UT San Antonio™
The University of Texas at San Antonio

AI Task Force Report

May 2026

Academic Affairs

Table of Contents

Task Force Members 3
Executive Summary 4
Teaching Subgroup Recommendations 6
Research Subgroup Recommendations 13
Operations Subgroup Recommendations 16
Appendices 24

Task Force Members

- **Steve Wilkerson, Co-Chair** -*Senior Vice Provost for Strategic Analytics & integrated Systems*
- **Glenn Martinez, Co-Chair** -*Dean, College of Liberal and Fine Arts*
- **Posie Aagaard** -*Senior Associate Vice Provost for Scholarly Resources, Libraries and Collections*
- **Lynn Barnes** -*Senior Vice Provost, Strategic Enrollment*
- **Rebecca Bria** -*Assistant Professor, College of Liberal and Fine Arts*
- **Amy Buechler-Steubing** -*Associate Vice Provost, Strategic Initiatives and Learning Innovation, Student Success*
- **Jiannan Cai** -*Assistant Professor, Klesse College of Engineering and Integrated Design*
- **Jessica Dawson** -*Associate Dean of Students – Involvement, Student Affairs*
- **Mary Dixson** -*Professor of Instruction and Faculty Advisory Council Representative, College of Liberal and Fine Arts*
- **Alex Hennel** -*Student, Cyber Security, SGA Treasurer*
- **Joe Houpt** -*Professor, College for Health, Community and Policy*
- **Don Lien** -*Professor, Statistics and Data Science, College of AI, Cyber and Computing*
- **Charles Liu** -*Professor and Department Chairs Council Representative, College of AI, Cyber and Computing*
- **Nadia Lopez** -*Program Manager, People Excellence*
- **Vittorio Marone** -*Professor, College of Education and Human Development*
- **Kelly Nash** -*Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs, Faculty Success*
- **Debra Pena** -*Associate Professor of Instruction and Program Director, Writing Program, University College*
- **Becky Sanchez** -*Senior Director Financial Analysis & Business Intelligence, Office of Financial Affairs*
- **Fidel Santamaria** -*Professor, College of Sciences*
- **Dan Sass** -*Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Associate Professor, Alvarez College of Business*
- **Michael Schnabel** -*Vice President and Chief Information Officer, University Technology Services*
- **Jennifer Swoyer** -*Professor of Instruction and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Representative, College of Education and Human Development*
- **Melissa Vito** -*Vice Provost, Academic Innovation*
- **Xiaoyin Wang** -*Professor and Graduate Faculty Committee Representative, College of AI, Cyber and Computing*

Resource members

- **Sondra Cooper** -*Assistant Director of Strategic Initiatives, Operations and Initiatives, Academic Affairs*
- **Rebecca Luther** -*Senior Director, Academic Strategic Communications, Academic Affairs*
- **Sarah Soulek** -*Faculty Evaluations Coordinator, Faculty Success, Academic Affairs*

Executive Summary

Background and Charge

In Fall 2025, the Provost convened the Artificial Intelligence (AI) Task Force to examine how UT San Antonio can strategically and responsibly integrate artificial intelligence across teaching, research, and operations.

Charge

The task force will identify ways of empowering faculty, staff and students to use AI with confidence, competence, and integrity. Examining factors such as opportunities for skill development, policy and process improvements, ethical considerations, and potential pathways to collaborate with the College of AI, Cyber and Computing, the task force will make recommendations to the provost on integrating AI strategically and responsibly to support excellence in teaching, research and operations.

Task Force Process

The task force met five times between November 2025 and March 2026. Following the kickoff meeting, members were organized into Teaching, Research, and Operations subgroups. Subgroups conducted much of their work independently and asynchronously, supplemented by breakout discussions during full task force meetings to discuss progress, share findings, and develop recommendations. Together, the subgroups examined current practices, opportunities, challenges, and emerging trends related to AI adoption across the university.

Summary of Findings

The task force identified several common themes across teaching, research, and operations. AI use is already occurring throughout the institution and will continue to expand. However, adoption is currently decentralized, resulting in varying levels of awareness, confidence, consistency, and support. Across all three areas, the task force identified a need for greater institutional clarity regarding expectations, responsible use, governance, and available resources. At the same time, the reports emphasize that AI implementation should remain flexible and adaptable, recognizing the rapidly evolving nature of AI technologies and the differing needs of academic disciplines, research activities, and operational functions.

The Teaching Subgroup focused on the role of AI in teaching and learning, examining how the university can support instructional quality, academic integrity, responsible use, and workforce readiness. Its recommendations emphasize the development of clear guidance for students and faculty, practical resources that support instructional implementation, transparency in the use of AI within educational settings, and approaches that ensure AI

enhances rather than replaces student learning and critical thinking. The subgroup also highlighted the importance of preparing students to engage thoughtfully and responsibly with AI in their future professions.

The Research Subgroup examined AI's role in advancing research while preserving research integrity and ethical standards. The subgroup recommends a values-driven approach grounded in transparency, integrity, human judgment, privacy, and scholarly rigor. Recognizing the diverse nature of research activities across the university, the subgroup advocates for institution-wide principles supported by local implementation, ongoing training, shared governance structures, and a continually updated repository of guidance and resources that can evolve alongside emerging technologies.

The Operations Subgroup focused on the use of AI to support administrative effectiveness and service delivery. Drawing on campus survey data and benchmarking against peer institutions, the subgroup found significant interest in AI adoption among faculty and staff, accompanied by a desire for clearer guidance, practical training, and institutionally supported tools. Its recommendations emphasize operationally focused training, clear guardrails for responsible use, strategic investment in supported technologies, and the identification of high-impact use cases that demonstrate measurable value while addressing ethical, environmental, and workforce-related concerns.

Conclusion

Taken together, the subgroup reports suggest that successful AI integration at UT San Antonio will require a balance between institutional coordination and functional flexibility. Common themes across all recommendations include the need for clear guidance and governance, practical and ongoing training, transparency in AI use, protection of privacy and data security, preservation of human judgment and accountability, and mechanisms that allow institutional practices to evolve as AI technologies continue to change. Rather than focusing solely on technology adoption, the task force's recommendations emphasize building the knowledge, skills, and structures necessary to support responsible and effective AI use across teaching, research, and operations.

Teaching Subgroup Recommendations

Institutional Guidance for Responsible AI Use in Teaching and Learning

Overview

The AI Teaching Subgroup aims to advance the intentional, pedagogically grounded use of artificial intelligence to strengthen teaching and learning at UT San Antonio. Although many faculty members are already incorporating AI tools into their courses, these efforts are decentralized and vary in scope and expectations, resulting in inconsistent student experiences and uneven implementation. Instructors are independently navigating evolving technologies, academic integrity concerns, accessibility standards, and data privacy considerations — a fragmented approach that increases faculty burden and creates variability in how students are guided in responsible AI use.

A coordinated institutional strategy can provide clear instructional guidance, align AI integration with learning outcomes, and ensure implementation is driven by pedagogy rather than tools. By supporting faculty development, centralizing resources, and embedding workforce-relevant AI competencies — such as critical evaluation, ethical reasoning, and applied problem-solving — the university can enhance instructional quality and equity.

The subgroup's recommendations are designed to move to a coherent, sustainable approach to AI-enabled teaching that preserves academic rigor, increases student engagement, supports faculty across all appointment types, addresses the diverse needs of all students including those with disabilities, and prepares students for an evolving professional environment. This subgroup notes that Academic Innovation is already addressing a number of these recommendations, which will help expedite the response to this report. In addition, this subgroup has not considered resource needs and appreciates that some of these recommendations may also require additional resources.

Guiding Principles

AI integration in teaching will be guided by four principles or pillars of success: instructional quality, academic integrity, responsible use, and workforce relevance. AI should enhance, not replace, faculty expertise and student intellectual engagement. The following recommendations move from policy and guideline clarity to implementation, assessment, and continuous improvement.

These recommendations apply across all course modalities. Online, hybrid, and in-person courses each present distinct challenges for AI integration and academic integrity, and guidance should be implemented with those differences in mind. AI integration should also remain sensitive to disciplinary norms and professional accreditation expectations. Programs should retain the autonomy to establish additional guidance appropriate to their field.

Recommendations at a Glance

Pillar	Recommendation	Priority
Pillar 1: Clarity & Academic Integrity	1. Establish Clear Institutional Guidance on Student AI Use	**High**
	2. Promote AI Literacy as Evaluative Judgment	**High**
Pillar 2: Faculty Support & Practical Integration	3. Provide Practical AI Teaching Toolkits	**High**
	4. Gather Faculty Feedback on AI Readiness and Needs	**Medium**
Pillar 3: Responsible Instructional Use	5. Provide Guidance on AI-Assisted Content Creation	**High**
	6. Ensure Transparency in AI-Assisted Grading and Feedback	**High**
	7. Encourage Appropriate Contexts for AI Integration	**Medium**
	8. Prevent AI Skill Offloading and Protect Student Learning	**High**
Pillar 4: Workforce Readiness Through Teaching	9. Emphasize Transferable AI-Related Competencies	**High**

Pillar 1: Clarity and Academic Integrity

Recommendation 1: Establish Clear Institutional Guidance on Student AI Use

Priority: High — *Foundational to all other recommendations; without shared baseline guidance, inconsistency will persist regardless of other efforts.*

Develop concise, university-level guidance that distinguishes between AI as a learning support tool and AI as a substitute for student work. The objective is to reduce uncertainty for both faculty and students: students should clearly understand when AI may be used for practice, brainstorming, or feedback, and when independent intellectual work is required.

Implementation Actions

- Provide model syllabus language that faculty can adopt or adapt.
- Offer brief assignment-level disclosure templates.
- Clarify how AI use aligns with existing academic integrity policies.
- Provide examples of appropriate and inappropriate AI use cases by discipline.
- Address consistency across online, hybrid, and in-person modalities in all guidance materials.
- Incorporate student perspectives when developing and refining guidance language to ensure clarity, engagement and relevance for the student experience.

Recommendation 2: Promote AI Literacy as Evaluative Judgment

Priority: High — *Critical for ensuring students develop durable cognitive skills rather than dependence on AI-generated outputs*.

Encourage instructional models that teach students to critically evaluate AI outputs rather than simply generate them. This positions AI literacy as a cognitive and professional skill — developing judgment, not just technical familiarity. Preparing students to supervise, critique, and responsibly apply AI is essential to their readiness for professional environments in which these tools are increasingly prevalent.

Implementation Actions

- Create examples of assignments requiring students to critique AI-generated responses.
- Promote structured reflection components in which students explain how AI was used and assessed.
- Highlight disciplinary standards for identifying bias, inaccuracies, or oversimplifications in AI outputs.

Pillar 2: Faculty Support and Practical Integration

Recommendation 3: Provide Practical AI Teaching Toolkits

Priority: High — *Faculty cannot be expected to navigate rapidly evolving AI tools in isolation; practical support is essential to consistent and effective implementation*.

Offer optional, implementation-ready resources that help faculty integrate AI strategically without increasing workload. Faculty autonomy remains central; these tools are designed to assist, not mandate. Resources should be relevant to faculty across all appointment types, including part-time instructors who may have fewer opportunities for extended professional development. Recognize that AI is evolving rapidly and ensure that the development of resources and other tools is dynamic and responds to continual changes in AI.

Implementation Actions

- Develop short guides with examples of AI-assisted rubric drafting, with emphasis on faculty review and refinement.
- Provide models for multi-stage assignments incorporating AI feedback and student revision.
- Share examples of AI use for formative feedback, case simulation, and practice problem generation.
- Clarify the distinction between AI for instructional efficiency and AI for deeper learning.

- Ensure toolkit resources meet accessibility standards and address modality-specific considerations for online and hybrid courses.

Recommendation 4: Gather Faculty Feedback on AI Readiness and Needs

Priority: Medium — *Gathering faculty feedback is most valuable after basic AI guidance and resources are in place — otherwise there is nothing concrete for faculty to respond to.*

Periodically gather brief feedback on faculty confidence, perceived risks, and support needs. This ensures responsiveness without adding significant reporting burden. Findings will be used to shape and prioritize targeted workshops, refine guidance, and identify where additional support is needed.

Implementation Actions

- Embed brief AI-related questions into existing faculty development surveys.
- Identify areas where faculty seek support, such as assignment redesign, prompt construction, AI tools, or academic integrity concerns.
- Use findings to shape targeted workshops or guidance materials.
- Regularly gather student feedback on how AI policies and practices are affecting their learning experience and use findings alongside faculty input to refine guidance.

Pillar 3: Responsible Instructional Use

Recommendation 5: Provide Guidance on AI-Assisted Content Creation

Priority: High — *Faculty are already creating AI-assisted content; clear expectations are needed now to ensure accuracy, accessibility, and compliance.*

Clarify expectations for responsible AI use in developing instructional materials, supporting innovation while preserving instructional integrity and compliance. Faculty retain full responsibility for the accuracy, fairness, and accessibility of any AI-assisted content used in their courses. Guidance should also recognize that AI tools can provide meaningful accessibility benefits for students with disabilities — including writing assistance, reading support, and content summarization — and that these uses should be acknowledged and appropriately supported rather than inadvertently restricted.

Implementation Actions

- Emphasize faculty responsibility for accuracy, bias review, and alignment with learning objectives.

- Provide examples of appropriate AI-assisted development of slides, quiz drafts, or practice materials.
- Reinforce accessibility standards for AI-generated content, including review for compliance with university and legal requirements.
- Provide guidance on how AI tools can support students with disabilities, in coordination with Digital Accessibility and Disability Services.

Recommendation 6: Ensure Transparency in AI-Assisted Grading and Feedback

Priority: High — *Students have a reasonable expectation to know when AI is being used to evaluate their work; transparency is fundamental to trust and fairness in assessment*.

As AI tools become more capable of generating feedback and supporting grading processes, faculty must be clear with students about when and how AI is used in evaluating their work. Just as students are expected to disclose their AI use, faculty should model the same standard of transparency. This is not about restricting faculty use of AI in assessment — it is about ensuring students understand the nature of the feedback they receive and can trust the integrity of the evaluation process.

Implementation Actions

- Develop guidance on how faculty should disclose AI use in grading or feedback, including recommended syllabus language.
- Clarify the distinction between AI-assisted feedback (e.g., AI-generated draft comments refined by faculty) and fully automated grading and establish appropriate expectations for each.
- Reinforce that faculty retain full responsibility for the accuracy and fairness of any AI-assisted feedback or grades provided to students.
- Encourage faculty to explain to students how AI-generated feedback should be interpreted and how it relates to faculty judgment.
- Address student rights to request human review of AI-assisted evaluations, particularly in high-stakes assessments.

Recommendation 7: Encourage Appropriate Contexts for AI Integration

Priority: Medium — *Important for long-term instructional quality and likely best implemented after foundational guidance and faculty support are established*.

Promote AI use in formative and low-stakes learning contexts while maintaining rigor in high-stakes assessments. This balances instructional innovation with academic

standards. Guidance should address how appropriate AI contexts may differ across online, hybrid, and in-person course formats.

Implementation Actions

- Share examples of AI-supported draft feedback and iterative revision processes.
- Highlight structured peer review models that incorporate AI critique.
- Reinforce expectations for independent student work in summative evaluations.
- Address modality-specific considerations, such as proctoring limitations in online courses and in-class writing options for in-person sections.

Recommendation 8: Prevent AI Skill Offloading and Protect Student Learning

Priority: High — *One of the most pressing concerns raised by faculty; students who outsource their thinking to AI graduate without the skills employers expect.*

One of the most significant risks of unguided AI use is skill offloading — students delegating their thinking, writing, and problem-solving entirely to AI tools and bypassing the learning process those tasks are designed to produce. This is not simply an academic integrity issue; it is a workforce readiness crisis in the making. Graduates who cannot perform core disciplinary skills independently will be underprepared for professional environments, even those that rely heavily on AI.

The university should support faculty in designing courses and assessments that make skill offloading difficult and genuine learning visible. The goal is not to prohibit AI but to ensure that AI use requires — rather than replaces — student reasoning, creativity, critical thinking, and judgment.

Implementation Actions

- Support faculty in redesigning assignments to require demonstrated reasoning, personal application, or iterative process that AI cannot replicate independently — such as reflective journals, oral defenses, in-class writing, or multi-draft projects with documented revision.
- Provide guidance on assignment structures that use AI as a starting point requiring substantial student critique, revision, and independent judgment rather than as a final product.
- Develop discipline-specific examples of assessments that validate students can perform core skills independently, particularly in high-stakes professional programs.
- Encourage transparency and disclosure requirements in which students document how AI was used and articulate their own independent contributions.

- Include skill offloading risks in faculty toolkit resources and academic integrity guidance so faculty can address the issue proactively in their syllabi and course design.

Pillar 4: Workforce Readiness Through Teaching

Recommendation 9: Emphasize Transferable AI-Related Competencies

Priority: High — *Employer expectations around AI competency are evolving rapidly; graduates without these skills will be at a competitive disadvantage*.

Frame AI integration around durable graduate capabilities rather than specific tools. The objective is to ensure graduates can supervise, critique, and responsibly apply AI in professional settings — skills that will remain relevant as specific technologies continue to evolve.

Core Competencies

- Critical evaluation of AI outputs
- Ethical reasoning, including bias detection
- Evidence-based decision-making
- Professional judgment in AI-assisted environments
- Prompt design and refinement
- Validation of AI-generated analyses
- Verification of AI-generated citations
- Integration of AI outputs into professional workflows

Implementation Actions

- Encourage assignments requiring students to assess and revise AI-generated recommendations.
- Align AI-related activities with existing program learning outcomes where appropriate.
- Engage employer advisory boards for input on applied AI expectations in relevant fields.

Research Subgroup

Values-Driven Use of Artificial Intelligence in Research

Overview

The Research Sub-Group of the AI Task Force is charged with developing a living, institution-wide strategy for the use of artificial intelligence in research at UT San Antonio. Recognizing that AI technologies are evolving at an unprecedented pace, the group's work is grounded in the understanding that AI integration into research cannot be static or centralized within a single office. Instead, it requires sustained, collaborative involvement across colleges, schools, departments, and administrative units.

Rather than promoting a one-size-fits-all approach, the sub-group envisions a core set of shared values and principles that guide the ethical and effective use of AI in research. These values would be applied locally by each academic unit to meet its distinct research objectives, disciplinary norms, and methodological needs. To support this decentralized yet aligned approach, the task force emphasizes the importance of comprehensive training on these core values for students, postdoctoral scholars, and faculty.

Mission and Vision Alignment

The sub-group's recommendations are explicitly aligned with the university's institutional mission and vision. UT San Antonio's mission provides a clear foundation for how AI should be used in research: AI adoption should directly advance excellence in research, discovery, commercialization, and health, while reinforcing UT San Antonio's role as a public research institution serving broad societal needs.

Similarly, UT San Antonio's vision of becoming a premier public research university informs the aspirational role of AI. Researchers should leverage AI to enhance scholarly productivity, expand access to research excellence, and prepare faculty and trainees to operate effectively in a global research environment. In this way, AI becomes not merely a set of tools, but a strategic enabler of the university's long-term research ambitions.

Recommendation #1: Tools

Tools, Governance, and Risk Considerations

The sub-group emphasizes that all stakeholders must acknowledge the rapidly changing AI landscape. Questions such as what tools will are relevant now and how those tools may evolve over five years underscore the need for flexibility and ongoing review. Enterprise-supported tools such as Microsoft Copilot may be immediately available, while other widely used tools (e.g., Claude) may offer distinct value for researchers but fall outside current institutional support structures.

Equally important are boundaries and restrictions on AI use. Researchers must understand limitations related to intellectual property, data security, and sensitive information. Clear guidance is needed on what types of research data may be entered into AI systems, even when those systems are institutionally approved. The sub-group recommends the development of AI-specific guidance aligned with IRB requirements, FERPA regulations, and human-subjects research protections.

Adoption, Leadership, and Capacity Building

Successful AI adoption in research will require shared leadership and distributed expertise. The sub-group proposes that UT San Antonio Libraries and Museum play a central coordinating role, complemented by AI faculty champions within colleges, schools, and departments. These champions would support local adoption, share best practices, and help translate institutional values into discipline-specific guidance.

Cross-disciplinary committees composed of faculty from across UT San Antonio can further support evaluation of emerging tools, address scientific challenges, and identify new research opportunities enabled by AI. This structure promotes consistency while respecting disciplinary differences and encouraging innovation.

Recommendation #2: Values

Policy Framework and Training

Rather than starting from scratch, UT San Antonio should build upon existing, well-established frameworks. The sub-group recommends using Cornell University's AI research policies as a baseline, given their generic and adaptable nature. Colleges and units could propose discipline-specific modifications, provided they do not contradict overarching institutional policies. These guidelines should be compared and aligned with UT San Antonio's own AI guidance issued in January 2025.

Policies should be values-based and flexible, enabling responsible adoption of new technologies as they emerge. Comprehensive training programs should be developed for undergraduate students, graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, and principal investigators, covering ethical use, data security, intellectual property, and privacy considerations in AI-enabled research.

Core Values Guiding AI Use in Research

All uses of AI in research should align with UT San Antonio's established principles of research integrity. These values serve both as criteria for evaluating whether AI should be used in a given context and as guidance for responsible practice once it is adopted. Key values include **transparency** in how AI tools are used and disclosed; **integrity** in authorship, data analysis, and interpretation; preservation of **human judgment** in

decision-making; protection of **privacy and data security**; and maintenance of **scholarly rigor** across the research lifecycle.

By grounding AI use in these values, UT San Antonio can encourage innovation while safeguarding trust, credibility, and ethical responsibility in research.

Recommendation #3: Living Document

A Living Document for a Rapidly Evolving Field

Finally, the sub-group highlights the urgent need for a living document that evolves alongside AI technologies. Static policies alone cannot keep pace with rapid change. A dynamic repository, potentially integrated with Canvas, could house discipline-specific case examples, guidance, and learning resources related to AI in research.

Such a resource would allow researchers to compare AI use across disciplines, learn from real-world applications, and continuously update practices. By developing and maintaining this living document, UT San Antonio has the opportunity to position itself as a national leader in responsible, innovative AI use across all areas of research.

Operations Subgroup

Supporting Staff Adoption and Effective Use of AI in University Operations

Process for Gathering Input

To inform these recommendations, we drew on two complementary sources of evidence. First, we administered a campus-wide survey to faculty and staff to understand current AI use, perceived opportunities, concerns, and gaps in support related to university operations and day-to-day work. Second, we conducted an external scan of aspirant peer and comparator institutions to identify emerging practices, governance models, training approaches, and operational use cases for AI in higher education. Taken together, these inputs provided both an internal perspective on UT San Antonio's needs and readiness and an external view of where peer institutions are leading, or still developing, allowing us to ground our recommendations in both campus voice and sector context.

UT San Antonio is at a pivotal moment in institutional AI adoption. Peer institutions are largely in a "tool-first" phase, offering enterprise AI access and general guidance, but far fewer have progressed to workflow-embedded, operations-focused enablement. At the same time, UT San Antonio's faculty and staff survey responses reveal a community that is simultaneously eager, cautious, and fragmented in AI use.

Across both inputs, five clear themes emerge:

1. Staff want clarity before enthusiasm—clear guardrails, data rules, and institutional backing matter more than hype.
2. Training must be practical and role-based, not abstract or technology-centered.
3. Tool choice and quality matter—limited or underpowered tools undermine trust and equity.
4. Operational use cases, not just access, and drive adoption.
5. Ethical, environmental, and workforce concerns must be addressed directly, not implicitly.

AI Survey – Summary and Insights

1. AI adoption is already widespread across faculty and staff.
AI use at UT San Antonio has clearly moved into the mainstream. In the survey (N=486), 67% of respondents said they use AI either occasionally (36%) or regularly (31%). Adoption is strong across roles, with 74% of faculty and 65% of staff reporting regular or occasional use. Only 14% say they haven't used AI yet, and just 1% are unsure. These numbers make it clear that AI has moved into the mainstream of daily work across campus.

2. Current AI use is focused on individual productivity rather than workflow transformation.
Current AI use is focused on individual productivity rather than workflow transformation. Most employees are using AI to make their own work easier and faster, mainly in writing and content creation. The most common use by far is writing, editing, or summarizing content (75%), followed by research and information gathering (45%) and creative or design tasks (41%) (N=407). In comparison, fewer employees are using AI for deeper operational work like automating administrative processes (23%) or advanced data analysis (30%). Even though many respondents

report using AI in multiple ways, those uses tend to improve existing tasks rather than redesign workflows. This suggests there's still room to help teams think bigger about how AI could transform processes, not just individual productivity.

3. Generative AI and Microsoft-integrated tools form the core of the current AI ecosystem.
The AI ecosystem at UTSA is dominated by generative AI platforms and Microsoft-integrated tools. A significant 87% of respondents (N=394) reported using tools like ChatGPT, Microsoft Copilot, or Google Gemini. In addition, 58% are using Microsoft applications with built-in AI features, such as Word, Excel, Outlook, or Teams. By comparison, only 12% report using enterprise systems with embedded AI capabilities. That tells us AI adoption is happening largely through tools employees can easily access within their existing day-to-day activities.

4. AI use is outpacing policy awareness.
While adoption is strong, understanding of AI policies hasn't quite caught up. Among those asked about policy familiarity (N=131), only 16% said they are "very familiar" with institutional AI policies. Most fall into the middle with 38% somewhat familiar and 29% slightly familiar. 11% are not familiar at all, and 5% aren't aware of any AI-related policies. At the same time, 21% of respondents (N=454) report using AI tools that are not officially supported by the institution, and another 19% aren't sure. This gap suggests employees are moving quickly to explore AI, and clearer, more practical policy communication could help support responsible and confident use.

5. Employees show cautious optimism and expanding engagement with AI.
The data suggests that employees are moving beyond one-off experimentation toward more frequent integration. While 27% report using AI for a single use case, a combined 73% report using it in two or more use cases (21% for two use cases, 33% for 3–4 use cases, and 19% for five or more). This indicates growing comfort and expanding application across daily work.

The open-ended responses show that AI adoption on campus is far from uniform. Some employees are building custom systems or using AI for coding. Others are using AI in more practical ways for teaching accessibility, brainstorming, or communication support. An expressive minority declared strong ethical objections related to environmental impact, academic integrity or professional identity. Several stated they will not use AI at all.

Altogether, the feedback shows that AI on campus is both a technical and cultural shift. Employees are actively exploring AI, but are doing so with different levels of experience, comfort and concern. Overall, employees appear cautiously optimistic, yet still working through governance, ethics, and best practices.

External Scan - Summary and Insights

The goal of the external scan was to identify how peer institutions are:

- upskilling staff to use AI in day-to-day operational work, and
- deploying AI to improve university operations and the student/staff experience.

This synthesis reflects what institutions publicly describe and what scan team members captured in notes/links; it may not reflect internal initiatives that are not externally visible.

Institutions Included: UT Austin, UT RGV, UT Arlington, UT Dallas, UT El Paso, UT Medical Branch, Arizona State University, UCLA, University of Michigan, University of Washington, UNC Chapel Hill, UC San Diego, University of Illinois

What's most common right now?

- AI visibility is high: Across the institutions captured, all 13 publicly reference AI use beyond teaching/research.
- Administrative/operations AI is mentioned often, but not universally: 11 of 13 reference staff or administrative AI use cases
- AI assistants/tools are the most visible operational entry point: 12 of 13 were marked as having chatbots/automation/AI assistants as an operational element; example: UT Dallas's CometAI).
- Staff-focused training exists but remains uneven: 8 of 13 explicitly include (or reference connections to) staff in AI training/resources
- Operational transformation is less frequently articulated than tool availability: In the structured scan fields, only 2 of 13 explicitly flagged student-facing service use cases (advising/enrollment/support), and only 2 of 13 explicitly flagged administrative efficiency use cases (HR/finance/reporting/comms)
- Guardrails are often present, but "approved vs. experimental" is rarely clear: For institutions where governance details were captured, many mention guidelines/principles and privacy/responsible use. However, none were marked as clearly distinguishing "experimentation vs. approved use" in public-facing guidance.

Examples to note:

UNC Chapel Hill stands out for being explicitly operations-forward, with staff-specific guidance and many operational examples.

- Example: https://ai.unc.edu/operations/, https://ai.unc.edu/staff-generative-ai-usage-guidance/, https://ai.unc.edu/experts/, https://aiacceleration.unc.edu/, https://ai.unc.edu/metrics/

University of Michigan stands out for a use-case library and broad resources that include operational contexts.

- Example: https://its.umich.edu/computing/ai/getting-started

UT Arlington stands out for a staff learning hub, campus AI adoption framing, and AI on-campus pages noting pilots underway; training hub organized by personas (staff, student, faculty, researcher).

- Examples: Artificial Intelligence – University of Texas at Arlington, AI Learning Hub – Artificial Intelligence, Guidelines – Artificial Intelligence (policies say under development)

UT Austin stands out for HR-centered staff resources and an institutional tool/policy presence (including UT Spark as a cross-audience interface).

- Examples: Guidance for Using Artificial Intelligence | Enterprise Technology

UT Medical Branch: AI Learn site and approved generative AI tools page example.

University of Illinois stands out for extensive tiered training and professional development options for faculty, staff, leaders, etc. Also, guidance for best practices for administrative operations and available tools and effective use.

- Examples: AI Apps – Enterprise GenAI, Best Practices in Administrative Operations – Enterprise GenAI, AI Apps – Enterprise GenAI, AI Professional Development Series | Illinois Human Resources

Recommendation 1: Establish Clear Institutional Guardrails for AI Use in Operations

Provide clear, scenario-based guidance that defines responsible AI use while encouraging thoughtful experimentation.

What the evidence shows:

- The external scan found that *nearly all* peers publish AI principles or guidance, but none clearly distinguish "approved" vs. "experimental" use in public-facing guidance.
- Survey responses repeatedly cite confusion, anxiety, and fear of misuse, especially around FERPA, privacy, intellectual property, and environmental impact.

Example: Create a clear, staff-facing AI use framework that answers three questions unambiguously:

- What tools are approved for institutional work?
- What data can and cannot be used in AI systems?
- What is allowed for experimentation vs. production use?

Tactics

- Publish an "AI Use Decision Tree" (e.g., "Can I paste this into an AI tool?").
- Maintain a living list of approved AI tools, with explicit intended uses.
- Clearly label "sandbox/experimental" vs. "institutionally supported" environments.
- Pair guidelines with rationale (privacy, ethics, legal, environmental impact).

Recommendation 2: Move from "AI Resources" to a Staff Operations Enablement Pathway

Focus training on real-world use cases rather than introductory overviews. Employees are seeking actionable learning that directly supports daily work.

What the evidence shows:

- Most peer institutions have AI hubs; few offer scenario-based, job-embedded training.
- Survey respondents overwhelmingly ask for hands-on, practical training tied to their actual work, not conceptual overviews.

Example: Develop a tiered AI enablement pathway for staff operations, aligned to real workflows.

Tactics

- Tier 1: Foundations
  - AI literacy (how AI works, limitations, hallucinations, bias).
  - Responsible and ethical use (privacy, IP, environmental considerations).
- Tier 2: Applied Workflows
  - Role-based examples (HR, advising, finance, communications, IT, research support).
  - Prompt patterns, checklists, and "before/after" workflow demonstrations.
- Tier 3: Advanced & Agentic Use
  - Automation, copilots, workflow orchestration (where appropriate).
  - Supported pilots for power users and units.

Delivery methods

- Short, modular workshops or learning sessions.
- Cohort-based learning for operations staff (learning communities).
- Recorded exemplars and templates housed centrally.

Recommendation 3: Anchor Early Strategy in the Tools Employees Already Use

Build institutional AI strategy around generative AI and Microsoft-integrated platforms, aligning governance, training, and support with where adoption is already occurring across campus.

What the evidence shows:

- Survey data indicates that AI adoption at UT San Antonio is concentrated in a small number of widely accessible tools. Eighty-seven percent of respondents report using generative AI platforms such as ChatGPT, Microsoft Copilot, or Google Gemini, and 58% report using AI features embedded in Microsoft applications (Word, Excel, Outlook, Teams).
- Far fewer employees are using AI embedded in enterprise systems, suggesting that adoption is driven by tools that integrate seamlessly into existing workflows rather than by specialized or standalone platforms.
- The external scan reinforces this pattern, with peers most visibly advancing AI adoption through enterprise-licensed generative AI tools and Microsoft-integrated environments before expanding to deeper system-level automation.

Example: Align institutional support and governance with high-adoption platforms.
Rather than dispersing effort across many tools, UT San Antonio can focus initial training, policy guidance, and support on the generative AI and Microsoft platforms employees already rely on for daily work.

Tactics

- Prioritize governance, guidance, and training for Microsoft-integrated AI tools and approved generative AI platforms.
- Embed AI guidance directly into existing staff workflows, such as Microsoft training, HR learning modules, and unit onboarding.
- Develop role-based examples and templates (e.g., Excel analysis, Outlook communication drafting, Teams knowledge support).
- Use these platforms as the primary environment for pilots and workflow redesign, expanding to other systems as capacity and readiness grow.

Recommendation 4: Pair AI Adoption with Visible Operational Use Cases and Outcomes

Center AI adoption on a small number of high-impact operational pilots that demonstrate clear improvements in services, workflows, and measurable outcomes.

What the evidence shows:

- Peers tend to announce tools first and tell stories later (if at all).
- Survey participants want proof that AI improves work quality and efficiency, not just speed.

Example: Anchor AI adoption around a small number of high-value, high-visibility operational pilots.

Priority pilot areas

- Student-facing services: inquiry triage, navigation, FAQs, advising prep.
- Administrative workflows: summarization, drafting, reporting, and knowledge retrieval.
- Internal services: IT/help desk support, HR policy guidance, procurement workflows.

Tactics

- Launch 2–3 pilots per semester with clear goals.
- Measure outcomes (time saved, cycle time reduction, satisfaction).
- Publish short “What We Tried / What We Learned” summaries.

Recommendation 5: Invest in Tool Quality, Choice, and Access

Support effective and widespread AI adoption by providing access to high-quality, institutionally supported tools aligned with staff needs and daily work.

What the evidence shows:

- Survey responses repeatedly note dissatisfaction with limited or underpowered institutional tools.
- Some staff and faculty are already paying out-of-pocket, creating inequities and shadow IT risks.
- Peers that stand out provide choice within guardrails, not a single mandated tool.

Example: Adopt a "curated choice" model for AI tools rather than a single-solution approach.

Tactics

- Provide access to multiple approved AI platforms suited to different tasks (writing, analysis, coding, retrieval).
- Ensure tools offer private, non-training sandboxes for institutional data.
- Offer tiered access (basic for all; advanced for roles with demonstrated need).
- Be transparent about licensing levels and limitations.

Recommendation 6: Address Ethical, Environmental, and Workforce Concerns

Strengthen trust and adoption by explicitly embedding ethical, environmental, and workforce considerations into institutional AI strategy.

What the evidence shows:

- Environmental impact (water, energy), job displacement, and academic integrity concerns are deeply felt.
- Avoidance and resistance increase when institutions appear dismissive of these issues.

Example: Integrate ethics and sustainability into AI strategy – not as disclaimers, but as design principles.

Tactics

- Publish a statement on ethical and sustainable AI use aligned with UT San Antonio's mission.
- Be explicit that AI is intended to augment, not replace, human expertise.
- Offer guidance on when not to use AI, including high-risk or low-value contexts.
- Support faculty and staff in teaching and modeling responsible AI use.

Recommendation 7: Accelerate the Shift from Productivity Gains to Workflow Transformation

Support departments in moving beyond individual efficiency toward AI-enabled workflow redesign that produces measurable institutional impact.

What the evidence shows:

- Survey results indicate current AI use is primarily focused on individual productivity. While 75% of respondents use AI for writing and content tasks, far fewer report using it for process automation (23%) or advanced operational analysis (30%), suggesting limited workflow-level transformation.

- The external scan reveals a similar pattern among peers. Most institutions emphasize tool access and individual use, with relatively few publicly describing AI-enabled process redesign or operational efficiency gains. Where transformation is visible, it is tied to intentional, unit-level workflow redesign.
- Without structured support, individual productivity gains remain fragmented and difficult to scale.

Example: Enable AI-supported workflow redesign at the departmental level. Rather than focusing only on how individuals use AI, the institution can help departments identify high-friction, high-volume processes—such as intake, reporting, communications, or service triage—and redesign them using AI-enabled automation or decision support.

Tactics

- Pair AI expertise with existing process improvement or service design capacity to support workflow redesign.
- Offer time-limited, structured engagements for departments to identify, map, and redesign priority workflows.
- Pilot a small number of automation-focused use cases with clear institutional value (e.g., reduced cycle time, improved responsiveness).
- Define and track simple success measures for each pilot and share outcomes through a centralized use-case library.

Appendices

A. References for Research Subgroup

References for AI Research Subgroup

Articles and books

Blau, W., Cerf, V. G., Enriquez, J., Francisco, J. S., Gasser, U., Gray, M. L., ... & Witherell, M. (2024). Protecting scientific integrity in an age of generative AI. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *121*(22), e2407886121.

Borger, J. G., Ng, A. P., Anderton, H., Ashdown, G. W., Auld, M., Blewitt, M. E., ... & Naik, S. H. (2023). Artificial intelligence takes center stage: exploring the capabilities and implications of ChatGPT and other AI-assisted technologies in scientific research and education. *Immunology and cell biology*, *101*(10), 923-935.

Chen, Z., Chen, C., Yang, G., He, X., Chi, X., Zeng, Z., & Chen, X. (2024). Research integrity in the era of artificial intelligence: Challenges and responses. *Medicine*, *103*(27), e38811.

Da Mota, M. (2024). Toward an AI policy framework for research institutions. *Artificial Intelligence*.

Jin-Hong, Y. (2025). Defining the Boundaries of AI Use in Scientific Writing: A Comparative Review of Editorial Policies. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*, *40*(23), 1-13.

Resnik, D. B., & Hosseini, M. (2025). The ethics of using artificial intelligence in scientific research: new guidance needed for a new tool. *AI and Ethics*, *5*(2), 1499-1521.

Resnik, D. B., & Hosseini, M. (2025). Disclosing artificial intelligence use in scientific research and publication: When should disclosure be mandatory, optional, or unnecessary?. *Accountability in research*, 1-13.

Van Noorden, R., & Perkel, J. M. (2023). AI and science: what 1,600 researchers think. *Nature*, *621*(7980), 672-675.

Zhou, X., & Al-Samarraie, H. (Eds.). (2025). *Institutional guide to using AI for research* (1st ed. 2025.). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-94809-1

Cornell's Generative AI in Academic research report

Link:
Generative AI in Academic Research: Perspectives and Cultural Norms - Cornell Research & Innovation
PDF:
Generative AI in Research_ Cornell Task Force Report-Dec2023
https://it.cornell.edu/sites/default/files/itc-drupal10-files/Generative%20AI%20in%20Research_%20Cornell%20Task%20Force%20Report-Dec2023.pdf

Other online resources

AI Ethical Guidelines | EDUCAUSE
https://library.educause.edu/resources/2025/6/ai-ethical-guidelines

Guides to using AI in research

University/Entity	Document	URL
National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER)	12 Best Practices for Leveraging Generative AI in Experimental Research	https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w33025/w33025.pdf
Texas A & M University	Best Practices for Generative AI in Research (released February 2024)	https://research.tamu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Best-Practices-for-Generative-AI-in-Research-updated-02162447-APPROVED.pdf
University of Florida	AI Technologies in Education at the University of Florida -- Guidance for Researchers (pages 19-22)	https://ai.ufl.edu/media/aiufledu/resources/GenAIBestPractices%5B4520%5D_updated12-18-24.pdf
University of Michigan	OVPR Guidelines for the Use of Generative AI in Internal Peer Review (updated August 2025)	https://research.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/OVPR-AI-Guidelines-Internal-Peer-Review_2025.pdf
University of Michigan	GenAI: Resources for Research	https://genai.umich.edu/resources/research
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign	Best Practices in Using Generative AI in Research	https://genai.illinois.edu/best-practices-using-generative-ai-in-research
University of Washington	Effective and Responsible Use of AI in Research	https://grad.uw.edu/advice/effective-and-responsible-use-of-ai-in-research/
Harvard University	Guidelines for the use of Generative AI tools at Harvard	https://www.huit.harvard.edu/ai/guidelines
University of South Carolina	Guidelines for the Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Graduate Research and Writing	https://sc.edu/study/colleges_schools/education/research/forms/ai_guidelines.php

AI policies – publishers

University pages and articles

Source	Document	Publishers' Policies Summarized/ Linked	URL
Purdue University	AI Publisher Policies and Requirements	ACM, Elsevier, Emerald, IEEE, Nature, Oxford Academic, PLOS, Sage, Taylor & Francis, Wiley	https://guides.lib.purdue.edu/c.php?g=1371380&p=10135076
University of Texas at Austin	Scholarly publisher policies on the use of AI	ArXiv, Cambridge Univ. Press, De Gruyter Brill, Elsevier, Nature and	https://guides.lib.utexas.edu/AI/publishing

BMJ	GAI use guidelines from top 100 largest academic publishers' websites (as of October 2023)	top 100 publishers	https://www.bmj.com/content/384/bmj-2023-077192

Associations

Publisher Group	Document	Topics	URL
Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)	Authorship and AI tools	AI tools do not meet criteria for authorship; any use of AI tools must be clearly disclosed.	https://publicationethics.org/guidance/cope-position/authorship-and-ai-tools
STM (International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers)	Recommendations for Classification of AI Use in Academic Manuscript Preparation (August 2024)	AI use allowance, prohibition, and level of disclosure	https://s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/stm.offloadmedia/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/23020709/STM_AI_Classification_Recs_19_Sept2025-1.pdf
ICMJE (International Committee of Medical Journal Editors)	Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals	II.a.4. Artificial Intelligence (AI)–Assisted Technology	https://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf
WAME (World Association of Medical Editors)	Recommendations on Chatbots, Generative AI, and Scholarly Manuscripts (May 2023)	Defines author roles and accountability; chatbots cannot be authors	https://www.wame.org/page3.php?id=106
EASE (European Association of Science Editors)	Recommendations on the Use of AI in Scholarly Communication (September 2024)	Recommends that journals/publishers create relevant policies and that AI use is transparently declared	https://ease.org.uk/2024/09/recommendations-on-the-use-of-ai-in-scholarly-communication
ASCE (American Society of Civil Engineers)	AI and Authorship	AI software cannot be an author Authors are required to disclose use of AI tools Reviewers shall not use LLMs or AI tools	https://ascelibrary.org/author-center/ai-policy

AI policies – funders

Funder	Policy/Notice Date	Main AI Policy Document	Main AI Policy Link
NIH	Notice: 2025	Notice: Supporting Fairness and Originality in NIH Research Applications (NOT-OD-25-132)	https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-23-149.html
NSF	Notice: 2023	Notice to research community: Use of generative artificial intelligence technology in the NSF merit review process	https://www.nsf.gov/news/notice-to-the-research-community-on-ai
NEH	2024	Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence for NEH Grant Proposals	https://www.neh.gov/sites/default/files/2024-10/NEH.AI_.Policy-10.23.24.pdf
U.S. Department of Education	2025	Grants and Artificial Intelligence (AI) Statement on Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) for the Transcription or Recording of Meetings by ED Grantees	https://www.ed.gov/grants-and-programs/apply-grant/getting-started-discretionary-grant-applications/grants-and-artificial-intelligence-ai