Survey Takeaways (AI generated)

Faculty and Staff Perspectives on AI — Buffalo State University

Survey Context

- The dataset consists of **just under 100 complete responses**.
- Responses are primarily **open-ended qualitative comments** rather than scaled numerical ratings.
- Findings below are based on **recurring themes, frequency of mentions, and consistency across independent responses**.

1. Barriers to AI Use Frequently Mentioned

Across responses, the following barriers appear repeatedly:

- Ethical objections to AI use
- Concern about negative effects on student learning and critical thinking
- Distrust of AI accuracy (e.g., hallucinations, fabricated information)
- Environmental impact (energy use, water use, data centers)
- Opposition to perceived pressure to adopt AI
- Belief that AI use undermines authentic intellectual work
- Lack of perceived usefulness for one's job
- Lack of clarity about how to integrate AI into coursework
- Desire for institutional policy clarity before adoption

Multiple respondents explicitly state **they do not intend to use AI regardless of training or support**.

2. Attitudes Toward Support and Training

Responses regarding support needs fall into distinct groups:

- Some respondents request:
  - Clear institutional policy
  - Examples of best practices
  - Workshops
  - Group training
- Others explicitly state:
  - They are not interested in training
  - No amount of training would change their position
  - They already understand AI but do not find it useful
  - They do not want to use AI in their work

This indicates that lack of adoption is **not solely attributable to lack of knowledge**.

3. Perceived Impact on Teaching and Learning

Commonly reported concerns include:

- Students submitting AI-generated work
- Difficulty determining whether work is student-authored
- Reduced value of grading and feedback when work is AI-generated
- Concern that AI discourages independent thinking
- Perception that AI enables avoidance of learning rather than support of learning

Some respondents describe grading AI-generated work as **professionally demoralizing** and **educationally ineffective**.

4. Ethical and Environmental Concerns Appear Frequently

Repeated themes include:

- Environmental impact of AI infrastructure
- Exploitation of creative work used in training models
- Concerns about corporate motives behind AI deployment
- Harm to vulnerable populations
- Data privacy and surveillance concerns

These concerns are raised independently by many respondents and are not isolated to a single discipline or role group.

5. Policy Language Generated Extensive Feedback

Respondents commonly critique the proposed AI statement for:

- Vagueness
- Lack of operational clarity
- Undefined terms such as:
  - "vetted tools"
  - "substantial use"
  - "qualified human"
  - "approved tools"
- Unclear enforcement mechanisms
- Lack of concrete examples

Multiple respondents explicitly request:

- Sample syllabus language
- Specific guidance on permitted vs. prohibited practices
- Clear lists of approved tools

6. Mixed Views on Faculty Discretion

Two positions appear repeatedly:

- Support for faculty autonomy in deciding AI use in courses
- Concern that inconsistent policies across courses may confuse students and create inequity

Both viewpoints are expressed by multiple respondents, indicating **no clear consensus**.

7. Evidence of Both Rejection and Acceptance

The data include:

- Respondents who state they will never use AI
- Respondents who use AI regularly but express ethical concern
- Respondents who support responsible adoption
- Respondents who support the proposed statement
- Respondents who oppose the statement entirely

This suggests the distribution of views is **heterogeneous rather than uniform**.

8. Repeated Requests for Institutional Clarity

Across multiple sections, respondents ask for:

- A published list of approved AI tools
- Clear rules regarding data entry into AI systems
- FERPA/privacy guidance
- Clear accountability structures
- Consistent institutional standards

This theme appears in responses from both supporters and skeptics of AI.

Summary

From a statistical perspective, the data support the following high-confidence conclusions:

- Concern about AI's impact on learning is **widespread**.
- Ethical and environmental objections are **not marginal**; they appear frequently.
- Lack of clarity in policy is a **dominant structural issue**.
- Resistance to AI adoption cannot be explained solely by lack of training.
- The respondent population exhibits **substantial variance in attitudes**, not polarization into two simple camps.