

AI Faculty Cohort Typologies

Programs cluster into a handful of recognizable shapes. Most programs are hybrids, but these archetypes name the centers of gravity. Each is illustrated with a documented example from the Collection.

1 • The Year-Long Fellowship

A small-to-mid cohort (often 5–20) commits for a full academic or calendar year, usually with a stipend or fellowship, and produces deliverables such as a redesigned course, an assignment, an event, or research. The most structured and resource-intensive shape; strong on depth and relationship-building, demanding on faculty time and program budget.

EXAMPLES

Northeastern's AI Fellows; Bryant University's Davis AI Fellows; Erasmus University Rotterdam's AI Teaching Fellows (the only program in the Collection offering protected time at 0.2 FTE).

2 • The Semester Community of Practice

A cohort meets regularly (often monthly or biweekly) across one semester for sharing, discussion, and low-stakes experimentation. Lower commitment, faster cycle, often uncompensated or modestly so; strong on community and accessibility, weaker on durable deliverables. The field's most replicable shape.

EXAMPLES

George Washington University's Designing for Student Learning CoP; Brandeis's Generative AI Faculty Learning Community; Naval War College's Faculty AI Learning Community.

3 • The Intensive (Institute / Camp / Bootcamp)

A compressed, high-intensity format ranging from a few days to two weeks that is sometimes followed by implementation work. Good for momentum and for reaching faculty who can't sustain a recurring commitment; weaker on the relationship depth that longer cohorts build. Often larger (40+).

EXAMPLES

New Mexico State's AI Teaching Institute; CUNY Hunter's three-day Camp AI; Kent State's two-week Innovation Initiative.

4 • The Mini-Grant / Spark Model

Faculty receive a small stipend to design and implement a specific AI intervention, often with light cohort convening around the funded work. Distributes agency to faculty and produces concrete artifacts; the cohort element can be thinner.

EXAMPLES

Middlebury's AI Mini-Grants; Hudson County Community College's Spark Grants.

5 • The Ambassador / Train-the-Trainer Model

The cohort's purpose is partly to seed expertise outward. Participants become disciplinary or departmental resources who carry learning back to peers. Addresses scale and disciplinary specificity at once; depends on identifying and supporting the right people.

EXAMPLES

American University in Cairo's AI Ambassadors; Pima Community College's AI Faculty Leads.

6 • The Multi-Program Ecosystem

An institution runs several coordinated offerings (e.g. a cohort, a workshop series, a CoP, drop-in sessions) that feed one another. Meets faculty at different levels and commitments; demands more staff capacity and coordination. About a dozen institutions in the Collection run two or more documented programs.

EXAMPLES

MassBay Community College (three programs); Ventura College (three); Boston College, Northeastern, San Francisco State, and UC Santa Barbara (two each).

7 • The Discipline-Specific Cohort

A cohort organized within or around a single field, accelerating past general AI literacy into discipline-specific practice. Almost none of the represented programs are single-discipline, but the shape is valued where it exists.

EXAMPLES

Fairfield University's nursing and health studies cohort; Northwestern's STEM-focused TEACH-AI; Lake Forest College's HUMAN (humanities-focused).

8 • The Critical / Inquiry-Oriented Group

Centered on inquiry, ethics, and critical literacy rather than tool adoption, explicitly making room for skepticism and refusal. Notably, two of the three oldest programs in the field take this shape.

EXAMPLES

Swarthmore College's Critical AI Inquiry Group (2022); SUNY New Paltz's AI Inquiry Group (2022); Saint Joseph's University's AI, Ethics, and Ignatian Pedagogy.

Prepared by CATLR. Typologies and examples are drawn from the AI Faculty Cohort Programs Crowdsourced Collection and the May 27, 2026 convening materials. Most real programs combine several shapes; the archetypes are named to make design choices discussable, not to sort programs into boxes.