ACADEMIC TRAINING PROPOSAL / 6-DAY COMPLETE PROGRAM

# Outsmart AI: The Human Edge

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

| DURATION | TRAINING | APPLICATION |
|---|---|---|
| **6 days · 36 hours** | **18 hours · mornings** | **18 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.

Across six days, students develop a structured practice for thinking with AI without surrendering responsibility to it. They challenge persuasive outputs, frame better questions, create alternatives, negotiate human concerns and bring those abilities together in a capstone decision. The central theme is thoughtful agency rather than speed.

## What participants will take away

**FINAL PARTICIPANT OUTCOME**

A human-AI reasoning portfolio with source critique, reframed problems, creative options, stakeholder analysis and a defensible final recommendation.

## 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 |
|---|---|
| **Explain important AI failure modes** | Evidence-based examples of plausible mistakes and uncertainty. |
| **Evaluate reasoning and sources** | An annotated evidence audit and bias checklist. |
| **Reframe complex problems** | Alternative problem statements with assumptions exposed. |
| **Create and assess original ideas** | A divergent-options portfolio and selection rationale. |
| **Account for people and consequences** | A stakeholder and ethics analysis of a difficult case. |
| **Make accountable decisions with AI input** | A capstone recommendation with trade-offs and reversal conditions. |

## 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 program teaches observable critical-thinking practices; it does not claim to quantify empathy, intelligence or creativity with a single score. AI acts as a tool for challenge and reflection, not an authority.

03 / SINGLE-PAGE TIMETABLE

## 6-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**<br>**Know what AI misses** | Model strengths, limits, uncertainty, hallucinations and overreliance. | Audit AI-generated advice and write a personal verification protocol. | AI limitations audit |
| **DAY 02**<br>**Think against the grain** | Cognitive biases, argument mapping, evidence quality and counterexamples. | Identify weak claims, verify sources and construct a stronger argument. | Reasoning + source map |
| **DAY 03**<br>**Ask a better question** | First principles, root causes, reframing and systems perspectives. | Rework an ambiguous campus case into testable problem statements. | Problem reframing brief |
| **DAY 04**<br>**Create beyond the obvious** | Divergent thinking, synthesis, creativity constraints and originality. | Generate and critique options independently, collaboratively and with AI. | Innovation option set |
| **DAY 05**<br>**Lead with care** | Stakeholders, emotional intelligence, ethical tensions and communication. | Simulate a high-stakes conversation and document decision trade-offs. | Stakeholder decision memo |
| **DAY 06**<br>**Integrate human judgment** | Strategic choices, uncertainty, working with AI and accountability. | Present a defensible team recommendation and respond to challenge questions. | Final case 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.

## Progression across the week

Days 1–2 develop the foundation; Days 3–4 extend it through guided application; Day 5 strengthens quality and judgment; Day 6 integrates the learning into a demonstrable capstone. Individual exercises may be completed in teams if appropriate to the cohort.

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 Evidence, not fluency

Learners compare AI responses to primary or supplied sources, identify framing bias and build an argument map that makes uncertainty visible.

**Evidence:** claim audit and improved argument.

### 02 The framing workshop

Students begin without AI, generate several explanations of an ambiguous institutional challenge and then use AI as a critic rather than a first-answer machine.

**Evidence:** alternative problem definitions and tests.

### 03 Creativity with constraints

Teams explore a challenge through independent brainstorming, structured combination and selective AI assistance, then justify the originality and feasibility of their choices.

**Evidence:** option portfolio and selection notes.

### 04 Decisions for real people

Groups work through a scenario involving competing stakeholder needs. They use AI for counterarguments, but own the final judgment, evidence and communication plan.

**Evidence:** stakeholder map, decision memo and defence.

## Capstone brief

END-OF-PROGRAM CHALLENGE

A case-based team portfolio: claim and source audit, reframed problem, multiple original response options, stakeholder map, trade-off analysis and a final recommendation that states what new evidence could change the decision.

## 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.

05 / EVIDENCE AND ACADEMIC FIT

## Assessment that a department can inspect

Assessment is practical and formative. Facilitators look at the quality of the work and the reasoning behind it, not just whether a tool produced an answer. The weights are suggested for workshop evaluation and can be adapted to the cohort.

| CRITERION | WEIGHT | WHAT REVIEWERS LOOK FOR |
|---|---|---|
| **Evidence and critical reasoning** | 30% | Claims verified, uncertainties and biases acknowledged |
| **Reframing and originality** | 25% | Competing frames and substantive alternatives |
| **Ethical and strategic judgment** | 30% | Stakeholder analysis, trade-offs and safeguards |
| **Communication and self-reflection** | 15% | Coherent defence and independent thinking |

## Evidence retained by learners

- Completed daily artifacts or short case submissions.
- A final project, demonstration or decision portfolio appropriate to the program.
- A brief explanation of what was checked, improved and left unresolved.

## Tools, access and responsible practice

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.

## Institutional value

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

## Suggested academic discussion

A short conversation with the relevant department can confirm the student level, preferred case domain and expected final artifacts. That alignment is enough to decide whether the program fits the institution’s learning priorities.