



PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

FACULTY AI PLAYBOOK

Make learning outcomes, permission, evidence, verification, disclosure and fair process visible.

Faculty, academic leaders, instructional designers, librarians, accessibility staff and integrity/process owners.

SET

Define the learning objective and activity-level AI rule.

DESIGN

Make process, verification and disclosure visible.

REVIEW

Use total evidence and established institutional process.

START HERE

DESIGN FOR LEARNING. REVIEW WORK FAIRLY.

Make activity-level AI decisions and review student work fairly through visible learning evidence and established institutional process.

WHO SHOULD USE THIS

Faculty, academic leaders, instructional designers, librarians, accessibility staff and integrity/process owners.

WHAT YOU WILL PRODUCE

An assignment permission card, evidence-preserving assessment plan or fair-review record.

KEEP THESE BOUNDARIES

Detector output may inform review but is not a finding. Institutional policy, due process, accessibility, privacy, copyright and research requirements remain controlling.

SET UP ONE ASSIGNMENT

01

Name the learning outcome

Identify what students must practice and demonstrate themselves.

02

State the AI rule

Specify allowed assistance, approved tools and data, and an accessible alternative.

03

Design the evidence

Tell students what drafts, sources, verification and disclosure to retain.

04

Plan a fair review

Use the work and process evidence; follow institutional procedures for concerns.

01 ORIENTATION AND SCOPE

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 01

MAIN AI Playbook

A practical guide for faculty to set clear course expectations, design learning-centered assignments, protect student information, review AI-assisted work, and keep human judgment accountable.

Set Course AI Rules

Use the Higher Education Policy Template

SOURCE BASIS U.S. Department of Education AI guidance | FERPA | DOJ ADA Title II web rule

02 HOW SHOULD FACULTY USE AI RESPONSIBLY?

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 02

The short answer

Start with the learning outcome. Decide what students must practice themselves, where AI may support learning, and what evidence will show their reasoning. Use only approved tools and appropriate data, disclose meaningful faculty uses, verify outputs, provide an accessible path, and retain responsibility for teaching and evaluation.

This voluntary planning resource is not legal advice or a substitute for institutional policy, academic-freedom commitments, accreditation requirements, accessibility processes, research oversight, or disciplinary procedures.

USE THIS WITH

- Department and program leaders
- Instructional designers
- Libraries and learning centers
- Accessibility and student-support teams
- IT, privacy, security, and procurement
- Academic integrity and faculty-development teams

SOURCE BASIS U.S. Department of Education AI guidance | FERPA | DOJ ADA Title II web rule

03 FACULTY AI DECISION MAP

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 03

Match control to consequence

Classify the activity, not the tool alone. The same product may present different risks depending on the data, learning objective, audience, automation, and consequence of error.

LOWER RISK: EXPLORE

- Brainstorm examples with no student data
- Generate practice questions for faculty review
- Rewrite faculty-authored instructions in plain language
- Develop multiple lesson-plan options

CONTROLLED: VERIFY AND DOCUMENT

- Feedback or rubric support
- Student-facing tutoring tools
- Research, coding, or data-analysis assistance
- AI-supported grading preparation

DO NOT DELEGATE

- Final grades or misconduct findings
- Accommodation or disability decisions
- High-stakes advising without qualified review
- Research compliance or safety approval

SOURCE BASIS U.S. Department of Education AI guidance | FERPA | DOJ ADA Title II web rule

04 SET RULES BY ACTIVITY, NOT ONE VAGUE SENTENCE

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 04

Make expectations usable

A course-wide statement is helpful, but students also need assignment-level directions. Explain the learning reason for each rule and what evidence of process is expected.

AI REQUIRED

Students must use a named, accessible tool or approved alternative to meet a defined learning objective. Teach the skill and the limits before assessing it.

AI PERMITTED

Students may use AI for stated purposes, such as brainstorming or feedback, with disclosure, verification, and any required citation.

AI LIMITED

AI is allowed for specific steps but not others. Name the boundary. For example, idea generation is allowed, but the submitted analysis must be the student's.

AI PROHIBITED

Students must complete the activity without AI because independent performance is the learning outcome. Define what counts as AI and provide a clear reason.

Disclosure and citation are related but different. Disclosure explains how AI affected the work; citation identifies a source according to the required style. Tell students exactly what your course requires and follow institutional or disciplinary guidance.

SOURCE BASIS U.S. Department of Education AI guidance | FERPA | DOJ ADA Title II web rule

05 ASSESSMENT THAT REMAINS MEANINGFUL WITH AI

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 05

Design for visible learning

There is no single "AI-proof" format. Use a balanced set of evidence that helps students demonstrate knowledge, process, judgment, and improvement.

SHOW THE PROCESS

Use proposals, annotated sources, decisions, drafts, revision notes, or version history when they serve the learning outcome.

USE AUTHENTIC CONTEXT

Connect work to local cases, course discussions, labs, field observations, unique datasets, or decisions with real constraints.

REQUIRE EXPLANATION

Add brief oral defense, demonstration, peer dialogue, or reflection so students explain choices and answer questions.

ASSESS VERIFICATION

Ask students to test claims, inspect sources, identify uncertainty, correct errors, and explain what they accepted or rejected.

Detection is not a substitute for fair process. Current evidence does not support treating a detector score as proof of authorship, authorization, or misconduct. Performance varies by product, model, dataset, genre, language, and revision method; both false positives and false negatives matter. A score may inform an initial review, but it should not be the standalone or sole basis for an adverse decision. Clarify the rule, review process evidence, speak with the student, and follow the institution's established procedure. Read MAIN's evidence guide to AI detection and verifying learning for the research, score definitions, and recommended review model.

SOURCE BASIS MAIN's evidence guide to AI detection and verifying learning | U.S. Department of Education AI guidance | DOJ ADA Title II web rule

06

WORKED METHOD: REDESIGN ONE ASSIGNMENT AND REVIEW FAIRLY

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 06

ILLUSTRATIVE ASSIGNMENT REDESIGN

Situation: an assignment asks students to write a general analysis, but it does not make the intended judgment, the AI boundary, or the evidence of learning visible. The redesign begins with the learning outcome rather than with a detector or a preferred tool.

Design decision	Before	Operational redesign
Learning outcome	Produce a polished final paper.	Defend a recommendation by comparing credible sources, applying course concepts, and explaining material choices.
AI status	Unstated or syllabus-only.	Limited: AI may help generate counterarguments or revision questions; it may not supply evidence or write the submitted analysis.
Student process	Final draft only.	Proposal, annotated source set, decision notes, draft checkpoint, verification note, final work, and a short explanation.
Verification and disclosure	Generic reminder to check work.	Open every cited source; identify accepted, rejected, and corrected suggestions; use the locally required disclosure format.
Access	Assumes every student can use the same account.	Name approved access, accessible formats, cost-free equivalent participation, and the route for accommodations or barriers.
Review	Writing style or detector score may dominate concern.	Review the actual rule, substantive evidence, natural process record, student explanation, and established institutional procedure.

FAIR-REVIEW RECORD

- 1. Clarify the applicable rule. Record the course, assignment, AI status, permitted and prohibited steps, disclosure requirement, and any material ambiguity.
- 2. Preserve relevant material. Keep the submitted work, cited sources, assignment directions, ordinary drafts or version history, and any institutionally authorized system evidence.

- 3. Examine substantive evidence. Identify fabricated sources, unsupported claims, missing required work, unexplained methods, or contradictions. A detector score is neither authorization evidence nor a finding.
- 4. Talk with the student. Ask the student to explain the argument, sources, calculations, code, revisions, and any AI assistance. Use the conversation to understand learning, not as an ambush.
- 5. Apply the established process. Route a supported concern through the institution's existing integrity procedure, required notice, documentation, decision, and appeal path.
- 6. Improve future clarity. Record what assignment language, evidence design, access route, or faculty preparation should change before the next use.

Complete when the record distinguishes fact from inference, names the controlling process and decision owner, documents the student's opportunity to respond, and identifies the outcome and appeal route. Stop informal review when required institutional procedure or qualified review must take over.

SOURCE BASIS U.S. Department of Education AI guidance | DOJ ADA Title II web rule | NIST synthetic-content detection report | FERPA

07 STUDENT DATA, ACCESS, COPYRIGHT, AND RESEARCH

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 07

Protect people and work

Before using an AI tool, confirm that the institution has approved the product and the specific data use. A consumer account is not automatically suitable for education records or confidential work.

DATA BOUNDARY

- Do not upload identifiable education records without authorization.
- Remove names and unnecessary identifiers.
- Check retention, model-training, sharing, deletion, and contract terms.
- Use the minimum information needed.

EQUITABLE ACCESS

- Provide an accessible, no-penalty alternative when appropriate.
- Do not require personal payment or data disclosure without institutional approval.
- Test keyboard, screen-reader, caption, contrast, and mobile usability.
- Coordinate through established accommodation processes.

COPYRIGHT AND ATTRIBUTION

- Use licensed or authorized inputs.
- Do not assume generated material is accurate, original, or free to use.
- Preserve meaningful human authorship and editorial judgment.
- Follow publisher, discipline, and institutional rules.

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY WORK

- Follow IRB, sponsor, journal, data-use, and research-integrity rules.
- Do not expose unpublished, proprietary, export-controlled, or participant information.
- Document material AI assistance when required.
- Keep researchers accountable for methods and claims.

SOURCE BASIS FERPA | DOJ ADA Title II web rule | U.S. Copyright Office AI initiative

08

FACULTY AI WORKFLOWS WITH HUMAN REVIEW

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 08

Five bounded workflows

Use only approved tools and appropriate information. Treat every output as a draft to test against your course, discipline, sources, students, and professional judgment.

1. LESSON-PLAN OPTIONS

Prompt pattern: "Using these faculty-authored outcomes, suggest three active-learning structures. State assumptions and accessibility considerations."

Verify: alignment, timing, inclusiveness, prerequisites, and factual accuracy.

2. ASSIGNMENT STRESS TEST

Prompt pattern: "Review this assignment for unclear AI rules, hidden prerequisites, ambiguous grading criteria, and likely accessibility barriers. Do not rewrite it yet."

Verify: policy fit, disciplinary norms, student workload, and rubric alignment.

3. PRACTICE QUESTIONS

Prompt pattern: "Draft practice questions that are not graded at three levels using only the supplied material. Include answers with source locations."

Verify: every key, source, difficulty, bias, and distractor.

4. FEEDBACK PREPARATION

Prompt pattern: "Using an anonymized sample and this rubric, identify places where feedback may be needed. Do not assign a grade or infer the student's intent."

Verify: privacy, fairness, context, tone, rubric fit, and the final faculty feedback.

5. PLAIN-LANGUAGE REVISION

Prompt pattern: "Offer a plain-language version of these faculty-authored instructions without removing requirements, dates, or technical terms. List any meaning that may have changed."

Verify: meaning, accessibility, terminology, and consistency across LMS materials.

CONNECTED OR AGENTIC TOOLS

An AI agent that can read email, change files, message students, or act in an LMS creates additional risk. Start read-only, minimize permissions, require confirmation for consequential actions, log activity, and maintain a tested way to stop or reverse it.

SOURCE BASIS U.S. Department of Education AI guidance | DOJ ADA Title II web rule

09 TWO FACULTY AI CHECKLISTS

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 09

Use before the semester and before release

COURSE READINESS

- Each important activity has a clear AI rule and learning reason.
- Allowed tools and data are institution-approved.
- Disclosure, citation, and process evidence are explained.
- An equitable, accessible path is available.
- Rubrics assess the intended human learning.
- Misconduct concerns use established fair procedures.

AI-ASSISTED MATERIAL REVIEW

- Facts, calculations, quotations, citations, and links are checked.
- No student or confidential data was exposed.
- Bias, tone, accessibility, and harmful assumptions were reviewed.
- Copyright, licenses, and attribution were considered.
- A qualified person approved the final material.
- Material use was documented or disclosed when required.

Minimum record for a controlled faculty AI use

Record	What to capture
Purpose	Learning outcome or faculty task; why AI adds value.
Boundary	Approved tool, permitted data, users, and prohibited actions.
Review	Named human reviewer, verification method, and release decision.
Evidence	Errors, revisions, student feedback, accessibility issues, and whether use should continue.

FROM COURSE IDEA TO CONTINUED USE

- Define. Name the learning outcome, the work students must do themselves, the current approach, and the reason AI might help.
- Check readiness. Use the course checklist above; confirm the exact tool and data use are approved, the assignment rule is clear, and every student has an effective participation route. Pause if a required approval or support is missing.
- Try one bounded activity. Set a duration and reviewer. Retain representative student work or explanations, verified errors and revisions, preparation and checking time, access concerns, and student feedback under institutional record rules.
- Decide. Compare the evidence with the original learning goal and workload. Within applicable academic freedom, policy, and approvals, faculty may continue, revise, or stop their own course activity. Stop an unreliable or inaccessible use; escalate a data or safety concern through the institution's process.
- Review and expand appropriately. Recheck before the next offering and after a material tool, rule, or task change. Department or program leaders decide on shared curricular practice within their authority; institution-wide tools, data uses, or requirements need the institution's designated academic, technology, privacy, accessibility, and procurement approvals.

SOURCE BASIS U.S. Department of Education AI guidance | FERPA | DOJ ADA Title II web rule

10 RELATED MISSISSIPPI AI RESOURCES

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 10

Continue with MAIN

HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY TEMPLATE

Adapt roles, acceptable uses, data rules, oversight, and review cycles to your institution.

[Open the policy template](#)

INSTITUTIONAL GUIDANCE DIRECTORY

Review publicly available AI guidance from Mississippi colleges and universities.

[Browse AI guidance](#)

EDUCATOR AND LEARNING RESOURCES

Find educator information, courses, tools, prompting guides, and other MAIN resources.

[Visit educator resources](#)

STUDENT AI PLAYBOOK

Give students a companion guide for learning, research, coding, privacy, verification, disclosure, and accountable submission.

[Open the Student AI Playbook](#)

AI + DUAL ENROLLMENT GUIDE

Align college academic expectations with K-12 technology, privacy, access, and student support.

Open the dual-enrollment guide

SOURCE BASIS [Open the policy template](#) | [Browse AI guidance](#) | [Visit educator resources](#) | [Open the Student AI Playbook](#)

11 FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 11

Faculty AI questions

HOW SHOULD FACULTY SET AI RULES FOR A COURSE?

State whether AI is required, permitted, limited, or prohibited for each meaningful activity. Explain the learning reason, allowed tools and data, disclosure or citation expectations, and how students can ask questions or request an accessible alternative.

SHOULD FACULTY USE AI DETECTORS TO PROVE MISCONDUCT?

No automated detector should be the sole basis for an academic-integrity finding. Follow institutional procedures and consider the full evidence, including the assignment design, drafts, sources, process records, and a fair conversation with the student.

MAY FACULTY ENTER STUDENT WORK INTO AN AI TOOL?

Only use an institution-approved tool and workflow appropriate for the information involved. Do not upload identifiable student records, grades, accommodation information, unpublished work, or other protected or confidential material unless the institution has authorized that specific use.

CAN AI GRADE STUDENT WORK?

AI may assist an approved, evaluated workflow, but faculty remain responsible for fair and accurate evaluation. Consequential grading decisions require meaningful human review, attention to bias and accessibility, and compliance with institutional policy.

HOW CAN FACULTY DESIGN ASSIGNMENTS FOR THE AI ERA?

Align the AI rule to the learning outcome and ask students to show meaningful process, evidence, judgment, reflection, revision, or oral explanation. Design for authentic learning rather than relying on surveillance or detection alone.

SOURCE BASIS [U.S. Department of Education AI guidance](#) | [FERPA](#) | [DOJ ADA Title II web rule](#)

12 SOURCES AND STANDARDS

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 12

Authoritative foundation

- U.S. Department of Education, Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning (May 2023)
- U.S. Department of Education, Guidance on Artificial Intelligence Use in Schools (July 2025), including responsible adoption, privacy, stakeholder engagement, and AI literacy principles
- U.S. Department of Education Student Privacy Policy Office, FERPA
- U.S. Department of Justice, accessibility of web content and mobile apps under ADA Title II
- U.S. Copyright Office, Copyright and Artificial Intelligence
- NIST AI Risk Management Framework and Generative AI Profile
- Student Guide to AI, a higher-education resource developed by Elon University and AAC&U
- Van Vlasselaer, Van Droogenbroeck & Spruyt (2026), Who wrote this?, a controlled-dataset study showing materially different detector performance and recommending initial flags rather than sole evidence
- Hadra, Cambridge & Mesbah (2026), Evaluating the accuracy and reliability of AI content detectors, documenting reliability and fairness limits in authentic EFL writing
- Turnitin, Using the AI Writing Report, vendor documentation requiring further scrutiny and human judgment rather than sole-basis action

SOURCE BASIS U.S. Department of Education, Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning | U.S. Department of Education, Guidance on Artificial Intelligence Use in Schools | U.S. Department of Education Student Privacy Policy Office, FERPA | U.S. Department of Justice, accessibility of web content and mobile apps under ADA Title II

13 TURN GUIDANCE INTO A TEACHABLE PRACTICE

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 13

Use this playbook with faculty, students, academic leadership, accessibility, IT, privacy, security, libraries, and support teams. Then revise it as tools, evidence, and institutional policy change.

Browse All AI Playbooks

Contact MAIN

Cover photograph: zhu yi / Pexels (license). Contextual photograph; no claim of MAIN affiliation or actual AI use.

LEAVE WITH A DECISION RECORD

An assignment permission card, evidence-preserving assessment plan or fair-review record.

01 SET

Define the learning objective and activity-level AI rule.

02 DESIGN

Make process, verification and disclosure visible.

03 REVIEW

Use total evidence and established institutional process.

14 SOURCES, REVIEW RECORD AND MAINTENANCE

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 14

MAIN developed the operating model, decision logic, examples and working tools in this playbook. The reviewed references below support the method and its boundaries. Law, agency guidance, research, institutional examples and vendor documentation serve different roles; none substitutes for applicable law, institutional policy or qualified review. Confirm current applicability and currency before use.

- 01 MAIN's evidence guide to AI detection and verifying learning
mainms.org
- 02 Open the policy template
mainms.org
- 03 Browse AI guidance
mainms.org
- 04 Visit educator resources
mainms.org
- 05 Open the Student AI Playbook
mainms.org
- 06 Open the dual-enrollment guide
mainms.org
- 07 U.S. Department of Education, Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning
ed.gov
- 08 U.S. Department of Education, Guidance on Artificial Intelligence Use in Schools
ed.gov
- 09 U.S. Department of Education Student Privacy Policy Office, FERPA
studentprivacy.ed.gov
- 10 U.S. Department of Justice, accessibility of web content and mobile apps under ADA Title II
ada.gov

REFERENCES — CONTINUED

11 U.S. Copyright Office, Copyright and Artificial Intelligence
copyright.gov

12 NIST AI Risk Management Framework
nist.gov

13 Generative AI Profile
nist.gov

14 Student Guide to AI
studentguidetoai.org

15 Van Vlasselaer, Van Droogenbroeck & Spruyt (2026), Who wrote this?
link.springer.com

16 Hadra, Cambridge & Mesbah (2026), Evaluating the accuracy and reliability of AI content detectors
link.springer.com

17 Turnitin, Using the AI Writing Report
guides.turnitin.com

18 NIST synthetic-content detection report
nist.gov

KEEP THE GUIDANCE CURRENT

Confirm applicability before use. Record the responsible local owner and what should trigger another review.

OWN

Name the person responsible for scope, access and decisions.

CHECK

Have qualified reviewers check evidence, risks and corrections.

STOP

Pause or reverse work that exceeds the approved boundary.