AI POWER PLAY

Decisions and Consequences

JSBF Cross Elective — Academic Year 2025–2026

Course Information

Course Title	AI Power Play: Decisions and Consequences
Course Code	TBD
Course Duration	13 Weeks of Instruction + 1 Week Revision (Lessons 27–28); includes scheduled Mid-Semester Co-Curricular Activity
Credit Hours	4 Credits
Class Meetings	Twice per week — 2 hours per session
Location	Preferred in JSBF AI & Finance Digital Lab
Prerequisites	Third Year Students or higher. Students from All schools and Institutes welcome
Equivalent Courses	None
Exclusive Courses	None

Instructor Information

Instructor(s)	Prof. (Dr.) Ram B. Ramachandran
Biography	Prof. Ram's focus is on imparting practical industry-relevant knowledge in interdisciplinary areas of strategic technology with Finance and Education. He also teaches cross-elective courses in Artificial Intelligence, Cybersecurity, Management Consulting, and Entrepreneurship. He brings more than 35 years of industry experience to the classroom.
Email	ram@jgu.edu.in
Phone	+91 9999360609 | +1 (732) 598-8949
Office	4E14, FOB
Office Hours	Twice a week by appointment
Homepage	https://jgu.edu.in/jsbf/prof-ram-b-ramachandran/

1. Course Description

The world stands at an inflection point. Artificial intelligence is no longer merely a technology story — it is a business story, a legal story, a policy story, and above all, a power story. According to the International Monetary Fund, AI is expected to affect nearly 40% of all jobs worldwide, with advanced economies facing up to 60% exposure. Goldman Sachs estimates that generative AI could automate tasks equivalent to 300 million full-time jobs globally, while simultaneously creating 170 million new roles by 2030 (WEF Future of Jobs Report, 2025). The economic stakes are staggering: AI could contribute up to USD 15.7 trillion to global GDP by 2030 (PwC, 2025), and workers who possess AI skills now earn a wage premium of up to 56% over peers in identical roles who lack them (PwC AI Jobs Barometer, 2025).

For India, the urgency is unique and immediate. A landmark joint study by IBM and IndiaAI (2026) found that India's current AI literacy rate among employees stands at just 30% — yet executives surveyed say this figure must nearly double to 57% by 2030 to unlock over USD 500 billion in economic gains. The India Skills Report 2026 confirms that while India now accounts for 16% of the world's AI workforce — placing it among the top three nations in Stanford University's Global AI Vibrancy Tool — structural gaps persist: only 38% of Indian households are digitally literate, and a mere 12% possess foundational ICT skills.

Yet awareness without application is empty. The leaders who will shape the AI future — in boardrooms, courtrooms, policy chambers, and investment committees across the world — cannot afford to be spectators. They need to understand not just what AI is, but what it can do, what it cannot do, who bears responsibility when it fails, and how the rules governing it are being written in real time across New Delhi, Brussels, Washington, and Beijing.

AI Power Play is designed for exactly this purpose. It is a cross-disciplinary course that equips students from business, finance, and social sciences with the strategic literacy, analytical frameworks, and decision-making practice needed to lead in an AI-driven world. The course is organised around three foundational questions: Who controls AI? Who benefits from it? And who is held responsible when it goes wrong?

Across 13 weeks and 26 lessons, students move through six integrated modules — AI Fundamentals, Competitive Strategy, Financial Valuation, Legal Liability, Policy and Regulation, and Multi-Stakeholder Simulations. The course draws on cases and contexts from across the globe — the United States, European Union, China, United Kingdom, Singapore, and Brazil — alongside India, ensuring students develop a genuinely international perspective on AI power and decision-making. Every concept is stress-tested through simulations, role plays, and lab exercises drawn from real boardrooms, regulatory hearings, and investment committees worldwide.

AI Power Play is structured as a continuous assessment course. There are no end-term examinations; every grade is earned through live performance — labs, simulations, role plays, a strategic brief, and one mid-course quiz. Students who complete this course will leave not as AI engineers, but as AI-literate decision-makers — capable of sitting in any room where AI is being discussed, anywhere in the world, and asking the right questions, assessing the right risks, and making defensible choices under uncertainty.

2. Course Intended Learning Outcomes

Course Intended Learning Outcomes	Teaching and Learning Activities	Assessments / Activities
CLO1: Demonstrate foundational AI literacy — understanding what AI is, how it works, and where it fails — sufficient to engage credibly in business, legal, and policy decision-making contexts.	Lectures and Discussions / AI Tool Demos / Case Discussions / Assigned Readings	Class Participation, Lab Reports, Quizzes, Simulations, End Term
CLO2: Analyze AI's strategic and financial implications — including competitive advantage, valuation methodologies, investment risk, and M&A dynamics — with specific reference to Indian markets and corporations.	Lectures / Financial Lab Exercises / Case Analysis / Role Plays	Lab Reports, Quizzes, Strategic Brief, End Term
CLO3: Evaluate the legal and regulatory frameworks governing AI — including tort liability, IP rights, data protection under India's DPDP Act 2023, and contractual risk — and apply these frameworks to real business scenarios.	Lectures / Contract Analysis Labs / Role Plays / Case Discussions	Lab Reports, Role Play Performance, Quizzes, Strategic Brief, End Term
CLO4: Assess AI governance and policy from multiple stakeholder perspectives — government, industry, civil society — and formulate defensible positions on key AI regulation challenges facing India and the global community.	Lectures / Policy Simulations / Debate / Guest Lectures / Policy Readings	Simulation Performance, Policy Brief, Strategic Brief, End Term
CLO5: Synthesize strategy, finance, law, and policy perspectives to make and defend complex AI-related decisions under uncertainty, demonstrating cross-disciplinary fluency through simulations, role plays, and lab exercises.	Full-Class Simulations / Role Plays / Strategic Brief Presentation / Peer Evaluation	Simulation Performance, Role Play Assessment, Strategic Brief Presentation

3. Scheme of Evaluation and Grading

Assessment Breakup

This is a 100% continuous assessment course. There is no end-term written examination. All grades are earned through live performance, written lab reports, and a capstone strategic brief. The End Term Reflection Paper (A5) serves as a structured analytical self-assessment submitted at the close of the semester.

Continuous Assessment Schedule

Assessment Task	Weightage (%)	Nature	Week of Assessment
A1: Quiz (one quiz — scenario-based)	20	Individual	End of Week 7 — Lesson 14
A2: Simulation & Role Play Performance (3 graded activities)	15	Individual & Group	Weeks 6, 9, and 12 (Lessons 12, 18, and 23–24)
A3: Lab Reports (3 labs; best 2 of 3 counted)	20	Individual	Within 1 week of each lab — Lessons 6, 12, 17
A4: Strategic Brief + Presentation	30	Individual & Group	Week 13 — Lesson 26
A5: End Term Reflection Paper	15	Individual	End of Semester — submitted online
TOTAL	**100**		

***** *Total: 100%. Assessment components are subject to change with prior notice to students. Details of each component will be shared in class well in advance.*

Assessment Components — Description

Quiz (A1): One scenario-based quiz will be conducted at the end of Week 7 (Lesson 14). It covers all concepts discussed up to that point — Modules 1, 2, and 3. The quiz is individual and may include multiple-choice questions, short-answer prompts, and mini-case scenarios. Duration: 30 minutes. Called out in the Session Plan.

Simulation & Role Play Performance (A2): Students are assessed across three graded simulation and role play activities scheduled in Lessons 12 (Role Play 1 — AI Strategy Debate), 18 (Role Play 2 — Global AI Liability Hearing), and 23–24 (Boardroom Crisis Simulation). Grading focuses on decision quality, argument construction, role fidelity, and cross-disciplinary thinking — not on 'winning'. Rubrics are distributed in advance of each activity. All three activities count; the average determines the A2 grade.

Lab Reports (A3): Three in-class lab exercises are conducted in Lessons 6, 12, and 17. Students submit an individual Lab Report (maximum 2 pages, professional memo format) within one week of each lab. The best two of three lab reports count toward the final grade. The memo must address: (1) What you found, (2) What it means, (3) What you would decide, and (4) The biggest risk in your decision.

Strategic Brief + Presentation (A4): Each student selects a real AI company, policy event, or technology deployment — from anywhere in the world — and prepares a 1,500–2,000 word Strategic Brief integrating all five CLOs. Students present their brief in Lesson 26 (10 minutes + Q&A). The brief must include a clear, defensible recommendation — not a 'balanced discussion'.

End Term Reflection Paper (A5): A 1,000–1,500 word structured analytical reflection submitted at the close of the semester. Students respond to three questions: (1) What is the most important AI decision challenge your chosen industry will face in the next five years, and why? (2) Which module's frameworks changed your thinking most, and how? (3) What is one AI-related decision you will approach differently as a result of this course? Graded on analytical depth, evidence use, and intellectual honesty. Not a summary of course content.

Grade Definitions

Letter Grade	% of Marks	Grade Value	Grade Definitions
O	80 and above	8	Outstanding: Exceptional knowledge of the subject matter, thorough understanding of issues; ability to synthesise ideas, rules and principles and extraordinary critical and analytical ability.
A+	75–79	7.5	Excellent: Sound knowledge of the subject matter, thorough understanding of issues; ability to synthesise ideas, rules and principles and critical and analytical ability.
A	70–74	7	Very Good: Sound knowledge of the subject matter, excellent organisational capacity, ability to synthesise ideas, rules and principles, critically analyse existing material and originality in thinking and presentation.
A–	65–69	6	Good: Good understanding of the subject matter, ability to identify issues and provide balanced solutions to problems and good critical and analytical skills.
B+	60–64	5	Fair: Average understanding of the subject matter, limited ability to identify issues and provide solutions to problems and reasonable critical and analytical skills.
B	55–59	4	Acceptable: Adequate knowledge of the subject matter to progress to the next level of study and reasonable critical and analytical skills.
B–	50–54	3	Marginal: Limited knowledge of the subject matter, irrelevant use of materials, and poor critical and analytical skills.
P1/C	45–49	2	Pass 1: Pass with basic understanding of the subject matter.
P2/D	40–44	1	Pass 2: Pass with rudimentary understanding of the subject matter.
F	Below 40	0	Fail: Poor comprehension of the subject matter; poor critical and analytical skills and marginal use of relevant materials. Will require repeating the course.
I	Incomplete	–	Extenuating circumstances preventing the student from completing coursework or taking the examination; or where the Assessment Panel at its discretion assigns this grade.

4. Academic Integrity

Academic Honesty, Cheating, and Plagiarism:

Learning and knowledge production of any kind is a collaborative process. Collaboration demands an ethical responsibility to acknowledge who we have learnt from and how reading and learning from others has helped shape our own ideas. All ideas must be supported by citations. All ideas borrowed from articles, books, journals, reports, statutes, websites, AI-generated content, or any other source — in print or online — must be credited with the original source. The university has a framework to deal with cases of plagiarism. All forms of plagiarism will be taken seriously and prescribed sanctions will be imposed on those who commit plagiarism.

A special note on the use of AI tools in this course: This course studies AI — and students are actively encouraged to use AI tools (ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Perplexity, etc.) for research, exploration, and lab exercises. However, any AI-generated content submitted as part of a formal assessment must be: (a) clearly disclosed, (b) critically evaluated and not blindly accepted, and (c) substantially developed, analysed, and interpreted by the student. Submitting AI output as your own analysis without disclosure constitutes academic dishonesty.

Participation / Attendance Policies:

- Pre-reads are essential for productive class discussions. It is mandatory to come prepared for every session.
- Students must bring their own laptops or tablets to class for lab exercises and simulations.
- Active, prepared participation in simulations and role plays is a core component of this course — non-participation will directly affect the Simulation & Role Play grade.
- Students are strongly advised not to miss classes, as all modules are interlinked. If a class is missed, it is the student's responsibility to catch up before the next session.
- School Attendance Policy is applicable.

Course Material

Required Books:

[M] Mollick, E. (2024). Co-Intelligence: Living and Working with AI. Penguin Press. ← Most accessible; start here.

[SW] Suleyman, M. & Bhaskar, M. (2023). The Coming Wave: Technology, Power, and the Twenty-first Century's Greatest Dilemma. Crown Publishers.

[AP] Acemoglu, D. & Johnson, S. (2023). Power and Progress: Our Thousand-Year Struggle Over Technology and Prosperity. PublicAffairs.

[L] Lee, K.F. (2018). AI Superpowers: China, Silicon Valley, and the New World Order. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

[C] Crawford, K. (2021). Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence. Yale University Press.

[R] Russell, S. (2019). Human Compatible: Artificial Intelligence and the Problem of Control. Viking.

Key Free Online Resources (no subscription required):

- Stanford HAI — AI Index Report 2025: https://aiindex.stanford.edu/report/
- McKinsey — State of AI Report: https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack/our-insights/the-state-of-ai
- IndiaAI Mission: https://indiaai.gov.in
- NITI Aayog — National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence: https://www.niti.gov.in/national-strategy-artificial-intelligence
- India DPDP Act 2023 (MeitY): https://www.meity.gov.in/data-protection-framework
- EU AI Act — European Commission: https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/regulatory-framework-ai
- FTC Reports on AI: https://www.ftc.gov/reports
- WEF Future of Jobs Report 2025: https://www.weforum.org/publications/the-future-of-jobs-report-2025/
- SEC EDGAR — AI Company Filings: https://www.sec.gov/cgi-bin/browse-edgar
- NSE India — Annual Reports: https://www.nseindia.com
- BSE India — Annual Reports: https://www.bseindia.com
- RBI — AI in Banking Circulars: https://www.rbi.org.in
- SEBI — Algorithmic Trading Circulars: https://www.sebi.gov.in
- Internet Freedom Foundation (India): https://internetfreedom.in
- Cornell Law School LII — Legal Research: https://www.law.cornell.edu
- NASSCOM Knowledge Centre: https://nasscom.in/knowledge-center

** Additional reading materials and exercises will be distributed in class as required. Book initials [M, SW, AP, L, C, R] are used in the Readings column of the Session Plan.*

★ *Red-shaded rows indicate graded assessment activities. Timing is fixed.*

Session Topics	Lesson Content	Learning Objectives	Readings	Activities / Assignments
MODULE 1: AI FUNDAMENTALS: WHAT EVERY DECISION-MAKER MUST KNOW (Weeks 1–3)				
Lesson 1: The AI Revolution — Why Now? | Course Orientation				
Introduction to the Course; The Scale of the AI Moment	Course structure, philosophy, and continuous assessment framework explained. Global AI inflection point: IMF — 40% of jobs affected globally; WEF — 170M new jobs, 92M displaced by 2030; PwC — USD 15.7T GDP contribution by 2030; 56% wage premium for AI-skilled workers. India context: IBM-IndiaAI (2026) — 30% AI literacy, USD 500B opportunity. US context: Goldman Sachs — 300M full-time job equivalents at risk.	CLO1	[M] Ch. 1 WEF Future of Jobs 2025 — weforum.org/publications/the-future-of-jobs-report-2025/ IBM-IndiaAI Study 2026 — businessworld.in (search: India risks falling short on AI) Stanford AI Index 2025 — aiindex.stanford.edu/report/	Lecture and Course Orientation; Live Demo: Run identical query across ChatGPT, Claude, and Gemini — compare responses on a question about global economic growth projections. Which AI is correct? Who is liable if a financial decision is made on wrong AI output? Open class discussion.
Lesson 2: What AI Actually Is — Demystifying the Black Box				
AI Concepts for Decision-Makers; No Mathematics Required	Machine learning vs rules-based systems; LLMs — inputs, outputs, probabilities; narrow vs general AI; why generative AI hallucinates; the difference between knowing and predicting; what AI is genuinely good at vs where it consistently fails. Global examples: GPT-4 hallucinating legal citations (US lawyers fined); Gemini generating historically inaccurate images (Google's response).	CLO1	[M] Ch. 2–3 [R] Ch. 1 MIT Technology Review: 'What is AI?' — technologyreview.com/topic/artificial-intelligence/ NITI Aayog AI Primer — niti.gov.in/national-strategy-artificial-intelligence	Interactive Lecture; Demo — ask Claude to explain a legal contract clause, then verify accuracy against the original text; Discussion: 'Two New York lawyers submitted a legal brief citing AI-hallucinated court cases. They were sanctioned by the judge. Who was responsible — the lawyers, OpenAI, or both?'

	Designed for non-technical students.			
Lesson 3: How AI Gets Built — The Global AI Supply Chain				
Data Pipeline; Foundation Models; Open Source vs Closed Source; Global Control of the Stack	Data → training → fine-tuning → deployment pipeline explained without code; foundation models (GPT-4, Gemini, Claude, Llama, Mistral) — who owns what; open source (Meta's Llama, Mistral — France) vs closed (OpenAI, Anthropic, Google); the compute layer — NVIDIA's USD 3T dominance; cloud platforms (AWS, Azure, GCP); who controls each layer globally and why it creates strategic risk. US export controls on AI chips to China — implications for India and other nations.	**CLO1 CLO2**	[SW] Ch. 1–2 Stanford AI Index 2025 — Technical Performance chapter [C] Ch. 2 NASSCOM AI Adoption Report — nasscom.in/knowledge-center	AI Supply Chain Mapping Exercise: Two parallel maps — (1) Amazon Rekognition deployed by US police departments: data source → AWS training → law enforcement deployer → citizen; (2) Aadhaar facial recognition: UIDAI data → model provider → deployer → Indian citizen. Compare: which layer bears liability in each system? Which layer is regulated in each country? Teams present both maps.
Lesson 4: The Global AI Race — US, China, EU, India, and the Rest				
Four AI Superpowers; Emerging AI Nations; India's Position	US AI ecosystem — OpenAI, Anthropic, Google DeepMind, Microsoft, dominance in foundation models, USD 200B+ in AI investment in 2024. China — Baidu ERNIE, Alibaba Qwen, ByteDance, government-directed AI development, DeepSeek's cost breakthrough. EU — Mistral (France), regulatory leadership through AI Act, digital sovereignty concerns. India — 16% of global AI workforce, IndiaAI Mission, Krutrim, Sarvam AI, structural gaps. Emerging markets: Singapore, UAE, Brazil, South	**CLO1 CLO4**	[L] Ch. 1–2 IndiaAI Mission — indiaai.gov.in Stanford AI Index 2025 — International chapter McKinsey State of AI 2024 — mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack	Comparative Discussion: Each team is assigned one AI power (US, China, EU, India). Present: (1) Biggest strength, (2) Biggest vulnerability, (3) One strategic risk that could undermine their position in 5 years. Class builds a comparison matrix on the board.

	Korea as AI policy innovators.			
Lesson 5: Where AI Breaks Down — Global and Indian Failure Cases				
Six AI Failure Modes; Global and Indian Cases; Lab 1 Preparation	Six failure modes: (1) Bias — Amazon's AI hiring tool rejected women (US, 2018); COMPAS recidivism algorithm disproportionately flagged Black defendants (US); HireFirst India discriminated by caste (India, hypothetical); (2) Hallucination — Air Canada chatbot gave wrong refund policy (Canada, 2024); (3) Opacity — UK A-Level grading algorithm downgraded disadvantaged students, system could not explain why (UK, 2020); (4) Security — Samsung employees leaked trade secrets via ChatGPT (Korea, 2023); (5) Concentration risk — Crowdstrike AI update crashed 8.5M Windows systems globally (2024); (6) Misuse — deepfakes in elections (multiple countries). India cases: Zomato surge pricing controversy; Air India chatbot; UIDAI facial recognition accuracy gap. Teams assigned mix of global and Indian cases for Lab 1.	**CLO1 CLO3**	[C] Ch. 1 and 4 FTC AI Report — ftc.gov/reports [AP] Ch. 2 MIT Technology Review on AI Bias — technologyreview.com	Team Case Preparation (Lab 1 Prep): Each team assigned one AI failure case — a mix of global and Indian cases across the class. Prepare a 10-min presentation for Lesson 6: What failed? Who was harmed? Who bears legal and financial liability? What regulatory gap allowed it? What changed (or should have)?
Lesson 6: AI Failure Case Gallery | Lab 1				
★ **ASSESSMENT** **A3: Lab Report 1** *[Individual]* Lab conducted in class today. Individual memo due within one week.				
Lab 1: Global and Indian AI Failure Case Gallery	LAB 1 (60 min): Each team presents its AI failure case (10 min). Cases span the US,	**CLO1 CLO2 CLO3**	All prior readings (Lessons 1–5) Case-specific news articles distributed in advance by instructor	★ A3 — Lab Report 1: Lab 1 conducted in class (60 min);

	UK, Canada, Korea, and India — giving a globally comparative view of AI failure patterns. Class evaluates each using a four-quadrant scorecard: (1) Financial impact, (2) Legal exposure, (3) Strategic consequence, (4) Policy gap. Instructor-led debrief (20 min): What common patterns emerge across jurisdictions? Where do regulatory responses converge and diverge?			class scorecard and debrief; individual Lab Report (2-page memo) due within one week of this lesson
MODULE 2: AI STRATEGY: COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE IN THE AGE OF MACHINES (Weeks 4–5)				
Lesson 7: AI Competitive Strategy — Moats, Machines, and Market Position				
Porter's Five Forces Reimagined; AI Moats; Global Examples	How AI rewrites Porter's Five Forces — data network effects destroy substitution barriers; compute concentration increases supplier power; AI platforms raise entry barriers. Four AI moat types with global examples: Data (Google Search, 90B+ daily queries; Zomato's 300M order history); Compute (NVIDIA's 80% GPU market share); Talent (OpenAI's concentration of leading AI researchers); Ecosystem (Microsoft's GitHub + Azure + OpenAI pipeline). Winner-take-all dynamics in AI markets — why second place is increasingly difficult. First vs last mover advantage: OpenAI vs	**CLO2**	[AP] Ch. 3 HBR: 'Competing in the Age of AI' — hbr.org/topic/subject/ai-and-machine-learning McKinsey State of AI 2024 — mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack [L] Ch. 3	Moat Analysis Exercise: Teams analyse one company each — Microsoft, Google, Meta, Reliance Jio. Map all four moat types for their company. Which moat is most defensible over 5 years? Which is most vulnerable to a specific competitor action? Class votes on which company has the most defensible overall AI moat.

	Google's 'better late' Gemini strategy.			
Lesson 8: AI Strategy — Global Tech Giants vs Indian IT				
Microsoft's OpenAI Bet; Google's Gemini Race; Meta's Open-Source Gamble; TCS, Infosys, Wipro	Global strategy comparison: Microsoft's USD 13B OpenAI investment — integration into Copilot, Azure, Teams; Google's Gemini acceleration — internal disruption risk ('Code Red'), loss of search dominance threat; Meta's Llama open-source strategy — give away the model, win the developer ecosystem; Apple's on-device AI vs cloud AI philosophical split. Indian IT response: TCS Ignio (AIOps), Infosys Topaz (GenAI platform, NVIDIA partnership), Wipro HOLMES (AI-led services). Are Indian IT companies building moats or becoming AI implementation services firms?	**CLO2**	Infosys Annual Report 2024 — infosys.com/investors TCS Annual Report 2024 — tcs.com/investors [L] Ch. 4 McKinsey: 'AI and the future of IT services' — mckinsey.com	Team Strategy Pitch (5 min each): Each team takes one company (Microsoft, Google, Meta, Infosys). Argue: Is their AI strategy truly differentiated or are they just spending more than everyone else? Peer teams ask one hard challenge question. Class votes: which strategy is most likely to create durable value by 2030?
Lesson 9: Build, Buy, or Partner — AI Capability Strategy				
Make vs Buy vs Partner; Global Case Studies; AI Talent Strategy; Platform Dependency	Global strategic choice framework: Build — Toyota developing its own autonomous vehicle AI (15-year timeline, USD 70B+); Buy — GM's acquisition of Cruise (USD 1.35B, became problematic); Partner — Salesforce integrating OpenAI into Einstein AI (fastest to market). The talent equation globally — US vs China vs India competition for AI researchers. Platform dependency risk: what happens when your AI	**CLO2**	HBR: 'Make or Buy AI Capabilities' — hbr.org McKinsey on AI Adoption Strategies — mckinsey.com [SW] Ch. 5 NITI Aayog: AI Sovereignty Discussion — niti.gov.in	Role Play Debate (20 min): Team A argues a major Indian bank (fictional: NationalTech Bank) should build its own AI credit model in-house; Team B argues it should license from a US AI provider (e.g., Zest AI); Team C argues it should partner with an Indian AI startup. Each team: 6 minutes to argue, 3 minutes rebuttal. Class votes with one sentence justification each.

	vendor is acquired, raises prices, or restricts access? DeepSeek's emergence as a cost disruptive force. For India: open source (Sarvam-1) as a sovereignty strategy vs Microsoft/OpenAI partnership for speed.			
Lesson 10: M&A in the Age of AI — The Global Acquisition Game				
AI M&A Logic; Global Deals; Valuing Intangibles; India M&A; Negotiation Simulation	Why AI changed M&A logic globally: acqui-hires (Google acquired DeepMind for £400M, primarily for talent); data acquisition (Microsoft's LinkedIn purchase — 900M professional profiles); technology acquisition (Salesforce's USD 27.7B Slack acquisition — distribution for Einstein AI). Valuing AI intangibles — talent, data, and model IP under IFRS and US GAAP. Indian AI M&A: Infosys acquiring Flutura (industrial IoT AI), Wipro's Appirio acquisition, Tata's AI portfolio build. Regulatory scrutiny: US DOJ on Google, EU on Microsoft/OpenAI, India's CCI.	**CLO2 CLO3**	[AP] Ch. 5 SEC EDGAR: Microsoft 10-K — sec.gov/cgi-bin/browse-edgar (search MSFT) Economic Times Tech M&A — economictimes.indiatimes.com CCI merger guidelines — cci.gov.in	Mini Simulation — The Cross-Border AI Acquisition (30 min): 'DataSense Global Ltd.' is a Singapore-incorporated AI data company with operations in India and UK (Series C, USD 200M valuation). Team A = US Big Tech acquirer; Team B = Indian IT major; Team C = European PE fund; Team D = DataSense founders. Negotiate: price, IP ownership, data rights post-acquisition, regulatory approval strategy.
MODULE 3: AI FINANCE: VALUATION, RISK, AND THE GLOBAL OPPORTUNITY (Weeks 6–7)				
Lesson 11: Valuing AI Companies — Global and Indian Perspectives				
AI Valuation Challenges; Global Benchmarks; Indian AI Valuations	Why traditional DCF fails AI companies — no near-term cash flows, rapid competitive change, winner-take-all dynamics. Four AI value drivers: data	**CLO2**	[AP] Ch. 6 NVIDIA 10-K 2024 — sec.gov/cgi-bin/browse-edgar (search NVDA) Zomato DRHP — sebi.gov.in (search Zomato DRHP) Yahoo Finance: Compare NVDA, MSFT, Infosys, TCS multiples — finance.yahoo.com	Valuation Debate: The class splits into two groups — Group A values NVIDIA at a 'justified premium', Group B argues it is overvalued. Each

	moats, talent density, platform network effects, regulatory positioning. Global benchmarks: NVIDIA — revenue grew 10x in two years, P/E exceeded 70x at peak (why?); OpenAI's USD 157B valuation on USD 3.4B revenue (2024) — what is the market paying for?; Anthropic's USD 7B Series E — safety as a competitive moat. Indian comparisons: Zomato's AI-enhanced delivery optimization and its revenue multiple; Paytm's AI credit scoring vs regulatory-driven collapse; Freshworks' US-listed AI product pivot.			group uses publicly available financials (Yahoo Finance + NVIDIA 10-K) to build a 5-minute case. Instructor then repeats the exercise with Zomato. What structural parallels and differences emerge between the US and Indian AI valuation stories?
Lesson 12: AI Financials Lab — Global and Indian Filings | Lab 2				
★ **ASSESSMENT** **A3: Lab Report 2** *[Individual]* Lab conducted in class today. Individual memo due within one week. ★ **ASSESSMENT** **A2: Assessed Role Play 1 — AI Strategy Debate** *[Individual & Group]* Graded today. Rubric distributed in advance. All students assessed.				
Lab 2: Cross-Border Financial Analysis + Assessed Strategy Role Play	LAB 2 — PART A (50 min): Teams analyse one US AI company (NVIDIA, C3.ai, or UiPath — use SEC EDGAR 10-K) alongside one Indian company (Infosys, Wipro, or Zomato — use NSE/BSE annual report). Comparative analysis: AI R&D as % of revenue; MD&A AI narrative; AI-specific risk disclosures; AI-related capex; market AI premium assessment. LAB 2 — PART B / ASSESSED ROLE PLAY 1 (40 min): Structured 'Investor vs Management' role play. One team plays	**CLO2**	NVIDIA 10-K 2024 — sec.gov/cgi-bin/browse-edgar Infosys Annual Report 2024 — infosys.com/investors Yahoo Finance — finance.yahoo.com NSE India — nseindia.com | BSE India — bseindia.com	★ A3 — Lab Report 2: Lab 2 Part A conducted in class (50 min); individual Lab Report due within one week. ★ A2 — Assessed Role Play 1: Investor vs Management AI Debate (40 min); graded today using the Role Play Rubric

	the Board of a fictional AI company defending its AI strategy and investment. The other team plays a sceptical institutional investor challenging the premium valuation. Graded on argument quality, use of financial evidence, and strategic coherence.			
Lesson 13: AI Investment Risk & Due Diligence — Global Framework				
AI-Specific Investment Risks; Global and Indian Regulatory Frameworks; Due Diligence	Seven AI investment risk categories with global examples: (1) Regulatory risk — EU AI Act compliance costs (USD 300M+ for large platforms), SEBI/RBI India exposure; (2) Model risk — Air Canada chatbot financial liability, Amazon's Alexa COPPA fine USD 25M; (3) Data quality risk — Microsoft's Tay chatbot poisoned by bad data (24 hours, shut down); (4) Competition disruption risk — GPT-4 wiped out 20+ AI writing startups in 72 hours; (5) ESG risk — AI data centre water consumption (Microsoft consumed 1.7B gallons in 2023); (6) Key person risk — Ilya Sutskever's departure from OpenAI; (7) Platform dependency — Twitter/X AI API pricing shock for developers. Building global AI due diligence checklists.	**CLO2 CLO3**	SEBI Circular on Algorithmic Trading — sebi.gov.in RBI Master Direction on IT Framework — rbi.org.in McKinsey AI Risk Framework — mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack FTC AI Report — ftc.gov/reports	Global Due Diligence Exercise: Teams build a prioritised due diligence checklist for fictional AI fintech 'FrontierCredit Technologies Ltd.' — incorporated in Singapore, operating in India and UK, seeking USD 50M Series B. Teams must assess risks under Indian (DPDP, RBI), UK (FCA), and Singapore (MAS) frameworks simultaneously. Present top 5 risk flags with cross-border mitigation for each.
Lesson 14: Global AI Startup Ecosystem + Quiz				

★ **ASSESSMENT** **A1: Quiz — Scenario-Based** *[Individual]* 30 minutes. Open at end of lesson. Covers all of Modules 1, 2, and 3 (Lessons 1–13).				
Global AI Startup Landscape; Funding Geography; Exit Strategies | Quiz A1	Global AI startup ecosystem: US — OpenAI (USD 157B), Anthropic (USD 7B), Cohere, Scale AI; Europe — Mistral (France, EUR 1B+), Aleph Alpha (Germany); China — Moonshot AI, Zhipu AI; India — Krutrim (USD 1B, India's first AI unicorn), Sarvam AI, Fractal Analytics, Darwinbox, SigTuple. VC flows: global AI investment hit USD 110B in 2024 (CB Insights) vs India's disproportionately small share relative to talent base. Structural barriers: data infrastructure, compute access, regulatory uncertainty. Exit strategies globally: IPO (Arm Holdings, USD 52B), M&A (DeepMind), PIPE. QUIZ A1 (30 min): Individual, scenario-based; covers Modules 1–3.	**CLO2 CLO4**	CB Insights AI Startup Report — cbinsights.com NASSCOM Startup Report — nasscom.in/knowledge-center Crunchbase Global AI Funding — crunchbase.com Stanford AI Index 2025 — Investment chapter	Pitch Simulation (40 min): Teams pitch a fictional global AI startup (location of team's choice — US, EU, India, or Southeast Asia) to a cross-border VC panel. Pitch must address: market size, AI moat, team, financials, regulatory risks in target markets, and exit path. VC panel includes one 'India-focused investor', one 'US growth investor', one 'EU impact investor'. ★ A1 — Quiz (30 min): Individual, scenario-based; held at end of session; covers all of Modules 1–3
MID-SEMESTER CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITY — No Lessons (Dates per Academic Calendar)				
MODULE 4: AI LAW & LIABILITY: WHO IS RESPONSIBLE? (Weeks 8–9)				
Lesson 15: AI Legal Liability — A Global Comparative Study				
Tort Law and AI; Product vs Service Liability; Global Cases	The AI liability chain: developer → deployer → user. Tort principles applied to AI — negligence, strict liability, product liability. Global case study gallery: (1) Air Canada chatbot, British Columbia (2024) — chatbot output legally bound the airline despite	**CLO3**	Air Canada Case (2024) — search: Air Canada chatbot liability 2024 FTC AI Accountability Report — ftc.gov/reports Cornell LII: Tort Law — law.cornell.edu/wex/tort Consumer Protection Act 2019 India — indiacode.nic.in	Discussion: Compare the Air Canada case (Canada), the Tesla Autopilot cases (US), and the BharatBank fictional scenario (India). Same failure pattern — AI gives wrong output, user relies on it, suffers loss — yet the legal

	disclaimer; (2) COMPAS recidivism algorithm, Wisconsin (2016) — court upheld use despite opacity challenge; (3) Tesla Autopilot fatal crash, California (2023) — product liability vs user error; (4) Uber self-driving car pedestrian fatality, Arizona (2018) — first AI-caused road death, civil settlement; (5) UK Benefits Agency algorithm — wrongly cut disabled benefits for thousands; (6) India — Air India chatbot incorrect refund policy; BharatBank (fictional) AI loan advisor giving incorrect EMI terms. Common pattern: who bears liability when you cannot explain the AI's decision?			outcomes differ across jurisdictions. Why? What does this mean for companies that operate globally? Teams map the liability chain for each case and identify where the law is clearest and where it has the largest gap.
Lesson 16: Data Rights — A Four-Jurisdiction Comparison				
GDPR vs CCPA vs China PIPL vs India DPDP: Four Frameworks, One Global AI Company	Comparative data protection law for AI: EU GDPR (2018) — broad rights, extraterritorial reach, DPIAs for AI, fines up to 4% of global turnover (Meta fined EUR 1.2B); California CCPA/CPRA (2020/2023) — opt-out rights, anti-discrimination, AI profiling rules; China PIPL (2021) — state security carve-outs, data localisation, algorithm transparency; India DPDP Act (2023) — consent model, Data Protection Board, penalties up to ₹250 crore. How a single global AI product must comply with all four. AI training data and IP	**CLO3 CLO4**	DPDP Act 2023 — meity.gov.in/data-protection-framework EU GDPR Full Text — gdpr-info.eu CCPA Overview — oag.ca.gov/privacy/ccpa Cornell LII on Copyright and AI — law.cornell.edu	Four-Jurisdiction Compliance Workshop (40 min): Fictional product 'RecruitAI Global' — an AI hiring screening tool — is launched simultaneously in the EU, US (California), India, and China. Teams identify the top 3 compliance requirements the product must meet in each jurisdiction, and the one requirement that differs most sharply across all four. Class synthesises a 'Global AI Compliance Checklist'.

	across jurisdictions — the NYT vs OpenAI lawsuit (US), Getty Images vs Stability AI (UK/US), copyright in AI outputs under each framework.			
Lesson 17: AI Contracts — The Red Flag Lab | Lab 3				
★ **ASSESSMENT** **A3: Lab Report 3** *[Individual]* Lab conducted in class today. Individual memo due within one week.				
Lab 3: Multi-Jurisdiction AI Contract Red Flag Analysis	LAB 3 (90 min): Students review a fictional AI Software-as-a-Service agreement between 'GlobalEnterprises Ltd.' (a UK-headquartered multinational with operations in India and EU) and a US AI software provider. The contract has been intentionally drafted with clauses that create risk under multiple jurisdictions. Students identify and flag problematic clauses across six categories: (1) liability cap and indemnity — UK vs US vs India standards; (2) IP ownership of model outputs — GDPR-compliant vs US copyright vs Indian Copyright Act; (3) data usage rights — can the US vendor use GlobalEnterprises' EU customer data to train future models (GDPR risk)?; (4) audit rights — EU AI Act conformity assessment requirements; (5) termination — data portability obligations differ under GDPR and DPDP; (6) governing law and dispute resolution —	**CLO3**	Cornell LII: Contract Law — law.cornell.edu/wex/contract GDPR Article 28: Data Processor Requirements — gdpr-info.eu/art-28-gdpr/ All prior Module 4 readings Fictional multi-jurisdiction contract distributed by instructor	★ A3 — Lab Report 3: Lab 3 conducted in class (90 min); individual Lab Report (2-page memo) due within one week. Focus: identify the single highest-risk clause under each of the three jurisdictions (UK, EU, India) and recommend a specific redline for each.

	which jurisdiction governs?			
Lesson 18: Role Play — The Global AI Liability Hearing				
★ **ASSESSMENT** **A2: Assessed Role Play 2 — Global AI Liability Hearing** *[Individual & Group]* Graded today. Role Play Rubric distributed in advance.				
Full-Class Role Play: Multi-Jurisdictional AI Hiring Discrimination Hearing	ASSESSED ROLE PLAY 2: 'HireFirst Technologies Inc.' — a US-incorporated AI hiring platform used by multinational companies — is shown to have systematically discriminated against women candidates and applicants from South Asian and African backgrounds at a rate 2.6x higher than comparable human screening. Three regulatory hearings are happening simultaneously across jurisdictions. Roles: HireFirst Legal Counsel (defending in all three); EU DPA Commissioner (GDPR/AI Act breach); US EEOC Representative (Title VII violation); India Ministry of Labour Official (DPDP and labour law breach); Civil Society Advocate (representing 12,000 affected applicants globally); Independent AI Auditor presenting technical findings; Financial Analyst assessing liability impact ($400M+ exposure). What decisions are made? Who is most powerful in this room?	**CLO3 CLO4 CLO5**	EEOC AI Hiring Guidance — eeoc.gov EU AI Act: High-Risk AI in Employment — digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu Internet Freedom Foundation — internetfreedom.in All prior Module 4 readings	★ A2 — Assessed Role Play 2: Full Class Role Play (80 min); structured instructor debrief (20 min); graded using Role Play Rubric; self-assessment reflection journal entry due within 48 hours
MODULE 5: AI POLICY & REGULATION: THE RULES OF THE GAME (Weeks 10–11)				
Lesson 19: Global AI Regulation — A Comparative Map				

EU AI Act; US NIST AI RMF; China's AI Laws; Singapore PDPA + AI Framework; India DPDP	The global regulatory spectrum from prescriptive to principles-based: EU AI Act 2024 — risk-tiered (unacceptable banned, high-risk conformity assessment, limited transparency only, minimal unregulated); US — NIST AI RMF 1.0 (voluntary), sector-specific (FDA, SEC, EEOC), no federal AI law; China — mandatory algorithm registration, content moderation, PIPL; Singapore — PDPA + Model AI Governance Framework (voluntary, principles-based, seen as 'pro-innovation'); UK — sector-based, FCA/ICO leading, post-Brexit flexibility; Brazil — AI Bill awaiting passage, inspired by EU. India's position — currently principles-based (NITI Aayog), with DPDP as the only binding AI-adjacent law. Regulatory arbitrage opportunities and risks for global companies.	**CLO4**	EU AI Act Overview — digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/regulatory-framework-ai NIST AI RMF 1.0 — nist.gov/artificial-intelligence Singapore AI Governance Framework — pdpc.gov.sg WEF AI Governance Report — weforum.org	Regulatory Map Exercise: Teams are assigned one company type — (A) US AI startup serving EU customers; (B) Indian IT company serving UK financial clients; (C) Chinese AI platform expanding to Southeast Asia; (D) UK fintech using AI credit scoring in India. Each team maps: (1) Which regulations apply today, (2) Which are coming in 2 years, (3) The single costliest compliance requirement. Class discusses: which regulatory environment best balances innovation and protection?
Lesson 20: India's AI Policy Framework — and How It Compares				
IndiaAI Mission; NITI Aayog; SEBI, RBI, MeitY; Comparison with Singapore, UAE, Brazil	India's AI policy architecture: IndiaAI Mission — 7 pillars; NITI Aayog Responsible AI principles; MeitY working groups; SEBI algorithmic trading circular; RBI AI in credit. Comparative cases — Singapore's 'Pro-Innovation' Model AI Governance Framework (voluntary, trusted AI certification,	**CLO4**	IndiaAI Mission — indiaai.gov.in/article/india-ai-mission NITI Aayog National AI Strategy — niti.gov.in/national-strategy-artificial-intelligence Singapore MAS AI Governance — mas.gov.sg SEBI Algorithmic Trading Circular — sebi.gov.in	Policy Memo Workshop (40 min): Each student drafts a 1-page policy memo to either: (A) the Secretary of MeitY on India's AI liability framework gap; or (B) a G20 Finance Ministers' meeting on AI risk disclosure standards for financial services. Both options require

	MAS AI guidance for financial services); UAE National AI Strategy 2031 (government mandates AI across ministries); Brazil's emerging AI Bill (EU-influenced, strong individual rights). What India can learn from each. The core tension in India: speed of innovation vs rights of 1.4 billion data subjects.			drawing on at least two international comparisons. Peer review (3 min written feedback per memo in pairs).
Lesson 21: Policy Simulation — The G20 AI Governance Negotiation				
Full-Class Simulation: G20 AI Governance Framework Negotiation	SIMULATION (90 min): The G20 AI Working Group is attempting to negotiate a non-binding but politically significant 'G20 Principles on Responsible AI Governance'. Agreement requires consensus. Groups: (A) US Delegation — pro-innovation, voluntary standards, concerned about EU regulatory export; (B) EU Delegation — risk-based mandatory standards, human rights focus, AI Act as global template; (C) China Delegation — state security priorities, data sovereignty, no external oversight; (D) India Delegation — pro-growth, balance innovation with rights, represents emerging markets; (E) Small Nations Coalition (Singapore, UAE, Kenya) — want access to AI benefits without being regulation-takers; (F) Big Tech Lobby (Google, Microsoft,	**CLO4 CLO5**	EU AI Act Summary — digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu IndiaAI Mission — indiaai.gov.in Internet Freedom Foundation — internetfreedom.in Stanford AI Index 2025 — Policy chapter	Full-Class G20 Policy Simulation (90 min); class produces a Draft G20 Framework; structured debrief (20 min); individual Policy Brief (1-page, memo format) due by next session

	Alibaba) — voluntary self-regulation, oppose liability; (G) Global Civil Society (Amnesty, EFF, Internet Freedom Foundation) — mandatory accountability, transparency. Goal: produce 5 agreed principles and 2 areas of irreconcilable disagreement.			
Lesson 22: Geopolitics of AI — Power, Sovereignty, and the Great Divide				
US-China AI Competition; India's Strategic Position; AI Sovereignty; The USD 15.7T Divide	The geopolitics of AI as a new Cold War: US export controls on AI chips to China (Oct 2022, Oct 2023, 2024 updates) — NVIDIA H100 banned; China's response — Huawei Ascend, SMIC advanced nodes; DeepSeek as a low-cost disruption signal. India's non-aligned AI position — strategic partner of the US (iCET), large Chinese-origin tech user, aspiring AI power. AI sovereignty debate: Europe's demand for 'digital sovereignty', China's 'data localisation', India's debate between Sarvam-1 and Microsoft/OpenAI. The Great AI Divide: USD 15.7T in gains concentrated in 10 nations (PwC, 2025) — what happens to the other 185? AI and development inequality. Africa's AI opportunity and risk.	**CLO4**	[L] Ch. 7–8 (AI Superpowers — geopolitics) Stanford AI Index 2025 — International chapter — aiindex.stanford.edu/report/ [SW] Ch. 9–10 PIB: India's Global AI Standing — pib.gov.in (search: India AI talent Rajya Sabha 2025)	Structured Debate (35 min): Motion: 'Smaller and emerging economies should build sovereign AI infrastructure rather than depend on US and Chinese AI platforms.' Team A (for — India, EU, African Union perspective); Team B (against — efficiency and speed argument). Each team: 10 min to argue, 5 min rebuttal, 5 min audience Q&A. Instructor synthesises: what are the non-negotiable conditions for responsible AI globalisation?
MODULE 6: INTEGRATION & SIMULATIONS: THE AI POWER PLAY IN ACTION (Weeks 12–13)				
Lesson 23: The Boardroom Crisis Simulation — Part 1				

★ **ASSESSMENT** **A2: Assessed Simulation 3 — Boardroom Crisis (Part 1 of 2)** *[Individual & Group]* Graded across Lessons 23 and 24. Rubric distributed one week in advance.

Full-Class Simulation: GlobalFinAI Ltd. — AI Credit Scoring Crisis, Hour 0–12	ASSESSED SIMULATION 3 — PART 1: 'GlobalFinAI Ltd.' is a Singapore-listed fintech with operations in India, the UK, and the UAE, USD 800M market cap. Eighteen months ago it deployed a unified AI credit scoring system across all three markets — same underlying model, local fine-tuning. Today: an investigative report by The Guardian (UK) and NDTV (India) simultaneously reveals the system denies loans at a rate 2.9x higher to women applicants and applicants from certain ethnic backgrounds — consistently across all three markets. The story runs at 8 AM GMT. Stock drops 12% in London by 9 AM; NSE circuit-breaker triggered at 11 AM. Regulatory exposure: FCA (UK), RBI (India), CBUAE (UAE). Media coverage is global. Teams take roles: Group CEO, Group CFO, Group General Counsel, Head of Global Regulatory Affairs, Chief Communications Officer, FCA Examiner (external), RBI Examiner (external), Lead Counsel representing a global class of affected customers. Briefing delivered. Hour 0–12 begins.	**CLO2 CLO3 CLO4 CLO5**	All prior readings — especially Modules 3, 4, and 5 RBI Fair Practices Code for Lenders — rbi.org.in FCA Principles for Business — fca.org.uk Simulation briefing packet distributed by instructor	★ A2 — Assessed Simulation 3 (Part 1): Boardroom Crisis Simulation Part 1 (80 min); Hour 0–12 of the global crisis; teams make first-round decisions across all three regulatory jurisdictions; all decisions documented; simulation continues in Lesson 24

Lesson 24: The Boardroom Crisis Simulation — Part 2 + Full Debrief				
Crisis Escalates — Three Regulators, a Class Action, and a Board Mutiny (Hour 12–72)	ASSESSED SIMULATION 3 — PART 2 (60 min): The crisis deepens globally. (1) FCA and RBI both announce formal investigations; UAE CBUAE requests a voluntary audit within 7 days. (2) A global class action is coordinated by a US law firm representing 27,000 affected customers across three jurisdictions — potential exposure USD 400M+. (3) Singapore's MAS asks for a board briefing. (4) GlobalFinAI's largest institutional investor (a US ESG fund, 9.3% stake) issues a public statement questioning the board's governance. (5) A whistleblower from the data science team goes public on LinkedIn, claiming the bias was flagged internally 6 months ago. Teams must make coordinated decisions across all five simultaneous pressures. Final 30 min: Full-class debrief — what decisions were made? What cross-border tensions emerged? What would have prevented this crisis entirely?	**CLO2 CLO3 CLO4 CLO5**	All prior readings FCA Enforcement Actions — fca.org.uk/news/press-releases RBI Supervisory Actions — rbi.org.in All simulation briefing materials	★ A2 — Assessed Simulation 3 (Part 2): Boardroom Crisis Part 2 (60 min); Full-Class Debrief (30 min); Simulation Performance graded across both parts using Simulation Rubric + peer scorecard; Reflection Journal entry due within 48 hours
Lesson 25: Strategic Brief Workshop				
Individual Strategic Brief Development; Peer Review; Preparation for Presentations	WORKSHOP (80 min): Each student delivers a 3-minute summary of their Strategic Brief in-progress — thesis, evidence base, and recommendation only.	**CLO1–5**	All prior readings Strategic Brief Rubric — distributed in Week 1 Anonymised sample briefs from prior cohorts — distributed by instructor	Strategic Brief Workshop (3-min individual previews + structured peer written feedback); Instructor gap analysis and coaching; Final

	Peers provide structured written feedback using the Strategic Brief Rubric. Instructor identifies the 3 most common analytical gaps across all briefs and addresses them live. Key reminder: the brief must make a single clear recommendation, not a 'balanced review'. It may address any AI topic — global or Indian — as long as it integrates at least three disciplinary lenses (strategy, finance, law, or policy). Students have approximately one week to finalise before Lesson 26 presentations.			Strategic Brief submitted 72 hours before Lesson 26
Lesson 26: Strategic Brief Presentations — Capstone Session				
★ **ASSESSMENT** **A4: Strategic Brief + Presentation** *[Individual]* Presentations graded today. Brief submitted 72 hours prior. 10 min + Q&A per student.				
Individual Presentations; Peer Panel; Course Synthesis	Each student presents their Strategic Brief (10 min + 5 min Q&A from a 2-student peer panel and instructor). Graded using the Strategic Brief Rubric. The brief must: (1) frame a real AI problem or opportunity anywhere in the world; (2) analyse it through at least three disciplinary lenses; (3) make a single clear, defensible recommendation; (4) identify and address the biggest risk in that recommendation. Final 20 minutes: course synthesis — what geographic and disciplinary patterns emerged across all briefs? What	**CLO1–5**	All prior readings Submitted Student Strategic Briefs	★ A4 — Strategic Brief Presentations: Individual, 10 min + 5 min Q&A (graded — 30% of total); 2-student peer panel per presenter; Course synthesis discussion; End-of-course reflection submitted online within 48 hours

	decisions will this cohort make differently? Instructor closes the course.			
REVISION SESSIONS — Lessons 27 and 28				
Lesson 27: Revision Session 1 — Modules 1, 2 & 3				
Review: AI Fundamentals, Strategy, Finance	Structured revision of Modules 1–3. Core concepts: AI literacy, failure modes, global AI race; competitive strategy frameworks (Porter + AI moats), build-buy-partner; AI valuation drivers, investment risk, due diligence. Common patterns in the quiz (A1): what did the class do well? Where were the gaps? Instructor provides sample reflection paper prompts from prior cohorts. Q&A. Student-led concept summaries (voluntary, 3 min each).	**CLO1 CLO2**	All Modules 1–3 readings A5 Reflection Paper prompts distributed by instructor	Structured revision; Q&A; Student-led concept summaries; A5 Reflection Paper briefing and prompt discussion
Lesson 28: Revision Session 2 — Modules 4, 5 & 6 | Course Close				
Review: AI Law, Policy, Integration | Reflection Paper Preparation	Structured revision of Modules 4–6. Key provisions across jurisdictions: GDPR vs CCPA vs DPDP; liability chain patterns from role plays; global vs India regulatory comparison; G20 simulation takeaways; GlobalFinAI crisis debrief insights. Reflection Paper writing workshop: instructor walks through each A5 question with a model response structure. Final 20 minutes: closing reflection — 'What is the one AI-related decision you will approach differently because of	**CLO3 CLO4 CLO5**	All Modules 4–6 readings A5 Reflection Paper guidelines (distributed by instructor)	Structured revision; A5 Reflection Paper workshop; Final Q&A; Closing one-sentence course reflection from every student

	this course?' Each student shares one sentence.			

** Additional materials and exercises will be distributed before or in class as required. Book initials [M, SW, AP, L, C, R] correspond to Required Books listed above. ★ R*