ENGLISH 1020: CORE COMPOSITION I

Classroom Activities for Engaging Generative AI

A Collection of Activity Ideas for Writing Instructors (Organized by Competency)

How to Use This Guide

This guide provides classroom activities for ENGLISH 1020, the first course in the Core Composition sequence. Because many students arrive with little critical exposure to generative AI tools, activities in this guide start from the ground up (what an LLM is, how it generates text, and where its limits are) before moving into process use, authorship, evaluation, and disclosure. Activities are organized into five competencies, plus a closing section of AI-free activities that protect key stages of the writing and thinking process.

Every activity follows the same structure so you can scan it quickly: an Overview, an Instructor Tip (a heads-up on common pitfalls), Materials Needed (listed before the steps, so you can prep ahead), numbered Step-by-Step Instructions, a Reflection Prompt, and often a Variation/Extension. Time estimates are guidelines; adapt as needed for your class.

Activities are grouped by competency but may overlap in practice. You're encouraged to mix and sequence activities to suit your own course arc rather than running them strictly in order. Materials marked “instructor-provided” or “instructor-prepared” need to be created or gathered before class; budget prep time accordingly, especially the first time you run an activity.

QUICK ORIENTATION FOR NEW INSTRUCTORS

- Skim the Instructor Tip on any activity before you run it for the first time.
- Anything listed as “instructor-provided” or “instructor-prepared” takes advance work.
- Activities marked “Full class” or “Full class + homework” run 60+ minutes.
- The AI-Free section at the end isn't optional filler. Weave a few of those activities throughout the semester to protect students' own thinking before AI enters the process.

Contents

Competency 1: AI Literacy and Orientation

- Activity 1: The Basics *50 min (full class)*
- Activity 2: Practice Prompting *(45 min)*
- Activity 3: Training Data Detective *(30–40 min)*
- Activity 4: Hallucination Hunt *(35–45 min)*
- Activity 5: The Probability Machine Analogy *20–30 min (can be homework)*
- Activity 6: Model FAQ — Ask the AI About Itself *(40 min)*
- Activity 7: AI Capability / Limitation Map *(30–45 min)*

Competency 2: AI as a Process Tool

- Activity 1: AI as Thinking Partner *(45 min)*
- Activity 2: AI Brainstorm Sprint *(40 min)*
- Activity 3: Outline Architect — Human vs. AI *(50 min)*
- Activity 4: The Drafting Experiment *(Full class + homework)*
- Activity 5: Reverse Outlining with AI *(25 min)*
- Activity 6: AI as First Reader — Peer Review Practice *(40 min)*
- Activity 7: The Revision Loop — AI as Revision Partner *(45–55 min)*
- Activity 8: AI as Peer Reviewer, Human as Editor *(50–60 min)*

Competency 3: Authorship, Voice, and AI

- Activity 1: Who Wrote This? — Authorship Debate *(40–50 min)*
- Activity 2: Voice Fingerprinting *(45 min)*
- Activity 3: The Authorship Spectrum Debate *(50 min)*
- Activity 4: Reclaiming the Draft *(Full class + homework)*
- Activity 5: Ghost-Writer or Collaborator? — Reading AI Ethics Cases *(40 min)*
- Activity 6: Writing Against the Machine *(30–40 min)*

Competency 4: Evaluating AI-Generated Content

- Activity 1: The Accuracy Audit *(50 min)*
- Activity 2: Bias Spotting in AI Outputs *(45 min)*
- Activity 3: The Logic Checker — Evaluating AI Arguments *(40 min)*
- Activity 4: Rhetorical Effectiveness Analysis *(45 min)*

Competency 5: Transparency and Disclosure

- Activity 1: AI Use Statement Workshop *(40 min)*
- Activity 2: Process Notes Portfolio *(Ongoing throughout unit / 30 min debrief)*
- Activity 3: Ethical Scenarios Gallery Walk *(40 min)*
- Activity 4: Attribution in Practice — Citing AI Responsibly *(35 min)*
- Activity 5: The 'What Would I Say?' Accountability Letter *30–40 min (can be homework)*

Preserving AI-Free Space for Writing & Reading

1. Committing to Cognitive Fitness (Reading) *(35 min)*
2. Ten-Minute Analog Freewrite *(15–20 min)*
3. Memory, Experience, and Stakes Map *(30–40 min)*
4. Question-Storming Circle *(25–35 min)*
5. Bad Ideas Before Good Ideas *(20–30 min)*

6. The 'Do Not Outsource This' Reflection *(25–35 min)*

Competency 1: AI Literacy and Orientation

Students develop a foundational understanding of how large language models and generative AI tools work — including how they are trained, what they can and cannot do, and why they produce the outputs they do — in order to engage with these tools as informed, critical users rather than passive consumers.

COMPETENCY AT A GLANCE

Activity	Time	Format
1. The Basics	50 min (full class)	Small groups + whole-class discussion
2. Practice Prompting	45 min	Individual practice
3. Training Data Detective	30–40 min	Individual + small group discussion
4. Hallucination Hunt	35–45 min	Individual verification + class debrief
5. The Probability Machine Analogy	20–30 min (can be homework)	Individual + AI comparison
6. Model FAQ — Ask the AI About Itself	40 min	Individual questions + pairs
7. AI Capability / Limitation Map	30–45 min	Individual + whole-class board

Activity 1: The Basics

50 min (full class) • *Small groups + whole-class discussion*

Overview. Students generate the same prompt across three different AI tools (ChatGPT, Claude, Copilot) and compare outputs side by side, working in small groups to identify patterns, surprises, and failures — building intuitive understanding of how LLMs generate text.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Line up a short (5–8 min), instructor-vetted explainer video on "what is a large language model" before class rather than searching live — a quick web search can surface video results that are outdated, overly technical, or aimed at developers rather than first-year writers.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Access to ChatGPT, Claude, Copilot
- 3 pre-written prompts per group
- Shared Google Doc or printed comparison worksheet
- Whiteboard

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Introduce the concept of a large language model (share a short introductory video).
2. Each small group receives the same three prompts: a factual question, a creative task, and an opinion question.
3. Groups run each prompt through two or three AI tools and screenshot or copy the outputs side by side.
4. Groups analyze: Where do outputs agree? Where do they diverge? What does that tell us about how the model 'knows' things?
5. Whole-class share-out and discussion (15 min). Instructor synthesizes key LLM concepts: training data, token prediction, hallucination.

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *In a short paragraph, describe one moment where an AI output surprised you. What does that surprise tell you about how the tool works — or doesn't?*

Variation / Extension. Advanced: Have students try to 'break' the AI with edge-case prompts and document what they find.

Activity 2: Practice Prompting

45 min • *Individual practice*

Overview. Students practice prompting AI in a way that yields better results.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Have students save both their original and revised prompts side by side (not just the outputs) — the before/after prompt wording is what makes the reflection concrete, and it's easy for students to overwrite the original if you don't ask for it explicitly.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- A topic of interest
- Bowen & Watson excerpt (pp. 58–69) or instructor-provided prompting tips handout
- AI chat tool

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Try an AI prompt with no special conditions.
2. Read tips on AI prompting (Bowen & Watson, p. 58–69). Take notes on the top 3 prompting tips.
3. Revisit your original AI prompt and revise it using those tips.

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *What changed between your original prompt and your revised prompt? Which tip made the biggest difference in the output you got?*

Activity 3: Training Data Detective

30–40 min • *Individual + small group discussion*

Overview. Students interrogate an AI tool to infer what kinds of sources and biases might be embedded in its training data, then connect this to discussions of whose voices and knowledge are centered in generative AI.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Pre-select and time-check your explainer video on training data (aim for under 8 minutes) rather than searching live in class. Preview it once yourself so you can flag any terminology it uses that your students haven't encountered yet.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat interface (any LLM)
- Reflection handout

- Pair of culturally contrasting prompt variations per student

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Instructor briefly explains what training data is and how it shapes outputs (8 min).
2. Students ask the AI the same question from two different cultural, geographic, or political perspectives — e.g., 'What is a good student?' framed from a U.S. vs. non-U.S. context.
3. Students note what assumptions, values, or cultural defaults appear in each response.
4. Small group discussion: What does the AI seem to 'know' most about? Whose voices are centered?
5. Students write a brief 'data biography' speculation: What kind of training data would produce this output?

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *Based on today's experiment, what gaps or biases might exist in the AI's training data? How might that matter when you use it for writing tasks?*

Variation / Extension. Ask the AI about a topic from your home culture or community and evaluate how well it responds.

Activity 4: Hallucination Hunt

35–45 min • *Individual verification + class debrief*

Overview. Students deliberately prompt an AI to produce plausible-sounding but verifiably false information, then fact-check claims using library databases — building skepticism and verification habits from day one.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Run this yourself on a couple of topics before class so you have a rough sense of how many fabricated sources to expect — with only a five-source list, if the AI happens to return mostly accurate sources for a given topic, students won't have much to work with. Have a backup topic ready.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat tool
- Library database access (JSTOR, EBSCO, etc.)
- Fact-checking tally worksheet

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Explain what hallucination means in AI contexts: confident-sounding fabrication (5 min).
2. Students ask the AI to list five scholarly sources on a topic related to their current writing assignment.
3. Students verify each source title and author in the library database or Google Scholar.
4. Students tally: How many were real? Partially real? Completely invented?
5. Class debrief: Why does this happen? What are the implications for research?

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *If you hadn't checked those sources, how might using them have affected your essay? What's your new rule for using AI in research?*

Variation / Extension. Repeat the hallucination hunt with a prompt that asks for current events from the last six months.

Activity 5: The Probability Machine Analogy

20–30 min (can be homework) • *Individual + AI comparison*

Overview. Using a simple fill-in-the-blank exercise, students explore how AI generates 'the most likely next word' — experiencing the probabilistic logic of LLMs firsthand before discussing its implications for creativity and truth.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *The first half (human completions) works well as a no-tech warm-up or even homework; save class time for the AI comparison and discussion, where the real learning happens.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Sentence-fragment worksheet (10 items)
- AI chat tool for comparison
- No tech needed for first half

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Give students 10 sentence fragments and ask them to write 'the most likely next word or phrase.'
2. Run the same fragments through an AI and compare human vs. AI completions.
3. Discuss: When do humans and AIs agree? When don't they — and why?
4. Connect to the concept of statistical patterns: AI 'writes' based on what's most common, not what's most true or most creative.
5. Brief lecture: implications for writing — AI defaults toward average, not excellent.

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *What does it mean that AI is always reaching for 'the likely' answer? How should that shape when you do or don't use it in your writing?*

Variation / Extension. Try this with sentence fragments from famous speeches or literature — observe how the AI's completions differ from what was actually written.

Activity 6: Model FAQ — Ask the AI About Itself

40 min • *Individual questions + pairs*

Overview. Students interrogate an AI tool about its own nature, limitations, and training — then critically evaluate the AI's self-report for accuracy, evasion, and anthropomorphism, developing critical meta-literacy.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Students sometimes take an AI's self-description at face value because it's phrased so confidently. Have your short reading on LLM limitations ready to distribute right after step 3, while the AI's claims are still fresh, rather than saving it for the very end.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat tool
- List of student-generated questions
- Brief reading on LLM limitations (provided by instructor)

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students individually draft five questions they genuinely want to ask an AI about how it works.
2. Students submit their questions to the AI and read the responses carefully.
3. In pairs, students identify: What did it claim it can do? What did it claim it can't? Did it avoid any questions? Did it personify itself?
4. Groups report out on one interesting AI self-report moment.
5. Instructor contextualizes: What AI actually says about itself vs. what researchers and engineers say.

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *Did anything the AI said about itself surprise or concern you? How confident should we be in an AI's self-description?*

Variation / Extension. Compare how two different AI tools answer the same 'What are your limitations?' question.

Activity 7: AI Capability / Limitation Map

30–45 min • *Individual + whole-class board*

Overview. Help students identify what AI can support and where human judgment remains essential by mapping AI's strengths and limits against their own coursework.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *This activity works well as a semester-opener but is even more valuable revisited briefly around midterm, once students have real AI-use experience to draw on — their principle statements tend to get much more specific the second time.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Two-column map worksheet
- AI Personal Principles Statement handout
- Whiteboard or shared board space

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students create a two-column map: 'AI Can Help With' and 'AI Cannot Fully Do For Me.' Categories might include brainstorming, summarizing, revising sentences, checking organization, understanding sources, making ethical decisions, developing lived-experience examples, choosing a meaningful topic, or deciding what they truly believe.
2. As a class, build a shared board with three zones: (1) Useful AI support, (2) Risky AI support, (3) Human-only responsibility.
3. Students write a personal AI-use principle beginning with: 'In this course, I think AI may be useful for..., but I should avoid using it for...'

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *In your AI Personal Principles Statement, name the kinds of AI use that sharpen your thinking and the kinds that serve to dull your ability to think, write, and read.*

Competency 2: AI as a Process Tool

Students experiment with generative AI at various stages of the writing process (brainstorming, outlining, drafting, revising, and getting feedback) and reflect in writing on where AI assistance felt generative or limiting, developing a conscious and deliberate personal approach to its use. Students also consider the strengths and challenges presented by varied LLM tools.

COMPETENCY AT A GLANCE

Activity	Time	Format
1. AI as Thinking Partner	45 min	Individual practice + written reflection
2. AI Brainstorm Sprint	40 min	Individual, then AI-assisted
3. Outline Architect — Human vs. AI	50 min	Individual drafting + comparison
4. The Drafting Experiment	Full class + homework	Individual drafting + AI continuation
5. Reverse Outlining with AI	25 min	Individual, AI-assisted revision planning
6. AI as First Reader — Peer Review Practice	40 min	Individual + peer exchange
7. The Revision Loop — AI as Revision Partner	45–55 min	Individual, iterative
8. AI as Peer Reviewer, Human as Editor	50–60 min	Individual + peer exchange + class discussion

Activity 1: AI as Thinking Partner

45 min • *Individual practice + written reflection*

Overview. Students practice using AI as a thinking partner that sharpens their thinking rather than a tool that outsources their thinking.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *The framing prompt matters here — ask students to prompt the AI to challenge or push back on their idea (not just elaborate on it). A pure elaboration prompt tends to produce agreeable filler rather than the friction this activity is designed to surface.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- A topic of interest
- AI chat tool

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Note that Vygotsky (1978), a key thinker behind constructivism, asserts that interaction and collaboration are essential to growth. What once involved only peers and teachers can now include AI as a collaborator.
2. Take a newly formed idea for an essay or project and practice using AI as a thinking partner: ask it to deepen your insight and challenge your thinking.
3. Write a reflection including: what specific prompts helped AI sharpen your thinking, how AI helped sharpen your thoughts, and a copy/pasted transcript.

> **Reflection Prompt**

> *Can AI sharpen our thoughts about important ideas? At what point is AI dulling our ability to think for ourselves? Where do I draw the line for myself?*

Variation / Extension. Try prompting the AI to argue the opposite of your position, on purpose. Does being pushed back on sharpen your thinking more than being agreed with?

Activity 2: AI Brainstorm Sprint

40 min • *Individual, then AI-assisted*

Overview. Students use AI to rapidly generate brainstorming material for an upcoming essay — then critically evaluate what the AI produced versus what they would have thought of themselves, and reflect on creative ownership.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Enforce the no-AI five minutes strictly — the point of comparison only works if the human list is genuinely generated first. Consider having students physically close laptops or put phones away during that stretch.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat tool
- Essay prompt or topic
- Personal brainstorm worksheet
- AI brainstorm recording sheet

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students spend 5 minutes brainstorming essay ideas entirely on their own (no AI) and record them.
2. Students then use AI to brainstorm the same topic and record the output.
3. Students compare: Which ideas overlapped? What did the AI miss? What did it generate that they hadn't considered?
4. Students choose their best idea (from either list) and explain why in writing.
5. Class discussion: At what stage of brainstorming does AI feel most or least useful?

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *Did using AI in brainstorming feel generative or limiting? Did it help you think more, or did it start to replace your thinking?*

Variation / Extension. Try brainstorming with a bad or vague prompt to the AI. Compare how that changes the usefulness of outputs.

Activity 3: Outline Architect — Human vs. AI

50 min • *Individual drafting + comparison*

Overview. Students build an essay outline by hand, then ask an AI to generate an outline for the same prompt, and finally create a 'hybrid' outline that draws on both. Practicing deliberate, intentional use of AI assistance.

> **Instructor Tip**

> *Twenty minutes for the hand-drafted outline is tight for students who are new to outlining. If your class hasn't practiced outlining yet this term, consider a quick 3-minute model on the board first so students aren't spending their drafting time figuring out the format itself.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Essay prompt
- AI chat tool
- Three-column outline worksheet (yours / AI's / hybrid)
- Annotation key

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students draft a complete essay outline by hand (20 min).
2. Students give the AI the same essay prompt and request a detailed outline.
3. Students compare: Where does the AI's structure differ? Are there sections or moves the AI included that they hadn't?
4. Students create a final hybrid outline, annotating each section with where the idea came from.
5. Share-out: What did you keep from the AI? What did you cut? Why?

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *What does your hybrid outline reveal about how you make structural decisions as a writer? Where did the AI fall short of understanding your purpose?*

Variation / Extension. Try giving the AI only your thesis (not a full prompt) and see if it can infer a useful structure.

Activity 4: The Drafting Experiment

Full class + homework • *Individual drafting + AI continuation*

Overview. Students write the first paragraph of an essay themselves, then ask AI to continue it — and then they revise both versions into a single unified paragraph, exploring the seam between human and AI voice.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Some students will be tempted to just keep the AI's paragraphs largely as-is because revising 'good enough' text feels unnecessary. Frame step 4 explicitly as a voice-matching task. The goal is a paragraph that sounds like one writer, not two, so revision has a clear target.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat tool
- Essay-in-progress
- Color-coded revision guide (yours / AI / revised)

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students write their essay's opening paragraph (15 min).
2. Students give the AI their paragraph and ask it to write the next two paragraphs continuing their argument.
3. Students read the AI continuation and mark: What fits? What doesn't sound like them? What is factually shaky?
4. Students revise all three paragraphs (their original + AI continuation + revisions) into a unified draft.
5. Brief written reflection on the experience (submitted with the draft).

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *Where did the AI's draft feel 'off'? Was it tone, argument, evidence, or something else? What does that tell you about your writing voice?*

Variation / Extension. Swap your AI-continuation paragraph with a classmate and have them identify which sentences were AI-written.

Activity 5: Reverse Outlining with AI

25 min • *Individual, AI-assisted revision planning*

Overview. Students practice using AI to see the organization of their current draft and use that image to revise and reorganize that draft.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *This works best once students already have at least a rough full draft. Running it on a half-finished draft tends to produce a reverse outline that's more about what's missing than how the existing organization works, which isn't the point of the exercise.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- A draft in progress
- AI chat tool

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Take a draft in progress (or one you consider done) and ask AI to reverse outline the draft.
2. Ask AI to point out your strongest argument/evidence and your weakest argument/evidence.
3. Decide what you can revise in your text (related to content and organization) as a result.

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *What did the reverse outline reveal about your draft's organization that you hadn't noticed before? How did AI's read of your strongest and weakest evidence compare with your own instincts?*

Variation / Extension. Ask AI to translate your paper into a new genre (a comic strip, a song, graphic novel, an infographic, etc.) to see how your ideas can be depicted in a shorter form.

Activity 6: AI as First Reader — Peer Review Practice

40 min • *Individual + peer exchange*

Overview. Students submit a draft paragraph to an AI for feedback, then receive peer feedback on the same paragraph from a classmate, comparing the two sets of feedback for quality, insight, and usefulness.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Give students the exact AI prompt wording to use (step 2) rather than letting each student phrase it differently. A vague student-written prompt versus a specific one will skew the comparison in step 4 before students even get to the real question of AI vs. human feedback.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Draft paragraph
- AI chat tool
- Peer review rubric
- Comparison reflection sheet

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students write or bring a body paragraph from their current essay.
2. Students submit it to an AI with the prompt: 'Please give me specific feedback on the argument, evidence, and clarity of this paragraph.'
3. Students exchange paragraphs with a peer who gives written feedback using the class's peer review rubric.
4. Students compare: What did the AI catch? What did the peer catch? What did each miss?
5. Class discussion: What is AI feedback good at? Where does human feedback win?

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *Which feedback was more useful for revision and why? What does peer feedback offer that AI feedback cannot?*

Variation / Extension. Try giving the AI the rubric and see if more structured AI feedback closes the gap with peer feedback.

Activity 7: The Revision Loop — AI as Revision Partner

45–55 min • *Individual, iterative*

Overview. Students systematically use AI for targeted revision tasks — improving a thesis, strengthening a transition, sharpening a conclusion — and track each iteration to develop a conscious revision methodology.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Remind students to request one revision at a time (step 2). Students who paste their whole essay and ask for "general improvement" get vague, hard-to-evaluate output that undermines the accept/reject/modify judgment this activity is built around.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Essay draft
- AI chat tool
- Revision loop log template
- Rubric or revision goals checklist

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students identify the weakest sentence or section in their draft.
2. Students ask AI to revise that specific element (one request at a time).
3. Students evaluate each AI revision: accept, reject, or modify?
4. Students repeat the loop two more times with different elements.
5. Students write a 'revision log' documenting each loop: what they asked, what the AI gave, and what they ultimately chose.

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *After the revision loop, which changes to your draft came from AI, which came from your own judgment, and which were collaborative? Does that distribution feel right to you?*

Variation / Extension. Try giving AI a bad thesis and asking it to revise it; compare to doing the revision yourself first.

Activity 8: AI as Peer Reviewer, Human as Editor

50–60 min • *Individual + peer exchange + class discussion*

Overview. Help students practice using AI feedback critically by comparing it directly against human peer feedback on the same draft.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Pair this activity with "AI as First Reader" earlier in the unit rather than running both back-to-back. Students get more out of the sorting task in step 2 once they've already seen once how AI feedback compares to peer feedback.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Draft essay
- AI chat tool
- Course-specific feedback prompt
- A peer to exchange drafts with

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Ask AI for feedback on a draft using a course-specific prompt, such as: 'Give me feedback on my thesis, paragraph focus, use of evidence, and clarity, but do not rewrite the essay for me.'
2. Sort the AI's feedback into three categories: Useful and specific; Too vague or generic; Not appropriate for my purpose.
3. Exchange drafts with a peer and compare human feedback with AI feedback.
4. Discuss as a class: What did the peer notice that AI did not? What did AI say that seemed useful?
5. Create a revision plan that includes at least one peer suggestion, one self-identified goal, and, optionally, one AI-generated suggestion.

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *Which feedback would you trust most, and why?*

Competency 3: Authorship, Voice, and AI

Students critically examine questions of authorship, ownership, and voice that arise when AI tools contribute to a text, reflecting on what it means to write authentically and how to maintain a distinct writerly identity when working alongside or against generative tools.

COMPETENCY AT A GLANCE

Activity	Time	Format
1. Who Wrote This? — Authorship Debate	40–50 min	Small groups + whole class
2. Voice Fingerprinting	45 min	Individual analysis + gallery share
3. The Authorship Spectrum Debate	50 min	Whole class + small group debate
4. Reclaiming the Draft	Full class + homework	Individual, extensive revision
5. Ghost-Writer or Collaborator? — Reading AI Ethics Cases	40 min	Small group reading + presentation
6. Writing Against the Machine	30–40 min	Individual writing + pairs

Activity 1: Who Wrote This? — Authorship Debate

40–50 min • *Small groups + whole class*

Overview. Explore authorship when multiple agents contribute to a text.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *The five scenarios cover a wide range — from light brainstorming help to a fully AI-generated thesis and outline. If groups rush, they tend to cluster everything in the middle of the ranking. Ask each group to name their most and least AI-authored scenario first, before ranking the rest, to force real differentiation.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Scenario handout or cards
- Space for group ranking discussion

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Examine several short writing scenarios: a student uses AI to brainstorm but writes the essay alone; a student asks AI to rewrite every paragraph; a student uses AI to generate a thesis and outline; a student writes a draft and asks AI for sentence-level polish; a student uses AI to explain a difficult source, then writes their own analysis.
2. In groups, rank the scenarios from 'mostly student-authored' to 'mostly AI-authored.'
3. Share rankings and reasoning as a class.
4. Write a personal authorship boundary statement for ENGL 1020.

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *Where does assistance become co-authorship? What kind of AI use changes the writer's ownership of the work? What would need to be disclosed?*

Activity 2: Voice Fingerprinting

45 min • *Individual analysis + gallery share*

Overview. Students identify the defining characteristics of their own writing voice by analyzing their previous work, then compare a passage they wrote to an AI-generated passage on the same topic, making the difference between their voice and AI's 'average' voice tangible.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Ask students to bring a writing sample from before the semester started (high school work is fine) rather than something drafted for this class, sampling only current coursework can make the 'voice fingerprint' list read more like assignment requirements than genuine personal style.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Personal writing sample (any genre)
- AI chat tool
- Voice Fingerprint worksheet
- Gallery display space or projector

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students select a paragraph from any previous writing they're proud of.
2. Students analyze it for voice markers: sentence variety, word choice, tone, punctuation habits, personal examples.
3. Students ask an AI to write a paragraph on the same topic.
4. Students write a 'voice fingerprint' list: 5 features that mark their writing as distinctly theirs.
5. Gallery share: Students read one sentence from their writing and one from the AI. Can the class tell which is which?

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *What makes your writing voice yours? If an AI could gradually learn to mimic it, at what point would it stop being your voice (or does that question matter)?*

Variation / Extension. Try deliberately making your voice MORE distinct and resubmit to AI for feedback. Does the AI recognize the difference?

Activity 3: The Authorship Spectrum Debate

50 min • *Whole class + small group debate*

Overview. Using real writing scenarios (from 'AI wrote 100%, human edited' to 'human wrote 100%'), students debate where on an authorship spectrum genuine authorship lies, building ethical and philosophical frameworks for AI use in writing.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Bring your course's actual academic integrity policy to this activity rather than paraphrasing it from memory (step 5). Students often have sharp, specific questions about edge cases once the spectrum discussion gets going, and it helps to have the exact wording on hand.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Authorship Spectrum visual (printed or projected)
- Course academic integrity policy

- Scenario cards (8 scenarios)

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Introduce a visual authorship spectrum on the board: 0% human — 100% human.
2. Present 6–8 scenarios (e.g., 'student wrote outline, AI wrote draft, student revised heavily') and ask students to place each on the spectrum.
3. Small groups debate two assigned scenarios: Is this the student's work? Why?
4. Groups share their placements and reasoning, class works to identify where consensus breaks down.
5. Instructor introduces academic integrity policies and asks students how they connect to the spectrum.

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *Where on the authorship spectrum do YOU draw the line for your own work? Write your personal authorship policy in 3–4 sentences.*

Variation / Extension. Research how a professional field you're interested in (law, journalism, medicine) is handling AI authorship questions.

Activity 4: Reclaiming the Draft

Full class + homework • *Individual, extensive revision*

Overview. Students receive an AI-generated draft on a topic they care about and are tasked with transforming it into something that sounds unmistakably like them-- an exercise in revision as identity-assertion.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Choose a prompt broad enough that every student has real personal material to draw on (the example, 'a challenge you've overcome,' works well). A narrower prompt risks leaving some students with nothing authentic to reclaim the draft with.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI-generated draft (prepared by instructor)
- Colored pens or tracked changes in Word
- Reclamation statement prompt sheet

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Instructor generates an AI draft on a broadly assigned topic (e.g., 'a challenge you've overcome').
2. Students receive the same draft and are asked: 'Make this yours. Change whatever you need to.'
3. Students revise extensively, tracking their changes (color-code: green = added, red = deleted, yellow = kept).
4. Students write a brief 'reclamation statement' explaining the biggest changes they made and why.
5. Share-out: What did almost everyone change? What did almost no one change?

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *What does it feel like to reclaim a piece of writing from an AI? What did you have to bring to the draft that the AI couldn't?*

Variation / Extension. Start with an AI draft on a topic the AI handles 'well' (e.g., a generic topic) and compare to one where it clearly lacks personal knowledge.

Activity 5: Ghost-Writer or Collaborator? — Reading AI Ethics Cases

40 min • *Small group reading + presentation*

Overview. Students read and discuss real-world cases of AI authorship disputes (in publishing, journalism, and academia) to develop nuanced positions on what ethical AI use in writing looks like across contexts.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *AI-authorship news moves fast, so refresh your set of 2–3 cases each time you teach this rather than reusing the same readings every semester, a case that felt current a year ago can feel stale, and recent examples land better with students.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- 2–3 short readings on AI authorship cases
- Position statement template
- Case analysis worksheet

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students read 2–3 short news or opinion pieces about AI authorship controversies (provided by instructor).
2. In groups, students identify: What did the author do? Why is it controversial? What should have been disclosed?
3. Each group develops a position: Was this ethical, unethical, or somewhere in between?
4. Groups present their case and position to the class.
5. Class synthesizes: What principles emerge across the cases?

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *After examining these cases, has your view of AI use in your own writing shifted? Where do you now draw the line and why?*

Variation / Extension. Find your own AI authorship case in the news and bring it to class for a 'rapid response' discussion.

Activity 6: Writing Against the Machine

30–40 min • *Individual writing + pairs*

Overview. Students are given an AI-generated essay on a topic they know well and tasked with writing a rebuttal or counter-essay, sharpening their voice and positioning themselves as the human expert the AI cannot replace.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Choose a topic students have genuinely lived through or studied closely (the college-transition example works well). The whole activity depends on students having real personal or classroom-specific knowledge to write from that the AI couldn't have had.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI-generated essay (instructor-prepared)
- Timer

- Response writing prompt sheet

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Instructor shares an AI-generated essay on a topic students have studied or experienced (e.g., college transition, a historical event from class).
2. Students read it critically: What does the AI get wrong, miss, or flatten?
3. Students write a 200–300 word response — in their own voice — correcting, complicating, or countering the AI version.
4. Students share their responses in pairs and identify: What unique knowledge or perspective did you bring that the AI couldn't?
5. Class debrief: What can only humans write? Does this change over time?

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *What did you have to draw on (personally, experientially, intellectually) to write against the AI's version? What does that tell you about what writing is for?*

Variation / Extension. Write 'with' the AI (instead of against it) on the same topic and compare the two final texts.

Competency 4: Evaluating AI-Generated Content

Students analyze outputs produced by generative AI tools for accuracy, bias, logical coherence, and rhetorical effectiveness, practicing the habit of treating AI-generated text as a rough, fallible draft that requires human judgment, fact-checking, and revision.

COMPETENCY AT A GLANCE

Activity	Time	Format
1. The Accuracy Audit	50 min	Individual fact-checking + class synthesis
2. Bias Spotting in AI Outputs	45 min	Individual prompting + comparison
3. The Logic Checker — Evaluating AI Arguments	40 min	Individual annotation + pairs
4. Rhetorical Effectiveness Analysis	45 min	Individual scoring + small group share

Activity 1: The Accuracy Audit

50 min • *Individual fact-checking + class synthesis*

Overview. Students receive an AI-generated factual paragraph on a topic from their field of interest and systematically fact-check every verifiable claim using credible sources-- developing habits of evidence-based skepticism.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Generate your sample paragraph a day or two before class and verify it yourself first. You want a paragraph with a genuine mix of accurate and inaccurate claims so students have real error patterns to discuss, not one that happens to be entirely correct or entirely wrong.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI-generated factual paragraph
- Library database access
- Fact-check report worksheet
- Credibility checklist

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Generate an AI paragraph on a factual topic with multiple checkable claims (e.g., a historical event, scientific concept, current policy).
2. Students underline every claim that can be checked against a source.
3. Using library databases, credible websites, or encyclopedias, students verify each claim.
4. Students create a 'fact-check report': claim, verdict (true / false / partly true / unverifiable), and source.
5. Class synthesizes: What's the AI's 'error rate' on factual claims? What kinds of errors were most common?

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *If a writer published this paragraph without checking it, what could go wrong? What is your new practice for using AI-generated factual content?*

Variation / Extension. Have students generate their own AI paragraphs on topics they know well and fact-check those instead.

Activity 2: Bias Spotting in AI Outputs

45 min • *Individual prompting + comparison*

Overview. Students prompt an AI to write about a contested social, political, or ethical topic and analyze the output for ideological assumptions, omissions, and framing choices-- developing critical reading skills for AI-generated rhetoric.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Set a ground rule before this one starts: the goal is naming patterns in AI-generated text, not staking out or debating students' own political positions. Naming that distinction up front keeps the comparison exercise focused and keeps the room comfortable for students across the political spectrum.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat tool
- Topic list
- Two-column bias analysis worksheet
- Brief reading on media framing

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students choose a contested topic (or instructor assigns one from a list: immigration policy, climate change, criminal justice, etc.).
2. Students prompt the AI twice: once 'neutrally' and once with a framing cue (e.g., 'Write from a conservative/progressive perspective').
3. Students compare outputs: What words, examples, and framings differ? What's missing from each?
4. Students identify 3 specific bias markers in each output.
5. Class discussion: Can AI ever be 'neutral'? What does this mean for using AI in argumentative writing?

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *What biases did you find and do you think the AI 'knows' it has them? How will this change how you read AI outputs?*

Variation / Extension. Compare outputs from two different AI tools on the same sensitive topic to see if biases differ across platforms.

Activity 3: The Logic Checker — Evaluating AI Arguments

40 min • *Individual annotation + pairs*

Overview. Students analyze an AI-generated argumentative essay paragraph by paragraph for logical fallacies, unsupported claims, and weak reasoning — applying classical rhetorical analysis to AI outputs.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *If your students haven't covered logical fallacies yet this term, hand out the fallacy reference sheet a class period early so they can skim it before this activity, introducing the vocabulary and applying it to a real text in the same 40 minutes is a tight fit.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI-generated argumentative essay
- Logical fallacy reference sheet
- Logic audit memo template
- Annotation guide

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Instructor provides or generates an AI-written argumentative essay (4–5 paragraphs) with deliberately planted logical issues.
2. Students read the essay and annotate for: unsupported claims, logical fallacies (list provided), weak evidence, circular reasoning.
3. Students write a brief 'logic audit' memo: What are the three biggest argumentative weaknesses?
4. Pairs compare audits and discuss disagreements.
5. Class shares: Which weaknesses were most common in AI argumentation?

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *AI can sound persuasive without being logically sound. What specific skills do you need to catch that gap?*

Variation / Extension. Have students use AI to generate counterarguments to the flawed AI essay, then evaluate those for quality too.

Activity 4: Rhetorical Effectiveness Analysis

45 min • *Individual scoring + small group share*

Overview. Students evaluate an AI-generated persuasive piece using the rhetorical triangle (ethos, pathos, logos) in order to determine where AI rhetoric succeeds, where it fails, and what revision would make it more effective.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *If this is students' first exposure to ethos/pathos/logos, a 5-minute board review with one quick example of each will make the 1–5 scoring in step 2 much more consistent across the room than assuming prior knowledge.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI-generated persuasive piece
- Rhetorical triangle rubric
- Revision space/worksheet
- Share-out timer

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students read an AI-generated op-ed or persuasive paragraph.
2. Using the rhetorical triangle framework (reviewed briefly), students score the piece on ethos, pathos, and logos (1–5 scale with explanation).
3. Students identify the single weakest rhetorical element and write one revised paragraph that addresses it.
4. Students share their revisions in small groups. Which revision was most effective?
5. Debrief: What does AI tend to do well rhetorically? What does it almost always fail at?

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *What does strong rhetoric require that AI seems unable to provide? How does this affect how you'd use AI for persuasive writing tasks?*

Variation / Extension. Write your own persuasive paragraph on the same topic and compare your rhetorical choices to the AI's.

Competency 5: Transparency and Disclosure

Students practice transparent documentation of how and when they used generative AI in their composing process (through process notes, AI-use statements, or reflective writing) developing habits of honest attribution and ethical self-accounting that carry across academic and professional contexts.

COMPETENCY AT A GLANCE

Activity	Time	Format
1. AI Use Statement Workshop	40 min	Individual drafting + peer review
2. Process Notes Portfolio	Ongoing throughout unit / 30 min debrief	Individual, sustained logging
3. Ethical Scenarios Gallery Walk	40 min	Gallery walk + whole class
4. Attribution in Practice — Citing AI Responsibly	35 min	Individual practice + peer check
5. The 'What Would I Say?' Accountability Letter	30–40 min (can be homework)	Individual reflective writing

Activity 1: AI Use Statement Workshop

40 min • *Individual drafting + peer review*

Overview. Students draft, workshop, and refine an AI-use statement for a recent assignment to build the habit of clear, honest, and specific attribution as a professional and academic practice.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Pull your model statements from your own course's AI policy and a couple of real academic-journal disclosure examples, rather than generic templates. Students write more specific statements when the models they've seen are specific themselves.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Model AI-use statement examples
- Statement drafting worksheet
- Peer review checklist
- Course AI policy

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Instructor introduces model AI-use statements from academic journals and university policies (10 min).
2. Students draft a 100–150 word AI-use statement for an assignment they completed, specifying: which tool, at which stage, for which purpose, and how outputs were evaluated/revised.
3. Students exchange statements with a peer who evaluates: Is it specific enough? Honest? Complete?
4. Students revise based on feedback.
5. Class synthesizes: What makes an AI-use statement actually useful versus a formality?

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *What does writing a real AI-use statement force you to think about that you might have skipped otherwise?*

Variation / Extension. Write two AI-use statements for the same assignment (one vague & one specific) and compare what each reveals.

Activity 2: Process Notes Portfolio

Ongoing throughout unit / 30 min debrief • *Individual, sustained logging*

Overview. Students keep a running 'process notes' document across a writing unit, logging every time they use AI (what they asked, what they got, what they did with it), then reflect on the full picture at the end.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Like any ongoing log, this one gets abandoned without a mid-unit nudge. Build in one quick check-in (even just "show a partner your log so far") partway through the unit so students aren't reconstructing two weeks of AI use from memory the night before it's due.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Process notes template (Google Doc or print)
- Essay assignment prompt
- End-of-unit reflection prompt
- Submission checklist

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Distribute process notes template at the start of the writing unit.
2. Students log each AI interaction: date, tool, prompt used, summary of output, and what they did with it (accepted / rejected / revised).
3. Mid-unit check-in: students share one log entry with a peer and discuss patterns.
4. At unit end: students review their full log and write a 1-page reflection on their AI use across the whole process.
5. Process notes submitted alongside final essay as evidence of ethical, reflective practice.

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *Looking at your full process notes log: What patterns do you notice? Did your AI use become more intentional over time?*

Variation / Extension. Redesign the process notes template yourself based on what you wished you'd tracked differently.

Activity 3: Ethical Scenarios Gallery Walk

40 min • *Gallery walk + whole class*

Overview. Students rotate through posted scenarios describing different levels and types of AI use and must decide: What should be disclosed? To whom? In what format? In this way, students are meant to develop nuanced ethical judgment.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Post the scenarios in a loop around the room with enough space between stations for small clusters, a common snag with gallery walks is bottlenecking at the first couple of stations while later ones sit empty for most of the period.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Printed/posted scenario cards
- Pens
- Sticky notes (3 colors)
- Professional disclosure standard examples

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Post 8–10 written scenarios around the room (e.g., 'Used AI to generate a title only,' 'Used AI to write a full draft and lightly edited,' 'Used AI to translate, then revised').
2. Students rotate through the gallery, writing on sticky notes: Disclose or not? What form of disclosure?
3. Class reviews the sticky note responses together, identifying where there's consensus and where there's debate.
4. Instructor introduces relevant professional and academic disclosure standards.
5. Students write a personal disclosure policy for their own AI use this semester.

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *What's the difference between disclosure that protects you legally and disclosure that reflects genuine intellectual honesty?*

Variation / Extension. Students write their own scenarios based on real situations they've encountered and add them to the gallery.

Activity 4: Attribution in Practice — Citing AI Responsibly

35 min • *Individual practice + peer check*

Overview. Students learn and practice multiple citation formats for AI-generated content (MLA, APA, Chicago), apply them to real examples from their own work, and discuss why citation norms for AI are still evolving.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Citation guidance for AI tools has been updated more than once since it was first introduced. Double-check the current MLA and APA guidance shortly before you teach this activity rather than reusing last semester's handout verbatim.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- MLA and APA AI citation guides (printed or projected)
- Style guide handout
- Student AI interaction examples
- Peer check worksheet

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Instructor briefly reviews the current citation guidelines for AI tools in MLA 9th edition and APA 7th edition (10 min).
2. Students retrieve two AI interactions from their own writing process (or use instructor-provided examples).
3. Students write full citations for each interaction in both MLA and APA format.
4. Students peer-check each other's citations against a style guide.
5. Discussion: Why are citation norms for AI still being debated? What do we owe readers by citing our AI use?

> **Reflection Prompt**

> *Why does it matter HOW we cite AI-- not just whether we cite it? What does the form of a citation communicate to a reader?*

Variation / Extension. Research how a professional field you're interested in currently handles AI citation — does it differ from academic style guides?

Activity 5: The 'What Would I Say?' Accountability Letter

30–40 min (can be homework) • *Individual reflective writing*

Overview. Students write an honest, reflective letter addressed to their instructor (or a future employer) explaining every instance of AI use on a completed assignment. Students should practice the habit of self-accounting as a transferable professional skill.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Frame this explicitly and repeatedly as low-stakes and non-punitive. Students who worry the letter will be used against them will write a defensive, vague version instead of an honest one, which defeats the point of the exercise.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Completed essay assignment
- Quiet writing time
- Letter prompt/guidelines

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Introduce the activity as a 'self-accounting exercise': not punishment, but professional practice.
2. Students review a completed assignment and write a letter (200–300 words) to their instructor or a future professional audience.
3. The letter must: name each AI tool used, specify when and why, describe what they did with the output, and reflect on what they learned.
4. Students read their letters silently and ask: Is there anything I'm glossing over? Anything I feel uncomfortable saying?
5. Optional: volunteers share one honest moment from their letter with the class.

> **Reflection Prompt**
> *If you had to send this letter, would you change anything about how you used AI on this assignment? What does that tell you about your own ethical instincts?*

Variation / Extension. Write a second version of the letter as if addressing a skeptical peer. Does your tone or level of detail change?

Preserving AI-Free Space for Writing & Reading

The principle here is that while there are times when AI can be used to sharpen our thinking and improve upon our productivity, there are also times when AI is simply used to bypass original thought, avoid the productive friction of new ideas, and that habit will dull our thinking. That means that we need to preserve specific skills by avoiding the use of AI, especially with novice writers and readers. The following activities help students experience the value of writing, thinking, questioning, and inventing without AI. They also help students recognize when avoiding AI may lead to deeper learning, stronger ownership, more authentic voice, and more meaningful inquiry.

1. Committing to Cognitive Fitness (Reading)

35 min • Purpose: *Strengthen the 'cognitive fitness' that sustained, effortful reading and writing builds, and reflect on what generative AI can and cannot offer that process.*

Activity. In small groups, students read and discuss two brief expert excerpts on 'cognitive fitness' and 'productive friction' in reading and writing, then debate technology visionary Edward Tenner's 2006 observation that 'it would be a shame if brilliant technology were to end up threatening the kind of intellect that produced it.' As a take-home, students pick one compelling, challenging text they genuinely want to understand and read it deeply, without AI assistance, before writing a 300–400 word reflection.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *The take-home reading works best when students choose the text themselves from something already on their radar — for example, a source from their current Exploratory Research Project — rather than a text assigned cold, since personal investment is what makes the 'productive friction' land as meaningful rather than punitive.*

PROMPTS

- What did you choose to read, and why did it matter to you?
- How does this text count as a 'cognitive fitness challenge' for you, specifically name the challenge it presents.
- How do you work through the moments when the reading gets especially hard? Describe one difficult passage and how you worked through it.
- Honestly, do you think generative AI helps you grow intellectually, and in what ways?
- What will you commit to doing (or not doing) to maintain your own cognitive fitness?

Follow-Up. Students submit the 300–400 word reflection alongside a note on which text they chose.

---

2. Ten-Minute Analog Freewrite

15–20 min • Purpose: *Give students protected time to generate ideas without external tools.*

Activity. Students put away laptops and phones, then write continuously by hand for ten minutes on a prompt connected to the current assignment, without stopping, editing, or consulting AI. They finish by highlighting one sentence, question, or image they want to develop further.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *This one works best as a recurring five-minutes-into-class ritual rather than a one-time event — students settle into the no-stopping rule faster the second and third time, and the ideas that surface tend to get sharper with repetition.*

PROMPTS

- What question keeps coming up for you about this topic?
- What experience has shaped the way you think about this issue?

Follow-Up. Students highlight one sentence, question, or image from the freewrite that they want to develop further.

---

3. Memory, Experience, and Stakes Map

30–40 min • Purpose: *Help students identify material AI cannot authentically supply: lived experience, personal stakes, local knowledge, and embodied memory.*

Activity. Students create a four-part map around a possible essay topic-- what they have experienced, what they have observed, what they care about, and what they still do not understand. Students should complete it without AI, since the purpose is to locate their own relationship to the topic. They then turn one part of the map into a possible inquiry question or thesis-in-progress.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Some students will draw a blank on 'what I have experienced' if the topic feels too abstract or academic. If that happens, let them start from the 'what I care about' quadrant instead and work outward. It's often the easier entry point.*

Follow-Up. Students turn one part of the map into a possible inquiry question or thesis-in-progress.

---

4. Question-Storming Circle

25–35 min • Purpose: *Encourage curiosity before answers.*

Activity. In small groups, students take turns sharing a topic. For three minutes, group members may only ask questions about that topic (no advice, no answers, no AI, no evaluation) while one student records all questions. The writer then chooses the three questions that feel most generative and selects one to guide the next stage of invention.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Model the 'questions only' rule with a 30-second demo before groups start. Students instinctively want to answer or advise and a quick example heads that off before it derails a group's three minutes.*

Follow-Up. Students select one question to guide the next stage of invention.

---

5. Bad Ideas Before Good Ideas

20–30 min • Purpose: *Reduce perfectionism and help students see invention as messy, playful, and human.*

Activity. Students write the 'worst possible' thesis, topic, title, or introduction for an assignment, then five more bad ideas. In pairs, they identify what each bad idea reveals about clichés, assumptions, overgeneralizations, or uninteresting directions, then choose one bad idea and transform it into a more complex, interesting, or honest version.

> **Instructor Tip**

> *Go first yourself with an exaggeratedly bad example. Students (especially early in the semester) are often reluctant to write something intentionally bad in front of classmates until they see the instructor model that it's genuinely welcome.*

Follow-Up. Students choose one bad idea and transform it into a more complex, interesting, or honest version.

---

6. The 'Do Not Outsource This' Reflection

25–35 min • Purpose: *Help students decide when AI use would interfere with learning, ownership, or ethical responsibility.*

Activity. Before beginning a major writing assignment, students respond in writing to reflective prompts about what should come from them personally, then discuss as a class or in small groups when difficulty is part of the learning process versus when assistance becomes avoidance. Students close by writing an 'AI-free commitment' for one stage of the project.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Collect these commitments and return them to students right before they start drafting, not just at the start of the unit as a reminder (in their own words), timed to when temptation is highest, does more than the initial reflection alone.*

PROMPTS

- What part of this assignment should come from me?
- What do I need to figure out before asking for help?
- What would I lose if I used AI too early?
- Where might AI make my writing sound less like me?
- What kind of struggle might actually help me learn?

Follow-Up. Students write an 'AI-free commitment' for one stage of the project, such as topic selection, personal reflection, first-draft invention, source interpretation, or final authorship reflection.
