

Academic Freedom and AI in Teaching

CU Faculty Council AI Committee | Guidance for Faculty | AY 2026–27 *This document offers guidance on [APS 6012](#) (Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence) and related Regent Law. It is advisory and does not create policy. Updated October 22, 2026.*

In practice: the AI policy for your course is yours to establish, subject only to requirements set by responsible faculty bodies in your unit. Choosing not to use AI is as protected as choosing to use it.

The governing principles and documents

[Regent Law 5.A.1.B](#) places principal responsibility for decisions concerning pedagogy and curriculum with faculty. Further, Regent Law 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)). APS 6012 states directly that this responsibility includes decisions about the use of AI tools in these contexts, and that the policy does not dictate the use or non-use of AI tools in coursework. In addition, APS 6012 stipulates: *Campus AI Committees shall not supersede the faculty responsibilities established in Regent Law 5.A* (III.B).

What this means for your teaching

- **You may decline AI entirely or fully employ it within the guidelines set forth in APS 6012 unless otherwise specified by a responsible faculty body in your unit.** APS 6012 makes clear: *Consistent with academic rights and responsibilities, individual faculty shall ensure that AI use aligns with academic standards, disciplinary norms, institutional practices, and pedagogical goals* (III.B.). The policy also recognizes that individuals and units may determine that certain activities should not rely on AI and may establish alternative processes.
- **Individual faculty cannot be compelled by their supervisors or individual students to accommodate student resistance or enthusiasm.** The only exception is a documented disability accommodation. Nonetheless, departments or units are encouraged to develop best practices in this area.
- **Unit-level practices must adhere to both Regent Law and Policy as well as all applicable APSs.** Schools, colleges, departments, and programs may adopt their own guidance on GenAI in teaching if it aligns with Regent Law and Policy, APS 6012, campus policies **and** is approved by a responsible faculty body (e.g. a curriculum committee in a department). Insist on the authority of shared governance.
- **Administrative authority does not extend to course-level content and method decisions.** APS 6012 gives system and campus administrators primary authority over campus-level tool procurement, security and risk review, and campus implementation (III.B, III.C). It also states that the Chancellor Campus AI Committees shall not supersede faculty responsibilities under Regent Law 5.A. Actions that effectively set instructional policy and practice belong to faculty bodies.
- **Know that APS 6012 includes disclosure requirements for faculty.** Users must disclose GenAI use to an appropriate audience when it contributes to high-impact outputs, defined to include outputs that significantly affect individuals (III.D.1). In the committee's reading, this includes grades, high-stakes evaluations, and other forms of assessment.
- **Set an explicit course policy and put it in your syllabus.** State whether AI is permitted, for which assignments, and what disclosure is expected from students, course staff, and yourself. . Additionally, ensure students understand how this relates to campus academic integrity policies.

Academic freedom governs what and how you teach; it does not waive obligations under FERPA, data classification (APS 6010), IT security (APS 6005), or records retention (APS 2006).

Brief Recommendations on Best Practices (coming soon)