Please ensure the proposition is ADA compliant or will be edited for compliance by the Faculty Senate Recording Secretary.

Proposition: 08-26/27

Proposal Type: ☒Bill ☐Resolution ☐Memorial ☐Joint Proposition ☐Other

(If Joint proposition, also select type)

Title: Bill Establishing Standards for Faculty Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Annual Performance Evaluation Submissions

Date Submitted: October 26, 2026

Sponsor(s): K.T. Manis (Business), Don Fuqua (Business), Tanya Allred (Alamogordo Community College)

Proposed Committee: Access, Opportunity, and Outreach

Prior Approvals: N/A

Proposal:

Whereas, ARP 9.31, Part 4.B.3 ("Submission from Faculty Member"), requires each faculty member's annual performance evaluation to include "a written section submitted by the faculty member detailing and citing accomplishments"; and

Whereas, generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools are now widely available to faculty and are capable of drafting, revising, and summarizing narrative text, but ARP 9.31 does not address whether or how faculty may use them in preparing that written section; and

Whereas, in the absence of a stated standard, faculty members cannot know whether such use is acceptable, and evaluators may apply differing and unstated expectations, contrary to the principle of Equitable Treatment in ARP 9.31, Part 2; and

Whereas, since Spring 2024 NMSU has required every course syllabus to state one of three standard levels of permitted generative AI use (Provost memorandum of January 3, 2024), a structure that faculty already understand and that respects differences among disciplines; and

Whereas, national standards for scholarly and grant writing, including those of the National Science Foundation, the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, and the Committee on Publication Ethics, hold that a human author remains fully responsible for the accuracy of any material prepared with AI assistance and that such assistance should be disclosed; and

Whereas, annual evaluation materials may contain student education records protected by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), unpublished research, and confidential personnel information that should not be entered into AI tools the university has not approved for such data;

Therefore, be it enacted, that ARP 9.31 (Annual Performance Evaluation, Regular Faculty) be amended as follows, with new language shown in italics:

1. Add a new item 8 to Part 4.A (Policies) of Part 4, Requirements for Principal Units' Evaluation Policies:

> *8. Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence. Each Principal Unit's evaluation policy shall state, or shall authorize each of its departments to state, which one of the following levels of generative artificial intelligence (AI) use applies to the written section submitted by the faculty member under Part 4.B.3. Where no level has been stated, Level 2 applies.*
>
> > *Level 1: Use Permitted with Disclosure. Faculty members may use generative AI tools to draft, revise, or edit the written section, provided that the use is disclosed as described in Part 4.B.3.*
> >
> > *Level 2: Limited Use with Disclosure. Faculty members may use generative AI tools to edit, condense, or organize text they have written themselves, but not to generate narrative content. Any such use must be disclosed as described in Part 4.B.3.*
> >
> > *Level 3: No Use Permitted. The written section must be composed by the faculty member without the use of generative AI tools.*
>
> *For the purposes of this item, conventional spelling and grammar checking, and assistive technology used under an approved accommodation, are not considered generative AI use.*

2. Add the following to the end of Part 4.B.3 (Submission from Faculty Member):

> *The faculty member is the author of this section and is responsible for the accuracy of every statement in it, including any error, omission, or fabricated content introduced by a generative AI tool. Where the applicable level under Part 4.A.8 permits generative AI use, the faculty member shall disclose that use in a brief note identifying the tool, its purpose, and the portions of the section affected; for example: "I used [tool] to [edit for length] in [Sections 2 and 4]. I reviewed all content and am responsible for its accuracy." Disclosed use that is consistent with the applicable level shall not by itself be a basis for a lower evaluation. Faculty members shall not enter student education records, unpublished research, intellectual property belonging to others, or confidential personnel information*

into any generative AI tool that the university has not approved for that type of data.

Be it further enacted, that each Principal Unit state its level, or authorize its departments to do so, before the start of the 2027-28 annual evaluation cycle, and that the Office of the Provost communicate this requirement to faculty, department heads, and deans in the same manner as the syllabus AI statement requirement; and

Be it further enacted, that the Faculty Senate standing committee responsible for faculty evaluation policy review the operation of this provision, and report to the Faculty Senate on whether revisions are needed, no later than the end of the 2029-30 academic year.

Rationale:

Faculty members are already asking whether they may use generative AI to help write their annual reports, and NMSU policy gives no answer. The question was raised by Faculty Senate leadership and taken up by the University Planning (now Faculty Success) Committee, whose bylaw charge includes ensuring that policy on faculty annual performance appraisals is up to date and applied consistently.

This bill takes a deliberately modest approach. Rather than impose one rule on every discipline, it adapts the three-level structure that NMSU already uses for course syllabi and lets Principal Units, or their departments, choose the level that fits their norms. A default level applies wherever no choice has been made, so no faculty member is left without a standard. Two protections apply everywhere regardless of level: the faculty member remains responsible for the accuracy of the report, and confidential data stay out of unapproved tools.

The disclosure and accountability language follows established national practice. The National Science Foundation states that proposers "are responsible for the accuracy and authenticity of their proposal submission," and the Committee on Publication Ethics holds that authors are "fully responsible for the content" of their work, "even those parts produced by an AI tool." Some institutions, including Virginia Tech for promotion and tenure dossiers and Dickinson College for personnel reviews, have chosen instead to prohibit AI use entirely; Level 3 preserves that option for units that prefer it. A university-wide ban was not proposed because AI detection tools are unreliable and a rule that cannot be applied consistently would itself undermine equitable treatment.

The protective clause stating that disclosed, permitted use shall not by itself lower an evaluation ensures that faculty who follow the rule and disclose honestly are not penalized for doing so. A companion proposition addresses the separate question of evaluators' use of generative AI.

References:

Committee on Publication Ethics. (2023). Authorship and AI tools: COPE position statement. https://publicationethics.org/guidance/cope-position/authorship-and-ai-tools

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. (n.d.). Artificial intelligence (AI)-assisted technology: AI use by authors. https://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/artificial-intelligence/ai-use-by-authors.html

National Science Foundation. (2023, updated 2026). Notice to research community: Use of generative artificial intelligence technology in the NSF merit review process. https://www.nsf.gov/news/notice-to-the-research-community-on-ai

New Mexico State University, Office of the Provost. (2024, January 3). AI syllabus statement. https://provost.nmsu.edu/communications/2024/01/ai_syllabus_statement_1-3-24.html

New Mexico State University. ARP 9.31, Annual Performance Evaluation, Regular Faculty. https://arp.nmsu.edu/chapter-9/9-31.html

Dickinson College, Faculty Personnel Committee. (2026, May). Policy on the use of AI in personnel reviews. https://www.dickinson.edu/download/downloads/id/17320/fpc_ai_policy_-_may_2026.pdf

Virginia Tech, Office of the Provost. (2025). 2025-26 promotion and tenure changes workshop. https://faculty.vt.edu/content/dam/faculty_vt_edu/files/promotion-tenure/2025-26%20PT%20Changes%20Workshop.pdf