

Guidelines for Faculty AI Syllabus Statements

Purpose

Every course syllabus must include an AI statement that clearly explains how students may and may not use AI in the course, how the faculty member may use AI, how AI use must be acknowledged, and what process will be followed if misuse is suspected. These guidelines define the required components of that statement. They are not intended to provide a single required syllabus statement; faculty should adapt their statements to the learning goals, assignments, and disciplinary expectations of their courses.

1. Institutional AI Statement Placeholder

Each syllabus must include a section for the general institutional AI statement.

[Institutional AI statement to be inserted here.]

2. Student AI Use Categories

Each syllabus statement must include clear sections describing student AI use in the course. At minimum, the statement must include sections for Allowed AI Use and Not Allowed AI Use. If applicable, it may also include a section for Required AI Use. **Faculty may not simply prohibit all AI use**, because some AI is unavoidable in ordinary academic work. Examples include spell-checking, grammar-checking, autocomplete, search engines, accessibility tools, and other embedded technologies. Faculty should distinguish between unavoidable or ordinary tool use and AI use that affects the intellectual substance of student work.

Each student-use category must include the following three elements: description, example, and rationale.

A. Allowed AI Use

The syllabus statement must describe what AI use is allowed in the course. This should be specific enough that students can understand which tools, tasks, and stages of work are permitted. The statement should clarify whether students may use AI for brainstorming, outlining, revising, grammar support, coding assistance, studying, tutoring, summarizing, generating examples, or other course-relevant tasks. It should also clarify whether allowed use varies by assignment.

This section must include at least one example. The example should show a realistic student situation and should be tied to the type of work students will actually complete in the course.

This section must also explain why the listed uses are allowed. The rationale should connect to course learning goals, skill development, professional practice, accessibility, responsible AI literacy, or other pedagogical reasons.

B. Not Allowed AI Use

The syllabus statement must describe what AI use is not allowed in the course. This should clearly identify uses that would interfere with the purpose of the assignment or misrepresent the student's learning. Examples might include submitting AI-generated work as one's own,

using AI to complete an assignment when the goal is to demonstrate unaided skill, using AI during an exam unless explicitly permitted, fabricating sources, using AI to avoid required reading or analysis, or using AI in ways that violate assignment-specific instructions.

This section must include at least one example. The example should make clear what crosses the line from acceptable assistance to academic misuse.

This section must also explain why the listed uses are not allowed. The rationale should connect to academic integrity, the learning that the students will not achieve, the learning outcomes of the course, accurate assessment of student ability, disciplinary standards, or professional ethics.

C. Required AI Use, If Applicable

If a course or assignment requires students to use AI, the syllabus statement must include a section describing that requirement. This section should identify the tool or type of tool required, the purpose of the AI use, the assignment or activity in which it will be used, and any limits on use.

This section must include at least one example showing what required AI use looks like in practice.

This section must also explain why AI use is required. The rationale should connect to course learning outcomes, AI literacy, disciplinary preparation, ethical evaluation of tools, comparison of human and machine output, or preparation for professional environments.

3. Faculty AI Use Disclosure

Because faculty are role models for their students, they must also have statements about their use in the syllabus. Faculty must include a section explaining how they plan to use AI in the course. This section should model the transparency expected of students. Faculty should disclose when and how they may use AI, such as for lesson planning, generating examples, drafting discussion prompts, creating practice questions, developing rubrics, improving assignment instructions, summarizing themes in course feedback, checking accessibility of materials, or other instructional tasks.

If the faculty member plans to use AI tools to evaluate, review, or detect possible AI use in student work, this must be stated explicitly. The statement should acknowledge that AI-detection tools are imperfect and should not be used as the sole basis for an academic integrity decision.

The faculty AI-use section must include a human-in-the-loop commitment. Faculty should state that they remain responsible for instructional decisions, grading, feedback, academic integrity determinations, and communication with students. AI may assist the faculty member, but it must not replace the faculty member's professional judgment.

This section should also clarify any limits faculty place on their own AI use. For example, a faculty member may state that they will not use AI to assign grades automatically, will not use AI to provide final determinations of misconduct, or will not enter sensitive student information into public AI

tools.

4. Student Acknowledgement of AI Use

Each syllabus statement must explain how students are expected to acknowledge or document AI use. The statement should specify what kinds of AI use must be acknowledged and what kinds, if any, do not require acknowledgement. Faculty should clarify whether routine tools such as spell-checking, grammar-checking, search engines, autocomplete, or accessibility tools require acknowledgement, or whether acknowledgement is required only when AI contributes to the substance, structure, analysis, language, code, images, data processing, or other meaningful elements of the submitted work.

The syllabus statement must specify the required acknowledgement format. Options may include a citation in the appropriate disciplinary style, a brief disclosure statement, an AI-use appendix, a process note, an assignment cover sheet, comments in code, footnotes, or another clearly defined method. The required format should consider asking students to identify the tool used, the purpose of use, the stage of the work in which it was used, and how the student evaluated, revised, or incorporated the output.

Faculty should make clear that acknowledging permitted AI use is not a penalty. The purpose of acknowledgement is transparency, responsible use, and accurate representation of the student's work.

5. Student Process Documentation and Evidence of Work

Faculty should include guidance about steps students can take while completing their work to show that they followed course AI policies and did not use unauthorized AI. This section may be required for all courses or recommended for courses and assignments where process evidence is especially important.

Students might preserve or submit evidence of their work process, such as version history, Track Changes, Google Docs history, incremental drafts, outlines, notes, annotated bibliographies, research logs, handwritten planning materials, code repositories, commit histories, lab notebooks, design sketches, screenshots of work stages, or process memos. Other methods might include use oral check-ins, conferences, presentations, demonstrations, or code walkthroughs to confirm that students understand and can explain their submitted work.

If AI use is allowed or required, students might want to keep an AI-use log. Such a log may include the tool used, prompts or queries submitted, summaries of output received, how the student checked the output, and how the student revised or incorporated it.

Faculty should be willing to explain what kinds of process evidence students are good to keep, when it may be requested, whether it is required for all students or only for particular assignments, and how long students should retain it. These expectations should be reasonable (not burdensome), accessible, and appropriate to the discipline. Faculty should avoid implying that any single item conclusively proves either misconduct or innocence. Process evidence should be used as context for understanding student work, not as an automatic determinant.

The purpose of this section is to support honest students, encourage good learning habits, make expectations visible, and provide additional context if questions arise.

6. Misuse of AI and Academic Integrity Process

Each syllabus statement must describe what happens if AI is used outside the boundaries established for the course or assignment. The statement should define misuse by referring back to the Not Allowed AI Use section and to any assignment-specific instructions. Misuse may include unauthorized generation of work, failure to acknowledge required AI use, misrepresentation of AI-assisted work as fully independent work, use of AI during restricted assessments, fabrication of sources or data, or use of AI in any way that violates course or institutional academic integrity expectations.

The statement must describe the process that will be followed when misuse is suspected. At minimum, this process should include review of the concern by the faculty member, an opportunity for the student to respond, consideration of available evidence, documentation of the concern and outcome, and referral or reporting according to institutional academic integrity procedures when appropriate. Faculty should not rely solely on AI-detection software or any single automated indicator. Evidence may include the submitted work, assignment instructions, student acknowledgement statements, process documentation, version history, prior work, student explanations, and other relevant information.

The syllabus statement must also identify possible consequences of misuse. These may include revision and resubmission, reduced credit, a zero on the assignment, failure of the course, referral for academic integrity review, or other consequences allowed by institutional policy. The statement should distinguish between consequences determined by the faculty member under course policy and consequences determined through institutional academic integrity procedures.

The statement must inform students that they have access to the institution's academic integrity process, including any appeal rights. It should identify where students can find the official policy, what office or committee handles appeals, and any relevant timelines if those are known. Students should understand that they have the opportunity to ask questions, provide evidence, and appeal decisions according to institutional procedures.

7. Assignment-Level Variation

Faculty should clarify whether the same AI policy applies to all assignments or whether expectations vary by assignment. If expectations vary, the syllabus statement should explain that assignment instructions will specify the applicable AI-use category. For example, one assignment may permit AI brainstorming but prohibit AI-generated prose, while another may require students to compare their own analysis with an AI-generated response. Faculty should make assignment-level expectations explicit before students begin the work.

8. Equity, Accessibility, and Student Support

Faculty should write AI policies in ways that are accessible and equitable. Students should not be penalized for unavoidable AI embedded in ordinary tools unless the faculty member has clearly defined a relevant restriction. Policies should account for accessibility tools, assistive technologies,

language-support tools, and other legitimate supports. If a tool is required, faculty should consider cost, access, privacy, device requirements, student data, and whether an alternative is available.

Faculty should invite students to ask questions when they are uncertain whether a particular use is allowed. The syllabus statement should make clear that students are responsible for understanding and following the policy, but that faculty will provide clarification when students ask in advance.

9. Required Checklist for Faculty

Before finalizing the syllabus, faculty should confirm that the AI statement includes all required elements:

- AI Course Policy. Defines what students may, may not, and must do with AI in the course.
 - The institutional AI statement.
 - Allowed AI Use section with description, example, and rationale.
 - Not Allowed AI Use section with description, example, and rationale.
 - Required AI Use section, if applicable, with description, example, and rationale.
 - Recognition that AI cannot be completely forbidden because some AI use is unavoidable.
 - Clarification of assignment-level variation, if applicable.
- Transparency and Disclosure. Ensures students understand how both students and faculty may use AI.
 - Faculty AI Use Disclosure section.
 - Statement about any faculty use of AI detection or AI-assisted review.
 - Student acknowledgement or citation requirements for AI use.
- Academic Integrity and Documentation. Provides evidence expectations and defines misuse.
 - Guidance on process documentation or evidence students may keep to show authorized work.
 - Misuse section defining unauthorized AI use.
 - Statement that AI-detection tools will not be the sole basis for a misconduct finding.
- Investigation and Due Process. Explains how concerns are handled and protects student rights.
 - Human-in-the-loop commitment for faculty decisions.
 - Steps followed when misuse is suspected.
 - Possible consequences for misuse.
 - Student appeal rights and reference to institutional academic integrity procedures.
- Equity, Accessibility, and Student Support. Addresses fairness and student success considerations.
 - Attention to accessibility, equity, privacy, and student support.

10. Recommended Faculty Practice

Faculty are encouraged to discuss the AI statement with students early in the course rather than simply placing it in the syllabus. Students should have an opportunity to ask questions, examine examples, and understand the relationship between the AI policy and the learning goals of the course. Faculty are also encouraged to revisit AI expectations before major assignments, especially when the permitted level of AI use changes from one assignment to another.

AI Disclosure: The content of the document was created by the human. A LLM helped with the wording, format, and a few additional examples.