

Build With AI Without Breaking Quality

Pre-design analysis for a professional-development workshop on AI-augmented content development

Prepared by Ehoro Village

Method Pre-design practitioner interviews (n=2)

Audience Corporate L&D + Higher Ed LXD

Background

In advance of designing the workshop, Ehoro Village conducted pre-design needs interviews with two senior learning experience practitioners: a Director of Learning Experience Design at a global enterprise organization and a Senior Learning Experience Designer embedded in a university instructional design office. Interviews consisted of seven open-ended questions targeting current AI use, perceived quality risks, desired behaviors, and barriers to adoption. Findings were synthesized to identify a shared performance gap and to scope the workshop content toward measurable behaviors rather than topics.

Key Findings

1 — Practitioners cannot reliably evaluate AI output quality before delivery.

Both reported difficulty assessing AI-generated content for quality prior to release — including inaccurate scenario feedback, tone misalignment, and assessment criteria that appeared rigorous but lacked pedagogical coherence ("it looks like a rubric; it is not a rubric").

2 — Hesitation concentrates around student- and learner-facing AI use.

Practitioners cited insufficient evidence of long-term learning impact and ethical concerns about substituting AI judgment for human judgment in formative moments.

3 — Governance is an organizational barrier, not a skill gap.

At enterprise scale, data privacy, bias auditing, and IP ownership constrain adoption independent of any individual's capability — placing it outside the scope of a skills intervention.

4 — Both define quality by learner behavior, not surface metrics.

Quality was described in terms of behavior change and intellectual engagement ("does the learner actually change behavior on the job," "productive surprise") — not aesthetics or completion rates. This directly shaped the audit checklist's emphasis on coherence over cosmetic correctness.

5 — AI is already used as a drafting tool — but without a formal audit method.

Both use AI to generate variations for human review rather than as a final producer, and both maintain human judgment at the evaluation stage instinctively — but neither has a structured framework for doing so. The workshop formalizes what they already attempt informally.

Performance Gap

Learning experience practitioners lack a structured method for evaluating AI-generated content at the point of review — before it reaches learners — resulting in output that appears pedagogically sound but may model incorrect behaviors, flatten disciplinary voice, or substitute surface-level rigor for genuine coherence.

"AI can help me execute faster, but it can also let me — or faculty — jump to solutions before we've actually diagnosed the problem."

— Senior Learning Experience Designer, higher education

What We Scoped Out (and Why)

Scoped out	Rationale
Enterprise governance & data privacy	Organizational policy problem, not a skill gap. Training cannot close it.
Student-facing AI ethics	Requires institutional norms and impact evidence beyond a practitioner skills workshop.
Large-scale localization	Depends on organizational infrastructure, not individual technique.

Documenting what was deliberately excluded — and why — keeps the intervention focused on the behaviors a 75-minute workshop can actually change.

Action Map

Business goal: Within two weeks of attending, practitioners apply at least one element of the Frame → Generate → Audit → Log framework to a real content task in their own work.

Target behaviors:

- Define objective, audience, constraints, and quality criteria before prompting (Frame)
- Generate AI output using structured prompts, then iterate (Generate)
- Evaluate output against an explicit seven-item checklist before delivery (Audit)
- Document decisions and rationale to create a reproducible record (Log)

Minimum content: Only what is needed to perform the audit — the seven checklist criteria, derived directly from the failure modes practitioners named — plus brief prompt-framing and logging guidance. Everything else was cut.

Design Implications

- The **Audit** step receives the most workshop time (15 min vs. 10) — it is the core skill gap and the central IP.
- The workshop is built as a **performance task**: participants apply the full loop to their own real content, not a hypothetical.

- Pre/post measurement is designed in from the start to capture a Level 2 learning delta and seed a Level 3 behavioral follow-up.