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

Proposition: 09-26/27

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

(If Joint proposition, also select type)

Title: Bill Prohibiting the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence by Evaluators in Faculty Annual Performance Evaluations

Date Submitted: October 26, 2026

Sponsor(s): K.T. Manis (Business), Don Fuqua (Business), Tanya Allred (New Mexico State University Alamogordo), Kim Lopez Gallagher (New Mexico State University Alamogordo)

Proposed Committee: Access, Opportunity, and Outreach

Prior Approvals: N/A

Proposal:

This bill amends ARP 9.31 (Annual Performance Evaluation, Regular Faculty) and provides for its implementation as follows. New ARP language is shown in italics.

1. Use of generative AI by evaluators.

Add the following new Part 4.C to Part 4 (Requirements for Principal Units' Evaluation Policies):

C. Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence by Evaluators

1. Department heads, deans, and members of any committee participating in the annual performance evaluation of a faculty member shall not use generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools to evaluate, rate, rank, or summarize a faculty member's performance or evaluation materials, or to draft any written evaluation, recommendation, or response concerning that faculty member's annual performance.

2. Evaluators shall not enter any part of a faculty member's evaluation materials, including the written section submitted under Part 4.B.3 and any supplemental materials, into a generative AI tool.

3. This Part C does not prohibit conventional spelling and grammar checking of text the evaluator has written, or the use of assistive technology

under an approved accommodation, provided that no part of the faculty member's evaluation materials is entered into a generative AI tool.

4. On written request by the faculty member, the evaluator shall confirm in writing that the evaluation was prepared in compliance with this Part 4.C.

2. Implementation.

The Office of the Provost shall communicate this requirement to department heads, deans, and evaluation committees before the start of the 2027-28 annual evaluation cycle.

3. Duration.

This prohibition shall remain in effect unless and until the Faculty Senate approves standards for the use of university-approved, secure generative AI tools in faculty evaluation.

All other provisions of ARP 9.31 remain unchanged.

Rationale:

ARP 9.31 assigns responsibility for evaluating each faculty member's annual performance to department heads, deans, and, where appropriate, departmental and college committees, and requires those evaluators to exercise professional judgment about the faculty member's accomplishments in light of the faculty member's Allocation of Effort. Annual evaluation materials contain confidential personnel information and may contain student education records protected by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), unpublished research, and other intellectual property, yet ARP 9.31 contains no provision governing how those materials may be handled.

This bill is a companion to the proposition establishing standards for faculty members' own use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) in annual performance evaluation submissions. It is offered separately because it addresses a different question: not how faculty prepare their reports, but how those reports are handled and judged by the people who evaluate them.

Two concerns drive the bill. The first is confidentiality: entering a faculty member's evaluation materials into a generative AI tool may expose those materials to third parties and to the tool's training processes. The second is integrity: an annual evaluation affects salary, promotion, and tenure and should reflect the evaluator's own considered judgment, and using an AI tool to rate, summarize, or write an evaluation may substitute automated output for the professional judgment the evaluation process requires.

Among the policies reviewed in preparing these propositions, this was the point of widest agreement. Institutions differ on whether faculty may use AI to prepare their own materials, but federal funding agencies, peer universities, and professional organizations

consistently bar reviewers from feeding confidential review materials into AI tools or relying on AI to form or write their judgments. The National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation prohibit reviewers from using generative AI in grant peer review, the University of Arizona does so for internal faculty peer review, and Virginia Tech and Dickinson College do so for faculty personnel reviews. The American Association of University Professors has stated that decisions about faculty careers should not rely primarily or exclusively on AI, and the University of California Academic Senate has recommended that faculty "should know when and if AI is being used in the preparation of their review files."

The bill is narrowly drawn. It permits ordinary spelling and grammar checking of an evaluator's own writing and protects approved accommodations. It gives faculty members a simple way to confirm compliance. It also anticipates change: if the university later adopts secure, approved AI tools, the Faculty Senate can approve standards for their use, as the University of Iowa has done through unit-level votes, rather than leaving the matter to individual discretion.

Should the Senate find this approach suitable, the sponsors anticipate a parallel amendment for promotion and tenure reviews under ARP 9.35.

References:

American Association of University Professors. (2025). Artificial intelligence and academic professions. https://www.aaup.org/reports-publications/aaup-policies-reports/topical-reports/artificial-intelligence-and-academic

National Institutes of Health. (2023, June 23). The use of generative artificial intelligence technologies is prohibited for the NIH peer review process (NOT-OD-23-149). https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-23-149.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

University of Arizona, Office of Faculty Affairs. (2024). Confidentiality agreement for peer review. https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/2024-02/2024-25_11_Confidentiality%20Agreement.pdf

University of California Academic Senate. (2025, December 10; transmitted 2026, January 5). Senate AI workgroup report. https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/council-chair-to-senate-divisions-senate-ai-workgroup-report.pdf

University of Iowa Faculty Senate. (2025, October). Guidelines for responsible use of AI in faculty reviews. https://faculty-senate.uiowa.edu/sites/faculty-

senate.uiowa.edu/files/2025-10/Acceptable-Use-of-AI-Guidelines-for-Faculty-Review_final.pdf

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