AI Capability Practice Guide: Teaching

Practical, Responsible, High-Impact AI Use for Educators and Learning Designers

---

Who This Guide Is For

This guide is for educators who want to use AI responsibly and creatively in:

- teaching preparation
- curriculum design
- assessment creation
- feedback and communication
- student support
- academic leadership

It is designed for:

- lecturers
- tutors
- module and programme convenors
- learning designers
- teaching fellows
- academic developers

You do **not** need technical AI expertise.
You *do* need to make decisions that affect students, their learning, and academic standards.

Who This Guide Is *Not* For

This guide is not intended to support:

- automated grading or marking-offloading
- removing educator judgement
- replacing teaching presence
- delegating curriculum decisions to AI
- “speed-first” approaches that compromise academic integrity

If you seek shortcuts that reduce professional responsibility, this guide will feel intentionally restrictive.

What You Will Be Able to Do in 30–60 Minutes

By engaging with this guide, you will be able to:

- decide when AI is pedagogically appropriate — and when it is not
- design clear educator–AI–student role boundaries
- create teaching materials with integrity and clarity
- anticipate student risks (equity, access, misunderstanding, over-reliance)
- design and review assessment with AI-awareness
- document teaching decisions transparently
- adjust your practice as AI evolves

You will also produce at least one **teaching artefact** (e.g., a revised assessment, lesson plan, or AI-use note) ready for immediate use.

FAST START — USE THIS NOW

This Fast Start is designed so that an educator can act responsibly with AI in **under 10 minutes**.

When to Use This Guide

Use this guide when:

- designing or updating a lecture, workshop, or online resource
- drafting assessment questions, criteria, or exemplars
- generating feedback or explanations for students
- creating course documentation or learning support
- anticipating how students might use AI (productively or problematically)
- supporting colleagues in AI adoption
- being asked to justify teaching decisions involving AI

If academic integrity, student learning, or fairness could be affected, this guide is essential.

The 10-Minute Teaching Workflow

Use this sequence before using AI in teaching or assessment.

Step 1 — Identify the Teaching Purpose

State clearly:

> "I am using AI to support: **[learning purpose]**"

Examples:

- clarifying complex concepts
- drafting initial materials
- generating examples
- widening perspectives
- modelling thinking

Avoid:

- outsourcing disciplinary judgement
- replacing student practice
- generating assessments without supervision

Step 2 — Define Educator–AI–Student Roles

Use this 3-part teaching-specific co-agency check:

1. **AI supports me by…**
2. **Students may use AI to…**
3. **I remain responsible for…**

If educator and student boundaries blur, pause — learning integrity is at risk.

Step 3 — Apply the Pedagogical Sanity Check

Before generating or using AI output, ask:

- Does this strengthen learning?
- Does this reduce opportunities for student practice?
- Does this risk cognitive offloading for students?
- Would clarity or difficulty be distorted?

If learning is weakened, do not proceed.

Step 4 — Run the Academic Integrity & Fairness Screen

Ask:

- Is this creating unfair advantage?
- Could this mislead students about expectations?
- Am I introducing unseen bias into learning materials?
- Will students know what is acceptable?

If the answer to any is uncertain, revise.

Step 5 — Make the Teaching Decision

Choose one:

- **Proceed carefully**
  (with review, disclosure, or adaptation)
- **Revise the task or prompt**
- **Pause and escalate**
  (assessment boards, QA, module lead, digital education team)

Document your reasoning — academic integrity requires traceability.

Worked Example: Same Teaching Task, Three Outcomes

Teaching Task

Preparing a reading guide for a complex topic using AI.

✅ Good Use

- AI drafts an outline
- Educator reviews for accuracy and level
- Misleading or overly confident statements are removed
- Student misconceptions are anticipated and addressed

Why this works:
AI accelerates structure, but *pedagogical judgement* shapes learning.

⚠ Risky Use

- AI produces a guide
- Educator edits lightly
- Level and language drift away from expected learning outcomes

Why this is risky:
Students may be misdirected or miscalibrated about difficulty.

⛔ Unacceptable Use

- AI-generated guide is posted as-is
- No check for conceptual accuracy or bias
- No transparency to students

Why this fails:
It breaches academic duty of care and undermines disciplinary integrity.

Your First Teaching Artefact

Create an **AI-Use Teaching Note** for the task you are working on:

> *Teaching task:*
> *Why AI is being used:*
> *Educator–AI–student roles:*
> *Integrity or fairness risks considered:*
> *Decision made:*

This note helps:

- justify decisions to boards, audits, or colleagues
- build consistency across modules
- improve future teaching design

STAGE 2 — AI CAPABILITY IN TEACHING PRACTICE

How the Six Domains Work *Differently* for Educators

Teaching with AI is **not** individual AI use at scale.
It is a **professional practice with downstream consequences**.

Every decision you make:

- shapes how students learn
- signals what counts as knowledge
- redistributes effort, advantage, and risk

This stage shows how each AI Capability domain **behaves differently in teaching contexts**.

The Teaching Capability Lens (Important Shift)

In teaching:

- mistakes scale to *many students*
- ambiguity confuses learning trajectories
- hidden AI use undermines trust
- unclear boundaries distort assessment

Therefore:

> **Teaching capability must be more explicit, documented, and anticipatory** than individual practice.

Domain 1 — Awareness & Orientation (Teaching-Specific)

What This Domain Means in Teaching

Educator awareness is not just AI literacy.

It includes:

- understanding how AI explanations *shape student mental models*
- recognising when AI oversimplifies disciplinary thinking
- anticipating common misunderstandings created by AI-generated material

---

Teaching-Specific Risks

- AI presents *answers* without modelling *reasoning*
- Concepts appear simpler than they are
- Uncertainty is smoothed away
- Disciplinary norms are misrepresented

These risks directly affect learning quality.

Apply Now — Awareness Check for Teaching

Before using AI-generated teaching material, ask:

- What thinking process does this *model* for students?
- What disciplinary judgement is missing?
- Where might students over-trust this explanation?

If you cannot answer, revise before use.

Teaching Failure Mode

> “It sounded clear, so I used it.”

Clarity without epistemic care erodes learning.

Domain 2 — Human–AI Co-Agency (Teaching-Specific)

What This Domain Means in Teaching

Teaching co-agency is **triadic**:

Educator ↔ AI ↔ Student

Each must have clearly differentiated roles.

Required Role Boundaries

AI may support educators by:

- drafting outlines or examples
- generating alternative explanations
- assisting feedback phrasing

AI may support students by:

- brainstorming
- language support
- self-checking understanding

AI must not:

- determine grades
- replace student thinking
- obscure authorship or responsibility

Apply Now — Co-Agency Mapping (Teaching)

Complete this for any AI-influenced task:

- Where does educator judgement enter?
- Where must students struggle productively?
- Where does AI assist *without displacing* learning?

If AI erodes productive struggle, redesign the task.

Teaching Failure Mode

> “Students will use AI anyway, so it doesn’t matter.”

This abdicates pedagogical responsibility rather than designing for reality.

Domain 3 — Applied Practice & Innovation (Teaching-Specific)

What This Domain Means in Teaching

Innovation in teaching with AI is **pedagogical design**, not technical novelty.

It involves:

- redesigning learning tasks
- changing assessment focus
- modelling ethical AI use explicitly

High-Value Teaching Uses

- generating multiple examples or counterexamples
- simulating stakeholder perspectives
- modelling analytical critique of AI outputs
- supporting inclusive access (language, structure, pacing)

Apply Now — Innovation Check

Ask:

- Does this use make learning *richer*, not easier?
- Does it surface thinking, not conceal it?
- Does it reward reasoning over outputs?

If innovation only increases speed, reconsider.

Teaching Failure Mode

> “I used AI to save time, but learning stayed the same.”

Innovation that does not improve learning is misdirected efficiency.

Domain 4 — Ethics, Equity & Impact (Teaching-Specific)

What This Domain Means in Teaching

Teaching ethics is about:

- fairness
- access
- representation
- assessment justice

AI intensifies existing inequities unless designed otherwise.

Teaching-Specific Risks

- language advantages for some students
- hidden norms embedded in AI outputs
- disadvantaging students unfamiliar with AI tools
- reinforcing dominant perspectives

Apply Now — Equity Check for Teaching

Before releasing materials or assessments, ask:

- Who is advantaged by this design?
- Who may be excluded or misrepresented?
- Are expectations explicit and transparent?

Ethical teaching requires anticipatory design.

Teaching Failure Mode

> "We didn't intend inequity."

Impact outweighs intention.

Domain 5 — Decision-Making & Governance (Teaching-Specific)

What This Domain Means in Teaching

Teaching governance ensures:

- assessment integrity
- transparency
- defendable academic decisions

It is not bureaucracy — it is professional protection.

Teaching Decisions That Require Governance

- assessment design
- marking or feedback practices
- AI guidance to students
- curriculum-level changes

For these:

- AI use must be explainable
- roles must be documented
- escalation pathways must exist

Apply Now — Teaching Governance Log (Minimal)

For high-impact teaching decisions:

Teaching Governance Note

- Decision affected:
- Role of AI:
- Human oversight applied:
- Risks considered:

A short record is sufficient — silence is not.

Teaching Failure Mode

> “No one asked, so I didn’t document it.”

Governance exists *before* challenge, not after.

Domain 6 — Reflection, Learning & Renewal (Teaching-Specific)

What This Domain Means in Teaching

Reflection is not personal rumination.

It is:

- pedagogical evidence
- curriculum learning
- quality enhancement

Apply Now — Teaching Reflection Prompts

After using AI in teaching, ask:

- Did this change how students engaged?
- What misconceptions appeared?
- What should be adjusted next time?

Share insights with colleagues — capability scales socially.

Teaching Failure Mode

> “It seemed fine at the time.”

Unexamined success can embed long-term harm.

The Teaching Capability Pattern (Summary)

Teaching with AI requires:

- **clear boundaries**
- **designed struggle**
- **explicit expectations**
- **documented judgement**
- **iterative refinement**

It is *not* about tool mastery.
It is about professional responsibility in an AI-rich learning environment.

STAGE 3 — APPLIED AI WORKFLOWS FOR TEACHING

Designing Learning, Assessment, and Feedback with AI Present

This stage answers one core question:

> **"How do I actually teach well when AI is part of the learning environment?"**

The focus here is *pedagogical design*, not personal productivity.

Teaching Reality Check (Important)

In teaching:

- outputs affect learners' understanding, not just efficiency
- design decisions shape what students practice
- poor AI design teaches the *wrong habits*

Therefore:

> **Every AI use in teaching is a curriculum decision.**

Workflow 1 — Designing Teaching Materials with AI

Appropriate Uses

AI can support educators by:

- generating alternative explanations
- suggesting examples or analogies
- drafting outlines or activities
- adapting materials for different levels

Teaching Workflow (Material Design)

1. **Define the learning intent**
    - What must students understand or practise?
2. **Use AI for variation, not authority**
    - Ask for multiple explanations, not “the best one.”
3. **Apply disciplinary judgement**
    - Remove inaccuracies, oversimplifications, or tonal drift.
4. **Reinsert epistemic cues**
    - Add uncertainty, assumptions, and limits explicitly.
5. **Align with assessment**
    - Ensure materials support, not shortcut, learning outcomes.

Good Practice Example

AI generates three alternative explanations of a difficult concept.
The educator selects one, rewrites parts, and adds a warning about common misconceptions.

Poor Practice Example

AI explanation is posted directly to the learning platform as “support material.”

Workflow 2 — Assessment Design in an AI-Rich Environment

The Core Shift

Assessment can no longer rely on:

- polished prose
- generic synthesis
- easily reproducible outputs

AI changes *what evidence of learning looks like*.

High-Integrity Assessment Principles

Design assessments that:

- require judgement, context, or justification
- make reasoning visible
- include reflective or process elements
- differentiate between support and substitution

Teaching Workflow (Assessment Design)

1. **Identify what must be human**
    - What cannot be meaningfully delegated to AI?
2. **Anticipate AI use**
    - Assume students will attempt to use AI.
3. **Design for transparency**
    - Require declaration or commentary where appropriate.
4. **Shift emphasis**
    - From product → process, critique, or application.
5. **Document the decision**
    - Capture the rationale for audit or review.

Good Practice Example

Students submit:

- a short output
- a reflective note explaining how AI was used (or not)
- a justification of final decisions

Poor Practice Example

Assessment remains unchanged but enforcement relies solely on detection.

Workflow 3 — Feedback and Student Communication

Why Feedback Is High Risk

AI-generated feedback:

- shapes student confidence
- influences effort and identity
- can unintentionally bias or demotivate

Feedback requires **relational judgement**, not generic phrasing.

Teaching Workflow (Feedback Design)

1. **Decide what feedback is for**
    - Improvement, reassurance, direction, challenge?
2. **Use AI as a drafting partner**
    - Tone, clarity, structure — not judgement.
3. **Review for bias and framing**
    - Especially for students at the margins.
4. **Personalise deliberately**
    - Ensure feedback signals human attention.

Good Practice Example

AI helps draft concise, neutral phrasing.
Educator adjusts emphasis, removes assumptions, and adds personalised comments.

Poor Practice Example

Bulk AI-generated feedback sent without review.

Workflow 4 — Student Guidance on Acceptable AI Use

Teaching Responsibility

If students do not know what is acceptable, **they will infer it**.

Silence ≠ neutrality.

Teaching Workflow (Student AI Guidance)

1. **Be explicit**
    - What AI use is acceptable, limited, or prohibited?
2. **Link to learning goals**
    - Explain *why* the boundaries exist.
3. **Model ethical use**
    - Show examples of critique, not just generation.
4. **Revisit regularly**
    - Guidance must evolve with tasks.

Good Practice Example

Students are shown:

- a weak AI-generated answer
- a critical review of it
- a revised, human-led response

Poor Practice Example

Generic policy statement with no task-level guidance.

Workflow 5 — Supporting Colleagues and Programmes

Teaching capability is collective.

AI use spreads informally unless shaped intentionally.

Programme-Level Teaching Practices

- share AI-use notes
- align expectations across modules
- document agreed boundaries
- surface risks early

This prevents inconsistent student experience.

Teaching Failure Pattern

> “Everyone is doing something different.”

This creates confusion, unfairness, and governance risk.

Teaching Capability Signals (Self-Check)

You are teaching well with AI if:

- students still struggle productively
- reasoning is visible in assessment
- expectations are explicit
- decisions can be explained
- learning improves, not just delivery speed

STAGE 4 — ETHICS, EQUITY, GOVERNANCE & PEDAGOGICAL RENEWAL

Designing Teaching That Remains Fair, Transparent, and Defensible in an AI World

AI introduces powerful teaching opportunities — but also substantial **ethical, equity, and integrity risks**.
In education, **impact is multiplied**: one decision affects dozens, hundreds, or thousands of learners.

This stage turns domains 4–6 of the AI Capability Framework into **teaching-specific safeguards and renewal mechanisms**.

DOMAIN 4 — ETHICS, EQUITY & IMPACT IN TEACHING

AI changes *who benefits* and *who is disadvantaged* in learning.

Ethical teaching requires **anticipation**, not reaction.

---

1. Ethics as a Teaching Design Constraint

In teaching, ethics is not optional reflection. It is a **professional requirement** that influences:

- what examples you choose
- how you explain concepts
- how accessible your materials are
- which students are unintentionally marginalised
- how assessment opportunities are distributed

AI amplifies these risks because it:

- reinforces common or dominant patterns
- erases minority perspectives
- generates confident but biased explanations
- homogenises tone and cultural reference points

Educators must intervene *before* these outputs reach learners.

---

2. Key Ethical Risks in Teaching with AI

A. Epistemic Distortion

AI often simplifies complex disciplinary ideas into:

- overly certain explanations
- generic patterns
- missing nuance

This mis-teaches the discipline.

B. Equity Gaps

AI may unintentionally:

- favour students with stronger digital literacy
- reinforce stereotypes
- present Western, anglophone framings as universal

These inequities become *learning inequities*.

C. Hidden Labour Displacement

If feedback or teaching materials are AI-produced with little human oversight:

- students experience less teacher presence
- relational belonging weakens
- trust in the programme declines

D. Assessment Justice

AI-generated exemplars or unclear boundaries can:

- advantage confident AI users
- disadvantage students who avoid AI due to integrity concerns
- create mismatches between teaching and marking standards

---

3. Ethics Application Tool — The Teaching Impact Scan

Use this **before** sharing AI-influenced materials or assessments:

TEACHING IMPACT SCAN

- Whose voice or perspective might be missing?
- Could this explanation misrepresent the discipline?
- Who gains advantage from this design?
- Who might be harmed, confused, or misled?
- What expectations are implicitly communicated to learners?

If any answer signals risk → revise, contextualise, or add human commentary.

DOMAIN 5 — DECISION-MAKING & GOVERNANCE IN TEACHING

Teaching decisions influenced by AI must be transparent, explainable, and defendable.

Educational governance is not bureaucracy — it is:

- protection for students
- protection for educators
- protection for institutional integrity

---

1. Why Governance Matters More in Teaching Than in Individual Practice

Teaching involves:

- accountability to boards and QA structures
- formal scrutiny (moderation, external examiners)
- public and regulatory expectations
- unequal power dynamics with students

Therefore:

> **If AI influences teaching or assessment, a governance trail must exist.**

---

2. When Governance Is Required

Governance is required when AI influences:

A. Assessment Design

- question generation
- reweighting of criteria
- exemplars or marking guides
- assessment format changes

B. Teaching Materials

- core explanations
- topic summaries
- diagrams or “authoritative” content
- reading guides or lecture notes

C. Student-Facing Communications

- feedback
- progression advice
- policy interpretation
- responses that imply decisions

D. Programme-Level Decisions

- module descriptions
- intended learning outcomes

- curriculum mapping

These contexts require:

- documented reasoning
- review by colleagues or committees
- clear declarations if AI assisted

---

3. Teaching Governance Tool — The Transparent Teaching Note

For any high-impact teaching decision:

> **TEACHING GOVERNANCE NOTE**
>
> - Decision area (assessment, teaching material, student guidance, etc.)
> - How AI contributed (draft, option generation, language support)
> - Human judgement applied (validation, rewriting, rethinking)
> - Risks considered (equity, integrity, misunderstanding)
> - Outcome (proceed, revise, escalate)
> - Oversight required? (yes/no — and by whom)

This protects you from:

- formal complaints
- integrity challenges
- student appeals
- external examiner scrutiny

4. Escalation Conditions

Escalate to programme leadership, assessment boards, or QA teams when:

- AI changes meaning or difficulty of assessment
- AI may introduce bias affecting student subgroups
- AI materially shapes a teaching decision with consequences
- Uncertainty remains after review
- Colleagues disagree about AI's role

Teaching-related risk must never be carried alone.

DOMAIN 6 — REFLECTION, LEARNING & RENEWAL (PEDAGOGICAL ADVANCEMENT)

Teaching capability evolves through cycles of use, evidence, and improvement.

Reflection is not personal introspection.
It is **pedagogical inquiry.**

The goal is not:

> "Did this AI use work for me?"

But:

> "Did this AI use support or distort learning?"

---

1. Teaching Reflection Prompts

After using AI in teaching, ask:

Learning Impact

- Did students engage differently with the material?
- Did misunderstandings increase or decrease?
- Did students rely on AI more than intended?

Assessment Integrity

- Did expectations remain clear?
- Did student outputs reveal gaps or over-reliance?

Equity & Access

- Who benefited most?
- Who faced new barriers?
- Did any group become disadvantaged unintentionally?

Future Adjustment

- What should be changed in the next cycle?
- What boundaries should be clarified?
- What evidence do I need to gather next time?

---

2. Teaching Renewal Practices

Renewal strengthens departmental and institutional capability.

Effective practices:

- sharing revised assessments and boundaries
- aligning expectations across modules
- co-developing discipline-specific guidance
- gathering student perspectives on AI use
- reviewing examples of good and problematic AI use

Reflection becomes professional knowledge, not private insight.

---

3. Indicators of Mature Teaching Capability

You know your teaching capability has matured when:

- AI use **strengthens** learning outcomes, not shortcuts them
- assessments still surface **student thinking**
- teaching materials model **disciplinary reasoning**
- expectations are explicit and unambiguous
- governance documentation becomes routine, not reactive
- students feel **supported**, not confused
- colleagues share a common AI use language

The Teaching Responsibility Principle

> **Students should learn *better*, think *better*, and act *more responsibly* because AI is present — not despite it.**

This principle anchors ethical and pedagogical responsibility across all teaching decisions.

STAGE 5 — TEACHING CAPABILITY SELF-CHECK, WORKED SCENARIO & OPERATING MODEL

From Responsible Intention to Defensible Teaching Practice

PART A — TEACHING AI CAPABILITY SELF-CHECK

This is **not** an evaluation and **not** a compliance tool.
It is a **rapid orientation instrument** to help educators decide **where to focus next**.

Complete in 5–7 minutes.

Domain 1 — Awareness & Orientation (Teaching)

✓ I can identify where AI explanations oversimplify disciplinary thinking

✓ I understand how AI outputs may reshape student mental models

✓ I recognise where AI fluency can mask conceptual gaps

If gaps exist:
Pause AI use in core teaching materials and revise explanations.

Domain 2 — Educator–AI–Student Co-Agency

✓ I explicitly design boundaries between educator, AI, and student roles

✓ I make expectations visible to students

✓ I avoid delegating judgement to AI

If unclear:
Re-design tasks before further AI integration.

Domain 3 — Applied Teaching & Innovation

✓ AI use strengthens learning rather than reduces struggle

✓ I use AI to reveal thinking, not hide it

✓ I test pedagogical impact rather than assume value

If weak:
Shift innovation from content generation to learning design.

Domain 4 — Ethics, Equity & Impact

✓ I anticipate unequal access or advantage

✓ I consider representation and framing

✓ I design for transparency and fairness

If uncertain:
Run the Teaching Impact Scan before material release.

Domain 5 — Decision-Making & Governance

✓ I document high-impact AI teaching decisions

✓ I can explain AI influence if challenged

✓ I know when escalation is required

If missing:
Implement the Teaching Governance Note immediately.

Domain 6 — Reflection & Pedagogical Renewal

✓ I review AI impact on learning outcomes

✓ I adapt tasks and guidance based on evidence

✓ I share learning with colleagues

If inconsistent:
Introduce a simple reflection cadence at module end.

Interpreting Your Results

- Early-domain gaps → **slow down and clarify foundations**
- Ethics or governance gaps → **increase oversight before scaling**
- Reflection gaps → **capability will stall without renewal**

Teaching capability grows through *alignment*, not acceleration.

PART B — WORKED SCENARIO: END-TO-END TEACHING PRACTICE

This scenario mirrors **routine but high-stakes teaching reality**.

Scenario

You are revising a **take-home assessment** in a module where students are actively using generative AI.
You must ensure integrity, fairness, and learning value.

Domain 1 — Awareness in Action

You recognise:

- AI can draft plausible answers quickly
- Surface-level synthesis is no longer valid evidence of learning

Design implication:
Assessment must require reasoning, not just output.

Domain 2 — Co-Agency in Action

You define roles:

Students may use AI to:

- brainstorm ideas
- clarify understanding

Students may not use AI to:

- generate final submissions without attribution

- replace analytical reasoning

Educator remains responsible for:

- assessment design
- marking standards
- fairness enforcement

These boundaries are documented and communicated.

Domain 3 — Applied Teaching & Innovation

You redesign the task to include:

- a short analytical output
- a justification of reasoning
- a reflective commentary on AI use (or non-use)

Learning evidence becomes visible.

Domain 4 — Ethics & Equity in Action

You consider:

- students unfamiliar with AI
- accessibility differences
- linguistic advantage

You:

- provide examples of acceptable AI use
- clarify expectations explicitly
- avoid penalising ethical restraint

Domain 5 — Governance in Action

You create a **Teaching Governance Note**:

- AI influenced task redesign
- Human judgement applied
- Equity risks considered

This protects assessment defensibility.

Domain 6 — Reflection in Action

After marking, you review:

- patterns of misunderstanding
- over-reliance on AI
- uneven performance across groups

You adjust guidance for next iteration.

What This Scenario Demonstrates

Good teaching with AI:

- redesigns assessment first
- documents judgement
- makes learning explicit
- improves future practice

PART C — TEACHING PRACTICE OPERATING MODEL

Your Repeatable Teaching System

This model turns principles into habit.

---

1 My Teaching-Appropriate AI Uses

Examples:

- generating alternative explanations
- drafting feedback structure
- creating counter-examples

Write yours:

---

2 My Educator–AI–Student Boundaries

AI may assist educators by:

_____

Students may use AI to:

_____

AI must never:

_____

---

3 My Teaching Ethics Red Lines

I pause AI use when:

- _____
- _____

---

4 My Teaching Governance Triggers

I document or escalate when AI affects:

- assessment design
- marking or feedback
- student progression
- curriculum standards

---

5 My Reflection & Renewal Practice

After each delivery cycle, I will:

- review learning evidence
- adjust guidance
- share insights with colleagues

Teaching capability is collective.

THE TEACHING COMMITMENT

I design learning intentionally in the presence of AI.
I protect student thinking, not just outcomes.
I make boundaries explicit and defensible.
I govern before I am challenged.
I renew teaching through evidence and reflection.
