

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.

MISSISSIPPI ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE NETWORK (MAIN)

MISSISSIPPI'S STATEWIDE AI INITIATIVE | MAINMS.ORG

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.

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 postsecondary teaching, assignment design and faculty practice. Both are voluntary. Applicable law, adopted standards and institutional authority remain controlling.

Read the August 2026 Statewide AI Framework (PDF)

Learning progression. Postsecondary: applied and technical fluency, with faculty developing workforce-level professional accountability. Select expectations for the actual learner and course.

Five priorities in practice

Provide an effective participation route (1); teach verification, integrity and fair review (2); approve student-data use (3); assess transferable reasoning (4); compare learning evidence and faculty effort before wider use (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
3. Critical Evaluation of AI Outputs	Students check real sources and explain corrections; retain selected verification evidence.
7. Ethical Reasoning and Responsible AI Use	State permitted assistance and disclosure; retain the assignment permission card.
8. Human Agency, Judgment, and Restraint	Faculty make and explain grades and integrity decisions; retain fair-review evidence.
9. Communication and AI Literacy Across Audiences	Explain rules, limits and question routes clearly; retain student-facing directions.

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 HOW SHOULD FACULTY USE AI RESPONSIBLY?

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 01

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

02 FACULTY AI DECISION MAP

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 02

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

03 SET RULES BY ACTIVITY, NOT ONE VAGUE SENTENCE

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 03

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.

Give students a concrete format and a privacy-safe way to document assistance. MAIN’s student citation and disclosure guide provides separate APA and MLA reference patterns and an optional reflection example. Choose the requirements for your activity; do not require public chat sharing by default.

RELATED MAIN RESOURCES student citation and disclosure guide

04 ASSESSMENT THAT REMAINS MEANINGFUL WITH AI

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 04

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.

CHECK LEARNING AFTER ASSISTANCE

Plan a later explanation or comparable new task in which AI does not perform the skill being assessed. Tell students the conditions in advance and preserve approved accommodations and necessary assistive technology. Compare the evidence with the original learning goal, rather than the polish of the supported submission alone.

For one bounded activity, record [target skill and starting evidence], [permitted assistance], [later task and conditions], [errors or misconceptions], [student access and support needs], [preparation and checking time], and [continue, revise or stop decision]. This is local formative evidence, not a validated proficiency measure or proof that AI caused a change.

APA’s educational-technology report addresses K–12 learners. This postsecondary check is a MAIN adaptation of the performance-versus-learning distinction and needs local evaluation.

APA educational-technology report

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 APA educational-technology report | U.S. Department of Education AI guidance | DOJ ADA Title II web rule

05 WORKED METHOD: REDESIGN ONE ASSIGNMENT AND REVIEW FAIRLY

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 05

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

06 STUDENT DATA, ACCESS, COPYRIGHT, AND RESEARCH

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 06

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.
- Removing names is not sufficient de-identification. Indirect identifiers and combinations of details can still identify a student.
- 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.

CHECK AN AI-ASSISTED RESEARCH METHOD

Before using AI to code or summarize research material, specify the question, the model and configuration, the permitted data and the human check. Have a qualified reviewer compare selected outputs with the underlying material and the analytic rules. Record consequential errors, unresolved disagreements and limits on interpretation; reassess after a material model or data change.

Fictional planning example: A research team considers AI coding of approved, non-sensitive feedback. Before relying on its themes, the team defines its categories and review sample, checks the model's coding against qualified human judgments, and examines omitted or distorted perspectives. The team sets its own acceptance criteria and retains the decision to revise or stop. This example supplies no universal accuracy threshold and does not replace research oversight, sponsor rules or participant protections.

AIR principles for AI in education research · Oxford research AI policy

Student work needs a specific data-use decision. Start with fictional or faculty-authored examples. For actual student work, use only the tool, account, and workflow authorized for that information. Tool approval does not authorize every data use. Removing a name alone does not make a narrative, file, or image anonymous; review indirect identifiers, metadata, and other information that could identify the student. Follow the institution's privacy process when the boundary is unclear. See FERPA, 34 CFR §§ 99.3 and 99.31(b)(1).

SOURCE BASIS AIR principles for AI in education research | Oxford research AI policy | FERPA, 34 CFR §§ 99.3 and 99.31(b)(1) | DOJ ADA Title II web rule

07 FACULTY AI WORKFLOWS WITH HUMAN REVIEW

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 07

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.

Meaningful human review. A reviewer with the relevant subject knowledge checks the actual student work and the AI suggestion against the assignment, rubric, sources, and student context. The reviewer must have time and authority to correct or reject the suggestion. For feedback, check accuracy, tone, fairness, and whether it helps the student act. For grading, faculty make and can explain the final judgment; accepting an AI score or batch of comments without checking the work is not meaningful review. Consequential advising also requires a qualified person to check current official requirements and the student's circumstances. This is MAIN's practical application of the U.S. Department of Education's recommendation for inspectable, explainable, overridable AI (official ERIC full text, May 2023), not a new legal requirement.

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 a fictional or faculty-authored 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’s recommendation for inspectable, explainable, overridable AI | official ERIC full text, May 2023 | U.S. Department of Education AI guidance | DOJ ADA Title II web rule

08 TWO FACULTY AI CHECKLISTS

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 08

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

1. Define. Name the learning outcome, the work students must do themselves, the current approach, and the reason AI might help.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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

09 RELATED MISSISSIPPI AI RESOURCES

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 09

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

RELATED MAIN RESOURCES Open the policy template | Browse AI guidance | Visit educator resources | Open the Student AI Playbook | Open the dual-enrollment guide

10 FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 10

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. Removing names alone is not sufficient de-identification. Use fictional or faculty-authored examples by default.

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. A qualified reviewer checks the actual work against the assignment and rubric, can correct or reject the AI suggestion, and makes and can explain the final judgment.

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

11 SOURCES AND STANDARDS

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 11

Authoritative foundation

- U.S. Department of Education, Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning (official ERIC full text, 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 | official ERIC full text, May 2023 | U.S. Department of Education, Guidance on Artificial Intelligence Use in Schools | U.S. Department of Education Student Privacy Policy Office, FERPA

12 TURN GUIDANCE INTO A TEACHABLE PRACTICE

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 12

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.

13 SOURCES, REVIEW RECORD AND MAINTENANCE

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE / SECTION 13

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.

EVIDENCE SOURCES

01 APA educational-technology report
apa.org

02 AIR principles for AI in education research
air.org

03 Oxford research AI policy
ox.ac.uk

04 FERPA, 34 CFR §§ 99.3 and 99.31(b)(1)
studentprivacy.ed.gov

05 U.S. Department of Education’s recommendation for inspectable, explainable, overridable AI
ed.gov

06 official ERIC full text, May 2023
files.eric.ed.gov

07 U.S. Department of Education, Guidance on Artificial Intelligence Use in Schools
ed.gov

08 U.S. Department of Justice, accessibility of web content and mobile apps under ADA Title II
ada.gov

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

REFERENCES — CONTINUED

10 NIST AI Risk Management Framework
nist.gov

11 Generative AI Profile
nist.gov

12 Student Guide to AI
studentguidetoai.org

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

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

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

16 Mississippi Statewide AI Framework, August 2026
mainms.org
Statewide framework foundation; alignment does not constitute validation of this playbook's methods.

17 NIST synthetic-content detection report
nist.gov

COMPANION RESOURCES AND NAVIGATION

These links provide related guidance and navigation. Their inclusion does not independently substantiate this playbook's claims.

student citation and disclosure guide
mainms.org

MAIN's evidence guide to AI detection and verifying learning
mainms.org

Open the policy template
mainms.org

REFERENCES — CONTINUED

Browse AI guidance
mainms.org

Visit educator resources
mainms.org

Open the Student AI Playbook
mainms.org

Open the dual-enrollment guide
mainms.org

Browse All AI Playbooks
mainms.org

Contact MAIN
mainms.org

IMAGE CREDITS AND LICENSES

Contextual photograph: zhu yi / Pexels (license). It does not document MAIN affiliation or actual AI use.

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.