

Yeshiva University
Undergraduate Artificial Intelligence in Teaching and Learning Policy
Yeshiva College · Stern College for Women · Sy Syms School of Business
August 2026

1. Purpose

The undergraduate colleges believe that preparing students for an AI-enabled world and protecting the integrity of their education are the same project. This policy pursues both, welcoming AI where it serves learning and drawing lines where it would substitute for it. Generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools are now widely accessible to students and faculty and are already shaping how people research, write, code, create, and solve problems. This document establishes policies for Yeshiva University's undergraduate colleges—Yeshiva College, Stern College for Women, and Sy Syms School of Business—on the use of AI in teaching and learning. These policies are consistent with the broader policies of the University; they provide additional detail suitable to the undergraduate programs. This document addresses artificial intelligence only; other forms of academic conduct and misconduct, such as plagiarism and cheating on examinations, continue to be governed by the University's existing academic integrity policies.

The colleges neither prohibit AI outright nor require it. Faculty decide how AI fits the learning goals of their courses, and students are expected to use AI honestly and as their courses allow. What matters is that any use of AI is constructive, reviewed, and disclosed. The policy is designed to:

- Give instructors clear authority and practical tools to set AI expectations for their own courses.
- Protect academic integrity while helping students build the AI skills their future careers will require.
- Develop responsible AI fluency appropriate to each discipline: the ability to use AI productively, evaluate and verify its output, recognize its limits, protect sensitive information, and take responsibility for work produced with its assistance.
- Protect intellectual property, safeguard student data privacy, and ensure equitable access to AI tools.
- Build a culture in which students ask before they act: when in doubt, don't; when unsure, ask.

2. Read This First: A Guide for Students

If you remember one rule from this document, remember this one: **unless your professor tells you in writing that you may use AI on an assignment, you may not use it.** Permission is never assumed. It is always granted, in writing, by your professor, for a specific course or a specific assignment. When no rule is stated, the rule is no AI.

Why is that the default? You came to college to build capacities: to think, write, analyze, argue, compute, and create. AI can strengthen those capacities or hollow them out, depending on how you use it. At the same time, AI is an important technology, and learning to use it well is part of preparing for your career. Your professors want to teach you to use AI in ways that help you learn. Sometimes that means restricting it now so that you become a stronger thinker, and a better user of AI, later. Work that AI does for you is potentially learning you did not do. This policy is not designed to catch you. It is designed to protect the value of your education and your degree, so that what you earn here is really yours.

How the policy works. Every assignment has an AI level, numbered UG 0 through UG 4 (UG for undergraduate). UG 0 means no AI at all. UG 1 means you may use AI to polish the grammar and mechanics of text you have already written. UG 2 means you may use AI to brainstorm and outline, but not to write anything you submit. UG 3 means you may use AI to help draft your work. UG 4 means the assignment itself is built around AI. Your professor will state the level on the syllabus and on each assignment. If no level is stated anywhere, the level is UG 0. Section 6 explains each level in full. Using AI on an assignment means more than having it write your text. Brainstorming, outlining, summarizing a reading, translating, or fixing code with AI all count as AI use, and the assignment's level applies to all of them.

If you use AI, say so. At any level above UG 0, you must submit a written statement identifying any AI tools or AI-enabled features used and explaining how they were used in producing the work. This is called “disclosure,” and it exists for the same reason that scholars cite their sources and professionals credit their tools. Disclosing permitted AI use is not an invitation to be graded differently, but hiding AI use is a violation of academic integrity principles and policies. You are responsible for everything you turn in. If AI invents a quotation or a source, you fail to confirm it, and you submit it as part of your work, that is your mistake.

Small, everyday uses do not count. Spellcheck, grammar underlining, and short autocomplete suggestions of a few words that are built into the word-processing or document-creation software in which the work is produced (e.g., Microsoft Word, Google Docs, or Apple Pages), AI summaries that appear on their own in search results, and assistive technology used under a documented accommodation do not count as AI use at any level. Your professor may restrict one of these only when it is central to what the assignment measures (for example, spelling in a language course), and they must say so explicitly.

Three habits will carry you through this policy and through professional life.

1. **Disclose:** telling your reader what help you received and what tools you used is basic honesty about your work.
2. **Keep your work:** your drafts and notes are the record of your own thinking, and they are also your best protection if a question ever arises.
3. **Ask before acting:** when a rule is ambiguous, asking first is what serious people do.

Asking is always safe. A good-faith question will never be held against you, and if you ask and follow your professor's written answer, you are fully protected. If your professor does not answer before the deadline, follow the strictest reasonable interpretation of the assignment's rules and note in your submission that you asked. When in doubt, don't; when unsure, ask.

3. Scope

This policy applies to all credit-bearing courses, labs, seminars, and supervised research offered by Yeshiva College, Stern College for Women, and Sy Syms School of Business, whether delivered in person, online, or in hybrid format. It also covers students from these colleges taking credit-bearing coursework anywhere at Yeshiva University. Where an instructor's stated course policy differs from this document, the instructor's policy controls. The policy applies to all instructors who design, teach, or grade these courses, and to AI use in coursework, assessment, feedback, and grading. Supervised research, theses, and research assistantships are addressed in Section 12.

Yeshiva University's graduate and professional schools are outside the scope of this policy and may adopt their own standards. It also does not govern AI use in institutional research, admissions, human resources, or other administrative operations, which fall under separate University policies.

4. Definitions

This policy applies to AI use in general and deliberately does not distinguish between assistive and generative AI tools. Assistive tools are increasingly built on generative engines, and the line between the categories is blurry. What matters under this policy is the level of use, not the type of tool.

Term	Definition
AI tool	Software that produces or transforms text, code, images, audio, or other content in response to a prompt or input, including chatbots, writing and coding assistants, and image, audio, and video generators.
AI-assisted work	Any student or faculty work produced with meaningful help from an AI tool. Meaningful help includes generating or rewriting sentences, paragraphs, or code; producing an outline, thesis, or argument; summarizing or translating substantial text; debugging or writing code; and generating analysis or interpretation of data. It does not include the minimal uses listed below.
Minimal uses (small, everyday uses)	Uses that do not count as AI use at any level of this policy: spellcheck and grammar underlining, autocomplete of a few words, AI-generated summaries that appear unsolicited in search results, and AI-based assistive technology used under a documented accommodation. These exceptions apply only when such features are built into, or integrated with, the permitted word-processing platform in which the document is produced (for example, Microsoft Word, Apple Pages, or Google Docs). Instructors may restrict a minimal use only where it is central to what an assessment measures (for example, spelling in a language course), and must say so explicitly.

Disclosure	A clear written statement, in the form and location specified by the instructor or assignment, identifying any AI tools used and how they were employed in producing the work.
------------	--

5. Guiding Principles

5.1 Instructor Authority Within a Common Framework

Individual instructors know best how AI use fits their course's learning outcomes. This policy sets a default across the undergraduate colleges and a shared vocabulary. Instructors may set stricter or more permissive rules for their own courses and for individual assignments, provided these are clearly stated as described in Section 7. Instructors are encouraged to consult with department chairs, deans, and colleagues, particularly when adopting approaches that depart substantially from the default. Instructors have a responsibility to set a clear AI policy and to communicate it; students have a responsibility to read it, understand it, and follow it.

5.2 Transparency and Disclosure

Any AI use above UG 0 must be disclosed in writing. This single, consistent rule encourages transparency and eliminates confusion. Beyond compliance, disclosure builds a habit of intellectual honesty, candor about where work comes from, what assistance was received, and what the author contributed. That habit is part of professional character. Transparency supports learning, meaningful assessment, and academic integrity. Undisclosed or unauthorized AI use inconsistent with stated expectations is an academic integrity matter.

5.3 Learning-Centered Use

AI should augment learning and skill development, never substitute for it or undermine it. Instructors are encouraged to design assessments in which genuine value is created through the combination of human and AI work, and to restrict AI where its use diminishes the value of the human work. Preparatory work is work: brainstorming, outlining, and clarifying concepts are part of an assignment, and AI assistance with them counts as AI assistance with the assignment.

5.4 Human Judgment and Accountability

Instructors may use AI tools to assist with drafting feedback and analysis, but final academic judgments (grades, degree progress decisions, and disciplinary determinations) must always be made and confirmed by a qualified human. The same principle binds students. AI may assist analysis, creation, and execution, but responsibility cannot be delegated to an AI system. Students remain accountable for the accuracy, integrity, ethical implications, and consequences of work submitted under their names.

5.5 A Culture of Asking

Reach out for permission and clarification whenever you are unsure. To make asking safe, this policy establishes a safe harbor. A good-faith question about whether an AI use is permitted will never be held against you. A student who asks and follows the instructor's written answer is fully protected under this policy. Instructors should answer AI permission questions promptly. If you receive no answer before a deadline, follow the most restrictive plausible interpretation of the assignment's rules and note your outstanding question in your submission.

6. Levels of Student AI Use in Coursework

This policy adopts a five-level framework describing what undergraduate students may do. The levels are written UG 0 through UG 4, for undergraduate, to distinguish them from any numbering used elsewhere at the University. Each level permits the uses of all lower-numbered levels unless the instructor states otherwise. Instructors may set different levels for different assignments within the same course. Levels should be chosen thoughtfully. Instructors are expected to consider which level best serves the learning goals of each course and each assignment; the default serves as a guide when no level is stated, and it is not meant to spare instructors that decision. Written disclosure attaches to every level above UG 0.

- **UG 0 (the default across the undergraduate colleges).** You may not use AI on this assessment. Minimal uses (Section 4) remain permitted unless your professor explicitly restricts them.
- **UG 1: Polish, with disclosure.** You may use AI to check and correct the grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and mechanics of text you have already written. AI may not generate, rewrite, or restructure your content.
- **UG 2: Preparatory use, with disclosure.** You may use the AI programs your instructor permits in writing for preparatory work such as brainstorming, outlining, and clarifying concepts, but not to generate anything you submit. Because preparatory work is part of the assignment, this use must be disclosed.
- **UG 3: Content generation, with disclosure.** You may use AI to help draft or substantially shape what you submit. You must disclose which tools you used and for what purposes, and you must retain records as described in Section 7.
- **UG 4: AI integrated into the assignment design.** The assignment itself requires AI use: for example, critiquing and improving AI output, building AI-enabled applications, or using AI for research, creative, or professional practice. You are evaluated on what you add to the machine's work: the errors you catch, the gaps you notice, the judgment you exercise, and the ethical choices you make. Disclosure is required.

In plain terms. Find the UG level on your assignment. If no level is written anywhere, it is UG 0 and you may not use AI. Every level above UG 0 requires a written disclosure from you. Each level includes the permissions of the levels below it unless your professor says otherwise. Not sure which UG level applies? Ask well before the deadline.

7. Stating the Rules and Disclosing AI Use

7.1 Where Instructors State the Policy

The course-level AI policy belongs on the syllabus. The assignment-level policy belongs on the assignment itself, in a clearly marked section or box that states the applicable level, any assignment-specific conditions, and the consequences of noncompliance (see Appendix B). Stating the policy on each assignment clarifies it and reflects that AI parameters may legitimately change from one assignment to the next within the same course.

7.2 What Students Disclose and Retain

Wherever AI use is permitted at UG 1 or above, you must submit a written statement identifying any AI tools or AI-enabled features used and explaining how they were used for the assignment. A structured statement of work is ideal, but any written disclosure satisfies this requirement; what matters is that you put your AI use on the record and stand behind what you report. A sample statement appears in Appendix C. The undergraduate colleges will provide a standard statement-of-work tool available to all courses; your professor may require its use.

You are responsible for everything submitted under your name. AI tools sometimes fabricate quotations and cite sources that do not exist, so you must verify the accuracy of all AI output before incorporating it into your work.

Keep your drafts and notes, whether digital or handwritten, for any assignment where AI use is permitted. Digital records (for example, version history or saved chat transcripts) are best because they document the development of your work.

In plain terms. If you used AI, say so in writing when you turn in your work. . . Telling your professor how you used AI is not a confession; hiding it is the violation. Check everything AI gives you; a fake quote or a made-up source is your responsibility. Keep your drafts, notes, and chats.

7.3 What Faculty Disclose

Faculty are expected to disclose substantial AI generation in course materials and feedback to their students. AI-generated media used in instruction (images, video, audio, avatars, or synthetic voices) must be identified as AI-generated. AI-generated media must not be used to impersonate, misrepresent, or deceive others and must be used in a manner consistent with the University's standards of academic integrity, ethical conduct, and respect for individual identity. External law may impose additional disclosure duties, such as New York State's requirement to disclose AI-generated synthetic performers in advertisements.

8. Academic Integrity, Evidence, and Enforcement

8.1 Relationship to Existing Academic Integrity Policy

All undisclosed AI use, and any AI use beyond the stated assignment level, is treated as academic misconduct, in the same manner as unauthorized collaboration or uncited sourcing. This policy does not create a new disciplinary process; it clarifies how existing processes apply to AI.

8.2 Evidence Standards

AI detector output may prompt a conversation with a student but does not alone support a finding of misconduct. To help verify authorship and support academic integrity, instructors may require students to retain drafts, notes, chat transcripts, and version histories and may require work to be completed using specific applications, platforms, or LMS features that preserve evidence of the work process. Oral follow-up conversations are a legitimate verification tool. Students are not required to submit prompts or chat histories with an assignment but may be asked to provide retained records in an academic integrity inquiry. The University's existing standard of proof

applies. These standards protect honest students as much as they equip instructors. The safe harbor in Section 5.5 applies in full to any integrity inquiry.

In plain terms. Using AI when it is not permitted, or hiding AI use you were required to disclose, is cheating, and it is handled like any other cheating. An AI detector alone is never enough to find you responsible. Your drafts and notes are your best protection. A question you asked in good faith can never be used against you.

9. Intellectual Property and Data Privacy

9.1 Course Materials

Course materials (including lecture slides, recorded lectures, copyrighted readings, exams, and assignment prompts) are the intellectual property of their creators or licensors. Students may not upload course materials into third-party AI systems without the instructor's permission. Instructors may restrict AI use both for pedagogical reasons and to protect their intellectual property.

9.2 Student Work and Data

Student work is protected by the University's privacy obligations, including FERPA. Faculty and staff may not enter student work, grades, or personally identifiable student information into consumer AI tools. Any AI use touching student work, including for grading support or feedback, is limited to institutionally approved tools that meet the University's privacy and security requirements. The Provost's Office maintains the list of approved tools.

10. Faculty Use of AI

10.1 Course Design and Materials

Faculty may use AI in course design, instructional materials, accessibility supports, simulations, case studies, and other learning experiences where it enhances student learning. AI supports, but never replaces, the instructor's expertise and professional judgment. Faculty may use AI to help draft assignments and assessments; the instructor of record must review them for accuracy. Substantial AI generation in course materials is disclosed to students under Section 7.3.

10.2 Grading and Feedback

AI tools may assist with generating draft feedback or flagging patterns (for example, common errors across a class), using institutionally approved tools only (Section 9.2). Grades and substantive evaluative judgments must be reviewed and confirmed by the instructor of record, consistent with Section 5.4.

11. Assessment Design

Instructors are encouraged to design assessments that remain meaningful in an AI-rich environment, for example:

- In-class writing and oral presentations or defenses.
- Scaffolded assignments that incorporate instructor feedback and require live meetings with the instructor.

- Experiential assignments: watch something and write about it, go somewhere and build a project around it, interview a real person, collect real data in the real world.
- Assignments in which genuine value is created through the combination of human and AI work, such as critiquing, correcting, and extending AI output.

Where AI use is appropriate, instructors are encouraged to place it in authentic disciplinary and professional contexts, so that students learn to use and evaluate AI in settings resembling those they will encounter beyond the classroom.

12. Supervised Research, Theses, and Research Assistantships

The framework in Section 6 applies to supervised research, senior theses, independent studies, and research assistantships, with the supervisor in the instructor's role. The default is UG 0 unless the supervisor states otherwise in writing at the outset of the project. Supervisors and students should discuss AI expectations early, revisit them as the project develops, and record any agreed departures from the default. Disclosure follows the norms of the relevant discipline in addition to the requirements of Section 7.

13. Equity and Accessibility

- Where an assignment requires AI use, the University will ensure at least one no-cost or institutionally licensed tool is available to all enrolled students.
- This policy does not limit the use of AI-based assistive technology (for example, speech-to-text or reading support) by students with documented accommodations through Disability/Accessibility Services.

14. Governance, Roles, and Review

A standing Committee on AI in Teaching and Learning, with faculty representation from each of the three undergraduate colleges and student representation, will review this policy at least annually, with an additional midyear review during the policy's first two years, or sooner if warranted by significant technological or legal change, and will recommend amendments to the Provost's Office.

Role	Responsibility
Provost's Office	Owens the policy; ensures alignment with accreditation standards; maintains the list of approved AI tools.
Committee on AI in Teaching and Learning	Reviews the policy annually; collects faculty and student input; recommends amendments; stewards the shared disclosure instrument.
Instructors	Set course- and assignment-level AI permissions using the level framework; state expectations on syllabi and assignments; answer permission questions promptly; design assessments accordingly; disclose their own substantial AI use.

Students	Comply with stated permissions; disclose AI use in writing as required; retain drafts and notes; be prepared to discuss their work; ask when unsure.
----------	--

This policy takes effect on [DATE].

Appendix A: Sample Syllabus Statements

UG 0 example (the default)

No use of AI tools (for example, ChatGPT, Copilot, Claude) is permitted on any assessment in this course, including drafting, editing, idea generation, or outlining. Spellcheck and similar minimal uses are permitted. Use of AI tools constitutes an academic integrity violation. If you are unsure whether a use is permitted, ask before submitting; a good-faith question will never be held against you.

UG 1 example

You may use AI tools to check and correct the grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and mechanics of text you have already written. You may not use AI to generate, rewrite, or restructure any text, code, or other material, or to brainstorm or outline. You must disclose this use in the written statement attached to your submission. If you are unsure whether a use is permitted, ask before submitting.

UG 2 example

You may use AI tools for preparatory work: brainstorming ideas, outlining, and clarifying course concepts. You may not use AI to generate any text, code, or other material that you submit as your own work. Preparatory work is part of the assignment, so you must disclose this use in the written statement attached to your submission. If you are unsure whether a use is permitted, ask before submitting.

UG 3 example

You may use AI tools to help draft or generate submitted work for this assignment. You must disclose which tools you used and how, using the disclosure statement in Appendix C (or the statement-of-work tool), attached to your submission, and you must retain your drafts and records. Undisclosed use will be treated as an academic integrity violation.

UG 4 example

This assignment requires you to use [specified AI tool] to generate an initial draft or output, which you will then critique, correct, and improve, or to build an AI-enabled project. Your grade reflects the quality of your analysis, revisions, and human contributions, not the AI's initial output. Appropriate disclosure is required.

Appendix B: Sample Assignment-Level Statement

Instructors should include a clearly marked section like the following on each assignment:

AI policy for this assignment: UG 2 (preparatory use with disclosure). You may brainstorm and outline with AI; you may not generate submitted text. Attach your written disclosure. Undisclosed AI use on this assignment will be treated as academic misconduct under the academic integrity policy. Questions: ask me before the deadline; asking will never count against you.

Appendix C: Sample Student AI Disclosure Statement

Students may be asked to attach a statement in this format when AI use applies:

- Tool(s) used: [for example, ChatGPT, Copilot, Claude]
- Purpose of use: [for example, brainstorming paper topics; generating a first draft of the introduction; debugging code]
- Where in the work it was used: [for example, the introduction; one function; the outline]
- Confirmation: "I have reviewed and take responsibility for the accuracy and originality of the submitted work."