ACADEMIC TRAINING PROPOSAL / 3-DAY ACCELERATED WORKSHOP

AI Agents & Automation

Design, connect and test useful AI-assisted workflows

DURATION	TRAINING	APPLICATION
3 days · 18 hours	**9 hours · mornings**	**9 hours · afternoons**

A practical learning opportunity

Students encounter AI assistants every day, but many have not yet learned to turn a task into a dependable process. This program bridges that gap. Learners work through a small workflow from problem definition and prompt design to integration, testing and human oversight. The emphasis is on the decisions that make an automation genuinely useful—not on collecting tools or flashy demos.

Over three days, participants progress from a clear use case to one small connected automation. They will not be expected to master the entire agent ecosystem. Instead, they will learn how to set a boundary, build within it, and show whether the workflow behaves as intended.

What participants will take away

FINAL PARTICIPANT OUTCOME

A functioning, bounded automation with an input, an AI-assisted step, a reviewed output and a basic test record.

Who this is designed for

SUITABLE PARTICIPANTS	STARTING POINT
Computer science, IT, engineering, innovation clubs, and students interested in practical workflow building.	Comfort using browser-based tools, files and spreadsheets. Coding is not required for the guided no-code route.

Why it matters to the department

Fits technical skill-development, innovation-cell activities and applied computing initiatives. Student prototypes can seed mini-projects or practical demonstrations without requiring production-system access.

This proposal is intended for academic review. Cohort-specific examples and delivery arrangements can be agreed with the department once there is interest.

02 / ACADEMIC DESIGN

Learning outcomes and evidence

The outcomes below describe work a participant can show at the end of the program. They are deliberately scoped to the available instructional time.

PARTICIPANTS WILL BE ABLE TO...	OBSERVABLE EVIDENCE
Explain where an agent is appropriate	A one-page comparison of chatbot, rule-based automation and agent choices.
Describe a safe automation workflow	A diagram identifying trigger, data, AI action, review and output.
Build a guided integration	A running prototype using sample inputs and one connected tool.
Evaluate a prototype honestly	Three test cases, one failure case and a brief demonstration.

How the workshop runs

SESSION	TEACHING APPROACH	PARTICIPANT EXPERIENCE
Morning · 3 hours	Concepts, worked examples, instructor demonstrations and guided questioning.	Understand the method, challenge assumptions and see a complete example.
Afternoon · 3 hours	Hands-on labs, structured iteration, peer critique and feedback.	Apply the method to a case, improve an artifact and leave with evidence of learning.

Illustrative daily timing: 09:30–12:30 training; 12:30–13:30 lunch (outside contact hours); 13:30–16:30 practice. The essential commitment is six instructional hours per day, split equally between learning and application.

What we will not overpromise

Scope: one guided tool connection, sample data and a classroom prototype. Production deployment, complex multi-agent orchestration and enterprise security configuration are beyond this accelerated format.

How participant work is evaluated

CRITERION	WEIGHT	WHAT REVIEWERS LOOK FOR
Task fit and workflow design	25%	Clear problem, suitable AI step, understandable map
Functional build and integration	35%	Repeatable run with sample data and correct output
Testing and safeguards	25%	Edge cases, review point and limits explained
Demonstration and handover	15%	Concise explanation and usable notes

03 / SINGLE-PAGE TIMETABLE

3-day teaching and practice schedule

Each day deliberately links the morning lesson to an afternoon artifact. The complete timetable is kept together on this page for ease of academic review.

DAY & FOCUS	MORNING TRAINING · 3 HOURS	AFTERNOON PRACTICE · 3 HOURS	DAILY EVIDENCE
DAY 01 **Frame the task**	Agents vs. chatbots; task boundaries; triggers, tools and human review. Turn an everyday process into a simple workflow map.	Build a task-specific assistant with structured instructions and agreed outputs; check it against realistic examples.	Assistant brief + workflow map
DAY 02 **Connect the steps**	No-code workflows; structured responses; connecting forms or sheets; permission and error-handling basics.	Connect a sample input to an AI processing step and a reviewed output. Trace one complete run from start to finish.	Working connected prototype
DAY 03 **Prove it works**	Test cases, false confidence, failures, monitoring basics and when to stop automation.	Run successful and edge cases; refine the workflow; prepare a short demo, evidence log and safe-use note.	Test log + final demonstration

Daily learning rhythm

Explore the idea → see a worked demonstration → practise with feedback → check the output → record what improved. The afternoon closes with an artifact, not only a completed exercise.

Practical emphasis

- One achievable problem is carried across all three days, so participants see continuity rather than isolated tool exercises.
- Each daily artifact is reviewed for usefulness, factual care and the participant's own decisions.
- The final day prioritises demonstration, feedback and an honest statement of limitations.

04 / LEARNING BY DOING

Hands-on studio: what students will actually do

The following activities show the level of work expected in the afternoon sessions. Case material and examples can be aligned with the department while preserving the core learning outcomes.

01 Define before you automate

In pairs, choose a repetitive, low-risk campus or workplace task. Decide what the workflow must never do, what a human needs to approve, and what a good output looks like.

Evidence: A scoped workflow map with explicit approval points.

02 Make one connection count

Using provided examples, create a form- or spreadsheet-triggered process. Learners inspect the input fields, shape the AI response and check the final output rather than relying on a polished demo.

Evidence: A runnable test plus an annotated input/output trail.

03 Break it safely

Teams deliberately test a missing field, an ambiguous request and an unsupported answer. They decide whether to retry, flag for review or stop the workflow.

Evidence: Three recorded tests, one improvement and a clear limitation.

Capstone brief

END-OF-PROGRAM CHALLENGE

A sample enquiry-triage or document-answering assistant with a connected action and an explicit human approval step. The final demonstration shows a normal case, an edge case and one known limitation.

Examples of suitable practice contexts

- Categorise enquiries from a sample spreadsheet and prepare draft replies for approval.
- Answer common questions from an approved, short reference document, while showing the source passage.
- Take a simulated form submission, prepare a structured summary and route it to a human reviewer.

Learning resources and safeguards

An institution-approved AI interface; one accessible no-code automation platform; forms, spreadsheets and approved sample documents. APIs or coding extensions are optional, subject to access.

Use synthetic or approved sample data. No live student records, unattended external messages or production credentials are needed. Every workflow includes a human review or stop condition.

What the institution can expect

Fits technical skill-development, innovation-cell activities and applied computing initiatives. Student prototypes can seed mini-projects or practical demonstrations without requiring production-system access.

The host department may align case studies with the cohort before delivery. This proposal is ready for academic review; program logistics can be discussed separately if it is a fit.