

*Support Document – Generative AI Crosswalk*  
*Action Item Mapping – ASEC planning document week of February 10–13, 2025*  
*Reviewed / Analyzed by ASEC Members*

*Key/Legend*

*Italicized purple = notes, edits from ASEC*

***Italicized red =Library Suggestion to consider adopting***

***Italicized orange = potential Senate Recos Up/Down Votes***

**Bold Green = Meta-themes as Agendized based on crosswalk analysis**

Resources

- “Academic Integrity” Santa Rosa Junior College – click [here](#) for the link
- ASCCC’s “Academic Integrity Policies in the Age of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Resource Document” - click [here](#)
- ASCCC’s “Academic Integrity Policies in the Age of Artificial Intelligence (AI)” PowerPoint Presentation – click [here](#)
- ASCCC’s “Artificial Intelligence: Considering Impacts and Opportunities on Academic and Professional Matters” - click [here](#)
- “Avoiding the Discriminatory Use of AI” United States Department of Education - click [here](#)
- CCC’s Webinars – click [here](#)
- “GenAI Resources” Santa Rosa Junior College – click [here](#)
- “National Institute on Artificial Intelligence in Society ‘Resources’” Sacramento State – click [here](#)
- “Shaping the Future Today: Embracing AI” Arizona State University - click [here](#)
- “Student Conduct and Discipline Due Process” Santa Rosa Junior College – click [here](#)

**[as agendized] Additional Note (see President’s Report for more detail): The Academic Senate Executive Committee conducted a crosswalk of the above two documents. Recommendations across four meta-themes were identified as follows:**

- a. **Recommendation for policy work to explicitly address Generative Artificial Intelligence in relevant Board Policies (BPs) and Administrative Procedures (APs)**
- b. **Recommendations for work specific to faculty professional development needs**
- c. **Recommendation for establishment of a GenAI Committee**
- d. **Recommendation that the Library is explicitly included anytime key constituents are identified specific to GenAI work and committees**

**Part one – Actionable Items within immediate Senate purview and interest**

**ITEM ONE** – Reco #3 Academic Integrity Framework for GenAI – *This one could/should thru BP/AP and College Council – and what areas need attention that are immediate points of contention?*

**RecoThree Up/Down Vote:** does the Senate wish to forward the Academic Integrity Framework language below to College Council for consideration?

**We Recommend that** in coordination with Vice President of Academic Affairs and Vice President of Student Services, SRJC revise the Academic Integrity Statement to include GenAI misuse as a form of academic dishonesty as follows: ~~–See recommendation above–~~

*Santa Rosa Junior College is committed to ethical, equitable, and transparent AI use, aligned with legal standards and focused on fostering critical thinking, creativity, student success, and inclusivity. Unauthorized use of GenAI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, DALL-E, Grammarly) that violates syllabus policies or assists without explicit permission is considered academic dishonesty. SRJC prioritizes data privacy, informed consent, and regular AI policy reviews. By supporting responsible AI use through training and community feedback, we uphold SRJC’s values of integrity, innovation, and preparing students for a technologically advanced future.*

We also believe that SRJC faculty must be provided with information on the limitations of current GenAI detection tools, which may disproportionately flag the work product of multilingual as well as marginalized students, especially students of color, as noted in recent studies. It is recommended to approach detection with caution and seek corroborating evidence before making any claims of AI misuse. Establish protocols that prioritize fairness in AI detection and assessment practices.



**ITEM TWO – Reco #4 Suggested Syllabus Statements on GenAI –  
faculty to faculty issue – Senate Professional Development Work potential**

**RecoFour Up/Down Vote: does the Senate wish to formally encourage faculty encourage instructors to include syllabus language that clarifies GenAI use in the classroom?**

**We Recommend that** SRJC encourage instructors to include syllabus language that clarifies GenAI usage policies. The guidelines should specify when and how GenAI tools can be used, reinforcing transparency and preventing academic dishonesty. Moreover, the AI policies, procedures, and consequences of misconduct should always be included in the syllabus and communicated to the students in the first week of class and before assignments.

Instructors could reflect on the below four approaches to dealing with GenAI in the classroom and determine which one they could adopt:

OPEN	CONDITIONAL	RESTRICTED	CLOSED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider adapting outcomes to reflect use of GenAI.</li> <li>• Design assignments that integrate transparent use of AI into students' processes.</li> <li>• Address how GenAI may be incorporated into your field.</li> <li>• Explain to students that use of AI in your class does not extend to other classes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider which learning outcomes may be negatively impacted using AI and discuss with students.</li> <li>• Incorporate a low-stakes assignment that draws on AI, illustrating risks and/or benefits.</li> <li>• Provide specific guidelines for what is and is not permitted.</li> <li>• Provide guidelines for citing use of GenAI.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify areas where AI may enhance learning or save time for higher-order thinking.</li> <li>• Consider demonstrating to students how use of GenAI may be useful in your course.</li> <li>• Be very clear with students about where you are asking not to use AI and why.</li> <li>• Provide guidelines for citing use of GenAI.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify to students that use of GenAI is not allowed in your course.</li> <li>• Consider reviewing and designing your assignments to emphasize process and reflection while discouraging the use of AI.</li> <li>• Consider accessibility when contemplating changes to assessments (e.g., handwritten exams, oral presentations).</li> </ul>

Please see Sample Syllabus Statements below or by ASCCC's in the "Academic Integrity Policies in the Age of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Resource Document" [see page 7. Sample Syllabus Statements](#)

- **Open Approach** "In this course, students may use generative AI tools as part of the learning process. Assignments are designed to encourage transparent and ethical AI usage. Students are encouraged to integrate AI thoughtfully, focusing on how it enhances their learning outcomes and processes. Please note that this permission is specific to this course and may not apply in other classes."
- **Conditional Approach** "Generative AI can be used in specific assignments in this course to illustrate its strengths and limitations. Students will receive guidelines for using AI responsibly, with clear expectations on what is permitted. Low-stakes assignments may explore AI's potential, but outcomes should prioritize critical engagement and ethical use."
- **Restricted Approach** "The use of generative AI is limited in this course. Specific assignments may allow it when it supports higher-order thinking, but only within set guidelines. Students must adhere to clear expectations regarding when and how AI is used, and citations are required for any AI-generated content."
- **Closed Approach** "Grammar, composition, and/or vocabulary are part of the learning outcomes of this course. Therefore, all assessments (writing assignments, oral compositions, presentations, summaries, etc.) must be your original work. The use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools, such as ChatGPT, is prohibited. The use of AI tools is considered plagiarism in this course, and disciplinary actions fall under the plagiarism guidelines. The instructor may follow up with the student with an oral conversation to assess the learning."

ITEM THREE – GenAI is a District wide concern, and limiting to a Senate subcommittee would not address or include the broader potential / needs associated

### Reco #1 Creation of a Permanent GenAI Committee

**RecoOne Up/Down Vote: does the Senate wish to recommend [a committee? Taskforce? 1-2 year workgroup?] a permanent Academic Senate Subcommittee on Generative Artificial Intelligence?**

**We Recommend that** SRJC establish a permanent subcommittee under the Academic Senate to continuously create, review, and refine resources and ethical guidelines for GenAI use, ensuring alignment with SRJC's values on equity, inclusion, sustainability, innovation, and student success. Item contexts, and it should consist of all affected parties, including faculty from the most impacted disciplines, and representatives such as **the Library**, SGA, Student Services, and Distance Education.

**\*\*Recommended edit** – remove “administrative” as our purview is instructional, curricular, assessment and student success based.

- **Library Suggestion:** does the Senate wish to add “the library” as one of the “most impacted disciplines” in recommendation #1? **Library's Rationale (highlight):** *As part of our discipline expertise, Library Faculty monitor and evaluate emerging tools and evolving resources for community college students. ...The Library Department is concerned about ... specifying a department role without representation or consultation of the Library Department Chair or designee.*

**RecOne POTENTIAL FOLLOW UP Up/Down Vote(s): IF a Senate (or ongoing) subcommittee is established (see above), does the Senate wish to assign the subcommittee with these related taskforce recommendations? Note, too, that in rec #5 there is already a webpage through DE at <https://de.santarosa.edu/generativeairesources>**

reco #5 Professional Development and Training: **We Recommend that the GenAI committee partner** with the Office of Distance Education and other relevant departments to create ongoing professional development opportunities for faculty and staff regarding responsible approaches to GenAI. We suggest considering a resource repository, including guides, policies, syllabus templates, and other resources. To ensure these resources are easily accessible, we suggest integrating them into SRJC's Canvas Learning Management System in addition to the campus web pages. This way, both instructors and students can benefit from them. Faculty will have access to a template library featuring syllabus statements, adaptable policy examples, and ethical guidelines related to GenAI use. This initiative will promote responsible engagement with AI tools. Topics for faculty and staff training may include, but not limited to: humanizing syllabus policy development; equitable GenAI use; discussions on the ethical implications of AI, and; assessment redesign methods that foster critical thinking and creativity.

reco #6 DEIAA and Student Support: **We recommend that the GenAI committee recognize** diversity, equity, inclusion, accessibility, and anti-racism (DEIAA) principles in developing student support and educational opportunities outside the classroom. While the classroom provides learning opportunities tied to outcomes, additional campus resources can directly support students in completing their coursework and interpreting requirements for courses. Critical considerations for designing student support include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Focus on reviewing syllabi and following instructor guidelines for coursework
- Support of chat tracking and review of prompt engineering when requested by instructors
- Discussion of ethical considerations of GenAI and academic integrity
- Review of attribution and discipline-selected options for citing GenAI-produced content when allowable
- Acknowledgement of critical thinking related to source evaluation and use of GenAI

The continuing evolution of GenAI impacts many disciplines, and there is no one true “home” for it within a discipline or department. Efforts should be collaborative across disciplines and departments for greater reach. There are potential partnerships with several campus departments to consider, including, but not limited to, Student Services, Tutorial Center, Library and Information Resources, Writing Center, and Distance Education. Consulting with the heads or chairs of these departments is critical in planning support.

**Library's Suggested language changes to highlighted paragraph above:** ~~There are To support student learning, we encourage potential partnerships with several campus departments to consider, including, but~~

~~not limited to, Student Services, Tutorial Center, Library and Information Resources, Writing Center, and Distance Education~~ across SRJC. Consulting with the heads or chairs of ~~these~~ departments is critical in planning student learning support services. **Library Rationale** (highlight): “...We support partnership collaborations through a unified approach such as a formalized multi-constituent committee or taskforce where the Library Department is represented.”

.....

.....

## Part Two – language from original taskforce recommendations not actionable and/or not within our immediate purview / goals

*[intro to #og recos – no action necessary] As artificial intelligence (AI) continues to advance, it presents both opportunities and challenges for education. The market for apps and AI-related technology is growing exponentially, and regulation is minimal. The task force acknowledges fundamental flaws in the technology behind Generative AI (GenAI), but this report's purpose is not to outline all of them. However, it is important to draw attention to various ethical issues such as, but not limited to, the perpetuation of existing biases, copyright concerns, data privacy, accuracy in the output of apps, and environmental impact from energy grid loads and sourcing. While AI tools can enhance learning and teaching, it's crucial to ensure academic integrity and authentic assessment of student abilities. This guide aims to provide SRJC with a comprehensive framework for ethical and effective GenAI consideration. It ensures alignment with SRJC's commitment to equity, academic integrity, sustainability, and innovation.*

### Continuation of #og reco one language

.....

*We believe that it is the obligation of educational institutions to carefully consider the challenges and promises presented by using GenAI tools. SRJC holds the responsibility to cultivate critical thinking and creative skills that are essential for preparing students for success in an increasingly automated world. Furthermore, adoption of new technologies in education carries both the promise of innovation and also the risk of unintended consequences such as those exacerbating inequalities. This requires ongoing, systemic, and scaffolded faculty and student support, as well as transparency, faculty input, and student input. For these reasons, the permanent subcommittee created under the Academic Senate must regularly provide feedback on advances and actions related to SRJC's GenAI initiatives. This includes gathering input from faculty, staff, and students to ensure ongoing alignment with ethical standards, addressing emerging challenges, and fostering a collaborative approach such that all stakeholders are supported and listened to. Through regular assessments, ongoing professional development, and open forums, the subcommittee should evaluate the impacts of GenAI on learning outcomes, equity, and inclusivity, ensuring that SRJC remains responsive, responsible, and adaptive in the face of rapid technological change.*

*[note that the following comes after the resolves in recommendation two's proposed resolution and would not be part of formal resolve and would require additional action – also something to consider forwarding to college council ]*

**Reco Misc Up/Down Vote:** does the Senate wish to forward these suggestions to College Council for consideration?

**We Also Recommend that** the created institutional, departmental, and instructor level policies ~~should explicitly outline potential dangers and proscribed uses, as well as acceptable uses of AI, and address potential impacts on student learning, student assessments, privacy, and academic integrity. Such policies~~ must be asset minded, emphasize a growth mindset, and ensure that faculty retain discretion over GenAI use in their courses, allowing instructors to adapt policies to fit the unique needs of their subject areas.

**Library Suggestion:** does the Senate wish to make the suggested edits to the paragraph above?

When necessary, departments may provide additional guidelines to help faculty members create consistent approaches or tailor AI use policies for specific course objectives and assignment requirements. Please see a sample

SRJC Policy Statement below or by ASCCC’s “Academic Integrity Policies in the Age of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Resource Document” [see page 5](#):

**Sample Policies on AI Usage to be added to the district's official Academic Integrity and the Student Conduct Code:**

1. **Institutional Policy** *(see reco #3)...*
2. **Departmental Policy:** This department is committed to fostering a learning environment that supports innovation while upholding academic integrity, equity, and inclusion. Instructors retain the discretion to determine GenAI use in their courses, in alignment with college policies and values. The use of GenAI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, DALL-E, Grammarly) in coursework is permitted only when explicitly allowed by the instructor. Unauthorized use that circumvents the expectations of individual assignments or assessments may result in academic integrity violations. **Senate voted the library’s suggested language changes down in an amendment to a resolution vote on 2/5/25 – could maybe be brought back / reworded / reordered. Their proposed language was as follows: “The use of GenAI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, DALL-E, Grammarly) in coursework is not permitted only when explicitly allowed banned by the instructor for specific use cases.”**
3. For Instructor level policies see #4. Suggested Syllabus Statements on GenAI.

.....

**Reco 8 Institutional Research and Monitoring GenAI Impact:** **[only necessary and actionable WHEN we have policies in place for a year at least]** **We Recommend that the GenAI committee partner** with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning to collect feedback from students and faculty on the effectiveness of AI policies. Survey reports can influence and inform iterative updates as needed to remain responsive to technological advancements.

Departmental impact assessments could provide information on the feasibility of new courses, programs, and other policy adjustments or goals. For example, a modified impact assessment scale could be one method of collecting information.

Department Impact Assessment Scale (based on the Saffir-Simpson model)

- Minimal Impact – GenAI use aligns seamlessly with learning objectives.
- Moderate Impact – Course adjustments are required to balance AI use.
- Major Impact – Course restructuring is needed to mitigate GenAI misuse.

.....

**Reco 7 Institutional Goals** **[this one is all over the map and mixes many different areas of our purview and also potentially outside our purview – better to focus on curricular and student success and prep areas...???**

**We Recommend** the development and review of AI-related courses, certificates, and program goals to provide students with the skills and knowledge necessary for success in a GenAI-driven world.

SRJC must continuously monitor new GenAI technologies while safeguarding academic integrity and protecting personal data. In addition, acknowledging the historical bias incorporated in AI models and reflecting on the use of the apps in automated processes is not just an individual pursuit but also an institutional pursuit.

SRJC must continually monitor the energy and climate impact of GenAI. AI Data centers use a high amount of energy which may lead to an increase in planet warming emissions and put a strain on our energy grid. In the future, SRJC must consider how its GenAI policy might conflict with sustainability initiatives and district energy policy (6.8.7 & 6.8.7p).

Promoting transparency of the use of GenAI tools, protecting sensitive personal student, faculty, and employee information, and reducing bias towards marginalized communities are essential goals looking ahead. One example is advising constituents when GenAI tools are used, such as providing notice when personal information is loaded into external systems.

We recommend communicating and collaborating with the President and Cabinet about GenAI at SRJC.

.....

**Reco #9 Ongoing Collaboration with Statewide and National Educational Bodies** **[ASCCC has not been consistent or even recommendable depending on who is presenting and materials being shared]**

**We Recommend that** SRJC stay engaged with the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) to align local policies with state recommendations on AI in education. Faculty and administration are encouraged to participate in ASCCC’s AI policy workshops and forums, where best practices and policy updates are shared across the California community college system.

.....

Recommendation #2 Institutional Policies and Instructor Autonomy

**Conflict between establishing policies but also allowing for autonomy, lacking too much information regarding student voice, resolution is repetitive in places in relation to other parts of the recommendations, multiple areas of concern identified...**

**RecoTwo Up/Down Vote: does the Senate wish to adopt the Academic Senate Resolution on the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools and Academic Integrity?**

**Academic Senate Resolution on the Use of  
Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools and Academic Integrity**

Johannes A.A.M. van Gorp, Ph.D. Department of Social Sciences

*[student and faculty concerns absent]*

**Whereas,** [Title 5 §41301](#) and the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Legal Opinions [07-12](#) and [95-31](#) promote academic integrity and aim to stymie academic dishonesty by outlining academic and professional ethics and disciplinary actions, and [Education Code 76224\(a\)](#) provides that faculty have the final authority on grade determination, in the absence of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency;

**Whereas,** advancements in generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) have progressed rapidly, with technologies such as OpenAI’s ChatGPT, AI-powered Bing, and Google’s Bard - among other GenAI technologies - have created powerful tools whereby students may generate powerful responses to queries that are not a product of the individual’s own effort, and could lead to potential questions and ethical dilemmas related to academic integrity;

**Whereas,** some academic departments and programs have recognized the transformative potential of GenAI tools and are actively engaged in guiding students towards responsible and ethical utilization, while other departments and programs advocate for the outright prohibition of GenAI tools, expressing concerns about their potential implications for academic integrity and educational process;

**Whereas,** Santa Rosa Junior College lacks a comprehensive policy that specifically addresses and regulates the use of GenAI tools.

**Be it Resolved** the Santa Rosa Junior College Academic Senate affirms that the decision to accept or reject the integration of GenAI tools ~~within a classroom setting~~ remains at the discretion of individual ~~instructors~~ faculty.

**Library Suggestion:** does the Senate wish to make the suggested edits to the “Be it resolved” as listed above?

**Be it Further Resolved** the Academic Senate requests the inclusion of the following example of dishonesty in the district's official Academic Integrity and the Student Conduct Code under the section “Types of Academic Dishonesty”:

Unauthorized use of generative AI: Use of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools (such as ChatGPT, GPT-3, DALL-E, Grammarly, etc.) on assessments or assignments in a way that violates an instructor’s articulated syllabus policy, or using it to complete coursework in a way not expressly permitted by the faculty member, is considered academic dishonesty.”

**Be it Further Resolved** that the Academic Senate recommends all instructors include one of four policy statements such as those found on page 7 of ASCCC’s [“Academic Integrity Policies in the Age of Artificial Intelligence \(AI\) Resource Document”](#) in their course syllabi regarding the use and misuse of GenAI in their course.