

CFD–TLTC AI Survey Summary – Fall 2025

Based on 58 faculty responses

1. Classroom Practices and AI Policies

- Many instructors are creating AI-resistant assignments such as handwritten essays, in-class writing, oral exams, and personal reflection tasks.
- Some allow limited AI use—like comparing ChatGPT to Excel/Python outputs, or permitting grammar tools but not content generation.
- Others use AI for case studies, critique exercises, or setting AI-use limits (e.g., 25% of writing assignments).

2. Faculty Learning Interests

- Detection of AI use, improving 'AI-proof' assignments, and prompt engineering.
- Interest in ethical, societal, and environmental implications.
- Requests for university-wide training and clearer institutional policy.

3. Topics for Discussion at SHU

- Desire for a clear, university-wide AI policy ensuring fairness and consistency.
- Balancing ethical use and disciplinary differences.
- Exploring AI's broader effects on cognition, motivation, and liberal arts education.

4. Faculty Concerns

- Erosion of critical thinking and creativity due to overreliance on AI.
- Academic integrity issues and unreliable AI outputs.
- Equity, bias, and environmental impacts.

5. Excitement and Opportunities

- Selective optimism toward AI's ability to automate routine tasks.
- Interest in personalized learning, tutoring, and creative idea generation.
- Persistent skepticism among humanities and writing instructors.

6. Overall Sentiment

The faculty community remains divided: most are cautious or resistant, emphasizing the protection of critical thinking and academic integrity, while a smaller group explores responsible AI integration. A shared priority is establishing supportive, transparent university-wide policies.