Published on *University of Colorado* (https://www.cu.edu)

Faculty Council Artificial Intelligence Committee [1]



Guidance Documents Guides in Development Emerging Best Practices Campus Resources Charge and Committee Members

Faculty guidance on the use of AI at CU

These one page guides and emerging best practices, written by faculty for faculty, are designed to help everyone understand how CU Academic Policy Statement 6012 and associated Regent Laws and Policies apply to teaching, research and service.

It is important to note that the Faculty Council Educational Policy and University Standards Committee has yet to endorse APS 6012 as important differences remain between faculty and administrators on matters including governance, ethics, risk management, and AI-model training.

Read APS 6012 [2]

Approved one-page guides

Each guide states the governing Regent Law and APS provisions, then what they mean for your practice. Where the committee is interpreting rather than restating, it says so. All guides

will be updated as needed throughout the year.

TEACHING

Academic Freedom and AI in Teaching

Who sets the AI policy for your course, what unit-level guidance may require, and where administrative authority stops.

One Page • PDF [3] **Read**

RESEARCH

Academic Freedom and AI in Research and Creative Work

Defensibility as method, sponsor and publisher rules, data handling, consent for depictions, and AI use in evaluation.

One Page • PDF[4] **Read**

ASSESSMENT

Faculty Use of AI in Student Assessment

Disclosure in grading, the line between feedback and a grade, adaptive courseware, and duty of care on disparate impact.

One Page • PDF [5] **Read**

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Student Use of AI and Academic Integrity

Why your syllabus is the authorization, why a detector score is not a finding, and how the campus processes differ.

One Page • PDF [6] **Read**

DATA PRIVACY

What Data Can Go Into Which AI Tool

Classification tiers, FERPA-protected student records, your own unpublished work, and the tool approval rule.

One Page • PDF [7]

Read

REFERENCE

The Governing Documents

APS 6012, Regent Law 5 and 7, the CU data classification standard, and the campus academic integrity policies, in one place.

One Page • PDF [8]

Read

Guides in Development

AI and Educational Materials IP

Your course materials, APS 1014, and what happens when a vendor tool trains on them.

AI and Faculty Evaluation

Reappointment, tenure and promotion: AI use as a criterion, and AI used to read dossiers.

AI in Hiring and Search Committees

Where Colorado SB 26-189 reaches employment decisions. To be written with University Counsel.

Emerging Best Practices (coming soon)

What follows is shared practice, not committee positions and not policy.

Writing an AI Syllabus Statement

Model language for permit, prohibit, and conditional approaches, assignment by assignment.

Syllabus language bank

Permit, prohibit, and conditional statements contributed by faculty across the four campuses.

Assignment redesigns

Approaches that generate visible process rather than relying on detection.

What units have adopted

Department and college guidance already in force, and how it moved through governance.

Have a practice worth sharing, or a question we have missed?

The committee has guides left to write and four campuses to hear from. Send syllabus language, a case this guidance does not cover, or a topic you need next.

Contact Us [9]

Your campus sets its own rules within the policies set by Regents and the CU System Office.

Academic integrity policy, approved tool lists, and AI committees differ by campus. Where this

guidance and your campus policy differ, your campus policy governs.

CU Boulder

Academic Integrity Policy and Honor Code

CU Denver

Campus Policy 7050, Academic Integrity

UCCS

Policy 200-019, Academic Ethics Code

CU Anschutz

School and College Honor Codes

Committee Charge and Members

Committee Charge

Charge

The Faculty Council Artificial Intelligence Committee is charged with identifying the appropriate role for the Faculty Council in shared decision-making as well as the development of guidance for faculty related to artificial intelligence. The FC AIC will partner with EPUS and other committees as needed on the development of AI-related policy.

Regent Law and Policy Informing Our Work

Shared governance

This committee is established by the Faculty Council under the shared governance principles of Regent Law Article 5, Part A.

Regent Law 5.A.1(B) provides that faculty "have the principal responsibility for decisions concerning pedagogy, curriculum, research, scholarly or creative work, academic ethics, and recommendations on the selection and evaluation of faculty," and that "the development of general academic policies shall be a collaborative effort between the faculty and administration." Regent Law 5.A.1(C) further provides that issues concerning "the academic calendar, course scheduling, and teaching modalities shall be determined in collaboration with the faculty."

The use of generative AI by faculty in teaching, in research, and in scholarly and creative work applies to all of these domains.

B. Academic Freedom and Intellectual Property

Regent Law Article 5, Part B affords individual faculty members academic freedom — "the freedom to inquire, discover, access, publish, disseminate, and teach truth as the individual understands it, subject to no control or authority, save the control and authority of the rational methods by which knowledge is established in the field" (5.B.2(A)). Regent Policy further clarifies these matters:

5.B.1(D): "faculty are afforded freedom in achieving the goals of their assigned courses," subject to 5.B.2(C).
5.B.1(B): faculty "shall not be subjected to direct or indirect pressures in an attempt to influence their work in a manner that would conflict with professional standards of the field," and the

Board of Regents and administration "shall not impose such pressures or influence and shall resist such pressures or interference when exerted from inside or outside the university." 5.B.2(C): faculty members remain "responsible for requirements (e.g., course content, topic order, course schedule, assessment mechanisms) specified by responsible faculty bodies, such as curriculum committees."

In other words, requirements concerning AI use in courses may only be set by “responsible faculty bodies,” not the administration. Individual instructors retain discretion over how they achieve course goals set by responsible faculty bodies, including whether and how AI is used. The use of AI in research and creative activities is governed by the standards in one’s field.

Regent Policy 5.H additionally assigns copyright in educational materials — syllabi, course design materials, learning objectives, assessments and rubrics, LMS content, materials provided to students, and recorded lectures — to their faculty authors, and expressly grounds that policy in the principles of academic freedom. Whether and on what terms such materials may be ingested, retained, or used to train vendor AI systems as well as CU’s own internal systems is a matter of immediate concern.

1. Matters of Principal Faculty Responsibility

Academic integrity and academic ethics.
Pedagogy and curriculum.

For example, the right of individual instructors to determine whether, and on what terms, generative AI is used in their courses, within requirements properly set by responsible faculty bodies (think program or department level).

Research and scholarly or creative work.

For example, protection against direct or indirect pressure from administrators or other faculty to adopt or to refrain from adopting AI in ways that conflict with the professional standards of a field in research or creative activities.

Selection and evaluation of faculty.

For example, questions of whether or not AI adoption or non-adoption shall not be a factor in annual evaluation, reappointment, promotion, or tenure as expressed in primary unit criteria developed by the faculty of the unit.

Intellectual property that is educational material.

The academic freedom implications of AI-detection tools, AI-assisted evaluation of teaching, and AI-mediated monitoring of instruction.
The availability of the Faculty Senate grievance process for alleged violations of academic freedom related to AI under Regent Policy 5.G.1(D) and whether or not this committee is receiving appropriate training on this matter.

2. Matters for Collaboration with the Administration

Under Regent Policy 5.A.1(B)–(C), the committee shall advise and collaborate on:

The process for recommending policies and procedures for faculty appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure and post-

tenure review, and the appeal of decisions in these areas.
In the preparation of campus and system budgets, the administration shall have the principal role, with early collaboration with the appropriate faculty governance group(s), subject to the ultimate authority of the Board of Regents or its designee(s).
The faculty shall collaborate with the administration in developing recommendations to the president or Board of Regents on system-level issues concerning the general academic welfare of the university

Note that “budget” and “general academic welfare” in this context may include institutional implications of AI adoption, data privacy and security, faculty and staff workload, vendors/contracts, evaluation criteria and metrics that can inform future institutional decisions as well as ethical, societal, and environmental dimensions of institutional AI use.

3. Representation and Liaison

Serve as liaison among the campus faculty assemblies, campus AI committees, the Faculty Council Executive Committee, university administration, and the Regent Governance and University Affairs committees, ensuring faculty voice in ongoing AI governance.

III. CU APS 6012

To be included in the committee workplan once we have had a chance to review this new policy.

IV. Deliverables

By the end of Fall 2026, the committee shall deliver to Faculty Council:

Guidance on Academic Freedom in relation to AI and teaching.
Guidance on the use of AI in research and creative works.
Guidance on Intellectual Property that is educational material in relation to AI.
Guidance on Disclosure of AI Use Involvement.
Guidance on the consideration of AI in faculty evaluation.
Guidance on AI resistance by students.

By the end of AY 2026-27, the committee shall deliver to Faculty Council:

An advisory report to the Faculty Council and the administration presenting findings and prioritized recommendations including:

Recommendations for including faculty in the procurement process when something has to do with matters over which we have principal responsibility.
Intellectual property beyond educational material
Faculty Senate Grievance Committee and AI-related issues

V. Membership

Ideally, membership will foster communication across campuses and committees, suggested composition includes:

Up to three representatives from each campus (Boulder, Colorado Springs, Denver, Anschutz Medical Campus).
At least one member per campus shall be a member of that campus's Faculty Assembly.
At least one member per campus shall be connected to that campus's AI committee or equivalent body.
The chair and chair-elect of the Faculty Council shall serve ex officio.
Membership shall reflect a range of disciplinary backgrounds

and a range of perspectives on AI but all members should be knowledgeable about AI and FC actions to date
At least one member of the Summer 2026 working group is encouraged to continue, for continuity.

Artificial Intelligence Committee Members

NAME	CAMPUS	SCHOOL/COLLEGE	TERM
Joanne Addison, Chair	CU Denver	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	Term 1, AY 2026-2027
Darija Medic	CU Denver	College of Arts & Media	Term 1, AY 2026-2027
Laurel Hyslop	CU Denver	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	Term 1, AY 2026-2027
Wendy Bolyard	CU Denver	School of Public Affairs	Term 1, AY 2026-2027
Thomas Kaufmann	CU Denver	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	Term 1, AY 2026-2027
Jed Brown, Vice Chair	CU Boulder	College of Engineering and Applied Science	Term 1, AY 2026-2027
Nesrine Mansour	CU Boulder	College of Communication, Media, Design and Information	Term 1, AY 2026-2027