AI Readiness Playbook

for OSU Colleges, Departments, and Units

Oregon State University
Ecampus

Introduction

We acknowledge that generative artificial intelligence (AI) has profound implications for teaching and learning across all disciplines, all levels, and all modalities in higher education, and that the process of adapting to this new technology will take time. We believe that adjusting teaching and learning practices in light of this new technology will be hard work, will be a moving target, and will necessitate faculty development and support.

We also believe that OSU students want to learn and that this new technology will not reduce their value of learning. Furthermore, we know that students value the relationships they form with faculty and believe that those relationships can be leveraged to guide students to the appropriate uses of AI technology. Finally, we believe that open and continuing conversations between staff, faculty, and students are an important part of the process of adapting to this new technology.

This guide is intended to help program leaders facilitate conversations with faculty during the year; resources provided here may also help guide policy formation, the selection of pedagogical approaches, and possible curricular adjustments in light of this new technology.

Helping faculty get to know AI

Some faculty in your unit may not have explored generative AI tools on their own yet. Experimenting with these tools is a critical step in understanding them and making informed decisions about what to do (or not do) with them in teaching and learning contexts. **Please encourage your faculty to experiment and explore** — specifically, to have some extended conversations with one or more tools (not just input one prompt and conclude the conversation). Each will provide different experiences and responses.

ChatGPT is perhaps the most recognizable name currently, but faculty might also try out Bing's Chat feature, which is driven by a newer algorithm (GPT-4). Many other AI-powered tools that might be of interest to students are being rapidly created too — like Merlin, which summarizes web content and allows the user to "interact" with the content by asking questions of it.

Informed decision-making with AI

Ecampus has produced an ethics statement and decision-making tree to help support questions around the use of generative AI tools in teaching and learning. Please share this resource with faculty in your unit. Note that the first question asks if the unit has an internal policy that should be consulted. Suggestions for supporting the creation of a unit-level policy can be found in the next section.

Shared principles & policy-making

Developing shared principles around the use of AI tools might be beneficial to both faculty and students, as developing shared principles around use of AI tools in teaching and learning may provide some framework to point back to when students have questions or concerns; otherwise, students may need to navigate different expectations and experiences within the major courses. There may be practical reasons for variation in use and policies to occur across classes, but these can be explained and justified within the context of a framework of shared principles. Additionally, these principles may be discipline-specific to some degree and might usefully be communicated to students as part of learning about where AI does and does not fit in their program.

The following questions can guide a conversation about identifying shared principles and working toward a statement that could be shared with students:

- What are our range of opinions about AI use? Where is there underlying similarity in our approaches? Are any differences related to the needs of individual courses?
- Beyond OSU, what are professionals in our field saying about AI? Are they using it, and if so, how? Have any key professional bodies published statements about AI? How do those positions affect our own approaches?
- Beyond OSU, what are other higher education colleagues in our discipline saying about AI? How do those positions affect our own approaches?
- Where is our common ground as a unit that we could potentially articulate to students in a policy statement, acknowledging that faculty may need to have some variation by course?

Example AI policy statement:
[MLA and College of Composition and Communication (CCCC)'s Joint Statement](#)

Ethics & integrity

In the context of teaching and learning, generative AI tools have renewed discussion about academic integrity, and this topic will likely arise in any faculty conversation about generative AI tools and their implications. This is a time when efforts to design and facilitate courses in pedagogically-sound and student-centered ways will help guard against instances of academic integrity violations. For example, fostering a culture of academic integrity in the course where students explore applications of policies and standards to their work in the course (and discipline), where there is an opportunity to ask questions about what is and is not allowed, and where students have opportunities for check-in and instructor feedback helps support students' cognitive processes while also lessening the chance that they will make a poor decision under duress.

The following guiding questions may help to unpack the conversation further around generative AI and academic integrity:

- **Links between generative AI tools and "cheating" are not likely to occur in one modality more than another; most courses involve activities and assessments completed outside of a monitored environment (e.g., homework).** What kinds of activities or tasks in our discipline are most at risk for students to use AI assistance? How might we approach them differently?
- **Students don't always understand academic integrity.** Where do we teach students about how to apply principles of academic integrity in our courses and discipline? Are there ways that we could bolster that support to address generative AI — and where would it make sense to do that (in all courses, in required introductory and "gateway" courses, etc.)?
- **AI detection tools are not reliable, and have been shown to be biased; it is recommended that results from them should not be used as a basis for Student Conduct cases.** If we suspect unauthorized student AI use, how should it be handled (at the unit and/or college level)? What does it look like to have an effective conversation with a student about suspected AI use?

Considering Curricular review in light of AI

With generative AI tools becoming increasingly ubiquitous and woven into tools and processes that we already use in teaching and learning (e.g., Microsoft Word, Google searches, etc.), faculty may wish to discuss whether learning outcomes in their courses and programs need review.

Take, for example, lower-division courses that may ask students to memorize information. In their future lives and careers, will students need to recall this information from memory? Or are they likely to have an AI assistant at the ready to pull up relevant factual information for them?

More than just memorization of information is implicated in this new world of generative AI technology. While there is potential for bias to be introduced, AI tools are already very good at analyzing and visualizing complex information, for example.

Ecampus has created a guide to help faculty reflect and decide if they want to update their course activities and assessments in light of AI developments and using [Bloom's Taxonomy as a reference point](). This tool could also be used to support a curricular review of **course- and program-level learning outcomes.**

Taking cues from other conversations related to questions in the above sections, faculty may be inclined to restrict or prohibit student use of AI tools, or they may be in favor of incorporating them strategically. In either case, the guide can be helpful for:
- Faculty who want students to avoid using AI, and who can lean into emphasizing and assessing skills at that same cognitive level but in areas that only humans can do.
- Faculty who want to incorporate AI use into their course activities and/or assessments, and who will still need to account for work that the student (not the AI tool) does.

Additional questions to consider:

- How might we make the value of doing specific assignments without AI assistance more apparent to students? Is there an opportunity to help students make connections between class assignments and future professional skills that need to be honed?
- How might we incorporate the use of AI to give students practice in course assignments that will prepare them to use AI ethically and effectively in their future careers?
- How might we help students learn to apply critical thinking skills in the use of AI, such as in how to interrogate an AI tool effectively and how to assess and incorporate the outputs into course assignments and projects?

Next steps

If you are scheduling AI-related conversations with faculty and would like to have a knowledgeable Ecampus staff member in the room to help answer questions or provide resources, we are happy to offer assistance. Please contact ecampusfacultysupport@oregonstae.edu to schedule.

Ecampus, the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), and Academic Technologies will be providing resources and events throughout the year to continue conversations around generative AI and its implications.

For Ecampus courses, faculty have a number of support options based on the scope of their request:
- Faculty desiring a 1:1 consultation can contact Ecampus Faculty Support to schedule an appointment.
- Faculty who want to make minor changes to their course (e.g., to a few assignments) can contact Ecampus Faculty Support for assistance.
- Faculty who want to more fully refresh their course can propose a partial or full redevelopment. This approach uses Ecampus' two-term development timeline and gives faculty the support of a dedicated instructional designer to help re-envision their course in part or in full.

For on-campus courses, faculty can request a CTL consultation to help support them with pedagogical questions or contact Academic Technologies for support with technical questions.