PROGRAM: 2026 Cogniti Mini-Symposium – Tuesday 17 November 2026

All times are in Sydney time (Australian Eastern Daylight Time, UTC+11)

	Stream 1	**Stream 2**	**Stream 3**
	Developing decision making skills	***Rehearsing hard conversations***	***Serious play: learning in character***
9:15	**[S1C1T1] The vibe-coding educator: Building your own simulations with Cogniti mini-apps** Mark Freeman, Mylene Struijk, Shenoli Perera and Yuheng Cao *The University of Sydney* We turned to mini-apps to build project management simulations, ethical dilemmas, stakeholder negotiations and decision-making environments, as well as turning a paper-based tutorial game into a Mars colony simulation, in which Master of Commerce teams govern a new society and live with the consequences of their decisions on surveillance, automation and data use. Ironically, an app written with AI produced the first class in which our students were deeply engaged without using AI themselves. I'll reflect on what happens when educators become creators of their own educational technology, and you'll leave ready to build your own.	**[S2C1T1] Low-stakes practice for high-stakes skills: Cogniti in CBT training for psychiatry residents** Petal Abdool *University of Toronto* I use Cogniti to give psychiatry residents on-demand practice in core CBT skills (formulation, Socratic questioning and cognitive restructuring) alongside faculty-led teaching and supervision. Preliminary feedback has been positive, with residents describing a low-pressure space to practise and sharpen their questioning, and reporting clinically accurate support for their learning. I'll also discuss a challenge familiar to anyone teaching busy clinicians: recruiting learners amid competing commitments. You'll get a glimpse of Cogniti in postgraduate mental health education, and ideas for complementing supervision with repeated practice.	**[S3C1T1] Students as agent designers: Toxicology personas in Cogniti Sandbox** Gurnit Kaur, Michelle Arnot and Koshiro Nonaka *University of Toronto* In a third-year toxicology course, student groups researched a toxicant in a community context, then used the Cogniti Sandbox to build an agent embodying the persona of an individual living in that community. Students had the opportunity to interact with their peers' agents to learn about toxicant impact on community health outcomes. Our analysis of student survey responses, peer review submissions, and student grades demonstrated that iterative refinement of the system message, the number of engaged collaborators, and system message quality were all associated with stronger grades.
9:30	**[S1C1T2] An academic integrity coach for exploring AI dilemmas** Elaine Khoo *University of Toronto Scarborough* Rather than simply teaching rules about misconduct, I designed a learning experience in which my students read institutional resources, hold a 10-minute dialogue with a Cogniti Academic Integrity Coach about authentic ethical dilemmas, then write reflective journals. The journals show students moving beyond simple notions of cheating to examine AI-assisted writing, translation, brainstorming and intellectual ownership, and many multilingual students valued being able to ask questions without judgement. I'll also share students' critiques, including the suggestion that the coach should ask them to make a judgement before explaining. You'll leave with a reusable approach to building critical AI literacy and authorial voice.	**[S2C1T2] A mini-app for rehearsing team conflict before it happens** Mesepa Lafaialii-Paul *The University of Sydney* Group work often goes wrong because students aren't ready for disruptive teammates. In BUSS2000, my One Bad Apple mini-app takes students through scenarios based on research into "bad apple" archetypes: they predict ripple effects, choose a response and get immediate feedback on the likely impact on trust, morale and performance, before teams agree on norms for their charter. Student reflections show a shift from "it's one person" to "it's how the team responds"; as one put it, "Staying quiet is still a choice." The mini-app is plug-and-play, so if you run team-based courses you'll find something you could adapt right away. Beyond the tool itself I will share the design principles behind the mini app and how it serves to enhance teaching and learning goals.	**[S3C1T2] Interview the CEO: Building Tane and Pohutu Wines for applied quality management** Peter Blakeway *Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology* My postgraduate Quality Management Systems students work with Pohutu Wines, a fictitious business, supported by two agents: a QMS study and consulting guide, and Tane, the company's CEO, complete with a detailed backstory, organisational culture, staff and competing priorities. Acting as quality consultants, students question and challenge Tane to test whether their ideas would work in a believable organisation. I'll share how much detail it takes for an agent to feel like a credible business leader, and how to make a guide genuinely helpful without becoming an answer portal or an endless "what do you think?" loop.

	Stream 1	Stream 2	Stream 3
9:45	**[S1C1T3] Working through the ethical tensions of an immersive planetary health eSim** Chris Zehntner and Aletha Ward *University of Southern Queensland* The Planetary Health eSim uses Cogniti as its platform, letting students work through evolving health, climate and sustainability scenarios with AI-enabled characters, make decisions and reflect on the consequences. I'll discuss the obvious tension of using AI to teach responsible stewardship, and how we turned that tension into material for critical discussion. I'll also share how we kept AI interactions transparent, bounded and aligned with the learning objectives. You'll take away ideas for designing simulations at scale, and for inviting students to critique the very technology they're using.	**[S2C1T3] Cogniti agents in an integrated wellbeing, digital citizenship and AI literacy programme** Julia Parker *St Cuthbert's College* At St Cuthbert's, we teach digital citizenship, AI literacy and wellbeing as one integrated programme in tutor time for Years 7–13, with around 20 Cogniti agents where ākonga (learners) can practise what they've learnt: responding to peer pressure, supporting a friend, reframing unhelpful thinking, exploring values and cultural identity, and pausing before posting. Developed with our counselling team, every agent is optional, some let students choose their emotional distance, and a tiered flag-review process ensures concerning conversations reach the right person. I'll also share how safety and choice shaped every design decision.	**[S3C1T3] Designing for play: Utility agents and non-human tutors in digital media projects** Travis Wall *University of Wollongong* I've used a range of agents, from practical to playful, across first-year and capstone project subjects in UOW's Digital and Social Media major. BCM Optimise helps students understand assessment requirements and improve their work, evolving from one subject to the next based on observed use. The Non-Human Tutor Dream Team selects one of nine non-human personas to suit each student's project and stays in character, while Frame Builder helps students turn scattered observations about digital change into an actionable project. I'll reflect on system message design, calibrating knowledge documents and what it means to design play into an agent, with plenty of inspiration for looking beyond the standard tutor.
10:00	**[S1C1T4] Will your recruit survive? Simulation mini-apps that rehearse the assignment** Andrew Bartlett *The University of Sydney* I've built two Cogniti mini-apps that we use in class: an HR recruitment simulator that gamifies hiring and induction, and a risk assessment tool that my students described as "eye opening". Used alongside agents in class activities, both double as preparation for assignment tasks. I'll share what students found engaging, and what several rounds of iteration taught me about planning a tool before building it. You'll come away with ideas for turning one of your own assessment tasks into a playable rehearsal.	**[S2C1T4] Role-play and in-character feedback for pre-service teachers** Erika Spray *The University of Newcastle* My agent lets initial teacher education students practise teacher–student conversations that apply course theory, then switches character to become a teacher educator offering specific feedback. More than 100 students have held around 150 conversations averaging over 11 minutes, and early feedback praised the authenticity and close alignment with an upcoming secure assessment. Because this cohort is not uniformly positive about AI, and quick to criticise simulations that feel inauthentic, I framed the task carefully within a broader plan for building AI competencies. I'll share ideas for introducing role-play to sceptical students, and a look at how the agent is evolving in response to their feedback.	**[S3C1T4] From branching to escape rooms: Approaches to multi-agent simulations** Reuben Fry *The University of Melbourne* I've built Cogniti meta-templates, the Scenario Builder: Simulation Architect and the JRPG Scenario Builder, that let educators generate the architecture and agent prompts for immersive role-plays and 2D spatial games without coding. My designs have evolved from simple branching to multi-agent group chats and escape rooms where students explore spaces, uncover clues and de-escalate characters, all driven by hidden variables, state transitions and a dedicated AI Evaluator. I'll open the hood on rolling context windows, multi-agent turn-taking, hidden state tags and linking dialogue to game physics. We'll cover the technical detail and a sense of how templates can put complex simulations within reach of every educator.
10:15	**Movement break**		

	Stream 1	Stream 2	Stream 3
	Thinking partners, not answer machines	*Feedback before the deadline*	*What the data says*
10:30	**[S1C2T1] Designing AI as a cognitive sparring partner** Sultana Lubna Alam, Mark Freeman, Diah Priharsari *The University of Sydney and Deakin University* Our research puts slow computing into practice through Cogniti agents designed to move students from fast, intuitive responses towards deliberate, analytical reasoning: a Business Case Companion, an Exam Preparation Companion and a Reflective Coach. Pilots in postgraduate and undergraduate business subjects, analysed through classroom observation, interaction logs and student reflections, point to three themes: AI challenged assumptions, cognitive struggle prompted evaluation of reasoning, and iterative dialogue supported judgement. I'll also share how the Socratic style frustrated some students already used to pasting cases into general-purpose AI. We'll discuss a theoretically grounded framework, and the practical conditions, for making productive struggle work.	**[S2C2T1] OrganoBot: When a required AI check makes student research judgement visible** Siew Chong *University of New England* In CHEM302, my students must submit their chosen research papers to OrganoBot before analysing a transition-metal-catalysed reaction. The agent checks whether each paper has a catalytic organometallic mechanism worth analysing, asks probing questions, and refuses to do the electron counting or mechanistic analysis that students are assessed on. I'll share the most surprising result: across my 2026 cohort, the depth of students' OrganoBot conversations consistently predicted assignment quality, even among otherwise high achievers. You'll take away a transferable design for scaffolding judgement without doing the thinking, and a fresh way to frame academic integrity as transparency.	**[S3C2T1] Five Layers and One Rule: Students Bring What the Experience Invites** Christopher Moore *University of Wollongong* Across the 2026 UOW Cogniti pilot, 50 academics built agents in 56 subjects, reaching 29 per cent of enrolments. The patterns of student use are unambiguous. Information agents helped to absorb administrative load; metacognitive coaches supported students' thinking; feedback agents attracted questions about drafts, grades and academic integrity rules. In this session I will introduce the five-layer Agent Learning Experience Design model that established the institutional vocabulary for agent building and the design thinking process that turned learning challenges into anticipated behaviours.
10:45	**[S1C2T2] Does a syllabus-true Socratic tutor build student self-efficacy?** James Cooper *The Scots College* NSW Business Studies rewards precise syllabus terminology, which general-purpose AI tools tend to paraphrase away. I built Cooper Jr., a Socratic tutor for Years 11 and 12 that stays true to the syllabus and guides students towards answers through questioning. This year I've investigated whether it strengthens students' belief that they can tackle specific tasks, such as short-answer questions, drawing on surveys, qualitative data and sentiment analysis of conversation transcripts. Come for fresh findings from a school classroom and a model for evaluating your own agents' impact.	**[S2C2T2] Coaching, not correcting: an AI agent for feedback on interview guides at scale** Barbara Gligorijevic *Australian National Institute of Management and Commerce (IMC)* This Cogniti AI agent acts as a formative feedback coach for master's level marketing students conducting qualitative inquiry into consumer attitudes, behaviours and issues related to a product category. Configured with the assessment brief, marking rubric, interview design principles and ethical expectations, it lets students review their draft interview guides for form, structure, length, logic and ethical concerns before submission. Its use has substantially reduced the number of draft reviews required, while the logic, form and phrasing of students' questions have improved, freeing time for higher-level research design issues. I will share my experience and practical tips on fine-tuning the agent's responses, length and structure to support a diverse international student cohort when providing feedback at scale.	**[S3C2T2] How challenging should the client be? Lessons from "Jane" and 681 first-year students** Jill Hnatiuk, Sara Dingle, Shannon Sahlqvist, Susie Macfarlane, Sachin Ranaweera and Nicolas Bennett *Deakin University* We developed an AI role-play client, "Jane", that supports around 850 first-year physical activity and exercise science students to practise communication and explore barriers to physical activity. Jane provides formative feedback at the end of each conversation, and students complete a metacognitive reflection as part of an assessment. Jane was used by 681 students (about 80% of the cohort) across more than 960 conversations, and 93% of surveyed students would recommend the approach. We'll explore a question every educator who uses role plays faces: when students find a client challenging, is that feedback to act on, or exactly the point?

	Stream 1	Stream 2	Stream 3
11:00	**[S1C2T3] A partner for reflection, not a source of answers: Cogniti in Chilean English teacher education** Malba Barahona *Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile* This presentation examines Cogniti AI use in an initial English teacher education course in Chile. Pre-service teachers (PSTs) held 491 conversations with the TEYL Reflective Partner, an AI agent I designed for weekly portfolio challenges. They used it to discuss course readings, analyse lesson plans against the national curriculum, design classroom activities, revise teaching scripts, and examine videos of their own teaching. Each interaction was followed by a reflection intended to keep pedagogical decision-making in PSTs' hands. Responses were mixed. Some PSTs valued the agent as a questioning partner, often deliberating over its prompts in pairs. Others resisted compulsory use or treated it as a means of checking work against assessment criteria. These contrasting responses raise questions about how mandated AI use shapes teacher agency. The presentation considers when such requirements expand or constrain opportunities for pedagogical judgement, and how teacher educators might decide how much AI use to require.	**[S2C2T3] How postgraduate learners used an AI study coach to shift from answer-seeking to dialogic drafting** Ruth Thomas *Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology* I analysed 229 conversations between postgraduate learners in my Adult Learning Theory course (most were new international students), and their Cogniti Coach. Requests for submission-ready wording persisted over 44 days, but the share of draft-led feedback requests rose from 30% to 55%. Conversations lengthened as many learners shifted to targeted questions, to test theory against practice and revise their claims. The data also showed where the agent held, and occasionally crossed, its academic integrity boundaries, and which learners needed human support. We will also look at how the Cogniti conversations gave valuable insights into students' thinking, triangulating other evidence to give me the best picture I have ever had of learner progress, support needs, and the integrity of their work processes.	**[S3C2T3] Agents across a faculty: What CARE is learning about personalised support in large engineering classes** Mary Lou Maher *The University of Sydney* As Director of CARE in the Faculty of Engineering, I'm collecting and synthesising academics' experiences of building Cogniti agents, with a view to sharing a collection across the Faculty. I'll draw on my own units, where agents act as an LLM thought partner and exam-prep tutor: around 75% of students engage weekly where use is optional, and conversations in an assessed unit show real depth and breadth. I'll also be candid about a hidden cost: preparing lecture content that works as a resource for an agent. This session should be useful if you're thinking about scaling agents beyond a single enthusiast's unit.
11:15	**[S1C2T4] From generic to targeted: Rebuilding a Socratic maths tutor for a bridging program** Luis Camacho *Federation University* In Federation University's FAST bridging program, the first version of our Socratic maths tutor saw low uptake, probably because its practice questions and advice were too generic. Over the semester break, we grounded the agent in the unit's own textbook (written by the course director, avoiding copyright issues) and changed our strategy, leading to considerably higher use. Students now use it to explain concepts, generate practice questions and work through textbook problems, rather than waiting days for an email reply. I'll also share how meetings and prompt iterations built the teaching team's confidence. If your first agent didn't take off, this one's for you.	**[S2C2T4] A multi-mode agent as tutor, customer, and investor for coursework and oral defences** Yunzhen Zhang and Lauren Moyes *Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology* In three Level 6–7 tourism and hospitality papers, we built agents with several modes: a Tutor Mode that scaffolds understanding and checks drafts against rubrics, a Presentation Mode that adopts an industry role to challenge ideas before oral defences, and Client Modes in which students pitch to a target customer or a potential investor. We'll share honest challenges, from overly generous mark predictions to performance in busy classes and keeping learners thinking independently. You'll leave with a flexible design pattern for preparing students for authentic oral assessment.	**[S3C2T4] Beyond usage numbers: Evaluating Cogniti as an institutional capability at Deakin** Joan Sutherland *Deakin University* Deakin's first institutionally integrated Cogniti pilot generated 4,215 conversations from 1,943 users across 22 units, with role-play, simulation, employability and assessment-related activities drawing the strongest engagement. I led the evaluation, and I'll share our human-led, multi-perspective approach, covering learner engagement, educator experience, platform performance, safety, governance, workload and readiness for scale. I'll be open about the limits of our evidence, including how we tried to tell meaningful pedagogical engagement from simple usage. If you're planning, or being asked to justify, an institutional rollout, this session is for you.
11:30	**Morning tea**		

	Stream 1	Stream 2	Stream 3
	Simulated patients	*Reaching every student*	*Scaffolding the learning journey*
12:00	**[S1C3T1] Meet Sara: A labour-and-birth role-play with a second caller** Nicki Hartney, Sara Dingle, Susie Macfarlane, Sachin Ranaweera and Nicolas Bennett *Deakin University* We built a Cogniti role-play agent "Sara", that simulates a woman in early labour phoning a birth centre for advice. Our second-year nursing and midwifery students take the midwife's role, assessing the caller's progress, whether she can stay at home and how to manage her pain. Partway through the call the agent simulates a contraction and the caller's partner "Paul" takes over, so students must adapt to a second caller. In a survey of 53 students, most found the agent realistic and reported that it improved their communication and critical thinking. We'll share how the two-persona design works, and what we learnt when platform guardrails flagged clinically appropriate conversations: useful if you're designing health role-plays.	**[S2C3T1] Kendal AI: Judgement-free support when students actually study** Kendal Sylvester *University of Tasmania* Kendal AI is a student support agent I've embedded across different units at the University of Tasmania, grounded in Universal Design for Learning and designed for first-year and returning learners. Across two semesters, engagement data shows consistent use, much of it overnight and at weekends, when students juggling work and caring responsibilities are studying and teaching staff are unavailable. I'll share how I refined the agnent to help students unpack content and assessment requirements in their own words, and the introductory materials I created to build trust and AI awareness. If you support diverse cohorts, you'll find a compelling equity case here.	**[S3C3T1] Mini-apps as scaffolds in postgraduate pain education** Paola Clews *The University of Sydney* In the postgraduate PAIN program, we use mini-apps to scaffold complex learning at key points in the student journey: decision trees for clinical reasoning, structured reflection on cases, and support for clinicians without a statistics background to spot conceptual errors. I'll walk through the draft–interact–refine cycle we use, and explain why the hardest part is choosing the right learning problem, not building the app. I'll also describe the shift I've seen when an academic watches their first mini-app working inside a module. You'll leave with a practical approach for finding where a mini-app adds the most value in an existing course.
12:15	**[S1C3T2] AI simulations for ISBAR and oncology risk communication to practice the hard conversations** Simmie Chung *The University of Sydney* I use Cogniti simulations so students can rehearse structured ISBAR communication and explain treatment risks, adverse effects and benefit-risk trade-offs to patients, with immediate feedback on their communication and clinical reasoning. I'll share how I design scenarios that are realistic and tied to learning outcomes, and how I help students treat the agent as a practice partner rather than a source of "correct answers". I'll also look ahead to workplace simulations for pharmacy interns, from escalating medication safety concerns to giving feedback to colleagues. If you want scalable communication practice without the cost of simulated patients, this session is for you.	**[S2C3T2] Reaching the students who don't ask: Cogniti across vocational education at BKI** Rebecca Laspatzis *Bendigo Kangan Institute* At Bendigo Kangan Institute we have six agents in use across Nursing, Vet Nursing, Animal Studies, Training and Assessment, Automotive, and Early Childhood Education and Care, supporting language, literacy, numeracy, digital skills and vocational content. A striking pattern has emerged: students who usually shy away from seeking help are using the agents most, and conversations have grown from one or two exchanges into sustained dialogue. I'll also speak frankly about teacher pushback and low student AI literacy, and how we're working through both. You'll gain a vocational perspective on equitable support that translates well beyond VET.	**[S3C3T2] "Ailing", a course agent for 437 students making videos in Chinese** Danping Wang *The University of Auckland* In CHINESE100, I created Ailing, an agent grounded in course materials that supports students through a major video project: understanding the task, developing ideas, drafting and revising Chinese, practising pronunciation, troubleshooting video production and checking submission requirements. Insights data shows sustained, multi-turn use as deadlines approach, with Ailing acting as a layer of support that teachers rarely get to see. I'll also share a lesson I think every course-agent builder should hear: good source documents don't guarantee curricular accuracy, so agents need a clear hierarchy of authoritative information. You'll leave with concrete ideas for structuring your own agent's knowledge base.

	Stream 1	Stream 2	Stream 3
12:30	**[S1C3T3] Patient, clinician, coach: A multi-role agent with avatar and voice for optometry** Damien Fisher *Queensland University of Technology* I developed agents to build optometry students' communication, self-reflection and clinical decision-making. In a single session the agent plays the patient for case history, then acts as a facilitator while students form differential diagnoses, plan the consult, extract clinical findings and reach a final diagnosis. The agent then reverts to being a patient for the student to deliver the diagnosis/es and management plan before giving tailored feedback, with students speaking to a 3D avatar by voice. Pre- and post-surveys from a year-long student research project showed improved confidence, and students particularly valued the instant feedback. I'll share the challenges of keeping an agent in role across stages and of working with voice, with practical lessons if you're building richer clinical simulations.	**[S2C3T3] AI support for research proposal review, a key doctoral milestone** Corinne Cortese *University of Wollongong* I developed 'RPR Buddy' to help higher degree research candidates navigate the Research Proposal Review milestone, drawing on university policies, procedures and resources to answer questions about requirements, timelines, documentation and process at any hour. It has reduced repetitive enquiries to academic and professional staff and given candidates more consistent information. I'll share what I learnt: deciding what belongs in agent knowledge versus linked resources, reaching a cohort with no Moodle site (via Microsoft Teams), and promoting a tool at the moment candidates need it. You'll see how agents can support research education and professional services, not just teaching.	**[S3C3T3] Agents that change role each week to scaffold career portfolios** Scott Pedersen and Anjia Ye *University of Tasmania* In our undergraduate Motor Learning unit at the University of Tasmania, Cogniti agents take on a different purpose each week (virtual peer, scenario generator, coach) to guide pre-service teachers and exercise science students through their career preparation portfolios. Two years of engagement data show sustained use, with students valuing the agents for brainstorming, organising ideas and clarifying expectations. We will also discuss asking students to verify AI-generated mock data rather than accept it, and the real costs of oversight and prompt refinement. You'll gain a model for weaving AI scaffolds through a semester of strong human-led teaching.
12:45	**Movement break**		
	Helping staff design well	***Building capability across schools and teams***	***Personalised pathways and support***
1:00	**[S1C4T1] Scaling Cogniti adoption at Auckland** Steve Leichtweis *The University of Auckland* At the University of Auckland, staff build a wide range of agents after onboarding with our central learning and teaching unit: course admin bots, Socratic tutors, written and oral feedback agents, simulations and interactive oral coaches. Our 2025 evaluation found students valued Cogniti as a 24/7, judgement-free space, while also asking for clearer guidance on effective use. I'll focus on the staff side: with workloads limiting time to develop prompting and design skills, we've built persistent coaching assistants that help academics create effective agents and mini-apps. You'll take away a pragmatic model for helping busy colleagues build AI literacy at a sustainable pace.	**[S2C4T1] Bringing a whole school along: Agents and mini-apps at Barker College** Steven Solomonides *Barker College* I'll share how we've introduced Cogniti agents and mini-apps at Barker College, and the positive effects on students' learning experiences and on collaboration among staff. I'll reflect on the biggest challenge of a school-wide approach, finding the time to upskill every teacher appropriately, and on what has helped. If you're an educational leader, you'll take away a perspective on building capability across a whole staff team.	**[S3C4T1] Mini-apps as the new interactives: Practice and personalised pathways in legal education** Jeanette Hobbs *College of Law New Zealand* I've moved from Cogniti agents to mini-apps, which I see as a natural alternative to interactives such as H5P. I use them to reinforce key concepts, give students independent skills practice and curate individualised learning pathways. I'll be honest about the work involved: finalising design, fixing rendering errors, improving accessibility and embedding in Canvas. If you're weighing up mini-apps for your own course, I'll give you a practical look at where they fit and what to plan for.

	Stream 1	Stream 2	Stream 3
1:15	**[S1C4T2] Building strong design principles for quality agents at Unitec** James Oldfield *Manukau Institute of Technology (MIT) and Unitec* My team and I work with teaching staff to develop Cogniti agents across a range of subjects, with a particular focus on nursing. Through iteration and learner feedback we've developed a set of design principles, and our learners are now asking for more agents. I'll share these principles and how we approach two persistent challenges: ensuring the quality of agent outputs, and keeping agents effective over time. You'll leave with a tested framework you can apply in your own context.	**[S2C4T2] Agents and mini-apps in Otago's AI for Educators course help students learn AI by experiencing it** Ammar Karkar *University of Otago* Our self-paced AI for Educators course, now rolled out to all academic staff at Otago, embeds Cogniti agents and mini-apps for guided prompting practice, role-play, gamified activities and reflection. The activities do double duty: building participants' AI literacy while modelling AI-based learning designs they can adapt for their own students. I'll share our pilot feedback, including that around two-thirds of respondents felt the agents improved their understanding of integrating AI into teaching, and what we learnt about differentiating for varied experience and getting the tone right (humour can read as sarcasm).	**[S3C4T2] Getting to know your students from day one through diagnostic assessment** Andy Mifsud *Barker College* At the start of my classroom Music course, students meet a Cogniti agent that asks progressively more scaffolded or more challenging questions, then produces a summary I can capture. The result is a quick read on each student's starting point and interests, which I use to differentiate content and tailor lessons. I'll share the design, along with a practical lesson about making sure students finish the session so the summary is generated. Whatever you teach, you'll see a simple, transferable way to use agents for diagnostic assessment.
1:30	**[S1C4T3] Personalised support at scale: Lessons from Lausanne's Cogniti pilot and the Forge du Tuteur IA** Jeff Van de Poël *University of Lausanne* At the University of Lausanne, we piloted Cogniti in five courses, including three first-year courses of more than 400 students each in programming and statistics. Teachers designed their own tutors, which generated several thousand interactions. I'll share what the logs revealed: many students still look for quick answers, while those who engage Socratically have remarkably rich exchanges. I'll also explain why writing a sound pedagogical prompt proved hard for teachers, and introduce the Forge du Tuteur IA, an open tool we built from a literature review to help teachers construct prompts across 25 pedagogical dimensions, which you can try for yourself.	**[S2C4T3] What shapes student engagement with AI activities in online units?** Vanessa Jefferson and Felicity Powell *Online Education Services (OES)* At OES, in partnership with Federation University, we've trialled different types of Cogniti agents in online units, giving students skills practice, scenarios and contextualised feedback, particularly in the lead-up to assessment. One lesson stood out: simply making an agent available isn't enough. I'll unpack how purpose, timing, placement, assessment relevance and promotion shaped uptake across units and disciplines, and how we developed a design and review process while building the agents. You'll leave with a practical lens for positioning an AI activity so that students actually use it.	**[S3C4T3] Around the clock, without doing the work: Four agents for online postgraduates** Julia Wilson *University of Tasmania* We embedded four Cogniti agents for a diverse postgraduate cohort studying asynchronously online: a general unit support agent and three assignment tutors that coach, give feedback and check task alignment without generating content. Our students, many studying around shift work and families or returning after 10–20 years away, have responded very positively, and our staff have seen a large drop in routine enquiries. I'll share how we resourced the early rollout, reached students already overloaded with information, and reassured learners worried about AI and academic integrity. If you support online and returning learners, you'll leave with a practical blueprint.
1:45	**Short plenary** Cogniti team		
2:00	**Lunch**		
2:45	**Optional workshop: Exploring research and evaluation opportunities on Cogniti** Olga Kozar		

	Stream 1	Stream 2	Stream 3
	Macquarie University A mini studio for Cogniti research and evaluation ideas. We will do a rapid scan of current Cogniti-related research and evaluation, then brainstorm feasible projects you can run in your own context or with others. There will be a "meet and match" networking activity to help you find collaborators, plus time to identify a realistic next step. Suitable for all experience levels, from first-timers to seasoned researchers and evaluators. Separate registration required: register here		
3:45	**Close**		