



Faculty Council

Thursday, September 3rd, 2026

12:00-3:00 p.m.

Hybrid Meeting: 1800 Grant Street, Denver and Zoom

Minutes

Attendees:

Faculty Council Leadership: Diana White (Chair, UCD), Greg Kinney (Chair-Elect, Anschutz), Jorge Chavez (Immediate Past Chair, CUD), Wendy Bolyard (FA Chair, UCD), Andrea Hutchins (FSGC Chair), David Paradis (FA Chair, UCB)

Anschutz: Madiha Abdel-Maksoud, Shandra Knight, David Kroll, Marybeth Makic, Cindy O'Bryant, Ernesto Salcedo, Ben Scott, Chris Smith, Christina Sun, Ellie Svoboda, Marisa Taylor

Boulder: Jed Brown, Andy Cowell, Alastair Norcross, Chris Ostro, Deb Palmer, Avedan Raggio, Jenna Settles, Ravinder Singh, Katie Sparks, Kay Weaver

UCCS: Suzanne Cook, Alex Ilyasova, Esther Lamidi, Karen Larkin, Norah Mazel, Kacey Ross, Janice Thorpe, Greg Williams

Denver: Joanne Addison, Eric Baker, Caitlin Cooke, Dennis DeBay, Yelena Gordiyenko, Dumayi Gutierrez, Michael Hanson, Erin Hauger, Laurel Hyslop, Kelly McCusker, Beth Myers, Elizabeth Pugliano, Carlos Reali, Lori Ryan, Jeffrey Schrader, Lynn Vanleer, Anthony Villano

System: Michael Lightner, Scott Munson, Jay Dedrick, Maureen Durkin, Anne Fleming, Jaimie Henthorn

Student Government: Jared Bynum

1. 12:15 p.m. Call to Order

- Diana White called the special Faculty Council meeting to order. The meeting was held in hybrid format and focused on artificial intelligence updates and discussion.

2. 12:20 p.m. CU Boulder/CU Denver AI Training - Christopher Ostro and Laurel Hyslop

A. Training Design and Purpose

- Ostro and Hyslop described the student AI training developed over the summer by the Boulder and Denver group. The team intentionally emphasized broad AI literacy rather than building the course around a single product.
- The training addresses both opportunities and limitations of generative AI and emphasizes the human purpose of learning. A limited ChatGPT Edu-specific section can be replaced if the University changes platforms, allowing the broader course to remain useful over time.
- The faculty-led team sought to keep the training to roughly 30 minutes while still providing enough context for people with very different levels of AI familiarity. Presenters described the course as a first iteration that will continue to be revised based on feedback.
- The team also deliberately sought a balanced tone that neither promotes nor rejects AI. Approximately 125-130 feedback responses had already been received; presenters reported that the large majority of respondents characterized the balance as appropriate, with the remaining responses split between viewing it as too optimistic or too pessimistic.



B. Participation and Communications

- Boulder reported approximately 2,400 students and 1,400 faculty/staff participants. Boulder also has a mirrored faculty/staff version of the training.
- CU Denver reported that just under 200 students had completed the training and obtained access as of the recent Faculty Assembly update; Anschutz had approximately 140 students who had completed the training and obtained access as of earlier that week.
- Presenters emphasized that completing the training and becoming eligible for ChatGPT Edu access is different from actually using the tool. Some faculty are assigning the module even when students are not required to activate or use ChatGPT Edu.
- Boulder used a broad communications push that included email, orientation/move-in messaging, and Canvas. Denver had promoted the training through several newsletters but had not yet conducted a comparable direct student communications campaign. Members noted that reaching students through mass communications remains difficult across campuses.

C. Discussion

- Discussion included whether a general AI literacy course should eventually be required more broadly, even for students who do not intend to use the University-supported tool. Presenters said this was not part of the training group's current charge, but noted that information about privacy, data use, and the difference between approved and public AI tools may be valuable for all students.
- Members also discussed student perceptions and anxiety about AI, including concerns that students may believe the University can monitor their individual ChatGPT Edu activity. Participants noted the importance of clear communication about privacy and approved uses.

3. 12:35 p.m. UCCS AI Training - Janice Thorpe and Kacey Ross

A. Course Structure and Content

- Thorpe and Ross described the UCCS course developed by a team of eight members: four faculty and four staff. The group reviewed materials developed elsewhere in CU and adapted them to the UCCS context rather than recreating the work from the beginning.
- UCCS built one course for students, faculty, and staff. The course follows a progression from foundational knowledge to application and critical evaluation and was designed to remain largely tool-agnostic.
- Module 1 defines key terms and explains how generative AI works. Module 2 addresses sustainability, bias, labor, misinformation, transparency, documentation, and the responsibility of students to follow individual faculty AI policies. Module 3 addresses data security and personal well-being, including campus wellness resources and potential risks associated with extended AI use.
- Module 4 covers ChatGPT Edu features and is the only platform-specific portion of the course, making it easier to replace if the supported tool changes. A fifth, optional module develops more advanced critical-use skills and can earn participants a digital foundations badge.
- Ross said the team wanted the training to help shape the campus conversation rather than either uncritically accepting AI or rejecting it. The objective is to equip users to make informed decisions about whether, how, when, and why they may use AI.



B. Participation, Requirements, and Promotion

- As of August 29, UCCS reported 493 users who had accepted the course invitation and logged in, including approximately 230 students and 263 staff. Of those, 375 had been active ChatGPT users, and 313 had completed the optional final module and received the foundations badge.
- The course is required for anyone who wants access to the UCCS ChatGPT Edu environment. Faculty who had received access before the new training was launched were given through the end of September to complete it in order to maintain access.
- UCCS promoted the training through an August 14 campus email, UCCS News, Chancellor and Provost welcome communications, and course-level syllabus messaging. There was not initially a standardized syllabus statement or a course feedback survey; the team indicated that a survey could be added and that the course had already been adjusted in response to compliance and legal feedback.

C. Privacy, Intellectual Property, and Data Discussion

- Members discussed student concern that faculty or administrators may be able to view individual ChatGPT Edu activity. Campus IT representatives emphasized that access to user-level information is tightly restricted and that academic misconduct concerns would be handled through established processes rather than informal review of student chats.
- The discussion also addressed faculty intellectual property when students copy instructional materials, rubrics, or assignments into AI tools. Michael Lightner clarified that APS 1014 does not require the University to recover or return faculty intellectual property that a student improperly places into an AI system; potential violations can be addressed through existing policy and procedures, while recovery of the material is a separate and currently unresolved question.
- Lightner and IT representatives reiterated that the CU supported ChatGPT Edu environment is intended to prevent CU entered content from being used to train the public. Participants noted that this protection does not prevent a student from placing material into a separate public AI service outside the CU environment.

4. 12:50 p.m. EPUS - APS 6012 Update - Ravinder Singh

A. EPUS Review Process

- Singh reviewed the history of EPUS involvement with APS 6012, beginning with discussions in late 2025 and continuing through spring and summer 2026. He thanked System administrators and staff who had engaged with EPUS and noted that the committee received additional time to provide faculty input.
- Singh said EPUS undertook substantial work over the summer, including a smaller cross-campus group that met repeatedly, reviewed drafts and administrative responses, and worked with Faculty Council leadership, System administrators, and legal representatives. He noted that summer work of this scope was unusual for EPUS.

B. Remaining Faculty Concerns

- Singh reported that EPUS still believes important issues remain unresolved. EPUS has not endorsed APS 6012. He specifically identified academic freedom, intellectual property, and political considerations among the areas that faculty feedback had not adequately been addressed or resolved in the current policy.
- He expressed concern that faculty recommendations appeared to have been incorporated selectively



without a clear explanation of why some were accepted and others were not. EPUS had repeatedly offered to meet directly with administrators and believed a face-to-face reconciliation of faculty and administrative positions could have produced better results.

- The discussion highlighted a broader concern that shared governance and relevant faculty expertise should be engaged earlier when University technology or policy decisions have significant classroom and pedagogical implications, rather than being brought in after major decisions have already been made.
- White and Jorge Chavez acknowledged both the work completed and the need for continued communication. White emphasized that APS 6012 is expected to remain under active review and that Faculty Council should use future discussions to better understand how faculty input is evaluated and incorporated.

C. Shared Governance Representation and Responsible Faculty Bodies

- White noted that the APS 6012 language allows shared governance groups to provide one to three names for faculty representation on Chancellor and systemwide AI advisory groups.
- Joanne Addison raised a related issue regarding decisions about enabling new ChatGPT Edu features. She noted that APS 6012 states that a Chancellor AI advisory group cannot substitute for a responsible faculty body on pedagogical matters, but campuses still need clarity about which faculty body has authority for particular decisions and how that review can occur on short timelines.
- Members also discussed the growing service burden created by the number of AI-related committees and decisions. Addison noted that existing governance structures may not have sufficient capacity to absorb substantial additional work without support.

5. 1:30 p.m. Break

6. 1:45 p.m. System AI Update - VP Michael Lightner and CIO Scott Munson

A. APS 6012 and Continuous Review

- Lightner thanked EPUS and the summer EPUS group for its work on APS 6012 and acknowledged the frustration described in Singh's presentation.
- Lightner explained that Administrative Policy Statements are ultimately approved by the University President after agreement with the chancellors. He said the general APS approach is to keep systemwide policy at an appropriate level and allow campuses to adapt implementation to their cultures, needs, and the authority of their chancellors.
- Lightner said the current APS 6012 was published to meet an immediate implementation need with the explicit understanding that it was not finished. Unlike a typical policy review cycle, the posted policy includes a feedback mechanism and may be revised whenever emerging issues and ongoing conversations warrant changes.
- Munson described the policy-development process as iterative, noting that the document had changed substantially as feedback was received. He said future work would benefit from concise feedback accompanied by rationale, research, or evidence supporting proposed changes, as well as clearer distinctions between issues appropriate for a System APS and those best handled by campuses or other functional areas.



B. Shared Governance, Pedagogy, and AI Advisory Structures

- Lightner distinguished between an AI advisory committee and a responsible faculty body. AI advisory groups may include faculty and shared governance representatives, but they do not replace faculty authority under Regent Law and Policy when a matter falls within faculty principal responsibility, including pedagogy and curriculum.
- Participants discussed the difficulty of identifying the responsible faculty body in practice because authority may reside at the program, department, school/college, campus, or other level depending on the issue. Members agreed that these structures need to be clarified before time sensitive AI decisions arise.
- Lightner and Munson said campuses should determine the structures that best fit their circumstances; a campus does not necessarily need to create a new committee for every AI issue if existing governance or administrative bodies can appropriately take on the work.
- The systemwide AI advisory group is still being formed. Chancellors and shared governance groups had submitted or were submitting names, with student, staff, and System Office representation still being assembled. The President was expected to finalize leadership and the charge once membership was complete.
- Participants emphasized the need for a more transparent, two-way process between systemwide and campus groups. Jed Brown urged that future recommendations show the rationale and research behind decisions so faculty expertise can be meaningfully incorporated rather than simply collected.

C. ChatGPT Edu Contract and Future Tools

- Munson reported that the current OpenAI/ChatGPT Edu arrangement is up for decision on January 4. Campus AI committees were being asked whether they are prepared to make a longer term decision by that date or whether an extension through the end of the academic year would provide needed time for evaluation.
- Campus groups were also asked to identify other AI tools for which coordinated master agreements might be useful, with Google Gemini discussed as one example. Responses from campuses were expected in early October and would feed into the systemwide advisory group, with recommendations to University leadership targeted for late October or early November because of procurement timelines.
- Munson emphasized that no extension or renewal decision had been assumed. If the University decides to extend the current arrangement only through the end of the academic year, System would continue to support that extension. Longer term renewals after that point would be campus decisions and campus-funded under the model discussed.
- For other tools, campuses may be able to gain economies of scale through coordinated agreements while still funding their own participation. Beth Meyer noted that campus IT capacity will also affect what kinds of local support models are feasible.
- Brown raised concern that a University contract can be perceived by students as an endorsement of a particular product, potentially complicating faculty efforts to set their own classroom AI expectations. Discussion returned to the distinction between institutional access to tools and faculty authority over pedagogical choices within applicable policy and curricular requirements.



7. 2:15 p.m. Faculty Council AI Committee - Joanne Addison and Diana White

A. Committee Scope and Early Priorities

- Addison reported that she is chairing the Faculty Council AI Committee and Jed Brown is serving as vice chair. The committee's charge was in final draft form but had not yet been fully approved.
- The committee has focused first on defining what it will not do. It does not intend to create or critique policy, make campus-level decisions, or review the OpenAI contract. Those matters belong to other governance or administrative processes.
- A likely early product will be a series of short guidance documents on topics such as academic freedom and AI, disclosure, and intellectual property. Addison said the documents would focus on how Regent Article 5 and APS 6012 operate in an AI environment, rather than prescribing classroom "best practices" that could infringe on academic freedom.
- The committee hopes to issue useful guidance relatively quickly while also maintaining a longer-term list of issues for future work. A year-end report is expected, although the scope of that report is still being developed.

B. Potential Issues and Resources

- Wearable technology was raised as one possible topic. Members discussed the need to distinguish recording AI devices from longstanding or medically necessary wearable technology and to account for disability accommodations.
- The FC AI committee's membership was still being finalized, with a goal of having campus representation and connections to Chancellor AI advisory groups so information can move in both directions. Addison invited members to send potential issues for the committee to consider.
- Lightner suggested that Faculty Council guidance include links to supporting research and be maintained as living web resources rather than static documents. Brown suggested that administrative websites link to faculty-developed guidance so students and employees receive more coherent messages across the University.

8. 2:40 p.m. Campus Chancellor AI Working Group Updates

A. Anschutz

- Council heard that the Anschutz Chancellor AI group had been formed and included faculty representation, but no presenter was available to provide a detailed status update.

B. Boulder - David Paradis

- Paradis reported that the Boulder Chancellor AI advisory group had met twice. The first meeting focused on the committee charge; the second addressed an urgent question involving Codex.
- The group recommended making Codex available to researchers and staff because of immediate research and contract needs. It also recommended that students be able to obtain trial access with a faculty sponsor. Paradis emphasized that the committee is advisory and that final decisions rest with campus executive leadership.



- Boulder is using a central advisory committee supported by subject matter subcommittees. The subcommittees can develop recommendations on specialized topics, which are then reviewed by the main group before advice is sent to executive leadership. Paradis said the subcommittee structure is flexible and may evolve as new issues arise.
- Discussion clarified that individual faculty generally do not need to seek permission from a curriculum committee to use AI in their own courses unless a responsible faculty body has adopted a curricular requirement that applies across a program or set of courses.

C. Colorado Springs - Kacey Ross

- Ross reported that UCCS has a steering committee that had been meeting for approximately six weeks. It includes two faculty, two staff, and two student seats; the student representatives had not yet been identified.
- A larger working group of approximately 20 people was still being formed, with representation expected from colleges and staff. The Chancellor selected the steering committee, while nominations for the broader group were solicited from deans, vice chancellors, and shared governance leaders.

D. Denver - Beth Meyers

- Meyers reported that the Denver committee was charged by the Chancellor in June and met nearly every week during the summer. Its membership includes three faculty, three staff, three administrators, three students, and additional AI Faculty Fellows. One faculty member specifically represents Faculty Assembly, one staff member represents Staff Council, and one student represents the Student Government Association.
- The group has discussed student AI training and the broader landscape of AI activity at Denver and is now concentrating on the questions surrounding ChatGPT Edu and future campus decisions.
- Wendy Bolyard clarified that CU Denver has two faculty shared governance bodies, Faculty Assembly and the University of Colorado Denver Association of Lecturers and Instructors (UCDALI), and emphasized that representatives designated as shared governance members should be selected through the governance bodies they represent rather than simply appointed as individual faculty members by administrators.
- Bolyard said Denver Faculty Assembly expects its representative to bring matters involving faculty principal responsibility back to the appropriate faculty governance body. She reiterated that a Chancellor advisory group may provide advice on classroom issues, but faculty governance retains its established authority over pedagogical matters.
- Bolyard also encouraged the Faculty Council AI Committee to help campuses share resources and approaches so that each campus does not have to recreate the same work independently.

9. 2:55 p.m. Open Discussion and Closing Remarks

- White summarized that CU now has significantly more AI-related structure than it did a year earlier, while a large number of unresolved policy, governance, implementation, and communication questions remain.
- In closing discussion, Bolyard highlighted the distinction between a possible System-supported extension of the current ChatGPT Edu arrangement through the end of the academic year and a later campus funded renewal. White reiterated that the first question is whether an extension is warranted at all; no decision to extend had been made.
- White recognized Jay Dedrick, who announced that he will retire from CU at the end of September after 17



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

Faculty Council
1800 Grant, Suite 500
Denver, CO 80203

years. Members thanked him for his work with CU Connections and his longstanding support of Faculty Council and shared governance, including the institutional history he has accumulated through years of covering governance meetings.

10. 3:00 p.m. Adjournment

Next Meeting: Faculty Council, Thursday, September 24th, 2026 | 12:00 p.m. | Zoom