

Learning in the Age of AI PSYC 2800

Instructor: Patricia Lindemann
Email: pgl2@columbia.edu
Office Hours: Mondays 11-1, 706 Uris

Teaching Assistant: Deborah Lee
Email: dl3892@tc.columbia.edu
Office Hours: Mondays 4-6, Location TBD

Bulletin Description

Every new educational innovation comes with proponents who tout dramatic improvements in efficiency alongside naysayers who claim the end of human thought has arrived. The advent of AI in education is the latest chapter in this old argument, raising the questions: What is the actual impact of AI tools on education? On students and faculty? On modes of thought? Drawing on philosophy, ethics, and educational psychology, students construct a personal framework for evaluating educational strategies and tools. They apply that framework to five essential aspects of the educational experience — self-testing, note-taking, study planning, building expertise, and writing — using hands-on experimentation with analog, digital, and AI-enhanced approaches. The course concludes by examining AI's impact on mental health and psychological well-being. Students leave with a system for evaluating educational tools as they continue to evolve.

Full Course Description:

When writing was invented, Socrates warned it would destroy memory. When calculators arrived, teachers feared students would stop understanding mathematics. Every new educational innovation comes with proponents who tout new vistas of human knowledge and dramatic improvements in efficiency, while the naysayers claim the end of human thought has arrived. The arrival of AI in education is the latest chapter in this old argument and it raises critical questions starting with the most basic – what is the impact of these tools on education?

Your work in this course will enable you to answer this question for yourself. To accomplish this, you will first consider relevant philosophical and ethical issues. Philosophical questions will focus on the purpose of education. What do we hope education will lead to for the individual and for society? The ethical questions will focus on challenges posed by AI models. We will consider issues like equity of access, bias and academic integrity as well as the impact on employment, questionable sourcing of training data, and environmental costs. The philosophical and ethical components are the starting point. Throughout most of the course, you will investigate the impact of AI on the learning process. The focus is on developing your understanding of foundational concepts in education that help explain how and why people learn most effectively. Based on your philosophical, ethical and psychological understanding, you will develop a personalized framework for evaluating how and when AI is an asset and when it is detrimental.

You will develop and apply your framework throughout the course considering five essential aspects of the educational experience - self-testing, note-taking, study planning, building expertise and writing. For each aspect, you will follow the same three-step process: 1. Examine the research, 2. Predict the effectiveness of available tools, 3. Evaluate using your framework.

An important part of the learning will be through hands-on experimentation with the tools. For example, you will try taking notes with pen and paper, taking notes on a laptop, and having an AI take the notes for you; and then you will evaluate the pros and cons of each approach based on your understanding of the relevant literature, your experience and your evaluative framework. By the end of the course, you will have a system you can use to evaluate educational tools as they continue to evolve.

Ideally, education fosters the development of individuals who are not just intellectually capable, but also mentally and emotionally flourishing. The final course unit concerns this goal as we turn to consider the impact of AI on mental health. The question is whether, when and how AI can support our psychological well-being. Can AI help students counteract feelings of anxiety and depression? Or serve as a low-cost therapist? How much of a risk is there of dangerous dependence? You will examine the emerging psychological evidence and reach your own conclusions.

Note: As part of this course, we examine ethical issues that lead some people to conscientiously object to using AI. Then we proceed to use it. My argument is that you will benefit from actually using the technology and evaluating its effectiveness. There is no alternative assignment for conscientious objectors. If you conscientiously object to using AI technology in this manner, then please select a different course.

Learning objectives:

By the end of this course, students will be able to:

1. Articulate a personal philosophy of education, including a reasoned position on the purpose of education and the role of technology in achieving that purpose.
2. Understand foundational concepts in educational psychology including memory, metacognition, cognitive development, and self-regulated learning.
3. Apply educational psychology concepts to predict the effectiveness of a range of educational tools.
4. Develop a personal framework to assess the value of educational tools (incorporating philosophical, ethical and psychological concepts). This framework will be applicable in the context of academic life and ultimately to questions of mental health and well-being.
5. Plan a lesson on a topic of personal interest incorporating both traditional and AI enhanced elements and be able to justify your teaching choices.

Prerequisite: PSYC 1001, COGS 1001, or permission of the instructor.

Role in the Curriculum:

PSYC UN2800 is an intermediate-level lecture course. It fulfills the following degree requirements:

- For the Psychology Major and the Postbac Certificate Program in Psychology, this course fulfills the special elective requirement.

Course Structure:

This is an interactive and experiential course. You will be evaluated as follows:

- Class Participation – 5%
- Learning Investigation Reflections – 25%
- Framework - 25%
- Teaching Project – 15%
- Midterm and Final – 30%

Class Participation (5%): Class time will include lecture, discussion, and hands-on activities. You are expected to attend and participate. We will use Poll Everywhere for interactive quizzing and assessment of participation.

You are allowed two free missed classes for any reason. Beyond that, please contact me and the TA with explanation for approval of any excused absence (e.g., illness, personal emergency or religious observance). Your participation grade will be the proportion of days that you are present and participate (or have excused absences) and will be based on your use of Poll Everywhere and submission of in class assignments. We will begin keeping track of participation on the second day of classes. Lecture slides will be available on canvas. Virtual participation will not be an option. If you miss a class, be sure to review the slides and connect with a classmate to find out what you missed. Then please come meet with me or the TA with any questions.

Learning Tool Investigation – Reflections: (25%): Throughout the semester, you will try out various analog and AI enhanced tools (Field Trials) and report on your experiences (Reflections) incorporating your own evaluative structure (Framework). Field trials and related reflections will cover five learning-related topics: self-testing, note-taking, building expertise, study planning, and writing. Fuller details of the assignments for each topic will be in a separate handout. Here is an overview.

Field Trials – You will actively engage with different educational tools, both analog and AI enhanced. This will sometimes be done during class and sometimes be done outside of class. For the most part, the field trials will involve trying out analog and AI tools in the context of the work you are doing for this course (e.g., developing your teaching plan). So they are not expected to increase your workload substantially.

Reflections – This is your thoughtful evaluation of your field trial in the context of your evaluative framework. The reflection has three parts. All must be included.

1. Briefly summarize your experience in the field trial.
2. Briefly explain the psychological foundations of the tools. Why would psychologists predict these tools would be effective (or not)?
3. Evaluate, using your framework. How do the tools you experimented with meet the criteria of your framework? Consider at least one philosophical, one ethical and one psychological aspect. What are your conclusions about the tools/strategies you used? What would you do in the future and why? This evaluation is not just your opinion. Your thoughtful analysis should be grounded in ideas taken from philosophy, ethics and (especially) psychology.

Note there is no single correct conclusion. What works for you depends on your personal framework and your current goals. If you find that the conclusions of your analysis contradict your own behavior, consider adjusting your behavior or re-evaluating your framework in light of your real-world goals.

Written reflection assignments are expected to be 2-3 pages. You are free to write longer. This will not impact the assessment of your work. There will be 5 reflections and grading of each will be on a 5 point scale (25 points total). You will be awarded 1 point for completing each part of the reflection (described above) and two additional points for overall quality (0 – poor/incomplete, 1 - complete/superficial, 2 – good/thoughtful).

Reflections are intended to be learning exercises to help you think through the psychological concepts, your framework and its application. Because writing is an

important part of the learning process (as we will discuss), do not use AI to generate your reflections. The writing should be yours alone.

Again - the required sections for a “good/complete” assignment

- summarize the field trial
- connect to psychology concepts
- apply the framework thoughtfully

Because they are intended as learning exercises, assignments do not need to be perfect to receive full credit. For the first one (Reflection 1) if you do not receive full credit, you may revise it within one week for full credit. Late submissions will lose 2 points. At the end of the term, I will review the reflections of students with borderline grades. If your entries are strong (they are complete plus they demonstrate careful thought on all three required aspects), your grade will be bumped up.

Framework Development (25%)

Your framework will be a personal set of guidelines. You will work on this throughout the semester and it will evolve. More details and a grading rubric will be provided in a separate handout. You will submit a draft of the first section after the first course unit, focused on your own philosophy of education and identifying two philosophical and two ethical criteria. Throughout the semester, you will edit the criteria - modifying existing criteria, adding new ones and subtracting ones you no longer find relevant. The final version will be submitted on the last day of class.

Teaching Project: (15%): Your teaching project will be to develop a lesson plan for a topic of interest to you. More details on topic selection and other aspects of the project will be provided in another handout. You should choose a topic for the project that you are at least somewhat familiar with and that you would be excited to teach to other people. You will be working on this project throughout the semester as you complete the Field Trials. Your lesson plan will incorporate at least two different teaching elements of your choice – one analog and one AI enhanced. During peer review, you will teach a part of your lesson to another student in the course. Unfortunately, we will not have time for everyone to share their lessons with the class.

Project Schedule:

1. Topic Proposal (1 paragraph) – Due Oct 28
2. Outline your strategy (Field Trial 3 activity)
3. Teach yourself about your topic (Field Trial 4 activity)
4. Draft activities and obtain peer feedback (Field Trial 5 activity)
5. Final Lesson Description (Due Dec 16 - end of reading period)

Your final lesson plan will be about 3 pages written plus supporting materials/activities. It will include a brief summary of your approach why you have adopted it. Optional for extra credit – submit a 5-10 minute video of you teaching (a part of) your lesson.

Exams: (30%): There will be two exams in this course, a midterm and a final. Questions will be a combination of multiple choice, short answer and paragraph responses. The emphasis will be on understanding psychological principles and applying them in educational contexts. Study materials will be provided at least one week prior to the exams. Your overall exam grade will be weighted with the better of the two exams being worth 20% of the final course grade and the lesser being worth 10%. The final exam will be cumulative.

Readings:

Most readings will be available as pdf files on canvas. A few are only included as links. We will be using sections of two textbooks:

Woolfolk, A., & Usher, E. (2023). *Educational psychology* (15th ed.). Pearson. (referred to as EP below)

The EP text is available in the library. Required Chapters are available on Canvas.

Brown, P. C., Roediger, H. L., III, & McDaniel, M. A. (2014). *Make it stick: The science of successful learning*. Harvard University Press. (referred to as MIS below)

The MIS text is available as an ebook through the Columbia Library.

Schedule:

(Reading may be adjusted)

Date	Readings	Assignments
Unit 1 — Introduction - Philosophical and Ethical Considerations		
Day 1 Sep 9	Cronon, W. (1998). "Only connect...": The goals of a liberal education. <i>The American Scholar</i>, 67(4), 73–80 Suggested: <i>Phaedrus</i> 274c–275b [The Thamus-Theuth passage on writing and memory] (excerpt). Suggested: Biesta, G. (2009). Good education in an age of measurement: On the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in education. <i>Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability</i>, 21(1), 33–46.	
Day 2 Sep 14	Postman, N. (1998, March). Five things we need to know about technological change [Conference presentation]. The New Technologies and the Human Person: Communicating the Faith in the New Millennium, Denver, CO. Kasneci, E., et al. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. <i>Learning and Individual Differences</i>, 103, 102274. Suggested: Crawford, K. (2021). <i>Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence</i>. Yale University Press. https://doi.org/10.12987/9780300252392	
Day 3 Sep 16	Hofmann, V., Kalluri, P. R., Jurafsky, D., & King, S. (2024). AI generates covertly racist decisions about people based on their dialect. <i>Nature</i>, 633(8028), 147–154. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07856-5 Brynjolfsson, E., Chandar, B., & Chen, R. (2025, revised 2026). <i>Canaries in the coal mine? Six facts about the recent employment effects of artificial intelligence</i> [Working paper]. Stanford Digital Economy Lab. https://digitaleconomy.stanford.edu/publications/canaries-in-the-coal-mine/ READ ONLY THE ABSTRACT (page 1)	

Date	Readings	Assignments
	Kyi, L., Mahuli, A., Silberman, M. S., Binns, R., Zhao, J., & Biega, A. J. (2025). Governance of generative AI in creative work: Consent, credit, compensation, and beyond. In <i>Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems</i> (16 pages). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3713799 READ ONLY THE HIGHLIGHTED EXCERPTS (find highlighted version on Canvas, about 5 pages) Suggested: Apeagyei, K., & Murthy, A. (2025, November 14). <i>The perilous future of AI work in the Global South</i>. Media@LSE. https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/medialse/2025/11/14/the-perilous-future-of-ai-work-in-the-global-south/ Gabbatiss, J. (2025, September 15). <i>AI: Five charts that put data-centre energy use – and emissions – into context</i>. Carbon Brief. https://www.carbonbrief.org/ai-five-charts-that-put-data-centre-energy-use-and-emissions-into-context	
Unit 2 — Cognitive Foundations		
Day 4 Sep 21	EP Ch. 8 — sections on Cognitive Views of Memory and Long-Term Memory (Note: No live class this day. Lecture will be recorded on zoom and available to view on canvas)	Submit Framework Initial Draft on Canvas
Day 5 Sep 23	EP Ch. 8 — sections on Teaching for Long-Lasting Knowledge EP Ch. 9 — sections on Complex Cognitive Processes: Metacognition and Learning Strategies	Field Trial 1 Session 1 (use physical flashcards)
Unit 3 — Strategy 1: Retrieval Practice		
Day 6 Sep 28	MIS, Ch. 2 — To Learn, Retrieve	Field Trial 1 Session 2 (use online flashcards)
Day 7 Sep 30	Karpicke, J. D., & Roediger, H. L. (2008). The critical importance of retrieval for learning. <i>Science</i>, 319(5865), 966–968. Craik, F. I. M., & Lockhart, R. S. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. <i>Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior</i>, 11(6), 671–684.	Field Trial 1 (use AI quizzing)
Day 8 Oct 5	MIS, Ch. 3 — Mix Up Practice	Submit Reflection 1 (on your experience with self-quizzing in Field Trial 1)
Unit 4 — Strategy 2: Effective Note-Taking		

Date	Readings	Assignments
Day 9 Oct 7	MIS, Ch. 4 — Embrace Difficulty	Field Trial 2 Session 1 (Note-taking by hand)
Day 10 Oct 12	Peper, R. J., & Mayer, R. E. (1978). Note taking as a generative activity. <i>Journal of Educational Psychology</i>, 70(4), 514–522. Mueller, P. A., & Oppenheimer, D. M. (2014). The pen is mightier than the keyboard: Advantages of longhand over laptop note taking. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 25(6), 1159–1168. Urry, H. L., et al. (2021). Don't ditch the laptop just yet: A direct replication of Mueller and Oppenheimer's (2014) Study 1 plus mini meta-analyses across similar studies. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 32(3), 326–339. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797620965541 READ ONLY THE HIGHLIGHTED EXCERPTS (find highlighted version on Canvas - about 8 pages)	Field Trial 2 Session 2 (Note-taking on a device)
Day 11 Oct 14	Midterm Review	
Day 12 Oct 19	Midterm	
Unit 5 — Foundations 2: Cognitive Development		
Day 13 Oct 21	EP Ch. 3 — section on Piaget's Theory of Cognitive Development Note: This lecture will be recorded and uploaded to NotebookLM as part of Field Trial 2. We will discuss how student privacy will be protected at the start of the session.	Field Trial 2 Session 3 (Note-taking by AI)
Day 14 Oct 26	EP Ch. 3 — section on Vygotsky's Sociocultural Perspective and Implications of Piaget's and Vygotsky's Theories	Submit Reflection 2 (on your notetaking experiences in Field Trial 2)
Unit 6 — Strategy 3: Planning and Goal Setting		
Day 15 Oct 28	EP Ch. 11 — sections on Agency and Self-Efficacy; Self-Regulated Learning: Skill and Will; Teaching Toward Self-Efficacy	Submit Teaching Proposal Project Topic Description
Nov 2	Election Holiday — No Class	
Day 16 Nov 4	Gollwitzer, P. M. (1999). Implementation intentions: Strong effects of simple plans. <i>American Psychologist</i> , 54(7), 493–503. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.7.493	Field Trial 3 – Session 1 (planning without using AI)
Day 17 Nov 9	Kornell, N., & Bjork, R. A. (2007). The promise and perils of self-regulated study. <i>Psychonomic Bulletin & Review</i>, 14(2), 219–224. Ariely, D., & Wertenbroch, K. (2002). Procrastination, deadlines, and performance: Self-control by precommitment.	Field Trial 3 - Session 2 (planning using AI)

Date	Readings	Assignments
	Psychological Science, 13(3), 219–224. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00441	
Day 18 Nov 11	Chi, V. B., Rietsche, R., Göldi, A., Ungar, L., & Guntuku, S. C. (2026). Optimized but unowned: How AI-authored goals undermine the motivation they are meant to drive [Preprint]. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2605.12344 READ HIGHLIGHTED SECTIONS (about 9 pages). Highlighted version available on Canvas. Lee, S., Jeong, J., Kim, M., Lee, S., Kim, S., & Jung, D. (2025). Development of a mobile intervention for procrastination augmented with a semigenerative chatbot for university students: Pilot randomized controlled trial. <i>JMIR mHealth and uHealth</i>, 13, e53133. https://doi.org/10.2196/53133 READ HIGHLIGHTED SECTIONS (about 5 pages). Highlighted version available on Canvas.	DUE Friday Nov 13 Submit Reflection 3 (on your experience developing and using a project plan in Field Trial 3)
Unit 7 — Strategy 4: Building Expertise		
Day 19 Nov 16	Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. In M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds.), <i>Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes</i> (pp. 79–91). Harvard University Press.	Field Trial 4 Session 1: (Building expertise on your topic without AI)
Day 20 Nov 18	MIS, Ch. 5 — Avoid Illusions of Knowing	Field Trial 4 Session 2 (Building expertise on your topic using AI)
Day 21 Nov 23	Kestin, G., Miller, K., Kiales, A., Milbourne, T., & Ponti, G. (2025). AI tutoring outperforms in-class active learning: An RCT introducing a novel research-based design in an authentic educational setting. <i>Scientific Reports</i>, 15, Article 17458. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-97652-6 (10 pages) Li, R., Jiang, Y.-H., Wang, J., & Jiang, B. (2025). How real is AI tutoring? Comparing simulated and human dialogues in one-on-one instruction. In B. Jiang et al. (Eds.), <i>Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Computers in Education</i>. Asia-Pacific Society for Computers in Education.(10 pages) YOU CAN SKIP:: all of §2, §3.3–3.4, and the ENA machinery in §4.2. Also skip Figures 3 and 4.	DUE Nov 27 Submit Reflection 4 (on your learning experience in Field Trial 4)
Nov 25 Thanksgiving Holiday — No Class		
Unit 8 — Strategy 5: Writing to Learn		

Date	Readings	Assignments
Day 22 Nov 30	Emig, J. (1977). Writing as a mode of learning. <i>College Composition and Communication</i> , 28(2), 122–128. Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. <i>College Composition and Communication</i> , 32(4), 365–387.	Field Trial 5 Session 1 – Creating your teaching materials yourself
Day 23 Dec 2	Madsen Hardy, S., Fassihi, P., Geng, S., McVey, C., & Parfitt, M. (2026). Generative AI use in college writing classes: An analysis of student chat logs and writing projects. <i>Journal of Writing Research</i> , 17(3), 483–500. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2026.17.03.05 (Note: focus on the introduction and the discussion)	Field Trial 5 Session 2 - AI generated teaching materials
Day 24 Dec 7	Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. <i>Review of Educational Research</i> , 77(1), 81–112. (Read pages 81–97, you can skip the analysis on 84-86)	Field Trial 5 Session 3 - Teaching project sample material peer review. Plus AI feedback.
Unit 9 — AI and Mental Health		
Day 25 Dec 9	Nyakhar, S., & Wang, H. (2025). Effectiveness of artificial intelligence chatbots on mental health & well-being in college students: A rapid systematic review. <i>Frontiers in Psychiatry</i> , 16, 1621768. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2025.1621768 (You can skip the Results section. 5 pages.)	Submit Reflection 5 (on your experience creating materials in Field Trial 5)
Day 26 Dec 14	Laestadius, L., Bishop, A., Gonzalez, M., Illenčík, D., & Campos-Castillo, C. (2024). Too human and not human enough: A grounded theory analysis of mental health harms from emotional dependence on the social chatbot Replika. <i>New Media & Society</i> , 26(10), 5923–5941. https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448221142007	Submit Final Framework today. Submit Full Teaching Project on Dec 16 (last day of reading period)
Dec 23 Final Exam 12:00-3:00pm		

Note that the Final Exam is VERY late and very close to Christmas. The registrar sets exam times. Please make your travel plans accordingly.

Academic Integrity

Academic honesty includes presenting only your own work in exams and assignments, and correctly attributing others' ideas where appropriate. Taking credit for work that is not your own is a serious violation within the academic community, and anyone found to be cheating or plagiarizing in this class will be reported to the university. Detailed definitions and examples of academic dishonesty (and a rundown of the consequences) are available in Columbia's Guide to Academic Integrity (<http://www.college.columbia.edu/academics/integrity>).

Regarding the use of AI. Please write your Reflections on your own. They are meant to be informal writing pieces that help you to codify your ideas. As we will discuss, in this context

using AI is unlikely to be helpful for your learning. It is entirely reasonable, actually necessary, to use AI in developing your Teaching Plan. You will be asked to document how you used it. The trickiest case is probably your framework. Because this is personal to you, it doesn't make much sense to have the AI help with generating ideas. The irony is that the framework is intended to help you decide when it is and is not acceptable to use these tools. As with your teaching plan, you will need to include a Disclosure on AI use with your framework.

Disability accommodations:

If you require special accommodations through the Office of Disability Services (ODS) or the Center for Accessibility Resources and Disability Services (CARDS), please let me know as close to the beginning of the semester as possible. More information about registering with ODS can be found here: <https://www.health.columbia.edu/content/disability-services>

Wellness

All of us at some point experience challenges to our mental health and well-being. This is true at any time, and has been even more so in the past couple of years. I urge you to take care of yourselves—and of each other. Please prioritize your mental health and wellbeing and know that there are many resources available to you both within our classroom community and throughout the university:

<https://health.columbia.edu/content/counseling-and-psychological-services>

<http://blogs.cuit.columbia.edu/nightline/>

<https://universitylife.columbia.edu/student-resources-directory#health>

<https://columbiavirtualcampus.com/>

Please reach out for help if you need it, and if you see others who are struggling, please point them toward these or other sources of help, or encourage them to talk to me or one of the other Directors of Undergraduate Studies in the Psychology Department.

AI Use Disclosure

AI was used to help identify readings for this course. It was also used collaboratively in revising and formatting this document.

ASSIGNMENT CALENDAR

Learning in the Age of AI • PSYC 2800 • Fall 2026

Part 1 — Sep 9 – Nov 2

	Unit 1 Intro: Philosophy & Ethics			Unit 2 Cognitive Foundations		Unit 3 Strategy 1: Retrieval Practice			Unit 4 Strategy 2: Note-Taking				Unit 5 Foundations 2: Cognitive Development			
	Sep 9	Sep 14	Sep 16	Sep 21	Sep 23	Sep 28	Sep 30	Oct 5	Oct 7	Oct 12	Oct 14	Oct 19	Oct 21	Oct 26	Oct 28	Nov 2
	Wed	Mon	Wed	Mon	Wed	Mon	Wed	Mon	Wed	Mon	Wed	Mon	Wed	Mon	Wed	Mon
Field Trials					FT1 S1	FT1 S2	FT1 S3		FT2 S1	FT2 S2			FT2 S3			
5 topics × hands-on sessions																
Reflections								R1						R2		
2–3 pages each																
Framework				Draft												
Teaching Project															Topic Proposal	
Exams												Midterm				

Part 2 — Nov 4 – Dec 23

	Unit 6 Strategy 3: Planning & Goals				Unit 7 Strategy 4: Building Expertise					Unit 8 Strategy 5: Writing to Learn			Unit 9 AI & Mental Health			
	Nov 4	Nov 9	Nov 11	Nov 13	Nov 16	Nov 18	Nov 23	Nov 25	Nov 27	Nov 30	Dec 2	Dec 7	Dec 9	Dec 14	Dec 16	Dec 23
	Wed	Mon	Wed	Fri	Mon	Wed	Mon	Wed	Fri	Mon	Wed	Mon	Wed	Mon	Wed	Wed
Field Trials	FT3 S1	FT3 S2			FT4 S1	FT4 S2				FT5 S1	FT5 S2	FT5 S3				
5 topics × hands-on sessions																
Reflections				R3					R4				R5			
2–3 pages each																
Framework														Final Version		
Teaching Project															Project Due	
Exams																Final Exam

FT = Field Trial • Yellow = due date not tied to a class session • Gray = no class (holiday)

Note that both the Framework and the Teaching Project are cumulative projects that include work from the Field Trials and Reflections. The work at the end will be your (relatively brief) final analysis of the experiences you had throughout the course.

