

AI Forums and Survey: Summary and Proposed Considerations

Background

After receiving many inquiries on AI use in curriculum from faculty members through various channels, the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) of the Academic Senate at San Jose State University organized two faculty forums and one anonymous Google form survey to investigate the possibility of creating a campus-wide AI-use policy. C&R acknowledges that broader consultation is essential, including involving more students and other campus AI groups. Therefore, this summary has limitations, but in preparing it, the committee has considered most of the faculty's opinions on the given statements.

Forum I: Forum I was held on 3/17/2025 (10-11:30 AM) in MLK 225. Its modality was hybrid, with 25 in-person and 45 online attendees. Four experts¹ in AI and the use of AI were invited to debate on four statements on AI use in teaching and learning:

- Statement A: “SJSU should generate a binding policy guiding what faculty and students may or may not do with regard to AI use in curriculum.”
- Statement B: “Students who are not taught how to properly use AI in their classes are less well prepared for the modern workforce.”
- Statement C: “Students may never be punished for using AI in coursework if they deny doing so.”
- Statement D: “Faculty should have the freedom to allow and prohibit the use of AI for all assignments and evaluations.”

The audience also participated in the Statement D debate. About 40 comments were received in the Forum I RSVP form. There was also active discussion in the Zoom chat room. The dialogue between the guest debaters was recorded and shared with all SJSU faculty ([link](#)).

Forum II: Forum II was held on 3/24/2025 (10 AM -12:00 PM) in MLK 225. Its modality was hybrid, with 20 in-person and 25 online attendees. It had three themes:

1. open mic discussion of the same topics as Forum I
2. presentations on AI resources at SJSU for faculty teaching
3. open mic: Other policy-related questions, and what AI tools and resources faculty want that are not currently available at SJSU.

About 30 comments were received in the Forum II RSVP form. There was also active discussion in the Zoom chat room. The presentations on AI resources were recorded and shared with all SJSU faculty ([link](#)).

¹ 10 experts were invited but only 4 were available.

Anonymous Google Form Survey: The survey asked for “Your Opinions about AI use in Education and Learning.” Eleven responses were received. The survey was disseminated during the two forums and also included in the email to all tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. The survey ended on 4/15/2025. Survey results were considered for C&R discussion, but are not being explicitly published for reasons of confidentiality.

C&R committee members attended both forums. The committee also reviewed the surveys and chat discussions. C&R members also have access to the complete recordings of both forums (including those not shared with the public). In the 4/21/2025 and 4/28/2025 C&R meetings, the committee discussed their observations and collectively drafted the following conclusions and referrals.

C&R Committee conclusions based on forum discussions, survey feedback, and other input / feedback

For now, no general, campus-wide AI policy. At SJSU, there is clearly a wide variety of opinions on the value and utility of AI, and a multiplicity of ways in which AI is already being employed on the campus. Given that, and given the large numbers of voices in the “for,” “against,” and “somewhere in between” camps and time constraints, the committee cannot draft a single campus-wide AI policy that governs its use at this time. For one, the term “AI” itself is amorphous. Many different forms of AI exist, and they are based on very different processes. The AI that makes robots walk uses very different algorithms and calculations than ChatGPT or Gemini. Predictive AI is not the same as generative AI. Some AI models can remember past actions and input, while others focus merely on the present and future, depending on their purpose. This variety of AI uses, along with the divergent opinions of their efficacies, makes an all-encompassing policy very difficult to attain.

Also, AI is a rapidly evolving field, and any new policy that delineates its use would likely be redundant in months or a few years (and policy is usually meant for the long term). For example, “prompt engineering” is currently considered an important skill for novices of generative AI to learn and master, but already, AI models are quickly becoming proficient at guessing what a user wants based on a general description of a problem. Similarly, the environmental impact of AI, currently significant, may (or may not) subside; or there may be a general societal backlash against AI. The impermanence of a field that has only become part of universal consciousness in the past few years renders the creation of a general policy particularly challenging.

C&R proposes three referrals in the next section of this document. C&R also proposes that the following general considerations that emerged from the forums in Spring 2025 serve as a starting point. These considerations pertain to the use of AI generally on the campus, but may be

especially relevant to generative AI. They are also non-exhaustive and should be considered malleable over time, especially given the rapid advancements in AI.

- When AI is employed, it should be with prudence, deliberation, and care. As with any emerging technology, AI has many documented flaws, including a tendency to confabulate. And as with any classroom resource or assignment (e.g., readings, software, technology, in-class and out-of-class activities), careful consideration should be given prior to its deployment. Teachers and students should acquire the habit of proactively asking themselves, “Why do I need this technology, right now, for this particular task? What alternatives exist? What are the limitations of this technology?”
- Any AI use in the classroom should enhance the learning experience and prepare students to use technology tools appropriately and ethically now in the classroom and in the future as part of the workforce. Any AI classroom use, whether required or encouraged by an instructor, should be related to course content, and come with reasonable advance warning (like on syllabi).
- AI is an evolving field. Any AI training materials should be updated frequently to reflect the current needs. Responsible use, bias identification, critical thinking, AI-assisted learning, and confidence training are all important themes.
- AI users should consider the costs of AI. Careful consideration that steers technology decision-making should involve ethical and academic integrity concerns. AI use also has environmental and technological implications to be considered. For any given use, an AI user might decide that the costs of AI employment outweigh its benefits for that particular task.
- Students, faculty, staff, and administrators should be transparent when they utilize AI for any task that helps result in an assignment submission, publication, or publicizing of a process or product, etc. Students should list or cite any AI used for any work or assignment submitted for evaluation.
- Faculty should retain the right to decide how much, and how, to incorporate AI in their classes. AI is a resource that can be used, but does not *have* to be, similar to other classroom technology (calculators, laptop computers, cell phones, tablets). Even the choice of books and other readings is left up to faculty; when departments require certain texts in multi-section classes, that decision is a faculty-led one. Different faculty already use (or do not use) AI in their classes in widely divergent ways with very different approaches, and they should continue to have those options. Faculty should continue to have the choice of using AI or *not* allowing its use in any of their classes.
- Whenever possible and needed, faculty should be supported and advised on class AI policy creation and validation, and provided with AI learning and training resources to redesign courses and learning outcomes.
- Students should retain rights to reasonable communications from individual faculty and / or via department-determined rules regarding the extent to which, and how, AI is

allowable in classes. As part of this assurance, parameters of AI use should be made clear on syllabi. Also, students should have the rights for appeal and redress if falsely accused of not abiding by a course policy around AI, just as they do for other disciplinary matters. (One of the referrals below pertains to this general point.)

- Personal information and other identifying data should be reasonably protected from input into AI applications. For example, student writing should not be uploaded unless the students themselves do so (or request it to be done) voluntarily. As another example, job applicants' CVs or cover letters should not be submitted to AI engines for processing when they include identifying information. Or, when students are asked to wear AR or VR glasses or headsets, they should be informed ahead of time about personal data issues. When possible, campus contracts with AI providers should ensure that identifying information is enclosed within their systems and is not used to help train their models.
- When possible and available, AI utilized should consist of the version provided by the CSU System and housed behind an SJSU firewall.

Referrals to Senate Committees

C&R proposes three policy referrals to Senate committees based on this semester's discussions.

- To Instruction & Student Affairs: AI can be misused or abused to create entire products (e.g. in writing, coding, art, engineering models, business models, music) with minimal or no effort or input by humans. In classes, academic integrity can therefore be threatened, i.e., students can misuse / abuse AI either unintentionally or not. I&SA could consider broadly the academic integrity implications of AI and decide whether to make refinements to SJSU's academic integrity policy, and if so, what those should be.
- To Professional Standards: discuss the concerns of AI usage that could impact/influence RTP evaluations and implications on collective bargaining. For example, in C&R, concerns were raised about the potential imbalance of peer-reviewed publications, books, and other products created by individuals using AI to enhance their RSCA productivity. It is likely that AI products, wholly or partially supported, could greatly influence (e.g., expedite, inflate) RSCA output compared to those not using AI in this manner.
- To Curriculum and Research: discuss the necessity and possibility of developing a GE course related to the use of AI, or including AI as a topic/GELO in the Information Literacy/Critical Thinking GE areas. Themes including responsible use, bias identification, critical thinking, AI-assisted learning, and confidence training should be considered. If any AI topics is to be included in GE, academic colleges need to be consulted to ensure a synergy between college AI education and GE AI education.

On April 28, 2025, C&R endorsed this document by a vote of 9–0–0.