The Obsolescence Continuum

Using the continuum below, reflect on your current source structure, delivery, and assessment design. Select which of the levels below best describes your current practices and consider that delivery, assessment design, student accountability, and AI stance may fall in different levels. Using the two higher levels in the continuum can help you rethink how you teach your course.

Table Continuum

Level 1: Transactional (Static & Rigid)	Level 2: Reactive (Aware but Vulnerable)	Level 3: Transitional (The Reality Check)	Level 4: Integrated (Human-in-the-Loop)	Level 5: Future-Ready (Adaptive & Empowered)
☐ **Delivery & Engagement:** Relying on standard, one-size-fits-all lectures or heavy content delivery disguised as "teaching," which largely ignores research on listening and retention. ☐ **Assessment Design:** Overemphasizing	☐ **Delivery & Engagement:** Class time is still predominantly lecture-based but includes occasional unstructured discussions or passive video viewings. ☐ **Assessment Design:** Faculty recognize that standard assignments are	☐ **Delivery & Engagement:** The course begins moving away from rigid delivery, integrating active learning strategies that acknowledge the unique characteristics of current generations like Millennials and Gen Z. ☐ **Assessment Design:** Outdated modes of	☐ **Delivery & Engagement:** Instruction balances technological tools with intentional human feedback loops and flexible adjustments for diverse student needs. ☐ **Assessment Design:** The "human-in-the-loop" model serves as the essential	☐ **Delivery & Engagement:** Learning environments are highly aligned with future-ready, career-ready capabilities. The course actively prepares students for a Web 5.0/ Web 6.0 landscape by merging digital spaces. AI is a potential learning partner, with

**The above continuum was organized with AI assistance, based on the information researched by Dr. De Leon. Some edits were done to better represent how to view obsolescence.*

lower-order skills through rote memorization, recall tests, and un-scaffolded standard essays that rely solely on factual accuracy. ☐ **Student Accountability:** Assigned readings feature little to no accountability, or utilize low-stakes, factual quizzes that are highly vulnerable to AI automation. ☐ **AI Stance:** Complete rejection or avoidance of AI, operating under a transactional model assuming all students learn and progress through identical pathways.	being automated by AI and large language models but may use AI detection software. ☐ **Student Accountability:** Homework and reading checks are modified marginally (e.g., changing essay prompts slightly), but the core tasks still fail to do not student originality or hybrid human-AI collaboration. ☐ **AI Stance:** Defensively focused on "how to stop students from using AI" rather than adjusting the underlying learning design	assessment undergo a structural change. Faculty introduce elements of localized research, personal connection, or required critical reflection to minimize factual copy-pasting. ☐ **Student Accountability:** AI detection software is not used because they are flawed tools that reports mere probability, can flag non-native English speakers unfairly, and fails when paraphrasing used. ☐ **AI Stance:** Faculty recognize the need for change. The mindset shifts from policing AI to identifying where	safeguard for academic rigor. Assignments are designed so that faculty and students maintain oversight and provide final judgment on AI-assisted outputs. ☐ **Student Accountability:** Students are held accountable through formative tasks, process-based grading to see how ideas evolve, and oral components. ☐ **AI Stance:** AI is treated as a tool that mimics human-like text without real domain expertise, semantic understanding, or common sense. Students are taught	human offered personalized, real-time feedback. ☐ **Assessment Design:** Tasks focus entirely on complex critical thinking, technological problem-solving, and emotional intelligence—areas where algorithmic mathematical logic fails where human judgement does not. ☐ **Student Accountability:** Authentic assessments demand deep disciplinary insight, ethical evaluation, and the synthesis of expert domain logic that AI and LLMs cannot easily do.

**The above continuum was organized with AI assistance, based on the information researched by Dr. De Leon. Some edits were done to better represent how to view obsolescence.*

		assignments overlap with automation.	to actively spot its hallucinations and biases.	☐ **AI Stance:** The course integrates relevant technologies. Instead of teaching the tool, it provides students with the cognitive frameworks and digital and AI literacy needed to evaluate, critique, and problem solve.

Reflection:

In what ways do you feel you are already prepared to

How can you adjust your teaching

Citation: Google. (2026). Google Gemini (May 20 version). [Large language model]. https://gemini.google.com/

**The above continuum was organized with AI assistance, based on the information researched by Dr. De Leon. Some edits were done to better represent how to view obsolescence.*