

FOCUS UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE

Madrid, Spain

AI LITERACY, GENERATIVE AI, AND HUMAN–AI COLLABORATION

Program Developer: Luis Fernando (Lou) Villalba, PhD., EdD.

Course Code:	AIB 501 (Provisional)
Credits:	3 North American Graduate Credits / Proposed 6 ECTS
Academic Level:	Graduate (Master's)
Duration:	14 Weeks
Student Workload:	Approximately 150 Hours (42 Guided + 108 Independent)
Delivery Mode:	Madrid-Based, Online, or Blended
Program/Stage:	Master of Business Administration in Finance / Common Trunk
Professor:	
Office Hours:	[To be determined]
Contact:	[To be determined]

1. Course Description

This common-trunk graduate course forms part of the Master of Business Administration in Finance. It contributes digital capability, business analytics, responsible innovation, and human–AI decision support to a full-function MBA spanning the principal areas of business administration. The common trunk establishes broad managerial competence before students progress to the finance-specialization courses in corporate finance and valuation, investment and portfolio management, financial risk, international finance and development banking, artificial intelligence in finance, and the applied finance capstone.

The course emphasizes generative AI as a probabilistic collaborator rather than an authoritative source. Students learn to formulate tasks, design effective interactions, verify claims and citations, evaluate output quality, recognize bias and uncertainty, protect sensitive information, and document AI use. Human-centred principles guide decisions about augmentation, automation, accountability, accessibility, and meaningful human oversight.

Through comparative tool exercises, evidence audits, workflow prototyping, a midterm examination, and an applied final project, students develop practical competence in human–AI collaboration. By course completion, students will be able to design, test, govern, and communicate an AI-enabled workflow that improves a professional activity while preserving human judgment, ethical responsibility, and measurable value.

2. Course Learning Outcomes

Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:

- LO1. **Explain** foundational AI, machine-learning, generative-AI, foundation-model, and large-language-model concepts in language suitable for professional decision-makers. [Bloom's Level 2: Understand]
- LO2. **Evaluate** AI outputs for factual accuracy, evidentiary support, bias, uncertainty, relevance, and fitness for a defined business purpose. [Bloom's Level 5: Evaluate]

LO3. **Apply** prompting, decomposition, iteration, retrieval, verification, and structured-output techniques to complete professional tasks efficiently and transparently.

[Bloom's Level 3: Apply]

LO4. **Evaluate** the environmental and social sustainability implications of AI across its lifecycle, including energy, water, materials, emissions, labour, accessibility, inclusion, and rebound effects, and compare credible lower-impact alternatives.

[Bloom's Level 5: Evaluate]

LO5. **Create** and defend a human–AI workflow that produces measurable business value while integrating sustainable development, stakeholder value, responsible governance, oversight, implementation controls, and professional communication.

[Bloom's Level 6: Create]

3. Required Materials

3.1 Main Texts and Open Educational Resource (OER)

- Main Text 1: Mollick, E. (2024). Co-intelligence: Living and working with AI. Portfolio.
- Main Text 2 (OER): University of Helsinki & MinnaLearn. (n.d.). Elements of AI. <https://www.elementsofai.com/>

3.2 Supplementary Texts (Non-Open Educational Resources)

- Shneiderman, B. (2022). Human-centered AI. Oxford University Press.
- Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO.
- Autio, C., et al. (2024). Artificial intelligence risk management framework: Generative artificial intelligence profile (NIST AI 600-1). National Institute of Standards and Technology.
- Selected current peer-reviewed articles, model documentation, public evaluations, and professional cases supplied through the LMS.

3.3 Open Educational Resources (OER)

- UNESCO AI Competency Framework for Students: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000391105>
- UNESCO Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693>
- NIST AI Risk Management Framework and Generative AI Profile: <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.600-1>
- NIST AI Resource Center: <https://airc.nist.gov/>
- OECD AI Principles and policy resources: <https://oecd.ai/en/ai-principles>
- European Union Artificial Intelligence Act, including Article 4 on AI literacy: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj>
- Elements of AI open course: <https://www.elementsofai.com/>
- Selected vendor-neutral tool documentation and current model/system cards provided through the LMS.

3.4 Technology Requirements

- Reliable internet connection and Learning Management System access
- Word-processing, spreadsheet, presentation, and process-mapping software
- Instructor-approved generative-AI tools; students will not be required to purchase multiple commercial subscriptions
- Video-conferencing capability with camera and microphone for synchronous sessions and final presentation

4. Assessment Structure

This course combines ongoing AI practice with an individual evidence audit, an independently completed midterm examination, a workflow prototype, and an applied final project. The final project replaces a conventional final examination and culminates in Week 14.

Assessment Component	Type	Weight	Due Date
Participation & AI Practice Lab	Ongoing	10%	Continuous
AI Output Verification Audit	Formative	15%	Week 4
Midterm Examination	Summative	20%	Week 7
Human–AI Workflow Prototype	Summative	20%	Week 11
Final Project: Human–AI Collaboration Portfolio	Summative	35%	Week 14
TOTAL		100%	

5. Grading Scale

This course uses the American University grading scale:

Letter Grade	Percentage	Description
A	93-100%	Excellent; exceptional achievement
A-	90-92%	Excellent work with minor areas for improvement
B+	87-89%	Very good; above average performance
B	83-86%	Good; solid understanding demonstrated
B-	80-82%	Good work with some areas for improvement
C+	77-79%	Satisfactory; meets basic requirements
C	73-76%	Adequate; acceptable understanding
C-	70-72%	Passing but below average
D	60-69%	Minimum passing; significant improvement needed
F	Below 60%	Failing; does not meet course requirements

6. Course Schedule

Week 1: AI Literacy and the Human-Centred Mindset

Topics: Definitions of AI literacy; AI systems in everyday and professional life; human agency; competency expectations; AI as prediction, generation, and decision support

Readings: UNESCO AI Competency Framework, introduction and human-centred mindset; EU AI Act, Article 4

Synchronous: Course orientation; map personal and organizational encounters with AI

Asynchronous: AI literacy self-assessment and professional-use inventory

Week 2: How Contemporary AI Systems Work

Topics: Rules, machine learning, neural networks, training and inference, foundation models, data, parameters, tokens, embeddings, context, and probabilistic generation

Readings: Mollick, selected chapters; Elements of AI, selected modules

Synchronous: Concept-mapping workshop: from data and training to output

Asynchronous: Explain an AI system to a non-technical executive using a visual model

Week 3: Generative AI, Multimodality, and Capability Boundaries

Topics: Text, image, audio, video, and code generation; model capabilities; context windows; hallucination; brittleness; knowledge limits; benchmarking and system cards

Readings: NIST GenAI Profile, Sections 1-2; selected current system cards

Synchronous: Comparative model laboratory across matched tasks

Asynchronous: Capability-and-limitation log using controlled prompts

Week 4: Prompting, Interaction Design, and Iterative Collaboration

Topics: Task specification; context; constraints; examples; decomposition; structured outputs; critique-and-revision loops; prompt limits; reusable interaction protocols

Readings: Mollick, selected chapters; instructor prompt-design guide

Synchronous: Prompt clinic and controlled comparison workshop

Asynchronous: Complete AI Output Verification Audit

Assessment Due: AI Output Verification Audit (15%)

Week 5: Verification, Evidence, and Output Evaluation

Topics: Claim extraction; source tracing; citation checking; calculation testing; rubrics; evaluation sets; confidence and uncertainty; reproducibility

Readings: NIST GenAI Profile, selected risks and measurements; selected evaluation guidance

Synchronous: Fact-checking and evaluation-rubric laboratory

Asynchronous: Build a verification checklist and test it on two AI outputs

Week 6: Responsible Use, Bias, Privacy, Security, and Intellectual Property

Topics: Bias and representational harm; privacy; confidential information; prompt injection; cybersecurity; copyright and attribution; environmental impacts; accessibility

Readings: UNESCO GenAI Guidance; NIST GenAI Profile, selected risk sections; EU AI Act overview

Synchronous: Risk-identification and safeguard-design workshop

Asynchronous: Prepare for midterm through a risk-and-responsibility case set

Week 7: Midterm Examination and Foundational Integration

Topics: Integration of AI concepts, generative-system capabilities, evaluation, responsible use, and human accountability

Readings: Review Weeks 1-6 materials

Synchronous: Individual midterm examination; no generative-AI assistance unless expressly authorized

Asynchronous: Post-examination reflection and correction plan

Assessment Due: Midterm Examination (20%)

Week 8: Human–AI Collaboration and the Jagged Technological Frontier

Topics: Augmentation and automation; centaur and cyborg patterns; capability frontiers; overreliance; calibration; expertise; complementary human strengths

Readings: Dell'Acqua et al. (2026); Shneiderman, selected chapters

Synchronous: Compare human-only, AI-only, and collaborative task performance

Asynchronous: Collaboration-pattern analysis and final-project opportunity scan

Week 9: Task Decomposition and Workflow Architecture

Topics: Process mapping; task boundaries; inputs and outputs; role allocation; retrieval; escalation; exception handling; documentation; value hypotheses

Readings: Shneiderman, selected chapters; NIST AI RMF Map function

Synchronous: Human–AI workflow mapping studio

Asynchronous: Submit final-project proposal and baseline-measurement plan

Week 10: Human Oversight, Decision Authority, and Accountability

Topics: Meaningful human control; decision rights; review thresholds; audit trails; contestability; escalation; responsibility gaps; high-impact contexts

Readings: NIST AI RMF Govern and Manage functions; EU AI Act selected human-oversight provisions

Synchronous: Oversight-and-escalation design laboratory

Asynchronous: Test workflow failure modes and revise controls

Project Milestone Due: Workflow map, risk register, and test plan for formative feedback

Week 11: Tools, Retrieval, Agents, and Workflow Prototyping

Topics: Tool use; retrieval-augmented generation; structured data; agentic patterns; permissions; monitoring; human checkpoints; prototype boundaries

Readings: NIST GenAI Profile, selected actions; current instructor-provided technical notes

Synchronous: Prototype demonstration, peer testing, and red-team review

Asynchronous: Submit Human–AI Workflow Prototype (20%)

Week 12: Organizational Adoption, Skills, Inclusion, and Change

Topics: AI readiness; job and task redesign; capability building; leadership; employee voice; inclusion; accessibility; productivity measurement; adoption failure

Readings: OECD and ILO selected materials on AI and work; UNESCO human-centred principles

Synchronous: Adoption scenario and stakeholder-engagement workshop

Asynchronous: Revise final project using stakeholder and change-readiness analysis

Project Milestone Due: Evaluation results and organizational implementation outline

Week 13: Final Project Studio, Evaluation, and Responsible Deployment

Topics: Integrated testing; baseline comparison; performance measures; error analysis; documentation; AI provenance; deployment readiness; monitoring and review

Readings: Review NIST, UNESCO, EU, OECD, and course materials relevant to the selected project

Synchronous: Final-project studio, peer evaluation, instructor consultation, and oral-defence rehearsal

Asynchronous: Complete draft report, evidence portfolio, AI Usage Statement, and presentation

Week 14: Final Project Presentations, Oral Defence, and Course Integration

Topics: Integration of AI literacy, generative-AI evaluation, human–AI collaboration, responsible use, organizational value, and professional learning

Readings: No new readings; review project evidence and course learning outcomes

Synchronous: Final-project presentations, oral defence, peer learning, and course synthesis

Asynchronous: Submit final Human–AI Collaboration Portfolio and individual reflection

Assessment Due: Final Project: Human–AI Collaboration Portfolio (35%)

7. Detailed Assignment Descriptions

7.1 Participation & AI Practice Lab - 10%

Learning Outcomes Addressed: All course learning outcomes

Description

Active participation is essential because AI literacy develops through disciplined experimentation, comparison, reflection, and dialogue. Students are expected to prepare for synchronous sessions, complete weekly AI practice activities, maintain appropriate records of tool use, test claims rather than accept outputs, and contribute constructively to peer review.

Requirements

- Attend a minimum of 12 of 14 synchronous sessions and participate actively
- Contribute evidence-based observations during demonstrations, evaluations, and case discussions
- Complete weekly practice activities and maintain a concise AI learning log
- Provide respectful, specific, and useful feedback during peer testing
- Follow privacy, security, attribution, and AI-use disclosure requirements

Participation Rubric

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Needs Improvement (1)
Engagement	13-14 sessions with consistently substantive engagement	12 sessions with regular engagement	10-11 sessions with basic participation	Fewer than 10 sessions or minimal presence
AI Practice	Complete, rigorous experiments with transparent records and insightful reflection	Strong practice with minor gaps	Basic practice with limited reflection	Incomplete, opaque, or superficial practice
Peer Contribution	Feedback materially improves peers' evaluation and workflow design	Constructive and relevant feedback	Basic acknowledgment with limited detail	Little or unprofessional engagement
Responsible Conduct	Consistently exemplary verification, privacy, attribution, and disclosure	Responsible conduct with minor lapses	Meets minimum requirements	Repeated or serious responsible-use concerns

7.2 AI Output Verification Audit (Formative Assessment 1) - 15%

Learning Outcomes Addressed: CLO1, CLO2, CLO3, CLO5

Due Date: Week 4

Description

Students conduct a documented audit of a generative-AI response to a professional research or decision-support task. The assignment develops the habit of separating fluent presentation from reliable evidence and provides formative feedback before later workflow assessments.

Requirements

1. Define the task, intended user, decision context, success criteria, and material risks
2. Preserve the material prompts or instructions and the resulting AI output
3. Extract and verify significant factual, numerical, and cited claims using credible original sources
4. Evaluate relevance, bias, uncertainty, omissions, privacy, environmental and social sustainability impacts, and fitness for purpose
5. Revise the interaction and output, explaining how human judgment improved the result

Total Length: 1,500-1,800 words plus annotated output, evidence table, and AI Usage Statement

Format: APA 7 audit report with appendices; submit via LMS as PDF

AI Output Verification Audit Rubric

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Needs Improvement (1)
Task & Record (15%)	Precise task and complete, reproducible interaction record	Clear task and strong record with minor gaps	Basic context and partial record	Unclear task or missing interaction evidence
Claim Verification (30%)	Systematic verification using authoritative original sources and transparent evidence	Strong verification with minor gaps	Basic checking with limited source quality	Claims largely unchecked or sources unreliable
Critical Evaluation (25%)	Nuanced analysis of limitations, uncertainty, bias, sustainability impacts, and fitness for purpose	Sound evaluation of major issues	Basic evaluation with limited depth	Evaluation superficial or credulous
Improvement & Judgment (20%)	Revised workflow and output demonstrate substantial, justified human value	Effective revision with clear rationale	Some improvement with limited rationale	Revision minimal or unjustified
Communication (10%)	Professional, precise, fully cited, and transparently disclosed	Well organized with minor issues	Adequate but uneven	Unclear, poorly cited, or undisclosed AI use

7.3 Midterm Examination (Summative Assessment 1) - 20%

Learning Outcomes Addressed: CLO1, CLO2, CLO3, CLO4

Due Date: Week 7

Description

The individual midterm examination assesses independent mastery of the course foundations. Unless expressly authorized by the instructor for a specific accommodation, students may not use generative-AI tools during the examination.

Requirements

1. Explain key AI, machine-learning, foundation-model, and generative-AI concepts
2. Interpret model behavior, capability limits, and evidence from short scenarios
3. Critique AI outputs for factual, methodological, ethical, and professional weaknesses
4. Recommend human oversight, verification, privacy, and security safeguards
5. Justify when AI should assist, automate, escalate, or remain outside a task

Format: 120-minute examination with applied short-answer, output-audit, and case-analysis questions

Conditions: Individual work; approved reference sheet permitted; generative AI not permitted

Midterm Examination Rubric

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Needs Improvement (1)
Conceptual Mastery (25%)	Accurate, integrated explanations with precise distinctions	Strong understanding with minor gaps	Basic understanding with some errors	Major concepts missing or inaccurate
Output Evaluation (25%)	Detects subtle errors, unsupported claims, uncertainty, and quality issues	Identifies major issues with sound support	Identifies obvious issues only	Accepts unreliable output or misdiagnoses issues
Applied Reasoning (25%)	Insightful application to unfamiliar professional scenarios	Sound application with minor gaps	Basic application with limited transfer	Reasoning unsupported or inconsistent
Oversight & Responsibility (15%)	Safeguards are proportionate, specific, and clearly justified	Practical safeguards with good rationale	Generic safeguards with limited rationale	Safeguards absent or inappropriate
Communication (10%)	Clear, concise, well structured, and professionally reasoned	Clear with minor issues	Understandable but uneven	Unclear or incomplete

7.4 Human–AI Workflow Prototype (Summative Assessment 2) - 20%

Learning Outcomes Addressed: CLO2, CLO3, CLO4, CLO5

Due Date: Week 11

Description

Students design and test a bounded human–AI workflow for a recurring professional task. The prototype must make the division of labour, information flows, human checkpoints, verification methods, safeguards, and measures of success visible and testable.

Assignment Focus

Students may use low-code tools, approved AI platforms, structured documents, spreadsheets, or process maps. Technical complexity is not rewarded by itself; the emphasis is on thoughtful task design, evidence, usability, human control, and responsible implementation.

Requirements

1. Problem statement, user needs, current process, baseline, and success criteria
2. Task decomposition and explicit allocation of human and AI responsibilities
3. Prototype artifacts, interaction protocol, workflow map, and representative test cases
4. Output-evaluation method, verification checkpoints, exception handling, and escalation rules
5. Risk register addressing privacy, security, bias, accessibility, intellectual property, and overreliance
6. Test results, observed failure modes, revisions, limitations, and next-step recommendation

Total Length: 2,000-2,500 words plus prototype artifacts, process map, test evidence, and AI Usage Statement

Format: Professional prototype report and 5-7 minute demonstration; submit via LMS

Human–AI Workflow Prototype Rubric

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Needs Improvement (1)
Problem & Baseline (15%)	Material problem, user needs, baseline, and success measures are precise	Clear problem and measures with minor gaps	Basic problem statement with weak baseline	Problem or value proposition unclear
Workflow Design (25%)	Human and AI roles, boundaries, handoffs, and exceptions are coherent and usable	Strong workflow with minor gaps	Functional workflow with limited detail	Workflow fragmented, opaque, or impractical
Evaluation & Evidence (20%)	Rigorous tests reveal strengths, failures, and measurable performance	Sound testing with useful evidence	Basic tests with limited evidence	Testing insufficient or conclusions unsupported
Safeguards (20%)	Verification, privacy, security, accessibility, and escalation controls are integrated	Relevant safeguards with minor gaps	Generic safeguards with limited integration	Material risks unaddressed

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Needs Improvement (1)
Iteration (10%)	Test evidence drives substantial, well-justified workflow improvement	Effective revision with clear rationale	Some revision with limited rationale	Minimal or unjustified iteration
Professional Quality (10%)	Transparent documentation and a compelling, accessible demonstration	Professional documentation and delivery	Adequate but uneven presentation	Unclear, incomplete, or poorly disclosed work

8. Final Project: Human–AI Collaboration Portfolio (Summative Assessment 3) - 35%

Learning Outcomes Addressed: All course learning outcomes (CLO1-CLO5)

8.1 Project Overview

The final project is the culminating assessment of the course and replaces a conventional final examination. Students design, pilot, evaluate, and defend an AI-enabled collaboration approach for a real or realistic organizational challenge. The project must demonstrate professional value while preserving human judgment, accountability, transparency, and responsible use.

8.2 Project Scope

Each student selects an approved professional process with sufficient access to non-confidential information. The project may refine the Week 11 prototype or address a broader workflow. Students compare the original process with the proposed human–AI approach, test representative cases, document failures and revisions, and present an evidence-based implementation recommendation.

8.3 Deliverables

Written Report and Evidence Portfolio (3,500-4,500 words, excluding appendices)

1. Executive Summary: Challenge, proposed collaboration model, evidence, value, and recommendation
2. Context and Baseline: Users, current workflow, performance, constraints, and success criteria
3. AI Literacy Analysis: Capabilities, limitations, model/tool selection, and assumptions
4. Human–AI Workflow: Task allocation, interaction protocol, human checkpoints, and exception handling
5. Evaluation: Test set, quality criteria, baseline comparison, results, failure modes, and uncertainty
6. Responsible and Sustainable Use: Privacy, security, bias, accessibility, intellectual property, energy and resource impacts, inclusion, and oversight

7. Implementation: Roles, skills, training, stakeholder engagement, resources, measures, and review cycle
8. Reflection and AI Use Record: Decisions, substantive human contributions, limitations, and complete disclosure

Executive Presentation and Oral Defence (15-20 minutes)

- Present during the Week 14 synchronous session
- 12-15 slides or equivalent visual narrative supported by selected project evidence
- Five-minute question-and-answer and oral-defence period following the presentation
- Professional presentation style, clear attribution, and demonstration of individual mastery expected

8.4 Project Timeline & Milestones

Week	Milestone	Deliverable	Weight
Week 9	Project Proposal	Scope, baseline, success criteria, and source plan	Formative feedback
Week 10	Workflow & Risk Review	Process map, controls, and test plan	Peer review
Week 13	Complete Draft & Evaluation	Draft report, artifacts, and test evidence	Instructor feedback
Week 14	Final Submission & Defence	Final portfolio and presentation	35% of final grade

8.5 Capstone Grading Rubric

Written Report (70% of Capstone Grade)

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Needs Improvement (1)
Problem, Baseline & Value (15%)	Compelling problem and transparent baseline support measurable value	Clear problem and value with minor gaps	Basic problem and limited baseline	Problem or claimed value unsupported
AI Literacy & Tool Judgment (15%)	Nuanced understanding of capabilities, limits, assumptions, and tool fit	Strong understanding with minor gaps	Basic understanding with limited critique	Tool use credulous, mismatched, or poorly explained
Collaboration Design (20%)	Human and AI roles form a coherent, usable, and accountable system	Strong design with minor gaps	Functional design with limited integration	Roles or controls unclear and impractical
Evaluation & Evidence (20%)	Rigorous comparative testing supports calibrated conclusions and iteration	Sound evaluation with useful evidence	Basic evaluation with limited testing	Evidence insufficient or conclusions overstated
Responsible Implementation (15%)	Risks, oversight, inclusion, skills, ownership, and review are fully integrated	Practical implementation with minor gaps	Basic implementation with generic safeguards	Material responsibilities or risks omitted
Reflection & Transparency (5%)	Candid, precise reflection and complete AI provenance record	Clear reflection and disclosure	Basic reflection with minor gaps	Opaque process or inadequate disclosure
Professional Quality (10%)	Executive-ready, persuasive, accessible, and fully documented	Professional and well organized	Adequate with presentation issues	Unprofessional or poorly documented

Executive Presentation (30% of Capstone Grade)

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Needs Improvement (1)
Evidence Narrative (30%)	Compelling narrative connects problem, workflow, tests, results, and recommendation	Clear narrative with sound prioritization	Adequate narrative with some gaps	Unclear or unsupported narrative
Visual & Demonstration Quality (25%)	Exceptional visuals and artifacts make the workflow and evidence understandable	Professional visuals support the argument	Basic visuals with limited analytical value	Visuals inaccurate, distracting, or absent
Executive Presence (20%)	Confident, concise, accessible, and audience-responsive	Professional delivery and engagement	Adequate delivery with limited engagement	Unprofessional or ineffective delivery

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Needs Improvement (1)
Oral Defence (25%)	Responses demonstrate independent mastery, calibrated judgment, and intellectual honesty	Sound responses demonstrate strong understanding	Basic responses with some uncertainty	Unable to explain decisions or verify mastery

9. Course Learning Outcomes, Program Outcomes, and Assessment Alignment

Course Learning Outcome	Participation	Verification Audit	Midterm Exam	Workflow Prototype	Final Project
CLO1	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓
CLO2	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
CLO3	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓
CLO4	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
CLO5	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓

Key: ✓ = Addressed | ✓✓ = Primary Focus

10. Course Policies

10.1 Attendance & Participation

Regular attendance and active participation in synchronous sessions are essential for success in this course. Students are expected to attend all scheduled synchronous sessions with cameras enabled. If you must miss a session, please notify the instructor in advance. More than two unexcused absences may result in a reduced participation grade.

10.2 Late Submission Policy

- Assignments submitted within 24 hours of deadline: 10% penalty
- Assignments submitted 24-48 hours late: 20% penalty
- Assignments submitted more than 48 hours late: not accepted without prior approval
- Extensions may be granted for documented emergencies with advance notice

10.3 Academic Integrity

All work submitted must be your own original work. Plagiarism, including the use of AI-generated content without proper disclosure, is a serious academic offense. All sources must be properly cited. Violations of academic integrity will result in a zero for the assignment and may lead to further disciplinary action.

10.4 AI Usage Policy

Artificial intelligence is both the subject of study and a required professional tool in this course. Students must use AI only as authorized for each activity and remain accountable for every claim, decision, source, and submitted artifact.

1. **Assessment Conditions:** The Week 7 midterm examination is completed without generative AI unless the instructor expressly authorizes a specific tool or accommodation.
2. **Transparency and Provenance:** Every AI-assisted submission must include an AI Usage Statement identifying the tools, purposes, material prompts or instructions, outputs used, verification steps, and substantive human revisions.
3. **Verification and Responsibility:** Students must verify AI-generated claims against credible sources, test calculations and outputs, correct errors, and cite original sources rather than treating an AI response as evidence.
4. **Privacy, Security, and Intellectual Property:** Confidential, proprietary, personal, or restricted information must not be entered into public AI systems. Students must respect licensing, copyright, attribution, and institutional data requirements.

10.5 Communication Expectations

The instructor will respond to emails within 48 hours during the work week. For urgent matters, please indicate 'URGENT' in the subject line. Course announcements will be posted on the LMS. Students are expected to check the LMS and their university email daily.

10.6 Accessibility & Accommodations

Focus University Institute is committed to providing equal access to all students. Students requiring accommodations should contact the Disability Services Office and the instructor at the beginning of the term. Reasonable accommodations will be made to ensure full participation in all course activities.

10.7 Netiquette Guidelines

Online learning requires respectful, professional communication. When participating in synchronous and asynchronous discussions, please use professional language, be respectful of diverse perspectives, avoid all-caps (which reads as shouting), and provide constructive feedback. Remember that cultural differences may affect communication styles.

11. Additional Resources

11.1 Library & Research Support

- Focus University Institute Library: Business, technology, legal, and interdisciplinary research databases
- Research Librarian consultations available for evidence verification and major assignments

11.2 Writing & Academic Support

- Writing and Learning Support: Graduate writing, presentation, and study consultations

- APA Citation Guide: Purdue OWL (owl.purdue.edu)

11.3 Technical Support

- IT Help Desk: LMS, account, access, and approved-tool support
- Tool-use, privacy, accessibility, and AI Usage Statement tutorials in the course 'Getting Started' module

11.4 Professional Development

- UNESCO: Human-centred AI competency and generative-AI guidance
- NIST AI Resource Center: AI RMF, GenAI Profile, evaluation, and risk-management resources
- OECD.AI and EUR-Lex: International AI policy, principles, and European regulatory materials

11.5 Suggested Bibliography (APA 7)

Autio, C., Schwartz, R., Dunietz, J., Jain, S., Stanley, M., Tabassi, E., Hall, P., & Roberts, K. (2024). Artificial intelligence risk management framework: Generative artificial intelligence profile (NIST AI 600-1). National Institute of Standards and Technology.

<https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.600-1>

Dell'Acqua, F., McFowland, E., Mollick, E. R., Lifshitz-Assaf, H., Kellogg, K. C., Rajendran, S., Kraye, L., Candelon, F., & Lakhani, K. R. (2026). Navigating the jagged technological frontier: Field experimental evidence of the effects of artificial intelligence on knowledge worker productivity and quality. *Organization Science, Articles in Advance*, 1-21.

<https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2025.21838>

European Parliament & Council of the European Union. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence. *Official Journal of the European Union*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj>

Long, D., & Magerko, B. (2020). What is AI literacy? Competencies and design considerations. *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376727>

Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research.

UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693>

Miao, F., Shiohira, K., & Lao, N. (2024). AI competency framework for students. UNESCO.

<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000391105>

Mollick, E. (2024). *Co-intelligence: Living and working with AI*. Portfolio.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). *Recommendation of the Council on artificial intelligence (OECD/LEGAL/0449)*.

<https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0449>

Shneiderman, B. (2022). *Human-centered AI*. Oxford University Press.

University of Helsinki & MinnaLearn. (n.d.). *Elements of AI*. <https://www.elementsofai.com/>

12. Syllabus Disclaimer

This syllabus represents a plan for the course and may be modified at the instructor's discretion based on pedagogical needs, rapid developments in artificial intelligence, tool availability, regulatory change, or unforeseen circumstances. Students will be notified of significant changes through the LMS and email. Continued enrollment constitutes acceptance of such modifications.

Focus University Institute

Madrid, Spain

© 2026 Focus University Institute. All rights reserved.