

University of Massachusetts Dartmouth AI Task Force

Report to the Provost¹

May 2026

Submitted by:

Amy Shapiro, Task Force Chair, Honors College Dean

Scott Ahrens, Professor of Design

Brian Ayotte, Professor of Psychology and Faculty Senate President

Julie Bowman, Associate Teaching Professor and Interim Director of the Office of Faculty Development

Nancy Godleski, Library Dean

Firas Khatib, Associate Professor of Computer and Information Science

Melody O'Donnell, Associate Teaching Professor of Medical Laboratory Science

Bharatendra Rai, Professor and Chair of Decision and Information Sciences

Michael Sheriff, Associate Professor of Biology and Director of the Office of Faculty Development

Mendy Smith, Instructional Designer

Matthew Sneider, Associate Professor and Chair of History, and Director of University Studies

Alexis Teagarden, Professor of English and Communication, and Director of First Year English

Iren Valova, Associate Dean of Engineering

Anoo Vyas, Assistant Professor of Law

¹ This report was primarily written and edited by humans. OpenAI's ChatGPT was used to "check for grammar and tighten language" on March 21, 2026, after a first draft was complete and before making final edits. The prompt to "summarize this text" was used on portions of the text to assist with writing a first draft of the Executive Summary, which the Task Force then edited. Also, in March 2026, many of the assessment rubrics and sample assignments in Appendix C were created using OpenAI's ChatGPT, Microsoft's CoPilot, Anthropic's Claude, or the UMass Dartmouth GenAI Platform then edited by pairs of Task Force members and re-edited by the Task Force as a group.

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Definitions	3
Working Principles	4
Executive Summary	4
AI Pedagogy at UMass Dartmouth in 2025-2026	6
Faculty Support and Development	7
Community Input to the Task Force	7
Recommendations for Faculty Support	8
Recommended Undergraduate Curriculum	10
Curricular Integration	12
Current AI Integration	12
Recommended AI Integration	13
Assessment and Evaluation	15
Implementation and Assessment Roadmap	15
Appendix A: eListening Session Input on Faculty Needs	18
Appendix B: Faculty Senate Guidelines on the Use of Generative AI	19
Appendix C: Suggested Assessment Rubrics and Assignments	21

Introduction

Education is at an inflection point. Artificial intelligence (AI) offers an unprecedented opportunity to provide, at scale, learning environments known to support deep learning. AI can quickly and affordably generate simulations, debate exercises, Socratic tutoring, and realistic problem sets that require students to apply and deepen their knowledge and skills. It also poses a major challenge to intellectual development by enabling students to bypass critical reading, writing, and problem-solving practices, however. Because many students use AI, and employers increasingly expect graduates to use AI in the workplace, curricula must evolve in the context of this reality.

In this context, Provost Ramprasad Balasubramanian convened the AI Task Force in fall 2025 and charged it with assessing current AI teaching and learning practices on campus; recommending supports for faculty and staff who are learning to use and teach about AI; proposing an undergraduate curriculum to prepare AI-ready graduates for the workforce; and suggesting integration and assessment plans for that curriculum.

The Task Force met throughout the 2025–2026 academic year. It engaged multiple campus constituencies, including library staff, the University Studies Committee (USC), the Office of Faculty Development (OFD), the Faculty Senate Technology Subcommittee, and the leadership of Computing and Information Technology Services (CITS) and Instructional Development (ID). It also held faculty listening sessions and conducted a campus survey on classroom AI pedagogy.

Beyond formal meetings, Task Force members attended numerous campus presentations such as the College of Engineering AI Seminar (held four times during the year) and the annual Teaching and Learning Conference, which focused on AI, in January 2026. Members reviewed AI practices at peer and aspirant institutions, participated in national webinars and conferences, and undertook both formal and informal study of AI technologies and use. All these activities informed the findings and recommendations in this report.

The information in this report is current as of its submission. The Task Force acknowledges, however, that both the technology and the contexts in which it is used are evolving rapidly. As a result, the recommendations should be considered provisional and may need revision as technologies and practices change.

Definitions

For the sake of brevity and in keeping with common usage, the Task Force uses the term AI throughout this report to refer to artificial intelligence, generative artificial intelligence, and agentic artificial intelligence. In cases where the distinction is contextually important, the terms generative AI or agentic AI will be specified. The committee agrees on the following definition of each term:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is a term referring to computational systems that perform tasks normally requiring human cognitive processes such as generating text, images, code, or decisions; recognizing patterns; summarizing information; translating language; or assisting in analysis using machine learning, statistical modeling, or similar techniques.²

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) refers to AI systems that create new content—such as text, images, code, audio, or video—based on patterns learned from large datasets.²

Agentic Artificial Intelligence is “an artificial intelligence system that can accomplish a specific goal with limited supervision. It consists of AI *agents*, machine learning models that mimic human decision-making to solve problems in real time. In a multiagent system, each agent performs a specific subtask required to reach the goal and their efforts are coordinated through AI orchestration. Unlike traditional AI models, which operate within predefined constraints and require human intervention, agentic AI exhibits autonomy, goal-driven behavior and adaptability. The term ‘agentic’ refers to these models’ agency, or their capacity to act independently and purposefully.”³

Working Principles

The Task Force’s work was guided by principles that emerged as foundational to the group’s thinking as it worked through each facet of the charge and recommendations for the campus. They are:

1. A primary role of the university is to guide students toward reaching their fullest potential as problem solvers, creatives, generators of knowledge, practitioners, analysts, and intellectuals. AI technology is a tool to be used in service of that goal and not as a replacement for it.
2. Human interaction and relationships are vital to the education of students and the health of all people and should not be circumvented by AI technology.

Executive Summary

Charge and Activities

In fall 2025 Provost Ramprasad Balasubramanian convened an AI Task Force to assess current campus AI teaching and learning practices; recommend faculty and staff supports; propose an undergraduate curriculum to prepare AI-ready graduates; and suggest integration and assessment plans.

The Task Force met throughout the 2025–2026 academic year and engaged a broad set of campus constituencies (Library, University Studies Committee, Office of Faculty Development, Faculty Senate Technology Subcommittee, CITS, Instructional

² This definition was generated by entering the following prompt into ChatGPT, “When creating institutional AI policy, what is a good definition of AI. For example, does Grammarly qualify as AI or just the big names - ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini...”

³ <https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/agentic-ai>

Development), held faculty listening sessions, and ran a campus survey. It reviewed peer institutions' approaches, attended national webinars and campus seminars, and conducted both formal and informal study of AI technologies and use. It compiled findings and provisional recommendations grounded in that evidence and with the recognition that technology and practices will continue to evolve.

Key Findings of the Task Force Campus Study (Fall 2025)

1. Across the university, at least 55 courses contain AI literacy or fluency content as of fall 2025.
2. Use is uneven: faculty most often teach about AI ethics and risks; fewer teach students how to use AI or require its use.
3. Preparation is limited: of the faculty using AI in courses, the large majority are self-taught and only a handful had formal coursework or workshops.
4. Faculty views range from active adoption to strong opposition; many non-adopters feel "left behind" and uncertain how to begin integrating AI.
5. Demand for training and clear institutional guidance is high.
6. UMass Dartmouth's level of AI activity appears broadly comparable to peer institutions, and use is increasing rapidly and unevenly across departments.

Core Recommendations

Faculty Support

1. Update the campus integrity policy and require syllabus clarity.
2. Revise the existing Academic Integrity Policy.
3. The Faculty Senate should review and update its guidelines as needed.
4. Provide model AI policy language and require an AI use statement in every course syllabus.
5. Explore the development of a centralized campus AI Center.
6. Create a comprehensive, scaffolded faculty AI training program and provide faculty with instructor-ready "how to" AI modules to embed in their Canvas sites for students.

Undergraduate Curriculum

Curricular Goals

1. Foundations of AI
2. Capabilities, limitations, and critical evaluation
3. Ethical and responsible use
4. Social, cultural, and emotional dimensions
5. Prompting and interaction skills
6. AI as a collaborative partner in learning and creativity
7. Disciplinary and professional applications

Integration Plan

1. Goals 1–4: deliver in the first year (recommended within University Studies area 1, preferably area 1e) via online modules; passing the modules should be

- required for the course. Support delivery with graduate TAs (three or more) to assist faculty and students.
2. Goals 5–7: deliver in departmental curricula with departments determining placement. To accommodate students in departments that do not integrate goals 5-7, a general course should be developed to deliver goals 5-7.
 3. Offer an AI literacy badge for completion of modules 1–4. Offer an AI ethics badge for completion module 3. Offer an AI certificate for students who complete a set of courses that include goals 1-7.

Assessment and Continuous Review

Assessment exercises and rubrics (suggested instruments are provided in Appendix C) should be used to measure competency for each learning goal. The AI curriculum should be placed on a periodic review schedule, and academic units offering curricular components should coordinate with the AI Center in conducting the reviews and/or revising curricula based on review outcomes. The recommendations in this document are provisional and intended to adapt as AI technologies and practices evolve. The AI Center should monitor changes and advise the Provost’s Office on curricular and pedagogical updates.

Bottom Line

UMass Dartmouth is at a moment of opportunity: AI can expand high-quality learning experiences at scale, but only if the institution equips faculty and students with skills, clear policies, and coordinated supports. The Task Force’s recommendation balances protection of academic values with realistic, forward-looking integration that prepares graduates for an AI-augmented workforce. The creation of a campus AI Center, paired with policy updates, training, curricular integration, and assessment, will position the university to manage risk and harness AI’s pedagogical benefits.

AI Pedagogy at UMass Dartmouth in 2025-2026

The Task Force conducted a survey of classroom AI use in fall 2025. Sixty-five faculty members responded, representing 21 departments across five colleges, and 17% of the 379 full-time faculty. Most respondents reported they do not use AI. Forty respondents (61.5%) indicated that they incorporate AI in some capacity in one or more courses. The modal response among those who do use AI indicates they use it in one course, though there was wide variability among respondents as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1. *Percent of survey respondents reporting some AI content in their courses.*

%	# Courses Involving AI
39%	0
30%	1
20%	2
11%	3 or more

The manner of use also varied widely among the 40 faculty who reported using AI, as indicated in Table 2. A majority teach about the ethics or risks of AI use rather than how to use it.

Table 2. *Percent of AI users reporting methods of AI integration in their courses. Respondents could select more than one option, so percentages sum to more than 100%.*

%	Manner of Use
66	I teach about the pitfalls or risks of AI use
55	I teach about AI ethics
38	I teach students how to use AI
38	I give students the option to use AI to complete one or more assignments
31	I create simulations for students to gain experience
31	The course subject matter is about AI (how to build it, effects on society, etc.)
21	I require students to use AI to complete one or more assignments
17	I use AI to create assignments
10	I use AI to design the course or create course content
7	I use AI to grade assignments
31	Other

Throughout the academic year, Task Force members attended multiple on-campus presentations by faculty who use AI in their courses, including seminars and conference sessions. The Task Force learned that some faculty members have a strong, negative view of AI and believe it should be kept out of the classroom. Increasing participation at campus AI teaching and learning events held before and after the survey led the Task Force to conclude that interest in, and volume and sophistication of, AI use among UMass Dartmouth faculty are increasing rapidly. The Task Force also heard from faculty who are skeptical of AI and feel increasingly negatively about allowing it into the classroom at all. Listening session feedback revealed a substantial cohort of faculty who feel “left behind” and uncertain about how to begin integrating or teaching AI. Based on comparative reviews of peer institutions, the Task Force finds that the level and breadth of AI use at UMass Dartmouth are broadly comparable to those at similar campuses.

Faculty Support and Development

Community Input to the Task Force

Of the 40 faculty who reported in the survey that they use AI in their courses, 35 indicated they were primarily self-taught. A smaller number reported other forms of preparation: five attended workshops or talks, two identified AI as their disciplinary specialization, and one completed formal coursework. (Responses were not mutually exclusive.)

Although the survey targeted early adopters, the Task Force opened listening sessions to all faculty and librarians. These sessions revealed widespread anxiety and trepidation among non-adopters about incorporating AI into teaching and learning. Common concerns included how to teach effective writing, higher-order thinking, and problem solving when

students can rely on AI, and how faculty can develop sufficient AI skills both to meet those challenges and to leverage AI's instructional benefits. Attendees suggested many useful resources; these are summarized in Appendix A.

The Task Force also consulted with representatives from Computing and Information Technology Services (CITS), Instructional Development (ID), the library, the Office of Faculty Development (OFD), and the Faculty Senate. These groups echoed many faculty recommendations and identified additional priorities. They recommended compiling an annotated listing of AI services and platforms organized by use case (e.g., image generation, problem solving, animation). They also advised updating the existing undergraduate academic integrity policy to address AI-related issues rather than creating a separate AI policy. Finally, these representatives reached consensus that the most effective organizational approach would be to establish a campus AI Center in which each unit participates and to which their web resources would link.

Recommendations for Faculty Support

Based on its research and campus feedback, the Task Force recommends the following:

1. Update campus integrity policy and ensure syllabus-level clarity about AI use.

To assure faculty, staff, and students receive clear guidance on campus expectations for AI use the Task Force recommends the following actions:

- a. Update existing policies to address AI (including generative and agentic AI) rather than creating a separate AI policy. Specifically, use the Academic Integrity Policy for Undergraduates (ACA-017) as the foundation for guidance on AI; revise the policy to include a definition of AI technologies and a clear statement of non-allowable uses (i.e., when AI use constitutes academic dishonesty). Consider including students' affirmative responsibilities related to AI use. Also consider removing "Undergraduates" from the policy title, so the policy explicitly applies to graduate students as well or alternatively create a corresponding graduate student integrity policy.
- b. Request that the Faculty Senate review and update its guidelines (see Appendix B) as needed to reflect ongoing technological and societal changes.
- c. Provide model AI policy language for faculty and require that every syllabus include an AI use statement. These model statements should be offered as templates that instructors may adapt. A useful example is the Northern Illinois University Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning⁴, which aggregates sample AI policy language from many institutions, including UMass Lowell and Salem State University.

⁴ <https://www.niu.edu/citl/resources/toolkits/artificial-intelligence/class-policies-for-ai-tools.shtml>

2. Develop Canvas modules for courses.

Create a series of concise, instructor-ready videos and/or modules that can be embedded into course Canvas sites. These modules should cover how AI works at a basic level, ethical considerations and academic integrity implications, and practical guidance on accessing and using AI tools effectively and responsibly.

3. Develop a comprehensive faculty training course or modular series.

Design training that assumes no prior AI knowledge and progresses to advanced, practice-oriented mastery. Training should be scaffolded to accommodate beginners and to provide pathways to more advanced applications and pedagogy. After completing the training, faculty will know:

- a. The difference between generative and agentic AI and how to use each
- b. How to save AI chats and use them to create proper AI use citations
- c. How students are using AI, for good (e.g., study aids, finding references) and bad (write their papers, cheat on exams)
- d. How to develop assignments and assessments in face-to-face courses and for online courses that develop students' thinking skills, and that cannot be "handed off" to AI.
- e. How to teach writing effectively with and without the use of AI
- f. How to use AI to create tutoring modules, simulations, Socratic dialogue, and other assignments that support deep learning
- g. How to keep grading and workload manageable with AI
- h. How to avoid the need to monitor students' misuse of AI

4. Explore the development of a centralized campus AI Center.

Understanding that budget constraints may not make all of this possible, the majority of the Task Force recommends the following:

- a. The AI Center should serve as a hub of information and education for faculty, staff, and students and as a convening space for researchers studying AI development, AI-integrated teaching and learning, the social impacts of AI, and AI ethics. While research is not part of the Task Force's charge, the Task Force envisions the AI Center as a hub for interdisciplinary AI research on campus.
- b. The Center should have an appointed director who is provided with sufficient support to run the center properly and efficiently. Leadership from CITS, Instructional Development (ID), the Office of Faculty Development (OFD), the Library, and the Faculty Senate should hold formal affiliations with the Center to ensure coordination and multi-way communication.
- c. The Center should provide and maintain core resources for the campus, including, but not limited to: an annotated listing of recommended platforms organized by use case (e.g., image generation, writing aids, animation, problem solving); a campus prompt library and links to external prompt libraries; and a calendar of AI-related events and training opportunities. Links to AI-related

offerings from units such as CITS, OFD, and the Library should be posted on the Center’s website so that community members can find all AI resources in one place. The AI Center should work with ID to create the learning modules recommended for Goals 1-4 and supervise the TAs assigned to the modules.

- d. The AI Center should be funded at a level sufficient to support these activities.

Recommended Undergraduate Curriculum

To determine the required competencies for students to graduate AI-prepared in the workplace, the Task Force reviewed AI curricula at peer and aspirant institutions, attended numerous webinars and seminars, and examined the U.S. Department of Labor’s 2026 *Artificial Intelligence Literacy Framework*.⁵ The Task Force evaluated and synthesized these sources and developed the following curriculum for AI literacy (goals 1-4) and AI fluency (goals 5-7). The Task Force unanimously recommends this undergraduate AI curriculum for UMass Dartmouth.⁶

1. Foundations of AI

Goal: Build conceptual understanding of what AI is, how it functions, and where it appears in daily life.

Key topics:

- a. What AI is and how it works: data, algorithms, and machine learning basics.
- b. How AI systems process information and make predictions: pattern recognition and probabilistic outputs.
- c. Recognizing everyday uses of AI (search engines, recommendation systems, generative tools).
- d. Understanding data quality, bias, and the limits of explainability.
- e. Differentiating AI literacy (ethical understanding) from AI fluency (effective application)

2. Capabilities, Limitations, and Critical Evaluation

Goal: Help learners critically engage with AI outputs and recognize when to trust or question them.

Key topics:

- a. Capabilities: summarization, brainstorming, outlining, repackaging, exploration of multiple perspectives.
- b. Limitations: hallucinations, lack of source transparency, uneven performance across topics, reasoning errors.
- c. Being cautious when requesting lists of sources, experts, or complex factual information.

⁵ <https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/ETA/advisories/TEN/2025/TEN%2006-25/Attachment%20I%20%28Accessible%20PDF%29.pdf>

⁶ The key topics and goals were generated by the Task Force members. ChatGPT was given the prompt “categorize these goals and topics into appropriate clusters to organize a sensible undergraduate AI literacy and fluency curriculum.” Task Force members collaborated on editing the output to arrive at a final version.

- d. SIFT method (Stop, Investigate, Find trusted coverage, Trace to source) for AI-assisted information literacy.
- e. Assessing accuracy, transparency, and explainability of AI-generated content.
- f. Comparing and verifying outputs across multiple AI tools and human sources.

3. Ethical and Responsible Use

Goal: Develop ethical judgment, integrity, and respect for intellectual property when using AI.

Key topics:

- a. Academic integrity: originality, plagiarism, and citation of AI-assisted work.
- b. Copyright and authorship concerns—AI as writing partner, not sole author, and understanding that information and/or documents that are uploaded may be copyrighted.
- c. Bias and fairness: recognizing that AI reflects the biases of data and developers.
- d. Privacy: awareness that prompts and outputs may be stored or used for LLM training.
- e. Ethical decision-making in AI use: know and follow the course, institution, employer AI use policy; know when *not* to rely on AI and when to disclose use.
- f. Affirmation of user responsibility: accountability for decisions and outcomes produced with AI.
- g. Distinguishing between responsible augmentation and unethical shortcutting.

4. Social, Cultural, and Emotional Dimensions of AI

Goal: Foster reflection on the human impacts of AI and automation.

Key topics:

- a. Social and emotional effects of AI in education, work, and communication.
- b. Cultural and relational values in technology design.
- c. Fairness, inclusivity, and representation in AI systems.
- d. Public policy, governance, and power dynamics surrounding AI adoption.
- e. The human role in oversight, empathy, and creativity in an AI-driven world.
- f. The impact of AI on labor, work, and economic structures.
- g. The environmental and financial costs of AI.

5. Prompting and Interaction Skills

Goal: Equip students with strategies to communicate effectively with AI tools.

Key topics:

- a. Writing clear, context-rich starting prompts (define purpose, audience, and level).
- b. Prompt refinement: regenerating, supplying relevant data/examples, and providing feedback to improve results.
- c. Evaluating and editing AI responses for accuracy, tone, logic, assumptions, and alignment with goals.
- d. Understanding the AI tool's functions (rewrite, feedback, citation modes), and differences among systems.

6. AI as a Collaborative Partner in Learning and Creativity

Goal: Encourage students to use AI to support—not replace—human creativity, reasoning, and dialogue.

Key topics:

Using sequential prompts to engage AI for questioning, reasoning probes, and information-literacy practice such as:

- a. Employing AI for brainstorming, outlining, organizing, or overcoming writer’s block.
- b. Using AI to consider multiple perspectives, simulate debate or negotiation, or prepare for argumentation.
- c. Transforming and reformatting existing work (e.g., from text to table).
- d. Reflecting on human-AI collaboration: where creativity, empathy, and critical thinking remain uniquely human.

7. Disciplinary and Professional Applications

Goal: Connect AI literacy to academic fields and future careers.

Key topics:

- a. Applying AI tools in discipline-specific contexts (business analytics, scientific research, humanities writing, arts and design) using discipline, industry, or organizational conventions, best practices, or expectations
- b. Evaluating ethical and effective AI use within professional and disciplinary standards
- c. Developing adaptability and leadership in AI-mediated workplaces

Curricular Integration

Current AI Integration

Responses to the faculty user survey showed that nearly one in five faculty are teaching about AI in some capacity, and that AI has made its way into many departments’ curricula, though not in a sufficiently coordinated or comprehensive way to assure competency across graduates. Table 3 indicates that as of fall 2025, AI literacy or fluency content was being taught in a minimum of 55 courses across the University. Major courses (22) and electives (19) were the most common curricular areas in which it was integrated, with few University Studies courses containing AI content. The English and Communications Department and Engineering responded most frequently to the survey. English & Communications faculty indicated most often that they taught about AI (i.e., AI literacy). Engineering faculty also indicated they teach AI literacy and were the most frequent adopters of AI in courses. They also teach students how to create AI. It is important to recognize that the data represent merely a moment in time. Based on what Task Force members’ have seen at campus seminars and informal conversation, it is apparent that AI use has spread much further into the curriculum and is being used in more sophisticated ways since these data were collected.

Table 3. *The number of courses integrating AI and their curricular roles, reported in the fall 2025 faculty user survey (some courses meet more than one requirement).*

Roles of Reported Courses in the Curriculum												
Department	# Reported Courses	Major	Elective	US 1a	US 1b	US 1c	US 1e	US 2b	US 3a	US 5a	US 5b	
Eng & Comm	9	2		5	1	1			1			
ECE	8	5	3				1					
CIS	7	1	3				1	1				
Psychology	7	1	3			1				2		
Education	3	1	1									
Unknown	3		2									
Arts/CVPA	3	3										
Lang/POR	3	1	1						1			
Crime & Justice	2	1	1									
Mathematics	2	1									1	
Physics	2	2										
Bioengineering	1		1									
CCB	1	1	1									
Philosophy	1	1	1									
Political Sci	1	1	1							1		
TOTAL	55	22	19	5	1	2	2	1	2	3	1	

Recommended AI Integration

Part of the Task Force’s charge is to define a comprehensive AI curriculum integration plan for the campus. The Faculty Senate President, Director of First-Year English, and Director of University Studies are members of the AI Task Force so have been in conversation about curricular integration of AI from the beginning of the Task Force’s work. The Task Force chair and several members also met twice with the full USC to discuss the potential for integration to the US or major curricula. These discussions and the Task Force’s internal work led to the following recommendations:

1. Goals 1-4 of the Task Force’s recommended curriculum teach general AI literacy. The Task Force recommends that goals 1-4 content be provided in students’ first

year. To assure all first-year students are exposed to the content, it should be offered within US area 1. While the specific first-year area 1 course(s) is not a critical distinction for the Task Force, it does recommend area 1e in recognition of the natural coherence with the following new area 1e goals:

- *Cultivate and apply evidence-based methods and skills for academic success.*
- *Reflect on one's own skills and behaviors that contribute to health and well-being, which may include financial wellness, informed decision making, information literacy, happiness, among others.*

The Task Force recommends that the content of the AI curriculum should be integrated into online modules developed in a collaboration between selected faculty with classroom AI expertise, the OFD's AI Assistant Director, and the Instructional Design Department. The Task Force also recommends that at least three graduate students be employed as TAs to assist faculty, hold office hours for students, and grade the module assignments.

Associate Provost Sarah Cosgrove agreed in principle to meet with the 1e instructors to discuss this plan in fall 2026. In the event 1e cannot accommodate the modules, the Provost's office should work with the US Committee to find another place in area 1 in which to house the AI goals. Regardless of which courses are chosen to house the AI objectives, the committee recommends that passing the modules should be required to pass the course.

2. Goals 5-7 of the Task Force's recommended curriculum teach AI fluency, beginning with basic use and growing into discipline-specific expertise. The Task Force recommends these goals should be met within department curricula, with each department deciding where in its curriculum these goals will be met. The Task Force is aware that some departments may decline to integrate AI into their curricula on principle. For students in those majors, the Task Force recommends the University work with a department willing to offer a course for goals 5-7 that will provide a pathway to learn how to use AI effectively and responsibly.
3. The campus should provide a badge in AI literacy to students passing modules 1-4. It may also benefit students to offer an AI ethics badge after passing module 3, specifically.
4. The Task Force recommends that the campus offer certificates in "AI in [name the discipline]" that will be earned by completing the US curriculum offering goals 1-4 and the course(s) within the student's major offering goals 5-7. In cases where majors do not offer goals 5-7, the Task Force recommends the University offer a course that teaches goals 5-7, which can be used to complete the certificate.

Assessment and Evaluation

It is important to assure students are meeting the desired curricular goals. The Task Force has developed a set of suggested exercises and an assessment rubric for each curricular goal to assess student performance. These are provided in Appendix C.

As the technology evolves and societal norms for its use become established, it will be important to periodically assess the relevance and quality of the curriculum itself. The task Force also recommends that any AI curriculum incorporated into US or a major be put on the same schedule of review as other requirements.

Implementation and Assessment Roadmap

To help guide implementation of the recommendations in this document, the Task Force recommends the following timeline of benchmarks and success indicators. Note that in the table below, the Task Force includes content, assignments, and student assessment when referring to “curriculum.”

			Academic Year				
Recommendation	Benchmarks	Indicators	27	28	29	30	31
Development of Faculty Resources and Training							
Explore establishing a Centralized AI Center	Provost engages in decision-making process	Decision made	Be In				
If Center is approved, AI Center established and AI leadership and affiliates appointed	Formal approval of AI Center; Director job description created and Director hired; affiliates and staff appointed	I1: Center created and staffing/ affiliates appointed I2: Campus-wide survey distributed to determine satisfaction with AI Center	Be In1		In2		In2
If Center is approved, AI Center website developed and published	Website containing mission, contacts, resources, events calendar, training signups, learning materials for faculty, staff and students	Web analytics such as unique users per month and event registrations on site; feedback from AI Center surveys (in I2 above)	Be In	In	In	In	In
Formal faculty training offered	B1: Faculty workshop series developed and launched B2: Faculty workshops updated as technology changes; advanced or additional training offered as technology develops	I1 & I2: Number of faculty completing workshops per year and implementing new pedagogies in classes; faculty satisfaction with workshops; pre-post course survey of faculty AI confidence and self-efficacy	Be1	Be2 In	B2 In	B2 In	B2 In
Reusable tutorials developed for AI-specific skills/topics that can be integrated into course Canvas sites.	Modules developed (e.g., foundations, ethics, prompt design) and expanded in number based on changes in technology and faculty requests	Number of modules published, number of course integrations, number of student users, student completion rates, module rubric scores, faculty satisfaction; timeliness of updates based on need	Be	In	In	In	In

Recommendation	Benchmarks	Indicators	27	28	29	30	31
Development for Goals 1-4							
AI modules 1-4 developed for US area 1 course (including assignments)	B1: Modules developed for AI goals 1-4 B2: Assignments developed	Four modules with assignments developed	Be1 Be2 In				
AI modules proposed to USC	Inclusion of modules approved by USC	Course and requirement approved by USC and UCC	Be In				
AI literacy requirements (goals 1-4) added to catalog and applied to incoming 1 st -year class	Catalog language drafted, approved, and published, and advising material updated	Requirement language included in catalog; advising materials updated for distribution to incoming class		Be In			
Review of modules and assignments delivering goals 1-4 to assess efficacy	Review of assessments conducted in approved courses	Percent of students passing modules		Be In	Be In	Be In	Be In
Review of AI curriculum related to learning goals 1-4 to assess relevance	B1: Establish review cycle term and identify review team (e.g., USC, departments, AI Center-affiliated faculty) B2: Curriculum reviewed	I1: Cycle and review team defined I2: First review of curriculum conducted		Be1 In1	Be2 In2	Be2 In2	Be2 In2
Development for Goals 5-7							
Development of curriculum proposals for goals 5, 6 & 7 by departments	Proposals developed	Proposals submitted and reviewed by appropriate approval bodies	Be In				
Departments integrate goals into courses or develop new courses to teach the goals	Goals 5-7 integrated into courses/department curriculum	Percent of majors teaching goals 5, 6 & 7; number of students passing required courses		Be In	Be In	In	In
Departments develop cyclic review schedule and process for courses delivering content for goals 5-7	B1: Establish review cycle term and identify review team) B2: Develop review process for assessing the continued relevance of goals 5-7	I1: Cycle and review team defined I2: Review process developed			Be1 Be2 In1 In2	Be1 Be2 In1 In2	

Recommendation	Benchmarks	Indicators	27	28	29	30	31
Review of AI curriculum related to learning goals 5-7 to assess relevance	B1: Curriculum reviewed B2: Student achievement measured	I1: Curriculum reviewed I2: Student achievement measures reviewed and assessed				Be1 Be2 In1 In2	Be1 Be2 In1 In2
Overall Success							
Campus badges given for AI literacy completion	Program marketed badges posted	Number of students earning AI literacy badges		Be In	In	In	In
Formalize certificate program	Be1: Develop course for goals 5-7 for students in majors not offering one Be2: List certificate in catalogue	In1: General course teaching 5-7 developed In2: Certificate is in the catalogue		Be1 Be2 In1 In2			
AI Certificate program offered	Program marketed and enrolled	Number of students enrolled, percent of departments offering courses		Be In	Be In	Be In	In
Assessment of AI education impact and utility	On-the-job AI use questions integrated into the 6-month graduate survey. Results analyzed to determine benefit of the AI curriculum	1. Add 3-5 questions about AI-use, confidence, and employer value to survey 2. Analyze to inform AI literacy and fluency curricula and badge program value; track trends and correlate AI training with employment attainment and outcomes				Be In1 In2	In1 In2

Appendix A: eListening Session Input on Faculty Needs

The following items were suggested as needed resources by faculty attending the listening sessions.

1. Campus policy on AI use in academic courses
2. Campus definitions of AI, Generative AI, and Agentic AI
3. Campus thesis and dissertation policy
4. Canvas modules that teach students how to use AI, which can be adopted by faculty in their courses
5. A comprehensive course or series of modules for faculty that starts with the assumption of no AI knowledge or skills and progresses to mastery of AI use. Faculty desired outcomes for the training are to know:
 - How students are using AI, for good (e.g., study aids, finding references) and bad (write their papers, cheat on exams with AI glasses)
 - How to develop assignments and assessments that can't be "handed off" to AI, which successfully develop students' thinking skills
 - Strategies for **online** assignments and assessments that can't be handed off to AI and successfully develop students thinking skills
 - How to teach writing effectively despite the availability of AI and with AI
 - How to keep grading and workload manageable with AI
 - How to avoid the need to police AI use
6. Seminar series in which professionals working in different fields explain how AI is used in their office or industry. Perhaps tie these to the Provost's seminar series. Perhaps get Alumni Affairs involved.
7. Should we work with high schools to help prepare students before they come to us? The early college courses might be a good place to begin acclimating students to university expectations.

Appendix B: Faculty Senate Guidelines on the Use of Generative AI

With acknowledgement that we are in a moment of rapid technological change that is also a challenge to the creative, critical analysis, knowledge development, and original research of the university, these guidelines aim to reaffirm existing university policies around academic integrity, affirm the value of the creative and original teaching and research across disciplines, and firmly center the *human* as both agent and object of university education and critical and creative research and practice.

The UMass Dartmouth GAI Policy aims to

- Define “GAI”
- Suggest that faculty clarify acceptable and prohibited AI use in syllabi and to their students
- Articulate standards on plagiarism connected to GAI
- Articulate fair use and prohibitions on GAI use by students, faculty, and staff

Definition:

Generative Artificial Intelligence refers to machine learning models that can generate text, images, code, and other content based on their training data. Generative AI (GAI in this document) brings with it a rapid real-time transformation for institutes of higher education as well as the world more broadly.

Current tools such as Large Language Models (LLMs), Image Generators, and other generative AI platforms seem to be able to rapidly replace human creative capacities. However, it is crucial to recognize that these tools mimic, rather than replace or even imitate, human creative, technical, and scholarly endeavors. They are not original or creative; they do not have analytical or critical capacities; and they are not driven by curiosity or human agency. Instead, they respond to prompts fed into them based on probability and prediction. Due to their foundation on widespread language, image, and code that are openly available, they often reinforce bias and spread inaccurate or incorrect information. They can also provide a false sense of security or ease as users hand over their own critical and creative faculties to computers.

The UMass Dartmouth Policy uses the term GAI to refer to all of these tools and other generative computing not yet available.

Syllabi

Faculty are encouraged to include a statement of their policy for GAI use in their courses.

GAI Fair Use

Some assignments might explicitly ask for the use of or engagement with GAI. As with other assignments, students should follow the instructions of individual instructors and courses. Students should always attribute and explain any

usage. Absent explicit permission or syllabus policy of an instructor, students are prohibited from using GAI.

Students must disclose the use of AI technologies in the creation of any coursework submitted for academic credit. This disclosure should include a description of the GAI's role in the work.

Students must use GAI technologies responsibly and ethically, avoiding any form of misuse that could harm others or give an unfair advantage. This includes respecting copyright laws and the rights of others.

Because students cannot be required to provide their information or original work to third parties that are not contracted by the university, faculty must take care when requiring the use of GAI to protect students' identities and original work.

AI and Plagiarism

As with any source (human, textual, creative, artificial), students and faculty are required to attribute source material, including text, image, code, etc. that has been generated by GAI. Failure to do so is evidence of academic dishonesty. Students should always follow both the Student Handbook and the course syllabus in understanding how to attribute sources.

The use of GAI technologies must not violate the principles of academic integrity. GAI-generated content must be properly cited, and students must ensure that the use of GAI does not constitute plagiarism or any other form of academic dishonesty.

Following an understanding of academic integrity, students should never present work generated by GAI as their own original work. This includes all levels of intellectual, technical, and creative processes, from low-stakes to high-stakes student work. Use disciplinary or instructor guidelines for attribution.

Appendix C: Suggested Assessment Rubrics and Assignments

Goal 1: Build conceptual understanding of what AI is, how it functions, and where it appears in daily life

Key topics:

- A. What AI is and how it works: data, algorithms, and machine learning basics
- B. How AI systems process information and make predictions: pattern recognition and probabilistic outputs
- C. Recognizing everyday uses of AI (search engines, recommendation systems, generative tools)
- D. Understanding data quality, bias, and the limits of explainability
- E. Differentiating AI literacy (ethical understanding) from AI fluency (effective application)

Rubric

Rubric Performance levels:

- 4 – Advanced: Accurate, precise, uses correct terminology, applies to new contexts, supports claims with reasoning/evidence
- 3 – Proficient: Correct core ideas, minor gaps, applies to familiar contexts with reasonable justification
- 2 – Developing: Partially correct but vague/incomplete; common confusions; limited application
- 1 – Beginning: Major misconceptions; cannot apply or justify

Passing is a mean of 3-4 and no category below 3.

Criterion	4 – Advanced	3 – Proficient (Meets)	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning
A. What AI is and how it works: data, algorithms, and machine learning basics	Clearly distinguishes AI/ML from rule-based programming; explains training vs inference; correctly uses key terms (features, labels, parameters, objective/loss, generalization/overfitting) and ties them to a concrete example	Defines AI/ML as learning patterns from data to make predictions/ decisions; explains roles of data + model/algorithm; describes training/inference at a high level	Vague mechanism (“computers that learn/think”); confuses model vs data vs “the internet”; incomplete or partly incorrect training/inference explanation	Treats AI as magic/always correct; cannot explain how learning/ prediction happens
B. How AI systems process information and make predictions; pattern recognition and	Accurately interprets probability scores (incl calibration concept ually); discusses base rates; explains threshold tradeoffs (false positives/negatives) for a	Explains predictions as statistical pattern recognition; correctly interprets a probability score as likelihood/ uncertainty	Misinterprets probability; limited understanding of thresholds/ tradeoffs	Treats outputs as certain facts; cannot explain uncertainty or what a probability score means

probabilistic outputs	scenario; emphasizes uncertainty and context	inty; acknowledges outputs are not facts		
C. Recognizing everyday uses of AI (search engines, recommendation systems, generative tools)	Correctly identifies AI across domains (search ranking, recommendations, ads, fraud, navigation, moderation, generative tools); explains inputs → objective (what’s optimized) → outputs; distinguishes AI from simple automation	Identifies common AI uses and gives plausible input/output explanations (e.g., recommendations use prior behavior)	Lists examples without justification; frequent misclassification of non-AI as AI (or misses obvious AI)	Cannot reliably identify or explain AI in daily life
D. Understanding data quality, bias, and the limits of explainability	Explains bias mechanisms (sampling/ selection, label/historical, measurement/ proxy variables, imbalance); connects to real impacts; proposes feasible mitigations (audits, relabeling, stratified eval, monitoring drift); articulates why interpretability can be limited and what partial explanations are possible	Explains how biased/low-quality data leads to unfair/unreliable outputs; provides at least one concrete mitigation; acknowledges explainability limits	Recognizes bias exists but lacks mechanism; mitigations are vague (“remove bias”); limited understanding of explainability	Denies/minimizes bias or assumes full explainability is always possible; cannot connect data issues to outcomes
E. Differentiating AI literacy (ethical understanding) from AI fluency (effective application)	Clearly distinguishes literacy from fluency; demonstrates through a documented workflow: task definition, tool choice (or non-use), evaluation/verification, documentation, and ethical safeguards	Correctly distinguishes literacy vs fluency and shows evidence in at least one task	Partial distinction; uses tools (or critiques them) without verification/evaluation or ethical reasoning	Cannot distinguish; equates “using AI” with competence or rejects nuance

Sample Assignments

1) AI-in-the-wild analysis; assesses: A–D (and some E)

Prompt: Choose two systems you use weekly (e.g., TikTok feed, Google search, Spotify, Gmail spam, Maps, credit card fraud alerts).

Deliverable: For each, write 800–1200 words addressing:

- What problem it solves and what it likely optimizes
- Likely inputs/features and the output (ranking/prediction/generation)
- Where uncertainty enters; what a “score” might represent
- One data-quality risk and one bias/feedback-loop risk
- What explanation a user could reasonably expect (and what they can’t)

2) Thresholds & tradeoffs short case analysis; assesses: B–D–E

Scenario: A model flags plagiarism, fraud, or medical risk with a probability score.

Deliverable (1–2 pages):

- Interpret what a probability output means
- Recommend a threshold for two contexts (low-stakes vs high-stakes)
- Discuss false positive/false negative impacts and who is harmed
- Propose a human-in-the-loop policy

3) “AI or not?” classification with justification; assesses A-C

Short quiz or homework: Provide 12–15 items to students (e.g., thermostat, Excel formula, face unlock, spellcheck, rule-based chatbot, recommender system, diffusion image generator). Students label AI / not AI / depends and justify each in 2–3 sentences focusing on learning-from-data vs rules and prediction under uncertainty.

Goal 2: Help learners critically engage with AI outputs and recognize when to trust or question them.

Key topics:

- A. Capabilities: summarization, brainstorming, outlining, repackaging, exploration of multiple perspectives.
- B. Limitations: hallucinations, lack of source transparency, uneven performance across topics, reasoning errors.
- C. Being cautious when requesting lists of sources, experts, or complex factual information.
- D. SIFT method (Stop, Investigate, Find trusted coverage, Trace to source) for AI-assisted information literacy.
- E. Assessing accuracy, transparency, and explainability of AI-generated content.
- F. Comparing and verifying outputs across multiple AI tools and human sources.

Rubric

Rubric Performance levels:

- 4 – Advanced: Accurate, precise, uses correct terminology, applies to new contexts, supports claims with reasoning/evidence
- 3 – Proficient: Correct core ideas, minor gaps, applies to familiar contexts with reasonable justification
- 2 – Developing: Partially correct but vague/incomplete; common confusions; limited application
- 1 – Beginning: Major misconceptions; cannot apply or justify

Passing is a mean of 3-4 and no category below 3.

Criterion	4 – Advanced	3 – Proficient (Meets)	2– Developing	1– Beginning
A. Capabilities: summarization, brainstorming, outlining, repackaging, exploration of multiple perspectives	Accurately describes a range of generative-AI capabilities; explains <i>why</i> each task plays to the model's strengths (e.g., pattern recombination, compression, paraphrasing); selects appropriate capabilities for a given task and articulates what the tool is actually doing (vs. "understanding"); provides concrete examples of effective use with quality criteria	Identifies key capabilities (summarization, brainstorming, outlining, repackaging, multi-perspective exploration) and gives a plausible explanation of when and why each is useful; recognizes that output quality varies by task type	Lists capabilities but cannot explain <i>why</i> AI performs well at them; conflates capabilities (e.g., treats summarization and factual research as equally reliable); limited sense of appropriate task selection	No task-matching reasoning; Cannot identify meaningful AI capabilities or describes them in purely magical terms ("it knows everything")
B. Limitations: hallucinations,	Precisely defines hallucination (c	Correctly identifies h allucination, source	Aware that AI "makes things	Denies or minimizes limitations; treats AI

lack of source transparency, uneven performance across topics, reasoning errors	onfident generation of plausible but fabricated content) and distinguishes it from simple error; explains <i>why</i> hallucinations occur (next-token prediction, training-data gaps, lack of grounding); identifies source-opacity, domain-dependent reliability, and common reasoning failures (e.g., multi-step logic, math, negation); provides real or realistic examples for each	opacity, uneven topic performance, and reasoning errors as distinct limitations; explains each at a high level with at least one example; understands that these are structural, not occasional glitches	up" but cannot explain the mechanism; conflates different types of limitations; may overstate or understate the problem (e.g., "it's wrong half the time" or "it's only wrong on obscure topics")	outputs as inherently reliable; cannot identify or describe hallucination or reasoning errors
C. Cautions when requesting lists of sources, experts, or complex factual information	Explains <i>why</i> source/citation requests are high-risk (model generates plausible-looking but often fabricated references; no live database access in base models; training-data-cutoff issues); distinguishes base-model behavior from retrieval-augmented or web-connected tools; proposes concrete verification steps before relying on any AI-supplied citation, name, or factual claim	Recognizes that AI-generated citations, expert names, and factual lists are frequently unreliable; understands that the model does not "look things up"; identifies at least one verification strategy (e.g., checking a library database, searching the DOI)	Acknowledges some risk but underestimates frequency or severity; may believe the tool is "usually right" about sources; verification strategy is vague ("just Google it") or absent	Trusts AI-generated citations, names, or factual lists at face value
D. SIFT method (Stop, Investigate, Find trusted coverage, Trace to source) for AI-assisted information literacy	Correctly names and explains all four SIFT moves; <i>adapts</i> SIFT to AI-generated content (e.g., "Stop" includes pausing before accepting AI output; "Investigate" includes checking the model's known limitations; "Find trusted coverage" includes cross-referencing with authoritative human sources; "Trace" includes locating the original data/study	Correctly identifies the four SIFT steps and applies them to at least one AI-output scenario; explains how each step helps catch errors or misinformation in AI-generated text	Can name some SIFT steps but applies them mechanically or incompletely; does not clearly connect SIFT to AI-specific risks (treats it as generic web-literacy only)	Cannot recall or apply SIFT; no systematic strategy for evaluating information quality in AI outputs

	behind a claim); demonstrates application in a worked example			
E. Assessing accuracy, transparency, and explainability of AI-generated content	Evaluates AI output along multiple quality dimensions: factual accuracy (verifiable claims), internal consistency, source transparency (can the claim be traced?), and explainability (does the tool reveal <i>how</i> or <i>why</i> it produced the answer?); proposes concrete quality-check routines (e.g., spot-check facts, request reasoning chains, compare to known sources)	Assesses AI output for accuracy and transparency; recognizes that AI tools generally do not explain their reasoning or reveal sources; applies at least one concrete quality-check strategy	Evaluates output superficially ("it sounds right"); limited understanding of transparency or explainability; may accept confident-sounding text as evidence of accuracy	Cannot assess AI output quality; equates fluency or length with correctness; no concept of transparency or explainability as evaluation criteria
F. Comparing and verifying outputs across multiple AI tools and human sources	Systematically compares outputs from multiple AI tools (noting convergence and divergence); triangulates with authoritative human sources (peer-reviewed literature, domain experts, reference works); explains <i>why</i> convergence across independent sources increases confidence but does not guarantee correctness; documents the comparison process and resolves discrepancies with evidence	Compares AI output to at least one other AI tool and one human source; identifies key agreements and disagreements; uses comparison to flag potential errors	Compares outputs informally or only within one tool (e.g., regenerating the same prompt); does not consistently consult human sources; limited analysis of discrepancies	Does not compare outputs; relies on a single AI response as the final answer; no verification against external sources

Sample Assignments

1) Capabilities & Limitations Audit; assesses: A-C

Prompt: Select a topic you are currently studying in another course. Use a generative AI tool to perform three tasks on that topic: (1) summarize a concept, (2) brainstorm applications or arguments, and (3) generate a list of five sources or key scholars.

Deliverable: For each task, write 600–1,000 words total addressing:

- What capability the AI is leveraging and why this task suits (or doesn't suit) the tool
- Where the output is strong and where it breaks down (identify at least one hallucination, reasoning error, or unsupported claim)
- For the source list: verify every item against a library database or Google Scholar and report what is real, fabricated, or distorted
- A brief reflection on which of the three tasks you would trust most/least and why

2) SIFT-in-Action Case Study; assesses: D-F

Scenario: You receive the following AI-generated paragraph (instructor provides a passage containing a mix of accurate claims, subtle inaccuracies, a fabricated citation, and a plausible-sounding but nonexistent expert name).

Deliverable (2-3 pages):

- Walk through each SIFT step as applied to the paragraph, documenting what you did at each stage
- Assess the passage for accuracy (which claims check out?), transparency (can you trace the claims?), and explainability (does the AI tell you *how* it arrived at these statements?)
- Cross-check at least two claims using a second AI tool *and* a non-AI authoritative source; report agreements and discrepancies
- Conclude with a revised, verified version of the paragraph and a reflection on what SIFT revealed that a surface reading would have missed

3) Tool Comparison & Verification Exercise; assesses B, E, F (and some A,C)

Prompt: Ask three different AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, Gemini, Copilot, Claude, Perplexity) the *same* complex factual question provided by the instructor (e.g., a question about a historical event, a scientific mechanism, or a policy debate that requires nuance and sourcing).

Deliverable (1–2 pages + comparison table):

- Create a side-by-side comparison table noting: key claims made, sources cited (if any), areas of agreement, areas of divergence, and apparent errors
- For each tool, assess: Did it cite sources? Were citations real? Did it acknowledge uncertainty? Did it make reasoning errors?
- Verify the core claims using at least two authoritative non-AI sources
- Write a short analysis (500–800 words): What did convergence across tools tell you? What did divergence reveal? What would you trust, and what requires further investigation? What does this exercise demonstrate about relying on a single AI tool?

Goal 3: Develop ethical judgment, integrity, and respect for intellectual property when using AI.

Key topics:

- A. Academic integrity: originality, plagiarism, and citation of AI-assisted work.
- B. Copyright and authorship concerns—AI as writing partner, not sole author, and understanding that information and/or documents that are uploaded may be copyrighted.
- C. Bias and fairness: recognizing that AI reflects the biases of data and developers.
- D. Privacy: awareness that prompts and outputs may be stored or used for training.
- E. Ethical decision-making in AI use: know and follow the course, institution, employer AI use policy; know when *not* to rely on AI and when to disclose use.
- F. Affirmation of user responsibility: accountability for decisions and outcomes produced with AI.
- G. Distinguishing between responsible augmentation and unethical shortcutting.

Rubric

Rubric Performance levels:

- 4 – Advanced: Accurate, precise, uses correct terminology, applies to new contexts, supports claims with reasoning/evidence
- 3 – Proficient: Correct core ideas, minor gaps, applies to familiar contexts with reasonable justification
- 2 – Developing: Partially correct but vague/incomplete; common confusions; limited application
- 1 – Beginning: Major misconceptions; cannot apply or justify

Passing is a mean of 3-4 and no category below 3.

Criterion	4 – Advanced	3 – Proficient (Meets)	2– Developing	1– Beginning
A and B. Academic integrity, copyright, and authorship	Produces clearly original work; applies appropriate citation standards for AI-augmented work; awareness of copyright rules; Does not upload copyrighted work to AI tools	Produces mostly original work; Cites use of AI; may occasionally upload copyrighted works by mistake.	Blurs line between human and AI authorship; Inconsistently cites use of AI; Uploads copyrighted material without consideration of copyright	Claims AI output as human-generated work; Plagiarizes or fails to cite AI-augmented work; Shows no awareness of copyright or authorship concerns.

C and D. Bias, Fairness, and Privacy	Critical analysis of how AI reflects biases of data and developers; Proactively protects sensitive information, understanding that uploaded data, prompts, and outputs may be stored or used for further model development	Recognizes common biases of data and developers; Demonstrates awareness of privacy concerns related to uploaded data and generally avoids inputting sensitive information	Accepts biased output without critical evaluation; Exhibits superficial awareness of bias or fairness of models; Occasionally shares mildly sensitive data	Assumes AI is objective and neutral; Freely shares private or sensitive information with no concern about how the information is used.
E. Ethical decision-making and compliance with policy	Consistently aligns use of AI with institutional and course policies with understanding that these may vary; Accurately determines when AI use is and is not appropriate; Clearly and consistently discloses use of AI	Is aware of and follows institutional and course policies; Demonstrates good judgement of when to rely on AI and how to disclose use appropriately with occasional errors	Partially follows policies but does not understand that policies may vary; Demonstrates occasional poor judgement related to when to use AI; Discloses AI use inconsistently	Ignores, violates, and/or is unaware of relevant policies; Inappropriately relies on AI; Does not disclose use of AI
F and G. Accountability and responsible augmentation	Affirms and accepts responsibility for decisions and output produced with AI; Uses AI augmentation responsibly; Firmly and consistently rejects unethical use of AI	Generally accepts responsibility for decisions and output produced with AI; Distinguishes between responsible use and unethical use of AI but may occasionally rely on AI too much	Hesitant to accept responsibility for decisions or errors made by AI; Struggles to distinguish between responsible use and unethical use	Takes no responsibility for decisions or errors made by AI; Uses AI inappropriately to avoid meaningful work

Sample Assignments

1) Bias/Fairness & Privacy Stress Test of an AI Tool

Purpose: Evaluate model bias and privacy risks through a structured audit and propose mitigations and responsible-use guidance.

Prompt: Pick one AI output from your instructor. It will be on topics such as advising, tutoring, hiring screening, scholarship selection, mental health info triage (non-clinical), housing assistance, or customer support. Examine the AI tool's outputs for bias, fairness, and privacy risks.

Deliverables:

1. **Results table** (for each prompt):
 - a. Output summary

- b. Bias/fairness issues observed (if any) and who might be harmed
- c. Privacy concerns (e.g., requests for personal data, unsafe advice to share data)
- d. Severity rating + evidence (quotes)
- 2. **Mitigation proposal:**
 - a. Prompting changes, workflow guardrails, human review steps, and “do not use AI when...” conditions
- 3. **One-page responsible-use guide** for a non-expert user in that scenario (what’s allowed, what’s risky, what must be disclosed).

2) Policy & Ethics Decision Simulation (“Use AI / Don’t Use AI”)

Purpose: Practice and demonstrate judgment, compliance, disclosure, and accountability across realistic academic/workplace scenarios.

Prompt: Complete a set of **8 short scenarios** (provided by instructor) where AI might be used (e.g., draft discussion post, summarize a study, analyze a dataset, write code, respond to a student email during tutoring, revise a resume, peer review a classmate’s draft, create meeting notes). For each scenario, decide whether AI use is appropriate and, if so, how to do it ethically.

Deliverables (for each scenario):

1. **Decision:** Use AI / Do not use AI / Use with restrictions.
2. **Policy citation:** Quote or cite the relevant course/institution policy clause (provided in LMS).
3. **Safe workflow**
 - a. What inputs are allowed (privacy screening/redaction)
 - b. What prompts you would use (2 prompts minimum if “use AI”)
 - c. What human work must be done (analysis, verification, final authorship)
4. **Disclosure statement** you would attach to the work (1–3 sentences).
5. **Accountability step:** one concrete verification or review action (fact-check, bias check, source check, or peer/human review).
6. **Capstone reflection (300–500 words):** Identify two times you chose *not* to use AI (or restricted it) and explain why; describe how you distinguish augmentation from shortcutting.

Goal 4: Foster reflection on the human impacts of AI and automation.

Key topics:

- A. Social and emotional effects of AI in education, work, and communication.
- B. Cultural and relational values in technology design.
- C. Fairness, inclusivity, and representation in AI systems.
- D. Public policy, governance, and power dynamics surrounding AI adoption.
- E. The human role in oversight, empathy, and creativity in an AI-driven world.
- F. The impact of AI on labor, work, and economic structures.
- G. The environmental and financial costs of AI

Rubric

Rubric Performance levels:

- 4 – Advanced: Accurate, precise, uses correct terminology, applies to new contexts, supports claims with reasoning/evidence
- 3 – Proficient: Correct core ideas, minor gaps, applies to familiar contexts with reasonable justification
- 2 – Developing: Partially correct but vague/incomplete; common confusions; limited application
- 1 – Beginning: Major misconceptions; cannot apply or justify

Passing is a mean of 3-4 and no category below 3.

Criterion	4 – Advanced	3 – Proficient (Meets)	2– Developing	1– Beginning
A. Effects of AI in education, work, and communication.	Analyzes the effects of AI in education, work, and communication with nuance and depth, considering multiple perspectives and broader social implications. Uses clear and relevant evidence or examples to support claims.	Explains major effects of AI in education, work, and communication with appropriate examples or supporting evidence. Demonstrates clear understanding of the topic.	Identifies some effects of AI, but explanation is limited, generalized, inconsistent, or insufficiently supported.	Shows little understanding of the effects of AI, or provides inaccurate, unclear, or unsupported discussion.
B. Cultural and relational values in technology design.	Insightfully analyzes how cultural assumptions, human relationships, and social values shape technology design and user experience. Supports analysis with relevant examples.	Clearly explains how cultural and relational values influence technology design and user experience. Demonstrates clear understanding of the topic.	Demonstrates partial or surface-level understanding of cultural and relational values in technology design.	Demonstrates little or inaccurate understanding of how cultural and relational values relate to technology design.
C. Fairness, inclusivity, and	Critically examines issues of fairness,	Clearly explains several issues	Identifies at least one	Demonstrates little or

representation in AI systems.	inclusivity, and representation in AI systems using specific examples and provides thoughtful analysis of causes or consequences.	related to fairness, inclusivity, and representation in AI systems. Demonstrates clear understanding of the topic.	issue related to fairness, inclusivity, or representation, but discussion lacks depth, clarity, or support.	inaccurate understanding of fairness, inclusivity, or representation in AI systems.
D. Public policy, governance, and power dynamics surrounding AI adoption.	Analyzes how public policy, governance structures, and power relationships shape the development and adoption of AI, addressing competing interests and broader societal consequences. Supports analysis with relevant examples.	Clearly explains several issues related to public policy, governance, or power dynamics surrounding AI adoption. Demonstrates clear understanding of the topic.	Demonstrates limited awareness of policy, governance, or power issues connected to AI adoption.	Demonstrates little or inaccurate understanding of policy, governance, or power issues related to AI adoption.
E. The human role in oversight, empathy, and creativity in an AI-driven world.	Reflects thoughtfully on the human role in oversight, empathy, and creativity in an AI-driven world. Supports analysis with relevant examples.	Clearly explains the importance of human oversight, empathy, and creativity in relation to AI systems. Demonstrates clear understanding of the topic.	Demonstrates basic awareness of the human role in oversight, empathy, or creativity, but discussion remains limited or underdeveloped.	Demonstrates little or inaccurate understanding of the human role in an AI-driven world.
F. The impact of AI on labor, work, and economic structures.	Analyzes the impact of AI on labor, work, and economic structures with attention to complexity, tradeoffs, and consequences. Supports analysis with relevant examples.	Clearly explains significant effects of AI on labor, work, and economic structures. Demonstrates clear understanding of the topic.	Demonstrates limited or uneven understanding of how AI affects labor, work, or economic structures.	Demonstrates little or inaccurate understanding of AI's impact on labor, work, or economic structures.
G. The environmental and financial costs of AI	Analyzes the environmental and financial costs of AI with attention to complexity, tradeoffs,	Clearly explains major environmental and financial costs associated with AI	Demonstrates partial or limited understanding of the	Demonstrates little or inaccurate understanding of the

	and consequences. Supports analysis with relevant examples.	systems. Demonstrates clear understanding of the topic.	environmental or financial costs of AI.	environmental or financial costs of AI.
--	--	--	---	---

Sample Assignments (All Take the Form of Brief Writing Assignments followed by discussion)

1) AI Impact Case Study (A-G): students analyze a real-world case in which AI has had significant consequences, identifying impacts, ethical issues, and the way these may flow from the values of those who applied AI in that particular case, with the end-product being a report and a conclusion on use, regulation, or prohibition.

2) Debate Briefs on Ethical Issues (A-G): ethical issues related to AI are generated by students collectively and then randomly assigned to individual students, who must prepare briefs for an in-class debate – briefs must make an argument, be supported by evidence, and address possible counterarguments.

3) Stakeholder Analysis Project (A-G): Students map the stakeholder groups affected by a specific AI technology (developers, users, workers, communities, governments) to identify benefits, risks, and unintended consequences for each group.

4) Policy Brief (A-G): Students write a short memo advising a university, company, or government body on responsible AI use.

5) AI Journals (A-G): students keep journals which record, for a week, their own encounters with AI – they are encouraged to reflect, at the end of the week, on the way these instances resonate with broader societal impacts or ethical concerns.

6) Speculative Fiction (A-G): students write short works of speculative fiction in which they imagine a future world impacted by AI (they decide the dimensions of this impact) – the central question will be what it means to be human in this world. The stories will be read by all students and will form the basis of a class discussion.

Goal 5: Equip students with strategies to communicate effectively with AI tools.

Key topics:

- A. Writing clear, context-rich starting prompts (define purpose, audience, and level).
- B. Prompt refinement: regenerating, supplying relevant data/examples, and providing feedback to improve results.
- C. Evaluating and editing AI responses for accuracy, tone, logic, assumptions, and alignment with goals.
- D. Understanding the AI tool's functions (rewrite, feedback, citation modes), and differences among systems.

Rubric

Rubric Performance levels:

4 – Advanced: Accurate, precise, uses correct terminology, applies to new contexts, supports claims with reasoning/evidence

3 – Proficient: Correct core ideas, minor gaps, applies to familiar contexts with reasonable justification

2 – Developing: Partially correct but vague/incomplete; common confusions; limited application

1 – Beginning: Major misconceptions; cannot apply or justify

Passing is a mean of 3-4 and no category below 3.

Criterion	4 – Advanced	3 – Proficient (Meets)	2– Developing	1– Beginning
A. Starting Prompt Clarity, Context & Structure	Prompts are specific, well-structured, unambiguous; include context, constraints, examples, desired format.	Prompts are generally clear; intent understandable; some basic details are missing.	Prompts vague or broad; Minimal context; AI must infer details.	Prompts unclear or confusing; No relevant context; prompts generic or disconnected; responses miss the mark.
B. Iterative Prompting & Rationale	Purposeful multi-round iteration; clear rationale.	Iteration with reasonable explanations.	Attempts iteration; rationale weak or missing.	No iteration or cannot articulate improvements.
C. Evaluating and Editing AI Responses	Effectively critically evaluates and edits AI output along multiple quality dimensions (accuracy, tone, assumptions, goal alignment); Uses concrete quality-check routines (e.g., spot-check facts, request reasoning chains,	Assesses and edits AI output for accuracy and transparency; recognizes that AI tools generally do not explain their reasoning or reveal sources; applies	Superficially evaluates output superficially ("it sounds right"); may accept confident-sounding text as	Cannot assess or edit AI output; equates fluency or length with correctness

	compare to known sources)	at least one concrete quality-check strategy	evidence of accuracy	
D. Tool Selection, Capabilities & Limitations	Accurately selects and justifies use of tools; identifies strengths/limitation; compares alternatives when needed.	Justifies tool selection and use with mostly accurate descriptions.	Partial or imprecise justification of use of AI tool.	No justification or misuse of the tool.

Sample Assignments

1) Prompt Engineering Mini-Project

Purpose: Demonstrate mastery of clear starting prompts, purposeful iteration, rigorous evaluation of AI output, and justified tool choice.

Task: Choose a topic (e.g., library service, policy, scientific concept). Develop a prompt set that produces a high-quality, structured output.

Deliverables:

- Assesses A — Starting Prompts: 3–5 initial prompts that include *context, constraints, examples, and desired format*.
- Assesses B — Context Note (100–150 words): Explain the goal, audience, constraints, and what background information you provided to the AI.
- Assesses C — Iteration Log: 2–3 refinement rounds. For each:
 - Revised prompt
 - 1–2 sentences explaining the *rationale* tied to a specific issue in the AI's previous output (accuracy, tone, assumptions, structure).
- Assesses D — Tool Memo (150–200 words): Justify your tool choice by identifying capabilities, limitations, and why alternatives were not selected.
- Assesses all — Final AI-assisted output, edited by the student to correct inaccuracies or misalignments.

2) AI-Assisted Research Summary

Purpose: Use clear prompting, strong context, iterative refinement, and critical evaluation to produce an accurate, audience-appropriate summary.

Task: Select a scholarly article or policy document. Guide an AI tool to produce a concise, structured summary.

Deliverables:

- Assesses A — Prompt Set: Initial summary prompt specifying structure (headings, bullets), length, and required elements.
- Assesses B — Context Brief: Source details, audience needs, and constraints (reading level, length, terminology).
- Assesses C — Refinement Pass: One revision cycle with 2–3 sentences explaining how the change addressed a specific flaw (e.g., missing nuance, incorrect claim, oversimplification).
- Assesses D — Tool Rationale (100–150 words): Explain why the tool is appropriate for summarization and how you mitigated its known limitations (e.g., hallucination, lack of citations).
- Assesses all — Final summary, edited by the student for accuracy and alignment with the source.

3) AI Interaction Protocol Design

Purpose: Build a repeatable workflow that demonstrates strong prompting, context setup, iterative refinement, and tool awareness.

Task: Choose a task (e.g., drafting a memo, designing a workshop). Create a protocol for using an AI tool to complete it.

Deliverables:

- Workflow Document (1–2 pages): Step-by-step protocol.
- Assesses A — Example Prompts: For each step, include prompts with explicit structure, constraints, and examples.
- Assesses B — Context Plan: Describe what background information you gather and how you provide it to the AI.
- Assesses C — Iteration Points: Identify where iteration is needed; include one demonstrated cycle with rationale tied to a specific quality issue in the AI's output.
- Assesses D — Tool Fit Note: Explain capabilities/limitations and why alternatives were not chosen.
- Assesses all — Demonstration: AI outputs showing the protocol in action, with student edits where needed.

4) AI Output Quality Audit

Purpose: Analyze how prompt clarity, context, iteration, and tool choice influence output quality.

Task: For a single task, run three prompting conditions and evaluate the resulting outputs.

Deliverables:

- Assesses A — Three Prompts & Outputs:

- Vague prompt with minimal context
- Moderately clear prompt with some context
- Highly structured prompt with rich context
- Assesses B — Context Notes: Explain what context was supplied in each condition and why.
- Assesses C — One Refinement: Choose the strongest condition and refine it once; include a 2–3 sentence rationale tied to a specific flaw in the AI’s output.
- Assesses D — Tool Note (~100 words): Explain tool suitability and identify at least one limitation observed during the audit.
- Assesses all — Student-edited version of the best output, demonstrating evaluation skills.

5) AI Tool Fit & Limitations Case Study

Purpose: Demonstrate expert-level tool selection and show how prompt clarity, context, and iteration mitigate tool limitations.

Task: Choose a realistic scenario (e.g., drafting a grant abstract, adapting policy text for students). Analyze the task and select the most appropriate AI tool.

Deliverables:

- Assesses B & D — Task Analysis (200–300 words): Audience, constraints, domain specifics, success criteria; identify key tool capabilities and limitations.
- Assesses A — Initial Prompt: A well-structured prompt specifying format, length, must-include elements, and context.
- Assesses C — Iteration Dossier: Two refinement rounds, each tied to a specific limitation observed in the AI’s output (e.g., incorrect assumptions, missing evidence, tone mismatch).
- Assesses D — Tool Fit Report (200–300 words): Justify the chosen tool against at least one alternative and explain how you managed limitations.
- Assesses all — Final output, edited by the student to correct inaccuracies or misalignments.

6) AI-Supported Creative Task

Purpose: Use AI as a creative partner while maintaining control through clear prompts, rich context, iteration, and justified tool choice.

Task: Produce a creative artifact (e.g., workshop outline, storyboard, marketing one-pager).

Deliverables:

- Assesses B — Design Brief: Audience, goals, constraints, success criteria.
- Assesses A — Prompt Pack: Initial prompt(s) specifying structure, tone, length, and deliverable format.

- Assesses C — Refinement Trail: 2–3 iterations, each annotated with the specific problem addressed (e.g., tone mismatch, missing elements, weak logic).
- Assesses D — Tool Statement (100–150 words): Explain why the tool is appropriate for the creative task and how you managed a limitation.
- Assesses all — Final creative product, with student edits demonstrating evaluation and control.

Goal 6: Encourage students to use AI to support—not replace—human creativity, reasoning, and dialogue.

Key topic:

Using sequential prompts to engage AI for questioning, reasoning probes, and information-literacy practice such as:

- A. Employing AI for brainstorming, outlining, organizing, or overcoming writer’s block.
- B. Using AI to consider multiple perspectives, simulate debate or negotiation, or prepare for argumentation.
- C. Transforming and reformatting existing work (e.g., from text to table).
- D. Reflecting on human-AI collaboration: where creativity, empathy, and critical thinking remain uniquely human.

Rubric

Criteria	Exemplary (5)	Proficient (4)	Developing (2-3)	Beginning (0-1)
A.Engaging AI as a writing/creative task or thinking partner, not the author.	You effectively used AI as a tool and not an author for 90-100% of the assignment. • Statements were corroborated and factually checked with reliable reference/source material. • Information obtained from AI tool was successfully integrated with student writing and reference material.	You effectively used AI as a tool and not an author for at least 80% of the assignment. • Most statements were corroborated and factually checked with reliable reference/source material. • Most information obtained from AI tool was successfully integrated with student writing and reference material.	You used AI as a tool and not an author for at least 50% of the assignment. 3 points • Some statements were corroborated and factually checked with reliable reference/source material. OR • Some information obtained from AI tool was successfully integrated with student writing and reference material.	You used AI as a tool and not an author for less than 50% of the assignment. 1 point • Most statements were not corroborated and factually checked with reliable reference/source material. OR • Information obtained from AI tool was not successfully integrated with student writing and reference material.
			2 points You used AI as a tool and not an author for at least 50% of the assignment.	0 points You did not use AI as a tool but as the author to the assignment.

			• Some statements were corroborated and factually checked with reliable reference/source material. • Some information obtained from AI tool was successfully integrated with student writing and reference material.	
The following are all aspects of this goal, and assignments may measure one or more of these to demonstrate attainment of the goal.				
Using AI for questioning, reasoning probes, and information-literacy practice.	You effectively used AI as a tool for understanding didactic information through sequential prompt iterations. • Sequential prompt iterations were provided to evaluate the thought process for developing information literacy.	You used AI as a tool for understanding didactic information through sequential prompt iterations. • Sequential prompt iterations were provided to evaluate the thought process for developing information literacy. • Minor gaps in iterations that made it unclear how you developed your understanding.	You used AI as a tool for understanding didactic information through sequential prompt iterations. 3 points • Sequential prompt iterations were provided to evaluate the thought process for developing information literacy. • Some gaps in iterations that made it unclear how you developed your understanding.	You used AI as a tool for understanding didactic information. 1 point • No sequential prompt iterations were provided to evaluate the thought process for developing information literacy. OR • Significant gaps in iterations that made it unclear how you developed your understanding.
			2 points • Sequential prompt iterations were provided to evaluate the thought process	0 points • No sequential prompt iterations were provided to evaluate the thought process for developing information literacy.

			for developing information literacy. Significant gaps in iterations that made it unclear how you developed your understanding.	Significant gaps in knowledge suggesting misunderstanding of didactic material.
Employing AI for brainstorming, outlining, organizing, or overcoming writer's block.	You effectively employed AI for brainstorming, outlining, organizing, or overcoming writer's block. Sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI was used for brainstorming, outlining, organizing, and overcoming writer's block.	You employed AI for brainstorming, outlining, organizing, or overcoming writer's block. - Sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI was used for brainstorming, outlining, organizing, and overcoming writer's block. - Minor gaps in iterations that made it unclear how effectively AI was used in this criteria.	You employed AI for brainstorming, outlining, organizing, or overcoming writer's block. 3 points - Sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI was used for brainstorming, outlining, organizing, and overcoming writer's block. - Some gaps in iterations that made it unclear how you used AI in this criteria.	You employed AI for brainstorming, outlining, organizing, or overcoming writer's block. 1 point - No sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI was used for brainstorming, outlining, organizing, and overcoming writer's block. OR - Significant gaps in knowledge suggesting ineffective use of AI for this criteria.
			2 points - Sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI was used for brainstorming, outlining, organizing, and overcoming writer's block. - Significant gaps in iterations that	0 points - No sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI was used for brainstorming, outlining, organizing, and overcoming writer's block. AND - Significant gaps in knowledge suggesting ineffective use of AI for this criteria.

			made it unclear how you used AI in this criteria.	
Using AI to consider multiple perspectives, simulate debate or negotiation, or prepare for argumentation.	You effectively employed AI to consider multiple perspectives. Sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI was used to consider multiple perspectives.	You employed AI to consider multiple perspectives. - Sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI was used to consider multiple perspectives. - Minor gaps in iterations that made it unclear how effectively AI was used in this criteria.	You employed AI to consider multiple perspectives. 3 points - Sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI was used to consider multiple perspectives. - Some gaps in iterations that made it unclear how effectively AI was used in this criteria.	You employed AI to consider multiple perspectives. 1 point - No sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI was used to consider multiple perspectives. OR - Significant gaps in arguments suggesting ineffective use of AI for this criteria.
			2 points - Sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI was used to consider multiple perspectives. - Significant gaps in iterations that made it unclear how effectively AI was used in this criteria.	0 points - No sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI was used to consider multiple perspectives. AND - Significant gaps in arguments suggesting ineffective use of AI for this criteria.
B. Transforming and reformatting existing	You effectively transformed and reformatted existing work	You transformed and reformatted existing work	You transformed and reformatted existing work 3 points	You transformed and reformatted existing work 1 point

work (e.g., from text to table).	Sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI transformed and reformatted work (i.e., using AI to create visual data based off text or to create text based on visual representation)	- Sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI transformed and reformatted work (i.e., using AI to create visual data based off text or to create text based on visual representation). - Minor inaccuracy of information.	- Sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI transformed and reformatted work (i.e., using AI to create visual data based off text or to create text based on visual representation). - Some inaccuracy of information.	- No sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI transformed and reformatted work (i.e., using AI to create visual data based off text or to create text based on visual representation). OR - Significant inaccuracy of information suggesting ineffective used of AI for this criteria.
			2 points - Sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI transformed and reformatted work (i.e., using AI to create visual data based off text or to create text based on visual representation). - Significant inaccuracy of information.	0 points - No sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how AI transformed and reformatted work (i.e., using AI to create visual data based off text or to create text based on visual representation). AND - Significant inaccuracy of information suggesting ineffective used of AI for this criteria.
C. Reflecting on human-AI collaboration: where creativity, empathy, and critical thinking remain uniquely human.	You reflected on how AI was used as a collaborator for generating ideas while maintaining critical thinking skills. Sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how was used	You reflected on how AI was used as a collaborator for generating ideas while maintaining critical thinking skills. Sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how was used	You reflected on how AI was used as a collaborator for generating ideas while maintaining critical thinking skills. 3 points Sequential prompt iterations were provided	You reflected on how AI was used as a collaborator for generating ideas while maintaining critical thinking skills. 1 point No sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how was used in developing or

	in developing or enhancing critical thinking skills.	in developing or enhancing critical thinking skills. Minor gaps in iterations that made it unclear how effectively AI was used to develop or enhance critical thinking skills.	to demonstrate how was used in developing or enhancing critical thinking skills. Some gaps in iterations that made it unclear how effectively AI was used to develop or enhance critical thinking skills.	enhancing critical thinking skills. Significant gaps in iterations that made it unclear how effectively AI was used to develop or enhance critical thinking skills.
			2 points - Sequential prompt iterations were provided to demonstrate how was used in developing or enhancing critical thinking skills. - Significant gaps in iterations that made it unclear how effectively AI was used to develop or enhance critical thinking skills.	0 points You did not reflected on how AI was used as a collaborator for generating ideas while maintaining critical thinking skills.

Example Assignment

This is an example of how an existing assignment was adapted to assess these AI competencies. Instructors are encouraged to use it as an example of how to assess AI in their discipline-specific course.

Instructions:

Throughout the semester, we explored the use of CRISPR as a method for genetic engineering. CRISPR can be applied to areas of agriculture, environmental disease control, and healthcare. Using what you have learned about CRISPR and independent research about mRNA technology used to develop the COVID vaccines, select a topic from below.

Topic:

Food sustainability related to climate change

Information that must be included in the essay:

1. If a reader does not know much about the topic, how would you briefly describe it?
2. How can CRISPR technology be used in addressing your topic?
3. Select one other method for genetic engineering (other than CRISPR) and discuss how it can be used to address your topic?
4. What are the benefits and disadvantages of using genetic engineering in the advancement of humankind?
5. How can genetic engineering increase **and** decrease healthcare inequality in different populations in the Massachusetts South Coast region?
6. Are there ethical considerations that need to be evaluated before the genetic engineering technologies can be used to treat fatal diseases?

Artificial Intelligence Policy for this Assignment

I recognize the power and potential of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) tools in shaping the educational landscape and even our lives in general. Although it may feel more convenient to use GAI to author an assignment, it is evident when students submit formal essays written solely by GAI. I want to make it clear that you should not be using GAI alone to complete written assignments in this course. GAI tools include: AI overview from Google search, Meta AI, ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude, Perplexity, Chegg, and many more. You can use GAI as a learning tool to help you understand concepts. However, using GAI generated responses without citing reference material from primary sources for assignments is considered plagiarism and will be submitted to academic affairs for review. Therefore, when using GAI as a learning tool, you must ensure that you are synthesizing your own writing and thoughts based on what you learned from the prompt entered. Additionally, you need to cite a reputable source that can be used to support the information to ensure that the information is not an AI hallucination and provide the prompt iterations used to develop your thought process.

I take academic integrity very seriously, and I will address any violations of this policy and follow disciplinary procedures as described by the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth (<https://www.umassd.edu/policies/active-policy-list/academic-affairs/academic-integrity-policy-and-reporting-form/>).

Think before you submit! In other words, if your paper is suspected of being AI generated (this is often obvious), your submission will be run through an AI detection software. If the analysis indicates that your paper is AI generated (whether it's specific sections or the entire paper), **you will earn a zero on the final paper with no opportunity for resubmission.**

Final papers must be/have:

- Submitted as a Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF document.
- No separate title page is needed.
- No longer than 5 pages (not including any figures, graphs, works cited page, or other supporting documents)
- Double-spaced
- 1- inch margins on all sides
- In Times New Roman 12-point font
- A minimum of 3 current (published after 2020) relevant references must be used to support the information written in the essay (references **MUST** be cited correctly within the essay).
 - “Relevant references” means that students are able to work the information into their writing in a way that supports the argument and not just random information that is thrown into the paragraph for the sake of fulfilling the minimum reference requirement.
 - **No direct quotes should be used in the essay.** This means that the student must interpret the information and rewrite it in their own words to demonstrate understanding of the material.
- References within the text and on the reference page at the end of the paper must be in APA citation format.

Goal 7: Connect AI literacy to academic fields and future careers.

Key Topics

- A. Applying AI tools in discipline-specific contexts (business analytics, scientific research, humanities writing, arts and design) using discipline, industry, or organizational conventions, best practices, or expectations
- B. Evaluating ethical and effective AI use within professional and disciplinary standards
- C. Developing adaptability and leadership in AI-mediated workplaces

Rubric

Performance Levels

- 4 – Advanced: Accurate, precise, uses correct terminology, applies to new contexts, supports claims with reasoning or evidence.
- 3 – Proficient: Correct core ideas, minor gaps, applies to familiar contexts with reasonable justification.
- 2 – Developing: Partially correct but vague or incomplete; common confusions; limited application.
- 1 – Beginning: Major misconceptions; cannot apply or justify.

Passing: Mean score of 3–4 with no category below 3.

Assessment Criteria

Criterion	4 – Advanced	3 – Proficient (Meets)	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning
A. Applying AI tools in discipline-specific contexts	Selects and applies appropriate AI tools to a clearly defined disciplinary task; explains why the tool fits the context; demonstrates strong understanding of inputs, outputs, limitations, and verification needs; compares AI-assisted and non-AI approaches where relevant; connects use to disciplinary methods or standards.	Applies an appropriate AI tool to a relevant disciplinary task; explains the basic fit between tool and purpose; identifies outputs and some limitations; shows reasonable verification of results.	Uses an AI tool in a loosely relevant way but with limited justification; disciplinary connection is vague or superficial; verification is incomplete or inconsistent.	Chooses tools arbitrarily or inappropriately; cannot explain why the tool fits the task; does not verify results; shows little understanding of disciplinary context.
B. Evaluating ethical and effective AI use within professional and	Evaluates AI use with reference to ethical, professional, or disciplinary standards such as accuracy,	Identifies relevant ethical and professional considerations; explains at least one meaningful risk and	Recognizes that ethical issues exist but discusses them in broad or formulaic terms; safeguards are	Ignores or minimizes ethical concerns; assumes AI use is acceptable if it

disciplinary standards	attribution, privacy, bias, transparency, authorship, consent, safety, or accountability; identifies risks and tradeoffs; proposes feasible safeguards	one appropriate safeguard	vague; limited connection to disciplinary expectations	saves time or produces plausible results
C. Developing adaptability and leadership in AI-mediated workplaces	Demonstrates adaptability by revising workflow, tool choice, or strategy in response to task demands or errors; articulates how professionals should guide and monitor AI-supported work; shows leadership through clear decision-making	Shows awareness that AI-mediated work requires adjustment and oversight; identifies strategies for adapting to changing tools or workplace expectations	Acknowledges workplace change but offers generic ideas about adaptation; limited discussion of oversight	Assumes AI use is either automatic progress or something to avoid entirely; cannot explain how professionals must adapt

Sample Assignments (length determined by instructor)

1) Discipline-Specific AI Use Case Analysis (Assesses A–B)

Students either complete or contemplate a realistic task (instructor chooses) in a field relevant to their major or intended career and analyze how AI assisted with that task. Discuss the tool used, strengths and limitations, disciplinary standards that should guide its use, and necessary human verification.

2) Professional Standards and Ethical Judgment Case Analysis (Assesses A–B–C)

Analyze an instructor-provided scenario where AI is used in a disciplinary or professional setting. Evaluate whether the use is appropriate, identify relevant ethical or professional standards, discuss risks, and propose a more responsible workflow.

3) AI Workflow Reflection and Adaptability Memo (Assesses A–B–C)

Complete a short task using AI support and write a reflection on the workflow. Explain what worked, what required correction, and what professionals should do to responsibly supervise AI-supported work.

4) Institutional Resource Comparison (Assesses A–B–C)

Compare two institutional or professional AI guidance resources. Analyze their intended audience, the AI uses they encourage or restrict, and which guidance would be most useful in your field.