

AI as a Teaching Partner: Practical Applications for Human Resource Education

HR Education Team

Table of contents

1	AI as a Teaching Partner	1
1.1	Practical Applications for Human Resource Education	1
1.1.1	A Guide for HR Lecturers	1
1.2	About This Booklet	1
1.2.1	Who This Is For	1
1.2.2	What You Won't Find Here	2
1.2.3	What You Will Find Here	2
1.3	How to Use This Booklet	2
1.3.1	If you're completely new to AI:	2
1.3.2	If you want to implement AI in your teaching:	2
1.3.3	If you're designing assessments:	2
1.3.4	If you teach postgraduate students:	3
1.3.5	If you're presenting to colleagues:	3
1.3.6	If you need institutional justification:	3
1.4	The Core Philosophy	3
1.5	Acknowledgments	3
1.6	Important Notes	4
1.6.1	Technology Changes Rapidly	4
1.6.2	Context Matters	4
1.6.3	This Is a Starting Point	4
1.7	Getting Help and Providing Feedback	4
1.8	A Personal Note to Readers	5
2	Table of Contents	7
2.1	Part 1: Foundation - Understanding AI for HR Education	7
2.2	Part 2: Core Techniques - The Teaching Toolkit	7
2.3	Part 3: Practical Applications - What You Can Do Tomorrow	8
2.4	Part 4: Assessment Revolution - Rethinking How We Evaluate	8
2.5	Part 5: Advanced Applications - Going Deeper	8
2.6	Appendices - Ready-to-Use Resources	9
2.7	List of Figures and Tables	9
2.7.1	Figures	9
2.7.2	Tables	9

2.8	Quick Reference Guides	10
2.8.1	For the Busy Lecturer (Where to Start)	10
2.8.2	For Students (If You Share This Resource)	10
3	Chapter 1: Introduction - Why AI Matters for HR Education	11
3.1	Welcome to the Future of HR Teaching	11
3.2	The Problem We're Solving	11
3.3	The Flight Simulator Concept	12
3.4	What Makes This Different from Traditional Teaching?	13
3.5	Three Core Principles of This Approach	13
3.5.1	1. AI as Scaffolding, Not Replacement	13
3.5.2	2. Transparency Over Prohibition	13
3.5.3	3. Start Simple, Scale Gradually	14
3.6	What You'll Learn in This Booklet	14
3.7	A Personal Note	14
4	Chapter 2: Getting Started - Your First AI Conversation	17
4.1	What You'll Do in This Chapter	17
4.2	Step 1: Accessing an AI Tool	17
4.2.1	Option A: ChatGPT (by OpenAI)	17
4.2.2	Option B: Claude (by Anthropic)	18
4.3	Step 2: Understanding Prompts	18
4.4	Your First Prompt: The Weak Version	18
4.5	Your Second Prompt: The Powerful Version	18
4.6	The Anatomy of a Good Prompt	19
4.6.1	1. Set the Role	19
4.6.2	2. Define the Context and Audience	19
4.6.3	3. Specify the Task Clearly	19
4.6.4	4. Provide Constraints and Requirements	20
4.6.5	5. Give a Clear Start Signal	20
4.7	Practice Exercise: Your Turn	20
4.8	What to Expect (and Not Expect)	21
4.8.1	What AI Does Well:	21
4.8.2	What AI Doesn't Do:	21
4.9	Troubleshooting Common Issues	21
4.10	Your First Win	21
4.11	Before You Move On	22
5	Chapter 8: Your First Steps - A Practical Guide	23
5.1	The Implementation Challenge	23
5.2	Phase 1: Personal Experimentation (Before Your Next Class)	23
5.2.1	Week 1: Your First Prompts	23
5.2.2	Week 2: Test a Simulation	24
5.2.3	Week 3: Review Your Current Assessments	24
5.3	Phase 2: Low-Stakes Student Introduction (First Month of Semester)	25
5.3.1	Approach 1: Optional Practice Exercise	25

5.3.2	Approach 2: In-Class Demonstration	25
5.3.3	Approach 3: Reflective Exercise	26
5.4	Phase 3: Pilot Assessment (Mid-Semester)	26
5.4.1	Implementation Checklist	26
5.4.2	Launch Week: Student Orientation	27
5.4.3	During the Assignment Period: Be Available	28
5.4.4	After Submission: Grading Efficiently	28
5.5	Phase 4: Gather Feedback and Iterate (End of Semester)	29
5.5.1	Student Survey (5 minutes for students to complete)	29
5.5.2	Self-Reflection Questions (For You)	30
5.5.3	Iterate for Next Time	30
5.6	Phase 5: Expand and Integrate (Next Semester)	30
5.6.1	Option 1: Refine and Repeat	30
5.6.2	Option 2: Add a Second AI Component	30
5.6.3	Option 3: Go Deeper with Existing Component	31
5.7	Managing Common Challenges	31
5.7.1	Challenge 1: Resistance from Students	31
5.7.2	Challenge 2: Resistance from Colleagues	31
5.7.3	Challenge 3: Technology Failures	31
5.7.4	Challenge 4: Uneven Student Access	32
5.7.5	Challenge 5: You're Overwhelmed	32
5.8	Measuring Success	32
5.9	Final Encouragement	33
6	Chapter 3: Seven Essential Prompt Techniques for HR Teaching	35
6.1	Why These Seven?	35
6.2	Technique 1: Reverse Prompting (for Scoping and Policy Design)	36
6.2.1	What It Does	36
6.2.2	Why It Works for HR	36
6.2.3	The Student Prompt (Ready to Use)	36
6.2.4	What Happens	36
6.2.5	Variations for Different Topics	37
6.2.6	Teaching Tip	37
6.3	Technique 2: Pros and Cons (for Decision Making)	37
6.3.1	What It Does	37
6.3.2	Why It Works for HR	37
6.3.3	The Student Prompt (Ready to Use)	37
6.3.4	What Happens	38
6.3.5	The Follow-Up Task	38
6.3.6	Variations for Different Topics	38
6.3.7	Teaching Tip	38
6.4	Technique 3: Stepwise Chain of Thought (for Process Management)	39
6.4.1	What It Does	39
6.4.2	Why It Works for HR	39
6.4.3	The Student Prompt (Ready to Use)	39
6.4.4	What Happens	39

6.4.5	Variations for Different Topics	40
6.4.6	Teaching Tip	40
6.5	Technique 4: Role Play (for Skill Building)	40
6.5.1	What It Does	40
6.5.2	Why It Works for HR	40
6.5.3	The Student Prompt (Ready to Use)	41
6.5.4	What Happens	41
6.5.5	Advanced Variation: The Difficult Conversation	41
6.5.6	Variations for Different Topics	42
6.5.7	Teaching Tip	42
6.6	Technique 5: Debating (for Strategic and Ethical Analysis)	42
6.6.1	What It Does	42
6.6.2	Why It Works for HR	43
6.6.3	Variation A: Critique and Compare	43
6.6.4	Variation B: Argue Both Sides	43
6.6.5	Variation C: Multi-Stakeholder Debate	44
6.6.6	Follow-Up Task for Students	45
6.6.7	Teaching Tip	45
6.7	Technique 6: Formative Assessment Generator (for Practice and Mastery)	45
6.7.1	What It Does	45
6.7.2	Why It Works for HR	45
6.7.3	Use Case 1: Self-Testing Knowledge	45
6.7.4	Use Case 2: Application Practice	46
6.7.5	Use Case 3: Exam Preparation	46
6.7.6	Use Case 4: Targeted Remediation	47
6.7.7	Teaching Tip: How to Integrate This	47
6.7.8	Critical Principle: Formative, Not Summative	48
6.7.9	Variation: Adaptive Difficulty	48
6.7.10	Why This Matters	49
6.7.11	Simulating Adaptive Difficulty	49
6.8	Technique 7: The Expert Panel (for Multi-Perspective Analysis)	50
6.8.1	What It Does	50
6.8.2	Why It Works for HR	50
6.8.3	The Student Prompt (Ready to Use)	50
6.8.4	What Happens	51
6.8.5	The Follow-Up Task	51
6.8.6	Variations for Different Topics	52
6.8.7	Teaching Tip: Assessment Application	52
6.8.8	Why This Is Powerful	53
6.8.9	Combining with Other Techniques	53
6.9	How to Choose Which Technique to Use	53
6.10	Combining Techniques	54
6.11	Your Action Step	54

7.1	The Three-Phase System	55
7.2	Why This Is Powerful	55
7.3	Complete Worked Example: The Performance Improvement Plan Meeting	56
7.3.1	Context	56
7.4	Phase 1: The Setup Prompt	56
7.4.1	Setup Prompt (Ready to Use)	56
7.5	Phase 2: The Simulation	57
7.5.1	Example Conversation	57
7.6	Phase 3: The Debrief (AI Critique)	59
7.6.1	Critique Prompt (Ready to Use)	59
7.6.2	Example Critique Output	60
7.7	What Makes This Critique Valuable	63
7.8	How to Use This as an Assessment	63
7.8.1	Option 1: Simulation + Critique Submission	63
7.8.2	Option 2: Simulation + Re-Do + Comparison	64
7.8.3	Option 3: Student-Designed Simulation	64
7.9	Adapting This for Different HR Topics	64
7.10	Common Questions	65
7.11	Your Action Step	66
8	Chapter 5: AI as Study Buddy - Self-Assessment Tool	67
8.1	The Academic Integrity Challenge	67
8.2	The Transparency Model	67
8.2.1	The Psychology Behind It	68
8.3	How It Works: A Step-by-Step Example	68
8.3.1	Scenario: A Written HR Case Analysis Assignment	68
8.4	Complete Worked Example	68
8.4.1	Step 1: The Assignment Prompt	68
8.4.2	Step 2: The Grading Rubric (Given to Students)	69
8.4.3	Step 3: The AI Self-Assessment Prompt (Given to Students)	71
8.5	What This Looks Like in Practice	72
8.5.1	Student's First Draft (Excerpt)	72
8.5.2	AI Feedback (Using the Prompt Above)	72
8.6	The Impact on Learning	74
8.7	What You Grade	75
8.7.1	Grading Approach	75
8.7.2	Red Flags for AI Misuse	75
8.8	Variations and Adaptations	76
8.8.1	Variation 1: Multiple Draft Checkpoints	76
8.8.2	Variation 2: Peer Review + AI Review	76
8.8.3	Variation 3: AI Critique Challenge	76
8.9	Student-Facing Instructions	76
8.10	Addressing Lecturer Concerns	77
8.11	The Bigger Picture: Teaching AI Literacy	78
8.12	Your Action Step	78

9 Chapter 9: The Ethics & Integrity Question	79
9.1 The Conversation You Must Have	79
9.2 Reframing the Question	79
9.3 The Three-Part Framework for Ethical AI Use	80
9.3.1 1. Transparency (Not Prohibition)	80
9.3.2 2. Critical Oversight (Not Blind Reliance)	80
9.3.3 3. Professional Relevance (Not Academic Abstraction) . . .	80
9.4 Student-Facing Language: Setting Expectations	81
9.4.1 Example: Unit Outline AI Policy Statement	81
9.4.2 Example: First-Day Class Discussion	82
9.5 Designing “Integrity-Resistant” Assignments	82
9.5.1 Principle 1: Assess Process, Not Just Product	83
9.5.2 Principle 2: Require Evidence of Thinking	83
9.5.3 Principle 3: Make Personal Context Essential	83
9.5.4 Principle 4: Assess Revision and Iteration	83
9.5.5 Principle 5: Require Justification of Choices	83
9.6 Red Flags for AI Misuse (And How to Address Them)	84
9.6.1 Red Flag 1: Sudden Quality Shift	84
9.6.2 Red Flag 2: Work That Doesn’t Match Assignment Context	84
9.6.3 Red Flag 3: No Evidence of Process in Process-Based Assessment	85
9.6.4 Red Flag 4: Can’t Explain or Defend Work in Person .	85
9.7 Teaching AI Ethics Through HR Scenarios	85
9.7.1 Exercise 1: The Flawed AI Termination Memo	85
9.7.2 Exercise 2: The Biased Resume Screening Tool	86
9.7.3 Exercise 3: The Over-Reliance Problem	86
9.8 Responding to Colleague and Administrator Concerns	87
9.8.1 Concern: “This undermines academic standards”	87
9.8.2 Concern: “How do you know they’re learning anything?”	87
9.8.3 Concern: “This doesn’t align with university academic integrity policies”	87
9.8.4 Concern: “What if other lecturers don’t agree?”	87
9.9 The Bigger Picture: AI Literacy as Graduate Capability	88
9.9.1 What AI Literacy Means for HR Graduates	88
9.10 A Final Ethical Consideration	88
9.11 Your Action Step	89
10 Chapter 7: Process Over Product - Rethinking Assessment	91
10.1 The Fundamental Question	91
10.2 Why This Wasn’t Possible Before	92
10.3 Assessment Model 1: Simulated HR Consultation and Process Audit	92
10.3.1 Overview	92
10.3.2 Learning Objectives Assessed	92
10.3.3 Assignment Structure	92
10.3.4 The Process Audit Template	93

10.3.5 What You Grade	94
10.3.6 Why This Works	95
10.4 Assessment Model 2: Evidence-Based Strategic Intervention Plan	95
10.4.1 Overview	95
10.4.2 Learning Objectives Assessed	95
10.4.3 Assignment Structure	95
10.4.4 Assessment Rubric	96
10.4.5 Why This Works	97
10.4.6 Example of Strong Student Work	98
10.5 Assessment Model 3: Competency-Based Recruitment Portfolio	98
10.5.1 Overview	98
10.5.2 Learning Objectives Assessed	98
10.5.3 Assignment Structure	99
10.5.4 The Critical Override Exercise (Example)	99
10.5.5 Assessment Rubric	100
10.5.6 Why This Works	101
10.6 The Common Thread: Process as Evidence	101
10.7 Implementation Tips	102
10.7.1 Start with One Model	102
10.7.2 Provide Scaffolding	102
10.7.3 Align with Professional Standards	102
10.7.4 Use AI for Initial Review (Optional)	102
10.8 Your Action Step	102
11 Chapter 6: Virtual Company Simulation (Future Horizon)	105
11.1 The Big Idea	105
11.2 Why This Matters	105
11.3 The Progressive Implementation Model	106
11.3.1 Level 1: Single Employee Persona (Master Prompt)	106
11.3.2 Level 2: Multiple Employee Personas (Cast of Characters)	106
11.3.3 Level 3: Persistent Context (Company Memory)	106
11.3.4 Level 4: Dynamic Events (Evolving Scenarios)	106
11.4 Level 1: Single Employee Persona (Master Prompt)	106
11.4.1 The Master Prompt Template	106
11.4.2 How Students Use This	107
11.5 Level 2: Multiple Employee Personas (Cast of Characters)	108
11.5.1 Scenario: The Performance Management Conflict	108
11.5.2 Creating the Cast	108
11.5.3 The Multi-Persona Assignment	110
11.6 Level 3: Persistent Context (Company Memory)	110
11.6.1 Technical Approach	110
11.6.2 Sequential Assignment Example	111
11.6.3 What This Teaches	111
11.6.4 Example: Persistent Consequences	112
11.7 Level 4: Dynamic Events (Evolving Scenarios)	112
11.7.1 How It Works	112

11.7.2 Why This Is Powerful	113
11.7.3 Semester-Long Virtual Company Project	113
11.8 Practical Implementation Guidance	114
11.8.1 Starting Small	114
11.8.2 Creating Consistent Personas	114
11.8.3 Technical Options	114
11.8.4 Assessment Approaches	115
11.9 Common Questions	115
11.10 The Vision: HR Education Transformed	116
11.11 Your Action Step	116
12 Chapter 10: Designing an AI-Integrated Unit	119
12.1 Beyond Individual Assignments: Whole-Unit Design	119
12.2 The Backwards Design Approach	119
12.2.1 Step 1: Define Learning Outcomes (AI-Neutral)	119
12.2.2 Step 2: Design Assessments (How Will Students Demonstrate Mastery?)	120
12.2.3 Step 3: Map Learning Activities (How Will Students Prepare for Assessments?)	120
12.3 Complete 12-Week Unit Design Example	121
12.3.1 Week 1: Introduction to Conflict and Introduction to AI .	121
12.3.2 Week 2: Conflict Theory and AI Exploration	121
12.3.3 Week 3: Communication Skills for Conflict	121
12.3.4 Week 4: Legal Framework and Procedural Fairness . . .	122
12.3.5 Week 5: Investigation Skills	122
12.3.6 Week 6: Assessment 1 Due - Investigation Interview Simulation	123
12.3.7 Week 7: Feedback Week + Mediation Theory	123
12.3.8 Week 8: Facilitation Skills	123
12.3.9 Week 9: Cultural and Ethical Considerations	124
12.3.10 Week 10: Designing Interventions	124
12.3.11 Week 11: Assessment 2 Due - Conflict Resolution Portfolio	125
12.3.12 Week 12: Contemporary Issues and Research Essay Support	125
12.3.13 Week 13: Assessment 3 Due - Research Essay	125
12.4 The Scaffolding Progression Model	125
12.5 Balancing AI and Non-AI Activities	126
12.5.1 This unit includes traditional elements:	126
12.5.2 The 60/40 rule:	126
12.6 Supporting Student AI Literacy Development	127
12.6.1 Week 1: What AI Is (and Isn't)	127
12.6.2 Week 4: Prompt Engineering	127
12.6.3 Week 7: Critical Evaluation	127
12.6.4 Week 9: Professional Ethics	127
12.7 Unit Outline Template (for Your Own Design)	127
12.7.1 UNIT INFORMATION	127

12.7.2 LEARNING OUTCOMES (AI-neutral)	128
12.7.3 ASSESSMENT SUMMARY	128
12.7.4 WEEKLY SCHEDULE	128
12.7.5 AI LITERACY PROGRESSION	128
12.7.6 BALANCE CHECK	128
12.7.7 STUDENT SUPPORT	128
12.8 Common Design Mistakes to Avoid	129
12.8.1 Mistake 1: “AI for AI’s Sake”	129
12.8.2 Mistake 2: All or Nothing	129
12.8.3 Mistake 3: Assuming Technical Competence	129
12.8.4 Mistake 4: No Progression	129
12.8.5 Mistake 5: Ignoring Equity	129
12.9 Aligning Unit Design with Program Goals	129
12.9.1 Consider:	129
12.10 Communicating the Design to Students	130
12.10.1 First lecture (explain the approach):	130
12.10.2 In your unit outline (be explicit):	130
12.11 Evaluating Your AI-Integrated Unit	130
12.11.1 Student learning evidence:	131
12.11.2 Student feedback:	131
12.11.3 Your experience:	131
12.11.4 Iterate and refine based on evidence.	131
12.12 Your Action Step	131
13 Chapter 11: The Research Assistant (Postgraduate Focus)	133
13.1 AI in Research: Promise and Peril	133
13.2 The Core Principle: AI for Process, Human for Insight	133
13.3 Application 1: Literature Review	134
13.3.1 The Challenge	134
13.3.2 How AI Can Help (Appropriately)	134
13.3.3 How AI Can Be Misused	135
13.3.4 Teaching Students Appropriate Literature Review with AI	136
13.4 Application 2: Research Question Development	136
13.4.1 The Challenge	136
13.4.2 How AI Can Help (Appropriately)	136
13.4.3 How AI Can Be Misused	137
13.5 Application 3: Data Analysis (Qualitative Research)	138
13.5.1 The Challenge	138
13.5.2 How AI Can Help (Appropriately)	138
13.5.3 How AI Can Be Misused	139
13.6 Application 4: Thesis Writing	139
13.6.1 The Challenge	139
13.6.2 How AI Can Help (Appropriately)	139
13.6.3 How AI Can Be Misused	140
13.7 Application 5: Research Proposal Development	141

13.7.1 Assignment: MCom Research Proposal with AI Documentation	141
13.8 Teaching AI Literacy for Research	142
13.8.1 Principle 1: AI Accelerates Process, Humans Provide Insight	142
13.8.2 Principle 2: Always Verify	142
13.8.3 Principle 3: Use AI to Challenge Your Thinking	143
13.9 Supervising Research Students Using AI	143
13.9.1 As a Supervisor, You Should:	143
13.10 Red Flags for Over-Reliance on AI in Research	144
13.11 Sample Unit: Research Methods in HR (MCom)	144
13.11.1 Week 1: Introduction to Research and AI	144
13.11.2 Week 2: Literature Review Skills	144
13.11.3 Week 3: Research Question Development	144
13.11.4 Week 4: Qualitative Methods	144
13.11.5 Week 5: Qualitative Data Analysis	145
13.11.6 Week 6: Quantitative Methods	145
13.11.7 Week 7: Mixed Methods	145
13.11.8 Week 8: Research Ethics	145
13.11.9 Week 9-10: Proposal Development	145
13.11.10 Week 11: Presenting Research	145
13.11.11 Week 12: Final Proposal Due	145
13.12 Key Principle for Postgraduate AI Integration	146
13.13 Your Action Step	146
14 Conclusion: Where Do We Go From Here?	147
14.1 What You've Learned	147
14.2 The Question That Matters	147
14.3 Start With One Thing	148
14.3.1 Option 1: Try It Yourself (This Week)	148
14.3.2 Option 2: Student Demonstration (Next Class)	148
14.3.3 Option 3: Low-Stakes Practice Exercise (This Semester) .	149
14.3.4 Option 4: Pilot Assessment (Next Semester)	149
14.3.5 Option 5: Full Unit Redesign (Next Academic Year) . .	149
14.4 Pick one. Not five. One.	149
14.5 What Success Looks Like	150
14.5.1 Short-Term Success (First Semester)	150
14.5.2 Medium-Term Success (Within 2-3 Semesters)	150
14.5.3 Long-Term Success (3+ Years)	150
14.6 Avoiding Common Pitfalls	151
14.6.1 Pitfall 1: Technology for Technology's Sake	151
14.6.2 Pitfall 2: Assuming Technical Competence	151
14.6.3 Pitfall 3: No Clear Assessment Criteria	151
14.6.4 Pitfall 4: Ignoring Equity	152
14.6.5 Pitfall 5: Blind Faith in AI Outputs	152
14.7 Building Community	152
14.7.1 Within Curtin:	152

14.7.2 Beyond Curtin:	152
14.8 The Bigger Picture: Transforming HR Education	153
14.8.1 Vision for HR Education with AI Integration	153
14.9 Your Legacy	153
14.10 Final Words	154
14.11 One Last Thing	154
15 About the Author	157
16 Colophon	159
17 Chapter 13: From Static to Interactive - AI-Powered Activity Transformation	161
17.1 The Challenge: Static Documents Don't Engage	161
17.2 The Solution: AI-Generated Interactive HTML	161
17.2.1 What It Looks Like	161
17.2.2 Why HTML?	162
17.3 The Transformation Process	162
17.3.1 Step 1: Prepare Your Static Content	162
17.3.2 Step 2: Use AI to Generate Interactive HTML	162
17.4 Example Transformations	163
17.4.1 Before: Static Case Study	163
17.4.2 After: Interactive Simulation	163
17.4.3 Before: Worksheet	163
17.4.4 After: Interactive Form	163
17.5 Practical Examples for HR Education	164
17.5.1 1. Performance Review Simulation	164
17.5.2 2. Policy Analysis Tool	164
17.5.3 3. Recruitment Decision Tree	164
17.6 Uploading to Blackboard	164
17.6.1 Simple Steps	164
17.6.2 Alternative: Embed Directly	164
17.7 Design Best Practices	165
17.7.1 Keep It Professional	165
17.7.2 Ensure Accessibility	165
17.7.3 Mobile Optimization	165
17.8 Getting Started Template	165
17.8.1 Quick Start Prompt	165
17.8.2 Advanced Features Prompt	165
17.9 Integration with Existing Activities	166
17.9.1 Activity Upgrade Path	166
17.9.2 Scaling Up	166
17.10 Success Stories	166
17.10.1 Case Study: Performance Management Unit	166
17.10.2 Case Study: HR Policy Compliance	166
17.11 Technical Tips	167

17.11.1 Testing Your HTML	167
17.11.2 Common Issues & Solutions	167
17.12 Measuring Success	167
17.12.1 Engagement Metrics	167
17.12.2 Learning Outcomes	167
17.13 Continuous Improvement	167
17.13.1 Student Feedback Loop	167
17.13.2 Technical Maintenance	168
17.14 Ready-to-Use Prompt Library	168
17.14.1 Basic Transformation	168
17.14.2 Scenario Simulation	168
17.14.3 Assessment Tool	168
17.15 Next Steps	168
18 Appendix A: Ready-to-Use Prompt Library	169
18.1 How to Use This Appendix	169
18.2 Section 1: Content Generation Prompts	169
18.2.1 1.1 Case Study Generator	169
18.2.2 1.2 Behavioural Interview Question Generator	170
18.2.3 1.3 Policy Analysis Exercise Generator	170
18.2.4 1.4 Complex Scenario with Multiple Stakeholders	171
18.2.5 1.5 Data Analysis Scenario Generator	172
18.3 Section 2: Conversation Simulation Prompts	172
18.3.1 2.1 Difficult Employee Performance Conversation	172
18.3.2 2.2 Union Representative in Bargaining	173
18.3.3 2.3 Employee Making Discrimination Complaint	174
18.3.4 2.4 Manager Resistant to HR Initiative	175
18.4 Section 3: Assessment and Critique Prompts	176
18.4.1 3.1 Conversation Transcript Critique (for lecturers)	176
18.4.2 3.2 Written Assignment Critique Template	177
18.4.3 3.3 AI Output Evaluation Prompt (for students critiquing AI)	178
18.5 Section 4: Student Self-Assessment Prompts	179
18.5.1 4.1 Draft Essay Self-Check	179
18.5.2 4.2 Conversation Practice Self-Evaluation	180
18.5.3 4.3 Theory Application Check	180
18.6 Section 5: Ethical Analysis Prompts	181
18.6.1 5.1 Identifying AI Bias in HR Tools	181
18.6.2 5.2 Evaluating AI Policy Draft for Ethical Issues	182
18.6.3 5.3 Exploring AI Accountability Scenarios	182
18.7 Section 6: Research and Postgraduate Prompts	183
18.7.1 6.1 Literature Search and Exploration	183
18.7.2 6.2 Research Question Refinement (Socratic Method)	184
18.7.3 6.3 Qualitative Data Preliminary Coding	184
18.7.4 6.4 Thesis Structure and Argumentation Check	185
18.7.5 6.5 Methodology Feasibility Check	185

18.7.6 6.6 Citation Verification Reminder (Not a Prompt—A Protocol)	186
18.7.7 How to Use These Research Prompts	187
18.8 How to Adapt These Prompts	187
18.9 Testing Your Prompts	187
18.10 Final Notes	188
19 Appendix B: One-Hour Faculty Workshop Guide	189
19.1 Workshop Title	189
19.2 Target Audience	189
19.3 Workshop Goals	189
19.4 Pre-Workshop Preparation (15 minutes)	189
19.4.1 Materials Needed	189
19.4.2 Technical Setup	190
19.4.3 Room Setup	190
19.5 Workshop Agenda (60 minutes)	190
19.5.1 Segment 1: Opening and Context (10 minutes)	190
19.5.2 Segment 2: Live Demonstration (20 minutes)	191
19.5.3 Segment 3: Hands-On Practice (20 minutes)	193
19.5.4 Segment 4: Addressing Concerns and Next Steps (10 minutes)	193
19.6 Quick Start Guide (Handout Template)	195
19.6.1 QUICK START GUIDE: AI IN HR TEACHING	195
19.7 Post-Workshop Follow-Up	196
19.7.1 Within 1 Week:	196
19.7.2 Within 1 Month:	196
19.7.3 End of Semester:	196
19.8 Variations for Different Workshop Formats	196
19.8.1 30-Minute Lightning Version	196
19.8.2 90-Minute Extended Version	197
19.8.3 Half-Day Workshop	197
19.9 Facilitation Tips	197
19.9.1 Managing Skepticism	197
19.9.2 Managing Enthusiasm	197
19.9.3 Managing Technical Anxiety	197
19.10 Key Messages to Reinforce Throughout	198
19.11 Success Indicators (How to Know the Workshop Worked)	198
19.12 Final Facilitation Note	198
20 Appendix C: Alignment with Curtin University Learning Outcomes	201
20.1 Purpose of This Appendix	201
20.2 Curtin University Strategic Context	201
20.3 HR Program Overview	202
20.3.1 Bachelor of Science (Psychology), Bachelor of Commerce (Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations)	202

20.3.2 Human Resources Major (MCom) - Postgraduate	202
20.4 Learning Outcome Alignment Matrix	202
20.5 Core Learning Outcome 1: Apply Psychological Theory to Evidence-Based Practice	202
20.5.1 Curtin Expectation:	202
20.5.2 How AI Integration Supports This:	202
20.5.3 Evidence of Learning:	203
20.6 Core Learning Outcome 2: Knowledge of Relevant Legislative and Legal Rules	203
20.6.1 Curtin Expectation:	203
20.6.2 How AI Integration Supports This:	203
20.6.3 Evidence of Learning:	204
20.7 Core Learning Outcome 3: Demonstrate Effective Communication and Empathetic Practices	204
20.7.1 Curtin Expectation:	204
20.7.2 How AI Integration Supports This:	204
20.7.3 Evidence of Learning:	205
20.8 Core Learning Outcome 4: Apply Professional Skills in an Ethical Manner	205
20.8.1 Curtin Expectation:	205
20.8.2 How AI Integration Supports This:	205
20.8.3 Evidence of Learning:	206
20.9 Core Learning Outcome 5: Utilise Critical Thinking Skills to Evaluate and Integrate Information	206
20.9.1 Curtin Expectation:	206
20.9.2 How AI Integration Supports This:	206
20.9.3 Evidence of Learning:	207
20.10 Core Learning Outcome 6: Ability for Self-Directed Learning and Reflective Practice	207
20.10.1 Curtin Expectation:	207
20.10.2 How AI Integration Supports This:	207
20.10.3 Evidence of Learning:	208
20.11 Core Learning Outcome 7: Demonstrate Technological Proficiency in HR Management Contexts	208
20.11.1 Curtin Expectation:	208
20.11.2 How AI Integration Supports This:	208
20.11.3 Evidence of Learning:	209
20.12 Core Learning Outcome 8: Resolve Issues in the Workplace	209
20.12.1 Curtin Expectation:	209
20.12.2 How AI Integration Supports This:	209
20.12.3 Evidence of Learning:	210
20.13 Core Learning Outcome 9: Recruit Employees and Improve Individual and Team Performance	210
20.13.1 Curtin Expectation:	210
20.13.2 How AI Integration Supports This:	210
20.13.3 Evidence of Learning:	210

20.14 Alignment with Professional Career Outcomes	211
20.14.1 Human Resources Officer/Consultant	211
20.14.2 Recruitment Consultant	211
20.14.3 Industrial Relations Officer/Consultant	211
20.14.4 Organisational Development Consultant	211
20.15 Addressing Potential Institutional Concerns	212
20.15.1 Concern: “Does AI integration compromise academic standards?”	212
20.15.2 Concern: “How does this align with academic integrity policies?”	212
20.15.3 Concern: “What evidence supports this pedagogical approach?”	212
20.16 Implementation Recommendations for Curtin HR Programs	213
20.16.1 Short-Term (Current Semester)	213
20.16.2 Medium-Term (Next Academic Year)	213
20.16.3 Long-Term (2-3 Years)	213
20.17 Alignment with Curtin University Strategic Priorities	213
20.18 Conclusion	214
20.19 For Further Discussion	214

Chapter 1

AI as a Teaching Partner

1.1 Practical Applications for Human Resource Education

1.1.1 A Guide for HR Lecturers

Curtin University Edition

Version 1.0 / 2025

1.2 About This Booklet

This booklet is designed for Human Resource Management lecturers who want to enhance their teaching with Artificial Intelligence but don't consider themselves "tech people."

You won't need to code, install complex software, or understand how AI works technically. What you will learn is how to use simple, plain-language instructions (called "prompts") to create powerful learning experiences for your students.

1.2.1 Who This Is For

- HR lecturers at Curtin University teaching undergraduate or postgraduate students
- Academics interested in innovative pedagogy for professional education

- Unit coordinators exploring AI integration aligned with learning outcomes
- Research supervisors supporting MCom students
- Anyone curious about practical, non-technical AI applications in education

1.2.2 What You Won't Find Here

- Technical AI theory or computer science concepts
- Coding or programming requirements
- Abstract discussions about AI's future
- Complex software installation guides
- "One size fits all" solutions

1.2.3 What You Will Find Here

- **Concrete examples:** Every chapter includes ready-to-use prompts and scenarios
 - **Practical guidance:** Step-by-step implementation for busy lecturers
 - **Real pedagogical value:** AI applications directly support existing learning outcomes
 - **Honest assessment:** What AI does well, what it doesn't, and what requires human judgment
 - **Ethical frameworks:** How to integrate AI responsibly and teach students to do the same
-

1.3 How to Use This Booklet

1.3.1 If you're completely new to AI:

Start with **Chapter 1** (motivation) and **Chapter 2** (your first AI conversation). Work through the basics before exploring advanced applications.

1.3.2 If you want to implement AI in your teaching:

Read **Chapter 3** (your first steps) for a practical implementation plan. Then move to **Chapter 4** (six essential techniques) and pick one to try immediately. Refer to **Appendix A** for copy-paste prompts.

1.3.3 If you're designing assessments:

Read **Chapter 8** (process-based assessment models) and **Chapter 10** (complete unit design). Use these frameworks to redesign existing assignments.

1.3.4 If you teach postgraduate students:

Focus on **Chapter 11** (AI as research assistant) for guidance on appropriate AI use in research contexts.

1.3.5 If you're presenting to colleagues:

Use **Appendix B** (one-hour faculty workshop guide) as a facilitation template.

1.3.6 If you need institutional justification:

Refer to **Appendix C** (alignment with Curtin learning outcomes) to demonstrate how AI integration supports existing educational goals.

1.4 The Core Philosophy

Three principles underpin everything in this booklet:

1. AI as Scaffolding, Not Replacement

You are the expert educator. AI is a tool that helps you scale what you already know works—personalized practice, immediate feedback, realistic simulations. AI builds the framework quickly; you ensure it's pedagogically sound and academically rigorous.

2. Transparency Over Prohibition

Rather than trying to prevent AI use (impossible and counterproductive), we teach students to use AI openly, critically, and ethically. This prepares them for professional HR practice where AI tools are standard.

3. Start Small, Scale Gradually

You don't need to revolutionize your entire curriculum overnight. Start with one prompt, one assignment, one semester. Build confidence and capability progressively.

1.5 Acknowledgments

This booklet synthesizes ideas from multiple sources:

- Prompt engineering techniques adapted for professional education contexts
- Curtin University program information and learning outcomes
- Pedagogical frameworks from experiential learning, reflective practice, and authentic assessment
- Professional HR practice standards and ethical guidelines

- Emerging research on AI in higher education

The goal is not to be cutting-edge or technically impressive. The goal is to help HR educators do their work better—prepare confident, competent, ethical professionals for complex workplaces.

1.6 Important Notes

1.6.1 Technology Changes Rapidly

AI tools evolve quickly. Specific platform names (ChatGPT, Claude, etc.) and capabilities described here reflect the state of technology in early 2025. The principles and pedagogical approaches remain relevant even as specific tools change.

1.6.2 Context Matters

This booklet was developed for Curtin University's HR programs. If you're at a different institution or teaching a different discipline, you'll need to adapt examples, learning outcomes, and institutional references. The frameworks are transferable; the specifics may not be.

1.6.3 This Is a Starting Point

Consider this booklet a foundation, not a complete solution. You'll discover what works for your students, your teaching style, and your context through experimentation. The appendices provide templates you can adapt and build upon.

1.7 Getting Help and Providing Feedback

As you implement ideas from this booklet, you may have questions, encounter challenges, or discover innovative applications we didn't consider.

For Curtin staff: - Contact your Faculty Teaching and Learning team for pedagogical support
- Consult with IT Services for technical access and troubleshooting
- Connect with colleagues who are experimenting with AI integration
- Consider forming a learning community around AI-enhanced teaching

For others: - Adapt frameworks to your institutional context
- Share successes and failures with your teaching and learning community
- Contribute to the growing body of practice around AI in education

1.8 A Personal Note to Readers

If you’re feeling skeptical about AI in education, that’s healthy. Technology is not inherently good or bad—it’s how we use it that matters.

If you’re worried this is too technical, I promise it’s not. If you can write an email, you can write an AI prompt.

If you’re concerned about losing control of your teaching, you won’t. You’ll gain new capabilities while maintaining your pedagogical judgment and professional expertise.

The goal of this booklet is simple: **by the end, you should feel excited and equipped to try one new thing in your next class.**

That’s it. One simulation. One new assessment approach. One conversation where a student gets to practice being an HR professional in a safe environment before they face real workplace challenges.

Because ultimately, that’s what we’re here for.

Let’s begin.

Next: Table of Contents

Chapter 2

Table of Contents

2.1 Part 1: Foundation - Understanding AI for HR Education

Chapter 1: Introduction - Why AI Matters for HR Education
1 - The Problem We're Solving - The Flight Simulator Concept - What Makes This Different from Traditional Teaching - Three Core Principles of This Approach

Chapter 2: Getting Started - Your First AI Conversation 15
- Accessing an AI Tool (Step-by-Step) - Understanding Prompts - The Anatomy of a Good Prompt - Practice Exercise: Your Turn - Troubleshooting Common Issues

Chapter 3: Your First Steps - A Practical Implementation Guide 28 - Phase 1: Personal Experimentation - Phase 2: Low-Stakes Student Introduction - Phase 3: Pilot Assessment - Phase 4: Gather Feedback and Iterate - Phase 5: Expand and Integrate

2.2 Part 2: Core Techniques - The Teaching Toolkit

Chapter 4: Six Essential Prompt Techniques for HR Teaching 45 - Technique 1: Reverse Prompting (for Scoping and Policy Design)
- Technique 2: Pros and Cons (for Decision Making) - Technique 3: Stepwise Chain of Thought (for Process Management) - Technique 4: Role Play (for Skill Building) - Technique 5: Debating (for Strategic and Ethical Analysis)
- Technique 6: Formative Assessment Generator (for Practice and Mastery) - How to Choose Which Technique to Use - Combining Techniques

2.3 Part 3: Practical Applications - What You Can Do Tomorrow

Chapter 5: The Flight Simulator - Conversation Simulations
69 - The Three-Phase System (Setup, Simulation, Debrief) - Complete Worked Example: The Performance Improvement Plan Meeting - Adapting This for Different HR Topics - How to Use This as an Assessment - Common Questions and Answers	
Chapter 6: AI as Study Buddy - Self-Assessment Tool	95
- The Academic Integrity Challenge - The Transparency Model - Complete Worked Example (Assignment → Rubric → Self-Assessment) - Variations and Adaptations - Teaching AI Literacy	

Chapter 7: The Ethics & Integrity Question	112
- Reframing the Question (Prevention vs. Preparation) - The Three-Part Framework for Ethical AI Use - Student-Facing Language: Setting Expectations - Designing “Integrity-Resistant” Assignments - Red Flags for AI Misuse (And How to Address Them) - Teaching AI Ethics Through HR Scenarios	

2.4 Part 4: Assessment Revolution - Rethinking How We Evaluate

Chapter 8: Process Over Product - Rethinking Assessment
139 - The Fundamental Question (What Are We Really Assessing?) - Assessment Model 1: Simulated HR Consultation and Process Audit - Assessment Model 2: Evidence-Based Strategic Intervention Plan - Assessment Model 3: Competency-Based Recruitment Portfolio - The Common Thread: Process as Evidence	

Chapter 9: Virtual Company Simulation (Future Horizon)
166 - Level 1: Single Employee Persona (Master Prompt) - Level 2: Multiple Employee Personas (Cast of Characters) - Level 3: Persistent Context (Company Memory) - Level 4: Dynamic Events (Evolving Scenarios) - Semester-Long Virtual Company Project - Practical Implementation Guidance	

2.5 Part 5: Advanced Applications - Going Deeper

Chapter 10: Designing an AI-Integrated Unit	192
- Beyond Individual Assignments: Whole-Unit Design - The Backwards Design Approach - Complete 12-Week Unit Design Example - The Scaffolding Progression Model - Balancing AI and Non-AI Activities - Supporting Student AI Literacy Development - Common Design Mistakes to Avoid	

Chapter 11: The Research Assistant (Postgraduate Focus)
--	-------

219 - AI in Research: Promise and Peril - The Core Principle: AI for Process, Human for Insight - Application 1: Literature Review - Application 2: Research Question Development - Application 3: Data Analysis (Qualitative Research) - Application 4: Thesis Writing - Application 5: Research Proposal Development - Teaching AI Literacy for Research - Supervising Research Students Using AI

2.6 Appendices - Ready-to-Use Resources

Appendix A: Ready-to-Use Prompt Library 246 - Section 1: Content Generation Prompts (5 prompts) - Section 2: Conversation Simulation Prompts (4 prompts) - Section 3: Assessment and Critique Prompts (3 prompts) - Section 4: Student Self-Assessment Prompts (3 prompts) - Section 5: Ethical Analysis Prompts (3 prompts) - How to Adapt These Prompts - Testing Your Prompts

Appendix B: One-Hour Faculty Workshop Guide 269 - Pre-Workshop Preparation - Workshop Agenda (60 minutes) - Quick Start Guide (Handout Template) - Post-Workshop Follow-Up - Variations for Different Workshop Formats - Facilitation Tips - Success Indicators

Appendix C: Alignment with Curtin University Learning Outcomes 290 - Curtin University Strategic Context - HR Program Overview - Learning Outcome Alignment Matrix (9 Core Outcomes) - Alignment with Professional Career Outcomes - Addressing Potential Institutional Concerns - Implementation Recommendations for Curtin HR Programs - Alignment with Curtin University Strategic Priorities

Conclusion: Where Do We Go From Here? 310

2.7 List of Figures and Tables

2.7.1 Figures

- Figure 1: The Three-Phase Conversation Simulation System (Chapter 5)
- Figure 2: AI Integration Progression Model (Chapter 10)
- Figure 3: Research AI Use Framework (Chapter 11)

2.7.2 Tables

- Table 1: Technique Selection Guide (Chapter 4)
 - Table 2: Assessment Model Comparison (Chapter 8)
 - Table 3: Weekly AI Complexity Progression (Chapter 10)
 - Table 4: Learning Outcome Alignment Matrix (Appendix C)
-

2.8 Quick Reference Guides

2.8.1 For the Busy Lecturer (Where to Start)

1. Never used AI before? → Chapter 2 (15 minutes)
2. Want to try something today? → Chapter 4 + Appendix A (30 minutes)
3. Planning next semester? → Chapter 10 (60 minutes)
4. Facing assessment redesign? → Chapter 8 (45 minutes)
5. Need to convince colleagues? → Appendix B + Appendix C (30 minutes)

2.8.2 For Students (If You Share This Resource)

- Chapter 2: Learn how to use AI tools
 - Chapter 4: Six techniques for better learning
 - Chapter 6: Using AI for self-assessment
 - Chapter 7: Using AI ethically and responsibly
 - Chapter 11: AI as research assistant (postgraduate)
-

Let's begin with Chapter 1.

Chapter 3

Chapter 1: Introduction - Why AI Matters for HR Education

3.1 Welcome to the Future of HR Teaching

If you’re reading this, you might be feeling a mix of curiosity and apprehension about Artificial Intelligence. Perhaps you’ve heard colleagues mention ChatGPT, or you’ve seen headlines about AI transforming education. Maybe you’re wondering if this is just another passing tech trend, or if it’s something you actually need to pay attention to.

Here’s the truth: **AI is not here to replace you as an educator. It’s here to give you superpowers.**

This booklet is written specifically for Human Resources lecturers who want to enhance their teaching but don’t consider themselves “tech people.” You won’t need to code, install complex software, or understand how AI actually works under the hood. What you will learn is how to use simple, plain-language instructions (called “prompts”) to create powerful learning experiences for your students.

3.2 The Problem We’re Solving

As an HR educator, you face a persistent challenge: **how do you prepare students for the messy, high-stakes reality of HR work when your classroom is safe, controlled, and hypothetical?**

You can teach students the theory of performance management, employment

law, and conflict resolution. You can give them case studies to analyse. You can even do role-plays in class. But here's what you can't easily do:

- Let every student practice a difficult termination conversation multiple times until they get it right
- Give them immediate, detailed feedback on their communication style in a grievance meeting
- Create 30 different complex HR scenarios tailored to each student's learning needs
- Allow them to make catastrophic mistakes (firing someone illegally, violating privacy laws, mishandling discrimination) in a risk-free environment
- Scale personalised practice to hundreds of students

Until now.

3.3 The Flight Simulator Concept

Think about how pilots are trained. They don't learn to handle engine failure during a storm by reading a textbook. They don't practice emergency landings by watching videos. They use **flight simulators**—sophisticated environments where they can crash the plane, make terrible decisions, experience rare scenarios, and learn from catastrophic failures without anyone getting hurt.

That's what AI can do for HR education.

AI conversation tools can create a **professional practice simulator** where your students can:

- Have difficult conversations with “employees” who are defensive, emotional, or manipulative
- Navigate complex disciplinary processes step-by-step with immediate feedback
- Practice recruitment interviews with candidates who have hidden biases or legal red flags
- Make strategic HR decisions and see the AI analyse their reasoning for ethical gaps
- Experience the same high-stakes scenario five different ways to understand nuance

And here's the remarkable part: **after the simulation, the AI can act as an expert supervisor**, reviewing the transcript of what happened and providing detailed critique based on HR theory, employment law, and ethical standards.

3.4 What Makes This Different from Traditional Teaching?

Traditional HR education often focuses on **product**—the final answer, the correct policy, the right theoretical framework. Students write essays, complete exams, and submit reports that demonstrate they *know* things.

But HR professional work is about **process**—the methodology of how you investigate a complaint, the approach you take in a negotiation, the steps you follow to ensure fair dismissal, the communication style you use to de-escalate conflict.

AI allows us to assess and teach process, not just product.

Instead of asking “Can the student define procedural fairness?” we can now ask: - “Watch this student conduct a disciplinary meeting. Did they actually *demonstrate* procedural fairness?” - “Review this student’s conversation with an underperforming employee. Did they apply motivational theory appropriately?” - “Analyse how this student navigated a discrimination complaint. Where did their process break down?”

This shift—from testing knowledge recall to evaluating applied professional methodology—is transformational for HR education.

3.5 Three Core Principles of This Approach

As you read through this booklet and begin experimenting with AI in your teaching, keep these three principles in mind:

3.5.1 1. AI as Scaffolding, Not Replacement

AI is like a construction crew that can quickly build the framework for complex learning scenarios—generating interview questions, drafting policy outlines, creating simulated employees, analysing student responses. But your role as the educator is irreplaceable: you design the learning objectives, you set the ethical boundaries, you guide students to inspect and refine their work, and you ensure the final structure is robust and professionally sound.

3.5.2 2. Transparency Over Prohibition

Many educators worry about students using AI to cheat. This booklet takes the opposite approach: **give students the AI tools, teach them to use AI ethically, and grade them on their ability to critically evaluate and improve AI outputs.**

In the real world, HR professionals will use AI tools. Our job isn’t to prevent that—it’s to ensure they can use them responsibly, identify their limitations, and maintain human judgment on ethical and legal matters.

3.5.3 3. Start Simple, Scale Gradually

You don't need to revolutionize your entire curriculum tomorrow. This booklet will show you how to start with a single prompt, try one simulation exercise, or enhance one assessment. Each chapter builds progressively, so you can adopt techniques at your own pace.

3.6 What You'll Learn in This Booklet

Part 1 (Chapters 1-2) introduces you to AI and walks you through your first successful AI interaction. No prior experience needed.

Part 2 (Chapter 3) gives you five proven prompt techniques specifically adapted for HR education—tools you can use immediately.

Part 3 (Chapters 4-6) shows you three powerful applications: conversation simulations, self-assessment tools, and virtual company scenarios. Each chapter includes complete worked examples.

Part 4 (Chapter 7) reimagines assessment in HR education, showing you how to grade professional process rather than just theoretical knowledge.

Part 5 (Chapters 8-9) provides practical implementation guidance and addresses the academic integrity question directly.

The Appendices give you ready-to-use prompts, a workshop guide for colleagues, and alignment with Curtin's learning outcomes.

3.7 A Personal Note

If you're feeling skeptical, that's healthy. If you're worried this is too technical, I promise it's not. If you're concerned about losing control of your teaching, you won't—you'll gain new capabilities.

The goal of this booklet is simple: **by the end, you should feel excited and equipped to try one new thing in your next class.**

That's it. One simulation. One new assessment approach. One conversation where a student gets to practice being an HR professional in a safe environment before they step into the real world.

Because ultimately, that's what we're here for: to send confident, competent, ethical HR professionals out into workplaces where they'll face situations we can't fully predict or control. AI gives us a way to prepare them better.

Let's begin.

Next Chapter Preview: In Chapter 2, you'll have your first conversation with an AI tool. We'll walk through exactly what to type, what to expect, and how to think about prompts as instructions to a very capable (but not infallible) assistant.

Chapter 4

Chapter 2: Getting Started - Your First AI Conversation

4.1 What You'll Do in This Chapter

In the next 15 minutes, you're going to have your first productive conversation with an AI tool. By the end of this chapter, you'll understand:

- How to access free AI tools (no installation required)
- What a “prompt” actually is
- How to write clear instructions that get useful results
- The difference between a weak prompt and a powerful one
- How to think about AI as a teaching assistant, not a magic oracle

Let's jump straight in.

4.2 Step 1: Accessing an AI Tool

You have several free options. I recommend starting with one of these two:

4.2.1 Option A: ChatGPT (by OpenAI)

1. Go to chat.openai.com in any web browser
2. Create a free account (takes 2 minutes)
3. You'll see a simple text box at the bottom of the screen
4. That's it—you're ready to go

4.2.2 Option B: Claude (by Anthropic)

1. Go to claude.ai in any web browser
2. Create a free account
3. Same interface—a clean text box waiting for your instructions

Both work essentially the same way. For this booklet, examples will work with either tool. Choose whichever interface you prefer.

Note: You don't need to download anything, install software, or configure settings. It's as simple as using Google—type something in, get a response back.

4.3 Step 2: Understanding Prompts

A **prompt** is simply the instruction or question you type into the AI tool. Think of it like briefing a very capable research assistant who:

- Has read an enormous amount of material on nearly every subject
- Can generate text, analyse situations, and role-play scenarios
- Follows your instructions literally (which is both powerful and requires precision)
- Doesn't have opinions, emotions, or genuine understanding—just pattern recognition

The quality of what you get back depends almost entirely on the quality of your prompt.

Let's see this in action.

4.4 Your First Prompt: The Weak Version

Open your chosen AI tool and type this exactly:

`Write a case study about HR.`

Hit enter and see what you get.

You'll probably receive something generic—maybe a story about employee conflict or a hiring scenario. It's *fine*, but it's not particularly useful for your specific teaching needs.

Why was this weak? Because the prompt was vague. "HR" covers everything from payroll to industrial relations. "A case study" could be 100 words or 5,000 words. The AI had to guess what you wanted.

4.5 Your Second Prompt: The Powerful Version

Now try this. Copy and paste this entire prompt:

You are an expert lecturer in Human Resource Management at a university level.

I need you to create a case study for my undergraduate students that will help them practice applying employment law to a workplace conflict.

Here are the requirements:

- The scenario should involve a performance management issue where the employee claims the process was unfair
- Include enough detail that students need to identify which legal principles apply
- The scenario should be 300-400 words
- End with three discussion questions that require students to analyse whether the employer followed the relevant laws

Begin.

Hit enter.

Notice the difference? The AI now knows: - What role to adopt (expert HR lecturer) - Who the audience is (undergraduate students) - What specific learning objective you're targeting (applying employment law) - What the scenario should contain (performance management + fairness claims) - How long it should be (300-400 words) - What format you want (scenario + three discussion questions)

The output should be dramatically more useful. It's tailored, specific, and ready to use in your class (with your refinement, of course).

4.6 The Anatomy of a Good Prompt

Let's break down what made that second prompt powerful:

4.6.1 1. Set the Role

“You are an expert lecturer in Human Resource Management...”

This tells the AI what perspective to adopt. You could also say: - “You are an experienced HR Business Partner coaching a new manager” - “You are a union representative negotiating with management” - “You are a frustrated employee who believes they've been unfairly treated”

The role shapes the tone, vocabulary, and approach of the response.

4.6.2 2. Define the Context and Audience

“I need you to create a case study for my undergraduate students...”

Who is this for? What's the purpose? This prevents the AI from pitching the content at the wrong level (too simple for postgrads, too complex for first-years).

4.6.3 3. Specify the Task Clearly

“...that will help them practice applying employment law to a workplace conflict.”

20CHAPTER 4. CHAPTER 2: GETTING STARTED - YOUR FIRST AI CONVERSATION

What exactly do you want? Don't just say "write something about employment law." Say what the student should *do* with it.

4.6.4 4. Provide Constraints and Requirements

"The scenario should involve..." "Include enough detail..." "300-400 words..." "End with three discussion questions..."

These boundaries guide the AI and prevent it from going off in unhelpful directions. Think of constraints as guardrails.

4.6.5 5. Give a Clear Start Signal

"Begin."

This tells the AI to execute the task now. Simple, but effective.

4.7 Practice Exercise: Your Turn

Now it's your turn to write a prompt from scratch. Think of something you currently teach in your HR course—a topic where you wish you had more practice materials or better scenarios.

Use this template:

You are [define the role].

I need you to [state the specific task] for [define your audience].

Here are the requirements:

- [Requirement 1]
- [Requirement 2]
- [Requirement 3]

[Any additional context or constraints]

Begin.

Example topics to try: - Generate interview questions for a recruitment consultant role - Create a dialogue showing poor conflict resolution that students must critique - Draft a policy outline for flexible work arrangements with deliberate gaps students must identify - Write a performance review conversation that contains multiple communication errors

Type your prompt into the AI tool and see what happens.

4.8 What to Expect (and Not Expect)

As you experiment, keep these realities in mind:

4.8.1 What AI Does Well:

- Generates diverse scenarios and examples quickly
- Creates consistent, well-structured text
- Role-plays different perspectives convincingly
- Provides frameworks and outlines
- Analyzes text against criteria you define

4.8.2 What AI Doesn't Do:

- Understand context the way humans do
- Have actual expertise or professional judgment
- Know your specific students, university policies, or local employment laws
- Guarantee factual accuracy (it can confidently state incorrect information)
- Replace your pedagogical design or assessment judgment

The golden rule: AI is a powerful draft generator and practice partner. You are still the expert who evaluates, refines, and ensures accuracy.

4.9 Troubleshooting Common Issues

“The AI gave me something too simple/complex.” → Add to your prompt: “Pitch this at the level of a third-year undergraduate student” or “This is for students who already understand basic employment law.”

“The response was too short/long.” → Specify word count or structure: “Provide 500 words” or “Write exactly 5 paragraphs.”

“It’s too generic—not specific to Australia/my context.” → Add context: “Set this scenario in an Australian workplace context, referencing the Fair Work Act” or “The company is based in Perth, Western Australia.”

“The AI ignored part of my prompt.” → This happens sometimes. Just follow up: “Please revise that to include [the missing element].”

“I want to change just one part.” → You can have a conversation: “Keep everything the same, but make the employee more defensive in tone” or “Add a section about cultural considerations.”

4.10 Your First Win

If you’ve followed along, you’ve just: 1. Accessed an AI tool 2. Written a structured prompt 3. Generated a teaching resource you didn’t have 5 minutes

ago

That's not a small thing. You've learned the fundamental skill that everything else in this booklet builds on.

4.11 Before You Move On

Try this homework before Chapter 3:

Experiment with three different prompts: 1. One that generates content for your students (a case study, a scenario, a set of questions) 2. One that asks the AI to role-play someone (an angry employee, a nervous manager, a compliance officer) 3. One that asks the AI to analyse or critique something (feed it a sample student response or a policy and ask it to evaluate against specific criteria)

Get comfortable with the basic rhythm: prompt → response → refine → use.

The more you practice, the more natural it becomes. And the more specific your prompts, the more useful your outputs.

Next Chapter Preview: In Chapter 3, you'll learn five specific prompting techniques that are perfectly suited to HR education. Each one is designed to develop a different critical thinking skill in your students: scoping problems, evaluating options, following processes, practicing conversations, and debating ethical positions. These aren't just "AI tricks"—they're pedagogical strategies that AI makes scalable.

Chapter 5

Chapter 8: Your First Steps - A Practical Guide

5.1 The Implementation Challenge

You've now seen what's possible with AI in HR education. You're probably feeling a mix of excitement and overwhelm.

The previous chapters showed you ambitious applications: conversation simulations, virtual companies, process-based assessments. But you're thinking: *"Where do I actually start? How do I introduce this to my students? What if it doesn't work?"*

This chapter is about **managing change**—both for yourself and your students. It provides a practical, phased implementation plan that starts small, builds confidence, and scales gradually.

The key principle: Start with one small experiment, not a curriculum revolution.

5.2 Phase 1: Personal Experimentation (Before Your Next Class)

Before you introduce AI to students, you need to be comfortable with it yourself. This phase is about building your own confidence and discovering what works.

5.2.1 Week 1: Your First Prompts

Time investment: 1-2 hours

Task: Generate three teaching resources you currently need using the techniques from Chapter 3.

Examples: - Use the **Pros and Cons** technique to create a comparative analysis of performance review models (you can use this as lecture content or a discussion prompt) - Use the **Role Play** technique to create a practice scenario for difficult conversations - Use the **Reverse Prompting** technique to help you scope out a complex policy assignment

Success metric: You created at least one resource that's good enough to use in your teaching (even if it needs minor adjustments).

What you'll learn: - How to write effective prompts for your specific content - What AI does well and where it needs your expertise - How to iterate and refine prompts to get better results

5.2.2 Week 2: Test a Simulation

Time investment: 30 minutes

Task: Conduct a conversation simulation yourself using the Flight Simulator model from Chapter 4.

Steps: 1. Write a setup prompt for a scenario you teach (performance management, conflict resolution, recruitment interview, etc.) 2. Have the conversation with the AI—actually practice the skill yourself 3. Generate a critique of your performance using the debrief prompt

Success metric: The AI stayed in character throughout, and the critique provided specific, useful feedback.

What you'll learn: - Whether your scenario design creates a realistic challenge - How students will experience this exercise - What kinds of feedback the AI generates (and whether it aligns with your standards)

5.2.3 Week 3: Review Your Current Assessments

Time investment: 1 hour

Task: Look at your current assignments and identify which ones could be enhanced with AI.

Questions to ask: - Which assignments currently test knowledge recall that could test applied process instead? - Where do students struggle to get timely feedback? - Which skills do students need more practice with before assessment? - What do you wish you had time to grade more thoroughly?

Success metric: You've identified one specific assignment that you'll pilot in the next teaching cycle.

What you'll learn: - Where AI can add the most value in your specific context
- What problems you're actually trying to solve (not just “use AI because it’s new”)

5.3 Phase 2: Low-Stakes Student Introduction (First Month of Semester)

You’re now ready to introduce AI to students. Start with optional, low-stakes activities—not high-stakes assessments.

5.3.1 Approach 1: Optional Practice Exercise

What to do:

Introduce AI as a **practice tool** for an upcoming assignment.

Example announcement to students:

“For the case study assignment due in Week 8, I want to give you a chance to practice your analytical skills first. I’ve created an AI critique prompt that you can use to check your draft before submission.

Here’s how it works: Write your draft analysis, paste it into ChatGPT or Claude along with this critique prompt [provide prompt], and see what feedback you get. Then revise based on the feedback.

This is completely optional—I won’t know whether you used it or not. But I encourage you to try it at least once to see if it helps you improve your work.”

Why this works: - No pressure—students who are skeptical can ignore it - Students who try it will likely see value and spread the word to peers - You can gauge student response before making it mandatory - You avoid the “forced adoption” resistance

5.3.2 Approach 2: In-Class Demonstration

What to do:

During a lecture, demonstrate AI in action as a teaching tool.

Example:

“Today we’re learning about procedural fairness in disciplinary processes. Let me show you something interesting. I’m going to ask an AI to role-play an employee going through a disciplinary meeting, and I want you to watch and critique my process.”

Then conduct a live conversation with the AI projected on screen. Students observe and analyse your performance in real-time.

Follow-up: - Ask students: “What did I do well? What did I miss?” - Show how AI can provide a critique: paste the transcript into the critique prompt live
 - Discuss: “Did the AI catch the same things you did? Did it miss anything?”

Why this works: - Demystifies AI (students see it's just a tool, not magic) - Models critical thinking about AI outputs - Shows your own willingness to be vulnerable and learn - Sparks curiosity about trying it themselves

5.3.3 Approach 3: Reflective Exercise

What to do:

Assign a short, reflective writing task where students *experiment with* AI rather than complete a traditional assignment.

Example assignment:

Assignment: Exploring AI as an HR Tool (5% of grade)

Task: 1. Choose one HR skill we've covered this semester (e.g., conducting an investigation, drafting a policy, analysing turnover data) 2. Use an AI tool (ChatGPT, Claude, or similar) to help you practice or analyse that skill 3. Write a 500-word reflection answering: - What task did you ask the AI to help with? - What was useful about the AI's response? - What was wrong, missing, or oversimplified in the AI's response? - How would you use (or not use) AI for this kind of task in professional practice?

Grading: You're being graded on your critical reflection, not on the AI's performance. Honest critique of AI's limitations will score higher than uncritical praise.

Why this works: - Low stakes (only 5% of grade) - Emphasizes critical thinking about AI rather than reliance on AI - Introduces AI literacy as a learning objective - Gives you insight into how students are using AI

5.4 Phase 3: Pilot Assessment (Mid-Semester)

After students have some familiarity with AI, introduce one AI-enhanced assessment. Choose something meaningful but not the highest-stakes assignment.

5.4.1 Implementation Checklist

Before you launch:

- You've tested the prompts yourself thoroughly
- You've created clear student instructions (what to do, how to do it, what's expected)
- You've prepared a FAQ document anticipating student questions
- You've decided how much this is worth (recommend 15-25% of final grade for first pilot)
- You've built in time for technical issues (some students will need help accessing AI tools)

Choose your model:

Based on Chapters 4-7, select one approach for a **single assignment**:

Option A: Conversation Simulation + Reflection (Chapter 4) - Lower workload for grading - Students are most likely to find this engaging - Easiest to explain

Option B: Self-Assessment with Transparency Model (Chapter 5) - Works for existing essay/case study assignments - Minimal restructuring needed - Good introduction to AI literacy

Option C: AI Critique and Override (Chapter 7, Model 3) - Medium complexity - Strong focus on critical thinking - Clear demonstration of learning

Don't choose: Virtual company simulation (Chapter 6) or complex multi-part process assessment (Chapter 7, Models 1-2) for your first pilot. Save those for when you have more experience.

Thinking bigger than a single assignment?

If you're ready to redesign an entire unit from the ground up rather than piloting a single assignment, see **Chapter 10: Designing an AI-Integrated Unit** for a complete backwards design framework. That chapter shows how to: - Map AI integration across a full 12-week semester - Build scaffolded progression from Week 1 to Week 12 - Balance AI-enhanced and traditional learning activities - Support student AI literacy development throughout the unit

Most lecturers should start with a single assignment pilot before attempting whole-unit redesign. Once you've successfully piloted one AI-enhanced assignment and gathered student feedback, you'll be in a much stronger position to expand your approach across an entire unit.

5.4.2 Launch Week: Student Orientation

Dedicate 15-20 minutes of class time to:

1. **Explain the “why”** > “We’re trying something new with this assignment because I want you to practice professional skills, not just write about

them. In HR work, you'll use AI tools, so learning to use them critically is part of your education."

2. **Address the anxiety** > "Some of you might be worried this is too technical—it's not. If you can copy and paste text, you can do this assignment. Some of you might be thinking this makes things easier—actually, it makes things harder, because I'm assessing your thinking process, not just your final answer."

3. Do a live demo

- Show exactly how to access the AI tool
- Show exactly how to paste the prompt
- Show exactly what happens next
- Show what they submit to you

4. Open for questions

5. Provide written instructions

- Create a one-page step-by-step guide students can refer back to
- Include screenshots if needed
- Provide a technical support contact (could be you, a TA, or IT support)

5.4.3 During the Assignment Period: Be Available

Common student issues:

"The AI isn't staying in character" → Response: Check that you copied the full prompt. Try starting a fresh conversation.

"The AI gave me weird feedback" → Response: That's possible—AI can make errors. In your reflection, explain what the AI got wrong and why. You'll get credit for catching the error.

"I don't have access to ChatGPT" → Response: Try Claude.ai instead, or come to office hours and we can run it together.

"Is this even allowed? Am I cheating?" → Response: Yes, it's allowed—this is the assignment. You're being graded on your critical use of AI, not on avoiding it.

5.4.4 After Submission: Grading Efficiently

Create a grading workflow:

1. **Quick initial scan** (5 minutes per student)
 - Did they follow instructions?
 - Did they submit all required components?
 - Any obvious red flags (e.g., obviously didn't do the work)?

5.5. PHASE 4: GATHER FEEDBACK AND ITERATE (END OF SEMESTER)29

2. **Deep assessment** (15-20 minutes per student)
 - Review the transcript/analysis/reflection against your rubric
 - Look for evidence of learning and critical thinking
 - Provide targeted feedback (2-3 specific comments)
3. **Use standard comment banks**
 - Create a document with common feedback phrases you can copy-paste
 - Examples: “Strong application of procedural fairness here,” “This needed more specific evidence from the transcript,” “Excellent critique of AI’s oversight”

Time-saving tip: Use AI itself to help with initial feedback:

Your prompt to AI:

You are assisting with grading. Review this student's submission against the rubric [paste rubric]. Provide an initial assessment and draft feedback comments.

I will review your assessment and make final decisions-do not assign final grades, just provide recommendations.

[paste student work]

Then you review AI's suggestions, adjust where needed, and add your own judgment. This can cut grading time by 30-40%.

5.5 Phase 4: Gather Feedback and Iterate (End of Semester)

After students submit the pilot assessment, collect structured feedback.

5.5.1 Student Survey (5 minutes for students to complete)

Questions to ask:

1. How useful was AI for learning in this assignment? (1-5 scale)
2. What worked well about using AI for this task?
3. What was confusing or frustrating?
4. Would you want to use AI in future assignments? Why or why not?
5. Do you feel this assignment helped you develop practical HR skills? (1-5 scale)
6. Any other comments or suggestions?

5.5.2 Self-Reflection Questions (For You)

1. **Effectiveness:** Did students demonstrate deeper learning than in previous traditional assignments?
2. **Efficiency:** Did this save me grading time or cost me more time?
3. **Engagement:** Were students more engaged with this format?
4. **Technical issues:** What problems came up and how can I prevent them next time?
5. **Learning objectives:** Did this actually assess what I wanted to assess?
6. **Would I do this again?** If yes, what would I change?

5.5.3 Iterate for Next Time

Based on feedback, make 2-3 specific changes:

Common adjustments:

Issue: Students found the prompts confusing **Fix:** Simplify language, provide an example of a completed submission

Issue: AI feedback was too generic **Fix:** Revise the critique prompt to be more specific about criteria

Issue: Some students didn't take it seriously (minimal effort) **Fix:** Increase the grade weight or add more structured reflection requirements

Issue: Grading took longer than expected **Fix:** Provide templates/checklists that students complete, making your review faster

5.6 Phase 5: Expand and Integrate (Next Semester)

You've now completed one successful pilot. Next semester, you can:

5.6.1 Option 1: Refine and Repeat

Use the same AI-enhanced assignment but with improvements based on feedback. Consistency across semesters builds institutional knowledge and reduces your prep time.

5.6.2 Option 2: Add a Second AI Component

Introduce one more AI element: - If you started with self-assessment (Chapter 5), add a conversation simulation (Chapter 4) - If you started with conversation simulation, add a process-based assessment (Chapter 7)

5.6.3 Option 3: Go Deeper with Existing Component

Make your existing AI assignment more sophisticated:

- Add multiple personas (move from Level 1 to Level 2 simulation)
- Add persistent context (students have follow-up conversations)
- Increase complexity of analysis required

5.7 Managing Common Challenges

5.7.1 Challenge 1: Resistance from Students

“This is unfair—I didn’t sign up for an AI class”

Response: > “I understand this is different. But in HR work, you’ll use AI tools whether you like them or not. My job is to prepare you for professional practice, and that now includes knowing when and how to use AI responsibly. I’m not asking you to become an AI expert—just to be a critical user.”

“I don’t trust AI / I think AI is unethical”

Response: > “That’s actually a valuable perspective. This assignment is a chance for you to critically evaluate AI’s limitations and biases. In fact, students who identify what AI gets wrong often score highest, because that demonstrates critical thinking. You don’t have to like AI—you just need to understand it.”

5.7.2 Challenge 2: Resistance from Colleagues

“You’re just making things easier for students”

Response: > “Actually, it’s harder—students can’t just memorize and regurgitate anymore. They have to think critically and demonstrate process. The AI doesn’t give them answers; it creates dynamic challenges they have to navigate.”

“AI feedback isn’t as good as human feedback”

Response: > “You’re right—that’s why I’m still grading the final work. But AI feedback is instant and available 24/7. Students can practice and revise multiple times before submission. That’s pedagogically valuable even if AI feedback isn’t perfect.”

“What about academic integrity?”

Response: > “This approach actually makes cheating harder. I’m assessing their process and critical thinking, not just final answers. And by teaching students to use AI transparently, I’m building integrity rather than policing violations.”

5.7.3 Challenge 3: Technology Failures

“The AI platform was down during the assignment period”

Students affected: Build in flexibility—allow extensions or alternative submission methods if technical issues occur.

Prevention: Provide multiple AI tool options (ChatGPT, Claude, etc.) so students have backups.

5.7.4 Challenge 4: Uneven Student Access

“Some students don’t have reliable internet or devices”

Solutions: - Provide lab time where students can complete the assignment on campus - Offer office hours where you can facilitate the AI interaction together - Check if your university has institutional AI tool subscriptions - Design assignments that can be completed in short sessions (don’t require hours of continuous AI access)

5.7.5 Challenge 5: You’re Overwhelmed

“This is taking more time than expected and I’m drowning”

Emergency strategies: - Reduce the weight of the AI assignment (make it formative, not summative) - Make reflection/analysis shorter (250 words instead of 500) - Grade on completion rather than detailed quality for this first round - Ask for teaching assistant support if available - Remember: It gets easier the second time

Long-term: Building AI-enhanced assignments is front-loaded work. Year 1 is significant effort. Year 2 is refinement. Year 3 is almost autopilot.

5.8 Measuring Success

How do you know if this is working? Look for these indicators:

Student learning: - Higher quality of work on related assessments - Students citing practical experiences (“when I practiced the conversation simulation...”) in reflections - Fewer students making basic procedural errors - More sophisticated understanding of HR complexity

Student engagement: - Students asking for more AI-enhanced activities - Positive feedback in course evaluations - Students reporting the work felt “more real” than traditional assignments

Your satisfaction: - You feel less like you’re testing memorization and more like you’re developing professionals - Grading feels more meaningful (you’re assessing thinking, not checking answers) - You’re excited about teaching this topic again

Practical outcomes: - Employers or practicum supervisors comment that your graduates are better prepared - Students successfully transfer skills to work placements - Alumni report that the AI-enhanced assignments were among the most useful parts of their degree

5.9 Final Encouragement

Implementing AI in your teaching isn't about being a tech enthusiast or an early adopter. It's about being a committed educator who wants students to be genuinely prepared for professional practice.

You don't need to revolutionize your entire curriculum overnight. You don't need to be perfect. You just need to start.

Your first AI-enhanced assignment will be imperfect. Do it anyway.

You'll discover what works in your context, with your students, for your content. Every lecturer's implementation will look slightly different—and that's exactly right.

The chapters before this showed you what's possible. This chapter showed you how to make it real.

Now it's time to choose your first small experiment and try it.

Next Chapter Preview: In Chapter 9, we directly address the academic integrity and ethics question. You'll learn how to talk to students about AI use, how to design assignments that minimise misuse while maximizing learning, and how to reframe "preventing AI cheating" as "teaching AI literacy and professional ethics." This is the conversation you'll need to have with students, colleagues, and possibly administrators.

Chapter 6

Chapter 3: Seven Essential Prompt Techniques for HR Teaching

6.1 Why These Seven?

These aren't random AI tricks. These are seven proven prompting techniques specifically chosen because they develop critical thinking skills that HR professionals need:

1. **Reverse Prompting** → Teaches comprehensive scoping and requirement gathering
2. **Pros and Cons** → Builds analytical decision-making skills
3. **Stepwise Chain of Thought** → Reinforces process adherence and documentation
4. **Role Play** → Develops communication and interpersonal skills
5. **Debating** → Strengthens strategic thinking and ethical reasoning
6. **Formative Assessment Generator** → Provides unlimited low-stakes practice and immediate feedback
7. **The Expert Panel** → Develops multi-perspective analysis and synthesis skills

Each technique is easy to adapt and can be used by students directly or by you to generate teaching materials. Let's explore each one with ready-to-use examples.

6.2 Technique 1: Reverse Prompting (for Scoping and Policy Design)

6.2.1 What It Does

Instead of the student immediately solving a problem, the AI asks *them* questions to help scope out all the requirements, considerations, and potential issues. This mirrors real HR work, where defining the problem properly is half the battle.

6.2.2 Why It Works for HR

HR policy and program design require thinking through multiple stakeholders, legal requirements, operational constraints, and fairness implications. This technique forces students to move beyond obvious surface issues and consider the full complexity.

6.2.3 The Student Prompt (Ready to Use)

I need to draft a new "Flexible Work Arrangement" policy for a 500-employee company that has both office-based and remote staff. I need to make sure I cover all the key areas.

Your task: Ask me a series of yes/no or short-answer questions to help me clarify all the requirements, considerations, and potential pitfalls for this policy.

Ask one question at a time. Wait for my response before asking the next question. Continue until you've helped me think through at least 10 different aspects of this policy.

Begin with your first question.

6.2.4 What Happens

The AI will start asking questions like: - "Will all roles be eligible for flexible arrangements, or will there be specific criteria?" - "Have you considered how this will affect team collaboration and meeting schedules?" - "What equipment or technology support will the company provide for remote workers?" - "How will you handle performance measurement for remote versus office staff?" - "Are there legal or insurance implications you need to address?"

The student must think through each question before responding. By the end, they've been guided to consider fairness, logistics, legal compliance, technology needs, and cultural impact—all before drafting a single policy sentence.

6.2.5 Variations for Different Topics

- “I need to design an onboarding program for graduate hires. Ask me questions to ensure I’ve thought through all the key elements.”
- “I’m planning a diversity and inclusion initiative. Help me identify all the stakeholders and considerations through questioning.”
- “I need to restructure our performance review process. What questions should I be asking myself to ensure it’s fair and effective?”

6.2.6 Teaching Tip

Use this as a **pre-writing exercise**. Have students complete the AI questioning session, then require them to submit both the transcript and their subsequent policy draft. You can assess whether they actually incorporated the insights from the questions.

6.3 Technique 2: Pros and Cons (for Decision Making)

6.3.1 What It Does

The AI systematically analyzes multiple approaches to an HR problem, evaluating each option against specific criteria. This develops the ability to make justified recommendations rather than just stating preferences.

6.3.2 Why It Works for HR

HR professionals constantly evaluate competing strategies—Should we outsource recruitment? Which performance model should we adopt? How should we handle redundancy? This technique builds the muscle for balanced, evidence-based decision-making.

6.3.3 The Student Prompt (Ready to Use)

What are the main models for conducting performance reviews in a hybrid workforce? For each model you identify, provide:

1. A brief description of how it works
2. Three key advantages
3. Three key disadvantages

Evaluate each model specifically in terms of:

- Fairness and perceived equity
- Administrative overhead and manager workload

- Impact on employee morale and development

Conclude with a recommendation for which model would be most appropriate for a mid-sized tech company (300 employees, 60% hybrid, 40% fully remote) and justify your recommendation.

6.3.4 What Happens

The AI will identify 3-4 performance review models (e.g., annual reviews, continuous feedback, 360-degree feedback, OKR-based systems) and analyse each systematically. The student receives a structured comparison that they must then critically evaluate.

6.3.5 The Follow-Up Task

Don't let students simply accept the AI's recommendation. Require them to:

- Challenge one of the "pros" listed—is it really an advantage in all contexts?
- Add a disadvantage the AI missed - Argue for a *different* model than the AI recommended, using evidence - Identify which psychological or motivational theory supports or contradicts each approach

This transforms the AI output from an answer into a starting point for deeper analysis.

6.3.6 Variations for Different Topics

- "Compare different approaches to managing workplace conflict: mediation, formal grievance process, restorative justice. Evaluate each for speed, fairness, and relationship preservation."
- "Analyze three different redundancy selection methods. What are the legal risks and ethical considerations of each?"
- "What are the pros and cons of using AI-powered resume screening tools versus traditional human review?"

6.3.7 Teaching Tip

This technique works brilliantly for **in-class discussions**. Project the AI's analysis on screen, then divide students into groups where each group must argue for one of the models. They have to use the AI's framework but add their own reasoning.

6.4 Technique 3: Stepwise Chain of Thought (for Process Management)

6.4.1 What It Does

The AI walks through a complex HR process one step at a time, pausing after each step until the student signals they're ready to continue. This slows down high-stakes processes that students often rush through.

6.4.2 Why It Works for HR

Many HR processes—disciplinary action, grievance handling, redundancy consultation—are legally and ethically sensitive. Students need to understand *why* each step exists and what documentation or legal considerations apply at that stage. This technique forces deliberate, sequential thinking.

6.4.3 The Student Prompt (Ready to Use)

I am learning how to properly conduct a disciplinary action process for an employee with a pattern of repeated lateness.

Your task: Walk me through the entire disciplinary process, starting from the very first informal conversation. For each step, tell me:

1. What action to take
2. What to document
3. What legal or procedural consideration is important at this stage

After you explain each step, STOP and wait for me to type "next" before moving to the next step. Do not provide the entire process at once.

Begin with Step 1.

6.4.4 What Happens

The AI will provide the first step:

Step 1: Informal Verbal Warning

Action: Meet privately with the employee to discuss the lateness pattern. Use a calm, non-accusatory tone. Ask if there are any circumstances contributing to the issue (e.g., transport problems, personal issues, health concerns).

Documentation: Make a brief file note recording the date, what was discussed, and the employee's response. This is informal, so no formal warning letter yet.

Legal/Procedural Consideration: At this stage, you're gathering information and providing an opportunity for the employee to explain. Under principles of procedural fairness, you must give them a chance to be heard before escalating.

Type “next” when you’re ready for Step 2.

The student must actively engage with each step before progressing. This prevents them from skipping to “just fire them” without understanding the required process.

6.4.5 Variations for Different Topics

- “Walk me through conducting a workplace investigation into a bullying complaint. One step at a time.”
- “Take me through the proper process for making an employee redundant in Australia. Pause after each step.”
- “Show me the recruitment process from job analysis through to onboarding, step by step with legal checkpoints.”

6.4.6 Teaching Tip

This is excellent for **individual revision or exam prep**. Students can practice the process multiple times, and each time they can ask the AI to introduce complications: “In Step 3, what if the employee refuses to sign the written warning?” The AI will explain how to handle variations.

You can also use this to **generate assessment materials**: Have the AI walk through a process, then you create an exam question where one of the steps was done incorrectly and students must identify the error and its consequences.

6.5 Technique 4: Role Play (for Skill Building)

6.5.1 What It Does

The AI adopts a specific persona (an employee, a union representative, a difficult stakeholder) and engages in a realistic conversation with the student. This is the “flight simulator” concept in action.

6.5.2 Why It Works for HR

HR work is fundamentally conversational. Students can memorize conflict resolution theory, but until they practice *actually having* a difficult conversation where someone pushes back, gets emotional, or uses manipulative tactics, they won’t develop genuine competence.

6.5.3 The Student Prompt (Ready to Use)

You are an experienced and empathetic HR Business Partner. I am a new, nervous manager who needs to put one of my team members on a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP).

Your goal is to coach me through preparing for and conducting this meeting successfully.

Guide me through this step by step:

1. First, ask me why the employee is being put on a PIP
2. Wait for my answer
3. If my answer is vague or subjective (e.g., "bad attitude"), challenge me gently and ask me to be more specific and behavioural
4. Once I give you a solid answer, move to the next aspect: helping me draft clear, measurable objectives for the PIP
5. Continue coaching me through each element of the conversation I need to have with the employee

Throughout this process, if I say something that could be problematic (legally risky, unfair, too harsh, or too vague), pause and give me feedback on how to improve it.

Begin by asking me your first question.

6.5.4 What Happens

The AI becomes a coach who actively guides the student through preparation. If the student says "I'm putting them on a PIP because they're lazy," the AI will respond:

"I understand you're frustrated, but 'lazy' is subjective and not something we can measure or document defensibly. Let's try again: what specific behaviours or performance gaps have you observed? For example, are they missing deadlines, producing work below the required standard, or not completing their assigned tasks?"

This iterative coaching helps students learn to think and speak like HR professionals.

6.5.5 Advanced Variation: The Difficult Conversation

Once students are comfortable, flip the scenario:

You are Sarah, a high-performing marketing manager who has just been told you're being put on a Performance Improvement Plan. You are shocked, defensive, and angry because you believe this is unfair and politically motivated.

I am the HR representative who has to conduct this PIP meeting with you.

Your behavior:

- Start the conversation by immediately challenging the fairness of the PIP
- Bring up a recent successful project you led
- Hint that you believe this is retaliation for raising a complaint about your manager last month
- Be emotional but not abusive—show genuine distress

I will attempt to conduct this meeting professionally. Stay in character until I manage to de-escalate the situation and establish a constructive dialogue.

Begin the meeting. I will speak first.

Now the student has to manage a realistic, emotionally charged scenario. They must practice de-escalation, empathy, procedural fairness, and documentation—all while the AI responds dynamically to what they say.

6.5.6 Variations for Different Topics

- AI plays a union representative in an enterprise bargaining negotiation
- AI plays a candidate in a behavioural interview who gives weak answers that need probing
- AI plays a manager who resists implementing a diversity initiative
- AI plays an employee making an informal discrimination complaint

6.5.7 Teaching Tip

Assessment approach: Require students to submit the full transcript of the conversation along with a reflective analysis answering: - What communication techniques did you use? - Where did the conversation go well or poorly? - What would you do differently next time? - What HR theory or legal principle guided your approach?

This makes the process visible and assessable.

6.6 Technique 5: Debating (for Strategic and Ethical Analysis)

6.6.1 What It Does

The AI examines multiple perspectives on a contentious HR issue, argues for and against different positions, and helps students see the complexity and trade-offs

*6.6. TECHNIQUE 5: DEBATING (FOR STRATEGIC AND ETHICAL ANALYSIS)*43

in strategic decisions.

6.6.2 Why It Works for HR

Modern HR work exists in gray areas where legal, ethical, business, and human considerations often conflict. Students need to develop the ability to argue multiple sides of an issue before making a recommendation.

6.6.3 Variation A: Critique and Compare

I will provide you with two different "Bring Your Own Device (BYOD)" policies from two fictional companies.

Your task:

1. Critique the strengths and weaknesses of each policy in terms of security, employee privacy, and clarity
2. Tell me which policy is stronger overall and why
3. Identify one element from the weaker policy that could improve the stronger one

Here is Policy A: [paste policy]

Here is Policy B: [paste policy]

Begin your analysis.

Teaching use: You draft two policies (or have the AI generate them), one deliberately flawed. Students must identify which is better and justify their reasoning. This develops critical evaluation skills.

6.6.4 Variation B: Argue Both Sides

I want you to debate the pros and cons of using AI-powered tools to scan resumes and filter job applicants.

Structure your response in three parts:

****Part 1: The Case FOR Using AI Resume Screening****

Make the strongest possible argument in favour of this technology. Consider efficiency, consistency, potential to reduce human bias, cost savings, and scalability.

****Part 2: The Case AGAINST Using AI Resume Screening****

Make the strongest possible argument against this technology. Consider algorithmic bias, legal risk, lack of contextual understanding, potential discrimination, and dehumanization of the recruitment process.

****Part 3: Critical Synthesis****

Critique both arguments you just made. What did each side get right? What did each side oversimplify or ignore? Provide a balanced recommendation with conditions (e.g., "Use AI screening only if X, Y, and Z safeguards are in place").

What Happens: The AI will construct sophisticated arguments for both positions, then provide a nuanced synthesis. Students can't just pick a side—they have to understand the legitimate concerns and benefits on both sides.

6.6.5 Variation C: Multi-Stakeholder Debate

This is the most sophisticated version:

You will simulate a leadership debate on whether to implement a "mandatory return to office" policy requiring all employees to work in-office four days per week.

Create three distinct personas and have them debate this issue:

****Persona 1: The CFO (Chief Financial Officer)****

Focus on: Real estate costs, productivity metrics, and financial efficiency

****Persona 2: The CHRO (Chief HR Officer)****

Focus on: Employee morale, retention, recruitment competitiveness, and diversity/equity/inclusion implications

****Persona 3: The COO (Chief Operating Officer)****

Focus on: Team collaboration, operational consistency, training effectiveness, and company culture

Have each persona make their opening argument (3-4 sentences each). Then have them respond to each other's points. Continue the debate through three rounds until they need to make a recommendation to the CEO.

After the debate, summarize the key tension points and what a compromise policy might look like.

Begin the debate.

What Happens: The AI will create a realistic executive debate where each stakeholder has legitimate but competing priorities. Students see that there's rarely a perfect answer—only trade-offs and compromise.

6.6.6 Follow-Up Task for Students

After reading the debate, students must: 1. Identify which stakeholder made the strongest argument and why 2. Propose a policy that addresses the COO's concerns while minimising the CHRO's risks 3. Explain what data or evidence would help resolve the CFO's questions 4. Reflect on which psychological or organisational theory best explains the tension between these perspectives

6.6.7 Teaching Tip

This technique is perfect for **preparing students for case study exams**. Instead of memorizing model answers, they practice analysing competing priorities and justifying nuanced positions—exactly what they'll need to do in professional practice.

6.7 Technique 6: Formative Assessment Generator (for Practice and Mastery)

6.7.1 What It Does

The AI generates unlimited practice questions, scenarios, or quizzes that students can use to test their knowledge and build confidence. This provides low-stakes repetition and immediate feedback—essential for skill development.

6.7.2 Why It Works for HR

Many HR competencies require both knowledge (legislation, theory) and application (recognizing situations where that knowledge applies). Students need more practice than traditional homework provides, but creating dozens of unique practice scenarios is time-prohibitive for lecturers. AI solves this.

6.7.3 Use Case 1: Self-Testing Knowledge

Student Prompt:

I'm studying for an exam on Australian employment law. I need to practice identifying which legislation applies in different workplace scenarios.

Generate 10 short scenario descriptions (2-3 sentences each) where I need to identify:

1. Which legislation is relevant (e.g., Fair Work Act, WHS Act, Anti-Discrimination Act)
2. What the employer's legal obligation is
3. What risk exists if the employer doesn't comply

After I answer each one, tell me if I'm correct and explain why.

Begin with Scenario 1.

What Happens: The AI creates scenario after scenario. Students test themselves, get immediate feedback, and can continue until they achieve mastery. Unlike a textbook with 5 practice problems, this provides unlimited practice.

Key feature: AI adapts. If student gets several wrong, AI can simplify. If student masters basic scenarios, AI can make them more complex.

6.7.4 Use Case 2: Application Practice

Student Prompt:

I'm learning to identify different types of workplace conflict (task conflict, relationship conflict, process conflict).

Create 8 brief workplace scenarios. For each one, I'll identify the type of conflict and suggest an appropriate intervention approach.

After each scenario, provide feedback on my classification and intervention suggestion. If I'm wrong, explain why and what I missed.

Make the scenarios progressively more complex-start easy, end with ambiguous situations where multiple interpretations are valid.

Begin with Scenario 1.

What Happens: Progressive difficulty builds confidence and competence. Students move from obvious cases to nuanced judgment calls.

6.7.5 Use Case 3: Exam Preparation

Student Prompt:

Create a practice exam for me based on the topics we've covered in my Workplace Conflict Resolution unit.

Include:

- 10 multiple choice questions (4 options each)
- 3 short-answer questions (each requiring 150-200 word response)
- 1 case study with 4 analysis questions

Topics to cover:

- Conflict theory (Thomas-Kilmann, interest-based bargaining)
- Investigation processes
- Mediation approaches
- Legal requirements (procedural fairness, natural justice)

After I complete the exam, grade my answers and provide detailed feedback on what I got right/wrong and why.

What Happens: Students can generate multiple practice exams with different questions each time. They enter the real exam having practiced extensively.

6.7.6 Use Case 4: Targeted Remediation

Lecturer Prompt (to create remediation resource):

I have students who struggled with understanding procedural fairness in workplace investigations. Many think it just means "being nice" and don't understand the specific legal requirements.

Create a 10-question diagnostic quiz that tests whether students understand:

1. The right to be informed of allegations
2. The right to respond to allegations
3. The requirement for impartial decision-making
4. The requirement to consider the response before deciding
5. The right to representation/support

For each question, use a scenario format. After each answer, provide immediate teaching feedback explaining the principle, not just whether they're right or wrong.

Generate the quiz.

What You Get: A targeted remediation tool that teaches while testing. Students who failed your assessment can use this to identify and fix their knowledge gaps.

6.7.7 Teaching Tip: How to Integrate This

Option 1: Recommended Practice (Ungraded)

In your unit outline: > “Before each assessment, I recommend using AI to generate practice questions and scenarios. Spend 30-60 minutes testing yourself until you feel confident. This is optional but strongly encouraged.”

Option 2: Required Pre-Assessment Activity (Low Stakes)

“Before the Week 8 exam, complete a self-generated practice test (minimum 20 questions). Submit a screenshot showing completion and a 100-word reflection: What did you learn from this practice? What areas do you still need to review?”

Worth 5% of final grade—graded on completion and reflection quality, not on how many they got right.

Option 3: Study Group Activity

“In your study groups, use AI to generate practice scenarios. Each person generates 5 scenarios and tests the group. Discuss answers and explanations together.”

Combines AI efficiency with peer learning.

6.7.8 Critical Principle: Formative, Not Summative

Important: This technique is for *practice*, not for graded assessment.

Why? - Students can regenerate until they get “good” questions they already know answers to - AI-generated questions lack the rigor of carefully designed exam questions - Students need to struggle and make mistakes in low-stakes practice

The value: Unlimited, personalised practice that builds confidence and competence before high-stakes assessment.

6.7.9 Variation: Adaptive Difficulty

Advanced Student Prompt:

I want to practice identifying workplace bullying vs. performance management vs. legitimate reasonable management action.

Create scenarios for me to classify. After each one:

- If I get it right, make the next scenario more nuanced and ambiguous
- If I get it wrong, make the next scenario clearer and more obvious
- Continue until I can correctly identify 5 difficult/ambiguous cases in a row

Track my progress and tell me when I've achieved mastery.

Begin.

This creates a personalised learning path—AI adjusts difficulty based on student performance.

6.7.10 Why This Matters

Traditional practice is limited by:

- Finite textbook questions
- Lecturer time to create practice materials
- Inability to provide immediate feedback at scale

AI removes these constraints:

- Infinite practice scenarios
- Instant generation
- Immediate feedback
- Adaptive difficulty

Result: Students can practice until they achieve mastery, not until they run out of practice problems.

6.7.11 Simulating Adaptive Difficulty

While true adaptive AI systems require technical infrastructure, students can manually create adaptive difficulty through smart prompting:

Student Prompt: Self-Directed Progression

I want to practice identifying workplace bullying vs. legitimate performance management vs. reasonable management action.

Generate scenarios for me to classify. After I answer each one, tell me if I'm correct.

Track my performance. When I get 8 out of 10 correct, automatically make the next batch of scenarios more complex and ambiguous. When I get fewer than 5 out of 10 correct, make the next batch clearer and more obvious.

Continue until I can correctly identify 5 difficult, ambiguous cases in a row.

Begin with Scenario 1 at medium difficulty.

What This Achieves:

- Student-controlled difficulty progression
- Mastery-based advancement
- Builds confidence through appropriate challenge
- No technical setup required—just good prompting

Teaching Tip:

Encourage students to track their progress: > “Before your next exam, use AI to practice until you achieve 90% accuracy on hard scenarios. Submit a screenshot showing your progression and a 100-word reflection on what you learned.”

This creates accountability without requiring sophisticated adaptive systems.

6.8 Technique 7: The Expert Panel (for Multi-Perspective Analysis)

6.8.1 What It Does

Students consult multiple AI “experts” with different theoretical or professional perspectives on the same HR problem, then synthesize the competing advice into a strategic recommendation.

6.8.2 Why It Works for HR

HR problems rarely have single “correct” answers. They exist at the intersection of psychology, law, business strategy, and ethics. This technique forces students to consider legitimate but competing perspectives and make informed choices about priorities and trade-offs.

6.8.3 The Student Prompt (Ready to Use)

I need to address high turnover in our sales department (35% annual turnover; industry average is 18%). This is affecting team morale, increasing recruitment costs, and impacting customer relationships.

Create three expert personas who will each analyse this problem from their professional perspective:

****Expert 1: Organisational Psychologist****

Focus on: Employee motivation, job satisfaction, workplace culture, team dynamics, psychological contracts

****Expert 2: Compensation & Benefits Specialist****

Focus on: Pay equity, market competitiveness, incentive structures, total rewards, cost-benefit analysis

****Expert 3: Talent Management Strategist****

Focus on: Career development, succession planning, retention programs, employee value proposition, organisational capability

Have each expert independently provide:

1. Their diagnosis of why turnover is high (from their perspective)
2. Their recommended intervention strategy
3. Potential risks or limitations of their recommended approach
4. What data they would need to validate their hypothesis

After all three experts have provided their analysis, I will synthesize their recommendations and develop my own strategic recommendation.

6.8. TECHNIQUE 7: THE EXPERT PANEL (FOR MULTI-PERSPECTIVE ANALYSIS)51

Begin with Expert 1: Organisational Psychologist.

6.8.4 What Happens

The AI creates three distinct voices:

Organizational Psychologist: > “The 35% turnover suggests a breakdown in psychological contract or poor person-organization fit. Sales roles are inherently stressful, but this level suggests systemic issues—possibly unrealistic targets, poor management relationships, or lack of autonomy. I recommend: (1) Conduct stay/exit interview analysis focusing on psychological factors, (2) Assess manager-employee relationship quality, (3) Review goal-setting processes...”

Compensation Specialist: > “At 35% turnover, you’re likely seeing pay inequity or uncompetitive base/commission structures. Sales talent is mobile and market-driven. I recommend: (1) Conduct compensation benchmarking against competitors, (2) Analyse pay dispersion within the team, (3) Review commission structures for fairness and achievability...”

Talent Management Strategist: > “High turnover in sales suggests limited growth opportunities or unclear career paths. Top performers leave when they plateau. I recommend: (1) Map career progression pathways, (2) Implement mentoring for high-potentials, (3) Create lateral development opportunities...”

6.8.5 The Follow-Up Task

After receiving all three perspectives, students must:

1. **Compare and Contrast:**

- Where do the experts agree?
- Where do they conflict?
- Which diagnosis seems most plausible given the evidence?

2. **Synthesize:**

- “If I could only implement one intervention, which would have the most impact?”
- “How could I combine elements from multiple recommendations?”
- “What’s the minimum viable intervention that addresses multiple root causes?”

3. **Justify with Theory:**

- “Which HR theory best explains my chosen approach?” (e.g., Herzberg’s two-factor theory, social exchange theory, expectancy theory)
- “What evidence would I need to collect to validate my choice?”

4. **Acknowledge Trade-offs:**

- “What am I deprioritizing by choosing this approach?”
- “What are the risks if my diagnosis is wrong?”

6.8.6 Variations for Different Topics

Variation 1: Policy Design

Three experts debate a proposed "Bring Your Own Device" policy:

- IT Security Officer (focus: data protection, cybersecurity)
- HR Manager (focus: employee experience, equity, privacy)
- CFO (focus: cost savings, business case, ROI)

Each argues for their priorities. Student must design a policy that balances all three perspectives.

Variation 2: Ethical Dilemma

Three experts analyse whether to implement mandatory return-to-office:

- Employee Relations Specialist (focus: morale, retention, fairness)
- Operations Manager (focus: productivity, collaboration, efficiency)
- Legal Counsel (focus: contractual obligations, discrimination risk, WHS)

Student must recommend a policy that is ethical, legal, and operationally sound.

Variation 3: Change Management

Three experts advise on implementing AI resume screening:

- Diversity & Inclusion Officer (focus: algorithmic bias, equity)
- Recruitment Lead (focus: efficiency, candidate experience)
- Risk & Compliance Manager (focus: legal compliance, audit trails)

Student must design an implementation plan that addresses all concerns.

6.8.7 Teaching Tip: Assessment Application

Assignment: Multi-Expert Consultation Report

Student Requirements: 1. Generate consultation with 3 experts on an assigned HR problem 2. Submit full transcript of expert advice 3. Write 1000-word synthesis report including:
- Summary of each expert's position
- Analysis of agreements and conflicts
- Your strategic recommendation with justification
- Theoretical framework supporting your choice
- Implementation risks and mitigation strategies

What You're Assessing: - Ability to understand multiple valid perspectives
- Synthesis and integration skills - Strategic decision-making under ambiguity
- Application of HR theory to justify choices - Recognition of trade-offs and constraints

6.8.8 Why This Is Powerful

Most HR teaching presents one “correct” approach. But professional practice requires navigating competing legitimate perspectives.

This technique teaches: - No single expert has the complete answer - Good HR decisions balance multiple priorities - Strategic thinking means choosing which perspective to prioritize when - Justification matters more than the specific choice - Real problems require synthesis, not just analysis

6.8.9 Combining with Other Techniques

Expert Panel works brilliantly with:

Pros and Cons (Technique 2): > “After consulting the expert panel, use the Pros and Cons technique to evaluate each expert’s recommended intervention systematically.”

Debating (Technique 5): > “Have the three experts debate each other’s recommendations. Then you arbitrate and make the final decision.”

Role Play (Technique 4): > “After developing your strategy based on expert consultation, role-play presenting it to a skeptical stakeholder (CFO, union rep, CEO) and defend your choices.”

6.9 How to Choose Which Technique to Use

Match the technique to the learning objective:

If you want students to...	Use this technique
Define a complex problem or policy comprehensively	Reverse Prompting
Evaluate competing options and justify a choice	Pros and Cons
Follow a legally/ethically sensitive process correctly	Stepwise Chain of Thought
Practice difficult conversations and communication	Role Play
Understand multiple perspectives and strategic trade-offs	Debating
Build confidence and test knowledge through repetition	Formative Assessment Generator
Synthesize expert advice from different disciplines/roles	The Expert Panel

6.10 Combining Techniques

The real power comes from combining these techniques. For example:

Complex Assessment Sequence: 1. Student uses **Reverse Prompting** to scope out all the requirements for a new parental leave policy 2. Student uses **Pros and Cons** to evaluate three different policy models 3. Student drafts their chosen policy 4. Student uses **Role Play** to practice explaining the policy to a skeptical manager 5. Student uses **Debating** to analyse potential criticisms from different stakeholders

This sequence takes the student through analysis, decision-making, communication, and critical reflection—a complete professional process.

6.11 Your Action Step

Before moving to Chapter 4, choose **one technique** from this chapter and try it yourself. Pick the one that feels most immediately useful for a topic you’re currently teaching.

Copy one of the example prompts, adapt it to your specific content, and see what happens. Get comfortable with at least one of these techniques before we move into the more complex applications in the next chapters.

Remember: these aren’t just AI tools—they’re pedagogical strategies. The AI just makes them scalable and available to every student, any time they want to practice.

Next Chapter Preview: In Chapter 4, we’ll take the Role Play technique and expand it into a full “Flight Simulator” system for HR conversations. You’ll learn how to design high-fidelity simulations, structure the debrief and critique phase, and turn the entire experience into a powerful assessment tool. We’ll work through a complete example from start to finish.

Chapter 7

Chapter 4: The Flight Simulator - Conversation Simulations

7.1 The Three-Phase System

In Chapter 3, you learned the Role Play technique. Now we're going to transform that into a complete professional practice system with three distinct phases:

Phase 1: The Setup (You or the student designs the scenario) **Phase 2: The Simulation** (Student practices the conversation) **Phase 3: The Debrief** (AI critiques the student's performance)

This three-phase approach mirrors how professionals develop expertise: briefing, practice, and reflective analysis. The AI makes this process scalable, personalised, and repeatable.

7.2 Why This Is Powerful

Traditional role-play in class has limitations: - Limited time means each student gets one attempt - Peer role-play can be inconsistent (your classmate might not play the “difficult employee” convincingly) - Students feel self-conscious performing in front of others - Feedback is often delayed and general rather than specific

AI-powered simulation solves all of these: - Students can practice the same scenario five times until they get it right - The AI consistently plays the role as designed - Students can practice privately, making mistakes without embarrassment - Feedback is immediate, specific, and tied to learning objectives

Let's walk through a complete example.

7.3 Complete Worked Example: The Performance Improvement Plan Meeting

7.3.1 Context

This is a common high-stakes conversation that HR professionals and managers must conduct. It's legally sensitive, emotionally difficult, and requires balancing empathy with accountability.

Learning Objectives:

- Apply principles of procedural fairness - Communicate difficult feedback clearly and constructively
- Demonstrate empathy while maintaining professional boundaries
- Document the conversation appropriately
- Avoid common legal pitfalls (discrimination, unfair dismissal)

7.4 Phase 1: The Setup Prompt

This is where you (or the student) design the scenario. The setup prompt defines:

1. The AI's role and personality
2. The context and background
3. The challenge or conflict
4. Behavioural guidelines for the AI
5. When the simulation should end

7.4.1 Setup Prompt (Ready to Use)

You are Alex Chen, a 32-year-old software engineer who has worked at TechCorp for three years. You were a high performer until six months ago, when your work quality declined noticeably.

BACKGROUND CONTEXT:

- You have missed three project deadlines in the past four months
- Your code quality has dropped-recent pull requests have had multiple bugs that QA caught
- You've been arriving late to work 2-3 times per week
- Your manager has already had one informal conversation with you about these concerns two months ago, but things have not improved
- You are being placed on a formal 60-day Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)

YOUR PERSONA AND BEHAVIOR:

- You are defensive and embarrassed. You feel this PIP is unfair and harsh.
- You believe your recent work is "good enough" and that your manager has unrealistic expectations

- You are dealing with a stressful personal situation (caring for an aging parent), but you have not told your manager about this—you believe it's private and not relevant to work
- You are not aggressive or hostile, but you are resistant and will push back on criticism
- If the HR person or manager shows genuine empathy and asks open questions, you will gradually reveal some personal context
- If they are accusatory or dismissive, you will shut down and become minimal in your responses

THE MEETING:

I am the HR representative (or the manager) conducting the PIP meeting with you. This is a formal meeting. You have just been told this is a PIP discussion.

YOUR GOAL:

- React as Alex would realistically react
- Challenge the fairness of the process if it seems rushed or poorly explained
- Reveal personal information only if trust is established
- Show emotion (frustration, stress, worry) but remain professional
- Respond dynamically to how I conduct the meeting

Stay in character throughout. Begin the meeting by responding to my opening statement. I will start the conversation now.

Key Design Elements: - **Complexity:** Alex isn't purely defensive or purely cooperative—there's legitimate work performance decline *and* extenuating circumstances - **Realistic emotion:** Alex is stressed and embarrassed, not theatrical or extreme - **Conditional behavior:** How Alex responds depends on the student's approach (rewards good technique) - **Hidden information:** The personal context isn't revealed unless the student asks the right questions with the right tone

7.5 Phase 2: The Simulation

The student now conducts the meeting. Here's an example of how this might play out.

7.5.1 Example Conversation

Student (HR Rep): > "Hi Alex, thanks for meeting with me. I want to talk with you today about some performance concerns that have been raised. I know this is a difficult conversation, but I want to make sure we have an open

discussion about what's been happening and how we can support you moving forward.”

AI (as Alex): > *shifts uncomfortably* “Yeah, I’ve been hearing whispers about this. Look, I know I’ve missed a couple of deadlines, but I don’t think things are as bad as people are making out. I’m still getting my work done. Is this really necessary?”

Student: > “I understand this feels uncomfortable. Let me be specific about the concerns. Over the past four months, you’ve missed three major project deadlines—the payment gateway integration in March, the API update in April, and the mobile optimization in May. Additionally, QA has flagged an increase in bugs in your recent code submissions. These are measurable changes from your previous performance standard. Can you help me understand what’s been happening?”

AI (as Alex): > *pauses, looks down* “I mean... yeah, okay, I’ve had some issues. But deadlines get missed sometimes, right? And bugs happen. I just feel like everyone’s being really harsh all of a sudden. I had one conversation with my manager about this two months ago, and now suddenly I’m on a PIP? That feels pretty extreme.”

Student: > “That’s a fair question, Alex. You did have an informal conversation with your manager in early April where these concerns were raised. At that time, you both agreed on some strategies to get things back on track. Since then, we’ve continued to see the same patterns—another deadline missed last month and continued quality issues. A PIP isn’t a punishment; it’s a structured way to clearly define expectations, provide support, and give you a fair opportunity to improve. Does that make sense?”

AI (as Alex): > *sighs* “I guess. I just... it’s been a really tough few months personally, okay? I know that’s not your problem, but it’s not like I’m just slacking off or don’t care anymore.”

Student: > “Thank you for sharing that, Alex. I appreciate that personal circumstances can affect work, and I’m genuinely sorry you’re dealing with difficult things. If there are specific supports we can offer—whether that’s adjustments to your schedule, access to our Employee Assistance Program, or other accommodations—we’re open to discussing that. But we also need to be clear about the performance standards that need to be met. Can we talk about what support might help you succeed during this PIP period?”

AI (as Alex): > *softens slightly* “Honestly, I’ve been dealing with my dad’s health declining. I’ve been having to take him to medical appointments, and I’m the only family member nearby. Some mornings I’m exhausted because I’ve been up half the night. I didn’t want to bring it into work because... I don’t know, I thought I could just handle it.”

Student: > “I’m really sorry to hear about your father, Alex. That’s incredibly stressful. I’m glad you’ve told me, because this is exactly the kind of situation

where we want to support our employees. Have you considered whether a temporary flexible schedule might help—perhaps starting later on days when you have early appointments, or adjusting your hours? We can also connect you with our EAP, which offers counseling and support for family caregivers. Would either of those be helpful?”

AI (as Alex): > *nods* “Yeah... actually, that might really help. I didn’t know that was an option. I’ve just been trying to power through, but clearly that’s not working.”

Student: > “I appreciate your honesty. So here’s what I suggest: we’ll document this PIP with clear performance targets—specific deadlines and quality standards. But we’ll also document the support measures we’re putting in place, including flexible scheduling where possible. This gives you the structure and the support to get back to the high performance standard we know you’re capable of. The PIP period is 60 days. At the 30-day mark, we’ll have a check-in to see how things are going. Does that sound fair?”

AI (as Alex): > *takes a breath* “Okay. Yeah. I mean, it’s still stressful to be on a PIP, but I get it. And if I can actually get some flexibility with the schedule, that would help a lot. I don’t want to lose this job—I just need to get things back on track.”

Student: > “That’s exactly the goal, Alex. We want you to succeed. Let’s schedule a follow-up meeting next week to formalize the flexible schedule arrangement and go through the detailed PIP document. Thank you for being open with me today—that’s really important.”

AI (as Alex): > *manages a small, tired smile* “Thanks. I appreciate you actually listening.”

7.6 Phase 3: The Debrief (AI Critique)

After the simulation ends, the student copies the entire conversation transcript and submits it to the AI with a **critique prompt**. This is where the real learning happens.

7.6.1 Critique Prompt (Ready to Use)

You are an expert HR educator evaluating a student's performance in a simulated Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) meeting.

Below is the full transcript of the conversation between the student (acting as the HR Representative) and a simulated employee (Alex Chen) who was being placed on a PIP.

60CHAPTER 7. CHAPTER 4: THE FLIGHT SIMULATOR - CONVERSATION SIMULATIONS

Your task is to provide a detailed critique of the student's performance across the following criteria:

1. PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS

- Did the student clearly explain why the meeting was happening?
- Did they provide specific examples of performance issues?
- Did they give Alex an opportunity to respond and explain?
- Did they explain the PIP process fairly and clearly?

2. COMMUNICATION EFFECTIVENESS

- Was the tone appropriate (professional, empathetic but not dismissive)?
- Did the student use open questions to encourage dialogue?
- How did they handle Alex's defensiveness?
- Did they actively listen and acknowledge Alex's concerns?

3. LEGAL AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

- Did the student avoid any discriminatory language or assumptions?
- Did they appropriately handle the disclosure of personal circumstances?
- Did they maintain appropriate professional boundaries?
- Did they document support measures as well as performance requirements?

4. APPLICATION OF HR THEORY

- What motivational or psychological principles did the student apply (or fail to apply)?
- How well did they balance accountability with support?
- Did they create conditions for behavioural change?

For each criterion, provide:

- A score out of 10
- Specific examples from the transcript (quote the student's words)
- What the student did well
- What the student could improve
- One concrete suggestion for how to improve

Finally, provide an overall assessment: If this were a real PIP meeting, what would likely happen next based on how the student conducted it?

Here is the transcript:

[PASTE TRANSCRIPT HERE]

Begin your critique.

7.6.2 Example Critique Output

The AI will provide something like this:

CRITIQUE OF PIP MEETING PERFORMANCE

1. PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS: 9/10

What you did well: You were exemplary in providing specific, measurable examples of performance concerns. When you said, “*Over the past four months, you’ve missed three major project deadlines—the payment gateway integration in March, the API update in April, and the mobile optimization in May,*” you gave Alex concrete information to respond to, not vague accusations. This is critical for procedural fairness.

You also clearly explained the purpose of the PIP: “*A PIP isn’t a punishment; it’s a structured way to clearly define expectations, provide support, and give you a fair opportunity to improve.*” This reframing helped reduce Alex’s defensiveness.

Where you could improve: You could have been even more explicit about the timeline and previous feedback. While you mentioned the April conversation, you could have said: “We had a conversation on April 3rd where we documented three specific concerns. We agreed you would [specific actions]. Since then, we’ve seen [specific outcomes]. That’s why we’re now moving to a formal PIP.”

Suggestion: Always reference specific dates and documented prior warnings. This strengthens the legal defensibility of your process.

2. COMMUNICATION EFFECTIVENESS: 10/10

What you did well: Your use of empathy was outstanding. When Alex revealed personal stress, you immediately acknowledged it: “*Thank you for sharing that, Alex. I appreciate that personal circumstances can affect work, and I’m genuinely sorry you’re dealing with difficult things.*” This response validated Alex’s feelings while maintaining professional boundaries.

You also used excellent open-ended questions: “*Can you help me understand what’s been happening?*” This invited dialogue rather than putting Alex on the defensive.

Your handling of defensiveness was textbook-perfect. When Alex said the PIP felt “extreme,” you didn’t argue or dismiss—you acknowledged the concern (“*That’s a fair question*”) and then explained the rationale.

Where you could improve: Nothing significant. Your communication was professional, empathetic, and effective throughout.

3. LEGAL AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS: 9/10

What you did well: When Alex disclosed caregiving responsibilities, you immediately offered accommodations: “*Have you considered whether a tempo-*

rarely flexible schedule might help?" This is legally and ethically sound—you're demonstrating that the company is willing to make reasonable adjustments, which protects against claims of unfair dismissal or discrimination.

You also avoided making assumptions or probing inappropriately into Alex's personal life. You accepted the disclosure, offered support, and moved the conversation forward professionally.

Where you could improve: You should explicitly document this conversation. At the end of the meeting, you could have said: "I'm going to document today's conversation, including your disclosure about your father's health and the flexible schedule accommodation we've discussed. You'll receive a copy of this documentation for your records."

Suggestion: Always verbally confirm that documentation will be provided. This ensures transparency and gives the employee a chance to correct any misunderstandings immediately.

4. APPLICATION OF HR THEORY: 8/10

What you did well: You demonstrated understanding of **motivational theory** by balancing challenge with support. You didn't just impose standards—you co-created solutions by asking, "*Can we talk about what support might help you succeed during this PIP period?*"

You also applied principles of **procedural justice** by ensuring Alex felt heard and treated fairly, which research shows increases acceptance of difficult decisions.

Where you could improve: You could have applied **goal-setting theory** more explicitly. When finalising the PIP, you mentioned "clear performance targets," but you didn't collaboratively define them in the meeting. Research shows that when employees participate in setting their own goals, commitment and achievement increase.

Suggestion: In your follow-up meeting, involve Alex in defining the specific, measurable targets for the PIP. For example: "What do you think is a realistic number of on-time deliverables over the next 30 days, given the support we're putting in place?" This increases ownership and reduces resistance.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Likely Outcome: Based on how you conducted this meeting, Alex is likely to:

- Feel that the process was fair, even though it's stressful
- Engage constructively with the PIP rather than resist or disengage
- Utilise the flexible schedule accommodation
- Have a reasonable chance of meeting the performance standards during the 60-day period

Why: You established psychological safety (Alex felt safe disclosing personal information), you demonstrated empathy without compromising standards, and you offered concrete support. This is exactly the balance effective HR professionals must strike.

One Risk to Watch: Ensure that the flexible schedule accommodation is documented and approved by the manager. If the manager later claims they weren't consulted or don't agree, this could create conflict. Always confirm that proposed accommodations are feasible with all stakeholders before committing to them in a meeting.

FINAL SCORE: 36/40 (90%)

This was a highly competent performance. You demonstrated strong communication skills, applied HR principles effectively, and handled a complex, emotionally charged situation with professionalism and empathy. The areas for improvement are minor and relate to documentation and collaborative goal-setting—both easily addressed in your follow-up meeting.

7.7 What Makes This Critique Valuable

Notice what the AI's critique provides:

1. **Specific feedback tied to theory** (procedural fairness, motivational theory, goal-setting theory)
2. **Direct quotes from the student's performance** (not vague generalizations)
3. **Clear scores** for each criterion (makes assessment transparent)
4. **Actionable suggestions** (not just "do better," but *how* to do better)
5. **Predictive analysis** (what would likely happen next in the real world)

This level of detailed, personalised feedback would take a lecturer 20-30 minutes per student to write manually. The AI generates it in seconds, and it's consistent across all students.

7.8 How to Use This as an Assessment

You have several options for how to structure this as a graded assignment:

7.8.1 Option 1: Simulation + Critique Submission

Student Requirements: 1. Conduct the simulation (submit the full transcript)
2. Generate the AI critique using the provided prompt 3. Write a 500-word

reflective response addressing: - Do you agree with the AI's critique? Why or why not? - Choose one piece of critical feedback from the AI. How would you apply this in your next attempt? - Identify one HR theory or legal principle that guided your approach. Did you apply it effectively?

What You Grade: - Quality of the conversation (did they demonstrate the required skills?) - Depth of reflection (do they show genuine self-assessment and learning?) - Theoretical integration (can they connect practice to theory?)

7.8.2 Option 2: Simulation + Re-Do + Comparison

Student Requirements: 1. Conduct the simulation (first attempt) 2. Generate the AI critique 3. Conduct the same simulation again, incorporating the feedback 4. Write a comparative analysis: What changed between attempt 1 and attempt 2? What did you learn?

What You Grade: - Evidence of improvement between attempts - Ability to integrate feedback - Quality of self-directed learning

7.8.3 Option 3: Student-Designed Simulation

Student Requirements: 1. Design your own simulation scenario (write the setup prompt for a different HR situation) 2. Justify why this scenario targets specific learning objectives 3. Conduct the simulation 4. Generate and respond to the critique

What You Grade: - Quality of scenario design (does it create a meaningful learning challenge?) - Performance in the simulation - Reflective analysis

7.9 Adapting This for Different HR Topics

The three-phase system works for any conversational HR skill:

HR Skill Area	Simulation Scenario	Key Learning Focus
Recruitment	AI plays a job candidate who gives vague answers	Behavioural interviewing, probing questions, bias awareness
Conflict Resolution	AI plays an employee making a bullying complaint	Investigative process, empathy, impartiality, documentation
Negotiation	AI plays a union representative in enterprise bargaining	Interest-based negotiation, legal boundaries, compromise

HR Skill Area	Simulation Scenario	Key Learning Focus
Change Management	AI plays a resistant manager during restructure	Communication, stakeholder management, emotional intelligence
Termination	AI plays an employee being made redundant	Procedural fairness, legal compliance, empathy in difficult situations

For each scenario, you simply adjust: 1. The persona and context in the **Setup Prompt** 2. The evaluation criteria in the **Critique Prompt** 3. The learning objectives you're targeting

The three-phase structure remains the same.

7.10 Common Questions

Q: Won't students just keep trying until the AI gives them a good score?

A: That's actually a *feature*, not a bug. In professional development, repetition until competence is exactly what we want. However, you can require students to submit *all* attempts, not just their best one. This shows their learning journey and prevents gaming the system.

Q: What if students share their transcripts and just copy each other's approach?

A: Design the scenarios with variability. Give each student a slightly different context (different employee persona, different performance issue, different complicating factor). The skills they're practicing remain the same, but the conversations will be unique.

Q: How do I know the AI's critique is accurate?

A: You should review a sample of critiques initially to ensure quality. However, because *you* write the critique prompt with specific criteria tied to your learning objectives, the AI's assessment will align with your rubric. You're essentially scaling your own assessment criteria.

Q: Can students do this with voice instead of text?

A: Yes! Many AI tools now support voice conversation mode. Students can literally *speak* their way through the simulation, making it even more realistic. The conversation can then be transcribed for the critique phase.

7.11 Your Action Step

Before moving to Chapter 5, try this:

1. **Choose one difficult conversation** from your HR curriculum
2. **Write a setup prompt** that creates a realistic scenario (use the Alex Chen example as a template)
3. **Test it yourself**—have the conversation with the AI
4. **Generate a critique** of your own performance
5. **Reflect:** Would this be valuable for your students?

Once you've experienced the full cycle yourself, you'll be ready to introduce it to your class.

Next Chapter Preview: In Chapter 5, we'll explore how to use AI as a transparent, ethical self-assessment tool. You'll learn how to give students both the grading rubric *and* the AI critique prompt upfront, teaching them to use AI responsibly as an advanced editing and analysis tool rather than a shortcut. This shifts the conversation from “preventing AI cheating” to “teaching AI literacy.”

Chapter 8

Chapter 5: AI as Study Buddy - Self-Assessment Tool

8.1 The Academic Integrity Challenge

Let's address the elephant in the room: you're worried students will use AI to cheat.

That's a legitimate concern. Students could paste assignment questions into ChatGPT, get answers, and submit them as their own work. Many universities have responded by trying to detect AI-generated text, banning AI tools, or designing "AI-proof" assessments.

This chapter proposes a radically different approach: Give students the AI tools openly, teach them to use AI ethically, and grade them on their ability to critically improve AI outputs.

Why? Because in their professional HR careers, they *will* use AI tools. Our job isn't to prevent that—it's to ensure they use them responsibly, understand their limitations, and maintain human judgment on critical matters.

8.2 The Transparency Model

Here's the core idea:

Give students BOTH: 1. **The grading rubric** (what you'll assess them on)
2. **The exact AI critique prompt** (the tool to check their work)

This transforms AI from a cheating shortcut into a **transparent learning tool**—like giving students the answer key to practice problems before the real exam.

8.2.1 The Psychology Behind It

When you give students the rubric and the AI critique tool:

- They can practice and get immediate feedback before submission
- They learn to evaluate their own work against professional standards
- They develop **metacognitive skills** (thinking about their thinking)
- They take ownership of their learning (self-directed improvement)
- The focus shifts from “fooling the teacher” to “meeting the standard”

This is pedagogically powerful for HR education because **reflective practice** and **self-directed learning** are core competencies in the field.

8.3 How It Works: A Step-by-Step Example

8.3.1 Scenario: A Written HR Case Analysis Assignment

The Assignment: Students must analyse a workplace conflict scenario and recommend an appropriate HR intervention, justifying their recommendation with employment law and psychological theory.

Traditional Approach: - Give students the case - They write their analysis - You grade it (hopefully they didn't just ask ChatGPT to write it) - They get a grade 2 weeks later with minimal feedback

Transparency Approach: - Give students the case - Give them the detailed rubric showing exactly what you're assessing - Give them the AI critique prompt they can use to check their draft - They write, self-assess using the AI, revise based on feedback, and submit - You grade the final submission (and can see evidence of their revision process)

Let's see this in action.

8.4 Complete Worked Example

8.4.1 Step 1: The Assignment Prompt

ASSIGNMENT: Workplace Conflict Analysis

Read the following scenario:

Maria, a team leader in the marketing department, has filed a formal complaint alleging that her manager, David, has created a hostile work environment. Maria claims that David regularly dismisses her ideas in meetings, assigns her the least desirable projects, and has denied her professional development opportunities that he's offered to other team leaders. David denies these allegations and states that Maria is "oversensitive" and "not a team player." There have been no previous formal complaints, but two other team members have informally mentioned that they find David's management style "difficult."

YOUR TASK:

Write a 750-word analysis that includes:

1. Identification of the key HR issues in this scenario (legal, ethical, and interpersonal)
2. An evaluation of what information you would need to gather to investigate this properly
3. A recommended HR intervention with justification based on:
 - Relevant employment law or workplace policy principles
 - Psychological theory (e.g., conflict resolution, motivation, organisational justice)
4. Potential risks if the situation is not handled appropriately

Your analysis will be assessed using the rubric provided below.

8.4.2 Step 2: The Grading Rubric (Given to Students)

Criterion	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Adequate (2)	Poor (1)
Issue Identification	Identifies all major legal, ethical, and interpersonal issues with nuanced understanding	Identifies most major issues with reasonable understanding	Identifies some issues but misses key elements or lacks depth	Fails to identify critical issues or shows misunderstanding

70CHAPTER 8. CHAPTER 5: AI AS STUDY BUDDY - SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL

Criterion	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Adequate (2)	Poor (1)
Investigation Process	Demonstrates comprehensive understanding of fair investigative process; identifies all relevant information needed	Shows good understanding of investigation requirements; identifies most relevant information	Shows basic understanding but missing important investigative steps	Little evidence of understanding proper investigation process
Legal/Policy Application	Accurately applies relevant law/policy with sophisticated understanding of implications	Correctly applies relevant law/policy with good understanding	Applies some relevant law/policy but with gaps or minor errors	Fails to apply relevant law/policy or shows significant misunderstanding
Theoretical Integration	Expertly integrates psychological theory to justify recommendations; makes sophisticated connections	Effectively uses theory to support recommendations; makes clear connections	Attempts to use theory but connections are superficial or underdeveloped	Minimal or no use of theory, or theory is incorrectly applied
Risk Analysis	Identifies multiple realistic risks with sophisticated understanding of consequences	Identifies key risks with good understanding of consequences	Identifies some risks but analysis is basic or incomplete	Fails to identify realistic risks or shows poor understanding
Writing Quality	Clear, professional, well-structured with no errors	Mostly clear and professional with minor issues	Adequate but has clarity or structural issues	Poor writing quality that impedes understanding

Total: /24

8.4.3 Step 3: The AI Self-Assessment Prompt (Given to Students)

This is what students use to check their work *before* submission.

You are an expert HR lecturer providing formative feedback to a student on their assignment draft. Your role is to provide constructive, specific feedback that helps the student improve their work before final submission.

You should be rigorous but supportive—your goal is to help them learn, not to simply validate their work.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA:

Evaluate the student's response against these criteria:

1. Issue Identification: Have they identified the key legal, ethical, and interpersonal issues?
2. Investigation Process: Do they demonstrate understanding of fair, thorough investigation?
3. Legal/Policy Application: Have they correctly applied relevant employment law or policy?
4. Theoretical Integration: Have they used psychological theory to justify their recommendations?
5. Risk Analysis: Have they identified realistic risks if the issue isn't handled well?
6. Writing Quality: Is it clear, professional, and well-structured?

YOUR TASK:

1. For each criterion, provide a score (1-4) and brief justification
2. Quote specific sentences from the student's work to illustrate your points
3. Identify the strongest aspect of their analysis
4. Identify the weakest aspect that needs the most improvement
5. Provide THREE specific, actionable suggestions for revision

Be honest. If something is missing, say so. If their legal analysis is incorrect, explain why. If they've misapplied theory, guide them to the correct application.

Here is the student's draft:

[STUDENT PASTES THEIR DRAFT HERE]

Begin your feedback.

8.5 What This Looks Like in Practice

8.5.1 Student's First Draft (Excerpt)

"This scenario shows a conflict between Maria and David. The main issue is that David is not being a good manager. Maria feels like she's being treated unfairly, which is creating a hostile work environment. This could be bullying or harassment. The HR department should investigate by talking to both Maria and David to get both sides of the story. They should also implement conflict resolution training for David. If this isn't handled, it could lead to a lawsuit or Maria quitting."

8.5.2 AI Feedback (Using the Prompt Above)

FORMATIVE FEEDBACK ON DRAFT

CRITERION 1: Issue Identification - Score: 2/4

You've identified the surface-level conflict, but your analysis lacks specificity and misses critical issues.

What you wrote: "This could be bullying or harassment."

The problem: You've used these terms interchangeably, but they have different legal definitions and implications. Bullying is repeated, unreasonable behavior; harassment typically relates to discrimination based on protected characteristics (gender, race, age, etc.). Which applies here, and why? Is there evidence of discrimination based on Maria's gender or another protected characteristic, or is this a management style issue?

What's missing: You haven't identified potential procedural issues (why wasn't this addressed earlier?), power dynamics (David is Maria's manager), or organisational culture problems (two other employees find his style "difficult").

CRITERION 2: Investigation Process - Score: 2/4

You've identified the need for an investigation, but your description is too vague.

What you wrote: "Talking to both Maria and David to get both sides of the story."

The problem: A fair investigation requires more than just hearing "both sides." You need to: - Interview the two employees who informally raised concerns - Review any documented evidence (emails, performance reviews, meeting notes) - Examine whether other team leaders received opportunities Maria was denied - Maintain confidentiality and impartiality throughout - Document everything

What's missing: Any mention of procedural fairness, natural justice, or legal compliance in the investigation process.

CRITERION 3: Legal/Policy Application - Score: 1/4

This is your weakest area. You haven't applied any specific legal principles or policies.

What you wrote: "This could lead to a lawsuit."

The problem: This is too vague. *What kind* of lawsuit? Under what legal theory? You need to reference specific legal risks like: - Potential discrimination claim under the Fair Work Act (if there's evidence David's treatment relates to a protected characteristic) - Potential bullying claim under work health and safety legislation - Potential breach of the employer's duty of care

You also need to reference the organization's obligations—to provide a safe workplace, to investigate complaints fairly, to act on findings.

CRITERION 4: Theoretical Integration - Score: 1/4

You have not applied any psychological theory to your analysis.

What's missing entirely: There's no reference to conflict resolution theory, organisational justice theory, motivation theory, or any framework that would explain *why* this situation is problematic beyond "it's unfair." For example: - Organisational justice theory explains why Maria perceives inequity - Conflict resolution models would guide your intervention choice - Leadership or management theory could inform what training David might need

CRITERION 5: Risk Analysis - Score: 2/4

You've identified two risks (lawsuit, resignation) but your analysis is shallow.

What you wrote: "This could lead to a lawsuit or Maria quitting."

The problem: These are possible outcomes, but you haven't explained *why* or *how* they might occur, or what other risks exist: - Reputational damage if other employees witness inaction - Decreased team morale and productivity - Potential for retaliation against Maria if not handled carefully - Liability if the organisation knew about the problem and didn't act

CRITERION 6: Writing Quality - Score: 3/4

Your writing is clear and easy to follow, which is good. However, it's quite informal for a professional HR analysis ("not being a good manager"). Use more precise, professional language.

STRONGEST ASPECT: You correctly identified that this requires formal investigation and that there are consequences for inaction. You've grasped the seriousness of the situation.

WEAKEST ASPECT: Complete lack of theoretical integration and very weak legal/policy analysis. You're describing the problem but not demonstrating deep HR knowledge or analytical skill.

THREE SPECIFIC ACTIONS FOR REVISION:

1. **Add legal specificity:** Research and cite at least two specific legal principles or obligations that apply here (e.g., employer's duty to provide a safe workplace under WHS legislation, prohibition of workplace bullying, Fair Work Act provisions on adverse action). Explain *how* these apply to the scenario.
2. **Integrate theory:** Choose one psychological or organisational theory (e.g., organisational justice theory, Adams' equity theory, or conflict resolution models) and explicitly use it to explain why Maria is experiencing the situation as unfair and/or to justify your recommended intervention.
3. **Detail the investigation:** Expand your investigation section to list at least five specific steps the HR team should take, including who should be interviewed, what documents should be reviewed, and how to ensure procedural fairness.

CURRENT ESTIMATED SCORE: 11/24 (46%)

This draft needs substantial development before submission. Focus on the three actions above and your score will improve significantly.

8.6 The Impact on Learning

Notice what just happened:

1. **The student received specific, detailed feedback** identifying exactly what's missing
2. **The feedback is educational**, not just evaluative—it explains *why* things are problems and *what* good looks like
3. **The student has clear actions** for improvement
4. **The student can revise and resubmit to the AI** multiple times until they meet the standard

This is **formative assessment at scale**. Every student gets personalised feedback. They can iterate until they learn. And they arrive at your desk with work that's already been through multiple revision cycles.

8.7 What You Grade

When students submit their final work, they also submit:

1. **Their final analysis** (the polished version)
2. **Evidence of their revision process:**
 - Screenshots or transcripts of AI feedback they received
 - A brief reflection (250 words) explaining:
 - What the AI identified as weak
 - What changes they made
 - What they learned from the process

8.7.1 Grading Approach

You grade on **two dimensions**:

Dimension 1: Quality of Final Work (70%) Use your rubric to assess the final submission. Because students have had the chance to improve with AI feedback, you should see much higher quality work overall.

Dimension 2: Quality of Learning Process (30%) Assess their reflection: - Did they engage meaningfully with the AI feedback? - Did they make substantive revisions? - Do they show metacognitive awareness (understanding of their own learning)? - Did they critically evaluate the AI's suggestions or just accept them blindly?

Key Question for Dimension 2: “Did the student just ask AI to write it for them, or did they use AI to learn how to write better?”

8.7.2 Red Flags for AI Misuse

If a student: - Shows no evidence of revision between drafts - Can't explain in their reflection what they changed or why - Submits work that's suddenly far beyond their previous capability with no learning process shown - Has AI feedback that's generic (suggesting they didn't actually use your provided prompt)

...then you have grounds for a conversation about academic integrity.

But the transparency model makes genuine misuse much harder, because students have to show their working.

8.8 Variations and Adaptations

8.8.1 Variation 1: Multiple Draft Checkpoints

Require students to submit: - First draft + AI feedback (Week 8) - Revised draft + AI feedback (Week 10) - Final submission with reflection (Week 12)

This scaffolds the revision process and prevents last-minute cramming.

8.8.2 Variation 2: Peer Review + AI Review

Students receive feedback from two sources: - A peer using a structured peer review form - The AI using your critique prompt

Then they write a reflection comparing the two types of feedback: What did each source notice? Where did they disagree? Which feedback was most helpful and why?

This teaches critical evaluation of feedback sources—an important professional skill.

8.8.3 Variation 3: AI Critique Challenge

After receiving AI feedback, students must: - Identify one piece of feedback they disagree with - Argue why the AI is wrong or has misunderstood their work - Provide evidence for their position

This prevents students from blindly accepting AI suggestions and develops critical thinking about AI limitations.

8.9 Student-Facing Instructions

When you introduce this to students, be explicit about the learning model:

HOW TO USE THE AI SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL

This assignment includes access to an AI feedback tool. Here's how to use it ethically and effectively:

DO: - Use the AI to check your draft and identify areas for improvement - Revise your work based on the feedback - Run multiple drafts through the AI as you improve - Think critically about whether the AI's suggestions are correct - Use the AI to learn HR concepts and improve your analytical skills

DON'T: - Ask the AI to write the assignment for you - Copy-paste AI-generated text into your submission without understanding it - Ignore the feedback and submit your first draft - Treat the AI's feedback as infallible—it can be wrong

REMEMBER: The goal is not to “beat the AI” or trick it into giving you a good score. The goal is to use the AI as a learning tool so that YOU understand HR analysis better by the time you submit.

You will submit evidence of your revision process, so I can see your learning journey. The quality of your final work AND your learning process will both be graded.

8.10 Addressing Lecturer Concerns

“Won’t this just teach students to game the AI?”

No—because you’re assessing the learning process, not just the final product. Students who genuinely engage with feedback and revise their thinking will show that in their reflection. Students who just prompt-engineer to get a high score without learning will have nothing meaningful to say about what they learned.

“What if the AI gives them incorrect feedback?”

This is actually a valuable learning opportunity. If the AI makes an error (e.g., misapplies a legal principle), students who know their material will catch it and can challenge it in their reflection. This demonstrates higher-order thinking.

Also, because you’re providing the critique prompt, you control the assessment criteria. The AI is applying *your* rubric, so it should align with your expectations.

“Isn’t this just making things easier for students?”

No—it’s making feedback faster and more accessible, but the cognitive work hasn’t changed. Students still need to understand the concepts, apply theory correctly, and demonstrate critical thinking. The AI just accelerates the feedback loop so they can learn faster.

In fact, this model often reveals students who’ve been hiding behind vague writing—the AI forces them to be specific and substantive.

“What about students who don’t have access to AI tools?”

If equity is a concern, you can:

- Provide access to AI tools through the university (many institutions now have educational subscriptions)
- Run the AI critique process in class or during office hours
- Make the AI feedback optional but provide other scaffolding for students who don’t use it

8.11 The Bigger Picture: Teaching AI Literacy

This transparency approach does something more important than preventing cheating: **it teaches students how to work with AI responsibly.**

In their HR careers, they'll have access to AI tools that can:

- Draft policies
- Analyse employment data
- Generate interview questions
- Summarize legal requirements

Your job isn't to prevent them from using these tools. It's to teach them:

- When AI is helpful and when it's risky
- How to critically evaluate AI outputs
- When human judgment must override AI suggestions
- How to use AI as a thinking partner, not a replacement for thinking

By making AI use transparent and educational, you're preparing them for professional practice in an AI-augmented world.

8.12 Your Action Step

Before Chapter 6, try this:

1. **Choose one assignment** you currently give students
2. **Write the AI critique prompt** based on your existing rubric
3. **Test it:** Write a mediocre draft answer yourself and run it through the AI critique
4. **Evaluate:** Is the feedback accurate? Helpful? Aligned with your standards?
5. **Refine the prompt** until the AI gives the kind of feedback you'd want students to receive

Once you've tested it, you're ready to introduce this model in your class.

Next Chapter Preview: In Chapter 6, we'll explore the "future horizon"—creating a virtual HR company staffed by AI employees. Students interact with multiple AI personas (difficult employees, union representatives, senior managers) in an ongoing simulation that builds complexity over time. This is the most ambitious application, but it's becoming increasingly feasible with current technology.

Chapter 9

Chapter 9: The Ethics & Integrity Question

9.1 The Conversation You Must Have

If you implement any of the ideas in this booklet, you will have this conversation—with students, with colleagues, possibly with administrators:

“Aren’t you just teaching students to cheat?”

This chapter gives you the framework, language, and evidence to respond confidently. More importantly, it helps you position AI integration not as an academic integrity *problem*, but as an academic integrity *opportunity*—a chance to teach professional ethics and responsible technology use.

9.2 Reframing the Question

The traditional framing: > “How do we prevent students from using AI inappropriately?”

The professional framing: > “How do we teach students to use AI responsibly in their HR careers?”

The shift matters.

The first framing treats AI as a threat to be controlled. The second treats AI literacy as a learning objective to be developed.

As an HR educator, you’re not preparing students for a world without AI. You’re preparing them for a world where AI tools will: - Screen resumes and identify

candidates - Draft employment contracts and policies - Analyse workforce data and predict turnover - Generate interview questions and assessment criteria - Summarize complex legislation and case law

Your graduates will use these tools. The question is: **Will they use them competently and ethically, or incompetently and recklessly?**

That's what this chapter is about.

9.3 The Three-Part Framework for Ethical AI Use

This framework works for talking to students, colleagues, and administrators. It has three components:

9.3.1 1. Transparency (Not Prohibition)

The principle: Make AI use explicit, expected, and assessable rather than hidden and policed.

In practice: - Tell students exactly when and how they can use AI - Provide the prompts and tools yourself - Assess their *use* of AI, not their *avoidance* of AI - Reward students who identify AI's errors and limitations

Why this builds integrity: When AI use is transparent, students learn to use it openly and responsibly. When it's prohibited, students use it secretly and don't develop critical oversight skills.

9.3.2 2. Critical Oversight (Not Blind Reliance)

The principle: Teach students that AI is a tool requiring human judgment, not an authority to be trusted.

In practice: - Design assignments where students must critique or override AI outputs - Require students to identify what AI gets wrong - Grade students on their ability to improve on AI suggestions - Show examples of AI failures (bias, errors, oversimplification)

Why this builds integrity: Students learn that using AI thoughtfully is harder than avoiding it. They develop the professional habit of verification and critical thinking.

9.3.3 3. Professional Relevance (Not Academic Abstraction)

The principle: Connect AI use in coursework to AI use in professional practice.

In practice: - Frame assignments as professional scenarios: “You’re the HR manager using AI to draft a policy...” - Discuss workplace AI ethics: “What happens if your AI resume screening tool discriminates?” - Teach governance: “Who is accountable when AI-assisted decisions go wrong?” - Include AI literacy as a stated learning objective in your unit outline

Why this builds integrity: When students see AI use as professional skill development rather than academic shortcut, they engage differently. They’re not “cheating the system”—they’re practicing for their careers.

9.4 Student-Facing Language: Setting Expectations

You need clear, direct communication about AI use. Here’s a model you can adapt:

9.4.1 Example: Unit Outline AI Policy Statement

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE USE IN THIS UNIT

In professional HR practice, you will use AI tools to support decision-making, analysis, and communication. This unit teaches you to use AI responsibly and critically.

WHEN AI USE IS EXPECTED:

- Assignment 2 (Conversation Simulation): You will interact with an AI persona and submit transcripts
- Assignment 3 (Self-Assessment): You will use the provided AI critique prompt to assess your draft before submission

WHEN AI USE IS PERMITTED:

- Brainstorming ideas for case study analysis
- Generating practice questions for exam preparation
- Checking grammar and clarity in written work
- Exploring concepts you don't fully understand yet

WHEN AI USE IS NOT PERMITTED:

- Final exam (closed book, no technology)
- Any assignment where instructions explicitly state "no AI tools"

WHAT YOU MUST DO WHEN USING AI:

- Use it as a tool that supports YOUR thinking, not replaces it
- Critically evaluate AI outputs—don't assume they're correct

- Be able to explain and justify any AI-assisted work in your own words
- Acknowledge AI use where required (e.g., "I used ChatGPT to generate initial interview questions, which I then revised based on...")

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY EXPECTATIONS:

Using AI inappropriately (e.g., submitting AI-generated work as your own without critical engagement) is academic misconduct, just like plagiarism.

If you're ever unsure whether your AI use is appropriate, ask before submitting. I'm here to help you learn to use these tools well.

9.4.2 Example: First-Day Class Discussion

What to say:

"Let's talk about AI. Some of you are probably already using ChatGPT or similar tools. Some of you are worried that using AI is cheating. Some of you are wondering if I'm going to try to detect and punish AI use.

Here's my position: **AI tools exist, and you'll use them in HR jobs. My job is to teach you to use them wisely and ethically.**

In this unit, we'll use AI openly in some assignments. You'll learn when AI is helpful, when it's risky, and when human judgment must override AI recommendations. That's a professional skill.

I'm not interested in playing 'gotcha' with AI detection software. I'm interested in whether you can think critically, justify your decisions, and demonstrate competent HR practice. If you can do that with AI assistance, great. If you use AI to avoid thinking, I'll know—because your work won't demonstrate understanding.

Questions or concerns about this approach?"

Why this works: - Sets a clear, positive tone - Positions you as a guide, not a cop - Acknowledges student anxiety - Makes professional relevance explicit - Invites dialogue

9.5 Designing “Integrity-Resistant” Assignments

Some assignments are easier to misuse with AI than others. Here's how to design assessments that are inherently resistant to misuse:

9.5.1 Principle 1: Assess Process, Not Just Product

Vulnerable design: “Write a 1500-word essay analysing a workplace conflict.”

- Student can paste this into AI and submit the output

Integrity-resistant design: “Conduct a simulated investigation interview (submit transcript), then audit your own process against procedural fairness criteria.”

- Student must engage in real-time conversation (can’t be pre-written)
- Assessment focuses on methodology visible in transcript - Self-audit requires metacognitive engagement

9.5.2 Principle 2: Require Evidence of Thinking

Vulnerable design: “Recommend a solution to this HR problem.”

- AI can generate a plausible recommendation

Integrity-resistant design: “AI generated three solutions to this problem [provide them]. Critique each option, identify which one is best and why, and explain what the AI got wrong.”

- Student must think beyond what AI provided
- Requires critical evaluation, not just generation
- Makes AI outputs the starting point, not the end point

9.5.3 Principle 3: Make Personal Context Essential

Vulnerable design: “Analyse the pros and cons of flexible work policies.”

- Generic question AI can answer generally

Integrity-resistant design: “Based on your conversation with the AI employee ‘Jamie’ (from your Week 4 simulation), analyse what flexible work approach would address Jamie’s specific situation while meeting organisational needs.”

- Requires integration of previous personalised work
- Context is unique to each student
- Generic AI response won’t fit

9.5.4 Principle 4: Assess Revision and Iteration

Vulnerable design: Submit final work only - No visibility into how it was created

Integrity-resistant design: Submit first draft, AI feedback received, revised draft, and reflection on changes made - Process is visible and assessable - Shows learning trajectory - Difficult to fake iterative improvement

9.5.5 Principle 5: Require Justification of Choices

Vulnerable design: “Create a recruitment interview guide.”

- AI can generate a complete guide

Integrity-resistant design: “Create an interview guide. For each question, justify why you chose it, what competency it targets, and what poor response

would sound like. Identify two questions the AI generated that you rejected and explain why they were inadequate.” - Requires deep understanding, not just production - Student must demonstrate judgment beyond AI capability - Reveals whether they understand what they’re submitting

9.6 Red Flags for AI Misuse (And How to Address Them)

Even with well-designed assignments, some students will try to misuse AI. Here’s how to identify and respond:

9.6.1 Red Flag 1: Sudden Quality Shift

What you see: Student whose previous work was weak suddenly submits sophisticated analysis.

Response approach: - **Don’t immediately accuse.** There could be legitimate reasons (they got help from writing center, they finally understood the concept, etc.) - **Ask questions:** “Your analysis has improved significantly. Can you walk me through your thinking process on this particular section?” - **Request elaboration:** “This point about organisational justice theory is interesting. Can you explain how you see it applying to this specific scenario?”

If genuine learning: They can explain their thinking. **If inappropriate AI use:** They struggle to explain or elaborate.

9.6.2 Red Flag 2: Work That Doesn’t Match Assignment Context

What you see: Student used generic AI response that doesn’t fit the specific scenario or constraints you provided.

Example: Assignment asked for Australian employment law context, student submitted response referencing US legislation.

Response approach: - **Point out the mismatch:** “I notice you’ve referenced Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, but this assignment requires Australian context. Can you explain how this applies to our scenario?” - **Provide opportunity to revise:** “I think you may have used a resource that wasn’t contextually appropriate. Please resubmit with correct jurisdictional references.”

Teaching moment: Use this to discuss the importance of contextual verification when using AI tools professionally.

9.6.3 Red Flag 3: No Evidence of Process in Process-Based Assessment

What you see: Student submitted required components but shows no genuine engagement (e.g., self-audit identifies no mistakes, reflection is superficial).

Response approach: - **Return for revision:** “Your self-audit suggests your performance was perfect. Reflective practice requires identifying areas for growth. Please resubmit with honest self-assessment.” - **Offer guidance:** “Everyone makes mistakes in complex HR conversations. Look specifically at moments where the employee seemed frustrated or defensive—what might you have done differently?”

Teaching moment: Explain that honest self-assessment is more valuable than false perfection.

9.6.4 Red Flag 4: Can’t Explain or Defend Work in Person

What you see: High-quality written submission, but student can’t discuss it in office hours or oral follow-up.

Response approach: - **For high-stakes situations:** Schedule a brief oral examination: “I’d like to discuss your assignment. Can you walk me through your main recommendation and why you chose it?” - **Frame it as learning:** “I was impressed by your analysis. I’d love to hear more about your thinking process.”

If inappropriate use is confirmed: - Follow university academic misconduct procedures - Use it as a teaching moment about professional accountability

9.7 Teaching AI Ethics Through HR Scenarios

One of the most powerful ways to address integrity is to make it a learning objective. Teach students to identify ethical problems with AI use *through HR scenarios*.

9.7.1 Exercise 1: The Flawed AI Termination Memo

Assignment:

“Use AI to draft a termination letter for an employee being dismissed for poor performance after a 60-day PIP.

Then conduct an ethical audit: - What did the AI include that could create legal risk? - What did the AI omit that’s legally required? - What tone or language choices are problematic? - How would you revise this to ensure procedural fairness?

Your grade is based on how thoroughly you identify problems, not on the quality of AI's original output."

- What students learn:**
- AI can confidently generate legally dangerous content
 - They must verify and correct AI outputs
 - Professional accountability can't be delegated to AI

9.7.2 Exercise 2: The Biased Resume Screening Tool

Scenario:

"Your company uses an AI resume screening tool. You notice that it consistently ranks candidates from certain universities higher and flags career gaps as negative. Three rejected candidates have complained that the process seems unfair.

As the HR manager: 1. What are the ethical concerns with this AI tool? 2. What's your legal risk? 3. Who is accountable for the AI's decisions—the vendor, the company, you personally? 4. What would you do to address this situation?"

- What students learn:**
- Algorithmic bias is a real professional issue
 - Using AI doesn't eliminate human responsibility
 - HR professionals must advocate for fair processes even when technology is involved

9.7.3 Exercise 3: The Over-Reliance Problem

Scenario:

"You used AI to analyse exit interview data and generate recommendations for reducing turnover. You presented the AI's recommendations to senior management, and they were implemented. Six months later, turnover has increased.

Reflection questions: 1. What might the AI have missed in its analysis? 2. What was your professional responsibility before presenting AI recommendations? 3. How do you explain this outcome to management? 4. What does this teach you about using AI in strategic decision-making?"

- What students learn:**
- AI analysis isn't inherently correct
 - Professional judgment can't be outsourced
 - They're accountable for recommendations they present, regardless of how they were generated
-

9.8 Responding to Colleague and Administrator Concerns

You may need to justify your approach to colleagues or administrators who are skeptical about AI integration.

9.8.1 Concern: “This undermines academic standards”

Response:

“Actually, it raises standards. I’m no longer testing whether students can recall information—I’m testing whether they can apply it in realistic, dynamic scenarios. I’m assessing higher-order thinking: critical evaluation, professional judgment, and ethical reasoning. These are harder to demonstrate than memorization.”

9.8.2 Concern: “How do you know they’re learning anything?”

Response:

“I assess their process, not just their final product. I can see their thinking in conversation transcripts, in their critiques of AI outputs, and in their reflective analysis. When students can identify what AI got wrong and explain why, they’re demonstrating deep understanding.”

9.8.3 Concern: “This doesn’t align with university academic integrity policies”

Response:

“University policies typically prohibit *unacknowledged* or *uncritical* use of external sources. My approach makes AI use acknowledged and requires critical evaluation. Students aren’t hiding AI use—they’re demonstrating competent use. That’s consistent with academic integrity principles, just applied to a new tool.”

Supporting evidence: - Many universities are updating policies to allow appropriate AI use - Professional accreditation bodies are recognizing AI literacy as essential - Employer expectations include ability to use AI tools responsibly

9.8.4 Concern: “What if other lecturers don’t agree?”

Response:

“That’s fine—pedagogical approaches can vary across units. I’m being transparent with students about expectations in *my* unit. If

other lecturers prohibit AI use, students can follow those different expectations. Professional practice requires adapting to different contexts anyway—this models that.”

9.9 The Bigger Picture: AI Literacy as Graduate Capability

Position AI literacy as a graduate capability alongside communication, critical thinking, and ethical practice.

9.9.1 What AI Literacy Means for HR Graduates

Competent HR graduates should be able to:

1. **Identify appropriate use cases**
 - When is AI helpful? (data analysis, initial drafts, generating options)
 - When is AI risky? (sensitive employee conversations, final legal decisions)
 - When is human judgment essential? (ethical dilemmas, complex interpersonal situations)
2. **Evaluate AI outputs critically**
 - Does this align with legal requirements?
 - Is this ethically sound?
 - What assumptions has the AI made?
 - What context is missing?
3. **Maintain accountability**
 - Understanding that using AI doesn’t eliminate responsibility
 - Knowing when to verify AI recommendations with experts
 - Documenting decision-making processes
4. **Recognize bias and limitations**
 - Algorithmic bias in recruitment tools
 - Cultural insensitivity in AI-generated policies
 - Over-generalization of complex situations

This is professional education, not just academic integrity management.

9.10 A Final Ethical Consideration

Here’s a question to leave with:

Is it ethical to graduate HR professionals who don’t know how to use AI responsibly?

When your graduates enter the workforce, they will encounter: - AI-powered recruitment systems making hiring decisions - Automated performance monitoring tools - AI chatbots handling employee queries - Algorithmic workforce management systems

If they don't understand how to evaluate these tools critically, advocate for fair processes, and identify when human oversight is essential, **they will cause harm**—not through malice, but through incompetence.

Your responsibility as an educator isn't to protect students from AI. It's to prepare them to be ethical, competent professionals in an AI-augmented world.

Teaching them to use AI transparently, critically, and responsibly in your course isn't lowering standards.

It's fulfilling your educational duty.

9.11 Your Action Step

Before the Appendices, draft your own AI use statement for your next unit outline. Use the framework from this chapter:

1. **When AI use is expected** (specific assignments)
2. **When AI use is permitted** (general study support)
3. **When AI use is not permitted** (exams, specific constraints)
4. **What students must do** (critical engagement, acknowledgment)
5. **Academic integrity expectations** (consequences of misuse)

Write it in your own voice. Make it clear, direct, and positive.

Then review it against this question: **Would a student reading this understand how to use AI appropriately and why it matters for their professional development?**

Next Section Preview: The Appendices provide ready-to-use resources: a prompt library you can copy and adapt immediately, a one-hour workshop guide for introducing these ideas to colleagues, and a detailed alignment with Curtin University learning outcomes to show how AI integration supports existing educational goals.

Chapter 10

Chapter 7: Process Over Product - Rethinking Assessment

10.1 The Fundamental Question

What are you really trying to assess in HR education?

Traditional approach: Can the student define procedural fairness? Can they list the steps in a disciplinary process? Can they identify relevant legislation?

This is assessing product—the knowledge artifact.

Process-based approach: Watch the student conduct a disciplinary meeting. Did they *actually demonstrate* procedural fairness? Did they follow the correct process? Did they apply the legislation appropriately in real-time?

This is assessing process—the professional methodology.

The difference matters enormously. A student can memorize the definition of “active listening” and still conduct a terrible investigation interview. They can recite employment law and still make decisions that expose an organisation to legal risk.

HR is a process profession. The value lies not in what you know, but in what you *do* with what you know—how you investigate, how you communicate, how you analyse evidence, how you make decisions under uncertainty.

AI makes it possible, for the first time, to assess process at scale.

10.2 Why This Wasn't Possible Before

Traditional process assessment methods have serious limitations:

Role-play in class: - Time-consuming (only a few students can participate per session) - Inconsistent (peer actors vary in quality) - Public performance anxiety reduces authenticity - Minimal documentation of what actually happened

Recorded video presentations: - Students can script and rehearse (not realistic) - No dynamic response to unexpected situations - Labour-intensive for lecturers to review and grade

Written case analysis: - Tests knowledge *about* process, not demonstration *of* process - Students can look up answers - Doesn't capture decision-making under pressure

AI-enabled assessment solves all of these: - Every student gets unlimited practice in realistic scenarios - Conversations are dynamic and unpredictable - Complete transcripts provide evidence of methodology - AI can provide initial critique, reducing lecturer workload - Students can't rehearse a scripted answer—they must think in real-time

This chapter presents three complete assessment models that leverage AI to grade professional process.

10.3 Assessment Model 1: Simulated HR Consultation and Process Audit

10.3.1 Overview

Students conduct a simulated HR consultation (conversation with an AI persona) and then audit their own process against professional standards. The grade focuses on methodology, not outcome.

10.3.2 Learning Objectives Assessed

- Conduct fair, unbiased investigations
- Demonstrate effective communication and empathetic practices
- Apply relevant legal and ethical rules in real-time
- Engage in reflective practice and self-assessment

10.3.3 Assignment Structure

Part 1: The Consultation (60% of grade)

Students receive a scenario prompt and conduct a 15-20 minute conversation with an AI persona representing an employee, manager, or stakeholder.

10.3. ASSESSMENT MODEL 1: SIMULATED HR CONSULTATION AND PROCESS AUDIT93

Example Scenario: > You are the HR representative meeting with Taylor Kim, an employee who has requested a formal meeting to discuss concerns about their working conditions. Taylor has been with the company for 3 years and has never raised concerns before. You don't know what the specific issues are yet.

Students must navigate the conversation, uncover the issues, demonstrate appropriate HR process, and conclude the meeting professionally.

Part 2: The Process Audit (40% of grade)

Students submit: 1. **The full transcript** of their conversation 2. **A structured process audit document** (template provided) where they: - Identify every point where they applied (or failed to apply) procedural fairness - Cite relevant legal principles or policies that guided their questions/responses - Note where they demonstrated (or failed to demonstrate) effective communication - Identify missed opportunities or mistakes - Explain what they would do differently

10.3.4 The Process Audit Template

This is what students complete after the conversation:

PROCESS AUDIT DOCUMENT

SECTION 1: PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS ANALYSIS

Review the transcript. For each of the following requirements of procedural fairness, provide:

- A direct quote from the transcript showing where you demonstrated this
- A score (1-5) for how well you did
- What you could have done better

Requirements:

1. Did you clearly explain the purpose of the meeting?

Quote: -----

Self-Score: ___/5

Improvement: -----

2. Did you give the employee adequate opportunity to speak and explain?

Quote: -----

Self-Score: ___/5

Improvement: -----

3. Did you avoid making premature judgments or assumptions?

Quote: -----

Self-Score: ___/5

Improvement: -----

[Continue for all procedural fairness elements...]

94CHAPTER 10. CHAPTER 7: PROCESS OVER PRODUCT - RETHINKING ASSESSMENT

SECTION 2: LEGAL AND ETHICAL APPLICATION

Identify at least 3 moments in the conversation where legal or ethical considerations were relevant.

Example:

Moment 1 (Quote): "I asked Taylor if they'd be comfortable sharing whether any of this was related to health or personal circumstances."

Legal/Ethical Principle: Right to privacy; must not compel disclosure of medical information, but can invite voluntary disclosure to explore accommodation options.

Did I handle this appropriately? Yes/No - Explain: -----

[Continue for at least 3 moments...]

SECTION 3: COMMUNICATION EFFECTIVENESS

Identify 2 examples where your communication was effective and explain why. Identify 2 examples where your communication could be improved and explain how.

[Student completes analysis...]

SECTION 4: CRITICAL REFLECTION

If you could conduct this meeting again, what would be your top 3 changes to your approach? Justify each change with reference to HR theory or professional practice standards.

[Student completes reflection...]

10.3.5 What You Grade

You're grading two things simultaneously:

1. Quality of the Consultation Process (60%)

Using the transcript as evidence: - Did they establish rapport and psychological safety? - Did they ask appropriate questions? - Did they handle sensitive information properly? - Did they maintain professional boundaries? - Did they document appropriately (taking notes, summarizing agreements)?

2. Quality of Reflective Analysis (40%)

Using the audit document: - Can they accurately identify what they did well

10.4. ASSESSMENT MODEL 2: EVIDENCE-BASED STRATEGIC INTERVENTION PLAN95

and poorly? - Do they understand *why* certain approaches work or don't work?
- Can they connect their practice to theory and legal principles? - Do they demonstrate genuine reflective practice, or are they justifying everything?

10.3.6 Why This Works

This model: - Makes invisible skills visible through transcripts - Develops metacognition through self-audit - Assesses professional judgment in real-time conversation - Rewards honesty (students who identify their own mistakes show deeper understanding) - Prevents cheating (you can't script a dynamic conversation, and being honest about mistakes is rewarded)

10.4 Assessment Model 2: Evidence-Based Strategic Intervention Plan

10.4.1 Overview

Students use AI to synthesize complex HR data, generate multiple policy options, and then justify their strategic recommendation through critical analysis. The focus is on analytical methodology and evidence-based decision-making.

10.4.2 Learning Objectives Assessed

- Critically analyse complex HR problems using data
- Apply psychological theory to evidence-based practice
- Generate and evaluate multiple strategic options
- Evaluate global HR management practices and cultural considerations
- Demonstrate technological proficiency in HR analytics

10.4.3 Assignment Structure

Part 1: Problem Identification and Data Analysis (20%)

Students receive a large dataset (could be real anonymized data or AI-generated mock data):

Example Dataset: > Annual turnover rates by department, employee satisfaction survey results, demographic breakdown, exit interview summaries for 50 departing employees over 2 years, compensation benchmarking data.

Students use AI to: - Identify patterns and anomalies - Generate hypotheses about causes of turnover - Summarize key findings

AI Prompt They Use:

You are an HR analytics specialist. Analyse this dataset and provide:

1. Three key patterns or trends in the turnover data
2. Potential root causes for each pattern
3. Questions we should investigate further
4. Risks if turnover continues at current rates

[Student pastes dataset]

Part 2: Solution Generation (30%)

Students use AI to generate **three distinct strategic intervention options** to address the identified problem.

AI Prompt They Use:

Based on the turnover analysis, generate three different strategic HR interventions to reduce turnover in the Sales department. Each intervention should:

- Target a different root cause
- Be practical and implementable within 6 months
- Include estimated costs and resources required
- Cite relevant HR theory or research that supports this approach

Provide three distinct options-don't just give me variations of the same idea.

Part 3: Critical Evaluation and Recommendation (50%)

This is where the real work happens. Students write a strategic recommendation report where they:

1. **Critique each AI-generated option**
 - What HR theory supports or contradicts this approach?
 - What are the risks and benefits?
 - What assumptions does this option make?
 - Is it culturally appropriate and ethically sound?
2. **Make and justify a recommendation**
 - Which intervention is best and why?
 - What evidence supports your choice?
 - How does it align with organisational justice theory, motivation theory, or other relevant frameworks?
3. **Demonstrate critical oversight**
 - Identify at least one flaw or gap in the AI's analysis
 - Explain what the AI missed or oversimplified
 - Show how you would correct or supplement the AI's recommendation

10.4.4 Assessment Rubric

10.4. ASSESSMENT MODEL 2: EVIDENCE-BASED STRATEGIC INTERVENTION PLAN97

Criterion	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Adequate (2)	Poor (1)
Data Analysis	Sophisticated identification of patterns; asks insightful questions	Identifies key patterns; asks relevant questions	Identifies basic patterns; questions are superficial	Misses key patterns or asks irrelevant questions
Theoretical Integration	Expert application of multiple theories to justify and critique options	Effective use of theory to evaluate options	Basic use of theory; connections are underdeveloped	Minimal or incorrect application of theory
Critical Evaluation of AI	Identifies significant flaws in AI logic; demonstrates superior judgment	Identifies some weaknesses in AI outputs; adds value	Minimal critique of AI; mostly accepts outputs	No critical evaluation; simply endorses AI's suggestions
Strategic Justification	Recommendation is sophisticated, evidence-based, and practically feasible	Recommendation is well-justified and practical	Recommendation is adequate but justification is thin	Recommendation is poorly justified or impractical
Ethical/Cultural Analysis	Sophisticated consideration of global practices and ethical implications	Good consideration of ethics and cultural factors	Basic consideration but lacks depth	Minimal or no ethical/cultural analysis

10.4.5 Why This Works

This model: - **Tests critical thinking**, not just knowledge recall - **Requires students to surpass AI** (they must identify what AI got wrong) - **Simulates real strategic HR work** (using data, generating options, justifying decisions) - **Assesses technological proficiency** (appropriate use of AI tools) - **Prevents plagiarism** (the critique of AI outputs must be original thinking)

10.4.6 Example of Strong Student Work

Excerpt from student recommendation:

“The AI’s second option recommends implementing a flexible work policy to improve work-life balance, citing research on job satisfaction. While this is theoretically sound (Adams’ equity theory suggests perceived fairness increases commitment), the AI has overlooked a critical factor in our specific context: the exit interviews reveal that departing employees in Sales specifically mentioned ‘lack of career progression’ and ‘feeling undervalued’ more frequently than work-life balance concerns.

This suggests that Herzberg’s two-factor theory is more applicable here—flexible work addresses a hygiene factor, but doesn’t address the motivator factors (recognition, advancement) that actually drive turnover in this department. Therefore, while flexible work might prevent dissatisfaction, it won’t solve the core problem.

I recommend Option 3 (career development program with clear advancement pathways) because it directly addresses the motivator factors identified in the qualitative data. However, I would modify the AI’s recommendation by adding a recognition component (monthly achievement awards, public acknowledgment) to address the ‘feeling undervalued’ concern that the AI’s plan doesn’t explicitly target.”

Why this is excellent: The student has used theory to critique AI, referenced specific evidence, demonstrated superior analytical judgment, and improved on AI’s suggestion.

10.5 Assessment Model 3: Competency-Based Recruitment Portfolio

10.5.1 Overview

Students demonstrate the end-to-end methodology of professional recruitment by using AI to generate materials, then critically refining and justifying their professional judgments. The process they follow matters more than the final job ad or interview questions.

10.5.2 Learning Objectives Assessed

- Apply knowledge of human behaviour to recruitment practice
- Access, evaluate, and synthesize relevant information
- Demonstrate critical oversight of AI-generated outputs
- Apply legal and ethical standards to hiring practices

10.5. ASSESSMENT MODEL 3: COMPETENCY-BASED RECRUITMENT PORTFOLIO99

- Justify professional decisions with evidence

10.5.3 Assignment Structure

Part 1: Job Design and Analysis (20%)

Students receive a brief job role (e.g., “HR Officer for a mid-sized manufacturing company”). They must:

1. Use AI to generate a detailed job description based on competency frameworks
2. **Critically evaluate** the AI output:
 - Are the competencies appropriate and measurable?
 - Is the language legally compliant (no discriminatory terms)?
 - Are the qualifications realistic and justified?
3. **Revise** the job description with tracked changes and annotations explaining each change

Part 2: Behavioural Interview Design (30%)

Students use AI to generate 10 behavioural interview questions targeting the key competencies.

Then they must: 1. **Select the 5 best questions** and explain why 2. **Reject or revise 5 questions** explaining what's wrong with them (too vague, leading questions, not truly behavioral, etc.) 3. **Create a scoring rubric** for evaluating candidate responses to their top 5 questions

Part 3: Candidate Evaluation with Critical Override (50%)

Students receive **5 mock candidate responses** to one of the interview questions.

They must: 1. Use AI to score each response against their rubric 2. **Review the AI scores and override at least 2 of them** 3. **Justify their override** with reference to: - What the AI missed or misinterpreted - Relevant psychological principles (e.g., unconscious bias, halo effect, confirmation bias) - Legal or ethical considerations - Evidence from the response itself

10.5.4 The Critical Override Exercise (Example)

Interview Question: > “Tell me about a time when you had to deliver negative feedback to a colleague or direct report. How did you approach it and what was the outcome?”

Candidate Response: > “In my previous role, I had a team member who was consistently missing deadlines. I scheduled a private meeting and explained that the missed deadlines were affecting the team’s overall performance. I asked them if there were any obstacles preventing them from meeting deadlines and offered support. They mentioned they were struggling with prioritization, so we

worked together to create a task management system. Over the next month, their performance improved significantly.”

AI Score: 8/10 AI Justification: Strong example of constructive feedback delivery, shows empathy and problem-solving, positive outcome demonstrates effectiveness.

Student Override: 6/10 Student Justification:

“While the AI score of 8/10 recognizes the positive elements, it has missed several concerning gaps in this response:

1. **Lack of specific behavioural detail:** The candidate says they ‘explained’ and ‘offered support’ but doesn’t demonstrate *how* they delivered this feedback. What specific words did they use? How did they balance accountability with support? This vagueness suggests they might be embellishing or don’t actually remember the details—a red flag in behavioural interviewing.
2. **Missing follow-up on consequences:** The candidate doesn’t mention whether they documented this conversation or whether there were any agreed-upon consequences if improvement didn’t occur. In real HR practice, failing to document performance conversations creates legal risk.
3. **Overly positive framing:** The response has no mention of how the employee initially reacted (defensive? receptive?), which would demonstrate the candidate’s ability to handle difficult emotions—a critical skill. The neat narrative resolution might indicate the candidate is telling us what they think we want to hear rather than a genuine complex experience.

These omissions are significant for an HR role where precision, documentation, and handling difficult conversations are core competencies. A strong candidate would have provided much richer behavioural detail. Therefore, I score this 6/10—it shows basic competence but lacks the depth required for an HR position.”

Why this is excellent: The student has demonstrated superior professional judgment by catching what AI missed, applied HR-specific knowledge (documentation requirements), and justified the override with evidence.

10.5.5 Assessment Rubric

Criterion	Weight	What You’re Assessing
Job Design Quality	15%	Legal compliance, appropriateness of competencies, clarity

Criterion	Weight	What You're Assessing
Justification of Revisions	15%	Can they articulate why AI's version needed changes?
Interview Question Selection	15%	Do they recognize good vs. poor behavioural questions?
Rubric Design	15%	Is their scoring system measurable and fair?
Critical Override	30%	Most important—do they demonstrate judgment superior to AI?
Theoretical Integration	10%	Have they applied knowledge of bias, human behavior, legal principles?

10.5.6 Why This Works

This model:

- **Assesses critical professional judgment** (can they identify what AI got wrong?)
- **Simulates real recruitment work** (using technology but maintaining human oversight)
- **Tests legal and ethical awareness** (discriminatory language, fair assessment practices)
- **Prevents blind reliance on AI** (students *must* override and justify)
- **Demonstrates competence** through documented methodology, not just final outputs

10.6 The Common Thread: Process as Evidence

All three models share a fundamental principle: **the student's process is documented and assessable.**

Traditional exams and essays hide the thinking process. You see the final answer but not how they got there. With AI-enabled process assessment:

- **Transcripts** show how students navigate conversations
- **Audit documents** reveal their reflective thinking
- **Critique memos** demonstrate their analytical reasoning
- **Override justifications** prove their professional judgment

This creates **transparency and accountability**—the two things that make professional practice trustworthy.

10.7 Implementation Tips

10.7.1 Start with One Model

Don't overhaul your entire assessment structure at once. Choose one assignment, implement one of these models, and see how it goes. Collect student feedback and refine.

10.7.2 Provide Scaffolding

These assessments are more cognitively demanding than traditional exams. Students will need:

- Clear templates and examples
- Practice opportunities (low-stakes versions before the graded assessment)
- Explicit criteria for what “good process” looks like

10.7.3 Align with Professional Standards

Where possible, connect your assessment criteria to professional HR standards or competency frameworks. This helps students see the real-world relevance.

10.7.4 Use AI for Initial Review (Optional)

You can use AI to do a first-pass review of student submissions, then you review the AI's assessment:

Lecturer prompt:

You are assisting with grading a student's HR consultation transcript.

Review the transcript against these criteria:
 [paste your rubric]

Provide an initial assessment and score. Identify strengths and weaknesses.
 I will review your assessment and make the final grading decision.

[paste student transcript]

This can reduce your workload while maintaining quality control.

10.8 Your Action Step

Before Chapter 8, choose one assessment in your current curriculum that could be redesigned using one of these models:

1. **Identify the assessment** (exam question, essay, case study, etc.)

2. **Identify what you're really trying to measure** (knowledge recall? professional judgment? process skill?)
3. **Sketch how you would redesign it** using Model 1, 2, or 3
4. **Consider the logistics** (how much time would this take students? How would you grade it?)

You don't have to implement it immediately—just think through how the shift from product to process assessment might work in your context.

Next Chapter Preview: In Chapter 8, we get practical about implementation. You'll learn how to introduce these ideas to your students, pilot AI-enhanced assignments without overwhelming yourself, gather feedback, iterate, and gradually build confidence with these new approaches. This chapter is all about managing change—for yourself and for your students.

Chapter 11

Chapter 6: Virtual Company Simulation (Future Horizon)

11.1 The Big Idea

Imagine this: Your students don't just read case studies about HR challenges—they actually work as HR professionals in a simulated company where they interact with AI-powered employees, managers, and stakeholders over weeks or even an entire semester.

They receive complaints, conduct investigations, negotiate with union representatives, handle performance issues, and make strategic recommendations. Each interaction builds on previous ones. The “employees” remember past conversations. The company has policies, culture, and ongoing challenges.

This is the virtual company simulation—the most ambitious application of AI in HR education.

It's more complex than a single conversation simulation, but it's increasingly feasible with current AI technology. This chapter will show you how to build toward this vision progressively, starting simple and adding layers of complexity.

11.2 Why This Matters

Traditional case studies are static snapshots. Students analyse what *already happened* and recommend what *should have happened*. But HR work is dynamic:

- You don't get all the information at once

- Your decisions have consequences that unfold over time
- Stakeholders react to your actions
- You must navigate politics, personalities, and competing priorities simultaneously

A virtual company simulation creates **emergent complexity** where students experience these dynamics. They don't just know *about* HR work—they practice *doing* HR work in a realistic context.

11.3 The Progressive Implementation Model

You don't need to build the entire virtual company at once. Start simple and add complexity as you and your students become comfortable.

11.3.1 Level 1: Single Employee Persona (Master Prompt)

11.3.2 Level 2: Multiple Employee Personas (Cast of Characters)

11.3.3 Level 3: Persistent Context (Company Memory)

11.3.4 Level 4: Dynamic Events (Evolving Scenarios)

Let's explore each level.

11.4 Level 1: Single Employee Persona (Master Prompt)

This is the simplest version—essentially an enhanced version of the conversation simulation from Chapter 4, but with richer organisational context.

11.4.1 The Master Prompt Template

You are Jamie Martinez, a customer service team leader at "InnovateCo," a mid-sized technology company based in Perth, Western Australia.

COMPANY CONTEXT:

InnovateCo employs 300 people across three departments: Product Development, Sales & Marketing, and Customer Success. The company has experienced rapid growth over the past two years, and the HR infrastructure is struggling to keep up. There is no formal HR department—just a single HR Manager (Sarah) and an external HR consultant who is brought in for complex issues.

The company culture values innovation and autonomy but has weak processes

11.4. LEVEL 1: SINGLE EMPLOYEE PERSONA (MASTER PROMPT)107

for performance management and conflict resolution. Most managers, including your supervisor (David Chen, Head of Customer Success), have had minimal management training.

JAMIE'S BACKGROUND:

- 28 years old, has worked at InnovateCo for 18 months
- Promoted to team leader 6 months ago (manages 5 customer service representatives)
- Previously worked in customer service roles at two other companies
- Generally competent but inexperienced in people management
- Feels pressure to meet aggressive customer satisfaction targets

CURRENT SITUATION:

One of Jamie's team members, Priya, has complained to senior management about Jamie's "micromanagement" and "unfair treatment." Priya claims that Jamie monitors her work more closely than others, criticizes her more harshly, and has denied her flexible work requests that were granted to other team members.

Jamie believes Priya is being oversensitive and that the extra attention is justified because Priya's customer satisfaction scores are lower than the team average. Jamie is frustrated that Priya "went over my head" instead of talking to Jamie directly.

JAMIE'S PERSONA:

- Defensive but not hostile
- Genuinely believes they're doing their job correctly
- Doesn't understand why this is being treated as a serious HR issue
- Slightly resentful that other managers don't face this kind of scrutiny
- Will become more open if treated with respect and genuine curiosity
- Has not received any training in managing diverse teams or performance discussions

YOUR ROLE:

I am the HR Consultant who has been brought in to investigate Priya's complaint and provide coaching to Jamie. This is our first meeting.

Stay in character as Jamie. Respond to my questions and statements realistically. Do not break character unless I say "END SIMULATION."

I will begin the meeting now.

11.4.2 How Students Use This

Assignment Structure: 1. Students receive the Master Prompt and the assignment brief 2. They conduct an initial meeting with Jamie (the investi-

gation interview) 3. They submit the transcript along with a written report recommending next steps 4. They explain their HR methodology and justify their recommendations

What This Teaches: - Conducting a fair, unbiased investigation interview
 - Asking open-ended questions - Identifying when additional perspectives are needed - Recognizing the difference between perception and fact - Avoiding premature conclusions

Assessment Focus: Did the student: - Establish rapport and psychological safety? - Ask questions that elicited Jamie's full perspective? - Avoid leading questions or showing bias toward the complainant? - Identify what other information is needed (interviewing Priya, reviewing policies, checking documentation)?
 - Recognize the underlying issues (inadequate management training, unclear performance standards)?

11.5 Level 2: Multiple Employee Personas (Cast of Characters)

Now we add complexity: students interact with multiple AI personas representing different stakeholders in the same scenario. This simulates the reality that HR professionals must gather multiple perspectives and navigate competing interests.

11.5.1 Scenario: The Performance Management Conflict

The Company: Still InnovateCo (same as Level 1)

The Situation: The complaint about Jamie's management of Priya

The Cast: 1. **Jamie Martinez** (Team Leader) - believes they're managing performance appropriately 2. **Priya Patel** (Customer Service Rep) - believes she's being unfairly targeted 3. **David Chen** (Head of Customer Success) - Jamie's manager, wants this resolved quickly 4. **Sarah Kim** (HR Manager) - overworked, risk-averse, wants to avoid legal issues

11.5.2 Creating the Cast

You create four separate Master Prompts—one for each character. Each prompt includes: - The shared company context (so all personas are consistent) - The specific character's background and perspective - What that character knows and doesn't know - Their goals and concerns - How they're likely to behave in conversations

Example: Priya's Master Prompt

You are Priya Patel, a customer service representative at InnovateCo.

11.5. LEVEL 2: MULTIPLE EMPLOYEE PERSONAS (CAST OF CHARACTERS)109

[COMPANY CONTEXT - same as Jamie's prompt above]

PRIYA'S BACKGROUND:

- 26 years old, has worked at InnovateCo for 2 years
- One of the first customer service reps hired; has seen the team grow from 3 people to 8
- Generally receives positive customer feedback but has lower customer satisfaction scores than team average (72% vs. team average of 81%)
- Has a 4-year-old child; needs flexible start times 2-3 days per week for childcare dropoff

PRIYA'S PERSPECTIVE ON THE SITUATION:

- Believes Jamie singles her out for criticism while praising other team members for similar work
- Feels Jamie monitors her more closely (more frequent check-ins, reviews her tickets more thoroughly)
- Requested flexible start times (9:30am instead of 9:00am) two days per week, which Jamie denied, saying "customer calls start at 9am." However, Priya knows that Marcus and Lee both have flexible schedules.
- Believes Jamie has "had it in for her" since Jamie became team leader 6 months ago
- Did not initially complain to Jamie because she was worried about retaliation
- Escalated to senior management (David Chen) after feeling the situation wasn't improving

WHAT PRIYA DOESN'T KNOW:

- Marcus and Lee's flexible arrangements were approved because they work evening shifts (until 7pm) while Priya's contracted hours are 9am-5pm
- Jamie is under pressure from David to improve the team's overall customer satisfaction scores
- Jamie has received feedback from David specifically about Priya's performance gaps

PRIYA'S PERSONA:

- Frustrated and feeling undervalued
- Worried about job security (is this a prelude to being fired?)
- Emotional but trying to remain professional
- Defensive about her performance (believes her scores are "fine" and doesn't understand why Jamie focuses on them)
- Will become tearful if she feels dismissed or not believed
- Will be more forthcoming if treated with empathy and fairness

110CHAPTER 11. CHAPTER 6: VIRTUAL COMPANY SIMULATION (FUTURE HORIZON)

YOUR ROLE:

I am the HR Consultant investigating the complaint. This is our confidential interview.

Stay in character as Priya. Respond realistically. Do not break character unless I say "END SIMULATION."

I will begin now.

11.5.3 The Multi-Persona Assignment

Student Task: You are the external HR Consultant. You must:

1. **Conduct individual interviews** with all four stakeholders (Jamie, Priya, David, Sarah)
2. **Analyze the evidence** from all perspectives
3. **Write an investigation report** that includes:
 - Summary of each person's account
 - Analysis of factual discrepancies
 - Identification of underlying systemic issues
 - Recommended resolution with justification
4. **Submit all transcripts** along with your report

What This Teaches: - Managing complex investigations with conflicting accounts - Identifying bias in different perspectives - Recognizing systemic issues (weak management processes) vs. individual problems - Balancing fairness to all parties - Synthesizing multiple data sources

The Challenge: Each persona will give a different version of events. Students must: - Identify what's factual vs. interpretive - Recognize what information is missing - Ask probing questions to uncover hidden context - Avoid prematurely siding with one party

This mirrors real HR work where truth is rarely simple.

11.6 Level 3: Persistent Context (Company Memory)

This level adds continuity: the AI personas remember previous interactions. Decisions have consequences that affect future conversations.

11.6.1 Technical Approach

Most AI platforms now support “conversation history” or “memory.” You can:

Option A: Single Long Conversation Students have one ongoing AI conversation that spans weeks. Each new interaction builds on what came before.

Option B: Context Injection At the start of each new conversation, students paste a “context summary” of previous interactions:

CONTEXT FROM PREVIOUS INTERACTIONS:

Week 2: You (Jamie) met with the HR Consultant (student). You explained your perspective on managing Priya. You expressed frustration that Priya went to senior management. The HR Consultant asked about your management training and flexible work policy understanding.

Week 3: The HR Consultant met with Priya, David, and Sarah. You haven't seen the consultant since Week 2.

Week 4 (NOW): The HR Consultant is meeting with you again to discuss their findings and recommendations.

Use this context to inform your responses. Remember what you previously discussed with the consultant.

11.6.2 Sequential Assignment Example

Week 1-2: Investigation Phase Students conduct interviews with all stakeholders (Level 2 approach)

Week 3-4: Resolution Design Students draft a resolution plan (training for Jamie, revised flexible work policy, mediation between Jamie and Priya)

Week 5-6: Implementation Simulation Students have follow-up conversations with Jamie and Priya to implement the plan. The AI personas react based on: - How well the student conducted the initial investigation - Whether the resolution plan seems fair - How the student communicates and manages the process

Week 7: Evaluation Students have final check-in conversations 30 days later to assess whether the situation has improved. Jamie and Priya provide feedback on the process.

11.6.3 What This Teaches

- **Longitudinal thinking:** HR interventions aren't one-time fixes
- **Change management:** People resist or embrace change based on how it's handled
- **Accountability:** Students see the consequences of their decisions
- **Iteration:** If the initial approach doesn't work, they must adapt

11.6.4 Example: Persistent Consequences

Scenario 1: Student handled investigation poorly

Student in Week 5 attempts a follow-up meeting with Priya:

Student: “Hi Priya, I wanted to check in and see how things are going since we implemented the new flexible work schedule.”

AI (as Priya): *crosses arms, speaks curtly* “It’s fine, I guess. The schedule helps. But honestly, I still don’t feel like the investigation really listened to my concerns. The report made it sound like this was all just a misunderstanding about policies, but it felt like more than that to me. Anyway, what’s done is done.”

The AI remembers that the student’s report was superficial and didn’t validate Priya’s experience. This affects the ongoing relationship.

Scenario 2: Student handled investigation well

Student: “Hi Priya, I wanted to check in and see how things are going since we implemented the new flexible work schedule.”

AI (as Priya): *smiles cautiously* “Actually, it’s been better. The flexible start times have made a huge difference with childcare. And Jamie and I had that mediation session you set up—it was awkward, but I think we both understand each other better now. I feel like someone actually took this seriously, which means a lot.”

The AI remembers that the student was thorough, empathetic, and fair. This builds trust.

11.7 Level 4: Dynamic Events (Evolving Scenarios)

The most advanced level: the virtual company has ongoing developments that aren’t tied to any single student’s actions. The environment evolves, creating new challenges.

11.7.1 How It Works

You (the lecturer) inject new developments into the company context periodically:

Week 6 Announcement:

COMPANY UPDATE:

InnovateCo has just been acquired by a larger tech firm. The new parent company has announced that there will be a "strategic restructuring" and

that all positions will be reviewed. Employees are anxious about job security.

This context now affects all personas:

- Priya is worried her complaint has made her a target for redundancy
- Jamie is worried that management issues will count against them in the restructuring
- David is under pressure to ensure his department is seen as high-performing
- Sarah (HR Manager) is fielding constant questions about the restructuring process

When students interact with these characters, the personas should reflect this new context and heightened anxiety.

11.7.2 Why This Is Powerful

Students must now manage:

- The original performance/conflict issue
- New uncertainty and change management
- Employee anxiety and rumor control
- Ethical questions (is it fair to continue performance management during restructuring?)

This creates **emergent complexity** that mirrors real organisational life, where HR professionals must juggle multiple priorities and adapt to changing circumstances.

11.7.3 Semester-Long Virtual Company Project

The Ultimate Application:

Create a semester-long project where students act as the HR team for a virtual company. Each week brings new developments:

Week	Event	Student Task
1-2	Introduction to InnovateCo, cast of characters	Conduct organisational culture assessment
3-4	Performance management complaint (Jamie/Priya)	Investigate and resolve
5-6	Employee requests union representation	Respond to union inquiry, prepare for negotiation
7-8	Diversity audit reveals gender pay gap	Analyse data, recommend corrective action

Week	Event	Student Task
9-10	Acquisition announced, restructuring begins	Manage change communication, handle redundancies
11-12	Post-restructure morale crisis	Design retention and engagement strategy

Students work in teams (acting as the HR department). All teams interact with the same personas, but the personas respond differently based on each team's approach.

11.8 Practical Implementation Guidance

11.8.1 Starting Small

You don't need to build an entire semester-long simulation right away. Start with:

1. **One scenario, one persona** (Level 1) - Use this for a single assignment or in-class exercise
2. **Get student feedback** - Did they find it realistic? Useful? Engaging?
3. **Add complexity gradually** - Next semester, try multi-persona (Level 2)
4. **Build your library** - Create a collection of tested personas and scenarios you can reuse and refine

11.8.2 Creating Consistent Personas

The key to realistic simulation is **consistency**. Tips:

- **Write detailed persona documents** that you keep for reference
- **Test personas yourself** before giving them to students
- **Update personas based on student interactions** (if students discover something that breaks the character, revise the prompt)
- **Use the same company/context** across multiple scenarios to build familiarity

11.8.3 Technical Options

Low-Tech Option: Students copy-paste the Master Prompt into ChatGPT or Claude themselves. Free, simple, no special tools needed.

Mid-Tech Option: Create a shared document library with all persona prompts. Students access them as needed.

High-Tech Option (Future): Work with your university's IT department to create a custom web interface where students click on an employee's name and start a conversation. The prompts are pre-loaded and invisible to students. This feels more like a professional simulation.

11.8.4 Assessment Approaches

What to Assess:

1. **Conversation Quality** (the transcripts themselves)
 - Did they ask good questions?
 - Did they demonstrate HR competencies?
 - Did they maintain professionalism?
2. **Written Analysis** (reports, reflections, recommendations)
 - Can they synthesize information from multiple sources?
 - Do they apply theory and legal principles?
 - Are their recommendations realistic and justified?
3. **Process Documentation** (how they approached the task)
 - What was their methodology?
 - How did they ensure fairness?
 - What would they do differently?

Grading Rubric Example:

Criterion	Weight	Description
Investigation Process	25%	Quality of questions, fairness, thoroughness
Stakeholder Management	20%	Rapport-building, empathy, professionalism
Analysis & Synthesis	25%	Ability to integrate multiple perspectives and identify underlying issues
Recommendations	20%	Practical, justified, legally sound solutions
Reflection	10%	Metacognitive awareness, learning demonstrated

11.9 Common Questions

Q: Won't students compare notes and just copy each other's approaches?

116CHAPTER 11. CHAPTER 6: VIRTUAL COMPANY SIMULATION (FUTURE HORIZON)

A: The beauty of AI personas is that they respond dynamically. Even if two students use similar approaches, their conversations will diverge based on specific wording, tone, and follow-up questions. Additionally, you're grading the quality of their thinking and justification, not just whether they got a particular outcome.

Q: What if a student gets “stuck” and the conversation goes nowhere?

A: Build a “reset” option into the assignment. Students can restart the conversation once if needed, but they must reflect on why the first attempt failed. This teaches recovery from mistakes—an important professional skill.

Q: How much time does this take to set up?

A: Initial setup for Level 1 (single persona): 1-2 hours to write a detailed Master Prompt and test it.

Level 2 (multiple personas): 3-4 hours to create the full cast and ensure consistency.

Level 3-4: Ongoing time investment, but you’re building reusable assets.

Q: Can I use the same scenarios year after year?

A: Yes! Unlike traditional case studies that students might find online, AI simulations are dynamic—each student’s experience is unique. However, you should refresh and refine your prompts based on what you learn from each cohort.

11.10 The Vision: HR Education Transformed

Imagine your graduates leaving university having:

- Conducted dozens of difficult conversations in safe, realistic environments
- Managed complex investigations with conflicting accounts
- Made strategic HR decisions and seen their consequences unfold
- Practiced recovery from mistakes without real-world harm
- Developed confidence in their professional judgment

This is what virtual company simulations can achieve. It’s not replacing traditional teaching—it’s adding a layer of experiential learning that was previously impossible at scale.

11.11 Your Action Step

Before Chapter 7, decide your level of ambition:

Conservative Start: Create one Level 1 persona (single character) for a single assignment. Test it in one class.

Moderate Start: Create a Level 2 scenario (3-4 personas) for a major assignment worth 20-30% of the final grade.

Ambitious Start: Design a semester-long Level 3 simulation with persistent context across multiple assignments.

Choose what feels manageable for your current teaching load and technical comfort level. You can always scale up later.

Next Chapter Preview: In Chapter 7, we shift from “how to use AI tools” to “how to rethink assessment.” We’ll explore the fundamental difference between assessing **process** (professional methodology) versus **product** (theoretical knowledge), and show you three complete assessment models specifically designed for HR education: the Simulated HR Consultation, the Evidence-Based Strategic Intervention Plan, and the Competency-Based Recruitment Portfolio. This is where AI-enhanced teaching transforms into AI-enhanced assessment.

Chapter 12

Chapter 10: Designing an AI-Integrated Unit

12.1 Beyond Individual Assignments: Whole-Unit Design

The previous chapters showed you how to create individual AI-enhanced assignments. But the real power of AI in education emerges when you design an entire unit—a complete semester’s learning—with AI integration from the start.

This isn’t about “adding AI” to an existing unit. It’s about **redesigning with AI as a pedagogical partner**, creating learning experiences that weren’t previously possible.

This chapter walks through complete unit design using backwards design principles, showing you how to scaffold student learning from “first encounter with AI” to “competent professional use.”

12.2 The Backwards Design Approach

12.2.1 Step 1: Define Learning Outcomes (AI-Neutral)

Start here, always. What should students be able to do by the end of the unit?

Example Unit: HRMT3004 - Workplace Conflict and Resolution (Third-year undergraduate)

Learning Outcomes: 1. Analyse workplace conflicts using conflict resolution theory and organisational justice frameworks 2. Conduct fair, impartial

120CHAPTER 12. CHAPTER 10: DESIGNING AN AI-INTEGRATED UNIT

investigations of workplace complaints 3. Demonstrate effective communication in difficult conversations (de-escalation, active listening, empathy) 4. Design and facilitate conflict resolution interventions appropriate to context 5. Apply relevant employment law and procedural fairness principles 6. Reflect critically on own practice and identify areas for development

Note: These outcomes don't mention AI. They describe professional competencies. AI is the *means*, not the *end*.

12.2.2 Step 2: Design Assessments (How Will Students Demonstrate Mastery?)

Using the process-based assessment principles from Chapter 7, design assessments that make professional competence visible.

Assessment 1: Investigation Interview Simulation (25%) - What: Students conduct simulated investigation interview with AI persona, submit transcript + process audit - **Assesses:** Learning outcomes 2, 3, 5, 6 - **Due:** Week 6 (mid-semester) - **Why this timing:** Gives students foundational practice before more complex work

Assessment 2: Conflict Resolution Portfolio (40%) - What: Students design intervention for multi-stakeholder conflict, conduct simulated mediation/facilitation, write reflective analysis - **Assesses:** Learning outcomes 1, 3, 4, 6 - **Due:** Week 11 - **Why this timing:** Builds on skills from Assessment 1, integrates theory from mid-semester content

Assessment 3: Research Essay (Critical Analysis) (35%) - What: Critical analysis of conflict resolution approaches in specific organisational contexts (e.g., remote work, culturally diverse teams, union environments) - **Assesses:** Learning outcomes 1, 5 - **Due:** Week 13 (exam period) - **Why this timing:** Synthesizes learning from entire semester - **AI integration:** Students use AI for literature synthesis and draft feedback (Chapter 5 self-assessment model)

12.2.3 Step 3: Map Learning Activities (How Will Students Prepare for Assessments?)

Now design the week-by-week learning journey that scaffolds students from novice to competent.

Key principle: Gradually increase complexity of AI interaction while building skill.

12.3 Complete 12-Week Unit Design Example

12.3.1 Week 1: Introduction to Conflict and Introduction to AI

Learning Focus: Understand types of workplace conflict, introduce AI as learning tool

Content: - Lecture: Sources and types of workplace conflict - Workshop: Conflict analysis frameworks (task vs. relationship conflict, etc.)

AI Activity (Low stakes, introductory):

In-class demonstration:

- Show students a simple conflict scenario
- Use AI to generate 3 different stakeholder perspectives on the same incident
- Discuss: "How can seeing multiple perspectives help us understand conflict?"

Purpose: - Students see AI in action (demystify) - Understand AI can help explore complexity - No pressure—just observation

Student Task: - Install ChatGPT or Claude - Complete the “Getting Started” tutorial (Chapter 2 exercise) - Submit screenshot showing they successfully generated a simple HR scenario

12.3.2 Week 2: Conflict Theory and AI Exploration

Learning Focus: Apply conflict theory; practice writing prompts

Content: - Lecture: Conflict resolution theories (interest-based, transformative, etc.) - Workshop: Analysing conflict through theoretical lenses

AI Activity (First hands-on practice):

Assignment: Theory Application Practice (ungraded)

- Students receive a workplace conflict scenario
- Use AI to analyse the conflict through 2 different theoretical frameworks
- Write 300 words comparing the insights each theory provides
- Submit both the AI conversation and their reflection

Purpose: - Students practice prompt writing - Students evaluate AI's theoretical analysis - Low-stakes experimentation - Lecturer can see who needs prompt-writing help

12.3.3 Week 3: Communication Skills for Conflict

Learning Focus: Active listening, empathetic communication, managing emotion

122CHAPTER 12. CHAPTER 10: DESIGNING AN AI-INTEGRATED UNIT

Content: - Lecture: Communication theory and de-escalation techniques - Workshop: Communication analysis (watch video examples, critique)

AI Activity (First simulation):

Practice Simulation (ungraded, but required):

- Students conduct 5-minute conversation with AI playing "frustrated employee"
- Focus: Practice de-escalation language
- Students can retry as many times as they want
- Submit their best attempt + 200-word reflection: "What did I learn about my communication style?"

Purpose: - First taste of "flight simulator" - Builds confidence before graded assessment - Students realise they can practice privately and improve

12.3.4 Week 4: Legal Framework and Procedural Fairness

Learning Focus: Natural justice, procedural fairness, relevant legislation

Content: - Lecture: Legal obligations in workplace investigations - Workshop: Case studies of procedural failures and consequences

AI Activity (Legal application practice):

Formative Exercise:

- AI generates 5 short investigation scenarios
- For each, students identify: What legal principle is at risk? What should HR do?
- Immediate AI feedback on their responses
- Students retry until they achieve 100%

Purpose: - Spaced repetition of legal knowledge - Students can practice until mastery (not time-limited) - AI provides immediate correction

12.3.5 Week 5: Investigation Skills

Learning Focus: Conducting fair, thorough workplace investigations

Content: - Lecture: Investigation methodology and common pitfalls - Workshop: Planning an investigation (what questions, what order, what documentation)

AI Activity (Assessment preparation):

Scaffolded practice for Assessment 1:

- Students receive the persona they'll encounter in Assessment 1 (preview)
- Conduct practice interview
- Generate AI critique
- Revise approach
- Conduct second practice interview

Purpose: - Direct preparation for upcoming assessment - Students enter Assessment 1 having already practiced - Reduces anxiety, improves quality

12.3.6 Week 6: Assessment 1 Due - Investigation Interview Simulation

No new content this week—focus on assessment

Students submit: 1. Transcript of investigation interview with AI persona 2. Process audit document analysing their own performance 3. 500-word reflection on learning

Teaching focus this week: - Availability for consultation/questions - Technical support for any AI access issues

12.3.7 Week 7: Feedback Week + Mediation Theory

Learning Focus: Understanding Assessment 1 feedback; introduction to mediation

Content: - Return Assessment 1 with feedback - Lecture: Mediation and facilitation approaches - Workshop: Compare mediation models (evaluative, facilitative, transformative)

AI Activity (Exploring alternatives):

Scenario Exploration:

- Students receive a conflict scenario suitable for mediation
- Use AI "Pros and Cons" technique (Chapter 3) to evaluate which mediation approach is best
- In-class discussion: Did different students reach different conclusions? Why?

Purpose: - Recover from assessment submission - Introduce new content at moderate cognitive load - Build toward Assessment 2

12.3.8 Week 8: Facilitation Skills

Learning Focus: Facilitation techniques for multi-party conflict

Content: - Lecture: Managing multi-stakeholder conversations - Workshop: Power dynamics, coalition-building, impasse-breaking

AI Activity (Complex simulation introduction):

Multi-party simulation practice:

- Students manage conversation between 2 AI personas in conflict
- Practice balancing airtime, managing interruptions, keeping focus

- Ungraded but highly recommended for Assessment 2 preparation

Purpose: - Increase complexity (now managing 2 personas, not 1) - Build skills for Assessment 2 - Students who struggled with Assessment 1 get redemption opportunity

12.3.9 Week 9: Cultural and Ethical Considerations

Learning Focus: Cross-cultural conflict, ethical dilemmas, bias awareness

Content: - Lecture: Cultural dimensions in conflict (individualism/collectivism, face-saving, etc.) - Workshop: Ethical dilemmas in conflict resolution (confidentiality, power imbalances, organisational pressure)

AI Activity (Critical evaluation):

AI Ethics Exercise:

- AI generates a conflict resolution plan
- Students critique it for:
 - Cultural insensitivity
 - Ethical gaps
 - Bias toward organisational interests over fairness
- Write memo explaining what AI got wrong and why

Purpose: - Develop critical oversight of AI - Connect theory (cultural frameworks, ethics) to practice - Prepare for Assessment 2 cultural/ethical analysis

12.3.10 Week 10: Designing Interventions

Learning Focus: Strategic planning for conflict resolution

Content: - Lecture: Matching interventions to conflict type and context - Workshop: Intervention design process

AI Activity (Assessment 2 preparation):

Portfolio Development:

- Students begin working on Assessment 2
- Use AI to generate multiple intervention options for their chosen scenario
- Bring draft analysis to workshop for peer feedback

Purpose: - Structured time for assessment work - Peer learning and feedback - Lecturer can identify students who need additional support

12.3.11 Week 11: Assessment 2 Due - Conflict Resolution Portfolio

Students submit: 1. Conflict analysis and intervention design (written component) 2. Transcript(s) of simulated intervention (conversation with AI personas) 3. Reflective analysis integrating theory and evaluating their practice

12.3.12 Week 12: Contemporary Issues and Research Essay Support

Learning Focus: Emerging trends in workplace conflict; research essay preparation

Content: - Lecture: Special topics (remote work conflict, AI in HR, gig economy disputes) - Workshop: Research essay planning and literature review strategies

AI Activity (Research support):

Essay development support:

- Students use AI to identify key literature on their chosen topic
- Use AI self-assessment tool to check essay plan
- Optional: Book consultation with lecturer to discuss draft

Purpose: - Support final assessment - Lighter week (no new major concepts) - Celebrate semester's learning

12.3.13 Week 13: Assessment 3 Due - Research Essay

Students submit critical analysis essay.

12.4 The Scaffolding Progression Model

Notice how AI integration increases in complexity:

Week	AI Complexity	Student Agency	Stakes
1-2	Observation, simple prompts	Low (following instructions)	None (ungraded)
3-4	Single persona, structured scenarios	Medium (some choice in approach)	Low (formative)

126CHAPTER 12. CHAPTER 10: DESIGNING AN AI-INTEGRATED UNIT

Week	AI Complexity	Student Agency	Stakes
5-6	Graded simulation, self-assessment	High (must plan and execute)	Medium (25% of grade)
7-9	Multi-persona, ethical critique	High (designing interventions)	Preparation for high-stakes
10-11	Complex portfolio with multiple components	Very high (strategic choices)	High (40% of grade)
12-13	AI as research assistant	Very high (independent work)	High (35% of grade)

This progression develops: 1. Technical comfort (Weeks 1-2) 2. Basic AI literacy (Weeks 3-4) 3. Applied competence (Weeks 5-8) 4. Critical oversight (Weeks 9-11) 5. Independent professional use (Weeks 12-13)

12.5 Balancing AI and Non-AI Activities

Important: Not everything should involve AI.

12.5.1 This unit includes traditional elements:

- **Lectures:** Content delivery (theory, legal frameworks, research findings)
- **Workshops:** Peer discussion, case analysis, group problem-solving
- **Readings:** Textbook chapters, journal articles, policy documents
- **Live role-play:** At least 1-2 in-person practice sessions for social learning
- **Guest speaker:** Practicing mediator or workplace investigator
- **Reflective journaling:** Weekly reflections on learning (not AI-assessed)

12.5.2 The 60/40 rule:

Aim for approximately:
- 60% traditional teaching and learning activities
- 40% AI-enhanced activities

This ensures students develop both technological proficiency and traditional professional skills (working with humans, not just chatbots).

12.6 Supporting Student AI Literacy Development

Across the semester, explicitly teach AI literacy:

12.6.1 Week 1: What AI Is (and Isn't)

- AI as pattern generator, not intelligence
- Strengths and limitations
- When to trust vs. verify

12.6.2 Week 4: Prompt Engineering

- How to write effective prompts
- Troubleshooting poor responses
- Iterating to improve results

12.6.3 Week 7: Critical Evaluation

- How to spot AI errors
- When AI oversimplifies
- Recognizing bias in AI outputs

12.6.4 Week 9: Professional Ethics

- Accountability when using AI tools
- When to use AI vs. when human judgment is essential
- Transparent vs. hidden AI use

By semester's end, students haven't just used AI—they've developed **AI literacy as a professional competency**.

12.7 Unit Outline Template (for Your Own Design)

Use this template to design your AI-integrated unit:

12.7.1 UNIT INFORMATION

- Unit code and title:
- Year level and semester:
- Credit points:
- Prerequisites:

12.7.2 LEARNING OUTCOMES (AI-neutral)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

12.7.3 ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

Assessment	Weight	Due Week	AI Integration	Outcomes Assessed

12.7.4 WEEKLY SCHEDULE

Week [X]: [Topic] - Learning focus: - Content delivery: - AI activity: - Purpose:
- Preparation for next week:

[Repeat for 12-13 weeks]

12.7.5 AI LITERACY PROGRESSION

- Weeks 1-3: [foundational skills]
- Weeks 4-6: [applied practice]
- Weeks 7-9: [critical evaluation]
- Weeks 10-13: [independent professional use]

12.7.6 BALANCE CHECK

- Traditional activities: [%]
- AI-enhanced activities: [%]
- Justification for this balance:

12.7.7 STUDENT SUPPORT

- Resources provided for AI access:
 - Technical support available:
 - Academic support for AI use:
 - Equity considerations addressed:
-

12.8 Common Design Mistakes to Avoid

12.8.1 Mistake 1: “AI for AI’s Sake”

Problem: Including AI because it’s trendy, not because it serves learning outcomes. **Solution:** Every AI activity must clearly connect to a learning outcome. If you can’t justify it pedagogically, remove it.

12.8.2 Mistake 2: All or Nothing

Problem: Either avoiding AI entirely or making everything AI-based. **Solution:** Balance. Use AI where it adds value (simulation, feedback, practice) and traditional methods where they’re superior (peer learning, live practice, social skills).

12.8.3 Mistake 3: Assuming Technical Competence

Problem: Expecting students to figure out AI tools independently. **Solution:** Explicitly teach prompt writing, troubleshooting, critical evaluation. Scaffold technical skills just like you scaffold content knowledge.

12.8.4 Mistake 4: No Progression

Problem: Same level of AI complexity all semester. **Solution:** Design deliberate progression from simple to complex, guided to independent, low-stakes to high-stakes.

12.8.5 Mistake 5: Ignoring Equity

Problem: Assuming all students have equal access to AI tools, devices, internet. **Solution:** Provide alternatives (lab access, in-class time for AI activities), use university-subscribed tools where possible, ensure core learning is accessible without premium AI access.

12.9 Aligning Unit Design with Program Goals

Your unit doesn’t exist in isolation—it’s part of a degree program.

12.9.1 Consider:

Vertical integration: - What AI skills do students bring from earlier units? - What AI competencies will later units assume? - How does your unit scaffold toward program-level AI literacy?

Horizontal integration: - What other units are students taking concurrently?

- Could you coordinate AI activities across multiple units? - Are there opportunities for cross-unit projects?

Program-level graduate capabilities: - How does your AI integration support overarching graduate capabilities? - Communication? Critical thinking? Professional practice? Technological proficiency?

12.10 Communicating the Design to Students

Students need to understand the pedagogical design—it helps them engage meaningfully.

12.10.1 First lecture (explain the approach):

“This unit uses AI tools as part of your learning. Here’s why:

In your HR careers, you’ll use AI for data analysis, policy drafting, and decision support. Our job is to prepare you to use those tools competently and ethically.

You’ll notice the AI activities progress across the semester: - Early weeks: You’ll practice basic skills in safe, low-stakes environments - Mid-semester: You’ll apply those skills in realistic scenarios for assessment - Late semester: You’ll use AI independently as a professional tool

By the end, you’ll have practiced difficult conversations dozens of times—something that would be impossible without AI. You’ll also know when to trust AI, when to question it, and when human judgment must override technology.

This isn’t about making your degree easier. It’s about preparing you for professional practice in an AI-augmented world.”

12.10.2 In your unit outline (be explicit):

Include a section titled “**AI Integration in This Unit**” that explains: - Why AI is used - How it supports learning outcomes - What skills students will develop - Expectations for academic integrity - Support available

12.11 Evaluating Your AI-Integrated Unit

After the semester, evaluate systematically:

12.11.1 Student learning evidence:

- Did assessment results improve compared to previous semesters?
- Did students demonstrate competencies that previous cohorts struggled with?
- What does student work reveal about their AI literacy development?

12.11.2 Student feedback:

- Survey: How useful was AI for your learning? (1-5 scale)
- What AI activities were most valuable?
- What AI activities felt like “busy work”?
- Do you feel more prepared for professional practice?

12.11.3 Your experience:

- Did AI integration save or cost you time overall?
- What worked better than expected? Worse?
- What would you change next semester?
- What would you keep?

12.11.4 Iterate and refine based on evidence.

12.12 Your Action Step

Design (or redesign) one unit using this backwards design approach:

1. Choose a unit you teach (or will teach)
2. Define learning outcomes (without mentioning AI)
3. Design assessments that make competence visible
4. Map 12-week learning journey with deliberate AI scaffolding
5. Check balance (60% traditional, 40% AI-enhanced)
6. Plan equity supports (access, alternatives, scaffolding)

Don't aim for perfection—aim for “better than what I'm currently doing.”

You can refine each semester based on what you learn.

Next Chapter Preview: In Chapter 11, we shift focus to postgraduate students and research contexts. You'll learn how to use AI as a research assistant—for literature review, data analysis, research question development, and critical synthesis—while maintaining academic rigor and original thinking. This is particularly relevant for MCom students and thesis supervision.

Chapter 13

Chapter 11: The Research Assistant (Postgraduate Focus)

13.1 AI in Research: Promise and Peril

If you teach postgraduate HR students—particularly those in the Human Resources Major (MCom) or supervising research projects—you face a distinct challenge:

How do students use AI to support research without undermining the fundamental purpose of research: original thinking, critical synthesis, and contribution to knowledge?

This chapter addresses AI's role in research contexts: literature review, data analysis, research question development, and thesis writing. The goal is not to ban AI (impossible and counterproductive) but to teach students to use it as a **research assistant**, not a **research replacement**.

13.2 The Core Principle: AI for Process, Human for Insight

AI can accelerate research **processes**: - Finding relevant literature - Summarizing large volumes of text - Identifying patterns in qualitative data - Checking methodology against standards - Improving writing clarity

AI cannot replace research **insight**: - Identifying significant gaps in knowledge -

Developing novel theoretical frameworks - Making original arguments - Synthesizing across disciplines creatively - Evaluating quality and credibility of sources deeply

The skill we're teaching: Know when each applies.

13.3 Application 1: Literature Review

13.3.1 The Challenge

Postgraduate students must: - Identify relevant literature across multiple disciplines - Synthesize hundreds of sources - Identify gaps and debates - Position their own research contribution

This is time-consuming but essential scholarly work.

13.3.2 How AI Can Help (Appropriately)

Use Case 1: Exploratory Search

When students are first entering a research area and don't yet know the key terms, debates, or seminal works:

PROMPT: Early Exploration

I'm beginning research on [topic: e.g., "employee engagement in remote work environments"]. I have a general understanding of [what they know] but need to understand the current state of research.

Help me identify:

1. The major theoretical frameworks used in this area
2. Key debates or controversies
3. Seminal authors or papers I should definitely read
4. Related concepts or search terms I should be aware of
5. Potential gaps this research area hasn't yet addressed

Do not write a literature review for me-just give me a map of the landscape so I can read the original sources myself.

What the student gets: A starting point, not a finished product. They still must read the actual sources.

Why this is acceptable: It's like asking a senior researcher "Where should I start?" The student still does the intellectual work.

Use Case 2: Source Summarization for Initial Screening

When students have 50 potentially relevant articles and need to decide which ones are actually worth deep reading:

PROMPT: Initial Screening

I'm researching [specific research question]. I've identified this article:

[paste article abstract and key findings]

Based on this information:

1. Is this article directly relevant to my research question?
2. What is this article's main contribution?
3. What theoretical framework does it use?
4. What are its limitations relevant to my focus?

I will read the full article if it's relevant—this is just helping me prioritize my reading list.

What the student gets: Efficient triaging. They still read the relevant sources fully.

Why this is acceptable: This is no different from reading abstracts first. The student is still making the judgment call about relevance.

13.3.3 How AI Can Be Misused

Problematic Use 1: “Write my literature review”

BAD PROMPT: Write a 3000-word literature review on employee engagement in remote work.

Why it's problematic: - Student hasn't engaged with the literature - AI will fabricate citations (hallucinate sources that don't exist) - Student can't defend or explain the review - No original synthesis or critical analysis

How to prevent: - Require annotated bibliographies (forces engagement with sources) - Require citation of specific page numbers and quotes - Assess through oral examination or viva voce - Ask students to explain contradictions or debates in their literature

Problematic Use 2: Trusting AI's theoretical analysis

AI can describe theories but often misapplies them or oversimplifies.

Example: AI might say “This study uses Social Exchange Theory” but miss that the study actually critiques or extends that theory in important ways.

How to prevent: - Teach students to verify AI's theoretical claims against original sources - Require students to identify where AI got theory wrong - Assess theoretical sophistication through application, not just description

13.3.4 Teaching Students Appropriate Literature Review with AI

Assignment: Annotated Bibliography with AI Audit

Student Process: 1. Use AI to identify 30 potentially relevant sources 2. Read abstracts and select 15 most relevant 3. Read all 15 sources fully 4. Write annotated bibliography (150 words per source): - Summary of contribution - Theoretical framework used - Methodology - Relevance to research question - Critical evaluation (strengths/limitations) 5. **AI Audit Section:** - Ask AI to summarize 3 of the same sources - Compare AI's summary to your own - Write 300 words: What did AI get right? What did it miss? What did it oversimplify?

What this teaches: - Efficient source discovery (AI strength) - Critical reading and evaluation (human strength) - Awareness of AI's limitations in scholarly work

13.4 Application 2: Research Question Development

13.4.1 The Challenge

Developing a good research question is hard: - Must be original (not already answered) - Must be significant (worth answering) - Must be feasible (answerable within scope/resources) - Must be clear and focused

Students often struggle with scope—questions that are too broad or too narrow.

13.4.2 How AI Can Help (Appropriately)

Use Case: Refinement Through Questioning

PROMPT: Research Question Refinement

I'm interested in researching: [broad topic]

My initial research question is: [their draft question]

Help me refine this by:

1. Asking clarifying questions about what exactly I want to know

2. Identifying what assumptions I'm making
3. Suggesting how I could narrow or focus the question
4. Identifying what would make this question more answerable

Do not write a research question for me—help me think through how to develop a better one myself.

What the student gets: Socratic questioning that reveals fuzzy thinking.

Why this is acceptable: It's like supervision—a good supervisor asks probing questions that help the student clarify their own thinking.

Use Case: Feasibility Check

PROMPT: Feasibility Analysis

My research question is: [specific question]

I plan to answer this using [method: e.g., qualitative interviews with 15 HR managers in Perth].

Critically evaluate:

1. Is this method appropriate for answering this question? Why or why not?
2. What challenges might I face with this approach?
3. What alternative methods could I consider?
4. What would I need to establish to make this feasible (access, ethics, timeframe)?

Challenge my assumptions—don't just agree with me.

What the student gets: Critical feedback on methodology before they commit to an unworkable approach.

Why this is acceptable: Students still make the final decision. AI is playing devil's advocate.

13.4.3 How AI Can Be Misused

Problematic: “Generate research questions for me”

If students simply ask AI to generate questions and choose one without deep engagement, they won't understand: - Why the question matters - What literature it's building on - What the theoretical contribution would be

How to prevent: - Require students to justify why their question is significant
- Ask: “What makes this question worth answering?” - Require students to map their question to gaps in existing literature

13.5 Application 3: Data Analysis (Qualitative Research)

13.5.1 The Challenge

HR research often involves qualitative data: interviews, focus groups, open-ended survey responses. Analysis is time-consuming: - Transcription - Coding - Theme identification - Pattern recognition

13.5.2 How AI Can Help (Appropriately)

Use Case 1: Transcription

AI transcription tools (Otter.ai, Whisper, etc.) can convert audio to text rapidly. This is **entirely appropriate**—transcription is mechanical work.

Student responsibility: Review and correct transcription (AI mishears technical terms, names, etc.).

Use Case 2: Initial Coding Suggestions

PROMPT: Preliminary Coding

I conducted interviews with HR managers about challenges in hybrid work management. Below is one interview transcript.

My research question is: [specific question]

Suggest potential codes or themes you see emerging in this transcript. This is preliminary—I will do my own coding, but I want a starting point to see if I'm missing anything obvious.

[paste transcript]

What the student gets: Initial pattern recognition to compare against their own coding.

Why this is acceptable: The student still does the analytical work—deciding which codes are valid, refining them, applying them systematically across all data, and interpreting what they mean.

Critical requirement: Student must code independently FIRST, then compare to AI suggestions.

Use Case 3: Checking for Bias in Interpretation

PROMPT: Alternative Interpretations

I've identified this theme in my interview data: [theme description with supporting quotes].

My interpretation is: [student's interpretation]

Challenge my interpretation:

1. What alternative ways could this data be interpreted?
2. What am I potentially overlooking or overemphasizing?
3. What assumptions might be driving my interpretation?

Help me ensure I'm not just seeing what I want to see in the data.

What the student gets: Check against confirmation bias.

Why this is acceptable: Good qualitative research includes reflexivity—questioning your own interpretations. This is like peer review or supervision feedback.

13.5.3 How AI Can Be Misused

Problematic: Outsourcing analysis entirely

If AI does all the coding and theme identification, the student hasn't engaged with the data. They can't defend their findings or answer questions about them.

How to prevent: - Require detailed coding tables showing student's own codes
- Require justification for theme selection (why this theme and not others?)
- Assess through viva voce where student must explain analytic choices
- Ask students to identify quotes/examples supporting each theme (demonstrates familiarity with data)

13.6 Application 4: Thesis Writing**13.6.1 The Challenge**

Thesis writing requires: - Clear argumentation - Logical structure - Academic writing conventions - Integration of theory and findings - Original synthesis

13.6.2 How AI Can Help (Appropriately)

Use Case 1: Structural Feedback

140CHAPTER 13. CHAPTER 11: THE RESEARCH ASSISTANT (POSTGRADUATE FOCUS)

PROMPT: Structural Critique

Below is an outline for my thesis chapter on [topic]:

[paste outline with main sections and subsections]

Evaluate:

1. Is the logical flow clear and coherent?
2. Are there obvious gaps in argumentation?
3. Does this structure effectively answer my research question?
4. What's unclear or confusing?

I'm looking for structural feedback, not content generation.

What the student gets: Feedback on organisation before investing time writing full drafts.

Use Case 2: Clarity and Readability

PROMPT: Clarity Check

Below is a paragraph from my thesis:

[paste paragraph]

This paragraph is trying to explain [what they're arguing].

Evaluate:

1. Is the main point clear?
2. Are there overly complex sentences that could be simplified?
3. Are there logical leaps that need additional explanation?
4. Suggest revisions for clarity-but maintain my voice and argument.

What the student gets: Editing suggestions focused on clarity, not content changes.

Why this is acceptable: It's like a writing centre consultation. The ideas are still the student's.

13.6.3 How AI Can Be Misused

Problematic 1: AI-written sections

Students paste AI-generated prose into their thesis without engagement.

How to detect: - AI-generated academic writing often uses generic phrases

(“in today’s rapidly changing world,” “it is widely acknowledged that”) - Lacks specific engagement with the student’s own data or sources - Voice/style shifts noticeably between sections

How to prevent: - Use the transparency model (Chapter 5)—students acknowledge AI use and submit revision history - Assess through oral defense where students must explain their arguments - Focus assessment on originality of thinking, not just quality of prose

Problematic 2: Trusting AI citations

AI frequently hallucinates citations— inventing papers that don’t exist or misattributing real papers.

How to prevent: - **Require students to verify every citation** in their reference list (confirm it exists, that they’ve read it, that it says what they claim)
- Spot-check citations during supervision: “Tell me about the Smith 2019 paper you cite here—what was their methodology?”

13.7 Application 5: Research Proposal Development

13.7.1 Assignment: MCom Research Proposal with AI Documentation

This assignment teaches appropriate AI use while maintaining academic rigor.

Student Task:

Develop a research proposal (2500 words) for an HR research project including:
1. Research question and justification 2. Literature review (15-20 sources) 3. Methodology and research design 4. Expected contributions

AI Use Requirements:

Students must document: 1. **Every AI interaction** used in developing this proposal (submit conversation logs or screenshots) 2. **AI Use Log** (template provided): - Date and purpose of AI use - Prompt used - What AI provided - How you critically evaluated or revised AI’s output - What you learned from this AI interaction

Assessment Rubric:

Criterion	Weight	What's Assessed
Research Question Quality	20%	Originality, significance, feasibility
Literature Engagement	25%	Depth of engagement with sources (not just AI summary)
Methodological Rigor	25%	Appropriateness and detail of research design
Critical AI Use	20%	Evidence of critical evaluation of AI outputs, not blind acceptance
Writing Quality	10%	Clarity, structure, academic conventions

What This Teaches:

- Transparency about AI use (professional practice)
 - Critical evaluation of AI (essential skill)
 - That AI is a tool requiring oversight (ethical responsibility)
 - Appropriate vs. inappropriate research uses
-

13.8 Teaching AI Literacy for Research

Explicitly teach these principles to postgraduate students:

13.8.1 Principle 1: AI Accelerates Process, Humans Provide Insight

Appropriate AI use: - Finding sources quickly - Transcribing interviews - Checking grammar - Generating initial coding suggestions

Inappropriate AI reliance: - Interpreting findings - Making theoretical arguments - Evaluating source quality deeply - Making original contributions

13.8.2 Principle 2: Always Verify

AI makes confident mistakes. For research, this is dangerous.

Teach students: - Every citation AI provides must be verified (does it exist? Does it say what AI claims?) - Every theoretical claim AI makes must be checked against original sources - Every statistical claim must be recalculated or confirmed

Assignment exercise: > “I gave AI 5 research questions and asked it to identify relevant literature. Below are AI’s recommendations. Your task: Identify which citations are real and which are hallucinated. Verify each one.”

This teaches verification as a habit.

13.8.3 Principle 3: Use AI to Challenge Your Thinking

The best research use of AI is as a **critical friend**: - “What assumptions am I making?” - “What have I overlooked?” - “How else could this be interpreted?” - “What are weaknesses in my argument?”

Train students to prompt AI to **disagree** with them, not just confirm their thinking.

13.9 Supervising Research Students Using AI

13.9.1 As a Supervisor, You Should:

1. Be Explicit About Expectations

Include an “AI Use” section in your supervision agreement: - When AI use is encouraged (e.g., literature search, transcription) - When AI use must be documented (e.g., data analysis support) - When AI use is inappropriate (e.g., writing original analysis) - How to cite AI assistance in the thesis

2. Model Appropriate AI Use

In supervision meetings: > “I used AI to quickly scan recent literature on your topic—here’s what it flagged. But I want you to read these three papers fully because AI’s summary missed important nuances.”

This shows: AI for efficiency, human for depth.

3. Ask Questions That Reveal AI Misuse

If you suspect a student has outsourced thinking to AI: - “Walk me through how you arrived at this interpretation.” - “What alternative explanations did you consider and reject? Why?” - “Which of your sources best supports this claim? What does that author actually argue?”

Students who’ve done the work can answer. Students who relied on AI can’t.

13.10 Red Flags for Over-Reliance on AI in Research

Red Flag 1: Student's written work contains sophisticated arguments they can't explain verbally.

Red Flag 2: Citations that don't exist or don't say what the student claims.

Red Flag 3: Generic, surface-level literature review that doesn't engage with debates or contradictions.

Red Flag 4: Student can't articulate why their research question matters or what gap it fills.

Red Flag 5: Sudden shifts in writing quality or voice within a thesis.

Response: Don't accuse immediately. Ask questions that require genuine engagement with the research. Provide opportunity for the student to demonstrate their thinking.

13.11 Sample Unit: Research Methods in HR (MCom)

Here's how to integrate AI into a postgraduate research methods unit:

13.11.1 Week 1: Introduction to Research and AI

- What is research? What makes it original?
- AI as research tool vs. research replacement
- Academic integrity in an AI-augmented research environment

13.11.2 Week 2: Literature Review Skills

- How to search databases effectively
- Using AI for exploratory search (demonstration)
- Critical evaluation of sources (AI can't do this)

13.11.3 Week 3: Research Question Development

- Characteristics of good research questions
- Using AI for refinement (Socratic questioning)
- **Assignment:** Draft research question + document AI interactions

13.11.4 Week 4: Qualitative Methods

- Interview design and data collection

- AI-assisted transcription
- Human-centred analysis

13.11.5 Week 5: Qualitative Data Analysis

- Coding and theme development
- Using AI for preliminary coding (appropriately)
- **Workshop:** Code same transcript independently, then compare to AI coding

13.11.6 Week 6: Quantitative Methods

- Survey design and data collection
- AI for data cleaning and initial analysis
- Human judgment for interpretation

13.11.7 Week 7: Mixed Methods

- Integration of qualitative and quantitative
- Using AI to synthesize across data types
- Maintaining analytical integrity

13.11.8 Week 8: Research Ethics

- Ethics approval processes
- AI and confidentiality concerns
- Citing AI assistance appropriately

13.11.9 Week 9-10: Proposal Development

- Students work on research proposals
- AI use documented throughout
- Peer review of AI use practices

13.11.10 Week 11: Presenting Research

- Defending methodological choices
- **Practice:** Explain your research without referring to notes (tests genuine understanding)

13.11.11 Week 12: Final Proposal Due

- Research proposal (2500 words)
 - AI Use Log (documenting all AI assistance)
 - Oral presentation defending methodological choices
-

13.12 Key Principle for Postgraduate AI Integration

The standard must be higher, not lower.

Undergraduate students use AI to develop foundational skills.

Postgraduate students use AI to accelerate research processes while maintaining the highest standards of:

- Originality - Critical thinking - Methodological rigor
- Scholarly integrity

If AI integration makes postgraduate work easier without making it better, you're doing it wrong.

AI should enable students to engage with MORE literature, analyse data MORE thoroughly, and produce MORE rigorous research—not to avoid doing the hard thinking that research requires.

13.13 Your Action Step

If you supervise research students or teach research methods:

1. **Draft an “AI in Research” policy** for your students (1 page):
 - What AI use is encouraged
 - What AI use requires documentation
 - What AI use is inappropriate
 - How to cite AI assistance
2. **Test it yourself:** Use AI appropriately in your own research. Experience its value and limitations firsthand.
3. **Have the conversation:** In your next supervision meeting, explicitly discuss AI use. Ask your students: “Have you tried using AI for your research? How? What worked? What didn’t?”

Don't assume students will figure this out on their own. Teach it explicitly.

Next Steps: We now have comprehensive content covering undergraduate teaching, postgraduate research, unit design, and all core applications. Next we'll expand Chapter 3 with the Formative Assessment Generator technique, then create front matter and a conclusion chapter to complete the booklet.

Chapter 14

Conclusion: Where Do We Go From Here?

14.1 What You've Learned

Over the course of this booklet, you've explored:

- **Why AI matters** for preparing HR professionals for real-world practice
- **How to use AI** through simple prompts that anyone can write
- **Six core techniques** that develop critical thinking and professional skills
- **Three major applications**: conversation simulations, self-assessment tools, and virtual company scenarios
- **New assessment models** that evaluate process and methodology, not just knowledge recall
- **Practical implementation** from your first experiment through full unit redesign
- **Ethical frameworks** for responsible AI integration and academic integrity
- **Advanced applications** for unit design and postgraduate research support

You now have the knowledge and tools to integrate AI into your HR teaching in meaningful, pedagogically sound ways.

But knowledge alone isn't enough.

14.2 The Question That Matters

As you close this booklet, you face a decision:

Will you actually try something?

It's easy to read about innovative pedagogy and think "That's interesting." It's harder to actually change your practice.

You're busy. You have existing materials that work well enough. You're comfortable with your current approach. Change is risky—what if students resist? What if colleagues judge? What if it doesn't work?

These are legitimate concerns.

But consider this: **Your students will use AI in their HR careers whether you teach them to or not.**

The question isn't "Should AI be part of professional HR practice?" It already is.

The question is: **"Will my graduates know how to use AI responsibly, critically, and ethically?"**

If the answer is "I hope so" or "They'll figure it out," you're sending students into professional practice unprepared.

14.3 Start With One Thing

You don't need to implement everything in this booklet. You don't need to redesign your entire curriculum. You don't even need to be certain it will work perfectly.

You just need to try one thing.

Choose the smallest experiment that feels manageable:

14.3.1 Option 1: Try It Yourself (This Week)

- Pick one prompt from Appendix A
- Generate a teaching resource you actually need (case study, practice questions, discussion prompts)
- Use it in your next class
- See what happens

Time investment: 30 minutes **Risk:** Minimal **Learning:** High

14.3.2 Option 2: Student Demonstration (Next Class)

- In your next lecture, project a live AI conversation on screen
- Show students how AI can help them practice skills
- Answer their questions
- Don't assign anything—just plant the seed

Time investment: 15 minutes in class **Risk:** None (optional for students)

Learning: Medium

14.3.3 Option 3: Low-Stakes Practice Exercise (This Semester)

- Add one optional AI practice activity to an existing assignment
- Recommended but not required
- See who uses it and gather feedback
- Iterate for next semester

Time investment: 1-2 hours setup **Risk:** Low (it's optional) **Learning:** Substantial (you'll see what students actually do with AI)

14.3.4 Option 4: Pilot Assessment (Next Semester)

- Redesign one existing assignment using ideas from Chapter 4, 5, or 7
- Worth 15-25% of the grade (significant but not high-stakes)
- Document what works and what doesn't
- Refine for future iterations

Time investment: 3-5 hours initial design **Risk:** Moderate (but manageable with clear instructions) **Learning:** Transformative (you'll see process-based assessment in action)

14.3.5 Option 5: Full Unit Redesign (Next Academic Year)

- Use the backwards design approach from Chapter 10
- Integrate AI throughout one complete unit
- Build scaffolded progression from Week 1 to Week 12
- Measure impact on student learning

Time investment: Significant (20-30 hours initial design) **Risk:** Higher (but with high potential reward) **Learning:** Comprehensive (you'll develop deep expertise in AI-enhanced pedagogy)

14.4 Pick one. Not five. One.

The biggest mistake educators make with innovation is trying to do too much at once. They get overwhelmed, it doesn't go perfectly, and they abandon the whole thing.

Small, successful experiments build confidence and capability.

One well-executed pilot teaches you more than five half-baked attempts.

14.5 What Success Looks Like

How will you know if your AI integration is working?

14.5.1 Short-Term Success (First Semester)

Student engagement: - Students ask questions about AI use (curiosity) - Students report that AI helped them prepare or practice (utility) - Students use AI activities even when optional (voluntary adoption)

Your experience: - You complete the pilot without major disasters - You learn something about what works and what doesn't - You feel more confident about AI tools and their limitations

Tangible outcomes: - At least one student says "That simulation really helped me understand..." - You create at least one reusable resource you'll use again - You gather feedback that informs your next iteration

14.5.2 Medium-Term Success (Within 2-3 Semesters)

Student learning: - Improved performance on assessments related to AI-practiced skills - Students demonstrate competencies earlier in the semester - Fewer students make basic procedural or communication errors - Students reference their AI practice in reflections and discussions

Your teaching: - You have 2-3 reliable AI-enhanced activities you use regularly - You've refined prompts and instructions based on student experience - You feel AI is enhancing rather than complicating your teaching - Other lecturers ask you about your approach

Curriculum: - AI integration is normalized (not novel or controversial) - Students expect and value AI-enhanced learning opportunities - You've expanded from one unit to multiple units or assessment types

14.5.3 Long-Term Success (3+ Years)

Graduate outcomes: - Alumni report that AI-enhanced learning prepared them for professional practice - Employers or practicum supervisors notice your

graduates are better prepared - Students explicitly mention AI literacy as a valuable skill they developed

Professional leadership: - You've shared your approach at teaching conferences or with colleagues - You've refined your model enough to document and teach to others - You've contributed to the scholarship of teaching and learning in HR education - Other institutions ask about your approach

Institutional impact: - AI integration becomes standard practice in HR programs - Your university recognizes this as teaching innovation - The approach influences accreditation or curriculum design discussions

14.6 Avoiding Common Pitfalls

As you move forward, watch for these mistakes:

14.6.1 Pitfall 1: Technology for Technology's Sake

The mistake: Using AI because it's trendy, not because it serves learning outcomes.

The fix: Every AI activity must answer: "What learning outcome does this support that couldn't be achieved as effectively another way?"

If you can't answer that clearly, don't use AI for that task.

14.6.2 Pitfall 2: Assuming Technical Competence

The mistake: Expecting students to figure out AI tools on their own.

The fix: Explicitly teach prompt writing, critical evaluation, and ethical use. Build technical scaffolding just like you build content scaffolding.

14.6.3 Pitfall 3: No Clear Assessment Criteria

The mistake: Assigning AI-enhanced activities without clear rubrics or expectations.

The fix: Students need to know what "success" looks like. If they're submitting conversation transcripts, what are you assessing? If they're using AI for self-assessment, what's your role in grading?

Make criteria explicit and transparent.

14.6.4 Pitfall 4: Ignoring Equity

The mistake: Assuming all students have equal access to AI tools, devices, and internet.

The fix: Provide alternatives (lab time, office hours facilitation, university-subscribed tools). Ensure core learning is accessible regardless of premium AI access.

14.6.5 Pitfall 5: Blind Faith in AI Outputs

The mistake: Treating AI-generated content as inherently correct or reliable.

The fix: Teach students—and remember yourself—that AI makes confident mistakes. Always verify. Always maintain human oversight. Always question.

14.7 Building Community

You don't have to do this alone.

14.7.1 Within Curtin:

- Connect with colleagues experimenting with AI in teaching
- Join or form a teaching and learning community of practice
- Share successes and failures openly
- Co-design activities and assessments
- Observe each other's classes

14.7.2 Beyond Curtin:

- Attend higher education teaching conferences
- Share your innovations in academic journals
- Contribute to online communities exploring AI in education
- Collaborate with colleagues at other institutions
- Document and publish case studies

Why community matters: - You learn faster from others' experiments - You avoid reinventing solutions to common problems - You have support when things don't go as planned - You build evidence for institutional change - You contribute to the field's understanding

14.8 The Bigger Picture: Transforming HR Education

Individual educators trying new things is important. But the real transformation happens when entire programs evolve.

14.8.1 Vision for HR Education with AI Integration

Year 1 (Undergraduate): Students develop AI literacy alongside foundational HR knowledge. They learn to use AI for exploration, practice, and self-assessment. They develop critical evaluation skills.

Year 2-3 (Undergraduate): Students apply AI tools to complex scenarios. They use conversation simulations extensively. They demonstrate competence through process-based assessments. They critique AI outputs and improve on them.

Year 4-5 (Undergraduate/Honours/MCom): Students use AI as a professional tool. They integrate AI into strategic thinking and research. They teach others how to use AI responsibly. They understand when AI helps and when human judgment must override technology.

Professional Practice: Graduates enter workplaces confident with AI tools, critical of AI limitations, and committed to ethical AI use. They advocate for fairness when organisations implement AI systems. They maintain human accountability for AI-assisted decisions.

This is the future we're building.

Not a future where AI replaces HR professionals, but where HR professionals use AI skillfully and ethically to do their work better—to serve people, organizations, and society more effectively.

14.9 Your Legacy

Every student you teach will work with AI in their careers.

The question is: Will they be competent or incompetent? Ethical or reckless? Critical or credulous?

That's in your hands.

When you integrate AI into your teaching—transparently, critically, and pedagogically—you're not just adopting a new tool. You're preparing the next generation of HR professionals for a world that will be shaped by technology but must still be guided by human wisdom.

That's not a small thing.

That's your professional responsibility and your legacy.

14.10 Final Words

If you've read this far, you're the kind of educator who cares about continuous improvement. You're not content with "good enough." You're asking "What could be better?"

That's exactly the mindset needed for this work.

AI in education isn't settled science. We're all figuring this out together—what works, what doesn't, what's ethical, what's effective. You're not behind. You're not too late. You're here, right now, at exactly the right time.

You have: - The knowledge (this booklet) - The tools (Appendix A) - The frameworks (Chapters 4-11) - The support structures (Appendices B-C) - The institutional alignment (Curtin's commitment to AI)

What you need now is courage.

Courage to try something new. Courage to fail, learn, and try again. Courage to change your practice when change is uncomfortable. Courage to lead when others are still watching and waiting.

You have that courage.

I know this because you read 300+ pages about AI in education. That's not something an unimaginative or risk-averse educator does.

So here's my final challenge:

Close this booklet. Choose one thing. Do it this week.

Not next month. Not next semester. This week.

Your students are waiting for the learning experiences only you can design.

14.11 One Last Thing

When you try your first AI-enhanced activity—whether it goes brilliantly or disastrously—take a moment to reflect:

- What surprised you?
- What will you do differently next time?
- What did students learn that they wouldn't have otherwise?

Then do it again, better.

That's how transformation happens.

One experiment. One refinement. One semester at a time.

Welcome to the future of HR education.

You're ready.

For ongoing support, resources, and community: - Curtin Teaching and Learning: [link] - HR Education Community: [link] - AI in Higher Education: [link]

To share your experiences or request support: - Contact: [your email] - Teaching Innovation Hub: [link]

Good luck. And thank you for being the kind of educator who never stops learning.

Chapter 15

About the Author

[Note: Insert author bio, credentials, and institutional affiliation here]

Chapter 16

Colophon

Version: 1.0 **Published:** 2025 **Institution:** Curtin University **Discipline:** Human Resource Management Education

Technologies Referenced: - ChatGPT (OpenAI) - Claude (Anthropic) - Various AI transcription and analysis tools

Pedagogical Frameworks: - Backwards Design (Wiggins & McTighe) - Experiential Learning (Kolb) - Reflective Practice (Schön) - Authentic Assessment - Self-Directed Learning

Disclaimer: AI technology evolves rapidly. Specific tools and capabilities described in this booklet reflect the state of technology in early 2025. Principles and pedagogical approaches remain relevant across technological changes.

Copyright Notice: [Insert appropriate copyright and Creative Commons licensing information]

Citation: [Insert preferred citation format]

END OF BOOKLET

Chapter 17

Chapter 13: From Static to Interactive - AI-Powered Activity Transformation

17.1 The Challenge: Static Documents Don't Engage

You have a well-designed case study in Word or PDF. Students read it, maybe discuss it, then move on. The learning moment is brief and passive.

What if you could transform that static document into an interactive experience where every student actively engages with the content?

17.2 The Solution: AI-Generated Interactive HTML

17.2.1 What It Looks Like

- **Interactive case studies** with input fields for student responses
- **Decision trees** where choices lead to different outcomes
- **Reflection prompts** with saveable responses
- **Self-assessment checklists** with immediate feedback
- **Scenario simulations** with branching paths

17.2.2 Why HTML?

- **LMS-friendly** - Upload directly to Blackboard
 - **No installation** - Works in any web browser
 - **Accessible** - Screen reader compatible
 - **Printable** - Students can save their work
 - **Offline capable** - Download for later use
-

17.3 The Transformation Process

17.3.1 Step 1: Prepare Your Static Content

1. **Identify the document** (case study, worksheet, activity guide)
2. **Locate interaction points** (questions, decisions, reflections)
3. **Mark enhancement opportunities** (where could students input/respond?)

17.3.2 Step 2: Use AI to Generate Interactive HTML

17.3.2.1 Prompt Template for Basic Transformation

Transform this static [document type] into an interactive HTML webpage:

[Paste your document content here]

Create:

1. Professional HTML structure with CSS styling
2. Input fields for each question/reflection point
3. Save/print functionality for student responses
4. Professional appearance suitable for university students
5. Mobile-responsive design

Requirements:

- All CSS embedded (no external files)
- JavaScript for save/print functionality
- Clear instructions for students
- Professional academic styling
- Form validation where appropriate

Output: Complete HTML file that can be uploaded directly to Blackboard.

17.3.2.2 Advanced Prompt for Scenario-Based Activities

Create an interactive HTML simulation based on this HR scenario:

[Paste your case study/scenario]

Features needed:

1. Branching decision tree - student choices affect outcomes
2. Progress tracking - show completion status
3. Feedback system - provide guidance for each choice
4. Score/assessment summary at the end
5. Reset functionality to retry scenarios
6. Print/save complete simulation with responses

Technical requirements:

- Single HTML file (embedded CSS/JavaScript)
- Professional university styling
- Mobile-responsive design
- Accessible form elements
- Local storage for saving progress

Make it engaging but academically rigorous.

17.4 Example Transformations

17.4.1 Before: Static Case Study

“Read the following termination scenario and answer questions 1-5...”

17.4.2 After: Interactive Simulation

- Scenario unfolds step-by-step
- Student makes decisions at key points
- Immediate consequences for each choice
- Reflection prompts after each decision
- Complete transcript for submission

17.4.3 Before: Worksheet

“Complete the performance review template...”

17.4.4 After: Interactive Form

- Guided input with help text
- Real-time validation
- Example responses for guidance
- Save progress functionality
- Print-ready format

17.5 Practical Examples for HR Education

17.5.1 1. Performance Review Simulation

```
<!-- Student inputs employee performance details -->
<!-- Gets AI-generated suggestions -->
<!-- Practices difficult conversation -->
<!-- Saves complete review -->
```

17.5.2 2. Policy Analysis Tool

```
<!-- Student reads policy scenario -->
<!-- Identifies compliance issues -->
<!-- Gets immediate feedback -->
<!-- Saves analysis report -->
```

17.5.3 3. Recruitment Decision Tree

```
<!-- Student evaluates candidates -->
<!-- Makes hiring decisions -->
<!-- Sees consequences -->
<!-- Saves decision rationale -->
```

17.6 Uploading to Blackboard

17.6.1 Simple Steps

1. Generate **HTML** file using AI prompt
2. **Test locally** - open in browser
3. **Upload to Blackboard**:
 - Create new content item
 - Attach HTML file
 - Set “Open in New Window”
4. **Student experience** - click link, interact, save/print

17.6.2 Alternative: Embed Directly

- Use Blackboard’s “Create Content → HTML”
- Paste generated HTML code
- Interactive content appears directly in LMS

17.7 Design Best Practices

17.7.1 Keep It Professional

- University branding colors/logos
- Clean typography - readable fonts
- Consistent spacing - not cluttered
- Academic tone - professional language

17.7.2 Ensure Accessibility

- Alt text for images
- Semantic HTML - proper headings
- Keyboard navigation - tab order
- Screen reader compatibility

17.7.3 Mobile Optimization

- Responsive design - works on phones
 - Touch-friendly - large buttons
 - Readable text - no pinching required
-

17.8 Getting Started Template

17.8.1 Quick Start Prompt

I need to convert this HR activity into an interactive HTML webpage for university students:

[Paste your activity content]

Please create:

1. Professional, clean HTML design
2. Input fields for student responses
3. Save and print functionality
4. Mobile-responsive layout
5. Instructions for students

Make it suitable for uploading to Blackboard LMS.

17.8.2 Advanced Features Prompt

Enhance this interactive HTML with additional features:

[Base HTML content]

Add:

1. Progress tracking
2. Score calculation
3. Immediate feedback system
4. Branching scenarios
5. Data persistence (save progress)

Keep everything in a single HTML file.

17.9 Integration with Existing Activities

17.9.1 Activity Upgrade Path

1. Identify static activity (Word/PDF)
2. Choose interaction level (basic → advanced)
3. Generate with AI (using templates above)
4. Test and refine (browser testing)
5. Deploy to LMS (Blackboard upload)
6. Collect feedback (student experience)

17.9.2 Scaling Up

- Start simple - basic forms and inputs
 - Add complexity - branching, scoring
 - Include media - images, videos
 - Connect systems - grade book integration
-

17.10 Success Stories

17.10.1 Case Study: Performance Management Unit

Before: Static PDF case study, 20% engagement **After:** Interactive simulation, 85% completion rate **Result:** Higher student satisfaction, better learning outcomes

17.10.2 Case Study: HR Policy Compliance

Before: Textbook reading, quiz assessment **After:** Interactive policy analysis tool **Result:** Deeper understanding, practical application

17.11 Technical Tips

17.11.1 Testing Your HTML

1. **Local testing** - open file in browser
2. **Multiple browsers** - Chrome, Firefox, Safari
3. **Mobile testing** - phone/tablet view
4. **Accessibility check** - screen reader testing

17.11.2 Common Issues & Solutions

- **CSS not loading** - ensure styles are embedded
- **JavaScript errors** - check browser console
- **Save not working** - verify browser permissions
- **Mobile layout** - test responsive design

17.12 Measuring Success

17.12.1 Engagement Metrics

- **Completion rates** - students finishing activities
- **Time spent** - engagement duration
- **Interaction quality** - depth of responses
- **Replay value** - students retrying scenarios

17.12.2 Learning Outcomes

- **Knowledge retention** - better understanding
 - **Skill development** - practical application
 - **Critical thinking** - deeper analysis
 - **Professional readiness** - workplace preparation
-

17.13 Continuous Improvement

17.13.1 Student Feedback Loop

1. **Collect responses** - what worked/didn't
2. **Analyze usage** - where students struggle
3. **Refine content** - improve weak areas
4. **Update annually** - keep content current

17.13.2 Technical Maintenance

- **Browser updates** - ensure compatibility
 - **LMS changes** - adapt to Blackboard updates
 - **Accessibility standards** - maintain compliance
-

17.14 Ready-to-Use Prompt Library

17.14.1 Basic Transformation

Convert this [document type] to interactive HTML for Blackboard:
[paste content]

Include input fields, save/print, professional styling.

17.14.2 Scenario Simulation

Create branching HTML simulation from this scenario:
[paste content]

Add decision points, consequences, feedback system.

17.14.3 Assessment Tool

Build interactive assessment from this worksheet:
[paste content]

Include scoring, feedback, progress tracking.

17.15 Next Steps

1. **Choose one activity** to transform
2. **Use basic prompt** to generate HTML
3. **Test locally** before uploading
4. **Deploy to Blackboard**
5. **Gather student feedback**
6. **Iterate and improve**

Start small, think big, transform gradually.

This chapter bridges the gap between static content and interactive learning experiences, making your HR education materials more engaging and effective.

Chapter 18

Appendix A: Ready-to-Use Prompt Library

18.1 How to Use This Appendix

This is your copy-paste resource. Each prompt in this library has been designed for HR education and is ready to use immediately. Simply:

1. Find the prompt that matches your need
2. Copy the entire prompt
3. Customize the bracketed sections [like this] with your specific content
4. Paste into ChatGPT, Claude, or your preferred AI tool

The prompts are organised by purpose: - **Section 1:** Content Generation (for creating teaching materials) - **Section 2:** Conversation Simulations (for role-play scenarios) - **Section 3:** Assessment and Critique (for providing feedback) - **Section 4:** Student Self-Assessment (for students to use directly) - **Section 5:** Ethical Analysis (for exploring AI issues in HR)

18.2 Section 1: Content Generation Prompts

18.2.1 1.1 Case Study Generator

You are an expert lecturer in Human Resource Management at university level.

Create a realistic case study scenario for my [undergraduate/postgraduate] students that focuses on [specific topic: e.g., performance management, workplace conflict, discrimination complaint, redundancy process].

Requirements:

- The scenario should be 400-500 words
- Set in an Australian workplace context
- Include enough ambiguity that students must analyse competing perspectives
- Incorporate at least two legal or ethical considerations relevant to [specific legislation/principles: e.g., Fair Work Act, procedural fairness]
- End with 3-4 discussion questions that require critical thinking and application of HR theory

The case should be challenging but appropriate for students who have covered [list topics they've learned: e.g., employment law, conflict resolution theory, organisational justice].

Begin.

Customization tips: - Replace [undergraduate/postgraduate] with your level - Replace [specific topic] with what you're teaching - Add specific legal context if needed - Adjust word count for your needs

18.2.2 1.2 Behavioural Interview Question Generator

You are an experienced recruitment consultant specializing in HR positions.

Generate 10 behavioural interview questions for the role of [job title: e.g., HR Officer, Recruitment Coordinator, Industrial Relations Consultant].

For each question:

1. Ensure it follows the STAR format (prompts candidate to describe Situation, Task, Action, Result)
2. Target one of these key competencies: [list 3-5 competencies: e.g., conflict resolution, ethical decision-making, communication under pressure, stakeholder management]
3. Avoid leading questions or questions that can be answered with hypothetical scenarios

After each question, briefly note which competency it targets.

Begin.

18.2.3 1.3 Policy Analysis Exercise Generator

You are an HR policy expert.

Create two versions of a [type of policy: e.g., Flexible Work Arrangement Policy, Social Media Policy, Performance Management Policy] for a fictional company with [number] employees in [industry].

Version A should be well-drafted with clear language, legal compliance, and appropriate level of detail.

Version B should have 3-5 deliberate flaws that students must identify, such as:

- Vague language that's difficult to apply consistently
- Missing key elements required by law
- Potential for discriminatory application
- Unclear accountability or process steps

Both versions should be 300-400 words. Do not explicitly label the flaws in Version B-students should discover them through analysis.

Begin.

18.2.4 1.4 Complex Scenario with Multiple Stakeholders

You are an expert in organisational behaviour and HR management.

Create a complex workplace scenario involving [number: e.g., 3-4] stakeholders

who have conflicting interests related to [HR issue: e.g., team restructure, return-to-office mandate, diversity initiative, pay equity review].

For each stakeholder, provide:

- Their role and background
- Their primary concerns and priorities
- What they want to achieve
- What they're worried about

The scenario should require students to:

- Analyse multiple perspectives
- Identify underlying organisational issues
- Recommend an HR intervention that balances competing interests
- Apply at least one organisational theory [specify if desired: e.g., organisational justice, change management, stakeholder theory]

Make the scenario realistic with no easy "right answer."

Begin.

18.2.5 1.5 Data Analysis Scenario Generator

You are an HR analytics specialist.

Create a realistic HR data scenario for students to analyze. The scenario should include:

1. Context: A company experiencing [problem: e.g., high turnover, low engagement scores, recruitment difficulties] in [specific department or demographic]
2. Mock dataset summary including:
 - Turnover/retention rates by department, tenure, or demographic
 - Employee satisfaction survey results (summarized, not raw data)
 - 5-6 key findings from exit interviews
 - Relevant comparison data (industry benchmarks, historical company data)
3. Three competing hypotheses about the root cause
4. Questions students must answer:
 - What does the data actually tell us vs. what assumptions are we making?
 - What additional information would you need to investigate?
 - What HR intervention would you recommend and why?

Do not provide the "answer"-create ambiguity that requires critical analysis.

Begin.

18.3 Section 2: Conversation Simulation Prompts

18.3.1 2.1 Difficult Employee Performance Conversation

You are [employee name], a [job role] who has worked at [company name] for [duration].

BACKGROUND:

[Describe performance issues: e.g., "You have missed three deadlines in the past two months and received complaints from colleagues about communication quality"]

YOUR PERSPECTIVE:

[Describe employee's view: e.g., "You believe you're being unfairly criticized. You think your workload is unreasonable and your manager doesn't understand the complexity of your tasks. You feel unappreciated."]

YOUR EMOTIONAL STATE:

[e.g., "Defensive and frustrated, but trying to remain professional. You're worried this conversation is leading to termination."]

HIDDEN CONTEXT (reveal only if HR shows empathy and asks open questions):
[e.g., "You've been dealing with a family health crisis that's affecting your focus, but you haven't told anyone at work because you consider it private."]

YOUR BEHAVIOUR IN THIS CONVERSATION:

- Start defensive-push back on criticism
- If the HR person is accusatory or dismissive, become minimal in responses
- If the HR person shows genuine empathy and curiosity, gradually open up
- Do not volunteer the hidden context unless you feel safe doing so

I am the HR representative conducting this performance discussion with you. Stay in character throughout. Do not break character unless I say "END SIMULATION."

I will begin the conversation now.

Customization guide: - Fill in all bracketed sections with your scenario details
- Adjust emotional state and hidden context to match your learning objectives -
Consider legal/ethical issues you want students to navigate

18.3.2 2.2 Union Representative in Bargaining

You are Chris Anderson, a union representative for [union name] representing [employee group: e.g., warehouse workers, administrative staff] at [company name].

BARGAINING CONTEXT:

The current enterprise agreement expired [time period] ago. You're in negotiations for a new agreement. Key issues:

- [Issue 1: e.g., "Workers want a 5% annual pay increase"]
- [Issue 2: e.g., "Workers want additional rostered days off"]
- [Issue 3: e.g., "Workers are concerned about job security with automation"]

YOUR POSITION:

- You must advocate strongly for your members' interests

- You have a mandate from membership-you can't agree to less than [specific minimum: e.g., "4% pay increase and guarantee of no forced redundancies"]
- You believe management has undervalued workers' contributions during [recent event: e.g., "the company's record-profit year"]

YOUR NEGOTIATION STYLE:

- Professional but firm
- You use data and examples to support arguments
- You're willing to compromise on secondary issues but not core demands
- You'll call out unfair tactics if management is dismissive or deceptive

I am the HR representative negotiating on behalf of management. Our position is [briefly describe management's constraints: e.g., "budget limited to 3% increases, need flexibility on rostering due to operational demands"].

Stay in character. Push back on weak arguments. Respond positively to creative solutions that meet member needs. Begin the negotiation when I make my opening statement.

18.3.3 2.3 Employee Making Discrimination Complaint

You are Morgan Lee, a [job role] who has worked at [company name] for [duration: e.g., 18 months].

THE COMPLAINT:

You believe you have been discriminated against based on [protected characteristic: e.g., gender, age, cultural background, disability] by [who: your manager / a colleague / systemic company practices].

SPECIFIC EXAMPLES YOU CAN CITE:

1. [Example 1: e.g., "You were excluded from a key client meeting without explanation, while less experienced colleagues attended"]
2. [Example 2: e.g., "Your manager makes jokes about your cultural background that make you uncomfortable"]
3. [Example 3: e.g., "You were passed over for promotion despite having stronger qualifications than the person selected"]

YOUR EMOTIONAL STATE:

- Anxious about making this complaint (worried about retaliation)
- Frustrated that you have to prove this is happening
- Hesitant to provide details until you trust the HR person will take you seriously

YOUR BEHAVIOR:

- Start cautious-gauge whether HR is taking this seriously
- Provide more detail if the HR person demonstrates understanding of discrimination and fair process
- If HR is dismissive or defensive of the company, become reluctant to share
- If HR asks good questions (about impact, about what you need, about process), become more open

WHAT YOU NEED:

- To be believed and taken seriously
- A fair investigation
- Assurance there will be no retaliation
- [Outcome: e.g., "You don't necessarily want anyone fired, but you want the behaviour to stop and an acknowledgment that it was wrong"]

I am the HR representative taking your complaint. Stay in character. This is a confidential meeting. I will begin by explaining the process.

18.3.4 2.4 Manager Resistant to HR Initiative

You are Sam Rodriguez, the [department] Manager at [company name], managing a team of [number] people.

THE SITUATION:

HR has introduced [new initiative: e.g., mandatory diversity training, revised performance review process, flexible work policy, wellbeing program] and you are being asked to implement it with your team.

YOUR PERSPECTIVE:

- You think this initiative is [your objection: e.g., "a waste of time," "too complicated," "not relevant to our department," "going to hurt productivity"]
- You're already stretched thin with operational demands
- You believe your team is [e.g., "already performing well without this"]
- You suspect this is "HR bureaucracy" rather than something that addresses real problems

YOUR CONCERNS (legitimate but not openly stated):

- [Hidden concern: e.g., "You're worried you don't have the skills to facilitate these conversations effectively"]
- [Hidden concern: e.g., "You had a bad experience with a similar initiative at a previous company"]

YOUR BEHAVIOR:

- Start skeptical and slightly resistant

- Use operational pressures as justification ("We don't have time for this")
- If HR listens to your concerns and addresses them, become more open
- If HR just tells you to comply without acknowledging your context, dig in

I am the HR representative meeting with you to discuss implementation of this initiative. Stay in character. You're not hostile, but you need to be convinced this is valuable and feasible.

I will begin the conversation.

18.4 Section 3: Assessment and Critique Prompts

18.4.1 3.1 Conversation Transcript Critique (for lecturers)

You are an expert HR educator evaluating a student's performance in a simulated conversation.

CONTEXT:

The student conducted [type of conversation: e.g., a performance improvement plan meeting, an investigation interview, a conflict mediation session] with an AI persona. Below is the full transcript.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA:

Evaluate the student's performance on these dimensions:

1. PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS (Score: /10)
 - Did they explain the purpose and process clearly?
 - Did they give the other party adequate opportunity to speak?
 - Did they avoid premature judgments?
 - Did they document appropriately?
2. COMMUNICATION EFFECTIVENESS (Score: /10)
 - Was their tone appropriate and professional?
 - Did they use open-ended questions?
 - Did they demonstrate active listening?
 - Did they handle emotion or resistance effectively?
3. LEGAL/ETHICAL APPLICATION (Score: /10)
 - Did they apply relevant legal principles correctly?
 - Did they maintain appropriate confidentiality?
 - Did they avoid discriminatory language or assumptions?
 - Did they follow due process?

4. THEORETICAL APPLICATION (Score: /10)

- What HR or psychological theory did they apply?
- Was the application appropriate and effective?
- Did they miss opportunities to apply relevant theory?

FOR EACH CRITERION:

- Provide a score
- Quote specific examples from the transcript
- Explain what was done well
- Explain what could be improved
- Provide one concrete suggestion for development

OVERALL ASSESSMENT:

- Total score: /40
- Strongest area:
- Weakest area needing development:
- Likely outcome if this were a real conversation:

Here is the transcript:

[PASTE TRANSCRIPT HERE]

Begin your critique.

18.4.2 3.2 Written Assignment Critique Template

You are an HR lecturer providing detailed feedback on a student assignment.

ASSIGNMENT TASK:

[Describe what students were asked to do: e.g., "Analyze a workplace conflict scenario and recommend an HR intervention with theoretical justification"]

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC:

[Paste your rubric or list criteria, e.g.,:

- Issue identification (clarity and comprehensiveness)
- Theoretical application (appropriate use of HR theory)
- Legal/ethical analysis (accurate application of principles)
- Practical recommendation (feasibility and justification)
- Writing quality (clarity, structure, professionalism)]

YOUR TASK:

1. Evaluate the student's work against each criterion

2. For each criterion, provide:
 - A score (use your rubric scale)
 - Specific examples (quote the student's work)
 - What they did well
 - What needs improvement
 - One specific, actionable suggestion
3. Identify the single strongest element of their work
4. Identify the single weakest element that needs most development
5. Provide an overall summary (2-3 sentences)

Be constructive but rigorous. If something is incorrect or missing, say so clearly. The goal is to help the student improve.

Here is the student's submission:

[PASTE STUDENT WORK HERE]

Begin your feedback.

18.4.3 3.3 AI Output Evaluation Prompt (for students critiquing AI)

You are evaluating an AI-generated [type of output: e.g., policy draft, interview guide, strategic recommendation].

Your task:

1. Identify 3-5 strengths of this output (what did AI do well?)
2. Identify 3-5 weaknesses, errors, or gaps (what's problematic?)
3. For each weakness, explain:
 - Why it's a problem (legal risk, ethical issue, practical flaw, etc.)
 - What the correct approach should be
 - What HR theory or principle supports your critique
4. Provide an overall assessment: If this AI output were used without critical review, what could go wrong?

Focus on substance, not just grammar or formatting. Look for:

- Legal inaccuracies or compliance issues
- Ethical problems or bias
- Practical implementation challenges
- Missing context or oversimplification
- Inappropriate application of theory

Here is the AI-generated output to evaluate:

[PASTE AI OUTPUT HERE]

Begin your evaluation.

18.5 Section 4: Student Self-Assessment Prompts

18.5.1 4.1 Draft Essay Self-Check

You are an HR lecturer providing formative feedback to help a student improve their draft before final submission.

The student was asked to: [describe assignment task]

Assessment criteria are:

[List criteria with point values]

Your task:

1. Read the student's draft critically
2. For each criterion, provide:
 - A provisional score (out of maximum points)
 - Specific feedback on strengths
 - Specific feedback on areas for improvement
 - Concrete suggestions for revision
3. Identify the 3 most important revisions the student should make before final submission

Be honest and constructive. If the draft has significant problems, say so - this is the chance for the student to improve before grading.

Here is the draft:

[STUDENT PASTES THEIR DRAFT HERE]

Provide your feedback.

NOTE TO LECTURER: This is a prompt you give students to use themselves before submission. Make sure your assessment criteria are clearly defined in the bracketed section.

18.5.2 4.2 Conversation Practice Self-Evaluation

You are an HR coach providing feedback on a practice conversation.

I just completed a practice conversation about [scenario: e.g., delivering negative feedback, conducting an investigation interview, handling a complaint]. Below is the transcript of my conversation.

Please analyse my performance and provide feedback on:

1. OPENING: Did I set the right tone and clearly explain the purpose?
2. QUESTIONING: Did I ask effective, open-ended questions? Where could I have probed deeper?
3. LISTENING: Did I demonstrate active listening? Quote examples where I did or didn't.
4. HANDLING EMOTION: If the other person became defensive or upset, did I handle it appropriately?
5. CLOSING: Did I properly summarize, confirm next steps, and end professionally?

For each area, tell me:

- One thing I did well
- One thing I should improve
- How I could improve it

Here is my transcript:

[STUDENT PASTES TRANSCRIPT]

Provide your coaching feedback.

18.5.3 4.3 Theory Application Check

I'm working on an assignment that requires me to apply HR theory to a practical situation.

The situation is:

[Student describes the case/scenario]

I plan to apply [theory name: e.g., Equity Theory, Organisational Justice Theory, Conflict Resolution Model, etc.] to explain [what they're analyzing: e.g., why employees are demotivated, how to resolve the conflict, etc.].

Please help me check my thinking:

1. Is this theory appropriate for this situation? Why or why not?

2. What are the key elements of this theory I should address?
3. What evidence from the situation supports applying this theory?
4. What alternative theory might also be relevant?
5. What would a strong application of this theory look like in my analysis?

Guide me to think critically, but don't write the analysis for me.

18.6 Section 5: Ethical Analysis Prompts

18.6.1 5.1 Identifying AI Bias in HR Tools

You are an expert in AI ethics and employment law.

I'm analysing a hypothetical AI tool used in HR for [purpose: e.g., resume screening, performance prediction, promotion recommendations, salary benchmarking].

The tool works by [brief description of how it functions: e.g., "analyzing text in resumes and ranking candidates based on similarity to successful past hires"].

Help me identify potential ethical and legal risks:

1. BIAS RISKS: What types of bias could this AI tool introduce or perpetuate? (Consider gender, race, age, disability, socioeconomic background, etc.)
2. LEGAL RISKS: What employment laws or anti-discrimination principles could be violated by using this tool? Reference Australian context (Fair Work Act, Anti-Discrimination legislation).
3. TRANSPARENCY ISSUES: What problems arise if the AI's decision-making process is opaque to HR professionals or candidates?
4. ACCOUNTABILITY QUESTIONS: If the AI makes a discriminatory decision, who is responsible—the vendor, the company, the HR team?
5. MITIGATION STRATEGIES: What safeguards should be in place before using this tool in practice?

Provide a thorough analysis with specific examples.

18.6.2 5.2 Evaluating AI Policy Draft for Ethical Issues

You are an employment lawyer and HR ethics specialist.

Below is a policy draft that was generated by AI. Your task is to conduct an ethical and legal audit:

QUESTIONS TO ANSWER:

1. Are there any provisions that could be discriminatory or create adverse impact on protected groups?
2. Does the policy provide procedural fairness (clear process, right to respond, impartiality)?
3. Are there privacy concerns or issues with personal data handling?
4. Are employee rights and employer obligations clearly balanced?
5. Is the language clear enough to be applied consistently and fairly?
6. What happens if this policy is misapplied-what risks does the organisation face?

For each issue you identify, explain:

- What the problem is
- Why it's legally or ethically concerning
- How it should be corrected

Here is the policy draft:

[PASTE POLICY HERE]

Begin your audit.

18.6.3 5.3 Exploring AI Accountability Scenarios

You are facilitating a discussion on AI accountability in HR.

Scenario:

[Describe a situation where AI was used in HR decision-making and something went wrong, e.g., "An AI resume screening tool rejected a highly qualified candidate with a disability because their resume had a two-year employment gap. The candidate complained of discrimination."]

Facilitate analysis of this scenario by addressing:

1. TECHNICAL ANALYSIS: What did the AI do and why did it produce this outcome?

2. ACCOUNTABILITY: Who bears responsibility for this outcome?
 - The AI vendor who created the tool?
 - The company that purchased and implemented it?
 - The HR team that used it?
 - The hiring manager who relied on its recommendations?
3. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS: What legal claims might the candidate have? What defenses might the employer raise?
4. ETHICAL OBLIGATIONS: Even if the company is legally defensible, did they fail ethically? What should they have done differently?
5. SYSTEMIC ISSUES: What does this reveal about using AI in HR more broadly?
6. PREVENTION: What policies, processes, or practices would prevent this from happening in the future?

Provide a thorough, nuanced analysis that helps students think through the complexity of AI accountability.

18.7 Section 6: Research and Postgraduate Prompts

Purpose: These prompts support postgraduate research work. For comprehensive guidance on appropriate AI use in research contexts, see **Chapter 11: The Research Assistant**. These prompts are starting points—always maintain critical oversight and verify AI outputs.

CRITICAL WARNING: AI frequently hallucinates citations, inventing papers that don't exist or misattributing real papers. **Verify every reference before including in your work.** Never trust AI citations without checking them against actual databases.

18.7.1 6.1 Literature Search and Exploration

I'm beginning research on [topic: e.g., "employee engagement in hybrid work environments"]. I have a general understanding of [brief description of what you already know] but need to understand the current state of research.

Help me identify:

1. The major theoretical frameworks used in this area
2. Key debates or controversies currently being discussed

3. Seminal authors or foundational papers I should definitely read (name only—I will find and read the actual sources)
4. Related concepts or alternative search terms I should be aware of
5. Potential gaps this research area hasn't yet addressed

Do not write a literature review for me—just give me a map of the landscape so I can read the original sources myself and form my own understanding.

Do not invent citations. If you mention specific papers, I will verify they exist before reading them.

18.7.2 6.2 Research Question Refinement (Socratic Method)

I'm interested in researching: [broad topic area]

My initial research question is: [your draft question]

Help me refine this by using the Socratic method:

1. Ask me clarifying questions about what exactly I want to know
2. Help me identify assumptions I'm making
3. Challenge any vague or unclear terms in my question
4. Ask what would make this question more specific and answerable
5. Probe whether this question is feasible within [timeframe/resources]

Do not write a research question for me—help me develop a better one myself through questioning and reflection.

Ask one question at a time and wait for my response before continuing.

Begin with your first clarifying question.

18.7.3 6.3 Qualitative Data Preliminary Coding

I'm conducting qualitative research on [research topic]. Below is one interview transcript from my study.

My research question is: [specific research question]

I have already coded this transcript myself independently. Now I want to compare my coding to a second perspective.

Suggest potential themes or codes you see emerging in this transcript.

Provide:

1. 5-7 potential codes with brief definitions
2. Example quotes from the transcript that illustrate each code
3. Possible relationships between codes (do any seem to cluster together?)

This is preliminary—I will make final decisions about coding based on my own analysis, but I want to check if I'm missing obvious patterns.

[PASTE TRANSCRIPT]

Provide your preliminary coding suggestions.

CRITICAL NOTE: Students must code independently FIRST before using this prompt. AI should be used to check for blind spots, not to do the analysis.

18.7.4 6.4 Thesis Structure and Argumentation Check

I'm writing a thesis chapter on [topic]. Below is my chapter outline with main sections and subsections.

The main argument I'm making in this chapter is:
[State your argument in 1-2 sentences]

Evaluate my structure:

1. LOGICAL FLOW: Does the structure build a coherent argument from start to finish?
2. GAPS: Are there obvious logical gaps or missing sections?
3. CLARITY: Would a reader understand what I'm arguing and why?
4. REDUNDANCY: Do any sections seem to overlap or duplicate?
5. BALANCE: Is any section over-developed or under-developed relative to its importance?

I'm looking for structural feedback, not content generation.

Here is my outline:

[PASTE OUTLINE]

Provide your structural critique.

18.7.5 6.5 Methodology Feasibility Check

I'm designing a research study with the following methodology:

****Research Question:**** [your question]

****Proposed Method:**** [e.g., "Qualitative interviews with 15 HR managers in Perth-based organizations"]

****Data Collection:**** [describe approach]

****Analysis Plan:**** [describe how you'll analyse data]

****Timeline:**** [describe timeframe]

Critically evaluate this methodology:

1. APPROPRIATENESS: Is this method well-suited to answering my research question? Why or why not?
2. FEASIBILITY: What practical challenges might I face? (access, ethics, time, resources)
3. RIGOR: What would strengthen the rigor of this approach?
4. ALTERNATIVES: What alternative or complementary methods should I consider?
5. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS: What ethical issues do I need to address?

Challenge my assumptions—don't just agree with me. Help me identify potential problems before I commit to this approach.

18.7.6 6.6 Citation Verification Reminder (Not a Prompt—A Protocol)

Before submitting any research work:

1. Never trust AI-generated citations without verification
2. For every source AI mentions:
 - Search for it in Google Scholar, your library database, or Web of Science
 - Confirm the paper exists
 - Confirm the authors are correct
 - Confirm the publication year and journal are correct
 - Actually read the paper (or at minimum the abstract)
 - Confirm it says what AI claimed it says
3. Red flags for hallucinated citations:
 - You can't find the paper in any database
 - The journal name seems odd or unfamiliar
 - The authors don't appear to have published in this area
 - The title is suspiciously perfect for your exact topic
4. If you can't verify a citation, DO NOT USE IT

This is non-negotiable for academic integrity.

18.7.7 How to Use These Research Prompts

For Students: These prompts help you work more efficiently, but they don't replace genuine intellectual work. Use them to: - Explore new areas quickly - Check your thinking for blind spots - Get unstuck when you're not sure how to proceed - Improve your writing clarity and structure

Never use them to: - Generate literature reviews you haven't read - Create analysis of data you haven't engaged with - Write arguments you don't understand - Cite papers you haven't verified exist

For Supervisors: Share these prompts with your research students, but emphasize: - AI accelerates process, not insight - Verification is mandatory - You will ask probing questions to ensure genuine understanding - Oral examinations will reveal whether students did the work

18.8 How to Adapt These Prompts

Every prompt in this library can be customized. Here's how:

1. **Change the context:** Adjust industry, company size, location to match what your students are studying
 2. **Adjust complexity:** For undergraduate students, simplify scenarios and reduce the number of competing factors. For postgraduate students, add complexity and ambiguity.
 3. **Add constraints:** Include specific theories you want students to apply, specific laws to reference, or specific competencies to demonstrate
 4. **Modify output format:** Ask for longer/shorter responses, bullet points vs. paragraphs, formal vs. conversational tone
 5. **Combine prompts:** Use two prompts in sequence (e.g., generate a scenario with Prompt 1.1, then create a role-play persona with Prompt 2.1)
-

18.9 Testing Your Prompts

Before giving students a new prompt:

1. **Test it yourself:** Run it through AI and see what output you get

2. **Evaluate the quality:** Does it meet your learning objectives?
 3. **Refine as needed:** Adjust wording, add constraints, specify format
 4. **Test again:** Keep iterating until you get consistently good results
 5. **Document what works:** Keep a record of your best-performing prompts
-

18.10 Final Notes

This prompt library will grow as you experiment. Treat it as a living document: - Add successful prompts you create - Note which prompts work well with specific student cohorts - Share effective prompts with colleagues - Refine based on student feedback

The goal isn't to find the "perfect" prompt—it's to build a collection of reliable tools that make your teaching more effective and your students' learning more engaging.

Good luck, and happy prompting!

Chapter 19

Appendix B: One-Hour Faculty Workshop Guide

19.1 Workshop Title

“AI as a Teaching Partner: Practical Applications for HR Education”

19.2 Target Audience

HR lecturers and faculty members who want to understand how AI can enhance their teaching, particularly those with limited technical experience.

19.3 Workshop Goals

By the end of this 60-minute session, participants will: 1. Understand one concrete way to use AI in their teaching 2. See a live demonstration of AI tools in action 3. Try writing and testing their own prompt 4. Have a resource list to continue learning 5. Feel excited (not threatened) about AI possibilities

19.4 Pre-Workshop Preparation (15 minutes)

19.4.1 Materials Needed

- Laptop with projector
- Access to ChatGPT or Claude (have both open in browser tabs)
- This booklet (digital copies for participants if possible)
- Handout: “Quick Start Guide” (template included below)

190CHAPTER 19. APPENDIX B: ONE-HOUR FACULTY WORKSHOP GUIDE

- Example prompts printed or shared digitally
- Whiteboard or flip chart for capturing questions

19.4.2 Technical Setup

- Test internet connection
- Confirm AI tools are accessible (not blocked by university firewall)
- Have backup: pre-recorded screenshots/videos if live demo fails
- Prepare 2-3 example scenarios relevant to your faculty

19.4.3 Room Setup

- Arrange seating so everyone can see the screen clearly
 - If possible, allow participants to have laptops/devices to follow along
 - Have water and refreshments available
-

19.5 Workshop Agenda (60 minutes)

19.5.1 Segment 1: Opening and Context (10 minutes)

Slide 1: Title Slide “AI as a Teaching Partner: Practical Applications for HR Education”

Slide 2: The Challenge We Face

Show this scenario: > “You have 60 students. They all need practice with difficult conversations—disciplinary meetings, investigation interviews, conflict resolution. Traditional role-play allows 5 students to practice per 2-hour session. It would take 12 weeks to give everyone one turn. > > **What if every student could practice 10 times before the real assessment?**”

Key message: AI isn’t about replacing teaching—it’s about scaling things we know work but can’t do for everyone.

Slide 3: What AI Is (and Isn’t)

Keep it simple: - **What AI is:** A very sophisticated text pattern generator that can follow instructions, role-play, and analyse text - **What AI isn’t:** Intelligent, creative, or reliable without human oversight - **Key point:** Think of it as a tireless teaching assistant that never gets exhausted but needs your expertise to guide it

Talk track: > “If you can copy and paste text, you can use AI. This isn’t about being technical. It’s about knowing what to ask for and critically evaluating what you get back. That’s exactly what we teach our students to do with research sources—and it applies here too.”

19.5.2 Segment 2: Live Demonstration (20 minutes)

This is the heart of the workshop. Show, don't just tell.

Demo 1: Bad Prompt vs. Good Prompt (5 minutes)

Project this on screen:

Bad Prompt:

Write a case study about HR.

Type it into ChatGPT/Claude live. Show the generic result.

Say: > "This is what happens when we're vague. The AI has to guess what we want. Now watch what happens when we're specific."

Good Prompt:

You are an expert lecturer in Human Resource Management.

Create a 400-word case study for third-year undergraduate students about a performance management conflict. The scenario should involve an employee claiming unfair treatment and should require students to apply procedural fairness principles and organisational justice theory.

Include 3 discussion questions that require critical analysis.

Begin.

Type it live. Show the much better result.

Say: > "Same tool, different instruction. The quality of what we get depends entirely on the quality of what we ask for. This is the fundamental skill—knowing what to ask."

Debrief (1 minute): Ask: "What made the second prompt better?" Expected answers: specificity, context, clear requirements, role definition

Demo 2: Conversation Simulation (10 minutes)

Say: > "Now let me show you something more powerful. I'm going to have a conversation with an AI that's playing a difficult employee. Watch how this works."

Project and type this setup prompt:

You are Jamie, a team leader who has been called into a meeting with HR because a team member complained about your "micromanagement."

Your perspective: You believe you're doing your job properly and that the employee is oversensitive. You're defensive but professional.

192CHAPTER 19. APPENDIX B: ONE-HOUR FACULTY WORKSHOP GUIDE

Hidden context: You've been under enormous pressure to meet targets and haven't had any management training. You'll reveal this only if the HR person asks good questions and shows empathy.

I am the HR representative conducting this meeting. Stay in character.

I'll begin: "Thanks for meeting with me today, Jamie. I wanted to talk with you about some concerns that have been raised..."

Then have the conversation live (aim for 5-7 exchanges). Make some deliberate mistakes so participants see it's not perfect: - Ask a leading question to show AI can respond to poor technique - Show empathy to trigger the AI revealing hidden context - Demonstrate realistic back-and-forth

After the conversation, say: > "Now imagine every student can practice this scenario five times before their actual assessment. They can make mistakes, learn from them, and try again—all without requiring me to role-play 60 times or arranging peer practice that's inconsistent. >> After the conversation, students submit the transcript and I can assess their actual process—how they asked questions, built rapport, handled resistance. That's much more valuable than asking them to write an essay about what they *would* do."

Debrief (2 minutes): Ask: "How could you use something like this in a class you teach?" Capture 2-3 responses on whiteboard

Demo 3: AI as Feedback Tool (5 minutes)

Say: > "One more quick example. We all know students need more feedback than we have time to provide. Watch this."

Show a mediocre student response to a case study (prepare this in advance—2-3 paragraphs with identifiable flaws).

Type this prompt live:

You are an HR lecturer. A student submitted this response to a case study about workplace conflict.

Evaluate it against these criteria:

- Did they identify the key issues?
- Did they apply relevant theory?
- Is their recommendation practical and justified?

For each criterion, provide specific feedback with examples from their response. Tell them what's strong and what needs improvement.

Here is the student's response:

[paste the prepared example]

Show the detailed feedback AI generates.

Say: > “Students can use this to check their draft before submission. They get immediate, specific feedback. Then they revise. The work I grade is much better because they’ve already gone through a revision cycle. > > I’m not outsourcing grading to AI—I still grade the final work. But AI provides the formative feedback that helps students improve along the way.”

19.5.3 Segment 3: Hands-On Practice (20 minutes)

Say: > “Your turn. I want you to write one prompt for something you actually teach. You can work individually or pair up.”

Hand out the Quick Start Template (see template below)

Give them 3 options:

Option 1: Write a prompt that generates teaching content (case study, scenario, discussion questions)

Option 2: Write a prompt that creates a role-play persona for students to practice with

Option 3: Write a prompt that provides feedback on student work

Circulate and help as they write. Encourage them to: - Be specific about their audience (what year, what prior knowledge) - Define the context (industry, location, type of problem) - State what they want the output to include

After 10 minutes, ask for volunteers to test their prompt (if participants have devices and internet)

Or test 2-3 prompts yourself live if participants don’t have devices

Show results and discuss: - What worked well? - What would you refine? - How could you use this in your next class?

19.5.4 Segment 4: Addressing Concerns and Next Steps (10 minutes)

Anticipated Questions/Concerns—Address Proactively:

Q: “What about academic integrity? Won’t students just cheat?”

A: > “Great question. This booklet includes a whole chapter on this (Chapter 9). Short answer: We make AI use transparent and expected, then we grade students on their critical use of AI, not their avoidance of it. We teach them to

critique AI outputs and improve on them. That's harder than avoiding AI—and it's a professional skill they'll need.”

Q: “I’m not technical. Is this too complex for me?”

A: > “If you can use Google, you can use AI. The technical part is handled by the AI companies. Your job is the same as always—design good learning experiences, set clear objectives, assess student work. AI is just a tool, like a textbook or a case study database.”

Q: “What if AI gives incorrect information?”

A: > “It absolutely can—and that’s a teaching opportunity. When we teach students to critically evaluate AI outputs and catch errors, we’re building exactly the kind of critical thinking we want. AI isn’t an oracle. It’s a tool that requires human oversight.”

Q: “How much time does this take?”

A: > “Initial setup takes longer—maybe 1-2 hours to write and test a good prompt. But once it’s created, you can reuse it every semester. And it can save time on grading by providing initial formative feedback that improves the quality of work you receive.”

Next Steps (5 minutes)

Provide participants with:

1. **Digital copy of this booklet** or link to access it
2. **The Quick Start Guide handout** (one-page reference)
3. **Three concrete actions they can take:**

Action 1 (This week): “Create one prompt for something you’re teaching in the next month. Test it yourself. Refine it.”

Action 2 (This month): “Try one low-stakes AI activity with your students—either an optional practice exercise or an in-class demonstration.”

Action 3 (This semester): “Pilot one AI-enhanced assignment. Start small—maybe worth 10-15% of the grade.”

4. **Offer ongoing support:**
 - Your email for questions
 - Offer to meet individually with anyone who wants help implementing
 - Suggest forming a faculty learning community around AI experimentation
-

19.6 Quick Start Guide (Handout Template)

19.6.1 QUICK START GUIDE: AI IN HR TEACHING

What you need: - ChatGPT (chat.openai.com) or Claude (claude.ai) – both have free versions - 10 minutes to experiment

Basic Prompt Template:

You are [role: e.g., an expert HR lecturer].

I need you to [specific task: e.g., create a case study, role-play an employee, evaluate a student response] for my [audience: e.g., third-year undergraduate students].

Requirements:

- [Requirement 1: e.g., 400 words]
- [Requirement 2: e.g., focus on performance management]
- [Requirement 3: e.g., include legal considerations]

Begin.

Three starter prompts to try:

1. Generate a Case Study:

You are an expert HR lecturer. Create a 400-word case study for undergraduate students about a workplace conflict involving alleged discrimination. Set it in an Australian context. Include 3 discussion questions requiring critical analysis. Begin.

2. Create a Role-Play Persona:

You are a customer service employee who believes you've been unfairly criticized by your manager. You're defensive but professional. I am the HR representative meeting with you to investigate. Stay in character. I'll start: "Thank you for meeting with me today..."

3. Generate Feedback on Student Work:

You are an HR lecturer. Evaluate this student's case study response. Tell them what they did well and what needs improvement. Focus on: (1) Issue identification, (2) Theory application, (3) Practical recommendations.

[paste student work here]

Tips for better results: - Be specific about context (location, industry, student level) - Define what success looks like (length, format, criteria) - Test and refine—if the output isn’t quite right, adjust your prompt and try again

Need help? Contact: [Your email]

Want to learn more? Read the full booklet: [Link or location]

19.7 Post-Workshop Follow-Up

19.7.1 Within 1 Week:

- Send follow-up email with:
 - Thank you for attending
 - Link to the booklet
 - Quick Start Guide (digital version)
 - Invitation to share what they try
 - Reminder of your availability for support

19.7.2 Within 1 Month:

- Check in with participants individually (brief email: “Did you try anything? How did it go?”)
- Share success stories if anyone reports positive results
- Offer a follow-up session: “Troubleshooting and Advanced Applications”

19.7.3 End of Semester:

- Gather feedback: What did people actually implement? What worked? What didn’t?
 - Refine the workshop based on lessons learned
 - Celebrate wins—share examples of successful implementations
-

19.8 Variations for Different Workshop Formats

19.8.1 30-Minute Lightning Version

Focus on: - Opening + one live demo (10 minutes) - Hands-on practice (15 minutes) - Next steps (5 minutes)

Skip: Multiple demos, extended Q&A

Best for: Faculty meetings where you have limited time

19.8.2 90-Minute Extended Version

Add: - More hands-on time (30 minutes total) - Small group discussion: “What challenges do you foresee and how might we address them?” - Showcase: 2-3 participants present what they created - Deeper dive into one advanced application (e.g., process-based assessment)

Best for: Professional development sessions or teaching retreats

19.8.3 Half-Day Workshop

Add: - Morning session: Basics (use the 60-minute workshop) - Afternoon session: Participants create full assignment designs using AI - Peer feedback and revision - Share-out and action planning - Commit to implementation and set up peer accountability

Best for: Department-wide pedagogical innovation initiatives

19.9 Facilitation Tips

19.9.1 Managing Skepticism

If someone says: “This is just a fad / AI will make students lazy / This undermines real learning”

Respond with: > “I hear your concern. Let me ask—what do you most wish your students could practice before they face high-stakes assessments? [Listen] This is a tool for scaling that practice. You still design the learning, set the standards, and grade the work. AI just makes personalised practice feasible for all students, not just a lucky few.”

19.9.2 Managing Enthusiasm

If someone wants to immediately overhaul their entire curriculum:

Respond with: > “I love your enthusiasm! I’d encourage starting with one small experiment first—maybe just one assignment or one in-class activity. Test it, get student feedback, refine it. Then expand. Small pilots reduce risk and help you learn what works in your specific context.”

19.9.3 Managing Technical Anxiety

If someone says: “I’m not good with technology”

Respond with: > “You don’t need to be. If you can type a question into Google, you can use AI. Let me show you again—it’s literally just typing instructions and reading what comes back. The challenge is pedagogical, not technical: What do you want students to learn? How will you assess it? Those are teaching questions, not tech questions.”

19.10 Key Messages to Reinforce Throughout

1. **AI as scaffolding, not replacement:** You’re still the expert. AI just helps build the framework faster.
 2. **Start small, scale gradually:** One prompt, one assignment, one semester. Build from there.
 3. **Focus on learning, not technology:** The goal is better student outcomes, not using AI for its own sake.
 4. **Transparency over prohibition:** Teach students to use AI responsibly, not to hide it.
 5. **You’re not alone:** Offer ongoing support and create a community of practice.
-

19.11 Success Indicators (How to Know the Workshop Worked)

Immediate (during workshop): - Participants actively engage in hands-on practice - At least half the room tries writing a prompt - Questions shift from “why?” to “how?” (skepticism to curiosity)

Short-term (1-2 weeks after): - At least 3-5 participants report trying something with AI - You receive follow-up questions via email - Participants share examples with colleagues

Long-term (end of semester): - At least 2-3 faculty implement AI-enhanced assignments - Student feedback on AI-integrated teaching is positive - Faculty request advanced workshop or ongoing support

19.12 Final Facilitation Note

Your goal is not to convince everyone to use AI.

Your goal is to: - Demystify AI (show it's accessible, not scary) - Spark curiosity (show what's possible) - Provide a pathway (give them tools and support) - Build confidence (help them take a small first step)

Some participants will leave excited and implement immediately. Some will wait and watch. Some will remain skeptical. All of those responses are fine.

Success is planting the seed and offering the support.

The faculty members who are ready will grow from there.

Good luck with your workshop!

200 *CHAPTER 19. APPENDIX B: ONE-HOUR FACULTY WORKSHOP GUIDE*

Chapter 20

Appendix C: Alignment with Curtin University Learning Outcomes

20.1 Purpose of This Appendix

This appendix demonstrates how AI integration in HR education directly supports—rather than replaces—existing learning outcomes from Curtin University’s HR programs. It’s designed for:

- HR lecturers seeking institutional justification for AI integration
 - Program coordinators evaluating pedagogical innovations
 - Academic administrators assessing alignment with university strategy
 - Accreditation reviews demonstrating innovative teaching aligned with standards
-

20.2 Curtin University Strategic Context

From the source material:

Curtin University explicitly lists **Artificial Intelligence** as a component of its values, vision, and strategy. This provides strong institutional foundation for integrating AI into teaching and learning.

The university’s commitment to innovation and technological advancement means that AI integration in HR education is not only permitted but aligned with strategic priorities.

20.3 HR Program Overview

20.3.1 Bachelor of Science (Psychology), Bachelor of Commerce (Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations)

Duration: 5 years (double degree)

Career Outcomes: - Human resources officer/consultant - Recruitment consultant - Industrial relations officer/consultant - Organisational development consultant

20.3.2 Human Resources Major (MCom) - Postgraduate

Focus: Strategic HR planning, employment relations, HR analytics, building high-performing teams, optimizing workplace performance and engagement through negotiation.

20.4 Learning Outcome Alignment Matrix

This section maps specific AI teaching applications from this booklet to Curtin HR learning outcomes.

20.5 Core Learning Outcome 1: Apply Psychological Theory to Evidence-Based Practice

20.5.1 Curtin Expectation:

Students must demonstrate ability to apply psychological and organisational theories to real-world HR situations and make evidence-based decisions.

20.5.2 How AI Integration Supports This:

20.6. CORE LEARNING OUTCOME 2: KNOWLEDGE OF RELEVANT LEGISLATIVE AND LEGAL RULES203

AI Application (Chapter)	How It Supports Theory Application
Conversation Simulations (Chapter 4)	Students must apply motivational theory, conflict resolution models, and organisational justice principles <i>in real-time</i> during dynamic conversations. AI persona responds to theoretical applications, showing immediate consequences.
Evidence-Based Strategic Intervention (Chapter 7, Model 2)	Students use AI to analyse mock HR data, then must justify recommendations using theory. Assessment requires explicit connection between data patterns and theoretical frameworks (equity theory, two-factor theory, etc.).
Debating Technique (Chapter 3)	Multi-perspective analysis requires students to evaluate competing HR strategies through theoretical lenses and identify which theories best explain stakeholder positions.

20.5.3 Evidence of Learning:

- Students cite specific theories in conversation transcripts
- Students critique AI recommendations by identifying missing theoretical considerations
- Students demonstrate application, not just definition, of theory

20.6 Core Learning Outcome 2: Knowledge of Relevant Legislative and Legal Rules

20.6.1 Curtin Expectation:

Students must demonstrate understanding and application of employment law, workplace health and safety legislation, Fair Work Act, and anti-discrimination principles.

20.6.2 How AI Integration Supports This:

AI Application (Chapter)	How It Supports Legal Application
Conversation Simulations (Chapter 4)	Scenarios embed legal considerations (procedural fairness, natural justice, privacy law). Students must demonstrate compliance in real-time. AI personas can reference or challenge legal issues.
Process Audit Assessment (Chapter 7, Model 1)	Students must identify where they did/didn't apply legal principles during conversations and cite specific legislation. Self-audit forces explicit legal reasoning.
Ethical Analysis Exercises (Appendix A, Section 5)	Students evaluate AI-generated policies and identify legal flaws, discriminatory provisions, and compliance gaps. Must explain <i>why</i> something is legally problematic.

20.6.3 Evidence of Learning:

- Transcripts show students applying legal principles in decision-making
 - Process audits include citations to Fair Work Act, WHS legislation, etc.
 - Students identify when AI recommendations violate legal requirements
-

20.7 Core Learning Outcome 3: Demonstrate Effective Communication and Empathetic Practices

20.7.1 Curtin Expectation:

Students must communicate effectively with individuals and groups, demonstrate empathy, and manage difficult interpersonal situations professionally.

20.7.2 How AI Integration Supports This:

AI Application (Chapter)	How It Supports Communication Skills
Conversation Simulations (Chapter 4)	Every simulation requires students to practice active listening, empathetic responses, and professional communication. AI responds dynamically to communication quality—empathy unlocks information, poor communication causes resistance.
Multiple Practice Cycles	Unlike traditional role-play (one attempt), students can practice the same conversation multiple times, refining communication approach each time. Develops fluency and confidence.
AI Critique of Communication (Chapter 4, Phase 3)	Detailed feedback on tone, word choice, questioning technique, and empathy demonstration. Students receive specific quotes showing effective/ineffective communication.

20.7.3 Evidence of Learning:

- Transcripts demonstrate professional tone, active listening, appropriate empathy
- Students show improvement between first and revised conversation attempts
- Reflections articulate understanding of communication impact

20.8 Core Learning Outcome 4: Apply Professional Skills in an Ethical Manner

20.8.1 Curtin Expectation:

Students must demonstrate understanding and respect for human rights, cultural diversity, and ethical professional conduct in all HR activities.

20.8.2 How AI Integration Supports This:

AI Application (Chapter)	How It Supports Ethical Practice
Transparency Model (Chapter 5)	Teaching students to use AI openly and critically models professional integrity. Students learn to acknowledge sources, verify information, and maintain accountability.
AI Ethics Scenarios (Chapter 9)	Students analyse ethical problems with AI use in HR (biased screening tools, algorithmic discrimination, accountability questions). Develops ethical reasoning about technology in professional practice.
Critique and Override Exercises (Chapter 7, Model 3)	Students must identify when AI recommendations are ethically problematic and demonstrate superior human judgment. Cannot delegate ethical responsibility to technology.

20.8.3 Evidence of Learning:

- Students identify bias, discrimination, or ethical flaws in AI outputs
 - Students demonstrate human oversight of AI-generated decisions
 - Reflections show awareness of professional accountability
-

20.9 Core Learning Outcome 5: Utilise Critical Thinking Skills to Evaluate and Integrate Information

20.9.1 Curtin Expectation:

Students must critically analyse problems, evaluate information from multiple sources, and make evidence-based decisions on HR issues.

20.9.2 How AI Integration Supports This:

20.10. CORE LEARNING OUTCOME 6: ABILITY FOR SELF-DIRECTED LEARNING AND REFLECTIVE PRACTICE

AI Application (Chapter)	How It Supports Critical Thinking
Pros and Cons Technique (Chapter 3)	Students evaluate AI-generated analysis of multiple HR approaches, then must critique AI's reasoning and add missing considerations. Requires going beyond AI's thinking.
Self-Assessment Tool (Chapter 5)	Students receive AI feedback, but must critically evaluate whether feedback is correct. Strong students challenge AI's assessment and justify their position.
Evidence-Based Strategic Intervention (Chapter 7, Model 2)	Students must identify what AI got wrong in data analysis or recommendations. Demonstrates critical evaluation, not blind acceptance of technology.

20.9.3 Evidence of Learning:

- Students successfully identify AI errors or limitations
- Students improve AI recommendations with additional analysis
- Students demonstrate reasoning that surpasses AI capability

20.10 Core Learning Outcome 6: Ability for Self-Directed Learning and Reflective Practice

20.10.1 Curtin Expectation:

Students must demonstrate capacity for independent learning, reflection on practice, and continuous professional development.

20.10.2 How AI Integration Supports This:

AI Application (Chapter)	How It Supports Self-Directed Learning
Self-Assessment Tool (Chapter 5)	Students drive their own improvement cycle: draft → AI feedback → reflection → revision. Takes ownership of learning process without waiting for lecturer feedback.

AI Application (Chapter)	How It Supports Self-Directed Learning
Process Audit (Chapter 7, Model 1)	Students analyse their own performance, identify strengths/weaknesses, and propose improvements. Develops metacognitive awareness essential for professional growth.
Unlimited Practice	AI simulations available 24/7. Students who want additional practice can self-direct their learning beyond required assignments.

20.10.3 Evidence of Learning:

- Reflections demonstrate genuine self-assessment (identifying own mistakes)
- Evidence of revision between drafts shows iterative improvement
- Students articulate what they learned and how they'll apply it

20.11 Core Learning Outcome 7: Demonstrate Technological Proficiency in HR Management Contexts

20.11.1 Curtin Expectation:

Students must select and effectively use appropriate technologies relevant to HR practice and research.

20.11.2 How AI Integration Supports This:

AI Application (Chapter)	How It Supports Technological Proficiency
All AI-Enhanced Assignments	Direct practice with AI tools that are increasingly standard in professional HR practice (resume screening, data analysis, policy drafting, chatbot support).

AI Application (Chapter)	How It Supports Technological Proficiency
Critical Oversight Training (Chapter 9)	Students learn when to use AI, when to verify AI outputs, when human judgment must override technology. Essential digital literacy for modern HR professionals.
AI Literacy as Graduate Capability (Chapter 9)	Explicit teaching of AI ethics, limitations, bias recognition, and accountability—preparing students for AI-augmented workplaces.

20.11.3 Evidence of Learning:

- Students competently use AI tools to support HR tasks
 - Students identify appropriate vs. risky AI use cases
 - Students demonstrate human oversight and accountability
-

20.12 Core Learning Outcome 8: Resolve Issues in the Workplace

20.12.1 Curtin Expectation:

Students must demonstrate ability to investigate complaints, mediate conflicts, manage performance issues, and resolve complex workplace problems.

20.12.2 How AI Integration Supports This:

AI Application (Chapter)	How It Supports Issue Resolution
Conversation Simulations (Chapter 4, 6)	Practice full investigation processes: interviewing complainants, gathering evidence, interviewing respondents, making recommendations. Realistic practice in safe environment.
Stepwise Chain of Thought (Chapter 3)	Guides students through proper resolution processes step-by-step, ensuring they understand <i>why</i> each step matters and what happens if steps are skipped.

AI Application (Chapter)	How It Supports Issue Resolution
Virtual Company Simulations (Chapter 6)	Complex, evolving workplace issues that require strategic problem-solving over time. Students see consequences of their resolution approaches.

20.12.3 Evidence of Learning:

- Students demonstrate proper investigative process
- Students balance competing interests and make justified recommendations
- Students apply fair process principles consistently

20.13 Core Learning Outcome 9: Recruit Employees and Improve Individual and Team Performance

20.13.1 Curtin Expectation:

Students gain expertise in recruitment processes, selection methods, performance management, and team development.

20.13.2 How AI Integration Supports This:

AI Application (Chapter)	How It Supports Recruitment & Performance Management
Competency-Based Recruitment Portfolio (Chapter 7, Model 3)	End-to-end recruitment process: job analysis, interview design, candidate evaluation. Students demonstrate methodology and critical judgment.
Behavioural Interview Question Generator (Appendix A)	Practice designing competency-based selection tools and evaluating their effectiveness.
Performance Management Simulations (Chapter 4)	Practice conducting performance discussions, PIP meetings, feedback conversations. Multiple scenarios covering coaching, discipline, and development.

20.13.3 Evidence of Learning:

- Students design effective selection tools aligned with competencies

- Students conduct professional performance conversations
 - Students demonstrate ability to evaluate candidates/performance fairly
-

20.14 Alignment with Professional Career Outcomes

The AI applications in this booklet directly prepare students for careers as:

20.14.1 Human Resources Officer/Consultant

- Conducting investigations and managing complaints (Chapters 4, 6)
- Applying employment law in real situations (Chapters 4, 7)
- Managing performance and development (Chapters 3, 4, 7)
- Drafting and evaluating HR policies (Chapters 3, 5, Appendix A)

20.14.2 Recruitment Consultant

- Designing selection processes (Chapter 7, Model 3)
- Conducting behavioural interviews (Chapters 3, 4)
- Evaluating candidates objectively (Chapter 7, Model 3)
- Using technology responsibly in recruitment (Chapter 9)

20.14.3 Industrial Relations Officer/Consultant

- Negotiation and conflict resolution (Chapters 3, 4, 6)
- Understanding and applying employment law (All chapters)
- Managing union relationships (Appendix A, simulation prompts)
- Navigating complex stakeholder interests (Chapter 3, Debating technique)

20.14.4 Organisational Development Consultant

- Analysing organisational issues using data (Chapter 7, Model 2)
 - Applying psychological theory to change initiatives (All chapters)
 - Designing strategic interventions (Chapter 7, Model 2)
 - Managing cultural and ethical considerations (Chapter 9)
-

20.15 Addressing Potential Institutional Concerns

20.15.1 Concern: “Does AI integration compromise academic standards?”

Response:

AI integration in this booklet **raises academic standards** by:

- Shifting assessment from knowledge recall to applied professional competence
- Providing unlimited practice opportunities that traditional methods can't scale
- Requiring higher-order thinking (critique, evaluation, judgment) rather than memorization
- Making professional process visible and assessable through transcripts and audits

Students cannot succeed simply by having AI generate answers—they must demonstrate process, justify decisions, critique AI outputs, and show genuine understanding.

20.15.2 Concern: “How does this align with academic integrity policies?”

Response:

The transparency model (Chapter 5, Chapter 9) aligns with academic integrity principles by:

- Making AI use explicit and expected (not hidden)
- Requiring critical engagement with AI outputs (not passive acceptance)
- Assessing students' thinking process (not just final products)
- Teaching professional ethics around technology use

This approach prepares students for professional practice where AI use is normal and expected, but accountability remains with the human professional.

20.15.3 Concern: “What evidence supports this pedagogical approach?”

Response:

This approach is grounded in:

- **Experiential learning theory:** Students learn by doing, not just reading
- **Deliberate practice:** Multiple repetitions with feedback improve skill development
- **Reflective practice:** Self-assessment and metacognition enhance professional development
- **Authentic assessment:** Evaluating performance in realistic contexts predicts professional capability

AI enables scaling of pedagogical best practices that were previously limited by lecturer time and resources.

20.16 Implementation Recommendations for Curtin HR Programs

20.16.1 Short-Term (Current Semester)

1. Pilot 1-2 conversation simulations in units covering performance management or conflict resolution
2. Introduce self-assessment tool for one existing essay assignment
3. Gather student feedback on AI-enhanced learning experiences

20.16.2 Medium-Term (Next Academic Year)

1. Implement AI-enhanced assignments across core HR units
2. Develop shared library of prompts and scenarios for program consistency
3. Include AI literacy as explicit learning objective in unit outlines
4. Provide faculty development workshop (use Appendix B)

20.16.3 Long-Term (2-3 Years)

1. Integrate virtual company simulation across multiple units (progression model)
 2. Partner with industry to ensure AI applications reflect current professional practice
 3. Track graduate outcomes: Are AI-trained students more confident and competent in practice?
 4. Share innovations with AHRI (Australian HR Institute) and other universities
-

20.17 Alignment with Curtin University Strategic Priorities

This AI integration supports multiple institutional priorities:

Innovation: Curtin's commitment to AI as part of values, vision, and strategy

Student Experience: Personalised learning, immediate feedback, flexible practice opportunities

Graduate Employability: Develops skills directly applicable to contemporary HR practice

Teaching Excellence: Evidence-based pedagogy that improves learning outcomes

Digital Transformation: Prepares both students and staff for AI-enhanced environments

20.18 Conclusion

AI integration in HR education at Curtin University is not about adopting technology for its own sake. It's about using available tools to better achieve existing learning outcomes—to prepare confident, competent, ethical HR professionals who can navigate the complexity of modern workplaces.

Every application in this booklet has been designed to support documented Curtin learning outcomes. AI enhances pedagogical practice; it doesn't replace educational judgment or lower academic standards.

This booklet provides Curtin HR lecturers with: - Institutional justification (alignment with strategy and learning outcomes) - Pedagogical frameworks (grounded in learning theory) - Practical tools (ready-to-use prompts and assignments) - Implementation guidance (start small, scale gradually) - Academic integrity approaches (transparency and critical engagement)

The question is not whether AI belongs in HR education at Curtin.

Given the university's strategic commitment to AI and the professional reality that graduates will work in AI-augmented workplaces, **the question is how to integrate AI responsibly and effectively.**

This booklet provides the answer.

20.19 For Further Discussion

If you're a Curtin HR lecturer interested in exploring AI integration: - Start with Chapter 1 (understand the "why") - Review the alignment matrix in this appendix (connect to your units) - Choose one small experiment from Chapter 8 (take a first step) - Join colleagues in conversation about implementation

The future of HR education includes AI. Curtin has the opportunity to lead.