

Notice, disclosure and intellectual property

When should someone know AI is involved?

Useful disclosure helps people understand authorship, interaction or a decision that affects them.

Recommended starting position

Require notice where AI involvement materially affects trust, authorship, evaluation, interaction or a consequential decision. Distinguish routine editing from substantive generation and automated interaction. Respect intellectual-property rights and contractual restrictions separately from disclosure.

A label on every spelling correction may obscure the uses people actually need to understand. A vague label on an automated service may say too little. Attribution also does not establish permission to upload copyrighted, confidential or partner-owned materials.

What the evidence supports

Northcentral distinguishes routine staff content assistance from autonomous interactions. RPCC takes a broader approach to labeling shared AI-generated content. This is a documented policy variance, not a single settled sector rule.

Establish these foundations

- Make consequential AI involvement intelligible to affected people.
- Define authorship and disclosure expectations for the task.
- Check rights to inputs and uses rather than assuming attribution is enough.

The choices to make locally

Task-based disclosure

Consider this when: The important distinction is the nature and extent of assistance.

Tradeoff: Provide examples so staff and students can apply the rule consistently.

Broad labeling

Consider this when: The institution chooses a simple and widely applicable disclosure rule.

Tradeoff: Clarify routine assistance and avoid labels that obscure more consequential uses.

Interaction and decision notice

Consider this when: People encounter automated assistance or an AI-influenced institutional decision.

Tradeoff: Explain the role, limitations and route to a person without exposing sensitive technical details.

Illustrative campus case

A message looks as though an advisor wrote it.

A student receives a personalized message generated and sent automatically by a college service. It appears under the advisor's name.

The student needs an accurate understanding of who reviewed the message and where to get help.

1. Make the automated nature and responsible institutional service clear.
2. Verify that the content, sending authority and contact route are approved.
3. Avoid implying personal review that did not happen.

What the team produces: A clear notice, accountable sender and usable support route.

Who is responsible

Board and trustees: Ask whether institutional communications and services represent human involvement accurately.

Institutional leaders: Set consistent expectations across communications, services and academic contexts.

AI task force: Develop practical examples and route intellectual-property questions to qualified review.

Illustrative language to adapt

AI involvement must be disclosed when it materially affects authorship, evaluation, interaction or understanding of an institutional decision. Communications must not imply human review or personal authorship that did not occur. Users must respect applicable intellectual-property, confidentiality and contractual requirements regardless of disclosure.

Read alongside model policy sections 5, 8, 10. Reconcile local authority and requirements before adoption.

Evidence of implementation

- Examples of acceptable notices for different uses.
- A clear process for rights and permissions questions.
- Communications that accurately represent the human involvement.

Reconsider when: Revisit when services become personalized, synthetic media becomes more realistic or an assistive workflow becomes autonomous.

Supporting sources

[Northcentral Technical College / Artificial Intelligence](#)

[River Parishes Community College / Use of Artificial Intelligence](#)