POLICY + COORDINATION

AI + DUAL ENROLLMENT GUIDE

Align authority, access, privacy, evidence and support so one student receives one usable path.

College and K-12 leaders, faculty, coordinators, facilitators, IT/privacy/accessibility staff, students and families.

ALIGN

Name the controlling college and K-12 authority.

SUPPORT

Provide access, privacy, accessibility and clear contacts.

RESOLVE

Route conflicts without making the student reconcile them.

MISSISSIPPI ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE NETWORK (MAIN)

MISSISSIPPI'S STATEWIDE AI INITIATIVE | MAINMS.ORG

START HERE

GIVE STUDENTS ONE CLEAR PATH ACROSS TWO SYSTEMS.

Align AI authority, access, instruction, evidence, privacy and conflict handling across college and K-12 systems.

WHO SHOULD USE THIS

College and K-12 leaders, faculty, coordinators, facilitators, IT/privacy/accessibility staff, students and families.

WHAT YOU WILL PRODUCE

A coordination record covering permission, access, privacy, evidence, conflict routing and named contacts.

KEEP THESE BOUNDARIES

This guide does not create law or make students responsible for reconciling institutional conflict.

COORDINATE ONE COURSE

01 **Confirm academic authority**

Agree on college requirements and the instructor's assignment-level AI rules.

02 **Check school access**

Confirm K–12 device, network, privacy and accessibility arrangements.

03 **Give consistent directions**

Tell students what is permitted, what evidence to keep and whom to contact.

04 **Resolve conflicts together**

Route disagreements to named college and school contacts, not to the student.

Built on Mississippi's Statewide AI Framework

The Mississippi Statewide AI Framework (August 2026) is the foundation for this playbook. It supplies shared priorities and a learning progression; this playbook applies them to AI learning and coordination across college and K-12 partners. Both are voluntary. Applicable law, adopted standards and institutional authority remain controlling.

Read the August 2026 Statewide AI Framework (PDF)

Learning progression. The high-school to postsecondary transition, including technical, transfer and workforce pathways. Course requirements remain with their applicable academic authority.

Five priorities in practice

Resolve access barriers across both partners (1); teach judgment and fair process (2); agree on accounts and student-data boundaries (3); prepare students for college and workplace expectations (4); review shared evidence and unresolved conflicts (5).

Priority numbers refer to literacy and access (1), ethics and critical thinking (2), privacy and governance (3), workforce readiness (4), and strategic alignment and measurable outcomes (5).

Selected Framework domains, practice and evidence

Framework domain	Practice and evidence to retain
10. Sector and Pathway Awareness	Connect the course to its actual next pathway; record the transition expectations.
9. Communication and AI Literacy Across Audiences	Give the student one clear instruction; retain the communication and named question route.
8. Human Agency, Judgment, and Restraint	Keep grading, integrity and conflict decisions with the responsible people; retain the resolution.
2. Data Literacy and Data Stewardship	Reconcile data and account permissions; retain both partners' scope-specific decisions.

Keep the shared human-review boundary

Apply the Framework's human-review triggers (p. 35) before action: assessment or credentials; financial allocation or compensation; health or physical safety; discipline or employment; legal or compliance content; and sensitive or protected information. Its additional agent triggers cover autonomous system-of-record changes; persistent memory; tool access, credentials or external transactions; handoffs in safety-critical, regulated or student-facing processes; missing stop conditions or logged escalation to a named human owner; and institutional responses to synthetic media about identifiable people. Product or pilot approval does not replace action-specific review. Review the system and access before enabling them; review each proposed system-of-record change before execution. Advance permission cannot waive these triggers.

Use evidence within its limits

Use the crosswalk to select practice and retain observable evidence. It is MAIN's implementation mapping, not a validated proficiency test, credential or certification. Local rubrics and pilot measures alone do not establish statewide proficiency or causal impact. Recheck alignment when the Framework changes; record the edition, local owner and next review.

Source: August 2026 Framework, pp. 5-7 (priorities), 14-30 (domains and progression), and 35-37 (review, measurement and maintenance).

01 A COLLEGE COURSE INSIDE A K-12 ENVIRONMENT

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 01

Start here

A dual-enrollment course is not simply a high-school class with college credit attached. The student is participating in postsecondary education while remaining in a K-12 setting. AI expectations can therefore depend on the college, department, course, instructor, assignment, tool, account, network, and information involved.

The practical solution is clear alignment + AI literacy. Preserve college-level expectations, give high-school students unusually clear directions, and teach them how to make sound AI decisions when no one is watching.

MISSISSIPPI TERMS MATTER

Dual enrollment: a high-school student enrolls in a Mississippi public postsecondary course and receives postsecondary credit.

Dual credit: the student receives both high-school and college credit for the postsecondary coursework.

These definitions follow Mississippi's current Procedures Manual and MCCB guidance. The terms should not be treated as interchangeable when a rule or agreement distinguishes them.

Verify current MCCB guidance

COLLEGE-LEVEL RIGOR REMAINS

Mississippi's current manual states that postsecondary academic standards apply whether the course is on campus, online, or at a secondary school.

K-12 CONTROLS REMAIN REAL

A district may control its devices, network, approved applications, accounts, filtering, privacy process, and local conduct expectations.

THE STUDENT SHOULD NOT ARBITRATE

Partners should identify and resolve conflicting requirements, document the answer, and give the student one clear instruction.

SOURCE BASIS Verify current MCCB guidance | Mississippi IHL Dual Enrollment | Mississippi dual-enrollment procedures manual

02 WHO SETS THE AI RULES?

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 02

One course, two systems

No single sentence resolves every case. Use the issue-specific path below and the partnership's current policies and agreement.

START WITH THE POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTION

Find institutional AI and integrity policies, approved tools, privacy/security rules, department guidance, and required syllabus language.

CHECK THE COURSE

Identify whether AI is required, permitted, limited, or not permitted, and whether the boundary changes by assignment.

CHECK THE K-12 ENVIRONMENT

Confirm approved tools, account and age restrictions, privacy requirements, acceptable use, devices, networks, filtering, and family communication.

RESOLVE CONFLICTS BEFORE INSTRUCTION

Route the issue through designated college and district contacts. Do not ask a student to choose which partner to disobey.

ACADEMIC EXPECTATIONS

The institution awarding college credit typically leads course standards, content, assessment, grading, and academic-integrity procedures. Instructor discretion operates within institutional and department policy.

TECHNOLOGY ENVIRONMENT

The K-12 partner typically leads local devices, networks, filtering, school-managed accounts, and district-approved technology. A college requirement does not authorize bypassing those controls.

PRIVACY, CONDUCT, AND ACCESS

Both partners may have applicable responsibilities. Determine which policy, process, contract, or agreement governs the specific data, conduct, accessibility, or account issue.

Mississippi foundation: the current statewide manual requires postsecondary academic standards for college-level courses, calls for communication with high schools to identify and resolve problems, and requires a board-approved agreement before participation in a dual credit program. This MAIN guide recommends adding AI coordination to those operating conversations; it does not claim new statewide authority.

SOURCE BASIS Mississippi IHL Dual Enrollment | Mississippi Community College Board Dual Enrollment | Mississippi dual-enrollment procedures manual

03 USE A CLEAR AI PERMISSION MODEL

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 03

Permission must be visible

MAIN recommends this adaptable four-status vocabulary. It is not a statewide mandate, and a course or institution may use other terms.

AI REQUIRED

Students must use the named approved tool or an approved alternative for a defined learning purpose. Teach the skill and limits before assessing it.

AI PERMITTED

Students may use AI within the stated boundaries and remain responsible for verification, disclosure, citation, and their own reasoning.

AI LIMITED

AI is allowed only for specified steps, such as brainstorming, tutoring, feedback, debugging, or revision. Name what the student must do personally.

AI NOT PERMITTED

Students complete the activity without generative AI because independent performance is the learning objective. Define the boundary and reason.

THE SYLLABUS IS NOT ENOUGH

Communicate at four layers: institutional policy, course/syllabus, LMS or course space, and assignment instructions. A general statement cannot answer every assignment-level question.

EVERY ASSIGNMENT SHOULD ANSWER

- May AI be used, and which tools?
- For what steps, and what may not be delegated?
- What disclosure, citation, or process evidence is required?
- What must the student verify and be able to explain?

SOURCE BASIS Mississippi IHL Dual Enrollment | Mississippi Community College Board Dual Enrollment | U.S. Department of Education dual-enrollment privacy resource

04 RESPONSIBILITY MATRIX

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 04

What am I responsible for?

"Leads" describes a common operating role, not a universal legal conclusion. Apply the current partnership agreement and institutional policies.

Dual enrollment AI responsibility matrix

Issue	College / university	Instructor of Record	K-12 partner	Facilitator / coordinator	Student
Institutional AI policy	Defines institution-wide requirements.	Applies policy within the course.	Reviews fit with district requirements.	Understands both systems.	Follows applicable directions.
Course and assignment permissions	Sets academic and department boundaries.	Typically leads: states clear, timely rules.	Flags access, privacy, or technology conflicts.	Reinforces; does not independently rewrite rules.	Checks before use; asks when unclear.
Academic standards and integrity	Typically leads: defines course standards and process.	Uses established procedures and evidence.	Coordinates where local conduct also applies.	Reports concerns through the defined path.	Submits work they can explain; participates fairly.
Approved AI tools	Approves tools for institutional academic use.	Requires only approved, appropriate tools.	Leads local access: devices, network, accounts, filtering.	Confirms classroom availability.	Uses authorized access; does not bypass controls.
Privacy and student data	Applies postsecondary privacy, security, and vendor review.	Uses minimum necessary data and approved environments.	Applies K-12 privacy, consent, security, and vendor processes.	Prevents unnecessary uploads and escalates questions.	Does not enter sensitive or restricted information.
Accessibility and equitable access	Provides institutional accessibility process and alternatives.	Designs an accessible, no-surprise activity.	Confirms device, network, and local support.	Identifies barriers early.	Reports barriers promptly through the right channel.
AI literacy	Provides college-ready expectations and resources.	Teaches discipline- and assignment-relevant judgment.	Builds age-appropriate digital and AI literacy.	Connects the two learning environments.	Practices, verifies, reflects, and improves.
Escalation and communication	Names a dual-enrollment and academic contact.	Clarifies course intent and academic requirements.	Names district/school contact and family process.	Coordinates: documents and routes the issue.	Receives one clear answer; is not the arbitrator.

SOURCE BASIS Mississippi IHL Dual Enrollment | Mississippi Community College Board Dual Enrollment | Mississippi dual-enrollment procedures manual

05 FOUR READINESS CHECKLISTS

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 05

Before the course starts

Use these during onboarding, annual partnership review, and course setup. Begin with the proposed course or assignment use and the learning outcome; the checklists establish whether both partners can support that specific use.

POSTSECONDARY PARTNER

- Identify AI, integrity, privacy, security, accessibility, and approved-tool requirements.
- Define Instructor of Record and facilitator responsibilities.
- Provide course and assignment communication guidance.
- Establish misuse, escalation, and contact processes.
- Share student-facing AI resources and literacy opportunities.

K-12 PARTNER

- Review college requirements for conflict with district technology and conduct rules.
- Confirm approved access, age/account terms, privacy, cost, and accessibility.
- Train facilitators and name a coordinator.
- Communicate expectations to students and families.
- Resolve conflicting academic instructions with the college rather than improvising.

INSTRUCTOR OF RECORD

- Define course- and assignment-level AI status.
- Name permitted and restricted uses, disclosure, citation, and verification.
- Coordinate with the facilitator before launch.
- Model appropriate AI use where relevant.
- Use established academic-integrity procedures, not ad hoc AI penalties.

HIGH-SCHOOL FACILITATOR

A high-school teacher appointed as the college Instructor of Record carries that instructor role; a facilitator who only supports delivery does not.

- Understand the postsecondary course requirements.
- Reinforce rather than independently change the college course rule.
- Help students see differences between high-school and college expectations.
- Escalate ambiguity; do not improvise policy.
- Model responsible use and build AI literacy, not only compliance.

FROM PROPOSED USE TO REPEAT USE

- Define the use. The Instructor of Record identifies the learning task, permitted AI step, student evidence, and an option if AI access is unavailable.
- Confirm readiness and authority. College academic and technology owners confirm course rules and approved tools or data; district owners confirm school accounts, access, privacy, age terms, supports, and any family process. Program contacts resolve conflicts before students act.
- Try a bounded implementation. Start with one assignment or course section under the agreed rules. The instructor and facilitator record student work or explanation, verification errors, access and support problems, staff time, and any incident through approved channels.
- Decide together where needed. The instructor may continue an assignment-level practice within institutional discretion and the agreed conditions. Program leaders coordinate changes across courses or partners; each institution's designated authorities approve changes to its tools, data, accounts, or academic requirements. Revise, pause, or stop if learning, access, or safeguards fail.
- Recheck alignment. Name the contact and date for the next course or annual partnership review. Reopen the decision after a policy, product, account, privacy, accessibility, or assignment change; use the annual alignment check below.

SOURCE BASIS Mississippi IHL Dual Enrollment | Mississippi Community College Board Dual Enrollment | U.S. Department of Education dual-enrollment privacy resource

06 BEFORE YOU USE AI

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 06

A reusable student decision check

AI can assist your work. You remain responsible for your work.

CHECK

Does my instructor allow AI for this assignment and this step?

KNOW

Which tools and kinds of help are permitted?

PROTECT

Am I uploading anything private, restricted, confidential, or someone else's?

VERIFY

Can I independently confirm the claims, sources, calculations, and code?

DISCLOSE

Must I explain, attribute, or cite how I used AI?

OWN

Can I explain and defend everything I submit?

SOURCE BASIS Mississippi IHL Dual Enrollment | Mississippi Community College Board Dual Enrollment | U.S. Department of Education dual-enrollment privacy resource

07 TEACH AI LITERACY, NOT JUST AI COMPLIANCE

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 07

College + workforce readiness

The objective is judgment, not proficiency with one chatbot. Dual enrollment is a transition point from K-12 to college to work, making it an unusually valuable place to teach responsible habits.

UNDERSTAND

How generative systems produce outputs; why confidence is not accuracy; and how hallucinations, false citations, bias, and missing context appear.

PRACTICE

Prompting, AI-assisted studying, research-keyword development, comparison, revision feedback, verification, disclosure, and discipline-relevant use.

JUDGE

When AI helps, when it weakens learning, what must remain human, what information is unsafe to share, and when to ask a qualified person.

EXAMPLES THAT MAY SUPPORT LEARNING WHEN AUTHORIZED

- Ask for another explanation or practice questions.
- Build a study guide from the student's own notes.
- Brainstorm topics, research keywords, or questions for an instructor.
- Compare problem-solving approaches or debug code.
- Practice language, interviews, or presentations.
- Request feedback on clarity before the student revises.

These examples never override course or assignment instructions.

HIGHER-RISK OR OFTEN RESTRICTED USES

- Generate an entire assignment or answer a graded assessment.
- Present generated discussion content as personal thought.
- Fabricate citations or paraphrase to conceal copying.
- Upload student records, classmates' work, or unpublished assessments.

- Allow an agent to submit work or act in an academic system.
- Use AI where the instructions prohibit it.

Some uses may be legitimate in a carefully designed activity; require explicit authorization and controls.

Disclosure is not always citation. Disclosure explains whether and how AI contributed. Citation or attribution credits a source or tool under the instructor, discipline, institution, or required style. Students should follow the stated requirements; this guide creates no universal AI citation rule.

SOURCE BASIS Mississippi IHL Dual Enrollment | Mississippi Community College Board Dual Enrollment | U.S. Department of Education dual-enrollment privacy resource

08 AI USE, AI DETECTION, AND MISCONDUCT ARE DIFFERENT

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 08

Integrity with due process

Authorized AI-assisted learning, unauthorized use, and an institutional finding of misconduct are not the same category.

AI USE

May be required, permitted, limited, or prohibited depending on the learning objective and governing instructions. Availability does not equal permission.

AI DETECTION

A probabilistic estimate that text has characteristics associated with generated or altered content. It does not determine authorization, intent, or misconduct.

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

A determination under applicable policy and procedure based on the actual expectation, conduct, evidence, context, and fair review.

WHAT CURRENT EVIDENCE SUPPORTS

Peer-reviewed 2026 studies reach different performance results across tools, datasets, genres, languages, model generations, and mixed human/AI writing. One June study found strong performance from one tool on its controlled dataset while other tools underdetected; another found two commercial detectors insufficient as the sole basis for high-stakes judgments on authentic EFL writing.

The careful conclusion is not "detectors never work." It is that performance is uneven and changes, and a score cannot establish whether use was authorized or whether misconduct occurred.

A FAIR OPERATING RULE

Do not use a detector score as standalone proof or the sole basis for a grade, accusation, or penalty. Even Turnitin's current guidance says its model may misidentify text and requires further scrutiny, human judgment, and institutional policy.

Validate any product in the institution's own context, document limits, monitor differential impacts, and preserve the established academic-integrity process.

Rethink the investment: institutions should ask whether additional time and money spent on detection would create more educational value if invested in AI literacy, faculty development, student orientation, equitable approved access, assessment design, mentoring, verification, and fair integrity processes. Current evidence does not support a universal cost-effectiveness figure, so this is a governance question, not a quantified claim.

SOURCE BASIS NIST synthetic-content detection report | U.S. Department of Education AI guidance

09 REVIEW THE LEARNING AND THE EVIDENCE

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 09

When misuse is suspected

Set clear boundaries. Teach responsible use. Design for learning. Address actual misconduct through the established process.

REVIEW THE EXPECTATION

Was the rule clear about permission, boundaries, disclosure, and process evidence? Address material ambiguity before assuming misconduct.

REVIEW THE WORK

Look for substantive issues: fabricated sources, unsupported claims, factual inconsistency, missing required steps, or unexplained reasoning, not writing style alone.

REVIEW THE PROCESS

When appropriate, inspect naturally produced outlines, notes, drafts, sources, calculations, research logs, or code/version history. Do not make surveillance the assignment.

TALK WITH THE STUDENT

Ask the student to explain the argument, sources, calculations, code, revisions, and any AI use. Use conversation to understand learning, not as an ambush.

TEACH WHEN APPROPRIATE

If policy allows, ambiguity or a developing skill may call for clarification, verification practice, reflection, explanation, revision, or resubmission.

USE ESTABLISHED PROCEDURE

When evidence supports a potential violation, follow the college's applicable integrity process and any required coordination. Do not invent an AI-only punishment system.

SOURCE BASIS NIST synthetic-content detection report | U.S. Department of Education AI guidance

10 DESIGN FOR VISIBLE LEARNING, NOT CONTINUOUS SURVEILLANCE

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 10

From detection to education

A useful progression is: Clarify → Teach → Model → Practice → Reflect → Verify → Improve.

MAKE THINKING VISIBLE

Use selected proposals, annotated sources, checkpoints, drafts, decision notes, oral explanations, demonstrations, portfolios, presentations, or version history when they serve the learning objective.

USE AUTHENTIC CONTEXT

Connect work to local issues, course discussions, labs, field observations, unique data, real constraints, or personalized application.

ASSESS JUDGMENT

Ask students to verify claims, critique an AI response, compare approaches, identify bias, correct errors, and explain what they accepted, rejected, or changed.

AI-INTEGRATED ASSIGNMENT IDEAS, WHEN PEDAGOGICALLY APPROPRIATE

- Generate a response, locate its errors, and repair it with verified sources.
- Compare AI-suggested sources with scholarly sources the student actually opens and evaluates.
- Improve a weak generated argument and explain every meaningful revision.
- Ask AI to explain a concept, then independently verify and correct the explanation.
- Compare the student's solution with an AI-generated solution.
- Document prompts, outputs, verification, revisions, and final judgment.
- Compare outputs from two systems and explain meaningful differences.
- Use AI to generate questions, then decide which actually demonstrate understanding.

Dual enrollment as transition: students are moving from K-12 toward higher education and the workforce. The enduring goal is not compliance while watched; it is the judgment to use powerful tools responsibly after the class ends.

SOURCE BASIS Mississippi IHL Dual Enrollment | Mississippi Community College Board Dual Enrollment | U.S. Department of Education dual-enrollment privacy resource

11 PROTECT STUDENTS BEFORE REQUIRING AN AI TOOL

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 11

Minors, records, and tool access

A public consumer account is not automatically an approved educational environment. Dual-enrollment students are often minors, but age alone does not answer every legal or contractual question.

PRACTICAL DATA RULE

Do not enter sensitive, restricted, confidential, or personally identifiable information into an AI system unless the applicable institution has approved that specific use and environment.

Use minimum necessary information and institution-managed access when provided.

FERPA CONTEXT

FERPA applies to education records maintained by covered agencies and institutions and defines personally identifiable information broadly. A student attending a postsecondary institution is an "eligible student" under FERPA even if under 18, which can affect record rights and family communication.

AGE AND ACCOUNT TERMS

Check the product's current minimum age, account terms, school or parent consent process where applicable, and whether the proposed account type is permitted. COPPA specifically addresses operators collecting personal information from children under 13; it is not a universal rule for every minor.

BEFORE THE COLLEGE REQUIRES AN AI PRODUCT

- Minimum age and account requirements
- Consent issues where applicable
- Institutional license and privacy/security review
- Data retention, use, sharing, and training settings
- Accessibility and accommodation process
- Cost and availability to every student
- District device, network, and filtering compatibility
- Alternative access when required
- Technical support at the high-school site
- Clear plan if the tool or terms change

SOURCE BASIS Mississippi IHL Dual Enrollment | Mississippi Community College Board Dual Enrollment | U.S. Department of Education dual-enrollment privacy resource

12 WHEN K-12 AND COLLEGE RULES CONFLICT

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 12

Resolve before the student acts

Use a documented, issue-specific resolution path.

IDENTIFY

State the exact conflict, affected course or assignment, tool, timing, and students.

PAUSE

Do not ask the student to bypass controls or choose which institution to disobey.

NOTIFY

Contact the Instructor of Record, postsecondary dual-enrollment office, district/school coordinator, and other designated authority.

CLASSIFY

Is the issue academic standards, technology access, privacy/security, conduct, accessibility, cost, or legal/compliance?

RESOLVE AND DOCUMENT

Identify the appropriate authority, agree on an accessible path, record the decision, owner, and effective period.

COMMUNICATE AND IMPROVE

Give the student one clear instruction and update future course materials, onboarding, or agreements if the issue is systemic.

SOURCE BASIS Mississippi IHL Dual Enrollment | Mississippi Community College Board Dual Enrollment | Mississippi dual-enrollment procedures manual

13 COURSE AND ASSIGNMENT TEMPLATES

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 13

Copy, adapt, and approve locally

These are model communication tools, not legal language or mandatory policy.

SAMPLE COURSE AI STATEMENT

Artificial intelligence expectations may vary by assignment. Follow each assignment's AI instructions and ask before using AI when the boundary is unclear. Unauthorized assistance may violate applicable academic-integrity requirements. When AI is authorized, you remain responsible for the accuracy, sources, calculations, code, originality, and final work you submit. Do not upload protected, confidential, restricted, or another person's information unless the applicable institution has authorized that specific data use and workflow. Approval of a tool alone is not permission to use every kind of information. Disclosure or citation requirements will be stated when applicable. Some activities may intentionally use approved AI to build critical, responsible AI skills.

AI USE FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT

Status: □ Required □ Permitted □ Limited □ Not permitted

You may: [Specify tools and allowed steps.]

You may not: [Specify restricted steps, content, or data.]

Disclosure / citation: [State requirement and format.]

Verify: You are responsible for checking all AI-assisted content.

Learning objective: [Name the thinking or work the student must perform personally.]

Questions: Ask before using AI if you are unsure.

SOURCE BASIS Mississippi IHL Dual Enrollment | Mississippi Community College Board Dual Enrollment | Mississippi dual-enrollment procedures manual

14 ORIENTATION, PREPARATION, AGREEMENTS, AND ANNUAL REVIEW

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 14

Make alignment operational

STUDENT AI ORIENTATION

- What generative AI is and is not
- College integrity and assignment rules
- Hallucinations, source checking, calculations, and code
- Privacy, safe tool use, and accounts
- Disclosure versus citation
- Learning with AI rather than outsourcing learning
- Critical comparison and human judgment
- AI in college and the workforce
- Student reflection or acknowledgment

Montgomery College's dual-enrollment fellowship offers one instructional example: short ethics instruction, guided use, student reflection, and a student-created commitment.

FACULTY AND FACILITATOR PREPARATION

- Institutional AI and integrity requirements
- Permission language and assignment design
- Privacy, approved tools, access, and accessibility
- AI limitations and verification
- Limits of detection and fair evidence review
- Process-based assessment without continuous surveillance
- Educational responses and required formal procedures
- Escalation and the transition to college expectations
- Modeling responsible professional use

PARTNERSHIP / MOU OPERATING CONSIDERATIONS

Mississippi's current manual already requires a board-approved agreement before student participation in a dual credit program. Partners should consider clarifying AI in the agreement, annual operating procedures, handbook, or onboarding materials:

- Academic policy and course-level authority
- Approved or restricted technology and data
- Training and student orientation
- Integrity process and escalation contacts
- Tool access, accessibility, and conflict handling
- How policy changes are communicated

This is a recommended coordination list, not a claim that Mississippi law specifically requires AI clauses.

ANNUAL AI ALIGNMENT CHECK

- College and district AI policies
- Approved tools, privacy, security, age, and account terms
- Syllabus and assignment language
- Integrity and detection practices against current evidence
- Orientation and faculty/facilitator preparation
- Student literacy and equitable-access opportunities
- Contacts, escalation path, and major policy changes

SOURCE BASIS Mississippi IHL Dual Enrollment | Mississippi Community College Board Dual Enrollment | U.S. Department of Education dual-enrollment privacy resource

15 WHAT SHOULD HAPPEN?

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 15

Six realistic situations

COLLEGE REQUIRES IT; DISTRICT BLOCKS IT

Do not tell the student to bypass the network. Pause the activity for affected students, route the conflict through designated contacts, confirm the academic goal and district concern, and provide an approved tool, configuration, location, or equivalent alternative before grading.

THE ASSIGNMENT IS UNCLEAR

The syllabus mentions AI generally, but the assignment does not. Clarify before use when possible. If a concern arises, examine whether a reasonable student could know the rule, teach the missing boundary, and improve future instructions before assuming misconduct.

COLLEGE PROHIBITS AI ON AN ASSESSMENT

A broad K-12 permission does not authorize AI on a college assessment with a clear, stricter course rule. Reinforce the assignment boundary and explain that independent performance is being assessed.

A MINOR CANNOT CREATE THE ACCOUNT

Do not shift the problem to the student or family after launch. Check the vendor's current terms, institutional approvals, consent process where applicable, and alternatives; revise the activity or provide authorized access before it affects a grade.

A FACILITATOR SUSPECTS MISUSE

Review the clarity of the rule, substantive evidence, and natural process artifacts. Talk with the student about the work and any AI use. Distinguish misunderstanding from a supported policy concern, then use the postsecondary institution's established process when required.

RESPONSIBLE AI-ASSISTED LEARNING

The assignment permits brainstorming and feedback. The student develops questions with AI, independently researches and writes, opens and checks every source, rejects inaccurate suggestions, discloses the permitted assistance, and can explain every conclusion. That is visible, accountable learning.

SOURCE BASIS Mississippi IHL Dual Enrollment | Mississippi Community College Board Dual Enrollment | U.S. Department of Education dual-enrollment privacy resource

16 WORKED COORDINATION CASE: PERMITTED ASSIGNMENT, BLOCKED TOOL

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 16

ILLUSTRATIVE CONFLICT - NO STUDENT BYPASS

Situation: a college assignment permits an AI-supported source critique, but the named consumer tool is blocked on the district-managed device. The student cannot create the required account under the proposed access path. The academic goal and the local technology boundary are both real; the student should not be required to choose which partner to disobey.

Record field	Illustrative completed entry
Issue	College activity permits a bounded critique; district device/account controls prevent the named access path.
Interim instruction	Pause the affected AI step. Continue any independent reading or planning that does not require the blocked tool. Do not bypass filtering or misstate age.
College owner	Instructor of Record confirms the learning objective, permitted assistance, evidence, grading impact, and acceptable equivalent activity.
K-12 owner	District or school technology/privacy contact confirms device, account, age, privacy, security, accessibility, and support constraints.
Classification	Technology access and account constraint with an academic-delivery consequence; not student misconduct.
Resolution options	Approved institution-managed access, an approved alternative tool, a supervised access location, or an equivalent non-AI activity meeting the same learning objective.
Final student instruction	Use the documented approved path for this assignment; contact the named coordinator before proceeding if access changes.
Record and review	Document authority, decision, effective period, students affected, communication, unresolved issues, and the trigger for course-material or agreement revision.

COMPLETE THE COORDINATION LOOP

- Complete when the student has one usable instruction, equivalent access, one named question route, and no grading consequence caused by an unresolved institutional conflict.
- Escalate when the issue concerns academic authority, privacy, records, accessibility, contract terms, consent, legal requirements, or a conflict the designated contacts cannot resolve.
- Review before the next course cycle and whenever policy, product terms, age/account conditions, approved tools, accessibility, or partner responsibilities materially change.

SOURCE BASIS Mississippi IHL Dual Enrollment | Mississippi dual-enrollment procedures manual | U.S. Department of Education dual-enrollment privacy resource | FTC COPPA FAQs

17 RELATED MISSISSIPPI AI RESOURCES

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 17

Continue with MAIN

Use this guide to align the dual-enrollment setting, then go deeper with the resource that owns the broader topic.

HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY TEMPLATE

Adapt governance, teaching, integrity, data, procurement, accessibility, and oversight language.

Open higher education guidance

K-12 POLICY TEMPLATE

Plan age-appropriate, safe, responsible district AI use and local governance.

Open K-12 guidance

MISSISSIPPI INSTITUTIONAL DIRECTORY

Review public AI guidance from Mississippi colleges and universities; policies vary by institution.

Browse institutional guidance

FACULTY AI PLAYBOOK

Use practical course rules, assessment design, student-data, accessibility, and human-review workflows.

Open the Faculty AI Playbook

STUDENT AI PLAYBOOK

Help students study, research, verify, protect information, disclose assistance, and own their work.

Open the Student AI Playbook

COURSES AND PRACTICAL SKILLS

Build foundational literacy through MAIN's free courses, student and educator resources, and prompting tips.

Browse free AI courses · Prompting tips

POLICY AND PROMPTING HUBS

Browse MAIN's full collections when a partner needs a different sector template or role-specific practice guide.

Policy guides · Prompting guides

STUDENT AND EDUCATOR HUBS

Find role-specific learning and support resources.

Student resources · Educator resources

STATEWIDE AI READINESS

Connect dual enrollment with Mississippi's shared AI literacy and workforce-readiness direction.

Statewide framework hub · AI priorities · AI in Mississippi

SOURCE BASIS Mississippi IHL Dual Enrollment | Mississippi Community College Board Dual Enrollment | U.S. Department of Education dual-enrollment privacy resource

18 FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 18

Practical questions

WHOSE AI POLICY APPLIES IN A DUAL-ENROLLMENT CLASS?

The postsecondary institution generally sets academic requirements for the college course. The K-12 partner may separately control local devices, networks, approved applications, accounts, privacy, and conduct. The current partnership agreement and applicable policies determine the specific answer; resolve conflicts before asking the student to act.

CAN A HIGH SCHOOL CREATE DIFFERENT AI RULES FOR A COLLEGE COURSE?

A district can set rules for its technology environment, privacy, safety, and local conduct, but should not independently weaken or rewrite the academic requirements of the college course. If a district rule creates conflict, the partners should resolve it through the designated process.

CAN ONE INSTRUCTOR ALLOW AI WHILE ANOTHER DOES NOT?

Yes, when institutional and department policy permits instructor or assignment-level discretion. Different learning objectives may justify different rules. The important requirement is timely, assignment-specific clarity.

IS ALL AI USE CONSIDERED CHEATING?

No. AI misuse may become misconduct when it violates an applicable institutional policy, course rule, assignment instruction, or requirement about authorship, disclosure, citation, or misrepresentation. Authorized learning use is different from unauthorized assistance.

CAN STUDENTS USE AI TO STUDY WHEN IT IS PROHIBITED ON AN ASSIGNMENT?

Possibly, but they should not assume so. A prohibition may apply only to the submitted task or may be broader. Ask whether AI can be used for explanations or practice without viewing or transforming the restricted assessment.

WHAT ARE PRODUCTIVE STUDENT USES OF AI?

When authorized: explanations, practice questions, study support using the student's own notes, brainstorming, research keywords, feedback, code debugging, language practice, comparison, and interview rehearsal. The student should verify outputs and keep their own reasoning central.

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN COLLEGE AND DISTRICT TECHNOLOGY RULES CONFLICT?

Do not tell the student to bypass controls. Identify whether the issue is academic, technical, privacy, security, accessibility, or compliance; notify both designated contacts; document an approved path or equivalent alternative; and communicate one clear answer.

CAN STUDENTS BE REQUIRED TO CREATE AN AI ACCOUNT?

Only after partners confirm current age and account terms, consent issues where applicable, institutional approval, privacy/security, accessibility, cost, equitable availability, and district compatibility. Resolve barriers before grading the activity.

WHAT IF THE STUDENT IS UNDER THE TOOL'S MINIMUM AGE?

The student should not misstate their age or bypass the product's terms. The partners must select an approved alternative, institution-managed pathway, or revised activity that the student can legitimately access.

SHOULD PARENTS OR FAMILIES BE NOTIFIED ABOUT AI TOOLS?

Follow applicable institutional, district, vendor, privacy, and consent requirements. Even when formal consent is not required, clear family communication about the purpose, data, account, cost, and support can prevent confusion. Remember that FERPA rights at the postsecondary institution may belong to the attending student even if under 18.

SHOULD STUDENTS DISCLOSE OR CITE AI USE?

Follow the instructor, assignment, discipline, citation style, and institutional requirements. Disclosure explains how AI contributed; citation or attribution credits a source or tool. They may overlap, but this guide creates no universal format.

CAN AN AI DETECTOR PROVE A STUDENT CHEATED?

No. Current research shows uneven, changing performance, and a detector cannot determine authorization or misconduct. A score should not be standalone evidence for an adverse decision. Review the expectation, work, learning process, conversation, and applicable procedure.

WHO HANDLES SUSPECTED ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT?

The postsecondary institution's applicable academic-integrity policy and designated officials typically govern a concern in the college course, with K-12 coordination where its conduct rules or agreement also apply. The facilitator should use the defined reporting path rather than impose an independent penalty.

WHAT BELONGS IN THE SYLLABUS?

Course-level status, how assignment rules may differ, approved tools, prohibited data, responsibility for verification, disclosure or citation expectations, consequences under existing policy, and where to ask questions. Repeat the operative boundary on each important assignment.

SHOULD DUAL-ENROLLMENT AGREEMENTS ADDRESS AI?

Partners should consider addressing AI in the agreement, annual operating procedures, faculty handbook, or onboarding materials. Clarify academic authority, technology and data, training, orientation, tool access, integrity processes, escalation, and policy-change communication. This is recommended planning, not newly claimed statutory language.

HOW OFTEN SHOULD AI GUIDANCE BE REVIEWED?

Before each academic year or partnership cycle and after material policy, product, privacy, security, age/account, or evidence changes. A named owner and revision date make the review usable.

HOW DOES AI LITERACY SUPPORT COLLEGE AND WORKFORCE READINESS?

It teaches students to interpret rules, protect information, verify claims, disclose assistance, preserve their own thinking, recognize limitations, and use AI with accountable human judgment. These skills transfer beyond one course or product.

SOURCE BASIS Mississippi IHL Dual Enrollment | Mississippi Community College Board Dual Enrollment | U.S. Department of Education dual-enrollment privacy resource

19 SOURCES AND REFERENCES

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 19

Authoritative foundation

Institutional practices below are examples, not Mississippi or national mandates.

MISSISSIPPI

- Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning: Dual Enrollment, including Mississippi Code § 37-15-38 and the current manual link.
- Mississippi Community College Board: Dual Enrollment and Dual Credit.
- Procedures Manual for Dual Enrollment and Accelerated Programs, Fall 2026, the edition linked by IHL.
- Mississippi Department of Education: College and Career Readiness.
- MAIN: AI Guidance from Mississippi Institutions, documenting that local institutional guidance varies.

EXTERNAL INSTITUTIONAL EXAMPLES

- Southeastern Louisiana University Dual Enrollment General Information and 2026-2027 Policy Statements: Instructor of Record/facilitator roles and course-specific AI expectations.
- Pima Community College Dual Enrollment Student Handbook: college standards, AI misuse, and potentially overlapping conduct requirements.
- Alvin College Dual Enrollment Student Handbook (current linked edition): one permission-based institutional model, linked from its current forms page.
- Maricopa Unified School District AI Guidance: AP and dual-enrollment students follow applicable external academic requirements.
- Montgomery College eFaculty Fellowship for Dual Enrollment: ethics instruction, guided practice, commitment, and reflection.

PRIVACY AND MINORS

- U.S. Department of Education Student Privacy Policy Office: FERPA, including education records, personally identifiable information, and eligible-student definitions.
- SPPO: Dual Enrollment privacy resource (updated August 2026), addressing education-record access and consent when records are maintained across high school and postsecondary institutions.

- SPPO: FERPA rights for a student under 18 enrolled in both high school and college, explaining the different record-rights context across the two institutions.
- Personally Identifiable Information for Education Records.
- Federal Trade Commission: Complying with COPPA FAQs.

AI DETECTION EVIDENCE

- Van Vlasselaer, Van Droogenbroeck & Spruyt (2026), Who wrote this? One tool performed strongly in the study's controlled dataset; tools should provide initial flags, not sole high-stakes evidence.
- Hadra, Cambridge & Mesbah (2026), Evaluating the accuracy and reliability of AI content detectors. Authentic EFL writing raised reliability, generalizability, and equity concerns for high-stakes judgments.
- Turnitin: Using the AI Writing Report. Vendor documentation warns against sole-basis adverse action and describes false-positive limits.

Educational and planning resource: This guide does not replace applicable law, state requirements, institutional or district policy, academic-integrity procedures, partnership agreements, accessibility processes, product terms, or legal counsel where needed. MAIN does not set institutional academic policy.

SOURCE BASIS Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning: Dual Enrollment | Mississippi Community College Board: Dual Enrollment and Dual Credit | Procedures Manual for Dual Enrollment and Accelerated Programs, Fall 2026 | Mississippi Department of Education: College and Career Readiness

20 CLEAR BOUNDARIES AND RESPONSIBLE AI USE CAN COEXIST

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 20

Align the two systems, teach students how to judge, and keep the college-level learning visible.

Explore MAIN AI Playbooks

Coordinate with MAIN

21 SOURCES, REVIEW RECORD AND MAINTENANCE

POLICY + COORDINATION / SECTION 21

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 Verify current MCCB guidance
mccb.edu

02 Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning: Dual Enrollment
mississippi.edu

03 Procedures Manual for Dual Enrollment and Accelerated Programs, Fall 2026
mississippi.edu

04 Mississippi Department of Education: College and Career Readiness
mdek12.org

05 Southeastern Louisiana University Dual Enrollment General Information
southeastern.edu

06 2026-2027 Policy Statements
southeastern.edu

07 Pima Community College Dual Enrollment Student Handbook
pima.edu

08 Alvin College Dual Enrollment Student Handbook (current linked edition)
alvincollege.edu

09 Maricopa Unified School District AI Guidance
musd20.org

10 Montgomery College eFaculty Fellowship for Dual Enrollment
pressbooks.montgomerycollege.edu

11 U.S. Department of Education Student Privacy Policy Office: FERPA
studentprivacy.ed.gov

12 SPPO: Dual Enrollment privacy resource
studentprivacy.ed.gov

REFERENCES — CONTINUED

13 SPPO: FERPA rights for a student under 18 enrolled in both high school and college
studentprivacy.ed.gov

14 Personally Identifiable Information for Education Records
studentprivacy.ed.gov

15 Federal Trade Commission: Complying with COPPA FAQs
ftc.gov

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

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

18 Turnitin: Using the AI Writing Report
guides.turnitin.com

19 Mississippi Statewide AI Framework, August 2026
mainms.org

20 NIST synthetic-content detection report
nist.gov

21 U.S. Department of Education AI guidance
ed.gov

Cover photo: Pexels asset 14462019; photographer in source record. Contextual image; it does not document an actual student, institution or dual-enrollment program.

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.