

Date of Hearing:

Fiscal: Yes

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PRIVACY AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

Rebecca Bauer-Kahan, Chair

SCR 82 (Niello) – As Amended June 11, 2026

SENATE VOTE: 37-0

SUBJECT: Public higher education: artificial intelligence usage

SYNOPSIS

Artificial intelligence (AI) has revolutionized many aspects of daily life. In higher education, generative AI systems like ChatGPT have shifted the ways in which learning and schoolwork is performed. Despite the near ubiquity of AI, best practices and guidelines for AI use in education are fragmented across different institutions, leading to a patchwork response that can significantly hamper student success in the evolving workforce.

To address these concerns, this author-sponsored measure encourages the leaders of the University of California (UC), California State University (CSU), and California Community Colleges to convene a workgroup to discuss best practices and strategies for AI use and deployment across the public institutions. The workgroup is asked to create a final report, to be made available to the public, detailing their strategies and best practices. Recent amendments request the workgroup to distribute the report within one year of the formation of the workgroup to the Legislature and relevant policy committees. Additionally, the amendments encourage the workgroup to consider strategies and best practices to protect student privacy, ensure safe and responsible use of AI, and mitigate user harm caused by excessive AI sycophancy and addictive features.

The measure is supported by the Associated Students Board of Directors at San Francisco State University. The measure has no registered opposition.

This measure was previously heard in the Higher Education Committee where it passed on a 10-0 vote.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Establishes the California State University (CSU), under the administration of the Trustees of the CSU, the University of California (UC), under the administration of the Regents of the UC, the California Community Colleges, under the administration of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and independent institutions of higher education as four segments of postsecondary education in the state. (Ed. Code §§ 66010, 70900, 66600, and Cal. Const. art. IX, § 9.)
- 2) Defines “artificial intelligence” or “AI” to mean an engineered or machine-based system that varies in its level of autonomy and that can, for explicit or implicit objectives, infer from the input it receives how to generate outputs that can influence physical or virtual environments. (Gov. Code § 11546.45.5.)

- 3) Requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to convene a working group on AI, and requires that working group to develop expanded guidance and a model policy on AI for use by local educational agencies. (Ed. Code § 33328.5.)
- 4) Requires the Secretary of Government Operations, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to evaluate, among other things, the impact that the proliferation of deepfakes has on state government, California-based businesses, and residents of the state, and the risks, including privacy risks, associated with the deployment of digital content forgery technologies and deepfakes on state and local government, California-based businesses, and residents of the state. (Gov. Code § 11547.5 et seq.)

THIS MEASURE:

- 1) States the following:
 - a. Rapid advancements in artificial intelligence present unprecedented opportunities and challenges for both students and faculty in higher education.
 - b. The University of California, California State University, and California Community Colleges lead higher education institutions across the state and the nation and must play a pivotal role in fostering responsible artificial intelligence integration.
 - c. Collaboration across the three institutions, that already work closely together, is vital to the coordination of student education, services, and outcomes.
 - d. Understanding how to use artificial intelligence in academic assignments is crucial to creating an environment that values innovation and knowledge while upholding academic honesty and integrity.
- 2) Encourages the President of the University of California, the Chancellor of the California State University, and the Chancellor for the California Community Colleges to create a workgroup of faculty, staff, and administrators to review the use of artificial intelligence in higher education.
- 3) Resolves that the workgroup should do all of the following:
 - a. Discuss strategies and best practices that lead to the acceptable use of artificial intelligence in higher education while emphasizing academic honesty and ethical academic standards;
 - b. Discuss strategies and best practices for acceptable use of artificial intelligence across the three segments of California public higher education;
 - c. Discuss strategies and best practices for the use of artificial intelligence in academic studies, including, but not limited to, mitigating plagiarism, ethically using artificial intelligence in academic assignments, and reasonable safeguards to protect student privacy and personal information;
 - d. Discuss strategies and best practices for using artificial intelligence as it relates to providing student academic support;

- e. Discuss and strategize on ways to provide professional support to professors on using artificial intelligence in student and faculty work;
 - f. Discuss and strategize on ways to provide professional support to professors on recognizing the use of artificial intelligence in student work, including reliable technologies for checking student work, and how to work with students to appropriately inform students when professors believe artificial intelligence was improperly used; and,
 - g. Discuss best practices for responding to violations of artificial intelligence usage standards, with student participation in these discussions for relevant feedback.
- 4) Encourages the workgroup to do all of the following:
- a. Collaborate with faculty, administrators, and students at the higher education segments, as well as individuals who work in higher education outside of California and experts in artificial intelligence;
 - b. Collaborate with liaisons from the statewide associated student bodies of the three segments of California public higher education; and,
 - c. Create a public report of the strategies and best practices for artificial intelligence usage agreed upon by the workgroup within one year following the formation of the workgroup and submit the report to the Legislature and relevant policy committees of the Legislature with jurisdiction over higher education and privacy and consumer protection.

COMMENTS:

1) **Author's statement.** According to the author:

As we know, Artificial Intelligence (AI) is an emerging technology. The Legislature is working diligently on how California can be at the forefront of using AI, and that includes thinking through the impact this technology is having on our daily lives and how that may need to be limited in some instances. In the case of higher education, it is important to discuss the impact and best practices to be sure students can thrive in their educational journeys. Since AI can be used to do almost anything, including helping students cheat by allowing the student to pass off work created by AI as their own, it is vital our education systems are prepared and communicating on how to deal with these situations.

In addition, professors/faculty are on the front lines trying to assess student mastery of the subject, and many are having a hard time catching work that was created by AI. In some classes, the use of AI is encouraged, while in others it is punished. It is time that they have access to the best practices and tools that will help ensure that students are applying what they learned in the classroom, and not just copying and pasting what an AI bot wrote for them.

While each institution is working on the issue on their own, it is imperative they be communicating as a group due to California's connected system. SCR 82 encourages dialogue amongst the CA higher education systems to help promote the best approaches in

teaching, as well as regulations around the allowable usage AI. This is important not only for the student, but also faculty who are in uncharted waters. Convening a workgroup is in the best interest of all parties involved to work towards clear guidelines for usage.

2) **Artificial intelligence in education.** AI, and specifically generative AI (GenAI), is already drastically altering the modalities of modern life. Since ChatGPT's launch in 2022, the use of GenAI chatbots has skyrocketed, with one report suggesting that roughly 115 million to 180 million people use GenAI daily.¹ A report published by the College Board in 2025 found that 84 percent of high school students use GenAI for schoolwork, predominantly as a source of information and answers.² This is a sharp increase from two years prior in 2023, when a Pew Survey found that just 13 percent of teens were using ChatGPT for schoolwork.³ Despite the widespread adoption of GenAI tools, many students and teachers still demonstrate apprehension surrounding the utility of the tool, with roughly half of all high school students surveyed falling neutral on whether they believe that the benefits of using AI outweigh the risks.⁴ Despite lingering questions regarding the benefits of GenAI tools, universities and workforces have begun to deploy these systems as tools to support learning and productivity. Students and faculty, therefore, must quickly develop AI literacy to adapt to the changing landscapes, and need appropriate guidance to navigate these systems.

3) **Existing workgroups and initiatives in higher education.** Separately, the UC, CSU, and California Community Colleges have undertaken several AI-related initiatives. In 2020, the UC convened the "UC Presidential Working Group on Artificial Intelligence," which issued a final report in 2021 titled "Responsible Artificial Intelligence: Recommendations to Guide the University of California's Artificial Intelligence Strategy."⁵ The final report made several recommendations, including institutionalizing the UC Responsible AI Principles in procurement and oversight practices, establishing campus-level councils and systemwide coordination through the UC Office of the President, developing a risk and impact assessment strategy, and documenting AI-enabled technologies in a public database.⁶

In 2024, the UC Academic Senate Workgroup on Artificial Intelligence was formed and tasked with surveying the use of AI in "admissions, teaching, and research, alongside issues of faculty workload and welfare."⁷ The resulting report, released in January 2026, highlighted three core principles for developing recommendations for AI use: faculty agency and shared decision-making in incorporating AI into teaching and research; adaptability and flexibility in adopting AI

¹ Andres, Guadamuz, "How many people are using generative AI on a daily basis? A Gemini report," (Apr 14, 2025), <https://www.technollama.co.uk/a-gemini-report-how-many-people-are-using-generative-ai-on-a-daily-basis-a-gemini-report>.

² Alexandra Adair et al., "U.S. High School Students' Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence," *College Board Research*, (Oct. 2025), <https://research.collegeboard.org/technology-learning>.

³ Olivia Sidoti & J. Gottfried, "About 1 in 5 U.S. teens who've heard of ChatGPT have used it for schoolwork," *Pew Research Center*, (Nov. 16, 2023), <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2023/11/16/about-1-in-5-us-teens-who've-heard-of-chatgpt-have-used-it-for-schoolwork/>.

⁴ Adair et al., "High School Students' Use of GenAI."

⁵ University of California Presidential Working Group on Artificial Intelligence, "Presidential Working Group on Artificial Intelligence," (Oct. 2021), <https://www.ucop.edu/ethics-compliance-audit-services/compliance/presidential-working-group-on-artificial-intelligence.html>.

⁶ *Id.*, p. 5-6.

⁷ "UC Academic Senate Workgroup on Artificial Intelligence," (Jan. 5, 2026), p. 1, <https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ai-workgroup/index.html>.

policies and practices; and responsible data stewardship through attention to transparency, data privacy, and data ownership.⁸

CSU launched their AI-Empowered Initiative in 2025 that established partnerships with some of the world’s leading tech companies and deployed a campuswide AI tool developed by OpenAI – ChatGPT Edu – that would enable “students, faculty, and staff to use AI to accelerate learning, optimize workflow efficiency, and foster cross-departmental collaboration.”⁹

A year after announcing the AI Initiative, CSU conducted a systemwide survey of over 75,000 individuals about students and faculty’s feelings about the initiative. Despite the nearly \$17 million spent on the initiative, students felt the implementation was rushed, inconsistent, and lacked adequate training and awareness.¹⁰ Many students appeared unaware of the tool or unsure how to use it, and students noted a lack of unified guidance across classrooms, leading to confusion about acceptable AI use. Additionally, conflicting faculty approaches, with some encouraging AI while others forbade its uses, exacerbated student confusion and apprehension of the tools.¹¹ Given these widespread concerns, over half of students – and over 70 percent of faculty – wanted formal training on AI tools.¹²

The California Community Colleges, in alignment with Vision 2030, established the Digital Center for Innovation, Transformation, and Equity, a systemwide hub that serves to provide hands-on professional learning to advance AI literacy and experimentation to address evolving workforce demands.¹³ Housed within the Digital Center for Innovation, Transformation, and Equity is the Play Lab Pilot, a systemwide professional learning initiative that supports faculty and staff in “developing practical, educator-led approaches to AI literacy through hands-on design and implementation.”¹⁴ Since its pilot launch in 2024, over 400 faculty and staff have participated in Play Lab’s training on developing AI tools.¹⁵

In 2024, California’s Education Learning Lab launched their AI Grand Challenge: Leveraging AI for Teaching and Learning grant program, which aimed to foster innovation in AI use to enhance curriculum and learning within California’s higher education system. Nearly 75 institutions across the California Community Colleges, CSU, and UC systems applied, and five projects were selected to receive grants of up to \$1.5 million each.¹⁶ These projects strive to

⁸ *Id.*, p. 2-3.

⁹ “CSU Announces Landmark Initiative to Become Nation’s First and Largest AI-Empowered University System,” *The California State University*, (Feb. 4, 2025), <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/news/Pages/CSU-AI-Powered-Initiative.aspx>.

¹⁰ “CSU Students’ Response to the CSU AI Initiative,” *California State Student Association*, (Feb. 24, 2026), <https://calstatestudents.org/cssas-white-paper-on-csus-ai-initiative/>.

¹¹ “CSU Students’ Response to CSU AI Initiative.”

¹² Jaweed Kaleem, “A \$17-million bet brought ChatGPT to CSU campuses. A year later, AI distrust leaves many divided,” *Los Angeles Times*, (Apr. 1, 2026), <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2026-04-01/csu-ai-survey-students-faculty>.

¹³ “Digital Center for Innovation, Transformation, and Equity,” California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, <https://ai.cccco.edu/initiative/digital-center/>.

¹⁴ California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, “Playlab Pilot,” <https://ai.cccco.edu/initiative/playlab-pilot/>.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ California Education Learning Lab, “2024-25 RFP: AI Grand Challenge Grant Awards Announced,” (Nov. 20, 2024), <https://calearninglab.org/2024/11/20/ai-grand-award-announcements/>.

promote equitable learning through AI to improve academic writing and performance in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) disciplines.¹⁷

4) What this measure would do. Despite widespread deployment of AI tools in higher education, there is currently little collaboration across public systems regarding best practices for AI use for education. This resolution encourages the UC President, the CSU Chancellor, and the California Community Colleges Chancellor to create a workgroup of faculty, staff, and administrators to review the use of AI in higher education. Specifically, this resolution asks the leaders of the three segments of California public higher education to discuss strategies and best practices for AI in academic studies, including how to mitigate plagiarism, teaching ethical use of AI, enforcing data privacy and good data stewardship, providing professional support to professors, and developing protocols to respond to violations in the AI usage standards. The resolution asks the workgroup to develop a report and make public the strategies and best practices for AI usage to be distributed to the Legislature and relevant policy committees.

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The Associated Students Board of Directors at San Francisco State University, write in support:

As the official voice of students at San Francisco State University, we support SCR82 as it will help create a workgroup for educators, staff and administrators on the best practices to use artificial intelligence.

We see this workgroup as a vital complement to the Systemwide CSU Generative AI Committee and the Chancellor's Office AI Course workgroup, ensuring that faculty, staff, administrators, and student representatives are involved in shared decision making.

As students, we believe SCR82 is necessary because it will help intersegmental leaders gain a better understanding about how the use of artificial intelligence will be utilized and implemented into higher education, with a focus on AI literacy, ethics, and best practice usage.

The use of AI has impacted students in the CSU and has raised a variety of questions and concerns such as environmental responsibility, academic integrity, transparency and critical thinking skills. In light of the CSU's \$17 million partnership with Open AI – an immense investment in AI during a time of faculty layoffs and financial strain makes the role of this workforce even more essential.

Ensuring awareness and promoting clearer communication on the different ways AI will be implemented throughout the CSU is important to reducing confusion and making sure students know how these tools are used.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Associated Student of San Francisco State University

Opposition

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

None on file.

Analysis Prepared by: Kate Davis / P. & C.P. / (916) 319-2200