DARTMOUTH

To: Sian Beilock, President of Dartmouth College

From: Advisory Committee

Subject: Review of Concerns Regarding AI Use by Provost Santiago Schnell

Date: October 27, 2026

This memorandum describes the findings of the independent advisory committee convened by President Beilock (the "Advisory Committee" or the "Committee") to examine Provost Santiago Schnell's AI use, honesty regarding such use, and potential violation of applicable Dartmouth College ("Dartmouth") policies. The Committee did not use Pangram or other AI tools when determining whether and to what extent Provost Schnell used AI, nor was AI used in conjunction with the drafting of this report.

I. Summary

This Advisory Committee was tasked with determining: (a) whether the Provost met the AI use and/or disclosure requirements of the publications that published his writings, (b) how the Provost used AI in his academic and published writings, (c) whether the Provost was honest about his AI use, and (d) whether the Provost's AI use constituted a violation of Dartmouth policy.

Despite the evidentiary limitations described in more detail below, this Advisory Committee finds that the Provost used AI to meaningfully alter his writing in violation of at least one publication's AI use and/or disclosure requirement, failed to disclose his use of AI in clear violation of a national newspaper's stated policy, was not forthcoming about his AI use, and fell short of the standards set forth by Dartmouth's Code of Ethical Conduct, the Academic Honor Principle, and Geisel's Policy on Expectations for Professionalism for Faculty, Non-Faculty Academics, and Staff. The Committee's process involved considering Provost Schnell's conduct in light of the evidence before it and the standards set forth by these policies. The Committee, however, was not proceeding under the procedures for assessing complaints under these policies nor recommending any related disciplinary action.

II. Introduction

On September 25, 2026, President Beilock convened the Advisory Committee to review Provost Schnell's AI use in his academic publications and public writings.[1] In her public remarks, President Beilock directed the Committee to conduct "a rigorous, objective review of how Santiago has used AI, measured against the criteria of the publications to which he submitted his work."[2]

[1] Sian Leah Beilock, *A Review and a Community Conversation on AI* (Sept. 25, 2026), https://president.dartmouth.edu/news/2026/09/review-and-community-conversation-ai.

[2] *Id.*

The members of the Committee are:

- David Kotz, ’86 (*chair*), Pat and John Rosenwald Professor in the Department of Computer Science and former Dartmouth Provost;
- Hany Farid, Donald Knuth Professor of Computation and Just Communities in the Department of Computer Science;
- Odette Harris, ’91, Trustee and Paralyzed Veterans of America Professor of Spinal Cord Injury Medicine at Stanford University School of Medicine;
- Peter Orner, Dartmouth Professorship in English and Creative Writing and Director of Creative Writing; and
- Lindsay Whaley, Professor of Classics and Linguistics and Chair of the Department of Linguistics.

The President sought answers to the charge by October 21, 2026.

III. Charge

President Beilock charged the Committee with answering the following questions regarding Provost Schnell’s writings that were published during the period of his appointment at Dartmouth (July 2025 to date):

a) Did Provost Schnell meet the AI use and/or disclosure requirements of the publications that published his writings?

b) How did Provost Schnell use AI in his academic and published writings?

c) Was Provost Schnell honest about his AI use?

d) Would Provost Schnell’s AI use constitute a violation of Dartmouth Policy?

The Committee has endeavored to provide answers to the President on the charge by the requested deadline. The Provost published at least 30 writings since he began his role at Dartmouth, with a further seven writings listed as forthcoming on his CV (his “academic and published writings” or “writings”).

Given the compressed timeframe, the Committee prioritized its work by focusing on a targeted review of certain writings, as a complete review of the Provost’s work would have been impossible. The Committee’s review was limited to those writings that (a) the Provost published since joining Dartmouth; (b) the Provost was sole author or lead author; and (c) wherein his AI use, and violation of potentially applicable publisher policies or Dartmouth policies, could be readily ascertained. The Committee focused its analysis on those writings for which there were (1) publisher policies either barring AI use or requiring the disclosure of AI use at the time that a writing was submitted for publication, (2) available records of the Provost’s own communications regarding his AI use or records of his use of the Dartmouth enterprise large language model (LLM) Claude that indicated that the Provost used AI to edit his research and/or writings, and (3) an incomplete or non-existent disclosure about AI use in the published writing.

The Committee faced an additional challenge: insufficient cooperation from the Provost. Although he did provide his Dartmouth-issued laptop for inspection, the Provost did not, upon request, provide logs of his use of personal LLM accounts that he used for his academic and public writings. The Provost also failed to make himself available at the time requested or to propose additional times that he could meet to discuss his AI use across his recent writings.

Nevertheless, based on the limited factfinding completed to date, the Committee is prepared to provide the following answers to the President's charge. The following factual findings may have been further informed by additional information in Provost Schnell's possession that he did not provide to the Committee.

A. Charges (a,b): Provost Schnell's AI Use and Adherence to Publication Policies

As to Charges (a) and (b), the Advisory Committee has found that the Provost used AI to materially alter his published work and failed to meet the AI use and/or disclosure requirements of the publications that published his writings in at least two instances.

1. The first instance of a publication policy violation arose in one of Provost Schnell's independently authored academic publications entitled *Reaction Acceleration: Reviving the second derivative in chemical kinetics*.[3] The Committee has determined that the Provost used Dartmouth's enterprise AI tool, Claude, logs of which the Committee reviewed, to substantially edit his research manuscript, troubleshoot errors in computer code, and generate figures for his publication following the receipt of major revisions from peer reviewers. For example, Provost Schnell prompted Claude in the following manners when addressing peer reviewers' edits of his manuscript:

- "I am getting read[y] to submit the enclosed paper, its supplementary materials and the enclosed repo to ChemSystemsChem. This paper is not biological, but rather chemical. Imagine that you are a reviewer for this paper with expertise in nonlinear chemical dynamics and mathematical chemical kinetics. What would be your referee report for this paper?"
- "Here you have the tex files for the paper. Please make the corrections to the files, and the repo. If you have to generate new figures, please provide them to me. Let me know what you change in the repo, and text files so that I can take a look into it."
- "We need to make some revisions to figure 5. I do not think we need in the figure the legend on the top of the figure, because it is already described in the figure caption. Also 'nominal 95%' is on top of the blue line in panel c."
- "Do you find any scientific issue with the paper, problem or contradiction that it would prevent me to submit it?"
- "Thank you. I made the corrections to the introduction. I asked ChatGPT to write a version of the response, which you will find enclosed. Please check it. Based on this version would you change anything in your version?"

[3] ChemSystemsChem 8(5), e70047 (Sept. 16, 2026), https://doi.org/10.1002/syst.70047.

The applicable publication policies at the time of the paper's submission, acceptance, and publication all required disclosure of AI use of this kind, and the Provost failed to provide any such disclosure at submission or at publication. In email correspondence to President Beilock on September 22, 2026, Provost Schnell said he was relying on pre-2025 "author instructions," which had since been updated to request AI disclosures. He explained that he had reviewed and made changes to the article "without checking the new instructions to the authors." According to Provost Schnell, the "updated instructions require disclosures only for developing the paper with AI and for substantive edits or a translation." He said, "This wasn't the case, but a disclosure would have been the best approach." On October 6, 2026, Provost Schnell then emailed the journal in which this article was published and noted that he "used OpenAI's ChatGPT to assist with language refinement and improve exposition, the review of Python code and reproducibility documentation, and consistency checks across the manuscript, Supporting Information, and figures." Provost Schnell did not disclose his use of Claude in this correspondence. The Advisory Committee did not find support for Provost Schnell's statement that the publisher only began requiring AI disclosures in 2025. Based on the Committee's review of the publisher's policies, the publisher has been requiring the disclosure of the use of AI since at least 2023.[4]

2. The second instance of a publication policy violation arose in Provost Schnell's independently authored opinion piece in the *Washington Post*, *Universities are fighting AI cheating. But there's a deeper problem*. In Provost Schnell's own electronic communications with journalists at *Semafor*, an on-line newsmagazine, he admitted to "us[ing] ChatGPT to refine a few arguments, check for grammatical errors, and submit it to the Washington Post."[5] The policies of the *Post* at the time the piece was submitted and later published both clearly stated that writers "agree[d] that the content that [they] submit was not created or manipulated with artificial intelligence or editing software." The Provost's conduct was in clear violation of this stated policy as reiterated by a spokesman for the *Washington Post* quoted in the *Semafor* article, dated August 26, 2026.[6]

3. The Committee focused on a third article where Provost Schnell appeared unforthcoming with respect to AI use in an academic publication, *Reproducible Agent-Based Simulations of Protein Aggregation: A FAIR Implementation.*[7] Provost Schnell co-authored the piece alongside two junior academics, one of whom is a graduate student. At the time of submission, the publication's policies mandated that "[u]se of an LLM should be properly documented in the

[4] Wiley, *Best Practice Guidelines on Publishing Ethics* (Dec. 15, 2023), as captured at https://web.archive.org/web/20231215212640/https://authorservices.wiley.com/ethics-guidelines/index.html.

[5] Santiago Schnell, *Universities are fighting AI cheating. But there's a deeper problem,* Wash. Post (Aug. 9, 2026), https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2026/08/09/university-fight-against-ai-cheating-doesnt-go-far-enough/.

[6] Reed Albergotti, *AI writing has already begun to appear on the opinion pages,* Semafor (Aug. 26, 2026), https://www.semafor.com/article/08/26/2026/ai-writing-has-already-begun-to-appear-on-oped-pages

[7] Bulletin of Mathematical Biology 88(181) (Sept. 19, 2026), https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11538-026-01739-8.

Methods section … of the manuscript."[8] That policy was later updated prior to the article's publication to permit certain uses of AI without restriction, while requiring disclosure of some uses, and barring others entirely. After this policy change, during the revision process, Provost Schnell emailed his co-authors to inform them that he "r[a]n the repository through Claude Max Code and ChatGPT Pro Code for optimization," and that "[b]oth LLMs provided consistent issues and other minor bugs with the code." Further, Provost Schnell directed his co-authors to certain files wherein they "will also find the changes that need to be changed." The facts developed to date do not clearly confirm a violation of publication policy at either submission or publication date. Specifically, evidence from his email communication with co-authors indicates he used "Claude Max Code and ChatGPT Pro Code" to review and edit the computer code used to produce some of the results in the paper. Although the publisher policy in place at the time of submission would require disclosure of this type of AI use "in the Methods section," no such disclosure appears in the final publication. The publisher policy in place at that time of the AI use, and again at the time of publication, however, does not clearly preclude use of LLMs for such work, nor clearly require disclosure of such use. The Committee found no evidence that the Provost used AI to edit or manipulate the text of the paper itself. Thus, based on the evidence available, the Committee could not conclude there was a violation of the publisher's policy.

B. Charge (c): Provost Schnell's Honesty

As to Charge (c), the Advisory Committee, based on its review of the facts, has determined that the Provost did not sufficiently disclose his AI use to publishers in contravention of those publications' policies as discussed in Part III.A above.

Additionally, as discussed above, the Advisory Committee did not find support for Provost Schnell's statement to President Beilock on September 22, 2026 that the policies for the publication in which *Reaction Acceleration* was published changed in September 2026 to require disclosure of AI use. Based on the Committee's review of historical versions of this policy as captured on the web, the publisher at issue has had AI disclosure policies in place since at least 2023.

The Committee also finds that Provost Schnell was not forthcoming about his AI use to a publication on at least one instance. Provost Schnell's Claude logs reflect that he uploaded to Claude a manuscript of a forthcoming article entitled *Academic Freedom and Catholic Mission: The Procedural Overlap Zone in University Governance* and prompted Claude: "Are there many signatures of AI writing in this article?" Schnell later submitted a revised manuscript that incorporated the kinds of changes Claude suggested. Although the publisher does not have a specific AI policy, publicity resulting from the *Semafor* article caused the publisher's editor to inquire about Provost Schnell's AI use in his submission. The Provost asked the editor to pause on the article's publication and wrote that he "used AI as an editorial tool during the article preparation and revision process to help refine sentences, improve clarity, and the expression of arguments." Schnell also noted that he "did not understand that this type of AI-assisted editing

[8] Springer, Editorial Policies (Aug. 14, 2025), as captured at https://web.archive.org/web/20250814180829/https:/www.springer.com/us/editorial-policies/artificial-intelligence--ai-/25428500.

required disclosure to the Journal" and that he "would of course have disclosed" had he known. The Committee believes this statement understates the nature of the Provost's actual AI use according to the Claude logs. Indeed, the Committee finds the Provost's AI use here, and the *Reaction Acceleration* paper above, went beyond his other public descriptions of his use of AI in writing – including in his statement quoted in *The Dartmouth*.[9]

Finally, the Committee reiterates the limitations imposed on it by Provost Schnell's delay and ultimate failure to provide access to critical requested information sought by this Committee in its effort to implement the President's charge.

C. Charge (d): Dartmouth Policy

As to Charge (d), the Advisory Committee, based on its review of the available facts, concludes that Provost Schnell's AI use or failure to disclose the same as laid out above could qualify as a violation of Dartmouth's Code of Ethical Conduct, the Academic Honor Principle, and Geisel's Policy on Expectations for Professionalism for Faculty, Non-Faculty Academics, and Staff of the Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth.

The Code of Ethical Conduct[10] states, in relevant part (emphasis added):

> Dartmouth College expects that those who are part of the Dartmouth community, including trustees, faculty, staff, and student employees ("Dartmouth Personnel") **will adhere to such standards in their dealings with each other and with those beyond the Dartmouth community.** Ethical conduct calls for all Dartmouth Personnel to assume responsibility for safeguarding and preserving Dartmouth's assets and resources in the fulfillment of its mission. Dartmouth will comply fully with all relevant laws and all contract and grant requirements, as well as with its own **high standards of integrity and quality.** Dartmouth Personnel are expected to assume personal responsibility and accountability for understanding relevant laws, regulations, and contract and grant requirements. In addition to complying with specific laws or regulations that govern business activities, **standards of fairness, honesty, and respect for the rights of others will govern Dartmouth's conduct at all times.**
>
> …
>
> Dartmouth Personnel should recognize that Dartmouth College has earned and must maintain a **reputation for integrity and quality that goes beyond compliance with laws, regulations, and contractual obligations**. Dartmouth strives for excellence in administration as well as academics. **Even the appearance of misconduct or impropriety can cause severe damage to**

[9] Alex Klee and Isabela Pierry, *Op-eds, academic articles by Provost Santiago Schnell flagged as 'AI-written' by 'near-zero error' AI detector Pangram*, The Dartmouth (Sept. 21, 2026), https://www.thedartmouth.com/article/2026/09/schnell-ai-writing.

[10] *Code of Ethical Conduct*, Policy Portal, Dartmouth (June 9, 2023 (last revised Aug. 13, 2025)), https://policies.dartmouth.edu/policy/code-ethical-conduct.

> **Dartmouth's reputation. As such, Dartmouth Personnel must strive at all times to maintain the highest standards of quality and integrity.**

Given the repeated emphasis on high standards of "integrity and quality," the expectation of the College is that all Dartmouth personnel adhere to a personal and professional code of conduct that goes beyond "compliance with laws, regulations, and contractual obligations."

The Academic Honor Principle,[11] which lists the Office of the Provost as the "office of primary responsibility," states, in relevant part (emphasis added):

> Academic integrity is foundational to a Dartmouth education. **All members of the Dartmouth community—faculty, staff, and students—are responsible for maintaining a culture of integrity, honesty, and respect in teaching, learning, scholarship, and creative work.**
>
> By upholding this principle, we foster an atmosphere of intellectual growth and personal development both within and beyond Dartmouth.

It is the Committee's view that as Dartmouth's chief academic officer, the Provost should not only uphold this Principle but model its application in his own academic and professional work. The Committee felt that the Provost's incomplete (or missing) disclosures about his AI use, and public statements characterizing his AI use, are not consistent with "a culture of integrity, honesty, and respect in … scholarship."

Finally, the Provost has an appointment as Adjunct Professor of Biochemistry & Cell Biology and Biomedical Data Science and is thus covered by the Policy on Expectations for Professionalism for Faculty, Non-Faculty Academics, and Staff of the Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth.[12] That policy states, in relevant part (emphasis added):

> It is Geisel's expectation that all Covered Persons will, in their professional capacities, behave in accordance with the following principles:
>
> - **Be honest and act with integrity.**
> - Treat others with dignity, respect, and fairness.
> - **Perform their academic responsibilities to a high standard of professional excellence.**
> - Demonstrate collegiality and a commitment to professional development.
> - Support the education and mentoring of our students and peers.
>
> …
>
> **Provide full, truthful and accurate information in reports and representations including, but not limited to, scholarship,** proposals (grants

[11] *Academic Honor Principle*, Policy Portal, Dartmouth (June 20, 2024 (last revised May 20, 2025)), https://policies.dartmouth.edu/policy/academic-honor-principle.

[12] *Policy on Expectations for Professionalism for Faculty, Non-Faculty Academics, and Staff of the Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth* (2021), https://geiselmed.dartmouth.edu/ofa/policy-on-expectations-for-professionalism-for-faculty-non-faculty-academics-and-staff-of-the-geisel-school-of-medicine-at-dartmouth/.

> and contracts), evaluations of student performance/conduct and actions of colleagues, financial and reporting obligations, and performance assessments.
>
> …
>
> Provide full, truthful and accurate attribution of work done by others both with respect to research/scholarship and more generally in giving credit where credit is due in daily activities in the workplace and classroom. **Adhere to foundational principles of ethical research beyond those addressed under specific institutional policies on research misconduct and authorship and provide appropriate attribution for ideas and/or work done by others** ([e.]g., as set out in the ICMJE guidelines incorporated into the APT Document). Although these guidelines are specific to attribution in published work, it is the expectation at Geisel that similar principles will govern attribution in proposals for grants/contracts, in all professional forums (for example, but not limited to, seminars and invited talks) and in all media (for example, but not limited to, PowerPoint presentations and **OpEd pieces**).

The latter paragraph recognizes the responsibility for Geisel faculty to "adhere to foundational principles of ethical research." The Committee felt that the Provost's incomplete (or missing) disclosures about his AI use, and public statements characterizing his AI use, do not meet "a high standard of professional excellence." The Committee also noted this policy's specific mention of OpEd pieces, and that it therefore applies to the Provost's *Washington Post* op-ed as well as his academic papers.

In sum, based on the evidence currently available to the Committee, it is the Committee's opinion that Provost Schnell's statements and disclosures about his AI use fall demonstrably short of the standards set forth by both the letter and the spirit of these policies.

= = =