

Annotated Bibliography

Connor Tracy

Research question: How can UDC fine arts students and instructors develop practical guidelines for responsible AI use in creative assignments so that AI supports brainstorming, research, and workflow without replacing originality, authorship, or creative decision-making?

Basty, R., Kropczynski, J., & Halse, S. (2025). Exploring higher education faculty insights on generative AI in creative courses. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, 24, Article 18. <https://doi.org/10.28945/5546>

This article examines how higher education faculty understand the use of generative AI in digital art, design, and other creative courses. The authors report that faculty see potential benefits in AI-supported ideation, experimentation, problem solving, and student engagement, but they also identify concerns about ethics, copyright, academic integrity, bias, technical limits, and uneven AI literacy. This is a strong source for my project because it focuses directly on creative courses, not just general writing or computer science classes. It also uses faculty perspectives, which matters because my research question asks how both UDC fine arts students and instructors could develop practical guidelines. The source helps me argue that responsible AI use in art education needs shared expectations, faculty support, and clear boundaries between AI assistance and student authorship.

Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20, Article 43. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8>

Chan and Hu study university students' perceptions of generative AI in higher education, including their familiarity with AI tools, perceived benefits, concerns, and ideas about responsible integration. Their survey found that students often see AI as useful for brainstorming, writing help, research, and personalized learning support, while also worrying about accuracy, privacy, ethics, and overreliance. This source is valuable because it adds the student perspective to my bibliography, which balances the faculty-centered sources. Although the study is not limited to fine arts students, its findings still help explain how students may experience AI as both helpful and risky. For my research question, it supports the need for guidelines that students can actually understand and use, rather than policies written only from an administrative point of view.

Kicklighter, C., Seo, J. H., Andreassen, M., & Bujnoch, E. (2024). Empowering creativity with generative AI in digital art education. In *ACM SIGGRAPH 2024 Educator's Forum* (pp. 1-2). Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3641235.3664438>

This short conference paper focuses on using generative AI as a creative tool in digital art education. Because it comes from the ACM SIGGRAPH Educator's Forum, it is especially relevant to art, design, and technology-based teaching rather than only general classroom policy. The source is brief, so it cannot provide the same depth as a full journal article, but its value is that it connects AI directly to digital art practice and creative instruction. It supports the idea that AI can be used to expand creative exploration when the assignment is designed carefully. For my project, this source helps show that responsible AI guidelines should not simply warn students away from AI, but should explain how AI can be used as a tool for experimentation while keeping the student's creative decision-making visible.

Miao, F., Shiohira, K., & Lao, N. (2024). *AI competency framework for students*. UNESCO.

<https://doi.org/10.54675/JKJB9835>

This UNESCO report outlines the kinds of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and ethical awareness students need in order to use AI responsibly. Instead of treating AI use as only a technical skill, the framework connects AI literacy to human-centered thinking, critical judgment, ethics, and social responsibility. This is a credible source because UNESCO is an international education organization, and the report gives my project a broader policy and education framework. It is not specific to fine arts, so I would need to adapt it carefully for creative assignments at UDC. Still, it helps answer my research question by showing that responsible AI guidelines should teach students how to think with AI critically, not just tell them what tools are allowed or banned.

Perkins, M., Furze, L., Roe, J., & MacVaugh, J. (2024). The artificial intelligence assessment

scale (AIAS): A framework for ethical integration of generative AI in educational assessment. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 21(6), Article e810.

<https://doi.org/10.53761/q3azde36>

Perkins, Furze, Roe, and MacVaugh present the Artificial Intelligence Assessment Scale, which gives instructors a way to define different levels of acceptable AI use in assignments. The framework is helpful because it moves beyond a simple allowed-or-not-allowed approach and instead asks how much AI involvement fits the learning goal of a task. This is a peer-reviewed education source and is especially useful for developing practical classroom guidelines. Its limitation is that it is not designed only for studio art or photography, so the scale would need examples that make sense in creative work. For my

project, it provides a concrete model for telling students when AI can be used for brainstorming, editing, or process support, and when it would replace too much of the student's own authorship.

Sáez-Velasco, S., Alaguero-Rodríguez, M., Delgado-Benito, V., & Rodríguez-Cano, S. (2024).

Analysing the impact of generative AI in arts education: A cross-disciplinary perspective of educators and students in higher education. *Informatics*, 11(2), Article 37.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/informatics11020037>

This article examines how arts educators and arts education students perceive generative AI in higher education. The authors use a qualitative focus group method and find that participants generally see AI as useful for generating illustrations and supporting motivation, but they also emphasize that the human factor cannot be replaced. This source is highly relevant because it directly addresses arts education and includes both educator and student viewpoints. Since the sample is small, it should not be treated as a universal answer, but it is useful for understanding the kinds of concerns and possibilities that appear in creative classrooms. It contributes to my research by supporting the central idea that AI can help with inspiration and workflow while still requiring human judgment, intention, and authorship.

University of the District of Columbia, Learning Resources Division. (2026, August 5). *Artificial*

intelligence (AI) help guide: Home. <https://udc.libguides.com/ai/home>

UDC's AI help guide provides local guidance and resources for understanding artificial intelligence in an academic setting. The source is important because it comes from the same university community that my proposal is meant to serve, so it can help keep my

recommendations connected to UDC rather than making them too general. As a library guide, it is not a peer-reviewed research article, but it is still useful because it reflects institutional language, available learning support, and the kind of AI literacy resources students may already encounter. This source helps me think about how a fine arts AI guideline could connect to existing campus resources instead of starting from nothing. It also supports the practical side of my project by showing that UDC already has a foundation for AI education that could be expanded with discipline-specific examples for art and photography.

U.S. Copyright Office. (2025, January). *Copyright and artificial intelligence, part 2:*

Copyrightability. <https://www.copyright.gov/ai/Copyright-and-Artificial-Intelligence-Part-2-Copyrightability-Report.pdf>

This U.S. Copyright Office report explains how copyright law applies to works involving generative AI, especially the question of when a work has enough human authorship to qualify for copyright protection. The report concludes that purely AI-generated material is not copyrightable, while works may still be protected when a human author contributes original expression, selection, arrangement, or meaningful creative modification. This is one of the most important legal sources for my research because fine arts students need to understand authorship, ownership, and disclosure when AI becomes part of the creative process. The source is authoritative because it comes from the federal agency responsible for administering U.S. copyright law. It helps my project define why responsible AI guidelines should ask students to document their creative decisions and distinguish their own work from machine-generated output.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology. (2023, May). *Artificial intelligence and the future of teaching and learning: Insights and recommendations*.

<https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/ai-report/ai-report.pdf>

This report discusses the opportunities and risks of AI in education and recommends that educational institutions keep humans in the loop, protect equity, promote transparency, and develop clear guidelines. It frames AI as a tool that can support teaching and learning, but it also warns about bias, privacy, unreliable output, and overdependence on automated systems. This is a credible government source that gives my project a broader policy foundation beyond fine arts. Its main limitation is that it is written for education generally, not specifically for studio or creative courses. For my research question, it supports the need for guidelines that are not only about creativity, but also about transparency, fairness, student learning, and instructor oversight.

Zylinska, J. (2020). *AI art: Machine visions and warped dreams*. Open Humanities Press.

<https://www.openhumanitiespress.org/books/titles/ai-art/>

Zylinska's book examines AI art from a humanities and media theory perspective, asking what AI changes about creativity, authorship, labor, aesthetics, and the role of the human artist. The book challenges the shallow question of whether computers can be creative and instead asks how art, technology, and human agency are already connected. It gives the fine arts side of my project a deeper creative and philosophical foundation. Although it is not a practical classroom policy guide, it explains why responsible AI use in art should not be reduced to a checklist of rules. For my research question, it supports UDC guidelines that protect human intention and authorship while recognizing artists' long history of working with changing tools.