

Monday Morning AI

Staff PD that starts with your Sunday afternoon — and ends with what your school still has to decide

Series 5 of 5 · Whole teaching staff, K-12 (adults only) · Free preview — C4Sight

In one breath

This is the free preview of our staff PD on AI. It hands your teachers one safe, worked time-saver they can use this week, and shows what the full session covers: the practical wins, plus the harder conversation about detectors, assessment and where your school stands. The full 90-minute session is \$2,200 for up to 60 staff.

This pack is yours to keep and share with your staff. Inside: what the series is, one complete "Monday win" — a worked, safe, copy-ready method any teacher can use this week — and an honest account of what the full session adds.

What this series is

The core question: *What can I actually use on Monday — and what is my school's position on any of this?*

Most AI PD is a hype talk or a fear talk. This one is a working session in two halves.

Half one: the wins. Your staff supply real tasks on the day — a rubric from a task description, report comments differentiated by achievement level, a passage rewritten to three reading levels, a quiz with an answer key. We build one live at the front. Staff see the prompt written and the draft appear, then do the part that matters: the room calls out what's wrong with the draft, because the tool gets it about 80% there and a teacher finishes it. Everyone leaves with the prompt scaffolds in their hand.

Half two: the hard part. Then the conversation nobody else has with staffrooms: how to redesign assessment so integrity doesn't depend on catching anyone; the plain truth that **AI detectors do not work**, and why acting on a detector's verdict puts students and the school at risk; the Australian Framework for Generative AI in Schools put into staffroom language; and an honest look at the gap between "our staff had a PD session" and "our school has a position."

The one big idea: you don't need to fear AI and you don't need to master it. You need a few reliable uses you trust, plus a school-wide agreement on the rest — and this session gets both started.

Two people deliver it. A working AI practitioner who builds these systems for commercial clients, and a registered teacher — someone who can say *"I use this on my own reports, here is how, and here is the line I do not cross,"* and who has actually sat in a moderation meeting. Teachers can tell the difference.

The safety promise — in every C4Sight session, no exceptions

- No identifiable student information goes into any AI tool — not live, not as taught practice. Everything we demonstrate is de-identified.

- No student data in any system. No student images generated or uploaded. Ever.
- In student sessions: no student devices, a school staff member in the room the whole time, and any camera points at objects — never faces.
- Everything runs on our own device and our own connection, never your school network. The live classifier used in student sessions is fully offline.
- We always show AI helping a teacher, never replacing one.

Your Monday win: one passage, three reading levels

This is a complete, worked method from half one of the session — free, because a teacher who tries it once understands the whole series. It turns one factual passage into three versions of itself — below level, at level, extension — with the same key facts in all three. The first time takes about fifteen minutes; after that, about five.

It also teaches you to do this safely. The two habits built into the steps below — the privacy rule and the verification pass — are what make you a teacher the school never has to worry about.

Step 0 — the rule before you start (not optional)

No child's name, no child's writing, no child's marks, no child's photo, no child's diagnosis — nothing that could identify a child — ever goes into an AI tool. Not in the staffroom, not on Sunday at your kitchen table.

This activity is safe because the only thing you paste is **your own passage** — one you wrote, or material your school is licensed to use. Never a student's work. The reason is blunt: entering a child's identifiable information into a third-party AI system is a disclosure the school never authorised, and it usually breaks the tool's own terms as well. The Framework's *Privacy, Security and Safety* principle says the same thing. Work de-identified, always.

Use any mainstream AI assistant, on your own device and your own account — and check your school or sector's guidance on approved tools first.

Step 1 — the prompt scaffold (copy this)

Fill the brackets and paste the whole thing:

"Take this factual passage and rewrite it at three reading levels for a mixed [Year 5] class: (1) below year level, (2) at year level, (3) extension. Keep the same key facts in all three. Shorten sentences and simplify vocabulary for level 1; add richer vocabulary and one more idea for level 3. Australian spelling. Here is the passage: [paste your own passage]."

Why each part is there: naming the year level anchors the pitch. "Same key facts in all three" stops the easy version turning into the empty version. The level-1 and level-3 instructions force real differentiation instead of three near-copies. "Australian spelling" saves you the clean-up.

Step 2 — what good output looks like (a worked example)

Year 5 science, the water cycle, roughly 55 words per level:

- **Below level:** "The sun heats water in oceans and lakes. The water turns into a gas and floats up. High in the sky it gets cold and turns back into tiny drops. The drops make clouds. When the clouds get heavy, the water falls as rain. Then it starts again."
- **At level:** "Heat from the sun causes water in oceans, rivers and lakes to evaporate, turning it into invisible water vapour that rises into the air. As the vapour cools higher up, it condenses into tiny droplets that form clouds. When the droplets grow heavy enough, they fall as precipitation, and the cycle begins again."
- **Extension:** "Solar energy drives evaporation, converting liquid water from oceans, waterways and even plants — through transpiration — into water vapour. As this vapour rises and cools, it condenses around tiny particles to form clouds. Once droplets coalesce and become heavy enough, they fall as precipitation, before collection and run-off return the water to the system, sustaining a continuous cycle."

All three carry the same facts. That's about twenty minutes of differentiation work done in one pass.

Step 3 — the verification pass (this is the habit)

The tool drafts. You decide. Sooner or later it will hand you something plausible and wrong — and you're the one teaching from it. Before anything reaches a student:

- Read all three levels, every time. No skimming.
- Check level 1 hasn't *lost* a fact your lesson needs — simplified versions quietly drop things.
- Check the facts themselves. You verify the science because your name is on the lesson, not the tool's.
- Check level 3's vocabulary against what you've actually taught — "richer" only helps if it's reachable.
- Edit until it reads like you. The version that reaches students is yours: you've checked it, and you can stand behind it.

That last line is the Framework's *Accountability* principle in one sentence — the teacher stays responsible for everything the tool produces.

Step 4 — personalise offline

If you then tailor a version for a particular student, do it **in your own documents, offline** — that's where the child's name and your professional knowledge of them belong. The AI tool never learns which student any version is for. De-identify, draft, then personalise offline: in that order, AI is genuinely useful and nothing sensitive ever leaves your hands.

Troubleshooting

If...	Then...
The three levels feel samey	Name the reading levels outright ("write level 1 at a Year 2 reading level") and cap the words ("about 60 words per level")
It drifts American	"Australian spelling" is already in the scaffold — add "use metric units" for science and maths passages
It adds an impressive extra "fact"	Delete it. That's the verification habit doing its job. Pasting your own source passage (instead of asking it to write from scratch) keeps it anchored and makes this rarer
A level is the wrong length	Ask again with a word count — asking twice is normal

Where else the same scaffold works: a science explanation, a history source introduction, an HASS article, exam-revision notes, a parent-newsletter item written plainly. Same four steps every time: rule, scaffold, verify, personalise offline.

What the full session adds (honestly)

This Monday win is real, and yours to keep. Here's what a staff who've each saved twenty minutes still don't have — and what the session is for:

In this pack	In the full session
One time-saver, worked	All four, built live on your staff's own tasks — rubric, differentiated report comments (the privacy showcase), levelled passages, quiz with answer key — with the prompt-writing narrated so staff can reuse the pattern on their own tasks
The privacy rule, written down	The privacy rule coached in the room — including the moment someone starts typing a real student's name and it becomes a teaching point, kindly
The verification habit, described	The habit run live — the tool gets something confidently wrong in front of everyone, staff try to spot it before it's named, and a professional shows the fix
One line on detectors	The full, evidenced version: why AI detectors do not work , why a detector's verdict is not evidence, and the eight-move menu for redesigning assessment so you don't need detectors
The Framework, referenced	The Framework walked through principle by principle as "so at your school that means..." — with the one-page plain-language handout
A method	The whole-school next step: who needs to be in the room to write your school's position, what the first meeting decides, and an honest look at the gap between "we had a PD" and "we have a policy"
This pack	The staff resource pack: the Prompt Card (all four scaffolds), the "No student data" card, the redesign menu, the Framework one-pager, and the next-step checklist

In the **half-day shape**, teachers also build their own time-saver at tables with the presenters coaching, and faculties redesign one of their *own* assessment tasks against the menu — the part leadership

teams consistently value most.

The framework this stands on

Staff PD doesn't map to student curriculum codes. It maps to the document that actually governs generative AI in Australian schools: the **Australian Framework for Generative Artificial Intelligence in Schools** (developed by the National AI in Schools Taskforce, approved by every Education Minister, and the reference point WA's sector bodies are aligning to). Six principles — here they are in staffroom language, and where this series meets each:

Principle	In plain language	Where this series meets it
Teaching and Learning	AI should make good teaching better, not replace the teacher or the thinking	Every build ends with the teacher's edit; task redesign keeps the thinking where you can see it
Human and Social Wellbeing	AI use must not harm anyone's safety or dignity	No tool ever makes a call about a child without a human in the loop
Transparency	People should know when and how AI is being used	"Be explicit on every task about what's allowed" — for students and staff alike
Fairness	Inclusive, accessible, non-discriminatory	Levelled resources done <i>well</i> help fairness; detector verdicts that fall hardest on EAL writers hurt it
Accountability	Humans stay in charge and stay responsible	The verification pass in your Monday win — the teacher owns every output
Privacy, Security and Safety	Protect student data and comply with Australian law	Step 0. The "no identifiable student information, ever" rule is the Framework and the law, not just good manners

The session also connects to the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers at standard level (assessment and feedback; professional learning; professional engagement), with exact focus-area wording confirmed for any certificate of attendance.

Where we stand on AI

You are about to put this in front of children, so you are entitled to know what the people who wrote it actually think.

We are not AI evangelists. Caleb uses these tools most working days and still would not call himself a fan. It is a drill: you pick it up when it suits the job and put it down when it doesn't. The moment it starts doing your thinking instead of your work, it has stopped being useful. That is the view underneath every one of these packs, and it is why the activities are built to make students sceptical rather than impressed.

Two things we think schools should keep well away from it: **creativity and judgement**. Drafting is labour and a machine can carry some of it. Deciding is different, and a student who never sits in the

not-knowing does not build the muscle that hard problems need later. The struggle was the point of the lesson.

What that means for a C4Sight session, without exception:

- No student devices. Everything hands-on is unplugged, or driven by the presenter.
- No student data is entered into any system, ever.
- No student images are captured, saved or shown. The camera frames only the objects students hold up.
- A school staff member is present throughout.
- The tool runs on the presenter's own device and hotspot, never your network, and the classifier runs fully offline.

And the thing schools least enjoy hearing from us: AI detectors do not reliably work. They flag honest work as cheating and wave real AI writing straight through, and the students who cop it worst are often the ones who speak English as a second language. We will not sell you one, and we will say so in front of your staff. What does work is changing how the task is set, and that is teachable.

All of it is published, dated, and open to being checked: [**c4studios.com.au/how-we-use-ai**](https://c4studios.com.au/how-we-use-ai)

If your school would rather keep AI outside the fence entirely, that is a fair position and we will not argue you out of it. We would rather you knew where we stood before you booked us than after.

Bring it to your staffroom

All prices exclude GST · Perth metro · two presenters.

Format	What it is	Capacity	Price
Staff PD	90 minutes — both halves, compressed but complete	Up to 60 staff	\$2,200
Staff PD, extended	Half day — adds hands-on table builds and a redesign-your-own-task workshop	Up to 60 staff	\$3,400
AI Policy Engagement	Whole-school AI policy, acceptable-use guidelines, assessment-integrity redesign and staff training, aligned to the national Framework	Whole school	From \$5,500
Parent Evening	90 minutes, evening — the same honesty for your families	Any	\$1,400 standalone · \$850 as an add-on

Runs as a twilight, a staff-meeting block, or a pupil-free-day morning. A **Full Day student booking (\$2,850) includes a free 45-minute after-school staff briefing** — a taste of half one. And the **Whole School Day** package (Full Day + Staff PD + Parent Evening) is **\$5,400**, saving \$500.

Or start free

Book the free 30-minute Taster. One class or a short assembly, one presenter, no cost — the fastest way for your leadership team to watch the model work with real students before committing a PD day. The rules: one per school, ever; a decision-maker (Principal, Deputy, HOLA or Digital Technologies coordinator) in the room; and it ends with a scheduled conversation about where AI fits at your school.

→ caleb@c4studios.com.au · c4studios.com.au

Who you'd be booking. You can check all of this yourself. We run a Perth studio building AI automation for commercial clients — real, current work. Our practitioner is a UWA JD (law) student, so the governance, copyright and privacy content comes from actual study. We make the C4Sight explainer series — public work you can watch before you book. And we deliver alongside a TRBWA-registered teacher who uses these methods on her own reports.

C4Sight Schools is a C4 Studios venture · ABN: confirm · Perth, WA
