Artificial Intelligence at the University of Alabama School of Law

To: Faculty, University of Alabama School of Law From: AI and Legal Pedagogy Committee Re: Framework for AI Integration in Legal Education

Date: 3.9.2026

Dear colleagues,

Following our discussion on integrating AI into the law school's curriculum and policies, the Committee has revised its previous memo. We heard the faculty's range of views and have narrowed this document to focus on concrete actions and resolutions that require faculty consideration. The Committee's previous memo detailed the transformation of legal practice and the national landscape. That analysis informs the following actions and resolutions.

Committee Actions

The Committee is transferring the following formal recommendations to the appropriate bodies to confer and devise policies, according to their mandates and assigned responsibilities.

1. To the Curriculum Committee: AI Skills Course

The Committee recommends that the Curriculum Committee review the possibility of introducing a required 1-credit Professional Foundations course. The Committee should consider whether this course should be integrated into the 1L curriculum, potentially tracking the model adopted by Boston University, or deferred to a later stage in the students' journey.

Learning objectives. The course would introduce students to AI tools (both general-purpose and legal-specific), skills in prompting, verification, and critical assessment of AI outputs, and the professional responsibility framework governing AI use. The instructor may incorporate additional professional development topics as appropriate.

2. To the Curriculum Committee: AI Designation

The Committee recommends that the Curriculum Committee review the possibility of developing a designation for courses where AI use is central to instruction. Such a designation could assist employers in identifying and recruiting AI-practice-ready students, favoring them over students from other institutions. Over time, this would also allow the School to establish expectations for AI competency among graduates, potentially including a requirement that students complete one or more AI-designated courses.

3. To the Curriculum Committee: New Methods of Examination

The Committee recommends that the Curriculum Committee review new methods of examination that are responsive to the rise of AI usage among students. These may include oral and video-recorded examinations. The review should also address adaptations of exam software to meet the challenge of AI usage, especially in cases where instructors would like to allow students to access their materials digitally.

4. To the Promotion and Tenure Committee: Norms for Evaluating AI Use

The Committee recommends that the Promotion and Tenure Committee consider how the changing academic landscape, including evolving norms regarding the use of AI in scientific and legal research and changes to the legal profession, should inform its evaluation processes. This is an inquiry, not a directive; the Committee takes no position on

whether or how AI use should factor into decisions regarding rank, promotion, security of position, or tenure. However, given faculty interest in clarity on these issues, it is important that the School develop norms that provide guidance to faculty as AI becomes more prevalent in teaching, research, and scholarship.

5. To the Dean: Resources and Training

The Committee recommends that the School develop resources and make available training for faculty to learn how to use AI in their work, and make accessible reasonable AI tools and platforms as may be necessary from time to time.

6. To the Law Reviews

The Committee recommends that the Law Reviews and their academic supervisors establish their own policies governing AI use in the publication of legal scholarship and in the editorial process, subject to the following guidelines:

a. *Article selection:* Editors should engage fully with articles under review. Final selection decisions must not be delegated to AI assessment.

b. *Student notes:* Each journal should articulate clear standards for AI use in the research, drafting, and revision of student notes. Students should be particularly attentive to the writing sample implications of AI-assisted note drafting.

c. *Editing process:* AI tools may assist with cite-checking, proofreading, and other editorial tasks, with final responsibility vesting with the editors.

7. **To Honors Council**

The Committee recommends that the Honors Council will develop norms on resolving issues related to academic integrity in the use of AI. The Council should pay special consideration to the problem that many ordinary uses of technology will likely implicate some element of AI and that line drawing will be difficult for faculty members to make. The Honors Council should also adopt a clear position on the use of AI detection tools to sanction students, taking heed of the unreliability of currently existing tools.

Proposed Faculty Resolutions

The Faculty is asked to vote on the following resolutions, to be added as procedures to the Compendium of Faculty Procedures. These resolutions are all in accordance with the overall commitment to academic freedom in allowing each faculty member to exercise their own professional judgment in adopting AI usage policies.

Resolution 1: Grading Procedures

Faculty members shall not use AI to determine the grade of students in any evaluative task, assignment, or exam. Faculty members may use AI to audit students' work, help identify common themes in written work, create rubrics, and for other purposes, so long as the faculty member engages in personal evaluation of students' work and is personally responsible for any issues with the quality of AI outputs informing the faculty member's decisions.

Resolution 2: AI in Examinations and Graded Assignments

Examinations. Unless a professor provides explicit authorization in writing, any use of AI tools by students during an examination constitutes a violation of examination integrity. This prohibition extends to all generative AI systems, AI-enhanced writing tools, autocomplete features, and AI rewriting or paraphrasing tools. Standard spellcheck functions that do not employ AI-generated suggestions remain permissible. This applies to in-person examinations, take-home

examinations, and any other assessed work completed under examination conditions. Faculty are encouraged to use exam software settings that restrict internet access when AI use is not permitted.

Studying with AI. Subject to any course-specific restrictions established by the instructor, this examination policy does not restrict the use of AI when studying for examinations, preparing pre-written exam materials such as outlines, or generating practice questions. The foregoing does not allow or excuse any usage of AI during the examination itself.

Other graded assignments. To preserve fairness in assessment, when a professor permits AI on graded assignments, students should use only AI tools provided or approved by the law school. This ensures that evaluation reflects student skill rather than differential access to premium tools. The law school will endeavor to make AI platforms of sufficient quality accessible to all students.

Resolution 3: AI Competencies

By graduation, the School shall aspire to provide students with sufficient opportunities to develop AI competencies relevant to legal practice, to include:

1. Demonstrable ability to use AI models to assist with research, drafting, material organization, and brainstorming.
2. Ability to identify hallucinations, bias, and gaps in AI output and verify results against primary authority.
3. Familiarity with ethical issues related to the use and misuse of AI tools.

These competencies will be developed in both dedicated coursework and in courses where usage of AI is permitted.

Resolution 4: Barred Usage of AI

Students, faculty, and staff must not enter confidential, privileged, or sensitive information into AI tools that lack appropriate data protection. This restriction includes client information in clinical matters, FERPA-protected student records, and any information subject to confidentiality obligations. When in doubt, students, faculty, and staff should not enter any information into AI tools without consulting supervising faculty or administration.