

## FPC AI Policy

Announced May 2026 with modifications from June 2026

The majority of this text derives from the FPC annual report for 2025-2026

A...priority this year was beginning to develop policy around faculty use of Artificial Intelligence in teaching, scholarship, service, and review documents. This was prompted by an expectation from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE), our accrediting body, that the college should have developed, implemented and assessed policy by the time of their site visit in 2029-2030.

The committee's first goal was to develop a baseline understanding of faculty uses of and concerns about AI. The committee gathered insights from faculty during PAS conversations and faculty meetings and then created and circulated a survey to gather information more systematically. We are grateful to the more than sixty faculty who sent extensive responses. We are also grateful to the members of the Presidential Working Group on AI and LLM's, whose report will continue to guide us.

We have a great deal of rich data and much to consider over the coming year. Indeed, we expect the development of policy around AI use to continue over multiple years. However, a few things have already become clear. First, faculty across the college are already using Generative AI and Predictive AI in many ways in their teaching and scholarship. These uses are as variable as faculty disciplines. Those who use it see value in its ability to assist in analyzing data, streamlining repetitive tasks, drafting code, refining text when publishing in languages that are not their first language, iteratively critiquing writing, searching text, and creating model problems and data sets for students, among many other uses. Second, the technology is changing rapidly enough that specific rules with respect to specific technologies are not likely to remain current for more than a semester. Therefore, any policy will evolve and need to be updated regularly, and general principles are more likely to be useful than specifics. Third, faculty have valid concerns about the uses of AI (e.g., a loss of trust in our profession if AI use becomes widespread; the ethics of AI tools having been trained on stolen texts, without attribution; the reproduction of biases related to race, class, gender, and other social identities; the massive energy use and the impact of data centers on our communities; the negative impact AI use may have on young people's development of critical thinking and writing skills, and on creativity, imagination, problem-solving skills, and attention spans; the flattening of prose and the elimination or devaluing of individual/idiosyncratic writing styles). Fourth, there are a few circumstances emerging that we need to respond to immediately, if impermanently.

Our initial approach, therefore, is twofold. Under most circumstances, we expect, the committee will judge faculty use of AI against values derived from existing practice. We will expect faculty to be able to clearly explain how their use of AI contributes to their teaching, scholarship, and service according to the standards set out by the academic handbook. We will expect faculty who use AI to become familiar with and adhere to their emerging disciplinary standards for doing so or be able to explain why they are diverging from those standards on intellectual grounds, just as they do with other

disciplinary standards. We will hold faculty responsible for errors or plagiarism caused by AI use, just as we would for errors or plagiarism under any other circumstances. We expect faculty to be transparent about their use of AI in methodology sections and footnotes, just as they are transparent about other uses of tools and methods. We expect faculty to consider the environmental impacts of AI use just as they should consider those of other high energy use research practices, like plane flight. We expect faculty to guard the privacy of others' data while using generative AI just as they should under other circumstances.

However, two areas have emerged with respect to which FPC plans to be more specific.

The first of these is in assessing and responding to student work. It seems clear that there are valid ways of using AI in assessing and responding to student work. For example, many faculty already use chat bots or other tools in student homework assignments to give students an opportunity to practice skills with immediate feedback. However, other uses seem more problematic. For example, using AI to feign personalized comment, by having ChatGPT process student papers and produce comments on its own, and then passing this off as the work of faculty without actual faculty attention, seems fundamentally dishonest. As a worst case scenario we can imagine a "dark factory" situation in which students use generative AI to pretend to write papers and faculty use generative AI to pretend to read them.

Starting in the 2026-2027 academic year, FPC will expect faculty to be transparent with students about their use of Generative AI tools in grading and feedback, explaining *when* they are using said tools, and *how* and *why* they are using them. We will consult with APSC about the advisability of requiring a syllabus statement.

Our second area of specific policy prescription concerns review documents. By review documents we mean the materials that candidates under review write, the memos and teaching observations produced by departments and review chairs, the letters written by external reviewers, and the memos written by FPC. We recognize that reviews require significant labor from our faculty colleagues. However, here we are asking for a moratorium on the use of generative AI for the production of any review documents, at least for the near term.

**External reviewers:** Starting in 2026, FPC will formally require that external reviewers not use LLMs to summarize or evaluate the work of our colleagues. Our goal in requesting external reviews is to gain the benefit of specific experts in the field in evaluating our colleagues' scholarship. If external reviewers substitute prompting for reading and writing, this value is undermined. While we do not expect always to be able to detect AI use, we expect that sharing this requirement will reduce the use of AI.

**Review Chairs and Committee Members:** FPC will require that review chairs and review committee members also not use generative AI in assessing their colleagues' work, for several reasons. First, because FPC relies on the specific insights and judgment of disciplinary colleagues as central to our processes of review. Second,

because, beyond their evaluative function, reviews offer an important opportunity for departmental faculty to pay constructive attention to each other's teaching, scholarship, and service, sometimes to see opportunities for coordination and collaboration, sometimes to offer mentoring and guidance within a specific institutional context. Third, because faculty reviews involve the use of faculty's confidential documents, particularly but not only unfinished manuscripts, and student feedback forms. We have not yet developed official practices or a community culture of using AI that would protect this data.

**Colleagues under Review:** FPC will require that colleagues under review not use LLMs or other generative AI to produce text for their PAS documents. In reading PAS documents and crafting PAS questions, the committee relies on candidates to offer their own reflections on their professional work. Our interest is not in polish or form—PAS documents come to us in many forms and styles. We would rather have a clunky document, which makes space for an authentic conversation, than a smoothly processed one which conceals important rough spots.

**FPC:** FPC does not use LLMs or other generative AI to process materials or generate memos. If that were to change, FPC would disclose and discuss this use with faculty.

**June 2026 Update:**

FPC has agreed that candidates up for review may use AI in order to identify patterns in *their own* student feedback forms, as long as they continue to read their student feedback forms in full.

In making this change, FPC reiterates the point above that *review committees* should not upload candidates' materials, including their student feedback forms, to LLMs as this violates confidentiality. FPC will continue to read all student feedback forms.