

Draft of Letter to campus on how to handle AI

From Faculty Senate working group on AI:

Raju Badireddy (CEMS/Research, Scholarship, and Creative Arts Committee)
Thomas Borchert (CAS/Faculty Senate)
Meaghan Emery (CAS/Curricular Affairs Committee)
Deanna Garret-Ostermiller (Center for Student Conduct)
Laura Haines (Libraries/Educational and Research Technologies Committee)
Susanmarie Harrington (CAS/Writing in the Disciplines)
Elizabeth Sargent (CNHS/Curricular Affairs Committee)

In the year since the release of ChatGPT, there has been a good deal of concern about how to handle generative AI (genAI). While AI technologies are well embedded in our lives already, the large language models that enable generative AI create challenges and opportunities that are different from previous forms of the technology, both in our classrooms and in our scholarly activities. The available technologies are developing, and so too is awareness across higher ed of the issues at hand. Think pieces in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and other places have breathlessly praised the [opportunities](#) genAI provides as well as forecast the [looming genAI apocalypse](#). While it is not practical to have a single policy governing genAI in all aspects of our work, it is clear that as an academic community we must work and learn together about how genAI affects us, our work, and our students. Over the last several months, a working group comprised of members of Faculty Senate committees, and representatives from the Writing in the Disciplines Program (WID), the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), and the Center for Student Conduct have considered some of genAI's implications for faculty work, and we bring forward a few recommendations. These recommendations are meant as a starting point for thinking about how generative AI in our work, and we encourage faculty to have discussions within their departments and academic units about these issues.

1. **GenAI and the classroom.** Faculty are strongly encouraged to state clearly--in their syllabi and at the start of class--their expectations for intellectual honesty as well as discussing how they want to use generative AI in their classes and what their expectations are for giving credit to the use of artificial intelligence. The [Code of Academic Integrity](#) was updated in early 2023 to note that all work submitted by a student must be authored by that student. Because the code defers to the standards set in the syllabus for what any given course's academic integrity standards are, it is crucial that faculty communicate their expectations to students. [WID](#) resources – both scholarship and workshops – can help faculty figure out how to approach this technology in class.

2. **GenAI in research.** Faculty must take responsibility for all knowledge created if they choose to use generative AI in their research activities. Furthermore, we encourage faculty to examine journal policies (as they vary) and their professional associations for discipline specific guidance. It has been widely reported that genAI does not always produce accurate texts and may [invent things](#), which has significant consequences for research activities. Generative AI seems to be effective at front end tasks, such as generating initial questions, and backend ones, such as drawing meta-inferences. However, [reporting and scholarship](#) suggest faculty should be wary of using the tools on material they are unfamiliar with.

3. **GenAI and ethics.** Faculty should be aware of the problematic ethics that have emerged about generative AI. GenAI outputs are reflective of the data sets they are trained on. [Concerns include:](#) prejudices in society are reproduced in the data sets and come out in material generated; reporting has raised concerns about the labor practices that this training entailed; there have been charges of intellectual property appropriated within data sets.

4. **GenAI and legal issues.** When data is put into a genAI tool, it becomes the property of the company. It is essential to be aware of the legal obligations to protect data (e.g. HIPAA, FERPA).