

AI Resilience 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 engage in meaningful learning experiences. 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 academic leaders facilitate conversations with faculty in their college, school, or department; resources provided here may also help guide policy formation, the selection of effective 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 tool will provide different experiences and responses.

The recommended place to begin experimenting is within OSU's Copilot Chat environment. Copilot Chat includes data protections, including that information provided is not being shared externally or used to train the model.

Informed decision-making with AI

Ecampus resources on AI are grounded in seven principles and we offer a [decision-making tree](#) to help support questions around the use of generative AI tools in teaching and learning. Please share these resources with your faculty. Note that the first question in the decision tree asks if the unit has an internal policy that should be consulted. Suggestions for supporting unit-level policy creation can be found in the next section.

Shared principles & policy making

Developing shared principles around the use of AI tools can be beneficial to both faculty and students, creating a touchpoint to reference when students have questions or concerns; otherwise, students may encounter significantly different expectations and experiences within the major coursework of a program. There may be practical reasons for variation in use and policies to occur across classes, but these can be explained, justified, and accounted for in a strategic way. Additionally, unit-level principles may be discipline-specific and might usefully be communicated to students as part of learning about where AI does and does not fit in their program and in their learning journey.

Full consensus within an academic unit is not necessary in order to form a useful unit-level set of principles or guidelines; the key is to outline any general agreement around if, when, and how AI may be used in teaching and learning relative to emerging and evolving disciplinary needs and standards.

Ecampus' research-based framework, [Six Essential Pedagogical Moves of Online Education in the AI Era](#), articulates specific areas where program-level decision making is especially helpful, including:

- Develop a program-level approach to course AI policies that is discipline-aware and consistent, while respecting faculty academic freedom.
- Identify program or course learning outcomes that need curricular revision because of AI.
- Develop a program-level strategy for student AI use and fluency development based on program and/or course outcomes.

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 or course sequences?
- Beyond OSU, what are professionals in our field saying about AI? Are they using it, and if so, how? Have any of our 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 set of principles or guidelines, acknowledging that faculty may need to have some variation by course?

Sample organization statements:

[MLA and College of Composition and Communication \(CCCC\)'s Joint Statement \(July 2023\)](#)

[MLA Statement on Educational Technologies and AI Agents \(October 2025\)](#)

[MLA Statement on AI and Assessment \(February 2026\)](#)

[APA - Artificial Intelligence and the Field of Psychology \(August 2024\)](#)

[National Society of Professional Engineers Position Statement \(February 2026\)](#)

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. Some examples include: 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), offering an opportunity to ask questions about what AI use 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 to outsource work to an AI tool.

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

- **Links between generative AI tools and “cheating” are not more likely to occur in one modality over another; most courses involve activities and assessments completed outside of a monitored environment (e.g., homework or take-home essays).** 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.)? How do our own disclosures about AI use in teaching affect what students perceive as acceptable AI use?
- **AI detection tools are not reliable, and have been shown to be biased; OSU does not subscribe to any, nor are they recommended.** 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, educational 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 is the skill that needs practice and evaluation the ability to verify the credibility of AI output?

Ideally, this conversation will occur at the program level, not just at the level of individual courses. The [Six Moves framework](#) suggests why: program level planning about the role of student AI use in

supporting or undermining learning is best addressed holistically, and those program-level decisions can and should affect how the online courses in the program would be (re)designed and taught.

Ecampus has created a specific guide to help support a curricular review of both **course- and program-level learning outcomes**: [Bloom's Taxonomy Revisited](#). This tool can also help faculty reflect and decide if they want to update their course activities and assessments in light of AI developments.

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 (or their approach may be somewhere in between). The guide can be helpful for:

- Faculty who want students to not use AI, and who can lean into emphasizing and assessing skills at that same cognitive level but in areas of distinctively human skill and work.
- 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 does in collaboration with an AI tool and the work completed on their own.

Additional questions to consider:

- How might we make the value of doing specific assignments without AI assistance more apparent to students? Are we sharing the more holistic justification for why they can use AI in some courses or places in the program and not others? Is there an opportunity to help students make connections between class assignments and future professional skills that need to be honed across their program?
- How might we strategically 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 (collectively as program faculty) 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

Ecampus and CTL staff are available to help support AI-related conversations in department gatherings or other standing faculty meetings. We can help structure the conversation and offer timely guidance and resources, or we can provide a short workshop. Please contact ecampusfacultysupport@oregonstate.edu to schedule.

Faculty may also request individualized support, as follows:

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.