

Effectv

REALISING THE VALUE FROM AI

Built on your faculty's own work, not on a generic curriculum.

A hands-on AI program for teaching, assessment, research and academic writing. Nothing is designed until we have spoken to you. Most of the room's time is spent working on material your faculty brought with them, and what they do with it afterwards is followed up and reported back to you.

HOW THE PROGRAM IS SHAPED

1

Understand

FUNDAMENTALS

What these tools actually do, in plain language, with no technical background assumed. How to tell whether an answer is correct. What can and cannot go into which tool, and why.

2

Build

HANDS-ON, ON THEIR OWN MATERIAL

Small groups working on a real case, a real question paper, a real reading list, a real draft. Every faculty member builds one working assistant on their own course material.

3

Apply, and track it

NINETY DAYS AFTER THE ROOM CLOSES

What faculty actually did in the three months after: papers submitted, assessments redesigned, course policies adopted. Collected from the faculty themselves and sent to you as a short note.

DELIVERED IN PERSON OR REMOTELY

Whichever suits your calendar and your campuses. The structure, the group work and the assistant each faculty member builds are the same either way.

Nothing is designed until we have spoken to you.

The difference between a session that lands and one that is politely tolerated usually comes down to one thing: whether the examples reflect the work the people in the room actually do. So the content is built after the interviews, not before.

WHAT THAT MEANS IN PRACTICE

Interviews first	Thirty to forty-five minutes each with the dean and the department heads. We ask what the faculty are actually teaching, what they have already tried, and what the institution's own policy position currently is.
A short exercise, before the day	Every attendee opens free accounts on the major tools, runs one short exercise on their own subject, and sends back what they got. That is what the worked examples are built from. It is not a test and it is not used to place anyone.
Every example is theirs	The cases, the assessments and the exercises come from your own faculty's material. Generic examples are the reason most AI training is forgotten within a week.
Rooms split by what people want to work on	Not by seniority and not by how much AI someone has already used. Faculty choose their own room. Nobody is placed, graded or sorted, which matters in a faculty where seniority and tool experience do not run in the same direction.
Up to thirty in a room	That is the upper limit, so everyone's own material actually gets worked on and every question gets answered. Larger faculties run as more than one room.

INCLUDED, AND NOT OPTIONAL

The interviews and the pre-work are part of the program. A faculty that skips them gets a generic program, which is a program we do not want to deliver.

HOW THE ROOM ACTUALLY RUNS

- No explanation block runs longer than about fifteen minutes before the next thing faculty do themselves.
- Groups of four to six, formed by department or subject wherever possible, so the worked example is shared.
- A live demonstration of a real working setup: the facilitator's own AI use, on real work, at full speed, with the mistakes left in.
- Question time is blocked into the agenda twice, in the middle and at the close. It is the part faculty rate highest, and an agenda with no room for it gets interrupted anyway.

THE HONEST NOTE ON THE INTERVIEWS

The interviews are program design. They are not a discovery call wearing a costume, and **we never sell other work inside a program**. If something surfaces that is worth a deeper conversation, it is raised openly after the program, as a separate proposition with its own scope.

Three stages, and the third one runs after everyone goes home.

Most AI training stops when the room empties, which is exactly when the habit either forms or does not. The last of the three stages runs after that.

STAGE 1. FUNDAMENTALS

Plain language, no technical background assumed. What these tools actually do, why three of them give three different answers to the same question, how to check whether output is correct, and what can and cannot go into which tool. Plus a working section on agents: the difference between an assistant that answers a question and an agent that carries out a multi-step task on its own, when to hand work to one, and where the human checkpoints belong.

Consistent across every room, so the faculty ends with one shared baseline rather than several.

STAGE 2. HANDS-ON, ON THEIR OWN MATERIAL

The majority of the room's time. Faculty work in small groups on something real they brought: a case, an assessment, a reading list, a paper draft. The facilitator moves between groups.

- **Everyone builds one working assistant** on their own course material, during the session, not a demonstration of someone else's.
- **Everyone drafts one written position:** a course or programme AI policy and a disclosure position, in their own words.
- Everything faculty do themselves runs on a free account. Nothing needs to be installed or purchased to take part.

STAGE 3. APPLICATION, TRACKED OVER NINETY DAYS

WHEN	WHAT HAPPENS
On the day	Each faculty member names the one task they will hand to AI first, and writes it down. Their own subject, their own words.
Day 30	One short written check-in to every attendee: what did you try, what worked, what broke. Answers go back to them, not only to us.
Day 90	A short note to you on what faculty actually did in the three months: papers submitted, assessments redesigned, course policies adopted. Collected from the faculty themselves.

WHY THE NINETY-DAY NOTE MATTERS

It is the honest measure of whether the program was worth doing. A program that is not measured afterwards is asking to be judged on the mood in the room, which is the least reliable signal there is.

AND ONE THING THAT RUNS ON ALL YEAR

A monthly newsletter for faculty. What is new, what is worth the time, and what faculty elsewhere are doing with it. Everyone in the room is enrolled at the end of the day, for a year. It is the reason the work does not stop when the day does.

Faculty are five roles at once. Each one has its own AI use.

Teacher, course designer, subject expert, administrator, researcher. Most faculty are already picking these tools up on their own, without a shared framework and without knowing what their institution or their publishers require of them. The question is not whether faculty use AI. It is whether that use is confident and correct.

TWO ROOMS. FACULTY CHOOSE THEIR OWN.

Teaching and assessment	Course and session design. Turning a subject into a case or a simulation. An honest look at what students can already produce, and redesigning an assessment so it still tests what it is meant to test. A teaching assistant built on the faculty member's own course material.
--------------------------------	--

Research and academic writing	Literature work without fabricated citations. Drafting support that keeps a paper's own voice. What publishers currently require in disclosure. Multi-step research work.
--------------------------------------	---

Both rooms cover the same core: what the tools do, how to check the output, and building one working assistant. They differ in what the worked examples are made of. The rooms normally run on separate days and are never merged into one.

What your institution and your publishers require comes first, before any hands-on work, because it is the concern that keeps faculty from touching the tools at all. That block sets out the requirements; it does not tell faculty what position to take on them. The day ends with them having drafted that themselves.

WHAT EACH FACULTY MEMBER LEAVES WITH

- One working AI assistant, built during the session, on their own course material, and practical methods for teaching preparation, assessment and research writing.
- A clear picture of what their students can already produce, and what to do about it.
- **A one-page position, in their own words:** what I use, what I disclose, what my journal requires, what my institution requires, what I will not do. Written and signed on the day. Most faculty are not held back by not knowing how. They are held back by not knowing whether what they already do will cause them a problem. This settles it.
- **A place on the monthly faculty newsletter**, for a year.

WHAT THE INSTITUTION LEAVES WITH

- **Your faculty's AI position, first draft.** Ten to twelve pages compiled from what the rooms produce and handed over on the day: each department's drafted course or programme AI policy, and the disclosure position worked out for research. Written by your own faculty, which is the only reason it is worth anything. Dated, and ready to go through whatever approval it needs.
- **The note at ninety days**, on what faculty actually did.

One facilitator, working on real material at full speed.

Rajeev Soni

FOUNDER & CEO · EFFECTV.AI

Eighteen years in product. Global Director, Search and Recommendations at Gartner. Founded SeeQR, later acquired. MBA, Ross School of Business, University of Michigan. Faculty and educator programs are currently running.

The block faculty consistently rate highest is watching a real working setup used on real work, with the mistakes left in. That is a large part of why the program is delivered by the person who actually works this way rather than by a presenter.

We sell no software and hold no vendor partnerships that pay us. What we recommend in the room is what we think is right for your faculty.

WHAT THIS PROGRAM DOES NOT DELIVER

This program builds capability and a working starting point. It does not deliver a finished institutional AI policy, a redesigned curriculum, or ongoing one-to-one research support. Those are real pieces of work, and faculty who want them can be scoped separately, after the program, once it is clear which ones are actually wanted.

The document handed over on the day is a first draft written by your own faculty. It is not an approved policy. This is stated before the program rather than after it, because a proposal that oversells the outcome underdelivers the trust the program runs on.

WHAT WE NEED FROM THE INSTITUTION

- The dean and department heads: thirty to forty-five minutes each, before the program.
- Faculty numbers and departments, so the rooms can be arranged.
- The pre-read exercise completed and returned by attendees, since the worked examples are built from it.
- A room with reliable wifi, or a working video setup if the program runs remotely, and faculty released to attend the full session.
- Confirmation of any existing AI policy for faculty or students, so the program builds around it rather than across it.

NEXT STEP

A short call with the dean or the department heads to confirm faculty numbers, departments, and any existing AI policy we should build around. That sets how the rooms are arranged, and the dates follow.

rajeev@effectv.ai · +1 704 386 9166 · +91 87506 11761 · effectv.ai