

Lesson 1 — Make Review an Inspectable Workflow

Learning question: Which parts of AI criticism deserve to become edits?

Workflows: W0, W1, W2, W6. Keep a short baseline unchanged. W1 may organise review and editing in one session; the guided exercise uses W2's fresh reviewer session to make the handoff visible. Neither arrangement establishes independent expertise.

Min.	Format	Teacher and participant activity	Observable result
0–5	Individual reflection and brief recall	Display the familiar context → clarification → approach → execution → review sequence. Participants locate today's work inside review, inspect their baseline themselves, and predict one defect AI will find and one it might miss	Initial human annotation and prediction
5–10	Demonstration	On the common case, ask for a harsh critique. Do not revise. Inspect one supported finding, one preference, or one unsupported objection if present. Use prepared contrasting output if needed and identify it as prepared	Annotated critique; distinction between forceful wording and justified findings
10–25	Guided device practice	In three short cycles, demonstrate and pause: open W2 in a fresh session with baseline, brief, evidence, and criteria; record a human accept/reject/defer decision on one or two findings; invoke W6 to edit an accepted finding and verify it against the original evidence	Saved review, revision decision, revised passage, verification note
25–34	Group exercise	Compare one participant case or a shared track. Check one finding against its source, identify a strength to preserve, and decide whether a proposed change is justified. Do not force a rejection if all findings are sound	One evidence-backed decision and one limit of the review
34–42	Presentation and discussion	Each group gives a 90-second explanation to a neighbouring group, then listens to its neighbour. Invite two one-minute plenary examples; use the remaining time to connect differences to criteria and evidence	Every group presents an excerpt, decision, and insight
42–45	Individual reflection	Complete a W1 card and finish: "I would use this loop when ...; I would stop or defer when ..."	First reusable workflow card

Facilitation and Evidence

"Harsh critique" is an experiment with an underspecified reviewing instruction, not the recommended default. Preserve its output so participants can compare the usefulness of findings. The later condition changes criteria, supplied context, and phase separation together; this short exercise does not isolate the effect of any one change.

The minimum successful outcome is one justified review decision and one checked revision, or an evidence-backed decision that no revision is warranted. Do not reward change for its own sake.

Lesson 2 — Select, Nest, and Recombine Workflows

Learning question: What should we do when the review itself reveals a problem in how we are working?

Workflows: W0, W3, W4, W5, returning to W1 and W6. Reuse the case and saved state from Lesson 1. Specify a common version before producing additional reviews.

Min.	Format	Teacher and participant activity	Observable result
0–4	Individual reflection	Present an obstacle: an unclear criterion, missing evidence, or contradictory recommendations. Participants choose a next move before prompting	Workflow selection and predicted benefit
4–9	Demonstration	Invoke W4 for a concrete need, such as separating evidence support from implementation feasibility. Ask AI to propose roles and handover prompts; remove an unnecessary role and approve useful boundaries	Two role cards showing input, output, perspective, and authority
9–20	Guided device practice	Participants adapt the cards, open a reviewer session on their own devices, and save its report. Demonstrate a consolidation session receiving two reports and returning one proposed revision plan; pause for participants to perform the same consolidation on their devices. Supply a prepared second report when time or latency prevents another live run	Separate reports and a proposed consolidated plan, with conflicts retained
20–32	Group exercise	Each group receives one obstacle card below, selects a workflow, carries it out on a bounded passage, and records the result returned to the parent. The teacher coaches choices without prescribing a sequence	Completed sub-workflow, handoff, human decision, and marked return point
32–40	Presentation and discussion	Neighbouring groups exchange 90-second presentations. Two groups show contrasting choices in one-minute plenary reports. Discuss whether the extra step earned its cost	Comparison of when to clarify, add a perspective, reconcile, or stop
40–45	Guided device practice and individual reflection	Demonstrate resuming from the accepted returned artefact. Participants resume their own parent task with one bounded step and finish a workflow card and transfer rule	Evidence that the handoff changed the next action

Obstacle Cards for Short Group Work

Initially show participants only the obstacle. The suggested workflows below are teacher facilitation notes; reveal them after groups have selected and justified their own next move.

1. **Unclear criterion:** reviewers disagree about what “actionable” means. Use W3 to clarify the intended decision, approve one observable criterion, and return to the disputed finding.
2. **Conflicting perspectives:** one reviewer asks for brevity while another requires a qualification supported by the source. Use W5 to expose the conflict and propose a resolution. A human decides what must be preserved.
3. **Missing evidence:** a reviewer claims that the proposal is infeasible, but no workload information was supplied. Use W3 to identify what would be needed. Return either supplied evidence or an explicit deferred judgement.
4. **Unhelpful role proliferation:** a plan proposes five reviewers with overlapping tasks. Use W4 to reduce it to contributions that could change the decision, and explain the removed coordination cost.

In a large cohort, distribute cards across groups; no group needs to complete all four. Groups may conclude that another AI session is unnecessary if the human can resolve the issue directly.

Lesson 3 — Make Evidence Visible for Human Judgement

Learning question: What do I need to see to identify a weakness and decide what should improve?

Workflows: W0 and W7; W8 for the telemetry example and W9 for the batch demonstration. The main manipulation is the evidence presentation available to a human, not the addition of a model verdict.

Min.	Format	Teacher and participant activity	Observable result
0–5	Individual reflection	Show a short fictional answer or proposal and a concrete decision. Participants note what they can judge, what they cannot judge, and what evidence they need	Initial judgement or explicit uncertainty and an evidence request
5–12	Demonstration	Use W7 to prepare an exam-correction view: criterion beside exact answer passages, reference material, and gaps, without an AI grade. Inspect an original passage and show how an omission could change a human judgement	Evidence view and a human finding; extraction distinguished from evaluation
12–23	Guided device practice	Participants choose assessment, proposal, communication, data, or process evidence. Ask AI what material is needed, approve the useful requirements, and produce a small evidence view. Check at least one extraction against its original	Evidence requirements and a checked view on each device
23–33	Group exercise	Exchange views with a neighbouring participant or group. A human reviewer identifies one supported concern or a reason to make no change. Another checks whether the view omitted relevant evidence. Improve the display or evidence request	Human judgement, source location, missing information, and proposed next action
33–39	Presentation and discussion	Groups present their view and insight in reciprocal 90-second exchanges; two one-minute plenary examples contrast different domains. Teacher identifies one transferable evidence requirement	Every group explains what the display enabled or obscured
39–43	Demonstration	Show a prepared business-proposal review interface or table. Open one case from the batch, trace a displayed passage to its original, and expose a missing-evidence case and a pending human decision	W9 overview and the role of storage, retrieval, and a review interface
43–45	Individual reflection	Write one rule: “To decide ..., I need to see ...; AI can prepare ..., and I must still check ...”	Personal rule for supporting human judgement

UNIT 6 · TEACHING NOTES

Prompt Scaffolds

Adapt these to the selected case. They illustrate workflow roles rather than fixed recipes.

W2 — Reviewer

Review the supplied version against these criteria using the supplied brief and evidence. Do not edit the artefact. For each finding, identify the criterion, exact location, supporting evidence, uncertainty, and proposed change. Distinguish a supported defect from a preference or missing evidence. Include strengths that should survive revision. “No supported issue found” is an acceptable result.

W4 — Role and prompt designer

We need to resolve [difficulty] in this review. Propose the smallest useful set of contributions. For each, specify perspective, inputs, permitted actions, output, and decisions reserved for the human. Draft its handover prompt. Explain which roles would be redundant. Wait for my decision before running the proposed review.

W5 — Consolidator

Combine these separate reviews of the same version into one proposed Markdown revision plan. Preserve finding IDs and evidence links. Identify duplicates, compatible edits, conflicts, unsupported suggestions, and dependencies. Do not silently resolve consequential conflicts or change the original. Leave accept/reject/defer decisions for me.

W7 — Evidence assistant

I need to decide [decision]. Help me specify what I must inspect. Using the supplied material, place the relevant original passages or observations beside each criterion and include their locations. Retain conflicting evidence and indicate gaps. Do not score, rank, judge, or rewrite the work. I will make the judgement after inspecting the evidence.

Any handoff between sessions

Resume [workflow ID] at [step]. Use [listed artefacts and versions] as the working state. The accepted decisions are [...]; unresolved issues are [...]. Your task is [...], and you may [...]. Return [artefact and required fields]. Stop and ask if [condition]. Do not assume access to earlier chats.

Working Artefacts and Evidence to Retain

Use Markdown or equivalent portable files. The following names describe proposed classroom outputs, not pre-existing repository files. Combine small records into one document where this reduces friction while preserving their roles.

Proposed artefact	Purpose and owner	Used by
brief.md, criteria.md, source pack	Accepted task, audience, criteria, and evidence; human approved	W1–W7 as relevant
baseline.md	Unchanged starting artefact with version identity	Reviews and before/after checks
review-a.md, optionally review-b.md	AI findings and evidence locations from bounded perspectives	W5 and human revision decisions
clarification.md, roles.md	Approved output from a necessary design detour	Resumed W2 or W5
revision-plan.md	Consolidated suggestions, conflicts, and human accept/reject/defer decisions	W6
revised.md, verification.md	Revised artefact, changes, checks, remaining issues	Human acceptance and later challenge evidence
evidence-view.md or equivalent table/sketch	AI-prepared material for human inspection, with links to originals	W7 and W9
human-judgement.md	Human finding, evidence, uncertainty, and next action	Further investigation or revision
workflow-card.md	Selected workflow, trigger, inputs, return point, stop rule, and lesson learned	Transfer to participants' own work

Participants should leave with one checked review decision, one completed or explicitly deferred sub-workflow, one tested evidence view, and a practical rule. The introduction provides material for Challenge 6; it does not add a separate submission requirement or replace the challenge's experimental design.