AI Playbook

Principles, Practices, and Policies for Faculty
July 2025, Revised October 2025

Purpose and Audience

This playbook is a *living guide* for Kelley faculty on the use of generative AI in teaching, grading, research, and service. Generative AI refers to tools that can create content—like text, code, or images—from a prompt. For a quick overview, see What is generative AI? - IBM Research This playbook reflects our shared values and outlines policies and practices to ensure responsible, effective, and ethical AI integration.

A faculty-only NotebookLM version of this playbook is available for exploration, reflection, and quick reference. It allows Kelley instructors to ask questions, summarize sections, or generate examples drawn directly from this document—modeling the same spirit of exploration we encourage in our students.

Playbook Organization

This playbook is organized into three parts:

- AI in support of teaching and learning (pp. 1-9)
- AI in support of research, scholarship, creative work and service (pp. 10-11)
- Appendix containing suggested AI syllabus language, compliance with relevant IU AI policies, AI resources, and suggested further reading (pp. 11-15)

Teaching and Learning: Preparing Students for an AI-Driven Workplace

Whether or not we use AI personally, we must recognize that our students will be expected to use it in the workplace. They will be hired into roles that assume AI fluency—often without training. As faculty, we have a responsibility to help them learn not just how to use AI, but how to use it wisely, ethically, and effectively.

Grounded in principles. Driven by innovation.
Authentically Kelley.

AI is evolving fast. So must we. These 5 principles guide how Kelley faculty use AI—ethically, intentionally and deeply aligned with our educational mission. Rooted in our values, they shape policy, teaching, and leadership.

1. AI Transparency Builds Trust

We clearly explain how AI is used in teaching, grading, and feedback.

→ Transparency invites trust and honest dialogue.
→ This document was created using multiple AI tools—intentionally and openly.

2. Authentically Kelley Purpose

We use AI when it serves learning.

→ Thoughtful adoption beats trendy tools.
→ We share what works—so all students benefit.

3. AI Supports, But Doesn't Substitute

Faculty are key to Kelley and its success.

→ AI assists our judgment—it doesn't replace it.
→ Mentorship, expertise, and human feedback remain core to the Kelley experience.

4. We Explore AI Together

Trial, error, and curiosity fuel growth.

→ Playful experimentation is part of progress.
→ We share wins and flops—with candor and civility.

5. We Model AI Discernment

We teach when to use AI—and when not to.

→ Students learn responsible, ethical AI habits by our example.
→ We foster honest conversations around AI's power and limits.

Bottom line:
AI isn't just a tool—it's a fundamental shift in how we approach our roles. Let's lead the way—together. ***Authentically Kelley.***

This document was created using multiple AI tools—intentionally and transparently.

Principle 1: AI Transparency Builds Trust

Faculty build trust by clearly communicating when and how AI is used in their teaching, grading, and feedback. Transparency supports ethical practice, helps students navigate varying expectations across courses, and sets the tone for critical engagement with AI.

What This Means for Faculty

- If AI helped create materials (slides, prompts, rubrics), say so.
- If AI is used in grading, describe how.
- Clarify your policy early, remind students often.
- Be explicit: "In this assignment, AI use is [allowed / restricted / required / prohibited]."
- Do not upload identifiable student work, grades, or FERPA-protected data to public AI tools (AI not licensed by IU)—even if anonymized. See IU's Data Classifications.

Students expect—and deserve—to understand what role AI plays in their learning environment.

Practical Examples

- Add a note on your syllabus:
  "Some materials in this course were created or refined using generative AI tools."
- Before major deliverables, remind students of your AI policy in assignment instructions or Canvas announcements.
- If AI assisted in writing feedback, say so:
  "This comment was drafted with help from Microsoft Copilot and reviewed by your instructor."

Policy Implications

- Disclose when AI is used in course design, grading, or instructional materials.
- Include your AI policy in the syllabus and reinforce it throughout the course.
- Clearly define acceptable AI use for faculty and students—avoid vague "you may use AI" rules.
- Transparency includes disclosure of instructor use, not just student rules.

Faculty–Student Consistency in AI Transparency

Transparency must go both ways—faculty and students should follow the same standards for AI use.

→ If you treat AI like a calculator—permissible to use without citation—state that clearly to students.
→ Requiring students to cite AI while not doing so yourself undermines trust and credibility.
→ Model the openness you expect–shared transparency sets clear, ethical norms for AI use.

Suggested Syllabus Language

"AI tools may be used by the instructor to help develop course materials and summarize feedback. Final grading decisions are made by the instructor and never delegated entirely to AI."

Pro Tips

- Use Gen AI to review your syllabus for clarity: *"What might confuse students in this policy?"*
- State your AI usage in plain terms during the first class session.
- If students ask, show them how you used AI—model openness.
- Add a quick early quiz to confirm students understand your AI policy and avoid confusion later.

Principle 2: Authentically Kelley Purpose

Not all AI is created equal—and not all of it belongs in your course. This principle reminds us to use AI when it serves a clear instructional purpose, not because it's popular or new. Thoughtful adoption helps students learn. Trend-chasing can confuse them.

What This Means for Faculty

- Use AI tools that improve teaching, feedback, or student engagement.
- Match the tool to the task—just because you can use AI doesn't mean you should.
- Share what works with others so we build collective wisdom.

Practical Examples

- Use AI to generate quiz variants or assignment rubrics—then refine.
- Ask Copilot or Gemini to summarize your syllabus for clarity—but confirm accuracy.
- Let students explore tools like NotebookLM for organizing course readings.
- Use multiple Gen AI! For example, Copilot to summarize student feedback, then paste the it into Gemini or ChatGPT for rewriting suggestions. Iterating across tools often leads to sharper insights.
- Draft your syllabus with NotebookLM to structure your materials, then ask Copilot to convert the outline into a polished course introduction.

Policy Implications

IU allows and enables use of **approved and IU-licensed generative AI tools** for instruction and University-Internal data (https://datamanagement.iu.edu/data-classifications/index.html). You must be logged in with your IU account (not a personal account). As of **Oct 2025**, these include:

Tool	Strengths	Access
Copilot Chat (https://copilot.microsoft.com)	Cited answers and research using the live web.	✅ Free to all IU accounts
Copilot for Microsoft 365 (https://copilot.microsoft.com)	Productivity within your own MS Office documents/emails/slides.	🟡 Paid (RATs fundable: $30/mo)
Google Gemini (https://gemini.google.com/)	Generating new content and brainstorming creative ideas.	✅ Free to all IU accounts
NotebookLM (https://notebooklm.google/)	Analyzing and questioning your uploaded source documents.	✅ Free to all IU accounts
Adobe Firefly (https://www.adobe.com/home)	Creating commercially safe images for presentations/courses.	✅ 1025 monthly credits; Free to all IU accounts
ChatGPT (https://chat.openai.com/)	General-purpose chat, text and image generation, data analysis, and code creation.	✅ Free with IU Login (faculty/staff now; students Jan 1, 2026)
Public Tools (e.g., Claude.ai)	Use cautiously and without institutional data	❌ Not IU-approved

All tools above are cleared for University-Internal data. REALLMs (p. 10) is approved for Critical data.

For questions on how to use a specific AI tool, it is recommended you ask the tool for help. For example, to learn how to use Gemini to create an image, go to Google Gemini and ask the tool for instructions.

For an overview of the difference between Copilot Chat and Copilot for Microsoft 365 apps, visit copilot.microsoft.com and About Microsoft 365 Copilot at IU - Indiana University Knowledge Base. Faculty may also use **RATs funds** to purchase personal licenses for additional AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT Plus), provided these are not used with restricted IU data.

Full list and updates: uits.iu.edu/ai and Generative AI tools at IU - Indiana University Knowledge Base

Why Use IU-Licensed AI Tools via Your IU Account?

- Compliant with university policy
- They are approved for use with University-Internal data For example, student submitted assignments are considered University-Internal unless they contain Health information or Personally identifiable information. Checkout IU's Data Sharing and Handling Tool which provides guidance on how to properly classify, store, and share the data you manage.
- Uploading identifiable student work, grades, or FERPA-protected data to public AI tools is against IU policy—even if anonymized.
- Support is available through IU
- Less risk of violating data privacy or FERPA
- Ongoing vetting and updates by the university

Pro Tips

- Bookmark this link: uits.iu.edu/ai — updated list of approved tools.
- Confirm that you are using your IU account login. Your browser might auto log you in using your personal account if you also have a personal account on that AI.
- Use RATs funds to pilot a new tool and share your experience at a Kelley meeting.
- If you're not sure what a tool does with data, assume it's public and check with UIPO before use.
- **Don't stop with one AI.** Try your draft in Copilot, Gemini, or NotebookLM—each has different strengths. Our students already do this. Faculty should, too. Iterating across tools often produces clearer, stronger results.
- **There are also times to skip AI entirely.** For a deeper discussion on when and why, see Section 6: We Model AI Discernment.
- Because AI is still evolving, some students may raise concerns about its broader implications—such as model training or environmental impact. Faculty may find it useful to anticipate these conversations, even if they're rare.

Principle 3: AI Supports, But Doesn't Substitute

AI can enhance our work—but it cannot replace our role as educators. This principle affirms that faculty expertise, mentorship, and judgment are an essential part of the Kelley learning experience. AI may assist with tasks like feedback or rubric alignment, but final decisions must remain human-led.

What This Means for Faculty

- AI may support—but not replace—teaching, grading, or student interaction.
- Students benefit from your feedback, evaluation, and modeling of responsible AI use.
- Be alert to prompt injection—hidden instructions that can alter an AI's response.
- Using AI in teaching should reduce repetitive effort, not reduce human connection.

Practical Examples

- Use AI to generate draft rubric comments—then edit before returning to students.
- Let Copilot summarize long-form assignments to help you triage where to focus.
- Use NotebookLM to review and organize student project reports—but retain final judgment.
- Clearly tell students when feedback or comments were assisted by AI.

Policy Implications

Faculty must remain involved in all assessment decisions. Kelley policy prohibits fully autonomous AI grading, and IU policy forbids uploading student data to public AI tools. [Data Classification: IU Data Management: Indiana University]

AI and Grading: What's Appropriate?

Grading Method	Permitted?	Details
Autograding (e.g., Canvas quizzes)	✅ Yes	Suitable for objective, factual content.
AI-Assisted Grading	✅ Yes	AI may draft summaries or comments, but faculty must review and approve.
AI-Enhanced Rubric Scoring	✅ Yes	AI can suggest alignment to criteria. Final scoring is faculty-controlled.
Fully AI-Generated Grading	❌ Not Permitted	AI cannot assign grades or comments without faculty oversight.
Unreviewed AI Feedback	❌ Not Permitted	AI-generated comments must be verified before sharing with students.

Suggested Syllabus Statement

> *"AI tools may assist grading and feedback, but all grades are reviewed and approved by the instructor. AI will never grade student work without faculty oversight."*

Pro Tips

- Let students know how you used AI—e.g., "Drafted with Copilot, then revised by your instructor."
- Before returning graded work, review AI-generated feedback for tone, clarity, and accuracy.
- Treat AI like a teaching assistant: helpful for prep, never in charge.

Principle 4: We Explore AI Together

Faculty don't need to have all the answers—especially with a tool that's evolving this fast. This principle encourages curiosity, collaboration, and iteration. Try things. Share results. Laugh when it goes sideways.

When we experiment, we grow. And when we share, others grow with us.

What This Means for Faculty

- AI is an experiential tool where you learn by doing. Play with it. Break it. See what happens.
- Teaching students how to think about AI starts by pushing yourself to explore.
- Treat early trials as prototypes—use feedback from students and colleagues to improve.

Practical Examples

- Run a classroom activity where students **use AI and reflect** on what worked, what didn't.
- Pilot a new AI-assisted assignment—then bring your results to a teaching meeting.
- Try 3 AI tools on the same task and compare results. Show your students the differences.
- Share a "flop" with your department: a bad AI draft, a surprising error, a funny misfire.

Policy Implications

- You are encouraged to experiment—but remain responsible for student experience and data protection.
- Don't pilot new AI workflows with **Restricted** or **Critical** data (e.g., grades, identifiable student records).
- Model responsible behavior: tell students when you're experimenting, and what you're learning from it.

Suggested Syllabus Statement

> *"In this course, we will explore how AI can support professional and academic work. You will be asked to use AI tools for certain assignments and reflect on their effectiveness."*

Pro Tips

- Build a low-stakes activity just to see what AI can (and can't) do—then debrief in class.
- Set a timer for 15 minutes: try the same prompt in three tools (Copilot, Gemini, NotebookLM). Compare results.
- Use multiple AI for the same project. Use one AI to draft and ask another AI to review.
- Share one insight at your next faculty meeting, brown bag, or hallway conversation. That's how we grow together.

The more we share what works—and what doesn't—the faster we all learn. Every experiment adds to Kelley's collective insight, keeping us learning forward. This adaptability is the same mindset students need to lead in an evolving business world.

Principle 5: We Model AI Discernment

Students are watching not just what we teach—but how we use AI. This principle challenges us to model responsible, ethical, and critical AI use.

Discernment means knowing when AI helps, when it harms, and when to leave it out entirely.

What This Means for Faculty

- Ai is *not* a teleportation device for faculty or students to travel from beginning to end of work.
- Design assignments that support original thinking and reduce the temptation to overuse AI (see Special Topics below).
- Show students that AI can be useful—but also flawed, biased, or just wrong.
- Demonstrate fact-checking, attribution, and responsible tool choice.
- Explain not just what AI did—but why you chose to use (or not use) it.

Critical thinking must remain central. When students or faculty use AI without reflection, they offload too much cognition—outsourcing mental work that should be done internally. This risks creating an illusion of learning without understanding, and can weaken memory, creativity, and long-term skill development.

Generative AI tools often produce information that is inaccurate, fabricated, or misleading. These errors may appear plausible at first glance but can contain false facts, flawed reasoning, or nonexistent citations. Faculty should model fact-checking, and students should never assume AI outputs are reliable without verification. AI outputs include not only text but also generated or analyzed images, slides, data visualizations, and other multimodal outputs. The same principles of verification and source evaluation apply to these multimodal outputs.

AI systems are trained on massive datasets that reflect existing social and cultural patterns—some of which are biased. As a result, generative AI can unintentionally reinforce stereotypes or one-sided perspectives. Faculty should be prepared to spot biased outputs and help students learn to question the assumptions baked into AI-generated content.

Practical Examples

- Use an AI-generated summary in class—then walk students through what it got wrong.
- Compare AI-written paragraphs with a strong student example and discuss the difference.
- Build an assignment where students must use AI **and** critique its output.
- Require students to cite AI tools when used in research, writing, or analysis.

When *Not* to Use AI, Skip AI entirely when:

- Working with private or restricted data (e.g., grades, student info, unpublished research)
- When it would violate restrictions imposed by the owner of the data or content, e.g., licensed datasets express prohibitions in the license or course materials.
- Tasks require critical reasoning, ethical nuance, or creative depth
- Learning outcomes depend on original thinking or skill development
- AI output can't be verified and accuracy is essential

Policy Implications

- Do not upload identifiable student work, grades, or FERPA-protected data to public AI tools—even if anonymized.
- Students must not pass off AI-generated work as their own. Clarify expectations and require disclosure.

Suggested Syllabus Statement (If AI Is Allowed)

> *"If you use AI tools in this course, you must clearly cite the tool and explain how you used it. Failure to do so may be considered academic misconduct."*

🚫 **AI Detection Tools: Not Reliable**

Some tools claim to detect whether a student used AI—but these services are highly unreliable. They often produce false positives and false negatives, especially with short-form writing or multilingual students.

- **No AI detection tools (such as GPTZero, Turnitin AI Detection, or Originality.AI) are approved for use at Kelley or Indiana University.** About AI detection tools - Indiana University Knowledge Base
- Faculty may **not** upload student work to any public or private detection service.
- Using these tools may violate university policy and student privacy protections.

This restriction applies only to the use of detection tools—not to the faculty member's ability to set expectations around AI use and pursue academic misconduct if those expectations are violated.

Instead of trying to "catch" AI use, focus on designing assignments that encourage process, reasoning, and authentic engagement. How to Productively Address AI-Generated Text in Your Classroom : Academic Integrity: Teaching Resources: Center for Innovative Teaching & Learning: Indiana University Bloomington

Pro Tips

- Say: "This draft came from Copilot, but here's what I changed—and why."
- Assign students to test an AI tool and explain what it misunderstood or missed.
- Redesign assignments to require reasoning, process, or decision-making AI can't fake.
- When in doubt, skip the AI—and tell your students why.

Leading by Example

Discernment is a lifelong skill. When faculty model it with intention, students learn to approach every new technology with the same curiosity and care. Transparency and discernment work together—modeling clear disclosure of AI use helps students build both ethical awareness and practical judgment.

AI in Research, Scholarship, Creative Work, and Service

As a scholar at the Kelley School of Business, you recognize the importance of staying at the cutting edge of research, including leveraging advancements in technology. The rise of generative AI (GenAI) and specifically large language models (LLMs) represents an important moment in scholarly research, offering both opportunities and challenges.

Opportunities and Risks
It is important to understand that LLMs and generative AI can be highly beneficial for researchers. As noted in IU's Generative AI Task Force report (March 2024):

> "Indiana University must be a leader in Generative Artificial Intelligence," and "GenAI can help in the pursuit of transformative, world-class research, scholarship, and creative activity."

We therefore encourage Kelley scholars to experiment with AI, identifying use cases in which GenAI can aid in creativity and research.

However, the use of GenAI in research poses several challenges. Technically, hallucinations remain a serious issue—researchers must be absolutely certain that LLM output, if used, is factual. There are also important concerns around the ethical use of AI. As the Task Force notes:

> "GenAI, while advanced, can produce outputs that are inaccurate or unreliable. The data used to train GenAI systems contains biases, which can be perpetuated or amplified by the algorithms, leading to unfair and discriminatory outcomes."

Privacy, Terms of Use, and Data Sensitivity
There are significant risks around both privacy and data security, some of which are not obvious. For example, some vendors prohibit the use of their data in generative AI systems and using such systems to analyze that data would be a violation of terms of use.

Until recently, **no AI tool—public or university-approved—was cleared for use with IU data classified as Restricted or Critical**. Faculty now have access to **REALLMs** (Research and Academic LLM Services), an IU-hosted large-language model service approved for use with Critical research data and PHI. REALLMs operates entirely on IU's on-premise infrastructure and complies with the **Management of Institutional Data (DM-01)** policy. Researchers with questions about data sensitivity should contact the **Data Steward for Research Data (datard@iu.edu)** for guidance. For more information, visit: REALLMs: Research and Academic LLM Services

Researchers should consult **IU's Data Classification Guidelines** before using GenAI tools with any institutional data. Data Classification: IU Data Management: Indiana University

Journal and Conference Policies
Importantly, guidelines around GenAI use in research are continuously shifting and vary not only by discipline but also across journals in the same field—or even across editorial roles within the same journal. For example:

- Some journals permit GenAI use if clearly acknowledged.
- Others prohibit its use in writing, peer review, or image generation.
- Be aware that prompt injection (hidden instructions to LLMs) can alter responses.
- Some allow AI-generated figures or illustrations but require human oversight and explanation.

There is no one-size-fits-all approach. Researchers must **continually check the policies** of scholarly forums, conferences, and journals where they plan to submit.

Grants and Funding Proposals
Many foundations and funding bodies **explicitly prohibit** the use of GenAI during the grant application process. Faculty preparing proposals are strongly encouraged to contact the Kelley School's Director of Proposal Development or the Associate Dean for Research to verify what is acceptable before using any AI tools in application drafting, budget narrative development, or documentation prep.

Final Note
GenAI presents both opportunities and challenges for scholars. By acknowledging its limitations and following evolving guidelines, researchers can harness AI's power while ensuring responsible use.

Faculty are encouraged to experiment with this exciting technology—but to do so critically and in alignment with disciplinary norms, ethical expectations, and university policy.

Special Topics

This section addresses important issues that affect multiple areas of teaching and policy. These topics are practical, actionable, and especially important for new faculty navigating AI for the first time.

🔍 AI and Grading: Summary Reference

Grading Method	Permitted?	Details
Autograding (e.g., Canvas quizzes)	✅ Yes	Suitable for objective, factual content.
AI-Assisted Grading	✅ Yes	AI may draft summaries or comments, but faculty must review and approve.
AI-Enhanced Rubric Scoring	✅ Yes	AI can suggest alignment to criteria. Final scoring is faculty-controlled.
Fully AI-Generated Grading	❌ Not Permitted	AI cannot assign grades or comments without faculty oversight.
Unreviewed AI Feedback	❌ Not Permitted	AI-generated comments must be verified before sharing with students.

🗂️ OneDrive, Copilot, and File Permissions

Copilot can access any file you've shared with "People in Indiana University"—even old files you forgot about and even if you never use Copilot yourself. REALLMS operates fully within IU infrastructure and does not have access to OneDrive or Microsoft 365 files.

This includes:

- Word, Excel, and PowerPoint files
- OneDrive folders
- Microsoft Teams and SharePoint content

What to do:

- Visit OneDrive > "Shared" > "By You" to see everything you've shared.
- Remove "People at IU" sharing if it's no longer needed.
- Avoid broad sharing when using institutional data.

🛠️ For details on sharing files in OneDrive see Share and collaborate on Microsoft 365 files - Indiana University Knowledge Base.

🎓 Student AI Literacy and Training

Students are already using AI. Help them use it well:

- Show how AI can support—but not replace—thinking.
- Discuss when AI might be helpful and when it's risky.
- Use reflection prompts:
  "What did AI get wrong?"
  "What did you revise after seeing AI output?"
- Refer students to IU's student-facing guide: Learn with AI

🤖 **Indiana University's GenAI 101 course**, developed in collaboration with Kelley faculty, provides a free, self-paced foundation in generative AI for all students, faculty, and staff. The course covers prompt engineering, AI as a thought partner, and responsible use of AI as a productivity amplifier—using IU-approved platforms only. While not required, faculty may encourage students to complete GenAI 101 to strengthen digital literacy or even offer extra credit for earning the completion badge when aligned with course outcomes. GenAI 101: AI at IU: University Information Technology Services: Indiana University

🧠 Assignments That Resist Overreliance on AI

Design assignments that support original thinking and reduce the temptation to overuse AI:

- Include a required reflection: "How did you use AI, if at all?"
- Ask students to compare their own draft to an AI version and explain differences.
- Use iterative work (drafts, feedback cycles) to focus on process, not just output.
- Create prompts that connect to personal, classroom, or team context (e.g., IU cases, Kelley team projects).

Appendices

This section includes reusable materials, resources, and references to support faculty adoption, course design, and responsible AI use across Kelley.

Appendix A: Sample Syllabus Language

Faculty may adopt any AI policy that fits their course—prohibitive, conditional, or permissive—as long as it aligns with university guidelines. The Kelley Digital Educational Technologies group has developed model language for each type. These sample statements are offered as suggestions only; syllabus language remains at the discretion of individual faculty.

Download the full syllabus language guide:
Suggested AI Language for Kelley Syllabi.docx

This resource includes:

- Sample statements for prohibited, conditional, and permissive AI use
- Suggested justifications to help you explain your policy to students
- AI citation guidance and student-facing examples

Grading Transparency

If you use AI in grading or feedback preparation, consider adding a brief statement like:

> *"AI tools may be used by the instructor to assist in feedback or grading prep, but all final decisions are reviewed and approved by the faculty member."*

This helps clarify expectations for students and reinforces Kelley's policy that grading may never be fully delegated to AI. See Principle 1: AI Transparency Builds Trust for additional examples of how to communicate faculty AI use to students.

Appendix B: Compliance with University Policies and Tool Use Summary

IU classifies data into four levels:

- **Public**
- **University-Internal**
- **Restricted**
- **Critical**

Only **Public** and **University-Internal** data can be used in university-approved AI tools—and only when logged in with your IU account. Data Classification: IU Data Management: Indiana University

Tool	Strengths	Access
Copilot Chat (https://copilot.microsoft.com)	Cited answers and research using the live web.	✅ Free to all IU accounts
Copilot for Microsoft 365 (https://copilot.microsoft.com)	Productivity within your own MS Office documents/emails/slides.	🟡 Paid (RATs fundable: $30/mo)
Google Gemini (https://gemini.google.com/)	Generating new content and brainstorming creative ideas.	✅ Free to all IU accounts
NotebookLM (https://notebooklm.google/)	Analyzing and questioning your uploaded source documents.	✅ Free to all IU accounts
Adobe Firefly (https://www.adobe.com/home)	Creating commercially safe images for presentations/courses.	✅ 1025 monthly credits; Free to all IU accounts
ChatGPT (https://chat.openai.com/)	General-purpose chat, text and image generation, data analysis, and code creation.	✅ Free with IU Login (faculty/staff now; students Jan 1, 2026)
Public Tools (e.g., Claude.ai)	Use cautiously and without institutional data	❌ Not IU-approved

All tools above are cleared for University-Internal data. REALLMs (p. 10) is approved for Critical data.

Tip: When in doubt, assume student data is **Restricted** and do not upload it to any AI tool.

REALLMS (Research and Academic LLM Services) – IU-hosted environment approved for Critical research data and PHI. Operates fully within IU infrastructure and compliant with DM-01. As of September 2025, REALLMs is authorized for Critical Data.

Faculty are responsible for ensuring that any use of AI tools complies with university data, privacy, and security policies. When in doubt—ask before using.

For help with compliance:

- **Privacy concerns (e.g., Copilot access):**
  privacy@iu.edu
- **Data classification or tool usage questions:**
  uipo@iu.edu or call **812-855-UIPO**

Be especially cautious when handling student data, research materials, or unpublished work. Always verify that the AI tool you're using is approved for the classification level of your content.

Appendix C: Resources and Further Reading

IU Support & Faculty Development

- AI at IU – https://uits.iu.edu/ai
- Teaching.IU – https://teaching.iu.edu
- LinkedIn Learning (search 'Generative AI') – https://one.iu.edu/task/iu/linkedin-learning
- Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning – https://citl.indiana.edu
- GenAI in the Classroom Canvas Modules – https://iu.instructure.com/enroll/PD37NC Free, self-paced introduction to generative AI for all IU faculty, staff, and students. Developed by Kelley faculty in partnership with IU. Covers prompt engineering, responsible use, and AI as a productivity amplifier. Faculty may optionally recognize completion badges for extra credit or digital literacy points.

Thought Leadership & Frameworks

- The Chronicle of Higher Education: 'How Are Students Really Using AI?' – https://www.chronicle.com/article/how-are-students-really-using-ai
- 'Assigning AI: Seven Approaches for Students, with Prompts' by Ethan and Lilach Mollick – https://www.oneusefulthing.org/p/assigning-ai-seven-ways-of-using

Policy & Privacy References

- IU Data Classification – https://datamgmt.iu.edu
- Acceptable Uses of Generative AI – https://servicenow.iu.edu/kb?sys_kb_id=3d02444a47c96290d500b87b716d43a0&id=kb_article_view&sysparm_rank=1&sysparm_tsqueryId=30e87bf53bfea290476d941864e45a13
- Data Sharing and Handling Tool – https://datamgmt.iu.edu/tools/dsh.html
- Privacy concerns: privacy@iu.edu
- Data concerns: uipo@iu.edu or 812-855-UIPO

Student & Classroom Resources

- Learn with A.I.: Study Stronger – https://learning.iu.edu/study-stronger/learn-with-ai.html
- CITL AI Guide – https://citl.indiana.edu/teaching-resources/gen-ai/index.html
- Kelley Suggested Syllabi Language – https://indiana.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/KelleyFaculty/Shared%20Documents/Collated%20Resources/Teaching%20Related%20Materials/AI%20suggested%20syllabus%20language.docx?d=waa16edf6713e4a71ba8dc624b53e53be&csf=1&web=1&e=LqLBK1

Procurement & Reporting

- Order Copilot for Microsoft 365 (funding account required): tsorder@iu.edu
- Report inappropriate data access: it-incident@iu.edu

AI at Kelley advances through shared purpose—ethical, transparent, and grounded in curiosity.