

Student Use of AI and Academic Integrity

CU Faculty Council AI Committee | Guidance for Faculty | AY 2026–27

This document offers guidance on [APS 6012](#) (Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence) in relation to [Regent Policy 5](#) (Faculty) and [Regent Policy 7](#) (Student Conduct) and related Regent Law. It is advisory and does not create policy. Updated October 22, 2026.

In practice: you decide what AI use is authorized in your course, and you set course-level sanctions. Suspected violations go through your campus academic integrity process, which differs by campus.

The governing principles and documents

Regent Law 5.A.1.B places principal responsibility for decisions concerning pedagogy, curriculum, and academic ethics with faculty. Regent Policies 5 and 7 provide additional detail: *The faculty shall have the principal role in originating academic policy and standards related to: the initiation and direction of all courses, curricula, and degree offerings; admissions criteria, grading and standards for continuation; regulation of student academic conduct; and determination of candidates for honors and degrees* (Policy 5.A.1.B.1). *Academic freedom notwithstanding, all students shall comply with standards of conduct, and with any reasonable procedures for classroom discussion established by the faculty member* (Policy 7.C.2.B).

Each campus implements these principles through its own academic integrity policy and conduct office.

What this means for your practice

- **It is your syllabus that authorizes or prohibits AI use:** Every campus code focuses on whether assistance was *authorized*, and this includes AI assistance. Only the instructor can authorize it. State which AI uses are permitted, which are not permitted, and what students must disclose. This is designed to foster academic integrity and build mutual trust.
- **A detector score alone is not evidence of misconduct.** A score may be a reason to look more closely, never a basis for a finding — relying on one would delegate an academic judgment to an AI system, contrary to APS 6012 (III.D.2). Submitting student work to a detector also transmits confidential, student-owned work to a vendor (III.A.2–3, III.A.5.b); use only tools approved for that data.
- **Course-level sanctions are yours; follow your campus process for everything else.** Each campus assigns course-level academic sanctions to the instructor. However, reporting requirements, contested findings, and disciplinary consequences vary by campus.
- **You may restrict smartphones, wearable tech, and other devices:** Faculty have the authority to require students to remove and/or store electronic devices that might be used to access unauthorized assistance whether or not it is AI enabled unless a student has a documented disability accommodation. This applies to both in person and online learning environments.
- **Campus-level academic integrity policies should be updated through faculty governance.** Each campus should update its academic integrity policies and processes through the required faculty governance process; administrators and staff can't do so without faculty.

Brief Recommendations on Best Practices (coming soon)