



Policy: Use of Generative AI in Northwest Academic Programs

Revisions:

Jeehoon Kim – March 23, 2026

Jonathan Numada – July 6, 2026

Numada/McGillivray – Aug 5, 2026

Approved by Provost's Office: July 6, 2026

1. Purpose of the Policy

This policy is intended to address the growing impact of AI on student work and to establish a coherent framework for responding to its use and misuse within a CBTE (Competency-Based Theological Education) context.

The purpose of this policy is twofold:

- 1) To uphold academic integrity and accountability in student work; and
- 2) To ensure that required learning outcomes and competencies are authentically demonstrated by students.

Within CBTE, assessment is not primarily concerned with task completion, but with the demonstration of actual competencies. Accordingly, concerns related to AI use are addressed not merely as rule violations, but as questions of whether the required competencies have been genuinely demonstrated.

Furthermore, within theological education, the use of AI is not merely a technical or academic issue, but also a matter of character formation. Students are being formed not only as learners, but as Christian leaders whose integrity, honesty, and discernment must reflect their calling. Therefore, the use of AI must align with the values of truthfulness, responsibility, and faithful stewardship.

2. Student Guidance on the Responsible Use of Generative AI

Generative AI refers to a category of AI tools that generate new content including text, images, summaries, or data in response to user prompts. Examples include ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, and Microsoft Copilot.

Generative AI tools may serve as helpful learning aids when used appropriately. Within CBTE programs, students are encouraged to use such tools in ways that support—rather than replace—their own learning and formation.

Appropriate uses may include:

- Clarifying concepts or terminology
- Assisting with language translation or grammar

- Brainstorming ideas or organizing thoughts
- Reviewing one's own writing for clarity

However, students must ensure that:

- AI is not used to generate substantive content that replaces their own reasoning, reflection, or theological judgment
- All AI assistance is clearly disclosed through appropriate citation in footnotes and/or bibliography
- Submitted work reflects the student's own understanding and competency

Students are encouraged to reflect regularly on how their use of AI shapes their habits of thinking, honesty, and dependence, recognizing that these practices contribute to their ongoing formation as Christian leaders. Students must indicate how AI tools were used in their work and how such use supported (or hindered) their learning and formation.

3. Distinguishing AI Use, Misuse, and Academic Integrity Violations

It is important to distinguish between three related but distinct categories:

- 1) *Appropriate AI Use*
The use of AI as a supportive tool that does not replace or distort the student's own development and demonstration of competency.
- 2) *AI Misuse*
The use of AI in a way that prevents the accurate assessment of a student's competency development. This is addressed primarily through re-assessment and mentorship.
- 3) *Academic Integrity Violations*
Intentional deception, concealment, or repeated misuse of AI that constitutes a breach of institutional academic integrity standards and may result in disciplinary action such as failure of a course or dismissal from their academic program due to plagiarism or academic dishonesty.

4. Principles Governing the Use of Generative AI

- 1) Generative AI tools may be used only in a limited, supportive capacity as described in section 2
- 2) Any AI-generated content incorporated into coursework must be clearly disclosed and appropriately cited.
- 3) Generative AI may not be used to replace, transform, or substantially alter a student's own work, specifically thinking, interpretation, analysis, or theological judgment.
- 4) Students retain full academic and ethical accountability for all content submitted, including any AI-generated material.

5. Defining AI Misuse within a CBTE Framework

Within a CBTE framework, misuse of generative AI is understood not merely as a procedural violation, but as follows:

“AI misuse occurs when the use of generative AI interferes with or replaces the student's own demonstration of required competencies—particularly their reasoning, reflection, or practice—such that the presence of those competencies in the student cannot be reliably assessed.”

Accordingly, AI misuse is first evaluated as a matter of competency not yet demonstrated.

6. CBTE-Based Response Framework

1) Determination of “Not Yet Competent”

When the use of AI prevents faculty and mentors from reliably assessing a student’s actual competency, the relevant assessment may be designated as Not Yet Competent. This determination is not punitive in nature. Rather, it indicates that the required competency has not yet been adequately demonstrated.

2) Re-Assessment of Competency

Consistent with CBTE principles, re-assessment shall not consist of a simple resubmission of the same assignment. Instead, faculty may employ alternative assessment methods designed to directly verify competency, including but not limited to:

- Timed oral assessments
- Live or in-person written evaluations
- Short-form analytical writing completed in an AI-restricted environment
- Structured interviews conducted by faculty or mentors

The purpose of re-assessment is to confirm that the student can independently demonstrate the required competency.

3) Formative Interventions

Where appropriate, the mentor team may require formative interventions, such as:

- An Academic Integrity Reflection
- A written analysis of how AI use interfered with competency demonstration
- A learning plan outlining steps for future competency development

These interventions are educational and formative rather than disciplinary and may be documented within mentoring or academic records.

7. Intentional or Repeated Misuse

While CBTE emphasizes flexibility and formation, academic integrity remains an essential and non-negotiable aspect of Christian academic and ministry formation. The following situations may warrant escalation beyond a “Not Yet Competent” determination:

- Intentional concealment of AI use
- Repeated misuse of AI after prior warning or intervention
- Extensive reliance on AI that fundamentally compromises assessment validity

In such cases, responses may include:

- Failure of the assignment or course
- Submission of an Academic Integrity Report
- Program review, academic probation, suspension, or dismissal, in accordance with institutional policy