

**From Demonstration to Collaboration:
Redefining AI Integration in Educational Workshops and Consultations**

Emily Lopez

University of Cincinnati

As an instructional designer, I get to use AI as I collaborate with faculty to design their courses. My audience is not a recurring class of students. Instead, I interact with faculty in a variety of settings, including workshops and individual consultations. Since beginning as an instructional designer in mid-2024 with AI continuously changing, I have changed my teaching of AI for course design from the classic demonstrator to the encourager of experimentation so that colleagues can explore AI hands-on rather than disembodied from the experience.

From the onset of my work as an educator – first a tutor for undergraduate peers and a middle school math teacher – I embraced active learning through collaborative learning techniques, involving learners with content and each other. When I began to use AI, I wondered how this tool might alter these collaborations. So, with a bit of confusion on how actively applying AI in the classroom might work effectively, I stepped into a lecturer-mode of teaching AI.

For the first workshop I facilitated as an instructional designer, I shared about how to use AI to create rubrics for assessments. I provided a demonstration of how to use ChatGPT and MagicSchool AI to create rubrics. This method of acting as a demonstrator took mental effort and made me feel like I needed to perform. Realizing this unnecessary weight and the lack of faculty engagement, I chose to have the audience members experiment with the previously listed tools to draft a rubric for an assessment. This process of involving the learners with the AI tool empowered faculty to participate in learning and building a useful output for their context rather than merely observing a model that they would not use in their own course. Importantly, faculty mentioned to me months after the workshop that they still use MagicSchool AI to draft rubrics because they gained comfort and experienced the value of the tool during the hands-on portion of the workshop.

My initial go-to was demonstrating AI use, which I also did in individual consultations following this workshop. I noticed that in both the rubric workshop and consultations, I demoed and then followed up with an opportunity for faculty to use the tool. For example, in a 1:1 consultation, I worked

with an adjunct faculty member to create an activity aligned with the course- and module-level learning objectives. First, I input the objectives into Copilot and then generated an activity. Then I asked the learner to prompt Copilot with questions to refine the activity. I think that my eagerness to find and show use of the tool rather than invite to participate made using AI for the first time less intimidating for the learner, yet also less impactful for future exploration of new AI tools (which are continually created) and unique prompting strategies.

With these challenges, I decided to let go of the control – and pressure of performance – that demonstrating seemingly provided me. In my co-facilitation of an educational technology workshop about AI and authentic assessment, I involved learners by asking them to independently prompt the AI tool of their choice (yet provided a few institution-sanctioned examples to adhere to policy) with topics related to their needs and interests. This method differed from my previous method because I completely removed modeling the use of AI, and I broadened the choices of AI tools. These changes both made me feel free – I did not have the weight of lecturing about a technical process nor the need to justify my choice of AI tools – and gave learners autonomy in the process.

Further, in this workshop, I asked learners to share their chatbot's outputs in a shared document. This made it straightforward to draw connections, highlight differences between participants' work, and ask learners questions about their discoveries about AI. The conversation flowed more naturally with me, my co-facilitators, and learners all observing and learning together and decreasing the overwhelm for first-time AI-users.

This collaborative, rather than individualized, use-AI-to-get-ahead mindset shaped my consultations, too. Currently, I am working with a faculty member who is developing a new course. To complete a course alignment map, the faculty member gathered the required course-level learning objectives and used her own prompts within an AI tool to generate a draft of all course components. The faculty member did this solo, and then we discussed ways to edit the objectives and assessments. Before spending too much time editing, I suggested that the faculty member try out another AI tool of her choice to compare outputs. Although this does not involve multiple faculty members, this created a similar collaborative effect to the workshop because the faculty member weighed activity options from multiple generative AI tools. This method encourages the learner to experiment, refine their work, and optimize our meeting time.

Overall, my teaching of AI for course design has changed from showing to creating space for experimentation and collaboration. I no longer demonstrate tools but instead place the learner in the driver's seat and ask them to draw connections between what they discover and what their peers or other tools share. I no longer mandate that a certain tool be used but instead ask learners to consider the benefits and purpose of various tools. I plan to continue encouraging and equipping learners to use AI collaboratively and experimentally to design courses.