AI Additional Comments – For Consideration

**From:** Erwin, Roseann <[RErwin@losmedanos.edu](mailto:RErwin@losmedanos.edu)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 3, 2025 11:00 AM  
**To:** Giambattista, Louie <[LGiambattista@losmedanos.edu](mailto:LGiambattista@losmedanos.edu)>  
**Cc:** Simone, Adrianna <[asimone@losmedanos.edu](mailto:asimone@losmedanos.edu)>; Gunder, Paula <[pgunder@losmedanos.edu](mailto:pgunder@losmedanos.edu)>  
**Subject:** RE: AI District Policy

The AI Task Team met yesterday and here are the variety of views expressed:

* The onus should be on the faculty to communicate their expectations regarding AI use.
* We need to have this policy as a starting point; AI needs to be addressed somewhere in the college’s policy since many faculty have already voiced concern over its usage and academic dishonesty.
* Faculty can’t anticipate how AI technology will evolve. Some faculty may not care about it now but their students could begin using it in ways they don’t anticipate. The “don’t use unless explicitly permitted” protects faculty against rapid and unexpected changes in the technology.
* Faculty who are in opposition to the proposed language should clarify what language or action they want to see.
* At the other two colleges, the policy has been part of a 2-pronged approach: Create a policy that defaults to AI prohibition while encouraging and supporting faculty in creating their own syllabus statement to make students aware of their expectations.
* We all agree that faculty should be transparent and forthcoming in their expectations. Aside from the student policy, is it possible to compel faculty to address AI in their course syllabi?

I am also unclear about how the LMC Senate > FSCC > DGC process is expected to work and how it relates to the efforts of Kelly Schelin. Do you want me to ask John Freytag? While I personally support the policy, I’m unclear on the impact of LMC’s Senate approval.

-- Roseann