

FEEDBACK RECEIVED BY OPE¹ ON LAWS AND POLICIES CURRENTLY UNDER REVIEW
(as of 3/16/2026)

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
172	3/2/26	Policy 13.J: Generative Artificial Intelligence	<p>Policy 13 J Feedback from Faculty Council EPUS Committee:</p> <p>-Title: Be consistent with APS 6012 (Include the word "Technologies" in this policy title) -Lines 12-14: Please change wording to: Further, the university shall provide mechanisms to govern responsible and secure use of genAI technologies.</p>	Faculty	CU System
173	3/2/26	Policy 13.J: Generative Artificial Intelligence	<p>As a staff member, I'm concerned by how much is left unsaid in this Artificial Intelligence policy. While I frequently enjoy our decentralized model, in talking with my peers and colleagues across the CU System, I'm very concerned about the lack of clearer policy expectations coming from both the University and the Regents. AI has the potential to reshape and rethink how so many of our roles are structured and I would like to believe that those in positions of authority are taking that seriously... but I'm concerned. I want to use AI and be a steward, but I want a more firm stance on how to use AI responsibly and how the University of Colorado is working to remain focused on sustainability while also moving us forward with AI.</p>	Staff	CU System
174	3/5/26	Policy 13.J: Generative Artificial Intelligence	<p>I am concerned this policy is silent on several areas of real concern. This policy should be expanded to include the following:</p> <p>- A requirement should be added for clear AI policies to be present for every task given to student and faculty by the university. For instance, every course should have clear AI policies for their coursework, but this requirement should also extend to non-coursework, such as AI policies regarding scholarship applications and essays, admissions, hiring documents, and the like. I have been in the past frustrated by</p>	Student	CU Boulder

¹ Office of Policy and Efficiency

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			<p>the lack of official guidance on the use of AI in scholarship essays in particular (certain specific scholarships have their own policies, but many offered through the scholarship office don't have written policies, and there is no general guidance on AI use in scholarship applications from that office). These policies should also address the various nuances of AI use. There is a broad spectrum of AI use, ranging from blatant plagiarism (e.g., pasting an essay prompt or question into an AI model and submitting it's unchanged response as the student's own work) and collaboratively working with an AI agent (for example, providing a manually written work to the AI to ask for feedback before submitting it, asking AI for help with research by providing a list of sources to read, or using AI to generate practice problems while studying for a test, etcetera), and these need to be reflected in AI guidance. University guidelines should be created for how professors and offices communicate these policies to students (i.e. rules could be made require course AI policies to address specific issues)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of AI in grading assignments should be outright banned. We deserve real feedback from a competent expert on our work, not text generated by an AI slop machine. - Protections should be put in place to prevent jobs at the university from being replaced by AI. This should include provisions banning or heavily restricting the use of AI where the university would otherwise hire a person to do that job, such as graphic designers, technical writers, IT personnel, etcetera. - The university must adopt a policy heavily restricting use of AI content in it's official work, and requiring clear disclosure in every case where AI generated material is used by the university. Official publications must be made without AI, or use of AI must be heavily restricted to instances where other approaches are impractical. This should include incidental use by the university, such as posters and pamphlets given or displayed by university offices, art used to decorate buildings, music being played at events, and social media posts made by the university or its offices. 		

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			<p>- Protections must be placed on the use of student, faculty, and staff materials for use in AI training or research. Student/faculty materials, like submitted assignments, personnel files, academic records, communications, and the like, must not be used to train AI models without the explicit, written consent of the students/faculty. Approval for such uses must not be required for any reason, made a condition of receiving any benefit (i.e., professors should not be able to give extra credit for students giving permission to use their work in AI), and denying said approval may not be punished in any way.</p> <p>- Official guidance must be given for cases where students are suspected of using AI in their work against policies. Specific procedures for handling identification of disallowed AI materials should be created and clearly disclosed. Students must be allowed to contest accusations of their own violations of AI policies.</p>		
175	3/5/2026	Policy 13.J: Generative Artificial Intelligence	Comments: To ensure that students learn the skills they are supposed to and do not become reliant on AI, I believe students should not be allowed to use it. (With exceptions for assignments related to artificial intelligence.) I also believe that paying for ChatGPT subscriptions for students is a massive waste of money.	Student	CU Boulder
176	3/12/2026	Policy 13.J: Generative Artificial Intelligence	The policy should clearly specify that the university will not indemnify providers of AI software for harms that their tools cause including harm to mental health. This is one of the most egregious terms in the current OpenAI agreement. If these companies are worried about getting sued for harm their products cause, maybe that means they should build less harmful products.	Faculty	CU Boulder
177	3/13/2026	Policy 13.J: Generative Artificial Intelligence	<p>There's no way to "appropriately" leverage generative AI in our university systems, research, and pedagogy until after their significant "ethical, legal, and operational challenges" have been resolved (I'll also add privacy challenges to that list, because those are substantial).</p> <p>Until and unless they are, integration of AI at CU is likely to cause irrevocable damage to our systems and our people. For</p>	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			this reason it will be essential to not put the cart before the horse. Before the university endorses any use of a generative AI system in our work, it must ensure that the company that produces that system has resolved the inherent challenges. The university must also put solid policy in place that does not shift responsibility for AI failures to students, staff, and faculty.		