ENGLISH 2030: CORE COMPOSITION II

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 2030, scaffolded for students who have completed a first-year composition course and are ready for sustained, scholarly research. Activities are organized into five competencies, plus a closing section of AI-free activities that protect key stages of the writing 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 & Tools (listed before the steps, so you can prep ahead), numbered Step-by-Step Instructions, a Reflection/Discussion Prompt, an Extension/Variation, and a Research Connection explaining how the activity supports the additional research layer of this class.

Many activities include a multimodal composing component. Students may produce infographics, podcasts, videos, visual argument maps, or public-facing companion pieces alongside research writing. 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.
- 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 and the Research Process

Activity 1: Source-Surfacing Audit *(50 min)*
Activity 2: Synthesis Flattening Lab *(45–55 min)*
Activity 3: Citation Trail Investigation *(40–50 min + homework)*
Activity 4: Algorithm Meets Archive: AI vs. Primary Sources *(Full class, 60–75 min)*
Activity 5: Research Workflow Mapping *(Ongoing, 2 weeks + 30-min debrief)*

Competency 2: Hallucination, Misinformation, and Verification

Activity 1: The Confidence Calibration Lab *(50 min)*
Activity 2: Fact-Check as Genre: Rewriting an AI Paragraph *(45 min)*
Activity 3: Misinformation Spread Simulation *(Full class, 65–75 min)*
Activity 4: Building a Personal Verification Protocol *(40 min + homework)*
Activity 5: Comparative Credibility Tribunal *(50 min (structured debate)*

Competency 3: Rhetorical Analysis of AI-Generated Texts

Activity 1: Ethos Autopsy: How AI Fakes Authority *(50 min)*
Activity 2: The Audience Illusion: Who Is AI Writing For? *(40–50 min)*
Activity 3: Logos Under the Microscope: Analyzing AI Argument Structure *(50 min)*
Activity 4: Pathos and the Performance of Emotion in AI Text *(45 min)*
Activity 5: Context Collapse: AI and the Rhetorical Situation *(Full class, 60 min)*

Competency 4: AI, Bias, and Epistemic Justice

Activity 1: The Bias Prompt Experiment *(50 min)*
Activity 2: Epistemic Justice Reading and Response *(45–55 min)*
Activity 3: Who Gets to Be an Expert? AI and Credential Bias *(45 min)*
Activity 4: Language Bias Lab: AI and Non-English Knowledges *(50 min)*
Activity 5: Counter-Narrative Research Project *(Multi-day project, 1–2 weeks)*

Competency 5: Ethical Research Writing & Considerations of AI's Social Impact

Activity 1: Ethical AI Stakeholder Map
Activity 2: Authorship on Trial: A Mock Academic Hearing
Activity 3: Labor Futures Synthesis Lab
Activity 4: Surveillance and Consent: An AI Ethics Audit
Activity 5: Environmental Cost Claim Clinic
Activity 6: The Conversation Entry Point: Situating Your Argument *(50 min)*
Activity 7: Counterargument Stress Test *(45–55 min)*
Activity 8: Synthesis Sprint: Weaving Sources Into Argument *(50 min workshop format*
Activity 9: The Multimodal Research Pitch *(Full class, 60–75 min)*
Activity 10: The Research Essay as Public Contribution *(Final project + class showcase)*

Preserving AI-Free Space for Generating Ideas

1. Pre-Research Curiosity Freewrite *(20–30 min)*
2. Human Question Lab *(35–45 min)*
3. Source Encounter Without Summary *(45–60 min)*
4. Multimodal Sketch Before Digital Tools *(35–50 min)*
5. "This Part Must Be Mine" Argument Reflection *(30–40 min)*

Competency 1: AI and the Research Process

Students critically assess how AI-powered research tools (such as AI search assistants, citation generators, and summarization tools) influence the research process, including what sources get surfaced, how claims get synthesized, and what disciplinary nuance or contradictory evidence may be flattened or lost in the process.

COMPETENCY AT A GLANCE

Activity	Time	Format
1. Source-Surfacing Audit	50 min	Individual research + gallery walk
2. Synthesis Flattening Lab	45–55 min	Individual analysis + pairs
3. Citation Trail Investigation	40–50 min + homework	Individual research + audio narrative
4. Algorithm Meets Archive: AI vs. Primary Sources	Full class, 60–75 min	Individual research + written analysis
5. Research Workflow Mapping	Ongoing (2 weeks) + 30-min debrief	Individual, sustained project

Activity 1: Source-Surfacing Audit

50 min • *Individual research + gallery walk*

Overview. Students run identical research queries through three environments-- a traditional library database (e.g., EBSCO/JSTOR), an AI search assistant (e.g., Claude, ChatGPT), and a standard Google search. Then, students analyze and visualize the differences in what gets surfaced, how sources are ranked, and what kinds of evidence are foregrounded.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Test your own library database and AI tool access before class. Pre-assign topics (or a topic bank) if you want comparable results across the room instead of students choosing overly narrow topics with sparse results.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Library database access (EBSCO/JSTOR)
- Claude or ChatGPT EDU
- Google Search
- Three-column audit worksheet
- Canva or Google Slides (for the infographic)
- Sticky notes for the gallery walk

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Each student selects a research topic relevant to their semester essay (or the instructor assigns one per pair).
2. Students run the same query in all three environments and take annotated screenshots of the first-page results.
3. Using a three-column worksheet, students log: source type, publication date, disciplinary affiliation, and whether the AI provided a citation or just a summary.
4. Students create a one-page visual infographic (Canva, Google Slides, or hand-drawn) comparing the three result sets: what overlaps, what doesn't, what's missing.
5. Gallery walk: post infographics around the room. Class identifies patterns across queries and tools.

6. Debrief: What kinds of sources does AI prefer? What disciplinary nuance or contradictory evidence was absent?

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *What would a researcher lose if they relied only on an AI search assistant? What does the 'shape' of your AI result set tell you about whose knowledge the tool is amplifying?*

Extension / Variation. Repeat the audit on a topic from a non-Western or underrepresented cultural context and compare how each environment handles it.

Research Connection. *Directly builds source evaluation and database literacy skills and surfaces the algorithmic curation hidden inside AI research tools.*

Activity 2: Synthesis Flattening Lab

45–55 min • *Individual analysis + pairs*

Overview. Students give an AI summarization tool a set of three scholarly articles on a contested research question, then compare the AI's synthesis to their own close-reading summary-- identifying what nuance, contradiction, or disciplinary debate the AI collapsed or erased.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Choose articles with a genuine disciplinary disagreement, not just different findings on the same topic. Run the AI synthesis yourself beforehand so you know what 'flattening' will look like and can guide students who are struggling to spot it.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Three scholarly articles/excerpts (instructor-provided)
- AI chat tool
- Color-coding annotation guide
- Corrected synthesis worksheet

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Instructor provides three short scholarly articles (or excerpts) that meaningfully disagree on the same research question.
2. Students spend 15 minutes reading and writing a 150-word synthesis of the disagreements in their own words.
3. Students paste the articles (or abstracts) into an AI tool and ask it to 'synthesize the key arguments across these three sources.'
4. Students annotate the AI synthesis using a color code: green = accurate, yellow = oversimplified, red = missing or distorted.
5. Students write a 'corrected synthesis' paragraph that restores what the AI lost.
6. Debrief: Which kinds of nuance did the AI consistently flatten? Why might that be?

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *What specific claims, qualifications, or counterarguments did the AI's synthesis omit? Why does it matter for your own research essay that you catch those gaps?*

Extension / Variation. Try the same synthesis task with a topic from a STEM field. Does the AI flatten scientific nuance differently than it does in humanities or social sciences?

Research Connection. *Trains students to treat AI synthesis as a starting sketch, not a finished argument — critical for research-based writing.*

Activity 3: Citation Trail Investigation

40–50 min + homework • *Individual research + audio narrative*

Overview. Students ask an AI tool to generate a bibliography on their research topic, then systematically trace each citation backward (checking existence, accuracy, and relevance) before recording a short 'research detective' audio narrative of what they found.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Run this activity with your own topic first so you have a rough sense of how many fabricated vs. real citations to expect. That way you can tell whether a student's confusion during class is genuine difficulty or an unusually hard-to-verify source.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat tool
- Library database access
- Audio recording app (voice memo)
- Citation verification tally sheet
- Shared class folder (Google Drive/Canvas)

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students prompt an AI to produce a 10-source bibliography on their semester research topic.
2. For each source, students attempt to locate the actual text in a library database and verify: title, author, journal, year, and basic argument.
3. Students categorize each citation: Real and accurate / Real but misrepresented / Partially fabricated / Fully fabricated.
4. Students record a 3–5 minute audio 'research detective' narrative (voice memo, Anchor, or Audacity) describing what they found and what it means for research trust.
5. Audio segments are shared with the class via a shared folder; the instructor plays 2–3 in class for discussion.
6. Students write a 200-word reflection to accompany their audio.

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *If a first-year student used this AI bibliography without checking, what might happen to their research? What is your verification protocol going forward?*

Extension / Variation. Do the citation trail exercise twice (once with a well-documented historical topic and once with a recent or niche topic) and compare the AI's accuracy rates.

Research Connection. *Grounds abstract discussions of hallucination in concrete research practice; builds annotated bibliography skills alongside verification habits.*

Activity 4: Algorithm Meets Archive: AI vs. Primary Sources

Full class, 60–75 min • *Individual research + written analysis*

Overview. Students use an AI tool to research a historical or social topic, then access a primary-source digital archive (e.g., Library of Congress, Chronicling America, HathiTrust) to locate primary documents the AI never mentioned. Analyze the gap between algorithmically surfaced knowledge and archival depth.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Confirm archive access works before class; some digital archives require a free account or campus login, and you don't want to lose class time to sign-up screens. Pick a topic with a genuinely rich digitized primary-source record so students aren't left empty-handed.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat tool
- Digital archive access (Library of Congress, HathiTrust, etc.)
- Topic assignment sheet
- Comparative analysis template

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Instructor introduces a research topic with rich primary-source history (e.g., labor movements, civil rights, immigration, public health crises).
2. Students spend 15 minutes researching the topic with an AI tool, noting every source type it references.
3. Students spend 20 minutes in a digital archive (instructor-assigned or student-chosen) searching the same topic.
4. Students identify at least two primary documents the AI never referenced and analyze what those documents add to understanding the topic.
5. Students write a short comparative analysis (300 words): What does each approach reveal that the other misses?
6. Class debrief: Why do archives exist? What is lost when AI replaces archival research?

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *What did the archive give you that the AI couldn't? How does 'going to the source' change your relationship to a research topic?*

Extension / Variation. Pair a historical primary source with a contemporary AI-generated summary of the same event and use the gap as the basis for a short research argument.

Research Connection. *Introduces primary-source research and archival thinking, essential skills for upper-division research writing that AI cannot substitute.*

Activity 5: Research Workflow Mapping

Ongoing (2 weeks) + 30-min debrief • *Individual, sustained project*

Overview. Over a two-week research unit, students document every step of their research process (including every use of AI tools) in a visual workflow map, then reflect on how AI shaped (or didn't shape) their actual scholarly inquiry.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Because this runs across two weeks alongside other coursework, students will forget to log unless you build in check-ins. Set a quick reminder (even a one-line Canvas announcement) rather than waiting until the final debrief to find out no one has been updating their map.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Workflow map template (or Miro/Canva)
- Annotation color guide
- Research unit assignment
- Research memo prompt

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. At the start of the research unit, distribute the workflow map template (or have students create their own using Miro, Canva, or pen-and-paper).
2. Students log each research action: source consulted, tool used, decision made, dead end encountered.
3. Students flag every AI touchpoint with a distinctive color or symbol.
4. At the end of the unit, students annotate their maps: Where did AI help? Where did it steer them wrong? Where did they go deeper without it?
5. In a 30-minute debrief session, pairs share maps and identify differences in workflow.
6. Students write a 300-word research memo summarizing what their map reveals about their research process.

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *Looking at your full workflow map, where was AI most genuinely useful? Where did it create false shortcuts or steer you away from better sources?*

Extension / Variation. Compare workflow maps with a classmate who chose a different topic: what does your map reveal about how topic type affects research approach?

Research Connection. *Makes the research process visible and reflective and builds metacognitive research literacy alongside practical skills.*

Competency 2: Hallucination, Misinformation, and Verification

Students investigate the phenomenon of AI hallucination (the generation of false, fabricated, or misleading information presented with apparent confidence) and develop systematic verification practices, cross-referencing AI-generated claims against peer-reviewed sources, primary documents, and established databases before incorporating any AI-assisted research into their own arguments.

COMPETENCY AT A GLANCE

Activity	Time	Format
1. The Confidence Calibration Lab	50 min	Individual research + data visualization
2. Fact-Check as Genre: Rewriting an AI Paragraph	45 min	Individual annotation + rewrite, then pairs
3. Misinformation Spread Simulation	Full class, 65–75 min	Role-play in three groups
4. Building a Personal Verification Protocol	40 min + homework	Individual design + video
5. Comparative Credibility Tribunal	50 min (structured debate)	Multimodal — debate/oral argumentation + written verdict

Activity 1: The Confidence Calibration Lab

50 min • *Individual research + data visualization*

Overview. Students systematically prompt an AI with questions at four confidence levels (well-documented facts, recent events, niche scholarly topics, and contested empirical claims) then verify each response, creating a data visualization of the AI's 'hallucination rate' by topic type.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Pilot the four-category prompt grid yourself first. Some AI tools have improved enough that 'settled facts' questions rarely produce errors. If your grid isn't producing any visible hallucination rate at all, tighten the 'niche' and 'contested' categories so students have real data to work with.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat tool
- Four-category prompt grid
- Library database access
- Graph-making tool (Google Sheets, Datawrapper, or hand-drawn)
- Verification log worksheet

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Instructor explains what hallucination is and why confident-sounding AI outputs are the most dangerous (10 min).
2. Students receive a four-category prompt grid: (1) settled facts, (2) recent events (past 12 months), (3) niche disciplinary claims, (4) contested empirical questions.
3. Students ask the AI 2–3 questions from each category and record the full response.
4. Students verify every verifiable claim using a credible source (library database, government database, peer-reviewed article).
5. Students create a simple data visualization (bar chart, table, or annotated grid) showing accuracy rates by category.

6. Class aggregates data: Which category had the highest hallucination rate? Why?

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *Where was the AI most confidently wrong? What does that tell you about when AI is most dangerous as a research tool?*

Extension / Variation. Run the same grid with two different AI tools and compare hallucination rates in order to ask: does the tool matter?

Research Connection. *Teaches students to modulate trust in AI outputs by topic type, a foundational skill for research-based writing.*

Activity 2: Fact-Check as Genre: Rewriting an AI Paragraph

45 min • *Individual annotation + rewrite, then pairs*

Overview. Students receive an AI-generated research paragraph seeded with both real and fabricated claims, perform a full fact-check using journalistic verification methods, and then rewrite the paragraph with corrected, properly cited information. Help students practice fact-checking as a genre of research writing.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Prepare your seeded paragraph well in advance and verify every claim in it yourself, noting which are true, false, or partially true in an answer key. Without a key, grading and debrief discussion will run long as you re-verify claims live.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI-generated research paragraph (instructor-prepared)
- Verification checklist (journalistic method)
- Library database access
- Rewrite template
- MLA/APA quick reference

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Instructor provides an AI-generated research paragraph containing 6–8 checkable claims, some accurate and some fabricated (prepared in advance using AI).
2. Students annotate the paragraph: underline every verifiable claim.
3. Using the verification checklist (primary source, corroborating source, expert attribution), students check each underlined claim.
4. Students label each claim TRUE, FALSE, PARTIALLY TRUE, or UNVERIFIABLE with source evidence for each judgment.
5. Students rewrite the paragraph using only verified claims, adding proper MLA/APA citations.
6. Pairs compare rewrites: what's different? What was hardest to verify?

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *Which kinds of claims were hardest to verify and why? What does the experience of rewriting a hallucinated paragraph teach you about your own research habits?*

Extension / Variation. Write your own 'seeded' AI paragraph (deliberately plant some false claims) and challenge a classmate to find them all.

Research Connection. *Directly practices the research writing move of grounding claims in verified sources-- a core skill for the semester's research essay.*

Activity 3: Misinformation Spread Simulation

Full class, 65–75 min • *Role-play in three groups*

Overview. Students role-play a misinformation spread scenario: one group generates a realistic-looking AI hallucination on a public health topic, while other groups 'encounter' it and must verify it before it spreads, building urgency around verification practices by making consequences visible.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Content note: because this activity deliberately produces a false health claim, use a clearly fictional condition, product, or statistic (e.g., an invented illness or an invented study) rather than a real vaccine or disease claim. This keeps the pedagogical value (spotting confident, false-sounding AI text) without risking a fabricated claim about a real medical topic circulating past the classroom or being screenshotted out of context.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat tool
- Simulated social media post template
- Library/government database access
- Argumentation map template
- Role assignment cards

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Divide the class into three groups: Generators (create a plausible AI hallucination on a public health topic), Spreaders (share the hallucination as if it were true, in a simulated social media post format), and Verifiers (must catch and debunk before the 'post' reaches the class).
2. Generators prompt the AI to produce a confident but verifiably false claim on an assigned topic using a fictional condition, product, or statistic rather than a real one.
3. Spreaders format it as a realistic-looking tweet/post/article excerpt and 'publish' it to the class channel.
4. Verifiers have 10 minutes to check the claim using databases, government sources, and expert sites.
5. Verifiers present their debunking argument to the class.
6. Groups produce a short argumentation map showing: the false claim, the verification path, and the corrected claim.
7. Debrief: What would have made this harder to catch? What are the real-world stakes?

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *What made the AI hallucination difficult to spot as false? What structural features of AI output create that difficulty?*

Extension / Variation. Repeat the simulation with a scientific topic students are currently researching for their essays.

Research Connection. *Connects verification skills to public discourse which is essential for students writing research arguments that intervene in real conversations.*

Activity 4: Building a Personal Verification Protocol

40 min + homework • *Individual design + video*

Overview. Students synthesize their verification experiences across the unit to design a personal, step-by-step verification protocol for AI-assisted research, then present it as a visual infographic and a short explanatory video.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *This activity works best as the capstone of the unit, after students have already done at least two other verification activities. Otherwise they won't have enough personal experience to draw a protocol from. Schedule it last in the sequence.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Canva or Adobe Express (infographic)
- Screen or phone recording app (Zoom, phone camera)
- Verification log from previous activities
- Shared class video playlist (YouTube/Canvas)

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students review their verification logs and fact-check records from previous activities.
2. Each student drafts a 5–7 step verification protocol tailored to their own research topic and habits.
3. Students design the protocol as a visual infographic (Canva, Adobe Express, or hand-drawn) — steps, tools, and decision points clearly mapped.
4. Students record a 2–3 minute video walking through their protocol, explaining the reasoning behind each step.
5. Videos are submitted to a shared class playlist; the class watches 4–5 representative examples.
6. Peer feedback: What's most useful? What's missing?

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *What's the single most important step in your protocol and why? What would happen to your research essay if you skipped it?*

Extension / Variation. Share your protocol with a peer in a different field of study. What would they add or change based on their disciplinary norms?

Research Connection. *Personalizes verification as a research practice and moves students from activity-by-activity checking to habitual, systematic rigor.*

Activity 5: Comparative Credibility Tribunal

50 min (structured debate) • *Multimodal — debate/oral argumentation + written verdict*

Overview. Students compare three sources on the same contested factual claim (one AI-generated, one from a tabloid/unreliable site, and one from a peer-reviewed journal), then conduct a structured 'credibility tribunal' in which teams argue for why each source should or should not be trusted.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Time-box this tightly with a visible timer. Three presentations plus cross-examination can easily run over 50 minutes. Consider pre-assigning teams before class so prep doesn't eat into tribunal time.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Three prepared documents (AI, tabloid, peer-reviewed)
- Credibility criteria checklist
- Debate timer
- Verdict writing prompt

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Instructor prepares three documents presenting a claim about the same topic: an AI-generated paragraph, a tabloid article, and a peer-reviewed excerpt.
2. Three teams are assigned one source each and given 10 minutes to build a credibility argument: Why should your source be trusted?
3. Each team presents their argument (3 min); opposing teams may cross-examine (2 min each).
4. Class votes on the most credible source, and they must justify their vote in writing.
5. Instructor debrief: What criteria determined the vote? Which credibility markers are visible, and which require digging?
6. Students write a 200-word 'verdict' explaining their credibility judgment and applying it to their own research.

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *What made the peer-reviewed source credible and what made it harder to read than the AI version? What does that tension mean for public knowledge?*

Extension / Variation. Run the tribunal with student-found sources instead of instructor-prepared ones.

Research Connection. *Teaches students to articulate credibility criteria explicitly, a skill needed whenever they evaluate sources for their research essays.*

Competency 3: Rhetorical Analysis of AI-Generated Texts

Students apply core rhetorical frameworks (ethos, logos, pathos; audience, purpose, context) to analyze AI-generated texts as rhetorical artifacts, examining how these texts construct authority, simulate credibility, and replicate or distort the conventions of academic and public discourse.

COMPETENCY AT A GLANCE

Activity	Time	Format
1. Ethos Autopsy: How AI Fakes Authority	50 min	Multimodal — annotated text analysis + visual breakdown slide
2. The Audience Illusion: Who Is AI Writing For?	40–50 min	Individual analysis + writing
3. Logos Under the Microscope: Analyzing AI Argument Structure	50 min	Individual mapping + written comparison
4. Pathos and the Performance of Emotion in AI Text	45 min	Multimodal — annotated text + short reflective video response
5. Context Collapse: AI and the Rhetorical Situation	Full class, 60 min	Multimodal — rhetorical analysis portfolio + presentation

Activity 1: Ethos Autopsy: How AI Fakes Authority

50 min • *Multimodal — annotated text analysis + visual breakdown slide*

Overview. Students perform a close rhetorical analysis of an AI-generated academic-style passage, dissecting every technique the AI uses to simulate scholarly authority (citation style, hedging language, disciplinary jargon, confident assertion) and then compare it to a genuine peer-reviewed passage on the same topic.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Generate the AI passage on a topic students already have some background in. If the content itself is unfamiliar, students will spend their energy understanding the topic instead of analyzing the rhetoric.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI-generated academic passage (instructor-prepared)
- Peer-reviewed excerpt
- Ethos annotation guide
- Slide or poster template
- Projector for share-out

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Instructor generates an AI academic-style passage (500 words) on a topic students have studied.
2. Students read a genuine peer-reviewed excerpt on the same topic.
3. Using an ethos annotation guide, students mark every authority-constructing move in each text: credentials signaling, citation behavior, hedging language, use of passive voice, precision of claims.
4. Students create a comparative visual breakdown (one-page slide or poster) showing the rhetorical techniques side by side.
5. Share-out: Which techniques are nearly identical? Which give the AI away?
6. Discussion: What does 'ethos' mean when there is no author with a real credential or lived experience?

Reflection / Discussion Prompt

If ethos is built on demonstrated expertise and trustworthiness, can an AI have ethos? What are the consequences for readers who don't ask that question?

Extension / Variation. Try the ethos autopsy on an AI-generated op-ed instead of an academic passage. Does the simulation of ethos work differently for a public audience?

Research Connection. *Trains rhetorical reading as a research skill — students who can anatomize AI ethos can also strengthen their own scholarly voice.*

Activity 2: The Audience Illusion: Who Is AI Writing For?

40–50 min • *Individual analysis + writing*

Overview. Students analyze how AI-generated texts construct an implied audience (the assumptions embedded in vocabulary level, cultural references, examples chosen, and stance) and compare three AI outputs on the same topic (but written for different specified audiences).

Instructor Tip

Have a backup set of three human-authored texts ready in case students struggle to find comparable radio/journal/policy excerpts on short notice. Sourcing three genuinely matched pieces mid-class can eat up more time than expected.

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat tool
- Audience prompt guide
- Three human-authored texts (radio, journal, policy)
- Rhetorical audience memo template
- Research essay draft

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students prompt an AI to write about the same research topic for three different audiences: a general reader, a scholarly audience, and a policymaker.
2. Students analyze each output for: vocabulary level, assumed prior knowledge, use of evidence, tone, and cultural references.
3. Students write a 'rhetorical audience memo' identifying: Who does the AI seem to assume is reading? What assumptions are embedded in the choices?
4. Students listen to or read a brief excerpt from a public radio segment, a journal article, and a policy brief on a related topic — produced by humans for real audiences.
5. Comparative discussion: How do human writers signal audience awareness differently than AI does?
6. Students draft one paragraph of their own research essay aimed at their actual target audience, annotating their own audience-awareness moves.

Reflection / Discussion Prompt

When the AI 'writes for scholars,' what does it actually do? Is that the same as what a human scholar does or a simulation of it?

Extension / Variation. Try the same audience prompt in a language other than English. Does the AI's audience simulation change across languages?

Research Connection. *Develops audience awareness as a composing skill directly applicable to the semester research essay.*

Activity 3: Logos Under the Microscope: Analyzing AI Argument Structure

50 min • *Individual mapping + written comparison*

Overview. Students map the logical structure of an AI-generated argumentative essay (identify claims, evidence, warrants, qualifications, and rebuttals…or their absence). Then, students compare the argument structure to a published op-ed on the same topic, using Toulmin's model as an analytical framework.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *If students haven't encountered Toulmin's model before, the 10-minute review will need to move briskly with a simple visual on the board (claim → grounds → warrant → qualifier → rebuttal) rather than a full lecture, or the mapping exercise will run short on time.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI-generated argumentative essay
- Published op-ed on the same topic
- Toulmin model reference sheet
- Coggle or Miro (or paper)
- Analytical paragraph prompt

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Instructor briefly reviews Toulmin's model of argument (claim, grounds, warrant, qualifier, rebuttal) for ~10 min.
2. Students receive an AI-generated argumentative essay on a debatable research topic.
3. Students map the argument using Toulmin's framework: What is the claim? What evidence is offered? What warrants connect them? What counterarguments are addressed?
4. Students produce a visual argument map (hand-drawn or using Coggle/Miro) for the AI essay.
5. Students repeat the mapping exercise for a published op-ed on the same topic.
6. Students write one analytical paragraph comparing the two argument structures, using rhetorical vocabulary.

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *Where does the AI's argument seem logically complete on the surface but hollow underneath? What's missing and why does that matter for readers?*

Extension / Variation. Use a student's own draft essay instead of an AI essay and apply the same Toulmin mapping, then revise based on what the map reveals.

Research Connection. *Builds the argumentative structure skills students need for their own research essays while sharpening rhetorical analysis capacity.*

Activity 4: Pathos and the Performance of Emotion in AI Text

45 min • *Multimodal — annotated text + short reflective video response*

Overview. Students analyze how AI deploys emotional appeals in persuasive writing by examining word choice, narrative examples, and markers of empathy before considering what 'authentic' pathos requires that AI cannot provide.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *This activity asks students to prompt AI on emotionally loaded social issues (climate, poverty, mental health, immigration). Offer a short list of pre-approved topics rather than fully open choice, so no student unintentionally lands on a topic that is personally painful for them or a classmate.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat tool
- Human-written personal essay on the same topic
- Pathos annotation guide
- Recording app (Loom, phone)
- Reflection template

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students prompt AI to write an emotionally persuasive piece on a social issue (climate, poverty, mental health, immigration).
2. Using a pathos annotation guide, students mark every emotional appeal: empathy language, urgency cues, humanizing examples, fear or hope appeals.
3. Students locate a human-written first-person essay or narrative on the same topic and annotate it with the same guide.
4. Students write a 150-word comparison: How does human emotional appeal differ from AI emotional appeal?
5. Students record a 2-minute reflective video responding to one of the texts emotionally and then analyze their own response.
6. Discussion: Can AI-generated pathos be ethically used in public persuasion? Under what conditions?

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *Did you respond emotionally to either text? What does that tell you about how pathos works and whether its source matters?*

Extension / Variation. Analyze an AI-generated charity or advocacy ad script using the same pathos framework.

Research Connection. *Sharpens students' understanding of emotional rhetoric, both to analyze it in sources and to deploy it responsibly in their own research arguments.*

Activity 5: Context Collapse: AI and the Rhetorical Situation

Full class, 60 min • *Multimodal — rhetorical analysis portfolio + presentation*

Overview. Students investigate 'context collapse'. What happens when AI generates text with no real rhetorical situation (no genuine speaker, no specific audience, no authentic occasion) by analyzing three AI texts across three different genres and assessing what the lack of genuine context costs each.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *This activity has the most moving parts of the competency (three genres, a portfolio, and presentations) so it works best after students have already practiced ethos/audience/logos analysis in earlier activities. Consider it a synthesis activity rather than a first exposure to rhetorical analysis of AI text.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat tool
- Three genre prompt templates
- Rhetorical situation analysis framework
- Portfolio template
- Presentation format (slides optional)

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students select a research topic and prompt AI to write about it in three genres: a personal essay, a policy brief, and a scholarly abstract.
2. For each text, students analyze the rhetorical situation: Who is speaking? To whom? For what purpose? In what context?
3. Students identify where the AI simulates a rhetorical situation (persona, implied audience, fake occasion) and where the simulation breaks down.
4. Students compile a mini 'multimodal rhetorical analysis portfolio': annotated texts + one-paragraph analysis for each genre.
5. Students present their most interesting finding from across the three genres (2–3 min each).
6. Class discussion: What does genuine context require that AI cannot provide? What are the rhetorical and ethical stakes?

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *Which genre suffered most from context collapse and why? What does that tell you about what makes writing in that genre genuine?*

Extension / Variation. Find a published example of AI-generated content that was passed off as genuine (journalism, social media, etc.) and analyze its context collapse.

Research Connection. *Develops genre awareness and rhetorical situation thinking which is essential for students learning to write in multiple academic and public genres.*

Competency 4: AI, Bias, and Epistemic Justice

Students investigate how generative AI systems encode and reproduce cultural, racial, gender, and linguistic biases drawn from their training data, analyzing specific examples and considering what perspectives, knowledge systems, and voices are structurally underrepresented or distorted — and what that means for research, writing, and the production of public knowledge.

COMPETENCY AT A GLANCE

Activity	Time	Format
1. The Bias Prompt Experiment	50 min	Multimodal — comparative visual analysis + oral report
2. Epistemic Justice Reading and Response	45–55 min	Multimodal — annotated reading + podcast response segment
3. Who Gets to Be an Expert? AI and Credential Bias	45 min	Multimodal — visual data chart + reflective research memo
4. Language Bias Lab: AI and Non-English Knowledges	50 min	Multimodal — multilingual comparison + collaborative poster
5. Counter-Narrative Research Project	Multi-day project, 1–2 weeks	Multimodal — research presentation + annotated counter-narrative essay

Activity 1: The Bias Prompt Experiment

50 min • *Multimodal — comparative visual analysis + oral report*

Overview. Students run parallel prompts asking an AI about the same topic from multiple cultural, racial, or gender framings…then analyze the outputs for whose knowledge is centered, whose is marginalized, and what stereotypes or defaults emerge (making the encoded biases of training data visible).

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Set clear ground rules before this activity begins: the goal is to name patterns in AI output, not to make generalizations about real people or groups in class discussion. Naming that distinction up front helps keep the debrief focused and respectful, especially in a class with diverse identities in the room.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat tool
- Three-framing prompt guide
- Annotation and comparison worksheet
- Canva or paper for visual comparison
- Report-out protocol

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Instructor assigns a neutral-sounding topic (e.g., 'beauty standards,' 'leadership qualities,' 'academic success,' 'family structure').
2. Students prompt the AI for each topic in three framings: with no cultural modifier, with a Western/White/male modifier, and with a non-Western/racial minority/female modifier.
3. Students place the three outputs side by side and annotate: What defaults appear? What vocabulary shifts? What examples does the AI use?

4. Students create a visual comparison (annotated side-by-side display or infographic) of all three outputs.
5. Small groups report out one key bias finding to the class.
6. Discussion: Where do these biases come from, and who is harmed by them in real research and public discourse contexts?

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *Which output surprised you most and why? If a student used any of these outputs in a research essay without analyzing them, what harm might result?*

Extension / Variation. Run the same experiment in two different AI tools and compare whether the biases differ by platform.

Research Connection. *Develops critical awareness of bias in sources (including AI-sourced material) essential for research essays that engage with questions of equity and representation.*

Activity 2: Epistemic Justice Reading and Response

45–55 min • *Multimodal — annotated reading + podcast response segment*

Overview. Students read a brief excerpt from Miranda Fricker's theory of epistemic injustice (or a course-appropriate secondary piece on AI and knowledge), then analyze a specific AI-generated research summary for examples of testimonial injustice and hermeneutical gaps.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Fricker's terminology (testimonial injustice, hermeneutical injustice) is dense for a first encounter. Give students a plain-language definition card alongside the reading-- e.g., 'testimonial injustice: being believed less because of who you are; hermeneutical injustice: lacking the shared concepts to name your own experience' so the vocabulary doesn't become the whole lesson.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Epistemic justice reading (2–3 pages)
- AI chat tool
- Annotation guide
- Recording app (Anchor, Audacity, phone)
- Podcast reflection prompt

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Assign a 2–3 page reading on epistemic injustice (Fricker's concept of testimonial and hermeneutical injustice, or an accessible explainer).
2. Students annotate the reading for key concepts: Who gets believed? What knowledge systems get recognized?
3. Students ask an AI to summarize 'the history of [a marginalized community's] intellectual contributions' on a topic from class.
4. Students analyze the AI output through the epistemic justice lens: What voices does it cite? What frameworks does it privilege? What knowledge does it flatten or ignore?
5. Students record a 3-minute podcast-style response to the AI's summary: What did it miss, and why does it matter?
6. Audio is shared and 2–3 examples are played in class; discussion follows.

Reflection / Discussion Prompt

What specific knowledge systems or communities did the AI summary erase or tokenize? What would a more epistemically just research summary look like?

Extension / Variation. Write a counter-summary that centers the marginalized knowledge the AI omitted and cite sources from within that community's own tradition.

Research Connection. *Introduces a key theoretical lens (epistemic justice) for research essays dealing with representation, power, and knowledge production.*

Activity 3: Who Gets to Be an Expert? AI and Credential Bias

45 min • *Multimodal — visual data chart + reflective research memo*

Overview. Students systematically analyze which kinds of 'experts' an AI cites or defers to when asked about various topics (track patterns of institutional affiliation, geographic location, gender, race, and language) and then discuss what this reveals about whose expertise AI systems recognize.

Instructor Tip

Remind students that biographical details like race are sometimes not publicly disclosed or knowable, and that guessing based on a name or photo is exactly the kind of stereotyping this activity is trying to surface, not practice. Have students mark 'unknown/not disclosed' rather than guess.

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat tool
- Chart-making tool (Google Sheets or paper)
- Expert analysis worksheet
- Research memo template
- Biographical research tools (academic databases, institutional sites)

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students select three research topics-- one in a STEM area, one in social science, one in humanities or arts.
2. For each topic, students prompt the AI: 'Who are the leading experts or most important thinkers on [topic]?' and record the full list.
3. Students research each named expert: institutional affiliation, country of origin, gender, racial identity if publicly disclosed, and whether they publish in English.
4. Students create a simple data chart or table aggregating the patterns across all three topics.
5. Small groups compare charts: What patterns appear? Whose expertise does AI not recognize?
6. Students write a 250-word research memo connecting their findings to the concept of credentialed vs. experiential knowledge.

Reflection / Discussion Prompt

Based on your data, whose expertise is AI most likely to recognize? Whose is it most likely to miss? What does that mean for who gets heard in AI-mediated public discourse?

Extension / Variation. Compare the AI's expert list to a citation analysis of a top journal in the field. How does AI's 'who matters' align with or diverge from the field's own gatekeeping?

Research Connection. *Directly challenges students to seek out diverse, non-dominant expert voices in their own research essays.*

Activity 4: Language Bias Lab: AI and Non-English Knowledge

50 min • *Multimodal — multilingual comparison + collaborative poster*

Overview. Students with multilingual backgrounds or language study experience prompt an AI in a language other than English and compare the outputs to the English equivalents-- analyzing differences in depth, cultural assumptions, and quality to expose the linguistic hierarchies embedded in AI training data.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Not every class has multilingual students in every language, and putting a student on the spot as 'the' representative of a language can feel isolating. Frame participation as optional and provide a verified-translation-tool pathway (with instructor guidance) for any student who wants to take part but doesn't read another language.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat tool (with multilingual capability)
- Translation support (DeepL or a verified tool)
- Bilingual comparison worksheet
- Poster paper or Canva
- Gallery walk sticky notes

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students who read another language (or with instructor-provided translations) query an AI about a culturally specific topic in both English and the non-English language.
2. Students with only English use a verified translation tool to approximate the comparison, with instructor guidance.
3. Students compare outputs: depth of response, cultural specificity, quality of historical or contextual detail.
4. Students identify specific moments where the English output was richer, vaguer, or differently biased than the non-English output.
5. Groups create a collaborative poster synthesizing findings across 3–4 languages or regions.
6. Gallery walk and discussion: What does this reveal about whose knowledge AI was trained to know?

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *What knowledge did the non-English AI response contain that the English one missed or vice versa? What does that tell you about who built the AI?*

Extension / Variation. Research a topic in a language the AI is known to handle poorly. Analyze the quality degradation and connect it to training data representation.

Research Connection. *Expands students' research horizon beyond English-language sources as a critical skill for research on global or cross-cultural topics.*

Activity 5: Counter-Narrative Research Project

Multi-day project, 1–2 weeks • *Multimodal — research presentation + annotated counter-narrative essay*

Overview. Students identify a topic on which an AI produces a noticeably biased, incomplete, or dominant-culture-centric account, then conduct independent research to construct a counter-narrative using sources from

communities and scholars that the AI systematically underrepresents, presenting their counter-narrative in both an essay and a multimodal format.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *This is the most substantial activity in the competency. Build in a mid-project check-in (around day 3–4) to review each student's three identified gaps before they commit to a full week of research. Catching a weak or overly broad gap early saves a rewrite later.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat tool
- Library and community publication access
- Counter-narrative essay template
- Multimodal creation tool (student choice: Canva, iMovie, Audacity, etc.)
- Presentation guidelines

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students query an AI on a topic touching on race, gender, class, disability, colonialism, or other axes of marginalization and document the response.
2. Students identify 3 specific gaps, omissions, or distortions in the AI account.
3. Students research each gap using library databases, community publications, or scholarly sources from within the affected community.
4. Students write a 500-word annotated counter-narrative paragraph for each gap (totaling ~1,500 words).
5. Students design a multimodal complement to their counter-narrative: an infographic, a short video essay, an audio documentary segment, or a visual timeline.
6. Students present both the essay and multimodal piece to the class, framing their project as a contribution to epistemic justice.

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *What did it feel like to actively seek out knowledge the AI doesn't know? What does that act of counter-research say about the purpose of research writing?*

Extension / Variation. Collaborate with a classmate on the same topic. One person writes the essay, the other creates the multimodal piece. Then, discuss how the two formats differently construct the counter-narrative.

Research Connection. *Produces a substantial, citation-rich research text and a multimodal complement that directly scaffolds the semester's major research project.*

Competency 5: Ethical Research Writing & Considerations of AI's Social Impact

Students engage in the substantive questions related to generative AI in society (labor, education, authorship, surveillance, environmental cost, etc.), demonstrating the ability to engage seriously with multiple perspectives, synthesize scholarly and public sources, and build their own well-reasoned position to these ongoing conversations.

COMPETENCY AT A GLANCE

Activity	Time	Format
1. Ethical AI Stakeholder Map	50 min	Small-group source analysis + gallery walk
2. Authorship on Trial: A Mock Academic Hearing	Full class, 60–75 min	Role-play + policy writing
3. Labor Futures Synthesis Lab	50–60 min	Jigsaw reading + synthesis writing
4. Surveillance and Consent: An AI Ethics Audit	50–60 min	Stakeholder analysis + policy memo
5. Environmental Cost Claim Clinic	Full class, 60–75 min	Source evaluation + public argument
6.The Conversation Entry Point: Situating Your Argument	50 min	Individual mapping + peer workshop
7.Counterargument Stress Test	45–55 min	Individual evaluation + structured pair debate
8.Synthesis Sprint: Weaving Sources Into Argument	50 min (workshop format)	Multimodal — annotated draft paragraph + audio self-assessment
9.The Multimodal Research Pitch	Full class, 60–75 min	Live presentation + visual abstract
10.The Research Essay as Public Contribution	Final project + class showcase	Multimodal — polished research essay + public-facing companion piece

Activity 1: Ethical AI Stakeholder Map

50 min • *Small-group source analysis + gallery walk*

Overview. Students investigate one contested use of generative AI by mapping stakeholders, potential benefits and harms, decision-making power, and missing voices across scholarly and public sources. After a gallery walk, students revise an initial position to account for competing values and unequal consequences.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Choose a concrete scenario rather than a broad question such as 'Is AI good or bad?' Prepare four short sources with genuinely different rhetorical situations and positions so students have meaningful tensions to map, not four versions of the same claim.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Four-source packet (scholarly, journalistic, stakeholder, institutional)
- Stakeholder map worksheet
- AI-in-society scenario cards
- Claim/evidence/values annotation guide

- Poster paper or shared slides
- Gallery walk sticky notes

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Instructor introduces a concrete controversy (e.g., a required AI writing assistant, an AI hiring screen, or replacement of entry-level writing work); students privately record an initial position.
2. In groups, students annotate the four sources for central claim, evidence, underlying value or assumption, and missing voice.
3. Groups complete a stakeholder map tracking each stakeholder's possible benefits, harms, decision-making power, source evidence, and unanswered questions.
4. Groups convert their analysis into a one-page visual map and post it around the room or in a digital gallery.
5. Gallery walk: classmates add one omitted stakeholder, one unintended consequence, and one question that must be answered before a policy decision.
6. Students write a 150–200-word revised position synthesizing at least two sources and stating one condition, tradeoff, or uncertainty.

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *Which stakeholder had the most power to shape the decision, and which stakeholder bore the greatest risk? How did that imbalance affect your revised position?*

Extension / Variation. Repeat the map at a different scale — campus, workplace, community, or national policy — and analyze how the stakeholders and consequences change.

Research Connection. *Builds rhetorical listening, stakeholder analysis, and source synthesis — essential moves for framing an ethically complex research question before taking a position.*

Activity 2: Authorship on Trial: A Mock Academic Hearing

Full class, 60–75 min • *Role-play + policy writing*

Overview. Students examine hypothetical cases ranging from brainstorming and language support to substantive generation and fabricated citations, then conduct a mock academic hearing to decide when AI assistance changes authorship. Groups draft policy language, and each student writes an individual ruling.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Keep the hearing focused on hypothetical cases, not suspected behavior by real classmates. Include accessibility and multilingual-writing scenarios so the discussion does not collapse into a simple 'AI use equals cheating' framework.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI-authorship case cards
- Stakeholder role cards
- Course policy template
- Scholarly and public source packet
- Hearing statement worksheet
- Timer and individual ruling prompt

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students complete the sentence: “A person should be considered the author of a text when that person has primarily controlled ___ and accepts responsibility for ___.”
2. Each group receives one case and assigns roles: student, instructor, classmate, writing-center tutor, accessibility advocate, or department chair. Sample scenarios here.

3. Each role prepares a one-minute statement containing a definition of authorship, a judgment about the case, evidence from one source, and a question for another stakeholder.
4. Groups conduct the hearing using a rhetorical-listening protocol: summarize another position and its underlying value before challenging it.
5. Groups draft a three-part course policy: uses permitted without approval; uses requiring disclosure or approval; and uses inconsistent with course authorship expectations — with a rationale for each category.
6. Students write a 250-word individual ruling that includes a decision, definition of authorship, evidence from two sources, the strongest counterargument, and a response.

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *Which mattered most in your judgment— control of ideas, control of language, decision-making, disclosure, or responsibility? Where was the boundary between assistance and substitution hardest to draw?*

Extension / Variation. Apply the group policy to a new borderline case and revise any clause that produces an inconsistent or unintended result.

Research Connection. *Practices definitional argument, counterargument, ethical classification, and policy writing — all transferable to a researched essay about education, authorship, or intellectual property.*

Activity 3: Labor Futures Synthesis Lab

50–60 min • *Jigsaw reading + synthesis writing*

Overview. Students compare a scholarly study, worker account, labor or professional association statement, employer or industry report, and public-facing article about generative AI and work. A jigsaw reading and synthesis matrix help students distinguish genuine disagreement from differences in scope, method, and stakeholder position.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Select sources that address a shared occupation, industry, or time frame closely enough to compare. Remind students that a projection, a peer-reviewed study, and a first-person account offer different kinds of evidence; the activity is not a vote for the most optimistic or alarming source.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Five-source labor packet
- Synthesis matrix
- Source-relationship sentence stems
- Expert-group role sheet
- Source evaluation checklist
- Synthesis paragraph prompt

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Expert groups study one source and identify its main claim, evidence, workers discussed, source interests, and stated or unstated limitations.
2. Students reorganize into mixed groups; each expert teaches the source while the group completes a synthesis matrix.
3. Groups compare predictions, beneficiaries, harms, proposed solutions, and uncertainties across all five sources.
4. Groups identify at least four relationships: agreement, disagreement, the same problem with different solutions, different conclusions caused by scope or time frame, or a public source simplifying a scholarly source.

5. Each group composes one sentence that places at least three sources in conversation rather than listing them separately.
6. Students write a 250–350-word synthesis paragraph answering "What is the most defensible conclusion we can currently draw about generative AI and labor?" using at least three sources, one disagreement, and one limitation.

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *How did each source's method and stakeholder position shape the labor future it described? Whose experience or evidence was still missing from the conversation?*

Extension / Variation. Add a current job posting, local worker interview, or workplace policy and explain whether it confirms, complicates, or challenges the source packet.

Research Connection. *Directly develops source synthesis, scope awareness, and qualified claim-making — central skills for writing about contested social effects without reducing the debate to prediction or opinion.*

Activity 4: Surveillance and Consent: An AI Ethics Audit

50–60 min • *Stakeholder analysis + policy memo*

Overview. Students audit a hypothetical university AI writing platform that collects drafts and revision data, generates feedback, flags writing, and shares summaries with instructors or administrators. They trace data flows, compare stakeholder consequences, and write a recommendation memo with concrete safeguards.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Keep the case hypothetical and do not ask students to disclose personal surveillance or academic-integrity experiences. Emphasize that automated flags are claims requiring review, not proof, and that an opt-out is not meaningful if the alternative creates a substantial penalty.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- University AI platform scenario
- Stakeholder role cards
- Risk-benefit matrix
- Data-flow annotation guide
- Six-question ethics audit worksheet
- One-page recommendation memo template

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students mark every point where data is created, collected, inferred, shared, stored, or used to make a decision.
2. Groups adopt a stakeholder role (student, instructor, accessibility advocate, administrator, privacy officer, vendor, or falsely flagged student) and identify possible benefits, burdens, and goals.
3. Groups audit the system through six questions: purpose, data, power, consent, consequences, and recourse.
4. Groups complete a risk-benefit matrix including likely benefits, likely harms, low-probability but severe harms, and unresolved information.
5. Mixed-stakeholder groups negotiate safeguards such as data minimization, deletion timelines, human review, transparent appeals, genuine non-AI alternatives, and limits on vendor reuse.
6. Students write a one-page memo recommending adoption, revision, a limited pilot, or rejection; the memo includes two benefits, two risks, evidence from two sources, three safeguards, and a challenge process.

Reflection / Discussion Prompt

When does educational convenience become surveillance? What conditions would make consent meaningful when a tool is embedded in a required course or institutional system?

Extension / Variation. Add or remove one safeguard from the scenario and write a short impact note explaining which stakeholder's risk changes most.

Research Connection. *Builds causal analysis, ethical reasoning, and evidence-based policy recommendation — useful for research essays addressing privacy, institutional power, or educational technology.*

Activity 5: Environmental Cost Claim Clinic

Full class, 60–75 min • *Source evaluation + public argument*

Overview. Students examine competing claims about the energy, water, carbon, and infrastructure costs of generative AI, distinguishing model training, routine use, and data-center development. They trace units, assumptions, scale, and uncertainty before writing a campus policy recommendation or public-facing op-ed.

Instructor Tip

Avoid building the lesson around one dramatic statistic. Choose sources that disclose enough methodology for students to trace the claim, and remind them that estimates may vary by model, region, energy mix, workload, and date.

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Five-source environmental cost packet
- Claim-dissection worksheet
- Campus AI policy scenario
- Environmental claim cards
- Units and scale reference sheet
- Op-ed or policy recommendation template

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students rank three environmental claims from most to least trustworthy before reading the full sources and explain the credibility cues they used.
2. Teams dissect one claim: what is measured, the unit, whether it concerns training, routine use, or infrastructure, the model or facility, region, time period, assumptions, baseline, and uncertainty.
3. Teams read the source in context and label the claim: well supported; accurate but misleading without context; too broad; uncertain or incomplete; or contradicted.
4. The class compares findings and maps reasons apparently conflicting claims may coexist: scale, energy mix, measured versus estimated use, training versus inference, and per-use versus system-wide totals.
5. Groups draft campus guidelines such as impact review for large deployments, vendor disclosure, lower-resource options, limits on unnecessary generation at scale, and annual reporting.
6. Students write a 500-word op-ed or policy recommendation synthesizing at least four sources, explaining one measurement difficulty, answering a serious counterargument, making a specific feasible recommendation, and distinguishing what is known from what remains uncertain.

Reflection / Discussion Prompt

Which claim became more or less persuasive once you examined its units, assumptions, and scale? How can a public writer communicate environmental cost without sensationalizing or minimizing it?

Extension / Variation. Translate the argument into a one-page infographic that includes source attribution, a visible uncertainty note, and one comparison that does not distort scale.

Research Connection. *Strengthens quantitative source evaluation, methodological literacy, and public argument — helping students turn uncertain technical evidence into a responsible, qualified recommendation.*

Activity 6: The Conversation Entry Point: Situating Your Argument

50 min • *Individual mapping + peer workshop*

Overview. Students map the existing scholarly and public conversation on their AI-in-society research question. They should be able to identify the major positions, key voices, and the gap or intervention their own argument will address using both traditional sources and AI-assisted searches to build a comprehensive 'conversation map' before drafting a word.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *If students are choosing their own research questions rather than working from a provided list, have them submit their question 1–2 days before this activity so you can flag questions that are too broad ('is AI good or bad?') or too narrow to support 5–7 distinct positions.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Library database access
- AI search tool
- Conversation map template (Miro, Coggle, or paper)
- Source log worksheet
- Research entry memo prompt
- Peer feedback guide

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students identify their semester research question (from an instructor-provided list or developed independently) in the broad area of AI in society.
2. Using library databases, Google Scholar, and at least one AI search tool, students locate 5–7 sources representing different positions on the question.
3. Students create a visual conversation map: major camps, key thinkers, unresolved tensions, and gaps.
4. Students identify where their own argument would 'enter' the conversation: what position are they supporting, challenging, or complicating?
5. Students write a 200-word 'research entry memo' articulating their tentative argument and how it relates to existing positions.
6. Peer workshop: partners assess whether the argument is genuinely entering a debate or just summarizing it.

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *What is the most important unresolved debate you found in your research? Where does your argument fit and what does it add that existing voices haven't said?*

Extension / Variation. Map the same conversation in both scholarly and public/journalistic sources and analyze whether the debates align or diverge.

Research Connection. *Foundational to the 'They Say / I Say' argumentative move which positions students as genuine participants in ongoing conversations rather than reporters on them.*

Activity 7: Counterargument Stress Test

45–55 min • *Individual evaluation + structured pair debate*

Overview. Students identify the strongest possible counterargument to their own research position on an AI-in-society question, then use both scholarly research and AI-generated perspectives to stress-test their argument and perhaps revise their thesis and test their evidence to address the most serious objections.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *The paired 'argue your partner's position' exchange (Structured Academic Controversy) works best when students already know each other's thesis beforehand. Ask students to swap one-sentence theses at the start of class so no one is arguing blind.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- AI chat tool
- Library database access
- Structured Academic Controversy protocol
- Counterargument evaluation worksheet
- Rebuttal paragraph template

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students state their current research argument in one clear sentence.
2. Students use AI to generate the three strongest counterarguments to their position.
3. Students evaluate each AI counterargument: Is it logically sound? Is it based on real research? Does it present a genuine challenge?
4. Students locate at least one scholarly source for the strongest counterargument.
5. Structured Academic Controversy: in pairs, each student argues their partner's position for 5 minutes, then switches.
6. Students write a rebuttal paragraph addressing the strongest counterargument in their essay, citing the scholarly source.

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *Did the AI's counterarguments identify weaknesses in your argument that you hadn't seen? How did it feel to argue your opponent's position?*

Extension / Variation. Give the AI your entire thesis and ask it to write a full rebuttal. Then use that as the basis for a real peer debate.

Research Connection. *Directly builds the counterargument-and-rebuttal section of the research essay to turn adversarial engagement into a writing skill.*

Activity 8: Synthesis Sprint: Weaving Sources Into Argument

50 min (workshop format) • *Multimodal — annotated draft paragraph + audio self-assessment*

Overview. Using their gathered sources, students practice the research writing skill of synthesis (e.g., integrating at least three sources into a single argumentative paragraph that goes beyond summary to make a distinct claim) then self-assess the paragraph in a brief audio recording.

> **Instructor Tip**

> *Students need to bring their own three sources to class for this to work, so send a reminder the class period before. If even a few students arrive without sources, have a backup set of shared sources ready so they aren't stuck watching rather than practicing.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- 3 student-gathered sources
- Synthesis paragraph model (instructor)
- Argument-first checklist
- Recording app
- Revised paragraph submission form

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students bring 3 sources relevant to one section of their research essay.
2. Instructor models a synthesis paragraph live using sample sources (10 min): how to quote selectively, paraphrase accurately, and connect sources to your claim.
3. Students draft one synthesis paragraph (200–250 words) in class, integrating all three sources around a single argumentative claim.
4. Peer review: partners assess whether the paragraph argues or just reports, using the 'argument-first' checklist.
5. Students record a 2-minute audio self-assessment: What synthesis move worked best? What needs revision?
6. Audio is submitted alongside the revised paragraph.

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *What's the difference between a paragraph that 'uses' three sources and one that 'synthesizes' them? At what point did your paragraph start doing the latter?*

Extension / Variation. Try writing the same synthesis paragraph twice (once with AI assistance drafting the connections, once entirely on your own) and compare the results.

Research Connection. *Targets the single most difficult skill in research writing: synthesizing rather than summarizing, directly improving the research essay.*

Activity 9: The Multimodal Research Pitch

Full class, 60–75 min • *Live presentation + visual abstract*

Overview. Students pitch their research argument to the class in a structured multimodal format (a 5-minute live presentation with a visual abstract or a one-page synthesis of their argument, key sources, and methodology) and receive targeted feedback before the final essay draft.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *With a full slate of 5-minute pitches plus Q&A, this activity fills the period fast. For classes over about 20 students, consider splitting pitches across two class days or running parallel small-group sessions so every student gets real feedback time.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Visual abstract template (Canva or Adobe Express)
- Pitch outline guide
- Recording device
- Post-pitch reflection prompt

- Structured feedback form

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students create a visual abstract: a one-page designed document (not a slide deck) that maps their research question, tentative argument, key sources, and main evidence threads.
2. Students prepare a 5-minute pitch presenting: their research question, why it matters, their argument, their strongest evidence, and one unresolved challenge.
3. Each presentation is followed by 3–4 minutes of peer questions focused on: Is the argument clear? Is the evidence sufficient? What's missing?
4. Instructors and peers complete a structured feedback form.
5. Students record their pitch on video (phone or Zoom) for self-review.
6. Students write a 200-word post-pitch reflection identifying the two most important revisions their essay needs.

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *What question from the audience exposed the biggest weakness in your argument and what will you do about it in your essay?*

Extension / Variation. Record the pitch as a 5-minute documentary-style video essay and submit it as a multimodal component of the final research project.

Research Connection. *Turns the invisible research process public by asking students to articulate argument, evidence, and gaps before drafting in order to improve final essays.*

Activity 10: The Research Essay as Public Contribution

Final project + class showcase • *Multimodal — polished research essay + public-facing companion piece*

Overview. Students complete a sustained research essay (1,500–2,500 words) arguing a well-supported position on an AI-in-society question, and pair it with a public-facing multimodal companion (e.g., an op-ed, infographic, podcast episode, or short video essay) adapting their scholarly argument for a real audience outside the classroom.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Have students identify their real public audience (step 2 below) at least a week before the multimodal piece is due, not the same day. Naming a genuine target outlet early shapes drafting choices — a piece written 'for no one in particular' is much harder to revise into something audience-specific at the last minute.*

MATERIALS & TOOLS

- Research essay (final draft)
- Multimodal creation tool (student choice)
- Adaptation statement template
- Class publication platform (website, podcast, or exhibit)
- Final reflection prompt

STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS

1. Students finalize their research essay incorporating instructor and peer feedback from the pitch and synthesis sprint.
2. Students identify a real public audience for their argument: a campus publication, a policy blog, a community organization, a student newspaper.

3. Students adapt their argument into a chosen multimodal format: op-ed (500–700 words), infographic (visual summary of argument + evidence), podcast segment (5–8 min), or short video essay (4–6 min).
4. Students write a 300-word 'adaptation statement' explaining what they changed for the public format and why.
5. Class showcase: multimodal pieces are shared on a class website, podcast feed, or exhibit space which makes the work genuinely public.
6. Students write a final 200-word reflection on what they learned about research argumentation by having to translate it for a real audience.

> **Reflection / Discussion Prompt**
> *What did you have to sacrifice or simplify when you moved from the essay to your public-facing piece and what does that tell you about the relationship between scholarly and public writing?*

Extension / Variation. Submit the public-facing piece to an actual publication, editor, or organization (making the 'public contribution' literal rather than simulated).

Research Connection. *Completes the research writing process by requiring students to take a public stance, connecting academic research to civic and professional engagement.*

Preserving AI-Free Space for Generating Ideas

These activities help students experience when AI should be avoided, especially in the early stages of inquiry, personal investment, ethical judgment, source interpretation, and original argument development. Because they protect thinking that happens before or apart from AI use, they work best woven throughout the semester rather than clustered at the end — for example, pair Activity 1 with the start of the research unit and Activity 5 with the start of drafting.

1. Pre-Research Curiosity Freewrite

20–30 min • Purpose: *Protect the moment before students know what they think.*

Activity. Before searching online or using AI, students freewrite by hand about a possible research topic.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Ask for handwriting, not typing, if at all possible. The slower pace itself is part of what protects unmediated thinking here.*

PROMPTS

- What do I already believe about this issue?
- Where did that belief come from?
- What am I unsure about?
- What would I need to learn before making a responsible argument?
- Why might this issue matter beyond the classroom?

Why AI-Free. Students need to encounter their own assumptions before a tool organizes the issue for them.

Follow-Up. Students identify one assumption, one question, and one possible research direction from the freewrite.

---

2. Human Question Lab

35–45 min • Purpose: *Help students generate research questions through curiosity rather than answer-seeking.*

Activity. Students work in groups of four. One student names a broad topic. For five minutes, group members may only ask questions. No one may answer, advise, search, or use AI. The goal is to generate complexity before narrowing the project.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Model the 'no answering' rule yourself for the first 30 seconds — students almost always slip into answering mode instinctively, and a quick demonstration heads that off.*

QUESTION TYPES

- Definition questions
- Cause-and-effect questions
- Stakeholder questions
- Historical questions
- Ethical questions

- Policy questions
- Counterargument questions
- “Who benefits?” questions
- “Who is harmed?” questions

Follow-Up. Each student selects three questions: one they can research, one they care about, and one that complicates their assumptions.

---

3. Source Encounter Without Summary

45–60 min • Purpose: *Preserve direct engagement with sources before AI-mediated summarization.*

Activity. Students read a short scholarly or public source without using AI summaries. They annotate the source for argument, evidence, key terms, confusion, and questions. Only after annotating may they compare their understanding with a peer.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Choose a source that is challenging but not overwhelming — the goal is productive struggle, not frustration that shuts students down before they annotate anything.*

ANNOTATION TASKS

- Identify the main claim
- Mark one important piece of evidence
- Circle unfamiliar terms
- Note one confusing passage
- Write one question for the author
- Identify one implication for their own research

Why AI-Free. Students practice tolerating difficulty and building interpretive confidence before outsourcing comprehension.

Follow-Up. Students write a source response beginning: "Before discussing this source with anyone else, I noticed..."

---

4. Multimodal Sketch Before Digital Tools

35–50 min • Purpose: *Help students design multimodal arguments from rhetorical intention rather than template logic.*

Activity. Before using AI, Canva, PowerPoint, or design templates, students sketch a multimodal argument by hand. They decide what the audience should see first, what evidence matters most, where text should appear, and how visual hierarchy should guide interpretation.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Reassure students up front that artistic skill isn't being graded (stick figures and boxes are fine). Otherwise, students who don't see themselves as 'visual people' will stall out on the drawing itself.*

SKETCH REQUIREMENTS

- Main claim

- Audience
- Medium
- Visual focal point
- Evidence placement
- Source attribution location
- Emotional or ethical effect
- One design choice they intentionally reject

Why AI-Free. Students learn that multimodal composing begins with rhetorical choices, not with automated design suggestions.

Follow-Up. Students write a designer's note explaining how the sketch reflects audience, purpose, and context.

---

5. “This Part Must Be Mine” Argument Reflection

30–40 min • Purpose: *Help students identify stages of researched argument where AI use may interfere with learning, agency, or ethical responsibility.*

Activity. Before drafting a researched argument, students write a reflection identifying which parts of the project should remain AI-free.

> **Instructor Tip**
> *Collect these boundary statements and hand them back at the midpoint of drafting so that students don’t forget their own stated intentions once deadline pressure sets in, and a reminder in their own words is more effective than a policy reminder from you.*

PROMPTS

- What part of this argument requires my own judgment?
- What ethical decision should I not outsource?
- What source do I need to interpret myself before asking for help?
- What claim do I need to struggle with before revising?
- Where might AI make the issue seem simpler than it is?
- What would I lose if I used AI too early?

Follow-Up. Students create a personal AI boundary statement for the project, such as: "I will not use AI to generate my research question," "I will not use AI to interpret my primary source before I annotate it," or "I will not use AI to write my central claim."
