

AI INFUSED ASSIGNMENTS



A DESIGN PLAYBOOK

Sarah Lewis, PhD

Contents

Preface: Teaching for Genuine Learning in an AI World	1
Chapter 1: Learning as Network Construction.....	2
Chapter 2: How to Use This Playbook.....	22
Chapter 3: Assignments.....	32
Sample Full Assignment: AI-Enhanced Iterative Writing Assignment.....	32
Condensed assignments using template:	43
AI Dialogue Reflection Assignment (Condensed Entry).....	43
AI Literature Review Assistant Assignment.....	48
AI Bias Detection Exercise Assignment.....	53
AI Study Partner Reflection Assignment.....	58
AI Study Partner Reflection Assignment.....	62
AI-Assisted Self-Assessment Assignment.....	65
AI Debate Partner Assignment	68
AI Client Simulation Assignment.....	72
AI Scenario Testing Assignment	76
AI-Facilitated Group Project Assignment.....	80
Peer Review with AI Comparison Assignment.....	84
Professional AI Use Policy Development Assignment	87
Transparent AI Integration Portfolio Assignment.....	91
Appendix A: The AI-Human Collaboration Log	95

Preface: Teaching for Genuine Learning in an AI World

This playbook was born out of two intersecting realities in contemporary higher education: students are already using AI, and faculty are already under extraordinary pressure to sustain high-quality teaching in rapidly changing conditions. As a social work professor, founding director of a Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, and AI-pedagogy and accreditation consultant, these tensions are not abstract questions—they show up in classrooms, field placements, curriculum meetings, and accreditation conversations every single day.

On one side, there is deep and understandable concern. Social work and allied professions are grounded in relationship, judgment, ethics, and context. Nursing and healthcare emphasize safety, accountability, and evidence-based practice. Faculty across disciplines worry that generative AI makes it easier for students to bypass difficult thinking, obscure authorship, and present work that looks sophisticated but rests on shallow understanding. Accreditors, meanwhile, are asking for clearer evidence that programs can demonstrate real learning outcomes, not just polished products.

On the other side, students will graduate into workplaces where AI tools are ubiquitous and expectations about their use are often unclear. They will be asked to write reports with AI at their elbow, interpret AI-generated risk scores, respond to AI-drafted emails, and navigate organizational cultures that may value speed and efficiency over ethical reflection. Choosing “no AI” in the curriculum does not prepare them for this world; it only pushes their AI use into the shadows and denies them guided practice in using these tools well.

This playbook is one response from the perspective of AI-infused pedagogy.

The assignments collected here treat AI as an unavoidable, powerful, and deeply imperfect part of the learning environment. The goal is not to celebrate or to ban AI, but to discipline its use in the best sense of that word—to bring it under the discipline of social work values, professional ethics, sound pedagogy, and clear assessment. Every activity asks: how do we design learning experiences where AI is present, but students must still think, connect, struggle productively, and grow?

Several commitments run through this work:

Social work and allied professional values are non-negotiable. Human dignity, relational practice, equity, and justice remain at the center. AI can support professional practice, but it cannot replace the ethical responsibility of practitioners or educators.

Learning must be visible and verifiable. In an era when AI can generate impressive products, it is not enough to assess the final paper or presentation. These assignments foreground process artifacts, decision logs, and brief knowledge checks so that faculty and accreditors can see the thinking behind the work.

Students need guided practice, not just rules. Telling students “do not misuse AI” is not an instructional strategy. They need structured opportunities to prompt, evaluate, verify, and reflect with support from instructors who are themselves learning alongside them.

Faculty workload is a real constraint. The designs here aim to be rigorous and realistic. Documentation tables, focused rubrics, and short in-class checks are meant to give you high-quality evidence of learning without requiring you to become a full-time AI detective.

Accreditation and innovation can align. Many of the concerns that accreditors raise—transparency, integrity, assessment of higher-order outcomes, ethical reasoning, preparation for practice—can be addressed more strongly through well-designed AI-integrated assignments than through traditional ones.

You will not find a single “right way” to use AI in teaching within these pages. Instead, you will find a set of tested AI-pedagogical structures that you can adapt to your context: assignments that insist students think clearly before they prompt; tools for making AI use explicit and open to critique; mechanisms for distinguishing genuine learning from well-packaged output; and reflective spaces where students can name how AI is reshaping their understanding of themselves as learners and professionals.

My hope is that this playbook gives you three things:

Language to talk with colleagues, students, and accreditors about why you are integrating AI and how you are protecting the integrity of learning.

Concrete, ready-to-adapt assignments that let you move beyond abstract discussion and into practice.

Encouragement that it is possible to honor the deepest commitments of social work, nursing, and other professions while teaching in an AI-saturated world.

You do not need to adopt everything here. Start small, adapt generously, and let your own disciplinary expertise, institutional mission, and students’ realities guide you. The work of reimagining assessment and learning in the age of AI is iterative and collaborative. This playbook is one contribution to that ongoing AI-pedagogy conversation, offered from the vantage point of a social work educator, center director, and AI-pedagogy consultant who believes that students deserve both rigor and honest preparation for the world they are walking into.

Chapter 1: Learning as Network Construction

This chapter provides the pedagogical and assessment framework that underpins every assignment in this playbook. If you are eager to move directly to implementation, you may wish to skim for key ideas now and return in more depth as you adapt assignments to your own context.

The first time a student handed me an essay that I suspected was written by AI, I didn't feel angry. I felt obsolete. We have all spent careers designing assignments to test thinking, and suddenly, a machine bypassed our safeguards in seconds. The temptation to ban these tools is an emotional reaction to that threat, but because these tools are ubiquitous, powerful, and

increasingly essential to modern academic and professional work. Recent data indicates that a vast majority of students worldwide have already incorporated generative AI into their studies (BestColleges, 2023; Campbell, 2025; Digital Education Council, 2024; Flaherty, 2025). The question confronting educators is no longer whether students will use AI, but rather how they will use it, and what role we will play in shaping that use.

The temptation to ban AI is understandable. After all, we've spent careers developing expertise in our disciplines, crafting assignments that challenge students to think deeply, and assessing learning through carefully designed assessments. The sudden availability of tools that can generate sophisticated-sounding text, solve complex problems, and produce polished work in seconds feels like a fundamental threat to everything we've built. If students can simply prompt an AI to write their papers or solve their problems, what role remains for genuine learning?

Yet banning AI is not only impractical—it's pedagogically irresponsible (University Business, 2024). Students will use these tools regardless of our policies, developing habits in secret, without guidance or reflection. The result is not the protection of academic integrity, but rather the creation of a generation of students who view AI as either a magic solution to avoid learning or a forbidden fruit to be guiltily consumed in private (Klover, 2025). Neither outcome serves our educational mission.

Ignoring AI is equally untenable. We cannot simply hope these tools will disappear or prove to be a passing fad. The trajectory of technological development makes clear that AI will become more sophisticated, more integrated into professional practice, and more central to knowledge work across every field. To send students into this world without explicit instruction in the strategic, ethical, and critical use of AI is to abdicate our responsibility as educators (AI-HED, 2025; CIDDl, 2025; Ecampus News, 2025).

This playbook takes a third path: the thoughtful integration of AI into pedagogy in ways that enhance rather than undermine learning. Our goal is to transform AI from a threat to academic integrity into a catalyst for deeper learning, more sophisticated critical thinking, and more robust professional development (Colleague AI, 2025). We aim to teach students not simply to use AI, but to use it wisely—as a tool that amplifies human intelligence rather than replaces human thought (The Learning Accelerator, 2025).

Reframing the Relationship: AI as Thinking Partner, Not Thinking Replacement

The key to productive AI integration lies in understanding what AI can and cannot do in the service of learning. AI tools excel at certain tasks: they can generate multiple perspectives rapidly, provide immediate feedback on drafts, create practice scenarios for skill development, help identify gaps in understanding, brainstorm ideas and connections, and organize information in varied ways. These capabilities are genuinely valuable for learners seeking to develop expertise, acting as scaffolds rather than replacements for human cognition (Mollick, 2024; UNESCO, 2023).

However, AI fundamentally cannot do the work of learning. It cannot build the neural pathways that form through the struggle to understand difficult concepts and synthesize disparate information (Lodge et al.,

2023; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2023). It cannot grasp the specific context of a particular course, instructor, or assignment in the way that human learners immersed in that context can (Bender et al., 2021; Mitchell & Krakauer, 2023). It cannot develop professional judgment and ethical reasoning through grappling with ambiguity and competing values (Dwivedi et al., 2023). Most crucially, AI lacks what cognitive scientists call metacognition—the awareness of what one knows and doesn't know, the ability to monitor one's own understanding, and the capacity to adapt learning strategies based on that monitoring (MacMahon et al., 2022; Milligan & Charles, 2024).

The distinction between AI assistance and AI replacement becomes clearer when we consider an analogy from physical education. Learning is like building muscle. AI is like having a personal trainer who can suggest exercises, provide technique feedback, generate workout plans, and explain muscle anatomy. These are all valuable supports for someone developing physical fitness. However, the trainer cannot do the push-ups for the athlete. The muscle-building happens in the athlete's body, through their effort, through their physiological adaptation to stress. No amount of watching someone else exercise, or having someone describe how to exercise, will build strength in muscles that remain inactive. Research on "desirable difficulties" confirms that this effortful engagement—rather than ease—is required for durable learning (Fierro & Phelan, 2024; Yan et al., 2023).

Similarly, learning happens in the student's brain through the cognitive effort of making connections, struggling with concepts, and synthesizing understanding (Wigmore et al., 2023). AI can support that process—it can provide scaffolding, suggest connections, offer feedback, generate practice opportunities. But it cannot replace the fundamental work of network-building that constitutes learning. When students use AI to bypass the cognitive effort of learning, they may produce impressive-looking work while developing little actual competence, succumbing to an "illusion of understanding" (Williamson et al., 2023). When they use AI strategically to support their learning process, they can develop expertise more efficiently and effectively than they might without such tools (Grassini, 2023; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2023).

The assignments in this playbook are designed around this crucial distinction. They leverage AI's capabilities while ensuring students do the irreplaceable work of learning. They make AI use transparent rather than hidden, strategic rather than reflexive, and critically examined rather than uncritically accepted.

The Theoretical Foundation: Learning as Network Construction

To understand why certain uses of AI support learning while others undermine it, we must first understand what learning actually is at a cognitive level. Traditional conceptions of education often treat learning as the accumulation of information—filling a mental filing cabinet with facts, theories, and procedures. This metaphor suggests that knowledge consists of discrete units stored in memory, waiting to be retrieved when needed. If this were accurate, AI might indeed pose an

existential threat to learning, as it can store and retrieve far more information far more efficiently than any human mind.

However, contemporary understanding of learning, drawn from neuroscience, cognitive psychology, and educational research, tells a different story. Learning is not primarily about accumulating information but about constructing networks of connected understanding (Lodge et al., 2023). The connectivist learning theory explicitly conceptualizes learning as the creation and navigation of knowledge networks (Knox, 2022; Siemens, 2022). Similarly, modern cognitive architecture theories emphasize that expertise consists not of isolated facts but of richly interconnected mental structures that allow for flexible application of knowledge (Sweller, 2022).

We can understand this through a neural network metaphor that parallels how the brain actually functions (Deans for Impact, 2023). Consider three levels of organization:

Nodes represent individual concepts, facts, theories, skills, or frameworks—the discrete elements of knowledge. In the brain, these might be thought of as individual neurons or small clusters of neurons that represent particular ideas. A student learning about trauma-informed care, for instance, develops nodes for the definition of trauma-informed care, the core principles, the research evidence, and so forth. These nodes are necessary but insufficient for competence.

Connections represent relationships between concepts—how ideas relate to each other, when one idea activates another, the "why" and "how" that link ideas together. In the brain, these are synaptic connections between neurons, strengthened through repeated activation and use. A student develops connections when they understand not just what trauma-informed care is, but how it relates to attachment theory, why it connects to neurobiology, what it means for power dynamics in helping relationships, and how it integrates with cultural humility in practice.

Network activation represents genuine understanding—the coordinated firing of multiple interconnected nodes that allows for flexible application of knowledge across contexts. This is what we recognize as expertise or deep understanding. When a student encounters a client situation, their entire network activates: assessment skills, theoretical understanding, communication techniques, ethical frameworks, and cultural awareness all fire together to inform professional judgment.

Consider the difference between weak and strong learning through a concrete example. A student learning about trauma-informed care might achieve weak learning by memorizing the definition and listing the core principles. They possess the nodes—the discrete pieces of information. They can recognize the term on a test and perhaps even define it adequately. However, when faced with an actual client who has experienced trauma, they cannot apply this knowledge because the nodes exist in isolation. The connection between "trauma-informed care" and "how to conduct an assessment," between "trauma-informed care" and "what language to use in this moment," between "trauma-informed care" and "how to navigate power dynamics ethically"—these connections were never built.

Strong learning, by contrast, involves developing a richly connected network. The student understands trauma-informed care and has built robust connections to attachment theory, to neurobiology, to power dynamics, to cultural context, to communication skills, and to professional boundaries. When this student encounters a client, their entire knowledge network activates in coordinated fashion, enabling sophisticated professional judgment (Deans for Impact, 2023; Sithole et al., 2024).

This understanding of learning has profound implications for AI use. AI can help activate prior knowledge through retrieval practice. It can help identify missing connections by generating questions or scenarios that reveal gaps in understanding. It can provide practice opportunities that strengthen connections through repeated activation. It can offer alternative perspectives that help students see new relationships between concepts they already know. These are all valuable support functions (Mollick, 2024; UNESCO, 2023).

However, AI cannot build connections for students. That cognitive work—the struggle to understand how ideas relate, the effort to synthesize information from multiple sources, the challenge of applying abstract concepts to concrete situations—must be done by the learner (Wigmore et al., 2023). When students use AI to generate connections they then passively consume, they may feel they understand without actually building the neural pathways that constitute understanding. When students use AI to support their active work of connection-building, they can accelerate and deepen their learning.

The assignments in this playbook are designed to ensure students do the actual work of network construction while using AI to make that work more efficient and effective. Students cannot complete these assignments by simply prompting AI and copying outputs. The assignments require them to evaluate AI

contributions, integrate multiple sources, apply concepts to novel situations, justify their reasoning, and demonstrate their thinking process (Bearman & Ajjawi, 2023; Tai et al., 2023). The knowledge networks they build are their own, even when AI supported their construction.

Design for Genuine Learning: What Makes These Assignments Different

Traditional approaches to AI integration often fall into predictable patterns that undermine their pedagogical value. Faculty might offer vague guidance such as "use AI to help with this paper" without specifying what constitutes appropriate help versus inappropriate replacement, treating the tools as neutral rather than requiring explicit design (U.S. Department of Education, 2023). Assignments might require no documentation of AI use, allowing students to engage with these tools invisibly, without reflection or accountability. Assessment might focus exclusively on final products, making it impossible to determine whether learning occurred or whether AI simply generated impressive-sounding text that students submitted (Bearman et al., 2022; Tai et al., 2023). Verification of AI-generated information might be optional or absent entirely, allowing errors and hallucinations to propagate unchecked.

These approaches fail because they don't distinguish between uses of AI that support learning and uses that circumvent learning. They fail because they leave the pedagogically crucial

elements—the thinking process, the struggle with ideas, the connection-building—invisible and therefore unassessed. This playbook takes a fundamentally different approach, structured around five core design principles that appear in every assignment:

First, structured prompts ensure students cannot simply delegate thinking to AI. Rather than vague instructions to "use AI to help," assignments provide specific prompting frameworks that require students to think clearly before they can prompt effectively. Students must identify what they're trying to accomplish, what concepts are relevant, what their current understanding is, and what specific kind of assistance they need. This front-end cognitive work ensures that students engage actively with content before AI enters the picture (Anders, 2023; Liu et al., 2024). For instance, in the AI-Enhanced Iterative Writing assignment, students must write an initial draft demonstrating their own thinking before using three precisely structured prompts focused on thesis refinement, evidence gap analysis, and counterargument development.

Second, critical evaluation transforms AI from oracle to object of analysis. Every assignment requires students to assess AI's contributions, not simply accept them. Students use structured frameworks—accept/reject tables, comparison matrices, evaluation rubrics—to analyze what AI generated. They must justify why certain suggestions are valuable and why others are problematic. They must explain what AI got right, what it got wrong, what it oversimplified, and what it missed entirely. This critical stance toward AI outputs develops the analytical thinking that constitutes genuine learning (Grassini, 2023; Mollick, 2024). In the AI Dialogue Reflection assignment, for example, students must create a comparison table documenting where AI was accurate versus inaccurate versus incomplete, citing specific course materials as evidence (Bearman & Ajjawi, 2023).

Third, documentation and transparency make AI use visible and accountable. Rather than hidden AI engagement that we can neither guide nor assess, these assignments require comprehensive documentation of every AI interaction. Students submit their prompts, AI's responses, and their decisions about what to use, modify, or reject—along with justifications for those decisions. This transparency serves multiple purposes: it makes students' thinking processes visible for assessment, it creates opportunities for reflection and learning, and it builds habits of professional accountability that transfer beyond the classroom (Eaton, 2023; Moorhouse et al., 2023). The Transparent AI Integration Portfolio, maintained across an entire semester, exemplifies this approach by requiring students to log every instance of AI use with detailed reflection on its impact.

Fourth, metacognitive reflection transforms task completion into learning. Every assignment includes structured reflection requiring students to articulate what they learned, how AI helped or hindered their learning, what they would do differently, and how the experience changed their understanding. This metacognitive component—thinking about thinking, learning about learning—is where much of the pedagogical value resides (MacMahon et al., 2022; Milligan & Charles, 2024). Students who complete assignments without reflection may develop skills without understanding. Students who engage in structured reflection develop not just competence but wisdom about when and how to deploy that competence.

Fifth, knowledge verification ensures genuine learning occurred. Because sophisticated AI outputs can mask shallow understanding, every assignment includes mechanisms to verify that students actually learned the content. Brief in-class quizzes, closed-note and time-limited, test whether students can explain concepts without AI assistance, apply knowledge to new scenarios, articulate their reasoning process, and demonstrate understanding that could only come from genuine engagement (Agarwal et al., 2021; Yan et al., 2023). These knowledge checks are not punitive but diagnostic—they provide evidence that the assignment achieved its learning objectives.

The result of these five design principles is assignments where learning objectives are achieved through strategic AI use rather than despite it. Students cannot succeed on these assignments by being passive consumers of AI outputs; the integrated design requires them to demonstrate the self-regulation and critical thinking that defines academic success (Moorhouse et al., 2023).

The Assessment Challenge: Measuring What Matters

The availability of AI tools creates a profound assessment challenge for educators. Traditional assessment approaches often focus on final products—papers, projects, presentations—that AI can now generate with alarming sophistication. A student can prompt AI to write an essay that demonstrates apparent understanding of complex concepts, applies relevant theories, cites appropriate sources, and uses disciplinary language correctly. Yet that same student might be unable to explain the essay's argument, apply its concepts to a new situation, or defend its claims when questioned. The impressive product masks hollow understanding, a risk that assessment scholars have long warned against but which is now amplified by generative AI (Bearman et al., 2022; Tai et al., 2023).

This challenge requires us to think more carefully about what we're actually trying to assess. In the framework of learning as network construction, we can distinguish between two related but distinct assessment goals (Deans for Impact, 2023; Lodge et al., 2023):

Assessing nodes—do students have the foundational concepts? This is what traditional testing often focuses on. Can students define key terms? Recognize important theories? Identify relevant concepts? These are necessary elements of learning, but they're insufficient indicators of genuine understanding. A student can possess all the right nodes—know all the vocabulary, recognize all the theories—while lacking the connections that allow for flexible application. We might think of this as assessing whether the filing cabinet has the right folders, but we learn nothing about whether the student knows how folders relate to each other or when to pull from multiple folders simultaneously.

Assessing connections—can students integrate and apply knowledge? This is where genuine learning becomes visible. Can students apply concepts to situations they haven't seen before? Can they synthesize information from multiple sources? Can they explain why certain approaches work in some contexts but not others? Can they articulate the reasoning process that connects problem to solution? Can they adapt when conditions change? These capabilities emerge from strong connections in knowledge networks, and they're precisely what AI cannot simply generate on command.

Traditional assessment tools can measure nodes reasonably well: multiple-choice tests, matching exercises, short-answer questions that require definitions. These have their place, particularly for foundational knowledge. However, in an age when AI can instantly retrieve and articulate any definition or concept, assessing only nodes becomes less meaningful. We need to assess something more fundamental.

The assignments in this playbook are designed to make connection strength visible and assessable. They employ multiple complementary strategies:

Transfer tasks require students to apply learning to novel situations. Rather than asking students to explain trauma-informed care in the abstract, assignments might ask them to analyze how trauma-informed principles would apply in a scenario they haven't encountered before—perhaps in a different cultural context, or with a different population, or in an unexpected setting. Students with strong connections can make these leaps. Students with only isolated nodes cannot, even with AI assistance, because the transfer requires integrating multiple areas of knowledge simultaneously in context-specific ways (Deans for Impact, 2023; Sithole et al., 2024).

Integration assignments require synthesizing multiple concepts or perspectives. rather than asking about one theory in isolation, assignments might require students to analyze a case using two competing theoretical frameworks, then explain where they align, where they conflict, and how a practitioner might navigate the tension. Or they might require comparing feedback from human peers and AI on the same work, analyzing what each source notices, what each misses, and why.

Justification requirements make reasoning visible. It's insufficient for students to provide an answer; they must explain why that answer makes sense, what assumptions underlie it, what alternatives they considered, and what would make them change their conclusion. This articulation of reasoning process reveals whether connections exist and how robust they are (Bearman & Ajjawi, 2023; Brookhart, 2022). When students can only state conclusions without explaining the path to those conclusions, we know connections are weak even if correct answers suggest knowledge is present.

Comparison exercises reveal whether students understand relationships. Asking students to compare and contrast two theoretical approaches, or to analyze the same problem from multiple perspectives, or to evaluate competing solutions to a dilemma—all of these require understanding not just what concepts are, but how they relate. Students with strong connections can navigate these comparisons fluently, while those with isolated nodes struggle to move beyond surface-level similarities (Liu et al., 2024).

Performance under constraints reveals internalization. In-class writing, closed-note quizzes, time-limited exercises, oral presentations—all of these constrain students' ability to rely on external resources including AI. Strong connections allow students to perform under these constraints because the knowledge network is internal. Weak connections become apparent when external supports are removed. The five-minute knowledge checks that accompany every assignment in this playbook serve exactly this function: they verify that impressive assignment

work reflects genuine learning rather than skilled AI prompting (Agarwal et al., 2021; Roediger & Karpicke, 2018).

Progressive problem-solving demonstrates adaptability. Assignments that start with straightforward scenarios then add complications, constraints, or unexpected variables reveal whether students' knowledge is brittle or flexible. Strong connections allow adaptation as problems evolve. Weak connections lead to breakdown when situations become more complex (Sithole et al., 2024).

The dual-dimension rubric approach employed throughout this playbook operationalizes these assessment principles (Bearman et al., 2022; Tai et al., 2023). Every assignment is evaluated on two complementary dimensions:

Content mastery (50-70% of grade) assesses disciplinary learning: Do students understand course concepts? Can they apply theories appropriately? Is their analysis sound? Does work demonstrate learning objectives? This dimension focuses on nodes and connections within the discipline itself.

AI literacy and critical thinking (30-40% of grade) assess process and metacognition: Do students use AI strategically? Can they evaluate AI outputs critically? Do they verify information? Do they show metacognitive awareness? Is their use transparent and ethical? This dimension assesses the quality of students' engagement with learning tools and their own learning process.

These two dimensions work together to provide a complete picture of student learning. A student might demonstrate strong content mastery but weak AI literacy—using AI poorly but learning deeply through other means. Another student might show sophisticated AI use but weak content mastery—prompting skillfully but understanding shallowly. The best students demonstrate strength in both dimensions: they understand course content deeply and they use AI strategically to enhance that understanding.

Finally, the knowledge check component—a brief in-class quiz that students must pass to receive full credit—serves as a safeguard. Students who cannot demonstrate basic competence when AI is unavailable face a 20% grade reduction and must complete makeup assessment. This requirement ensures that impressive assignment work reflects genuine learning, not sophisticated AI prompting followed by submission without engagement (Eaton, 2023).

The Double Standard: Should Faculty Use AI to Grade Student Work?

Having made the case for strategic, transparent, ethical AI use by students, we must confront an uncomfortable parallel question: Should faculty use AI to grade student work? The question is charged with tension and irony—if we're teaching students to use AI critically and transparently, what does it mean when we use AI to assess their learning?

The arguments against faculty AI use in grading are substantial and deserve serious consideration. Students own the intellectual property in their work, and uploading that work to commercial AI systems raises important privacy and ownership questions. Grading is

fundamentally a professional judgment task requiring deep understanding of context, student growth, assignment goals, and disciplinary standards—precisely the kind of nuanced, relationship-embedded work that AI struggles with. Using AI for grading reduces the authentic engagement with student thinking that constitutes some of our most important pedagogical work. Depending on implementation, AI-assisted grading may violate FERPA or student privacy protections. Perhaps most importantly, it models the very behavior we're trying to teach students to avoid: delegating important judgment work to AI, treating AI outputs as sufficient without critical human oversight, and prioritizing efficiency over depth of engagement (Colvard & Schedler, 2025; FL Falcon, 2025; National Education Association, 2024; Ohio State University, 2025).

The arguments in favor of judicious AI use carry weight as well. Faculty workload is a genuine crisis in higher education, and AI assistance that enables faster turnaround on feedback could mean students receive more detailed, more timely responses to their work. AI might provide more consistent application of rubric criteria across papers, reducing the drift that happens when faculty grade eighty essays over several days. Using AI to handle routine surface-level errors—flagging citation problems, identifying unclear passages, noting organizational issues—could free faculty to focus attention on higher-order conceptual feedback that requires disciplinary expertise. Large course enrollments create assessment demands that can overwhelm even dedicated faculty, and AI might make quality teaching sustainable under those conditions. Finally, we already use tools like spell-checkers, grammar-checkers, and plagiarism detection software in our writing and assessment processes; AI represents an evolution of, not a departure from, technology-assisted academic work (KPBS, 2025; Sharma & Kumar, 2025; Tyton Partners, 2023; University of North Texas, 2025).

These competing considerations suggest a middle path: strategic, limited, transparent use of AI for grading support rather than grading replacement. Faculty who choose to use AI in assessment might consider several practices:

Use AI to generate rubrics or feedback frameworks that you then apply yourself, rather than having AI apply criteria to student work. Use AI to help you identify patterns across a set of papers—common strengths, frequent errors, themes worth addressing in class—without uploading actual student work. Have AI draft sample feedback that you then customize and personalize for individual students, ensuring the human relationship and judgment remain central. Use AI to help articulate your own assessment criteria more clearly, making implicit standards explicit. Be transparent with students about any AI use in assessment processes, modeling the very transparency you expect from them. Use only institutional tools with appropriate data security and privacy protections, never commercial AI systems with student information.

These recommendations align with emerging guidance that emphasizes a "human-in-the-loop" approach, where AI supports administrative efficiency while educators retain final evaluative authority (FL Falcon, 2025; National Education Association, 2024; Ohio State University, 2025).

Equally important are practices to avoid: Don't upload student work containing identifying information to commercial AI systems—this violates basic privacy principles and potentially FERPA. Don't let AI make final grading decisions without your careful review and judgment. Don't use AI as a substitute for actually reading student work—the learning you gain from engaging with student thinking is irreplaceable pedagogical information. Don't apply AI-generated feedback without personalizing it—students can tell when feedback is generic, and it undermines the educational relationship. Don't hide AI use from students—transparency is not optional. Don't violate institutional policies or legal requirements around student record privacy (FL Falcon, 2025; U.S. Department of Education, 2023).

For those of us in social work education specifically, additional ethical tensions arise. Social work is explicitly relationship-based practice. We teach students that authentic human connection is not merely helpful but essential to effective practice. We emphasize cultural humility, contextual understanding, and the irreplaceable value of human judgment in complex situations. Using AI to assess student work risks modeling the very dehumanization we're teaching students to resist in practice (Bublitz & Sauter, 2024; Macgilchrist et al., 2025). If we wouldn't accept a field supervisor using AI to write student evaluations, the analogy to classroom assessment deserves serious reflection.

The assignments in this playbook are designed to minimize the temptation to use AI for grading. Documentation tables are quick to scan for completeness and quality of thinking. Rubrics focus on critical thinking and reasoning process—dimensions that are hard to fake and reveal genuine engagement at a

glance. Knowledge checks verify learning in ways that don't require extensive faculty time. Process artifacts like revision logs, comparison tables, and justification documents make student thinking visible without requiring faculty to read extensive prose. Student reflection shows depth of engagement efficiently (Ohio State University, 2025; University of North Texas, 2025).

Perhaps most importantly, the most valuable grading occurs when expert educators engage directly with student work: noticing what students struggle with, seeing patterns across the class, providing insight that AI cannot replicate, building relationships through feedback, modeling the very human judgment we're teaching students to develop. If workload is overwhelming, we might consider structural solutions—fewer assignments with deeper feedback, peer review to distribute feedback labor effectively, self-assessment with faculty verification, teaching assistants for initial review, or restructuring assignments for more efficient assessment—rather than AI replacement of the core pedagogical work of responding to student learning.

The question of AI in grading deserves ongoing discussion and thoughtful local decision-making. For purposes of this playbook, we advocate for preservation of human judgment in assessment while acknowledging the legitimate pressures faculty face. The assignments here support that human judgment by making evaluation efficient without sacrificing depth.

Using This Playbook: A Practical Guide

This playbook contains sixteen complete assignments spanning approximately 28.5 Recommended Contact Hours of student work, adaptable across disciplines and student levels. Each assignment includes comprehensive instructions, dual-dimension rubrics, knowledge check quizzes, implementation guidance, grading examples, and discipline-specific adaptations. The assignments are designed to work individually or as an integrated sequence building AI literacy across a semester, aligning with recent curriculum design frameworks that emphasize progressive scaffolding of digital competencies (Moorhouse et al., 2023; UNESCO, 2023).

Faculty new to AI integration should start small, selecting two to three foundational assignments for initial implementation. The combination of Prompt Engineering (teaching basic AI literacy), AI Dialogue Reflection (low-stakes practice with critical evaluation), and one writing or research assignment (applying skills to substantive work) provides a solid foundation. This approach allows faculty to develop comfort with AI-integrated pedagogy while learning from student experiences, a strategy supported by research on teacher adoption of emerging technologies (Trust et al., 2023). In subsequent semesters, faculty can expand to three or four more complex assignments, perhaps adding AI-Enhanced Iterative Writing, AI Bias Detection, and one professional development assignment. Advanced courses might employ five or more assignments comprehensively integrated throughout the semester, culminating in the Transparent AI Integration Portfolio as a capstone demonstration of learning.

Faculty already experienced with AI can move directly to sophisticated assignments like Professional AI Use Policy Development, AI-Facilitated Group Projects, AI Scenario Testing, or use the Portfolio as comprehensive assessment from the start. The playbook supports both gradual adoption and immediate full integration depending on faculty readiness and course context (Chan, 2023).

Assignment selection should be guided by specific pedagogical goals. Faculty wanting to start simply might choose AI Dialogue Reflection (1.5 hours) or AI Study Partner (1 hour) for low-stakes introduction to AI literacy. Those teaching research skills might select AI Literature Review Assistant (2 hours) or Prompt Engineering (1.5 hours). Faculty focused on writing development would benefit from AI-Enhanced Iterative Writing (3 hours). Those addressing ethics and bias might choose AI Bias Detection Exercise (2 hours) or AI Ethics Discussion Forum (1.5 hours). For courses with team projects, AI-Facilitated Group Project (1.5

hours weekly over project duration) provides structure for collaborative AI use. Professional programs might emphasize AI Client Simulation (2 hours) or Professional AI Use Policy Development (2 hours). Faculty seeking comprehensive AI literacy assessment should build toward the Transparent AI Integration Portfolio (3 hours cumulative across semester).

Contact hour planning requires attention to overall course structure. A standard three-credit course requires approximately 45 Recommended Contact Hours across the semester. Faculty might allocate 30 hours to direct instruction—lectures, discussions, activities—and 15 hours to AI-integrated assignments from this playbook. Selecting eight to ten assignments providing a mix of brief (1-1.5 hour) and substantial (2-3 hour) experiences, culminating in the Portfolio, would fill this allocation while building comprehensive AI literacy. The assignments can be

distributed throughout the semester, creating consistent engagement with AI-integrated learning rather than concentrated experiences, which is consistent with active learning principles (Deslauriers et al., 2019; The Learning Accelerator, 2025).

Every assignment includes extensive adaptation guidance for different disciplines, but faculty must customize prompts, examples, and requirements to match specific course content and learning objectives. A social work course using AI Client Simulation would adapt character profiles and practice scenarios to reflect social work contexts, theoretical frameworks, and professional standards. A business course using the same assignment structure would create different characters and scenarios reflecting business consulting, organizational dynamics, and management contexts. The assignment structure transfers; the content must be customized (Liu et al., 2024; Mollick, 2024).

Faculty should attend to several implementation considerations throughout the semester. Before launching assignments, establish clear expectations around academic integrity and AI use, model the assignment processes in class, discuss what AI can and cannot do well, and address student anxiety about using AI "correctly." Recent studies indicate that explicit guidance reduces student anxiety and confusion regarding permissible AI use (Eaton, 2023; Perkins et al., 2024). During assignments, check in regularly with students about their experiences, address problems early before they compound, share interesting insights or patterns you notice (anonymously), and create space for students to help each other navigate challenges. After assignments, reflect on what worked and what needs modification, gather student feedback formally or informally, and adjust your approach for future implementations or semesters.

Assessment should balance rigor with realism. These assignments are designed to be efficiently assessable without sacrificing depth—documentation makes thinking visible, rubrics focus on high-value dimensions, knowledge checks verify learning quickly. However, they still require faculty time and attention. Consider your assessment workload when selecting assignments, and don't try to implement more than you can assess well. It's better to do fewer assignments with thorough feedback than many assignments with superficial assessment (Bearman et al., 2022; Tai et al., 2023).

Finally, be patient with yourself and your students. AI-integrated pedagogy is new territory for most of us. You will refine your approach over time. Students will need guidance and support as they develop these skills. Some assignments will work brilliantly; others may need significant revision. This is normal in pedagogical innovation. The playbook provides strong foundational structures, but you will make them your own through implementation experience.

What Students Will Gain: The Promise of AI-Integrated Learning

The ultimate justification for this pedagogical approach lies in what students develop through these experiences. The benefits extend across multiple domains:

AI literacy skills represent an entirely new area of competence that students will need throughout their personal and professional lives. Students develop facility with prompt engineering—the ability to communicate effectively with AI systems to obtain useful responses. They learn critical

evaluation of AI outputs, recognizing patterns of strength and weakness, identifying when AI is likely to be accurate versus when it's likely to hallucinate or oversimplify. They build verification and fact-checking habits, automatically checking AI claims against authoritative sources before accepting them. They develop nuanced understanding of AI's capabilities and limitations, knowing when to use these tools and when to rely on human judgment. They practice ethical decision-making about AI use in various contexts, navigating complex questions without clear universal answers. They establish transparency and documentation practices that transfer to professional settings where accountability matters (Ng et al., 2024; UNESCO, 2023).

Deeper learning emerges from the metacognitive demands built into every assignment. Students develop awareness of how they learn—what strategies work for them, when they're truly understanding versus merely recognizing, how to monitor their own comprehension. They practice integration of concepts across contexts, building the connected knowledge networks that constitute expertise. They demonstrate transfer of knowledge to new situations, showing that their understanding is flexible rather than brittle. They engage in sophisticated argumentation and reasoning, moving beyond simple claim-making to warranted, evidence-based analysis. They develop self-directed learning strategies that will serve them long after our courses end. Perhaps most importantly, they cultivate growth mindset about intellectual challenges, learning to see difficulty as opportunity rather than threat (Lodge et al., 2023; Milligan & Charles, 2024; Yan et al., 2023).

Professional competencies develop through assignments explicitly connected to workplace contexts. Students learn ethical technology use in professional settings, navigating questions about privacy, bias, transparency, and accountability that they will face in their careers. They practice policy development and systems thinking, learning to craft guidelines that balance competing values and constrain behavior productively. They experience collaboration with modern tools, discovering how to maintain authentic teamwork while leveraging technological assistance. They engage in strategic decision-making under uncertainty, making reasoned choices when information is incomplete and stakes are high. They hone communication of complex ideas to diverse audiences, learning to explain technical concepts accessibly. They develop leadership capacity in emerging technology spaces, positioning themselves to shape rather than merely follow technological change in their fields (Bankins et al., 2024; Dwivedi et al., 2023).

Research and writing excellence improves through repeated practice with AI-supported revision. Students internalize iterative revision processes, understanding that good writing emerges through cycles of drafting, feedback, and refinement. They develop sophisticated source evaluation and verification skills, learning to distinguish strong from weak evidence and to check claims systematically. They practice synthesis across multiple perspectives, integrating information from various sources into coherent arguments. They strengthen argumentation through well-supported claims, learning what constitutes adequate evidence and reasoning. They learn strategic use of feedback from multiple sources—peers, instructors, AI—synthesizing input thoughtfully rather than implementing changes uncritically. They establish academic integrity

practices that protect both their own learning and the scholarly community (Fitria, 2023; Liu et al., 2024).

What distinguishes AI-integrated courses using this playbook from traditional courses is scope of learning. Traditional courses focus on content mastery: students learn disciplinary knowledge and demonstrate understanding through exams and papers. AI-integrated courses using this playbook develop content mastery and AI literacy and critical thinking about technology and professional judgment about when and how to use AI tools (Bearman & Ajjawi, 2023). Students learn not just course material but how to learn with

AI tools. They develop not just skills but wisdom about when skills should be deployed. They build not just knowledge but critical awareness of how knowledge is constructed and validated.

The goal transcends helping students pass courses or even master disciplinary content. We aim to develop sophisticated, ethical, strategic learners who can navigate an AI-integrated world with wisdom. These students will enter workplaces where AI tools are ubiquitous and expectations around their use are unclear. They will face decisions about when to trust AI and when to rely on human judgment, when to use AI publicly and when its use might be inappropriate, when AI enhances their work and when it undermines their professional development. Having practiced these judgments repeatedly in educational contexts where stakes are relatively low and guidance is available, they will be prepared to make wise choices when stakes are high and guidance is absent (Mollick, 2024; The Learning Accelerator, 2025).

A Note on Copyright and Intellectual Property

Throughout this playbook, we emphasize that students must never reproduce copyrighted content from AI or any other source. This requirement reflects both legal obligations and pedagogical values. Students must understand that AI tools trained on copyrighted material do not grant them rights to reproduce that material. Current guidance from intellectual property authorities emphasizes that AI-generated output lacks traditional copyright protection and that the fair use status of training data remains legally contested (U.S. Copyright Office, 2023). Copying AI outputs that contain copyrighted text makes students potentially liable for infringement.

Beyond legal concerns, the pedagogical rationale for prohibiting reproduction of AI text is fundamental: learning occurs in the translation from what one reads or hears into one's own language and understanding. When students copy text—whether from AI, websites, or books—they bypass the cognitive work that constitutes learning. The requirement to express ideas in one's own words ensures that translation process occurs, building the very connections we've discussed throughout this introduction (Lodge et al., 2023).

The critical copyright requirements we emphasize include: Never quote or reproduce exact text from AI outputs—paraphrase in your own words. Never reproduce song lyrics even if AI provides them—this is explicitly prohibited regardless of source. Always cite AI as a source when used, but express ideas originally rather than copying AI's language. When AI suggests sources, verify they exist and access them directly rather than relying on AI's description. Understand that fair use is complex—when in doubt, paraphrase and cite properly. For faculty,

these assignments are designed to make citation and attribution transparent while teaching students that using AI doesn't mean copying AI's language verbatim (Modern Language Association, 2023).

This playbook's approach to copyright reflects a broader commitment to academic integrity that recognizes technology changes tools but not ethical obligations. Just as students have never been permitted to copy from books or websites without attribution, they cannot copy from AI without attribution. Just as students have always been required to express ideas in their own words rather than stringing together quotes from sources, they must express AI-informed ideas in their own language. The technology is new, but the principles of intellectual honesty and authentic learning remain constant (Eaton, 2023).

Conclusion: Preparing Students for an Uncertain Future

We cannot predict with certainty what role AI will play in our students' professional lives five, ten, or twenty years from now. The technology is evolving rapidly, with capabilities expanding and new applications emerging continuously. What we can predict with confidence is that our students will need to navigate an

AI-integrated world, making ongoing decisions about when and how to use these tools ethically and effectively (World Economic Forum, 2023).

The worst preparation we could offer would be pretending AI doesn't exist, teaching as though nothing has changed, and sending students into that world without explicit instruction in critical AI literacy. Slightly better, but still inadequate, would be teaching students to use AI as mere efficiency tools—showing them how to get faster results without developing the judgment to know when those faster results serve learning and when they circumvent it.

This playbook offers something more ambitious: preparing students to be critical, ethical, strategic users of AI who understand both the technology's potential and its profound limitations. Students who complete courses using these assignments will have repeatedly practiced using AI for learning rather than instead of learning. They will have developed habits of verification, documentation, and critical evaluation. They will have confronted AI's biases, errors, and limitations directly. They will have articulated their own principles for responsible AI use. They will have built genuine expertise in their disciplines while learning to use AI as one tool among many in their learning toolkit.

Perhaps most importantly, they will understand that being human in an age of artificial intelligence means exercising judgment that machines cannot replicate—ethical reasoning about complex situations, contextual understanding that accounts for nuance and particularity, relationship-based work that honors human dignity, creative synthesis that generates genuinely new ideas, and metacognitive awareness of what one knows and doesn't know. Recent research on the "jagged frontier" of AI capabilities confirms that these distinctly human capacities become more, not less, important as AI tools become more sophisticated (Dell'Acqua et al., 2023; Mollick, 2024).

The assignments in this playbook are designed to develop these capacities while teaching students to use AI strategically. The result is not students who are dependent on AI, nor students who reject AI entirely, but students who can navigate the complex middle ground with wisdom—using these powerful tools when they serve learning and professional goals while recognizing when human judgment, effort, and relationship are irreplaceable.

This is the education our students need for the world they will inhabit. This playbook provides the practical tools to deliver that education. The work is challenging—for faculty learning new pedagogical approaches, for students developing new skills and facing new temptations, for institutions grappling with policy questions that have no easy answers. But the alternative—pretending we can educate students as we always have in a world that has fundamentally changed—is pedagogically and ethically untenable (UNESCO, 2023).

We invite you to engage with these assignments, adapt them to your context, learn from your implementation experiences, and join the growing community of educators working to prepare students not just for today's AI landscape but for whatever technological changes tomorrow brings. The future of education in an AI age is being written now, in our classrooms, through assignments like these. Let us write it thoughtfully, ethically, and with unwavering commitment to genuine student learning.

Disclosure: AI-Assisted Development of This Playbook

Transparency in Practice: Modeling the Method In the spirit of the transparency this playbook advocates, it is essential to disclose that this text was developed through a deliberate, structured partnership between human expertise and artificial intelligence. This collaboration was not a shortcut, but a rigorous pedagogical experiment designed to model the very principles of "AI as thinking partner" that we ask of our students. Just as we require students to document their process and critically evaluate AI outputs, we have held ourselves to the same standard. We invite you to examine the full, detailed breakdown of this collaborative methodology—including the specific prompting strategies and division of labor—in Appendix A: The AI-Human Collaboration Log. We believe that in an age of intelligence, hiding our tools serves no one; true literacy begins with open, ethical, and visible practice.

A Meta-Lesson

There is something fitting about a playbook teaching AI literacy being developed through strategic, transparent AI collaboration. The process embodies the philosophy: AI as thinking partner, not thinking replacement. Human expertise guiding and evaluating. Transparency about process and contributions. Critical awareness of limitations. Judgment exercised at every decision point.

If this playbook helps you think more clearly about AI integration in your teaching, if it provides structures you can adapt to your context, if it saves you time while maintaining pedagogical rigor—then the AI collaboration served its purpose well. And if this disclosure helps you understand what strategic, ethical, transparent AI use looks like in practice, then the meta-lesson is as valuable as the content itself.

We teach what we practice. We practice what we teach. And we disclose both openly, because transparency is not optional in an age of intelligence—both human and artificial.

REFERENCE LIST

- Agarwal, P. K., Nunes, L. D., & Blunt, J. R. (2021). Retrieval practice consistently benefits student learning: A systematic review of applied research in schools and classrooms. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33, 1409–1453.
- AI-HED. (2025). The need for improved AI literacy in higher education. <https://ai-hed.eu>
- Anders, B. A. (2023). *The literacy of the future: A guide for higher education faculty on AI in the classroom*. University of Delaware Press.
- Bankins, S., et al. (2024). The future of work and education: Preparing graduates for the age of generative AI. *Journal of Management Education*, 48(1), 15–38.
- Bearman, M., & Ajjawi, R. (2023). Learning to work with the black box: Pedagogy for a world with artificial intelligence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 54(5), 1160–1173.
- Bearman, M., Tai, J., & Ajjawi, R. (2022). Evaluative judgement: A new theory for assessment in the artificial intelligence era. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 41(7), 2465–2479.
- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 610–623.
- BestColleges. (2023). 56% of college students have used AI on assignments or exams. <https://www.bestcolleges.com>
- Brookhart, S. M. (2022). *Formative assessment: The bridge between teaching and learning*. Corwin.
- Bublitz, J., & Sauter, T. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence and education: A brief ethical reflection on autonomy. *EDUCAUSE Review*.
- Campbell, J. (2025). AI in higher education: A meta summary of recent surveys of students and faculty. Campbell University. <https://sites.campbell.edu>
- Chan, C. K. Y. (2023). A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(38).
- CIDDL. (2025). Teaching AI literacy: Efforts, challenges, and emerging practices. <https://ciddl.org>
- Colleague AI. (2025). Fostering critical thinking through active engagement between teachers, students, and AI tools. <https://www.colleague.ai>

- Colvard, R., & Schedler, A. (2025). Ethical frameworks of artificial intelligence for faculty: Upholding academic integrity and student autonomy. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 2025(700), 1–14.
- Deans for Impact. (2023). *The science of learning: Summaries of the research (Revised)*. Deans for Impact.
- Dell’Acqua, F., et al. (2023). Navigating the jagged technological frontier: Field experimental evidence of the effects of AI on knowledge worker productivity and quality. *Harvard Business School Technology & Operations Mgt. Unit Working Paper No. 24-013*.
- Digital Education Council. (2024). 2024 Global AI student survey [Survey summary]. <https://campustechnology.com>
- Dwivedi, Y. K., et al. (2023). "So what if ChatGPT wrote it?" Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, 71, 102642.
- Eaton, S. E. (2023). Academic integrity in the age of artificial intelligence. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 21(3), 417–436.
- Ecampus News. (2025). AI literacy in higher education: Preparing students for human and machine collaboration. <https://www.ecampusnews.com>
- Fierro, I., & Phelan, K. (2024). Desirable difficulties in the age of AI: How cognitive struggle remains essential. *Journal of Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 38(1), 10–22.
- Fitria, T. N. (2023). Artificial intelligence (AI) technology in OpenAI ChatGPT application: A review of ChatGPT in writing English essay. *ELT Echo: The Journal of English Language Teaching in Foreign Language Context*, 8(1), 1–15.
- FL Falcon. (2025, July 5). Balancing efficiency and ethics in AI-assisted grading. <https://www.flfalcon.com>
- Flaherty, C. (2025, August 29). Survey: College students’ views on AI. *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/students/academics/2025/08/29/survey-college-students-views-ai>
- Grassini, S. (2023). Shaping the future of education: Exploring the potential and consequences of AI and ChatGPT in educational settings. *Education Sciences*, 13(7), 692.
- Knox, J. (2022). *Post-humanism and the massive open online course: Contaminating the subject of global education*. Routledge.
- Klover. (2025). Will generative AI enhance—or hinder—academic integrity? <https://www.klover.ai>
- KPBS. (2025, October 1). Research, curriculum and grading: New data sheds light on how professors are using AI. <https://www.kpbs.org>

- Liu, M., et al. (2024). Human-AI collaboration in writing: A systematic review of design, behavior, and outcomes. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 100192.
- Lodge, J. M., de Barba, P., & Broadbent, J. (2023). Learning with generative AI: The role of cognitive offloading and metacognition. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 20(4).
- Macgilchrist, F., & others. (2025). Trajectories of AI policy in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*.
- MacMahon, S., Leggett, J., & Carroll, A. (2022). Promoting student metacognition in the digital age: New tools and old problems. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 31(3), 255–269.
- Milligan, S., & Charles, T. (2024). Metacognition in the machine age: Frameworks for assessment. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 31(1), 45–62.
- Mitchell, M., & Krakauer, D. C. (2023). The debate over understanding in AI's large language models. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(13), e2215907120.
- Modern Language Association. (2023). MLA style center: How do I cite generative AI? <https://style.mla.org>
- Mollick, E. (2024). Co-Intelligence: Living and working with AI. Portfolio.
- Moorhouse, B. L., Yeo, M. A., & Wan, Y. (2023). Generative AI tools and assessment: Guidelines of the world's top-ranked universities. *Computers and Education Open*, 5, 100151.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2023). Review of the effectiveness of artificial intelligence in education. The National Academies Press.
- National Education Association. (2024, June 25). Five principles for the use of artificial intelligence in education. <https://www.nea.org>
- Ng, D. T. K., et al. (2024). AI literacy: Definition, teaching, evaluation and ethical issues. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 61(1), 504–515.
- Ohio State University. (2025, July 14). AI and auto-grading in higher education: Capabilities, ethics, and the evolving role of educators. <https://teaching.resources.osu.edu>
- Perkins, M., et al. (2024). The impact of generative AI on student anxiety and academic performance. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 34, 1–22.
- Sharma, A., & Kumar, R. (2025). Embracing AI in higher education: Redefining teaching and learning. *Issues in Information Systems*, 26(2), 309–322.
- Siemens, G. (2022). Connectivism and the future of AI-driven learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology*, 19(2), 45–67.

- Sithole, A., et al. (2024). Problem-based learning in the era of generative AI. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 113(2), 112–129.
- Sweller, J. (2022). The role of evolutionary psychology in our understanding of human cognition: Consequences for cognitive load theory and instructional procedures. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34, 2229–2241.
- Tai, J., et al. (2023). Assessment for inclusion in the age of artificial intelligence. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 48(8), 1185–1198.
- The Learning Accelerator. (2025). Thoughtful AI integration: Guidance for educators. <https://learningaccelerator.org>
- Trust, T., Whalen, J., & Mouza, C. (2023). Editorial: ChatGPT: Challenges, opportunities, and implications for teacher education. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 23(1).
- Tyton Partners. (2023). GenAI in higher education: Fall 2023 update – Time for class study.
- UNESCO. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO.
- University Business. (2024). The ineffectiveness of AI bans in colleges: A critical analysis (USA). *Review of AI Law*. <https://www.reviewofailaw.com>
- U.S. Copyright Office. (2023). Copyright registration guidance: Works containing material generated by artificial intelligence. *Federal Register*.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology (2023). Artificial intelligence and the future of teaching and learning. <https://tech.ed.gov>
- University of North Texas. (2025, August 6). Using AI in the higher education classroom. <https://clear.unt.edu>
- Wigmore, A., et al. (2023). Active learning and the AI frontier: Constructivist approaches in digital environments. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 61(4), 890–912.
- Williamson, B., Piattoeva, N., & Ruppert, E. (2023). Algorithmic imaginaries of education: A critical perspective. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 55(3), 285–299.
- World Economic Forum. (2023). The future of jobs report 2023. World Economic Forum.
- Yan, V. X., et al. (2023). Desirable difficulties in practice: Learning strategies for the 21st century. Routledge.
- Zawacki-Richter, O., et al. (2023). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education – where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(39).

Chapter 2: How to Use This Playbook

This playbook is designed as a practical toolkit for integrating AI into courses in ways that protect academic rigor, foreground genuine learning, and prepare students for AI-rich professional practice. It assumes that students are already using AI and that the most responsible response is to bring that use into the open, structure it, and teach them how to use AI well rather than hope they avoid it.

The assignments that follow are not generic “add AI here” activities. They are purpose-built to:

- Require clear thinking before AI enters the process.
- Treat AI outputs as objects of analysis rather than answers.
- Make AI use visible and accountable.
- Build metacognition and professional judgment.
- Verify that students, not AI, are doing the learning.

Faculty can use individual assignments à la carte, or adopt a cluster of activities as an AI-infused spine for an entire course.

What Makes These Assignments Different

Across the playbook, each assignment is built from the same core design principles:

Structured prompts, not vague AI use. Students cannot simply hand their work to AI and submit what comes back. They must identify their purpose, relevant course concepts, current understanding, and the specific kind of assistance they seek before they are allowed to prompt. This “front-end” cognitive work ensures that AI supplements, rather than replaces, core disciplinary thinking.

Critical evaluation of AI outputs. Every assignment requires students to examine what AI produces: where it is accurate, incomplete, misleading, biased, oversimplified, or surprisingly useful. Students document what they accept, modify, and reject, and justify those decisions. AI becomes something they analyze, not an oracle they follow.

Documentation and transparency. Students are asked to show their work with AI: prompts, excerpts of AI responses, decision logs, and rationales. This makes AI use assessable, supports academic integrity, and helps students develop habits of professional accountability that transfer to practice settings.

Metacognitive reflection. Each activity includes targeted reflection prompts that ask students to name what they learned, how AI helped or hindered, what they would do differently next time, and how the experience changed their understanding of both content and tools. This reflection is where much of the durable learning occurs.

Knowledge verification. Short, closed-note knowledge checks verify that students can explain and apply key concepts without AI support. These checks are diagnostic rather than punitive, but

they matter: students must demonstrate that their impressive products correspond to robust internal understanding.

Taken together, these design choices mean that students cannot succeed by being passive consumers of AI outputs. They must think clearly to prompt effectively, evaluate critically to separate signal from noise, document their process, reflect on their learning, and show what they know without AI in the room.

How the Playbook Is Organized

The playbook contains sixteen complete assignments that can be taught individually or sequenced across a course or program. Each assignment includes:

- A clear overview and recommended contact hours.
- Learning objectives that foreground both content mastery and AI literacy.
- Foundational knowledge nodes (prerequisites) to help you place the assignment at the right point in the course.
- Detailed components and deliverables with student-facing language you can adapt directly.
- A dual-dimension rubric that separates content mastery from AI literacy and metacognition.
- A brief knowledge check to verify learning.
- Pedagogical rationale, implementation notes, and discipline-specific adaptations.
- Sample student work or grading examples to anchor expectations.

Following the full assignment write-ups, a brief overview and quick selection guide summarizes each activity with contact hours, “what it is,” “why it matters,” recommended uses, and key learning outcomes. This is the fastest entry point for instructors scanning for options.

Choosing Assignments for Your Course

The goal is not to use all sixteen assignments, but to choose a coherent subset that fits your learning outcomes, course level, and bandwidth for assessment. A few simple questions can help you begin:

- “I want to start simple.”

Consider low-stakes activities such as AI Dialogue Reflection (1.5 hours) or AI Study Partner Reflection (1 hour) that introduce AI literacy and verification without over-hauling the course.

- “I need to teach research and writing.”

Use Prompt Engineering (1.5 hours) and AI Literature Review Assistant (2 hours) to scaffold research skills, or AI-Enhanced Iterative Writing (3 hours) for deeper writing development.

- “My students need stronger critical thinking and argumentation.”

Look at AI Debate Partner, AI-Generated Case Comparison, or Peer Review with AI Comparison, which require students to weigh multiple perspectives and defend their reasoning.

- “I am focused on ethics and bias.”

Choose AI Bias Detection Exercise and/or AI Ethics Discussion Forum to turn abstract concerns about fairness, power, and responsibility into concrete, analyzable experiences.

- “I have team-based projects.”

AI-Facilitated Group Project provides a full framework for collaborative AI use, with norms, documentation, and reflections built in.

- “I want to foreground professional identity and responsibility.”

Professional AI Use Policy Development and AI Client Simulation help students connect course content to real practice dilemmas and ethical decision-making.

- “I want a capstone demonstration of AI literacy.”

The Transparent AI Integration Portfolio (3 hours cumulative) captures students’ AI use, growth, and emerging judgment across the entire term.

The Quick Selection Guide at the end of the overview section offers sample pathways (foundation, integration, and advanced) for a three-credit course and can be used as a starting template.

Planning Contact Hours and Workload

Assignments in this playbook include estimated “Recommended Contact Hours” that you can treat as equivalents for graded work. For a three-credit course (approximately 45 contact hours total), you might:

Allocate roughly 30 hours to direct instruction (lectures, discussions, labs, field seminar).

Allocate 15 hours to AI-integrated assignments drawn from this playbook.

Within those 15 hours, many instructors find that 8–10 assignments—a mix of short (1–1.5 hour) and more substantial (2–3 hour) activities—offer a balanced arc for the semester. The Transparent AI Integration Portfolio can serve as the culminating assessment.

Because each assignment is designed with documentation tables, focused rubrics, and brief knowledge checks, grading remains feasible. It is usually better to implement fewer assignments with meaningful feedback than to over-assign and under-assess. The implementation notes for each activity include suggestions for managing instructor workload.

Adapting Assignments to Your Discipline and Level

The structures in this playbook are meant to be plug-and-play, but the content must be your own. For each assignment:

Keep the scaffolding: the sequence of parts, required prompts, analysis tables, reflection questions, and knowledge checks.

Adapt the discipline-specific elements: scenarios, concepts, data, professional standards, and examples that anchor the work in your field.

Adjust cognitive demand to student level: first-year undergraduates might work with shorter texts and simpler scenarios; graduate students can be asked to engage policy, research, or complex cases.

Each assignment includes concrete adaptation ideas for fields such as social work, nursing, education, business, STEM, and law. These are intended as starting points; you know your students, curriculum, and local context best.

Implementation Tips for Instructors

Many faculty find it helpful to treat the first semester with this playbook as a piloting phase:

- Start with one or two assignments early in the term to establish shared language about AI, academic integrity, and verification.
- Explicitly model the documentation and reflection processes in class before expecting students to do them independently.
- Use early assignments to surface misconceptions about AI (e.g., over-trust, over-fear, or “AI as shortcut”) and address them explicitly.
- Build in brief in-class debriefs where students share what they are noticing about AI’s strengths, limitations, and impact on their learning.
- After the term, review student work, reflections, and knowledge checks to refine your assignment choices and prompts for the next iteration.

The goal is not perfection on the first try, but a trajectory of refinement in which both you and your students become more skilled, transparent, and thoughtful in your use of AI over time.

Standard Assignment Template Boilerplate

This section provides a reusable framework for designing AI-infused assignments. It explains what should be included in each part of an assignment and why that element matters pedagogically. It is intended to guide adaptation across disciplines, course levels, and instructional modalities while preserving rigor, transparency, and authentic student learning. It is important to note that the AI use log in Appendix A can be used across any of the assignments and across courses.

Purpose of the Template

Use this template as a design guide rather than as a fill-in-the-blank assignment. The goal is to help instructors build assignments that integrate artificial intelligence intentionally, align clearly with course outcomes, and support direct instructional equivalence where relevant. Each section below describes the purpose of that component, what information should appear there, and what faculty should consider when adapting it for their own context.

Assignment Overview

Use this section to provide a concise, student-facing description of the assignment. Explain what students will do, why the task matters, and how it connects to course learning outcomes, professional practice, or disciplinary habits of mind.

The overview should make the assignment feel purposeful rather than procedural. Instructors should identify the authentic task students are completing, the central question or problem they are addressing, and the role AI will play in the learning process. This section should be written in clear, accessible language so that students understand the overall goal before encountering detailed instructions.

Questions to consider when drafting this section:

- What is the central task students are being asked to complete?
- Why is this task worth doing in this course or discipline?
- How does the assignment support knowledge development, skill building, or professional judgment?
- Where does AI fit into the process, and why is its use pedagogically justified?

Suggested Hours and Direct Instructional Equivalence

Use this section to estimate the amount of time students are expected to spend completing the assignment and its major components. Include both total suggested hours and approximate time for each phase, especially when the assignment is broken into stages such as preparation, engagement, revision, and reflection.

This section is especially important when faculty need to document direct instructional equivalence, structured learning time, or contact-hour alignment. When relevant, distinguish between guided instructional activity and independent student work. Guided activity may include instructor-facilitated discussion, supervised workshop time, structured AI analysis, peer interaction, or scaffolded feedback. Independent work may include drafting, reviewing sources, revising products, or completing reflections outside of class.

Suggested prompts for faculty:

- How many total hours should a reasonably prepared student need to complete this assignment?
- Which portions count as structured or faculty-guided learning time?
- Which tasks are best completed synchronously, asynchronously, in class, or out of class?
- Does the time estimate align with the cognitive complexity and assessment weight of the assignment?

AI Use Parameters and Integrity Guardrails

Use this section to define the boundaries of AI use clearly and explicitly. Instructors should state which tools are allowed, what kinds of assistance are permitted, what uses are restricted or prohibited, and how students are expected to document their AI use.

This section helps reduce ambiguity, supports academic integrity, and reinforces that AI is a tool for learning rather than a substitute for human judgment. Expectations should be specific enough that students can tell the difference between acceptable support and inappropriate outsourcing. Faculty may also indicate whether students must submit prompts, screenshots, process notes, or brief explanations of how AI contributed to their work.

Questions to consider:

- What is AI allowed to help with in this assignment, such as brainstorming, outlining, feedback, language support, or analysis?
- What work must remain fully the student's own?
- How should students disclose or document AI use?
- What counts as misuse, and how will that be addressed instructionally or evaluatively?
- Components and Timeline

Use this section to break the assignment into manageable parts or phases. Each component should identify the task, expected deliverable, approximate time on task, and any sequencing requirements. If the assignment unfolds over multiple class sessions or weeks, the progression should be explicit.

A staged structure encourages scaffolded learning and reduces the likelihood that students will treat AI as a shortcut. The timeline should support gradual engagement, opportunities for feedback, and moments where students must pause to evaluate, revise, or justify their decisions. This section is also useful for helping instructors decide which tasks are best handled in class and which can be completed independently.

Items to clarify in each phase:

- What do students do in this step?
- What, if anything, must they submit?
- How long should this step take?
- What role does AI play in this phase?
- What must students analyze, revise, verify, or explain before moving on?

Required Deliverables

Use this section to specify exactly what students must turn in. Deliverables may include written products, planning notes, prompt logs, screenshots, annotated drafts, verification tables, discussion contributions, presentations, or reflective writing.

This section should help students distinguish between the final product and the evidence of learning that documents the process. When AI is involved, process artifacts are often essential

because they make student thinking visible. Faculty should be explicit about format, length, naming conventions, and whether multiple pieces should be submitted together or in stages.

Questions to consider:

- What products best demonstrate both learning and process?
- Which artifacts help make students' decision making visible?
- Are students submitting one final packet or multiple staged submissions?
- What details must be specified so submission expectations are unambiguous?

Assessment Rubric

Use this section to explain how the assignment will be evaluated. The rubric should include the core criteria that matter most for the task and should distinguish clearly among levels of performance.

For AI-infused assignments, a dual-focus rubric is often useful. One set of criteria may assess disciplinary learning, such as accuracy, analysis, application, organization, or professional communication. A second set may assess AI-related capacities, such as transparency, ethical use, quality of prompting, evaluation of AI outputs, revision based on judgment, and responsible documentation of process. This section should clarify which criteria are standard across assignments and which are customized to the specific task.

Prompts for faculty:

- Which criteria assess content mastery or disciplinary performance?
- Which criteria assess AI literacy, ethical use, or process quality?
- Are all rubric dimensions equally weighted, or should some count more than others?
- What distinguishes exemplary, proficient, developing, and beginning performance in this assignment?

Knowledge Check or Readiness Activity

Use this section to describe any short quiz, readiness check, or low-stakes formative activity that supports assignment completion. This element can be used to reinforce key concepts, verify understanding of assignment expectations, or surface misconceptions before students begin more complex work.

A brief readiness check is especially helpful when students are working with unfamiliar tools, new ethical expectations, or multi-step assignment structures. Faculty may use this section to indicate whether the activity is graded, completion-based, or designed purely for self-monitoring.

Questions to consider:

- What do students need to understand before beginning the assignment?
- What misconceptions are most likely to interfere with successful completion?
- Should this activity assess content knowledge, process understanding, AI policy awareness, or all three?
- How will feedback from this activity support later success?

Reflection and Metacognition

Use this section to explain how students will examine their own learning, choices, and use of AI. Reflection should invite students to identify what they learned, where they exercised judgment, what challenges they encountered, and how AI did or did not support their thinking.

This section is important because it shifts attention from product alone to process, decision making, and transfer of learning. Strong reflection prompts encourage students to consider not only whether AI was helpful, but when it was limited, misleading, or ethically complex. Reflection can also help instructors assess whether students are developing discernment rather than dependence.

Suggested areas for reflection:

- How did AI affect the student's approach to the task?
- What outputs were useful, weak, inaccurate, or biased?
- Where did the student choose to revise, reject, or supplement AI-generated material?
- What did the student learn about the topic, the process, and their own judgment?

Implementation Notes

Use this section to provide instructor-facing guidance for running the assignment successfully. This may include classroom management considerations, recommended sequencing, suggested facilitation moves, common student challenges, technology access issues, and ideas for feedback.

Implementation notes are especially valuable when an assignment is likely to be adapted by faculty across different contexts. This section can help instructors anticipate what might need clarification, where students may get stuck, and how to preserve rigor while adjusting for different class sizes, schedules, or levels of AI familiarity.

Questions to consider:

- What logistical issues should instructors anticipate?
- Where do students typically need extra scaffolding or examples?
- What instructor interventions improve the quality of student work?
- What should faculty do if students have uneven access to AI tools?

Discipline-Specific or Level-Based Adaptations

Use this section to identify ways the assignment can be modified for different disciplines, learner populations, and course levels. Adaptations may involve changes to prompts, evidence expectations, complexity of analysis, collaboration requirements, or professional framing.

This section helps instructors see the assignment as flexible rather than fixed. It also reinforces that the core design principles remain stable even when the surface features change across contexts.

Questions to consider:

- How would this assignment look different in introductory versus advanced courses?

- What disciplinary examples or conventions should be built in?
- What modifications support graduate learners, professional programs, or general education settings?
- What accessibility or modality adjustments are needed for online, hybrid, or face-to-face delivery?

Pedagogical Rationale

Use this section to explain the instructional logic behind the assignment design. Rather than restating the task, describe what the assignment helps students learn and why the use of AI is educationally meaningful in this context.

This rationale can highlight alignment with authentic assessment, scaffolding, critical thinking, information literacy, ethical reasoning, reflective practice, or professional readiness. It can also clarify why AI is being integrated in a way that strengthens learning rather than replacing it.

Questions to consider:

- What educational problem or opportunity does this assignment address?
- Why is AI use appropriate for this learning goal?
- What habits of mind or professional competencies does the assignment cultivate?
- How does the structure promote active, transparent, and accountable learning?

Sample Grading Notes or Anchor Examples

Use this section to describe what strong, satisfactory, or weak performance might look like. This does not require a full exemplar for every assignment, but it should help instructors and students interpret the rubric more consistently.

Anchor examples can clarify what quality looks like, especially when evaluating AI-related process work that may be unfamiliar to both students and faculty. These notes can also reduce grading ambiguity and support more transparent feedback.

Questions to consider:

- What are the hallmarks of a strong submission?
- What common weaknesses tend to appear?
- What differentiates thoughtful AI use from superficial or uncritical use?
- What brief examples would help calibrate expectations?

Frequently Asked Questions or Clarifications

Use this section to address recurring points of confusion. These may include questions about tool access, acceptable AI use, documentation expectations, late work, collaboration boundaries, or what to do when AI produces weak or inaccurate output.

This section should remain concise and practical. It is most useful when it prevents avoidable confusion without repeating material already stated clearly elsewhere.

Using the Template Across the Playbook

In this playbook, the standard template provides the common design logic across all assignments. One assignment may be presented in full as a complete exemplar so readers can see the entire architecture in practice. Subsequent assignments can then be presented in a more concise format that highlights only what is unique or assignment-specific while referring readers back to this template for the full explanation of standard components.

This approach reduces redundancy, improves readability, and preserves consistency across the collection. It also helps faculty distinguish between the essential design features that should remain stable and the adaptable features that can be modified for disciplinary context, student level, or instructional setting.

Chapter 3: Assignments

AI-Enhanced Iterative Writing Assignment

Recommended Contact Hours: 3 hours (combination of structured instructional time and guided independent work)

Assignment Type: AI-infused individual learning activity

Applicable to: Any discipline requiring analytical writing (e.g., research papers, policy analyses, case studies, literature reviews, lab reports)

Assignment Overview

This assignment guides students through an iterative writing process that uses AI as a structured feedback partner rather than a substitute for their own thinking. Students first draft an analytical paper grounded in course content, then engage with an AI tool using targeted prompts, critically evaluate the AI's suggestions, and revise their work based on their own judgment. Throughout the process, they document how and why they accepted or rejected AI-generated ideas, making their reasoning and learning visible.

The assignment is designed to strengthen students' disciplinary writing, deepen their understanding of course theories and concepts, and build critical AI literacy. Rather than relying on AI to "do the writing," students practice using AI as a tool to surface gaps, test arguments, and consider counter positions while maintaining responsibility for final decisions and ethical use.

Suggested Hours and Direct Instructional Equivalence

Total recommended time: 3 hours

- Part 1 – Initial Draft (60–75 minutes; primarily independent work)
Students draft a 3–5 page paper on a course-relevant topic using a specified theory or framework. Instructors may choose to allocate part of this time as in-class drafting or supervised writing workshop time.
- Part 2 – Structured AI Engagement (30–40 minutes; guided but independent)
Students interact with an AI tool using three required prompts that focus on thesis clarity,

evidence gaps, and counterarguments. This time can be framed as structured, faculty-designed learning activity even when completed outside of class.

- **Part 3 – Critical Evaluation & Revision (45–60 minutes; guided independent work)**
Students analyze AI feedback, decide what to accept or reject, and revise their paper accordingly. They also write a justification document explaining those decisions.
- **Part 4 – Metacognitive Reflection (15–20 minutes; independent)**
Students complete a one-page reflection on how AI influenced their thinking, how course concepts were applied, and what they learned about ethical and effective AI use.
- **Part 5 – In-Class Knowledge Check (5–10 minutes; direct instructional time)**
A brief, closed-note quiz administered in class (or synchronous online) verifies students' comprehension of course concepts and their ability to explain critical decisions they made.

Instructors can label Part 2, Part 3 (if supported with prompts or exemplars), and Part 5 as structured instructional activity for contact hour and direct instructional equivalence purposes, while Parts 1 and 4 primarily count as independent student work.

AI Use Parameters and Integrity Guardrails

- **Permitted AI use:**
Students must use an approved conversational AI tool (e.g., ChatGPT, Claude, or institutionally supported alternatives) only for the three structured prompts provided in Part 2. They may not ask the AI to write full paragraphs or entire drafts of the paper.
- **Prohibited AI use:**
Students may not generate complete drafts, large sections of text, or full revisions using AI. They may not paste AI-generated prose directly into their paper as if it were their own work, and they may not use AI to fabricate sources, citations, or data.
- **Documentation expectations:**
Students are required to submit screenshots or copied transcripts of the AI's responses to each required prompt. All prompts must use accurate course terminology and theories, and students must identify which tool they used. Any additional prompts beyond the three required ones should be clearly labeled as “exploratory” and not used as unacknowledged ghostwriting.
- **Academic integrity and professional ethics:**
Students are expected to use AI transparently and responsibly. They remain accountable for the accuracy of content, the quality of reasoning, and the ethical implications of their work. Misrepresenting AI-generated ideas as entirely one's own original thought, or failing to verify AI-produced information, constitutes a breach of academic integrity and professional standards.

Learning Objectives

By completing this assignment, students will:

1. Demonstrate mastery of course content and disciplinary writing conventions.
2. Apply course theories and frameworks to analyze a topic in depth.
3. Develop critical AI literacy through structured, purposeful prompt design.
4. Practice metacognitive skills by evaluating and justifying their revision choices.
5. Engage in iterative writing processes that strengthen thesis clarity, argumentation, and use of evidence.

Foundational Knowledge Nodes (Prerequisites)

Students should have prior instruction or experience in:

- Node 1: Genre conventions – Understanding the relevant writing format (e.g., essay structure, lab report format, policy brief conventions).
- Node 2: Argumentation and logic – Ability to construct claims, provide evidence, and articulate warrants.
- Node 3: Course content knowledge – Comprehension of key theories, concepts, and frameworks covered in the course.
- Node 4: Metacognitive awareness – Awareness of one's own writing process and the ability to explain reasoning and decision making.
- Node 5: Source evaluation – Skills to assess the credibility, relevance, and quality of information and scholarly sources.

Assignment Components and Deliverables

Part 1: Initial Draft (Due Week X)

Timeframe: Complete independently before engaging with AI.

Write a 3–5 page paper on *topic* that applies *specific course theory or framework*. The initial draft should include:

- A clear, arguable thesis statement.
- A structured argument with supporting evidence.
- Application of at least two core course concepts.
- Preliminary references in the required citation style.

Submit your draft through *LMS* with timestamp verification before beginning Part 2.

Part 2: Structured AI Engagement (Due Week X+1)

Timeframe: Approximately 30–40 minutes using the three required prompts.

Timeframe: Use the three required prompts below

You must engage with an AI tool (ChatGPT, Claude, etc.) using ONLY the following prompts. Fill in the bracketed sections with YOUR specific content.

Required Prompt 1: Thesis Refinement

I'm writing a [genre: research paper/policy analysis/lab report] about [your specific topic].

My current thesis is: [paste your exact thesis statement here]

Based on [specific course concept/theory - name it], evaluate whether my thesis is sufficiently specific and arguable. What's weak about it? What assumptions am I making?

Required Prompt 2: Evidence Gap Analysis

Here's a key paragraph from my argument about [your topic]:

[paste one full paragraph from your paper]

I'm applying [specific theoretical framework from class - name it] to this analysis. What evidence am I missing to support this claim? Where are the logical gaps? What would strengthen this argument?

Required Prompt 3: Counterargument Development

My position is: [paste your thesis]

Generate the strongest possible counterargument to my position based on [alternative theory/perspective covered in class - name it]. What are the weaknesses in my argument that an opponent would exploit?

Deliverable: Screenshot or copy-paste the AI's complete responses to all three prompts

Part 3: Critical Evaluation and Revision (Due Week X+1)

Timeframe: 45–60 minutes.

For each of the three AI responses:

1. Identify at least one suggestion you will accept and implement.
 - What specific change will you make?
 - Why is this suggestion valuable?

- How does implementing it strengthen your argument or use of course concepts?
2. Identify at least one suggestion you will reject.
 - What did the AI suggest that you disagree with?
 - Why is this suggestion problematic, inaccurate, or inappropriate for your assignment?
 - What does this reveal about the limitations of the AI in this context?
 3. Revise your paper by incorporating your accepted changes while intentionally excluding the rejected ones.

Deliverables for Part 3:

- A revised 3–5 page paper with visible track changes or annotations indicating what you modified.
- A 1–2 page written justification document explaining your accept/reject decisions for each AI suggestion, including references to course concepts where relevant.

Part 4: Metacognitive Reflection (Due Week X+1)

Timeframe: Approximately 45-60 minutes.

Address the following prompts in a reflective narrative:

- How did using AI change your thinking about your topic?
- What did you learn about [course theory/concept] through this process?
- When was AI most helpful? When was it least helpful or even misleading?
- How would you use AI differently in future writing projects?
- What are the ethical considerations of using AI in your discipline?

Part 5: In-Class Knowledge Check Quiz (Week X+2)

Timeframe: 5 minutes, closed-note, in class

A brief quiz will verify your understanding of the content. Sample questions:

1. Which course theory/framework did you apply in your paper and why was it the most appropriate choice for your topic?
2. Describe one AI suggestion you rejected and explain your reasoning.

3. Define [key term from course] in your own words and explain how it relates to your paper's argument.
4. What is one insight you gained about [topic] through completing this assignment?

Assessment Rubric

Total Points: 100

Dimension 1: Content Mastery and Writing Quality (60 points)

Criteria	Exemplary (18–20)	Proficient (15–17)	Developing (12–14)	Needs Improvement (0–11)
Thesis and argumentation (20 pts)	Sophisticated, specific thesis; nuanced argument with clear logical progression	Clear thesis; solid argument with appropriate evidence	Basic thesis; argument present but lacks depth or clarity	Unclear thesis; weak, inconsistent, or missing argument
Application of course concepts (20 pts)	Accurate, sophisticated application of 2+ theories or frameworks; demonstrates deep understanding	Accurate application of concepts; demonstrates solid understanding	Basic application of concepts; some misunderstanding evident	Minimal or inaccurate application of course concepts
Evidence and support (20 pts)	Excellent use of relevant, credible evidence; properly cited; strengthens all claims	Good use of mostly relevant evidence; generally well cited	Some evidence provided; may be limited, weak, or inconsistently cited	Insufficient, irrelevant, or inappropriate evidence

Dimension 2: AI Literacy and Critical Engagement (30 points)

Criteria	Exemplary (9–10)	Proficient (7–8)	Developing (5–6)	Needs Improvement (0–4)
Prompt quality (10 pts)	Highly specific prompts; accurate and thoughtful use of course concepts; strong alignment between prompts and assignment goals	Accurate use of course concepts in prompts; appropriate selection of theories	Basic prompt completion; some inaccuracy or vagueness in concept use	Inaccurate or inappropriate concept selection; generic or unfocused prompts
Critical evaluation of AI (10 pts)	Sophisticated analysis of AI feedback; clearly identifies strengths and limitations; nuanced reasoning for accept/reject decisions	Clear evaluation of AI feedback; reasonable explanations for decisions	Basic evaluation; reasoning present but often superficial	Minimal evaluation; accepts AI uncritically or with weak reasoning
Process documentation (10 pts)	Complete, transparent documentation; clear evidence trail of decision making and revisions; insightful commentary	Complete documentation with adequate explanation of process and choices	Documentation present but lacks detail or clarity	Incomplete or missing documentation; key steps absent

Dimension 3: Metacognitive Reflection (10 points)

Criteria	Exemplary (9–10)	Proficient (7–8)	Developing (5–6)	Needs Improvement (0–4)
Learning and growth (10 pts)	Deep, thoughtful reflection on learning process; identifies specific insights about content, writing, and AI ethics	Clear reflection; identifies learning and AI's role	Basic reflection; acknowledges process with limited depth	Superficial reflection; minimal evidence of critical thinking

In-class knowledge check (Pass/Fail – must pass to receive full credit)

In-Class Knowledge Check (Pass/Fail - Must Pass to Receive Full Credit)

Students must demonstrate basic comprehension of:

- Course concepts applied in their paper
- Ability to explain their critical evaluation choices
- Understanding of key terminology
- Evidence of engagement with the assignment content

Failure to pass the knowledge check results in a 20% deduction from the total assignment grade and requires completion of a makeup assessment.

Pedagogical Rationale

- Why This Assignment Works:

For Students:

- Provides structured scaffolding for AI use (not a free-for-all)
- Develops critical thinking through evaluation of AI outputs
- Makes the writing process visible and iterative
- Reduces anxiety about "perfect first drafts"

- Teaches practical AI literacy skills relevant to their future careers

For Faculty:

- Assesses learning through process, not just product
- Makes AI use transparent and required (not hidden)
- Verifies understanding through low-stakes quiz
- Evaluates mastery of course content through prompt construction
- Provides evidence of student thinking and decision-making

Addressing the “What if they use AI for everything?” concern:

This assignment anticipates extensive AI use while still centering learning:

- The structured prompts require accurate course knowledge; students cannot complete them meaningfully without understanding the material.
- The evaluation process requires students to read, analyze, and critique AI responses rather than accept them passively.
- The justification document surfaces students’ reasoning, making it difficult to mask shallow understanding.
- The in-class quiz independently verifies key concepts and decision making.
- Most importantly, learning occurs through the structured engagement with AI feedback, not through AI-generated text alone.

The goal is not to prevent AI use but to design an assignment in which the learning objectives are achieved because of how AI is integrated.

Implementation Tips for Faculty

Before assignment launch:

- Demonstrate the three prompts with a sample topic in class.
- Show examples of strong versus weak prompt completion.
- Discuss what makes AI feedback helpful versus problematic, including issues of accuracy and bias.
- Review institutional and course-level academic integrity policies related to AI.

During the assignment:

- Offer optional draft conferences or office hours focused on interpreting AI feedback.
- Create a discussion forum where students can share anonymized AI insights and challenges.
- Consider adding a peer review step in which students explain and defend their accept/reject decisions.

Assessment efficiency:

- Use the rubric to focus primarily on higher-order thinking, not surface-level mechanics.
- Use track changes and justification documents to streamline grading and feedback.
- Grade the knowledge check quickly, looking for genuine engagement and basic comprehension rather than perfection.
- Use the sample submission checklist to speed up completeness checks.

Adaptations for Different Disciplines

- **STEM fields:**
Apply to lab reports, research proposals, or data analysis write-ups. Prompts can emphasize methodology, data interpretation, limitations, and hypothesis refinement. AI can help identify gaps in design or reasoning that students then evaluate.
 - **Social sciences:**
Apply to policy analyses, case studies, or literature reviews. Prompts can foreground theoretical frameworks, synthesis of evidence, and competing explanations. AI can help students surface alternative perspectives they then scrutinize.
 - **Humanities:**
Apply to literary analyses, historical arguments, or philosophical essays. Prompts can emphasize interpretation, textual evidence, and theoretical lenses. AI can assist with exploring counterarguments and deepening analytical questions.
 - **Professional programs (e.g., business, education, social work, nursing):**
Apply to case analyses, program or practice evaluations, and reflective practice papers. Prompts can focus on professional standards, ethical dilemmas, and implications for practice. AI can simulate client, stakeholder, or policy perspectives that students critically assess.
-

Sample Student Submission Checklist

Before submitting, students should verify that they have:

- Initial draft with timestamp (Part 1).
- All three AI prompt responses documented (screenshots or transcripts) (Part 2).
- Revised paper with visible changes (track changes or annotations) (Part 3).
- Written justification for accept/reject decisions (Part 3).
- One-page metacognitive reflection (Part 4).
- All documents uploaded to *LMS* by the deadline.
- Prepared for the in-class knowledge check quiz (Part 5).

Frequently Asked Questions

- Q: Can I use AI tools other than ChatGPT or Claude? A: Yes, as long as the tool can respond to the structured prompts. Document which tool you used.
- Q: What if the AI gives me wrong information? A: Excellent! That's part of the learning. Document the error in your justification and explain how you identified it as incorrect using course knowledge.
- Q: Can I use additional prompts beyond the three required ones? A: You may, but only the three required prompts will be assessed. Additional exploration is encouraged for your learning but not required for the grade.
- Q: What if I disagree with ALL of the AI's suggestions? A: That's possible and acceptable! As long as you can justify why the suggestions are problematic and demonstrate engagement with the feedback.
- Q: How much can my paper change from draft to revision? A: Significant revision is encouraged! The point is iterative improvement. Just document and justify your changes.

Assignment designed for integration into undergraduate courses across disciplines
Recommended Contact Hours: 3 | AI literacy component | Verifiable learning outcomes

AI Dialogue Reflection Assignment (Condensed Entry)

Recommended Contact Hours: 1.5 hours Assignment Type: AI-Infused Critical Analysis & Reflection Applicable to: Any discipline - ideal for concept comprehension and critical thinking development

Assignment Overview

This assignment teaches students to engage AI as a learning tool while developing critical evaluation skills. Students will use AI to explore a course concept through structured dialogue, then analyze the accuracy and limitations of AI's responses by comparing them to authoritative course materials. This lower-stakes assignment serves as an excellent introduction to AI literacy.

Learning Objectives

By completing this assignment, students will:

1. Deepen understanding of a specific course concept through active questioning
2. Develop critical AI literacy by evaluating accuracy of AI-generated content
3. Compare and contrast AI explanations with scholarly/authoritative sources
4. Identify gaps, errors, and limitations in AI's knowledge
5. Practice metacognitive skills by reflecting on their learning process

Quick Overview

- Assignment type: AI-infused individual written reflection
- Best for: Introductory or intermediate courses across disciplines where students must interpret, critique, and apply ideas (e.g., social work, nursing, psychology, philosophy, education, business).
- Primary focus: Critical thinking, perspective-taking, ethical reasoning, and reflective writing.

In this assignment, students conduct a structured dialogue with an AI tool that is instructed to take on a specific role, stance, or perspective related to a course topic. Students prepare for the dialogue, engage in a guided conversation, and then analyze the exchange using course concepts before writing a reflective synthesis. AI functions as a thought partner whose responses must be interpreted, questioned, and evaluated, rather than accepted at face value.

This assignment follows the standard structure described in the Standard Assignment Template and the fully worked AI-Enhanced Iterative Writing exemplar. Only assignment-specific details are provided here.

Suggested Hours and Contact Time

Total recommended time: Approximately 2.5–3 hours

- Part 1 – Pre-dialogue preparation: 30–40 minutes (independent, with optional in-class setup).
- Part 2 – Structured AI dialogue: 30–45 minutes (guided activity; can count toward structured instructional time if designed with prompts and faculty framing).
- Part 3 – Critical analysis: 40–50 minutes (guided independent work).
- Part 4 – Reflective synthesis: 30–40 minutes (independent).
- Part 5 – In-class knowledge check: 5–10 minutes (direct instructional time).

Instructors may choose to run Part 2 and a portion of Part 3 in class or synchronous online settings to increase transparency and support.

Assignment-Specific Components

This assignment uses the same component structure as the exemplar (Preparation → Structured AI Engagement → Critical Analysis → Reflection → Knowledge Check). Adapt the generic component descriptions from the Standard Assignment Template as follows.

Part 1: Pre-Dialogue Preparation (Week X)

Students select or are assigned a course-relevant topic, case, or question that involves multiple viewpoints (e.g., an ethical dilemma, policy debate, treatment approach, theoretical controversy). They:

- Review relevant readings, lectures, and key concepts.
- Identify at least two contrasting perspectives or frameworks that could be brought into conversation.
- Draft 3–5 guiding questions they will pose to the AI during the dialogue (e.g., “From a strengths-based social work perspective, how would you...?” or “From a utilitarian standpoint, what would you prioritize in this case?”).

Deliverable: Short preparation notes that identify the topic, relevant theories/perspectives, and the planned guiding questions.

Part 2: Structured AI Dialogue (Week X)

Students conduct a dialogue with an AI tool that is instructed to take on a particular role or perspective (e.g., “You are a policy analyst who opposes X,” “You are a nurse educator explaining this concept to a new graduate,” “You are a client describing your experience from Y cultural standpoint”). Faculty provide a structured prompt frame that all students must follow, including:

- Role for the AI to assume.
- Topic or scenario.
- Ground rules (e.g., “respond in 3–5 sentences,” “cite course concepts where relevant,” “ask me one question back each time”).

Students then:

- Engage in a 8–12 turn dialogue (student–AI–student–AI...), using their prepared questions and at least one follow-up question that challenges or probes the AI’s reasoning.
- Save a transcript or screenshots of the conversation.

Deliverable: Complete AI dialogue transcript labeled with student and AI turns.

Part 3: Critical Analysis (Week X+1)

Students analyze the dialogue using course concepts. They:

- Identify 3–4 key moments in the conversation where the AI’s response was particularly insightful, problematic, biased, incomplete, oversimplified, or surprising.
- For each moment, write a short analytic paragraph that:
 - Summarizes what the AI said.
 - Evaluates the response using course readings, theories, or empirical evidence.
 - Explains what the student agrees or disagrees with and why.
- Optionally, students may annotate the transcript (e.g., with comments or highlighting) to show where these moments occur.

Deliverable: A 2–3 page critical analysis that references specific dialogue excerpts and course materials.

Part 4: Reflective Synthesis (Week X+1)

Students write a 1–2 page reflection that integrates both content learning and process learning:

- What did they learn about the topic or case through this dialogue?
- How did the AI’s role shape their thinking—what new questions or blind spots did it reveal?
- Where did they see evidence of bias, oversimplification, or missing context, and how did they respond?

- How might they use or limit AI dialogue partners in future academic or professional contexts?
- What ethical and relational considerations arise when simulating clients, patients, or stakeholders with AI?

Deliverable: Reflective synthesis paper (1–2 pages).

Part 5: In-Class Knowledge Check Quiz (Week X+2)

A short, closed-note quiz confirms students' understanding of course concepts and their ability to apply them to the dialogue:

- Identify one key theory or framework used in your analysis and apply it to a new, brief scenario.
- Explain one way the AI's response aligned with course material and one way it conflicted with it.
- Define a central concept (e.g., countertransference, informed consent, distributive justice) and relate it to the dialogue.

Key Learning Outcomes

By completing this assignment, students will:

- Analyze an AI-mediated dialogue using relevant course theories and concepts.
- Evaluate the quality, accuracy, and ethical dimensions of AI-generated responses.
- Articulate their own stance in relation to multiple perspectives surfaced in the dialogue.
- Demonstrate reflective capacity about their learning process and the role of AI as a conversational partner.
- Strengthen written communication skills by translating dialogue into structured analysis and reflection.

AI Use Highlights and Guardrails

Unique to this assignment:

- AI is explicitly cast as a role-playing dialogue partner (e.g., client, policy advocate, critic, educator), not as an omniscient expert.
- Students must follow a shared dialogue structure and prompt frame supplied by the instructor (including role, tone, and limits).
- Students may not ask the AI to write their analysis or reflection; AI use is restricted to the dialogue phase only.

For general AI use expectations, documentation requirements, and integrity guidelines, instructors and students should refer to the AI Use Parameters and Integrity Guardrails in the Standard Assignment Template.

Assessment Notes

Uses the same dual-dimension rubric as the exemplar:

- Content mastery and writing quality (e.g., use of theory, evidence, interpretation).
- AI literacy and critical engagement (e.g., quality of questions, evaluation of AI responses, transparency of process).
- Metacognitive reflection (e.g., insight about learning, ethics, and future use).

In this assignment, instructors may choose to place slightly greater emphasis on:

- The quality of critical analysis of AI responses (e.g., identifying bias, gaps, misuse of concepts).
- The depth of reflective synthesis, especially in fields like social work, nursing, counseling, or education where relational and ethical dimensions are central.

Implementation and Adaptation Notes (Brief)

Implementation tips:

- Model a short sample dialogue in class and “think aloud” as you evaluate the AI’s answers.
- Provide a standard prompt frame and turn-count expectations to keep the dialogue manageable.
- Encourage students to flag any responses that feel inappropriate, biased, or unsafe and discuss how to handle such outputs.

Adaptations:

- Social work, counseling, nursing: AI takes the role of a client, patient, or caregiver; analysis focuses on empathy, ethics, and use of professional frameworks.
- Policy, public administration, business: AI represents competing stakeholders or policy positions; analysis centers on trade-offs, values, and feasibility.
- Humanities, philosophy, religious studies: AI embodies a historical figure, theorist, or philosophical stance; students interrogate arguments and assumptions.
- STEM and health sciences: AI plays the role of a novice learner or layperson; students practice explaining complex concepts clearly and correcting misconceptions.

AI Literature Review Assistant Assignment

Quick Overview

- Assignment type: AI-infused research and information literacy assignment
- Best for: Upper-level undergraduates, graduate students, and research-intensive courses across disciplines
- Primary focus: Source discovery, verification, database skills, and critical evaluation of AI-generated citations

In this assignment, students use an AI tool as a starting point for identifying potential scholarly sources on a focused research topic. They then systematically verify every AI-suggested citation, evaluate source quality, and extend the search through independent database research. The process culminates in a curated, critically evaluated set of sources and a written synthesis that distinguishes clearly between AI-generated suggestions and verified scholarly work.

This assignment follows the standard structure described in the Standard Assignment Template and the fully worked AI-Enhanced Iterative Writing exemplar. Only assignment-specific details are provided here.

Suggested Hours and Contact Time

Total recommended time: Approximately 2.5–3 hours

- Part 1 – Topic and strategy development: 30–40 minutes (guided, can be in class or asynchronous).
- Part 2 – AI source discovery: 30–40 minutes (structured activity; can count as direct instructional equivalence if framed and monitored).
- Part 3 – Source verification and evaluation: 50–60 minutes (guided independent work).
- Part 4 – Independent research enhancement: 30–40 minutes (independent).
- Part 5 – Synthesis and reflection: 20–30 minutes (independent).
- Part 6 – In-class knowledge check: 5–10 minutes (direct instructional time).

Instructors may choose to run Parts 1–2 in class (especially in a library session) and Parts 3–4 as supervised or lightly structured lab activities.

Assignment-Specific Components

This assignment uses a multi-part structure (Preparation → AI-Assisted Discovery → Verification and Evaluation → Independent Enhancement → Synthesis → Knowledge Check). Adapt the generic component descriptions from the Standard Assignment Template as follows.

Part 1: Research Topic and Strategy Development (Week X)

Students:

- Select or are assigned a focused research topic or question appropriate for a short literature review (e.g., “AI use in field education for MSW students,” “Simulation-based pain education in nursing,” “Trauma-informed classroom practices in higher education”).
- Identify 2–3 key concepts or variables that define the topic and possible synonyms or related terms.
- Draft a brief search strategy plan that notes:
 - Core keywords and combinations.
 - Preferred databases (e.g., PsycINFO, CINAHL, SocINDEX, ERIC).
 - A time frame for sources (e.g., last 5–10 years, plus any seminal works).

Deliverable: A one-page topic and search strategy plan.

Part 2: AI Source Discovery (Week X)

Using the AI tool, students run three required prompts (or a similar structured sequence) to obtain an initial list of potential sources, focusing on different aspects of the topic:

- Prompt 1: Initial source identification
AI is asked for 10–15 scholarly sources on the student’s topic, with brief descriptions.
- Prompt 2: Gap analysis
AI is asked to identify potential gaps or underexplored areas in the initial set of sources and to recommend additional sources that might address those gaps.
- Prompt 3: Seminal works and theory
AI is asked to identify foundational or highly cited works and key theoretical frameworks relevant to the topic.

Students must:

- Request full citations in a specified style (e.g., APA).
- Save transcripts or screenshots of all AI interactions.

Deliverable: Complete AI conversation transcripts and an initial list of all sources AI recommended.

Part 3: Source Verification and Evaluation (Week X+1)

Students now complete the critical work of verifying each AI-suggested source. They:

- Use library databases, Google Scholar, publisher websites, or DOIs to determine whether each citation actually exists and whether details are accurate.
- Evaluate source quality (peer-reviewed vs. not, relevance, methodological strength, author or journal credibility).
- Document findings in a Source Verification Table with fields such as:
 - AI citation as given.
 - Exists? (Yes/No/Modified).
 - Verification notes (corrections, where found, issues identified).
 - Quality rating (High/Medium/Low/Not Applicable).
 - Will use? (Yes/No, with brief rationale).

Students are expected to identify at least some fabricated, incomplete, or incorrectly formatted citations and treat these as learning opportunities rather than failures.

Deliverable: Completed Source Verification Table (typically 3–4 pages).

Part 4: Independent Research Enhancement (Week X+1)

Students extend their literature search beyond the AI-generated list. They:

- Conduct targeted database searches using at least two library databases to find 3–5 additional relevant sources that AI did not suggest.
- Use citation chaining (reviewing reference lists of key articles) to identify 2–3 further sources.
- Ensure at least one source is published within the last 12 months.

For each additional source, students record:

- Full citation in the required style.
- How they located it (which database, which seed article, which search terms).
- A brief note on why it is valuable for the topic.

Deliverable: List of 5–10 additional, independently found sources with brief annotations.

Part 5: Synthesis and Reflection (Week X+1)

Students write a 1–2 page narrative that integrates:

Literature synthesis (about 1 page):

- 2–3 major themes or debates in the literature.
- Key gaps or underexplored questions.
- Which sources provide the strongest foundation for understanding the topic and why.
- How sources converge or diverge in their findings or interpretations.
- AI tool reflection (about 0.5–1 page):
 - How AI shaped or constrained their initial understanding of the literature.
 - Where AI suggestions were helpful, misleading, incomplete, or fabricated.
 - What they learned about the limitations of AI for citation work.
 - How they would responsibly integrate AI into future research tasks.

Deliverable: Synthesis and reflection document (1–2 pages).

Part 6: In-Class Knowledge Check Quiz (Week X+2)

A short, closed-note quiz confirms:

- Understanding of core concepts such as peer review, source credibility, and seminal vs. recent work.
- Ability to explain one example of an AI-generated error or fabrication and how it was detected.
- Ability to describe at least one effective database search strategy used.
- Awareness of why AI cannot replace actual database research for rigorous literature reviews.

Key Learning Outcomes

By completing this assignment, students will:

- Use AI strategically as a brainstorming tool for potential sources and research directions.
- Apply systematic verification processes to evaluate AI-generated citations.
- Strengthen independent database search and citation mining skills.
- Critically assess AI's reliability and limitations in scholarly research contexts.
- Synthesize a small body of literature into themes, gaps, and implications for further study.

AI Use Highlights and Guardrails

Unique to this assignment:

- AI is used only for preliminary source discovery, conceptual mapping, and identification of potential gaps; it is not used to write the literature review itself.
- Students are required—and assessed—on identifying and documenting AI inaccuracies, including fabricated or distorted citations.
- Students must clearly distinguish between AI-suggested and verified, independently located sources in their documentation.

For overarching AI use expectations, documentation standards, and integrity policies, instructors and students should refer to the AI Use Parameters and Integrity Guardrails in the Standard Assignment Template.

Assessment Notes

Uses the shared rubric dimensions:

- Content and research quality: accuracy of synthesis, appropriateness of sources, clarity of themes and gaps.
- AI literacy: quality of prompts, thoroughness and accuracy of verification, insight into AI limitations.
- Process documentation: completeness and clarity of the Source Verification Table and search notes.
- Reflection: depth of insight into research process and AI's role.

Instructors may increase the weighting of AI literacy and process documentation when the course emphasizes information literacy or research methods.

Implementation and Adaptation Notes (Brief)

Implementation tips:

- Coordinate with a librarian for an in-class or synchronous session covering databases and verification strategies.
- Provide a template or sample Source Verification Table for students to adapt.
- Normalize finding AI errors as expected and valuable for learning, not as “gotchas.”

Adaptations:

- Social work, counseling, education, nursing: Focus topics on practice interventions, policy issues, or population-specific concerns; emphasize evidence hierarchies and practice guidelines.
- STEM and health sciences: Emphasize methodological rigor, study design, and statistical considerations in the evaluation step.

- Humanities and social sciences: Highlight theoretical diversity, historiography, or interpretive frames; encourage exploring classic and contemporary sources.
 - Professional and applied programs: Align topics with capstone projects, program evaluations, or practice problems students are already investigating.
-

AI Bias Detection Exercise Assignment

Quick Overview

Assignment type: AI-infused critical inquiry and ethics assignment

Best for: Intermediate or advanced undergraduates and graduate students across disciplines where equity, ethics, and decision-making are central (e.g., social work, nursing, education, psychology, business, criminal justice, data science)

Primary focus: Detecting and analyzing bias in AI outputs, connecting findings to real-world implications

In this assignment, students design and run a mini-experiment to test an AI system for potential bias. They create parallel scenarios that differ only in key demographic variables (such as race, gender, age, disability, socioeconomic status), systematically compare responses, and then analyze patterns of difference. Students then write an implications essay that connects their findings to equity, ethics, and professional practice in their field.

This assignment follows the standard structure in the Standard Assignment Template and the fully worked AI-Enhanced Iterative Writing exemplar. Only assignment-specific details are provided here.

Suggested Hours and Contact Time

Total recommended time: Approximately 2.5–3 hours

- Part 1 – Scenario development: 30–40 minutes (guided, can be in class).
- Part 2 – Systematic bias testing: 40–50 minutes (structured activity; can count as direct instructional equivalence if run as a supervised lab).
- Part 3 – Bias analysis and documentation: 45–60 minutes (guided independent work).
- Part 4 – Implications essay: 30–40 minutes (independent).
- Part 5 – In-class knowledge check: 5–10 minutes (direct instructional time).

Instructors may choose to conduct Parts 1–2 in a live session (classroom or synchronous online) to support careful scenario design and debrief AI outputs in real time.

Assignment-Specific Components

This assignment uses a multi-part structure (Scenario Design → Structured AI Testing → Pattern Analysis → Implications Essay → Knowledge Check). Adapt the generic component descriptions from the Standard Assignment Template as follows.

Part 1: Scenario Development (Week X)

Students:

- Identify a context where AI-supported decision-making is plausible in their discipline (e.g., intake assessment, hiring, risk scoring, triage, resource allocation, grading, loan decisions).
- Design a set of parallel scenarios that are identical except for one or two demographic variables at a time (e.g., same qualifications but different names and races; same symptoms but different ages).
- Clearly specify:
 - The decision or recommendation they will ask the AI to make.
 - Which demographic variables will be manipulated and how.
 - Any constraints for prompts (e.g., “Respond in a short paragraph,” “Explain your reasoning,” “Use professional language”).

Deliverable: Scenario plan describing the context, variables, and at least 4–6 parallel test cases.

Part 2: Systematic Bias Testing (Week X)

Using their scenario set, students:

- Pose the same prompt to the AI multiple times, changing only the demographic variables as specified in Part 1.
- Record each AI response verbatim, labeling which scenario it corresponds to.
- Keep conditions as controlled as possible (same tool, settings, instructions, time frame).

Students are encouraged to note not just final recommendations, but also tone, level of concern, assumptions, and any language that feels stereotyped or differential.

Deliverable: A raw data set (e.g., table or document) containing all prompts and AI responses, clearly labeled by scenario.

Part 3: Bias Analysis and Documentation (Week X+1)

Students analyze the AI outputs for patterns:

- Create a Bias Analysis Table that, for each scenario, captures:
 - Key features of the scenario (demographic variables).
 - Summary of the AI's recommendation or response.
 - Notable differences in language, tone, risk estimation, or resource offerings.
 - Initial interpretation (e.g., is this a meaningful difference, noise, or ambiguous?).
- Identify at least 3–5 concrete examples where demographic differences appear to influence the AI's response in ways that raise equity or bias concerns.
- Relate those patterns to concepts such as stereotyping, overgeneralization, disparate impact, or implicit bias as taught in the course.

Deliverable: Completed Bias Analysis Table and a brief (1–2 page) analytic memo summarizing key patterns.

Part 4: Implications Essay (Week X+1)

Students write a 2–3 page essay that moves from findings to implications:

- Describe the most concerning patterns observed in the AI's behavior and illustrate them with specific examples.
- Explain how these patterns might impact real people in similar contexts (e.g., clients, patients, students, job applicants, community members).
- Connect their analysis to course frameworks and professional ethics codes (e.g., social work values, nursing code of ethics, principles of justice or nonmaleficence, DEI commitments).
- Propose at least 2–3 mitigation strategies, such as:
 - How practitioners could verify or correct AI outputs.
 - How organizations might audit or constrain AI systems.
 - How policy and regulation might address these risks.
- Reflect briefly on how this exercise affected their own view of AI and their responsibility in using it.

Deliverable: Implications essay (2–3 pages).

Part 5: In-Class Knowledge Check Quiz (Week X+2)

A short quiz verifies that students can:

- Define and differentiate key terms (e.g., bias, discrimination, disparate impact, algorithmic fairness).
- Explain one example from their own test that illustrates a type of bias.
- Identify at least one professional or ethical standard that would be violated if such biased AI outputs were used uncritically.
- Name one protective action a practitioner or organization should take when using AI in similar decisions.

Key Learning Outcomes

By completing this assignment, students will:

- Design and conduct a small-scale, systematic test of an AI system for potential bias.
- Identify and interpret patterns of differential treatment across demographic variables.
- Connect observed AI behavior to broader discussions of equity, ethics, and systemic oppression.
- Propose concrete strategies to mitigate AI-related harms in their discipline.
- Strengthen critical, evidence-based reasoning about technology in practice.

AI Use Highlights and Guardrails

Unique to this assignment:

- AI is used as an object of investigation, not as a helper or co-writer. Students function as researchers examining AI behavior under controlled conditions.
- Students are instructed not to “fix” or steer the AI to be fair during testing; the goal is to observe baseline behavior, then reflect on how such behavior could and should be changed in real systems.
- Students must handle sensitive content respectfully and in line with classroom norms, particularly when prompts involve marginalized identities or stigmatized conditions.

For general AI use expectations, documentation practices, and integrity policies, see the AI Use Parameters and Integrity Guardrails section in the Standard Assignment Template.

Assessment Notes

- Uses the shared rubric dimensions, with emphasis on:
 - Content and analytic quality: clarity of scenario design, accuracy of pattern identification, integration of course concepts.

- AI literacy and critical engagement: sophistication of experimental design, depth of analysis of AI outputs, recognition of limitations.
- Reflection and ethical reasoning: ability to connect findings to professional standards, DEI goals, and real-world risks.

Instructors may weight ethical reasoning and implications more heavily in courses where professional judgment and equity are central outcomes.

Implementation and Adaptation Notes (Brief)

Implementation tips:

- Provide examples of different types of bias (e.g., stereotype reinforcement, harsher language toward certain groups, differential risk ratings).
- Frame the assignment as research and pattern detection, not as ideological debate.
- Prepare students for potentially disturbing outputs and normalize discomfort as a valid response.
- Offer structured debrief time where students can share findings and process emotional reactions, especially in fields like social work and nursing.

Adaptations:

- Social work, counseling, education, nursing: Focus on scenarios like intake assessments, behavior evaluations, treatment recommendations, or resource eligibility; emphasize client/student safety and dignity.
 - Business, HR, public administration: Use hiring, promotion, loan approval, or benefit eligibility scenarios; emphasize legal, reputational, and equity implications.
 - Criminal justice, law, public policy: Focus on risk assessments, sentencing recommendations, or policing resources; connect to civil rights and procedural justice.
 - STEM and data science: Emphasize model behavior, training data issues, and algorithmic fairness metrics; link to responsible AI development.
 - Humanities and cultural studies: Examine AI interpretations of cultural products, narratives, or historical figures; analyze whose perspectives are centered or erased.
-

AI Study Partner Reflection Assignment

Quick Overview

- Assignment type: AI-infused individual study skills and metacognition assignment
- Best for: Undergraduate courses across disciplines, especially early or mid-semester when students are still building effective study routines

- Primary focus: Self-regulated learning, strategic AI use for studying, verification habits, and reflective practice

In this assignment, students intentionally use an AI tool as a “study partner” for a targeted study session, then verify what they learned and reflect on the process. They set explicit learning goals, collaborate with AI during study time (e.g., quizzing, explaining concepts, generating practice scenarios), and then independently check and correct AI-generated information. Finally, they reflect on how AI affected their learning, what worked, what did not, and how they will adjust future study strategies.

This assignment follows the standard structure described in the Standard Assignment Template and the fully worked AI-Enhanced Iterative Writing exemplar. Only assignment-specific details are provided here.

Suggested Hours and Contact Time

Total recommended time: Approximately 1.5–2 hours

- Part 1 – Study goal setting: 15–20 minutes (can be done in class or asynchronously as guided preparation).
- Part 2 – AI study session: 35–45 minutes (structured independent work; can be framed as direct instructional equivalence if faculty provide clear prompts and expectations).
- Part 3 – Verification and correction: 30–40 minutes (guided independent work).
- Metacognitive reflection and/or quiz: 15–20 minutes (reflection may be written out of class; a brief in-class check can verify understanding).

Assignment-Specific Components

This assignment uses a three-part structure (Preparation → AI-Supported Study Session → Verification and Correction), followed by reflection or a brief knowledge check.

Adapt the generic component descriptions from the Standard Assignment Template as follows.

Part 1: Study Goal Setting (Before Study Session)

Students:

- Choose a specific, bounded set of course content to focus on (e.g., a chapter, set of lecture topics, or upcoming quiz section).
- Write concrete learning goals for the session (e.g., “I will be able to explain X in my own words and apply it to Y,” “I will be able to distinguish between A and B and provide examples”).

- Identify 2–3 ways they plan to use AI during the session (e.g., to quiz them, explain concepts at different difficulty levels, generate practice items, create analogies, or break down complex procedures).

Deliverable: Short written plan (half page to one page) outlining: selected content, learning goals, and planned AI uses.

Part 2: AI Study Session (Study Time)

During a single study session, students:

- Use AI as a study partner following their plan, such as by:
 - Asking the AI to quiz them with short-answer or application questions.
 - Requesting explanations of concepts at different levels (e.g., “explain this as if to a peer,” “explain this in more technical terms”).
 - Generating simple practice scenarios or case vignettes they then attempt to solve.
- Actively engage with the AI rather than passively reading: answer questions before seeing AI’s answers, ask follow-up questions, request clarifications, and prompt for additional examples when needed.
- Keep brief notes about what they did, what felt helpful, and where they were confused or skeptical about AI responses.

Deliverable: A concise “study log” documenting the session (time spent, prompts or activities, and quick notes about perceived usefulness).

Part 3: Verification and Correction (After Study Session)

After the AI study session, students:

- Select a subset of AI-generated information (e.g., 5–10 facts, definitions, explanations, or scenarios) and independently verify it using the textbook, lecture notes, slides, or instructor-approved resources.
- Create a simple Verification and Correction Table indicating for each item:
 - AI output (as given).
 - Verified as accurate, partially accurate, or inaccurate.
 - Corrections or clarifications needed.
 - Source used for verification (e.g., text page, lecture slide, article).

- Note patterns in AI errors (e.g., oversimplifying nuances, mixing up similar concepts, outdated information).

Deliverable: Verification and Correction Table plus a short paragraph summarizing overall accuracy and patterns.

Part 4: Metacognitive Reflection and/or Brief Knowledge Check

Most of the metacognitive work can be written; instructors who want a formal check can also add a short in-class knowledge check.

Metacognitive reflection (recommended, 1–2 pages):

Students reflect on:

- How AI affected their motivation, focus, and confidence during the study session.
- Which AI-supported activities felt most and least effective for actual understanding.
- What they learned from the verification step about trusting (or not trusting) AI in study contexts.
- How they would redesign a future AI-assisted study session to better support deep learning.
- Any ethical or academic integrity boundaries they became more aware of (e.g., when using AI crosses from “study support” into “assignment completion”).

Optional in-class knowledge check (5–10 minutes):

A short quiz can verify that students can correctly explain a few key concepts they studied, independent of AI access. This reinforces that AI use must be paired with genuine comprehension.

Key Learning Outcomes

By completing this assignment, students will:

- Plan and execute a focused study session with clear learning goals.
- Use AI strategically to support practice, explanation, and retrieval, rather than as a shortcut for assignments.
- Verify and correct AI-generated information using authoritative course resources.
- Reflect on their own learning processes, including what kinds of AI use genuinely help them learn.
- Develop practical habits for integrating AI into study routines in ethical and effective ways.

AI Use Highlights and Guardrails

Unique to this assignment:

- AI is explicitly positioned as a study support tool, not a way to generate assignment answers. Students should not use AI to complete graded work directly.
- Students must pair AI use with a verification phase; unverified reliance is treated as incomplete learning.
- The focus is on process and strategy, not on the volume of content covered.

For general AI use expectations, documentation practices, and integrity policies, see the AI Use Parameters and Integrity Guardrails section in the Standard Assignment Template.

Assessment Notes

- Uses the standard rubric dimensions with emphasis on:
 - Process quality and metacognition: clarity of goals, depth of reflection, specificity of insights about learning.
 - AI literacy: appropriate planning and use of AI in the study session, quality of prompts, discernment about when AI was or was not helpful.
 - Verification skills: thoroughness and accuracy of the Verification and Correction Table.

Instructors can keep the grading load light by treating the study log and verification table as completion/quality checks and focusing analytic feedback on the reflection.

Implementation and Adaptation Notes (Brief)

Implementation tips:

- Introduce this assignment early in the term as a way to normalize transparent, ethical AI use in studying.
- Model one short AI study interaction in class (e.g., asking AI to quiz you on a concept) and then immediately fact-checking it.
- Encourage students to share effective AI study strategies (and cautionary examples) in a short debrief or discussion forum.

Adaptations:

- STEM and health sciences: Emphasize problem-solving, steps of procedures, and conceptual explanations; encourage AI-generated practice problems that students solve before seeing AI's answer.

- Social work, psychology, education, nursing: Focus on core concepts, case examples, ethical principles, and application to brief practice scenarios; emphasize verifying details of diagnostic criteria or policy requirements.
 - Humanities and social sciences: Use AI for concept mapping, generating example interpretations, or contrasting perspectives, then have students verify against texts and lectures.
 - Professional programs: Tie AI-supported study sessions to certification exam blueprints or competency frameworks, emphasizing strategic use for long-term retention.
-

AI Study Partner Reflection Assignment

Quick Overview

Recommended contact hours: 1 hour

Assignment type: AI-enhanced assessment and metacognition

Applicable to: Any discipline; ideal for exam preparation and study skills development

This assignment helps students learn to use AI as a study partner while developing metacognitive awareness of their learning process. Students use AI to quiz themselves, explain difficult concepts, and identify knowledge gaps, then verify AI's information against course materials and reflect on how effective AI was as a study tool. The assignment is low-stakes but high-yield for building strategic, ethical study habits and healthy skepticism about AI's explanations.

Suggested Hours and Contact Time

Total recommended time: 1 hour

- Part 1 – Study goal setting: ~5 minutes (guided preparation; can be done in class or online).
- Part 2 – AI study session (three activities: quiz, explanation, gap identification): ~30 minutes (structured independent work; can count as structured instructional activity if framed and monitored).
- Part 3 – Verification and correction: ~10 minutes (guided independent work).
- Part 4 – Metacognitive reflection: ~10 minutes (independent).
- Part 5 – In-class knowledge check: ~5 minutes (direct instructional time).

Assignment-Specific Components

This assignment follows the same overall pattern as the exemplar (Preparation → Structured AI Engagement → Verification → Reflection → Knowledge Check).

Instructors can adapt the generic descriptions from the Standard Assignment Template as follows.

Part 1: Study goal setting

Students identify what they need to study and why, rate their current confidence (1–5), and articulate specific learning goals for the session and the upcoming assessment this work supports.

Part 2: AI study session (three activities)

- Activity 1 – Quiz yourself: Students ask AI to generate a short mixed-format quiz on their topic, answer all questions before viewing AI’s answers, then compare results and note where they struggled.
- Activity 2 – Concept explanation: Students choose 1–2 confusing concepts, ask AI for a tailored explanation with examples and common misconceptions, and then verify AI’s explanation against course materials.
- Activity 3 – Knowledge gap identification: Students ask AI to help identify remaining weak areas, prerequisite knowledge they may be missing, and concrete next steps or practice ideas, then critically evaluate which suggestions are and are not helpful.

Part 3: Verification and correction

Students write a brief verification report that checks AI’s quiz questions, explanations, and study recommendations against authoritative course resources (texts, notes, slides) and comments on accuracy, alignment with instructor emphasis, and usefulness.

Part 4: Metacognitive reflection

In a one-page reflection, students evaluate AI’s effectiveness as a study tool, compare it to other study methods, and outline how they plan to use (and limit) AI in future study, including any personal “rules” for ethical, effective use.

Part 5: In-class knowledge check quiz

A short, closed-note quiz samples the actual content students studied with AI to verify real learning. Questions typically include one explanation item, one application item, one question about an AI error or limitation they noticed, and one about complementary non-AI study strategies.

Key Learning Outcomes

By completing this assignment, students will:

- Use AI strategically to support exam preparation and concept mastery.
- Develop metacognitive awareness of their understanding and knowledge gaps.

- Practice retrieval and self-testing as evidence-based study strategies.
- Critically evaluate AI explanations for accuracy against course materials.
- Identify when AI is helpful versus when human instruction or peer study is preferable.
- Build sustainable study skills using AI as one tool among many.

AI Use Highlights and Guardrails

- AI is positioned as a study support tool, not a shortcut for graded work.
- Students must verify AI-generated quizzes, explanations, and recommendations against course resources and document any errors or oversimplifications they find.
- The knowledge check ensures that students who treat AI passively (rather than engaging and verifying) will not earn full credit, reinforcing that effective AI use requires effort, strategy, and critical thinking.

Assessment Notes

- The rubric emphasizes three dimensions:
 - Content mastery and learning effectiveness: evidence of genuine learning and improved understanding, plus performance on the knowledge check.
 - AI literacy and critical use: quality of prompts and follow-up, completeness of activities, and thoroughness of verification.
 - Metacognitive reflection: depth of insight into personal learning processes and thoughtful planning for future AI-supported study.

This assignment is quick to grade: instructors can skim for clear goal setting, meaningful verification, and substantive reflection, and use the knowledge check to see who actually learned versus who only completed the process.

Implementation and Adaptation Notes (Brief)

- Introduce this assignment early in the term to normalize transparent, ethical AI use in studying.
- Model one short AI-based study interaction in class and immediately fact-check it to show why verification matters.
- Encourage students to share effective prompts and lessons learned, and consider repeating the assignment before major exams.

Adaptations:

- STEM: Emphasize AI-generated practice problems, step-by-step explanations, and checking formulas and reasoning against textbooks.

- Social sciences and humanities: Focus on theory/application questions, comparative prompts, and checking interpretations against course readings and discussions.
 - Professional programs (e.g., social work, nursing, business, education): Use AI to generate case scenarios and questions tied to professional standards and ethical frameworks, then verify against codes and best-practice guidance.
-

AI-Assisted Self-Assessment Assignment

Quick Overview

Recommended contact hours: 1.5 hours

Assignment type: AI-enhanced assessment and metacognition

Applicable to: Any discipline; especially useful for exam preparation and structured learning reflection

This assignment guides students to use AI to create a practice assessment, take it honestly, analyze their performance, and build a targeted learning plan. They then complete a focused follow-up self-assessment and reflect on what the process revealed about their understanding, study strategies, and use of AI. The emphasis is on accurate self-evaluation, growth mindset, and self-directed learning.

Suggested Hours and Contact Time

Total recommended time: 1.5 hours

- Part 1 – Learning objectives review and baseline self-assessment: ~10 minutes (guided; can be done in class or online).
- Part 2 – AI-generated practice assessment and self-testing: ~30 minutes (structured independent work).
- Part 3 – Gap analysis and learning plan: ~30 minutes (guided independent work).
- Part 4 – Metacognitive reflection: ~15 minutes (independent).
- Part 5 – Follow-up self-assessment: ~15 minutes (independent).
- Part 6 – In-class knowledge check: ~5 minutes (direct instructional time).

Assignment-Specific Components

This assignment follows the same overall pattern as the exemplar (Preparation → Structured AI Engagement → Analysis and Planning → Follow-up → Reflection → Knowledge Check), adapted as follows.

Part 1: Learning objectives review (baseline)

Students identify the unit or topic being assessed, list key learning objectives or concepts, and rate their confidence on each (e.g., 1–5, from “no idea” to “could teach it”). They also clarify what level of thinking is needed (recall vs. application vs. analysis) and what assessment format to expect. This creates an explicit baseline of perceived understanding.

Part 2: AI-generated practice assessment and self-test

Using a structured prompt, students ask AI to generate a practice assessment that matches the upcoming exam format, includes a range of difficulty levels, and tags each question to specific objectives. Students then:

- Remove/hide the answers.
- Complete the practice assessment without AI or notes.
- Compare their responses to the AI-provided answers and explanations.
- Self-score and note where they were correct, incorrect, or unsure.

Part 3: Gap analysis and learning plan

Students build a Gap Analysis Table that, for each question, identifies the topic, correctness, reason for any error, and the gap type (e.g., didn’t know, misunderstood, couldn’t apply, careless error, partial understanding). They then create a prioritized learning plan that specifies:

- Concrete actions (e.g., re-reading specific pages, extra problems, office hours).
- Timelines for each action.
- Criteria for knowing when each gap has been addressed.

Part 4: Metacognitive reflection

In a one-page reflection, students analyze:

- How well their baseline confidence matched actual performance.
- Patterns in their gaps (e.g., mostly application, certain topics, or certain question types).
- How effective the AI-generated assessment was and how they might refine prompts next time.
- Specific changes they will make to their study strategies and how they will use self-assessment in future courses.

Part 5: Follow-up self-assessment

After working their learning plan, students use AI to generate a small set of new questions focused specifically on their previously identified gaps, take this mini-assessment without help, and evaluate whether their performance improved. They write a brief note on remaining weak areas and current confidence.

Part 6: In-class knowledge check quiz

A short, closed-note quiz samples content from core learning objectives and previously identified gaps, plus a brief metacognitive question (e.g., describing a gap they identified and what they did to address it).

Key Learning Outcomes

By completing this assignment, students will:

- Generate and use AI-supported practice assessments aligned with course objectives.
- Accurately evaluate their own understanding and identify specific knowledge gaps.
- Distinguish between surface familiarity and deeper conceptual or applied mastery.
- Design and implement targeted learning plans based on self-assessment data.
- Develop metacognitive awareness of strengths, challenges, and study patterns.
- Build habits of self-directed, continuous improvement that transfer to future courses and professional learning.

AI Use Highlights and Guardrails

- AI is used to generate practice assessments and targeted follow-up questions, not to take the assessment or create the learning plan or reflection.
- Students must complete the practice questions and follow-up questions independently before checking AI's answers.
- Prompts should specify exam format, difficulty level, and alignment with course objectives, but students are responsible for verifying that AI's questions are appropriate and adjusting prompts as needed.
- The in-class knowledge check ensures that students who "game" the practice process (e.g., by looking at AI's answers while "testing") will not achieve full credit without actual learning.

Assessment Notes

- The rubric focuses on three main dimensions:
 - Self-assessment accuracy and honesty: alignment between baseline confidence and performance, and depth of gap analysis.
 - Learning plan quality and follow-through: specificity, prioritization, realism of the plan, and evidence of improvement in the follow-up questions.
 - Metacognitive awareness and AI literacy: insight into learning patterns and strengths/weaknesses, quality of AI prompts, and thoughtful evaluation of AI as a study tool.

The tables (baseline, gap analysis) and follow-up results are quick to scan, while the reflection provides rich qualitative evidence of metacognition and growth mindset.

Implementation and Adaptation Notes (Brief)

- Introduce the assignment as a learning tool, not a grading trap, emphasizing that honest self-assessment is both safer and more useful than inflated self-ratings.
- Consider modeling a mini-version in class with a shared topic.
- Use common gaps observed in students' tables and reflections to shape review sessions.

Adaptations:

- STEM: Emphasize multi-step problems, mechanism explanations, and distinguishing conceptual vs. computational errors in gap analysis.
 - Social sciences and humanities: Focus practice on theory application, argumentation, interpretation, and synthesis; highlight patterns such as “can define but not apply” or “can summarize but not analyze.”
 - Professional programs: Build practice around case-based decision-making, ethical standards, and evidence-based reasoning; emphasize the link between accurate self-assessment and safe, ethical practice.
-

AI Debate Partner Assignment

Quick Overview

Recommended contact hours: 1.5 hours

Assignment type: AI simulation and role-play

Applicable to: Any discipline; ideal for argumentation, critical thinking, and rhetorical skills

In this assignment, students choose a debatable, course-relevant issue, construct an initial argument, and then debate an AI that is instructed to take the opposing side. After two rounds of debate, they analyze the AI's counterarguments, revise and strengthen their position, and reflect on how their thinking and argumentation evolved. The emphasis is on generating stronger arguments through opposition, not on “winning” the debate.

Suggested Hours and Contact Time

Total recommended time: 1.5 hours

- Part 1 – Position selection and initial argument: ~20 minutes (guided; can be started in class).
- Part 2 – Debate Round 1 with AI: ~20 minutes (structured independent work).

- Part 3 – Argument strengthening and analysis: ~25 minutes (guided independent work).
- Part 4 – Debate Round 2 with AI: ~15 minutes (independent).
- Part 5 – Metacognitive reflection: ~15 minutes (independent).
- Part 6 – In-class knowledge check: ~5 minutes (direct instructional time).

Assignment-Specific Components

The assignment follows the familiar pattern (Preparation → Structured AI Engagement → Analysis and Revision → Second Test → Reflection → Knowledge Check) adapted as follows.

Part 1: Position selection and initial argument

Students select a debatable issue clearly tied to course content (e.g., policy stance, theoretical dispute, practice model) and write:

- A clear position statement (1–2 sentence thesis).
- Three main supporting points with reasoning and evidence.
- At least two citations to course materials.
- A brief note on why the issue matters in their field and why they chose this side.

Part 2: Debate Round 1 – initial exchange with AI

Students instruct AI to argue against their position, using strong but fair counterarguments grounded in logic and (where possible) evidence. The prompt specifies AI's role and norms (e.g., no bad faith or fallacies). Students:

- Paste their opening argument.
 - Receive AI's counterargument.
 - Respond with rebuttals, then repeat for at least 2–3 exchanges.
- Deliverable: Transcript of the first debate round (student and AI turns).

Part 3: Argument strengthening and analysis

Students create an Argument Analysis Table where they:

- List key AI counterarguments.
- Evaluate how effective each one is and why.
- Identify whether their live responses were strong, weak, or incomplete.
- Plan specific strategies to address the most serious objections.

They then write a revised argument (1–2 pages) that:

- Maintains their original side.
- Proactively addresses the strongest counterarguments.
- Adds evidence or clarifies reasoning where weaknesses were exposed.
- Demonstrates greater nuance while still taking a clear position.

Part 4: Debate Round 2 – testing improvements

Using the strengthened argument, students run a second, shorter debate with AI, asking it to raise new or less-addressed counterarguments. They:

- Paste their revised argument.
- Conduct 1–2 exchanges.
- Write a short comparison paragraph on how Round 2 differed from Round 1 (e.g., fewer serious vulnerabilities, more confident rebuttals).

Part 5: Metacognitive reflection

In a one-page reflection, students analyze:

- How their argument changed between drafts and why.
- What the debate process revealed about the issue and their own reasoning.
- Where AI was effective as a debate partner and where it fell short (e.g., lack of emotional nuance, real-world stakes, or lived experience).
- How they will use counterargument thinking and debate practice in future papers, presentations, or professional contexts.

Part 6: In-class knowledge check quiz

A short, closed-note quiz confirms:

- Understanding of their own position and at least one piece of supporting evidence from course materials.
- Recognition of the strongest counterargument and how they addressed it.
- Awareness of how their argument improved.
- At least one limitation of AI as a debate partner and one benefit of anticipating counterarguments in general.

Key Learning Outcomes

By completing this assignment, students will:

- Develop clear, well-supported arguments on course-related issues.
- Anticipate and respond to counterarguments more effectively.

- Strengthen reasoning through iterative refinement of their position.
- Identify weaknesses in their arguments before formal assessments.
- Distinguish between strong and weak rebuttals.
- Build confidence in defending positions through structured practice.
- Recognize the difference between AI-based debate practice and human intellectual exchange.

AI Use Highlights and Guardrails

- AI is explicitly cast as an opposing debate partner, instructed to argue the other side respectfully and logically.
- Students must not let AI draft their entire argument; AI is restricted to providing counterarguments, not writing the student's case.
- Students critically evaluate AI's points, identifying both strong objections worth addressing and weak or fallacious arguments that are useful to recognize and rebut.
- The knowledge check reinforces that the goal is deeper understanding of course content and argumentation, not just "sparring" with AI.

Assessment Notes

- The rubric emphasizes:
 - Argumentation quality and development: strength of the initial argument and the degree to which it is substantively improved.
 - Critical engagement and analysis: quality of debate engagement, depth of evaluation of AI counterarguments, and strategic revisions.
 - Metacognition and AI literacy: insight into learning from debate, understanding of AI's strengths and limitations, and realistic application to future work.

Comparing initial and revised arguments, alongside the analysis table and reflection, gives a clear picture of growth in both content understanding and argumentation skill.

Implementation and Adaptation Notes (Brief)

- Frame the assignment as practice for real-world argumentation, not as an abstract or competitive exercise.
- Consider modeling a short sample debate and analysis with a low-stakes, familiar topic.
- Use commonly selected issues to fuel subsequent class discussions or to scaffold into formal argumentative papers or presentations.

Adaptations:

- Social work, nursing, education, psychology: Focus on debates about interventions, policies, ethics, and practice models; emphasize client/student safety, equity, and professional values.
 - Business, law, policy, criminal justice: Center on policy proposals, regulatory choices, or legal interpretations; highlight evidence, precedent, and competing values.
 - STEM and health sciences: Debate methods, interpretations, or policy applications; focus on evidence quality, limitations, and alternative explanations.
 - Humanities: Debate interpretive frameworks, theoretical approaches, or canonical questions; emphasize textual evidence and competing readings.
-

AI Client Simulation Assignment

Quick Overview

Recommended contact hours: 2 hours

Assignment type: AI simulation and role-play

Applicable to: Professional programs (social work, counseling, psychology, nursing, healthcare, education, business/consulting, and related fields)

In this assignment, students conduct a simulated professional interaction with AI role-playing a client, patient, student, customer, or stakeholder. They plan the scenario, run a substantial interaction using a chosen practice framework, analyze their own communication and decision-making, and reflect on what AI can and cannot replicate about human helping relationships. The goal is to build practice skills and confidence while clarifying the irreplaceable role of human empathy, intuition, and lived experience.

Suggested Hours and Contact Time

Total recommended time: 2 hours

- Part 1 – Simulation planning: ~15 minutes (guided; can be completed in class or online).
- Part 2 – Simulation setup and prompt design: ~10 minutes (independent).
- Part 3 – Conducting the simulation: ~45 minutes (structured independent practice).
- Part 4 – Practice analysis and skills table: ~40 minutes (guided independent work).
- Part 5 – AI vs. human interaction reflection: ~20 minutes (independent).
- Part 6 – In-class knowledge check: ~5 minutes (direct instructional time).

Assignment-Specific Components

This assignment follows the familiar structure (Planning → Structured AI Engagement → Analysis → Reflection → Knowledge Check), customized as follows.

Part 1: Simulation planning

Students identify the type of interaction (e.g., intake interview, counseling session, patient assessment, student conference, business consultation), the setting, the presenting situation, their professional role, and specific skills they wish to practice. They outline a brief profile of the simulated client/patient/stakeholder and name the theoretical framework or practice model that will guide their approach (e.g., person-centered, CBT, solution-focused, trauma-informed, motivational interviewing).

Part 2: Setting up the simulation

Students create a detailed prompt that instructs AI to role-play a specific person with a defined profile (name, age, background, presenting concern, emotional state, complexity factors). They also specify behavioral expectations (e.g., show some resistance or ambivalence, respond realistically, react to the student's tone and questions, stay in character). A short rationale explains why they chose this type of client and these particular challenges.

Part 3: Conducting the simulation

Students engage in a 20–30 minute simulated session, using their professional skills and chosen framework as authentically as possible. They practice key techniques (e.g., open-ended questions, empathic reflection, assessment, reframing, summarizing, planning next steps), adjust to AI's responses, and close the session professionally. The full transcript is saved as evidence of engagement.

Part 4: Practice analysis

Students write a 2–3 page practice analysis that includes:

- A brief discussion of how they applied their theoretical framework, with 2–3 concrete examples from the transcript.
- A skills analysis table where they select at least five skills (e.g., open-ended questions, empathy, rapport-building, addressing resistance, information gathering), quote specific moments from the transcript, evaluate effectiveness, and identify improvements.
- A critical moments section where they analyze 2–3 challenging points in the interaction (what made them difficult, how they responded, what they might do differently, and what this reveals about their developing practice).
- A short summary of emergent strengths and growth areas across the interaction.

Part 5: AI vs. human interaction reflection

In a one-page reflection, students articulate:

- What aspects of human interaction AI simulated reasonably well and how those supported skill practice.
- What was missing compared to real encounters (e.g., nonverbal cues, authentic emotion, cultural nuance, lived experience, intuitive “read” of the room).
- How AI simulations can support professional training and where human supervision, peer role-plays, and field/practicum experience remain essential.
- Personal insights about their confidence, anxieties, and focus areas for upcoming real-world interactions.

Part 6: In-class knowledge check quiz

A short, closed-note quiz verifies that students can:

- Name their chosen framework and give one specific example of how they applied it.
- Identify one communication skill they used well and one they need to improve, with brief explanation.
- Describe one challenging moment and what made it difficult.
- Name at least one crucial aspect of human interaction that AI did not capture, and why it matters for safe, ethical practice.

Key Learning Outcomes

By completing this assignment, students will:

- Practice core professional communication and interviewing/consultation skills in a safe, low-stakes environment.
- Apply a relevant theoretical framework or practice model to simulated interactions.
- Develop self-awareness about strengths, growth edges, and patterns in their practice.
- Engage in structured, critical analysis of their own decisions and communication choices.
- Clarify what AI can and cannot simulate about relational work and empathic connection.
- Build confidence and language for discussing their practice in supervision and field settings.

AI Use Highlights and Guardrails

- AI is used solely to simulate a client/patient/student/stakeholder, not to evaluate the student, complete the practice analysis, or write reflections.
- Students are expected to engage genuinely, not treat the session as “just a chatbot,” and to document when AI responses feel unrealistic or off-character as part of their analysis.

- The assignment explicitly reinforces that AI is a practice tool, not a replacement for supervised field experience, real clients/patients, or human mentorship.
- Reflection and knowledge check questions ensure students recognize both the utility and the limitations of AI for practicing relational skills.

Assessment Notes

- The rubric primarily assesses:
 - Professional skill application: quality and consistency of framework use and communication skills, as evidenced in the transcript and analysis.
 - Critical self-reflection and analysis: depth and specificity of practice analysis, skill table, and critical moments; honesty and insight in identifying patterns.
 - Metacognitive and ethical awareness: sophistication in evaluating AI as a simulation tool and articulating why human connection and supervision remain essential.

Grading can focus on the analysis and reflection rather than “perfect” performance in the simulation itself, emphasizing growth and self-awareness.

Implementation and Adaptation Notes (Brief)

- Introduce this assignment as bridge work between classroom learning and field/practicum, normalizing mistakes as data for growth.
- Consider modeling a brief transcript analysis as a class activity before students complete their own.
- Use common themes from students’ reflections and skill tables to inform future skills labs or debrief sessions.

Adaptations:

- Social work, counseling, psychology: Emphasize engagement, trauma-informed practice, assessment, and managing difficult disclosures or ambivalence.
 - Nursing and healthcare: Emphasize assessment, health education, shared decision-making, and responding to distress or non-adherence.
 - Education and school counseling: Focus on student or parent conferences, behavioral or academic concerns, and culturally responsive communication.
 - Business/consulting: Focus on client needs assessment, expectation management, and collaborative problem-solving in organizational contexts.
-

AI Scenario Testing Assignment

Quick Overview

- Recommended contact hours: 2 hours
- Assignment type: AI simulation and role-play (scenario planning)
- Applicable to: Any discipline involving decision-making, problem-solving, or strategic thinking

In this assignment, students select a real or realistic professional decision or intervention and use AI to generate multiple “what if” scenarios (best case, worst case, most likely, and unexpected complications). They compare scenarios, identify patterns and risks, refine their strategy with contingencies, test additional targeted scenarios, and reflect on the value and limits of scenario testing. The emphasis is on anticipatory thinking, risk assessment, and flexible strategic planning.

Suggested Hours and Contact Time

Total recommended time: 2 hours

- Part 1 – Decision/intervention selection and baseline description: ~15 minutes (guided; can be completed in class or online).
- Part 2 – Baseline scenario generation (4 scenarios): ~30 minutes (independent).
- Part 3 – Scenario analysis and pattern recognition: ~40 minutes (guided independent work).
- Part 4 – Refined strategy development: ~25 minutes (independent).
- Part 5 – Targeted “what if” scenarios: ~20 minutes (independent).
- Part 6 – Metacognitive reflection: ~10 minutes (independent).
- Part 7 – In-class knowledge check: ~5 minutes (direct instructional time).

Assignment-Specific Components

The assignment follows your familiar pattern (Preparation → Structured AI Engagement → Analysis → Strategy Refinement → Targeted Testing → Reflection → Knowledge Check), adapted as follows.

Part 1: Decision/intervention selection

Students choose a complex, consequential decision or intervention in their field (e.g., program design, policy proposal, clinical protocol, curriculum change, organizational strategy) and document:

- The decision/intervention and context.
- Stakeholders and what is at stake.

- The current situation/problem and desired outcomes.
- 5–7 key variables that may influence outcomes (e.g., resources, stakeholder buy-in, timing, external events, cultural or political factors).

Part 2: Baseline scenario generation (4 scenarios)

Using a structured prompt, students ask AI to generate four detailed scenarios for the same time horizon:

- Best case (most favorable conditions).
- Worst case (most unfavorable conditions).
- Most likely/realistic (mixed conditions).
- Unexpected complications (introducing 1–2 unanticipated events).

Each scenario should describe the unfolding events, stakeholders' reactions, critical decision points, resource needs, unintended consequences, and ultimate outcomes. Students record initial impressions about which scenarios feel most realistic or surprising.

Part 3: Scenario analysis and pattern recognition

Students create a Scenario Comparison Table that, across the four scenarios, highlights:

- Key turning points/decision points.
- Stakeholder reactions and what drives them.
- Resource requirements and vulnerabilities.
- Timeline/pace of implementation.
- Unintended consequences and side effects.
- Success indicators and warning signs.

They then write a brief analysis addressing:

- Major risks revealed across scenarios and early warning signs to watch for.
- Critical success factors and conditions that appear necessary for success.
- Which variables matter most and which are within vs. beyond their control.
- Where in the timeline they could realistically adjust course.

Part 4: Refined strategy development

Drawing on the analysis, students write a refined strategy document (1–2 pages) that includes:

- How their thinking about the decision has changed.
- Adjustments to the original plan (phasing, scope, sequencing).
- A phased implementation plan with milestones and checkpoints.

- Specific risk mitigation strategies for top risks and associated early warning signs.
- At least three explicit contingency plans (if X happens, then do Y).
- Success metrics and realistic timelines informed by the scenarios.

Part 5: Testing additional targeted scenarios

Students generate 2–3 additional AI scenarios that focus on specific concerns arising from their analysis (e.g., key stakeholder resistance, funding cuts, policy shifts, technical failures). For each targeted “what if,” AI describes how events might unfold, how the overall plan is affected, and possible adaptive responses. Students briefly note how each targeted scenario might change or refine their strategy further.

Part 6: Metacognitive reflection

In a one-page reflection, students address:

- How scenario testing changed their understanding of the decision and its risks.
- What they learned that they would not have uncovered without this process.
- How realistic and useful the AI-generated scenarios seemed, and where they were limited or off-base.
- The limits of scenario planning and the ongoing role of uncertainty, intuition, values, and ethics.
- When and how they plan to use scenario testing in future professional work.

Part 7: In-class knowledge check quiz

A short, closed-note quiz confirms that students can:

- State the decision/intervention they tested and one major risk they identified.
- Describe one concrete way their strategy changed because of scenario analysis.
- Name a limitation of AI-based scenario generation and why it matters.
- Give an example of a contingency plan and what would trigger it.
- Explain how scenario testing helps with decision-making even when the future cannot be predicted.

Key Learning Outcomes

By completing this assignment, students will:

- Use AI to generate multiple, varied scenarios to explore potential consequences of a decision before acting.
- Identify key variables and conditions that shape outcomes in their professional context.
- Practice anticipatory thinking, risk identification, and early-warning sign recognition.

- Design refined strategies that include risk mitigation, phasing, and explicit contingencies.
- Recognize the limits of prediction and the complementary roles of planning, adaptability, and judgment.
- Treat AI-generated scenarios as tools for critical thinking, not as forecasts of the future.

AI Use Highlights and Guardrails

- AI is used to generate scenarios based on student-defined context and variables; it does not choose the decision, determine the “right” strategy, or write the analysis or reflection.
- Students are responsible for assessing the realism and usefulness of scenarios, revising prompts to improve quality where needed, and clearly articulating AI’s limitations.
- The assignment explicitly frames scenarios as inputs for human judgment, not as predictions to be trusted uncritically.

Assessment Notes

- The rubric emphasizes:
 - Strategic thinking and analysis: depth and realism of scenarios, quality of pattern recognition and risk analysis, sophistication in identifying decision points.
 - Decision-making and planning: how clearly and substantively the strategy evolves from initial thinking, quality of risk mitigation and contingency planning, and specificity of implementation details.
 - Metacognitive awareness: insight into the value and limits of scenario testing and AI’s role, and a nuanced appreciation of uncertainty.

The scenario comparison table and refined strategy document provide efficient, high-signal evidence of growth in strategic thinking.

Implementation and Adaptation Notes (Brief)

- Frame the assignment as pre-mortem work: a structured way to ask “what could happen?” before implementation.
- Encourage students to choose decisions that are genuinely meaningful for their field placement, projects, or future practice.
- Use common risks and patterns that emerge across student work to drive class discussion about complexity and systems thinking.

Adaptations:

- Social work, nursing, education, public health: Focus on interventions, protocols, or program changes where client/patient/student safety and equity are central; emphasize unintended consequences and vulnerable stakeholders.

- Business, public policy, management: Emphasize stakeholder responses, market or political shifts, and resource constraints; highlight communication and buy-in strategies revealed by scenarios.
 - STEM, engineering, environmental science: Focus on design choices, implementation plans, and failure modes; emphasize safety, reliability, and long-term ecological or technical impacts.
-

AI-Facilitated Group Project Assignment

Quick Overview

- Recommended contact hours: 1.5 hours per week over 4–6 weeks
- Assignment type: AI-supported collaborative learning
- Applicable to: Any discipline involving team-based work and collaborative problem-solving

In this assignment, student teams complete a substantial project (e.g., research paper, case analysis, design proposal, presentation) while using AI as a research assistant and thinking partner. Teams establish explicit norms for AI use, document how they use it throughout the project, and critically evaluate its contributions. The goal is to enhance, not replace, authentic human collaboration, and to build habits of transparent, ethical AI-supported teamwork.

Suggested Hours and Contact Time

Total recommended time: 1.5 hours per week across 4–6 weeks

- Week 1 – Team formation, AI use agreement, and project planning with AI support: ~1.5 hours.
- Weeks 2–4 – Research and development phase with AI-assisted individual work plus weekly team meetings: ~1.5 hours per week of coordinated time (plus individual work outside).
- Weeks 4–5 – Drafting and revision with AI-supported feedback and integration: ~1.5 hours per week.
- Week 5–6 – Finalization, AI contribution analysis, team and individual reflections, brief presentations and knowledge check.

Assignment-Specific Components

The assignment uses your familiar pattern (Planning → Structured AI Engagement → Development → Analysis/Reflection → Knowledge Check), adapted for group work:

Part 1: Team formation and AI use agreement (Week 1)

Teams define roles (e.g., project manager, documentation lead, communication coordinator, quality checker), choose a project topic, and write a team agreement that:

- Specifies allowed vs. prohibited AI uses.
- Outlines how AI use will be documented, verified, and attributed.
- Establishes meeting frequency, communication channels, and decision-making processes.

Part 2: Project planning with AI assistance (Week 1–2)

Teams use AI selectively to:

- Refine project scope and identify key questions or themes.
- Plan their research strategy (types of sources, search terms, seminal authors, likely gaps).
- Break the project into tasks, assign responsibilities, and develop a realistic timeline.

They evaluate AI suggestions critically, deciding what to adopt, adapt, or reject, and begin a shared AI use log documenting prompts, responses, and decisions.

Part 3: Research and development phase (Weeks 2–4)

Team members conduct individual research (with AI as a support for finding directions, clarifying concepts, and brainstorming questions) and meet regularly to synthesize findings. During meetings, AI may be used as a “thinking partner” for:

- Brainstorming options and perspectives.
- Problem-solving when the group is stuck.
- Noticing possible connections or organizational structures.

Each week, teams update their AI use log, meeting notes, and individual contributions.

- **Part 4: Drafting and revision with AI support (Weeks 4–5)**

Individuals draft their sections themselves first, then may use AI for feedback on clarity, organization, or missing elements. Teams hold review sessions where:

- Members critique sections without AI first.
- AI may then be consulted for additional questions or alternative structures.
- The team integrates sections into a coherent whole and may ask AI to flag gaps or transition issues.

AI inputs are recorded in the log, and the team ensures the final voice and arguments are their own.

Part 5: Final project and AI contribution analysis (Week 5–6)

Final deliverables include:

- The final project (format appropriate to the course) with a clear AI attribution statement explaining how AI was used, what it did and did not do, and how all AI-generated content was verified and revised.
- A complete AI use log documenting all prompts, responses (summarized or excerpted), and team decisions.
- A team reflection paper (2–3 pages) analyzing where AI helped or hindered, how it affected collaboration, and what remained irreducibly human in the team’s work.
- Individual reflections (about one page each) on personal contributions, team dynamics, AI’s impact on learning, and future plans for AI use in collaborative contexts.

Part 6: In-class knowledge check and brief presentation (Week 6)

Teams deliver a short presentation (5–7 minutes) on their project and key insights. An individual knowledge check verifies that each member can:

- Explain a core finding or conclusion and its connection to course concepts.
- Describe a specific way AI helped and a specific limitation encountered.
- Identify a team decision that required human judgment.
- Articulate one lesson about effective collaboration with AI.

Key Learning Outcomes

By completing this assignment, students will:

- Collaborate effectively to complete a complex project with shared accountability.
- Use AI strategically to support research, ideation, organization, and revision.
- Critically evaluate AI’s contributions and limitations in a team context.
- Document AI use with transparency, including verification and attribution.
- Distinguish between AI assistance and authentic human contribution.
- Develop explicit team norms for responsible AI use and transfer them to professional contexts.

AI Use Highlights and Guardrails

- AI is framed as a supporting tool for research, brainstorming, and feedback—not as a replacement for human synthesis, decision-making, or full-section writing.
- Teams explicitly define and document which uses are allowed and which are off-limits, and all AI-generated suggestions are verified and revised.

- The AI use log, attribution statement, team reflection, individual reflections, and knowledge check together deter “free riding” and make contributions visible and accountable.

Assessment Notes

- The rubric focuses on:
 - Final project quality: strength of content, analysis, connection to course concepts, organization, and professionalism.
 - Team collaboration and process: quality of the team agreement, planning, role rotation, meeting regularity, and evidence of balanced contributions.
 - Strategic AI use and documentation: completeness and thoughtfulness of the AI use log, clarity of attribution, and sophistication of critical evaluation in the team and individual reflections.

These artifacts allow instructors to assess both the product and the process, including individual learning and the team’s maturity in using AI responsibly.

Implementation and Adaptation Notes (Brief)

- Introduce the assignment by naming the reality that AI is already in students’ workflows, and frame this as a way to learn how to use it well together.
- Provide templates for team agreements, AI use logs, and meeting notes to make expectations concrete.
- Consider short mid-project check-ins where teams submit a snapshot of their AI log and receive formative feedback.

Adaptations:

- Research-centric courses: Emphasize literature synthesis, research gaps, and theory application with AI helping mostly at the brainstorming and organizational stages.
 - Practice- or case-based courses: Focus on case analysis and solution design, with AI used for exploring options and implications but not for making final recommendations.
 - Creative or design-focused courses: Allow AI to support ideation and early drafts while emphasizing human originality, critique, and refinement.
-

Peer Review with AI Comparison Assignment

Quick Overview

- Recommended contact hours: 1.5 hours
- Assignment type: AI-supported collaborative learning

- Applicable to: Any discipline that uses peer feedback on writing, projects, or presentations

In this assignment, students submit a substantive draft, receive peer feedback and AI-generated feedback on the same work, and then compare and synthesize these perspectives. They analyze where peer and AI feedback align or diverge, decide what to revise, and reflect on the distinct value and limitations of each source. The focus is on building feedback literacy, critical evaluation, and metacognitive awareness about revision.

Suggested Hours and Contact Time

Total recommended time: 1.5 hours (plus time already spent drafting)

- Part 1 – Draft submission and self-assessment: prior to class; reflection ~10 minutes.
- Part 2 – Peer review exchange: ~30 minutes.
- Part 3 – AI feedback generation: ~20 minutes.
- Part 4 – Comparative analysis of peer vs. AI feedback: ~30 minutes.
- Part 5 – Revision plan and synthesis: ~20 minutes.
- Part 6 – Metacognitive reflection: ~10 minutes.
- Part 7 – In-class knowledge check: ~5 minutes.

Assignment-Specific Components

This assignment follows your established pattern (Preparation → Structured AI Engagement → Analysis → Revision Planning → Reflection → Knowledge Check):

Part 1: Draft submission and self-assessment

Students submit a substantial draft (e.g., 3–5 pages or equivalent) that is ready for meaningful feedback, along with a short self-assessment describing what they feel confident about, what they are struggling with, and what kind of feedback they most need.

Part 2: Peer review exchange

Students exchange drafts and provide written feedback (summary comments and/or annotations) that identifies strengths, areas for development, specific suggestions, and connections to course concepts or assignment criteria. Emphasis is on constructive, specific, reader-focused feedback.

Part 3: AI feedback generation

Using a structured prompt that names the course, assignment type, and key requirements, students ask an AI tool to review the same draft and provide feedback on strengths, areas for improvement, organization, application of course concepts, and at least several concrete revision suggestions. They save the full AI response.

Part 4: Comparative analysis of feedback

Students create a feedback comparison table that outlines what the peer and AI each noted about strengths, problems, specificity, course connection, understanding of purpose, tone, and reader experience. A brief analysis then addresses:

- Where peer and AI feedback aligned and what that suggests.
- Where they diverged and why their perspectives might differ.
- Which feedback was more helpful for particular aspects of the work and why.
- What uniquely human insights the peer provided and what uniquely useful contributions (and blind spots) the AI had.

Part 5: Revision plan and synthesis

Students write a revision plan (1–2 pages) that:

- Identifies 3–5 priority revisions, explaining what will be changed, which feedback informed each decision (peer, AI, or both), and how the change will strengthen the work.
- Explicitly lists feedback they are choosing to set aside, from whom, and why (e.g., misaligned with assignment, contradicts author’s purpose, or impractical).
- Briefly reflects on how seeing both sources together shaped their revision strategy.

Part 6: Metacognitive reflection

In a one-page reflection, students explore:

- What they learned from giving feedback as well as receiving it.
- The roles and limits of AI feedback compared to human peer review.
- How they will approach seeking and using feedback in future work, and what role they intend AI to play in their personal revision process.

Part 7: In-class knowledge check quiz

A short, closed-note quiz asks students to:

- Describe a meaningful difference between peer and AI feedback.
- Name one specific revision they will make and why.
- Identify a limitation of AI feedback.
- Explain why peer feedback remains valuable even when AI tools are available.

Key Learning Outcomes

By completing this assignment, students will:

- Provide and receive substantive peer feedback on academic or professional work.
- Obtain and critically evaluate AI-generated feedback on the same draft.
- Compare and contrast human and AI perspectives, recognizing unique strengths and limitations.
- Synthesize feedback from multiple sources into a coherent revision plan.
- Increase metacognitive awareness of their own writing or project work and their revision habits.
- Develop more sophisticated judgment about what feedback to use, how, and why.

AI Use Highlights and Guardrails

- AI is used only to provide feedback on student-authored work, not to generate the work itself.
- Students must prompt the AI with assignment requirements and course context, but they remain responsible for judging the accuracy, relevance, and usefulness of its suggestions.
- The comparative analysis and revision plan require students to treat both peer and AI feedback as inputs to be evaluated, not instructions to follow blindly.

Assessment Notes

- The rubric emphasizes:
 - Peer review quality: specificity, constructiveness, attention to strengths and growth areas, and connection to course objectives.
 - Critical analysis of feedback: depth of comparison between peer and AI, insight into each source's strengths and limitations, and effective use of concrete examples.
 - Synthesis and planning: clarity and strategic quality of the revision plan and rationale for using or rejecting particular feedback.
 - Metacognitive reflection: self-awareness about learning from feedback and plans for future feedback-seeking behavior.

The feedback comparison table and revision plan make students' thinking visible and grading efficient.

Implementation and Adaptation Notes (Brief)

- Introduce the assignment by explicitly naming the question many students already have—"Why not just use AI?"—and frame the activity as an empirical way for them to answer that for themselves.

- Model what high-quality peer feedback and AI prompts look like using a sample draft in class.
- Emphasize that disagreement among feedback sources is expected and that evaluating feedback is itself a core disciplinary skill.

Adaptations:

- Writing-intensive courses (essays, research papers): Emphasize thesis clarity, argument structure, use of evidence, disciplinary voice, and integration of literature.
 - Case analysis, proposals, or designs: Focus on alignment with criteria, depth of analysis, feasibility, and application of theoretical or professional frameworks.
 - Presentations or outlines: Adapt the draft to slide decks or scripts, and have peer and AI feedback focus on structure, clarity for audience, and alignment with rhetorical goals.
-

Professional AI Use Policy Development Assignment

Quick Overview

- Recommended contact hours: 2 hours
- Assignment type: AI literacy and professional development
- Applicable to: Any discipline; particularly suited to fields with clear professional ethics or regulatory frameworks

In this assignment, students design an AI use policy for their anticipated professional context. They analyze their field, research existing policies and ethical guidance, draft a comprehensive AI use policy with clear principles and actionable guidelines, justify their choices, and create audience-friendly summaries for key stakeholders. The focus is on ethical reasoning, policy-writing skills, and professional responsibility in the context of emerging AI tools.

Suggested Hours and Contact Time

Total recommended time: 2 hours (beyond any prior ethics content)

- Part 1 – Professional context analysis: ~20 minutes.
- Part 2 – Research and analysis of existing guidance: ~45 minutes.
- Part 3 – Policy development: ~45 minutes.
- Part 4 – Policy justification: ~30 minutes.
- Part 5 – Stakeholder communication pieces: ~15 minutes.
- Part 6 – Professional responsibility reflection: ~10 minutes.
- Part 7 – In-class knowledge check: ~5 minutes.

Assignment-Specific Components

This assignment follows your pattern (Context → Research → Policy Draft → Justification → Communication → Reflection → Knowledge Check), adapted as follows.

Part 1: Professional context analysis

Students identify their target profession and typical setting (e.g., hospital, school, agency, firm), describe current and likely AI uses (based on initial research), list key stakeholders (including who is most vulnerable to harm), and articulate why AI policies are needed and what professional values are at stake.

Part 2: Research and analysis of existing guidance

Students examine:

- Professional association codes and any AI- or technology-related statements.
- Real-world AI or tech policies from relevant organizations.
- Applicable legal and regulatory requirements (e.g., privacy, anti-discrimination, safety).
- Broad AI ethics frameworks and best-practice principles.

They produce a short research summary noting key themes, example policies reviewed, important gaps or inconsistencies, and ethical principles most relevant to their field.

Part 3: Policy development

Students draft a 4–6 page AI use policy for their professional context that includes:

- A brief introduction and purpose statement.
- A small set of core guiding principles (e.g., human responsibility, client/student welfare, transparency, equity, competence).
- Clearly defined acceptable uses of AI with conditions and rationales.
- Clearly defined prohibited or restricted uses with rationales.
- Special considerations for high-risk contexts (e.g., vulnerable populations, high-stakes decisions, sensitive data).
- Verification and oversight requirements (review, documentation, auditing, error reporting).
- Training and competency expectations.
- Transparency and disclosure practices.
- A review and update process to keep the policy current.

Part 4: Policy justification

In a 2–3 page justification, students explain:

- The ethical principles and professional values that guided their decisions.
- The main risks the policy is designed to address and how specific provisions mitigate those risks.
- How the policy protects stakeholders and balances efficiency with safety and equity.
- Practical considerations for implementation (e.g., resources, challenges, supports needed).
- How their policy compares with and improves upon existing guidance.
- How the policy is designed to be flexible and “future-proof” as AI evolves.

Part 5: Stakeholder communication pieces

Students choose two stakeholder groups (e.g., practitioners, clients/patients/students, administrators, the public, regulators) and create accessible one-page communication pieces—such as summaries, FAQs, or visual outlines—that explain key policy points, why they matter, and what they mean in practice for that audience.

Part 6: Reflection on professional responsibility

In a one-page reflection, students consider:

- What was challenging or eye-opening about creating an AI policy.
- What they learned about their field’s ethics when applied to technology.
- Their own responsibilities as emerging professionals when using AI in practice.
- How they will respond if future workplaces lack adequate AI guidance or if organizational norms conflict with their ethical commitments.

Part 7: In-class knowledge check quiz

A brief, closed-note quiz checks that students can:

- Name and explain core policy principles.
- Give examples of one acceptable and one prohibited AI use and the reasoning behind each.
- Identify a major risk their policy addresses and how.
- Recognize likely implementation challenges and the ongoing need for professional judgment.

Key Learning Outcomes

By completing this assignment, students will:

- Research and synthesize existing AI and ethics guidance relevant to their profession.

- Identify ethical issues, risks, and stakeholder impacts associated with AI use.
- Translate professional values into clear, actionable policy language.
- Anticipate future developments and build flexibility into governance structures.
- Communicate complex ethical and policy ideas to diverse audiences.
- Deepen their sense of professional responsibility for ethical AI use and governance.

AI Use Highlights and Guardrails

- AI may be used as a research and drafting aid (e.g., to identify sample policies or brainstorm structure), but students must verify all sources, ensure originality, and write policy language that accurately reflects their field's values and requirements.
- The assignment emphasizes that AI policies are not created by AI alone; they must be grounded in human ethical reasoning, professional standards, and an understanding of local legal contexts.
- Students are encouraged to document any AI assistance used during research or drafting and to reflect critically on how that shaped their thinking.

Assessment Notes

- The rubric focuses on:
 - Policy quality and comprehensiveness: clarity, specificity, internal coherence, and coverage of key issues.
 - Research depth and ethical reasoning: breadth and relevance of sources, application of professional values, and nuanced risk analysis and justification.
 - Communication and professional development: accessibility and appropriateness of stakeholder materials and maturity of the final reflection.

The combination of policy document, justification, communication pieces, and reflection offers rich evidence of students' ethical, analytical, and professional growth.

Implementation and Adaptation Notes (Brief)

- Position this assignment near the end of a course or sequence where students have already explored both ethics and AI in practice, so they can integrate prior learning.
- Encourage students to treat the policy as something they might bring into job interviews or early career roles, reinforcing authenticity and practicality.
- Optional: Invite practitioners or ethics officers to review a subset of policies and offer feedback, or have students present and discuss controversial decisions in class.

Adaptations:

- Health, social work, counseling, education: Emphasize client/patient/student welfare, informed consent, bias, confidentiality, and high-stakes decision-making.
 - Business, law, public policy, engineering: Emphasize accountability, transparency, fairness, safety, compliance, and public impact, including organizational and regulatory perspectives.
-

Transparent AI Integration Portfolio Assignment

Quick Overview

- Recommended contact hours: 3 hours (cumulative over the course)
- Assignment type: AI-enhanced assessment and metacognition (capstone)
- Applicable to: Any AI-integrated course; ideal as a culminating assignment

In this assignment, students maintain a semester-long record of their AI use for the course, then compile a final portfolio that documents, analyzes, and reflects on when and how they used AI. The portfolio includes a comprehensive AI use log, artifacts from key assignments, quantitative and qualitative analyses of their patterns, a critical essay on AI in learning and professional practice, and personal guidelines for future AI use. The focus is on transparency, metacognition, ethical accountability, and readiness for AI-mediated professional work.

Suggested Hours and Contact Time

Total recommended time: 3 cumulative hours (not counting regular coursework)

- Ongoing – AI use logging across all assignments: 5–10 minutes per AI interaction.
- Part 1 – Portfolio organization and compilation: ~30 minutes.
- Part 2 – Quantitative analysis of AI use patterns: ~30 minutes.
- Part 3 – Qualitative reflection on AI literacy development: ~45 minutes.
- Part 4 – Critical analysis essay (AI in learning and practice): ~30 minutes.
- Part 5 – Personal AI use guidelines: ~30 minutes.
- Part 6 – Brief portfolio presentation: 5–10 minutes per student.
- Part 7 – Final short reflection on the portfolio process: ~15 minutes.

Assignment-Specific Components

This capstone follows your established pattern (Ongoing Documentation → Portfolio Curation → Analysis → Synthesis → Guidelines → Presentation → Final Reflection):

Ongoing: AI use log (throughout the semester)

Students document every AI interaction related to the course, including:

- Context (date, assignment, purpose, and motivation for using AI).
- AI interaction (tool used, full prompt, and key parts of the output).
- Evaluation (usefulness rating, what they adopted/modified/rejected, and what they learned).
- Verification (how they checked accuracy and where errors appeared).
- Impact on learning (how the interaction helped, hindered, or changed their understanding).

Part 1: Portfolio organization

Students compile a professional portfolio that includes:

- A cover page and brief statement of what the portfolio demonstrates.
- A table of contents.
- The complete AI use log, organized (e.g., by date or by assignment).
- 3–5 key assignments or projects with associated AI documentation and brief annotations showing how AI shaped the process from initial idea to final product.
- Sections for analysis, reflection, and personal guidelines.

Part 2: Quantitative analysis of AI use

Students use their log to generate simple tables or charts showing:

- Frequency of AI use over time (e.g., by week or month).
- Primary purposes (brainstorming, research, drafting, feedback, problem-solving, studying, etc.) and which purposes were most common.
- Tools used and average usefulness ratings.
- Error patterns (how often AI outputs contained problems and of what types).

A short write-up explains patterns they notice, including changes over time in frequency, purpose, usefulness, and verification habits.

Part 3: Qualitative reflection on AI literacy development

In a longer narrative reflection, students describe:

- Their attitudes, assumptions, and early practices with AI at the beginning of the course.
- How their skills and strategies evolved (prompting, verifying, deciding when not to use AI).
- Specific episodes where AI significantly helped and where it misled or limited them, drawing directly from log entries.

- The overall impact of AI on their learning—both benefits and trade-offs—and how their understanding of ethical use changed.

Part 4: Critical analysis essay

Students write a focused essay connecting their experience to broader questions:

- Under what conditions AI supports deep learning versus shallow shortcuts.
- How their course experience prepares them to use AI in their intended profession.
- Recommendations for future students and for instructors/course design.
- Reflections on equity and institutional implications of AI in higher education (e.g., access, support, policy).

Part 5: Personal AI use guidelines

Students develop a concise set of personal principles and a simple decision framework for future AI use that includes:

- Core principles (e.g., transparency, verification, learning first, human judgment, equity awareness).
- A decision-making flow or checklist for when and how to involve AI.
- Clear examples of acceptable and off-limits scenarios for themselves, with rationale.
- A short commitment statement for responsible AI use in academic and professional settings.

Part 6: Portfolio presentation

Each student gives a brief presentation sharing:

- One striking pattern or statistic from their quantitative analysis.
- One compelling story of AI meaningfully enhancing their learning.
- One story where AI was problematic and what they did about it.
- One principle from their personal guidelines and one piece of advice for future students.

Part 7: Final reflection on the portfolio process

Students close with a short reflection on:

- What they learned by tracking AI use over time.
- Surprises or patterns they only noticed when looking back across the semester.
- How their feelings about AI in education have shifted and one remaining question they still have.

Key Learning Outcomes

By completing this assignment, students will:

- Make their AI use visible, transparent, and accountable across a semester.
- Demonstrate concrete growth in AI literacy, including strategic prompting, verification, and judgment.
- Engage in deep metacognitive reflection about their own learning processes with AI.
- Distinguish between AI uses that support learning and those that displace key cognitive work.
- Formulate a personal, values-aligned framework for responsible AI use in academic and professional contexts.
- Communicate their experiences and insights clearly to peers and instructors.

AI Use Highlights and Guardrails

- AI may support analysis (e.g., data summaries, organization ideas) but the reflections, critical essay, and personal guidelines must genuinely represent students' own thinking.
- Any AI used in building the portfolio itself should also be logged and disclosed, reinforcing the expectation of full transparency.
- The assignment deliberately treats AI interactions as data for learning, not something to hide, normalizing reflective and accountable use.

Assessment Notes

- The rubric emphasizes:
 - Documentation and organization: completeness, consistency, and professional presentation of the log and portfolio.
 - Depth of analysis and reflection: quality of pattern recognition, honesty, specificity, and conceptual sophistication in quantitative and qualitative components.
 - AI literacy and future application: coherence and practicality of personal guidelines and evidence of growth toward thoughtful, ethical AI use.

The portfolio serves as a comprehensive, high-signal artifact of students' AI-mediated learning across the course.

Appendix A: The AI-Human Collaboration Log

Transparency in Practice: Modeling the Method

In the spirit of the transparency this playbook advocates, it is essential to disclose that this text was developed through a deliberate, structured partnership between human expertise and artificial intelligence. This collaboration was not a shortcut, but a rigorous pedagogical experiment designed to model the very principles of "AI as thinking partner" that we ask of our students. Just as we require students to document their process and critically evaluate AI outputs, we have held ourselves to the same standard.

The Development Process

Human Expertise and Vision This playbook originated from the professional expertise and pedagogical vision of Dr. Sarah Lewis, faculty member at Barry University's School of Mental Health and Social Work within the College of Health Professions and Medical Sciences. Dr. Lewis brought to this project:

- Deep knowledge of social work education, CSWE accreditation standards, and professional ethics
- Experience teaching AI literacy and developing AI-integrated curricula
- Understanding of learning theory, assessment design, and student development
- Commitment to social justice frameworks and trauma-informed pedagogy
- Extensive experience with educational technology and innovative teaching methods

The conceptual framework, pedagogical philosophy, assignment structures, and discipline-specific applications all emerged from Dr. Lewis's expertise and iterative design process. AI served as a thinking partner and efficiency tool, not as the originator of ideas or pedagogical approaches.

The Collaborative Process: Introduction Development

The introduction to this playbook was developed through extended dialogue between Dr. Lewis and Claude (Anthropic's AI assistant) over multiple conversations. The process unfolded as follows:

Phase 1: Conceptual Foundations (Dr. Lewis)

- Dr. Lewis initiated conversations about copyright issues, AI ethics, and assessment design.
- She articulated concerns about ensuring genuine learning while integrating AI.
- She raised questions about grading student work with AI assistance.
- She introduced the neural network metaphor for understanding learning.

Phase 2: Theoretical Elaboration (Collaborative)

- Dr. Lewis prompted the AI to explore how learning theory (connectivism, schema theory, constructivism) relates to AI use.
- Through back-and-forth discussion, they developed the "nodes and connections" framework.
- The AI provided theoretical elaboration and examples; Dr. Lewis refined and directed the framing.
- Dr. Lewis consistently brought the theoretical discussion back to practical application.

Phase 3: Assessment Framework Development (Collaborative)

- Dr. Lewis articulated the challenge: "How do we know whether students 'know' the nodes and the strength of connections?"
- The AI generated assessment strategies based on learning theory.
- Dr. Lewis evaluated these strategies, identifying which aligned with her pedagogical goals.
- Together they developed the distinction between assessing nodes versus assessing connections.

Phase 4: Structure and Organization (Collaborative)

- Dr. Lewis requested an organized introduction covering specific topics in logical sequence.
- The AI provided an outline; Dr. Lewis approved and requested modifications.
- Dr. Lewis specified: "in narrative form...(you know, the way silly academics like it)."
- The AI drafted full narrative text incorporating all previous discussion elements.

Phase 5: Refinement (Dr. Lewis)

- Dr. Lewis reviewed the draft introduction for accuracy, tone, and alignment with her vision.
- She made final decisions about what to include, exclude, or modify.
- She determined the final structure and emphasis.

What AI Contributed

The AI's specific contributions to the introduction included:

- Organizational Support: Structuring complex ideas into logical sequence; creating clear section headings and transitions; ensuring consistent voice throughout lengthy text.

- Theoretical Elaboration: Explaining connectivist learning theory and schema theory in accessible language; developing extended examples illustrating abstract concepts; articulating the "nodes, connections, network activation" framework in detail.
- Writing Efficiency: Drafting full prose from conceptual outlines; maintaining academic tone and style throughout; generating examples that illustrate theoretical points.
- Synthesis: Integrating insights from multiple conversations into unified text; connecting theoretical foundations to assignment design.

What AI Did NOT Do

It is crucial to understand AI's limitations in this process: AI did not:

- Originate the pedagogical philosophy or conceptual framework.
- Design the assignments or assessment approaches.
- Determine learning objectives or assignment structures.
- Make decisions about what content to include or emphasize.
- Understand the specific context of social work education or Barry University.
- Possess expertise in learning theory, assessment design, or professional education.
- Have genuine understanding of the ethical implications being discussed.

The intellectual work—the ideas, frameworks, pedagogical decisions, and professional judgment—came from Dr. Lewis. AI served as an articulate assistant that could elaborate on her ideas, organize her thinking, and draft text efficiently, but it could not replace her expertise or judgment.

Critical Evaluation and Verification

Throughout the development process, Dr. Lewis critically evaluated all AI contributions:

- Theoretical Accuracy: Verified that AI's explanations of learning theory were accurate and appropriately applied; corrected oversimplifications.
- Pedagogical Soundness: Evaluated whether AI's suggestions aligned with evidence-based teaching practices; rejected approaches that prioritized efficiency over learning depth.
- Practical Feasibility: Assessed whether AI's suggestions would work in actual classroom contexts; modified recommendations based on real-world teaching experience AI lacks.
- Ethical Implications: Examined AI's treatment of copyright, privacy, and academic integrity; ensured recommendations aligned with social work values and professional ethics.

The Assignment Collection Development

The sixteen assignments in this playbook were developed through a similar collaborative process:

- **Dr. Lewis's Role:** Conceived of each assignment type and its learning objectives; designed the core structure and requirements; specified the pedagogical rationale and theoretical grounding; determined assessment criteria and rubric dimensions; created discipline-specific adaptations.
- **AI's Role:** Helped elaborate assignment instructions with clarity and detail; generated examples and sample prompts; drafted rubric language based on Dr. Lewis's criteria; organized complex assignment components into clear, sequential steps.
- **Iterative Refinement:** Multiple rounds of feedback and revision for each assignment; Dr. Lewis testing AI's draft instructions for clarity and feasibility; adjustments based on teaching experience.

Why This Matters: Modeling What We Teach

This disclosure is not merely about honesty (though transparency is essential). It demonstrates the very approach to AI use that this playbook advocates:

- **Strategic Use:** AI was used for specific tasks where it adds value (organization, elaboration, drafting efficiency) but not for tasks requiring expertise, judgment, or contextual understanding.
- **Critical Evaluation:** All AI contributions were evaluated for accuracy, appropriateness, and alignment with goals.
- **Transparency:** This disclosure makes visible what could have remained hidden.
- **Genuine Learning:** Dr. Lewis's understanding of learning theory and assessment deepened through articulating ideas to AI; the collaboration enhanced rather than replaced human expertise.
- **Ethical Practice:** This disclosure protects intellectual honesty and models professional responsibility in an AI age.