

MEMORANDUM

To: Suffolk Law Faculty

From: Dean Andrew Perlman¹

Date: July 27, 2026

Re: Recommended Next Steps on Artificial Intelligence and Teaching

Executive Summary

AI tools perform a growing number of law-related tasks at a sophisticated level, and a national survey indicates that many law students use the tools regularly. Building on the conversation we had at our May 14 retreat, this memorandum proposes a structured, evidence-informed response to AI's increasing capabilities, organized around four questions:

- What should students learn *about* AI?
- To what extent should students learn *with* AI?
- How might faculty effectively *teach with* AI?
- And how should we *assess* students in an AI world?

The memo recommends a year of committee work to address each of these four questions in detail, with reports and proposals submitted to the faculty in spring 2027. The work will include the following charges:

- The Curriculum Committee, in consultation with other relevant faculty committees, will:
 - Conduct a comprehensive curriculum review to ensure that our students continue to learn the knowledge and skills they need in a changing legal profession, including any new knowledge and skills related to AI;
 - Recommend a school-wide policy on students' use of AI in coursework; and

¹ This memorandum was lightly edited with AI tools, including ChatGPT and Claude. I wrote the memo in all relevant respects in consultation with the Law School's academic deans, and I personally identified the four questions, drafted the recommendations, framed the committee charges, verified the footnotes, and developed the interim measures. Of course, I take full responsibility for the memorandum and any errors it contains. Given the increasing ubiquity of AI tools, I believe that this disclosure will soon become unnecessary for a memorandum of this kind and that it will simply be assumed (as it always has been) that we take full responsibility for any content to which we attach our names. I offer the disclosure, however, because expectations in this area are still evolving.

- Lead a review of our assessment policies, including any needed updates to our certifications for unproctored written summative assessments (i.e., assessments that impact a student's grade in the course and occur outside of proctored conditions), new standards for investigating unauthorized AI use, and guidance on examination conditions and the use of unproctored summative assessments.
- The Teaching Committee will:
 - Develop training and resources for students on effective, responsible studying with AI; and
 - Gather effective faculty practices and recommend faculty training, disclosure norms, and human-review standards for AI in teaching.

The memo also proposes a limited set of interim measures while the above work is underway. Subject to your input, the measures will take effect this fall and expire on June 30, 2027, unless the faculty extends or replaces them. These measures include:

- Requiring every syllabus to state the course's AI policy, supported by a model statement that the deans will circulate and that faculty are welcome to adjust to their course needs;
- Subject to approved accommodations and other authorized exceptions, requiring all summative assessments in Civil Procedure, Constitutional Law, Contracts, Criminal Law, Property, and Torts to be administered using secure examination software that blocks internet and local file access, unless the academic deans approve a professor's request that is submitted at least one month before the assessment, describes the alternative in detail, and includes the professor's plan for ensuring the integrity of the exam administration;
- Subject to approved accommodations and other authorized exceptions, prohibiting students from uploading class recordings or any identifiable contribution from another student to third-party generative AI services without written permission from the instructor and every affected student (a standard that effectively precludes the uploading of most class recordings);
- Including a more robust session during orientation regarding AI use and distributing to all students an evidence-informed guide to studying with AI; and
- Encouraging faculty who supervise substantial papers to pilot oral defenses or AI-use documentation.

We will have continuing dialogue about these topics over the course of the coming year. If you have any immediate feedback for the deans to consider in finalizing committee charges and implementing the proposed interim measures, please send me your thoughts by Monday, August 10.

Introduction

On May 14, 2026, we held a faculty retreat focused on the implications of artificial intelligence for our work. This memorandum continues that conversation by (1) briefly describing recent advances in AI in legal practice and legal education; (2) identifying the teaching implications of those developments and recommending next steps for the coming academic year; and (3) proposing a limited set of interim measures. Subject to input on this memorandum, the interim measures will take effect at the beginning of the academic year, will be reviewed by the committees referenced below, and will expire on June 30, 2027, unless the faculty affirmatively extends or replaces them.

The issues we need to tackle are complex, and our approach should be nuanced. For example, we may conclude that students should be required to learn how to use AI effectively and ethically in law school (learning *about* AI) while restricting students' use of AI in 1L courses (learning *with* AI) so that students acquire the foundational knowledge and skills they will need in practice. The former approach prepares our students to use the tools they will encounter, while the latter ensures that they develop the sophistication to use the tools effectively. We may similarly wish to use controlled conditions for some assessments and redesign some outside writing assignments (*assessing* in an AI world), while at the same time encouraging faculty to explore how AI might improve pedagogy and expand opportunities for formative assessments (*teaching with* AI).

In short, a simple "AI is good" perspective fails to account for ways in which unfettered AI use could undermine our educational mission, and a simple "AI is bad" perspective may do our students a disservice by failing to prepare them for the profession they will enter. We need an evidence-informed, context-specific, and revisable approach to AI's role in our educational mission.

AI may prove to be one of the most consequential technologies for education ever invented, and we have a responsibility to study its effects and respond accordingly. To this end, I look forward to your feedback on this memorandum and its recommendations over the course of the coming year. Any immediate comments that you would like the deans to consider before finalizing this year's committee charges and the interim measures described below would be most helpful if received by Monday, August 10.

I. Rapid Advances in AI

AI tools are improving at a remarkable pace. Among many law-related examples, the tools can generate A+ answers on law school examinations;² produce competent, well-written scholarship with extensive (and increasingly accurate) citations;³ help faculty prepare hypotheticals, assessments, and slides; and offer students new methods of engaging with

² See, e.g., Andrew Blair-Stanek et al., *AI Gets Its First Law School A+s* 1-3 (May 29, 2025) (unpublished manuscript), <https://ssrn.com/abstract=5274547>.

³ See, e.g., Andrew M. Perlman, *Generative AI and the Future of Legal Scholarship (June 2026 Edition)* (June 9, 2026) (unpublished manuscript), <https://ssrn.com/abstract=6913278>.

course material that (depending on the use case) can either support or undermine learning and professional development.

If your experience with generative AI is limited to an early or free version of ChatGPT, it is worth revisiting one of today's leading systems using its most capable available setting. The change has not been incremental. In a randomized controlled study involving 137 upper-level law students at the University of Minnesota and the University of Michigan, newer AI tools (using a retrieval-augmented generation platform and an AI reasoning model) improved work-product quality on at least four of six tasks relative to no-AI controls.⁴ A 2025 industry benchmark similarly reported that an AI product matched or exceeded the report's lawyer baseline on five of the seven assigned tasks: data extraction, document question answering, document summarization, transcript analysis, and chronology generation.⁵ Importantly, AI capabilities have improved considerably since these studies were completed.⁶

Recent research also demonstrates the increasing capability of AI tools in the context of legal education. In a 2026 Stanford-led unpublished study, sixteen contracts professors from fourteen law schools drafted questions typical of what they receive during office hours.⁷ The authors then asked each of the professors to write out their answers to a subset of forty representative questions and engage in blind comparisons of AI-generated answers and professor-drafted answers. The authors found that the professors *preferred the AI-generated answers* roughly three-quarters of the time and rated them as potentially harmful to student learning *less often* than they rated their colleagues' answers (approximately 3.5% versus 12%).⁸ (The forced-choice design measured relative preference and perceived harmfulness, not objective doctrinal accuracy or student learning.)

These developments have important implications for our work across teaching, scholarship, and service, but this memorandum focuses on our teaching responsibilities.

II. AI's Impact on Teaching

The centerpiece of our mission is to teach students the knowledge and skills they need for modern law practice. This mission remains unchanged, but rapid developments in AI require us to examine whether we need to adjust how we achieve our goals.

Among other questions, we need to determine (1) what students should learn about the use of AI in delivering legal services (learning *about* AI); (2) when students should be permitted or, in appropriate cases, encouraged to use AI in coursework (learning *with* AI) while taking

⁴ Daniel Schwarcz et al., *AI-Powered Lawyering: AI Reasoning Models, Retrieval Augmented Generation, and the Future of Legal Practice*, 3 J.L. & Empirical Analysis 220, 220-21 (2026), <https://doi.org/10.1177/2755323X261427048>.

⁵ Vals AI, *Vals Legal AI Report* (Feb. 27, 2025), <https://www.vals.ai/industry-reports/vlair-2-27-25>.

⁶ Sha Sajadieh et al., *Artificial Intelligence Index Report 2026* 10 (2026), https://hai.stanford.edu/assets/files/ai_index_report_2026.pdf ("AI capability is not plateauing. It is accelerating and reaching more people than ever.").

⁷ Alejandro Salinas et al., *Law Professors Prefer AI over Peer Answers 2* (May 27, 2026) (unpublished manuscript), https://law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/salinas_et_al.pdf.

⁸ *Id.* at 1, 5-8.

into account the potential impact on their acquisition of the knowledge and cognitive skills they will need in practice; (3) what role AI should play in our own pedagogy (*teaching with AI*); and (4) how to assess students so that we can evaluate their mastery and protect the integrity of grades and other performance measures (*assessing in an AI world*). As described below, we have been proactive in some of these areas, but we have more work to do in others.

A. Learning about AI

As AI becomes more common in legal practice, lawyers who use it must understand its capabilities and limitations. For this reason, instruction in the appropriate use of AI is increasingly important.⁹

We have already made significant progress in this area. For more than a decade, Suffolk Law has offered students an unusual array of opportunities to learn how technology, innovation, and, more recently, AI are changing the delivery of legal services. These initiatives include the Legal Innovation & Technology (LIT) Concentration (approved in 2013 and launched in fall 2014), LIT Clinic, LIT Lab, AAA–Suffolk Online Dispute Resolution Innovation Clinic, LIT LL.M., and mandatory introductory generative AI training in our Legal Practice Skills course, among other offerings.

Graduates have benefited from these offerings and have secured professional opportunities because of our distinctive curriculum. Instruction in this area, however, remains largely optional, with required instruction limited to the Legal Practice Skills course and the curriculum required of LIT concentrators.

Recommendation. Future lawyers will continue to need the traditional competencies we have long taught, including problem solving, negotiation, effective written and oral advocacy, client counseling, fact investigation, and analytical and strategic thinking. We must continue teaching these and other foundational competencies.

At the same time, we need to identify the emerging skills students will need to succeed in a rapidly changing profession. The recent Ad Hoc Preparation for Practice Committee conducted a broader exercise of this kind and made several recommendations for other committees to consider during the coming year, including possible mandatory technology training beyond the Legal Practice Skills (LPS) course. The retreat also identified a concrete question: whether to add a required one-credit AI-literacy course for 1Ls. The Curriculum Committee should evaluate that possibility alongside the sixth LPS credit already under consideration by the LPS Committee. The deans will charge the Curriculum Committee with reporting to the faculty during the spring 2027 semester on the extent to which we need to

⁹ See ABA Comm. on Ethics & Pro. Resp., Formal Op. 512, *Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools* 3-5 & n.8 (2024), https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional_responsibility/ethics-opinions/aba-formal-opinion-512.pdf; Mass. R. Prof. C. 1.1 cmt. 8, <https://www.mass.gov/supreme-judicial-court-rules/rules-of-professional-conduct-rule-11-competence>; see also Andrew M. Perlman, *The Legal Ethics of Generative AI*, 57 Suffolk U. L. Rev. 345, 360-62 (2024).

make any curricular changes to ensure that our students continue to acquire the knowledge and skills needed for their careers.

B. Learning with AI

National survey evidence indicates that many law students already use AI as part of their studies, whether faculty are aware of it or not. A 2026 survey of more than 1,800 law students found that almost six in ten used AI at least several times per week for academic work.¹⁰ Uses can include uploading faculty members' slides and class recordings to generate outlines or explanations of difficult concepts; generating practice essays and multiple-choice questions and asking AI to evaluate the students' responses; using AI to simulate Socratic dialogue before class or to answer questions during class; and creating podcasts and other summaries from syllabi, casebook chapters, and slides.

In addition to the questions about copyright, licensing, consent, and privacy that these practices raise, there are many unsettled questions about the extent to which these uses help or harm learning. The current evidence is mixed. For example, in a 2026 randomized controlled study, ninety-one second- and third-year University of Minnesota law students completed a structured, four-stage exercise designed to test whether students who used AI during an initial phase would show weaker comprehension and reasoning after AI access was removed.¹¹ Students with access to AI produced stronger initial work more quickly, but contrary to the researchers' hypothesis, their early AI use did not reduce later unaided performance.¹² At the revision stage, when all students used AI, students who began with weaker drafts improved while those who began with stronger drafts regressed.¹³ The study counsels against assuming that AI either inevitably erodes or reliably builds legal reasoning; effects may depend on the task, user, timing, and manner of use.¹⁴

Law schools around the country are taking different approaches to this issue. UC Berkeley Law recently adopted a restrictive default for students' use of AI in coursework.¹⁵ Unless an instructor departs from the default rule in writing and with appropriate notice, Berkeley students may not use AI to conceptualize, outline, draft, revise, translate, or edit work submitted for credit; use AI for any purpose during an examination; or upload course materials, including slides and class recordings, to generative AI systems. The default policy permits AI use in researching papers only to identify possible sources, such as cases, statutes, or secondary sources, and requires disclosure when an instructor authorizes AI use.

¹⁰ See Thomson Reuters Inst., *2026 Law Student Pulse Survey: How Law Students Understand AI Better than Their Institutions* (May 21, 2026), <https://www.thomsonreuters.com/en-us/posts/legal/law-student-pulse-survey-2026/>.

¹¹ See Nicholas Bednar et al., *Artificial Intelligence and Human Legal Reasoning* 6-7, 27 (Minn. Legal Stud. Rsch. Paper No. 2026-21, Apr. 5, 2026), <https://ssrn.com/abstract=6525800>.

¹² *Id.* at 7.

¹³ *Id.* at 8.

¹⁴ *Id.* at 52-59.

¹⁵ Univ. of Cal., Berkeley, Sch. of L., *Artificial Intelligence Policy* (effective summer 2026), <https://www.law.berkeley.edu/academics/registrar/academic-rules/artificial-intelligence-policy/>.

In a June 2026 strategy letter, the dean of the University of Texas School of Law described a different approach.¹⁶ Dean Bobby Chesney mapped AI learning objectives onto selected for-credit courses and practical AI training sessions within the school's required Professional Pathways Program, while renewing the emphasis on Socratic, in-class engagement as a setting in which faculty can directly observe students' reasoning.¹⁷

The University of Chicago Law School also recently published an AI strategy statement, concluding that law schools should neither ban AI outright nor ignore its risks to learning but should redesign pedagogy and assessment to be "AI-resilient."¹⁸ As part of a 2026–27 pilot, Chicago will prohibit electronic devices and require in-class examinations without internet or file access in all required 1L core courses, subject to limited exceptions.¹⁹ Similar rules will operate as defaults rather than mandates in upper-level electives. Chicago will also restructure its first-year writing program to treat writing without AI as the foundation while using AI at selected stages for research, revision, draft iteration, and oral-argument preparation.²⁰ Beginning with rising 2Ls in 2026–27, students must discuss the reasoning of substantial research papers orally with supervising faculty.²¹ Chicago also plans to expand elective and clinical instruction on the responsible, effective, and ethical use of AI.

Suffolk has already adopted some of these measures, including a layered approach to AI in legal writing and the incorporation of AI education for clinic students. Our other policies generally leave decisions about students' AI use, both inside and outside the classroom, to individual faculty members. That approach preserves pedagogical discretion, but its effectiveness depends in part on the extent to which faculty know how students use the tools and whether faculty are communicating clear rules. If either condition is missing, stronger institutional defaults may be warranted. If we continue to leave these questions primarily to individual faculty members, we should identify the steps necessary to keep faculty informed and establish consistent expectations for communicating course-specific AI policies.

Finally, we need to examine the training and resources we offer students so that they can use AI in ways that reinforce learning rather than shortcut it.

Recommendations.

Curriculum Committee. The Curriculum Committee, in consultation with the Teaching, LPS, and Academic Success Committees, should review the best available evidence on how AI may support or undermine learning and recommend a Law School policy on students' use of AI in coursework. The policy should distinguish among course levels, learning objectives,

¹⁶ Bobby Chesney, *AI and Legal Education* 3, 7-8 (June 16, 2026) (memorandum to faculty), <https://reason.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/AI-and-Legal-Education-UT-Austin.pdf>.

¹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁸ Univ. of Chi. L. Sch., *Rethinking Legal Education in the AI Era* 2 (July 9, 2026), https://www.law.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/2026-07/UChicago%20AI%20Strategy%20Statement_Final.pdf.

¹⁹ *Id.* at 3.

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ *Id.* at 4-5.

types and stages of work, and authorized uses, and it should specify disclosure expectations.

The policy will also need to define clearly what we mean by “AI,” as artificial intelligence includes a wide range of technologies. Even if the policy is limited to “generative AI,” generative AI features are now available in or alongside many commonly used tools, including Grammarly, Microsoft Word, Westlaw products, and Lexis+ (although availability depends on the product and license).

The committee should report its recommendations to the faculty during the spring 2027 semester.

Teaching Committee. The committee should develop training and resources for all students on effective, responsible study with AI.

Deans. During the 2025–26 annual review process, the deans have been asking each faculty member to describe the faculty member’s approach to AI and teaching and are discussing appropriate course or syllabus adjustments. The goal is not to intrude on academic freedom but to ensure that faculty choices on this subject are deliberately made, accurately communicated to students, and grounded in an up-to-date understanding of the benefits and risks of students’ use of these tools. As an interim step, every syllabus during the coming academic year must state the course’s AI policy: what is permitted, what is prohibited, and under what conditions. To support this requirement, the deans will circulate a model syllabus statement before the start of classes; it will address both student AI use and the instructor’s anticipated use of AI in the course. The Law School should revisit this disclosure requirement annually as the tools, evidence, and institutional policies evolve.

Interim Measures. In addition to the syllabus requirement referenced above, two interim measures will take effect while the Curriculum Committee and Teaching Committee develop their recommendations. Subject to any approval required by applicable faculty-governance rules, these two measures will apply this fall and expire on June 30, 2027, or when superseding faculty-approved policies take effect, whichever occurs first.

First, subject to approved accommodations and other authorized exceptions, students may not upload class recordings or any identifiable contribution by another student, including a recorded classroom comment, to a third-party generative AI service without written permission from the instructor and every affected student. Faculty should state in their syllabi whether, and on what terms, students may upload instructor-created materials such as slides. Instructor permission extends only to material the instructor or Suffolk has authority to license and does not override third-party copyright, licensing, or contractual restrictions.

Second, we will add a more robust session on AI to this fall’s orientation for incoming students. It will cover our policies, academic-integrity expectations, and what emerging evidence suggests about how different uses of AI may affect learning. We will also distribute to all students a short, evidence-informed guide to studying with AI in ways that reinforce

learning rather than shortcut it. The guide will be provisional and will inform, rather than prejudge, the resources the Teaching Committee develops.

C. Teaching with AI

AI is not only changing what and how our students learn; it is also becoming a powerful tool for our own teaching. Used thoughtfully, for a defined pedagogical purpose, and with appropriate human review, it may reduce preparation time and improve the quality and consistency of materials offered to students. It may also make it more feasible to provide additional formative assessment and feedback in larger classes. Used carelessly, it can introduce error, compromise privacy or confidentiality, reproduce bias, and create legal or institutional risk. In addition to the examples below, faculty should consult the [Suffolk University Generative AI Guidelines](#) and the Law School's [Generative AI Faculty Resources](#).

Opportunities. Potential faculty uses include:

- generating hypotheticals and in-class exercises tailored to a particular doctrine or case;
- producing simulations, such as [negotiation exercises](#);
- drafting model answers and grading rubrics for examinations and sample questions;
- drafting formative and summative assessments;
- supporting self-assessment and formative feedback at scale through faculty-validated rubrics and (when student work is processed) services approved by Suffolk for that use;
- pressure-testing examination questions for ambiguities, unfairness, or unintended “tells” before administering them; and
- creating diagrams, timelines, and other illustrations that make difficult material more understandable.

Risks. These same capabilities carry real risks that faculty must keep in mind:

- **Student privacy (FERPA).** Faculty should not disclose personally identifiable information from an education record maintained by Suffolk, including identifiable student work or grades and recordings of student participation in the classroom and other instructional settings, to an external AI service unless Suffolk has approved the service for that use and either the student has provided FERPA-compliant written consent or a FERPA exception applies.
- **Inaccuracy.** These tools can produce confident, polished answers that are wrong, including fabricated authorities or citations. Faculty must review any AI-generated content used in teaching, including hypotheticals, model answers, explanations, and

grading materials, and verify legal propositions and citations before the content reaches students.

- **Confidentiality and security.** Information entered into an AI tool may be retained, reviewed, or used to train models, depending on the product, account type, settings, and current terms. Faculty should use only services and settings Suffolk has approved for protected information. Settings that limit model training or retention may reduce some risks, but their operation is product-specific and may change. Consistent with Suffolk University's Generative AI Guidelines, faculty and staff are expected to opt out of allowing the AI tool to use input data for training wherever that option exists. Clinical faculty and students should consult Clinic leadership about any additional clinic-specific obligations.²²
- **Copyright, licensing, and recordings.** Uploading course materials, casebook content, recordings, or other third-party materials may implicate copyright, licensing, consent, or privacy requirements. An instructor's permission authorizes only uses that the instructor or Suffolk has the legal authority to permit.
- **Bias and over-reliance.** Outputs may reflect bias, omit relevant perspectives, or encourage reliance that weakens the independent judgment we are trying to model for our students.
- **Equity.** Differences in students' access to and facility with these tools may widen gaps we are working to close.
- **Transparency and responsibility.** Faculty should disclose any material use of AI to generate individualized feedback or assist in evaluating student work. Faculty remain responsible for the resulting feedback and evaluation, and an AI output should never be treated as dispositive of a student's performance.

Faculty should consult the previously referenced guidelines and policies before using AI in their teaching.

Recommendation. Faculty who find AI pedagogically useful should develop carefully designed experiments, subject to the cautions above. During annual reviews, the deans are asking faculty to describe their approaches to AI and teaching so that we can identify useful practices, needed support, and appropriate course or syllabus adjustments. This discussion is developmental and is not intended to create any expectation that faculty use AI.

The Teaching Committee will gather and share information about appropriate and effective faculty uses of AI. Working with the Curriculum Committee's Learning Outcomes Subcommittee, it will provide recommendations during the spring semester of 2027 concerning (1) faculty training and support; (2) disclosure norms for using AI to generate

²² See, e.g., Mass. R. Prof. C. 1.6(a), (c), <https://www.mass.gov/supreme-judicial-court-rules/rules-of-professional-conduct-rule-16-confidentiality-of-information>; ABA Comm. on Ethics & Pro. Resp., Formal Op. 512, *supra* note 9, at 6-7.

instructional material, individualized feedback, or evaluations; and (3) minimum human-review and accountability practices.

D. Assessing in an AI World

Because current tools can generate sophisticated responses to take-home examinations and graded essays, every faculty member should carefully consider how they evaluate student performance. For example, the LPS Program recently undertook such a review and has already adopted a closed-book final examination to address the kinds of issues raised in this memorandum.

Faculty who are not yet familiar with what current models can produce are welcome to send me a recent examination question. I am happy to demonstrate the answers the best current models can generate.

Faculty designing fall assessments should assume that students completing work outside proctored conditions have access to these advanced AI tools. That capability warrants attention to assessment design, but it does not establish that any single approach (e.g., closed-book exams, oral examinations) is superior for every course.

Last year, the faculty revised the Law School's [academic integrity policy](#) to include updated language regarding artificial intelligence that had originally been adopted in 2023. With continued advancements in AI capability, including the embedding of AI in many research, writing, citation, translation, and accessibility tools, the faculty should review the policy and also update the related certification requirements for work completed outside of proctored conditions.

Recommendation. The Curriculum Committee will lead this assessment review, consulting the Teaching Committee, the Office of Academic Services, the Administrative/Disciplinary Committee, the LPS Committee, the Academic Success Committee, and other relevant offices (e.g., Disability Services) and administrators. By the end of the academic year, it should submit proposed policy language, a supporting rationale, and an implementation plan addressing the following subjects:

- **Certification, definitions, and disclosure.** The committee should recommend a certification for graded work completed outside proctored conditions; define AI use for purposes of research, writing, translation, grammar, citation, accessibility, and assistive-technology features; and specify any disclosure and documentation requirements for authorized AI assistance.
- **Evidence and enforcement.** The committee should recommend standards in consultation with the Administrative/Disciplinary Committee for investigating possible unauthorized AI use. AI-writing detectors can produce false positives and false negatives and should not, standing alone, be treated as dispositive evidence of misconduct.
- **Examination conditions.** The committee should consider separately whether particular courses or categories of courses should require (1) in-person

administration, (2) proctoring, (3) secure examination software, and (4) closed-book conditions. These are distinct design choices. The committee should identify the learning objective served by each proposed restriction and consider effects on accessibility, approved accommodations, assistive technology, student equity, pedagogical diversity, and academic freedom.

- **Work completed outside class.** The committee should determine when an unproctored summative assessment remains appropriate and what safeguards should accompany it, including for work submitted to satisfy the Law School's upper-level legal writing requirement. Options may include staged submissions, process documentation, oral discussion or defense, expressly AI-permitted assignments, and disclosure of authorized AI use. The committee should not presume that all work completed outside proctored conditions is invalid; in some courses, evaluating responsible AI-assisted work may itself serve an important learning objective.

Interim Measures. Subject to your input, the following measures will take effect for the 2026–27 academic year. They will expire on June 30, 2027, or when superseding faculty-approved policies take effect, whichever occurs first.

- For the 2026–27 academic year, and subject to approved accommodations and other authorized exceptions, all summative assessments in Civil Procedure, Constitutional Law, Contracts, Criminal Law, Property, and Torts will be administered using secure examination software that blocks internet and local file access, unless the academic deans approve a professor's request that is submitted at least one month before the assessment, describes the alternative in detail, and includes the professor's plan for ensuring the integrity of the exam administration.
- Faculty whose courses include a substantial graded paper, including a paper submitted to satisfy a writing requirement, are invited (but not required) to pilot one or both of two approaches: (1) an oral presentation or discussion in which the student explains and defends the paper's reasoning, or (2) a requirement that students document AI use at specified stages of the research and writing process and certify compliance. The results of these pilots will inform the committee's work.

III. Conclusion

None of this is settled, so please share your feedback with me by Monday, August 10 if you want it to be considered before committee charges and interim measures are finalized. If you have a particular interest in serving on one of the identified committees, please let me know.

Thank you for the seriousness of your engagement with these questions in recent years and at our retreat. The issues described in this memo are critically important for the future of education in general and legal education in particular, and our collaborative approach to studying them and addressing them will be essential in the months and years ahead.