UC Berkeley

Academic Senate, Berkeley Division

Dear Faculty Colleagues,

The Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate wishes to provide the following guidance **to all faculty (all titles with a teaching function)**. Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) technologies present significant new challenges and opportunities for how we teach, learn, and conduct research. To address teaching and learning, the Academic Senate GenAI Working Group was convened to address the role of GenAI in education. The working group included Senate and non-Senate faculty, and was charged with assessing opportunities and challenges of GenAI in the classroom and developing guidance for faculty. The working group met during the Spring 2025 semester. Discussions were informed by feedback provided during a special session of the fall meeting of the Academic Senate, results from the Student Pulse Survey regarding GenAI, feedback from faculty in various departments, and Divisional Council discussions related to the rollout of GenAI offerings to the broader campus.

On June 10th, UC Berkeley provided campus-wide access to Google Gemini — which includes data protections through UC Berkeley agreements with Google — to address privacy and security concerns related to the use of GenAI tools on campus. There is a wide range of critical questions surrounding how, or whether, we should incorporate this technology into our educational mission and the broader consequences of adopting this technology. Our goal is to help support the academic community as they explore whether or not to use these technologies in their courses. **We wish to remind faculty of their authority over courses and curriculum, and to make clear that academic expectations should be established in the course syllabus**. With GenAI creating new confusion about what might constitute legitimate methods for completing student work, it

is important to ensure that students understand that GenAI hasn't changed the baseline expectations of work in our academic disciplines.

Recognizing that there is a range in the pedagogical utility of GenAI tools, **we recommend that all faculty include a clear statement on their syllabus about course expectations regarding the use of Google Gemini or any other GenAI tool for course-related work. In the absence of such a statement, students may be more likely to use these technologies inappropriately or fail to utilize them effectively as a learning tool.** The working group focused on developing a set of sample syllabus statements (see below and included in the Center for Teaching and Learning's guidance on communicating course expectations with students here) to convey faculty expectations regarding the use (or not) of GenAI in their courses. This process was guided by existing policy templates collected at UC Berkeley and other institutions. As technology and best practices continue to evolve, we anticipate that this document will evolve. Additionally, the systemwide Academic Senate AI Workgroup is finalizing a set of recommendations, including recommendations for instruction, that will be disseminated to all campuses with the expectation that Divisional Senates will determine what recommendations to adopt in the area of instruction and will work with the administration on their implementation.

The Berkeley Academic Senate AI Working Group provides the appended guidance to support faculty. These are not meant to be exhaustive, but rather to provide a starting point for faculty to build and implement the policies that work best in their classrooms. The guidance is organized into three sections. The first section – Arguments for either the Adoption or the Prohibition of Generative AI Tools – addresses arguments that faculty should consider when deciding which policy might be best for their course. The second section – Sample Syllabus Statements – contains three basic policy statement examples. The final section – Implementation Details – addresses some of the mechanisms faculty could adopt to support the basic policies.

We hope this guidance is useful and look forward to working with you on additional guidance in the coming academic year. Additionally, Research, Teaching, & Learning has a set of GenAI resources with an updated teaching guide that faculty wishing to further explore the use of GenAI in their teaching may find helpful. For faculty interested in having a confidential, non-evaluative, and personalized one-on-one conversation about addressing GenAI usage in their Fall courses, consider scheduling a consultation with an educational developer in the Center for Teaching and Learning.

I. Arguments for either the Adoption or the Prohibition of Generative

AI Tools

Instructors should carefully evaluate the arguments for and against the use of GenAI before choosing a policy for their course. We provide a non-exhaustive list of arguments below:

Arguments for prohibiting GenAI use:

- Use of GenAI on assignments **short-circuits the learning process**. If students rely on such tools to analyze, explain, research, synthesize, or create, then they may not develop their own abilities.
- Without learning to accomplish tasks manually, **students may not be able to learn to judge the quality** of a GenAI's output.
- Using GenAI tools that were trained on unlicensed human work is **ethically questionable**.
- GenAI tools sometimes **fabricate information, delivering false statements** even when they appear to be citing published work.
- GenAI tools produce **products that can be biased** based on their training data and the organizations that oversee the training.
- Some GenAI tools require substantial amounts of energy to run and are sustained by extensive physical infrastructure, **resulting in adverse environmental impacts** in terms of emissions and disruptions to natural habitats.

Arguments for allowing GenAI use:

- **The use of GenAI tools is already ubiquitous,** and students likely use these tools in other contexts.
- Students **may benefit from using GenAI tools for research** to guide the process of information-gathering and contextualization.
- GenAI tools **may help students learn to write more effectively** by correcting grammatical errors and providing real-time critical feedback.
- GenAI tools can **accelerate data processing and programming tasks** so students can focus on other relevant tasks or concepts.
- GenAI tools **may help non-native speakers communicate more effectively** by aiding in translation and providing guidance on potential points of confusion.
- **Encouraging students to use campus-approved GenAI tools** ensures that students take advantage of the enhanced data protection in these tools and potentially lowers the climate impact.

Arguments for encouraging or requiring GenAI use:

- GenAI tools are pervasive in the workforce. **Students need to learn how to effectively utilize GenAI tools** to prepare for their future careers.
- GenAI tools may lead to **innovative teaching methods**, such as interaction with virtual teaching aids or debating alternative perspectives.
- Provides **hands-on experience so students understand the deficiencies and limitations of GenAI tools**.
- Supports students in learning how to **critically evaluate GenAI output**, teaching students the appropriate use of prompting and co-learning with GenAI.
- Enables **equitable access** to GenAI through a clear pedagogical structure.

II. Sample Syllabus Statements

We provide three sample statements. Instructors should modify them to fit their course requirements. The three statements include the two extremes, with the most and least GenAI use. We also include a third option that is approximately in the middle between the two; it is offered as a sample since it is likely that instructors will choose a different combination of GenAI allowances and prohibitions.

Full AI

This is a GenAI-required course. Students will be required to use GenAI tools provided by the instructor to complete assignments. Students may also use other GenAI tools unless specifically prohibited. There may be assignments in this class (e.g., exams) where the use of GenAI is not permitted, and these will be clearly identified, where appropriate, in the syllabus.

Some AI

This course enables limited uses of GenAI tools but also prohibits broad use of them in cases that would be considered plagiaristic if the tool's output had been composed by a human author. If unauthorized GenAI use on a particular assessment is suspected, the instructors may require you to complete a short, in-person examination orally or on paper, related to the content and skills tested in the original assessment.

Permitted use cases (examples):

- *It may be used to perform research in ways similar to search engines such as Google, and for other functions attendant to completing an assignment.*
- *It may be used as a writing assistant in its capacity as a word processor, such as Word or Pages, i.e., for correcting grammar and spelling, and other functions like synonym suggestion.*

- *It may be used as translation software for consultation purposes; you should never present the GenAI translation as your own text. Remember to cite the translation software.*
- *Copying any text directly from a homework or lab problem into a GenAI tool is considered cheating. Students, however, are permitted to break problems into steps and paraphrase those steps in their own words.*
- *When assignments in the course permit or incorporate the use of GenAI tools, the assignment will ask you to include an acknowledgement of your use of any type of GenAI in your submitted work and share the prompts and outputs utilized at the time of submission. The suggested format is as follows:*

    I acknowledge the use of [insert AI system(s) and link] to [specific use of GenAI]. The prompts used include [list of prompts]. The output from these prompts was used to [explain the use].
- *GenAI tools may be used for [assignment types A, B, and C] with appropriate citation, but not for [assignment types D, E, and F].*

Unpermitted use cases (examples):

- *GenAI tools may not be used for any purpose in the following situations: [provide complete list].*
- *The use of GenAI tools such as ChatGPT or equivalent should not be used to summarize, generate, or interpret any thoughts present in any of your work. The software may not be used to compose any part of the submitted assignment.*
- *GenAI should never be employed for a use that would constitute plagiarism if the GenAI source were a human or organizational author.*
- *Having another person/entity do the writing of any substantive portion of an assignment for you is against academic integrity policies, and can include hiring a person or a company to write essays and drafts and/or other assignments, research-based or otherwise, and using GenAI tools.*

No AI

In this course, we prioritize active engagement, students' knowledge acquisition, and the development of critical thinking skills. To achieve these objectives, we have chosen to prohibit the use of any GenAI tools or automated services during class sessions and when completing assignments or exams. GenAI use is not permitted in any aspect of completing work that is part of an assignment, including brainstorming, drafting, analysis, editing, or generation of figures or images. If unauthorized AI use on a particular assessment is suspected, the instructor may require you to complete a short, in-person examination orally or on paper, related to the content and skills tested in the original assessment.

III. Implementation Details

Discussion of Risks and Limitations

Faculty should actively engage students in discussions about topics relevant to the use of GenAI in the specific course. These topics could include:

1. How to properly cite GenAI sources
2. Ethical and legal considerations around the training data and application of GenAI
3. Environmental impact of GenAI
4. Reasons GenAI usage could be detrimental to learning
5. Data protection aspects of using GenAI tools
6. Potential bias produced by GenAI
7. Identifying inconsistencies or errors in GenAI output
8. Enforcement mechanisms of GenAI use prohibitions

Required Access to GenAI Tools

For any assignments where the instructor encourages or requires the use of GenAI tools, instructors should ensure that students have access to the necessary computing resources to run those GenAI tools. If non-campus-sanctioned resources are required, it is the instructor's responsibility to provide access to those resources. The syllabus should clearly outline the acceptable use of non-campus and instructor-provided GenAI tools. For any assignments where the use of GenAI tools is permitted but not required, the instructor should make a reasonable effort to ensure that access to external tools does not provide an unfair advantage.

Citation Guidance

In-text Citation:

Include an in-text citation when incorporating content from a GenAI tool into your academic paper. For example:

"Berkeley Haas is a top-tier business school due to its academic excellence, innovative curriculum, strong alumni network, prime location, diverse community, emphasis on leadership and ethics, and abundant experiential learning opportunities (OpenAI, 2024)."

Reference List Entry:

In your reference list, provide the full details of the source. Since ChatGPT is an online tool, provide the publication date (if available), title, model, and URL:

Source: OpenAI. (2024). *ChatGPT* (May 2 version) [Large language model]. https://chat.openai.com/chat

Note: Please be aware that the exact format may vary depending on the specific guidelines of your institution or the publication to which you are submitting your work. Always follow the guidelines provided by your professor or the publication's style guide for precise formatting.

Related Resources:

APA Style: How to cite ChatGPT (2024)

Policy Enforcement Mechanisms

GenAI detection tools are increasingly less accurate; there are no validated GenAI detection tools. Therefore, assignments or learning activities where GenAI is not permitted should consider adopting one or more of the following solutions:

- Written Statement of Academic Integrity: As a member of the UC Berkeley community, I act with honesty, integrity, and respect for others.
- In-person proctored exams/activities
- An additional interview component (or oral exam) to an assignment where students are graded on an explanation of their work. A randomized approach could be considered.

Instructors are encouraged to directly state the consequences of cheating and their reporting process as part of the AI Policy. For example, *a student who is suspected of violating the GenAI policy will be reported to the Center for Student Conduct and will be required to redo the assignment in person.*

Excerpt from the Code of Student Conduct

Appendix II: Academic Misconduct (Revised July 2023) This appendix provides students with a further explanation of different forms of academic misconduct. This list is not exhaustive. Individual departments at the University of California, Berkeley may have differing expectations for students, and therefore students are responsible for clarifying the standards and expectations of their individual departments.

A. Cheating
Cheating includes fraud, deceit, or dishonesty in an academic assignment, or using or attempting to use materials, or assisting others in using materials that are prohibited or

inappropriate in the context of the academic assignment in question.

B. Plagiarism
Plagiarism includes use of intellectual material produced by another person without acknowledging its source. Plagiarism also includes self-plagiarism.

C. False Information and Representation and Fabrication or Alteration of Information
Furnishing false information, failing to identify oneself honestly, fabricating or altering information and presenting it as legitimate, or providing false or misleading information to an instructor or any other University official in an academic context.

D. Theft or Damage of Intellectual Property
Sabotaging or stealing another person's work, improper access to or electronically interfering with the property of another person or the University, or obtaining or distributing a copy of an exam or assignment without the permission of the instructor.

E. Alteration of University Documents
Forgery of an instructor's signature, submitting an altered transcript of grades to or from another institution or employer, putting one's name on another individual's work, or falsely altering a previously graded exam or assignment.