Episode 68 – Some Uses of Artificial Intelligence in Graduate Education

Welcome to Grad-post! I'm your host, Brian S. Mitchell, and we're here to talk about life before, during and after graduate school, and whether an advanced degree is right for you. I'll draw upon my experiences as a graduate dean and research mentor as well as my network of students, colleagues and experts to bring you the most complete information on graduate education that I can.

We're still in the early days of artificial intelligence impacting our colleges and universities and there's a lot we're still trying to figure out. Generative AI will certainly play a role in how research is formulated and executed going forward, and it will also play a role in how dissertations and theses are produced and evaluated. If you are of the view that AI has already killed the dissertation as recently opined by Dan Sarofian-Butin of the Chronicle of Higher Education, then we're already apparently too late. Personally, I believe the reports of the dissertation's demise are greatly exaggerated, and we will soon come to accept AI-generated dissertations in the same way we allow calculators on standardized tests. I'll elaborate on that thought at some point, but today's topic is not about generative AI per se, but rather how artificial intelligence is viewed from an administrative standpoint in graduate education. To illustrate some of these uses, I solicited the advice of two graduate dean colleagues.

First, I had the pleasure of speaking with Annie Pilote, Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies at the Universite Laval in Quebec City, Canada about their newly developed policies on the "Responsible Use of Generative AI in Master's and Doctoral Theses." Here are some of her comments:

Brian Mitchell: Annie, welcome! I really appreciate you taking some time to talk with me today about this document in particular that has been generated at the Universite Laval, called the "Toolkit for Responsible Use of Generative AI in Master's and Doctoral Theses." So, tell me a little bit about how this document was created, and kind of what it contains as well.

Annie Pilote: Thank you for having me. We're very proud of the work that we've done at Laval, and it's ongoing work, but we decided to adopt a pedagogical way of dealing with AI in graduate programs. But I want to start at the beginning. In 2024, our institution launched "Guiding Principles for AI in Teaching and Learning." At that time, we were surprised that there was nothing specific regarding graduate programs. But of course, there was so many things to deal with, just starting with everything that was happening, and just regular teaching courses. We convinced our higher leadership that the impact on thesis, master's and doctoral thesis was very important, and that we needed to have a deep reflection on our institution would be ahead of whatever is happening with AI. So we started in the fall of 2024 of forming a committee.

And this committee was actually quite extensive committee where we group people from the administration, people from program chairs, regular faculty members, students, and we wanted people who were from different backgrounds, different disciplines, but also different levels of experience and let's say comfort or even postures regarding generative AI. So, we really wanted to be challenged to this work. Our community saw the future of that. For most of that year, 2024, 2025, we explore different ways of seeing how we could include those questions in graduate programs.

© Copyright 2026 Brian S. Mitchell

We arrived at one basic principle. The first one was that the supervisor should be the guardian. And so nothing should be done or not done without having the supervisor's consent. So that's first. That first thing was very important, I think, to get the faculty on board with us, really respecting that they are in a good place to make a judgment. But while they can make a judgment and make decisions on what use will be allowed or not allowed for students, we wanted also to encourage transparency. And so this led us to adopt a mandatory declaration in all master's and doctoral thesis.

This went into effect last January. This has been going for a while now, and it's going well. We wanted everyone to include this declaration, even if no AI has been used, because we wanted people to be straightforward and to not stigmatize that use, to be really transparent about how, why, and with what precaution it has been used, so the toolkit that we developed. It's meant to guide a student and their research supervisor into all the important discussions that they should be having about that responsible use, and to what they should think about critically to make sure that the development of competencies and knowledge remains protected through this new, these new ways of doing research.

Brian Mitchell: So tell me a little bit more about the development process. You said you pulled faculty from a variety of disciplines, which I think makes perfect sense. Were there differences of opinion on what should be in this document and what should not, based on just disciplinary background?

Annie Pilote: I would say some people wanted us to draw a line on what is allowed and what is not allowed. So, we've had a lot of discussions around that. And we felt that, if we wanted an institutional guideline, something that could be used for anybody, it would be very difficult to agree on specific use. And also it would've been hard to - as it develops - to always stay up to date. So that's why we went with something broader. But there were a lot of people on the committee who felt that they needed to draw a line, a clear line, that this is not acceptable. So, we took it from an ethical point of view. We're really talking about integrity in research training. We need to put that responsible ethical way of doing research in the center of everything that's doing. People really adhered. They were on board with that.

We made sure that we documented practices that we're doing elsewhere, also, to make sure that we're not too far from other universities or journals also. We explored journals regulations, but then we saw that it could be very different from one discipline to the other, so we wanted to have something that was quite open at the higher level, but then let the programs decide for themselves if they wanted to close certain doors in terms of what would be allowed or not allowed at the program level. But our basic principle remained around the research supervisor, who is the guardian.

Brian Mitchell: Did the document go through any other kind of approval process after it was formulated? Can you talk a little bit about that?

Annie Pilote: Yeah, of course, we have quite a complex governance; it's a large university. We have a Faculty Council, of course, who needs to approve everything that we do, but we have a research commission, the commissions of studies and programs, the commissions for students, affairs, different committees, and so we really consulted with all of those, governing instances, at the institutional level before we made any decisions. The Faculty Council was responsible for the regulation regarding the master's and thesis declaration, so we were quite autonomous to adopt that rule and put it into effect.

© Copyright 2026 Brian S. Mitchell

So, we did this, but after that, we went a step further, and we went to the University Council to be able to add another regulation. That second regulation is the obligation to include the agreement relative to AI use in the student research in the collaborative plan. The collaborative plan is an agreement between a student and their supervisors that follows them throughout their research program. And so, we made it an obligation that AI agreement is included in that plan that needs to be done when the students start their program. So, we really had to go to the higher level of instances to get approval on that.

At every step of the way, people were really positive about all of that because they wanted us to take charge. They were happy to see us guiding the way, but they still wanted autonomy. So, we found the right balance, and this is really through those conversations in different instances that we found the right balance. But now, the conversation is still ongoing, like I said. And once it came into effect, we did a lot of engagement with students, of course, but also a lot with faculty members to explain them everything that's in the toolkit, the basic principles that you can find in there. I can talk a little bit about that later if you want me to. We did those workshops with faculty members. And one thing that we noticed, and they still want us to go a little bit further because they still want to know what to do or how to do it, how to find the best practices to guide them.

This is where we're going from now on. We're trying to develop more pedagogical tools to help programs, but also just supervisors find ways to validate a different step of the way that the student really is developing their research skills, and they are really having full control over their research process. This is where we're going.

One thing that we will be exploring in the course of the next months is that we have, of course, a defense for the doctoral thesis, but not at the master's level. We don't have any oral examination for all the programs, but we really want to deep dive into that with our community this year to see if we could make it an obligation for every master's student to have a chance to present orally their work and to the program to verify that the student really is developing their research skills. So, these are hard questions, because that needs resource, but I think the community wants us to go in that direction. So we will be continuing that work in the next months, and seeing how we can adapt, because this is a living document, so we really want to keep updating it. We have a website that is... we have different questions, and once we document new questions, we can always put it without doing everything again. We can just update it as we go along, but this pedagogical concern into how we guide the research part of the program.

If we don't do it, nobody will be doing it, and programs will be left to their own means, so we really want to find ways to help the programs find the best way for them in their disciplines, but with a bit of guidance from our part.

Brian Mitchell: You mentioned developing tools, and I think that's a great approach, in addition to running the workshops for training and for information and educational purposes. One of the things you have on your website that you mentioned here is a logbook. Can you talk a little bit about the logbook? Is this a required component of what the students must submit, or is it simply to aid them in their use of AI?

Annie Pilote: Exactly. We suggest it as a tool, but we're conscious that people will not necessarily be using that specific logbook, but we wanted to illustrate what it could be. Because if we want a student to

© Copyright 2026 Brian S. Mitchell

declare at the end of the process what they've done, well, we need them to reflect as they go along, and ask themselves the right questions. So, this logbook is pretty simple. We have basic questions that we want them to consider when they choose to use a technology. How do they use it? Why? What have they taken as precautions to make sure that they document everything that you're doing and everything, and then it will be easier for them to make their declaration at the end of the line, but also to make sure that throughout their research report, that they will be able to describe their methodology, all of the precautions that they've taken. So, it's basically the same thing as keeping a field journal when you go and collect data, or having a lab, a lab book, but specifically documenting AI, and all the micro-decision that you have to make when deciding, is this a good thing? Is that not a good thing? And I think this will help students to not only becoming more critical, but also making sure that how they tell the story is as transparent as can be.

This is something that was asked from the examinators. I think this was one of the first considerations, when people from the external started evaluating our thesis at Laval, and they would ask us, well, is it allowed? And we had no answer to them. Well, just "you be the judge." Now we tell them, you be the judge! It is allowed to the extent that the research supervisor has agreed to what is in the thesis. But now you need to judge the quality of that work. from what the student has actually explained in their process. And if it's not convincing enough, but at least they will be able to ask the right question, point it out in their reports, and this is where the defense becomes so much more important than it ever was.

Brian Mitchell: Maybe we can get into some of the specifics, then, of this document. You talked about just ethical use of AI. What does that mean in practice, then? There are some specific recommendations and best practices in this document, like asking yourself questions before you use AI, and as you said, documenting it in the logbook, one of the things I noticed was that AI-generated text should be put in quotations, for example. That was something that was new to me. So, what are some of the specific guidelines, in terms of maybe not prohibiting or allowing certain usages, but just best practices for students in the use of AI in their dissertation and theses?

Annie Pilote: Well, some of those recommendations are meant to be evolving as practices evolve, of course. But like I said, we have six ethical guidelines. The first one that we already talked about is preserving the acquisition of research skills, of course. Then there's the responsible part, that checking and validating the content. So if the student has used some tool to help them do their lit review, well, they are responsible that each and every one of those references really exists. It's not any hallucinations, but even if it exists. They need to check it out and make sure that they have read it and make sure that what they are saying about that reference is right, because they are responsible for each and everything that appears in their work. So, this seems simple enough, but you would be surprised at how many faculty members come to us with "Oh, my student, this and that," and so there are still a lot of good practices to develop around, around that.

And then all of the academic integrity standards. This is where the AI is not necessarily plagiarizing, but sometimes we never know, because where does it actually come from, if you generate text? So this is where some of our experts recommended that AI is not an author, but if some exactly textual part is taken from AI-generated text, well, maybe it would be better to put it into quotation and to actually say that this

© Copyright 2026 Brian S. Mitchell

was generated material, because we can find it maybe somewhere in an authentic document that the student has no way of knowing. So it's a way also to protect them. But we're aware that that might be hard when a lot of text is being generated. We wanted them to be conscious that sometimes you can really have some of this content that exists in other publications.

There was the precaution all around protecting the work - also the work of the student. So, we don't want examiners or the supervisor to take the work of the student and put it in open system AI and then expose that work to all of the use that could be made. So, these are other precautions. This is another rule actually that we introduced recently is that examiners are not allowed to use AI when they evaluate masters and doctoral theses. They can use it to help them write their report, but they cannot take the actual manuscript and put it in the AI system, and have help from AI. We want the expert to actually use their own expertise to judge the student's work, and not have that report produced by AI. So this is another ethical component that concerns examiners. So we try to take these rules and guidelines from different perspectives. And also the environmental issue, of course. Just having students reflect on what level of use is also acceptable concerning the environmental impact of all those practices?

Brian Mitchell: Are the documents then checked, the dissertations and theses then checked for AI use? You say that it's not, the reviewers are not allowed to submit this for review. Does that mean that the documents are not checked at all for AI usage?

Annie Pilote: They're not. At the institutional level, we consulted with a lot of experts around those systems, and there's a high level of fake, wrong diagnosis. Let's say it like that. We feel that it's not a good practice to actually rely on such a tool. That's why we went on just the transparent. We don't want you to pretend you've not been using it. We want you to tell us how and why and let us judge if the work that you've done really meets the standards that we have, and it meets the objective of the program.

But we don't want to doubt the work of the student, but of course, if some doubts remains, and that the student might have used it without the consent of their research directors, well, we have the whole process for that. Well, this is still ongoing work because it is quite hard to prove to a very, very high level of confidence. But, even at the disciplinary level, we're not using those tools.

Brian Mitchell: So, what's required then of the student with submission of their dissertation in the defense? Is it a statement that must be included in the document itself? Do they have to submit this log book, or are these things that they just have on file if needed?

Annie Pilote: Yeah, the logbook is completely up to their use. We don't even encourage them to discuss with their supervisors their logbook. It's their tool to document what they're doing. And the actual declaration is in the preface, at the start of the thesis. And they have only a short declaration to make, a general declaration. We have designed a few models to help them see the kind of things that we want them to address, but we didn't want to give a specific model that would be just fill in the blanks, or just check the form, yes and no, to different questions. We really wanted it to be personalized and be able to reflect the real use and considerations in the world of the student themselves. So, it can take different forms, but it is something that is relatively short, but we really encourage to develop all of those aspects throughout the manuscript.

© Copyright 2026 Brian S. Mitchell

Brian Mitchell: Finally, where do you see this going? You say it's a living document, it's evolving, maybe within the university, where do you see it going, and are others adopting these practices, especially in Canada? What's being done at other universities in this regard?

Annie Pilote: Well, I think we opened the way with having a mandatory declaration, and a lot of my colleagues in other universities are telling me that they are looking into doing the exact same thing. I don't know if everybody will be going into the old pedagogical approach of doing something broad, but I think that the more we discuss, and the more we are aligned with best practices in other institutions. Well, the better it will be, because we do a lot of international research, we do a lot of collaboration with other institutions, our examinators come from all sorts of universities, and so we need to have a common ground. And so we've been doing a lot of engagement also with the community to see how this is seen, and it is quite, I think, well accepted, and because there was a little bit of worry at first that we would be alone asking this, and that it would be, to the detriment of our students that they declare.

So, we made the bet on the fact that going through, exposing and being very transparent about everything is the best way to go. And I don't think it will cause any prejudice to students. To the contrary, I think it will serve them well. And well, if other universities embark, it will be even more stronger. So I hope that it will generalize. However, I am sure that we will, still having to deal with a whole diversity of what will be truly allowed or not allowed from one discipline to the other, but also from one supervisor to another.

And this is another source of worry, I would say internally because, some worry that a colleague will allow a lot of things, another colleague will not, and then students might be disadvantaged. And so that's why when we engage in those workshops, we really want the discussion to happen around the units, the departmental units and the program itself, so that people, at least in the same field, can develop their own limits. We agree on a certain set of practices, and then they could communicate this in a more straightforward manner to students. But it would be very hard to do this in a large university such as ours, where we have all disciplines. It would be very, very hard to get there in a few years, but who knows where this will be going?

Brian Mitchell: Annie, thank you very much. Thank you to you and your colleagues for taking a lead in this really important area, and we look forward to hearing more as the toolkit and the process develops. Thank you again.

Annie Pilote: Well, thank you for having us.

I also had an opportunity to speak with Wojtek Chodzko-Zajko, Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Dean of the Graduate College at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign about how they are looking at AI. Here are some excerpts from our conversation:

Brian Mitchell: Wojtek, thank you for joining me today, I really appreciate your time. Can you tell me a little bit about how you and the University of Illinois are thinking about the use of AI, specifically in graduate admissions?

Wojtek Chodzko-Zajko: Well, we're thinking about it hard. Have we made any final decisions? No. So, currently, at the University of Illinois, all graduate admissions-related decisions involve human beings

© Copyright 2026 Brian S. Mitchell

making decisions. And for a long time, we have had guidance regarding the composition of admission committees. The numbers of individuals who should be involved in reviewing files, even if there are very large numbers of applications. So, in that sense, nothing has changed.

However, like everything in graduate education, actually everything in higher education, we are thinking long and hard about how AI may impact the way we do things moving forward, for a wide variety of reasons. So, in the graduate admissions space, we have been working with some units across campus to run some pilot studies in which we either look real time at student applications, or we look historically at prior student applications, and we ask the what-if question. So, what if we had asked AI to make that decision? And one of the things we're trying to do is to look critically about What decisions did the human beings make? What decisions did AI recommend that we make, and how might they be different from one another? And so when I say we're doing some pilot testing, we're essentially attempting to assess What would be some of the unexpected consequences if we moved to an AI role in decision making, and how could we predict those? So, there are two things that we have looked at.

The first one is, can we use AI to extract information from student transcripts, particularly from students coming from international destinations? Very often then it's difficult to equilibrate the GPA or the level of performance on different classes. There's a very different structure to a degree, and that takes a significant amount of time to review these transcripts, and a significant amount of expertise. So could that be accelerated using AI? So that's one of the things that we're doing.

The other pertains to holistic admissions criteria and admissions rubrics. So, if a particular admission committee creates a standardized rubric that itemizes all the things that they're looking for in applicants to a particular degree program. And what we're interested in is looking at if human beings rate an individual application along that rubric. That's very useful, because if there are multiple committee members, you can try to increase the likelihood that they're paying attention to the same kinds of things, and it creates a degree of consistency across individual members. So, we've done some preliminary studies where we'd say to AI, here's a rubric that identifies the aspects that we're looking for. And here's the weighting for each of those individual characteristics in the rubric. Now please go through these application files and rank the students in accordance with these rubrics. So, we've done that for admissions. But we've also done that for applications for fellowships. Similar kind of process.

And then we've done this only historically. So we're not doing it for actual future admissions, or for actual awarding of fellowships. But when you look at the decisions made by the humans and you look at the decisions made by the machine, one of the things that is interesting is to look at who was highly ranked by the machine that wasn't caught by the humans? One of the things we're thinking, we're imagining in the future, we may be able to identify some individuals who have some characteristics that might have been missed by the human process. And you could then imagine a feedback loop where those particular files could be sent back to the committee and said, would you like to take another look, a second look, at those files? So that's kind of how we're imagining it might be done.

But the reality is, we're not confident that we're at a level of precision that we're ready to move forward with respect to that. So, in the pilot that we did with college application transcript review, the AI did pretty good on some of the interpretation of the qualitative questionnaire items. But it struggled with GPA

© Copyright 2026 Brian S. Mitchell

interpretation. It didn't have a good understanding of how credentials from one country map up to credentials in the United States. Generally, it gave us pause to think about "we need to study this further."

Now, Brian, from my perspective, I think it's coming. We've heard that, for example, like many universities, we're pretty heavily into using external vendor software. Slate has an AI component in it, which we are not using, but I think that in the future, it's likely that some of these are going to be addressed and maybe utilized. From my point of view, it's not simply about accuracy. It's also about consistency, bias, transparency, data quality, and the return on investment. I don't mean necessarily financial investment, I mean, if we use this tool, are we saving ourselves a significant amount of time, and are we doing a better job using the tool? Now, I have to say that I think in many realms of the functioning of a graduate college. we've already proved that we're saving that time. So, for example, we have an extraordinarily good chatbot that is providing answers to graduate student, faculty, staff questions 24-7 at a level of accuracy and precision that I don't think even our most experienced staff in the Graduate College could achieve. And so, there are some elements of AI implementation that I think we're ready to do. With respect to admissions in particular, at least from the review of files, I think that's not ready for prime time yet.

Now, I will say that one of the things that you haven't talked about or asked me about is about guidance for use of AI for students who are submitting applications, and that's an interesting area, too, because I think, prospective students are asking about that. And, like many institutions, we are somewhat sitting on the fence. We do not tell students there is an absolute prohibition of utilizing AI, but we do have, two or three paragraphs on our guidance for students that are applying to Illinois, and I sort of selected some of the key points.

The first one is applicants are responsible for ensuring that all materials submitted as part of their application are accurate, authentic, and reflective of their own work. Then the second part is [they] may choose to use generative AI tools to help organize your ideas, improve flow, or identify spelling or grammatical errors. However, AI should not be used to generate substantive portions of your statement. And then we kind of give students, prospective students, some advice. Over-reliance on AI-generated content may result in a statement that does not effectively convey your personal background and experiences. So, my concern is that you may well have a student that has very carefully thought through the points that they want to make in their application statement, but for whatever reason - because they're a multilingual learner, because they don't have that much experience - they then iterate back and forwards with AI to generate that statement, which is still reflective of their backgrounds and experiences, but if you feed it into an AI detecting software, it may well come out as being substantially assisted by AI. I personally don't think that that would be problematic. So we're living in a rapidly shifting environment.

Your next question was about dissertations? We fairly strongly believe that it is the responsibility of the program faculty to determine the norms and expectations for their disciplines. We don't have much appetite for central campus to issue broad, broadly applied edicts as to what units should or should not do. We do not have a policy about AI use in dissertations, and I don't think we're close to coming up with one, given the tremendous diversity we have in our faculty with respect to attitudes towards the use of AI

© Copyright 2026 Brian S. Mitchell

and how we should be thinking of student learning outcomes or goals of graduate education in a world that is very different today than it was even 10 years ago. And so, from my point of view, the ideal situation would be if the faculty in a department came together and said "This is what we think we want to do in our department for our doctoral students," for example. I'm not sure many departments will actually achieve that consensus, and there'll be a variety of different perspectives there. So if it's not possible for a unit to come up with a single strategy. Then I think the most important thing is transparency and clear guidance to the individual student with regard to "this is the policy that that particular committee will use around AI use and other issues."

I'll say that it's a topic we're very interested in. We have established a campus-wide task force on graduate student learning outcomes. To think through "Well, how would we know?" If a doctoral student has the knowledge, skills, and abilities that they will need to move forward as a doctoral student from the University of Illinois and how does AI change that in any way, or does it? And I think that those are the things we're grappling with. How will we evaluate a dissertation or a dissertation-quality work moving forward?

Brian Mitchell: There certainly are a food for thought there, Wojtek. So maybe with respect to your last point on requesting that faculty, you know, think carefully about the use of AI in dissertations and what their viewpoints are. Is there a call, though, from the faculty or from the students for guidance on any of this, from a more central standpoint?

Wojtek Chodzko-Zajko: Yes, absolutely. I think there are lots of faculty who would want us to tell them exactly what they should be doing. The problem is that there's no agreement on what that guidance should be, and there are some faculty who are absolutely adamant that there's no place for AI, and there are others who are adamant that we must harness the ability of these tools to the maximum extent possible in order to prepare our students for the future world. And that's the challenge, is I think that for a variety of reasons, including sort of disciplinary expertise, or sometimes maybe even interdisciplinary expertise, but also academic freedom, I think there will be faculty members, sort of, maybe ... it'd be unfair to call them "AI Luddites," but nonetheless, let's say they're, "laggards" in terms of application and adoption of the software, or of the opportunities, who say, "No, I do not want to do that." I believe they have the academic freedom to do that. And so, consequently, for the university to say to an individual faculty member "Thou shalt run your dissertation like this," I think is a step too far. Now, having said that, I think universities can make some general statements about AI literacy and AI fluency expectations. And we have a committee at Illinois right now looking at AI graduate curricular expectations you know.

Let me just add that I think that our professional organizations are stepping forward to assist, so the CGS AI Toolkit, I think, is a very useful resource. And the NORC in Chicago worked in partnership with the AAU and the Sloan Foundation to develop a white paper on AI use in graduate education, and I think that underscores how important this topic is. But it also underscores that it's very much a working in progress, and that we've still got a long way to go before we know how to do it.

Graduate education is not the same as undergraduate education. We don't have mandatory general education requirements at the graduate level. And so, I think that committee might end up recommending that there be a menu of options from which graduate students could select in order to

© Copyright 2026 Brian S. Mitchell

have a basic understanding of AI, AI privacy issues, AI challenges, AI opportunities, but I don't think it's going to be the same for students across the university. I think of it maybe a little bit like research methods courses. Many doctoral programs have some kind of course that requires a sort of a basic understanding of research or scholarship within that particular canon, and maybe AI needs to be integrated into some of those opportunities, but honestly, I cannot see a central edict for how to do that.

Brian Mitchell: Great, well, as I said, that certainly leads to a lot of questions, and it's an evolving state of affairs. But, you know, as you alluded to earlier, if it causes us as graduate educators to review what the outcomes of graduate education are, then I think that's a good thing, and I look forward to hearing from you and the University of Illinois as to what you find with respect to the use of AI in graduate education outcomes. I think it's a really important thing, so thank you.

Wojtek Chodzko-Zajko: My pleasure. Thank you, Brian, and I really appreciate the opportunity to chat.

Thank you to both of my guests for their insights and expertise and thank YOU for joining me today. Visit my website at grad-post.com for more information to help you plan your adventure for an advanced degree and check back for more episodes on the uses of AI in graduate education.

Even with the dawn of AI in higher education, every human degree will still count.

Links

https://www-chronicle-com.eu1.proxy.openathens.net/article/has-ai-destroyed-the-doctoral-dissertation
https://www.fesp.ulaval.ca/en/system/files?file=public/memoires-theses/trousse_ia_generative_eng.pdf
https://cgsnet.org/resources/toolkits
https://www.norc.org/content/dam/norc-org/pdf2026/AI-in-Grad-Ed-White%20Paper.pdf

© Copyright 2026 Brian S. Mitchell