



Boulder Faculty Assembly

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO **BOULDER**

BFA Special Assembly

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, April 16th, 2026

The Boulder Faculty Assembly held a special meeting on Thursday April 16th, 2026, in person at the CU Law School, Wittemyer Courtroom with a Zoom option. BFA Chair Alastair Norcross presided over the meeting. The meeting convened at 4:01 p.m. and was adjourned at 5:34 p.m.

I. Welcome — Alastair Norcross, BFA Chair

Norcross welcomed members of the Boulder Faculty Senate and guests to the meeting and recognized that the meeting overlapped with the regular meeting of the College of Arts & Sciences Faculty Senate meeting, and the A&S Faculty Senate chair planned to end early to allow people to attend this meeting. Norcross discussed the outline of the meeting and the background of advocacy work being done behind the scenes before moving on to the open comment section of the meeting.

II. Advocacy and Background

a. Faculty Governance Updates on the OpenAI Contract — Alastair Norcross, BFA Chair

Norcross gave some background on the status of the OpenAI contract, noting that the announcement about the ChatGPT.edu partnership from CU system had been announced in early February and that the initial rollout would be available to faculty, staff and students on March 31st, but said product would be available only after individuals had gone through a training. Norcross noted that the BFA requested a copy of the contract, and that concerns about both the partnership and specific parts of the contract were almost universally shared among the four campuses, with the exception of CU Anschutz. There was significant pushback, and the feedback from faculty succeeded in having a delayed rollout for students, who would be able to access the product on August 14th, but faculty and staff would be able to access ChatGPT.edu on the original March date.

Norcross discussed his experience with the training before accessing the product, which he described as extremely limited and could be accomplished within 5 or so minutes. Norcross noted that the contract was amended to address one of the major concerns faculty had, but there were other outstanding worries which were not addressed. CU Boulder, Denver and Colorado Springs are each setting up working groups to review responsible use of AI and to create guidelines around responsible uses. CU system's Faculty Council will be doing the same, with

Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA) Norlin Library – E138

University of Colorado Boulder Boulder, CO 80309

303-492-6271

www.colorado.edu/bfa



FC coordinating with the different campus groups. The BFA's Academic Technologies Committee (ATC) was asked by Norcross to come up with guidelines for ethical use which will be further elaborated on in the meeting by ATC Chair Janet Casagrand. Norcross emphasized the ATC was under significant time constraint as they were asked to produce the recommendations prior to the original rollout date, and [the guidelines are available on the BFA website](#). An additional document "Recommendation Regarding Ethical and Responsible Use Policy" was sent out prior to the meeting to BFA representatives as an accompanying document and is available in the BFA OneDrive. Norcross then introduced Casagrand to discuss the guidelines created by the ATC.

b. Academic Technologies Committee (ATC) Recommended Guidelines on Ethical and Responsible Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) as an Academic Technology & Accompany FAQ — Janet Casagrand, ATC Chair

Casagrand described the process in which the ATC created the guidelines and accompanying FAQ, noting that the ATC worked with a variety of on campus departments and subject matter experts. She shared that Norcross asked for the guidelines to be four pages [to encourage people to read the full document] the end document was six pages, but the accompanying FAQ was around 20 pages to include all the information people felt was necessary. Casagrand noted the document is a living document subject to change as the technology changes, but that the ATC wanted to get something out to faculty in the time being to provide guidance.

c. Faculty Council Educational Policy & University Standards Committee — Ravinder Singh, EPUS Chair

EPUS chair Singh introduced himself as a faculty member in the Molecular, Cellular & Developmental Biology (MCDB) department, and that he has been involved in shared governance for 21 years. He shared a few slides [available in the OneDrive for review] and described metaphorically and literally that AI was all around, emphasizing that he agreed with those who supported AI, but also stated that "all was not well with AI". Singh described the work that is done on the EPUS committee, and that he would be focusing on the policy side of their work and not specifically on the contract.

He noted that EPUS two years ago during the drafting of policy 1014 "Intellectual Property That is Educational Materials" the topic of AI came up, but that when APS 6012 "Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)" was being drafted EPUS was not initially made aware of it. In December policy makers met with EPUS and the draft off 6012 was sent out to the faculty and significant feedback was gathered. Singh shared that the perception surrounding the process of APS 6012 is that faculty shared governance has not been respected and that the argument that high use of Open AI/ChatGPT.edu constitutes a reason to contract with Open AI is a bandwagon logical fallacy argument. Singh emphasized that a policy that respects faculty right to the



Boulder Faculty Assembly

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO **BOULDER**

curriculum and academic freedom is critical, but the policy at present is incomplete and is currently focused more on compliance.

BFA Coordinator Kelly Curtis noted that APS 6012 draft policy was available in the OneDrive for anyone to review, and Norcross stated that it was also available via the system policy webpage. Norcross added on that Open AI contract was for a year, and the contract clock started in January, and that it is up to each campus to renew or amend the contract, and there is a serious question about how involved faculty are going to be in the renewal process moving forward.

d. Open AI & AI Survey — David Paradis, BFA Chair Elect

Paradis discussed a new survey the BFA was hosting, different from the Qualtrics survey that went out prior to the meeting which gathered comments for said special meeting. This survey, completable in 5-7 minutes, is open to anyone, faculty, staff or students, and is designed to gather thoughts on the Open AI contract. Paradis emphasized it was important to have as many responses as possible to take to the administration, and that another survey would go out in November to track faculty's evolving feelings on the contract and to help inform the decision on renewal. Curtis will place the link for the survey on the BFA website for people. Norcross asked if Paradis wanted to discuss the data that had already been gathered and Paradis shared that at the time of the meeting based on the data from the Qualtrics Survey, 82% of the faculty responses had major issue with the contract, while 49% believed it [the contract] is not in the interest of the university.

III. Open Comment

a. Jonathan Lack, Cinema Studies Department

Lack introduced himself and shared that he had previously been a student at CU earning both his undergraduate and graduate degree at CU. He described an experience as an undergraduate student at orientation where current CU student employees shared about the honor code and what it meant to “distinguish a degree from a piece of paper” based on that honor code. Lack shared he felt that the partnership with Open AI undermines faculty's position as educators. He described a set of experiments he did with the ChatGPT.edu using different prompts and that the product would provide entire writing assignments without any pushback, and that in one instance unprompted, shared suggestions on how to hide evidence of cheating. In Lack's experience in comparing the ChatGPT.edu version with the free public version, the edu version had no additional guardrails to reduce or prevent academic dishonesty. After Lack was finished speaking Curtis shared she would upload the report to the meeting OneDrive for individuals to review.

b. Faith Boninger, School of Education

Boninger introduced herself and described her research which reviews and analyzes contracts between school districts and providers of digital technologies. She noted that the amendment to



Boulder Faculty Assembly

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO **BOULDER**

the Open AI contract on March 19th changed the student data privacy section, but all the other concerns with the contract remained, expressing her concern that the amendment did not address issues related to the collection of data about, and from students. The original language allowed OpenAI to use data, much of which is identifiable student data even if it is deidentified, and to own said data for commercial purposes. In Boninger's opinion the amendment uses new opaque language referring to privacy laws in order to accomplish similar things the original language had, noting that if Open AI is named as a school official under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), under specific conditions tech providers can access student records without explicit consent of the student or students family. This applies if the technology is under the control of the school, but as Boninger asserts, CU has no control over Open AI or what information it provides, because to have actual control it would need to access internal policies and proprietary information, which CU does not have access to. Boninger notes that the student data processing agreement (DPA) does not set a clear limit on how long student data is kept, how data is disposed of, and allows student data to be shared with multiple subcontractors who are subject to change. Boninger continued stating that the contract allows Open AI to advertise to students and to share potentially identifiable data with law enforcement, noting that it is a particularly dangerous time for such a risk.

c. Lori Emerson, Media Studies Departments

Emerson introduced herself and thanked her colleagues and the BFA for the opportunity to speak about the agreement. She shared that thanks to fact finding from colleagues across different departments, ChatGPT.edu shares no advantage to the free version of ChatGPT but is costing the CU system money. She stated concerns about the lack of financial health from CU system, noting that faculty raise pools had not yet been announced, but had been warned merit raises may not come next year, noting stagnation of both faculty and staff salaries. Emerson noted that budget projections for the next few years predict deficits, and challenged the contract justification being equitable accesses, noting the existence of thousands of studies which assert Large Language Models (LLM) production of biased outputs. A second concern she raised noted that with the integration of the contract and the likelihood of faculty who integrate ChatGPT into their classrooms there will still be students who opt to pay for the \$200 a month model which offers higher functions than those who use the CU provided version. Emerson asserted in her final point that it should cause pause that CU system partnered with and is facilitating this relationship and collection of student data by OpenAI when the biased outputs of LLM's is well established. Upon sharing all of these points Emerson wrapped up her comments by noting she would like the agreement to be cancelled.

d. Jed Brown, Computer Science Department

Brown introduced himself as both a professor in the Computer Science department and a co-president of AAUP-Boulder. He shared a statement which he noted he had shared before at the most recent Regents meeting, and that the statement was part of the notes in the document

Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA) Norlin Library – E138

University of Colorado Boulder Boulder, CO 80309

303-492-6271

www.colorado.edu/bfa



referenced earlier in the meeting “Recommendation Regarding Ethical and Responsible Use Policy” and was co-written with Faith Boninger and Alex Molnar, both members of the National Education Policy Center (NEPC). Brown asserted that the contract goes against Regent Law 5, which places matters of pedagogy and curriculum in the hands of the faculty. Brown asserted that the BFA chair was not alerted about the partnership until the night before and discussed AI’s links with eugenics referencing a film “Ghost in the Machine” which had been streamed on campus some time earlier.

Brown discussed the advocacy involved in changing the previous student data section of the contract, and that the amendment while changed, now claims CU owns student generated content, which he asserts as false as students own their own content. Brown notes that the contract labels Open AI as a school official, holds CU liable for student generated content, and requires CU to indemnify Open AI. Brown noted current concerns around chatbots coaching individuals to suicide, to stalk others, or other such behaviors, but because of the contract CU has a conflict of interest in cases where such behavior may happen. Brown asserts that CU is providing a financial incentive for AI based pedagogy without the involvement of shared governance despite studies showing harmful effects of AI on learning. Brown also asserted that such products exhibit “the strongest covert racism against speakers of African American English that have ever been experimentally observed.”, noting the products fails tests of construct validity, or produces major errors. Brown noted that sufficient safety protocols for reliability around this tech does not exist and asserted it is necessary to conduct research with integrity before finishing his statement.

e. Emily Yeh, Geography Department

Yeh introduced herself and noted that she had many different objections but would limit her statement to concerns around environmental harm. She noted claims from CU leadership hoping to become national and international leaders in sustainability, with CU’s climate action plan (CAP) with advancing equitable solutions, and that the incoming common curriculum will also have a sustainability focus. Yeh stated that this is in contrast to CU choosing to partner with Open AI, and that AI companies data centers are predicted to contribute to an estimated 9% raise in U.S greenhouse gas emissions by 2030. Yeh noted that the U.S is already the largest emitter in the world and that greenhouse gas emissions were previously decreasing. She noted that the U.S has ten times more data centers than the next highest country, the United Kingdom, and that LLMs like ChatGPT has already consumed ten times more energy this year than they did three years ago. Data centers use “dirty” energy, coal and natural gas, rather than renewable energy, and Yeh asserts such data centers have played a documented role in keeping coal plants operational due to concerns about grid instability. Yeh also shared that electricity demands are growing faster than renewable supply so the energy use needed from data centers cannot be met with renewable energy alternatives. She pointed out that the emissions associated with cloud computing have often not been calculated in CU’s scope 3 emissions and the contract would be a significant contributing factor to those emissions. Yeh discussed the water intensive nature of data centers and the risk they pose to drought-stricken areas like Colorado, and the placement of



data centers in historically marginalized communities noting a current concern around a data center in CO. Yeh further noted that OpenAI does not publish their emissions data, and controversial remarks CEO Sam Altman made about the time it takes to train a human in energy usage when asked about OpenAI's energy usage. Yeh ended her remarks by stating she felt the deal should be cancelled, or at minimum not renewed.

f. Meghan Van Portfliet, LEEDS School of Business

Van Portfliet introduced herself situating her position as not anti-AI but holding decisions made by the university to the same standards CU sets for itself. Van Portfliet discussed the [vision statement for sustainability implementation](#) and noted she was proud of said document. [Recording became choppy throughout Van Portfliet's recording and so some sentences may have been missed because of this]. She discussed the water usage involved in LLM prompts, and shared concern around the endorsement of a significant environmental impact with little to no guidelines, transparency, or training on responsible AI usage. Noting goal 3 ["Lead by example in our stewardship of sustainable campus operations and the campus as a living laboratory"] Van Portfliet points out that it calls for the integration of innovative and clean technology thoughtfully with transparent and measurable targets. She notes that the agreement, which has no usage guidelines and no impact disclosures is the opposite of what the vision statement for sustainability implementation calls for. She emphasizes she is not anti-AI tools in education, and that she takes the arguments for equity seriously, but equity and sustainability are not opposite and that tools with environmental costs should not be given to students without discussing it. She discussed how Open AI in more recent years have made decisions which break from their publicly stated ethical commitments for commercial interests. Van Portfliet noted that if CU wants to model values for the students it must choose vendors which model those values. She finished her statement by requesting that any AI tool rollout include clear sustainability disclosures for students, usage guidelines and a review of if the vendor follows institutional values.

g. Mattias Richter, Center for Asian Studies

Richter introduced himself and shared that he was the chair of the department of Asian Languages and Civilization and that he wanted to speak from the angle of working in arts and humanities. He shared how he felt that to be human in a meaningful way is something you learn and build on throughout one's life, and that is our [the faculty's] job here. He notes that in his department they train students on Asian languages, literature and culture, and stated he is not anti-AI and can see some of the uses, noting AI can be used to some extent in his field. He shared his primary concerns were around generative AI conducting research or writing texts. Richter shared examples of more "harmless" uses of AI, such as graduate students from China having difficulty writing in academic English and using AI to help polish the language in their papers,



but then noted that students still need to find their own writing voice. Richter stated that he finds it concerning that he hears people discuss using AI to write papers for them and then through individual editing the papers become “theirs”, and that you have to search for relevant questions to use and check the sources, and that cannot be done on behalf of someone. He continued noting that giving an easy tool like AI to students while they are learning how to be a human being strikes him as counterproductive. He notes that the partnership [with Open AI] feels like it making the process of learning for the student more difficult, and the partnership undermines this process of teaching students philosophically how to be a human being and what that means in a deeper context, which he feels is faculty’s job in arts and humanities.

h. Joshua Nunziato, LEEDS School of Business

Nunziato began his remarks by noting he was going against some of the previous shared opinions and arguing for AI as a pedagogically transformative tool and should be embraced with the opportunity to do so. He noted he is a professor of sustainability and cares about the carbon and water footprint, and social equity issues associated with AI, and that he wanted the conversation around AI to be empirically grounded. He noted that within the current meeting, and in previous BFA meetings he has felt the conversation around AI has been thinly empirically grounded in data and the data that has been used has been quite broad. He shared that a previous speaker spoke of thousands of studies speaking to AI equity issues, but that when he searched for a gap in the research, he could only find two credible studies which showed that AI was amplifying implicit racial or gendered bias beyond what is perpetuated by human beings as a baseline. Nunziato emphasized that implicit bias is a problem and should be addressed, but that the claims being made that AI is making those issues worse needs more empirical data. Nunziato shared that the benefits that he sees include high levels of productivity, the potential for students to engage with a 1:1 tutor for the frontier models, which he noted ChatGPT.edu is not a frontier model, and that he has seen the use of frontier models benefit student responses in the classroom. He noted he actively encourages students to use AI, with detailed guidelines, and he has observed an elevated level of work. He shared as a professor, the use of AI assists him an ability to provide higher quality feedback to his students, in a more timely fashion. Nunziato emphasized he does not have an AI model do his grading for him but involves it in providing higher quality and more timely feedback to student work. Nunziato provided two additional pedagogical examples, sharing he feels it is a great tool for fact checking and providing feedback on slide decks, to see how a field has evolved and updating presentation decks, as well as enhancing assessments, exams or tests. Nunziato added this is true for the frontier models, not the free models as those are significantly behind the frontier models and challenged his colleagues who haven’t used a frontier model to try it out and see how it can be used to improve work as a researcher and professor.

i. Brian Talbot, Philosophy Department



Boulder Faculty Assembly

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO **BOULDER**

Talbot introduced himself beginning by noting that he feels Open AI is explicitly hostile to the values of CU Boulder, with the worst track record as a company against those values, with a

model build from the theft of intellectual property, sycophantic, built on academic dishonesty, and growth as a predicated on environmental harm. Talbot expressed that it is deeply foolish to give money to a company which expressly works against the values you [CU Boulder] hold, and that if CU is making these decisions out of a concern for surviving, it still does not justify making the decision to partner with Open AI. Talbot noted that CU should not function as a trade school, or brand itself for providing economic outputs, which as he shared would lead to the death of the university. He expressed that for the university to survive students should understand that education, critical thinking, and pursuit of real understanding and creating real art and broaden one's horizons are valuable for the skills own sake and require struggling with and working through intellectual problems. He emphasized that self-exploration, and self-expression require developing fundamental skills, and shared the value in failing, even when something else could do it for you. Talbot shared he believes students want to know and do these things, and if students are given the tools to cut corners and cheat and they are encouraged to do this, and the partnership with Open AI is predicated on this concept, it tells students not to struggle, not to develop their skills, and to do things the easy way. Talbot shared he feels that this tells students they don't matter, either their work, their education or their development as human beings. He finished his remarks by noting he feels like this is immoral to tell students, and that even if people disagree with him on that, it is stupid to only care about the survival of the university.

j. Jeremy Koch, Mechanical Engineering Department

Koch introduced himself as a teaching professor in Mechanical Engineering, and a previous award recipient by The College of Engineering and Applied Sciences to study the use of AI in the classrooms. He noted that there is an opportunity cost associated with the partnership, stating it wasn't clear to him what the benefits were and the announcement alluded to equity and inclusion, but that he has not seen evidence that such benefits are being distributed equitably. As he's observed, if a student has access to ChatGPT then they have a shortcut on their homework. He noted that he's mostly observed other mechanical engineers have used AI mostly around summarizing emails or similar work. Koch stated he knows many individuals use AI for advance reasons, including himself, but that for \$2 million dollars CU boulder could purchase a thousand laptops for incoming low-income students, around 20 staff members could be hired to assist first generation students ease their transition to college, 20 additional people could be hired to staff Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) and other examples of what the contract money could be used on with clear benefits to students. Koch noted that if an AI company had to be chosen, he would not have chosen Open AI, citing an example of competitor Anthropic rejecting a military contract because of discomfort around the possible use of the technology for domestic surveillance or autonomous drone combat, and Open AI won said contract. Koch noted that there are amendments to the contract [unclear if Koch is referring to the federal or CU contract] that make some of the concerns overblown, but that the look for CU is bad to be partnered with a



Boulder Faculty Assembly

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO **BOULDER**

company who makes such questionable military actions. Koch finished his statement by quoted OpenAI CEO Sam Altman who said “We see a future where intelligence is a utility, like

electricity or water, and people buy it from us on a meter and use it for whatever they want to use it for.” Stating that he [Koch] feels that this [quote] feels like the anthesis of a college education.

k. Nate Wasylik, Student

Wasylik introduced himself as a second-year communications student and wanted to offer a student perspective within the conversation, noting he wanted to echo statements previously made by faculty, who share the same concerns students have. Wasylik shared he felt that the conversation was lacking the view of what the contract was from the perspective of the “AI Hater to AI Power User” because in his perspective both sides are disgusted by the contract. He notes from the AI Power user perspective, who uses frontier models and believes in AI, that those users don’t want the amount spent on a subpar AI model, whereas AI haters are upset that the university is engaging with the contract or conversation based on a belief that AI is anti-intellectual. Wasylik shared he felt like the guardrails are extremely bad, noting in 5 or so minutes with specific prompts ChatGPT gave him instructions on how to make napalm and a bomb. Wasylik also noted that AI model Grok, sharing widespread sexual images of children, and although supposedly has fixed the issue, might still generate the images within the paid model, and that OpenAI is moving towards a more adult-centered model. He also shared that many students have received unclear instructions or feedback [on AI] from their professors, and the frustration that student work could be uploaded into an engine which would mine for student data is horrifying to him and he does not want to support an institution which makes such decisions.

l. Nicole Wright, English Department

Wright introduced herself as a professor in the English department and as a member of the BFA ATC working alongside Casagrand on the ethical use of AI guidelines [mentioned previously in the meeting]. Wright noted she has been advocating for many years for a comprehensive policy guidance, and lacking such guidance “the chickens are coming home to roost”. Wright expressed concerns shared by students to her around job market competitiveness and the issue of cognitive offloading. Wright defined cognitive offloading and noted that her comments come from informally surveying her students in her own courses, and from students from CU Boulder & Denver whom she met in individual and group meetings across the semester. Two CU-Denver students surveyed more than 250 of their peers at Denver, and Wright observed within the data that students in careers that are threatened by ChatGPT reported feeling “betrayed” and “abandoned”, with little guidance on how to pivot. Wright pointed out the demographic cliff and the modest pay these students face in these threatened fields. Wright shared that students reported receiving mixed messages about ChatGPT with messaging either entirely absent, or unclear. Some students report being told to only use ChatGPT for guidelines or brainstorming,



Boulder Faculty Assembly

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO **BOULDER**

but as Wright points out, that can be some of the most challenging parts of a project, and that without guidance students could be less competitive as critical thinkers. Wright noted other students lack needed vocabulary, in her courses only two students could define what a Deepfake

was, showing a lack of skills to navigate these tools. Wright also discussed the use of “emotional offloading” or the use of chatbots to avoid interpersonal issues, and her concern for students who should use CAPS but will instead use chatbots, which have no standardized regulatory oversight. Wright noted as a professor she has been on front lines assisting students with mental health challenges and using CAPS is one of the first steps to getting the help the students need, but without guidance more students are at risk.

m. David Paradis on behalf of Anonymized Faculty Member

Paradis noted that he was asked by a faculty member to speak on their behalf, who desired to speak at the meeting but feared social and professional consequences of doing so. Paradis noted that this was important to keep in mind and emphasized that academic freedom and that civility among peers is important, and that faculty who are using AI to teach critical thinking and critique in their classrooms are providing a valuable exercise. The faculty members statement noted that AI literacy in education is important because people need to understand what the tools do and where they fail. The statement noted they hear frequently from peers and colleagues that the concerns around AI are already concerns faculty deal with in their classrooms, like bias, week accountability and reliance etc. The statement continued to emphasize that if faculty do not have AI literacy, then they cannot make thoughtful decisions about when AI supports learning and when it undermines it. The faculty member noted that they do not think faculty should be fully for, or against AI, but to be critical, informed and adaptable in the middle, continued to emphasize teaching students how to use AI responsibly and ethically while understanding the consequence of use without guidance. The statement continued noting faculty can teach students about authorship, data use, and bias, while recognizing that AI is part of the world students are entering, and future students will be facing. The statement finished by noting that if students were already going to use the tool, it is the responsibility of the faculty to guide them with clarity, boundaries and ethical judgement.

n. Sheiva Rezvani, ATLAS Institute

Rezvani introduced herself, noting she is the Faculty Director of Undergraduate Programs at the ATLAS institute, in the college of Engineering and Applied Science and that they were the first to offer classes on AI, including a course called Applied AI Ethics. Rezvani noted she wanted to share her opinion, emphasizing it was not a summary of her program. She shared that although the program is on the cutting edge of emerging technologies and the creative ways to use them, work with such technologies is heavily couched in the context that technologies have history. In the context of the partnership, ignoring technologies history and moving quickly to partner with one company is a wrong choice. Rezvani emphasized that the university should not contract with



Boulder Faculty Assembly

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO **BOULDER**

Open AI, and that while she doesn't think it is bad to use AI in the classroom, noting that ATLAS tells faculty to be explicit about allowable use, she agreed with previous statements that guidelines need to be created, built on existing research and from a technological, values, and financial perspective.

o. Jeremiah Contreras, LEEDS School of Business

Contreras introduced himself, noting he is in the LEEDS School of Business and is also a Faculty Director for Digital Innovation for Teaching and Learning, and that in that role he looks at AI in education for the business school. He affirmed concerns around the Open AI partnership but shared he felt that disengagement was a bigger risk. He noted that concerns around the contract should not be dismissed, but the commitment to responsible use and data protection is important, and that students are using models which have no data protection or security. Contreras shared the question is not an issue of if AI is going to enter faculty classrooms, noting it already has, but if faculty are going to be involved in shaping AI use. He noted that since November 30th, 2022 [the date ChatGPT was released to the public] faculty have had the opportunity to consider how AI will be used in education, noting that he used it since that date to understand how it works, its limitations and its impact to education. He noted that in the world where AI exists faculty have to make sure there isn't cognitive offloading by students, and that students can communicate, and that in March of 2024 LEEDS made the decision to establish committees, clear syllabus statements, and policies on AI including language on prohibiting it. He emphasized that AI does not need to be used in every class, but it should be considered in every class. He shared that AI is a focus in the core business curriculum, exploring limits, sustainability, and design assignments that require judgement, and accountability. Contreras shared LEEDS does faculty workshops, trainings and that they have seen that AI can improve learning when used intentionally improving critical thinking and exposing when students lack understanding on certain topics. Contreras finalized his words by noting the risks associated with the contract are real, but the risk associated with not engaging are more pressing.

p. Ernesto Acevedo-Muñoz, Cinema Studies Department

Acevedo-Muñoz spoke briefly encouraging everyone to read his colleague Lack's report, noting that based on Lack's experiments ChatGPT.edu's default is to cheat and to hide evidence of cheating.

q. Markus Pflaum, Mathematics Department

Pflaum introduced himself and situated himself as a member of the math department, a BFA At-Large member, and a Co-Chair of the BFA IT Security Working Group before discussing the issue of the removal of Linux servers and server management across campus. Pflaum noted that AI companies, including OpenAI, use Linux servers to compute their calculations for LLMs, and that CU doesn't need a black box. He emphasized that in his opinion ChatGPT is useless for

Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA) Norlin Library – E138

University of Colorado Boulder Boulder, CO 80309

303-492-6271

www.colorado.edu/bfa



Boulder Faculty Assembly

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO **BOULDER**

undergraduate education, and what is important for students to learn what exactly LLMs are and how they work. Pflaum noted that instead of purchasing a tool such as ChatGPT, CU should create their own LLM, citing another institution which is doing the same, as a way to educate students on Linux server management and ethical LLMs. Pflaum emphasized that this should be

discussed with higher administration, noting that the partnership was made without consulting field expert faculty members.

r. Loren Hough, Physics Department

Hough introduced himself and spoke briefly affirming comments made previously and emphasizing the importance of faculty governance and having a locally managed AI system which would not sell data elsewhere. He added an antidote that his lab uses AI frequently in research and he asked his undergraduate students to ask the same question across multiple different LLM models, and ChatGPT got the worst answer, lying that certain data existed, while other models reported such data did not exist. Hough finalized his statement noting that if an AI model was going to be picked, ChatGPT was not the right one.

IV. New Business

No official new business was raised after open comment.

Norcross closed the meeting by sharing that a task force will be convened over the summer, and that comments submitted online will be sent to the task force, OIT, the Provost and the Chancellor. Norcross noted that one of the biggest complaints about the contract was the lack of faculty involvement in the decision. Yeh remarked her surprise by the comments Paradis made on behalf of a faculty member and Norcross noted that people may feel intimidated, even if others are open to listening, and that it appeared the opposition to the contract was stronger, or more audible than those in favor, but thanked everyone for being open to listening to everyone. Norcross noted that the recording and meeting minutes of the special meeting will be uploaded for people to review after. Curtis also requested people to sign in online or in person and noted that she would be manually writing the meeting minutes without AI assistance before the meeting was closed out.

V. Meeting Adjournment



Boulder Faculty Assembly

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO **BOULDER**

- Zoom Link: <https://cuboulder.zoom.us/j/99587007297>

Please note the Zoom meeting has a limit of 500 attendees. If you are planning on attending remotely please arrive to the Zoom meeting early to ensure you can be let in. The meeting will be recorded so if you are unable to get into the meeting, the recording will be uploaded to the OneDrive afterwards, as well as having an in-person option for attendance.

Please note that questions from Zoom will be called on by the BFA Chair.

Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA) Norlin Library – E138

University of Colorado Boulder Boulder, CO 80309

303-492-6271

www.colorado.edu/bfa