

AI Task Force Final Report: Teaching & Learning

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Teaching & Learning Working Group was charged with four goals: creating guidelines for effective AI use in teaching that maintains educational quality; developing policies for academic integrity in an AI environment; identifying opportunities for teaching AI skills across disciplines; and suggesting faculty development resources for AI integration.

The working group drew primarily on the campus-wide Fall 2024 survey as an initial baseline for understanding current attitudes toward AI at SU. Survey results reveal a campus at a genuine inflection point — broadly familiar with AI, using it conditionally, but divided on adoption, with significant concerns about academic integrity, overreliance, and the impact on foundational skills. The working group’s recommendations prioritize meeting faculty and students where they are, building literacy progressively, and establishing policy guardrails that preserve instructor authority while protecting academic integrity.

WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

| Member | Title / Role | Department / School |
|-------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Janice Orcutt* | Chair / Instructional Designer | Instructional Design and Delivery |
| Becky Anthony | Associate Professor | Social Work |
| Catherine Jackson | IDIS Program Specialist | Fulton School of Liberal Arts |
| Emily Zerrenner | Research & Instructional Services Librarian | Library |
| Heidi Fritz | Associate Professor | Psychology |
| Junyi Tu | Assistant Professor | Computer Science |
| Karen Silverstrim | Instructional Designer | Instructional Design and Delivery |
| Leonard Arvi | Department Chair & Professor | Finance |
| Melissa Bugdal | Associate Professor & Writing Center Director | English / University Writing Center |
| Melissa Thompson | Clinical Assistant Professor | Social Work |

* Designated Chair

Summary of Recommendations

- Immediate (0–6 months): Sustain Faculty Development Day conversations; expand Faculty Learning Communities on AI; deliver tiered professional development via ID&D and Google/NASH; establish syllabus AI use policy framework (AI Inclusive, AI Conditional, AI Restrictive); draft AI language for Academic Misconduct Policy.

- Short-term (6–12 months): Deploy USM AI Fellows as campus trainers; continue Practice & Play workshop series; participate in AI Exchange with UBalt and Frostburg; evaluate campus-wide tool licenses.
- Long-term (1–2 years): Establish a campus-wide AI training program for faculty and staff; integrate AI literacy into academic programs or general education requirements.

CURRENT STATE ASSESSMENT

The Salisbury University AI Task Force supports the core mission of the university, which states that “Our highest purpose is to empower our students with the knowledge, skills, and core values that contribute to active citizenship, gainful employment, and life-long learning in a democratic society and interdependent world.” Toward that mission, the task force advises the campus on the development and implementation of a strategy to responsibly integrate artificial intelligence across teaching and learning, research and scholarship, student success, and operations and administration.

KEY FINDINGS FROM THE FALL 2024 CAMPUS SURVEY

Existing Practices

- Familiarity with AI is high: Faculty report Very Familiar at 68.1%; Graduate Students are lowest at 52.9%. By school, Henson leads at 70.0% and Fulton is lowest at 57.0%.
- Current use is moderate: Campus-wide average for “Sometimes” use is 43.3%, ranging from Health Sciences (36.8%) to Henson (57.0% “Often”).
- Writing and Communication Support is the most common use (25% campus-wide); Graduate Students are highest at 34%. Social Work reports highest school-level use at 31%; Health Sciences lowest at 9%.
- Efficiency and Productivity is the primary positive driver for Faculty (20%) and Other Academic (33%). Context and Task Dependence is the primary driver for Staff, Graduate Students, and Undergraduates (21–23%). Ethical Concerns rank as the primary negative factor at Fulton (36%) and Social Work (28%).
- No explicit campus-wide AI classroom policies exist. Permissible use is currently determined by individual instructors.

Identified Gaps

- Skepticism and Caution are prominent: Health Sciences (33%), Fulton (23%), Henson (21%), and Perdue (21%) most strongly voice conditional adoption dependent on resolution of fears. Resistance to adoption is also present (Other Academic 27%, Undergraduates 23%).
- Ethical Use and Policy Development is a primary concern for Graduate Students (18%) and Faculty (15%); Seidel ranks this highest at 20%. Nursing (26%), Social Work (24%), and Perdue (21%) identify Integration into Practice as the primary gap.
- Training and Professional Development is the primary resource needed by Faculty (26%), Staff (25%), and Graduate Students (21%). Nursing specifically identifies GenAI Literacy — foundational knowledge about what GenAI is, how large language models work, and their limitations — as the highest-priority need.

Opportunities

- Undergraduates (27%) and Staff (18%) identify Conceptual Understanding and Learning Support as the primary benefit of AI for learning. Graduate Students (25%) prioritize Efficiency and Time Management; Faculty (17%) prioritize Creativity and Idea Generation.
- By school, Conceptual Understanding and Learning Support is the primary benefit identified by Henson (44%), Social Work (36%), Perdue (36%), Nursing (33%), Health Sciences (33%), and Fulton (26%). Seidel (30%) leads on Efficiency and Time Management.
- Staff (24%) and Faculty (18%) see significant potential for AI as an Educational Tool for the future of higher education.

Risks and Challenges

- Overreliance and Dependency on AI is the primary drawback identified by Graduate Students (25%), Staff (24%), Faculty (18%), and Other Academics (18%). Accuracy and Trustworthiness is the primary drawback for Undergraduates (20%). By school, Health Sciences (43%), Social Work (29%), and Perdue (22%) rank

Accuracy and Trustworthiness highest; Fulton (24%), Henson (23%), and Seidel (23%) rank Overreliance highest.

- Impact on Foundational Skills is the primary threat to the future of education identified by Graduate Students (25%) and Other Academic (30%). Academic Integrity and Ethical Concerns rank highest among Undergraduates (22%), Seidel (57%), Perdue (25%), Nursing (22%), and Social Work (21%).

RECOMMENDATIONS

PRIORITY 1 – IMMEDIATE ACTIONS (0–6 MONTHS)

Recommendation 1: Inform and Listen – Faculty Development Day

Faculty Development Day provided an opportunity to inform and listen to faculty concerns and ideas through roundtable discussions and hands-on workshop presentations. This format should be sustained as a recurring touchpoint.

Recommendation 2: Faculty Learning Communities

Two FLCs approved for AY 2025/26 directly address AI in the classroom:

- Beyond Papers and Tests: Rethinking Assessments in the Time of AI – helps instructors shift from AI-vulnerable traditional assessments to AI-resistant or AI-resilient assignments.
- Exploring Generative AI in the Classroom – supports instructors developing or intentionally integrating AI into course design. This FLC will identify exemplars to share with faculty broadly.

Recommendation 3: Professional Development (ID&D and Google/NASH)

Two initiatives are underway:

- Google/NASH training: Available throughout the past year and continuing for at least two more. Provides foundational AI skills and basic prompting techniques.
- Practice & Play workshop series (ID&D): Four in-person workshops in September, October, and November on practical AI applications in the classroom, with a simultaneous self-paced option.

Rationale:

To alleviate fears; to better prepare students for AI-influenced futures; to help faculty and staff streamline workloads; and to ensure the campus community is well-trained in current tools and technologies.

Resources Required:

Financial access to AI tools – use free options where possible. ID&D resources for hands-on workshops and self-paced online training.

Implementation Steps:

- Brief Chairs and Deans before rollout to faculty and staff.
- Promote professional development opportunities via electronic bulletin boards and internal resources.
- Identify exemplars and recruit Faculty Fellows for buy-in.
- Offer tiered training: novice to intermediate, in-person and self-paced online.

Recommendation 4: Policy Development – Syllabus AI Use Framework

AI use policy within a course should remain under the authority of the instructor. Three categories of use are established:

| AI Usage Level | Description | Example |
|----------------|---|--|
| AI Inclusive | GenAI tools can be used for any and all coursework. | Students are encouraged or expected to use GenAI tools to help foster AI literacy. |

| AI Usage Level | Description | Example |
|----------------|--|--|
| AI Conditional | GenAI tools can be used with certain parameters, such as on specific assignments, use of specific tools, or with appropriate attributions. | Students can use GenAI tools to develop visual aids for presentations, but must attribute the tool used. |
| AI Restrictive | GenAI tools are wholly prohibited for coursework. | All academic work must be the result of the learner's own thought, research, or self-expression. |

Syllabus statements must clearly communicate the allowances for AI use and the consequences for non-compliance. Sample language is posted on the SU website at the ID&D Syllabus GenAI Considerations page. Language examples were also provided at FDD and a dedicated roundtable.

Beyond the classroom, the working group has drafted recommended additions to the Academic Misconduct Policy – specifically to the Definitions section – addressing Lying/Fabrication (A), Cheating (B), and Plagiarism (C). Draft language is provided in Appendix C.

Policy Implications:

Survey respondents clearly communicated the need for policy that guides faculty and students without restricting instructor authority over classroom AI use. The Student Academic Misconduct Policy must be updated to address AI-generated content.

PRIORITY 2 – SHORT-TERM ACTIONS (6–12 MONTHS)

Recommendation 1: USM AI Fellows as Campus Trainers

SU has two faculty representatives participating in the USM AI Fellows initiative. These faculty will be trained as trainers and will offer AI-based professional development in Spring. ID&D will continue rolling out additional Practice & Play workshops in both in-person and self-paced formats.

Recommendation 2: AI Exchange with UBalt and Frostburg

SU faculty and staff will participate in the AI Exchange with the University of Baltimore and Frostburg State University to share information about AI programming and explore potential sponsorship of an intercampus AI competition.

Rationale:

Continued faculty conversations about AI – its benefits and drawbacks – are necessary to maintain current knowledge and skills. Respecting the variation in adoption across campus is essential for building trusted stakeholder relationships.

Resources Required:

Consideration of campus-wide licenses or access to specific tools, led by IT. ID&D resources to work with liaison departments and schools to evaluate needs and interest in AI integration.

Implementation Steps:

- Continue researching free options and communicating their limitations to faculty.
- IT must evaluate the cost and trade-offs of committing to specific platforms.
- Develop department-specific training on free AI tools tailored to disciplinary needs.

PRIORITY 3 – LONG-TERM ACTIONS (1–2 YEARS)

Recommendation 1: Campus-Wide AI Training Program

Establish a sustained, campus-wide training program for faculty and staff that builds progressively on foundational AI literacy toward discipline-specific and role-specific applications.

Recommendation 2: AI Literacy in Academic Programs

Integrate AI literacy and training into academic programs or as part of general education requirements, ensuring all students graduate with foundational AI competency and an understanding of ethical use.

Rationale:

AI is not receding. The skills, knowledge, and ethical frameworks required to work with AI must be systematically made available to all students. The campus community needs a durable infrastructure for AI learning — not a series of one-time workshops.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

New Policies Required

Given the range of opinions and adoption rates across campus, a prescriptive campus-wide AI use policy is unlikely to succeed unless it explicitly preserves instructor authority to set standards within their own courses. Modifications to the existing Academic Misconduct Policy are necessary to ensure all stakeholders understand the consequences of misuse.

Existing Policies to Update

The Student Academic Misconduct Policy must be updated. The working group has drafted recommended additions to the Definitions section addressing Lying/Fabrication, Cheating, and Plagiarism as they relate to AI-generated content. Full draft language is provided in Appendix C.

Governance Structures

An ongoing oversight mechanism for AI in teaching and learning should be established — likely as a standing subcommittee of the Faculty Senate or Academic Affairs — to monitor policy currency as AI capabilities continue to change.

Compliance and Legal Considerations

Academic integrity policy updates must move through appropriate shared governance channels. FERPA implications for any AI tools used in advising or student-facing capacities must be reviewed by IT and Legal Counsel.

RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

Technology Infrastructure

Evaluate campus-wide licensing for AI tools in coordination with IT. Free tools should be leveraged where possible, with clear communication to users about their limitations.

Budget Estimates

To be determined based on decisions about campus-wide tool licensing, training vendor selection, and long-term program development. Near-term costs are minimal — existing FLC, ID&D, and Google/NASH resources are already in place.

Professional Development

Layered training strategy: foundational (Google/NASH), practical applications (Practice & Play), peer-led (USM AI Fellows), and discipline-specific (departmental workshops). Long-term goal is integration into a formal campus-wide AI literacy program.

COLLABORATION AND DEPENDENCIES

Cross-Group Coordination

The syllabus AI use framework and Academic Misconduct Policy updates developed by this group should be coordinated with the Student Support working group (which has developed a four-tier AI use framework) to ensure consistent institutional language. The Operations & Administration group's AI Acceptable Use Policy work is also directly relevant and should be aligned.

External Partnerships

Google/NASH training partnership is active. USM AI Fellows initiative is underway. AI Exchange collaboration with UBalt and Frostburg is in progress. IT should lead evaluation of vendor tool licensing options.

Campus Stakeholder Engagement

Faculty Senate must be involved in any Academic Misconduct Policy revisions. Deans and Chairs should be briefed before any faculty rollout. ID&D, Library, and the University Writing Center are key implementation partners. Student voices should be included in policy development, particularly around academic integrity language.

NEXT STEPS

Immediate Actions Required

- Submit recommended Academic Misconduct Policy language (Appendix C) through appropriate shared governance channels.
- Publish and communicate the syllabus AI use framework (AI Inclusive, AI Conditional, AI Restrictive) to all faculty.
- Brief Deans and Chairs on working group recommendations and upcoming professional development offerings.
- Confirm schedule for Practice & Play workshop series and Google/NASH training for Spring 2026.

Decision Points

- Faculty Senate approval of Academic Misconduct Policy revisions.
- Leadership direction on campus-wide AI tool licensing (IT-led evaluation).
- Endorsement of long-term AI literacy integration into general education requirements.

Follow-up Timeline

- 0–3 months: Launch Practice & Play series; brief Deans and Chairs; submit policy language to governance.
- 6–12 months: USM AI Fellows begin training; AI Exchange with UBalt and Frostburg; IT tool licensing evaluation complete.
- 12–24 months: Campus-wide AI training program established; AI literacy general education proposal developed.
- Conduct follow-up AI use survey to benchmark changes in adoption, concerns, and needs.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Research and Data Sources

Fall 2024 Campus-Wide AI Use Survey — full results. Follow-up survey to be conducted.

Appendix B: Best Practices Examples

Case studies from peer institutions to be compiled.

Appendix C: Draft Policy Language — Academic Misconduct Revisions

Recommended additions to the Student Academic Misconduct Policy Definitions section are provided below. Proposed additions are indicated.

A. Lying/Fabrication:

The falsification or invention of any information or citation in any academic course or exercise, including the misrepresentation of AI-generated content as one's own original work.

B. Cheating – proposed addition (item 9):

Using artificial intelligence (AI) tools in a manner that violates academic integrity, including but not limited to: using AI in a manner prohibited by the instructor; submitting AI-generated content without proper attribution; misrepresenting the extent of AI use; altering AI outputs to conceal their origin; using wearable AI technology in the completion of assessments; and/or using AI to bypass assignment or time constraints.

C. Plagiarism – proposed addition:

This includes presenting AI-generated content (text, code, images, etc.) as original work without clearly acknowledging its AI origin and properly citing the AI tool used. It also includes failing to properly attribute ideas or information derived from AI-generated sources.

Appendix D: Stakeholder Feedback

Report on the Fall 2024 AI use survey. Follow-up survey to be conducted and results compiled.

CONCLUSION

The Fall 2024 survey reveals a campus community that is broadly AI-literate but genuinely divided – some faculty already integrating AI intentionally, others firmly resistant, and many occupying the uncertain middle. The Teaching & Learning Working Group's recommendations do not try to resolve that division by mandate. They try to support it: building shared knowledge through FLCs and professional development, giving faculty a policy vocabulary (AI Inclusive, AI Conditional, AI Restrictive) that preserves their authority while setting clear expectations for students, and updating the Academic Misconduct Policy so that the institution's academic integrity framework reflects the reality students and faculty are already navigating.

The immediate recommendations require no new budget – they build on programs already underway (FLCs, ID&D workshops, Google/NASH training, USM AI Fellows). The harder work is longer-term: embedding AI literacy into general education, sustaining a campus-wide training infrastructure, and keeping policy current as the technology moves faster than governance typically can. That requires Faculty Senate engagement, leadership commitment, and close coordination with the Operations, Student Support, and Research working groups to avoid fragmented institutional frameworks.

The follow-up AI use survey recommended by this group is not a formality – it is essential. The campus is changing its relationship with AI in real time, and policy that was appropriate in Fall 2024 may need revision by Fall 2026. Building a feedback loop into the institution's AI governance is the most durable thing this working group can recommend.