



Building Blackboard
Together 2026

AI in Every Program

A Scalable Framework for Institution-Wide AI Curriculum Integration

Timothy L. Smith

Director, Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning

Lamar University

Kimberly A. Conner, JD

Director, University Innovation

Lamar University

Meet the Presenters



Timothy L. Smith, MS
Director, Center for Innovation
in Teaching & Learning



Kimberly A. Conner, JD
Director, University Innovation



**Building Blackboard
Together 2026**

WHERE WE'RE HEADED

Today's Roadmap

Themes: Institutional Understanding | Collaborative governance | Academic social structures | Disciplinary frameworks | Secure tools

1 Challenge

The gap between what students need and what programs deliver

2 Conditions

What circumstances set the stage for success

3 Framework

What AIEP is and how it builds

4 People

How faculty engage, curiosity first

5 Evidence

What the first six months of the work produced

6 Tools

Intentional AI in the classroom by design.

7 Takeaways

What transfers across institutions

T H E S T A K E S A R E R A I S E D

Agentic AI is building new urgency

If AI can complete a course, are we evaluating the process or the product?



GENERATIVE AI · RESPONDS

Creates content in response to a prompt. It can write, summarize, translate, explain, code, brainstorm, and revise.



AGENTIC AI · ACTS

Pursues goals through planning and action. It breaks a goal into steps, retrieves information, uses connected tools, and executes and monitors a full workflow.



WHY THIS MATTERS

Agentic AI can independently complete entire online courses. Autonomous bots can be configured to watch lectures, generate discussion posts, solve quizzes, and submit homework. How can we work within our learning management systems to offer human-centric learning opportunities?

Course completion can now be outsourced. How do we make sure the learning process isn't?

THE CHALLENGE

The Gap Is Documented

AI is reshaping every discipline, every workplace, and every student's expectation, faster than any single department can keep up.

69%

of online students nationally say AI is not yet in their institution's curriculum

Only 19%

of online students say faculty teach them how to use AI as a workplace tool most, or all, of the time.

THE CORE QUESTION

How do you move an entire university toward AI-ready curriculum without losing faculty trust or institutional governance?

LAMAR UNIVERSITY'S ANSWER

AI IN EVERY PROGRAM: A phased, discipline-specific framework, supported by Blackboard's AVA tools for safe, ethical AI access.

THE CONTEXT

Knowing Our Institution First

AI in Every Program is organic by design.



Dual Carnegie Designation

R2 (high research output) and a **Carnegie Opportunity University**: research growth alongside a deep commitment to access and success.



~18,000 Students

A majority non-traditional body: working adults, caregivers, and first-generation learners, many balancing school with real responsibilities.



140+ Programs

100+ undergraduate and 40+ graduate programs across Engineering, Education, Business, Health Professions, and Applied Arts.



94% Career-Driven

Online students pursuing degrees for career outcomes. Workforce alignment is not aspirational. It is the expectation.



Regional Responsibility

Lamar serves Southeast Texas and the Gulf Coast. What our graduates know about AI shapes the region's workforce.

Setting the Stage for Success

Academic transformation requires a shared belief in how courses bring value to students.



Shared Mission and Vision

Institutional messaging around AI-responsive programming is consistent and clear. Ignoring the impact of AI is not an option.



Policy and Governance

AI policy is developed collaboratively, drawing credibility and relevance from roots in the faculty community.



Social Structures

Forums for discussing challenges, successes, and opportunities spark curiosity and build confidence.



Universal Framework

AI in Every Program sets an expectation of intentional and informed academic transformation.

These conditions developed alongside the are impacted by our work.

THE FRAMEWORK

AIEP as a Universal Roadmap

AI in Every Program is a phased, discipline-customized framework for institution-wide curriculum integration.



Disciplinary Assessment

Each program examines how AI is reshaping its own field.



Program-Level Design

Programs plan for AI-responsive curriculum refinements.



Course-Level Responsiveness

What skills must be developed without assistance? Where is AI a relevant tool?

EVERY PROGRAM'S CENTRAL QUESTION

What must students be able to do with AI and what must they learn to do without AI in your program's professions?

Scaffolding AI-Responsive Curriculum

Programs set the AI posture. Faculty set assignment expectations. Student capability scales from foundations to professional practice.

- 1** **CORE COURSES**
Responsibility
Students learn what AI is and what responsible use requires, including data security, bias, and ethical implications.
- 2** **FOUNDATIONAL COURSES**
Applications
Students apply AI to brainstorming, studying, and practice, with faculty setting the posture assignment by assignment.
- 3** **ADVANCED COURSES**
Integrations
Students integrate AI into disciplinary work and must evaluate, verify, revise, and explain its contributions.
- 4** **CAPSTONE COURSES**
Transformations
Students produce discipline-based work meeting professional expectations for ethics, documentation, and accountability.

Students should not have to guess what is permitted, what is not, and why.

One Program, One Semester

Strategic Communications, a proof of concept, from disciplinary assessment to a revised assignment.



1 · Program Position Statement

“Strategic communication practice now assumes AI in the workflow. Our graduates enter agencies and communication offices where drafting, audience research, and media monitoring are already AI-assisted. This program prepares students to direct those tools with professional judgment, and to hold the capabilities that judgment rests on audience analysis, ethical reasoning, message strategy, and clear original writing.”



2 · Shared Syllabus Language

“Every assignment in this course carries an AI expectation, labeled prohibited, restricted, assistive, or expected, with the reason stated. Where AI use is permitted, document the tool you used and what you did with its output. These expectations protect the capabilities you are here to build.”



3 · One Assignment, Before and After

Crisis communication plan · COMM 5320

Assignment: Write a 1,200-word crisis communication plan for the select organization.

BEFORE AI – The assignment ends here.

AI-Responsive – The assignment assesses judgement beyond what AI can generate.

EVALUATE

Use an approved AI tool to generate two alternative message frames for the assigned crisis. Submit your prompts and the unedited outputs. Evaluate each frame for audience fit, clarity, tone, and likely effectiveness.

INTEGRATE

Use an approved AI tool throughout the planning process to identify stakeholder concerns, test message strategies, and adapt communications for different audiences and channels. Submit the final crisis communication plan with an annotated process record showing how you verified, revised, and incorporated AI-generated contributions.

THE PEOPLE

A Framework on Paper Moves No One

A framework only matters once people use it. Policy and governance set the stage. Adoption is where the real work happens.



Communities



Relationships



Shared Strategies



Peer Networks

SHARE YOUR EXPERIENCE

What are some challenges standing between your institution and meaningful AI engagement?

THE FACULTY

Faculty Are More Curious Than You Think

CURIOSITY IS THE COMMON RESPONSE

Faculty want to know:

- What does AI do well?
- What are AI's limits?
- How can I use AI to be more productive?
- What does it mean for my field?
- How do I, and my students, use it responsibly?

The dominant narrative, that faculty are resistant and fearful, overstates what is truly happening at our institution.

WHAT THE EVIDENCE SHOWS

Approximately 100 faculty attended our Summer AI Community of Practice series. Workshops came voluntarily. They came because they were curious.

University Innovation's faculty community of practice sees consistently high engagement when the framing is exploration and collaboration.

THE COMMUNITY

Translating Curiosity into Connection



A Faculty Community of Practice

Regular, optional, cross-disciplinary gatherings where faculty share what they are exploring with AI in their courses.



Faculty-Led Presentations

Faculty teaching faculty. A nursing professor on AI in clinical case studies lands differently than a feature walkthrough.



A Shared Microsoft Teams Site

A centralized, growing, peer-contributed repository of resources. Built by faculty, not a top-down resource dump.



CITL and UI Collaboration

CITL and UI provide structure, facilitation, and continuity to build faculty confidence

The key: CITL created the conditions. UI created the framework. Faculty created the momentum.

THE GUIDANCE

Responsible and Ethical Use

DIRECT, the Division of Innovation, Responsible Ethics, and CyberTech, is one home for governance, security, and adoption.



AI Policy

Evaluate Tools · Safeguard Data · Validate Output · Practice Transparency.
One baseline shared across programs.



Data Classification

Public · Sensitive · Confidential · Regulated (Policy 15.01.02). Faculty learn which data can be added to which tool before a privacy problem emerges.



Platform Evaluation

Every AI platform clears the Information Security Office's evaluation before it reaches a classroom: security, data protection, and risk reviewed against one standard.



Adoption

Approval is the start, not the finish. Every cleared tool comes with change management and hands-on faculty training.

Safe Tools by Design

Faculty champions need tools they can trust, and trust is built through governance rather than product quality alone.

Blackboard's AVA suite and the AI Design Assistant are a safe, governed entry point. Before any AVA tool reached a Lamar classroom, it cleared DIRECT's integrated review:



Security Review

Compliance, data protection, risk assessment.



Adoption Strategy

Change management and faculty onboarding.



Faculty Training

Hands-on support and critical evaluation of AI outputs.

INSTRUCTOR CONTROL IS STRUCTURAL

Faculty decide which AI features are active. Students are informed. Access is equitable. Control is built in rather than bolted on.

ALIGNED TO BLACKBOARD'S TRUSTWORTHY AI

- Fairness
- Transparency
- Instructor control
- Value alignment
- Accountability

How the Work Gets Staffed

For the leaders in the room: These are the teams you need

Division of Innovation, Responsible Ethics, and CyberTech (DIRECT) & Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning (CITL)



University Innovation

Strategy, governance, and curriculum integration. AIEP framework, policy, field guides, and program support.

*2 full-time staff
1 consulting staff*



CITL, including Instructional Design and Educational Technology

Faculty development and course design. Workshops, the community of practice, and instructional support.

4 consulting staff



Information Security and Data Governance Offices

Platform evaluation and data classification. Every AI tool clears this review before a classroom sees it.

*Half-time staff
1 consulting staff*

Governance, security, and adoption answer to aligned leadership.

How Long It Actually Takes

Are you wondering whether this framework is achievable at your institution? The answer depends on strength and unity of vision.

February 2026

- University Innovation established
- AI in Every Program implemented

1

2

March to May 2026

- AIEP Quick-Start Framework created
- AI Field Guides guides published
- Provost speaks about the importance of institutional relevance through AIEP

3

4

August 2026

- AIEP designated an institutional priority
- AIEP presentations to new faculty, returning faculty, and select colleges

5

6

February to March 2026

- University Innovation website established
- AI policy drafted
- AIEP documents refined for multiple audiences

June to July

- Five faculty-led community of practice sessions
- Strategic Communications exemplars created

Fall 2026

- Programs begin position statements
- Google Workspace for Education deployment

The framework itself was refined over several months. Building the trust and governance that programs want is an ongoing process.

REFLECTION

What Worked



Customized ownership

Programs defined what AI-ready means for their own field, which deepened engagement well beyond compliance.



Faculty-led learning

Peer-to-peer sessions and the community of practice built trust that our office could not have built on its own.



Adaptive policy

Iterating on AI policy kept us relevant and credible as the landscape shifted underneath us.

START WHERE THE ENERGY IS

You don't need institution-wide buy-in on day one. Find champions, support them well, and let results do the persuading.

SHARE YOUR IDEAS

What is one action our university could take this month to move our programs toward an AI-responsive curriculum?

What We Would Do Differently

The three things we would change if we started again this morning.



Bring in Student Voices

We designed the framework around what faculty and employers said graduates would need. Students were consulted after the structure was set, and their questions about fairness and disclosure would have sharpened the syllabus language from the beginning.



Set AI Literacy Baselines

We assumed a working familiarity with AI tools that many faculty did not have, so early sessions spent time on fundamentals we had not planned for. A short baseline check would have let us group people by starting point.



Streamline Resource Access

Faculty spent real time hunting for guidance that already existed across separate sites and channels. Consolidating into one navigable home should have come before we produced more materials.

What Programs Can Do Now

It's ok to start small when change is intentional.

Investigate how AI is impacting the field using a variety of academic and lived experience resources.

Develop program-level AI Position Statements around what students need to know now and 5 years from now.

Create common AI-use syllabus language across the discipline. When messaging is inconsistent, students become confused.

The goal is continuity. Shared understandings between programs and students elevate student success.

THANK YOU

Make the Framework Your Own

We hope this sparks ideas you can bring back to your own institution. Reach out. We'd love to keep the conversation going.

Timothy L. Smith

Executive Director, Center for
Innovation in Teaching and Learning
tlsmith7@lamar.edu



Kimberly A. Conner, J.D.

Director, University Innovation
kconner6@lamar.edu



Session slides will be shared following the event.

Blackboard Catalyst Award • Ethical AI Leadership 2026 Lamar University, CITL / University

Lamar University & AIEP



AIEP Document Suite

Guides for leadership, faculty, implementation team. AIEP Quick-Start Template. The student guide is in development.



Cardinal AI Field Guides

Plain-language references for faculty and staff: eleven faculty guides and five staff guides grounded in university policy.



Data Classification Tiers

Public · Sensitive · Confidential · Regulated.
Users learn which data can interact with which tool.



Community of Practice

Faculty AI Community of Practice series.
Optional, cross-disciplinary, faculty-led.



University Innovation Learning Hub

<https://www.lamar.edu/university-innovation/learning-hub/index.html>



Policies and Guidelines

<https://www.lamar.edu/university-innovation/policies-guidelines/index.html>

RESOURCES

Research

Select links to review the resources.

EVIDENCE OF THE CHALLENGE

[Voice of the Online Learner, 2025 \(Risepoint\)](#)

[Scarfe et al. \(2024\)](#)

[Corbin et al. \(2026\)](#)

[Stribling et al. \(2024\)](#)

[Luo \(2024\)](#)

[Abou Ali et al. \(2026\)](#)

[Microsoft \(2025\)](#)

[Deloitte \(2023\)](#)

[EAB \(n.d.\)](#)

LEARNING DESIGN AND MOTIVATION

[Bransford & Schwartz \(1999\)](#)

[Priniski et al. \(2018\)](#)

[Ryan & Deci \(2000\)](#)

[Loewenstein \(1994\)](#)

[Schutte & Malouff \(2023\)](#)

[Brauer et al. \(2025\)](#)

[Gajda et al. \(2017\)](#)

[Tight \(2020\)](#)

[Kofinas et al. \(2025\)](#)

AI FLUENCY AND PRACTICE

[Ng et al. \(2021\)](#)

[Long & Magerko \(2020\)](#)

[Aoun \(2017\), Robot-Proof](#)

[Mills \(2026\), Agentic AI: Considerations for Educators](#)

[Lamar University \(n.d.\), AI in Every Program](#)