

# Abstracts

In Order of Appearance in the Program



## KEYNOTE SESSION

### **Teaching and Learning in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education**

**Talitha Washington**, Executive Director, Center for Applied Data Science and Analytics;  
Sean McCleese Endowed Chair Office of the Provost and Professor of Mathematics,  
Howard University

Artificial intelligence is reshaping higher education, influencing how students learn, how faculty teach, and how institutions prepare students for an AI-driven workforce. This transformational shift presents both challenges and opportunities for teaching, learning, and assessment across disciplines. This keynote explores how institutions are reenvisioning pedagogy, curriculum, and institutional policies through the responsible integration of AI while maintaining academic rigor and preparing students to lead and thrive in an AI-enabled world.

## SESSION I. TRACK A

### **AI and Online Assessment and Evaluation Best Practices**

**Trevor Adams**, Associate Professor of the Practice, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

1. A working group of professors teaching at an online campus created a Community of Practice to address the impact of evaluating and assessing student work given the rise in the number of students using GenAI to complete assignments. The significance of this work was to develop a list of best practices to address this issue

that could be easily implemented into current evaluation and assessment practices and look to future practices as they evolve in the reform of undergraduate STEM education.

2. The approach involved discussing what were the key elements in trying to evaluate and assess student work that would result in students having to perform and complete assessments with a reduced reliance on GenAI.
3. The evidence of this work resulted in creating assessments that directed students to complete assignments directly without copying and pasting GenAI created content into the university's Learning Management System.
4. This session will focus on some best practices in assessing and evaluating student work in the age of generative artificial intelligence in the online environment. Participants will review several software tools and other strategies that require students to directly engage in course materials, reducing their ability to leverage generative artificial intelligence in providing answers during assessments and evaluations including discussions. Not only will participants see some direct examples of these tools and strategies, but it will also allow them to think about alternate ways to assess and evaluate students in the context of their own digital classrooms.
5. The expected learning outcomes for the audience are:
  - a. Analyze ways to best evaluate and assess student work in the age of AI.
  - b. Identify assessment activities that reduce AI usage.
  - c. Construct online discussions that reduce AI usage.

## **When Good Writing Isn't Good Evidence: Rethinking Assessment in Online STEM**

**William Ford**, Adjunct Professor, Space Operations, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

AI makes polished, structured writing easy, which challenges traditional writing-heavy assessments in online STEM learning. The central pedagogical issue is not detecting AI use, but how to preserve learning when AI is available and exposing weaknesses in traditional assessment design.

In two online sessions of the same course, an AI disclosure policy was established to ensure academic rigor of discussions, presentations, and final paper. AI use was explicitly allowed so long as it was disclosed and did not replace the student as author. The course requires APA formatting and sourcing, however, an instructional change was implemented

when student work lacked sufficient authorship and source traceability. This change was designed to encourage critical thinking and increase visible evidence of reasoning using a structured correction and revision process.

Across 44 students, 8 had enough evidence to trigger the correction and revision process which gave the opportunity for bounded comparison. After revision, 5 of the students' revised submissions demonstrated stronger source support, clearer claim-to-source connections and greater specificity. These observations suggest that bounded AI use may better preserve learning when assessments require traceable evidence through more rigorous source-specific attribution.

Attendees will be asked to identify an assignment type in their course vulnerable to polished output and propose one redesign.

At the conclusion of the presentation, attendees will be able to identify where current assignment design over-rewards polished structure, distinguish apparent fluency from traceable understanding, and apply practical redesign moves to increase visible cognitive work in online STEM courses

## **Innovating Higher Education Through AI: Lessons from a Liberal Arts and STEM Integration Model**

**Karryll Phillips**, Assistant Professor/Transformation Officer, Fayetteville State University

The rapid evolution of higher education, accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic and increasing demands for technological proficiency, has highlighted the need to reform undergraduate STEM education. Institutions, particularly HBCUs, must adopt innovative approaches that integrate technical knowledge with critical thinking and career readiness to prepare students for an evolving workforce. This presentation highlights the work of a Liberal Arts Innovation Center (LAIC) focused on bridging STEM and liberal arts education through interdisciplinary, career-focused initiatives.

The LAIC utilizes a multifaceted approach that includes curriculum redesign, integration of career development into coursework, and the incorporation of emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI). Key strategies include cross-disciplinary faculty collaboration, experiential learning opportunities, and targeted initiatives to enhance student engagement and retention.

Evidence of effectiveness includes increased student participation in career development activities, expanded interdisciplinary course offerings, and strengthened alignment

between academic programs and workforce pathways. These outcomes reflect the impact of integrating high-impact practices and technology-enhanced learning.

Audience engagement will be facilitated through real-world case studies, guided discussions, and live polling to encourage reflection and idea-sharing across institutional contexts.

By the end of the session, participants will be able to identify strategies for integrating AI into STEM curricula, apply interdisciplinary approaches to program design, and develop initiatives that promote equity, access, and workforce readiness among diverse student populations.

## **Big Data from Quick Emails: Transforming Learner Experiences into Actionable Insights**

**Barbara Lom**, Professor of Biology, Davidson College

In the age of emerging AI tools, the lived, real-time experiences of human learners remain the most critical data STEM instructors can gather to improve their instruction. Although traditional mid- and end-of-semester evaluations can offer important insights, such anonymous student feedback is often too distant to capture shifting engagement levels and hidden barriers that students face. The student co-host model, a high-impact pedagogical partnership designed to reform undergraduate STEM education, fosters rapid and regular learner-centered feedback. A rotating schedule of undergraduate co-hosts each manage class transitions (openings/closings) and post notes for all classmates to access. Critically, co-hosts also send a meta-email to the instructor identifying and explaining one aspect of the day's class session that supported their learning and one that did not. These meta-emails provide the instructor with granular, actionable, real-time data regarding aspects of course design such as pacing, "muddy points, student stressors, engagement hooks, and logistical hurdles. Drawing on 25 years of teaching experience and a year-long pilot of the meta-email intervention, this pedagogical partnership revealed invisible classroom dynamics such as the need for physical tools such as staplers to external stressors that caused greatest hit lessons to fall flat and small incidental comments to resonate with students. This pedagogical partnership respects learner experiences and facilitates immediate pedagogical pivots that can reduce power differentials, foster engagement, and enhance student success. This lightning talk will share the meta-email prompt and structure as well as student feedback examples so interested attendees who desire to adapt a co-hosting structure into their own STEM courses, will be able to gather real-time learner-centered data through a simple

intervention that also develops student feedback literacy and professional communication skills.

## **SESSION I. TRACK B**

### **From Experimentation to Practice: Faculty-Led GenAI Learning Experiences in STEM Classrooms**

**Audeliz Matias**, Professor and Mete Cetiner, Associate Professor, Empire State University; **Keion M. Clinton**, Professor, **Cayla M. Gaworecki**, Associate Professor and **David Wolf**, Director of Instructional Design and Online Learning, SUNY Schenectady

Since the emergence of generative AI (GenAI) tools such as ChatGPT, responses in higher education have ranged from cautious exploration to rapid adoption. While interest in the use of GenAI for teaching is growing, questions remain regarding how these tools can be effectively integrated to support student learning, critical thinking, and AI literacy in undergraduate STEM education.

This session will begin with a brief overview of a multi-institutional initiative exploring the efficacy and usability of four GenAI tools (ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, and Perplexity) in online and in-person course-based learning experiences across a wide range of disciplines, using an AI-enabled educational platform. This overview will provide context for how three participating faculty members have approached the design and implementation of these activities.

Faculty presenters will share STEM examples drawn from courses in health informatics, introductory web development, and quantitative reasoning, highlighting how the tools have been incorporated into problem-solving activities and student learning support. They will also share their experiences throughout the development process and lessons learned. Examples will illustrate how GenAI was used to support problem-solving and disciplinary thinking in STEM contexts, as well as the role of scaffolding in guiding student use of AI tools. Faculty reflections will highlight observed patterns in student engagement, common challenges, and how their approaches evolved through implementation.

Audience engagement will include guided discussion and exchange of ideas related to course implementation of GenAI-infused experiences. Participants will leave with concrete examples of AI-integrated learning activities, practical strategies for implementation, and insights into how faculty are adapting teaching and assessment practices in response to AI.

## **An AI Update: How to integrate AI guidelines into your class**

**Erin Doughney**, Associate Professor, Wake Technical Community College

Students enter higher education with widely varying levels of academic preparation, creating challenges for instructors seeking to support all learners effectively. Emerging artificial intelligence (AI) tools present new opportunities to address these differences by providing students with additional support for studying, concept clarification, and skill development. This session describes an approach to integrating artificial intelligence into undergraduate life science courses at Wake Technical Community College. Over the past year and a half, the presenter has completed professional development focused on teaching with AI, including institutional credentialing courses, webinars, and participation in a faculty learning community.

Following this training, several strategies were implemented to promote responsible and productive AI use among students. These strategies included incorporating a clear AI statement in the course syllabus, developing a student-centered resource outlining appropriate ways to use AI for studying and concept review, and establishing explicit guidelines that define when and how AI tools may be used in coursework.

To better understand student perspectives, an anonymous survey was administered to gather information about the frequency and purposes of AI use. Students were also asked how they would prefer instructors to address situations in which AI use might negatively impact learning. Responses provided insight into students' current practices and their openness to constructive feedback.

Participants will engage in discussion about how AI is used in their own teaching contexts and explore strategies for incorporating clear guidelines. By the end of the session, participants will be able to develop transparent AI policies and implement strategies that encourage students to use AI tools to support effective studying and deeper learning

## **Rethinking Learning in the Age of AI: A Neurocognitive Framework for Curiosity-Driven STEM Education**

**Cynthia van Golen**, Associate Professor, Delaware State University

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into society, and by extension higher education, is transforming not only how students access information, but also how they engage with learning itself. As AI increasingly mediates knowledge acquisition, traditional models of instruction, particularly those centered on content delivery and assessment of

recall, are becoming less effective and less relevant. This shift raises a critical question: how should STEM education evolve to align with how humans learn in an AI-enabled world?

This presentation introduces an inclusive curiosity-driven learning framework grounded in cognitive neuroscience, offering a model for rethinking teaching and assessment in undergraduate STEM education. Drawing on research demonstrating that curiosity activates dopaminergic reward pathways and enhances hippocampus-dependent memory formation, this framework positions curiosity rather than content coverage as the primary driver of learning. The model integrates three core components: (1) curiosity activation through knowledge gaps, (2) structured inquiry to support cognitive load and novice learners, and (3) inclusive design principles (Universal Design for Learning) to support diverse and neurodivergent learners.

Importantly, this framework reframes the role of AI in education as a cognitive partner. Rather than viewing AI as a threat to academic integrity, it positions AI as a tool that can support exploration, while emphasizing that deep learning depends on human-driven curiosity and meaning-making. The presentation will outline the theoretical foundation of the model and provide examples of how it can be implemented in introductory biology courses. The audience will be engaged through polls throughout the presentation.

This work offers a neuroscience-informed, equity-centered approach to designing learning environments that remain effective in an AI-transformed educational landscape.

## **SESSION II**

### **A Weekly Cycle for AI Verification: Embedding Critical Evaluation in Undergraduate Engineering**

**Reza Ebadi**, Assistant Professor of Teaching, Worcester Polytechnic Institute

As AI tools become standard in technical workplaces, employers increasingly expect graduates to use AI fluently and evaluate its outputs critically. Yet most undergraduate STEM courses focus on whether to permit AI rather than on scaffolding the judgment needed to use it responsibly. This presentation describes a low-overhead intervention designed to develop AI verification as a transferable skill within an existing undergraduate Kinematics of Mechanisms course at Worcester Polytechnic Institute.

The intervention introduces a weekly AI comparison cycle into the course rhythm. With support from two undergraduate teaching assistants, the instructor designs take-home

quiz problems intentionally selected to produce instructive AI interactions. Students first solve each problem independently, then submit it to an AI model and compare its response to their own work. The instructor solves the problem live, after which the class collectively evaluates the AI response in real time. Full credit is awarded for participation rather than correctness, deliberately lowering stakes to encourage honest engagement.

End-of-term evaluations (n=57) included two scaled items and an open-ended reflection prompt. The low-stakes structure scored 4.6/5.0, indicating strong buy-in. When asked whether the activity helped develop judgment about when AI can and cannot be trusted, students averaged 3.6/5.0, suggesting areas for refinement around pacing and discussion. Qualitative responses revealed that students independently noted AI often captured correct methods while producing incorrect calculations, and that fluent-sounding outputs required domain knowledge to evaluate.

Attendees will observe a sample problem and AI response, and reflect on how the framework might transfer to their own disciplines. Participants will leave with a replicable cycle structure, insight into student reception including resistance, and a starting point for embedding AI verification into any STEM course.

## **Teaching Professional Judgment, Not Just Tool Proficiency: A Cognitive Apprenticeship Model for AI Integration Across STEM**

**Emily Monroe**, Lecturer, Thayer School of Engineering at Dartmouth College; **Patrick Tebbe**, Professor, Minnesota State University

As generative AI becomes embedded in STEM workflows, educators face a shared challenge: students readily adopt AI as a source of answers but struggle to evaluate whether those answers are trustworthy. This challenge is fundamentally epistemic, not technical. The question is not whether students can use AI, but whether they can exercise the professional judgment required to verify, challenge, and take responsibility for AI-generated outputs—the same judgment that licensing bodies, professional societies, and employers increasingly expect of workforce-ready STEM graduates. We present a cognitive apprenticeship framework positioning AI as an epistemic tool mediating how students come to know and verify disciplinary knowledge. The framework uses three mechanisms: modeling (faculty demonstrating), coaching (evaluated work), and scaffolded practice (students use AI for tasks like risk identification, then verify outputs against ASHRAE standards and peer-reviewed literature). A formal AI Disclosure and Certification policy reframes academic integrity from "did you use AI?" to "can you certify what AI produced?", replicating the accountability structures that licensed and certified STEM professionals

navigate in industry. Preliminary findings from an engineering capstone course reveal that AI-generated errors function as productive teachable moments, making visible the verification practices working professionals perform routinely. We observe early evidence of epistemic shifts: students moving from treating AI outputs as pre-verified (a novice stance) toward recognizing that independent verification is a core workforce competency. This model applies to any STEM field where practitioners must evaluate claims against empirical evidence, disciplinary standards, or ethical frameworks. Participants will engage in a brief verification exercise using a sample AI-generated technical summary and discuss how to adapt the framework's scaffolding structures for their own disciplines.

### **Is Culturally Focused Experiential Learning a ‘Solution’ to Support Critical Thinking in the Age of Generative Artificial Intelligence?**

**Michele Guannel**, Assistant Professor of Biology and **Molly Perry**, Associate Professor of History and Geography, University of the Virgin Islands

Dependency on generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) threatens to undermine the development of critical thinking skills among learners. Simultaneously, culturally grounded project-based learning may incentivize authentic student work. We present analysis of student products and academic success markers for two Caribbean-focused, freshman general education courses at the University of the Virgin Islands, in which students pursued either experiential learning projects or traditional research papers. We further hypothesized that experiential learning would yield measurable gains in critical thinking and retention between freshman and sophomore years. Here, we discuss data from the 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 academic years. For 47 sets of consented student work from the 2024-2025 academic year, 40% of student products could not be assessed for student learning outcomes, primarily due to markers of generative AI. The majority of AI evidence existed among traditional research papers, rather than the experiential learning projects. Further, for the 2024-2025 cohort, 12% of the students who failed the natural sciences course had elected the experiential learning project option, compared to an overall failure rate near 30%. Among students who passed the course, students who completed projects achieved a significantly higher final grade average ( $p=0.03$ ) in contrast to students who completed papers. Finally, for the 2023-2024 cohort, experiential learning students exhibited a retention rate of 88%, versus 61% of other students. Experiential learning thereby holds promise to foster authentic student work, student learning outcomes, and higher retention rates. In this session, colleagues will discuss diverse pedagogical approaches to develop critical thinking foundations, amidst the availability of AI tools, in small groups. Participants will prioritize new or existing strategies that are tailored to their institutional

settings.

## **From AI Generation to Student Reflection: Designing AI-Integrated Assignments in Introductory Computing Courses**

**Zakia Hmamou**, Instructional Designer/ Instructor, Hudson County Community College

Artificial intelligence tools are rapidly transforming how students approach coursework in undergraduate STEM education. Many students already use AI systems to generate explanations, summaries, and project content, creating challenges for instructors related to academic integrity, critical thinking, and authentic assessment. Rather than attempting to prohibit AI use, educators can redesign assignments that guide students to use these technologies transparently and responsibly.

This presentation describes the implementation of an AI-integrated assignment sequence in an introductory computer literacy course (CSC-100) at a community college. The design includes three stages that structure student interaction with AI tools. First, students participate in a discussion exploring the opportunities, risks, and ethical considerations of AI in academic work. Second, students propose a project topic and identify the AI tools they intend to use. Third, students submit examples of AI-generated content alongside their revised and improved work, demonstrating how they evaluated and modified AI outputs. Students also complete a reflection describing how AI influenced their learning process.

Preliminary observations suggest that structured AI integration encourages students to move beyond passive content generation toward critical evaluation, revision, and responsible AI use.

Audience engagement will include discussion of sample assignments and opportunities for participants to consider how similar structures could be applied in their courses. Participants will leave with practical strategies for designing AI-integrated assignments and promoting responsible AI use in undergraduate STEM courses.

## SESSION III

### **Reimagining Open Education: Leveraging Artificial Intelligence to Create and Curate High-Quality STEM OER**

**Vincent Granito**, Professor, Psychology, Lorain County Community College

The rising cost of textbooks continues to create barriers to student access and success in undergraduate education, particularly in STEM disciplines where course materials are often expensive and rapidly evolving. Open Educational Resources (OER) have emerged as a powerful strategy for increasing affordability and expanding equitable access to high-quality learning materials. However, developing and maintaining OER can require significant time and expertise from faculty. Recent advances in artificial intelligence (AI) present new opportunities to support the creation, curation, and continuous improvement of open educational resources. This presentation explores how AI tools can assist faculty in developing high-quality OER while maintaining academic rigor and disciplinary accuracy. Participants will be introduced to practical strategies for using AI to support multiple stages of the OER development process, including resource discovery, content drafting, editing for clarity and accessibility, generating practice questions and case studies, and aligning materials with course learning outcomes. Drawing on current work in AI-assisted OER development and faculty professional development initiatives, this presentation will highlight practical workflows that instructors can use to accelerate OER development while preserving scholarly integrity. Participants will also explore examples of AI-supported materials that promote active learning, critical thinking, and student engagement. By the end of the session, attendees will gain a clearer understanding of how AI can serve as a collaborative tool that supports open education initiatives while reducing barriers to adoption. The presentation will provide faculty with practical strategies for leveraging AI to expand access to affordable, high-quality learning materials and strengthen undergraduate teaching and learning in an AI-enabled educational landscape.

### **Thinking with AI: Using Artificial Intelligence as a Mindtool to Promote Critical Thinking**

**Jacqueline Washington**, Adjunct Professor of Biology and **Mary Mawn**, Professor of Biology, Empire State University

Recent developments in the creation of artificial intelligence (AI) tools and increased accessibility to the general public have changed the educational landscape. While

educators are increasingly embracing the use of artificial intelligence in their classrooms, there is limited guidance on how it can be used to foster critical thinking in biology education, an essential skill for objective analysis, independent reasoning, and creative problem-solving. Building upon the “mindtools” framework of Jonassen (1998), students can learn ways to use AI technologies to actively construct and extend knowledge, which goes beyond passively retrieving information. During this session, we will explore the use of AI as mindtools in the STEM classroom. We will share several examples of AI-infused activities, such as what-if modelling, concept mapping, and error analysis, and identify concrete ways these approaches can promote learners’ higher-order thinking skills of analysis, evaluation, and synthesis. Virtual participants will actively engage in this session through polling, interactive discussions, and the sharing of practical tips for classroom implementation. By the end of this session, participants will be able to identify the ways in which AI technologies can be used as mindtools and describe several approaches for using AI to foster critical thinking across STEM disciplines.

Jonassen, D. H., Carr, C., & Yueh, H.-P. (1998). Computers as mindtools for engaging learners in critical thinking. *TechTrends*, 43(2), 24–32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02818172>

## **Learning with AI and Learning about AI: A Framework for Quantitative Methods Pedagogy**

Teddy Svoronos, Senior Lecturer, Harvard University John F Kennedy School of Government

The rapid proliferation of generative AI tools poses a fundamental challenge for quantitative methods instruction: how should we integrate AI into student learning, and what new competencies about AI itself must we cultivate? This talk presents a practical framework developed through the redesign of a graduate-level introductory statistics course for public policy students, organized around two complementary approaches.

**Learning with AI:** I present research from several pedagogical innovations that leverage AI to enhance learning in an introductory statistics course. These include (a) the use of custom AI chatbots for guided practice and concept development, (b) AI-facilitated oral assessments as an alternative to traditional evaluation, and (c) the use of AI to generate targeted exam questions. I share student survey data alongside usage and descriptive outcomes, as well as validation data on the ability of AI generated exam questions to approximate human-written questions.

**Learning about AI:** As AI agents become capable of executing entire analytical workflows, from data cleaning to modeling to interpretation, quantitative methods students need a

new set of competencies. I discuss emerging skills in the area of agentic data analysis including evaluating AI-generated statistical analyses for correctness and methodological soundness, managing "cognitive debt" when delegating technical work, and directing agentic AI systems through iterative verification. I argue that these represent a genuinely new domain of statistical literacy and discuss how to sequence their development alongside traditional statistical education.

## SESSION IV. WORKSHOP A

### **"Can I use AI for that?": Using Transparent Design and an AI Assessment Scale to Transform Assignment Design in STEM (and Beyond)**

**Caroline Brinkert**, Lecturer, SLHS Department and **Benjamin Keating**, Assistant Director, Curricular Innovation, Boston University

Transparency is a powerful lever for equitable, evidence-based reform in undergraduate STEM education. Grounded in the Transparency in Learning and Teaching (TILT) framework and the AI Assessment Scale (AIAS), our work responds to the need for clearer expectations around both learning and generative AI use. This session will introduce TILT's core components (explicit purpose and relevance to students' academic/professional development, tasks, and criteria for success) and show how pairing them with AIAS levels of AI use (e.g., no AI, AI as thinking partner, AI-supported drafting) can make the "hidden curriculum" of AI use visible and navigable for students.

Using a case example from a graduate-level speech-language pathology course, attendees will explore how to translate TILT+AIAS principles to undergraduate STEM curriculum. They will redesign key assignments to include transparent statements of learning goals, step-by-step task descriptions, aligned evaluation criteria, and explicit AIAS designations clarifying when AI is prohibited, when it may support learning, and when critiquing AI output is central to the task. Preliminary evidence from student feedback and instructor observations indicates increased perceptions of fairness and clarity, fewer policy-related questions, and richer, more critical reflections on decision-making.

During the session, participants will have time for independent brainstorming and guided, hands-on work with their own course materials. Using a concise TILT+AIAS worksheet, they will analyze one of their assignments, identify opportunities for clarification, and discuss potential revisions in small groups before a brief whole-group share-out. By the end, participants will be able to 1) describe how TILT and AIAS together can support more

transparent assignment design, 2) apply frameworks to revise at least one assignment, and 3) articulate concrete next steps for scaling transparent, AI-informed assessment practices in their programs.

## **SESSION IV. WORKSHOP B**

### **Beyond Copy-and-Paste: Rethinking AI, Learning, and Assessment Through Scaffolded Assignment Design**

**Racquel Bethea**, Adjunct Professor, Bennett College

As artificial intelligence becomes more common in higher education, undergraduate STEM instructors face a growing challenge: how to integrate AI without weakening critical thinking, originality, problem-solving, and process-based learning. This work addresses that challenge by treating AI not simply as a tool issue, but as a teaching and assessment design issue. Its significance lies in offering a practical approach to reforming undergraduate education by making student thinking more visible, accountable, and harder to outsource.

The approach uses structured templates, staged deliverables, guided prompting, revision checkpoints, and accessible workflow tools to reduce low-effort AI dependence. Students move through idea development, source use, questioning, reflection, and revision in ways that require judgment, context, and originality throughout the process, not just in the final product.

Evidence of effectiveness includes clearer differentiation in student voice, stronger accountability across assignments, greater instructor insight into student thinking, and more substantive final work.

Audience engagement will include a brief interactive assignment redesign activity in which participants identify one AI-vulnerable assessment and revise it using a scaffolded, AI-aware framework. The session will also highlight free and accessible tools that help instructors structure assignments, monitor progress, strengthen accountability, and make learning more visible without adding unrealistic workload demands.

Attendees will leave with practical strategies they can implement immediately to redesign assessments, increase transparency in student learning, and use AI in ways that support rather than replace critical thinking.