wcet

AI Literacies in Practice

A COMPREHENSIVE PLAYBOOK FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

AI Literacies in Practice: A Comprehensive Playbook for Higher Education

Authors

Angela Gunder, Ph.D.
Joshua Herron, Ph.D.

Recommended Citation

Gunder, A., Herron, J. (2026, January). *AI Literacies in Practice: A Comprehensive Playbook for Higher Education*. WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technologies.

Images

The illustrations in this playbook were generated with Gemini 3 Pro (Nano Bana Pro) with prompts that were created by the authors using Chat GPT Plus.

WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technologies (WCET)
3035 Center Green Drive, Suite 200, Boulder, CO 80301

About the Organizers

WCET, the WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technologies, is the leader in the practice, policy, & advocacy of digital learning in higher education. WCET is a member-driven organization which brings together colleges, universities, higher education organizations, and companies to collectively improve the quality and reach of digital learning programs. Learn more at wcet.wiche.edu.

D2L is transforming the way the world learns, helping learners achieve more than they dreamed possible. Working closely with customers all over the world, D2L is on a mission to make learning more inspiring, engaging and human. Find out how D2L helps transform lives and delivers outstanding learning outcomes in K-12, higher education and business at d2l.com.

Opened Culture is a pioneering collaboratory that helps educators, institutions, and organizations across the globe strengthen academic innovation initiatives and open culture through strategic consulting, professional learning, and community-engaged facilitation. We partner with practitioners, leaders, and cross-functional teams to design human-centered, values-aligned approaches to AI literacies, digital transformation, and sustainable change. Learn more at openedculture.org.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

How might educators cultivate a plurality of AI literacies such that generative AI strengthens pedagogy, operations, and governance rather than undermine it?

Image: Group of professionals collaborating on colorful blocks under a starry constellation sky.

Higher education is redesigning teaching, services, and policy in the presence of generative AI. This work centers values like agency and access so AI adoption strengthens learning and community rather than outsourcing judgement. "AI literacies" (plural) emphasizes evolving mindsets and skillsets: the ability to ask better questions, verify and attribute, collaborate across roles, and make transparent choices about tools and data. Designed for faculty, staff, and leaders alike, this guide provides flexible entry points to begin or strengthen AI literacies work across an institution.

This playbook builds on the WCET report *AI Literacies in Focus* and synthesizes the landscape scan of AI literacies frameworks into an applied guide. It grounds practice in three interdependent domains of Pedagogy, Operations, and Governance that are defined and articulated in the *WCET AI Education Policy, Guideline, and Practice Ecosystem Framework*. This playbook also highlights the constellations of AI literacies that form when AI is used in education, combining eight different Dimensions of AI Literacies that are used and gained across a plurality of academic contexts.

We anchor to three core frameworks—The Scaffolded AI Literacy (SAIL) Framework (scaffolded growth and scaling), the UNESCO AI Competency Framework for Teachers (ethics and human rights), and the Open University Framework for the Learning and Teaching of Critical AI Literacy Skills (inclusive learning design and openness). Additional frameworks from our systematic literature review appear as influences. Throughout, we foreground the agentic power of local communities of practice, and adapt global systems to campus values, constraints, and community goals.

Introduction

How can higher education cultivate the literacies—mindsets and skillsets—that empower us to shape AI ethically, creatively, and collectively rather than be shaped by it?

***Image**: People and an AI robot connecting data, tools, and shared insight.*

Higher education stands at a pivotal moment, one defined not simply by technological disruption, but by the choices we make about how intelligence itself is shared, cultivated, and sustained. The arrival of generative AI challenges us to reimagine learning and leadership as profoundly human endeavors, where tools amplify rather than replace judgment, creativity, and care. This playbook invites campuses to move beyond reaction toward reflection and reimagination, to see AI not as an external force to manage, but as the building blocks for impactful learning, collective meaning-making, and transformative community building. The resources and guidance found in the following sections offer pathways for aligning institutional purpose with technological possibility, helping educators, staff, and leaders develop the literacies necessary to navigate an age where curiosity, integrity, and imagination are the most powerful technologies we have.

As AI becomes woven into every facet of higher education—from curriculum design to

student services—developing AI literacies is no longer optional; it is foundational to educational integrity and innovation. Rather than a singular state of literacy, AI literacies are a constellation of interconnected mindsets and skillsets that enable individuals to comprehend, use, and critically evaluate AI within complex social, cultural, and technical contexts (Gunder et al., 2024). Rather than flattening AI literacy into a harmful binary of literate-versus-illiterate, this pluralistic approach recognizes that our engagement with AI is dynamic and situated—shaped by roles, environments, and values. These constellating AI literacies illuminate how educators, learners, and leaders can make informed choices, adapt tools to local needs, and uphold ethical and inclusive practices in their work (Gunder, 2024). Together, they offer a vocabulary and framework for navigating a rapidly changing landscape—one where understanding, creativity, and care remain the true measures of intelligence.

Why AI Literacies Matter Now

The urgency of cultivating AI literacies arises from a simple but consequential reality: artificial intelligence is not waiting for education to catch up. As algorithms increasingly mediate how knowledge is created, accessed, and assessed, higher education must decide whether to react to these forces or to actively shape them. Developing plural, values-driven AI literacies enables institutions to do the latter—to align innovation with purpose, and to ensure that technological progress amplifies rather than erodes our collective capacity for learning, opportunity, and human judgment.

When we talk about "AI literacies" rather than "AI literacy," we're making an important distinction. This isn't about mastering a single tool or memorizing best practices that will be outdated next semester. AI literacies are evolving capabilities. Literacies are ways of thinking, evaluating, and creating that help you maintain agency and authority as these technologies reshape education.

Furthermore, simply learning to use AI isn't the goal. Our real goal is to strengthen learning, improve support, and uphold our shared values, which engage distinctly human capacities while tools evolve around us. In meeting this goal, AI literacies help us to:

- Ask better questions to make judgements about vendor claims, student work, and institutional readiness
- Recognize patterns in how AI succeeds, fails, or introduces bias into processes
- Design experiences that use AI as material for thinking rather than a shortcut
- Build transparency into decisions about data, privacy, and tool selection

- Maintain human judgment at the center of teaching, assessment, and support

Without these literacies, institutions risk two equally problematic paths: either rejecting AI entirely and falling behind, or adopting it uncritically and undermining core educational values. AI literacies provide a third way—thoughtful integration that strengthens rather than replaces human expertise.

Building on *AI Literacies in Focus*

This playbook extends the groundwork laid in *AI Literacies in Focus*, which surveyed more than fifty post-2023 AI literacy frameworks to identify patterns, tensions, and opportunities across higher education. That report revealed both convergence—shared commitments to ethics, critical thinking, and human agency—and divergence in how institutions approach implementation based on their unique contexts, resources, and values.

Where the initial report provided a landscape analysis organized through WCET's three domains (Pedagogy, Operations, and Governance), this playbook translates those insights into action. We move from "what exists" to "what works," offering concrete tools, role-specific guidance, and adaptable strategies that respect the diversity of institutional contexts.

The playbook carries forward three exemplar frameworks that demonstrated particular strength across all domains:

- The Scaffolded AI Literacy (SAIL) Framework for its scaffolded approach to growth and scaling
- UNESCO AI Competency Framework for Teachers for its grounding in ethics and human rights
- Open University Framework for the Learning and Teaching of Critical AI Literacy Skills for its commitment to inclusive design and openness

Additional frameworks from the original analysis appear throughout as influences and alternatives, ensuring you have multiple models to draw from as you develop locally relevant approaches.

Connecting Literacies and Domains

Literacies guide how we think and act; domains define where those actions unfold. Together, they create a scaffolded approach that links individual capacity with institutional transformation. The following two resources help to focus our lens on AI literacies development across multiple domains and educational contexts.

WCET AI Education Policy, Guideline, and Practice Ecosystem Framework

This playbook aligns with the AI Education Policy, Guideline, & Practice Ecosystem Framework (2025), which introduces the latest articulation of the three core domains that shape institutional AI readiness: Governance, Operations, and Pedagogy. Together, these domains form the structural backbone of this playbook. The eight AI Literacies describe the mindsets and capabilities that educators, staff, and leaders cultivate within each domain.

Pedagogy

Encompasses how institutions and educators design learning environments, assess student progress, and support learners through the evolving demands of AI-enabled education.

Operations

Refers to building and maintaining the technological, procedural, and organizational capabilities that enable effective AI adoption. This dimension centers on the infrastructure and workflows needed to implement AI responsibly and sustainably.

Governance

Refers to how institutions define their vision and values for AI use, establish policies and guidelines, make decisions about risk, and communicate shared responsibility across roles

Dimensions of AI Literacies Taxonomy

This playbook is grounded in the Dimensions of AI Literacies Taxonomy (Gunder et al., 2024), which names eight interwoven literacies that shape how people learn with, work with, and lead with AI across institutional life. Remixed from the work of Belshaw's Essential Elements of Digital Literacies (2014), these literacies offer a shared vocabulary for the mindsets and skillsets educators, staff, leaders, and students develop as they navigate AI-enabled environments.

Cultural AI Literacies
Recognizing the connections between people, AI-informed resources and tools, and points of engagement within AI tools and AI-enabled environments.

Cognitive AI Literacies
Expanding intellectual capabilities by engaging with AI-enabled processes and environments.

Constructive AI Literacies
Utilizing AI tools to build, remix, and generate new content, applying AI capabilities.

Communicative AI Literacies
Leveraging AI technologies to convey ideas effectively, recognizing the sociocultural practices and nuances that AI interprets and influences in different settings.

Confident AI Literacies
Developing the ability to solve problems and manage learning within AI-driven environments by understanding and harnessing their unique features and potentials.

Creative AI Literacies
Engaging in ideation and generative actions using AI, focusing on how AI can add value and introduce new possibilities within specific contexts.

Critical AI Literacies
Examining the power dynamics and ethical considerations inherent in AI practices, reflecting on the broader societal impacts of AI-driven decisions and actions.

Civic AI Literacies
Employing AI knowledge and skills to contribute positively to society, using AI to foster community empowerment, engagement, and societal progress.

In this playbook, the taxonomy is used to help readers identify which literacies are most relevant to a given challenge, design learning experiences and supports that cultivate them, and recognize evidence of growth over time. The WCET domains clarify where institutional action happens; the AI literacies clarify how people build the capacity to act well within those domains. Together, they connect individual development to coordinated, sustainable institutional change.

What You'll Find Ahead

This playbook provides multiple entry points and pathways depending on your role, context, and current readiness. Rather than prescribing a single approach, it offers:

Approach Maps that match strategies to your stage of readiness—whether you're exploring, piloting, or scaling AI integration.

Design Principles that translate AI literacies into practice, serving as a north star for ethical and practical design decisions.

Role Highlights that clarify responsibilities and first moves for faculty, administrators, technologists, librarians, and students.

Remix Spotlights for adaptable activities that help you rework existing assignments, processes, or policies with AI literacies in mind.

Practical Toolkits from assignment redesign templates to governance decision guides to turn frameworks into action.

Reflection Prompts provide guided questions that foster individual and collective reflection, helping teams connect literacies to decision-making and planning.

Additionally, applied examples drawn from real institutional practices with adaptation notes, as well as detailed planning frameworks will help you to maintain momentum through structured cycles of implementation and review.

The sections ahead are organized to support both linear reading and targeted consultation. Whether you're seeking immediate guidance for tomorrow's class, preparing for a committee discussion about AI vendors, or developing institution-wide professional development, you'll find relevant, actionable content grounded in the collective wisdom of the field.

Most importantly, this playbook positions you not as a passive recipient of AI transformation but as an active agent in shaping how these technologies serve

educational purposes. The goal isn't to become an AI expert but to develop sufficient literacies to make informed decisions, ask critical questions, and maintain educational values even as the technological landscape shifts beneath our feet.

How to Use This Playbook

This playbook is for Faculty, Educational Developers, Administrators, Technologists, Librarians, and all collaborators involved in the teaching and learning process.

While we're all grappling with the rapidly changing landscape of generative AI in education, we're also approaching through different histories, roles, and resources. This guide meets you where you are and helps you take the next sensible step.

Start with something real. Pick an area of work that matters on your campus, such as assessment redesign, vendor review, or support pathways. In each domain you'll find a Role Spotlight to clarify who contributes what and a guide to move from talk to action. Constellations of AI literacies (Gunder, 2024) will help you make focused, values-aligned design choices.

Use this on your own or with a team. It works for quick working groups, PD series, and onboarding. Skim, choose a starting point, and build momentum one practical move at a time.

If you're...	Start here	Try this tool...
Just beginning an initiative	Section 1: Beginning Your Journey + Section 2: Culture First	Appendix D: AI Integration Maturity Snapshot
Redesigning assessments	Section 3: Pedagogy	Appendix B: Assignment Authenticity Audit Template
Rethinking staff workflows	Section 4: Operations	Appendix E: Cross-Functional Collaboration Planning Template
Updating policies or	Section 5: Governance	Appendix F: AI Policy

governance structures		Decision Guide Template
Teaching AI ethics or literacies	Section 3: Pedagogy or Section 6: Exemplars in Action	Appendix C: Guided AI Use & Reflection Cycle for Students

Design Principle

Start small. One course, one workflow, one policy. Use the review cycle to scale what works.

How to Contribute to this Playbook

We invite your expertise and experience to strengthen this playbook. Suggesting examples, refining approaches, or sharing what's working at your institution will help create a more robust resource for the entire higher education community.

Follow the steps in **Appendix A: Contributor Wall** under How to Comment in Google Docs and Complete the **Contributor Form** to ensure we properly recognize you and can keep you updated on the final release.

SECTION 1

Beginning Your Journey of AI Literacies Development

How do we begin our AI literacies journey in ways that honor where we are, who we serve, and what we hope to become as both a learning community and a field?

Image: Woman uses telescope beside seated laptop user; stars fill large circle.

Before any institution can scale or standardize its approach to AI, it must first locate its own point of departure. Beginning the journey of AI literacies development is less about adopting the newest tools and more about cultivating shared readiness—an understanding of how values, roles, and resources intersect in practice.

This playbook is designed to be entered from more than one door. Readiness looks different across campuses and roles, so begin by naming your approach: Exploring, Piloting, or Scaling. That choice is a marker, not a label.

Exploring favors learning in small, low-risk moves.

Piloting tests a bounded change with clear guardrails.

Scaling turns a proven pattern into routine practice.

Once you've identified your approach, choose an area of work that matters in your context. Keep it concrete but broad: assessment, vendor review, or help pathways are common entry points, and there are many others that will fit your institution just as well. The goal is to anchor the playbook to a real slice of work rather than roaming in the abstract.

From there, agree on one concrete move with collaborators. Name it in plain language and put a short review on the calendar so the work stays visible. In each domain you'll find a Role Spotlight to clarify who contributes what and tools to carry the conversation forward. AI literacies will support keeping decisions values-aligned and focused; they're there to help you see which mindsets and skill sets need to be active at the same time.

You don't have to read cover to cover. Skim the approach descriptions, pick your area, grab the tool, and run a small cycle. If the work shifts, change lanes. Exploring can become Piloting; Piloting can become Scaling. The point is momentum that fits your context, not perfection on the first pass.

To make this concrete, below is a quick map that pairs each lane with a place to consider starting a coordinated move. Use it to pick your doorway, not to box yourself in. These examples span the three domains that organize this playbook—Governance (vendor review), Operations (service triage), and Pedagogy (assessment redesign). As you move through Sections 3-5, you'll find deeper guidance for each domain.

Approach × Area × First Move

Approach	Area of Work	First Coordinated Move	Primary Roles	Key Literacies Support
 Exploring	Assessment redesign	Co-create one "build-with-AI" pilot assignment that foregrounds student voice, transparency, and choice. Use it as a shared learning object for faculty reflection and revision.	Faculty, Instructional Designers, Students	Constructive, Communicative, Confident
 Piloting	Ethical AI decision making	Convene a short sprint (2–3 weeks) to test an AI use scenario and collectively define "what ethical use looks like" in your context. Document insights as a public artifact.	Administrators, Technologists, Librarians, Faculty, Students	Civic, Critical, Cultural
 Scaling	Service or workflow innovation	Launch a cross-functional AI "learning lab" to prototype one institutional support improvement (e.g., advising triage, multilingual tutoring). Pair the pilot with shared storytelling on outcomes and lessons learned.	Technologists, Administrators, Student Services	Communicative, Constructive, Cultural

Now that you've identified your starting point and taken first steps, you're ready to ensure these efforts align with your institutional identity. Section 2 explores how to ground AI initiatives in your mission, vision, and values because while technologies will continue to evolve, your educational purpose provides the north star for navigating change. As your team begins to experiment, reflect, and refine its first AI initiatives, remember that progress is not defined by scale but by alignment. Each small step—each pilot assignment, workflow improvement, or governance conversation—reveals how your institution's culture interprets and enacts its values. The goal is not to rush

toward uniformity, but to build a shared understanding of what *good practice* looks like in your context. With early momentum established, the next stage is to connect these emerging practices to the deeper foundation that sustains them: your institutional mission, vision, and values.

SECTION 2

Culture First: Mission, Vision, and Values

What kind of learning community do we become when our values—not our technologies—set the terms of innovation in the age of AI?

Image: Five people stand on colorful blocks, holding glowing stars, under constellations.

Culture anchors our AI practices. When AI tools evolve weekly and frameworks multiply monthly, your institutional mission and values provide the stable foundation for decision-making. This section helps you map abstract values to concrete AI literacies practices, ensuring that technology serves your educational purpose rather than driving it.

From Mission to Method: Making Values Operational

Your mission statement is the expression of the DNA that should inform every AI decision. How does "student-centered learning" guide chatbot implementation? What does "inclusive excellence" mean for AI tool selection? How does "community engagement" shape your AI governance structure?

The challenge is translation. Abstract principles need to become concrete practices. This section bridges that gap by helping you extract actionable commitments from mission statements, map them to specific AI literacies dimensions, and design practices that make values visible in daily work.

Why Values-First Matters Now

Four realities make culture-centered AI practice essential.

First, speed demands *clarity*, especially given the lack of *certainty* on the tools' impact. When new AI tools launch monthly and vendors pitch weekly, you need decision criteria that don't require committee meetings. Clear values enable distributed decision-making because everyone understands the "why" behind the "what."

Second, students arrive AI-experienced. They're already using AI for coursework, job applications, and creative projects. Values-based practices help you meet them where they are while guiding them toward ethical, effective use.

Third, mission differentiates. Every institution is navigating a similar AI tools landscape. What distinguishes your approach is how you deploy them in service of your unique educational mission. A community college's AI practices should look different from an R1's not because the tools differ, but because the purposes do.

Finally, sustainability matters. As institutions deploy AI tools at scale, we must account for both environmental and labor impacts, including energy consumption, water usage in model training, and the often-invisible labor that undergirds AI systems. Embedding sustainability into values-based AI literacies strategies ensures we are not just adopting efficiently, but ethically and responsibly.

The Mission-to-Literacies Alignment Process

How do you ensure your AI efforts reflect your institution’s deepest commitments and not just the latest tools? Start by translating your mission, vision, and values into concrete AI literacies priorities. This isn’t about slogan-matching. It’s about building a

bridge between institutional purpose and everyday practice.

The following approach walks you through that translation process, helping cross-functional teams clarify what matters most—and where to begin.

Step 1: Surface Your Institutional Commitments

Begin with the language your campus already uses: mission statements, strategic plans, accreditation reports, and presidential messages. What values keep showing up—access, innovation, student success? List the phrases that define who you are and what kind of change you aim to make.

Step 2: Map Values to Literacies

Before mapping your institution's AI practices, it helps to ground that work in a shared vocabulary for what AI literacies actually are. The Dimensions of AI Literacies taxonomy (Gunder et al., 2024) offers a plural and dynamic way to think about the competencies that enable meaningful engagement with AI. Rather than a checklist of skills, this taxonomy describes eight interrelated skillsets and mindsets that help individuals and institutions navigate, create, critique, and communicate within AI-rich environments. Together, these dimensions form constellating AI literacies: adaptive combinations of knowledge, habits, and values that shift depending on context and purpose. Using this lens to map your institution's strengths and gaps can illuminate how AI work already reflects your mission and where new growth is possible. Use the AI literacies dimensions as lenses, not checkboxes. Ask: What kind of literacies do we need to live out these values?

Core Value	Primary Literacies	Why This Alignment Matters
Opportunity & Access	*Cultural, Civic, Confident*	Ensures all students can engage regardless of background
Critical Thinking	*Critical, Cognitive, Civic*	Develops questioning mindsets and systems understanding
Innovation	*Creative, Constructive, Cognitive*	Enables novel solutions and hands-on creation

Community	*Communicative, Civic, Cultural*	Builds dialogue skills and diverse perspectives
Student Success	*Confident, Constructive, Communicative*	Empowers self-efficacy and practical skills
Excellence	*Cognitive, Critical, Constructive*	Deepens understanding and knowledge creation
Global Citizenship	*Cultural, Civic, Communicative*	Fosters cross-cultural competence and collaboration
Career Readiness	*Constructive, Confident, Cognitive*	Builds real-world skills and problem-solving

Step 3: Focus Your Literacies

You don't need to activate all eight literacies at once. Use your value-to-literacies map to identify 3–4 focal dimensions that most resonate with your mission and student needs. Consider gaps: Which literacies are underdeveloped on your campus but essential for your goals?

Step 4: Make It Real

For each prioritized literacies dimension, describe what it looks like in practice. For example:

- **Constructive**: Faculty design build-with-AI assignments; staff streamline workflows; students transform AI outputs responsibly through critical editing.
- **Civic**: Student governance includes AI policy review; public artifacts show deliberation, not just decisions
- **Confident**: All roles get onboarding, not just tech power users; self-paced tutorials scaffold growth over time

The key is specificity. When you name practices that embody literacies, you make your values visible and actionable.

Step 5: Define Progress on Purpose

Create shared criteria to assess whether your AI work is living up to your values. This might include:

- Student and staff participation rates in AI pilot programs
- Quality of reflections on AI use and decision-making
- Feedback from stakeholders most impacted by new tools or policies
- Evidence that your priorities are shaping—not chasing—AI adoption

Assessment doesn't mean standardization. It means staying accountable to your mission as technologies evolve.

Making Values Visible Daily

Values live through repeated practices across all institutional roles.

Faculty start each semester asking students about their AI experiences and goals, design assignments reflecting disciplinary values, and share how their AI use aligns with teaching philosophy.

Administrators connect AI discussions to institutional mission in meetings, allocate resources proportionally to values, and celebrate values-aligned practices publicly. If access matters most, invest in initiatives that remove barriers . If innovation drives strategy, support experimental pilots.

Staff design student services embodying institutional commitments, document how tools advance or challenge values, and advocate for implementations serving mission-critical populations. Technologists evaluate tools against values criteria, not just technical specifications, building systems that make values-aligned use easier than misaligned use.

Sustaining Culture-Centered Practice

Culture requires cultivation through regular practices. Weekly, ask whether decisions reflect values and who benefits from choices. Monthly, celebrate values-aligned wins and identify where compromises occur. Quarterly, assess whether AI practices strengthen mission delivery and what new literacies your values demand. Annually, conduct full mission alignment reviews, update charters, and integrate learnings into

strategic planning.

Culture work doesn't have to add new burdens. Each institution can choose a cadence that fits its capacity. For some, this may mean weekly reflections during existing team meetings; for others, quarterly conversations about values and mission alignment. The point isn't the frequency, but it's the consistency of practice that keeps culture visible and actionable.

Common challenges arise but have straightforward responses. "We don't have time for culture work" overlooks that clear values prevent rework or redundancy. When purpose is shared, decisions come faster and with greater confidence. "Our mission is too vague" can be addressed by using strategic plan goals as specific proxies. "Different departments have conflicting values" resolves by focusing on shared commitments like student success and academic integrity.

With culture as your anchor and values as your guide, you're ready to transform the heart of educational practice. Section 3 explores how pedagogy evolves when AI literacies become central to educational design rather than an add-on or threat to manage. As you chart your constellation of AI literacies, look not only for what's present but for what patterns emerge—where your mission already shines through your practices, and where new stars might still need to be named.

SECTION 3

Pedagogy: Learning & Teaching with Integrity

How can we design learning experiences that use AI to deepen—rather than diminish—the integrity, creativity, and humanity of teaching?

Image: Woman types while sitting on a stack of books; man on ladder aims telescope at star.

The pedagogical domain is where AI's impact feels most immediate and personal. Faculty worry about academic integrity. Students navigate mixed messages about AI use. Staff supporting instruction wonder how to guide both groups. Everyone remains curious as to what "authentic" learning means when machines can write, code, and

create. From writing assignments and design projects to research planning and feedback loops, entire learning experiences are being reshaped in real time.

This section explores how to treat AI not as a threat to academic norms but as material for meaning-making and a partner in inclusive practice.

Instead of asking "How do we catch AI cheating?" the more transformative question becomes: "How do we design for ethical, transparent, and intentional AI use?" This section reimagines pedagogy through a literacies lens, where integrity is built into design, and where the learning process matters as much as the student end product.

Three core principles guide pedagogical AI literacies:

- **Treat AI as material for thinking and making, not a shortcut.** AI becomes part of the creative and intellectual process, not a way to bypass it.
- **Integrity is designed, not policed.** Transparent prompts, reflection checkpoints, and collaborative drafting make reasoning visible.
- **Learning happens through interconnected literacies.** Focal areas that guide pedagogical practice include Integrity & Process, Inquiry & Verification, and Access & Voice.

Grounding the Practices

The WCET *AI Literacies in Focus* report revealed pedagogy as the most developed dimension across existing frameworks—yet also the most saturated with fear-based narratives. This playbook, in accord with the findings of the report, moves beyond detection anxiety to ask: *How might we create meaningful, future-facing learning experiences that center human agency and creativity?*

To help reframe pedagogy as a site of possibility rather than constraint, the following callouts highlight how prominent AI literacy frameworks interpret and support this dimension. Each summary distills the pedagogical principles embedded within a different framework, showing how varied perspectives converge around common commitments: cultivating ethical awareness, creative problem-solving, and learner empowerment. Taken together, these overviews provide a map of how AI literacies in practice can guide teaching that is as intentional as it is innovative.

The Scaffolded AI Literacy (SAIL) Framework shapes our approach to AI literacies through progressive development – from exploring to scaling. It emphasizes growth over compliance, positioning AI use as a continuum of learning rather than a fixed skillset. Its structure helps teams pilot responsibly, reflect collaboratively, and build capacity for sustainable integration.

The UNESCO AI Competency Framework for Teachers grounds our work in global standards for ethics, transparency, and human rights. It highlights fairness, accountability, and inclusion as critical dimensions of teacher preparation, particularly within Access & Voice literacies.

The Open University Framework advances inclusive design and openness through transparent attribution practices. It situates AI literacy within digital and critical pedagogies, emphasizing student agency and co-creation. Its focus on accessibility and reflection informs our approach to participatory learning and responsible technology adoption.

The LEAD Framework is built on four pillars: Learn, Engage, Acknowledge, and Develop. It informs our emphasis on process evidence and transparent documentation. It echoes the call reflection and feedback loops found across this playbook, ensuring that growth is continuous and publicly visible.

The Barnard Framework scaffolds AI learning across four progressive levels: understand, apply, evaluate, and create. These align directly with pedagogical objectives that evolve across the curriculum. Its emphasis on generative AI integration complements our call for assignment redesign that emphasizes both process and ethical uses.

The Yale Generative AI Literacy Framework provides competencies across four domains: consume, create, evaluate, and analyze. These support discipline-specific instructional design and the development of student agency.

The pedagogical domain activates Critical literacies (interrogating AI outputs), Constructive literacies (creating with AI), Communicative literacies (articulating process), and Cognitive understanding (metacognitive reflection).

Design Principle

Literacies live through design. When we build assignments that make thinking visible, test claims, and honor voice, integrity emerges as a practice, not a policy.

Types of Pedagogical AI Literacies

Assessment design is where literacies move from concept to practice. Each redesign choice signals what a course or program believes about integrity, authorship, and creativity.

The following three focal areas outline complementary approaches to reimagining teaching and learning with AI: making thinking visible, strengthening inquiry, and preserving authentic expression. Together, they form clusters of pedagogical literacies that illuminate how learning, ethics, and creativity intertwine.

Designing Visible Thinking — Integrity & Process

When students reveal how they think, they demonstrate more than skill—they show judgment. This focal area shifts attention from product policing to process transparency, turning curiosity into a habit of mind.

Students trace how ideas evolve through AI interaction: what they asked, what they accepted or rejected, and how their choices shaped the final work. These records—screenshots, annotations, brief process notes—become artifacts of learning, not evidence for enforcement.

In practice, this can look like:

- Replacing a single essay submission with a process portfolio that includes prompt histories, reflections, and revision rationales.
- Having students submit an AI "editor's memo" explaining one key decision they made based on AI feedback.
- Using side-by-side annotation activities where students compare an AI-generated draft with their human revision.

These approaches activate Critical, Cognitive, and Communicative Literacies simultaneously. Students learn to articulate reasoning, interrogate their own methods, and practice intellectual honesty as a creative act. The result is not surveillance—it's authorship made visible.

For an additional resource on authentic assessment, see **Appendix B: Assignment Authenticity Audit Template**.

Building Critical Evaluation — Inquiry & Verification

AI's speed and fluency can mask inaccuracy and bias. This focal area helps students cultivate disciplined skepticism by learning to question, verify, and contextualize what AI produces before accepting it as truth.

Assessment redesign here means integrating verification as a learning outcome, not an afterthought.

Students practice:

- Cross-checking AI outputs against primary sources or scholarly databases, then presenting an evidence map showing what was confirmed or contradicted.
- Conducting bias audits where they compare multiple AI tools and analyze whose perspectives or datasets are represented.
- Writing reflective commentaries that document how they determined reliability and what ethical concerns surfaced.

Faculty model these behaviors openly—sharing flawed outputs, demonstrating fact-checking routines, and discussing what "good evidence" looks like in their field.

These practices engage Critical, Cognitive, and Civic Literacies, producing learners who not only detect bias but can explain why it matters and how to address it in their disciplines.

See **Appendix C: Guided AI Use & Reflection Cycle for Students** for a ready-made structure that helps students analyze, verify, and revise AI-supported work.

Preserving Authentic Expression — Access & Voice

AI should extend human expression, not flatten it. This focal area prioritizes designs that protect and amplify student voice across languages, modalities, and learning conditions. Assessment becomes a space for identity, experimentation, and representation.

Examples include:

- Encouraging students to use AI for translation or accessibility support while keeping reflective commentary about how meaning or tone shifted.
- Assigning creative remix projects where students integrate AI-generated visuals, text, or audio with personal narrative, analyzing how collaboration changed their message.
- Using oral defense, video reflection, or multi-modal submissions to foreground the human behind the product.

These designs cultivate Communicative, Cultural, and Confident Literacies. They help students claim ownership of their learning while using AI to enhance access and expression. Integrity, in this sense, isn't about containment—it's about amplified authenticity.

Making It Real: Role-Based Actions

If you're faculty, your superpower is designing authentic tasks where student voice and reasoning remain visible. Select one assignment this term to redesign for transparency and creativity. Embed reflection prompts after the first draft and engage with students in class discussions on ethical collaboration as well as the wins and limits of using AI.

If you're an instructional designer or librarian, you bridge faculty innovation and student success. Co-develop short templates for documenting AI interaction and verifying information. Facilitate mini-studios where instructors compare redesign outcomes and share models.

If you're academic support staff, you see where theory meets student reality. Host a focus group asking students about their actual AI use, not what they think you want to hear, but what they're really doing. Share these insights with teaching teams. Your frontline perspective reveals gaps between policy and practice that others might miss.

If you're an administrator, you create the conditions for innovation. Give faculty permission to try new approaches. Fund small pilots. Celebrate both successes and failures. Your support transforms individual experiments into institutional learning.

Examples from the Field

PILOTING

ESL, AI, and Academic Honesty

Institution: Cochise College in Arizona
Submitted by: Wendy Ashby
Primary Literacies: Communicative, Critical, Confident

An ESL faculty member redesigned writing assignments to include transparent, ethical use of generative AI as a language support tool. Students in an Advanced ESL Communications course were encouraged to use AI for brainstorming and grammar support — but with structured attribution and reflection requirements. Faculty embedded collaborative Google Docs where students shared prompt histories, drafts, and process notes. The approach focused on integrity through visibility, not prohibition.

Practices in Action:

- Students submitted AI prompt histories and drafts with inline notes.
- Attribution statements were scaffolded for multilingual learners.
- Writing center staff were trained in AI-assisted feedback techniques.

Evidence of Literacies:

- Students demonstrated a clear understanding of AI support vs. authorship.
- Faculty reported more nuanced conversations about voice and academic integrity.
- The model spread to other language-support and developmental writing courses.

SCALING

Brave New Critical Worlds

Lead: Liza Long (College of Western Idaho)
Primary Literacies: Constructive, Critical, Confident

A literature instructor and her students co-developed an OER textbook on "Introduction to Literature" using GenAI tools. Students critiqued and revised AI-generated summaries, added original cultural context, and wrote bias audits for each chapter. The iterative editorial process required prompt documentation, collaborative editing, and source attribution.

Practices in Action:

- AI outputs were used as drafts, not endpoints.
- Students annotated editorial decisions and reflected on the limits of machine-generated content.
- The final OER includes prompt history, change logs, and cultural representation notes.

Evidence of Literacies:

- Transparency in editing and attribution
- Student reflections on ethical remixing
- Public-facing OER artifact that models integrity and authorship

Remix Spotlight

Take the exemplar and make it yours:

- How might your students collaborate with AI to co-author or annotate course content in your discipline?

- What would a low-stakes pilot version of this look like (e.g., one unit, one reading, one prompt activity)?
- How could you scaffold prompt editing, bias detection, or revision tracking without overloading students?
- What role could your library, OER team, or writing center play in supporting a similar process?

Developing Pedagogical AI Literacies Over Time

Progress happens in stages, and that's okay. The journey from AI-curious to AI-integrated pedagogy follows predictable patterns.

Approach × Area × First Move

Approach	Area of Work	First Coordinated Move	Primary Roles	Key Literacies
 Exploring	Assessment redesign	Co-create a "build-with-AI" assignment emphasizing voice, transparency, and choice.	Faculty, Designers, Students	Constructive, Communicative, Confident
 Piloting	Academic integrity evolution	Draft a living honor-code addendum with clear AI examples; run student focus groups; iterate from feedback.	Administrators, Faculty, Students	Civic, Critical, Communicative
 Scaling	Program-level integration	Build a shared repository of redesigned assignments and mentorship network; publish discipline-specific guidelines.	Department Chairs, Faculty Teams, Students	Communicative, Constructive, Cultural

When exploring, focus on learning through low-stakes design. Success looks like clear student reflections and present attribution statements—not perfection, but engagement. When piloting, prototype with intention and clear boundaries. Success means students demonstrating real metacognition about their collaboration choices. When scaling, institutionalize what works and share widely. Success shows in consistent practices across sections and recognition of your innovative approaches.

Reflection and Action

What would it mean to trust students as partners in defining ethical AI use? How

might your evaluation criteria shift if reflection and revision carried as much weight as final output? What new forms of excellence become possible when we stop preventing AI use and start making it visible?

Next Steps
Start small: one assignment, one conversation, one visible artifact. Document what happens, share it with colleagues, and invite iteration. Pedagogical AI literacies grow not through enforcement but through collective learning.

Pedagogical AI Literacies Toolkit

As educators face increasing angst around academic integrity and the role of AI in student work, this section highlights tools that support redesign and reflection, both at the assignment and student levels.

[Appendix B: Assignment Authenticity Audit Template]
Use to examine existing assessments for agency and transparency. Redesign prompts to emphasize iteration and authorship.

[Appendix C: Guided AI Use & Reflection Cycle for Students]
A four-stage instructor-led framework (Use → Review → Revise → Reflect) with discussion and journaling components that transform AI interaction into metacognitive growth.

Together these tools enable educators to move beyond detection toward design, where assessment becomes a living demonstration of literacies in action.

SECTION 4

Operations: Building Strong Operational Foundations

How might our operational decisions today lay the groundwork for agile, ethical, and future-ready uses of AI across the institution?

Image: People connect glowing stars with lines.

Operations transform AI aspirations into institutional reality. While pedagogy reimagines learning and governance sets direction, operations make both workable through infrastructure, support systems, and sustainable practices. This section shows how to build the operational muscle that prevents innovative pilots from becoming stranded experiments.

The operational domain is home of the "messy middle" part of initiatives. IT teams juggle security concerns with innovation demands. Staff wonder how AI will change their daily work. Leaders seek evidence that investments yield returns. This section provides frameworks for aligning technology with mission, ensuring every initiative has clear ownership, and building support systems that scale.

Three core principles guide operational AI literacies:

- **Operations make pedagogy and governance workable.** Every operational decision enables or constrains what happens in classrooms and committees.
- **Align AI strategy and usage to mission and infrastructure.** Technology choices must connect to institutional purpose and existing systems.
- **Prevent stranded pilots.** Require an owner, metric, and sunset date for every initiative from day one.

Grounding the Practices

The *AI Literacies in Focus* report identified operations as the least consistently developed dimension across frameworks—a critical gap, since even the best pedagogical innovations fail without operational support. This playbook addresses that gap by translating operational theory into practical infrastructure.

The Scaffolded AI Literacy (SAIL) Framework emphasizes aligning infrastructure with pedagogical goals, helping institutions avoid "stranded" pilots.

The Open University Framework emphasizes principle-driven operations, encouraging values-based, context-aware implementation.

UNESCO AI Competency Framework for Teachers contributes capacity-building guidance that foregrounds ethical use and institutional readiness.

The Yale Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) Literacy Framework informs our operational design through its emphasis on transparent evaluation and analysis competencies—core elements of risk assessment, tool review, and staff development.

The Barnard Framework for AI Literacy's four levels offer a usable scaffold for professional development programming across staff roles, helping operations teams build AI fluency in a staged, sustainable way.

The operational domain activates Constructive literacies (building systems and workflows), Confident literacies (empowering staff), and Communicative literacies (clear documentation and shared learning).

Design Principle

Every pilot needs three things before launch: an owner who wakes up thinking about it, a metric that matters to leadership, and a sunset date that forces a decision.

Types of Operational AI Literacies

Operations make innovation possible. They turn ideas into infrastructure, pilots into practice, and values into systems that last. While governance sets direction and pedagogy drives learning, operations connect both through coordination, care, and clarity.

The following three focal areas outline complementary approaches to reimagining institutional work with AI: ensuring equitable access, developing adaptive capacity, and sustaining people and culture. Together, they form a cluster of operational literacies that keep institutions transparent, agile, and humane.

Building Equitable Infrastructure — Access & Quality

Operational excellence starts with access—not just to AI tools, but to the understanding and confidence to use them meaningfully. This focal area redefines "access" as an ongoing commitment to enablement, not simply availability.

When access is equitable, innovation doesn't depend on who happens to have the right account, hardware, or insider knowledge. It's shared, supported, and intentional.

Operational Moves

- Map your ecosystem. Conduct an "AI access audit" across departments to see who can use what—and who's left out.
- Design for reuse. Build an open AI Resource Hub with curated tools, tutorials, and update logs that anyone can adapt.
- Translate expertise. Create short, role-based guides (e.g., AI for Advisors, AI

for Communications, AI for Faculty Onboarding) that convert technical language into practical action.

Note: See Appendix D: AI Integration Maturity Snapshot for readiness mapping.

Growing Institutional Agility — Learning Systems & Practice

Institutions often describe themselves as "slow to change," but agility doesn't mean speed—it means learning loops: short, intentional cycles of trying, gathering evidence, reflecting, and iterating. This focal area develops those loops, treating operations as an iterative system that reflects, adapts, and evolves in response to real feedback.

AI integration is a moving target; agility helps institutions keep pace without losing strategic and ethical coherence—shared goals, aligned expectations, and consistent safeguards across units. Teams approach change as a design cycle, not a project.

Operational Moves

- **Prototype deliberately.** Run micro-pilots—short, bounded experiments that test one AI tool in a single workflow (e.g., scheduling, data entry, or communication).
- **Document what happens.** Replace long reports with two-page "Change Notes" that capture outcomes, missteps that help us to fail forward, lessons learned, and next steps.
- **Institutionalize learning.** Create an internal "pilot library" where teams can browse what's been tried and avoid duplication.

Note: Pair with Appendix E: Cross-Functional Collaboration Planning Template to align roles and review cadences.

Sustaining People & Culture — Service & Care

Behind every process map and automation lies human labor—often invisible, often overstretched. This focal area recognizes that operational excellence depends as much on emotional sustainability as on efficiency.

Strong systems are maintained by people who feel seen, supported, and connected. Designing for care means making well-being part of the operational fabric, not a postscript.

Operational Moves

- **Host AI learning circles.** Create informal communities where staff, faculty, and administrators share their experiments and challenges.
- **Capture local wisdom.** Encourage short "Practice Notes" (100–200 words) documenting insights like "How I used AI for time tracking" or "One prompt that saved an hour."
- **Celebrate iteration.** End each term or fiscal quarter with a "What We Learned" showcase that frames productive failure as responsible experimentation—spotlighting what was tried, what evidence emerged, what didn't work as intended, and how the next iteration will improve.

Making It Real: Role-Based Actions

If you're a technologist (IT/Help Desk), you're the operational backbone. Your strengths include routing requests efficiently, managing permissions thoughtfully, designing clear escalation pathways, and maintaining knowledge base hygiene. Your skills span workflow mapping, access control, plain-language documentation, change management communication, and metric tracking. Start with this: Publish an AI support escalation map showing exactly how requests flow from initial contact to resolution. Define two success metrics—perhaps median response time and first-contact resolution rate. Review these weekly, watching for drift that signals emerging problems. This simple framework creates accountability and surfaces issues before they become crises.

If you're in instructional design or academic technology, you bridge technical capability and educational need. Create reusable templates that make AI integration feel manageable rather than overwhelming. Document successful implementations so others can adapt rather than starting from scratch. Your ability to translate between technical and pedagogical languages makes you invaluable connectors.

If you're in HR or organizational development, you shepherd the human side of technological change. Design support structures that acknowledge anxiety while building capability. Create professional development pathways that meet people where they are, not where you wish they were. Your understanding of organizational culture determines whether AI integration feels like opportunity or threat.

If you're an administrator, you set operational priorities through resource allocation. Fund pilots with clear success criteria. Remove bureaucratic barriers that slow innovation unnecessarily. Celebrate learning from failure as much as success. Your visible support transforms operational initiatives from compliance exercises to mission-critical work.

Exemplar from the Field

PILOTING

Laying the Groundwork for AI Adoption in Staff Workflows

Institution: Regional Comprehensive University
Primary Literacies: Constructive, Confident, Civic

Staff teams mapped repetitive, high-friction workflows (e.g., financial aid communications, advising scheduling), then piloted AI-based enhancements. All pilots had a documented owner, success metric, and sunset clause. Training was delivered through 30-minute micro-sessions with peer feedback.

Practices in Action:

- Staff co-designed pilot boundaries to preserve job clarity.
- Union reps were included from the start.
- Workflow maps and prompt guides were iteratively improved based on feedback.

Evidence of Literacies:

- 25% time savings in pilot areas
- Staff confidence in using AI tools for productivity and efficiency rose by 15%
- Employees proposed new AI use cases after pilot success

Remix Spotlight

Take the exemplar and make it yours:

- What is one repetitive or time-consuming workflow your team currently manages? Could AI reduce friction there?
- If you had just 60 minutes for a pilot, what task would you try first and who would need to be involved?
- What documentation or change-tracking practices already exist that could help you measure pilot impact?
- How would your HR team or union leadership need to be involved to build trust?

Developing Operational AI Literacies Over Time

Progress in operations follows predictable patterns. Recognize where you are to identify appropriate next steps.

Approach × Area × First Move

Approach	Area of Work	First Coordinated Move	Primary Roles	Key Literacies Support
 Exploring	Infrastructure assessment	Inventory current AI tools in use (official and shadow IT); identify security gaps; create initial acceptable use guidelines	IT, Security, Compliance	Cognitive, Constructive, Communicative
 Piloting	Workflow integration	Map 2-3 high-impact workflows; launch contained pilots with clear metrics; develop targeted micro-training	Department Leaders, IT, HR	Constructive, Confident, Cultural
 Scaling	Institutional capability	Establish cross-functional AI operations team; develop service catalog; create continuous improvement cycles	Leadership, Operational Units	Communicative, Civic, Confident

When exploring, focus on understanding your current state without judgment. Success looks like a clear inventory of what's already happening and initial guidelines that provide safety without stifling innovation. When piloting, test specific improvements with clear boundaries and metrics. Success means measurable efficiency gains and growing staff confidence. When scaling, institutionalize what works through formal structures and ongoing support. Success shows in consistent service delivery and proactive rather than reactive operations.

Reflection and Action

What would it mean to build operations that learn as fast as the technology changes? How might you create support systems that make people feel capable rather than overwhelmed? Where are the hidden operational heroes whose work makes innovation possible?

Operations often feel thankless—invisible when working, blamed when failing. But strong operations create the conditions for everything else. They transform good intentions into sustainable practices. They make innovation safe and failure instructive. They ensure that when someone has a breakthrough in pedagogy or governance, the infrastructure exists to scale it.

Start with one operational improvement. Map one workflow. Create one template. Build one support structure. Document what you learn. Share with those doing similar work. Your operational foundations today enable tomorrow's innovations.

Next Steps

Choose one operational practice from this section to implement. Set a 30-day review to assess impact. Document both technical and human outcomes. Share learnings with operational peers across campus. Remember: great operations make the extraordinary feel routine.

Operational AI Literacies Toolkit

Operational readiness is often the bottleneck between intention and execution. This section focuses on enabling infrastructure, cross-role support, and institutional self-assessment.

Appendix D: AI Integration Maturity Snapshot

A diagnostic tool for institutional leaders to evaluate current status across five key domains—access, policy, support, procurement, and data—and surface actionable priorities.

Appendix E: Cross-Functional Collaboration Planning Template

A pre-structured planning tool that helps institutions clarify who is Responsible, Accountable, Consulted, and Informed (using the RACI framework) across AI initiatives, avoiding duplication and surfacing where key literacies are activated.

These tools are designed to prevent siloed efforts and to equip cross-functional teams with clarity, coordination, and readiness checkpoints.

SECTION 5

Governance: Enabling Ethical and Inclusive Leadership

How might we build governance structures that not only manage risk but also cultivate readiness for the futures we want to create?

Image: People arrange star pathways; one jumps between stars; crescent moon nearby.

Governance transforms AI possibilities into institutional commitments.While pedagogy reimagines learning and operations builds infrastructure, governance ensures that AI integration remains ethical, inclusive, and aligned with institutional values. This section shows how to create decision-making structures that balance innovation with responsibility, speed with deliberation, and technology with humanity.

The governance domain is where values become policy. Leaders navigate competing pressures—innovation versus risk, efficiency versus opportunity, autonomy versus accountability. Boards seek assurance that AI investments align with mission. Faculty demand voice in decisions affecting academic freedom. Students expect transparency about how AI shapes their education. This section provides frameworks for inclusive decision-making that honors all stakeholders while maintaining institutional coherence.

Three core principles guide governance AI literacies:

- **Governance enables rather than constrains.** Good governance makes the right thing to do the easy thing to do.
- **Inclusive structures yield better decisions.** Multiple perspectives strengthen outcomes when roles and responsibilities are clear.
- **Adaptive governance evolves with technology.** Build review cycles and sunset dates into every policy and structure.

Grounding the Practices

The *AI Literacies in Focus* report revealed governance as moderately developed but inconsistently implemented. Institutions recognize its importance but struggle with implementation. This playbook bridges that gap by translating governance principles into practical structures and processes.

UNESCO's AI Competency Framework for Teachers guides institutional policy development and professional standards.

The Open University Framework advances participatory, inclusive leadership and systemic opportunity.

The Scaffolded AI Literacy (SAIL) Framework encourages alignment between governance and organizational culture, prompting review cycles and stakeholder engagement.

The University of Adelaide Artificial Intelligence Literacy Framework, which deepens our attention to ethical use, privacy, and attribution policies.

The Queen Mary University Conceptual Framework for Artificial Intelligence (AI) Literacy, which supports tiered policy development, faculty participation, and progressive AI integration.

The Yale Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) Literacy Framework, with its emphasis on transparent evaluation and responsible use, adds nuance to governance decision-making and procurement strategies.

The governance domain activates Civic literacies (understanding societal impact), Critical literacies (interrogating systems and power), and Cultural literacies (centering opportunity, access, and diverse perspectives).

Design Principle

Good governance makes the right thing to do the easy thing to do. When policies align with practice and support structures exist, ethical AI use becomes the path of least resistance.

Types of Governance AI Literacies

Governance gives structure to institutional judgment. It's how values turn into policies, decisions, and public commitments that shape how AI enters teaching, research, and operations. Effective governance is less about control and more about clarity: who decides, who's informed, and how learning from those decisions loops back into future action.

The following three focal areas outline complementary approaches to reimagining institutional governance with AI: building trust through transparency, enabling innovation through ethical experimentation, and sustaining excellence through continuous adaptation. Together, they form a constellation of governance literacies that keep institutional decision-making participatory, principled, and future-ready.

Building Trust Through Transparency & Accountability

Trust begins with visibility. When people understand how and why decisions are made—and can see their own role in shaping them—governance transforms from gatekeeping to stewardship.

This focal area emphasizes open communication, clear authority lines, and inclusive participation. Faculty, students, and staff should not only understand what a policy says and how it came to be, but (where appropriate) have meaningful ways to inform and shape those decisions.

Governance Moves

- **Map the process.** Publish a visual outline of how AI-related decisions flow through committees and offices.
- **Create feedback loops.** Open comment windows for major policies and report back on how feedback changed outcomes.
- **Communicate outcomes.** Post decision records and rationales in a shared dashboard so all stakeholders can learn from institutional reasoning.

Note: See Appendix F: AI Policy Decision Guide Template.

Enabling Innovation Through Ethical Experimentation

Governance should make responsible innovation easier, not riskier. This focal area establishes structured freedom: clear parameters for exploration with ethical safeguards. When experimentation is invited and bounded, institutions learn faster and with greater accountability.

Governance Moves

- **Tier the risk.** Develop a framework that distinguishes between low-, medium-, and high-risk experiments—matching review depth to potential impact.
- **Encourage pilots.** Create a standing "AI sandbox" policy allowing small, time-bound experiments with rapid review and reflection.
- **Document and share.** Treat every pilot as a learning artifact, requiring short public summaries of what worked, what didn't, and what's next, all within a culture that makes it safe to experiment (and even fail).

Sustaining Excellence Through Continuous Adaptation

Governance doesn't end with a vote or a policy but it's a living system that must learn, iterate, and sunset outdated guidance. This focal area ensures that AI-related governance remains relevant and adaptive by embedding review, reflection, and renewal into every cycle.

Governance Moves

- **Build review rhythms**. Schedule annual policy audits, quarterly operational updates, and monthly scanning of emerging AI issues.
- **Design for deprecation.** Include sunset dates in every policy and pilot charter so decisions remain active rather than obsolete.
- **Empower advisory groups.** Give student, staff, and faculty councils the responsibility—and recognition—to surface new questions and revise guidance collaboratively.

Making It Real: Role-Based Actions

If you're an administrator or governance lead, you excel at translating institutional values into actionable policies. Your strengths include strategic thinking, stakeholder management, and balancing competing priorities. Your skills span policy development, inclusive facilitation, and evidence-based decision making. Charter an AI governance council with clear authority and diverse membership. Include faculty, staff, students, and external stakeholders. Define what decisions the council makes versus recommends. Set regular meeting cadence and sunset dates for review. Act on their recommendations visibly. Nothing kills engagement faster than ignored input.

If you're faculty governance (senate/council), you protect academic freedom while ensuring responsible innovation. Your strengths include understanding pedagogical implications and representing diverse disciplinary perspectives. Establish an AI subcommittee that reviews academic policies through an AI lens. Start with honor codes and assessment policies. Create clear consultation processes that give faculty meaningful voice in AI decisions affecting teaching and research.

If you're a student leader, you bring lived experience of AI's impact on learning. Your strengths include understanding peer practices and identifying gaps between policy and reality. Survey students about actual AI use patterns and ethical dilemmas they face. Present findings to governance bodies with specific policy recommendations. Push for student voting representation on AI committees, not just advisory roles.

If you're in compliance or legal affairs, you navigate the regulatory landscape while enabling innovation. Your strengths include risk assessment and translating legal requirements into practical guidance. Create a tiered risk framework that streamlines low-risk experiments while ensuring appropriate oversight for high-stakes applications. Publish clear, accessible guidance that empowers rather than paralyzes.

Exemplar from the Field

PILOTING

AI Toolkit Creation

Institution: St. John Fisher University
Submitted by: Katie Sabourin
Primary Literacies: Cognitive, Communicative, Critical, Confident

A team at St. John Fisher University developed an institutional AI Toolkit to support responsible, transparent AI use across the university. The toolkit consolidates guidance on how to evaluate AI outputs, distinguishes between protected and unprotected AI tools, and provides a shared foundation for selecting and using AI in ways that are consistent, teachable, and trustworthy.

Practices in Action:

- Published a centralized AI Toolkit that gives campus stakeholders shared guidance for responsible, transparent AI use.
- Clarified protected vs. unprotected tools and identified university-approved options to reduce fragmented adoption and inconsistent practice.
- Built in iterative updates so guidance evolves with changing tools, risks, and institutional needs

Evidence of Literacies:

- Stakeholders used shared criteria to evaluate AI outputs critically rather than treating them as authoritative.
- Users demonstrated more informed tool selection by distinguishing where protected vs. unprotected tools were appropriate.
- The toolkit increased institutional coherence by standardizing expectations and providing a living reference resource.

Remix Spotlight

Take the exemplar and make it yours:

- Where do your multilingual or language-support learners intersect with AI policy concerns?
- Could you pilot a similar transparent process using tools your students already know (e.g., Google Docs, Word Track Changes)?
- What scaffolds would your students need to distinguish between language assistance and content outsourcing?
- How might your writing center or tutoring services get involved in designing, supporting, or evaluating such a practice?

Developing Governance AI Literacies Over Time

Progress in governance follows predictable patterns. Understanding your current state helps identify appropriate next steps.

Approach × Area × First Move

Approach	Area of Work	First Coordinated Move	Primary Roles	Key Literacies Support
 Exploring	Policy foundations	Form AI advisory committee with diverse stakeholders; draft initial use guidelines; run 30-day comment period	Administrators, Faculty Senate, Student Leaders	Civic, Critical, Cultural
 Piloting	Vendor governance	Create one-page decision record with purpose, risks, barriers, privacy notes, and exit plan for one AI tool	Policy Lead, IT, Compliance	Critical, Civic, Communicative
 Scaling	Shared governance	Establish AI council with formal charter, decision authority, and public transparency register; set quarterly review cycles	Leadership, All Stakeholder Groups	Civic, Cultural, Confident

Reflection and Action

What would governance look like if it enabled innovation rather than constraining it? How might decision-making change if those most affected had the strongest voice? Where does your institution need more structure, and where does it need more flexibility?

Governance often feels distant from daily work—something that happens in committees and boardrooms. But effective governance shapes every AI interaction on campus. It determines what tools are available, how they're used, and who benefits.

Start with one governance improvement. Charter one inclusive committee. Create one clear policy. Establish one feedback mechanism. Document what you learn. Share with peer institutions.

Next Steps

Choose one governance practice from this section to implement. Engage stakeholders early and often. Set clear success criteria and review dates. Document both decisions and decision-making processes. Remember: governance at its best is creating conditions for ethical, inclusive, and sustainable AI integration.

Leadership in the age of AI must move beyond compliance into proactive, inclusive stewardship. This section supports ethical decision-making, participatory design, and sustained institutional reflection.

Governance AI Literacies Toolkit

[Appendix F: AI Policy Decision Guide Template]

A one-page tool that structures institutional policy decisions with clarity, documenting rationale, risks, literacies affected, and stakeholder input.

[Appendix G: Student Advisory Planning Guide]

A design toolkit for building meaningful student governance roles—moving beyond tokenism to sustained, compensated, participation that expands access and authentic representation.

These governance tools operationalize the civic, critical, and cultural literacies that are too often abstracted—bringing them into real-world, collaborative decisions.

SECTION 6

Exemplars in Action: Constellating AI Literacies Across Governance, Operations, and Pedagogy

How do AI literacies come alive when institutions connect their values, people, and practices across traditional boundaries of governance, operations, and pedagogy?

Image: Open book below; three people study constellation, one uses telescope.

The most impactful AI literacies efforts don't stay confined to one office, one course, or one pilot. They ripple outward—connecting governance, operations, and pedagogy through shared purpose, transparent practices, and the development of human capability alongside machine capacity.

In collaboration with Opened Culture, this playbook spotlights a selection of institutional exemplars drawn from the AI Literacies Case Example Database, an open and growing repository of global practice. These cases illustrate what it looks like when AI literacies are not abstract ideals but constellations in motion—anchored in mission, shaped by culture, and sustained through collaboration.

The examples that follow offer brief portraits of how institutions are bringing AI literacies to life through programs, policies, and partnerships. We invite you to explore these exemplars, remix what resonates, and contribute your own story to the database so that others can learn from your experience. Together, these shared insights form a living map of how higher education is charting its collective course toward ethical, creative, and inclusive engagement with AI.

Global AI Literacies Exemplars in Action

Applying Critical AI Literacies in Academic Development
Submitted by: Anthea Jacobs, University of Western Cape
Primary Literacies: Critical, Civic, Cognitive
Domains Activated: Governance, Operations, Pedagogy

Anthea embedded critical and civic AI literacies into faculty development workshops that foregrounded social justice and decolonization. Rather than focusing on tool tutorials, sessions explored power dynamics in AI systems, cultural assumptions in training data, and the risks of algorithmic harm. Faculty connected these insights to their own assignments, prompting shifts in course design and assessment framing. Simultaneously, the initiative aligned with the institution's access and opportunity commitments and surfaced infrastructure gaps for operational teams to address.

Constellation Insight: When academic development centers critical inquiry and lived context, it creates ripple effects across operations and governance—not just pedagogy.

Institutional Audit Sprint for AI Tool Governance
Composite of field-sourced practices (anonymized)
Primary Literacies: Civic, Communicative, Cultural
Domains Activated: Governance, Operations, Pedagogy

A mid-sized university launched a 30-day cross-functional sprint to audit AI tool use across the institution—including approved platforms, shadow tools, and ad hoc student usage. Faculty, staff, and students submitted tool inventories and described how AI was being used in context. Results surprised leadership: instructors were using ChatGPT for multilingual scaffolding; advisors had started writing form letters with Jasper. This audit prompted the development of clearer procurement protocols, better training, and syllabus guidance rooted in transparency rather than restriction.

Constellation Insight: Seeing your ecosystem clearly—especially its informal realities—unlocks inclusive governance and more grounded pedagogy.

Cross-Role AI Learning Circle (Community College Network)
Composite of field-sourced practices from multiple states
Primary Literacies: Confident, Cultural, Constructive
Domains Activated: Operations, Governance, Pedagogy

A regional community college network launched monthly AI learning circles where advisors, faculty, librarians, IT staff, and even students shared real-world experiences. These weren't presentations—they were structured dialogue spaces with rotating facilitators, simple case templates, and access-first norms that emphasized inclusion and shared opportunity. Participants explored new tools, wrote shared guidance, and identified student-facing practices in need of clarity. What began as informal conversations grew into a system-wide playbook, onboarding module, and microcredential for faculty and staff.

Constellation Insight: When culture precedes policy, governance gains traction and pedagogy becomes more confident, adaptive, and shared.

Map Your Constellation: Reflective Prompts

- ***What campus groups (e.g., advising, IT, student support, faculty) have already touched AI without coordination?***
- ***Could you launch an audit sprint or learning circle to surface latent expertise?***
- ***Which AI literacies are alive in your campus culture—even if unnamed?***
- ***What's the smallest possible experiment to connect two domains (e.g., governance + pedagogy)?***
- ***What public artifact would make your next AI move visible to others?***

These institutions didn't start with scale. They started with alignment. The next constellation could begin in your next committee meeting, course design, or team

debrief. What matters is that it begins—with purpose, with people, and with literacies that make the work visible and sustainable.

These institutions didn't start with scale. They started with alignment and clarity to the values that guide decisions. The next constellation could begin in your next committee meeting, course design, or team debrief. What matters is that it begins with purpose, with people, and with literacies that make the work visible and sustainable.

See **Appendix H: AI Literacies Reflection and Teaching & Facilitation Guide** for a ready-to-use resource to help your team lead conversations, document insights, and build cross-functional momentum.

SECTION 7

Planning & Closure

How do we transform what we've learned about AI literacies into sustained action—anchored in values, guided by strategy, and shaped by community?

Image: Rocket lifts from open lightbulb; two people hold bulb pieces open.

Sustainable AI integration requires rhythm, not revolution. This section provides the practical frameworks for turning aspirations into action through steady cycles of experimentation, learning, and adaptation. The tools and templates here help you maintain momentum while avoiding the twin traps of endless planning and ungoverned sprawl.

The Rhythm of Progress

Plan → Pilot → Review → Publish/Retire → Iterate

Successful AI literacies development follows a predictable cadence. Each cycle builds on the last, creating institutional muscle memory for innovation.

Plan with intention but not perfection. Every initiative needs an owner who wakes up thinking about it, a metric that matters to someone with budget authority, and a sunset date that forces a decision. Planning shouldn't take months—a two-page charter with clear boundaries beats a fifty-page strategy that never launches.

Pilot with boundaries that protect both innovation and stability. Define what success looks like before you start. Set limits on scope, timeline, and resources. Make failure safe by keeping pilots small enough to abandon without institutional trauma. Document everything—what worked, what didn't, what surprised you, and what you might do differently next time.

Review with honesty and transparency. Gather evidence beyond anecdotes. Include voices from those most affected, not just those most enthusiastic. Ask hard questions: Did this solve the problem we identified? Who benefited and who didn't? What would we do differently?

Publish or Retire with equal celebration. Publishing successful practices creates institutional knowledge that outlasts individual champions. Retiring failed experiments with grace and learning creates psychological safety for future innovation. Both decisions deserve recognition—learning what doesn't work is as valuable as discovering what does.

Iterate based on evidence, not momentum. Success doesn't mean scaling everywhere immediately. Sometimes the right move is another bounded pilot with refined parameters. Sometimes it's a pause to digest learning. Sometimes it's rapid expansion because the need is urgent and the solution proven.

Making It Visible: The Public Artifact Commitment

Every sprint ends with something tangible and public. Not a lengthy report for filing, but a living document that invites engagement. This might be a one-page practice brief, a revised syllabus statement, a workflow diagram, or a decision record. The format matters less than the commitment to transparency.

Public artifacts serve multiple purposes. They create accountability—it's harder to let initiatives drift when you've promised to share results. They build collective knowledge—others learn from your experiments without repeating your mistakes. They invite participation—seeing what's possible encourages others to contribute.

Include three elements in every artifact: what you tried and why, what you learned (including failures), and what's next with a specific date. This simple structure keeps documentation lightweight while ensuring continuity.

The Planning Toolkit

Appendix I: Initiative Charter Template

A resource template capturing the essential elements of any AI initiative:

- Problem statement and opportunity
- Owner and core team with roles
- Success metrics and evidence plan
- Timeline with review points
- Risk assessment including barriers to access
- Communication plan for stakeholders
- Sunset clause or scaling triggers

Appendix J: Access Impact Assessment Guide

Before launching any AI initiative, work through these prompts:

- Who benefits from this change? Who might be harmed?
- How will this affect our most vulnerable populations?
- What voices are missing from our planning?
- How will we know if access improves or deteriorates?
- What safeguards protect against unintended consequences?

[Appendix K: Communications Planning Template]
Map stakeholder communications across your initiative lifecycle:

- Who needs to know what, when, and why
- Channels and frequency for different audiences
- Feedback mechanisms and response protocols
- Crisis communication plans if things go wrong
- Success story templates for sharing wins

Managing the Portfolio: Backlog and Deprecation

The Visible Backlog

Maintain a public list of AI initiatives under consideration. This isn't a commitment to implement everything—it's a transparent view of institutional thinking. Include brief descriptions, potential owners, and rough priority levels. Update quarterly based on emerging needs and completed pilots.

The backlog serves several functions. It prevents duplicate efforts by making ideas visible before they become projects. It encourages collaboration by revealing shared interests across units. It manages expectations by showing what's in queue versus what's active. It captures institutional memory of ideas that might not be right today but could be perfect tomorrow.

The Deprecation Path

Every tool, policy, and practice needs an end-of-life plan from day one. This isn't pessimism—it's realism about the pace of technological change. Include sunset dates in all AI-related decisions. Review dates for policies. Renewal decisions for vendor contracts. Migration plans for when tools disappear or better options emerge.

Document deprecation decisions as carefully as adoption ones. What worked about this tool or practice? What didn't? What capabilities do we need to preserve in whatever comes next? Who needs support through the transition? This institutional memory prevents cycling through the same mistakes.

Practical Application: Your 90-Day Quick Start

Days 1-30: Foundation Setting

- Form a small, nimble cross-functional AI literacies team that will ensure decisions reflect actual classroom practice, technical realities, and student experience. Consider Including the following:
    - faculty member from a teaching-intensive discipline
    - instructional designer or teaching/learning center representative
    - technologist (IT or data governance)
    - student representative selected through an existing governance or advisory process
    - administrator connected to academic or student success functions
- Conduct a landscape scan of current AI use (official and shadow IT)
- Choose one concrete problem to address
- Draft a two-page initiative charter
- Set weekly 30-minute check-ins

Days 31-60: Pilot Launch

- Run a bounded pilot with clear success metrics
- Document everything—successes, failures, surprises
- Gather feedback from participants and affected parties
- Create your first public artifact (even if imperfect)
- Identify what would need to change for scaling

Days 61-90: Review and Decide

- Analyze evidence against success metrics
- Conduct access impact assessment
- Make a clear decision: scale, modify, or sunset
- Publish learnings regardless of outcome
- Choose your next initiative from the backlog

Reflection and Action

What would change if every AI initiative had a clear owner, metric, and sunset date from the start? How might visible backlogs and deprecation paths reduce anxiety about technological change? Where in your institution is the energy for experimentation highest?

The planning frameworks in this section aren't about control but about creating conditions for sustainable innovation. They make the implicit explicit, the invisible visible, and the overwhelming manageable.

Start with one initiative. Use the templates to give it structure. Set a review date. Share what you learn. Build from there.

Appendix I: Initiative Charter Template

A concise charter template that helps teams define and govern an AI initiative by clarifying the problem and opportunity, ownership, success evidence, timeline, risks to access and opportunity, stakeholder communication, and clear triggers for scaling or sunsetting.

Appendix J: Access Impact Assessment Guide

A short pre-launch reflection guide that helps teams anticipate who benefits, who may be harmed, which voices are missing, how access impacts will be measured, and what safeguards will prevent unintended consequences.

Appendix K: Communications Planning Template

A practical planning tool that maps what to communicate to each stakeholder group across an initiative's lifecycle—through the right channels, with clear feedback loops, crisis-response protocols, and reusable formats for sharing wins.

Your Continuing Journey

While this playbook ends, your work continues. The frameworks, tools, and examples here provide starting points, not final answers. AI literacies will evolve as technology advances and our understanding deepens. And remember: perfect is the enemy of good, done is better than perfect, and learning is the only real measure of success.

Additionally, our work is only as strong as that which we share within and across our communities for iteration, continuous improvement, and alignment to impact. As such, you're warmly welcomed to join the community of practice sharing insights, ideas, failures, and successes online in our AI Literacies Case Example Database. Share your artifacts, learn from others' experiments, and contribute to the growing knowledge base of AI literacies in higher education. Your pilot today could be someone else's exemplar tomorrow.

Learn more on the Opened Culture website, and submit a case example using the online form.

Share Your Insights
Don't forget to submit your contributions for inclusion in this dynamic playbook at tiny.cc/literacies-playbook.

Final Thought

Institutions that thrive in the AI age won't be those with the best technology or biggest budgets. They'll be those that learn fastest, include most voices, and maintain their values while embracing change. The literacies and practices in this playbook give you the tools. What you build with them will define your institution's future.

The next review date for this playbook is **June 1, 2026**. Until then, experiment boldly, fail safely, learn constantly, and share generously, both here within this playbook and community of practice, as well as with the many stakeholders that make up your own community.

AI Usage Statement

As generative AI technologies continue to develop rapidly, the authors affirm the importance of transparency and openness in scholarly practice through the inclusion of usage statements. These declarations foster trust, support responsible research practices, and contribute to a broader culture of knowledge-sharing, especially as institutions and scholars continue to grapple with the evolving role of AI in academic work.

In this project, generative AI tools were selectively used to support aspects of the research process. AI-powered search platforms, including Elicit and Semantic Scholar, assisted in identifying and reviewing initial sources for the literature review. Additionally, ChatGPT Plus was used as a comparative reference alongside human-coded summaries prepared by the author. Finally, Grammarly AI was used to assist with copy-editing suggestions.

No generative AI tools were used in writing this manuscript.

References

Belshaw, D. (2014). *The essential elements of digital literacies*. https://dougbelshaw.com/essential-elements-book.pdf

Gunder, A. (2024). *Constellating AI literacies: Illuminating the sociocultural and pluralistic dimensions of AI in education*. Opened Culture. https://www.openedculture.org/publications/oec-2024A0001-f01491.pdf

Gunder, A., Herron, J., Weber, N., Chelf, C., & Birdwell, S. (2024). *Dimensions of AI literacies*. Opened Culture. https://openedculture.com/projects/dimensions-of-ai-literacies/

Hauck, M., Moore, E., & Wright, C. (2025). *A framework for the learning and teaching of critical AI literacy skills*. The Open University. https://www.open.ac.uk/blogs/learning-design/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/OU-Critical-AI-Literacy-framework-2025-external-sharing.pdf

MacCallum, K., Parsons, D., & Mohaghegh, M. (2024). *The scaffolded AI literacy (SAIL) framework for education: Preparing learners at all levels to engage constructively with artificial intelligence*. He Rourou, 1(1), 23. https://doi.org/10.54474/herourou.v1i1.10835

Miao, F., & Cukurova, M., (2024). *AI competency framework for teachers*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://doi.org/10.54675/ZJTE2084

Milberg, T. (2025, May 22). *Why AI literacy is now a core competency in education*. World Economic Forum. https://www.weforum.org/stories/2025/05/why-ai-literacy-is-now-a-corecompetency-in-education/

WCET. (2025). *AI Education Policy, Guideline, and Practice Ecosystem Framework*. WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technologies. https://wcet.wiche.edu/resources/ai-education-policy-guideline-and-practice-ecosystem-framework/

Frameworks and Other AI Literacies Resources

Conceptual Frameworks

The foundational models that shaped the approach and analysis presented in this report:

Dimensions of AI Literacies Taxonomy

- Authors: A. Gunder, J. Herron, N. Weber, C. Chelf, S. Birdwell
- Organization: Opened Culture

A taxonomy mapping 8 dimensions of literacies that encompass the skills needed to comprehend, utilize, and critically evaluate AI within complex environments.

AI Education Policy & Practice Ecosystem Framework (2025)

- Organization: WCET

A framework for institutions to develop policies related to AI in higher education across three interconnected dimensions of Governance, Operations, and Pedagogy.

AI Literacy Frameworks

The resources below represent the nine frameworks that were selected for deeper analysis in this review, based on their focus on higher education, post-2023 publication, and availability in English. These frameworks were assessed for their relevance across institutional contexts and their alignment with the WCET governance, operations, and pedagogy domains.

A Competency Framework for AI Literacy: Variations by Different Learner Groups and an Implied Learning Pathway
Authors: H. Chee, S. Ahn, J. Lee

Defines 8 core competencies and 18 sub-competencies spanning technical, ethical, problem-solving, communication, affective, and career-related domains; intended to guide AI literacy development across education levels and professions.

LEAD AI Literacy Framework
Authors: B. Christie
Organization: Alchemy

Defines four pillars—Learn, Engage, Acknowledge, Develop—to guide educators in understanding AI, creating effective prompts, modeling transparency, and adapting to evolving tools.

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) Literacy Framework
Authors: G.L. Haskell
Organization: Yale University

A four-domain framework to guide the ethical and effective consumption, creation, evaluation, and analysis of GAI outputs, with accompanying competencies and instructional examples.

A Framework for the Learning and Teaching of Critical AI Literacy Skills
Authors: M. Hauck, E. Moore, C. Wright
Organization: Open University

Defines Critical AI Literacy as context-specific, social practice-oriented competencies emphasizing ethical, inclusive, and reflective AI engagement; includes EDIA principles and examples for teaching and learning.

A Framework for AI Literacy
Authors: M. Hibbert, E. Altman, T. Shippen, M. Wright
Organization: Barnard College

A four-level scaffold guiding higher education faculty, staff, and students to understand, apply, analyze/evaluate, and create AI, with emphasis on generative AI literacy.

The Scaffolded AI Literacy (SAIL) Framework
Authors: K. MacCallum, D. Parsons, M. Mohaghegh
Organization: University of Canterbury, academyEx, Auckland University of Technology

Provides a four-level scaffold (from awareness to creating AI) across six categories and three domains; aims to support equitable, age-agnostic AI literacy development.

AI Competency Framework for Teachers
Authors: F. Miao, M. Cukurova
Organization: UNESCO

Defines 15 competencies across five dimensions (Human-centred mindset, Ethics of AI, AI foundations and applications, AI pedagogy, AI for professional learning), organized in three progression levels (Acquire, Deepen, Create); designed to guide national policy and teacher training.

Artificial Intelligence Literacy Framework
Authors: University Library
Organization: The University of Adelaide

Defines competencies for students to responsibly recognize, use, evaluate, and reflect on AI tools; explicitly focuses on effective and ethical engagement in academic contexts.

Conceptual Framework for Artificial Intelligence (AI) Literacy
Authors: X. Zhou, L. Schofield
Organization: Queen Mary University of London

Defines AI literacy across four dimensions—Know and Understand AI, Use and Apply AI, Evaluate and Create AI, and AI Ethics—with suggested learning objectives, activities, and tools; aims to help educators integrate AI into curricula progressively.

Complementary Scholarship and Resources

Additional research articles, white papers, and emerging frameworks that offer complementary perspectives on AI literacies development and its application in educational contexts.

Decision Tree for Practitioners: AI Integration in Education
Authors: American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)
Organization: AAAS

Offers a practical decision-making tool for educational practitioners to assess and guide the ethical and effective integration of AI technologies into their teaching and administrative practices.

Generative AI Literacy: Twelve Defining Competencies
Authors: R. Annapureddy, A. Fornaroli, D. Gatica-Perez

Defines 12 competencies required to understand, use, evaluate, and adapt generative AI tools responsibly, spanning foundational knowledge, technical skills (e.g., prompt engineering, fine-tuning), ethics, legal aspects, and continuous learning.

Ten-Dimension AI Readiness Framework
Organization: Digital Education Council

Identifies ten dimensions for evaluating AI readiness in educational organizations, spanning areas such as pedagogy, infrastructure, ethics, innovation, and policy alignment, with a self-assessment tool for institutions.

[Higher Education Generative AI Readiness Assessment]
Organization: EDUCAUSE

A self-assessment offering institutions a sense of their preparedness for AI initiatives, along with recommendations for increasing their institutional capabilities with AI.

[Developing a Holistic AI Literacy Assessment Matrix – Bridging Generic, Domain-Specific, and Ethical Competencies]
Authors: N. Knoth, M. Decker, M. Laupichler, M. Pinski, N. Buchholtz, K. Bata, B. Schultz

Defines AI literacy as the intersection of three horizontal dimensions (Generic AI Literacy, Domain-Specific AI Literacy, AI Ethics Literacy) and three vertical dimensions (Cognition, Behavior, Attitude); proposes assessment items and a model for designing instruments and learning pathways.

[AI Literacy in Higher Education]
Authors: Oregon State University Ecampus
Organization: Oregon State University

Presents a staged model of AI literacy aligned with Bloom's Taxonomy to help educators scaffold student learning and awareness of generative AI tools across multiple cognitive levels.

[Understanding AI Literacy]
Authors: Teaching Commons
Organization: Stanford University

Defines AI literacy through four domains—Functional, Ethical, Pedagogical, and Rhetorical—describing how educators can critically and effectively engage with AI tools and concepts in teaching and learning.

[Developing a Model for AI Across the Curriculum: Transforming the Higher Education Landscape via Innovation in AI Literacy]
Organization: University of Florida

Defines five categories of AI literacy adapted from Ng et al.'s model, paired with Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) to scaffold AI literacy development across undergraduate curricula, including a process for reviewing and labeling courses.

[Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning]
Authors: Office of Educational Technology
Organization: U.S. Department of Education

Provides policy recommendations, examples, and design principles for integrating AI into U.S. educational systems, emphasizing safe, effective, and human-centered uses.

Why AI Literacy Is Now a Core Competency in Education
Organization: World Economic Forum

Advocates for AI literacy as essential for civic and workforce readiness, highlighting the need for inclusive, cross-sector approaches to upskilling and education reform.

Appendices

Appendix A: Contributor Wall

How to Comment in Google Docs

1. Highlight the area where you want to leave a comment. Select the text, section, or tool where you have feedback, suggestions, or examples to share.
2. Click the + icon on the right side of the document to begin adding a comment. The comment box will appear in the margin next to your selected text.
3. Type your comment and click Comment to post. Be specific about your suggestion or example. Include your institution type if relevant (e.g., "At our community college, we found...").

Types of Contributions We're Seeking

- Real-world examples: Share what's worked (or hasn't) at your institution
- Role-specific insights: Add perspectives from your functional area
- Tool refinements: Suggest improvements to templates and frameworks
- Access considerations: Highlight accessibility or inclusion gaps
- Resource additions: Recommend readings, tools, or exemplars we should include
- Language clarifications: Help us communicate more clearly across contexts

Complete the Contributor Form

After adding your comments, please complete our brief **Contributor Form** to:

- Ensure proper attribution in our Contributor Wall.
- Receive updates on the final release
- Join our community of practice for ongoing collaboration
- Share additional context about your contributions

Contribution Guidelines

- Be constructive: Frame critiques with suggested improvements
- Be specific: Ground feedback in concrete examples when possible
- Be inclusive: Consider diverse institutional contexts and resources
- Be practical: Focus on what practitioners can actually implement

Timeline

- **Comment Period**: January 2025—May 2026
- **Integration Period**: June 2026
- **Final Release**: August 2026

Appendices B-K: AI Literacies Implementation Toolkits

*The following appendices provide ready-to-use tools aligned with the **WCET AI Education Policy, Guideline, and Practice Framework** and the **Dimensions of AI Literacies**. Each toolkit includes a rationale, template structure, and implementation notes to guide institutional action. These can be used independently or as part of broader AI literacies planning workshops.*

Appendix B: Assignment Authenticity Audit Template

Purpose	Identify quick, high-leverage changes that make learning visible, situated, and owned—so students demonstrate authentic thinking and process (not just polished outputs).
Best for	Brown bags (30m), Working Sessions (60m), Retreat Blocks (90m)

Authenticity in learning comes from visible thinking and creative ownership, not from surveillance. This toolkit supports educators in transforming assignments into opportunities for voice, iteration, and collaboration. Grounded in the Constructive, Communicative, and Confident Literacies, it reframes "academic integrity" as a design question: How might we make the learning process transparent, participatory, and worth showing off?

Section	Prompt	Your Response
Original Assignment	*Paste or summarize the current prompt. What is the task really asking students to do, make, or think?*	
Purpose & Literacies Activated	*Which literacies are most alive in this task? Where could others be added?*	
Agency Opportunities	*How can students make meaningful choices, use AI intentionally, or personalize their approach?*	
Opportunity & Access Check	*Does the design presume access to certain tools or language expertise? How can supports be added?*	
Attribution & Transparency	*What mechanisms invite students to show how AI was used or revised (e.g., prompt*	

	history, reflection note)?	
Next Iteration	*One small change that could make the task more open, inquiry-driven, or collaborative.*	

Implementation Tips

- Use during department or program redesign sessions to audit how learning is demonstrated, not only what is submitted.
- Pair with the AI Reflection Prompts in **Appendix C: Guided AI Use & Reflection Cycle for Students** to capture the learner's decision-making.
- Invite students or librarians to join redesign discussions to surface multiple perspectives.
- Revisit annually to document evolving literacies in your discipline.

Appendix C: Guided AI Use & Reflection Cycle for Students

Purpose	Provide a simple, repeatable Use → Review → Revise → Reflect cycle that helps students document AI-supported learning in transparent, ethical ways—so instructors can assess thinking, decision-making, and ownership, not just the final product.
Best for	Course kickoffs and assignment launches (15–20m), Brown bags (30m), Working sessions (60m), Retreat blocks (90m)

Students are already experimenting with AI in complex ways. Rather than hiding or fearing that use, this guide helps educators make it visible, discussable, and formative. This guide gives instructors a four-stage cycle of Use → Review → Revise → Reflect that embeds AI use directly into the learning process. It develops Cognitive, Critical, Communicative, and Civic Literacies by asking learners to make decisions visible and discuss them openly.

The Four-Stage AI Learning Cycle

Stage	Instructor Guidance	Student Actions	Artifacts / Evidence
1. Use: Guided First Drafting	Demonstrate one AI tool (e.g., ChatGPT, Claude, Copilot). Model how to craft a clear, bounded prompt. Remind students: the goal is exploration, not perfection.	Generate an initial idea, outline, or draft with AI. Note the exact prompt(s) used and any immediate reactions.	Screenshot of prompts and first output. Short note: "What did I ask? What did I notice?"

2. Review: Evaluate the Output	Lead a mini-lesson on criteria: accuracy, bias, originality, tone, alignment with assignment. Provide an evaluation checklist.	Assess AI output against those criteria. Highlight what seems credible, what feels "off," and where human judgment is needed.	Annotated AI output with comments or highlights.
3. Revise: Human Rewrite & Expansion	Remind students this is where their voice takes over. Encourage rewriting in their own words, adding research, examples, or data.	Produce a human-revised version that keeps useful ideas but rewrites or expands them authentically.	Side-by-side comparison: AI → Student Draft. One-paragraph note: "What did I keep, change, or delete—and why?"
4. Reflect: Dialogue & Meta-Learning	Facilitate in-class or online discussion (see below). Ask what surprised them, frustrated them, or sparked new ideas. Tie back to literacies: critical, constructive, confident.	Complete reflection prompts and join peer discussion.	

Instructor Guidance: Using AI with Purpose

1. Model openness. Demonstrate one AI tool in class—show both the useful and flawed results. Discuss your thinking aloud: What did I ask? Why did I edit this output?

2. Set boundaries and invitations.
    - Clarify what kinds of AI use are encouraged (e.g., brainstorming, translation, accessibility support) versus restricted (e.g., full-text substitution).
    - Emphasize attribution: students explain or cite any AI contribution.

3. Integrate reflection throughout, not at the end. Add a short reflection checkpoint at each project milestone: ideation, drafting, revision, presentation.

4. Make reflection count. Grade on depth of analysis, not the presence or absence of AI use.

5. Normalize emotion. Tell students it's fine to feel both excited and uneasy; literacies grow through tension.

Student Reflection Prompts

1. Quick Check (Assignment Submission Add-on)

☐ I used AI for … (ideation / outlining / editing / translation / other)
☐ I revised or expanded the AI output substantially
☐ I noted where I used or cited AI
☐ Something unexpected happened when I used AI … (brief note)

2. Reflective Journal (Short Paragraphs or Voice Notes)

- What question or problem did you bring to the AI?
- What did you learn about your own process from the interaction?
- Where did the AI frustrate or mislead you?
- What creative idea or shortcut did it reveal that you might keep using?
- How did using AI change your confidence or curiosity about this topic?

3. Discussion & Dialogue Prompts

In Class (15–20 minutes)

1. In small groups, share one "AI win" and one "AI fail."
2. Ask: What did this experience teach you about thinking, bias, or originality?
3. Groups identify one insight to post on a shared board or Padlet: "When AI helps learning," "When AI hurts learning," "When AI surprises me."

Online (Asynchronous)

- Create a discussion thread titled AI & Me.
- Prompt: "Describe a time AI made your work easier or harder than expected. What did you learn about yourself as a learner?"
- Encourage peers to respond with curiosity, not correction: "What's one strategy from this post you might try?"

Implementation Tips

- Use reflections as conversation starters at mid-semester check-ins or advising sessions.
- Pair with **Appendix B: Assignment Authenticity Audit Template** to align reflection with assignment design.
- Collect anonymized student quotes to illustrate evolving literacies in departmental PD.
- Encourage multimodal reflections (audio, video, sketch notes) to capture authentic voice.

Appendix D: AI Integration Maturity Snapshot

Purpose	Create a shared snapshot of where your institution is right now in integrating AI (across teaching/learning, operations, and governance), so teams can align on priorities, surface gaps and strengths, and choose the next 1–3 moves for building AI literacies in a coordinated, sustainable way.
Best for	Leadership or cross-functional alignment meetings (30m), Working sessions to set quarterly priorities (60m), Strategic planning retreats (90m)

Many campuses leap into AI initiatives without clarity on readiness or dependencies. The Maturity Snapshot, modeled after WCET's institutional maturity tools, helps cross-functional teams identify strengths and capacity gaps across Access, Support, Policy, Procurement, and Data. It supports iterative operational improvement and access-centered planning.

Assessment Domains

Domain	Status (Select One)	Notes
Access & Opportunity Ensuring AI supports are usable and beneficial for all learners and staff, without creating new barriers.	Not Started In Progress Operational Scaling	
Policy & Procurement Establishing rules and decision processes for selecting, approving, and purchasing AI tools and services.	Not Started In Progress Operational Scaling	
Data Governance	Not Started	

Defining how data used with AI is collected, protected, shared, and retained responsibly.	In Progress Operational Scaling	
Support & Training Building the guidance, professional learning, and help structures people need to use AI effectively and responsibly.	Not Started In Progress Operational Scaling	
AI Tool Ecosystem The set of AI tools, integrations, and workflows your institution supports—and how they fit together.	Not Started In Progress Operational Scaling	

Implementation Tips

- Facilitate as a group exercise during strategic retreats.
- Color-code results to visualize progress over time.
- Review biannually to track institutional growth.

Appendix E: Cross-Functional Collaboration Planning Template

Purpose	Clarify roles, responsibilities, decision rights, and communication routines so cross-functional teams can coordinate AI literacies work efficiently and avoid gaps, duplication, or stalled progress.
Best for	Project kickoffs and alignment meetings (30m), Working sessions to set ownership and cadence (60m), Retreat blocks launching multi-unit initiatives (90m)

Siloed AI experimentation can lead to redundant investments or inconsistent ethical standards. This tool operationalizes collaboration using a RACI (Responsible, Accountable, Consulted, Informed) structure, ensuring shared ownership across domains. It activates a plurality of AI literacies through transparent communication and alignment.

- **Domains**: Pedagogy, Operations, and Governance
- **AI Literacies**: Cultural, Cognitive, Constructive, Communicative, Confident, Creative, Critical, and Civic
- **Role**: Responsible, Accountable, Consulted, Informed
- **Review Cadence**: Annually, Semesterly, Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly, Daily

Initiative	Domain(s)	Literacies Activated	Stakeholder	Role (R/A/C/I)	Review Cadence
e.g. Launch AI Knowledge Base	*Ops, Governance*	*Cognitive, Confident*	*Director of IT*	*A*	*Quarterly*

Implementation Tips

- Use early in planning to define roles before resource commitments.
- Integrate review cadence into standing committee schedules.
- Pair with **Appendix D: AI Integration Maturity Snapshot** for readiness planning.

Appendix F: AI Policy Decision Guide Template

Purpose	Support teams in making transparent, well-reasoned policy decisions about AI use—anchored in institutional values, risk awareness, and practical implementation—so guidance is coherent, enforceable, and teachable.
Best for	Policy drafting sprints (60m), Governance working groups and stakeholder reviews (90m), Retreat blocks to align on direction and decision logic (120m)

Transparent governance practices reinforce trust and accountability. The Decision Record Template draws from the Critical and Civic Literacies, supporting institutions in making values-based decisions that document rationale, stakeholder engagement, and ethical considerations. It helps leaders determine whether an existing policy can be remixed to fit AI contexts or if new guidance is required.

Policy Decision Flow

Before drafting, determine which path fits best:

Remix Existing Policy: Adapt an established framework (e.g., honor code, procurement, data privacy) to explicitly address AI use.
Create New Policy: Develop new guidance where existing language does not cover emerging AI practices.
Hybrid Approach: Add an AI supplement or appendix to existing policies.

Template Sections

- Policy Context & Rationale: What prompted this decision?
- Remix or Create New?: ☐ Remix Existing ☐ Create New ☐ Hybrid
- Student Input Consulted?: ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Literacies Affected: e.g., Civic, Critical, Communicative
- Stakeholders Consulted: Names, roles, how input was gathered
- Risks & Mitigations: Potential harms and mitigation plans
- Sunset or Review Date: When will this be revisited?
- Public Artifact: Will this be published or shared? If so, where?

Implementation Tips

- Include student councils, advisory groups, or representatives in review cycles.
- Maintain a shared repository for transparency.
- Review annually with institutional AI councils or task forces.
- Document rationale for remix vs. new creation decisions.

Appendix G: Student Advisory Planning Guide

Purpose	Provide a structure for engaging students as informed partners in AI strategy and practice—so institutional decisions reflect learner realities and build trust, legitimacy, and shared responsibility.
Best for	Program design and launch planning (60m), Stakeholder alignment sessions with student affairs/academic units (90m), Retreat blocks to build a charter, recruitment plan, and first-meeting agenda (120m)

Students are the most affected by institutional AI policies yet are often excluded from governance conversations. This guide promotes co-design and shared leadership, activating Civic and Cultural Literacies by ensuring diverse voices inform decision-making and institutional direction.

Planning Elements

Focus Area	Notes/Examples
Purpose Define whether the group will Inform, Co-Design, or Review.	
Recruitment Identify strategies for diverse representation.	
Meeting Cadence Determine frequency, modality, and compensation.	
Sample Charter Excerpts Language for formalizing	

student roles.	
Guiding Questions e.g., “How is AI changing your learning reality?”	

Implementation Tips

- Start small: invite 3–5 student voices to existing governance groups.
- Provide stipends or course credit to ensure meaningful participation.
- Integrate student insights into annual reports or policy reviews.

Example in Practice

A technical institute launched a Student AI Fellows program using this guide, leading to the co-creation of a campus-wide AI ethics statement and peer education campaign.

Appendix H: AI Literacies Reflection & Teaching & Facilitation Guide

Purpose	Equip facilitators to run practical, low-lift sessions that build shared language, surface local examples, and translate AI literacies into concrete commitments and next steps across roles and units.
Best for	Faculty/staff development workshops (60–90m), Community-of-practice sessions (60m), Retreat blocks for institutional planning and follow-through (90–120m)

Institutional change depends on reflective practitioners who can translate individual learning into shared understanding. This toolkit activates the Confident, Cognitive, and Civic Literacies, supporting individuals to move from learner to mentor. It merges personal reflection with a ready-to-run facilitation structure, helping users share their experience in workshops, meetings, or professional development series.

Reflection Prompts

Focus Area	Notes / Examples
Understanding What new perspective or skill have you gained through using these toolkits?	
Application Where did you apply or adapt one of the tools at your institution?	
Impact What changed in your teaching, policy, or team practices as a result?	

Challenge What barriers did you encounter when integrating these approaches?	
Next Step How might you mentor or train others to use these tools effectively?	

Workshop & Meeting Facilitation Blocks

Use these agenda blocks to design a short (60–90 minute) workshop or meeting:

1. **Open (Aim)**: Frame the focus—Which section or toolkit are we exploring today?
2. **Mini-Demo / Try**: Walk participants through a tool and let them use it briefly.
3. **Reflect (One Insight)**: Invite individuals to capture one key takeaway or mindset shift.
4. **Plan (Who/When/How)**: Participants identify one next step to apply or adapt.
5. **Teach-Back Prep**: Each participant outlines how they'll share or teach the concept to colleagues.
6. **Follow-Up Date**: Schedule a return meeting or asynchronous check-in to share outcomes.

Teaching & Sharing Plan

1. **Audience Identification**: Who would benefit most from this learning (faculty, staff, students, leadership)?
2. **Format Options**: Department workshop, lightning talk, "brown bag" session, or shared guide.
3. **Core Message**: What's the single insight or mindset shift you want to model?
4. **Artifacts to Reuse**: Slides, toolkits, or short case examples from this playbook.
5. **Feedback Mechanism**: How will you capture participant insights or new ideas?

Implementation Tips

- Use as a closing activity for PD cohorts or AI literacies working groups.
- Encourage participants to co-present with colleagues or students.
- Combine reflection worksheets with live workshop facilitation.
- Link outcomes back to institutional AI literacies or access goals.

Appendix I: Initiative Charter Template

Purpose	Create a one-page charter that makes an AI initiative legible and governable—aligning the problem/opportunity, ownership, success evidence, timeline, risks (including access barriers), communication, and clear criteria for scaling or sunsetting.
Best for	Kickoffs for new initiatives (30–45m), Working sessions to finalize scope and ownership (60m), Retreat blocks to align multiple initiatives into a portfolio (90m)

Institutional change accelerates when initiatives are clear enough to govern, resourced enough to deliver, and measurable enough to learn from. This template activates the Cognitive, Constructive, and Civic Literacies by helping teams translate a promising idea into a shared plan with accountable ownership, evidence of impact, and decision points for iteration. It supports AI literacies development by making expectations explicit—what responsible, transparent practice looks like in action, and how it will be sustained over time. Use it to turn informal momentum into a coordinated initiative that can scale without losing trust.

Focus Area	Reflections
Problem statement & opportunity What specific problem are we solving, for whom, and what meaningful opportunity becomes possible if we solve it well?	
Owner & core team with roles Who is accountable for outcomes, and do we have the right mix of roles to make decisions and deliver the work without bottlenecks?	

Success metrics & evidence plan How will we know this worked—what evidence will we collect, from whom, and by when?	
Timeline with review points What are our key checkpoints for learning and decision-making, and what will we review at each one?	
Risk assessment (including barriers to access) What could go wrong—especially in ways that reduce access or opportunity—and what will we do now to prevent or mitigate it?	
Communication plan for stakeholders Who needs to know what, when, and through which channels so expectations stay clear and trust stays intact?	
Sunset clause or scaling triggers What evidence or conditions would lead us to scale this initiative—and what evidence or	

conditions would lead us to pause or stop it?	

Appendix J: Access Impact Assessment Guide

Purpose	Identify likely benefits, harms, and access barriers before launching an AI initiative, so teams can include missing voices, define evidence of access impact, and build safeguards that prevent unintended consequences.
Best for	Pre-launch checks for any AI initiative (15–20m), Working sessions to finalize readiness and mitigations (30–45m), Retreat blocks to review a portfolio of initiatives through an access lens (60m)

AI literacies development is not only about capability—it is about ensuring new practices expand access and opportunity rather than limit benefits or amplify harm. This guide activates the Critical, Civic, and Cultural Literacies by prompting teams to anticipate who is helped, who is burdened, and which perspectives must be included before launch. It strengthens institutional learning by translating values into safeguards, evidence, and feedback loops that can be monitored over time. Use it as a pre-flight check to design initiatives that are both effective and accountable.

Focus Area	Reflections
Benefits & harms Who benefits from this change—and who might be harmed (directly or indirectly)?	
Vulnerable populations How might this initiative affect our most vulnerable populations, and what additional supports or alternatives are needed?	
Missing voices	

What voices, roles, or lived experiences are missing from our planning, and how will we bring them in before launch?	
Evidence of access impact How will we know if access improves or deteriorates—what indicators will we track, for whom, and on what timeline?	
Safeguards What safeguards will protect against unintended consequences, and what is our plan to pause, revise, or roll back if harms emerge?	

Appendix K: Communications Planning Template

Purpose	Create a coordinated, trust-building communication plan for AI initiatives by clarifying who needs information, what they need, when they need it, how feedback will be handled, and how the team will respond if issues arise—while also making it easy to document and share successes.
Best for	Initiative kickoffs and stakeholder alignment (30m), Working sessions to finalize cadence and protocols (60m), Retreat blocks coordinating communications across multiple initiatives (90m)

AI initiatives succeed when people understand what is changing, why it matters, and how to participate safely and confidently. This template activates the Cultural, Communicative, Confident, and Civic Literacies by helping teams plan consistent messaging across the full initiative lifecycle—from early alignment to feedback, response protocols, and learning-oriented updates. It supports AI literacies development by making communication a form of capacity-building, not just announcement-making: stakeholders learn shared language, norms, and expectations through the way the initiative is communicated. Use it to build trust, reduce confusion, and create pathways for shared sensemaking and continuous improvement.

Remixable Prompts

1) Initiative context

- What is the initiative (one sentence), and what change will people experience?
- What phase are we in right now?
  ☐ Planning ☐ Pilot ☐ Launch ☐ Scale ☐ Sustain ☐ Sunset
- What is the single most important message we want to be true across all communications?

2) Stakeholder map: who needs to know what, when, and why

For each stakeholder group:

- Who is this audience (roles/groups—not names)?
- What do they need to know to do their work or make decisions?
- What do we want them to understand (context, rationale, expectations)?
- Why does this matter to them (benefit, risk, responsibility, timeline)?
- When do they need this information (before what decision or moment)?
- What action (if any) do we want them to take?

3) Channels, cadence, and ownership

For each audience:

- Which channels will we use (email, website page, LMS notice, town hall, FAQ, Slack/Teams, training session, office hours, student comms, etc.)?
- How often will we communicate (weekly/biweekly/monthly/at milestones)?
- Who owns drafting and who approves?
- Where will the "single source of truth" live (link/location)?

4) Message standards (consistency + clarity)

- What terms or labels will we use consistently (and what terms will we avoid)?
- What boundaries are we setting (what the initiative is not)?
- What accessibility commitments apply to all communications (format, language, captioning, translation, alternative channels)?

5) Feedback mechanisms

- How will stakeholders give feedback (form, office hours, listening session, advisory group, help desk, survey)?
- What feedback are we explicitly asking for (usability issues, access barriers, confusion, harms, suggestions)?
- How frequently will we review feedback, and who is responsible?

6) Response protocols (service-level expectations)

- What is our response time target for questions/concerns (e.g., 48 hours)?
- What gets a standard reply vs. a personalized response?
- What issues must be escalated (privacy, harm, discrimination, security, academic integrity disputes)?
- Who handles escalations and what is the escalation path?

7) Crisis communication plan (if things go wrong)

- What scenarios are we planning for (tool failure, data incident, bias/harm report, public criticism, policy confusion)?
- What triggers a crisis response (thresholds, severity levels)?
- Who is on the crisis response team and who is the spokesperson?
- What is the first message we will send (acknowledge, impact, immediate steps, where to get help)?
- What updates will follow, and on what cadence?
- What is our plan for pausing/rolling back if needed?

8) Success story templates (sharing wins)

- What counts as a "win" for this initiative (access improvement, time saved, learning gains, reduced friction, increased confidence)?
- Whose voices will we elevate (students, faculty, staff, community partners)?
- What evidence will we include (quotes, metrics, artifacts, before/after examples)?
- Where will we share wins (internal newsletter, blog, board update, campus leadership brief, social posts, conference proposals)?

Success Story Prompt

Prompt	Reflections
Challenge: What problem were we trying to solve?	
What we tried: What did we implement (and with whom)?	
What changed: What is different now (experience, outcomes, access)?	
Evidence: What signals/metrics/stories support this?	
What's next: How we will iterate, scale, or sustain.	

9) Review and refresh

- When will we revisit this communication plan (next review date)?
- What indicators tell us the plan is working (engagement, reduced confusion, fewer escalations, higher trust)?
- What will we change after the next review?