats.
- Fairness and bias mitigation: assess and mitigate material, foreseeable bias relevant to Institute use cases; provide high-level testing methods or results upon request; commit to remediation if material bias is identified in production use.

Records and Secure Storage

The Office of Procurement and Business Services maintains records demonstrating that agreements address the principles and safeguards above and documenting any approved exceptions or escalations. Records must be retained in accordance with applicable USG and Institute retention schedules and stored in Institute-approved secure repositories.

Relationship to Other Guidance

This section complements the Institute's routing and approval guidance for AI Tools. If a change in law, regulation, supplier practices, or model behavior creates new risk, OGC may issue an advisory memo to the AI Governance Officer and the AI Governance Committee and, for high-risk matters, to Executive Sponsors, which may prompt re-review of affected tools or updates potential addendums to contracts.

Professional Development for AI Use

This section outlines the Institute's approach to AI training and awareness for faculty, staff, affiliates, and student employees. It specifies the training platforms used, identifies supplemental resources available, and sets expectations for timing and completion. It also describes how completions and attendance are monitored and how communications will be delivered and tracked to maintain ongoing awareness. These practices operationalize the Institute's Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy in Academic and Research Contexts.

Training Tools

- Faculty, Staff, Affiliates, and Student Employees: Training will be provided via the KnowBe4 platform, which is currently utilized across the University System of Georgia.
- Supplemental learning and resources will be provided via asynchronous resources on the Office of Information Technology's AI website, the Office of Research Integrity Assurance's website, and the Office of Student Integrity's website, including modules from Momentum U (USG Guide to AI Literacy), LinkedIn Learning, KnowBe4, and Wharton Online, to ensure GT community members understand AI risks, ethics, responsible use, and compliance.

Training Schedule

- New Hires: All incoming employees will be required to complete AI training as part of new hire onboarding.
- Existing Faculty, Staff, Affiliates, and Student Employees: Existing faculty, staff, affiliates, and student employees will be required to complete AI training as part of the established compliance campaign.

Monitoring of Completion & Attendance Logs

- New Hires: Completion records from the KnowBe4 platform will log training progress, quiz scores, and completion status. These records are accessible to Georgia Tech's Office of Information Technology and compliance administrators, who review completion reports at the end of the new hire onboarding training. New Hires who have not completed the required training will be flagged for follow-up during the onboarding period.
- Existing Faculty, Staff, Affiliates, and Student Employees: Completion records from the KnowBe4 platform will log training progress, quiz scores, and completion status. These records are accessible to Georgia Tech's Office of Information Technology and compliance administrators, who review completion reports after the compliance campaign. Faculty, staff, and affiliates who have not completed the required training will be flagged for follow-up reminders during the compliance campaign.

- Supplemental Learning: Engagement with asynchronous resources (e.g., LinkedIn Learning, Momentum U) will be tracked within those platforms. Completion certificates or usage data can be exported as supplemental evidence of voluntary learning activity.

Delivery of Communications

Awareness will be achieved through a multi-channel communications strategy and ongoing programming:

- The Office of Information Technology's AI website (https://oit.gatech.edu/ai) will serve as the central hub, with links to policy, standards, training resources, and schedules for sessions and workshops.
- The Office of Research Integrity Assurance's website will provide resources to assist researchers in understanding AI risks, ethics, responsible use, and compliance. The website will include links to policy, standards, training resources, and schedules for sessions and workshops.
- The Office of Student Integrity's website will provide resources to assist students in understanding AI risks, ethics, responsible use, and compliance. The website will include links to policy, standards, training resources, and schedules for sessions and workshops.
- The AI Governance Officer will coordinate with the Office of the Provost, Office of the Executive Vice President for Research, and Institute Communications to promote AI policy updates through:
  - The *Academic & Research Update* e-newsletter
  - Email distribution lists
  - The Institute's daily publication, *The Daily Digest*
- Generative AI sessions and workshops will continue to be offered regularly, featuring tool demonstrations, use cases, and best practices. These opportunities will also be promoted and archived via the AI website.
- The AI Governance Officer will develop a cadenced communication schedule to ensure consistent awareness and engagement across semesters.

Monitoring of Awareness Activities

- Website Analytics: The OIT AI website will be monitored using web analytics to track visits, page views, and engagement with policy and training resources.
- Workshop Attendance: Sign-in sheets, T participation logs, or registration records should be collected for each generative AI workshop or session, to provide a record of participation.

Feedback Surveys: Post-session surveys and feedback forms should be used to measure awareness, understanding, and effectiveness of outreach efforts.

Monitoring AI Legal and Policy Changes, Audit Records, and Secure Storage

This section details how the Institute monitors AI-related legal and regulatory changes, maintains records to support audits and investigations, and stores those records securely. It operationalizes, and must remain consistent with, the Institute's Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy in Academic and Research Contexts.

Monitoring Legal and Regulatory Changes

The Office of the General Counsel (OGC) monitors AI-related legal and regulatory developments on an ongoing basis. When a significant change is noted, OGC may issue a brief advisory memo to the AI Governance Officer and the AI Governance Committee. If the change poses a high risk to the Institute, OGC should also inform the Executive Sponsors. Noted changes may prompt review or updates to Institute Policy, Standards, Specifications, Procedures, and entries in the Institute and Local AI Registers. Coordination of any follow-up actions will be led by the AI Governance Officer.

Self-Monitoring for Compliance

GT community members using AI Tools in academic and research contexts have a responsibility to ensure compliance with USG and Institute policies and procedures. Named roles and committees with significant responsibilities in the AI Governance Program perform self-monitoring to ensure compliance with the Institute AI in Academic and Research Contexts Policy, and to ensure records are maintained.

These named roles and committees include:

- AI Governance Committee
- AI Governance Officer
- AI Tool Points of Contact
- Executive Sponsors
- Academic and Research Domain Points of Contact (e.g., Provost Point of Contact)
- Local AI Points of Contact (e.g., College Point of Contact)
- Office of General Counsel
- Office of Procurement and Business Services
- Vice President for Technology and Chief Information Officer

Named roles and committees with significant responsibilities in the AI Governance Program (see the list in the subsection above) maintain records sufficient to demonstrate compliance. The AI Governance Officer may serve as the point of coordination for audits and investigations. Audits may be conducted by the AI Governance Officer, Internal Audit, or, as required by policy, law, regulation, or contract, by the University System Office, the State of Georgia, or other authorities. Internal Investigations and the University System Office may conduct investigations.

Retention

Retain records in accordance with the applicable USG and Institute records retention schedules.

Secure Storage Procedures

All records of evidence must be stored in Institute-approved secure repositories and remain accessible to the Institute for audit or investigation. Approved storage includes, for example, Microsoft OneDrive, Microsoft SharePoint sites, and departmental file servers. Do not store official records on personal devices or in unapproved third-party systems.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) for AI Use

1. What is the purpose of the AI Policy? The AI Policy aims to guide the ethical, responsible, and secure use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) within Georgia Tech's Academic and Research Contexts. It ensures that AI tools are used in a manner that aligns with the Institute's values and regulatory requirements. (See policy section 2.2)

2. What are AI Tools as defined in this policy? AI Tools refer to any software, platform, device, or cloud service whose core functionality relies on AI systems. This includes Institute-licensed, open-source, embedded, or publicly accessible tools. (See policy section 2.1)

3. What ethical principles guide the use of AI at Georgia Tech? The policy outlines several guiding ethical principles, including safeguarding protected data, accountability, transparency, human oversight, accessibility, safeguards against hallucination, prompt injection risk, and fairness and bias mitigation. (See policy section 2.1)

4. How should GT community members handle protected data when using AI tools? GT community members must not submit (1) any data categorized by the Institute as Protected Data or (2) any data including personally identifiable information (including PII that can indirectly identify someone, like major, GPA, and academic term) into an AI tool not listed on the Institutional AI Register. Even when using institutionally approved tools, GT Community Members must adequately safeguard this data from improper disclosure. (See policy section 2.2.2)

5. What is the role of the AI Governance Program? The AI Governance Program is responsible for ensuring that institutional tooling and supplier agreements reflect the guiding ethical principles. It maintains the AI Register, which identifies AI tools meeting the Programmatic Use and Institutionally Approved classifications. (See policy section 2.3.2)

6. What are the responsibilities of GT community members regarding AI use? GT community members are responsible for understanding the terms and conditions of AI tools, respectecting others' intellectual property rights, ensuring data compliance with privacy laws, verifying the accuracy of AI-generated information, and appropriately disclosing AI use in their academic and research products. (See policy section 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.5)

7. How should AI be used in academic instruction? Instructors should provide students with clear guidance about permissible and impermissible uses of AI in their courses and assignments. Instructors should refer to Section VI.I.1 of the current Georgia Tech Catalog for requirements regarding syllabus content describing acceptable student conduct as it relates to the use of AI. (See policy section 2.2.6)

8. What are the requirements for AI use in research practices? GT community members should use independent human oversight and validation appropriate to their discipline and

context when implementing AI tools in research. They should verify AI outputs before using them in research processes or data analysis and comply with applicable funder and publisher policies. GT community members and their teams should also appropriately disclose the use of AI tools to produce or substantively inform their work. (See policy section 2.2.7)

9. What is the scope of this AI Policy? The policy governs the use of AI in academic and research contexts by all GT faculty, researchers, staff, affiliates, students, and units. It covers all teaching, learning, research, administrative, and related activities and is supported by additional policies and procedures. (See policy section 2.3)