



Faculty Development in the AI Era

A Guide for Universities and Business Schools

Jawad Syed, PhD | Professor of Leadership, Lahore University of Management Sciences (LUMS)

Citation: Syed, J. (2026). Faculty Development in the AI Era. *SAAM Working Paper 20261011*. South Asian Academy of Management.

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI), particularly generative AI (GenAI), is reshaping teaching, research and academic responsibilities in higher education. Faculty development, however, often emphasises familiarity with tools rather than the professional capabilities needed to use AI effectively and responsibly. Drawing on a small body of peer-reviewed research, international guidance and practitioner evidence, this guide proposes a five-capability framework (AI literacy, teaching and assessment, research, ethical judgement, and professional and institutional development) and a four-phase development cycle. It discusses faculty autonomy, equitable access, workload and institutional governance, and sets out who typically decides what, from individual faculty to university leadership.

Two hands-on activities, designed for deans, vice-chancellors and faculty-development leaders, illustrate the approach: redesigning an MBA assessment with AI, and allocating a business school's faculty-development budget. The guide closes with a 12-month roadmap, a four-level evaluation framework, a facilitator guide and a leadership checklist. Its central argument is that faculty development should strengthen academic judgement and professional effectiveness rather than promote AI use as an end in itself.

Keywords: academic leadership; artificial intelligence; faculty development; generative AI; higher education; professional learning

1. Introduction: Rethinking Faculty Development

1.1 The challenge

Artificial intelligence, particularly GenAI, is changing academic work. Faculty can use AI systems to draft teaching materials, develop case studies, generate assessment questions, explore research ideas, support literature searches and prepare administrative communications. These capabilities create opportunities for efficiency and educational improvement, but they also raise questions about accuracy, confidentiality, intellectual ownership, academic integrity and the place of human expertise.

For universities, the challenge is not simply technological adoption. It is developing the capabilities that allow academics to use AI critically, effectively and responsibly. An academic who can generate a lecture outline is not necessarily a better teacher, and a researcher who can produce an AI-assisted literature summary is not necessarily conducting better research. Value depends on how outputs are verified, adapted and incorporated into professional judgement.

This guide therefore argues for a shift from tool-centred training to capability-centred faculty development. The goal is not to maximise AI use but to improve the quality of academic decisions and outcomes.

1.2 Purpose, audience and context

The guide is written for those who decide how institutions develop their faculty: vice-chancellors, pro-vice-chancellors, deans, associate deans, department chairs, heads of teaching-and-learning or quality-

assurance units, and faculty-development committees. It can also be used with faculty themselves. Its aims are to (a) summarise what current evidence does and does not tell us, (b) offer a practical framework for designing development, (c) provide two ready-to-run activities that build the judgement the framework describes, and (d) give leaders a roadmap, an evaluation approach and a checklist.

The scenarios use Pakistani rupees (PKR) and a business-school setting, but the principles apply to other institutions and disciplines. The evidence base comes mainly from North American, European, Middle Eastern and international sources, and little of it is drawn from South Asian institutions. Leaders should therefore calibrate the framework to local regulation, resources and academic culture rather than adopt it unchanged.

1.3 How to use this guide

- **For design:** use Sections 2 and 3 to shape a development strategy and Section 6 to plan and evaluate it.
- **For training:** run Activity 1 (Section 4) and Activity 2 (Section 5) as stand-alone sessions or together. Section 7 gives agendas and facilitation advice.
- **For governance:** use the decision-rights table (Section 3.5) and the leadership checklist (Section 7.3) to clarify who decides what.

2. What Does the Evidence Tell Us?

The evidence on AI and faculty development is young, and much of it is descriptive. The sources below are used for what they can support, and each is accompanied by a statement of what it cannot support.

2.1 Faculty readiness and adoption vary

Spathopoulou, Pitychoutis and Papakonstantinidis (2025) report a quantitative survey of faculty perceptions of AI in teaching, research and administration. Their findings suggest that confidence and adoption vary with career stage, discipline and institutional context. Junior faculty reported higher confidence and adoption, while senior faculty more often took AI leadership roles but were more sceptical about its pedagogical value. Faculty in technology-driven environments reported greater confidence. Faculty in content-based fields tended to see AI mainly as a teaching tool, whereas those in applied disciplines described more strategic use, including administrative and leadership work. The authors also point to data privacy, algorithmic bias and institutional readiness as challenges. However, these are self-reported survey results from the authors' samples and may not be generalised uncritically to other countries or institution types. The practical implication is modest but important: a single workshop is unlikely to serve faculty at very different stages of readiness.

2.2 Professional learning requires more than technical training

The *Faculty Development and GenAI Playbook* (Lewis Miller et al., 2025), produced by Every Learner Everywhere with the Online Learning Consortium (OLC), reports a mixed-methods study that began with a survey of centres for teaching and learning at US higher education institutions and continued with interviews with their leaders. It describes four stages: awareness and foundations; engagement and skill building; integration and institutionalisation; and frequent iteration. A February 2026 practitioner summary (Every Learner Everywhere, 2026) distils ten practices, including tiered and flexible learning, discipline-specific tailoring, respect for faculty autonomy, peer leaders and learning communities, attention to barriers such as time and unclear policy, institutional support such as funding and recognition, and regular evaluation.

The playbook documents the experiences and promising practices of centre leaders; it does not show that any programme causes better teaching, research or learning, and the 2026 summary is a restatement of the playbook, not independent evidence.

2.3 What earlier faculty-development research suggests

Before GenAI, a large literature examined faculty development for teaching. Steinert et al. (2006) reviewed studies in medical education and identified features that were repeatedly associated with effective programmes: experiential learning with opportunities to practise, systematic feedback, peer and collegial relationships, grounding in principles of teaching and learning, and the use of multiple instructional methods. The authors stressed that most included studies were weakly designed, so these features are promising rather than proven. The review concerns a different field and era; its value here is as a reminder that attendance and satisfaction are poor proxies for impact, and that practice, feedback and peer support are plausible design principles for AI-related development. Whether they hold for AI is untested.

2.4 AI competence has multiple dimensions

UNESCO's *AI Competency Framework for Teachers* (Miao & Cukurova, 2024) sets out 15 competencies across five aspects (a human-centred mindset, ethics of AI, AI foundations and applications, AI pedagogy, and AI for professional development) at three progression levels: Acquire, Deepen and Create. It was not designed exclusively for university academics, but it offers a useful foundation for development that goes beyond familiarity with particular software products. UNESCO's guidance on GenAI in education and research (Miao & Holmes, 2023) adds a policy perspective that foregrounds human agency, privacy and ethical validation.

2.5 Roles and workloads are changing, but the scale is unknown

Faculty are increasingly asked to respond to AI alongside teaching, research, mentoring and administration. Systematic evidence on the scale of any resulting workload effect is still scarce. Establishing it would require longitudinal workload surveys, time-use studies and comparisons across institutions, disciplines and career stages. Until then, leaders should treat workload as a question to be examined locally, not as a settled finding.

Two broader sources frame the field. In a systematic review, Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) found limited attention to educators and pedagogical perspectives in research on AI in higher education, a review that predates GenAI. Kasneci et al. (2023) subsequently discussed both the educational opportunities of large language models and the need for critical thinking, verification and oversight. Taken together, these sources support faculty development that combines AI literacy with pedagogical, research, ethical and institutional judgement.

2.6 What the evidence does and does not support

Table 1. What the Evidence Supports—and Does Not Support

The evidence supports	The evidence does not support
Differentiating development by readiness, career stage and discipline	Claims that any specific AI-training programme improves learning, research quality or retention
Embedding development in authentic academic tasks, with peer learning and feedback	The assumption that more AI use means better teaching or research
Pairing AI literacy with ethical, pedagogical and institutional judgement	Estimates of the size of AI-related workload effects
Planning evaluation from the start and looking beyond attendance and satisfaction	Generalising survey findings from one setting to all institutions

3. A Practical Framework for AI-Era Faculty Development

The framework below is an author-proposed synthesis, not an established or empirically validated model. AI literacy and ethics draw on UNESCO's competency dimensions; teaching and assessment reflect its pedagogy emphasis; professional and institutional development draws on UNESCO's professional-

learning dimension and the OLC playbook's emphasis on institutionalisation. Research capability is made explicit because university academics have scholarly responsibilities that extend beyond the teaching focus of many competency frameworks.

3.1 Five capabilities and three levels

Each capability can be developed at three levels, borrowing the Acquire, Deepen and Create labels from UNESCO. The level descriptors are the author's own and are intended to help leaders differentiate provision for faculty at different stages.

Table 2. Five Capabilities and Three Levels of Faculty Development

Capability	Faculty learning goal	Acquire	Deepen	Create
AI literacy	Understand what GenAI can and cannot do, and why it errs	Explains how outputs are produced and why they can be wrong	Tests tools on discipline tasks and documents failures	Designs verification protocols that colleagues adopt
Teaching and assessment	Improve pedagogy, assessment and feedback where AI adds value	Identifies where AI affects the outcomes of own courses	Redesigns tasks and sets AI-use rules aligned with outcomes	Leads programme-level redesign and shares evidence
Research capability	Use AI critically while maintaining research integrity	Uses AI for low-risk tasks and verifies every citation	Integrates AI into search, analysis or design critique with documented methods	Shapes disciplinary norms and disclosure practice
Ethical judgement	Address privacy, bias, authorship and accountability	Applies institutional rules; keeps confidential data out of tools	Evaluates cases and trade-offs (bias, ownership, consent)	Contributes to policy and ethics review
Professional and institutional development	Collaborate and respond to changing responsibilities	Joins peer learning and shares practice	Mentors colleagues and runs small pilots	Leads departmental or school strategy and evaluation

3.2 From awareness to sustained capability

A practical development cycle has four phases: **Explore** (understand AI and its limits), **Experiment** (try authentic academic tasks), **Integrate** (redesign selected workflows) and **Evaluate** (assess outcomes and refine). The cycle is a proposed adaptation of the OLC playbook's stages and the UNESCO framework. Attendance, prompt counts and adoption rates alone are insufficient measures of success.

Table 3. Aligning the Development Cycle, Roadmap and Activities

Cycle phase	Playbook stage it adapts	Roadmap months	Where it appears in this guide
Explore	Awareness foundations and	1–3	Baseline and readiness assessment (6.2); AI literacy and ethical judgement at Acquire level
Experiment	Engagement and skill building	4–6	Activities 1 and 2 (assessment redesign and budget simulation); optional research-verification exercise (7.2)
Integrate	Integration and institutionalisation	7–9	Implementation of approved proposals; pilots with protected time
Evaluate	Frequent iteration	10–12, then continuous	Four-level evaluation framework (6.3)

3.3 Discipline-specific and research applications

A finance professor, a historian and a clinical educator may need different kinds of AI expertise. An organisational behaviour academic might use AI to simulate a difficult managerial conversation, while a researcher investigating employee engagement might use it to develop search terms, identify competing theoretical explanations or challenge a research design. The researcher must independently verify citations, inspect original studies, assess methods and defend interpretations. AI-generated references, quotations and empirical claims must never be accepted without verification. A recurring theme in what follows is that plausible explanations are not proof of causation, and Activities 1 and 2 are built to make participants confront that point with incomplete data.

3.4 Equity, access and faculty workload

Faculty do not develop AI capability under equal conditions. Institutional licences, infrastructure, protected development time, departmental resources and teaching loads may influence who can participate. These are plausible structural disadvantages, not universal effects established by the reviewed studies. Universities should examine access gaps, offer flexible formats and provide appropriate support, for example by providing institutionally licensed tools so that capability does not depend on personal subscriptions.

Faculty should not be penalised merely for declining a particular AI product when its use is neither necessary nor required. Where faculty have principled reservations about AI, development should still equip them to understand its effects on their students and field. Faculty development should reduce capability gaps rather than reproduce inequalities, and time spent learning, checking and implementing AI-supported practice should be recognised in workload allocation.

3.5 Autonomy and governance: who decides what

Academic autonomy and institutional accountability can pull in different directions. Clear decision rights help: individuals need room for professional judgement within boundaries, and the institution needs consistent rules where privacy, integrity and legal exposure are at stake. Table 4 suggests a typical allocation; every institution may adapt it to its own statutes and to national regulators such as higher-education commissions where they apply.

Table 4. Illustrative Decision Rights for AI in Academic Work

Level	Typically decides	Should escalate or seek approval for
Individual faculty	How to use approved tools in own teaching and research; what to disclose; whether to opt out of optional tools	Any use involving student data, confidential material or unapproved tools
Department or programme	Course-level AI-use categories; shared assessment designs; peer-learning arrangements	Changes that conflict with academic-integrity regulations or accreditation requirements
School or dean	Allocation of development funds and protected time; local guidance; evaluation design	Tool procurement, data-processing arrangements and policy exceptions
University leadership (VC, academic council, IT, legal)	Approved tools and data-protection rules; integrity regulations; authorship and IP position; ethics review; procurement	Regulatory and legal obligations beyond the institution

4. Hands-on Activity 1: Redesigning an MBA Assessment with AI

Duration: 60 minutes | **Audience:** Deans, associate deans, programme directors, faculty and teaching-development staff | **Group size:** 4–6 participants per group

Learning objective: Use GenAI critically to redesign an assessment while preserving evidence of student learning and recognising institutional governance requirements.

Preparation: Groups need the data table below, access to an approved GenAI tool (or the facilitator's pre-generated outputs; see Section 7.1), and printed copies of the rubric. Participants must not paste real student, staff or confidential data into any tool.

4.1 Scenario and data

A core MBA Human Resource Management course has 60 students. Students currently submit a 2,000-word report on turnover at a fictional manufacturer. Because AI can generate plausible reports, the instructor must decide whether to (A) prohibit AI and retain the assignment, (B) permit unrestricted AI and assess the final report, or (C) redesign the assessment to permit specified AI assistance while independently testing reasoning. Option C should not be assumed preferable without evaluation; groups should test it against A and B in Step 3.

Fictional workforce indicators

Table 5. Fictional Workforce Indicators for Activity 1

Indicator	Value
Employees	800
Annual voluntary turnover	22% (about 176 leavers a year)
Turnover among employees with under two years' service	35%
Employee engagement score	58/100
Reporting inadequate supervisory support	46%
Dissatisfied with career progression	52%
Annual HR training budget	PKR 4 million (about PKR 5,000 per employee)

Missing information includes exit interviews, department-level turnover and pay competitiveness. The figures do not establish causality, and a good student answer will say so.

4.2 Procedure (60 minutes)

1. **Diagnose without AI (10 minutes).** Agree the intended learning outcomes: evidence interpretation, causal reasoning, prioritisation and defensible managerial recommendations. Decide which of these AI could do for a student and which it should not.
2. **Generate an AI-assisted redesign (15 minutes).** Paste the data table and the specimen prompt below into the approved tool.

SPECIMEN AI PROMPT

Act as an experienced MBA assessment designer. Redesign a 2,000-word HRM turnover assignment for 60 MBA students using the fictional data I will paste below. Test evidence interpretation, causal reasoning, prioritisation and managerial judgement. Specify permitted AI use, independently assessed components, an oral defence, a marking rubric, fairness safeguards and institutional policy dependencies. Do not invent missing data; identify assumptions and limitations. [Paste the data table here.]

3. **Critique the AI output (15 minutes).** Does it measure learning? Can it be marked fairly for 60 students? Does paid-tool access create disadvantage? Which assumptions are unsupported? Is Option C actually better than A or B for this course?
4. **Improve the assessment (15 minutes).** Produce revised components, a disclosure requirement and an independent defence.

5. **Reflect (5 minutes).** Identify one AI contribution, one AI error or weakness, and one decision requiring academic judgement.

Note: the specimen prompt asks for an oral defence. Facilitators may wish to remove that phrase to see whether groups arrive at independent testing without being steered, then compare.

4.3 Illustrative redesign

Table 6. Illustrative Redesigned MBA Assessment

Component	Weight	AI use	How it is secured
Independent diagnosis	25%	Not permitted	Supervised, in class, individual
Evidence-based intervention plan	30%	Permitted with disclosure	Take-home; AI prompts and edits submitted as an appendix
AI-output critique and disclosure	15%	Used by design	Individual written critique of an AI draft
Individual oral defence	20%	Not permitted	Live questioning on the student's own plan
Reflection on limitations and missing data	10%	Language support only	Individual; marked for reasoning, not polish
Total	100%		Supervised individual work and oral defence: 45%

Feasibility. The oral defence is where this design is most likely to fail. At 12 minutes each, 60 defences require 12 hours of examiner time, and a two-person panel doubles the staff hours, before allowing for changeovers. Groups should consider shorter vivas, sampling with a clear and fair rule, ensuring equitable assessment, or splitting the load across a teaching team, and should say who approves any extra marking resource.

This is a specimen, not a validated assessment instrument. Before implementation, participants must check approved tools, confidentiality, accessibility, integrity rules and the authority to set course-level AI policies. Where institutional guidance is missing, groups should record the decisions needing approval instead of assuming the instructor can make them alone.

4.4 Decision rubric

Groups score their final design from 1 to 5 on each criterion, where 1 = not addressed, 3 = addressed with significant gaps and 5 = addressed convincingly with stated evidence or reasoning. Scores are meant to structure discussion and comparison between options; they are not summed into a decision and are not a validated measurement instrument.

Table 7. Decision Rubric for Activity 1

Criterion	Question	Score (1–5)
Value	Does the design assess the intended learning?	
Evidence	Are claims and design choices defensible?	
Feasibility	Can it be delivered and marked with available staff and time?	
Equity and ethics	Is it accessible, fair and consistent with policy?	
Human accountability	Are instructor and institutional responsibilities clear?	

4.5 Expected output and debrief

Expected output: Each group submits a one-page assessment redesign containing revised components and weightings, permitted and prohibited AI uses, a brief justification, the institutional approvals required and its scores against the five criteria.

Debrief questions: (1) Where did the AI add genuine value, and where did it sound confident but fail? (2) What did the redesign cost in staff time, and who bears it? (3) Which of your decisions would you not allow an individual instructor to make alone? (4) What would you need to see after one semester to decide whether the redesign worked?

5. Hands-on Activity 2: Designing a Faculty Development Strategy for a Business School

Duration: 75 minutes | **Audience:** Vice-chancellors, deans, associate deans, chairs and faculty-development committees | **Group size:** 4–6 participants per group

Learning objective: Use AI as decision support to allocate scarce development resources while distinguishing capability-building from wider motivation and retention policies.

Preparation: Groups need the two data tables below, access to an approved GenAI tool (or pre-generated outputs), a calculator or spreadsheet, and the rubric. All figures are hypothetical.

5.1 Scenario and data

A business school with 75 full-time faculty has PKR 15 million annually (roughly USD 53,000 at recent exchange rates; the figure is illustrative) for faculty development and related support. Its three-year priorities include teaching quality, research, industry engagement and talent retention. The Dean must make an allocation with incomplete evidence. The school's strategic identity—whether research-intensive, teaching-intensive or industry-engaged—should also shape its priorities.

Table 8. Faculty Profile and Attrition by Department (Hypothetical)

Department	Faculty	Annual attrition	Main reported need
Marketing	15	13%	Research methods and industry projects
OB, Leadership, Strategy and HRM	18	6%	Research assistance and case development
Finance and Accounting	14	7%	Advanced analytics and research methods
Operations and Analytics	16	19%	Retention and specialised development
Economics and Business Policy	12	8%	Research collaboration and teaching innovation
Total	75		

Table 9. Faculty Engagement Survey Results (60 of 75 Responded; Hypothetical)

Survey statement	Favourable
Adequate research support	38%
Teaching excellence recognised	42%
Industry opportunities	35%
Manageable workload	31%
Satisfied with development opportunities	45%

These results are diagnostic, not causal, and no reliable evidence links any particular development intervention to lower attrition. The numbers are also small. If the stated headcounts approximate the relevant average staffing denominators, the rates suggest roughly two departures in Marketing, three in Operations and Analytics, and one in each other department—approximately eight overall. Actual counts depend on how attrition and headcount were measured. A single resignation can materially change a small department's rate, so differences should not automatically be treated as stable patterns.

5.2 Procedure (75 minutes)

1. **Allocate without AI (15 minutes).** Prioritise and allocate PKR 15 million. Distinguish training and development from recognition, compensation and other HR interventions.
2. **Use AI to develop scenarios (15 minutes).** Generate research-led, balanced and retention-led allocations using the prompt below, pasting in Tables 8 and 9.

SPECIMEN AI PROMPT

Act as an advisory team to a business school Dean. Using the fictional department and faculty-survey data I will paste below, propose research-led, balanced and retention-led allocations of PKR 15 million. Consider research methods, teaching development, research assistant support, AI tools and secure access, industry and consultancy skills, protected time, recognition and faculty collaboration. Distinguish development from wider HR interventions. Show amounts that sum exactly to 15, with rationale, equity implications, risks, implementation responsibilities and indicators. Do not invent evidence, infer causality or create department-specific survey results. Flag missing information and required consultation or approvals. [Paste Tables 8 and 9 here.]

3. **Critique the alternatives (15 minutes).** Does high attrition warrant extra funding? Is the allocation equitable across departments and workloads? Is each expense authorised and does it belong in a development budget? Do the amounts actually sum to 15?
4. **Negotiate a final budget and justification (20 minutes).**
5. **Present the decision and reflect (10 minutes).** Report on AI's contribution and limitations.

5.3 Illustrative allocations

Table 10 shows three specimen allocations. They are illustrative, author-designed budgets, not empirically optimal allocations. Facilitators can show them after groups have worked, to compare. Note that the lowest-rated survey item (manageable workload, 31%) is addressed through protected time, which is a development-adjacent response; other workload remedies lie outside this budget.

Some categories, particularly recognition and development incentives, may fall outside a strictly defined faculty-development budget and would require authorisation. Pilot evaluation is ring-fenced so that it is not consumed by other pressures.

Critical follow-up. Suppose Operations and Analytics attrition reflects external salary competition rather than development gaps. Additional training alone is unlikely to resolve the problem. Compensation, workload, promotion and job design may require separate policy responses. AI can organise scenarios, but it cannot identify causes from incomplete evidence.

Table 10. Illustrative Faculty Development Budget Allocations (PKR Million)

Category	Research-led	Balanced	Retention-led
Research methods and scholarly development	3.5	2.5	1.5
Research assistant support	4.5	3.0	2.0
Teaching and assessment development (including AI-enabled assessment redesign)	1.5	2.5	2.0
AI tools, secure access and support	1.0	1.5	1.5
Industry engagement and consultancy	1.5	1.5	1.0
Protected time for development (workload relief)	1.0	1.5	2.5
Recognition and development incentives	0.5	1.0	2.5
Faculty community and collaboration	0.5	0.5	0.75
Pilot evaluation (ring-fenced)	0.75	0.75	0.75
Contingency	0.25	0.25	0.5
Total	15.0	15.0	15.0

5.4 Decision rubric

The scoring scale and cautions are the same as in Activity 1.

Table 11. Decision Rubric for Activity 2

Criterion	Question	Score (1–5)
Strategic value	Does the budget advance school priorities?	
Evidence	Are assumptions supported and gaps acknowledged?	
Feasibility	Is spending affordable and authorised?	
Equity and ethics	Are opportunities fair across faculty groups?	
Human accountability	Are consultation and approval roles clear?	

5.5 Expected output and debrief

Expected output: Each group prepares a one-page decision memo for the Dean, including a budget allocation table totalling PKR 15 million, the rationale for major allocations, equity and implementation considerations, missing information or required approvals, and three measurable indicators for subsequent evaluation.

Debrief questions: (1) What did the AI scenarios leave out that you had to supply? (2) Which line items would you defend to a sceptical faculty member, and which to a vice-chancellor? (3) What would you stop funding if the budget were cut by a third? (4) Which of your indicators measure capability and practice, and which merely measure activity?

6. Institutionalising Faculty Development in the AI Era

6.1 Design principles

Institutions should differentiate learning by readiness and discipline, embed development in actual academic work, support peer communities, provide governance without unnecessarily constraining

academic autonomy, and recognise the time involved in learning, checking and implementing AI-supported practice. UNESCO's guidance on GenAI in education and research (Miao & Holmes, 2023) foregrounds human agency, privacy and ethical validation. The NIST AI Risk Management Framework (2023) offers complementary general risk-management principles; it is not itself a faculty-development model.

6.2 Proposed 12-month roadmap

Table 12. Proposed 12-Month Implementation Roadmap

Period	AI-specific priority	Deliverable	Suggested owner
Months 1–3	Assess readiness, tool access, teaching loads, privacy and academic-integrity policies	Baseline, equity gaps, initial guidance	Dean or PVC with faculty-development lead, IT and legal
Months 4–6	Offer tiered workshops, authentic tasks and peer-learning groups	Revised assessments, research workflows, development proposals	Faculty-development unit with department chairs
Months 7–9	Support small pilots with protected time; record costs, errors and faculty experiences	Pilot evidence and interim feedback	Pilot leads; Dean's office for resourcing
Months 10–12	Evaluate learning, practice, workload and participation equity; revise priorities	Evaluation report and next-cycle plan	Faculty-development committee, reporting to the Dean or academic council

The roadmap is proposed, not validated. It assumes that someone is accountable for the whole cycle; naming that person early is the single most useful governance decision a school can make.

6.3 Evaluating faculty development

Immediate workshop outputs, such as an assessment redesign or budget memo, demonstrate participation and preliminary capability, not sustained changes in practice. Follow-up should examine whether proposals were implemented, reviewed and adjusted. Attendance and satisfaction do not prove better learning, nor should changes in student performance, research productivity or retention be attributed to AI training without appropriate evidence. Evaluation should therefore examine several levels separately, in the spirit of established training-evaluation models (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006; Guskey, 2002), adapted here to AI-era faculty development.

Table 13. Four-Level Framework for Evaluating Faculty Development

Level	Question	Example indicators	Evidence source
1. Participation and reaction	Who took part, and did it feel useful and fair?	Participation by department, rank and gender; access gaps; satisfaction	Registers, short surveys
2. Capability	Can faculty do what the programme intended?	Quality of verification protocols; ability to critique AI output on own discipline tasks	Work samples, structured observation, peer review
3. Practice	Has academic practice changed, and at what cost?	Redesigned assessments in use; disclosure practice; time spent; errors found	Course documents, interviews, time logs
4. Outcomes	Have educational or institutional results changed?	Evidence of student learning on redesigned tasks; integrity cases; workload equity; retention	Comparisons across cohorts or units, with caveats about causation

Level 4 evidence will usually be suggestive rather than conclusive. Leaders should say so in reports and should avoid claiming that development caused changes that other factors could explain.

7. Running This Guide as a Training Programme

7.1 Agenda options

Table 14. Half-Day Programme for Vice-Chancellors and Deans (3.5 Hours Including a 15-Minute Break)

Time (min)	Segment	Material
0–30	Framing: why capability, not tools; what the evidence supports	Sections 1–3
30–90	Activity 1: assessment redesign (60 min)	Section 4
90–105	Break	
105–180	Activity 2: development budget (75 min)	Section 5
180–210	Roadmap, evaluation and personal commitments	Sections 6 and 7.3

A full-day version can add the research-verification exercise (7.2), a 45-minute governance workshop using Table 4 and a longer evaluation-design session.

Facilitation notes.

- Use only fictional or public data. Ask participants not to enter student, staff or confidential institutional data into any tool.
- Participants may not have access to the same tools. Pre-generate two or three AI outputs before the session and give them to groups that cannot run the prompts; this also keeps comparisons fair.
- Run each activity's no-AI step first. The contrast between unaided and AI-assisted thinking is the main source of learning.
- Expect AI outputs to be fluent and wrong in instructive ways, for example inventing policy, ignoring marking workload or implying causes the data cannot support. Ask groups to mark every unsupported claim.
- Keep time strictly; the reflection steps are the most valuable and the easiest to lose.

7.2 Optional exercise: verifying an AI-assisted literature search (30 minutes)

This exercise develops the research capability, which the two main activities do not cover. Each participant asks an AI tool for five references on a topic in their own field, then checks each one in a scholarly database. Participants record which references exist, which are misattributed or fabricated, and which real sources say something different from the AI's summary. The group then agrees a minimum verification and disclosure standard for AI-assisted literature work in their school.

7.3 Leadership checklist

Leaders can use these questions to judge their institution's readiness. A "no" or "don't know" identifies a task for the roadmap.

1. Do we know, with local evidence, how ready our faculty are, by department and career stage?
2. Is there a named person accountable for faculty development in the AI era?
3. Do all faculty have access to an institutionally approved tool, or are we relying on personal subscriptions?
4. Do faculty know which data may and may not be entered into AI tools?
5. Is it clear who may set course-level AI policy, and who approves exceptions?
6. Is time spent learning and redesigning recognised in workload allocation?

7. Can faculty decline optional tools without penalty?
8. Is development tailored to discipline and readiness, not delivered as one workshop for everyone?
9. Do we separate development needs from pay, workload and job-design problems when we analyse retention?
10. Have we decided in advance how we will evaluate this, and at which of the four levels?

8. Limitations

This guide has several limitations. The framework and cycle are an author-proposed synthesis and have not been validated; the roadmap, rubrics and specimen designs are illustrative. The evidence base is small, largely descriptive and concentrated outside South Asia, and some sources are practitioner or policy documents, not peer-reviewed studies. The activities use hypothetical data, and the activities themselves have not yet been evaluated in training settings. Technology and policy are changing quickly, so tools, regulations and findings cited here may be superseded. Readers should treat the guide as a structured starting point to be adapted and tested locally.

9. Conclusion

AI offers opportunities to reconsider how universities teach, conduct research and support academic work. Its value depends on the knowledge, judgement and professional capabilities of those using it. Faculty development should therefore go beyond introductory demonstrations to authentic tasks, critical verification and decisions grounded in educational goals, scholarly standards and institutional values.

The two proposed activities offer practical starting points. Assessment redesign places pedagogical judgement at the centre of AI use, and the Dean's budget exercise gives leaders practice in strategic analysis while keeping accountability with them. Their effectiveness remains to be evaluated in actual development settings. The ultimate measure of success is not how extensively faculty use AI, but whether they become more effective teachers, rigorous researchers and thoughtful decision-makers.

The purpose of faculty development in the AI era is not to make academics dependent on intelligent systems, but to strengthen the human capabilities that make their use worthwhile.

Disclosure: The synthesis and framework presented in this article are the author's own. AI tools assisted with language editing. The author reviewed the final text and takes responsibility for its content.

References

- Every Learner Everywhere. (2026, February 23). *10 best practices for generative AI faculty development: Insights from the field*. <https://www.everylearnereverywhere.org/blog/10-best-practices-for-generative-ai-faculty-development-insights-from-the-field/>
- Guskey, T. R. (2002). Does it make a difference? Evaluating professional development. *Educational Leadership*, 59(6), 45–51.
- Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., ... Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, Article 102274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274>
- Kirkpatrick, D. L., & Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2006). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels* (3rd ed.). Berrett-Koehler.
- Lewis Miller, C., Barth, D., Gay, K., Scherer, F., & Herron, J. (2025). *Faculty development and GenAI playbook: Evidence-based best practices*. Online Learning Consortium and Every Learner Everywhere. <https://www.everylearnereverywhere.org/resources/faculty-development-and-gen-ai-playbook/>

- Miao, F., & Cukurova, M. (2024). *AI competency framework for teachers*. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/ZJTE2084>
- Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/EWZM9535>
- National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2023). *Artificial intelligence risk management framework (AI RMF 1.0)* (NIST AI 100-1). <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.100-1>
- Spathopoulou, F., Pitychoutis, K. M., & Papakonstantinidis, S. (2025). AI and higher education: Understanding faculty roles in teaching, research, and administration. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 17(4), Article ep600. <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/17406>
- Steinert, Y., Mann, K., Centeno, A., Dolmans, D., Spencer, J., Gelula, M., & Prideaux, D. (2006). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to improve teaching effectiveness in medical education: BEME Guide No. 8. *Medical Teacher*, 28(6), 497–526. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01421590600902976>
- Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education: Where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16, Article 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>