

## RESEARCH QUESTION

**What leadership structure and support systems predict increased faculty redesign of their assessments considering increased student use of Gen AI?**

## MOTIVATION

- **Dissertation interest:** faculty adoption of AI
- **A different approach** from commonly applied technology adoption models like TAM and UTAUT, which often focus on ease of use
- **Alternate leadership explanations** for the variation in adoption patterns among faculty

## A PRECISE OUTCOME

*Rather than broad descriptions of faculty adoption of AI:*

**Enacted assessment redesign: Do faculty address whether their existing assignments and assessments can effectively measure student learning outcomes in the age of AI, and adapt them as necessary?**

## YOUR TURN

**What led you to redesign, or not redesign, an assessment because of Gen AI?**

*Add a sticky note*

## AREAS BEING EXPLORED

### 01 Loose coupling and faculty discretion

Leadership may provide signals about the desirability of change, but faculty retain high autonomy in their actual practice (Orton & Weick, 1990; Weick et al., 1976).

### 02 Leadership schemas

Different faculty may view the legitimacy of leaders as hierarchical, shared, or distributed (Lizier et al., 2022; Wellman et al., 2022).

### 03 Leader-follower interactions

Legitimacy based on leadership claims and grants, or through trust, sense-giving, or influence by others (peers, support units) (Derue & Ashford, 2010; Laufer et al., 2024; Laufer et al., 2025).

### 04 Support pathways

How teaching centers and instructional designers may interact with formal leaders to enact change, it may not be a linear path (McGrath, 2020; Mihai et al., 2025; Svedmark et al., 2026).

## RESEARCH DESIGN

- Early conceptual study for the dissertation
- Explores perceptions of leadership variation and possible pathways for change through support units like teaching centers
- Interviews across three to four colleges, chosen to assure some differences in directives or guidance on AI

## Who would be interviewed

|                                            |                                                                               |
|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Faculty                                    | What motivated changes to assessments, and what barriers exist                |
| College instructional designers            | Their role in translating leadership signals and implementing goals           |
| University and college leadership          | Messaging from the highest level; consistency and uptake at the college level |
| OTL leadership and instructional designers | How they perform the same translation and implementation tasks                |

## What the faculty interviews look for

- Motivations of those who made specific changes to their assessments
- Barriers for those who did not, or made only minor changes like syllabus statements or rules
- Evidence of denied leadership grants, or other causes of non-uptake: role/identity conflicts, lack of resources, limited guidance
- **In-depth exploration of enacted assessment redesign examples: what changes were made and why (potential construct development for the outcome variable)**