Missouri State
UNIVERSITY

# Academic Affairs
# Guidelines for Faculty Use of Artificial Intelligence in Teaching and Learning

## Purpose

Artificial intelligence (AI), including generative AI, is changing how students learn, how faculty teach, how researchers conduct scholarship, and how graduates work and participate in their communities (Watson & Rainie, 2026). Missouri State University should engage AI in ways that advance learning and research while keeping human judgment, dignity, ethical responsibility, and institutional values at the center. This approach is consistent with the University's *Artificial Intelligence Purpose Statement*, which identifies teaching and learning, research and scholarship, and workforce and community engagement as key areas for purposeful and effective AI development. While the University's broader AI Purpose Statement focuses on a range of areas, these guidelines focus specifically on the use of AI in teaching, learning, and assessment.

These guidelines are intended to:

- provide faculty guidance on how to clarify expectations for AI use;
- support academic integrity; and,
- encourage thoughtful incorporation of AI into teaching and learning.

These guidelines do not establish a single University-wide rule for AI use in every course or assignment. Faculty determine appropriate AI use based on course objectives, disciplinary expectations, and the purpose of an assignment.

## 1. Put Learning and People First

AI should augment rather than replace the human judgment, creativity, relationships, and intellectual work central to higher education. Faculty should consider whether AI supports the intended learning outcomes or instead performs tasks that students are expected to demonstrate independently.

The University's AI Purpose Statement emphasizes a "people-first" approach, advocating for AI as a tool that enhances human capabilities while preserving human relationships, decision-making, and accountability. This commitment to keeping human creativity, judgment, and responsibility at the heart of education, and preventing tools from replacing essential cognitive effort, aligns with broader guidance emerging across higher education. For example, MIT's Ad Hoc Committee on AI Use in Teaching, Learning, and Research Training (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2026) emphasizes placing humanity at

the center of education, using AI to augment rather than automate learning, teaching with intentionality, and recognizing that there is no single approach appropriate for every discipline or educational context. This perspective also aligns with general pedagogical guidance on generative AI from Cornell University (Cornell University Center for Teaching Innovation, n.d.) as well as syllabus policy guidance from institutions such as the University of Minnesota (n.d.) that emphasize that GenAI tools are not substitutes for students' intellectual effort or scholarly expression, and that active engagement with learning outcomes should never be outsourced to technology.

Faculty are encouraged to consider:

- *What do I want students to learn to do independently, and what do I want them to learn to do with AI?*
- *How does AI improve/expand what students learn and/or produce?*
- *Conversely, how might AI limit their ability to critically and creatively think or perform?*
- *What AI related skills do future employers expect students to have?*

**2. Clearly Communicate AI Expectations**

Students should be able to easily discern whether AI use is permitted within a course.

Faculty should communicate in the syllabus and assignment guidelines:

- whether AI is prohibited, limited, permitted, encouraged, or required;
- which uses are permitted and prohibited;
- whether AI use must be disclosed or cited;
- what responsibility students have for verifying AI-generated information; and,
- what students should do when they are uncertain about whether a particular use is acceptable.

Missouri State's Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning (n.d.) recommends that faculty establish clear course and assignment expectations (see section 4) for AI and provide detailed instructions when AI is permitted. Clear communication regarding when and how AI may be integrated into course design aligns with broader guidance from institutions like Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2026) and Cornell University Center for Teaching Innovation (n.d.). Recommending that instructors provide explicit syllabus statements outlining tasks allowed and prohibited, specifying approved tools, establishing citation standards, and advising students to confirm policies before beginning work is strongly supported by the University of Minnesota's (n.d.) syllabus guidance.

A useful test is: *Could a student read the syllabus and assignment instructions and accurately explain what AI use is acceptable*? This would make for a beneficial first activity for the course—asking students to explain the course AI policy. If they cannot do so, the expectations need clarification.

### 3. Relationship to Existing Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures

These guidelines operate within Missouri State University's existing *Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures (Op3.01)* (2023a) and *Academic Integrity Procedures Summary (Op3.02)* (2023b).

The University's policy states that students are responsible for knowing and following the University's academic integrity policy as well as additional, course-specific policies.

Accordingly, AI use is not inherently an academic integrity violation. Unauthorized or improperly disclosed AI use may constitute an academic integrity violation when it is inconsistent with the expectations established for a course or assignment (Missouri State University, 2023a). These guidelines do not create a separate academic integrity process for AI. Rather, they help faculty establish clear course and assignment expectations that operate within MSU's existing academic integrity framework.

### 4. Consider Five Approaches to AI Use

Faculty should identify the appropriate level of AI use for **each** assignment or assignment type: (see FCTL Guidelines for sample statements)

- **No AI:** AI may not be used because independent performance is central to the learning objective. (This approach needs to take into account that many basic online tools, including standard library website search boxes and library databases, now have AI integrated by default.)
- **Limited AI:** AI may be used only for specifically identified purposes, such as brainstorming, feedback, or practice.
- **AI Permitted:** Students may use AI but its use is neither expected nor part of the learning objective.
- **AI Encouraged:** Students are encouraged to use AI as part of the learning process and critically evaluate its output.
- **AI Required:** Students use AI because learning to use, evaluate, or critique AI is itself part of the learning objective.

The appropriate approach should be based on what students are expected to learn and demonstrate, rather than on a general preference or bias for or against AI. Categorizing course and assignment policies into clear levels—such as prohibited/no AI, limited use for specific tasks, or broad permission with requirements for explicit authorization and citation—reflects the core framework of syllabus guidance model policies (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2026; University of Minnesota, n.d.). This approach is consistent with MSU's existing FCTL guidance (Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning, n.d.), which encourages faculty to consider different levels of AI use and to establish assignment-specific expectations.

**5. Encourage AI Literacy**

AI literacy should be more than knowing how to effectively use an AI tool. Developing AI literacy involves building the capacity to understand, evaluate, and critically engage with AI technologies (Cornell University Center for Teaching Innovation, n.d.; Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2026).

Students should have opportunities, as appropriate within their disciplines, to learn how to:

- evaluate the accuracy and reliability of AI-generated information;
- recognize bias, limitations, and fabricated information;
- verify AI-generated sources and claims;
- protect confidential and personal information;
- understand ethical and professional implications of AI use; and,
- exercise independent judgment about when AI should—and should not—be used.

The university's AI Purpose Statement (Missouri State University, 2026) specifically calls for AI literacy and applied AI skills across disciplines and for graduates to be able to critically evaluate AI-generated content and understand its ethical dimensions.

**6. Encourage Thoughtful Integration of AI**

Faculty are encouraged to explore ways AI can enhance learning rather than simply determine whether students may be allowed to use it.

Potential applications include:

- brainstorming and idea development;
- practice and formative feedback;
- simulations and role-playing;
- generating examples and counterexamples;
- analyzing and critiquing AI-generated work;
- identifying errors or weaknesses in AI output;
- coding and problem-solving;
- professional and disciplinary applications; and,
- exploring the ethical and societal implications of AI.

MSU's FCTL guidance (Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning, n.d.) encourages faculty to consider AI as a potential mentor, tutor, coach, teammate, simulator, or tool and emphasizes using AI to expand rather than offload student thinking. Leveraging generative tools to spark creativity, explore ideas, assist with task-specific needs (e.g., idea generation, grammar support, coding debugging), and provide instant actionable feedback reflects strategies highlighted by other institutions of higher education (Cornell University Center for Teaching Innovation, n.d.; Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2026; University of Minnesota, n.d.).

Faculty should consider whether assignments can be designed *with and around* AI so that students practice analysis, evaluation, judgment, and application.

**7. Apply the Same Principles to Faculty Use of AI**

Faculty should model the same behavioral standards expected of students. The goal is not to impose identical rules on different roles but to apply the shared institutional principles of transparency, human judgment, accountability, and learning (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2026).

Faculty should adhere to the following standards when integrating AI into their course:

- **Prioritize Relationships:** Ensure AI does not replace the meaningful faculty-student interactions and mentorship central to teaching.
- **Maintain Accountability:** Maintain responsibility for all instructional, assessment, and academic choices, even if assisted by technology.
- **Verify Accuracy:** Critically review all AI-generated content for bias, inaccuracies, and wrong assumptions.
- **Model Transparency:** Explicitly disclose any major AI use to students to preserve academic clarity regarding instruction and grading.
- **Limit Grading Automation:** Guard against automated grading; AI may help organize rubric feedback or identify patterns in student work, but faculty remain responsible for reviewing AI-assisted evaluations and making final grading decisions (University of Missouri, 2026).

Faculty should not use AI to replace the professional judgment, relationships, and responsibilities that are central to teaching and learning.

**8. Protect Privacy and Access**

Faculty and students should not enter confidential, protected, or sensitive University information into AI systems unless the tool is approved for that purpose (Missouri State University, 2026). This includes faculty uploading student work into an external AI system for grading or feedback. These expectations align with the University's *Acceptable Use Policy (Op12.02-1)* and reinforce the responsibility of faculty, staff, and students to use technology resources appropriately, protect sensitive information, and comply with applicable laws and University policies (Missouri State University, 2025). When using AI tools, users should safeguard institutional, employee, and student information and use only tools that are approved for the intended purpose.

When AI use is required, faculty should also consider whether students have reasonable access to the necessary technology, including issues of cost, accessibility, and privacy. Prioritizing university-licensed tools that have been vetted for data privacy and

accessibility standards before requiring third-party platforms aligns with institutional data governance recommendations (University of Minnesota, n.d.).

These expectations align with the university's AI Purpose Statement's (Missouri State University, 2026) commitment to equitable access, data governance, protection of sensitive information, and the use of vetted AI tools.

**9. Do Not Rely Solely on AI Detection**

Given the unreliability of AI detection tools, they should not be treated as definitive evidence of an academic integrity violation (Vanderbilt University, 2023). Faculty should consider the totality of available evidence, including the assignment expectations, the student's work and process, sources and citations, and the student's ability to explain or demonstrate their work. When concerns arise, faculty should provide students an appropriate opportunity to explain their work and should evaluate the available evidence in context.

Potential academic integrity violations should be addressed through Missouri State's established *Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures* (Missouri State University, 2023a), rather than through a separate AI-specific process.

**References**


Cornell University Center for Teaching Innovation. (n.d.). *Generative artificial intelligence*. https://teaching.cornell.edu/generative-artificial-intelligence

Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (2026, August 13). *Report of MIT's Ad Hoc Committee on AI Use in Teaching, Learning, and Research Training*. https://aiandeducation.mit.edu/report/

Missouri State University. (2023a). *Academic integrity policies and procedures (Students)* (Op3.01). https://www.missouristate.edu/policy/Op3_01_AcademicIntegrityStudents.htm

Missouri State University. (2023b). *Academic integrity procedures summary* (Op3.02). https://www.missouristate.edu/policy/Op3_02_AcademicIntegritySummary.htm

Missouri State University. (2025). *Acceptable use (Op12.02-1)*. https://www.missouristate.edu/Policy/Chapter12/Op12_02_1_AcceptableUse.htm

Missouri State University. (2026). *Artificial intelligence purpose statement*.

Missouri State University, Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning. (n.d.). *Teaching &*

*learning with artificial intelligence*. https://www.missouristate.edu/FCTL/ai.htm

University of Minnesota, Office of the Provost. (n.d.). *GenAI syllabus statements*. https://provost.umn.edu/chatgpt-syllabus-statements

University of Missouri, Office of the Provost. (2026). *AI grading and feedback*. AI @ Mizzou. https://ai.missouri.edu/guidelines/academic-policies/ai-grading-and-feedback/.

Vanderbilt University. (2023, August 16). *Guidance on AI detection and why we're disabling Turnitin's AI detector*. https://www.vanderbilt.edu/brightspace/2023/08/16/guidance-on-ai-detection-and-why-were-disabling-turnitins-ai-detector/

Watson, C. E., & Rainie, L. (2026). *The AI challenge: How college faculty assess the present and future of higher education in the age of AI*. American Association of Colleges and Universities & Elon University's Imagining the Digital Future Center. https://dgmg81phhvh63.cloudfront.net/content/user-photos/Research/PDFs/AI_Challenge.pdf