Summary of FAIR Faculty Survey on AI Use in Classroom Instruction
Written and submitted by Hugh Sheehy

On the question of needing guidelines, faculty generally fall into two groups, those who want clear Academic Integrity Policy at the College or convening group level and those who don't feel they need any guidance. A small minority (7/64) of respondents indicate a desire for help with course development. The vast majority (51/64) of faculty indicate using a policy of strict prohibition on or transparent and guided use of AI tools in their courses. (It should be noted that not all responding faculty teach regular courses.) Most of those who indicate the latter (using the "transparent and guided option" or by describing alternative policies that might be characterized as "transparent and guided") qualify or explain their selection in followup comments that reveal efforts to discourage students from using LLMs in major assignments or projects. The predominant themes in those comments are varying levels of comfort with students using LLMs as a supplement, usually as a research or brainstorming tool; a smaller number express tolerance for LLM use in homework assignments or for editing original writing. A few faculty report having students use LLMs to illustrate their limits in relation to course assignments. More than half of the faculty who selected "guided and transparent" to describe their AI policies report emphasizing that students must do their own writing or prove their ability to arrive at a correct answer by showing their work.

Takeaways

1. Faculty views on the place of AI tools in the classroom and in student work vary.
2. Faculty who allow or encourage AI tools in the classroom see them as supplements, not replacements, for thinking, knowing, or exercising creative or critical faculties.
3. Faculty continue to consider originality and academic integrity fundamental to student work.

In response to the question "What are your main concerns or challenges regarding AI-Tools use in coursework?" all but a few respondents express concerns with student skill loss and academic dishonesty. Another commonly stated concern is the difficulty of developing AI-resistant assignments, efficiently identifying plagiarized LLM-generated work, and uncertainty about institutional support.

Takeaways

1. Faculty are concerned about student skill loss in reading, writing, programming and software design, and critical thinking.
2. Faculty are witnessing an unprecedented level of academic integrity violations in student work.
3. Faculty feel they could use more institutional support at various levels, from assignment design to college-wide policy.

In response to the question "In your view, what are the potential benefits of using AI-Tools in your courses?" about one third of respondents state there is none or leave the space blank. The most commonly cited potential benefits are research, prewriting, and editing activities (brainstorming, outlining, proofreading and editing); preparing students for the workplace; producing simplified overviews of difficult material or lessons; providing feedback on different kinds of work; and supplemental tutelage.

Takeaways

1. A significant minority of respondents see no use for AI tools in the college classroom.
2. Many faculty see promise in teaching students to use AI tools as supplements for academic work.
3. Many faculty feel obligated to prepare students to use AI tools in the workplace.
4. Many faculty feel AI tools can support student learning by providing feedback and simple digests.

Faculty comments and suggestions in the final part of the survey range widely. The most common theme is the thought that the college might support faculty in this area in a variety of ways. One of those is to develop syllabus templates, policy, and guidelines like those we've crafted in our working document. Another common refrain is that the college might invest in technologies that support enforcing course-level AI policies (eg lockdown browsers, internet-free classrooms). Finally, some faculty suggest revising WI guidelines and developing courses aimed at helping students understand what AI tools are and when it is appropriate to use them.

Takeaways

1. Craft optional institutional guidelines to help faculty solve AI-related problems specific to their courses.
2. The college should supply technological resources to help decrease AI-based cheating.
3. The college should revise its WI policies and develop courses in AI literacy, ethics, and use.