

Status: draft — grounds in `handoff/context/c4sight-schools-positioning-and-pricing.md`, `handoff/context/c4sight-schools-sessions-and-lessons.md` (Spine C, Teachers), `deliverables/lessons/teacher-pd-session-plan.md` (the source PD session, including the worked three-levels example), and the Australian Framework for Generative Artificial Intelligence in Schools. Public preview pack — PDF-ready once the open questions at the end are settled.

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

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 either a hype talk or a fear talk. This is neither. It is a working session in two halves, built on one deal:

Half one: the wins. A real teacher time-saver is built live, in front of the room, on a task your staff supply 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. Teachers watch the prompt being written, watch the draft appear, and — this is the part that matters — watch the *edit*, because the tool gets it 80% there and the teacher finishes it. Everyone leaves with the prompt scaffolds in their hand.

Half two: the hard part. The conversation nobody else is having with staffrooms: assessment integrity redesigned so it doesn't depend on catching anyone; the plain truth that **AI detectors do not work** — and why acting on a detector's verdict is a risk to students and to the school; the Australian Framework for Generative AI in Schools translated into staffroom language; and the honest naming of the gap between "our staff had a PD session" and "our school has a position."

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

Two people deliver it. A working AI practitioner who builds these systems for commercial clients, and a registered teacher — the person in the room 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 two-person model is the product.

The safety promise — in every C4Sight session, without exception

- No identifiable student information is entered into any AI tool — live, or as taught practice. Everything demonstrated 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 present throughout, and any camera frames objects — never faces.
 - Everything runs on our own device and connection, never your school network. The live classifier used in student sessions is fully offline.
 - The framing is always augmentation, never replacement.
-

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. First time through takes about fifteen minutes; after that, about five.

It is also, deliberately, a lesson in doing this *safely and professionally*. The two habits built into the steps below — the privacy rule and the verification pass — are the difference between a teacher a school never has to worry about and a headline.

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. This is not C4Sight being cautious: entering a child's identifiable information into a third-party AI system is, at best, a disclosure the school never authorised — and it is usually against 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 becoming the empty version; the level-1 and level-3 instructions force genuine differentiation rather than 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."

Same content, three doors in. Twenty minutes of differentiation work, done in one.

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

The tool drafts. You decide. It will, eventually, hand you something plausible and wrong — and you are 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. Simplification loves to delete.
- Check the facts themselves. You verified the science above because your name is on the lesson, not the tool's.
- Check level 3's vocabulary against what you've actually taught — "richer" is only useful if it's reachable.
- Edit until it reads like you. The version that reaches students is yours: owned, checked, defensible.

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 versions further for particular students, do it **in your own documents, offline** — where the child's name and your professional knowledge of them belong. The tool never sees the join. De-identify, draft, then personalise offline: that method makes AI genuinely useful with nothing sensitive ever leaving your hands.

Troubleshooting

If...	Then...
The three levels feel samey	Name reading levels explicitly ("write level 1 at a Year 2 reading level") and cap the words ("about 60 words per level")
It drifts American	"Australian spelling" is in the scaffold — add "use metric units" for science and maths passages
It adds an impressive extra "fact"	Delete it. This is the verification habit doing its job. Pasting your own source passage (rather than 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 — iteration is normal, not failure

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 is what a staff who've each saved twenty minutes still don't have — and what the session is actually 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 craft narrated so the pattern generalises
The privacy rule, written down	The privacy discipline <i>modelled and coached</i> — including the moment someone starts typing a real student's name and it becomes a teaching point, kindly
The verification habit, described	The habit <i>demonstrated</i> — watching the tool get something confidently wrong, and watching a professional catch it
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 assessment-redesign menu that replaces detection with design
The Framework, referenced	The Framework translated principle by principle into "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 the honest naming of 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 segment leadership

teams consistently value most.

The framework this stands on

Professional learning for staff 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> are a fairness tool; detector verdicts falling hardest on EAL writers are the opposite
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.

Bring it to your staffroom

All prices exclude GST · Perth metro · two presenters.

Format	What it is	Capacity	Price
Staff PD	90 minutes — the full two-half arc, compressed and 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. We don't ask you to take claims on faith. What you can check for 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 is genuine, not borrowed. We produce 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

Open questions for Caleb

- 1. Preview generosity.** This pack gives away one of the four time-savers in full (the levelled passage — the most immediately useful and the safest to self-run) and *names* the other three. Alternative: give all four scaffolds and hold back only the live coaching and half two. I recommend one-in-full — the pack must be genuinely useful alone, but the Prompt Card should stay a thing the session hands you. Confirm.
- 2. Tool-agnostic wording.** The pack deliberately never names an AI product ("any mainstream AI assistant, your own account, check your sector's approved-tools guidance"). Naming products dates the pack and picks fights with sector tool lists; staying agnostic models the Framework's Accountability principle. Confirm that's the standing rule for all public packs.
- 3. The teacher's line.** The credibility strip says the registered teacher "uses these methods on her own reports." That's drawn from the PD plan's framing — confirm she's comfortable with that exact public claim before the PDF ships.

