

SM5363: HUMAN-CENTERED AI: AGENTS, INTERACTION, AND INTEGRATION

Effective Term

Semester A 2026/27

Part I Course Overview

Course Title

Human-Centered AI: Agents, Interaction, and Integration

Subject Code

SM - School of Creative Media

Course Number

5363

Academic Unit

School of Creative Media (SM)

College/School

School of Creative Media (SM)

Course Duration

One Semester

Credit Units

3

Level

P5, P6 - Postgraduate Degree

Medium of Instruction

English

Medium of Assessment

English

Additional Information

Postgraduate course for MFA students across fine arts, game design and human computer interaction (HCI) streams; practice-focused with hands-on labs and project-based learning

Part II Course Details

Abstract

Human-Centered AI: Agents, Interaction, and Integration is a practice-focused postgraduate course designed for students across fine arts, game design, and human-computer interaction (HCI) streams. The course demystifies AI agent development and multimodal AI integration, equipping creative practitioners with the core skills to build, design and deploy human-centered AI agents as powerful creative tools—with no advanced technical or programming prerequisites required. Centered on the intersection of AI technology and creative practice, the curriculum covers foundational AI agent principles, AI tool integration, prompt design, agent workflow construction, and multi-agent collaborative systems, with a consistent focus on ethical AI use, the preservation of artistic agency, and alignment with real-world creative industry needs. Through hands-on lab sessions, discipline-specific creative assignments, and a capstone project focused

on developing publicly accessible AI agent systems, students learn to leverage AI to enhance rather than replace human creative expression, building functional AI agent solutions tailored to fine arts, game design, or HCI practice. By the course's conclusion, students will be able to select and apply appropriate AI agent tools for creative workflows, design human-AI collaborative systems, and deploy AI agents with clear ethical guidelines—cultivating in-demand skills for the AI-driven creative landscape while centering human creativity and real-world user needs.

Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

CILOs		Weighting (if app.)	DEC-A1	DEC-A2	DEC-A3
1	Cultivate a curious, exploratory attitude toward AI as a creative tool, and actively experiment with AI agent applications for fine arts, game design and HCI practice	20%	x		
2	Master the basic skills to build and customize AI agents (code/no-code) and integrate multimodal AI capabilities (text/vision/audio) into creative workflows	25%		x	
3	Design and implement human-centered AI agent systems that enhance creative expression and preserve artistic agency for discipline-specific creative projects	25%		x	x
4	Evaluate and select appropriate AI agent platforms/tools for different creative use cases (art creation, game design, HCI prototyping)	20%	x	x	
5	Communicate AI agent design ideas and creative applications effectively, and provide constructive peer feedback on AI-augmented creative projects	10%	x	x	x

A1: Attitude

Develop an attitude of discovery/innovation/creativity, as demonstrated by students possessing a strong sense of curiosity, asking questions actively, challenging assumptions or engaging in inquiry together with teachers.

A2: Ability

Develop the ability/skill needed to discover/innovate/create, as demonstrated by students possessing critical thinking skills to assess ideas, acquiring research skills, synthesizing knowledge across disciplines or applying academic knowledge to real-life problems.

A3: Accomplishments

Demonstrate accomplishment of discovery/innovation/creativity through producing /constructing creative works/new artefacts, effective solutions to real-life problems or new processes.

Learning and Teaching Activities (LTAs)

LTAs		Brief Description	CILO No.	Hours/week (if applicable)
1	Interactive Thematic Lectures	Instructors deliver core content (AI agent fundamentals, multimodal integration, AI ethics) with discipline-specific case studies.	1, 2, 4, 5	2

2	Guided Hands-On Lab Sessions	Structured lab work with TA support; step-by-step practice for dev environment setup, API integration, no-code agent building and basic framework use. Adapted for non-technical creative learners with stream-specific task prompts.	2, 3	1.5
3	Weekly In-Class Peer Discussions	Students share short weekly AI agent prototypes/prompt experiments, discuss human-centered design choices and ethical considerations, and provide guided constructive peer feedback. Fosters cross-stream creative inspiration and communication skills.	1, 5	0.5
4	Project Workshops	Focused workshops for course assignments (creative assistant agent, multi-agent collaborative workflow) and capstone projects. Instructors provide 1:1 feedback on project design, technical implementation, platform selection and alignment with artistic/ethical goals.	2, 3, 4	0.5
5	Capstone Project Development & Peer Review	Ongoing structured support for final AI agent system development (independent/group work). Includes mid-project check-ins, peer review sessions to refine design/functionality/ethics, and pre-presentation feedback. Culminates in week 13 capstone demos and discussions.	2, 3, 4, 5	0.5

Assessment Tasks / Activities (ATs)

	ATs	CILO No.	Weighting (%)	Remarks ("- " for nil entry)	Allow Use of GenAI?
1	In-Class Participation & Peer Feedback	1, 5	20	Ongoing engagement in weekly lectures/ labs/discussion	Yes
2	AI Agent Assignment 1	1, 2, 3, 4	20	Build a discipline-specific AI Agent	Yes
3	AI Agent Assignment 2)	2, 3, 4, 5	20	Design/prototype an agent system for a creative project	Yes
4	Capstone Project	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	40	Individual/group task; Develop a fully functional human-centered AI agent system.	Yes

Continuous Assessment (%)

100

Additional Information for ATs

All deliverables require clear AI content attribution and adherence to ethical AI use

Assessment Rubrics (AR)**Assessment Task**

In-Class Participation & Peer Feedback

Criterion

Consistent active engagement in all course activities, quality of demo submissions, and provision of constructive, actionable peer feedback aligned with course focus on human-centered AI and creative practice (CILO1, CILO5)

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Consistently initiates thoughtful discussions/stream-specific questions; provides detailed, actionable feedback that addresses human-centered design, technical implementation, and ethical AI use for classmates' work.

Good (B+, B, B-)

Regularly participates in course discussions/activities; provides meaningful, specific feedback that identifies key strengths and targeted areas for improvement in classmates' work.

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Sporadically participates in course activities (only responds when prompted); provides generic, brief feedback with only surface-level comments on classmates' work.

Marginal (D)

Rarely attends/engages in course activities; provides unconstructive/irrelevant feedback with no specific suggestions for classmates.

Failure (F)

No attendance/engagement in any course activities; no peer feedback provided for any classmate work.

Assessment Task

AI Agent Assignment 1

Criterion

Holistic quality of the discipline-specific (fine arts/game design/HCI) AI agent including technical functionality/multimodal integration, human-centered/creative stream-aligned design, and clarity of the accompanying design reflection (CILO1, CILO2, CILO3, CILO4)

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Agent functions flawlessly with seamless multimodal integration; optimal platform/tool selection with clear rationale; exceptional human-centered design that amplifies artistic agency and highly creative stream-specific application; design reflection is detailed and articulates all key design choices/experimentation processes.

Good (B+, B, B-)

Agent works well with minor technical bugs and effective basic multimodal integration; appropriate platform/tool selection; strong human-centered design that preserves artistic agency and creative stream-specific application; design reflection is clear and explains core design/platform choices.

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Agent functions with noticeable technical bugs and limited multimodal integration; platform/tool selection lacks clear justification; basic human-centered design with functional but low-creativity stream-specific application; design reflection is brief with minimal explanation of key choices.

Marginal (D)

Agent is non-functional for core creative tasks with no meaningful multimodal integration; incorrect platform/tool selection; poor human-centered design that compromises artistic agency and little to no stream alignment/creativity; design reflection is incomplete/undecipherable with no rationale provided.

Failure (F)

No agent prototype submitted; core assignment requirements unmet; no design reflection provided (or reflection is entirely unrelated to the task).

Assessment Task

AI Agent Assignment 2

Criterion

Overall quality of the group multi-agent system (technical functionality/agent coordination/workflow logic), human-centered/creative stream-aligned design, comprehensiveness of the ethical use statement, and individual contribution to group collaboration (CILO2, CILO3, CILO4, CILO5)

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Multi-agent system functions flawlessly with seamless agent coordination and optimized creative workflow; workflow amplifies collaborative agency with highly creative stream-specific design; individual consistently leads key tasks, communicates effectively, and meets all group deadlines.

Good (B+, B, B-)

Multi-agent system works well with minor bugs and effective agent coordination/logical workflow; workflow preserves agency with creative stream-specific design; individual reliably completes assigned tasks, communicates well, and meets all group deadlines.

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Multi-agent system functions with noticeable bugs and inconsistent agent coordination/disjointed workflow; basic human-centered workflow with functional but low-creativity stream-specific design; individual sporadically contributes, leaves tasks incomplete, and has minor deadline delays.

Marginal (D)

Multi-agent system is non-functional with no agent coordination/illogical workflow; workflow compromises agency with little to no stream alignment/creativity; individual rarely contributes, completes no assigned tasks, and has major deadline delays.

Failure (F)

No multi-agent prototype/workflow document submitted; individual makes zero contribution to all group work/activities.

Assessment Task

Capstone Project (Final AI Agent System + Presentation)

Criterion

Holistic quality of the final stream-aligned AI agent system including public deployment/accessibility, real-world usage demonstration, technical functionality/multimodal integration; human-centered/creative design and artistic agency focus; adherence to ethical AI practice (attribution/bias mitigation); completeness/polish of all deliverables (agent, demo video, report, deployment docs); and clarity/confidence of the in-class presentation + Q&A response (CILO1, CILO2, CILO3, CILO4, CILO5)

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Agent system successfully deployed for public use with initial real user engagement, clear data-backed demonstration of meeting genuine real-world creative/industry needs, and thoughtful reflection on early user feedback; functions flawlessly with advanced multimodal integration; exceptional human-centered design that centers artistic agency with highly innovative stream-specific creative goals; impeccable ethical practice (full attribution, detailed bias mitigation/authorship reflection); all deliverables (including deployment docs/early user engagement data) are polished, complete, and on-time with a well-structured, rationale-rich report; presentation is engaging/well-timed and answers all Q&A with depth/confidence, with clear articulation of deployment, user engagement and real need fulfillment.

Good (B+, B, B-)

Agent system fully deployed and publicly accessible (no real user engagement required), with a clear, compelling demonstration of how it addresses real-world creative/industry needs; works well with minor technical bugs and effective multimodal integration (fully functional for public use); strong human-centered design that preserves artistic agency with creative stream-specific goals; strong ethical practice (full attribution for all AI content, basic bias mitigation/ethical reflection); all deliverables (including full deployment documentation) are complete and on-time with a clear, well-structured report; presentation is clear and on-time, answers all Q&A with confidence, and clearly explains the deployment process and real-world usage value.

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Agent system deployed in a limited public/beta access format (functional for public access but with restricted availability), with a basic demonstration of alignment to real-world creative/industry needs (no formal validation of need fulfillment); functions with noticeable minor bugs and limited multimodal integration (core public functionality intact but non-essential features impaired); basic human-centered design with functional but low-creativity stream-specific goals; basic ethical practice (partial AI content attribution, minimal reflection on ethical use/bias); all deliverables (including basic deployment notes) submitted (minor delays allowed) with a report that has minor structural issues and incomplete rationale for design/deployment choices; presentation is slightly disorganized (minor time overruns), explains core project/deployment details, and struggles with some Q&A on real-world need alignment and deployment limitations.

Marginal (D)

Agent system not deployed for public use (local/classroom demo only), with only a superficial description (no clear demonstration) of how it might address real-world creative/industry needs; functions with significant bugs and limited/no meaningful multimodal integration (core functionality only operational for demo use); poor human-centered design with vague or non-stream-aligned creative goals; poor ethical practice (missing attribution for key AI content, no consideration of bias/ethical use); incomplete deliverables submitted (major delays) with a disorganized report and only superficial explanation of deployment barriers; presentation is incoherent (major time issues), provides minimal project details, and cannot answer most Q&A on deployment planning, real-world need alignment, and technical functionality.

Failure (F)

No final agent system or key deliverables submitted; core project requirements (including deployment planning and real-world need analysis) unmet; no presentation delivered and no participation in Q&A; severe ethical breaches (e.g., plagiarism, uncredited AI use); no attempt at public deployment, no meaningful demonstration of core agent functionality, and no analysis of real-world creative/industry needs.

Part III Other Information

Reading List

Compulsory Readings

Title	
1	N/A

Additional Readings

Title	
1	N/A