



Academic Senate

UCR Joint Senate-Administrative Council on Artificial Intelligence [AIC]

August 3, 2026

To: Kenneth Barish, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Alejandra Dubcovsky, Chair
AIC

Re: Teaching with AI at UCR

The AI Council submits the following document, Teaching with AI at UCR, developed as part of the Council's charge. It is intended as a foundation resource—guiding principles, suggested practices, and an academic integrity framework—not as policy or mandate. It will appear on the AI HUB website we are developing as part of the committee's charge.

We welcome the Senate's input on the document in full. Two items in particular would benefit from broader conversation and deliberation:

- The guiding principle on ethics (second bullet). The Council was nearly evenly divided on whether and how this principle should be included. As a compromise, we reference the University's ethical commitments without enumerating the specific concerns: environmental impact, intellectual property, privacy, labor, and others. Members disagreed both about whether a teaching resource is the right place to raise these questions and about how far into specifics such a document should go. Senate guidance on this bullet point would be valuable.
- The "closed–conditional–open" framework. This model, developed by the University Writing Program, is drawn from practices in use at many universities and is already being adopted by UCR faculty. The Council offers it as a suggested best practice; consistency across courses and departments benefits students, but the choice remains with the instructor.

The Council views this as a living document that will be revised as practice develops, and we are grateful for the Senate's review.

Teaching with AI at UCR

Generative AI has moved quickly from novelty into professional work and everyday life. It is integrated into our digital workspaces, search engines, and educational technologies. It represents a real change to how writing, problem-solving, research, and creative work is performed. Students who graduate understanding how AI applies to their discipline—including its strengths and limitations — will be better prepared for their professional and personal futures. Recognizing this, UCR is committed to equipping our students and instructors with the knowledge and skills to appropriately and effectively utilize AI. These guiding principles, suggested practices, and academic integrity framework serve as a foundational resource for responsibly integrating these powerful tools into instructional settings at UCR.

Guiding Principles

- **AI has affordances and limitations.** Like all technologies, AI can be used in both helpful and harmful ways. Because it is becoming an important aspect of education and work, our goal is to help instructors and students maximize what it does well and mitigate what it does poorly.
- **Engaging with AI's ethical dimensions is part of using it well.** The [UC Responsible AI Principles](#) commit the University to fairness, transparency, human values, accountability, and to AI that delivers equitable social, economic, and environmental benefits. Meeting those commitments depends on how AI is actually used and understanding the contexts in which these tools are built and deployed.
- **Mission-aligned use.** The use of AI in instructional settings should aim to advance the university's instructional mission, which includes a commitment to equitable access and opportunity, and upward mobility.
- **Information security.** Information uploaded to a publicly available AI tool can be retained by the provider, used to train its models, or otherwise exposed, putting institutional and personally identifiable information at risk. To keep UCR data secure, community members should only use UCR-licensed tools for UCR work and follow the [policies](#) that govern protected information. UCR provides access to vetted, [secure tools](#). Before using any AI tool that ITS has not approved for UCR work, consult with ITS first.
- **Local authority.** AI can be a transformative technology with broad applications across many aspects of our operations and practices, but a one-size-fits-all approach is counterproductive. Standards of use tend to be highly dependent on local circumstances and context, and on the preferences and judgments of those with local authority. In instructional settings, this means the faculty have broad latitude to determine whether and how AI may be used, provided this use is consistent with these guidelines and the applicable policies ([including UC APM-010](#)) and rules governing data security and instruction at UCR.
- **User accountability.** Anyone using AI for any purpose is accountable for the consequences of their use, regardless of the nature of the AI-generated content. This accountability applies to all aspects of teaching and learning and includes

but is not limited to violations of academic integrity policies, other institutional policies and rules, and applicable laws including those related to intellectual property. Users also are responsible for any errors or hallucinations produced by the AI tool, and their downstream effects.

- **Transparency.** AI is a potentially useful and powerful information source and thought partner which can enhance productivity and learning. Anyone who utilizes AI to assist with the creation of intellectual material must conform with prevailing ethical scholarship practices, rules related to plagiarism, and standards for representing intellectual products as one's own work.

Suggested Practices for Instructors

These suggested practices are intended to provide a starting point for instructors, not a complete rulebook. These practices will evolve as AI does.

- **Talk with your students about AI.** Share your own views, including how you use AI (or don't) in your research and teaching, and what evolving standards look like in your discipline. Differentiate between “active AI use” (e.g., prompting Google Gemini) and “passive AI use” (e.g., web searches, spell checking, or other embedded uses). Discuss how strategic AI use can enhance productivity and innovation, while also reminding students that over-reliance on AI can undermine the intellectual growth they came to a university for — and the skills employers and graduate programs will eventually test them on. Listen to student views across the spectrum of AI engagement; whether they are incorporating AI into their work or raising legitimate concerns about environmental impact, labor practices, and intellectual ownership, these diverse perspectives are worth understanding. [Contact the UCR Library](#) to access resources for students on ethical and responsible AI use in their academic, research, and professional work.
- **Be mindful of security and privacy issues.** AI offers benefits but also raises security and [privacy concerns](#). Vulnerabilities can lead to data breaches and [loss of intellectual property](#). Adhering to AI security and privacy practices is vital to protecting UCR's intellectual property and individual user data.
- **Experiment with AI.** Explore the capabilities of AI by logging into your UCR account and experimenting with tools such as Google Gemini. UCR has established contractual agreements with Google for its AI tools, which offer enhanced security and privacy compared to other third-party AI services. For more details, refer to the [ITS knowledge article on this topic](#). Experimentation will help you form a sharper view of what AI can do well and what it cannot, including work that you might assign to your students.
- **Look to your discipline for additional guidance.** Talk with your colleagues about professional practices and consider using available standards in your discipline to guide development of your course standards. Also consider how you can achieve some degree of alignment of your course standards with those of your immediate colleagues, as students stand to benefit from some degree of consistency at the department-level.
- **Revisit your assessment methods.** Sound assessment design is one of the

most constructive responses to AI in coursework. The widespread availability of AI is a reason to reconsider the learning outcomes you want to evaluate and how you evaluate them, not a reason to AI-proof every pre-existing assignment.

[Authentic assessment methods](#) — case studies, oral exams, portfolios, presentations, reflective writing, in-class work — often align better with how knowledge is actually used after graduation, including alongside AI. If you keep more traditional assessments, think carefully about what you are measuring and the conditions under which students complete the work. Avoid creating situations where it is easy for AI to quietly do the work for students.

For training, consultations, and discipline-specific examples, XCITE, the University Writing Program, and the UCR Library offer ongoing workshops and one-on-one support. The AI Council's resource hub collects current campus guidance in one place.

Academic Integrity Framework

- **Unauthorized AI use is already covered by existing policy.** Under UCR's academic integrity standards, unauthorized use of AI in coursework falls within the established definitions of "fabrication" and "unauthorized collaboration" used by Student Conduct and Academic Integrity Programs (SCAIP). Suspected misconduct should be handled through standard campus procedures, which protect both faculty and students by ensuring evidence is reviewed and students have an opportunity to respond. If you suspect academic misconduct, follow the [standard campus procedures](#).
- *Students have a right to explain their work.* If you suspect unauthorized AI use, the first step is a conversation. Students should have a meaningful opportunity to walk through their process, share drafts or notes, and respond to specific concerns before a formal case is opened. This protects students who have been wrongly accused and produces stronger cases with a more efficient conduct process where misconduct genuinely occurred.
- **Set clear expectations.** Students benefit when AI expectations are clear. Address AI explicitly in your syllabus, and again in individual assignment prompts. Students cannot follow a policy they have to infer. The University Writing Program's "closed–conditional–open" framework is a useful structure, endorsed by UCR's AI Council, that can further benefit students as they become familiar with it across courses and departments:
 - *Closed:* AI is not permitted. If you choose this, tell students why — the reasons (ethical concerns, the specific learning goals of the assignment, disciplinary norms) matter as much as the rule.
 - *Conditional:* AI is permitted for some purposes and not others. This is where most courses will land, and it is also where students get into trouble most easily. Specify which tools, for which steps, and how use should be documented. Vagueness here generates misconduct cases that better

- instructions would have prevented.
- *Open*: AI is generally permitted. Even here, ask students to document what they used and how. Be mindful that requiring non-UCR tools raises equity and privacy concerns.
 - **Be skeptical of AI detection tools.** AI detection is a flawed technology. These tools are error-prone; they disproportionately misclassify writing by non-native English speakers, neurodivergent students, and others with learning differences as AI-generated; and they raise privacy and ownership concerns when student work is processed by third-party applications without explicit consent. They typically operate as black boxes, with little transparency about how conclusions are reached. SCAIP does not accept detection tool output as standalone evidence, and instructors should not rely on it as such.

[XCITE](#) and the University Writing Program have suggested syllabus language; instructors are encouraged to adapt rather than adopt verbatim.

This is a learning process for everyone. Beneficial integration of AI into teaching and learning is a long-term project. Faculty will encounter situations that don't fit existing categories. Share what you learn with colleagues, with XCITE, and with the AI Council so that campus guidance can develop with practice.