ACADEMIC TRAINING PROPOSAL / 3-DAY ACCELERATED WORKSHOP

Outsmart AI: The Human Edge

Critical thinking, creativity and sound judgment in an AI-rich world

DURATION	TRAINING	APPLICATION
3 days · 18 hours	**9 hours · mornings**	**9 hours · afternoons**

A practical learning opportunity

As AI becomes easier to use, students need stronger—not weaker—habits of independent thought. This program explores where AI can help and where people must still judge evidence, frame the real problem, consider consequences and communicate with care. Students practise these skills through cases, critique and collaborative challenges.

The short program uses structured challenges to sharpen three habits: question the answer, ask a better question and make a reasoned choice. The aim is to develop confident collaboration with AI, not to position people and machines as opponents.

What participants will take away

FINAL PARTICIPANT OUTCOME

A documented case response showing evidence checks, creative reframing, a considered decision and a personal human-AI working guide.

Who this is designed for

SUITABLE PARTICIPANTS	STARTING POINT
Students from any faculty, especially those developing analytical, leadership, communication and interdisciplinary problem-solving capabilities.	No coding requirement. Willingness to discuss cases, challenge assumptions, collaborate and explain decisions.

Why it matters to the department

Offers a complementary human-capabilities track for employability, leadership development, ethics and multidisciplinary learning—not a claim that human reasoning is infallible.

This proposal is intended for academic review. Cohort-specific examples and delivery arrangements can be agreed with the department once there is interest.

02 / ACADEMIC DESIGN

Learning outcomes and evidence

The outcomes below describe work a participant can show at the end of the program. They are deliberately scoped to the available instructional time.

PARTICIPANTS WILL BE ABLE TO...	OBSERVABLE EVIDENCE
Identify confident but weak reasoning	An annotated critique of an AI-generated response.
Frame problems before solving them	A reframed problem statement with competing explanations.
Generate original options	A divergent-ideas board and justified selection.
Make and communicate a defensible decision	A final case presentation with trade-offs and human accountability.

How the workshop runs

SESSION	TEACHING APPROACH	PARTICIPANT EXPERIENCE
Morning · 3 hours	Concepts, worked examples, instructor demonstrations and guided questioning.	Understand the method, challenge assumptions and see a complete example.
Afternoon · 3 hours	Hands-on labs, structured iteration, peer critique and feedback.	Apply the method to a case, improve an artifact and leave with evidence of learning.

Illustrative daily timing: 09:30–12:30 training; 12:30–13:30 lunch (outside contact hours); 13:30–16:30 practice. The essential commitment is six instructional hours per day, split equally between learning and application.

What we will not overpromise

The exercises do not grade personality traits or claim to measure intelligence. Students are evaluated on observable reasoning, justification, collaboration and reflection.

How participant work is evaluated

CRITERION	WEIGHT	WHAT REVIEWERS LOOK FOR
Critical evaluation	30%	Claims, assumptions and evidence are distinguished
Creative problem framing	25%	Useful alternative framings and options
Judgment and ethics	30%	Trade-offs, stakeholder needs and limitations
Communication and reflection	15%	Clear reasoning and personal learning insights

03 / SINGLE-PAGE TIMETABLE

3-day teaching and practice schedule

Each day deliberately links the morning lesson to an afternoon artifact. The complete timetable is kept together on this page for ease of academic review.

DAY & FOCUS	MORNING TRAINING · 3 HOURS	AFTERNOON PRACTICE · 3 HOURS	DAILY EVIDENCE
DAY 01 **Question the output**	Capabilities and limits, reasoning traps, bias, missing evidence and source evaluation.	Audit a persuasive AI answer; find assumptions and rewrite an evidence-aware conclusion.	AI answer audit
DAY 02 **Frame before solving**	First principles, perspective-taking, problem framing and creative divergence.	Reframe a complex case; develop multiple options with and without AI assistance.	Problem framing + ideas
DAY 03 **Choose with judgment**	Decision trade-offs, ethics, empathy, communication and human accountability.	Run a team decision simulation and defend a recommendation against critique.	Case decision portfolio

Daily learning rhythm

Explore the idea → see a worked demonstration → practise with feedback → check the output → record what improved. The afternoon closes with an artifact, not only a completed exercise.

Practical emphasis

- One achievable problem is carried across all three days, so participants see continuity rather than isolated tool exercises.
- Each daily artifact is reviewed for usefulness, factual care and the participant's own decisions.
- The final day prioritises demonstration, feedback and an honest statement of limitations.

04 / LEARNING BY DOING

Hands-on studio: what students will actually do

The following activities show the level of work expected in the afternoon sessions. Case material and examples can be aligned with the department while preserving the core learning outcomes.

01 The plausible answer trap

Participants inspect a confident AI response that mixes facts with unsupported assumptions. They label claim types and decide what evidence is still missing.

Evidence: An annotated critique and corrected summary.

02 Five problems hiding inside one

Teams receive an ambiguous case, interview the brief, write several competing problem statements and use AI only after the framing work.

Evidence: Reframed questions and an alternatives map.

03 A decision with consequences

Groups weigh stakeholder needs, uncertainty and ethical concerns. Each must argue for a recommendation and explain what evidence could reverse it.

Evidence: A decision memo and five-minute defence.

Capstone brief

END-OF-PROGRAM CHALLENGE

A team response to a realistic campus or workplace dilemma: critique an AI recommendation, reframe the actual issue, explore alternative ideas and present a justified decision with uncertainty noted.

Examples of suitable practice contexts

- Spot missing evidence in an AI-generated recommendation and identify what would change the decision.
- Reframe an ambiguous campus problem before asking AI for options.
- Respond to a difficult stakeholder scenario with both empathy and practical judgment.

Learning resources and safeguards

An approved AI assistant, supplied case studies, reading extracts and collaborative documents. All core exercises can be completed without a specialist paid platform.

Participants treat AI suggestions as hypotheses, disclose use where required, and avoid relying on generated content for high-stakes personal or institutional decisions.

What the institution can expect

Offers a complementary human-capabilities track for employability, leadership development, ethics and multidisciplinary learning—not a claim that human reasoning is infallible.

The host department may align case studies with the cohort before delivery. This proposal is ready for academic review; program logistics can be discussed separately if it is a fit.