A Report for Union Leadership

Facing the AI Future: A Call to Action for Union Leaders

Troy A. Swanson, PhD, MLIS,
Legislative Chair
tswanson@ccctu.org

Executive Summary

Artificial intelligence (AI) is already transforming higher-education workplaces. If we act strategically, AI can *enhance* our work and reaffirm the human mission of education; if we do not, it can erode jobs, autonomy, and academic integrity. This briefing is a roadmap for members of Local 1600 and by extension colleagues across education in IFT and AFT. Our aims are to

1. **Protect existing members** through collective-bargaining language and forward-looking legislation.
2. **Transform work** by championing new employment models—such as team-based "AI apprenticeship" structures—that free educators to do higher-value, creative tasks.
3. **Keep AI aligned with human goals** by insisting on transparency, ethics, and human oversight in every algorithmic decision.
4. **Rethink learning in colleges** so curricula emphasize critical thinking, creativity, and AI literacy for students *and* employees.

Facing the AI Future: A Call to Action for Union Leaders

1 | Why AI Matters Now

A once-in-a-generation labor shock
Generative AI leapt from research labs to mainstream workrooms in late 2022, and investment has exploded since then. Analysts now converge on startling numbers: 92 million jobs are expected to be displaced by 2030 while 170 million new ones will be created requiring new skills. Under more aggressive scenarios that include robotics and advanced automation, the transition could be more stark given that **up to 30 percent of all hours now worked in the U.S. are technically automatable within the decade**. (For additional perspectives see "Trends--Artificial Intelligence" by Mary Meeker, et al)

Why community-college employees feel it first
Colleges are micro-cities: they grade, schedule, advise, market, maintain facilities, and process thousands of micro-transactions daily. Those clerical, grading, and advising workflows map almost perfectly onto the current strengths of AI:

- *Assessment engines* already draft rubric-based feedback and can score short-answer quizzes at near-human accuracy.
- *Chatbots* now handle first-tier student questions—everything from "What's my password?" to "Which math class meets at 10 a.m.?"
- *Predictive-risk dashboards* flag "at-risk" students automatically, shifting pastoral judgment from student development experts to opaque algorithms.

Each tool promises efficiency, but together they threaten to

A. **displace faculty and clerical staff,**
B. **add unpaid 'algorithm-babysitting' duties to faculty workloads, and**
C. **strip professional autonomy if administrators impose systems without shared governance**.

The real risk is *how* change happens
History suggests technology rarely eliminates whole professions overnight; instead it **reshapes jobs, reallocates tasks, and rewrites power relations**. In higher education we can already see three fault-lines:

1. **Job displacement vs. job redesign** – Will AI learning systems *replace* developmental education instructors or free them to teach students more deeply?

2. **Workload creep** – If faculty must verify every AI grade or investigate every false plagiarism flag, automation adds labor instead of removing it.

3. **Loss of democratic control** – Top-down tech roll-outs erode shared governance and can embed bias or profit motives contrary to the college mission.

The Innovation Interim: Opportunities if labor acts now
We are entering an **innovation interim** where rapid change is the norm and the risks for mishandling that change are extremely high. We are moving from the current economic equilibrium to a new equilibrium and the question that faces us is what happens during this interim.

We are entering an **intentional world** where we an intentional world where we can choose how this change unfolds. The same reports warning of displacement also flag a soaring demand for ***new* roles**—AI ethics officers, learning-analytics specialists, prompt-engineering librarians—and for frontline workers who can wield AI responsibly. Whether those roles become *union* jobs with fair pay and standards depends on bargaining units and statehouses today (not in 2030).

Bottom line: AI-driven disruption is inevitable; *its direction is not*.
Unions that bargain for:

- **human-in-the-loop safeguards,**
- **paid reskilling pathways,**
- **and transparent algorithmic governance**

will turn a potential de-humanizing wave into a force that *rehumanizes* education—keeping people, not machines, at the center of community-college work. (See Tim O'Reilly's post, "AI First Puts Humans First")

---

2 | What's at Stake for Union Members

Artificial intelligence potentially does **four** things at once in a college workplace:

1. it removes routine tasks,
2. creates new technical chores,
3. shifts decision-making power upward,
4. and intensifies data collection.

Each of those shifts touches core working conditions—job security, professional respect, workload, and privacy—that are at the heart of every collective-bargaining agreement. Below is a deeper look at the four headline threats and the specific leverage points unions can use to turn risk into opportunity.

2.1 Job Displacement → Job Redesign

What the tech can do
Automated scoring engines can already grade short-answer quizzes and give first review of freshman-composition drafts with passable accuracy and chatbots can now field routine advising questions around the clock. Administrators facing budget pressure may be tempted to "let attrition do the work," leaving vacant positions unfilled and pointing to AI tools as the reason.

Union leverage

- *Contract language*: negotiate a **"no lay-off without paid retraining"** clause plus a guarantee that any AI-generated grade gets human sign-off.
- *Legislation*: support artificial Intelligence legislation at the state and federal level, which requires employee retraining plans that include notice to the union, a retraining plan, and human approval before any AI-induced job change.
- *Joint committees*: insist on an AI-Impact Review Committee with equal labor/management seats to vet every pilot project.

2.2 Devaluation of Expertise → Re-asserting Professional Autonomy

What the tech can do
Generative "courseware" can outline entire syllabi or populate an LMS shell in minutes. If faculty are sidelined, the message to legislators and the public is that *any* content generator can do the work of a professor.

Concrete examples
A dean uploads past syllabi into an AI tool that spits out a turnkey online course and presents it as a cost-saving alternative to instruction (or threatens to replace adjunct instructors). Or a publisher bundles AI-graded homework with its textbook and pressures departments to adopt the bundle.

Union leverage

- Assert **copyright and intellectual-property rights** over faculty-created content so it cannot be fed into proprietary AI models without permission.
- Make **shared-governance sign-off** mandatory for any AI that touches curriculum or assessment.
- Bargain for **stipends or release time** when faculty are asked to "tune" or "prompt-engineer" institutional AI content.
- Lobby for legislation that ensures **human decision makers** are central to the operation of higher education institutions.

2.3 Workload Creep → Workload Transparency

What the tech can do
AI rarely "just works." Faculty are asked to monitor false plagiarism flags, audit auto-grading errors, and troubleshoot chatbots—often with zero extra time or pay.

Real-world ripple effects
A writing instructor now spends countless hours double-checking the bot's essay scores; an advisor fields student complaints when the chatbot gives wrong degree-audit advice. The promised efficiency flows one way—*up* to management.

Union leverage

- Fold every new AI duty into the **workload formula** and attach FTE or stipend values.
- Negotiate a **right to refuse untested tools** until workload impact is jointly assessed.
- Require continuous **professional-development funding** so members can master (not just babysit) emerging systems .

2.4 Privacy, Bias & Surveillance Risks → Algorithmic Accountability

What the technology is already doing
Modern campuses run on data. "Student-success" dashboards can rank incoming students by retention risk; automated résumé-screening tools can shortlist job applicants; keystroke loggers and learning-management analytics can track how long employees linger on each screen. Because these systems are trained on historical data, they replicate the blind spots and inequities hidden in that data—even as they assemble ever-larger dossiers on workers and students.These are just a few examples.

Union leverage points

1. **Bias audits with human appeals**: Insist—both in contracts and in state law—that every predictive model undergo an independent fairness test *before* rollout and that anyone harmed by an algorithm has access to a clear, timely human appeal.

2. **Data-minimization and full disclosure**: Use new Personnel-Record provisions to force the employer to list which data an algorithm consumed, when the model was last updated, and who reviewed each output. No secret scoring.

3. **Grievance trigger language**: Define any opaque algorithmic action affecting workload, evaluation, discipline, or promotion as automatically grievable. If the machine's decision cannot be explained, it cannot stand.

4. **Advance notice and retraining**: Tie every AI deployment to at least 180 days' warning plus fully funded upskilling or redeployment for any position the system might alter.

5. **Human final authority**: Codify that AI outputs are *advisory.* Grades, hiring decisions, and disciplinary actions do not become official until a qualified human signs off.

6. **Workload credit and pay for oversight**: Count AI monitoring, bias-checking, and troubleshooting as compensated professional duties, not invisible "other duties as assigned."

7. **Standing bias-audit requirement**: Make periodic, independent testing part of the life-cycle of every predictive model, with results shared transparently with the union.

---

3 | Union Principles for an AI World

3.1. No Wholesale Outsourcing of Human Work

- **Why it matters** – AI must *augment* educators, counselors, librarians, and support staff, not replace them. Every time a budget crisis tempts management to "let the algorithm handle it," the default union position is *humans first*.

- **Implementation levers** – Require advance notice, a risk assessment, and a retraining plan before any AI-related job change; embed a non-outsourcing clause in the local contract.

3.2. Right to Retire or Reskill

- **Why it matters**: For members within ~5 years of retirement, sudden tech mandates amount to forced early exit; mid-career workers need pathways into the new AI-shaped roles.

- **Implementation levers**: Fight to prevent displacement but if this is not possible, guarantee 180-day notice *plus* paid tuition, release time, or early-retirement options when AI alters duties--outline in legislation and echo in contract language.

3.3. Human-in-the-Loop by Law

- **Why it matters** – Algorithms influencing hiring, promotion, grading, discipline, or dismissal must never render final judgments alone; human oversight preserves due process and academic freedom.

- **Implementation levers** – Statutory requirement for human sign-off on every AI decision; campus forms add a mandatory reviewer line ("Human reviewer of AI output: _____").

3.4. Transparent Data Practices

- **Why it matters** – Members own their data footprints. Knowing which data feed an AI system—and how outputs are used—prevents hidden surveillance and biased scoring.

- **Implementation levers** – FOIA and Personnel-Record amendments to legislation open AI impact assessments to public view; contracts can demand advance notice of any new data pipeline touching personnel files.

3.5. Rehumanizing Work

- **Why it matters** – AI savings should reduce drudgery and restore time for mentoring, creativity, and student support—not accelerate speed-ups.

- **Implementation levers** – Negotiate "AI-efficiency dividends" as release time or creativity grants; require that any productivity gains be measured in *hours returned to human interaction*, not merely cost cuts.

---

4 | Protecting Members: Contract & Legislative Agenda

The best defense against disruptive technology is **to bake protections into the two places where management must listen: the collective-bargaining agreement and the law.** Local 1600 already has draft language and model statutes on the shelf; the task now is to push them across the finish line.

4.1. Contract article — "AI Adoption & Impact Review"

Every AI pilot should move through the same gate that new academic programs do: a **standing, joint labor–management committee** empowered to examine risks and stop deployment if jobs, academic integrity, or student equity are threatened. Local 1600's internal guidance urges chapters to "propose a standing committee on AI that includes faculty, staff, and union representation" so decisions are never made in a silo. .

- *Contract language*: "No AI system shall be introduced without prior review and majority approval of the AI Adoption & Impact Review Committee. The Committee may suspend or modify any deployment pending impact mitigation."

4.2. Job-security clause

Technology shouldn't become a pink-slip machine. State and federal legislation should set a floor for notice of job changes, a human-reviewed impact assessment, and a funded retraining pathway before any displacement. The same standard belongs in our contracts so that *every* community-college employee—tenured faculty, adjuncts, classified staff, and professional staff—enjoys a guaranteed bridge to the next role, not a cliff.

- *Contract language:* "No bargaining-unit member shall be laid off, demoted, or suffer a reduction in hours as a result of AI implementation without (a) 180 days' notice, (b) a college-funded retraining or retirement option, and (c) union concurrence that the plan meets these requirements."

4.3. State-level legislation

Illinois must add sections to the Community College Act and the Higher Education Act to forbid AI-driven job cuts without notice, retraining, and **human sign-off on grading or personnel decisions**. Companion amendments to the Illinois Educational and Public Labor Relations Acts

must **emphasize that AI deployment is a *mandatory subject of bargaining*.** Administrators cannot roll out an algorithm first and talk later .

What we do next:

- Finish bill drafting with coalition partners, then press for spring-session hearings.
- Recruit member storytellers—faculty, advisors, IT staff—to testify how human oversight protects students and equity.

4.4 Federal advocacy

AI is also a national labor issue. The AFT's 2023 resolution demands federal rules that keep humans in control and fund large-scale worker reskilling . Local 1600 can:

- Urge Illinois's congressional delegation to fold "no AI lay-off without retraining" language into the next PRO Act update or parallel legislation.
- Lobby for Department of Labor competitive grants so unions can run **member-led reskilling consortia**—a model already floated in the Roadmap .
- Cite the Writers Guild contract win on AI limits as proof that federal policy can follow labor's lead.

Bottom line: By linking airtight contract clauses to state statutes and federal campaigns, the union builds a three-layer shield:

- campus-level veto power,
- statewide minimum protections,
- and national funding to pay for the transition.

That strategy turns AI from a management shortcut into a union-negotiated upgrade—on our terms, not theirs.

---

5 | Transforming Work: From Automation to *Augmentation*

The four strategies below turn AI from a budget weapon into a workforce accelerator—ensuring the machines do the drudge work while union members climb to more creative, data-rich, and student-centered roles.

5.1 Human-AI Collaboration

The **"Human-AI Collaboration"** approach in a *community college* setting can enhance both teaching and administrative functions by using AI to **augment**—not replace—human expertise. For example, in student services, the goal is to improve access and personalization without diminishing human relationships. For example, in advising and registration, AI can automate scheduling, suggest course sequences, or flag missing prerequisites while human advisors step in for nuanced discussions around academic and career goals. In financial aid & counseling, chatbots and virtual assistants can answer basic questions 24/7 while Human staff handle complex cases, emotional support, and appeals.

5.2 AI-Apprentice Teams

Integrating apprenticeships with AI can be a great way to blend traditional training with modern tech. In this model, apprentices could learn core skills from experienced workers, while also using AI tools for routine tasks. The AI could handle repetitive processes, data analysis, or even provide instant feedback, allowing apprentices to focus on learning complex skills and creative problem-solving. This approach combines the best of both worlds—mentorship and cutting-edge tech—to prepare workers for future jobs. Instead of eliminating a clerical post, for example, the college could re-title it “Learning-Analytics Apprentice” and pair that employee with an experienced advisor who interprets the dashboard and decides interventions. Similar apprenticeship models already succeed in other sectors and are explicitly recommended for emerging tech roles in community colleges. Unions should bargain for **formal ladders and stipends** that make “AI-apprentice” a promotable rung, not a stop-gap. The impact of AI on daily work, presents an opportunity to rethink teams and how we coordinate work.

5.3 AI-Augmented Decision-Making

The **AI-Augmented Decision-Making** model centers on using artificial intelligence to **inform and support human judgment**, not replace it. For example, in curriculum review and assessment, artificial intelligence may work to track learning outcomes and conduct analysis of student work across departments. This could be a way to spot gaps or partners and aid faculty who can interpret results to revise curriculum.

The 2015 paper by Ancona, Isaacs, and Elaine Backman, “Two Roads to Green: A Tale of Bureaucratic versus Distributed Leadership Models of Change” offers insights into ways to

decentralize decision-making. Even though this article focuses on sustainability (and not AI), the authors note that employees in distributed models acting under a shared vision were more able to innovate new ways of working together and spread new ideas across the organization. Given the distributed model of community colleges, this approach with AI-augmentation seems to have fertile ground in which to grow.

5.4 Cross-Craft Innovation Hubs

Good ideas spread faster when faculty, librarians, advisors, professional staff, and administrators share one sandbox. A **cross-craft innovation hub** is a standing group—part makerspace, part community of practice—where workers test AI tools, swap prompt libraries, and co-write data-governance rules. Monthly meet-ups like these already operate informally on some campuses and are highlighted in the Roadmap as a low-cost engine for peer learning and ethical oversight . Formalizing the hub in contract language (with release time and micro-grants for pilot projects) turns experimentation into an institutional habit and keeps union eyes on early failures before they scale.

5.5 The Creativity Dividend

Automation's real promise on campus is *time*—hours no longer spent re-typing rosters or hand-scoring quizzes. Contracts can capture that time as an **"AI-savings dividend"** earmarked for scholarship, course redesign, or high-touch outreach. Road-tested scenarios show that when routine processing in financial-aid or advising goes to bots, staff who remain can pivot to coaching students, running workshops, or innovating curricula—activities that boost retention and morale instead of speed-ups . The bargaining goal: translate every efficiency gain into paid release time or creativity grants, not bigger workload quotas.

5.6 Protecting Against Bias, Hallucinations, and Lack of Context

To protect against bias, hallucinations, and lack of context in AI models, we must use overlapping strategies that will require new positions across all departments. First, regularly audit AI systems for fairness and accuracy. This means checking the data they use and the outcomes they produce. Second, ensure there's human oversight, especially for critical decisions. Humans can catch errors and provide context that AI might miss. Third, prioritize transparency in AI processes, so users understand how decisions are made. Finally, diversify development teams to reduce unconscious biases in AI design.

5.7 Continuous Reclassification

As tasks automate, **job titles must evolve** at the same pace. A “financial-aid processor” might become a “financial-wellness coach & AI-oversight analyst”; an “IT support specialist” could pivot to “AI security specialist.” This kind of reclassification—pairing old domain expertise with new AI stewardship—retains institutional memory while raising the skill ceiling for employees. Bargaining teams should insist on annual joint reviews of job descriptions, automatic pay-grade realignment when AI adds advanced duties, and clear pathways from legacy roles into the higher-value positions that augmentation creates.

---

6 | Aligning AI with Human Goals

Even the strongest job-security language cannot protect members if the actual algorithms deployed on campus undermine equity, privacy, or academic freedom. Aligning AI with human goals requires a values-driven framework that is applied **before, during, and after** every rollout. Four building blocks—ethics, bias testing, shared governance, and community voice—translate those values into daily practice.

6.1. Ethics First

The American Federation of Teachers’ 2023 resolution on AI spells out a simple, union-crafted test for any new tool: **Transparency, Accountability, and Fairness** .

- *Transparency* means the college must disclose what the system does, which data it uses, and how humans can challenge its outputs.
- *Accountability* assigns a named human decision-maker to every algorithmic action—a safeguard echoed in Illinois’ draft “Artificial Intelligence Employment Protections” sections requiring human sign-off for grading or personnel decisions .
- *Fairness* demands evidence that the tool does not systematically disadvantage any protected group.

Embedding this rubric in institutional policy turns lofty ethics into enforceable checkpoints: no AI purchase order, no syllabus plug-in, and no back-office script moves forward until it clears all three tests.

6.2. Bias Audits (and Ongoing Monitoring)

Unchecked algorithms can encode discrimination, flagging first-generation students as “high risk” or mis-scoring non-standard English in writing assignments. Local 1600’s briefing lists bias as a top institutional hazard, warning that it “can perpetuate inequalities in grading, admissions, or resource allocation” . Therefore:

- **Pre-deployment audits** must use *diverse human panels* representing race, gender, disability status, and job role to stress-test the model.
- **Post-deployment dashboards** should surface error rates by demographic slice so problems can be fixed before harm spreads.
- **Contract triggers**: a documented disparate-impact finding automatically pauses the system and activates union–management remediation, leveraging the Personnel-Record and FOIA amendments in the omnibus bill that make audit data public .

6.3. Shared Governance as the Default Operating System

Faculty senates, librarians, advisors, and staff representatives must co-author AI policies, syllabus statements, and acceptable-use rules—not merely comment on them after the fact. Shared governance must ensure that AI remains a supplement, not a substitute, for human relationships, and it must protect data privacy, equity, and academic integrity. Practical steps include:

- A standing **AI Policy Committee** with equal labor–management seats and rotating student observers.
- A **public docket** where every proposed AI tool is logged, with time for comment before purchase.
- Mandatory union endorsement before any AI is infused into curriculum or assessment—turning professional judgment into a contractual guardrail.

6.4. Community Voice—Especially from the Underserved

First-generation, working-adult, and minority students bear the brunt of algorithmic misfires, yet they are often excluded from technical decision-making. Community colleges must ensure all students can access and trust AI tools. Skepticism is highest among those who have felt surveilled or stereotyped by data systems To earn trust:

- **Student focus groups** should run alongside technical pilots, rating whether the tool feels supportive or punitive.

- **Equity impact statements**—short plain-language summaries—should be published for every major deployment.

- **Feedback loops**: grievances, help-desk tickets, and survey data feed back into the Bias Audit cycle, closing the loop between lived experience and algorithm tuning.

---

7 | Rethinking Learning & Curriculum

AI literacy across the core
Just as basic computer skills became a general-education requirement in the 1990s, a working knowledge of artificial intelligence is **now** essential. *Every* program should embed "foundational AI knowledge" so graduates can navigate an AI-infused world regardless of major. Miami Dade College and other schools in a national consortium are already inserting short AI modules into nursing, automotive, and business courses . One initial option to scale this is an interdisciplinary, one-credit seminar—"AI in Society and Work"—paired with discipline-specific assignments (e.g., a marketing student critiques how an AI tool segments customers; a welding student analyzes AI-guided robotic arms). This approach not only prepares students for changing workplaces but also strengthens digital citizenship by teaching ethical use and limits of AI tools.

Critical-thinking reset
Generative AI can now produce B-minus essays and solve routine problem sets in seconds, exposing the weakness of memorization-heavy assessment. Reports warn that if colleges cling to rote assignments they invite cheating *and* fail to instill higher-order skills students will need in the workforce. The remedy is to design assessments that require judgment, reflection, and real-world synthesis—capstone portfolios, peer-reviewed debates, community-based research, and multimodal presentations. When writing is assigned, instructors can ask students to *use* an AI draft transparently and then annotate where the machine fell short, forcing them to articulate original insight. Shifting the question from "Can you recall?" to "Can you reason?" makes human thinking visible and AI plagiarism irrelevant.

Creativity & problem-finding
AI excels at producing variations on existing patterns; humans excel at identifying *which* problems are worth solving and *why* a particular solution matters. Embedding open-ended design challenges—whether prototyping a sustainable campus transport plan or composing a multimedia artwork with AI-generated layers—trains students to frame questions, iterate, and critique outputs. The Roadmap's occupation analyses show that roles growing fastest (data analysts, instructional designers, AI ethics officers) reward exactly this blend of creative problem-finding and technical fluency . Courses can treat AI as a brainstorming partner: the tool

generates options, but students (and faculty) decide what's novel, ethical, and context-appropriate.

Faculty development as the keystone
Curricular change stalls if educators are not confident with the technology. The Roadmap calls professional development "the engine of adaptation," urging colleges to formalize AI training for faculty and staff through workshops, certifications, and learning communities . Contracts should guarantee paid release time for this study—parallel to sabbaticals or course-release for research—and recognize librarians and instructional designers as campus leads on AI information ethics and tool vetting . A faculty member who masters an AI analytics dashboard can, for example, identify at-risk students earlier; a librarian who understands deepfakes can teach source evaluation in a post-truth media landscape. Investing in human expertise ensures that AI augments pedagogy rather than dictating it. State-level support for writing curricula and training faculty should be put in place. The State of Illinois should create working groups to address curricular gaps and resource needs to transform the curricula.

Conclusion – Turning Automation into a Union-Powered Renaissance

Artificial intelligence is already rewriting the boundaries of what machines can do in higher education. What **cannot** be automated, however, is the human mission at the heart of community colleges: fostering discovery, equity, creativity, and solidarity. Everything in this roadmap—contract clauses that outlaw wholesale outsourcing, legislation that embeds a human-in-the-loop, AI-apprentice teams that open new career ladders, creativity dividends that return time to mentoring, curricula that prize critical thinking, and bias audits shaped by student voices—drives toward one larger thesis:

> **If unions lead, AI will not dehumanize work; it will *rehumanize* it.**

That future will not arrive on its own. It will be bargained, legislated, piloted, audited, taught, and—above all—**organized** into being. Local 1600, the Illinois Federation of Teachers, and the American Federation of Teachers now have a coherent strategy:

- **Protect** every member through binding notice, retraining, and no-layoff guarantees.
- **Transform** jobs by redirecting routine tasks to algorithms and elevating humans to roles that demand judgment, empathy, and creativity.
- **Align** every system with transparent, accountable, and bias-free governance co-written by faculty, staff, and students.

- **Educate** the next generation to use, critique, and create with AI—so that technology remains a servant of democratic learning, not its ruler.

The tools are on the table; the statutes are drafted; the bargaining language is ready. What remains is collective will. By acting now—at the negotiating table, in Springfield, in Washington, and in every classroom—we can ensure that each new algorithm deployed on our campuses strengthens quality education, dignified work, and social justice.

Let's write that future *together*—before someone else programs a lesser one for us.

Appendix A: *Roadmap: Action List*

- **Changes to Collective Bargaining Agreements:**
  - **Add an "AI Adoption & Impact Review" article to CBAs.**
    - Guarantee Human Final Authority : AI outputs remain advisory; final grades, hiring, promotion, or discipline require a qualified human sign-off.
    - Establish a **standing joint committee** with veto power over any AI rollout that threatens jobs, academic integrity, or equity.
    - Annual union-management audit of job descriptions; automatic pay-grade bumps when AI adds higher-skill duties (e.g., "financial-aid processor" → "AI analytics specialist").
  - **Lock in a job-security clause**
    - Compensate AI oversight as real work: Bias-checking, model tuning, and troubleshooting folded into workload formulas.
    - Guarantee jobs from displacement when possible. When not possible, establish 180-day notice, college-funded credential program, or optional early-retirement packages.
    - Convert documented AI efficiency gains into **paid release time or creativity grants** (the Creativity Dividend).
  - **Protect intellectual property and curriculum control.**
    - Faculty retain copyright over instructional content; any AI course-generation tool needs **shared-governance approval and a stipend** for faculty prompt-engineers.

- **Rethink the Nature of Work**
  - **Launch AI-Apprentice Teams.**
    - Pair newer staff with AI tools under senior mentorship.
  - **Create Innovation Hubs.**
    - A makerspace–style group where librarians, advisors, IT, and faculty test tools, share prompt libraries, and co-write data-governance rules.

    - **Adopt the AFT's "Transparency–Accountability–Fairness" rubric campus-wide.**
        - No purchase order, syllabus plug-in, or back-office script moves forward until it passes all three tests.

- **Curriculum & Professional-Development Actions**
    - **Embed AI literacy across the core.**
        - Create faculty teams to review and transform the curricula
        - Work at the state and national levels to outline guiding documents to assist in this development.
    - **Redesign assessment for critical thinking and creativity.**
        - Shift from rote essays to project-based, collaborative, and reflective tasks; allow transparent AI use followed by human annotation of machine errors.
    - **Guarantee paid faculty development.**
        - Release time or stipends for AI-pedagogy workshops, certifications, and librarian-led modules on information ethics.

- **Legislative Actions:**
    - **Enact legislation at the state and federal levels that protects employees:**
        - All public sector employee unions should push for legislation that protects public employees and slows the transformation of job duties.
        - Add "no AI lay-off without notice and retraining" language to state and federal laws.
        - Add a human-in-the-loop requirement for significant education decisions (grading, personnel, financial, etc).
        - Champion state and federal algorithmic transparency & fairness laws requiring public colleges to publish bias-audit results and data inventories for every predictive
    - **Win federal and state reskilling money.**
        - Back Department of Labor and NSF grant programs that fund "union-led reskilling consortia" for public-sector workers shifted by AI.
        - Seek a state-level budget lines for **AI apprenticeship/team pilots**.

Appendix B: *Resources & Further Reading*

- *Genesis: Artificial Intelligence, Hope, and the Human Spirit* (2024) by Eric Schmidt, Henry A. Kissinger, and Craig Mundie

- *Co-Intelligence: Living and Working with AI* (2024) by Ethan Mollick

- *Empire of AI: Dreams and Nightmares in Sam Altman's OpenAI* (2025) by Karen Hao
- *AI 2041: Ten Visions for our Future* (2021) by Kai-Fu Lee
- *The Algorithm: How AI Decides Who Gets Hired, Monitored, Promoted, and Fired and Why We Need to Fight Back Now* (2024) by Hilke Schellmann
- *The Alignment Problem: Machine Learning and Human Values* (2020) by Brian Christian
- *Radically Human: How New Technology is Transforming Business and Shaping our Future* (2022) by Paul R. Daugherty and H. James Wilson.
- *What Is ChatGPT Doing … and Why Does It Work?* (2023) by Stephen Wolfram
- "AI First Puts Humans First" by Tim O'Reilly
- "Two Roads to Green: A Tale of Bureaucratic versus Distributed Leadership Models of Change" (2015)by Isaacs Ancona and Elaine Backman
- "Reviving the art of apprenticeship to unlock continuous skill development" (2021) by Lisa Christensen, Jake Gittleson, Matt Smith, and Heather Stefanski
- "This is how businesses should approach reskilling for AI" (2024) by Kathy Diaz
- "Trends--Artificial Intelligence" by Mary Meeker, et al.
- "Superagency in the workplace: Empowering people to unlock AI's full potential" (2025) by Hannah Mayer, Lareina Yee, Michael Chui, and Roger Roberts

---