Capstone Project Proposal

Responsible Artificial Intelligence Guidelines for Fine Arts

Project Team: Connor Tracy

Team Name: Individual Project

Course: IGED 210, Discovery Writing for Arts & Sciences

Date: August 13, 2026

Project Partner(s)

Proposed partners include UDC Art Program faculty, the UDC Learning Resources Division, and fine arts student volunteers. Their participation would be requested during the project and is not assumed in advance.

Need Statement

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?

Artificial intelligence is becoming part of creative education and professional art practice, but UDC fine arts students and instructors need clearer ways to decide when it supports learning and when it begins to replace the student's own creative work. Students may use AI for brainstorming, research, transcription, accessibility, mockups, or workflow. The same tools can generate images, text, and design decisions that make originality and authorship difficult to evaluate. Without shared expectations, students may not know what requires permission or disclosure, and instructors may apply different standards from one assignment to another.

This proposal recommends a small eight-week pilot rather than a university-wide policy. The pilot would gather student and instructor perspectives, create a one-page assignment-level AI guide and disclosure statement, and test the materials through a fine arts workshop. The purpose is to help instructors set limits that match an assignment's learning goals while helping students explain which ideas, decisions, and revisions remain their own.

Background/Significance of the Problem

The problem developed as generative AI moved rapidly into education and creative software. UDC's Art Program includes studio art, graphic design, and photography and emphasizes conceptual thinking, technical skills, digital tools, and preparation for the creative marketplace (University of the District of Columbia, n.d.). Art and photography have always changed alongside technology, but generative AI is different from many earlier tools because it can create parts of the concept or final expression rather than only helping an artist carry out a decision.

Several solutions have already been tried at broader levels. UDC's Artificial Intelligence Help Guide introduces generative AI, its limitations, and methods for evaluating and citing AI-assisted material (University of the District of Columbia, Learning Resources Division, 2026). The U.S. Department of Education (2023) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2024) recommend human-centered AI literacy, transparency, critical judgment, and accountability. Perkins et al. (2024) developed the AI Assessment Scale, which allows instructors to communicate different levels of permitted AI use according to an assignment's learning outcomes. These resources provide useful foundations, but they do not answer medium-specific questions such as whether generative fill is appropriate in documentary photography, when AI-generated imagery can be used in graphic design, or how a studio art student should document generated visual references.

The problem today is therefore not simply whether AI should be allowed. It is how students and instructors can distinguish assistance from substitution. Basty et al. (2025), in a study of 53 faculty members teaching creative courses, found possible benefits for ideation, problem-solving, and engagement alongside concerns about copyright, bias, academic integrity, and faculty preparation. Copyright guidance also reinforces the importance of human contribution. The U.S. Copyright Office (2025) explains that copyright protection continues to depend on human authorship, even when AI is used as an assistive tool. In the DMV, responsible AI is also becoming a workplace expectation; the District of Columbia introduced responsible AI training for government employees and contractors in 2026 (Office of the Chief Technology Officer, 2026). UDC fine arts students therefore need both creative freedom and professional habits of transparency.

Interdisciplinary Approaches and Possible Solutions

The proposal combines three disciplinary ways of thinking because none can solve the problem alone. **Fine arts and creative-practice methodology** focuses on intention, process, critique, authorship, and the relationship between a tool and the final work. This perspective will shape realistic scenarios from photography, graphic design, and studio art and will identify the creative decisions that should remain with the student.

Education and social-science methodology focuses on learning outcomes and evidence. A short anonymous survey will gather student and instructor perspectives, while pre- and post-

workshop scenario questions will measure whether the proposed materials improve clarity. This keeps the project from being based only on my personal opinion as a photographer and art student.

Ethics, copyright, and technology-policy methodology focuses on disclosure, bias, accountability, privacy, and human authorship. Research from UDC, the U.S. Department of Education, UNESCO, the U.S. Copyright Office, and the AI Assessment Scale will guide the categories and language used in the materials.

These approaches will be integrated through three connected solutions:

- An assignment-level guide with four categories: no AI use, assistive AI use, limited generative use with disclosure, and instructor-directed AI exploration.
- A disclosure statement asking students to identify the tool, explain where it entered their process, describe generated material used, and name their original decisions and revisions.
- A 60-minute workshop using fine arts scenarios, group critique, and pre/post questions to test whether the guide is understandable and useful.

The disciplines contribute different strengths. Creative practice makes the guidance relevant to artists; educational research provides evidence of whether it works; and ethics and copyright establish responsible limits. The pilot also recognizes limitations. It would not create permanent policy, settle every copyright question, or assume that one rule fits every medium. Faculty would continue deciding the permitted level of AI use for each assignment.

Brief Project Description and Goals/Objectives

The eight-week pilot will survey participants, draft and review the guide and disclosure statement, conduct one workshop, measure participant understanding, and revise the final materials. The project goal is to improve communication about AI use while protecting student originality, authorship, and creative decision-making.

- **Objective 1:** By the end of Week 2, collect anonymous responses from at least 20 UDC fine arts students and four instructors about current AI use and assignment expectations.
- **Objective 2:** By the end of Week 4, create a one-page guide defining four AI-use categories and a draft disclosure statement with examples from three fine arts areas.

- **Objective 3:** During Week 6, conduct one 60-minute workshop for at least 15 participants; at least 80% will correctly evaluate four of five scenarios after the workshop.
- **Objective 4:** By the end of Week 8, revise the materials using faculty and participant feedback and distribute the final digital guide, disclosure statement, and evaluation summary.

Project Design

Week	Activity and Evidence
1	Contact proposed partners and prepare an anonymous survey. Evidence: completed survey and invitations.
2	Distribute the survey. Evidence: at least 20 student and four instructor responses.
3	Analyze responses and relevant research. Evidence: one-page findings summary.
4	Draft the four-category guide and disclosure statement. Evidence: two completed drafts.
5	Obtain feedback from at least two Art Program faculty members and one Learning Resources staff member; prepare five workshop scenarios.
6	Conduct the workshop and pre/post questions. Evidence: at least 15 participants and completed responses.
7	Compare results and revise the materials. Evidence: evaluation summary and second drafts.
8	Distribute final materials and recommendations to participants and proposed partners.

Participation will be voluntary, and the survey will not request names or sensitive personal information. Success will be measured through response totals, faculty feedback, scenario scores, and completion of the final materials. If recruitment is lower than expected, the workshop can be tested in one fine arts class or critique group.

Resources and Budget

The project would require cooperation from UDC Art Program faculty, the Learning Resources Division, student participants, and access to a classroom, projector, email, and an online survey tool. The Art Program would review discipline-specific examples and help identify an appropriate class, critique group, or student audience for the workshop. The Learning Resources Division would help check the AI literacy, citation, and disclosure language, while student volunteers would test whether the guide is understandable from a learner's perspective. Possible financial support could come from the Art Program, a student organization, the Learning Resources Division, or a small campus programming fund. Most resources are available as in-kind university support.

Resource	**Calculation**	**Cost**
Printed pilot guides	40 double-sided copies x $0.30	$12.00
Workshop posters	2 color posters x $8.00	$16.00
Sticky notes and markers	One workshop set	$15.00
Optional refreshments	20 participants x $3.00	$60.00
Contingency	Printing or supply allowance	$10.00
Total		**$113.00**

The project can be completed without refreshments if funding is unavailable, reducing the cash requirement to $53.00. Classroom space, faculty review, projector use, survey software, and digital distribution would be requested as in-kind support.

References

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

University of the District of Columbia, Learning Resources Division. (2026, August 5). *Artificial intelligence (AI) help guide: Home*. https://udc.libguides.com/ai/home

Office of the Chief Technology Officer. (2026, February 12). *DC becomes first major U.S. city to require responsible AI training for government workforce*. DC.gov. https://octo.dc.gov/release/dc-becomes-first-major-us-city-require-responsible-ai-training-government-workforce

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

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2024). *AI competency framework for students*. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000391105

U.S. Copyright Office. (2025). *Copyright and artificial intelligence, part 2: Copyrightability*. https://www.copyright.gov/ai/Copyright-and-Artificial-Intelligence-Part-2-Copyrightability-Report.pdf

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology. (2023). *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

University of the District of Columbia. (n.d.). *Art: Studio art, graphic design and photography - B.A.* https://www.udc.edu/cas/arts-humanities/art/