

CEDC Teaching and Learning AI Use Guidance and Expectations

Governing AI use in CEDC courses and coursework. A companion policy addressing AI in research and scholarship is under separate development.

(Date: 08/14/2026)

As artificial intelligence (AI) tools and systems, especially those based on generative large language models, code assistants, design assistants, and autonomous agents, are evolving rapidly and becoming ubiquitous, teaching and learning should be regarded as dynamic endeavors requiring flexibility. In general, teaching, assessment methods as well as the expectations will differ depending on the course, faculty, assignment, and any class activity. A recent survey conducted by the CEDC's AI Task Force (AITF) at the end of Spring 2026 found that over half of the CEDC courses did not have any explicit policy on the AI use mentioned in the syllabi.

As such, providing AI-use policy statements and guidelines for individual courses that clearly specify the expectations in the syllabus and are continually reinforced for specific assignments would enable students to focus on achieving the learning objectives set by the faculty. It is recognized that some uses of AI may support student learning while other uses may interfere with the important learning processes and may infringe existing academic integrity policies. However, without an explicit AI-use policy in place for courses and specific assignments, students are often unsure when or if they can use AI tools or what are the consequences of their inappropriate use.

This policy focuses on the use of AI tools and systems in teaching and learning in the CEDC courses. It is organized as follows. Section I presents the guiding principles for the faculty, followed by a list of questions to be considered while framing AI-use policy statements for their courses. The different categories of policy statements on AI use that the faculty can adopt and articulate their stance in their courses are provided in Section II. Subsequently, Section III summarizes the role of faculty and responsibilities of the students as they relate to AI use in coursework. Finally, additional resources on AI-use policy are provided in Section IV.

Scope: This document is CEDC's Teaching and Learning AI Use Guidance and Expectations. It governs AI use in coursework, assignments, and classroom instruction only. We request and strongly encourage faculty to have their rules spelled out in their syllabi and course assignments and activities. AI use in research, scholarship, grant preparation, and sponsored projects raises distinct questions—disclosure in publications, funder rules, authorship—and is addressed in a separate CEDC Research AI Policy currently under development. Faculty and students with research-related AI questions

should consult that forthcoming policy and their funding agency's current guidance in the interim.

I. Guiding Principles in Framing AI-Use Policy Statement for Courses

Due to the varied nature of teaching and learning activities and outcomes across courses, there is no generic AI-use boilerplate policy statement that is applicable for all courses. Therefore, a tiered policy framework is proposed for the faculty and all the instructional staff (such as TA and graders) to declare their AI use policies in their courses according to their course objectives. The proposed framework is described in Section II; while preparing the AI-use policy statement for their courses according to this framework, the faculty should adhere to the following guiding principles:

- Align AI use with the learning objectives that encourage intentional pedagogy.
- Reduce ambiguity for students on AI use.
- Support ethical uses of AI when appropriate with disclosures on how they are used for transparency.
- Prepare students for professional settings/industry where AI-assisted workflows are becoming commonplace.
- Align AI-use policy statements for courses with the [CU Denver's Academic Integrity Policy & Honor Code](#), [CU Denver's AI Policy Recommendations](#), [CU Denver's Guidance on AI Tools Use](#), and [CU's AI Guiding Principles](#).
- Ensure data privacy and compliance with institutional, local, state, national, and international data privacy regulations (e.g., FERPA, HIPAA) that explicitly prohibit uploading protected, proprietary, or Personally Identifiable Information (PII) to cloud-based AI tools.
- Revisit and review periodically the existing AI-use policy statements due to the rapidly evolving technology landscape and the capabilities of Generative AI tools; this policy will be formally reviewed and updated at least annually, each spring, by the AITF in coordination with the Dean's Office, ahead of the following academic year.
- Set a clear default for silence: absent an explicit AI-use statement for a course or a specific assignment, students should assume AI use is prohibited (the *Closed* option below) until the faculty states otherwise.
- Restrict tool use corresponding to sensitivity of the data involved. CU's institutionally licensed ChatGPT EDU (available to CEDC students beginning August 14, 2026) and other CU-approved tools may be used with certain university data, but general-purpose tools such as Claude and Gemini remain unauthorized for CU work. No CU data, student records, or unpublished work should be entered into any

AI tool without first confirming its approval status — see Section IV for current guidance.

- Make students aware (e.g., in a strong syllabus statement) that AI use expectations are done at a course level, AND students may find other expectations/policies for use in courses outside CEDC and they are obligated to follow those.
- Inform students that uploading course materials to unauthorized AI agents infringes on intellectual property rules of the university and is strictly prohibited without permission from the faculty.

The following set of specific questions should also be considered by the faculty while framing an AI use policy statement for a course:

1. What are the learning objectives of students for a course?
2. How might the use of AI help students learn? In what ways might AI use by students be inappropriate and hinder their learning?
3. How might the policy for AI use differ between assignments for a course? How will they be rationalized and communicated with the students?
4. What are the academic and other potential consequences of inappropriate use of AI and how any resulting punitive measures are enforced?

II. Tiered Framework for AI Use Policy Statement

Faculty are the subject experts responsible for what is taught, approaches used for teaching, and the methodologies used for the assessment of student learning. The AI tools may influence all three, and the faculty have flexibility in how they can be used for each of these endeavors that are consistent with the principles outlined in Section I. In this section, we present a tiered framework to be used by the faculty to articulate AI use policies in their course materials according to their course requirements. In particular, this framework recognizes three options for AI use, namely, *Closed*, *Constrained*, and *Open*, which can be further characterized and required by the faculty for each of their course deliverables according to the corresponding expected outcomes of the course deliverables. This tiered framework is meant to consolidate the AI use expectations unambiguously and coherently for students, while maintaining the teaching and learning standards in a dynamically changing environment¹. Below we further elaborate on these AI use options.

¹ We note here that a university-level AI committee is currently developing a web-based tool as a wizard to help faculty generate customized policy statements relevant for their course outcomes to be included in their course materials. This tool, which is developed based on a similar tiered framework can facilitate developing of custom course policies for AI-use in courses.

*Default: If a course or assignment has no stated AI-use policy, **Closed** applies until the faculty states otherwise.*

Option 1: Closed (Total Prohibition of AI Use)

Policy Statement: When the faculty prohibits use of specific AI tools by choosing the *Closed* option for a particular course deliverable, AI use is unauthorized and students should present their work without the use of AI. This option prohibits any use of AI with a course deliverable, including but not limited to chatting, searching, outlining, generating content (text, code, images, etc.), and brainstorming ideas with AI. Given that AI surveillance and plagiarism detection tools (such as GPTZero, Grammarly, and Copyleaks) are shown to be ineffective and at times problematic as the main tool for enforcing the *Closed* option, the faculty can consider complementary pedagogical solutions (e.g., closed-book paper-based written deliverables, in-class demonstrations, oral verification of submissions, incentivizing disclosures in grading) to help with enforcing this option.

Here is a sample *Closed* policy statement: “*Generative AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Copilot) may not be used in any form to prepare this course deliverable. Using AI in any form is considered unauthorized assistance in violation of the university’s Academic Integrity Policy. Ask if you are unsure – clarity is part of learning*”.

Option 2: Constrained (Limited AI Use)

Policy Statement: When the use of AI tools in a course deliverable is allowed for certain use-cases but not all (e.g., text polishing is ok but not text generation), the faculty should clearly differentiate and specify in their course AI-use policy statement the engagement levels of students by deeming acceptable or unacceptable AI use for each course deliverable/coursework. Some use-cases of AI are listed below but this list is certainly neither exhaustive nor static:

- Chatting
- Searching
- Polishing text
- Outlining
- Generating content (text, code, images, etc.)
- Researching
- Brainstorming ideas
- Project management support
- Performing calculations or doing modeling in engineering analysis problems
- Etc.

In addition, to ensure responsible use of AI by students in their coursework, when appropriate (e.g., in exams) the faculty can subject the students to the *Human-in-the-Loop (HITL)* requirements, e.g., ask the students to explain their submission generated with AI assistance.

Here is a sample *Constrained* policy statement: “You may use Gen AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Copilot) for brainstorming and outlining only. Any text included in your submission must be your original writing. If you consult AI, include a short “AI use” note at the end: list the tool, date, prompt(s), and how you used the output. Directly pasted AI text is not permitted”.

Prohibitions: While in general any AI use-case could be allowed or disallowed based on faculty insight as well as relevance to the course outcome, the following activities should generally be considered as not acceptable for AI use, and statements to explicitly prohibit the activities should be included in the course materials (e.g., course syllabi) as appropriate:

- **Plagiarism via AI:** Submitting AI-generated content (text, code, images, etc.) as original work without disclosure.
- **Assessment Evasion:** Using AI to complete assessments such as quizzes, exams, individual reflections, or comprehension checks.
- **Opaque Content Insertion:** Incorporating generated content in deliverables when the student cannot explain, debug, or justify.
- **Automated Decision Outsourcing:** Allowing AI to make architectural, ethical, or safety critical decisions.
- **Data or Privacy Violations:** Uploading proprietary or personal data into online AI systems without authorization.

Foundational Principles of AI use: The faculty should provide written guidelines to students based on the following core principles on AI usage.

- **Transparency** — Students must clearly disclose when, how, and why AI tools were used.
- **Human Accountability** — Students retain full responsibility for correctness, safety, ethics, design quality, and originality of submitted work as appropriate.
- **Verifiability** — All student submissions must be explainable without relying on the AI system.
- **Intellectual Honesty** — AI cannot be used to hide lack of understanding or misrepresent authorship.
- **Professional Ethics** — Use must align with the ASCE Code of Ethics, ACM Code of Ethics, ASME Code of Ethics, BMES Code of Ethics, and the IEEE Code of Ethics, as applicable.

Disclosure Requirements: To maintain transparency and academic integrity, when *Constrained* use of AI is allowed, the faculty should also include a disclosure requirement in their syllabi asking the students to disclose the specific AI uses in their coursework. The students must document and attribute the AI use as appropriate using academic referencing styles (APA, IEEE, MLA, Chicago, etc.). The items to be disclosed include (but are not limited to):

- Used AI tool(s)
- Purpose of use
- Extent of use
- Whether Human verification is performed

The disclosure requirement applies to all relevant types of deliverables across various types of CEDC courses (including lecture, design, laboratory, studio, etc.). Faculty are encouraged to design and provide disclosure statement samples corresponding to the specific types of their course deliverables. Here are some sample disclosure statements for different deliverables:

“GitHub Copilot was used to suggest boilerplate React components for Login and Dashboard (approx. 15% of code). All logic, state management, and security decisions were human-authored and reviewed by the team.”

“An AI design assistant was used to generate three alternative truss configurations for comparison; the configuration submitted was selected and independently verified by hand calculation against load requirements.”

“ChatGPT was used to draft an initial outline of the literature review section; all summarized sources were independently retrieved and verified by the author.”

Option 3: Open (Free AI Use)

Policy Statement: When the faculty permit the use of AI tools freely, students are expected to use them ethically and responsibly. As in Option 2, the students should be required to document and attribute the use of AI tools as appropriate to the academic style (APA, IEEE, MLA, Chicago, etc.) or a professional style specified by the faculty. Moreover, they should be subject to the human-in-the-loop requirements by ensuring that they validate or verify and explain the output from the AI tools. Also, in framing the AI-use policy statement, it is important to point to students that while AI-generated content may appear reliable and factual, that is not always the case, and that errors and false citations may be overlooked if they are overly reliant on them.

Here is a sample *Open* policy statement: “Students are encouraged to use generative AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Copilot) as a collaborator for idea generation, drafting, and revision. You remain responsible for accuracy, originality, and citation. Include an “AI use” note (tool, date, prompt(s), and contribution). When quoting or closely paraphrasing AI output, mark it as such and provide attribution”.

III. Role of Faculty and Responsibilities of Students

The faculty have the flexibility and discretion to fully allow, prohibit or strategically permit a partial use of AI in their courses and course deliverables. However, they must communicate and articulate their stance on the appropriate AI use for their course deliverables to the students via explicit policy statements in their course materials (including course syllabi). If the faculty decide to fully permit or partially allow AI use in their courses, they should elaborate and explain the specifics of the AI usage, including giving details on how the students should provide disclosures and attributions (as discussed in Section II of this document). They should also declare any punitive measures adopted for inappropriate use of such AI tools, albeit consistent with the CU Denver’s Academic Integrity Policy. Suspected AI-related academic integrity violations follow CEDC’s existing grievance process: cases are handled first at the department level and, where a formal grievance is raised, by the CEDC Academic Integrity Faculty Standing Committee under the Faculty Fellow for Academic Integrity, consistent with the Student Honor Code. Such practices should not only be applied to framing the course policy, but also when preparing individual class assignments as appropriate. Faculty who wish to experiment with AI tools that haven’t yet been officially approved may do so only after receiving approval from the University office of Ethics, Risk and Compliance. Compliance will often require limiting use to non-sensitive data, conducting risk assessment, documenting how the tool is used, and informing students that the tool is experimental, among others. Providing such clear guidelines for the students would promote a culture of academic integrity and excellence.

On the other hand, students have the responsibility to obtain and follow guidance from the faculty on appropriate use of AI tools. If the students are unsure about AI use policy on their courses, they should seek clarification from the faculty and should not make assumptions about what is allowed and not allowed, particularly when a partial/restrictive use of AI tools is permitted. Students should understand that the output generated by the AI tools does not necessarily replace the student’s understanding and interpretation of the subject material. The students should also understand that inappropriate AI uses against the course policy can carry potential consequences. Moreover, students must understand that engineering judgement cannot be delegated to AI and recommendations from AI tools

require verification; in particular, the students remain responsible for calculations, designs, simulations, safety decisions, code correctness, standards compliance, and ethical implications, among others. Workforce-ready students may need to develop generative AI skillsets; they should learn appropriate professional and academic uses of AI tools in a responsible and ethical manner while ensuring data privacy and security according to their AI use course policies.

IV. Additional Resources on AI-Use Policy

The following links provide some additional internal and external resources on AI-use policy in courses.

Because tool approvals and data-classification tiers change frequently — including the phased rollout of CU's institutional ChatGPT Edu instance to students beginning August 14, 2026 — faculty and students should treat CU Denver's Guidance for AI Tools Use (linked below) as the current source of truth on which tools are approved for which data types, rather than relying on this policy for that detail.

- Internal resources
 - CU Denver's AI Policy Recommendations:
https://www.ucdenver.edu/docs/aiatcudenverlibraries/default-document-library/ai-strategy-policy-recommendations.pdf?sfvrsn=637dcfb4_1
 - CU Denver CEDC Honor Code:
https://engineering.ucdenver.edu/docs/librariesprovider29/default-document-library/student-honor-code-revised12_2022.pdf?sfvrsn=8624fbb_0
 - CU Denver's Guidance for AI Tools Use:
<https://www.cu.edu/service-desk/how-guides/guidance-artificial-intelligence-tools-use>
 - CU's AI Guiding Principles:
<https://www.cu.edu/gen-ai>
 - Academic Integrity Policy at CU Denver:
https://www.ucdenver.edu/docs/librariesprovider284/default-document-library/7000-student-affairs/7050---academic-integrity.pdf?sfvrsn=a7a2fdb_2
- External Resources (Sample Syllabi with AI Use Policy Statements)
 - <https://genai.umich.edu/resources/faculty/course-policies>
 - <https://cetli.upenn.edu/resources/syllabus/generative-ai-policies/>
 - <https://fisd.utexas.edu/chatgpt-and-generative-ai-tools-sample-syllabus-policy-statements>
 - <https://policy.utdallas.edu/utdsp5017>

- <https://utsa.screenstepslive.com/a/1904327-sample-syllabus-statements-for-student-use-of-generative-ai-in-coursework>
- <https://learning.nd.edu/resource-library/writing-ai-syllabus-policies-a-practical-guide-for-notre-dame-faculty/>
- List of several dozens of crowdsourced syllabi statements on generative AI tools use policy:
<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1lM6g4yveQMyWeUbEwBM6FZVxEWCLfvWDh1aWUErWWbQ/edit?pli=1&gid=0#gid=0>