<div align="center">

INSTITUTIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
November 21, 2025

</div>

Present: Adrian Bautista, Claudette Castillo '28, Marc Conner (Chair), Amy Frappier, David Hargadon, Timothy Harper (Vice Chair), Michelle Hubbs, Zhenelle LeBel, Ting Li, Yueqi Li, Samantha Majiedt '27, Kerry Nelson, Jess Ricker, Tarah Rowse, Joe Stankovich, Elizabeth Stauderman, Natalie Taylor, Amy Tweedy, Sarah Vero, Joshua Woodfork, Aiwu Zhao.

Absent: Michelle Hubbs, Ting Li, Joe Stankovich.

Zoom: Zhenelle LeBel, Kerry Nelson, Murat Yildiz.

Guests: AI Resistors Barbara Black and Erica Wojcik.

This meeting was called to order at 10:33 a.m.

1. **Approval of November 7, 2025 Meeting Minutes**

VP Woodfork announced two corrections to the IPPC meeting minutes draft. With no further proposed changes, **the November 7 minutes were unanimously approved.**

2. **Artificial Intelligence (AI) Discussion with AI Working Group Members**

The committee held its second dedicated AI discussion, this time featuring Erica Wojcik (Psychology) and Barbara Black (English) as representatives of the "AI Resistors" group—faculty members with critical perspectives on AI use in higher education. This session was designed as a parallel conversation to the 11/7 meeting with the AI Working Group members.

Faculty Critical Perspectives (Erica and Barbara's Opening Remarks)

Academic Integrity Concerns:
- AI fundamentally undermines the educational process by doing students' thinking for them
- Students are using AI to complete assignments without genuine learning or skill development
- Traditional assignments (essays, problem sets) are becoming obsolete when AI can generate responses
- Detecting AI use is nearly impossible and creates an adversarial relationship with students
- Honor code violations are difficult to prove, leading to erosion of academic standards

Pedagogical Issues:
- AI short-circuits the learning process, particularly in writing and critical thinking development
- Students are bypassing the productive struggle necessary for deep learning
- Faculty are having to fundamentally rethink assessment methods, which is exhausting
- The focus shifts from teaching content to policing AI use

- Students don't understand that using AI deprives them of learning opportunities

Equity and Access Concerns:
- Not all students have equal access to advanced AI tools (premium subscriptions, latest versions)
- Creates an unfair advantage for students with resources to access better AI tools
- Students with disabilities who need assistive technology may face confusion about what's permitted (although AI can also be an assistance tool for these students)
- Digital divide extends to AI literacy and access

Labor and Professional Concerns:
- Faculty workload dramatically increases: redesigning courses, monitoring for AI use, updating syllabi
- Pressure to adopt AI tools they're uncomfortable with or see as harmful
- Professional devaluation—if AI can do aspects of faculty work, questions about faculty necessity
- Administrative push to "embrace AI" feels coercive rather than supportive (although it remains unclear where this "administrative push" is seen—might be more a perception than a reality)

Broader Educational Values:
- AI represents a corporate technology being imposed on educational institutions, one could argue
- Shifts education from process-oriented to product-oriented
- Threatens the liberal arts mission of developing critical thinking, not just producing outputs
- Students are being prepared to be consumers of AI rather than independent thinkers
- Concerns about data privacy, surveillance, and commercialization of student work

Committee Discussion and Responses

Student Perspectives:
- Students acknowledged widespread AI use among peers
- Recognition that many students don't understand what constitutes academic dishonesty with AI
- Desire for clear guidelines across courses (currently very inconsistent)—which needs to come from faculty
- Students want to learn but also feel pressure to use AI to keep up with workload
- Need for education about appropriate vs. inappropriate AI use

Administrative Considerations:
- Acknowledgment that doing nothing is not an option—risks legal liability and policy vacuum
- Need to balance faculty autonomy with institutional guidance
- Tension between those wanting rapid policy implementation and those wanting thorough consultation

- Recognition that one-size-fits-all policies won't work across all disciplines and courses

Practical Challenges Raised:
- How to distinguish between AI as a tool (like spell-check) vs. doing the intellectual work
- Where to draw lines: outlining vs. drafting? Editing vs. generating?
- How to maintain academic standards while acknowledging AI's presence
- Need for faculty development and support, not just policy mandates
- Assessment redesign needed across the institution

Environmental and Ethical Dimensions:
- Environmental impact of AI's energy consumption (raised again from prior meeting)
- Bias and accuracy concerns with AI outputs
- Copyright and intellectual property questions
- Long-term implications for workforce preparation and human capabilities

Areas of Agreement
- Status quo is untenable—some institutional response is necessary
- Faculty need support, not just mandates
- Students need clear, consistent guidance
- Cannot ignore AI or ban it effectively
- Discipline-specific and even course-specific approaches may be needed
- Academic integrity policies need updating to address AI explicitly

Points of Tension
- Speed of policy development (urgency vs. thorough consultation)
- Faculty autonomy vs. institutional consistency (and importance of recognizing that there is no single faculty view on AI—many faculty already embrace it, just as many strongly oppose it)
- Embracing AI as opportunity vs. resisting AI as threat to education
- Individual faculty discretion vs. baseline institutional standards
- Process-focused learning vs. product-focused outcomes

Next Steps
- **Immediate Action (December Faculty Meeting):** CEPP (Committee on Educational Policies and Planning) will make a statement at or before the December faculty meeting providing baseline guidelines for faculty regarding AI use in teaching—described as "a toe in the water" with a few fundamental points
- **Policy Development Process:**
  - President reiterated commitment that no policies will go forward without community-wide opportunity for feedback (though acknowledged this creates tension with desire for speed)
  - Cabinet and AI Working Group continuing to identify issues requiring immediate attention to avoid institutional liability
- **Ongoing Stakeholder Engagement:** Continue gathering perspectives across campus community

3. 2024-2025 Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness Annual Report

Institutional Effectiveness Specialist Amy Tweedy presented the report which was worked on by the Subcommittee on Institutional Effectiveness. The report is helpful with our Middle States reaccreditation effort as it curates how we are learning about ourselves across the institution. It showcases a systematic process of how we are documenting our assessment work. Specialist Tweedy noted that AI was utilized in preparing the report.

4. Call for Agenda Items
    a. Discuss appropriate next steps for "AI baseline policy"
    b. Review event publicity policy (separate long-standing item from the Student Affairs Subcommittee)
    c. Committee members to read the Institutional Effectiveness Annual Report before next meeting and provide feedback
    d. Various IPPC subcommittees continuing their work to report to full committee in spring semester

5. Other Business

The Committee on Intercultural and Global Understanding is holding two forums today on the *Strategic Plan's* Foundation 4 on continuing the work of an inclusive community, introducing the People, Practices, and Programs (3P) Model, updating on a campus-wide land acknowledgement, learning about access efforts, and soliciting feedback.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:56 a.m.

Summary document assisted by Claude AI.

    Please advise the President's Office of any suggested changes to these meeting minutes.