



Who Owns the Work? AI and Attribution

Competency

Learners explore how AI-generated content may borrow from or replicate existing work and consider when such use is fair, original, or requires attribution. They reflect on the ethical implications of AI-assisted creation.

Key Method

The educator models ethical use of AI by making authorship, attribution, and decision-making transparent. Through intentional modeling and reflection, the educator demonstrates how AI can support thinking without replacing original student work.

Method Components

In classrooms where AI tools are available, teachers and students are learning together how to navigate new ways of thinking, learning, and creating. We ask AI for help brainstorming, revising, and organizing ideas, and as we do this, we need to pause and ask, "Is this still my work?"

Modeling Ethical Use and AI Attribution

Educators who are skilled in their craft model the behaviors and thinking they want their students to emulate; the same is true of AI. Educators should model ethical AI use by making their AI decisions visible, including when AI is used as a thinking partner, and by clarifying expectations when student work must remain fully student-authored.

Artificial intelligence introduces many opportunities but can also blur the boundaries of authorship and originality when expectations are unclear.

Teachers should:

- Distinguish between AI as a support versus AI as a source of thinking or content
- Identify when AI assistance should be acknowledged
- Use clear, developmentally appropriate language to explain attribution expectations

When teachers credit AI contributions and name appropriate boundaries for use, it normalizes ethical AI use in the classroom. This visible modeling helps students understand responsible AI use as part of the learning process and identifies it as a support.

Teaching Attribution as a Classroom Norm

Finding a manageable way to teach attribution without adding to an already heavy workload is a valid challenge. The best action plan is to make attribution and ethical use of a shared classroom learning experience and an established classroom norm, rather than to rely on legal or technical requirements. Teachers need not act as legal experts; instead, they should implement practical norms that help students understand how to use AI responsibly while focusing on learning.

Teachers can explicitly support students by:

- **Establishing clear expectations** for when AI-generated ideas, language, or structure should be acknowledged
- **Modeling and reinforcing shared language** for explaining AI use in simple, honest terms
- **Connecting attribution norms** to learning, trust, and academic integrity—even when AI use is allowed

Classroom teachers should not teach attribution in a silo. As with all student learning, especially expectations, they are best strengthened when educators collaborate with colleagues such as librarians, English teachers (at the secondary level), or instructional specialists, and when expectations align with existing school or district practices. Shared language and consistent reinforcement across classrooms help students better understand and apply ethical AI use.

Supporting Originality and Student Ownership of Thinking

Originality and creative integrity are strengthened when students reflect not only on how AI influenced their thinking but also on their use of technology. Rather than spending teacher energy trying to catch AI misuse, focus on questioning techniques that support deeper learning. Shifting goals from AI as a judgment to more of a tool is one way to use it more creatively. Students who can explain AI choices and use will understand their own AI more deeply and what needs to be attributed.

Implement these principles by:

- **Asking students to explain** which ideas came from their own thinking and how AI contributed to their process
- **Designing tasks that emphasize revision, synthesis, and decision-making**, rather than polished AI-generated output
- **Providing feedback that prioritizes reasoning and reflection**, encouraging students to add their own insights, perspectives, or creative choices
-
- **Using structured thinking routines** (such as 'See, Think, Wonder' or the 'AI Sandwich') to help students systematically identify patterns in AI responses and decide what to keep, adapt, or reject.
- **Valuing revision, mistakes, and growth** by recognizing when students persist, revise, or improve their thinking without immediately relying on AI-generated answers

When instruction values learning and human thinking, students are more willing to reflect with their teacher and peers. Shifting student class time away from correctness on tasks is challenging but imperative in our current world.

Designing Transparent Learning Experiences with AI

To design transparent AI-supported learning experiences, clarity must be built into lessons and daily routines. Clearly name:

- how AI may be used,
- when it is appropriate for students to use it, and
- providing time for students to plan, explain, discuss, and reflect on their use of AI.

Transparency works best when it is introduced proactively rather than reactively. Transparency is strongest when it is embedded in all classroom tasks and becomes part of the learning culture.

In practice, this may include:

- **Designing assignments that ask students to describe their process**, such as how they brainstormed, revised, or made decisions with or without AI
- **Providing prompts or sentence frames** that normalize explaining AI use as part of learning, rather than something to hide

- **Building in reflection checkpoints** where students pause to consider what AI helped with, what it did not, and what thinking remained their own
- **Allowing time for revision and discussion**, so transparency is connected to learning and growth rather than speed or perfection.
- **Allowing for “productive friction”** or discussing with students what tasks should not be offloaded, because it builds cognitive fortitude. In other words, make the tasks of brainstorming, formulating a thesis, and ethical reasoning not about a task to achieve, but an active engagement in brain power building.

When transparency is intentionally designed into everyday learning, students come to see explaining their thinking and tool use as a part of the learning process. Metacognitive habits support not only the ethical use of tools like AI but, more importantly, build the critical thinking skills students need. For teachers, these moments are also a formative assessment, helping guide next steps in instruction.

Reflective Practice on AI’s Role in Creativity and Attribution

As AI becomes part of education, it is helpful to reflect on your own beliefs around AI use and attribution. Reflection brings clarity, which helps teachers feel confident in the norms they set. When expectations align with a teacher’s values and existing practice, AI use is more likely to be modeled consistently and taught with integrity, rather than treated as a compliance requirement. Clarity also makes instruction AI easier.

To engage in reflective practice:

- Consider classroom scenarios that involve AI use and consider how attribution would be handled
- Examine example policies, guidance documents, or case studies from trusted educational organizations.
- Engage in professional dialogue with colleagues.
- Use district guidance and professional resources to inform classroom norms

When educators reflect on AI use, they take the first step toward creating meaningful integration in their classroom. The next step is to model reflective use and then create norms that make AI processes and discussions part of everyday learning. Students learn that AI supports thinking.

Evaluation of AI Training Data and Bias

AI-generated content can reflect bias or incomplete perspectives. Educators should support ethical AI use by helping students recognize that human choices and patterns shape AI responses and that these responses do not represent a neutral truth.

Rather than teaching the technical details of how AI is trained in the classroom, which is already full of content objectives, teachers can focus on instructional strategies that engage critical thinking.

In classroom practice, teachers can support this awareness by:

- Asking students to question AI responses (such as, *What might be missing? Who might this represent well or poorly? Where did AI find this information?*)
- Comparing AI-generated content with other sources, texts, or lived experiences
- Discussing whose perspectives are emphasized and whose may be absent
- Encouraging students to decide when AI output is helpful, incomplete, or needs revision
- Using Interrogation Routines that require students to explicitly identify the perspective of the AI (for example: Who is this answer written for, or what voice is missing)

Ethical AI use is ultimately about digital citizenship, specifically participating in learning spaces with responsibility, awareness, and respect for others' ideas and one's own thinking.

Supporting Rationale and Research

AI Literacy Framework (Review Draft). (2025).

This framework provides a broad view of AI literacy, including ethical use, attribution, bias, and authorship. It is offered as a reference to support educator reflection and alignment, not as a required standard for implementation.

https://ailiteracyframework.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/AILitFramework_ReviewDraft.pdf

Cornell University Center for Teaching Innovation. (n.d.). *Ethical AI for teaching and learning*. Retrieved October 30, 2025, from

<https://teaching.cornell.edu/generative-artificial-intelligence/ethical-ai-teaching-and-learning>

Microsoft. (n.d.). *Responsible AI*. Retrieved October 30, 2025, from <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/ai/responsible-ai>

Professional & Executive Development. (n.d.). *Building a responsible AI framework: 5 key principles for organizations*. Harvard Division of Continuing Education. Retrieved October 30, 2025, from <https://professional.dce.harvard.edu/blog/building-a-responsible-ai-framework-5-key-principles-for-organizations/>

Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP. (2025, May 15). *Copyright Office weighs in on AI training and fair use*. <https://www.skadden.com/insights/publications/2025/05/copyright-office-report>

Southern Regional Education Board. (2025, April 21). *A roadmap for responsible and effective use of AI in K–12 classrooms*. <https://www.sreb.org/news/roadmap-responsible-and-effective-use-ai-k-12-classrooms>

UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693>

World Economic Forum. (2024, January 17). *AI guidance for school leaders and policy-makers on responsible use in education*. <https://www.weforum.org/stories/2024/01/ai-guidance-school-responsible-use-in-education/>

Resources

AI Support for Educators
[Microsoft Elevate for Educators](#)

Attribution and Intellectual Property

[AI Glossary of Terms](#)

[Citation and Attribution - Generative Artificial Intelligence - Library Guides at Brown University](#)

[Who Owns The Rights To AI-Generated Content?](#)

[Using CC-Licensed Works for AI Training - Creative Commons](#)

AI in Education

Who Owns the Work? AI and Attribution
Revised on : Apr 15, 2026

Ethical and Policy Considerations for AI Use
[National Education Association Policy Statements 2023-2024](#)

[TeachAI | Principles | AI Guidance for Schools Toolkit](#)

[2025-26 Guidance for Artificial Intelligence Tools and Other Services](#)

[AI Webinar: Preparing Students for an AI-Powered Future](#)

Instructional Strategies for Teaching AI Use

[The AI Sandwich | Centre for Teaching Excellence](#)

[Design Strategies for Assessing Learning with AI | FIU Center for the Advancement of Teaching](#)

[Digital Citizenship in Education \(ISTE\)](#)

[Empowering Educators in the Age of AI | NEA](#)

[Teaching Students to Think Critically About AI | Harvard Graduate School of Education](#)

Scenario Resources

[A.J. Juliani | Five “AI In Schools” Scenarios We Need To Discuss](#) (Discussion-oriented classroom scenarios)

[Princeton Dialogues on AI and Ethics Case Studies](#) (General AI ethics cases; not all education-specific)

[Scenarios for Artifact 1: Who Owns the Work? AI and Attribution](#)

[Student Use Cases for AI | Harvard Business Impact Education](#) (Examples of student-facing AI use in learning)

Policy, Ethics, and Intellectual Property

[With Great Power Comes Great Responsibility: The Ethics of AI](#)

Teaching Resources

[AI vs Visible Learning - Supercharging Hattie’s High-Impact Strategies & Research - Cohort 2\]](#)

[Empowering Educators in the Age of AI | NEA](#)
[ISTE AI Lessons](#)

[Gen AI and the essay: Evaluating task specificity and rubric alignment](#)

[How Students Can Use AI in Project-Based Learning](#)

[Human-Centered AI Guidance for K-12 Public Schools](#)

[ISTE Hands-On AI Project for K-12](#)

[The AI Horizon: Case Studies in Michigan Education's Transformation \(Part 1\)](#)

[Unlock generative AI safely and responsibly—classroom toolkit](#)

[Using CC-Licensed Works for AI Training - Creative Commons](#)

Submission Guidelines and Evaluation Criteria

To earn this micro-credential, you must receive a passing score in Parts 1 and 3 and be proficient in all components in Part 2.

Part 1. Overview Questions (Provides Context)

(200-350 word count)

Please do not include any information that will make you identifiable to your reviewers.

Answer the following questions:

1. What grade level and subject do you teach? Include any relevant demographics or learning considerations (such as, multilingual learners, IEP/504 supports, age range, or general classroom context) that help reviewers understand your teaching environment.
2. What is your current understanding of how AI tools create and generate content?
3. What concerns or questions do you have about originality, authorship, or ownership when using AI tools?
4. How do you define “ethical use” of AI in an educational setting? Include specific examples to illustrate your thinking.
5. What outcomes do you hope to gain from this micro-credential, not only professionally but for your students as well?

Passing:

A passing response clearly describes your teaching context, purpose, and motivation for pursuing this micro-credential. It demonstrates your current

understanding of AI generation, authorship, and ethical use while maintaining confidentiality and excluding identifying information.

Part 2. Work Examples/Artifacts/Evidence

To earn this micro-credential, please submit the following three artifacts as evidence of your learning. See the Rubric for the passing score.

*Please do not include any information that will make you or your students identifiable to your reviewers.

Artifact 1: Reflecting on AI Use Scenarios

Select three AI-related classroom or school-based scenarios from this micro-credential's Resources Section. Scenarios may involve students' use of AI, educators' use of AI, or AI-generated media in school settings.

Part 1: Scenario Review

Briefly summarize each of the three scenarios you selected. Each summary should show that you considered at least the following:

- **Who is involved in the scenario** (student, teacher, families, colleagues, etc)
- **The purpose of the task or situation** (What was the original intent or goal?)
- **The educator's role and choices** (What decisions does the educator need to make?)
- How bias, incomplete perspectives, or uneven representation were involved in the scenario(s).

Part 2: Scenario Analysis

Choose one of the scenarios you summarized and reflect. In your reflection, address the following:

- What ethical, instructional, or professional questions does this scenario raise?
(For example: questions about learning, assessment, attribution, transparency, originality, or appropriate use of AI.)
- How would you respond as an educator in this situation? Or, if you were not the primary educator, what advice would you give your colleague?
 - Consider instructional or professional choices, including assessment and communication.

- How does your response support learning and understanding rather than discouraging reflection, revision, or appropriate use of AI?
- What professional values, principles, or guidance inform your reasoning?
 - (For example: classroom norms, district guidance, professional judgment, ethical responsibilities, or commitments to student growth and integrity.)

Upload: Combine your three scenario summaries and your reflection analysis into a single PDF.

Artifact 2: Human–AI–Human Collaboration With Attribution

This artifact asks you to demonstrate how AI can be used as a thinking partner while maintaining clear ownership and providing attribution.

Part 1: Original Work and AI Iteration

Select one of the following:

- Your written reflection from Artifact 1, or
- A short piece of professional writing you authored (for example: a lesson plan excerpt, classroom guideline, assignment, or family communication)

If you do not use your Artifact 1 reflection, you must include the original human-created version of the writing.

Then:

- Use an AI tool to revise, expand, or rework the text.
- Engage in at least one round of iteration, adjusting your prompt or responding to the AI output to better match your intended purpose.
 - Provide by pasting screenshots of your chat history or by copying the text of your prompts. Ensure your evidence clearly labels 'Attempt 1' and 'Attempt 2'.
- Revise the AI-generated version to create your final authored version.
- Attribute the creation.

Part 2: Reflection on Learning, Decisions, and Attribution

In 150–200 words, reflect on the process by addressing the following:

- What role did AI play in your thinking or revision?
- What decisions did you make as the human author (what did you ask, what did you accept or reject)?
- How did iteration improve the final result?

Upload: Combine the original human-created version (unless you used Artifact 1), the AI-generated version, the final educator-revised version, and a 150–200-word written reflection into a single PDF.

Artifact 3: Reflective AI Teaching Philosophy on Authorship

This artifact asks you to describe your professional approach to the use of AI, authorship, and attribution in instructional practice.

Write a reflective philosophy (300–750 words) that addresses the following:

- How do you define authorship and originality in an AI-supported learning environment?
- When does AI support student thinking, and when does it risk replacing student reasoning?
- How do your values around learning, creativity, and integrity shape your expectations for AI use?
- When and how should AI use be acknowledged or attributed in your instructional context?
- How do assessment, feedback, and reflection support learning when AI tools are involved?
- How will this philosophy guide the classroom expectations or norms you establish for AI use?

Upload: Submit your reflective AI teaching philosophy as a single PDF.

Part 2. Rubric

	Proficient	Basic	Developing
Artifact 1: Reflecting on AI Use Scenarios	<p>All three scenarios clearly identify who is involved, the purpose of the situation, and the specific choices or decisions the educator must make.</p> <p>Explicitly identifies ethical, instructional, or professional questions related to AI use.</p> <p>Describes a specific response to the situation, explaining the instructional or professional decisions.</p> <p>Explains how decisions support learning, reflection, or understanding, rather than focusing solely on rule enforcement or compliance.</p> <p>Clearly references guiding considerations such as classroom norms, instructional goals, district</p>	<p>All three scenarios are summarized, but one or more may lack clarity about who is involved, the purpose, or the educator's choices.</p> <p>Identifies ethical, instructional, or professional questions related to AI use, but these may be general or briefly stated.</p> <p>Describes a response to the situation, but the instructional or professional decisions may lack detail or explanation.</p> <p>Mentions learning or reflection, but the connection between decisions and learning may be limited or implied.</p> <p>References guiding considerations (such as norms or goals), but connections are not fully explained.</p> <p>Writing is clear but may focus on a single perspective or overlook broader implications</p>	<p>Scenario summaries are incomplete, unclear, or do not consistently identify who is involved, the purpose, or the educator's role.</p> <p>Ethical, instructional, or professional questions related to AI use are unclear, superficial, or missing.</p> <p>Response to the situation is vague, minimal, or focused primarily on rules or compliance without explanation.</p> <p>Limited or no explanation of how decisions support learning, reflection, or understanding.</p> <p>Guiding considerations such as norms, goals, or professional commitments are not clearly referenced.</p> <p>Writing lacks clarity, focus, or evidence of reflection on multiple perspectives.</p>

AI in Education

Who Owns the Work? AI and Attribution

Revised on : Apr 15, 2026

	<p>guidance, or commitments to student growth and integrity.</p> <p>Writing is clear, focused, and demonstrates consideration of more than one perspective or implication of the scenario.</p>		
<p>Artifact 2: Human-AI-Human Collaboration With Attribution</p>	<p>Includes the original human-created version of the work.</p> <p>Submission includes a clear transcript or log of the prompts used, demonstrating a progression from the initial request to the final output.</p> <p>Demonstrates at least one clear round of AI-supported revision or expansion.</p> <p>Shows evidence of iteration.</p> <p>Final version reflects educator decision-making,</p>	<p>Includes an original version and an AI-generated version, but evidence of iteration is limited or unclear.</p> <p>The final version shows some educator revisions, but the voice or intent may still rely heavily on AI output.</p> <p>AI use is attributed, but it is minimal or unclear.</p> <p>Reflection describes the process but provides a limited explanation of decisions or learning from iteration.</p>	<p>Original human-created work is missing or unclear.</p> <p>AI-generated content is used with little evidence of iteration or educator revision.</p> <p>The final version does not clearly reflect an educator’s voice or decision-making.</p> <p>Attribution of AI use is missing or unclear.</p> <p>Reflection is incomplete, unclear, or does not explain the role of AI or the educator’s decisions.</p>

	<p>rather than direct adoption of AI output.</p> <p>Clearly attributes AI use and distinguishes between human-authored and AI-supported contributions. Reflection explains the role of AI, decisions made by the educator, and how iteration improved the final result.</p>		
<p>Artifact 3: Reflective AI Teaching Philosophy on Authorship</p>	<p>Clearly defines authorship and originality in an AI-supported learning environment.</p> <p>Explains when AI supports student thinking and when it risks replacing student reasoning within their teaching/context.</p> <p>Connects values to AI use.</p> <p>Describes when and how AI use should be acknowledged or attributed in the educator’s context.</p> <p>Articulates how the philosophy will guide their</p>	<p>Defines authorship and originality, but the definitions are general or lack clarity.</p> <p>Describes AI support and risks, but distinctions between supporting and replacing student thinking may be unclear or loosely connected.</p> <p>References values related to AI use, but connections are limited.</p> <p>Mentions acknowledgment or attribution of AI use, but guidance may be vague or incomplete.</p> <p>Indicates how the philosophy may influence educational</p>	<p>Provides limited or unclear definitions of authorship or originality in relation to AI.</p> <p>Does not clearly explain when AI supports student thinking versus when it replaces reasoning.</p> <p>Values related to AI use are missing, unclear, or disconnected from instructional practice.</p> <p>Acknowledgment or attribution of AI use is not clearly addressed.</p> <p>Does not clearly explain how the philosophy will guide</p>

	educational practice. Writing is coherent.	practice, but connections are underdeveloped. Writing is clear but may lack focus or cohesion.	educational practice. Writing lacks clarity or coherence.
--	---	---	--

Part 3 Reflection

(200–400 words)

Use the word count above as a guide to write a personal reflection about your work on this micro-credential.

For tips on writing a good reflection, review the following resource:

[How Do I Write a Good Personal Reflection?](#)

Please do not include any information that will make you identifiable to your reviewers.

Answer the following questions:

1. How will you connect your learning from this micro-credential to your future curriculum or instructional practice? Describe one or more specific ways you plan to integrate what you learned into lessons, units, classroom routines, or district plans.
2. How does your experience with this learning connect to established best practices in your content area or pedagogy? Describe the specific improvements in student engagement or learning outcomes you anticipate and explain why you expect these results.
3. What concerns do you still have concerning AI authorship and the ethical implications of using AI-assisted creations?

Passing:

Clearly addresses all questions. Demonstrates professional insight into how learning informs curriculum, instruction, and collaboration, and provides specific examples of student engagement, growth, or understanding. The reflection connects insights to effective instructional practices and responsible AI use, while also acknowledging remaining questions or concerns that reflect ongoing professional curiosity and growth.