THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

Education in the age of AI

Green Paper: The University of Sydney's approach to learning, graduate capability and the student experience

Education and Students Portfolio

Contents

Executive Summary

Generative artificial intelligence (AI) and other emerging technologies represent one of the most consequential transformations in the history of higher education. Unlike previous technological developments, which primarily affected access to information or modes of delivery, AI is reshaping the nature of intellectual work and employment. It is changing how knowledge is produced and validated, and raising the standard for the human capabilities graduates must demonstrate.

This document sets out the University's institutional response to this transformation. It argues that the University of Sydney must act decisively to ensure that learning remains meaningful, assessment provides credible assurance of capability, and qualifications continue to signal trusted value to employers and society. The University has already established national and international leadership in assessment reform and educator-controlled AI systems. This document outlines how that leadership will be sustained and extended across student capability, learning experience, assessment, educator capability, and the broader student experience.

At its core, the University's position is grounded in three imperatives. First, education must continue to develop and value deep human capability, alongside disciplinary expertise, including judgement, creativity, adaptability, learning agility, ethical responsibility, and active contribution to society. Second, that capability must be demonstrable in ways that are robust, transparent, and trusted by students, employers, regulators, and the community. Third, graduates must be prepared not simply to use AI and other emerging technologies, but to work critically and effectively with them. To do this, students must develop an understanding of the ethical, social, and environmental impacts of these technologies and be equipped to contribute responsibly to their use.

The approach outlined in this document reflects both institutional leadership and alignment with broader sector developments. At its core, the framework shifts attention from the production of outputs to the development, demonstration, and assurance of genuine capability. Qualifications must increasingly certify demonstrated capability and prepare graduates for successful participation in an AI-enabled workforce and society. It responds to growing international evidence that AI can enhance learning while also creating the risk of superficial or illusory achievement if not deliberately integrated into curriculum design, assessment, and the student experience. It also reflects a commitment to core principles, including human capability, connection and community, trust, integrity, equity, and relevance.

Rather than incremental change, this document proposes coordinated transformation across five domains:

- The development of student capability through the systematic and embedded development of AI fluency, judgement and responsible use
- The redesign of learning experiences to support active, personalised, and relational engagement
- The evolution of assessment through program-level design and the Sydney Assessment Framework (two-lane approach) for capability development and assurance
- The development of educator capability to design and deliver excellent AI-enabled education, and
- The redesign of the broader student experience, including engagement, support, community, and preparation for employment.

This transformation includes the continued development of program-level assessment models, the use of progression points to assure capability across degrees, the introduction of foundational capability assurance and mastery-based progression, graduation as a final assurance point for graduate capability, the redefinition of graduate qualities and educator capabilities for an AI-enabled world, the embedding of AI fluency across staff and students, and the deployment of educator-controlled technologies, such as Cogniti, to enable scalable, high-quality learning and support.

Without this holistic redesign, there is a material risk that:
- Assessment no longer provides credible assurance of capability
- Student capability becomes uneven, opaque, and difficult to assure
- Prospective and current students will not value or find our degrees relevant
- Educators do not feel enabled to deliver a transformative education
- Trust in qualifications is eroded among employers and the community, and
- The value and credibility of our graduates and degrees decline

This framework also aligns with emerging national priorities, including ATEC and Mission-Based Compacts, by supporting clearer pathways, stronger workforce alignment, greater confidence in graduate capability, and a more integrated, responsive, and capability-focused tertiary education system.

1. Purpose and context

The emergence of generative AI, and other emerging technologies such as robotics and biotechnology, marks a structural shift in the conditions under which education operates. For much of their history, universities have existed within an environment defined by information and cognitive scarcity, with controlled access to knowledge and expertise. In this context, assessment tasks such as essays, reports, and exams could reasonably be used as proxies for student knowledge and capability, because they required sustained individual effort, demonstrated internalised understanding, and reflected skills valued in professional work.

These assumptions no longer hold. The widespread availability of these technologies, and the rapid pace of their development, means that they are already capable of generating coherent, well-structured, and contextually appropriate outputs across a wide range of disciplines, drawing on vast volumes of knowledge and increasingly taking agentic roles. As a result, the production of outputs can no longer be taken as reliable evidence of underlying capability or as relevant preparation for graduate employment. Whilst this paper focuses primarily on the impact of generative AI on the capabilities our graduates need, it should also be recognised that other forms of AI and emerging technologies such as robotics are likely to have similarly profound effects on the ways in which humans learn and work.

This shift raises a fundamental tension in higher education. On the one hand, AI presents significant opportunities to enhance teaching and learning, including personalised guidance, rapid feedback, and new forms of interaction. On the other, it challenges the validity of existing assessment practices and raises questions about whether universities are effectively developing and assuring the capabilities required in a rapidly changing world and for responsible participation in society.

AI does not change the purpose of the University, but it raises the standard for how that purpose is realised. The role of the University is not simply to transmit knowledge or certify participation, but to develop and assure genuine capability. This

requires a more deliberate focus on human capabilities such as judgement, adaptability, and the ability to learn and apply knowledge in context, and to demonstrate these in ways that are credible and trusted, including for leadership for societal benefit.

The challenge is therefore not simply to integrate AI and emerging technologies into existing courses and teaching, but to redesign curriculum, assessment, and the broader student experience so that they remain aligned with these purposes in an AI-enabled world.

2. Institutional position

The University's position reflects a clear recognition that AI is not an optional add-on, but a defining feature of contemporary and future knowledge and practice. It is already shaping how knowledge is created, applied, and shared across disciplines, and its influence will continue to grow.

Ignoring or attempting to exclude AI from learning environments is neither feasible nor desirable. Such an approach would create an artificial separation between education and practice, and leave our graduates uninformed. This would undermine the relevance of our degrees and leave our graduates unprepared for their future professional and societal roles.

At the same time, existing models of assessment are no longer sufficient. When students can generate high-quality outputs using AI, those outputs can no longer be taken as reliable evidence of learning. This does not diminish the importance of developing understanding, writing, analysis, or problem-solving, but it does require a reconsideration of how these are learnt and assessed and what constitutes valid evidence of capability.

These developments lead to a reframing of academic integrity. Rather than being understood primarily as a matter of rule enforcement or misconduct detection, integrity is a design challenge. Our education must and can be structured to assure authentic demonstrations of capability, supported by clear expectations, transparent processes, and appropriate use of technology.

Consistent with this position, the University distinguishes between developing capability and assuring it. When students learn, practice, and receive feedback, AI should be integrated purposefully wherever appropriate to support engagement, feedback, and skill development. When capability is being assured, assessment conditions must provide credible and trusted evidence of individual achievement.

The focus, though, must remain on the development and demonstration of human capability, including judgement, independence, and the ability to apply knowledge responsibly. In this way, the University will ensure that graduates are prepared not only to work critically and effectively with AI and emerging technologies, but to exercise informed judgement and contribute responsibly and to influence their professions and society for good.

The University's ambition is not merely to respond to AI and emerging technologies, but to help shape how they are used in education, professions and society for the benefit of all.

3. Redefining the distinguishing capabilities of Sydney graduates and educators

The AI-enabled world has led to a fundamental shift in the human capabilities most valued in our graduates. The ability to produce outputs is no longer the primary marker of expertise. Instead, the four distinguishing characteristics of Sydney graduates should be:

- Human capacity for judgement, creativity, discovery, empathy, curiosity, resilience, and the ability to apply knowledge in context
- Ability to interpret and apply knowledge in context
- Ability to work effectively with AI and emerging technologies, and
- Ability to be adaptive humans who can thrive and provide leadership for societal benefit, addressing the ethical, social, and environmental impacts of AI and technological change

Appendix 1 reinterprets the University's existing graduate qualities in line with these characteristics, ensuring they remain aligned with an AI-enabled world. Appendix 2 similarly reinterprets the educator capabilities in the Academic Excellence Framework. These reinterpreted capabilities provide the foundation for the University's response. The following principles and domains describe how curriculum, assessment, learning experiences and the broader student experience can be aligned to develop, demonstrate and assure these capabilities.

4. Core principles

The University's approach to AI in education and the student experience is guided by a set of principles that together define a coherent vision for transformation:

1. **Human capabilities:** Learning must be oriented toward the development of human capabilities rather than the reproduction of information. This requires a deliberate focus on higher-order capabilities and dispositions, including judgement, creativity, empathy, curiosity, resilience, and the ability to apply knowledge in context. AI and emerging technologies should be used to support and enhance, not replace, these capabilities, raising the standard for how they are developed and demonstrated. Similarly, AI should support and enhance, not replace, people and human capability.
2. **Connection and community:** Learning is inherently relational, grounded in meaningful interaction between students, educators, and the broader University community. In an AI-enabled environment, the University affirms the central importance of connection, participation, and belonging across the full student experience. AI should be used to personalise education and support, and to streamline transactional activities, creating more time for collaboration, discussion, mentorship, and engagement in community life, including sport, the arts, and co-curricular activities. This approach strengthens engagement, wellbeing, and identity for students.
3. **Trust:** Trust is foundational and must be designed into our education. Curriculum and assessment must provide credible assurance of capability, maintaining confidence among students, employers, and the broader community. In an AI-enabled environment, this assurance requires transparent, well-designed approaches rather than reliance on detection. Trust is also relational: students must have confidence in the fairness and purpose of teaching and assessment; educators must be able to rely on students to engage responsibly; and educators must also have confidence in and exercise control over the AI tools they use in

teaching and learning. Institutional trust requires a further commitment to transparency about how student data is collected, used and governed, including explicit human accountability for AI-informed decisions.

4. **Integrity:** Academic integrity must be embedded in the design of curriculum, assessment, and the student experience. Authentic tasks, transparent expectations, and structured learning processes support environments in which integrity is the natural outcome of participation, rather than an enforced constraint.
5. **Equity:** Equity must be explicitly addressed. AI technologies have the potential both to reduce and to exacerbate disparities. Ensuring equitable access to tools, capability development, and well-designed learning experiences is essential to maintaining fairness and inclusion. Equity also requires that AI fluency be a core expectation for both students and educators, both supported according to their starting point, prior knowledge, and level of familiarity.
6. **Relevance:** Education must remain aligned with the realities of lifelong learning and a rapidly changing world. Graduates will enter careers characterised by continuous change, requiring adaptability, ongoing learning, and the ability to work with emerging technologies. Developing the capacity for adaptation, agility and independent, sustained learning is therefore as important as any specific disciplinary knowledge.

Taken together, these principles represent a shift from a content-centred model of education to a capability-centred model, designed to prepare graduates to work effectively with AI and to contribute responsibly and for societal benefit. This includes understanding and shaping the ethical, social, environmental, and sustainability impacts of technological change.

5. Domains

These domains provide the operational framework through which the University develops, demonstrates, and assures graduate capability in an AI-enabled world.

(a) Student capability

The development of student capability in an AI-enabled world requires a systematic and embedded approach. As with educator capability, this cannot be effectively addressed through isolated or optional learning experiences – although that may be needed in the short term. The holistic development of student capability must be integrated across the student experience, aligned with disciplinary learning, and progressively developed over time.

From digital literacy to AI fluency

The concept of AI fluency extends beyond traditional forms of digital literacy. While digital literacy focuses on the use of tools and information systems, AI fluency encompasses a broader set of graduate qualities related to:

- Effective engagement with AI and emerging technologies
- Critical evaluation of automated outputs, and
- Understanding of socio-technical implications

This approach reflects a shift from interacting with static systems to working alongside dynamic, generative technologies that actively shape outputs and decisions.

A developmental model of student capability

AI familiarity, literacy, and fluency are critical components of student capability and must be embedded across curricula in ways that are both systematic and discipline-specific. Research in this area emphasises the importance of a socio-technical approach, encompassing not only technical understanding but also critical evaluation, ethical awareness, and consideration of broader societal impacts.

Effective use of AI depends on deep disciplinary knowledge and skills. The development of foundational disciplinary knowledge needs to include opportunities for independent practice that are not supported by AI, building the basis for productive engagement with AI tools, interpreting and evaluating outputs and applying critical judgement. It should be noted that as AI changes the disciplines themselves, this includes learning how to use AI within the disciplinary context.

Capability development needs to be deliberately sequenced, with early phases prioritising core knowledge and methods (though, as outlined below, AI-driven tools and artefacts developed using AI may support this process). As students progress, disciplinary-focused AI use can be integrated to support and enhance application and problem-solving. Appropriate scaffolding will build an understanding of when and how to use AI while being able to demonstrate independent performance when required, with sequencing ensuring that AI enhances and does not substitute for genuine learning.

Within this sequenced approach, AI capabilities must be understood as developmental. Students enter the University with widely varying levels of prior exposure and capability, and they must be supported to progress from foundational understanding to advanced application and evaluation.

In the early stages of study, students must develop a basic understanding of what AI systems are, how they function, and where their limitations lie. This includes recognising that AI outputs are probabilistic and may contain errors, biases, or omissions.

As students progress, the focus shifts toward effective interaction. This involves developing the ability to use AI tools productively, including the construction of prompts, the integration of AI into workflows, and the use of AI to support problem-solving and knowledge generation.

Students must develop critical evaluation skills. This includes assessing the reliability and validity of AI-generated content, cross-checking information against authoritative sources, and making informed decisions about when and how to rely on AI.

Finally, students must engage with the broader implications of AI in their discipline and in society. This includes professional approaches and norms for use in their disciplinary context, ethical considerations, impacts on professional practice, and the role of human judgement in AI-mediated contexts.

This developmental approach aligns with contemporary models of AI literacy that emphasise understanding, interaction, evaluation, and contextual awareness as core components of capability.

Embedding AI fluency, judgement and responsible use in curriculum

AI fluency, judgement and responsible use must be embedded within disciplinary curricula, rather than treated as a standalone or generic competency. Each discipline has its own methods, standards, professional contexts, and, where relevant, industry

and accreditation expectations, and AI must be understood in relation to these. It is likely that the disciplines themselves will rapidly evolve leading to new divisions within them, new disciplines and new interdisciplinary interactions.

This curricular approach requires:
- Integration of AI-related learning outcomes into programs
- Development of discipline-specific teaching resources, and
- Alignment of assessment tasks with AI capability development

The Library, in collaboration with the Division of Teaching and Learning and the Learning Hub in the Division of Students, plays a critical role in this process. Its expertise in information literacy provides a strong foundation for extending into AI-enabled knowledge practices, including evaluation, attribution, and the use of AI in research and scholarship. The Library will initially support foundational skills through the development and support of a dedicated module for new students.

Developing judgement and independence
A central challenge in AI-enabled learning is ensuring that students develop independent reasoning, rather than reliance on AI.

AI can support learning, but it can also:
- Reduce cognitive effort
- Bypass critical thinking and disciplinary reasoning
- Reinforce superficial or incomplete learning
- Create overconfidence in the absence of underlying capability, and
- Introduce errors, bias and misinterpretation that students do not have the knowledge to detect

As highlighted by the OECD, amongst others (see Further Reading), there is a risk that students may perform well in AI-supported tasks while failing to develop underlying capability.

The development of reflective judgement and critical reasoning requires deliberate design, including:
- Scaffolding of foundational knowledge and skills prior to AI-supported tasks
- Tasks that require explanation and justification
- Opportunities for performance independent of AI
- Structured reflection on AI use and its limitations, and
- Constructive alignment in the curriculum to ensure that students receive practice and feedback ahead of high stakes assessment.

The two-lane assessment approach supports this design by ensuring that students both develop capability in AI-enabled contexts and demonstrate that capability independently.

Equity and access
Ensuring equitable access to AI tools, re-designed curriculum, fluent educators and capability development is a critical responsibility for the University. Without structured support, there is an educational, reputational and societal risk that students with prior experience, better access to technology and in courses with contemporary design and pedagogy will leverage AI to advance more rapidly, while those without are more likely to use AI to reduce cognitive effort, meaning that disparities in capability will widen over time.

The University must therefore:
- Provide access to approved AI tools for all students
- Ensure consistent expectations across programs and classrooms, and
- Support students with varying levels of prior experience

Preparing graduates for an AI-enabled world
The outcome of this developmental approach is a graduate who can work effectively with AI and emerging technologies, apply sound judgement using deep disciplinary knowledge, adapt to technological change, and contribute responsibly to their profession and society.

(b) Learning experience

Teaching and learning must move from models centred on content delivery toward models focused on capability development. Physical and online learning experiences need to be designed to enable active engagement, application of knowledge in context, and the development of judgement, supported by AI.

Use of AI platforms to personalise and support learning
AI-enabled platforms play a critical role in supporting this shift. The University's development of Cogniti reflects a deliberate commitment to ensuring that AI integration remains aligned with pedagogical intent and that educators and students have equitable access to the best AI models. Unlike generic AI tools, which operate as external systems, Cogniti is designed to allow educators to construct AI-enabled learning experiences that are embedded within their courses, informed by disciplinary knowledge, and steered by explicit instructional design.

This approach enables the creation of customised AI agents that support feedback, interactive inquiry, simulation, and practice-based learning experiences aligned to disciplinary goals. Importantly, Cogniti ensures that educators retain control over how AI is used, addressing concerns about trust, reliability, and alignment with learning outcomes, with effective use requiring ongoing educator judgement to manage the limitations of current AI systems. As we aim to develop educators beyond the early adopters and champions, these principles are key for change management.

AI-enabled learning environments, including those supported by industry-standard tools and Cogniti, provide powerful opportunities to support capability development. They can deliver personalised feedback, create opportunities for structured practice, and enable students to engage with realistic disciplinary and professional contexts. When aligned with clear pedagogical intent, these approaches can support engagement, application of knowledge, and the development of judgement.

Teaching
The learning experience increasingly extends beyond traditional classroom boundaries. AI enables continuous learning through personalised feedback, structured practice, and simulation when deliberately integrated into learning design.

As AI tools increasingly support content delivery, the relational side of learning becomes central to the value and distinctiveness of a university education. Meaningful engagement between students and educators, and among peers, becomes more important for developing judgement, communication, collaboration, belonging, and community.

The shift from information transmission to personalised and interactive learning is likely to change the role and nature of lectures within university education. AI agents are beginning to emerge, including on the Cogniti platform, which can personalise the introduction and development of curriculum topics and support students from different starting points at an appropriate pace. This creates opportunities for learning experiences that are more active, adaptive, and responsive to individual needs.

Plenary lectures will, though, continue to play an important but different role. Bringing larger groups together at key points in the learning journey supports the development of belonging, community, and shared identity, while also providing opportunities to engage with research, industry, and societal challenges.

The increased importance of connection and participation will strengthen the role of small-group learning experiences, including tutorials, studios, laboratories, workshops, and practice-based activities. These environments provide opportunities for discussion, collaboration, feedback, and application of knowledge in context.

These developments will reshape how students experience learning. While the number of traditional contact hours may decline, students are likely to engage in more personalised learning, more small-group interaction, and more opportunities to practise, receive feedback, and apply their learning in authentic contexts.

Curriculum

The distinguishing AI-enabled interpretation of the characteristics and qualities of Sydney graduates are described above and in Appendix 1. Embedding these in our degrees so that our graduates have the capabilities needed requires significant changes to both the structure and the content of our curriculum. Ensuring that each degree provides a coherent pathway for capability development is essential to maintaining the credibility and relevance of degrees. This requires program-level design and a shift away from isolated delivery in units of study. Curriculum design must deliberately sequence capability development, building from foundational knowledge and skills towards the integration, application, and demonstration of graduate capability across a degree.

This coherence needs to be a strong feature of the structural changes being implemented through the Curriculum Quality and Sustainability (CQS) curriculum requirements. Close collaboration will be required across University leadership, faculties, and schools, as well as alignment with professional accreditation requirements where applicable.

A key part of the required redesign goes beyond structure. AI challenges us to rethink what is valuable to learn and assess, and how to embed the distinguishing characteristics and qualities of Sydney graduates across our courses. This rethinking needs to be done in collaboration with industry, employers, professional bodies, schools, TAFE and other education providers, and the broader community. Learning outcomes will need to be re-defined towards the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that prepare graduates for a rapidly changing world. Programs will also need to identify the foundational capabilities that students must develop early in their studies in order to successfully engage with more advanced disciplinary learning and effective use of emerging technologies. The key common graduate qualities will include disciplinary expertise alongside human characteristics such as empathy, curiosity, resilience, self-awareness, and learning how to learn.

As noted above, AI is already catalysing disciplinary self-discovery and this is likely to lead to new disciplines and novel interdisciplinary interactions that must be reflected in our degree portfolio. New disciplinary combinations and interdisciplinary interactions will create opportunities for graduates to address complex societal challenges and provide leadership for societal benefit.

Education models are moving toward greater flexibility, with an increased emphasis on capability-based progression, lifelong learning pathways and greater interaction across all levels of education including primary and secondary schools, TAFE and professional education. This aligns with emerging national priorities, including ATEC and Mission-Based Compacts, which emphasise clearer pathways, workforce alignment, and coordinated delivery. Our curriculum and assessment models must reflect this to position the University to contribute to a more integrated and responsive tertiary system, and a strong and sustainable strategic advantage for the University of Sydney.

(c) Assessment

Assessment design must evolve. The adoption of the two-lane model provides a coherent institutional architecture for separating and securing the dual purposes of assessment: capability development and trusted assurance through:

- Open assessments that focus on development (where AI use is permitted and scaffolded) and
- Secure assessments that focus on assurance (where conditions are controlled)

The model recognises both the value of AI in learning and the need for credible verification of capability. In the two-lane model most assessments perform only one of these functions. Open assessments are primarily designed to support learning and capability development. Secure assessments are deliberately designed to provide assurance and require increasingly high levels of supervision and security. Separating these enables both to be achieved more effectively, reducing staff and student workload and enabling educators to align their design with their purpose.

Crucially, it also supports a shift toward program-level design. Rather than treating assessments as isolated tasks within individual units, we must align assessment across entire programs, ensuring that capability development and assurance are coherent, cumulative, and aligned with the demonstration of graduate capability. Secure assessment should be used deliberately and only where necessary.

Assessment diversification must also be part of this program level approach. Expanding the use of a range of assessment types, particularly those that involve oral communication, practical demonstration, and workplace engagement, strengthens the ability to develop and evaluate capability in ways that are authentic, robust and relevant. A variety of assessment formats is also needed to reflect the different dimensions of the capabilities our degrees certify.

Program-level assessment and progression

Assessment must be designed not only to evaluate learning within individual units of study, but to assure achievement of graduate outcomes across a degree. This requires deliberate progression points at which students demonstrate key capabilities before advancing to more complex learning.

These progression points provide opportunities to:

- Assure foundational capability
- Identify students who require additional support

- Ensure learning and student capabilities develop coherently across a program
- Strengthen confidence in the achievement of graduate outcomes, and
- Support greater mobility and recognition across the broader tertiary education system.

Where capability is assured at carefully selected progression points, other assessments can focus primarily on learning, feedback, experimentation, and capability development. This also reduces unnecessary assessment burden, lowering unnecessary staff and student workload. Ultimately, students should progress through a degree, and graduate, based on development and demonstration of capability rather than simply the accumulation of credit points.

Foundational capability and mastery
Program-level assessment design also creates opportunities for the introduction of foundational capability units, particularly in the early stages of study. These units may focus on essential knowledge, skills, behaviours, and habits of learning that are critical for later success across a degree. Rather than emphasising fine-grained grade differentiation, they can focus on achievement of clearly defined standards, mastery of foundational capability, and readiness for progression.

In an AI-enabled world, foundational capability becomes increasingly important. Students require strong disciplinary knowledge and independent reasoning before they can exercise effective judgement about when and how emerging technologies should be used. Assessment therefore needs to assure not only that students can produce high-quality outcomes, but that they possess the underlying knowledge, understanding, and judgement required to use technology responsibly and effectively. Students who have not developed these foundations may be able to produce sophisticated outputs without developing genuine capability.

Such units may appropriately use "satisfied requirements" (pass/fail) assessment approaches where the primary purpose is assurance of foundational capability rather than ranking student achievement. This reinforces a focus on mastery, feedback, and capability development during transition into university study, while ensuring that later learning can build upon a trusted foundation.

Graduation as the final assurance point
The final progression point within a degree is graduation itself. Graduation must represent more than the successful completion of a collection of units of study. It needs to provide credible assurance that students have achieved the University's threshold standard for graduate capability, graduate qualities, and course learning outcomes.

Program-level assessment creates opportunities to design final assurance activities that evaluate achievement across multiple course learning outcomes simultaneously. These assessments focus on whether students can integrate and apply their knowledge, skills, and judgement in ways that reflect the expectations of graduates entering professional practice, further study, and civic life.

Our approach is the use of mastery or threshold assessments in which students demonstrate achievement of multiple course learning outcomes against clearly defined minimum standards. Rather than relying on graded performance scales, these assessments focus on assurance through threshold judgements, asking whether each outcome has been demonstrated at the required standard. This approach is already built into our Academic Board governance pathways through

integration into the *Comprehensive Course Review* and *Curriculum Amendment* processes, ensuring long term compliance as well as sustainability and consistency.

Achievement of all required outcomes is necessary for successful completion. This approach provides a transparent and defensible mechanism for assuring graduate capability while maintaining alignment with program-level learning outcomes. Such assessments may take a variety of forms, including integrative projects, professional tasks, portfolios, practical demonstrations, capstone experiences, or secure final assessments. The defining feature is that they provide explicit evidence that students have achieved the capabilities expected of graduates. Graduation therefore becomes a meaningful assurance point that strengthens confidence in the quality of University qualifications and the value of Sydney graduates.

Targeting secure assessment
The identification of progression points and foundational capability also allows secure assessment to be used more strategically. Rather than attempting to secure every assessment task, secure assessment can be concentrated at points where assurance of capability is most important, including progression points and graduation. This enables a greater proportion of assessment across a degree to focus on authentic learning, application, creativity, collaboration, and capability development within AI-enabled environments, while maintaining confidence in the integrity and value of University qualifications.

This capability development, primarily through open assessments, must become continuous and integrated. AI-enabled systems provide opportunities to support ongoing feedback, make capability development more visible, and help students understand their progress over time. Assurance of learning must similarly incorporate progression points that validate achievement of key program outcomes and graduate capabilities. Together, these approaches support a model of assessment that develops capability, assures achievement, and strengthens confidence in the value of University qualifications.

Together, open assessments, secure assessments, progression points, and final assurance create a coherent assessment framework that develops capability, assures achievement, and strengthens confidence in the value of University qualifications. The goal is not simply to assess what students produce, but to provide trusted evidence of what graduates know, can do, and are prepared to become.

(d) Educator capability

The transformation required by generative AI depends fundamentally on the capability, confidence, and agency of educators. While technologies, policies, and frameworks are critical enablers, it is educators who ultimately design learning environments, shape engagement, and support the development of student judgement and outcomes.

In this context, professional learning is not a peripheral activity, but a central pillar of institutional change. It must be reconceptualised from a model of episodic training to one of continuous, embedded capability development. In many ways, AI changes what it means to be an academic with a shift in teaching practices from content delivery towards design, facilitation and coaching with significant impacts for promotion, workload and identity. The University should also encourage experimentation, evaluation and continuous refinement of AI-enabled learning designs.

Many of these changes also have implications for research practice, with educators increasingly required to navigate the opportunities and challenges that emerging technologies create across both teaching and scholarship.

Reframing the role of the educator

The emergence of AI necessitates a shift in how the academic role is understood. Historically, educators have been positioned as subject matter experts and deliverers of content. While disciplinary expertise remains essential, contemporary AI-enabled education requires educators to design learning environments that develop capability, facilitate deep engagement, provoke, create ideas and coach judgement and responsible practice. AI therefore reinforces the importance of educators as designers of learning, mentors, and scholarly teachers, rather than simply transmitters of content.

This shift aligns with broader international evidence that generative AI can enhance teaching effectiveness when educators are able to exercise control and apply pedagogical intent, rather than relying on generic or externally defined tools. Professional development requires supporting educators to understand AI, design with AI, and importantly to design with the broad-ranging implications of AI for research, business and humanity in mind.

Building educator AI familiarity and fluency

The development of student capability depends on educators who are confident, informed, and able to exercise sound judgement in the contemporary environment. Educator capability must therefore extend beyond familiarity with particular tools to include understanding how emerging technologies are reshaping disciplines, professions, education, and society.

A comprehensive competency framework of educator fluency includes four interconnected dimensions:

- **Understanding technologies and their limitations.** Educators require a conceptual understanding of AI and other emerging technologies, including how they operate, where they perform well, where they are unreliable, and how they influence learning, assessment, and professional practice.
- **Using technologies appropriately in teaching and disciplinary contexts.** Educators must be able to evaluate when and how emerging technologies can support learning, scholarship, and professional practice. This includes understanding how technologies are being adopted within their disciplines and how graduates are likely to encounter them within their disciplines, professions, and workplaces.
- **Exercising and fostering critical judgement.** Educators must be able to critically evaluate technological outputs, recognise limitations, bias, and error, and make informed decisions about their use. They must also be able to design learning experiences that help students develop the same discernment and judgement.
- **Understanding broader implications for society.** Educators must engage with the ethical, social, cultural, environmental, and professional implications of emerging technologies. This understanding is critical in ensuring that curriculum remains relevant and forward-looking and that students are prepared to contribute responsibly to their professions and to society.

This conception of fluency reflects the socio-technical nature of AI fluency and published literacy frameworks. It recognises that excellence in teaching requires not only familiarity with emerging technologies, but also the judgement, adaptability, and intellectual curiosity needed to respond to ongoing change.

Designing AI-enabled learning environments
A central focus of professional development is enabling educators to design AI-enabled learning environments that are pedagogically rigorous, discipline-sensitive, and aligned with learning outcomes and assessment requirements.

Platforms such as Cogniti provide educators with new opportunities to design learning experiences that are personalised, interactive, and responsive to student needs. However, effective use of these technologies depends on educator judgement. Educators must be able to determine when and how AI can add educational value, where human interaction remains essential, and how technology can best support the development of student capability.

This includes the ability to:
- Design learning activities that align technology use with educational goals
- Evaluate the effectiveness of AI-enabled learning experiences
- Maintain transparency and trust in the use of technology
- Recognise and respond to limitations, bias, and unintended consequences
- Adapt approaches to disciplinary, professional, and student contexts

AI-enabled learning environments may include personalised learning pathways, simulations, interactive learning activities, and AI-supported feedback.

The role of the educator is not simply to adopt these approaches, but to design, evaluate, and continuously improve them in ways that strengthen learning, judgement, and student success. Professional development must therefore provide structured opportunities for educators to:
- Design and test AI-enabled learning activities
- Develop and deploy AI-supported learning experiences
- Evaluate the impact of technology on student learning
- Share effective practice with colleagues.

Over time, this capability will become a defining feature of contemporary teaching practice.

Embedding professional learning in practice
To be effective, professional learning must be embedded within the normal work of educators rather than delivered as a separate or optional activity. Developing capability for an AI-enabled world requires ongoing learning, reflection, experimentation, and adaptation as technologies, disciplines, professions, and educational practices continue to evolve.

This approach includes:
- Integrating professional learning into curriculum redesign and educational innovation activities
- Aligning professional learning with assessment reform and capability development initiatives
- Providing access to exemplars, templates, shared resources, and practical support
- Creating opportunities for educators to evaluate and reflect on the impact of their practice.

Communities of practice, including those for education-focused academics and AI champions, play a critical role in supporting capability development, sharing effective practice, and enabling collegiate cultural change. By creating opportunities for discussion, mentoring, and collaboration, these communities help educators navigate uncertainty, learn from one another, and develop confidence in new approaches. Professional learning must also recognise that capability development is not a one-time activity. As technologies, disciplines, and societal expectations continue to evolve, educators will require ongoing opportunities to refresh, extend, and adapt their practice.

Recognising and supporting educators

The transformation of teaching and learning described in this document requires significant investment of time, effort, and professional learning by educators. New expectations around curriculum design, assessment, student support, and engagement with emerging technologies cannot be achieved through individual effort alone. They require sustained institutional support.

This includes:

- Aligning workload models with expectations for curriculum redesign, assessment reform, and educational innovation
- Recognising teaching excellence, educational leadership, and innovation in promotion and career progression
- Providing dedicated time, resources, and professional development opportunities to support capability development
- Supporting collaboration, mentoring, and the sharing of effective practice across the University.

Institutional systems must recognise that capability development is an ongoing process rather than a one-time transition. As technologies, disciplines, and educational practices continue to evolve, educators will require continued opportunities to develop, refine, and extend their practice.

Without this alignment, there is a risk that transformation will be uneven or unsustainable, with innovation dependent on individual commitment rather than supported systematically across the institution. By recognising and investing in educator capability, the University creates the conditions required for sustained excellence in teaching and learning.

From adoption to leadership

The ultimate goal is not simply to ensure that educators can use AI and other emerging technologies, but to enable them to lead the design of excellent education in an AI-enabled world.

This requires educators who are confident in redesigning curriculum, assessment, and learning environments; who can model curiosity, judgement, adaptability, and lifelong learning; and who can help students navigate the opportunities and challenges created by technological change.

Educational leadership in this context includes:

- Contributing to institutional, sector, and public conversations about the future of education
- Developing and evaluating new approaches to learning, assessment, and student support
- Mentoring colleagues and sharing effective practice

- Engaging with industry, professions, and communities to ensure education remains relevant and future-focused
- Contributing scholarship and evidence that informs educational innovation and policy.

The University is well positioned to build on its existing leadership in assessment reform and educational innovation. By investing in educator capability and supporting educational leadership at all levels, it can help shape the future of higher education in a way that strengthens human capability, supports student success, and contributes to societal benefit.

(e) Student experience

The transformation described in this document extends beyond curriculum, assessment, and formal teaching. It reshapes the broader student experience, including how students study, manage their university affairs, seek support, learn how to learn, unlearn and relearn, and prepare for employment. In an AI-enabled world, the student experience becomes a critical differentiator for universities. Belonging, community, support, personalised guidance and the development of identity are becoming increasingly important components of student success.

Student experience and success must be understood broadly, encompassing learning, support and services, and the wider experience of belonging, community and student life. In an AI-enabled environment we need to develop a coherent ecosystem that seamlessly supports learning, connection and confidence across all interactions with the University.

Students will increasingly expect the University to deploy AI tools to improve the speed, clarity, and accessibility of our services and support. Thoughtful use of AI can reduce friction, improve access to support services, and allow staff capacity to be focused where human expertise adds the greatest value – focussing on relational support to strengthen students' sense of belonging, particularly at moments of pressure or vulnerability.

The University's role is not to shield students from AI, but to prepare them to use it effectively and confidently in learning, work, and society. AI must be implemented as an enabler of connection, supporting timely access and clarity while maintaining human judgement, care, and relationships. When embedded deliberately across learning, support, and service delivery, AI can strengthen confidence, capability, and belonging, enhancing student outcomes and the student experience.

Delivering on this vision requires clear institutional direction. Current approaches are uneven, risking a fragmented student experience. A consistent framework is needed to define expectations, guide implementation, and ensure that AI is deployed in ways that support a coherent student experience across learning, services and student life.

Academic and learning support

The student learning experience increasingly extends beyond formal teaching. Students seek support, feedback, practice opportunities, and guidance through a wide range of interactions with the University. Academic and learning support services therefore play an increasingly important role in helping students navigate their studies, build confidence, and develop effective learning practices in the contemporary environment .

The role of these services is not to duplicate the curriculum, but to complement it. Through the Library, Learning Hub, discipline-specific support, and AI-enabled platforms such as Cogniti, students should be able to access timely, high-quality assistance that supports learning, while remaining aligned with course expectations, assessment requirements, and graduate capability development.

Effective academic support should:
- Provide timely access to guidance and learning resources
- Support students in developing productive study habits and learning strategies
- Assist students in interpreting and acting on feedback
- Help students navigate unfamiliar forms of assessment and learning
- Provide opportunities for practice in a supportive environment, and
- Support students to become increasingly independent and self-directed learners.

AI and other emerging technologies can strengthen these services by providing greater personalisation, accessibility, and responsiveness. Students increasingly expect support to be available when and where it is needed. AI-enabled tools can assist with this by providing immediate access to information, structured practice opportunities, formative feedback, and tailored recommendations for further learning.

The University should therefore develop a coherent ecosystem of academic and learning support that complements teaching, extends access to guidance beyond scheduled classes, and helps students successfully navigate their journey from transition to graduation. This includes ensuring that support is equitable, aligned with curriculum and assessment, and available to students with differing levels of experience, confidence, and familiarity with AI and other emerging technologies.

Supporting effective and responsible student use of AI
As student use of AI expands, clear guidance and support become increasingly important. Students frequently report uncertainty about when and how AI should be used, differing expectations across courses, and concern about making mistakes when using emerging technologies. The University therefore has a responsibility to provide consistent guidance that helps students use AI effectively, responsibly, and in ways that support learning rather than replace it.

Student support should include:
- Clear guidance on appropriate and effective use of AI
- Discipline-specific examples of good practice
- Support for developing productive study habits in AI-enabled environments
- Advice on navigating differing assessment requirements and expectations

This approach deliberately extends support beyond academic integrity. The goal is not simply to prevent misuse, but to help students become confident, informed, and responsible users of AI and other emerging technologies.

An **AI in Education** website, co-designed and written with student partners, is already available and will be continuously updated to ensure it meets these goals.

Embedding AI into academic support services
Academic support services must evolve alongside changes in learning, assessment, and student expectations. Students increasingly seek assistance through digital channels and expect support that is timely, personalised, and available when required. AI and other emerging technologies create opportunities to extend the

reach, responsiveness, and effectiveness of academic support while maintaining alignment with curriculum and assessment.

The University should integrate AI into academic support services in ways that complement, rather than replace, educator and professional expertise. This includes supporting students to develop effective study practices, interpret feedback, evaluate information, improve academic communication, and prepare for unfamiliar forms of assessment.

This approach includes:
- Integrating AI into academic skills development and learning support
- Supporting students to critically evaluate AI-generated information and outputs
- Providing guidance on AI-assisted research, communication, and study practices
- Assisting students to prepare for unfamiliar assessment formats, including oral and interactive assessments
- Providing adaptive support that responds to differing levels of confidence, capability, and prior experience.

AI-enabled tools also create opportunities for new forms of support, including interactive study assistants, personalised learning recommendations, skills diagnostics, and structured practice environments. Services such as those offered through the Learning Hub and Library can leverage these technologies to provide scalable support while maintaining alignment with University expectations and educational goals.

These services must remain accessible, equitable, and connected to the broader student learning journey. Their purpose is not simply to answer questions, but to help students become increasingly capable, confident, and self-directed learners.

Wellbeing, belonging and support
Student success is underpinned by wellbeing, belonging and agency. Students are more likely to thrive academically when they feel connected to their university community, have confidence in their ability to navigate challenges, can access support when needed and are empowered to make informed decisions about their learning and broader university experience. AI should be used to strengthen students' sense of agency, helping them understand their options, make informed choices, develop self-efficacy, and confidently navigate increasingly complex educational and career pathways.

Student wellbeing encompasses mental health and social connection, the ability to seek help when needed, and the capacity to manage the range of pressures involved with tertiary study. The University has obligations to provide timely and effective support across these domains, including proactive referral to academic support services, enrolment advice, counselling and mental health services, welfare and crisis response, disability and inclusion support, and financial hardship assistance.

The role of AI is to assist with providing access to information, highlighting patterns of need, and matching students with the most relevant support. However, wellbeing support cannot and should not be fully automated. AI needs to be used to strengthen, not substitute for, human support, improving coordination between support services and identifying students who may need support earlier. Students must also understand when and why AI is being used and how their data will be handled, building trust with transparency.

While AI brings potential operational benefits, it also brings risks for student wellbeing that need to be reflected in the University's support offerings. Overreliance on AI tools may make students less likely to seek human support, exacerbating existing trends towards social isolation and disengagement. The University must therefore ensure that AI-enabled services have low-friction pathways to human advice and support, and that students know how to access it.

A wellbeing-first approach requires the University to deploy AI in ways that proactively identify students who may benefit from additional support, personalise interventions, and connect students with appropriate services earlier. AI could support case management by summarising student interactions across services, helping staff identify emerging trends in student need, or enabling more coordinated and holistic support. These measures should strengthen, not replace, the human relationships and professional judgement that underpin effective wellbeing support.

The objective is not to automate wellbeing support, but to create a more connected, responsive and personalised student experience. Meaningful human connection, belonging, and participation in university life remain essential contributors to student wellbeing and success.

Community, Student Life and Partnership
In an AI-enabled world, a University of Sydney education must be distinguished by the capabilities students develop and who they become as part of a shared university community. Peer relationships, belonging, co-curricular engagement, student leadership and connection with educators are key to the student experience; they cannot be replicated by AI tools and must not be crowded out.

The University must actively protect what builds community, including co-curricular activities, sports and societies, and student leadership programs. The campus environment and informal spaces need to encourage relationship building. AI should be used to improve information and access, not to replace the experiences.

Student partnership has been key to our response to AI through staff-student panels, presentations to Academic Board and Senate, and co-design of resources and policies. This model should continue to be strengthened and deepened, with students having ongoing input into design, governance and evaluation of how AI is deployed for learning and for their broader student experience.

Many of the capabilities most valued in the contemporary environment , including collaboration, leadership, communication, resilience, and cultural competence, are developed through participation in communities and shared experiences, not through technology alone. This aligns with the University's goal of developing graduates who are not only capable of working in an AI-enabled world, but who are connected to their communities, engaged in public life, and prepared to contribute responsibly to society.

Preparing students for employment
The implications of generative AI for the student experience extend beyond learning and assessment to the conditions under which graduates enter the workforce. Students are increasingly navigating a labour market characterised by rapid technological change, evolving skill demands, and increasing uncertainty in traditional graduate pathways.

Recent international analysis highlights that generative AI is reshaping both the nature of work and the distribution of opportunity. While AI has the potential to

enhance productivity and create new forms of employment, it also raises concerns about the displacement of entry-level roles and the restructuring of early career pathways. In such a context, graduates must be equipped not only with disciplinary knowledge, but with the capacity to demonstrate their value in environments where AI performs many routine cognitive tasks.

As generative AI provides opportunities to reshape and enrich the learning environment, including the provision of targeted co-curricular services and supports, generative AI can be leveraged to support the design and delivery of employability services for our students. The technologies will assist in the development of career-ready skills through the identification of our students' gaps in career-ready capabilities from the point of induction into the university, and aid the provision of personalised employability support services. With the use of emerging platforms, students will be able to access personalised services, delivered at-scale, and complemented by traditional job coaching and career counselling services where effective and needed. The AI-enabled environment will assist students across their academic life-cycle in matching with student placements, internship opportunities and with Work-Integrated and Experiential learning opportunities embedded within the curriculum.

This analysis reinforces the central premise of this strategy: that the University must focus on developing and assuring genuine capability and the qualities defined above.

The student experience must therefore include explicit preparation for this environment. Preparation for an AI-enabled workforce must extend beyond the curriculum. Co-curricular experiences, including student leadership, volunteering, entrepreneurship, sporting and cultural activities, peer mentoring, and engagement with industry and community partners, provide important opportunities for students to develop and demonstrate capabilities such as collaboration, communication, initiative, resilience, and leadership. These experiences will become increasingly important as employers place greater value on capabilities that complement, rather than compete with, emerging technologies.

This preparation includes:

- Connecting learning to professional contexts, through authentic tasks, simulations, and workplace-relevant scenarios
- Supporting students to articulate and evidence their capability, including through assessment, reflection, and feedback
- Strengthening engagement with employers and industry, ensuring alignment between curriculum, capability development, and workforce expectations, and
- Providing guidance on the changing nature of work, including the opportunities and risks associated with AI and automation

There is also a growing need to support students in navigating uncertainty. Reports of contraction in some traditional graduate employment pathways have heightened student concern about future employment prospects. Addressing this concern requires not only enhanced career support, but a clear institutional commitment to developing distinctive human capabilities that remain valuable in an AI-enabled economy.

Importantly, the model of learning and assessment described in this document provides a strong foundation for this preparation. By combining AI-enabled learning (development) with secure demonstration of capability (assurance), the University

ensures that graduates can both develop relevant skills and demonstrate them with credibility.

In this respect, employability is not an additional outcome of the student experience, but a core expression of it. The University's role is not simply to prepare students for existing jobs, but to equip them with the capability, judgement, adaptability, and learning agility required to shape and succeed in the evolving world of work.

Together, these domains ensure that graduates develop the capability to work effectively with AI and to provide leadership for the societal benefit.

Conclusion

AI marks a defining moment for higher education, raising the standard for how capability is developed, demonstrated, and trusted. Through a coordinated approach across student capability, learning experience, assessment, educator capability, and student experience, the University must redesign education to ensure that capability is deliberately developed, authentically demonstrated, and credibly assured. In the contemporary environment , qualifications must increasingly provide trusted evidence of what graduates know, can do, and are prepared to become, rather than simply record participation in learning activities. Students should progress through their degrees, and ultimately graduate, on the basis of demonstrated capability. The purpose of the University is to develop, demonstrate, and assure capability. A Sydney degree should be trusted evidence of that capability.

The transformation requires collective commitment across the University. Faculties, schools, educators, and professional staff must work together to redesign curriculum, assessment, and the student experience in line with the principles and domains set out in this document.

Collectively, we can create a transformative student and educator experience that strengthens human capability, supports leadership for societal benefit, and positions the University of Sydney to lead in an AI-enabled world. In doing so, we can ensure that a Sydney degree remains a trusted signal of capability, character, and potential in a world increasingly shaped by AI and emerging technologies.

Further Reading

- The Castlereagh Statement (2026). Retrieved from **https://castlereagh.ai/**.
- OECD (2023). *OECD Digital Education Outlook 2023*. OECD Publishing, Paris. Retrieved from **https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/2023/12/oecd-digital-education-outlook-2023_c827b81a.html**.**https://unisyd-my.sharepoint.com/personal/adam_bridgeman_sydney_edu_au/Documents/Microsoft Copilot Chat Files/The-Castlereagh-Statement-v1.00-1.pdf**
- OECD (2024). *AI and the Future of Skills, Volume 2*. OECD Publishing, Paris. Retrieved from **https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/ai-and-the-future-of-skills-volume-2_a9fe53cb-en.html**.**https://unisyd-my.sharepoint.com/personal/adam_bridgeman_sydney_edu_au/Documents/Microsoft Copilot Chat Files/The-Castlereagh-Statement-v1.00-1.pdf**
- OECD (2026). *OECD Digital Education Outlook 2026: Exploring Effective Uses of Generative AI in Education*. OECD Publishing, Paris. Retrieved from **https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/oecd-digital-education-outlook-2026_062a7394-en.html.** **https://unisyd-**

my.sharepoint.com/personal/adam_bridgeman_sydney_edu_au/Documents/Microsoft Copilot Chat Files/The-Castlereagh-Statement-v1.00-1.pdf

- Jobs and Skills Australia (2025). *Our Gen AI Transition: Implications for Work and Skills*. Australian Government. Retrieved from https://www.jobsandskills.gov.au/publications/generative-ai-capacity-study-report

Appendix 1. The Sydney graduate qualities in an AI-enabled world

AI and other emerging technologies do not redefine the University's graduate qualities. They raise the standard for how they are developed and demonstrated, strengthening the human capabilities required to lead responsibly and for societal benefit. In the contemporary environment, these qualities are demonstrated through the ability to work critically, responsibly, and effectively with AI and emerging technologies. These qualities increasingly depend on the development of curiosity, discernment and judgement, creativity, discovery, collaboration, courage, responsible citizenship, and learning agility.

Quality	Definition
Depth of disciplinary expertise	Demonstrates deep disciplinary knowledge and skills and the ability to apply these with judgement in contexts where technologies increasingly shape professional and academic practice. Engages critically with key technologies while maintaining intellectual independence and disciplinary rigour.
Critical thinking and problem solving	Critically evaluates information, explores unfamiliar questions and perspectives, and applies sound judgement in complex and uncertain contexts, including when working with technologies to support responsible and effective decision-making. Identifies bias, error, and limitations, and determines when independent reasoning is required and when technology-supported analysis can add value.
Oral and written communication	Communicates clearly and effectively, including in contexts where technology is used to generate, refine, or present ideas. Co-creates with technology, when appropriate, while maintaining clarity of reasoning, transparency of contribution, and the ability to explain, justify, and defend decisions and interpretations.
Information and digital literacy	Demonstrates confident, critical, and responsible engagement with digital technologies while maintaining human agency. Interacts effectively with various technologies; understands their capabilities, limitations, and impacts, and exercises informed judgement in how they are used and applied.
Inventiveness	Applies creativity and innovation to generate, test, and refine ideas in complex contexts and in response to unfamiliar challenges, including in environments where technologies expand possibilities for generating and exploring ideas. Uses technology to augment and advance creative thinking while exercising originality and critical judgement.
Cultural competence	Engages effectively across diverse cultural and global contexts, recognising the broader societal and environmental implications of technologies. Understands how technology impacts different communities, identifies bias and inequity, and applies inclusive and culturally responsive approaches that contribute to equitable outcomes.
Interdisciplinary effectiveness	Works effectively across disciplines and diverse teams, integrating insights from multiple fields in contexts where technologies reshape knowledge and practice. Collaborates

	in interdisciplinary environments while maintaining clarity of perspective and contribution.
Integrated professional, ethical, and personal identity	Acts with integrity, responsibility, and courage, demonstrating ethical judgement and professional accountability including in the use of technology. Recognises the ethical, social and environmental implications of technologies in decision-making and maintains transparency, honesty, and responsibility for outcomes and their broader societal impact.
Influence	Exercises leadership and contributes positively to professional and community contexts. Communicates informed perspectives, collaborates effectively with others, and shapes the responsible, sustainable, and impactful use of emerging technologies for societal benefit.

Appendix 2. The Sydney educator capabilities in an AI-enabled world

New tools, including AI and other emerging technologies, do not redefine teaching excellence. They raise the standard for how educators design learning, support students, assess capability, engage in professional learning, and exercise educational leadership. Collectively these capabilities enable educators to develop, demonstrate, and assure the graduate capabilities required for the contemporary environment.

The University's Academic Excellence Framework (AEF) articulates the core capabilities expected of educators. In an AI-enabled world, these capabilities remain essential and must increasingly be developed and demonstrated through the effective, critical and responsible use of AI and related technologies.

Educator capability	**Interpretation**
Support student learning through appropriate approaches and environments	Designs engaging learning environments that use approaches and tools, including emerging technologies, to build positive learning experiences for students and colleagues. Learning experiences aim to develop student judgement, curiosity, independence, and capability, while maintaining meaningful human interaction, inclusion, and student wellbeing.
Assess and give feedback for learning	Designs assessment that distinguishes capability development and assurance, provides timely and meaningful feedback, and incorporates emerging technologies where they strengthen learning and the demonstration of capability.
Design and plan learning activities and programs of learning	Designs student-centred curriculum and learning pathways that develop disciplinary capability and future-focused graduate qualities, including AI fluency where appropriate. Creates opportunities for students to explore unfamiliar problems, connect ideas across disciplines, and develop creativity, collaboration, and adaptability.
Support and guide learners	Guides students in the responsible, ethical and effective use of AI and other emerging technologies, supporting their confidence, agency, success, and transition to future study and work. Supports students to develop the judgement and courage needed to respond to the ethical, social, and environmental implications of emerging technologies.
Enhance practice through continuing professional development	Engages in ongoing professional learning about education, disciplines, professions, and society, including the opportunities and implications of AI and other emerging technologies. Demonstrates learning agility through continual adaptation, reflection, and improvement, using evidence, scholarship, and emerging practice to inform teaching.
Lead and influence educators and their practices	Leads educational innovation through mentoring, scholarship, and the sharing of effective practice, including the effective and responsible integration of AI and other emerging technologies.

Contact

Division of Teaching and Learning

Education and Students Portfolio

pvc.tl@sydney.edu.au

sydney.edu.au

CRICOS 00026A

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY