

Designing an AI Development Series for Community College Faculty: A Case Study

Craig Brewer

*Educational Technology Coordinator
Ivy Tech Community College - Lake County*

Justin Dammeier

*Assistant Vice President
Educational Technology and Instructional Design
Ivy Tech Community College*

Annie Gray

*Dean
School of Arts, Sciences, and Education and Teaching and Learning
Ivy Tech Community College - Bloomington*

Stacy Hootman

*Assistant Vice President for Teaching & Learning
Ivy Tech Community College*

Angela Sparkman

*Assistant Faculty Lead and Professor, Life Sciences
Ivy Tech Community College - IvyOnline*

Amanda Wilkerson

*Assistant Faculty Lead
School of Information Technology
Ivy Tech Community College - IvyOnline*

[Abstract] *Purposeful and Practical: Teaching with AI at Ivy Tech* was a ten-session faculty development series delivered across two eight-week terms in a statewide, multi-campus community college system. The series was built in direct response to faculty who, after a prior AI book club, asked for direction around concrete classroom practice. This practitioner case study describes the design of the series, which scaffolded participants from articulating an AI teaching philosophy through student-facing conversation, tool demonstrations, course design, AI-resilient assignment redesign, and disciplinary adaptation. We describe the risk-aware guardrails the planning committee adopted in the absence of formal college policy, the portable frameworks introduced across sessions, and post-series survey outcomes indicating increased faculty

confidence and shifted attitudes toward appropriate AI use. Sustainability structures, including a companion website and a faculty learning community, extended the series beyond its final session. We close with adaptation guidance for institutions of different sizes and contexts.

[Keywords] generative artificial intelligence, faculty development, community colleges, academic integrity, instructional design

1. Introduction

Generative artificial intelligence entered higher education faster than any comparable technology. Public adoption of generative AI has outpaced the adoption curves of both the personal computer and the commercial internet at equivalent points in their histories (Bick et al., 2025), and national polling indicates that students use these tools regardless of institutional posture. In the Lumina Foundation-Gallup 2026 State of Higher Education Study, more than half of college students (53%) reported that their institutions discourage or prohibit AI use in coursework, yet 57% reported using AI at least weekly, including nearly half of the students at institutions that discourage it (Gallup & Lumina Foundation, 2026). Faculty are therefore navigating a genuine gap between what institutions have decided, what students are doing, and what employers increasingly expect of graduates. At Ivy Tech Community College, Indiana's statewide community college system, that gap lands on particularly compressed ground.

The college's workforce mission ties curriculum directly to employer expectations, which now include AI skills even in entry-level postings (National Association of Colleges and Employers, 2026). Its faculty body is large, geographically distributed, and heavily supplemented by adjunct instructors who have limited time for professional development. And its instructional calendar, largely structured around eight-week terms, requires faculty to be focused and efficient in course delivery and continuous improvement. In this environment, faculty development around AI must be practical, cumulative, respectful of faculty time, and honest about what is and is not known.

This article is a practitioner case study of one attempt to meet that need. *Purposeful and Practical: Teaching with AI at Ivy Tech*, was a ten-session faculty development series delivered live over Zoom across two eight-week terms during the spring semester of 2026, with all sessions recorded for asynchronous completion. The series grew directly out of faculty feedback from a prior semester-long AI book club built around Bowen and Watson's *Teaching with AI* (2024). Participants in that book club valued the discussion but told organizers, explicitly and repeatedly, that they wanted specifics: concrete tools, concrete assignment designs, and concrete language they could put in front of students. The series described here was designed to answer that request.

We present this series as an example of the kind of professional development needed by a varied set of community college faculty with a diverse background and familiarity with AI. The article proceeds in four parts. First, we situate the series in its institutional context and articulate its purpose. Second, we describe the practice in detail: the design principles, the safety guardrails adopted in the absence of formal college policy, the scaffolded ten-session arc, and the portable

frameworks that faculty carried away. Third, we report outcomes, including post-series survey results and the sustainability structures that continue past the final session. Finally, we offer recommendations for institutions of different sizes and contexts that may wish to adapt this model. Throughout, we write as reflective practitioners, offering a documented account of design decisions and their rationale so that others can borrow, adapt, and improve on what we built.

2. Purpose of the Practice as Related to the Educational Context and Setting Institutional Context

Ivy Tech Community College is Indiana's community college system, serving students across a multi-campus, statewide network. Instruction is delivered face to face, online through a centralized online division, and in blended formats, with most courses running on eight-week terms. Many online courses are built from statewide course packages developed centrally and taught by faculty across campuses, a structure that shapes both the opportunities and constraints of course-level innovation. The faculty body includes full-time faculty, adjunct instructors, deans who teach, and staff in hybrid instructional roles, distributed across campuses and disciplines from nursing and biology to English, philosophy, information technology, and the skilled trades.

At the time the series was planned, the college had convened an AI task force, which had produced a stoplight model inviting faculty to situate themselves as red light (limited AI use, prioritizing unaided critical thinking), yellow light (conditional use, fostering responsible integration), or green light (open use, embracing innovation). The stoplight gave faculty a shared vocabulary but operated at the level of a whole course or a whole instructor stance. No formal college-wide policy governed faculty or student use of AI tools. This policy vacuum was not unusual, and it mirrors the situation at many institutions, where practice is running ahead of governance. But it created a real design problem for professional development: How can faculty demonstrate tools and encourage experimentation responsibly when the institution has not yet said what responsible means?

2.1 The Prior Book Club and the Faculty Request

In the semester preceding the series, the college's Teaching and Learning division ran a faculty book club around Bowen and Watson's *Teaching with AI* (Bowen & Watson, 2024). The book club succeeded in community building and as a first exposure to the pedagogical questions AI raises, but participant feedback converged on a single theme: The discussions never really got into specifics, and specifics were what faculty wanted. That feedback became the founding document of the new series. The planning committee treated the request for specifics as a request for actionable practice: What do I say to my students, what do I put in my syllabus, how do I redesign this assignment, what does this tool actually do when I click the button?

2.2 Goals of the Series

The series pursued four goals. First, to increase faculty comfort and confidence with AI by starting, in the organizers' words, from ground zero, assuming no prior experience, and building

deliberately toward advanced topics such as agentic AI. Second, to equip faculty with portable, discipline-agnostic frameworks for making and communicating decisions about AI in their courses. Third, to model responsible use explicitly, including privacy, compliance, and professional judgment, in the absence of formal college policy. Fourth, to build structures that would sustain faculty learning after the series ended, so that ten webinars would leave behind a community and a resource base.

Organizationally, the series was co-sponsored by the college's Educational Technology and Instructional Design division and its Teaching and Learning division and planned by a committee drawn deliberately from across the college: Campus educational technology coordinators, an academic dean, assistant faculty leads from the online division in health sciences, life sciences, and information technology, and teaching and learning administrators. The committee's cross-campus, cross-disciplinary composition was itself a design decision. It ensured that demonstrations and examples came from multiple disciplines, that the series did not read as the project of a single office, and that a member of the committee was available in every session to staff the question-and-answer channel while another presented.

3. Description of Practice

3.1 Format and Delivery Decisions

The series comprised ten one-hour sessions delivered live over Zoom during a spring semester, five in each of the two eight-week terms. Faculty could register for individual sessions or the full series, and every session was recorded and posted, with attendance and asynchronous completion tracked through the college's learning management platform for professional development. Sessions were scheduled over the lunch hour, and the committee deliberately left the fourth and eighth weeks of each term free, recognizing those as high-workload grading periods. Participation counted toward the college's online teaching certification requirements, which gave adjunct and online faculty a concrete incentive to attend.

In contrast to the discussion-based book club, sessions were designed to be information-based: presentation and demonstration first, with the chat available for peer conversation and a staffed question-and-answer channel running throughout. A single links document per session collected every resource, slide deck, and article referenced, so that participants could stay focused on the presentation. These are small logistical choices, but the committee regarded them as pedagogical ones: the series modeled the kind of clarity, redundancy, and respect for cognitive load that it was asking faculty to build into their own courses.

3.2 Risk-Aware Guardrails in the Absence of Formal Policy

The most consequential design decision concerned the tool demonstration sessions. Because the college had no formal AI policy, the planning committee drafted a standing statement, the Faculty AI Safety Guardrails, that the host read verbatim at the start of every session involving live tool demonstrations. The statement acknowledged the policy vacuum directly, explained that the

committee had made a deliberate decision to model practices minimizing risk to faculty and the institution, and asked faculty who chose to go beyond the demonstrations to follow five risk-aware practices: align AI use with current and emerging college policies and institutional priorities; consult supervisors or department leadership before implementing new or expanded uses; document and communicate AI use to students through syllabus statements and course materials; never input personally identifiable student information into AI tools, which could constitute a violation of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA); and obtain student consent for AI use, with a reasonable opt-out option where applicable (Appendix B).

The guardrails served three functions. Practically, they protected faculty and the institution during a period of regulatory uncertainty. Rhetorically, they signaled that the series took faculty concerns about privacy and compliance seriously. And structurally, the ritual of reading the same statement at each demonstration session made caution a norm, in much the same way that a well-designed syllabus statement makes classroom expectations a norm. Demonstrations reinforced the guardrails in practice. When a presenter demonstrated an agentic browser completing quizzes, for example, he did so in a free, sandboxed instance of the learning management system populated with open educational resources, explicitly so that no student data or institutional system was exposed.

3.3 The Scaffolded Arc

The ten sessions' foci were sequenced as a deliberate arc from stance, to conversation, to fluency, to design, to discipline, to planning (Appendix A). Here we describe the arc in four phases, highlighting the frameworks introduced in each.

Phase One: Philosophy and Student-Facing Conversation (Sessions 1 and 2)

Session 1, Developing Your AI Teaching Philosophy, opened with a live poll using the task force's stoplight model; in that first audience, 40% identified as red light, 49% as yellow, and 11% as green. The presenter immediately validated all three positions and then complicated the model by inviting faculty to move the decision from the whole course to the level of the individual assignment or assessment. The vehicle for that shift was the AI Assessment Scale (Perkins et al., 2024), a five-level, Creative Commons-licensed framework running from Level 1 (no AI; students demonstrate core skills in a controlled environment) through AI planning, AI collaboration, and full AI to Level 5 (AI exploration, in which students and instructors co-design novel uses).

The session walked through advantages and disadvantages, sample student-facing language, and worked examples of how a single writing assignment would be modified at each level. The presenter also modeled the practice she had adopted in her own physical science course that term, labeling every assignment in the course with its scale level and pasting the corresponding expectations at the top of each assignment. She reported this was a task that took far less time than she had feared.

In session 1, *Developing Your AI Teaching Philosophy*, participants also did significant emotional work. The presenter narrated her own trajectory from anxiety to experimentation, framed by prior disruptions she had weathered as an instructor, e.g., the arrival of Google, graphing calculators, smartphones, and pandemic-era remote instruction. In each case, she argued, the instructor's role changed, questions shifted from production to interpretation, and faculty adapted without being replaced. She paired that narrative of Khan's (2024) argument that AI tutoring could, at full potential, address Bloom's (1984) two sigma problem, while explicitly flagging the equity questions Khan underplays. The session closed with concrete recommendations: Add an AI policy to the syllabus, vary the stance by assignment, state AI instructions at the top of every assignment with a rationale, consider grading process alongside product, and align any AI stance with the values already expressed in one's teaching philosophy.

Session 2, *Talking with Your Students About AI*, moved from stance to conversation. It featured a panel of faculty from nursing, English, sciences, and philosophy who had already integrated AI conversations into their courses, sharing concrete practices. Examples were: A nursing instructor who shows students the AI-generated case studies she uses and then walks them through every hallucination she had to correct; an English instructor who requires students to submit their AI conversations and treats runaway grammar tools as teachable moments about authorial responsibility; a philosophy instructor who has students compare their own summaries of a text against AI-generated ones to surface the machine's shortcomings. Around the panel, the session introduced three portable frameworks. The transparency triad holds that any communication with students about AI should include expectations, boundaries, and rationale. The use, misuse, and dishonesty continuum reframes most student AI behavior as occurring in a middle space of over-reliance that weakens learning without being deceptive, on the premise, supported by national survey findings from EDUCAUSE and Inside Higher Ed cited in the session, that students frequently do not know where the line is; the instructional task is to make the line visible. Finally, the pause-and-question prompt gives students three discipline-agnostic questions to ask of any AI output: Where might this output be wrong or incomplete? What evidence or source would I need to verify it? What decision am I still responsible for making?

Phase Two: Faculty Fluency with Tools (Sessions 3 Through 5)

Sessions 3 through 5 were the hands-on core of the series and the sessions at which the safety guardrails were read. Session 3, *AI for Faculty: Understanding and Exploring AI*, began with definitions, distinguishing generative AI, which creates content in response to prompts, from agentic AI, which plans and executes multi-step actions toward a goal, and grounded both in examples faculty already knew, such as adaptive courseware. It then made an extended argument that integrity precedes tooling: expectations must be defined before tools are adopted, guidelines must align with course outcomes, and the governing question is always what is being assessed. The presenter's framing principle, *amplify, do not replace*, positioned productive struggle as essential to learning. The second half demonstrated four tools (Perplexity, ChatGPT, Padlet, and Canva) applied to authentic faculty tasks such as building an interactive debate scenario, with costs and free-tier limits disclosed for each. The session closed with the stair-step image that participants

recalled for the rest of the series: no one needs to see the whole staircase; they need only take the first step.

Session 4, *AI for Faculty: Getting Comfortable With AI*, was built entirely on the free tier of ChatGPT, a deliberate equity decision, and focused on prompting as the core faculty skill. The practical focus was on effective prompt techniques to generate practice questions. Presenters contrasted poor prompts, which generate recall-level trivia questions that students can answer with a single search, with what one presenter called “black belt prompting.” These more effective prompts are verbose and constraint-rich, specifying realistic case scenarios, required data elements, observable details, and course-specific terminology. These richer prompts produce higher-order, scenario-based items including two-part questions in which students must select an answer and then defend it using module vocabulary. The session framed this explicitly as shifting assessment from *what do you remember* to *how do you apply*, which is both better assessment and more AI-resistant assessment. It also demonstrated a quality-improvement workflow available to any faculty member: exporting item analysis reports from the learning management system's quiz statistics and asking a chatbot to interpret difficulty indices and discrimination values, surfacing weak items on an existing exam. The closing advice distilled the session's theory of prompting: the model runs on context, so the more guardrails and guidelines you give it, the better it produces.

Session 5, *Practical Tools for Teaching and Productivity*, applied the same fluency to a task nearly every instructor finds burdensome: rubric construction. The presenter rebuilt a decade-old assignment rubric using Perplexity, comparing the AI-generated version against his original Canvas rubric criterion by criterion. The session then inventoried the AI features native to the college's learning management system, distinguishing features that would remain available from those scheduled to be discontinued for cost reasons at the end of the fiscal year, with dates. That transparency about institutional tool churn, including telling faculty plainly which features might disappear, was consistent with the series' general posture of honesty over promotion.

Phase Three: Design (Sessions 6 Through 8)

Session 6, *AI in Course Design*, anchored AI-assisted design in two established frameworks: backward design (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005), which starts from course-level outcomes and works backward through summative assessment to learning activities, and Universal Design for Learning (CAST, 2018), with its multiple means of representation, engagement, and expression. Within that structure, the session demonstrated using AI to draft measurable module-level sub-objectives aligned to course-level outcomes using Bloom's action verbs, to generate aligned formative and summative assessments, and, in an extended practical example, walked through an actual redesign of an introductory biology course, including the workflow decisions where AI assisted and where human judgment governed. The presenters' answer to why backward design matters more in the AI era became one of the series' recurring lines: it anchors every decision to what students should learn and keeps rapidly changing tools in service of authentic thinking.

Session 7, *AI in Instruction Across Modalities*, addressed a problem specific to systems that teach from shared course packages: how individual instructors can personalize centrally built courses. Presenters demonstrated using AI to customize learning activities within statewide online course

packages, to adapt materials designed for asynchronous delivery into synchronous class sessions, and, in paired prompt libraries, to support both faculty tasks and legitimate student uses, with the two categories visually distinguished throughout the deck. The session's premise was that modality should not determine the quality of AI-supported instruction, and that faculty teaching from shared shells retain more customization latitude than they often assume.

Session 8, *Designing AI-Resilient and AI-Integrated Assignments*, was the series' pivot and, by design, its most uncomfortable session. It opened by conceding that the discursive approach of the early sessions, scales, pledges, and stated expectations, is necessary but insufficient because students do not always understand the rules, do not always follow them voluntarily, and compliance is difficult to verify. The first segment then dismantled the most common institutional response, AI detection. Drawing on independent evaluation literature, the presenter explained that detectors measure two statistical proxies, perplexity (vocabulary predictability) and burstiness (sentence-length variation). AI “detection” is really no more than a statistical probability that a given text matches patterns common in machine-generated writing. It was made clear that no tool can determine authorship and that vendor accuracy claims derive from evaluations of early-generation models and have not been reproduced independently (Weber-Wulff et al., 2023). And the presenter pointed out further difficulties:

- Detection accuracy collapses when students make even light edits or use paraphrasing tools
- False positives fall disproportionately on English language learners, whose more constrained vocabulary and syntax mimic the statistical signature detectors target (Liang et al., 2023)
- Outputs from paid frontier models evade detection more readily than free-tier outputs, creating a resource-linked inequity in who gets caught
- Detection vendors themselves instruct institutions not to use scores punitively.

The presenter noted that institutions are taking notice: major disciplinary organizations in writing studies have advised against reliance on detectors, several universities have discontinued their use, and that even the maker of the most widely used chatbot (OpenAI) withdrew its own detection tool over reliability concerns. He closed with an arithmetic point: even accepting a vendor's claimed 1% false positive rate at scale implies hundreds of thousands of false accusations per year, with academic records, scholarships, and in some cases visa status at stake.

The second segment delivered what the team called the worst news: a live demonstration of an agentic browser, operating in a sandboxed, non-institutional instance of the learning management system, autonomously locating and completing course quizzes from a one-sentence prompt. When the browser's own safeguards refused an instruction to act more human, the presenter easily circumvented the agent by asking it to wait thirty seconds between answers for page-loading reasons, producing a quiz log that appeared entirely human. The point was situational awareness: such tools cost a few dollars per month with an education email address, students discuss their use openly online, and the context of online assessment has fundamentally shifted.

Only after that honesty did the session turn to its constructive core. If policing does not work, design must. The framing principle is borrowed from *Learner-Centered Teaching: Putting Research on Learning into Practice* (2011), in which Terry Doyle states that “the one who does the work does the learning.” Cognition requires productive friction, which means teachers must create opportunities for the right amount of desirable difficulty. With AI, what counts as cheating is best understood as using technology to avoid the friction necessary for learning. Crucially, the session noted that the weakest students are the most likely to offload cognition to AI, so teaching productive AI use is an equity intervention (Lodge & Loble, 2026). The organizing framework was VOICE, adapted freely from work in the higher education press. VOICE stands for

- Verification of process (proactive evidence that students did the work, from in-class practice of foundational skills to process documents)
- Ownership through reflection (metacognitive requirements attached to any AI use, including the AI sandwich in which human framing precedes AI assistance and human reflection follows it)
- Iterative stages (scaffolded, interconnected assignment stages whose outputs feed subsequent inputs, which both supports learning and resists one-shot outsourcing)
- Collaborative engagement (relationship-rich structures, peer interaction, and primary research such as interviews that AI cannot easily simulate; and emphasis on authenticity (authentic assessment tied to real contexts and audiences).

A worked example from a writing course showed an assignment in which students feed a structured prompt to a chatbot that is explicitly instructed to coach rather than write, then submit both the revised paragraph and the full AI conversation, which is itself graded. The session's closing lines became the series' most quoted: The goal is not AI-proof assignments but learning-rich assignments; we cannot control the tools, but we can design for learning.

Phase Four: Disciplines and Planning (Sessions 9 and 10)

Session 9, *AI Across the Disciplines*, connected classroom decisions to labor market realities. Presenters shared spring update data from the National Association of Colleges and Employers. These indicated that the share of entry-level jobs requiring AI skills had risen sharply within the academic year, reaching more than one-third of postings. According to the National Association of Colleges and Employers (2026), this is roughly triple the level reported the previous fall, alongside a parallel rise in the share of job descriptions mentioning AI skills.

The session paired that urgency with two reassurances. First, a prepared statement addressed the anxiety that AI was being elevated above disciplinary expertise. It argued the opposite: AI has no meaning without the depth and judgment that come from the disciplines, and the graduates best prepared are those who hold both deep content knowledge and critical AI fluency. Second, exposure data showed that AI's current and projected capabilities are distributed very unevenly across fields, so the appropriate response is discipline-specific. The session reported shared fundamentals that industry stakeholders had identified in collaboration with the college's information technology and education programs. These fundamentals include tool selection and evaluation, working knowledge of how language models operate, AI as augmentation of human

workflows, and applied systems practice, alongside a renewed emphasis on the durable human skills employers request. The session culminated in discipline-specific breakout rooms, sorted by a live poll of participants' schools, using a collaborative whiteboard to surface how colleagues in each school were currently using or planning to use AI.

In Session 10, *Building Your AI Classroom Plan*, participants converted nine sessions of material into individual action. After a structured recap of the series' frameworks, the team unveiled the sustainability infrastructure described in the Outcomes section below, walked participants through a third-party self-check tool for auditing whether their AI stance on a specific assignment is clearly communicated, and introduced the series' capstone artifact.

An AI skill development checklist was produced in which the entire series was organized into four stages (beginner, developing, intermediate, and advanced). Each stage was then mapped to specific sessions, with learning focus, concrete actions, free and low-cost resources, portfolio-building suggestions, readiness checkpoints, weekly practice activities, resume and professional profile language, and common mistakes to avoid, such as jumping to tools before developing a philosophy or skipping a FERPA review. Participants then met in facilitated breakout rooms to commit to next steps, and planning committee members modeled lifelong learning by sharing their own, from graduate certificates in AI and education to a facilitated summer cohort of a free, externally developed AI literacy course for community college instructors.

4. Outcomes

4.1 Participation and In-Series Indicators

Across the ten sessions, faculty enrolled 1,621 times in the live synchronous offerings, an average of 162 enrollments per session, and had logged an additional 300 asynchronous enrollments in the recorded versions as of mid-July 2026, a figure that continues to grow as the recordings remain available. Completions totaled 1,133 across both formats. Enrollment followed a pattern familiar in long-format professional development: the first term drew the largest audiences, peaking with Session 3 (209 synchronous enrollments and 183 total completions), while the second term settled into a smaller, committed cohort. The clear exception was Session 8, on AI-resilient assignment design, which drew the second term's largest live enrollment (182), suggesting faculty appetite for the series' most direct treatment of detection and agentic tools.

In-session polling offered informal snapshots of the audience across the arc. In Session 1, participants distributed themselves 40% red light, 49% yellow light, and 11% green light on the college's spotlight model. By Session 3, live polling showed a wide range of current use, from daily users to faculty who had never opened a chatbot, and moderate levels of self-reported confidence. Presenters used this information in real time to adjust the pacing and level of detail for the remaining sessions.

4.2 Post-Series Survey

At the close of the series, participants received a survey addressing session quality, self-reported confidence with AI, attitudes toward appropriate student use, and possible future topics. Results indicated increased faculty confidence in using AI for instructional tasks and a shift in attitudes toward appropriate AI use, away from a binary framing of permitted versus prohibited and toward assignment-level, communicated decisions consistent with the AI Assessment Scale and the transparency triad. We note the obvious limitation that these are self-report measures from a self-selected professional development audience. We make no causal claims, and we did not assess downstream effects on course design artifacts or student outcomes, both of which are natural next steps for study.

4.3 Sustainability Structures

The committee treated the final session as a handoff to three persistent structures. First, we created a companion website within the college's Teaching and Learning communications site. Every session recording remains available along with the slide deck used, documents linked during the session. The site also highlights the college's updated AI faculty resources, curated open educational resource books and library e-books, external webinar collections, and the AI skill development checklist. We continue to maintain and update the site as a living resource. Second, a faculty learning community continues in the college's collaboration platform through three channels: One for tool how-to's and troubleshooting, one for instructional strategies, and one for a facilitated summer cohort working through an external AI literacy course together. At the time of writing, the community numbers 53 members. Third, the checklist itself functions as a self-paced continuation of the series, giving faculty who join later, or who want to revisit the material, a structured path through all ten sessions' resources at their own pace.

5. Recommendations

We offer the following adaptation guidance based on our design decisions and what we would repeat or change:

1. Start From Faculty-Identified Needs, and Sequence Philosophy Before Tools

The single most protective decision we made was building the series from explicit faculty feedback. The second was refusing to open with tool demonstrations. Sessions on stance and student communication came first because a tool demonstration lands very differently once instructors have articulated what they want students to learn and how they will communicate expectations. Institutions adapting this model should resist the temptation to lead with the shiniest demonstration.

2. Adopt Explicit Guardrails when Policy Lags and Say So Out Loud

A standing, verbatim safety statement, naming the policy vacuum, committing the series to risk-minimizing demonstrations, and specifying faculty responsibilities around FERPA, consent, documentation, and consultation, cost us two minutes per session and bought credibility, protection, and normed caution. Smaller institutions without a policy office can draft such a statement in an afternoon; the essential move is acknowledging uncertainty honestly.

3. Tell Faculty the Truth About Detection and Agentic Tools and Pair Every Piece of Bad News with Design Strategies

Our most praised session was the one that delivered the worst news. Faculty can absorb the unreliability of AI detectors and the reality of agentic browsers if, and only if, the same session hands them concrete, evidence-informed design responses. Delivering the bad news without the design strategies produces despair; delivering design strategies without the bad news produces complacency. They belong in the same session.

4. Prefer Portable, Discipline-Agnostic Frameworks Over Tool Tutorials

Tools churn; frameworks travel. The artifacts our participants cited most, the AI Assessment Scale, the transparency triad, the use-misuse-dishonesty continuum, the pause-and-question prompt, and VOICE, are all tool-independent and survive model releases. Demonstrations should run on free tiers wherever possible, both for equity and because free tiers are what most students use.

5. Design the Series Like a Well-Designed Course

Everything we ask faculty to do for students we tried to do for faculty. This included stated objectives per session, scaffolded sequencing, respect for workload (no sessions in crunch weeks, one hour at lunch, recordings for asynchronous completion), a single links document per session to reduce cognitive load, credit toward an existing certification, and a capstone that converts content into an individual plan. Professional development that violates its own pedagogical advice undermines it.

6. Build Sustainability Structures During the Series, Not After It

The companion website, the learning community channels, and the staged checklist were built behind the scenes while the series ran and launched in the final session. A series that ends with a thank-you slide evaporates; a series that ends with a handoff persists. The checklist model, which maps every session's resources into staged, self-paced action with readiness checkpoints, is the artifact we would most encourage others to replicate.

7. Adapt the Scale to Your Context

A large multi-campus system benefits from central registration infrastructure, professional development credit, and a cross-campus committee that distributes labor and lends every session a subject-matter question-answerer. A small college can compress the arc into five sessions (philosophy and student conversation; tool fluency; course and assignment design; detection honesty and AI-resilient design; disciplines and planning) delivered by one facilitator with rotating faculty panelists. Institutions with heavy online enrollment should treat asynchronous parity (recordings, links documents, and the self-paced checklist) as a

first-class requirement. And every adaptation should preserve the two commitments we regard as non-negotiable: honesty about what is not known and the primacy of learning design over policing.

References

- Bick, A., Blandin, A., & Deming, D. J. (2025, November 13). *The state of generative AI adoption in 2025*. Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. <https://www.stlouisfed.org/on-the-economy/2025/nov/state-generative-ai-adoption-2025>
- Bloom, B. S. (1984). The 2 Sigma problem: The search for methods of group instruction as effective as one-to-one tutoring. *Educational Researcher*, 13(6), 4-16.
- Bowen, J. A., & Watson, C. E. (2024). *Teaching with AI: A practical guide to a new era of human learning*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- CAST. (2018). Universal Design for Learning guidelines version 2.2. <https://udlguidelines.cast.org>
- Eaton, S. E. (2021). *Plagiarism in higher education: Tackling tough topics in academic integrity*. Libraries Unlimited.
- Felten, P., & Lambert, L. M. (2020). *Relationship-rich education: How human connections drive success in college*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gallup & Lumina Foundation. (2026). AI in higher education: Widespread use, unclear rules. <https://www.luminafoundation.org/resource/ai-in-higher-education-widespread-use-unclear-rules/>
- Khan, S. (2024). *Brave new words: How AI will revolutionize education (and why that's a good thing)*. Viking.
- Lang, J. M. (2013). *Cheating lessons: Learning from academic dishonesty*. Harvard University Press.
- Liang, W., Yuksekgonul, M., Mao, Y., Wu, E., & Zou, J. (2023). GPT detectors are biased against non-native English writers. *Patterns*, 4(7), Article 100779.
- Lodge, J. M., & Loble, L. (2026). *Artificial intelligence, cognitive offloading and implications for education*. Centre for Social Justice and Inclusion.
- National Association of Colleges and Employers. (2026). Job outlook 2026: Spring update. <https://www.nacweb.org/research/reports/2026/job-outlook/spring-update/>
- Perkins, M., Furze, L., Roe, J., & MacVaugh, J. (2024). The Artificial Intelligence Assessment Scale (AIAS): A framework for ethical integration of generative AI in educational assessment. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 21(6).
- Warner, J. (2025). *More than words: How to think about writing in the age of AI*. Basic Books.
- Weber-Wulff, D., Anohina-Naumeca, A., Bjelobaba, S., Foltyniek, T., Guerrero-Dib, J., Popoola, O., Sigut, P., & Waddington, L. (2023). Testing of detection tools for AI-generated text. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19, Article 26.
- Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (2nd ed.). ASCD.

Appendix A

The Ten Sessions of Purposeful and Practical Teaching with AI at Ivy Tech

1. Developing Your AI Teaching Philosophy: from a whole-course stoplight stance to assignment-level decisions using the AI Assessment Scale; syllabus and assignment language; philosophy statement guidance.
2. Talking With Your Students About AI: faculty panel; the transparency triad; the use, misuse, and dishonesty continuum; the pause-and-question prompt.
3. AI for Faculty: Understanding and Exploring AI: generative versus agentic AI; integrity before tooling; demonstrations of four tools; the stair-step principle.
4. AI for Faculty: Getting Comfortable With AI: prompting fundamentals and black belt prompting; higher-order, AI-resistant item design; item analysis workflows; free-tier tools only.
5. Practical Tools for Teaching and Productivity: AI-assisted rubric generation; learning management system AI features, including transparent sunset dates.
6. AI in Course Design: backward design and Universal Design for Learning as anchors; AI-assisted sub-objective and assessment drafting; a worked introductory biology redesign.
7. AI in Instruction Across Modalities: personalizing statewide course packages; adapting asynchronous materials for synchronous delivery; paired faculty and student prompt libraries.
8. Designing AI-Resilient and AI-Integrated Assignments: the evidence against AI detection; an agentic browser demonstration; productive friction; the VOICE design framework; learning-rich assignment design.
9. AI Across the Disciplines: labor market data; uneven disciplinary exposure; industry-identified shared fundamentals and durable human skills; discipline-specific breakouts.
10. Building Your AI Classroom Plan: series recap; companion website; assignment-level stance self-check; the four-stage AI skill development checklist; next-step commitments and continuing community.

Appendix B

Faculty AI Safety Guardrails (Standing Statement Read at Tool Demonstration Sessions)

This session will focus on specific AI tools and will include demonstrations of what these tools can do. In the absence of formal college-wide guidance on the use of AI, we are taking a cautious and responsible approach to our demonstrations. While there are many additional ways that these tools can be used, the planning committee made a deliberate decision to model practices that minimize risk to faculty and to the institution. Our goal is to demonstrate examples that prioritize student privacy, compliance with applicable laws and policies, and professional responsibility. If you choose to use AI tools beyond what we demonstrate, we strongly encourage you to follow these risk-aware practices:

- Align your use of AI tools with any current or emerging college policies and institutional priorities.
- Consult with your supervisor or department leadership before implementing new or expanded uses of AI.
- Clearly document and communicate your AI use to students through syllabus statements or course materials.
- Do not input or share personally identifiable student information with AI tools, as this may constitute a FERPA violation.
- Obtain student consent for AI use and provide a reasonable opt-out option when applicable.