


## OVERVIEW • LESSONS 1–3

# Two ways to support judgement

Choose the kind of help that your next decision requires.


## LESSONS 1–2 • AI reviews; humans control revision

W1



## LESSON 3 • AI prepares evidence; humans judge

W7



Both routes retain human responsibility. The AI contribution changes.


LESSONS 1-2 • W1

# The reflection loop

Which findings deserve an edit, and what shows that the result improved?

**INPUTS**

Fixed artefact + task brief + criteria + evidence



**OUTCOME**

Accept the checked artefact, retain the baseline, or record a deferred judgement.

## LESSON 2 • W5

# Multiple review perspectives

W4 can define the review roles and prompts before the split.




Different roles add perspectives. Their labels do not confer independent expertise.

## LESSON 2 • W3 INSIDE W2

# Pause, clarify, return

Resolve a specific gap, then resume the exact review step that needed it.

## PARENT WORKFLOW • W1



If the criterion changes, reassess both versions. If the gap remains, defer that judgement.

## LESSON 3 • W7

# Evidence for human judgement

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

**INPUTS**

Decision question + criteria + original material

**1 HUMAN**

## Define the decision

Specify what must be seen

Evidence requirements

**2 AI**

## Prepare linked evidence

Passages · gaps · conflicts

Evidence view

**3 HUMAN**

## Inspect the originals

Check selection and context

Supported observations

**4 HUMAN**

## Judge and choose the next action

Improve · clarify · retain

Decision record

**AI prepares the evidence view. The human develops the judgement.**

No AI score, ranking, verdict, or suggested edit in this exercise.