# <u>Decision Report: Using Generative AI for Video Content</u>

**To:** Director of Communications, Syracuse University School of Information Studies (iSchool) **From:** Vaishnavi meka, Research Analyst **Date:** September 30, 2025 **Subject:** Analysis and Recommendations on Using Google Veo 3 for Educational Video Content

# Executive Summary

This report analyzes Google's Veo 3 video model for creating educational content. A test creating an "AlStreetInterview" video showed the model produces high-quality visuals, offering a way to speed up video production. However, this one test also revealed significant risks in factual accuracy and potential demographic bias, which could impact our brand's reputation.

- Primary Recommendation: Run a controlled, one-video public trial, clearly labeled as Al-generated, to test audience reaction and build an ethical review process (Medium Risk).
- **Further Actions:** Start a small, internal pilot program to build skills (Low Risk). Do not adopt this technology for full-scale production at this time (High Risk).

# 1. Background & Decision Question

The iSchool needs to create more short-form educational videos. Traditional production is slow and costly. Generative AI models like Google Veo 3 offer a way to create high-quality videos more efficiently.

The question is: Should the iSchool invest in and use Al tools like Veo 3 for public-facing videos?

### 2. Data & Methods

We evaluated Google Veo 3 by testing a single, detailed text prompt to generate an 8-second video of a street interviewer asking a data scientist to define "Data Wrangling." The resulting video was then evaluated for quality, accuracy, and potential bias.

#### 3. Findings

The single test showed both promise and significant problems.

- **Finding 1: Excellent Visual Quality.** The model successfully produced a stunning, 1080p video that perfectly matched the prompt's cinematic and stylistic instructions.
- Finding 2: Reliability is Unknown. Our single test produced a high-quality video. However, one successful result does not guarantee future performance. The model could produce flawed outputs on other attempts, meaning 100% human review of every video is essential.
- Finding 3: Potential for Demographic Bias. The prompt asked for "a sharp, casually dressed data scientist." The model generated a white male. While this is

- only a single data point, it raises concerns that the model may default to stereotypical representations. This poses a risk to the iSchool's diversity and inclusion standards and requires further investigation.
- **Finding 4: Factually Inaccurate Audio.** The audio generated by the model for the definition of "Data Wrangling" was incoherent and incorrect. The model cannot be trusted to create accurate educational content, and a human-verified script and voiceover would be required.

## 4. Recommendations (Tiered by Risk)

- Tier 1: Operational (Low Risk)
  - Action: Start an internal team pilot program to experiment with Veo 3 for non-public content (e.g., presentation concepts).
  - o **Rationale:** This is a safe way to build skills without public brand risk.
- Tier 2: Investigatory (Medium Risk)
  - o **Action:** Fund a single, public "AlStreetInterview" episode.
  - Safeguards: The video must be labeled "Al-Generated" and be rigorously reviewed for accuracy and bias.
  - Rationale: A controlled experiment is needed to see how our audience reacts to AI content.
- Tier 3: High-Stakes (High Risk)
  - o **Action: Do not** adopt Veo 3 for all departmental video production.
  - Rationale: The risks of bias, unreliability, and inaccuracy make a fullscale rollout premature.

### 5. Ethical & Legal Concerns

- **Transparency:** We must clearly label all Al-generated content to maintain trust.
- **Accountability:** The iSchool is fully accountable for the accuracy and fairness of its content, regardless of how it was made.
- **Bias:** Unchecked use of this Al could create content that reinforces harmful stereotypes.

#### 6. Next Steps & Validation Plan

- 1. Immediate: Create a departmental "Generative Al Best Practices" guide.
- 2. **Q4 2025:** Begin the internal pilot program (Tier 1).
- 3. **Q1 2026:** If the pilot is successful, launch the single-video public trial (Tier 2). Success will be measured by analyzing audience comments and engagement for 30 days.

# **Appendices**

#### Appendix A: Raw Text Prompt for Veo 3

A cinematic, hyperrealistic 8-second steadicam shot in Times Square, NYC at dusk. The camera follows a street interviewer with a microphone asking a quick question (What is Data Wrangling in Data Analysis) to a sharp, casually dressed data scientist. The data scientist nods, then answers confidently with a clear, concise hand gesture for emphasis. The interviewer smiles and gives an impressed nod. The background is a vibrant, bokeh blur of massive glowing billboards and bustling crowds.

## Appendix B: Link to Generated Video Output

 https://sumailsyrmy.sharepoint.com/:v:/g/personal/vameka\_syr\_edu/EY21Wj\_5nVpHvGXbg1alTaoBGu-E6-2MZLSacE32OTHevA

# • Appendix C: Bias and Fairness Check Documentation

- Objective: To assess the demographic representation generated by the model for a professional role.
- Methodology: The original prompt from Appendix A, which used the neutral term "a sharp, casually dressed data scientist," was executed once.
- Result from Original Prompt: The model generated a character that appeared to be a White male.
- Conclusion: This single result is not enough to prove a pattern of bias.
  However, it highlights a potential risk that the model may default to narrow demographic stereotypes. Further testing is required to understand the model's behavior.
- Recommended Next Step (Mitigation Test): Run a modified prompt that actively specifies underrepresented demographics (e.g., "...a Black female data scientist in her 50s...") to test the model's ability to generate diverse characters upon request.