

# AI Governance and Responsible Use (LP7.8)

## LANDER UNIVERSITY POLICY

<i>First Draft</i>	5/19/2026
<i>Last Draft</i>	
<i>Effective</i>	
<i>Revised</i>	6/16/2026
<i>Policy Owner</i>	Board of Trustees
<i>Policy Administrator</i>	Chief Information and Technology Officer
<i>Affected Parties</i>	Employees, Students, Contractors

## 1 Purpose and Scope

1.1 This policy and related guidelines establish a shared framework for the responsible use and governance of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies at Lander University. AI tools and systems are increasingly used for teaching, learning, research, administration, communication, and decision making. For the purposes of this document, AI includes:

- Generative AI tools e.g., (ChatGPT, Copilot, Gemini, Claude, etc.)
- Algorithmic decision systems and predictive models
- Other software that performs tasks that normally require human intelligence

1.2 This policy applies to students, faculty, staff, administrators, contractors, and affiliates and any AI tool or system used in connection with university work or study, whether provided by the university or accessed through third party services.

1.3 Usage of “data”: Within this policy, “data” denotes institutional information assets as a whole and is treated as a collective (mass) noun, so singular verbs are used (e.g., “data is protected,” “data is a critical institutional asset”).

## 2 Guiding principles

Lander University adopts the following guiding principles for AI use and governance:

2.1 Data protection and privacy

- 22           2.1.1   Institutional, confidential, or student identifiable data must not be entered  
23                   into public AI tools unless specifically approved and protected by university  
24                   contracts and ecosystems.
- 25           2.1.2   AI use must comply with FERPA, HIPAA (where applicable), federal laws, state  
26                   laws, and university data and security policies.
- 27           2.2     Human-centered learning and work
- 28           2.2.1   AI should enhance, not replace, faculty instruction, staff expertise, and  
29                   student learning.
- 30           2.2.2   Individuals remain ultimately responsible for administrative and academic  
31                   work, official communications, and institutional decisions.
- 32           2.3     Academic integrity and transparency
- 33           2.3.1   Undisclosed or prohibited AI use in coursework or research may be treated as  
34                   academic misconduct.
- 35           2.3.2   When AI assistance is allowed, users must follow course or project  
36                   requirements for disclosure and attribution.
- 37           2.4     Critical Evaluation of Output Reliability
- 38                   AI-generated outputs are shaped by the data, methods, and design choices embedded  
39                   in the systems that produce them. Those outputs may be incomplete, inaccurate, or  
40                   unrepresentative of all relevant populations, contexts, or institutional values.
- 41           2.4.1   The burden of accuracy and appropriateness rests with the user, not with the  
42                   AI system. AI outputs are starting points for human analysis, not substitutes  
43                   for it. All users bear a due-diligence responsibility to critically evaluate AI  
44                   outputs before acting on them, and no AI output should be accepted as  
45                   authoritative without appropriate human review.
- 46           2.4.2   Due Diligence in Evaluating AI Outputs.
- 47                   Users of AI tools and systems are responsible for critically evaluating all outputs  
48                   prior to use, distribution, or reliance. This due diligence obligation includes:
- 49                   2.4.2.1   Verifying factual claims and data against authoritative or primary  
50                                   sources.
- 51                   2.4.2.2   Applying professional judgment, domain expertise, and institutional  
52                                   knowledge when interpreting or acting on AI-generated content.

- 53 2.4.2.3 Identifying hallucinations, logical inconsistencies, or outputs that  
54 appear plausible but are unsupported.
- 55 2.4.2.4 Recognizing that AI systems trained on historical or incomplete data  
56 may produce outputs that are skewed, partial, or not representative  
57 of the university's community or context.
- 58 2.5 Human Oversight for High-Impact Institutional Decisions
- 59 Given the potential consequences of AI-assisted or AI-informed decision-making at the  
60 institutional level, Lander University requires meaningful human review and deliberation  
61 for decisions with significant impact on individuals, programs, or the university's  
62 strategic direction. AI tools may inform analysis and surface patterns, but they may not  
63 serve as the sole or determinative basis for high-impact decisions.
- 64 2.5.1 Scope of High-Impact Decisions
- 65 Human oversight on AI outputs is required at all levels of institutional decision-  
66 making, including but not limited to:
- 67 2.5.1.1 Individual decisions: Admission, financial aid awards, academic  
68 standing, student discipline, hiring, promotion, performance  
69 evaluation, and termination.
- 70 2.5.1.2 Academic and programmatic decisions: Creation, modification,  
71 suspension, or elimination of academic programs, majors,  
72 certificates, or courses.
- 73 2.5.1.3 Budget and resource allocation: Significant budget decisions,  
74 reallocation of resources, staffing models, and financial planning  
75 that affect university operations or personnel.
- 76 2.5.1.4 Strategic and governance decisions: Institutional planning, policy  
77 development, accreditation submissions, Board of Trustees agenda  
78 items, presidential priorities, and decisions made by cabinet-level  
79 administrators.
- 80 2.5.2 Responsibilities at Decision-Making Levels
- 81 The human oversight obligation applies proportionally across the institution:
- 82 2.5.2.1 Frontline staff and faculty must not substitute AI outputs for  
83 professional judgment in individual-level decisions.
- 84 2.5.2.2 Department chairs, directors, and deans must ensure that  
85 programmatic and unit-level decisions involving AI analysis are  
86 reviewed with appropriate deliberation and documentation.

- 87                   2.5.2.3   Vice presidents, cabinet members, and the president bear  
88                                   responsibility for ensuring that institutional and strategic decisions  
89                                   are grounded in verified, contextually sound analysis – not solely in  
90                                   AI-generated summaries, projections, or recommendations.
- 91                   2.5.2.4   The Board of Trustees should expect that any AI-assisted analysis  
92                                   presented in support of governance decisions has been reviewed,  
93                                   validated, and contextualized by accountable institutional leaders  
94                                   before presentation.
- 95           2.6    Transparency and accountability in AI systems
- 96                   2.6.1    Users of AI systems/tools should be transparent about their use of AI, when  
97                                   disclosure of use is expected by law, university policy (including course syllabi  
98                                   requirements), publisher requirements, or the norms of an academic  
99                                   discipline.
- 100                  2.6.2    Users of AI systems/tools remain accountable for the work product or  
101                                   decisions resulting from the use of AI.
- 102           2.7    Innovation and literacy
- 103                   2.7.1    The university encourages thoughtful exploration of AI to improve teaching,  
104                                   learning, and operations.
- 105                   2.7.2    Faculty, staff, and students should build AI literacy, including understanding  
106                                   limitations, hallucinations, bias, and appropriate evaluation of outputs.
- 107   **3    Acceptable and Prohibited Uses**
- 108           3.1    Acceptable Use Examples
- 109                   When consistent with these guidelines and other university policies, acceptable uses  
110                   include but are not limited to:
- 111                   3.1.1    Drafting outlines, brainstorming ideas, or generating practice questions for  
112                                   teaching and learning.
- 113                   3.1.2    Assisting with code examples, pseudocode, or debugging, with human review  
114                                   of correctness and security.
- 115                   3.1.3    Summarizing non confidential documents or public articles to support study or  
116                                   administrative work.

- 117 3.1.4 Creating draft accessible materials (e.g., captions or alt text) subject to  
118 human editing.
- 119 3.1.5 Supporting low risk administrative tasks (e.g., draft templates for routine  
120 emails) with human review before sending.
- 121 3.2 Prohibited Use Examples  
122 When consistent with these guidelines and other university policies, prohibited uses  
123 include but are not limited to:
- 124 3.2.1 Entering confidential or restricted institutional data (e.g., social security  
125 numbers, detailed student records, sensitive HR information, protected health  
126 information) into public AI tools.
- 127 3.2.2 Using AI to generate or substantially rewrite graded work when the syllabus or  
128 assignment prohibits AI assistance.
- 129 3.2.3 Relying solely on AI outputs to make high impact decisions related to:
- 130 3.2.3.1 Student admission, financial aid, discipline, or academic standing
- 131 3.2.3.2 Employee hiring, promotion, or termination
- 132 3.2.4 Using AI to create false or deceptive content (e.g., falsified research data,  
133 fabricated references, impersonation, or deepfakes) for academic or  
134 institutional purposes.
- 135 3.2.5 Deploying AI tools that continuously monitor individuals or process biometrics  
136 without appropriate legal, ethical, and institutional review.

## 137 4 Roles and Responsibilities

- 138 4.1 Vice Presidents and Cabinet Members
- 139 4.1.1 Recommend AI strategy and priorities to the President.
- 140 4.1.2 Review proposed institutional AI systems and higher risk AI projects that use  
141 university data or influence decisions about individuals.
- 142 4.1.3 Ensure alignment with applicable university policies, federal laws, and state  
143 laws (e.g., FERPA, ADA, data security, acceptable use, etc.), in consultation  
144 with the Chief Information and Technology Officer (CITO).

- 145           4.1.4    Recommend updates to this policy and guidelines.
- 146           4.2     Information Technology Services (ITS)
- 147           4.2.1    Evaluate AI related tools, systems, and vendors for security, accessibility, and  
148                    data protection.
- 149           4.2.2    Maintain a list of approved AI tools and services, including any institutionally  
150                    licensed AI assistants.
- 151           4.2.3    Provide or coordinate training and resources on AI literacy, safety, and best  
152                    practices.
- 153           4.2.4    Publish technical guidance and training on safe data handling with AI and  
154                    respond to AI related security incidents.
- 155           4.3     Faculty and Academic Administrators
- 156           4.3.1    Clearly state expectations for AI use in syllabi (e.g., prohibited,  
157                    limited/allowed, or encouraged with attribution).
- 158           4.3.2    Design assignments that either meaningfully incorporate AI or make  
159                    unauthorized AI use less attractive or feasible.
- 160           4.3.3    Model responsible AI use and help students critically evaluate AI outputs and  
161                    recognize bias
- 162           4.4     Students
- 163           4.4.1    Follow all course specific AI rules and ask instructors when expectations are  
164                    unclear.
- 165           4.4.2    Accurately represent their own learning and contributions in assignments,  
166                    exams, and research.
- 167           4.4.3    Evaluate AI outputs critically and verify important information with reliable  
168                    sources.
- 169           4.5     Staff and Administrators
- 170           4.5.1    Use AI in ways that support, rather than replace, professional judgment and  
171                    personal engagement with students and colleagues.

172 4.5.2 Seek Vice Presidents/Cabinet and IT reviews and approvals before adopting  
173 AI tools, especially those that handle student records, HR information, or  
174 other institutional data.

175

## 176 5 Data Protection

177 The classification of data determines the type of data protection required. The university's data  
178 classification categories are aligned with the State of South Carolina data classification scheme  
179 and include public, internal, confidential, and restricted.

### 180 5.1 PUBLIC

181 Public data includes but is not limited to data intended for public dissemination (e.g.,  
182 website content, brochures, press releases, published policies, etc.).

183 5.1.1 Public data may be used with AI tools, provided copyright and privacy are  
184 respected.

### 185 5.2 INTERNAL

186 Internal data includes but is not limited to nonpublic operational information that does  
187 not include regulated personal data (e.g., internal memos, draft agendas, training  
188 materials, aggregated data, agency procedures, and/or standards).

189 5.2.1 Internal data may be used only with institutionally approved AI tools/licenses  
190 that have appropriate contractual and security safeguards.

### 191 5.3 CONFIDENTIAL

192 Confidential data includes but is not limited to biometric identifiers, photographs of  
193 individual people, pension/retirement benefit information, security plans, unpublished  
194 information about agency personnel.

195 5.3.1 Confidential data must not be entered into AI tools unless the service has  
196 been explicitly reviewed by IT and officially acquired by the university.

### 197 5.4 RESTRICTED

198 Restricted data includes but not limited to student education records, HR records,  
199 financial records, social security numbers, driver license numbers, protected health  
200 information, and other regulated or sensitive information.

201 5.4.1 Restricted data must not be entered into AI tools unless the service has been  
202 explicitly reviewed by IT and officially acquired by the university.

## 203 6 AI Tool Selection

### 204 6.1 Approved vs. Unapproved Tools

205 6.1.1 ITS will maintain a list of approved AI tools, noting permitted data types and  
206 typical use cases.

207 6.1.2 The university allows the use of third-party AI tools, including user-selected  
208 LLMs, provided that only publicly available information is used. Users must  
209 not input or expose confidential, restricted, or non-public university data to  
210 these systems.

## 211 7 Teaching, Learning, and Syllabus Language

212 See Lander University's *University Policies in Syllabi* for AI policies related to teaching, learning,  
213 and syllabus language:

214 [https://www.lander.edu/about/offices-departments/academic-affairs/university-policies-in-](https://www.lander.edu/about/offices-departments/academic-affairs/university-policies-in-syllabi.html)  
215 [syllabi.html](https://www.lander.edu/about/offices-departments/academic-affairs/university-policies-in-syllabi.html)

## 216 8 Research and Scholarly Use

217 8.1 AI tools may not be listed as authors; human researchers remain responsible for  
218 content, methodology, and integrity.

219 8.2 When AI is used in data analysis, translation, or text generation, researchers must  
220 document how AI was used and validate outputs.

221 8.3 Any AI system that processes identifiable human subject data must receive IRB  
222 approval and satisfy data protection and security requirements.

## 223 9 AI License Requests for Faculty and Staff

224 To support faculty and staff whose roles significantly benefit from AI, Lander University will  
225 maintain a structured process for requesting institutionally funded AI licenses.

### 226 9.1 Guiding Principles for License Allocation

227 License allocation is guided by:

228 9.1.1 MISSION ALIGNMENT: Priority to roles that directly support teaching, student  
229 success, academic support, university operations, and institutional  
230 effectiveness.

231 9.1.2 DATA STEWARDSHIP: Where possible, licenses should move high impact users  
232 from unapproved consumer tools to secure, institutionally governed tools.

## 233 9.2 Request Process

234 9.2.1 Complete an AI ITS service request ticket that includes name, title,  
235 department, and VP approval.

236 9.2.1.1 Provide a description of the job duties that would be supported by  
237 the requested AI tool.

238 9.2.1.2 Intended uses (e.g., drafting communications, curriculum  
239 development, advising support, workflow automation).

240 9.2.1.3 Whether the work involves student or employee data and, if so, at  
241 what sensitivity level.

242 9.2.1.4 Estimated frequency of use and expected benefits (e.g., time saved,  
243 improved quality, new capabilities).

244 9.2.2 Requests are routed to:

245 9.2.2.1 The requester's supervisor (and/or Dean/VP) for initial approval,  
246 then routing the request according to the type of request:

247 9.2.2.1.1 If the request is a license for an approved AI tool, route the  
248 request to IT for review, prioritization, and final approval to  
249 go through appropriate purchasing channels.

250 9.2.2.1.2 If the request is for a new AI-based system or large project, or  
251 involves university data with institutional impact, route the  
252 request to the VPs/Cabinet for pre-approval before routing to  
253 ITS for review.

254 9.2.2.2 Certain requests may be submitted by the CITO for review by the  
255 State AI Center for Excellence

## 256 9.3 Evaluation Criteria

257 Requests are typically prioritized when they:

258 9.3.1 Are clearly aligned with student learning, student success, or institutional  
259 priorities.

260 9.3.2 Replace current use of unapproved consumer AI tools with secure institutional  
261 tools.

262 9.3.3 Involve substantial volume or complexity of content where AI can realistically  
263 improve efficiency or quality.

264 9.3.4 Include a reasonable, concrete plan for tracking benefits or sharing practices  
265 with colleagues.

## 266 9.4 Training and Renewal

267 9.4.1 Approved license holders must complete basic training on using AI Safely and  
268 Securely before activation. The training is available on Blackboard.

269 9.4.2 Licenses will be reviewed annually for renewal based on usage, impact, and  
270 evolving departmental needs

271 9.4.3 Underused licenses may be reallocated to other units, with notice to affected  
272 users.

## 273 10 General AI Purchases and Procurement

274 To protect university data, manage risks, and ensure responsible use of institutional funds, all AI  
275 related purchases must follow existing procurement and contract policies as well as these policy  
276 and AI guidelines.

### 277 10.1 What counts as an AI Purchase?

278 10.1.1 Paid licenses or subscriptions for AI tools or services (stand alone or as add-  
279 ons to existing systems).

280 10.1.2 “Free” or trial versions that require a contract, institutional login, or access to  
281 university data.

282 10.1.3 Cloud services, plugins, or integrations that add AI capabilities (e.g.,  
283 summarization, prediction, chatbots, etc.) to current systems.

### 284 10.2 Approval and Routing

285 Before making an AI purchase or accepting an AI-enabled contract or terms of use,  
286 employees must complete the following review steps:

#### 287 10.2.1 Departmental review

288 10.2.1.1 The requester obtains supervisor or department chair approval,  
289 confirming the purchase supports unit goals and budget.

290 10.2.1.2 The requester confirms whether the tool will use student, employee,  
291 or other institutional data.

292 10.2.1.3 The AI request will undergo the request process in section 9.2.

293 10.2.2 ITS and Procurement review

294 10.2.2.1 ITS reviews technical, security, and integration implications and  
295 confirms whether similar functionality already exists in approved  
296 systems.

297 10.2.2.2 Procurement reviews contracts and terms and approves final  
298 purchases.

299 10.3 Prohibited and Unauthorized Purchases

300 10.3.1 Individual employees may not independently agree to AI related terms of use,  
301 click through agreements, or data sharing arrangements on behalf of the  
302 university without going through the required approvals

303 10.3.2 Use of personal credit cards with later reimbursement to bypass this process  
304 is not permitted.

305 10.3.3 Units must not upload or sync institutional data into unapproved AI tools,  
306 even if the tool is “free,” “beta,” or labeled for “educational” use.

307 10.4 Preferred and Shared Solutions

308 To avoid fragmentation and reduce risk:

309 10.4.1 The university will prioritize enterprise or shared AI solutions that multiple  
310 departments can use, rather than many small, isolated purchases.

311 10.4.2 Where a centrally approved AI capability already exists, departments are  
312 encouraged to use these tools before seeking new, overlapping products.

313 10.4.3 ITS will periodically publish a list of approved AI tools and recommended use  
314 cases, limits, and permitted data types.

## 315 11 AI Projects and Pilots

316 Lander University encourages well-designed AI projects that support innovation in teaching,  
317 learning, and operations, while managing risks.

318 11.1 What can be considered an AI Project?

- 319 Examples include but are not limited to:
- 320 11.1.1 A pilot using AI assisted advising or chatbots for common student questions.
- 321 11.1.2 A proof of concept predictive model to identify students who may need  
322 additional support.
- 323 11.1.3 An AI supported workflow for automating routine administrative tasks (e.g.,  
324 form triage, template responses, etc.).
- 325 11.1.4 A department-level initiative to integrate AI across a sequence of courses.
- 326 11.2 Project Proposal Expectations
- 327 Before starting a moderate or high impact AI project, the sponsoring unit/individual must  
328 follow the process described in section 9.2 to include:
- 329 11.2.1 Project title, requestor, description, and team members.
- 330 11.2.2 Goals and anticipated benefits.
- 331 11.2.3 Description of AI capabilities involved (e.g., text generation, summarization,  
332 classification, prediction).
- 333 11.2.4 Data to be used, including whether it includes student or employee records,  
334 and how data will be protected.
- 335 11.2.5 Expected scale (e.g., pilot with one program vs. campus wide deployment).
- 336 11.2.6 Potential risks and mitigation plans.
- 337 11.2.7 How success will be measured and how results will be shared.
- 338 11.2.8 Project approval outcomes include:
- 339 11.2.8.1 Proceed as a low risk pilot.
- 340 11.2.8.2 Proceed with conditions (e.g., limited scope, additional training,  
341 specific language consent, etc.)
- 342 11.2.8.3 Require additional formal review (e.g., IRB, security, accessibility,  
343 etc.).
- 344 11.2.8.4 Decline or request substantial revision if risks outweigh benefits.

## 345 12 Training, Support, and Continuous Improvement

346 12.1 The Center for Teaching and Learning and Library and ITS will offer periodic training  
347 sessions and concise guides on AI literacy for students, faculty, and staff.

348 12.2 ITS will publish quick start guides on approved AI tools and maintain training and  
349 FAQs on Safe, Secure, and Responsible AI use.

350 12.3 These policy and guidelines will be reviewed annually by the policy administrator to  
351 recommend updates (in consultation with university stakeholders) to respond to  
352 changing technology, regulations, and campus needs.

## 353 13 Related Policies

354 This policy operates alongside other university policies, including but not limited to:

- 355 • Student Handbook
- 356 • Institutional Data Governance (LP2.6)
- 357 • Records management
- 358 • Student Data Privacy and Protection (LP7.2)
- 359 • Research misconduct and human subjects research policies
- 360 • Human Resources policies governing staff conduct and performance
- 361 • Email Use for Faculty and Staff (LP7.1)
- 362 • Technology Acceptable Use (LP7.5)
- 363 • Website Privacy (LP7.6)

## 364 14 Violations

365 Violations of this AI policy may be addressed under applicable student and employee  
366 misconduct policies. Any disciplinary action will reflect the nature and impact of the violation.

## 367 15 Policy Revision History

- 368 • First draft of policy created by Chief Information and Technology Officer on 4/25/2026.
- 369 • Prepared for review by Policy Coordinator on 6/2/2026.
- 370 • Revised provisional draft approved by Chief Information Technology Officer and AVP for  
371 Planning, Analytics and Decision Support on 6/16/2026.
- 372 • Stakeholder review and provisional approval of policy on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 373 • Final revisions applied by Policy Coordinator on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 374 • Reviewed by Board of Trustees Policy Committee on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 375 • Lander University Board of Trustees review: Pending.

376