

FAMU Generative AI Coursework Use Policy

Faculty FAQ: Implementing the AI use policy

Q: Do I have to allow AI in my classroom?

A: No. Faculty retain full authority over their courses. You may choose to prohibit AI entirely (Red), allow it for specific assignments/tasks (Yellow), or encourage full integration (Green) based on your specific learning objectives. However, faculty are encouraged to attend University-sponsored workshops designed to train faculty on how to effectively utilize generative AI in their courses.

Q: What is the “Stoplight Model” and how do I use it?

A: It is a standardized way to communicate expectations.

- **Red:** No AI content generation allowed.
- **Yellow:** “Hybrid Use”—you specify exactly which tasks (like data cleaning or outlining) are okay.
- **Green:** Full “Permissive Use”—students are encouraged to use AI throughout the course.

Q: How do I handle a student who used AI without permission?

A: Unauthorized use of AI is considered like any other case of academic dishonesty. You should address these instances as you would any other case of academic misconduct, via instructor-led resolution or following the procedures in the Student Code of Conduct.

Q: How can I ensure transparency when I do allow AI use?

A: You are encouraged to use the **AI Usage Attestation**. This asks students to identify the tools they used and describe their process. This creates a paper trail and reinforces the student’s responsibility for the accuracy of their final submission.

Q: What if I want to change my AI policy for a specific upcoming project?

A: You may revise your designation at any time, provided you give students a minimum of **one week’s notice** in writing. This ensures students have enough time to adjust their workflow for the assignment.

Q: Should I use AI detectors, such as the one in TurnItIn, to determine whether students used AI for an assignment?

FAMU Generative AI Coursework Use Policy

A: AI detectors can be a limited reference tool, but they should not be used as definitive proof that a student used AI. Current research shows that these tools are inconsistent, prone to false positives, and especially unreliable when students edit or paraphrase AI-generated text. They may also disproportionately flag polished writing or work by multilingual students. Due to these limitations, AI detector results should never be the sole basis for an academic integrity decision. Best practice is to use detectors, if at all, only as one piece of contextual information, alongside assignment design, student work history, drafts, and direct conversation with the student about their process.