Writing with AI: Making Informed, Defensible Choices Before You Submit

Lance Eaton, Paperpal, April 2026

- Workshop Slides
- Results May Vary: A post about custom instructions
- **Paperpal Resources**
  - Paperpal
  - Promoting Authorship Transparency
  - AI Disclosure Templates
  - How to Get Started with using Paperpal

*You can sign up for my newsletter: **AI+Edu=Simplified**.*

Connect with me on my blog, Twitter, Bluesky, Mastodon, LinkedIn, or YouTube. If you have additional questions, please reach out to me at lance.eaton@gmail.com.

Work by or featuring Lance Eaton

- Damm, C., & Eaton, L. (2026, March). **From prompt to practice: A framework for transparent GenAI use in higher education.** EDUCAUSE Review.
- Eaton, L., Nemeroff, A., & Sun, X. (2026). AI-assisted course design and development. In K. S. Ives, M. Cini, & R. Schroeder (Eds.), ***AI applications in online higher education administration: Strategies for maximizing returns and improving outcomes***. Routledge.
- "**In the Room Where It Happens: Generative AI Policy Creation in Higher Education**" co-authored with Esther Brandon, Dana Gavin and Allison Papini. EDUCAUSE Review (May 2025)
- **Does AI have a copyright problem?** LSE Impact Blog, May 2025.
- Torres, JT, Eaton, L, & Kronenberg, K. "**Growing Orchids Amid Dandelions**". Inside Higher Ed, April 2025.
- Brandon, E., Eaton, L., Gavin, D. & Papini, A. "**Campus Approaches to Building a Generative AI Policy**". EDUCAUSE Review, December 2023.
- Eaton, L & Waddell, S. "**10 Ways Technology Leaders Can Step Up and In to the Generative AI Discussion in Higher Ed**". EDUCAUSE Review, October 2023.
- Leek, D & Eaton, L (2023). "More Than Tech Support: Instructional Designers as Community Partners in eService-Learning" in **Taking eService-Learning to the Next Level: Models and Tools for Next Generation Implementation** (eds. Strait, J; Shumer, R; Nordyke, K.). Information Age Publishing.
- Mills, A., Bali, M. and Eaton, L. (2023). **How do we respond to generative AI in education? Open educational practices give us a framework for an ongoing process**. Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching 6(1), 2023.

- **The New LMS Rule: Transparency Working Both Ways**. Journal of Interactive Technology and Pedagogy. December, 2021

AI Resources created/sourced by Lance Eaton

- AI+Edu=Simplified: A newsletter on exploring and explaining generative AI in higher education.
- Examples of Syllabi Policies on Generative AI - 200+ crowdsourced syllabi organized by Lance Eaton
- Lightning Talks on Using Generative AI through Higher Ed - 8 short talks about how different parts of the institution might use generative AI for their work.

License: This work is licensed by Lance Eaton under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. You are welcome to reuse this with a Share-Alike CC license and if possible, please let Lance Eaton know.

Padlet Activity

This Padlet invites you to reflect on where your personal boundary lies for using AI in academic writing across a range of tasks, from brainstorming and revision to paraphrasing and drafting. You may respond to one prompt or several, using the space to identify what feels acceptable, uncertain, or off-limits to you and why.

1. Go to the Padlet: https://padlet.com/lanceeaton1/bulletin-board-k52jzxnwf9jgwr62
2. Post what you believe is your appropriate line to one or more of the areas.
3. Use the ❤️ on other posts if you've had a similar thought.

How to use the Padlet

1. **Choose a column**
    - *Early-stage thinking*
    - *Planning & structure*
    - *Draft development*
    - *Revision & editing*
    - *Source-related issues*
2. **Add a post**
    - Click the **"+"** button under the relevant column.
    - Write **what is YOUR line of appropriate use** in this category.
3. **Engage with others**
    - Click the ❤️ on posts where you've seen a similar experience.
    - Read across columns to identify shared themes and tensions.
4. **Optional depth**
    - Add multiple posts if you have examples in different categories.
    - Build on others' posts by adding related examples rather than repeating.
5. **Focus**
    - Prioritize **observations from practice**, not predictions.
    - Aim for clarity and usefulness to peers.

AI Use Practices & Documenting

How to use this guide. Each practice includes a brief explanation and a strong example drawn from a different disciplinary or academic-role context. Not every project needs all 15 practices; most people will combine 4-6 of them into a proportionate workflow.

1. AI Use Log / Research Journal

Maintain a dated running log of meaningful AI use across the project. Record the tool, task, material entered, output received, what was adopted or rejected, and what verification followed. This creates a contemporaneous audit trail that supports transparency and later disclosure.

> **Example:** A doctoral student in education keeps a shared project log for a dissertation literature review. After each ChatGPT or Gemini session, the student records the date, purpose, exact task (for example, "cluster themes from coded memos"), whether any claims were retained, and which ideas were later checked against the original articles before entering the dissertation draft.

2. Prompt Archive

Save the substantive prompts and follow-up prompts that materially shaped the work. A prompt archive is especially useful when AI is used for ideation, outlining, coding help, search strategy refinement, or revision support because it preserves how the tool was directed rather than only what it returned.

> **Example:** A faculty researcher in sociology stores prompts in a file named "AI prompting record" alongside the manuscript. When the researcher later writes the disclosure statement, the archive makes it possible to describe that AI was used to generate alternative coding-category labels and not to interpret findings or draft the results section.

3. Output Retention Folder

Retain key AI outputs that influenced decisions, especially summaries, outlines, code suggestions, analytic tables, or reformatted text. Keep only outputs that materially affected the project so the record remains usable and proportionate.

> **Example:** A biomedical postdoc saves AI-generated outputs in dated subfolders during manuscript preparation. One folder contains alternative figure-caption drafts and another contains suggested R troubleshooting steps; both are preserved because they affected the final paper, while trivial grammar-only outputs are discarded.

4. Manuscript Change Log

Track where AI affected the manuscript itself. A simple table with columns such as date, section, AI role, human revision, and verification status helps distinguish assistance with expression from assistance with substantive reasoning.

> **Example:** A humanities scholar writing a book chapter keeps a change log noting that AI was used to propose three alternative section headings and to compress a 250-word paragraph into

This resource was created using ChatGPT and reviewed by a human. To view the log, see this link.

140 words for readability. The scholar then records that all interpretive claims and close reading remained fully human-written.

5. Version Control / Version History

Use Git, Overleaf history, Google Docs version history, or Word tracked changes so the project has a visible timeline of development. When paired with meaningful commit messages or revision notes, version history shows when AI was used and how later human revision changed the work.

> **Example:** An engineering graduate student writing a conference paper uses Git for the manuscript and code repository. Commits such as "AI-assisted pseudocode clarification; equations and implementation manually checked" make it possible for the adviser to inspect what changed and why.

6. Source Verification Checklist

Whenever AI suggests facts, quotations, references, statistics, or claims, document how each was verified against an original source. This is one of the most important safeguards because fabricated citations and inaccurate summaries remain a persistent risk in AI-assisted research workflows.

> **Example:** A public health faculty member uses a one-page checklist for every literature-synthesis section: original article located, claim checked against article, population/sample confirmed, numbers rechecked, quotation matched, and citation metadata verified in Zotero. No claim moves into the manuscript until the checklist is complete.

7. Disclosure Statement Draft File

Maintain a living disclosure statement from the start of the project rather than trying to reconstruct usage at submission time. This makes it easier to tailor disclosures for a dissertation, article, conference proposal, or journal submission because the core facts are already documented.

> **Example:** A psychology professor keeps a short disclosure draft in the manuscript folder that is updated throughout the project. By submission, the statement can accurately note that AI was used for language refinement and brainstorming of search terms, while study design, data analysis, interpretation, and final prose remained the author's responsibility.

8. Citation Acquisition Record

Track where sources came from: disciplinary databases, citation chaining, librarian consultation, adviser recommendation, or AI-assisted discovery. This helps researchers evaluate search bias, avoid overstating comprehensiveness, and show how AI fit into the broader literature search process.

> **Example:** A master's student in history creates a spreadsheet with columns for source, discovery route, and relevance. The sheet reveals that AI surfaced several useful review essays, but most primary and secondary sources still came from JSTOR, archival finding aids, and backward citation searching.

This resource was created using ChatGPT and reviewed by a human. To view the log, see this link.

9. Decision Memo After Major AI Sessions

After a substantial AI session, write a short memo explaining what the tool suggested, what was adopted, what was rejected, and why. Decision memos are especially useful when AI is used near conceptual, methodological, or interpretive boundaries where later scrutiny is likely.

> **Example:** A business-school faculty member uses AI to stress-test a conceptual framework for a management article. After the session, the scholar writes a memo noting which critiques were genuinely useful, which reflected generic business jargon, and why the final framework retained only two of the suggested modifications.

10. AI Use Matrix by Task Type

Create a matrix listing which tasks are permitted, limited, or prohibited for a given project. This is a practical way to operationalize boundaries for co-authors, graduate assistants, lab members, or dissertation teams.

> **Example:** A lab director in neuroscience creates a one-page matrix for the group: AI permitted for code debugging and copyediting, limited for literature discovery and summarization, and prohibited for generating results interpretation, peer review text, or confidential participant-data analysis without approved tools. The matrix becomes part of the group's onboarding materials.

11. Risk Classification Log

Classify AI uses as low, medium, or high risk and require more oversight for higher-risk use. A risk-based approach keeps documentation proportional: grammar help may need only minimal logging, while analytic interpretation or sensitive-data use should trigger fuller records and human review.

> **Example:** A law professor supervising student note-writing labels AI uses into tiers. Low-risk uses include headline variants and readability edits; medium-risk uses include case-law summarization; high-risk uses include doctrinal analysis and policy argumentation, which require saved prompts, source checks, and supervisor review before any text is retained.

12. Data Exposure Register

Record what information was entered into which AI system, under what privacy conditions, and with what restrictions. This is essential whenever work involves sensitive, confidential, proprietary, student, patient, or unpublished material.

> **Example:** A clinical research coordinator uses an approved enterprise AI tool for protocol-adjacent writing support and keeps a data exposure register. Each entry records whether the input contained de-identified text, whether protected health information was excluded, and whether the tool met institutional privacy requirements.

This resource was created using ChatGPT and reviewed by a human. To view the log, see this link.

13. Reference Validation Spreadsheet

Use a dedicated spreadsheet to validate every citation that was suggested, reformatted, or summarized with AI assistance. This is a focused control for one of the most common failure points in AI-assisted scholarship: fabricated, incomplete, or misattributed references.

> **Example:** A doctoral candidate in public policy asks AI to suggest adjacent literatures but never imports references directly into the dissertation library. Instead, each suggested citation is entered into a validation sheet with fields for existence confirmed, metadata corrected, abstract read, full text obtained, and final inclusion decision.

14. Authorship Boundary Statement

Write an internal statement clarifying which contributions remain human and accountable and which were AI-assisted. This is especially useful on multi-author projects because it prevents role drift and aligns authorship claims with publisher expectations.

> **Example:** A multi-author chemistry paper includes an internal authorship memo stating that all experimental design, interpretation, figure selection, and conclusions were produced by human authors. AI assistance was limited to language editing and code-comment cleanup, and every named author reviewed the final text.

15. Final Methods Note / Reproducibility Appendix

For dissertations, reports, technical papers, or projects where methods transparency matters, include a short appendix or methods note describing the AI tools used, the functions they served, and the validation steps taken. This is the most public-facing form of documentation and often the easiest for readers and committees to understand.

> **Example:** An information-science researcher includes a reproducibility appendix in a methods-heavy article. The appendix states which AI tools were used for search-term expansion and code explanation, identifies what was never delegated to AI, and summarizes the manual verification steps applied before publication.

A practical minimum bundle

For most projects, a proportionate starting bundle is: an AI use log, a prompt archive, version history, a source verification checklist, and a short disclosure statement draft. Sensitive-data projects should add a data exposure register; citation-heavy projects should add a reference validation spreadsheet.

This resource was created using ChatGPT and reviewed by a human. To view the log, see this link.

Usage Possibilities

Use this table to answer the tier gate ("which risk tier applies to this task?") at each phase of the lifecycle.

Phase	Beneficial	Cautious	Minimal / Prohibited
1. Ideation & question framing	• Brainstorming candidate angles • Alternative framings of a known problem • Generating draft research questions to pressure-test	• Structuring a research question or hypothesis you have not yet reasoned about • Doctoral candidates: discuss planned use with supervisor	• Letting AI declare originality, novelty, or contribution • Outsourcing the judgment of what is worth studying
2. Literature review & search	• Drafting and refining search-term strings • Literature triage against your inclusion criteria • Generating plain-language summaries of known sources you have read	• Synthesis support for sources you have collected • Cross-case clustering and evidence tables — treat as second-reader only	• AI-generated citations without verification (hallucinated references are common) • AI-written literature review prose presented as independent synthesis
3. Methods & data	• Instrument drafting first passes • Rubric and codebook brainstorming • Reproducibility documentation and README scaffolds	• Statistical explanation paraphrasing — verify assumptions, model limits, causal claims • Translation of short excerpts or archival leads • IRB: check institutional rules before using AI with protocol or consent language	• Uploading participant data, consent forms, or protected information to public tools • AI-fabricated or synthetic data patches where provenance cannot be verified
4. Analysis & coding	• Coding assistance for boilerplate and troubleshooting (with tests) • Visual or table drafting from your supplied content	• Qualitative coding assist as second reader — preserve audit trail and reflexive memos • First-pass thematic suggestions (validate against transcripts) • Requires supervisor agreement in doctoral contexts	• Autonomous interpretation of findings • Unverified evidence synthesis presented as conclusions • Delegating inferential judgment
5. Drafting & writing	• Language editing and concision for fluency	• Substantive generation in methods or results — disclose in Methods	• AI-drafted theoretical framing, contribution claims, or interpretation

This resource was created using ChatGPT and reviewed by a human. To view the log, see this link.

Phase	Beneficial	Cautious	Minimal / Prohibited
	• Rhetorical restructuring and transitions • Language support for multilingual scholars • Accessibility rewriting and plain-language summaries	• Reference-format checking (never trust source existence without manual verification)	• Discussion and conclusion sections written by AI (these are the sections most likely to be tested orally and judged for independent scholarship)
6. Peer-review response (as author)	• Language polishing of your own response • Reformatting comment-response tables	• Tone editing of contested passages — argumentation must reflect your reasoning and concessions • Have a co-author or supervisor verify the response before submission	• AI-generated responses to reviewer substance that you cannot independently defend
7. Submission & disclosure	• Checking venue AI policies against your actual use • Drafting disclosure language from a verified log	• Choosing between Methods and Acknowledgments placement — check venue template • Grants: follow funder rule (NIH, NSF, UKRI, Wellcome, EC all require or permit disclosure with caveats)	• Submitting AI-developed grant sections where the funder treats them as non-original (e.g., NIH guidance) • Submitting AI-generated content without disclosure when the venue requires it

Graduate Student vs. Faculty Considerations

Decision point	Graduate student path	Faculty path
Who must be consulted before substantive use	Supervisor, then dissertation committee; increasingly required prior to use in dissertation work	Co-authors and, for grants, institutional research-integrity office; venue policy is authoritative
What counts as the hardest-to-defend zone	Dissertation chapters — especially discussion and conclusion — are likely to be tested orally in a viva or defense	Author claims of originality, novelty, and contribution; grant proposal sections substantially developed by AI may be treated as non-original
Peer-review and assessment obligations	Rare for doctoral students except in limited mentored review; default to full refusal of AI in any review role	Reviewers must not upload submissions; most funders (NIH, NSF, UKRI, EC) prohibit or restrict AI in assessment; dissertation examiners do not delegate examination judgment

This resource was created using ChatGPT and reviewed by a human. To view the log, see this link.

Decision point	Graduate student path	Faculty path
Disclosure practice	One disclosure paragraph per chapter or paper draft is becoming standard; retain a prompt archive and validation notes	Methods or Acknowledgments per venue; Wiley, Taylor & Francis, and JAMA/BMJ families now require structured disclosure of substantive use
Agentic / autonomous workflows	Introduce only after a stable, supervisor-approved human workflow exists; prefer reversible, inspectable, low-stakes delegation	Human-in-the-loop for inclusion decisions, interpretation, coding; human-on-the-loop acceptable only for bounded retrieval and formatting
Image and data rules	Defer to committee and journal rules; do not use generative AI for figures or data where provenance cannot be shown	Most major publishers (Nature, Elsevier, T&F) prohibit generative creation or manipulation of original research images and data

---

Disclosure Log Template

Keep one row per substantive use. The emerging COPE/global standard centers on tool, version, date, task, human verification, and impact on conclusions. The example column shows what a completed entry looks like; the blank column is yours.

Field	Example entry	Your entry
Date(s) of use	*Feb 4 & Feb 11, 2026*	
Tool, version, provider	*Claude Opus 4.5, Anthropic*	
Phase	*Literature review — search-term drafting*	
Specific task	*Generated 12 candidate MeSH + keyword combinations for database search*	
What you did first (think step)	*Drafted 4 candidate strings from PICO framing; identified gaps in coverage*	
Verification performed	*Ran each string in PubMed and Scopus; cross-checked hit counts; retained 5 strings, discarded 7*	
Output retained in final work	*Search strings only; no AI text in the review prose*	

This resource was created using ChatGPT and reviewed by a human. To view the log, see this link.

Impact on conclusions	*None — AI-assisted discovery only*	
Supervisor / co-author consulted?	*Yes — supervisor approved plan on Feb 3*	
Confidentiality check	*No participant data or unpublished manuscripts uploaded*	
Venue disclosure drafted?	*Yes — Methods paragraph, v. 1, saved in /disclosures/*	

Brief bibliography for further guidance

American Psychological Association. (n.d.). APA journals policy on generative AI: Additional guidance. https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/resources/publishing-tips/policy-generative-ai

American University. (n.d.). University guidance on the responsible use of artificial intelligence (AI). https://www.american.edu/oit/security/responsible-use-of-ai.cfm

Chen, Z., Chen, C., Yang, G., He, X., Chi, X., Zeng, Z., & Chen, X. (2024). Research integrity in the era of artificial intelligence: Challenges and responses. Medicine, 103(27), e38811. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38968491/

Committee on Publication Ethics. (2023). Authorship and AI tools. https://publicationethics.org/guidance/cope-position/authorship-and-ai-tools

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. (2024). Use of AI by authors. https://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/artificial-intelligence/ai-use-by-authors.html

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. (2024). Use of AI by reviewers. https://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/artificial-intelligence/ai-use-by-reviewers.html

Nature Portfolio. (n.d.). Artificial intelligence (AI) editorial policies. https://www.nature.com/nature-portfolio/editorial-policies/ai

University of Virginia. (n.d.). Reminder of the importance of research integrity and use of AI. https://compliance.research.virginia.edu/about/integrity-and-ethics/reminder-importance-research-integrity-use-ai

van Dis, E. A. M., Bollen, J., Zuidema, W., van Rooij, R., & Bockting, C. L. (2023). ChatGPT: Five priorities for research. Nature, 614, 224-226. https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-023-00288-7

Weaver, K. D. (2024). The Artificial Intelligence Disclosure (AID) Framework: An introduction. College & Research Libraries News, 85(10). https://crln.acrl.org/index.php/crlnews/article/view/26548/34482

World Association of Medical Editors. (2023). Chatbots, generative AI, and scholarly manuscripts: WAME recommendations. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10712422/

This resource was created using ChatGPT and reviewed by a human. To view the log, see this link.

AI Prompt Library for Doctoral Students and Researchers

Table of Contents

How to Use This Handbook **2**
Reading the disciplinary-fit markers 2
Part I. Responsible Use Guidance for Scholars Using AI **2**
1. Augment judgment, do not replace it. 2
2. Verify citations, claims, and evidence. 2
3. Protect confidential and sensitive material. 2
4. Disclose material AI assistance. 3
5. Maintain authorship integrity. 3
6. Preserve original contribution and voice. 3
7. Weight AI use toward process, away from core scholarship claims. 3
8. Keep a contemporaneous research log. 3
9. Review every output critically. 3
Clear Alignment: 3
Part II. Core Categories of Legitimate AI Use **3**
Part III. The Prompt Library **6**
01. Thematic Gap Scan for Literature Triage 6
02. Source-Grounded Thematic Synthesis 7
03. Adversarial Argument Stress-Test 9
04. Outline Pressure-Test for Macro-Structure 10
06. Qualitative Codebook Second-Reader 12
07. Methods Clarity Pass for Reproducibility 13
08. Citation Verification Triage 14
09. Plain-Language Adaptation with Claim Preservation 15
10. AI-Use Disclosure Statement Drafter 17
11. Pre-Submission Reviewer Self-Check 18
12. Reviewer Response Letter Scaffold 19
13. Agentic Workflow Specification Builder 20
References **22**

How to Use This Handbook

This handbook is organized into three parts.

Part I lays out responsible-use guidance distilled from 2026 publisher and funder convergence.

Part II defines the categories of legitimate AI use for research and scholarly writing.

Part III is the prompt library itself — 13 paste-ready prompts, each mapped to a category, marked with a disciplinary fit profile, and flagged with senior-researcher extensions where relevant.

Prompts use bracketed placeholders (e.g., [discipline], [draft text], [target journal]) that you replace before sending. All prompts assume the user — you — remains accountable for verification, interpretation, and final authorship. No prompt in this library is designed to generate citations, fabricate sources, or produce your core intellectual contribution.

Reading the disciplinary-fit markers

Each prompt includes a Recommended For… line noting the methodological orientations, disciplines, and research stages where the prompt tends to work best. These are guidance, not hard lines. A qualitative researcher may still find value in a prompt tagged for systematic review; treat the markers as a starting calibration.

Part I. Responsible Use Guidance for Scholars Using AI

The 2026 consensus across publishers, funders, and research-integrity bodies is that AI may assist with bounded, verifiable tasks; it may not substitute for interpretive judgment, author accountability, or the confidentiality obligations that underwrite the scholarly system. The nine principles below summarize that convergent norm.

1. Augment judgment, do not replace it.

Treat AI as an instrument, not an oracle or a co-author. Meta-analytical evidence suggests the strongest gains come from reducing mechanical load such as formatting, triage, first-pass structuring, so that cognitive resources are freed for theory-building, interpretation, and argumentation. The moment AI is producing your core claim, the tool has overstepped its role.

2. Verify citations, claims, and evidence.

Citation fabrication remains the most empirically documented failure mode. Reported hallucination rates range from roughly 6% on well-covered clinical topics to more than 90% on specialized queries across frontier models. Treat every AI-surfaced reference as unverified until you have opened it in a trusted database and confirmed author, title, venue, year, and claim.

3. Protect confidential and sensitive material.

Unpublished manuscripts, peer-review submissions, proposal drafts, participant data, and proprietary materials should not be entered into public or unapproved AI tools. Funders and publishers (including) NSF, NIH, UKRI, the European Commission, Nature, Science, Elsevier, Wiley, Taylor & Francis) have independently converged on this as the bright line. Use institutionally governed, privacy-protected environments for any non-public material.

4. Disclose material AI assistance.

Over 83% of high-impact journals now require explicit AI disclosure, and disclosure norms are standardizing around tool, version, date, task, and human verification steps. Basic grammar and spell-checking are often exempt; substantive use — rhetorical restructuring, synthesis support, coding assistance, qualitative coding — typically requires a Methods or Acknowledgments statement.

5. Maintain authorship integrity.

No AI system may be listed as an author. The Committee on Publication Ethics position is that authorship requires the capacity for accountability, which AI cannot provide. You remain legally and ethically responsible for every claim, citation, and data point submitted under your name.

6. Preserve original contribution and voice.

Your dissertation, your theoretical framing, and your discussion/conclusion sections are proofs of mastery. AI-generated prose in these sections frequently exhibits generic argument flow and methodological shallowness that committees and editors are increasingly trained to detect. Use AI to stress-test your own thinking, not to compose it.

7. Weight AI use toward process, away from core scholarship claims.

The defensible pattern is: heavy AI involvement in process support (formatting, search-query drafting, workflow orchestration, language polishing) and light AI involvement in substantive claims (theory, interpretation, inference, novelty judgment, ethical reasoning).

8. Keep a contemporaneous research log.

Journals are moving toward Reproducibility Appendix requirements for AI-assisted research: model name and version, dates, system prompts, parameters, and the human-in-the-loop verification protocol. Maintain this log from the start of the project, not at submission.

9. Review every output critically.

Fluent prose is not evidence of reliable scholarship. Independent evaluations of frontier systems continue to document silent errors — from misclassified novelty to inverted statistical interpretations — that read as confident and well-structured. The practical heuristic: if you cannot defend the passage orally, do not submit it.

Clear Alignment:

Across otherwise fragmented policy, one principle is uniform: do not upload others' confidential work (peer-review submissions, grant proposals under evaluation) to AI tools. This is the one rule that every major funder and publisher has independently converged on, and it is the most serious line to cross.

Part II. Core Categories of Legitimate AI Use

The categories below are the ones with the strongest evidentiary grounding and the clearest governance patterns; these are the categories the prompt library draws from.

The table below summarizes each category. The prompt library in Part III draws one or more prompts from each of the most evidentiarily supported categories.

Category	Appropriate Boundaries
Literature Triage & Search-Query Generation Using AI to expand search vocabulary, decompose research questions into sub-queries, and perform first-pass relevance screening across large corpora. Why it is valuable: Reduces the information-explosion problem. Meta-analyses indicate this is where cognitive-load reduction is most pronounced. Strong Tier-1 evidence.	Use library databases as the system of record. Validate inclusion/exclusion criteria manually. Audit random samples for retrieval blind spots.
Source-Grounded Synthesis Support Using AI within a retrieval-augmented workflow to cluster, compare, and surface themes across a researcher-supplied corpus of verified sources. Why it is valuable: Enables distal reading at scale. Grounding in a closed corpus reduces hallucination risk compared to open-web synthesis.	Every synthesized claim must be traced back to its primary source. Do not accept AI-surfaced relationships between papers without reading both.
Argument Stress-Testing & Counterargument Generation Using AI adversarially — to generate objections, counterexamples, weak-point analyses, and reviewer-style critiques of the researcher's own drafted argument. Why it is valuable: Simulates disciplinary pushback before submission. Pressure-tests reasoning without substituting for it. Adversarial framing is now explicitly endorsed across guidance documents.	Treat outputs as provocations, not verdicts. Evaluate whether each objection identifies a real weakness or a surface-level pattern.
Outlining & Macro-Structure Support Using AI to propose structural sequences, section architectures, and rhetorical scaffolds for long-form scholarly writing. Why it is valuable: Reduces blank-page friction and helps align argument structure with field conventions.	Check for disciplinary fit. AI outlines tend toward formulaic structures that may not match humanities, historical, or theoretical conventions.
Rhetorical Restructuring & Clarity Editing Using AI to improve flow, concision, readability, and audience alignment at the sentence and paragraph level of researcher-authored text.	Line-by-line verification for substantive sections. Watch for semantic drift where clarity edits alter scientific meaning.

Category	Appropriate Boundaries
Why it is valuable: Highest evidentiary support in the report. Particularly valuable for multilingual scholars and for audience adaptation across academic, policy, and public contexts.	
Qualitative Coding Assistance (Second-Reader) Using AI as a supplementary coder for first-pass thematic coding, codebook ideation, or pattern surfacing on qualitative text. Why it is valuable: Moderate evidence. GPT-4-class models achieve Cohen's κ ≈ 0.40 with human coders on inductive first-level coding. Useful as a second reader, not a primary coder.	Human-led first read is mandatory. Preserve reflexive memos separately. Never allow AI-generated themes to stand alone in the final interpretive account.
Methods Drafting Support Using AI to convert a researcher-authored analysis plan, protocol, or workflow into prose suitable for a Methods section. Why it is valuable: Good fit for converting structured content into disciplinary prose. Reduces drafting time on highly proceduralized writing.	Every methodological choice must reflect what was actually done. AI cannot know lab-specific deviations, protocol adaptations, or environmental factors.
Citation Verification Workflows Using AI to flag potentially fabricated, miscited, or stale references in a reference list for manual verification — not to generate citations. Why it is valuable: Useful as a triage step to prioritize manual checking. The key inversion: AI is the suspect, not the source.	Never trust AI to confirm a reference exists. Only trust it to flag references worth double-checking against trusted databases.
Translation & Accessibility Adaptation Using AI to produce translation leads, plain-language summaries, alt text, or audience-adjusted versions of scholarly material. Why it is valuable: Expands reach and reduces language inequity. Particularly useful for multilingual scholarship and public-facing communication.	Verify with a qualified reader for any consequential claim. Check that plain-language versions preserve methodological qualifications.
Disclosure & Reproducibility Documentation Using AI to help draft Methods-section disclosure statements, acknowledgment text, prompt archives, and reproducibility appendices for AI-assisted work. Why it is valuable: Operationalizes transparency norms. Journal-specific disclosure is standardizing around a recurring set of fields.	Cross-check against the specific venue's current policy. Disclosure language should reflect actual use, not a generic template.
Pre-Submission Reviewer Self-Check Using AI to produce reviewer-style feedback on your own manuscript before submission. Why it is valuable: Liang et al. (2024) found GPT-4 feedback overlapped with human reviewer comments at 30–39% —	Weakest on deep methodological critique. Do not use in reverse — never upload anyone else's manuscript under review.

Category	Appropriate Boundaries
comparable to human-human reviewer overlap. Strongest for catching obvious flaws.	
Agentic Task Delegation with Governance Using agentic systems to execute multi-step, tool-calling workflows (retrieval, extraction, formatting) with explicit specification, checkpoints, and termination conditions. Why it is valuable: Enables scale. The 2026 shift from "copilot" to "agent" makes this increasingly standard for literature-scale work.	Require specification, checkpoints, and human-in-the-loop approval before any consequential action. Never permit autonomous citation, interpretation, or peer-review activity.

Part III. The Prompt Library

Thirteen prompts follow. Each is paste-ready. R eplace bracketed placeholders with your own content . Each maps to a category defined in Part II. The Recommended For… section gives the disciplinary and methodological fit. Use Carefully When… flags the conditions under which the prompt's value degrades or becomes epistemically risky.

Where a prompt scales up meaningfully for senior researchers, a Senior Researcher Extension notes the upgraded use case.

01. Thematic Gap Scan for Literature Triage

Category: *Literature Triage & Search-Query Generation*

BEST USE CASE

Early-phase mapping of a research area when you need to identify unexplored intersections and generate targeted search queries before entering library databases.

PROMPT

```
You are a research methodologist helping me scope the literature in [discipline]
on [research topic]. I have not yet done formal database searches.

Please do three things, in order:

1. Propose 8–12 sub-topics or thematic angles a rigorous literature scan on this
   topic would need to cover. Flag which angles are likely well-covered in the
   existing literature and which are likely underexplored based on the topic's
   structure.

2. For each sub-topic, generate 2–3 specific search-term combinations I could
   run in [Scopus / Web of Science / PubMed / ERIC / discipline-specific database].
   Use Boolean operators. Favor specific disciplinary vocabulary over generic
   terms.

3. Identify 3–5 plausible thematic gaps or contradictions worth investigating,
   and for each one explicitly state what evidence in the literature would
   confirm or disconfirm that the gap actually exists.

Do not invent citations. If you reference a study, framework, or author, use
phrasing like "research on X suggests…" without attributing it to a specific
source unless you are certain. I will verify all claims against primary sources.
```

WHY IT WORKS

It decomposes a topic into search-ready sub-queries and forces the model to distinguish genuine gaps from apparent ones — the discipline-specific vocabulary and explicit no-citation instruction mitigate the two most common failure modes in this use case.

USE CAREFULLY WHEN

The proposed gaps are hypotheses, not findings. Confirm gap claims by reading rather than by accepting the model's confidence.

RECOMMENDED FOR

Strong fit for systematic reviews, scoping reviews, dissertation proposal development, and interdisciplinary projects where search-term vocabulary is unsettled. Useful across quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods orientations. Most valuable at the proposal or prospectus stage.

SENIOR RESEARCHER EXTENSION

Senior researchers can add a fourth step asking the model to contrast the topic's treatment across 2–3 adjacent disciplines, which often surfaces translational opportunities that single-discipline searches miss.

---

02. Source-Grounded Thematic Synthesis

Category: *Source-Grounded Synthesis Support*

BEST USE CASE

Mid-phase synthesis when you have already selected and read a set of sources and need to cluster themes, surface tensions, and identify underdeveloped threads across them.

PROMPT

```
I am synthesizing [number] sources for a [literature review / theoretical
framework / dissertation chapter] in [discipline] on [research topic].

I will paste excerpts and my own notes below. Work ONLY from what I paste —
do not introduce claims, authors, or findings from outside this corpus.

For each analytical pass, produce:

1. A thematic clustering of the sources. Name 4–6 themes and list which sources
   map to each. Note sources that sit in more than one cluster.

2. A tensions map. Where do the sources disagree, contradict, or frame the
   same phenomenon through incompatible premises? Quote the specific phrasing
   from my notes that demonstrates the tension.

3. An underdevelopment analysis. What is implied but not argued across the
   corpus? What questions does the corpus collectively raise but not answer?

4. Three synthesis candidates — one-paragraph framings I could develop into
   my own argument. Flag which synthesis each draws most heavily from so I
   can verify.

Do not generalize beyond the supplied material. If I have not given you
enough to answer a sub-question, say so explicitly.

--- MY SOURCE NOTES ---
[paste your notes, each clearly labeled with an author–year tag you will use
for internal tracking]
```

WHY IT WORKS

It constrains the model to a closed corpus, eliminates the most common hallucination vector (out-of-corpus authority), and separates clustering from synthesis so you can verify each layer before trusting the next.

USE CAREFULLY WHEN

Synthesis candidates will sound plausible even when the underlying clusters are weak. Audit the cluster-to-source mapping before accepting any synthesis.

RECOMMENDED FOR

Works well for integrative reviews, conceptual framework development, and chapter-level synthesis. Particularly valuable in qualitative, interpretive, and theoretical traditions where the researcher's own close reading of sources is non-negotiable. Less suited to systematic review extraction tables — use structured extraction workflows there.

SENIOR RESEARCHER EXTENSION

Add a fifth step: "Identify the paradigmatic assumptions each source operates within (positivist, interpretivist, critical, pragmatist, etc.) and note where assumption mismatches may explain apparent contradictions."

---

03. Adversarial Argument Stress-Test

Category: *Argument Stress-Testing & Counterargument Generation*

BEST USE CASE

Late-draft pressure-testing of a central argument before submission, dissertation defense, or high-stakes review.

PROMPT

```
Below is the core argument of my [paper / chapter / grant proposal] in
[discipline]. I want you to stress-test it — not improve it, not rewrite it,
not agree with it.

Act as three distinct skeptical reviewers, one at a time:

1. The methodological skeptic. What methodological moves am I relying on that
   a tough reviewer would flag? Identify unstated assumptions, weak inferential
   steps, and places where I am claiming more than my evidence supports.

2. The theoretical skeptic. Where is my framing doing work I have not argued
   for? Name alternative framings that would reshape or weaken my claims, and
   explain what reshaping would occur under each.

3. The practical skeptic. What would a hostile reader — someone already
   invested in a competing position — target first? Give their three strongest
   objections in their voice, not a softened version.

After all three, produce one paragraph named STRONGEST COUNTERARGUMENT I
SHOULD PRE-EMPT that synthesizes the most dangerous single critique.

Do not offer fixes or reassurance. Push back.

--- MY ARGUMENT ---
[paste 2–6 paragraphs of your actual argument, not an abstract]
```

WHY IT WORKS

The tripartite reviewer framing mirrors how real disciplinary critique is structured, and the explicit prohibition on fixes prevents the model from collapsing into its default sycophantic mode. The synthesizing final step forces consolidation rather than diffuse complaints.

USE CAREFULLY WHEN

The model may generate plausible-sounding but shallow critiques. Use the stress-test to surface issues to investigate, not as a verdict on your argument's strength.

RECOMMENDED FOR

Broadly applicable — quantitative, qualitative, theoretical, humanistic, applied, and professional scholarship all benefit. Especially valuable before dissertation proposal defense, grant submission, conference Q&A preparation, and journal submission to selective venues. Works in any tradition where argumentative rigor is the evaluative standard.

SENIOR RESEARCHER EXTENSION

Senior researchers can add a fourth reviewer — the paradigmatic skeptic — who challenges whether the question itself is framed correctly, which often surfaces deeper problems than surface-level methodological critique.

---

04. Outline Pressure-Test for Macro-Structure

Category: *Outlining & Macro-Structure Support*

BEST USE CASE

Restructuring a long-form piece (article, chapter, grant narrative) when the content is sound but the architecture is not serving the argument.

PROMPT

```
Below is the current outline of my [journal article / dissertation chapter /
grant narrative] in [discipline]. My target audience is [audience / journal
readership]. The argument I am making is: [one-sentence thesis].

Analyze the outline against four criteria:

1. Argumentative load-bearing. Which sections do the most argumentative work,
   and are they positioned where readers will encounter them with enough
   preparation?

2. Sequencing logic. Where does the current order require the reader to hold
   information they do not yet have, or repeat information they already have?

3. Disciplinary convention fit. For a [journal target / dissertation in
   discipline], what structural expectations does the outline meet, and which
   does it deviate from? State whether the deviations are productive or
   distracting.

4. Weak sections. Which sections look structurally thin — likely to feel
   rushed, transitional rather than substantive, or padded?

Then propose two alternative outlines: one that is a light restructuring
(fewer than three major moves) and one that is a substantial restructuring
(re-sequences the core argument). For each, explain what the reader
experience gains and loses.

Do not rewrite prose. Work at the outline level only.

--- MY CURRENT OUTLINE ---
[paste section headings, subheadings, and a one-sentence description of
what each section does]
```

WHY IT WORKS

The four-criterion analysis maps to how editors and dissertation committees actually evaluate structure, and the outline-level constraint keeps the model from drifting into premature sentence-level rewriting.

USE CAREFULLY WHEN

The model's sense of disciplinary convention is averaged across its training data and may be dated or field-generic. Treat convention-fit claims as prompts for you to check against recent exemplar publications in your target venue.

RECOMMENDED FOR

Strong fit for IMRaD and social-science empirical structures, humanities long-form argument, policy reports, and grant narratives. Less reliable for field-specific formats like law reviews or theology dissertations with rigid formal traditions — cross-check against a recent exemplar in those cases.

---

05. Rhetorical Restructuring for Target Journal Voice

Category: *Rhetorical Restructuring & Clarity Editing*

BEST USE CASE

Converting a draft written for one audience or register into one suited to a specific target journal's conventions, without altering meaning.

PROMPT

```
I need to restructure the prose below for submission to [target journal],
which publishes work in [discipline / subfield]. The current draft was
written [for a seminar / as a dissertation chapter / for a general audience /
as a grant narrative].

Do three passes on the draft, producing each as a separate output:

PASS 1 — DIAGNOSTIC. In bullet points, identify:
- where the current voice mismatches [target journal]'s typical register;
- sentences that carry more hedging or less hedging than the venue expects;
- paragraphs where the topic sentence does not do the work a reader expects.
Do not rewrite anything in this pass.

PASS 2 — RESTRUCTURED. Rewrite the draft with the adjustments flagged in
Pass 1. Preserve every substantive claim, qualifier, and citation tag.
Do not add new claims. Do not remove qualifications. Do not change the
order of evidence.

PASS 3 — DIFF NOTES. List every non-trivial change you made and why. Flag
any change that altered — even subtly — the scientific or conceptual meaning.

I will verify the restructured version line-by-line against my original
before using any of it.

--- MY DRAFT ---
[paste draft — a section, not an entire paper]
```

WHY IT WORKS

Separating diagnosis, restructuring, and diff-tracking into distinct passes makes the model's interventions auditable. The explicit preservation constraints reduce the most common failure mode — silent semantic drift during clarity edits.

USE CAREFULLY WHEN

Hedging changes can shift a claim from "this study suggests" to "this study shows" in ways that look stylistic but are substantive. Verify every qualifier.

RECOMMENDED FOR

Strong across empirical and review article drafting. Particularly valuable for multilingual scholars and for authors switching between disciplinary registers (e.g., moving a policy piece toward a peer-reviewed venue). Works for quantitative, qualitative, and theoretical prose. Less suited to highly stylized humanities essays where voice is itself the argument.

SENIOR RESEARCHER EXTENSION

Senior researchers submitting to top-tier venues can add a fourth pass: "Identify phrasings that read as junior scholarship (over-signposting, excessive caveats, generic framing) and propose alternatives that preserve the substance."

---

06. Qualitative Codebook Second-Reader

Category: *Qualitative Coding Assistance (Second-Reader)*

BEST USE CASE

After you have completed a first human-led coding pass, using AI as a supplementary coder to check codebook coverage and surface potential missed themes.

PROMPT

```
I have completed a first-pass coding on a qualitative dataset in [discipline].
My research question is: [research question]. My methodological tradition
is [grounded theory / thematic analysis / interpretive phenomenological
analysis / discourse analysis / other].

My current codebook is below, followed by a subset of transcript excerpts
I am using for this verification pass.

Acting as a supplementary second reader — not as the primary analyst —
please do the following:

1. For each excerpt, assign the code(s) from my codebook that you think apply.
   If an excerpt does not fit any existing code, say so explicitly rather
   than inventing a new code.

2. Identify up to three candidate codes that my codebook may be missing,
   based only on excerpts that did not fit. For each candidate, explain what
   analytical distinction it would capture and why it is not already
   subsumed by an existing code.

3. Flag any excerpt where you are uncertain between two codes, and describe
   the interpretive ambiguity in plain terms.

4. Do NOT assign codes to cultural nuance, emotional valence, or
   positionality dimensions — flag these for me to code myself.

I will not treat your codings as final. I will use them to audit my own
codebook's coverage and reflexive memos.

--- CODEBOOK ---
[paste codebook: code name, definition, inclusion/exclusion criteria,
illustrative quote]

--- EXCERPTS ---
[paste 10–20 transcript excerpts, numbered, with minimal context]
```

WHY IT WORKS

Explicitly framing the model as a second reader — not primary coder — matches the evidentiary base (Cohen's κ around 0.40 for first-level inductive coding) and the methodological concerns about "premature closure." Carving out cultural and positionality dimensions for human coding only preserves interpretive authority.

USE CAREFULLY WHEN

The model tends to pattern-match surface vocabulary and miss theoretically significant outliers. Never accept AI codings as ground truth, and disclose this second-reader use in your methods section.

RECOMMENDED FOR

Fits grounded theory, thematic analysis, content analysis, and mixed-methods qualitative strands. Use only with supervisor agreement in IPA and discourse analytic work where interpretive nuance is constitutive of the method. Not appropriate for clinical qualitative research involving patient data in public AI tools — use institutionally governed environments only.

---

07. Methods Clarity Pass for Reproducibility

Category: *Methods Drafting Support*

BEST USE CASE

Converting a researcher-authored analysis plan or protocol into a Methods section that is both readable and reproducibility-ready.

PROMPT

```
Below is my analysis plan / protocol for a study in [discipline] using
[methodology / method]. I have written it as working notes. I need to
convert it into a Methods section suitable for [target journal / dissertation
chapter / registered report].

Rewrite it as continuous prose organized in the conventional Methods
subsections for this venue. While doing so:

1. Preserve every procedural choice exactly as I specified it. Do not
   substitute conventional choices for my stated ones. If I specified a
   non-standard choice, preserve it and note it neutrally.

2. Flag — in a separate REPRODUCIBILITY GAPS list — every place where a
   careful reader would need more information to replicate the work:
   missing parameters, unnamed software versions, unclear thresholds,
   undefined terms, unspecified sampling rules, or missing exclusions.

3. Flag — in a separate AMBIGUITIES list — any place where my notes are
   internally inconsistent or where two readings of my notes are possible.

4. Do NOT add information I did not provide. If my notes say "we used a
   standard protocol," do not specify what that protocol was.

--- MY ANALYSIS PLAN ---
[paste your protocol or analysis plan notes]
```

WHY IT WORKS

Separating the rewrite from the gap-flagging and ambiguity-flagging steps prevents the model from silently filling in missing information with plausible defaults, which is the signature failure mode in methods drafting.

USE CAREFULLY WHEN

If the gap list is short, that is a warning sign, not a reassurance. A thorough reproducibility audit almost always surfaces gaps; a short list usually means the model filled them in for you.

RECOMMENDED FOR

Fits quantitative empirical work, computational methods, experimental protocols, and systematic review methods. Useful in mixed-methods designs. For qualitative methods, pair with a reflexivity check — this prompt is oriented toward proceduralizable choices and may understate the interpretive dimensions of qualitative method. Not for use with sensitive participant data in public tools.

SENIOR RESEARCHER EXTENSION

Senior researchers running complex studies can add: "Produce a supplementary Reproducibility Appendix entry listing every software version, random seed, hyperparameter, and data-processing step in a structured table suitable for a public repository."

---

08. Citation Verification Triage

Category: *Citation Verification Workflows*

BEST USE CASE

Prioritizing which references in a reference list deserve manual verification when time is limited — using AI as a suspicion-raiser, not a source of truth.

PROMPT

```
Below is the reference list for my [paper / chapter / grant]. Recent evidence
shows frontier LLMs fabricate plausible-sounding references at rates varying
widely by topic. I need you to help me triage which references deserve the
most careful manual verification.

For each reference, produce a risk score (LOW / MEDIUM / HIGH) based on
these cues:
- Does the reference use a common author–title pattern that is easy to
  hallucinate (e.g., generic titles like "A framework for…" paired with
  plausible author combinations)?
- Is it in a niche subfield where training data is likely thin?
- Is the journal or venue one that exists but is frequently confused with
  similarly named venues?
- Is the year suspiciously convenient (e.g., published just before a draft
  deadline, very recent but cited as seminal)?
- Does the reference include unusual formatting quirks — missing DOI,
  unusual page range, inconsistent volume/issue?

For HIGH-risk entries, flag exactly which cue raised the concern.

Do NOT confirm that any reference is real. Your job is only to rank
verification priority. I will verify every reference — starting with HIGH,
then MEDIUM — against [Scopus / Web of Science / the publisher's website /
Google Scholar].

--- REFERENCE LIST ---
[paste full reference list]
```

WHY IT WORKS

It inverts the standard citation-check use case: the model is treated as the suspect, not the oracle. Risk-scoring with explicit cues produces actionable triage without inviting fabrication.

USE CAREFULLY WHEN

A LOW risk score is not a verification. It is only an instruction about where to look last. If you cannot verify a reference in trusted databases, remove it — regardless of risk score.

RECOMMENDED FOR

Universally applicable across disciplines. Most valuable when reviewing a long reference list under time pressure or when auditing AI-assisted drafts for hallucination artifacts. Especially important in law, medicine, and policy-adjacent scholarship where fabricated authorities can cause professional harm.

---

09. Plain-Language Adaptation with Claim Preservation

Category: *Translation & Accessibility Adaptation*

BEST USE CASE

Producing plain-language summaries for public-facing communication, grant lay summaries, or accessibility without losing methodological qualifications.

PROMPT

```
I need a plain-language version of the text below. The target audience is
[audience: e.g., policymakers, patients, general public, undergraduate
students]. The purpose is [lay summary / policy brief / press release /
accessibility adaptation].

Produce the plain-language version under strict claim-preservation rules:

1. Every qualifier in the original ("may," "suggests," "in this sample,"
   "under these conditions," "preliminary") must appear in the plain-language
   version in an equivalent form. If you change "suggests" to "shows," that
   is a substantive error.

2. Every scope restriction ("in rural contexts," "among adolescents aged
   13–17," "in cross-sectional data") must survive the rewrite.

3. Uncertainty language must scale with evidence quality. Do not upgrade
   "associated with" to "causes." Do not upgrade "one study suggests" to
   "research shows."

4. After the plain-language version, produce a QUALIFIER AUDIT table listing
   each original qualifier and its plain-language equivalent, so I can
   verify nothing was softened or strengthened.

5. Flag any sentence where no plain-language version preserves the meaning
   without loss — tell me and leave the technical phrasing in place.

--- ORIGINAL TEXT ---
[paste 1–4 paragraphs]
```

WHY IT WORKS

The qualifier audit table makes claim-preservation auditable, and the explicit rule against upgrading uncertainty language addresses the best-documented failure mode in plain-language adaptation — the silent drift from association to causation.

USE CAREFULLY WHEN

Audiences with low literacy or specific accessibility needs may need further adaptation beyond what the model produces. Pilot plain-language output with members of the target audience when possible.

RECOMMENDED FOR

Useful across all disciplines but particularly in health research, policy-relevant social science, and publicly funded work with lay-summary obligations. Strong for multilingual accessibility adaptation. Not a substitute for professional translation of scholarly work — treat translated output as a discovery draft to be verified by a qualified bilingual reader.

---

10. AI-Use Disclosure Statement Drafter

Category: *Disclosure & Reproducibility Documentation*

BEST USE CASE

Producing a first draft of the Methods-section disclosure, Acknowledgments statement, and prompt archive entry for a specific project's AI use.

PROMPT

```
I need to produce AI-use disclosure documentation for a [journal submission /
dissertation / grant proposal]. The target venue is [venue] and its current
policy is [paste policy or link title]. If the policy is unclear on any
point, flag it rather than assuming.

Below I have described — honestly — the ways I used AI in this project.

Produce four outputs:

1. A METHODS-SECTION DISCLOSURE paragraph suitable for insertion. Name the
   tool(s) and version(s), the phase of the project, the specific tasks,
   and the human verification steps. Keep it specific; generic disclosures
   increasingly draw editorial scrutiny.

2. An ACKNOWLEDGMENTS STATEMENT for uses that do not rise to Methods-level
   disclosure but are still worth noting (e.g., language polishing).

3. A PROMPT ARCHIVE ENTRY template for my records, with fields for
   interaction ID, phase, tool and version, prompt summary, output
   evaluation, human modification, and verification notes.

4. A FLAGGED CONCERNS list — anything in my use pattern that may not align
   with the stated venue policy, or any area where the policy itself is
   ambiguous and I should confirm with the editorial office.

Do not sanitize or minimize my actual use. Disclose what I describe.

--- MY ACTUAL AI USE ---
```

[describe honestly: which tools, which versions, at which phases, for which tasks, what you verified, what you retained, what you discarded]

WHY IT WORKS

Generating four aligned artifacts from one input — disclosure, acknowledgment, log template, and policy-mismatch flags — produces coordinated documentation rather than inconsistent scraps. The explicit "do not sanitize" instruction counters the model's tendency to soften admissions.

USE CAREFULLY WHEN

Policies change quickly. Confirm venue policy against the current website before submission, not against what the model reports. When in doubt, over-disclose.

RECOMMENDED FOR

All disciplines and all submission types. Particularly important for health sciences (GAMER, ICMJE, JAMA Network expectations), for funder-backed work (NSF, NIH, UKRI, Wellcome, European Commission), and for doctoral students preparing committee memos. Not a substitute for reading the target venue's current policy yourself.

SENIOR RESEARCHER EXTENSION

Senior researchers with multiple co-authors can request a fifth output: "Produce a co-author agreement template documenting each collaborator's AI use, consent to disclosure language, and responsibility for verification of AI-assisted sections they authored."

---

11. Pre-Submission Reviewer Self-Check

Category: *Pre-Submission Reviewer Self-Check*

BEST USE CASE

Simulating reviewer-style feedback on your own manuscript before submission, to catch obvious weaknesses that cost rounds of review.

PROMPT

Below is my manuscript for submission to [target journal] in [discipline]. The journal's typical reviewer profile includes [describe briefly: e.g., methodologists, senior clinicians, interdisciplinary readers]. The manuscript type is [empirical article / review / methods paper / theoretical piece].

Produce a reviewer-style report in the format the journal typically uses. Structure your report as follows:

1. SUMMARY — one paragraph stating, in your words, what the paper claims, what it does, and what it concludes. This is a comprehension check: if your summary misstates my paper, that is my signal that my framing is unclear.

2. MAJOR ISSUES — 3–5 substantive concerns a tough but fair reviewer would raise. For each, state the concern, the location in the manuscript, and what would resolve it.

3. MINOR ISSUES — up to 10 clarity, consistency, or citation issues (without inventing corrections — flag, do not fix).

4. OBVIOUS FLAWS — a separate list of issues that a reviewer will definitely notice and that I should fix before submission regardless of the journal: internal inconsistencies, missing definitions, unsupported claims, broken references, structural gaps.

5. RECOMMENDATION CALIBRATION — your best guess of the outcome range (desk reject / major revision / minor revision / accept), with a one-line justification. I will not treat this as authoritative; it is a gut-check.

Do not upload anyone else's manuscript to any AI tool — this prompt is for MY OWN work only.

--- MY MANUSCRIPT ---
[paste manuscript or sections]

WHY IT WORKS

The empirical evidence (Liang et al., 2024) shows LLM feedback overlaps with human reviewer comments at roughly the same rate as human-human reviewer overlap — highest on weaker papers, which are exactly the cases where pre-submission self-check is most valuable. The explicit comprehension check in step 1 catches framing problems before they cost a round of review.

USE CAREFULLY WHEN

Strongest for catching obvious flaws; weakest on deep methodological critique. Never use in reverse — do not upload a manuscript you are reviewing for a journal. That crosses the confidentiality bright line.

RECOMMENDED FOR

Works across most submission types. Most valuable for junior scholars preparing first submissions to selective venues and for authors returning to a paper after a long gap. Less valuable for very short-format pieces (commentaries, letters) where structure is pre-determined.

SENIOR RESEARCHER EXTENSION

Senior researchers can add: "Act additionally as the Editor-in-Chief and produce a 3-sentence decision letter, including one sentence on fit to the journal's recent publication patterns."

---

12. Reviewer Response Letter Scaffold

Category: *Argument Stress-Testing & Counterargument Generation*

BEST USE CASE

Structuring your own responses to peer reviewer comments — not delegating the substance, but organizing and pressure-testing how you plan to respond.

PROMPT

```
I received peer review on my manuscript in [discipline] at [target journal].
Below are (a) the reviewer comments and (b) my initial response plan —
written in rough bullet form — for each comment.

Do NOT draft my response letter. Instead, do the following:

1. For each reviewer comment, identify what the reviewer is actually
   asking for — separating the explicit request from the underlying
   concern. Reviewers often ask for X when the real issue is Y.

2. Critique my response plan. Where am I agreeing when I should push
   back? Where am I pushing back when the reviewer is right? Where am
   I promising changes that are larger than they need to be — or smaller?

3. Identify any reviewer comment where my plan sidesteps the substance
   rather than engaging it. Flag these plainly.

4. For each response plan element, suggest the tone that is most likely
   to land well with this reviewer (concede clearly, defend with
   evidence, clarify the misunderstanding, or acknowledge and decline
   to change). Explain why.

5. Identify any comments where two reviewers are contradicting each
   other, and describe the cleanest way to respond to both without
   alienating either.

The actual response prose I will write myself. I want your help
thinking, not drafting.

--- REVIEWER COMMENTS ---
[paste reviewer comments, each numbered]

--- MY RESPONSE PLAN ---
[paste your bullet-form plan for each comment]
```

WHY IT WORKS

The explicit prohibition on drafting keeps the substance in your hands, which is the line major publishers draw for reviewer responses. The separation of explicit request from underlying concern is the single highest-leverage reframing in responding to reviews.

USE CAREFULLY WHEN

The model may misread the tone of reviewer comments, especially terse ones. Treat its tone assessments as provocations to check with a colleague or mentor, not as calibrated reads.

RECOMMENDED FOR

All empirical and review article submissions. Particularly valuable for authors navigating first revise-and-resubmits, for responding to contradictory reviewer panels, and for career-critical revisions. Works across methodological traditions.

---

13. Agentic Workflow Specification Builder

Category: *Agentic Task Delegation with Governance*

BEST USE CASE

Before delegating a multi-step research task to an agentic system, specifying exactly what the agent may do, where it must stop, and what you will verify.

PROMPT

I am planning to use an agentic AI system to support [task: e.g., screening 5,000 abstracts against inclusion criteria / compiling a structured comparison of methods across a set of papers / organizing an archive of research materials].

Before I delegate anything, help me produce a GOVERNED WORKFLOW SPECIFICATION with the following sections:

1. SCOPE. State precisely what the agent is permitted to do and what it is not permitted to do. Err on the side of narrower scope. Include explicit prohibitions on: generating citations, making interpretive judgments, deleting or modifying source files, and accessing any material outside the designated workspace.

2. INPUTS. What files, databases, or tools may the agent access? What must it NOT access (unpublished manuscripts, confidential data, sensitive correspondence, etc.)?

3. TERMINATION CONDITIONS. Where must the agent stop and return control to me? Propose checkpoints after each substantive step, not just at the end.

4. OUTPUT STRUCTURE. What format must the agent's outputs take for me to review efficiently? (Structured tables are usually better than prose.)

5. FAILURE MODES. What are the three most likely ways this workflow could go wrong — including error propagation across steps, retrieval blind spots, and silent fabrication? For each, propose a detection method.

6. VERIFICATION PROTOCOL. Exactly what will I check manually before accepting any output? Include a random-sample audit plan.

7. LOG REQUIREMENTS. What will be recorded for the reproducibility appendix: prompts, tool versions, files accessed, outputs retained, human approval points.

Do not execute any task yet. Produce the specification only.

--- MY INTENDED TASK ---
[describe the task, the inputs, and why you want to delegate it]

WHY IT WORKS

It converts the 2026 governance principles — specification, termination conditions, human-in-the-loop checkpoints — into a pre-flight document you can share with a supervisor or IRB before running the workflow. The explicit failure-modes section preempts the most common error pattern in agentic research: silent propagation of errors across chained steps.

USE CAREFULLY WHEN

A specification is not a guarantee. Agentic systems can be misled by adversarial inputs in retrieved documents ("agent hijacking"). Always review a sample of intermediate outputs, not just the final product.

RECOMMENDED FOR

Most valuable for large-scale systematic reviews, archive organization, multi-site data harmonization, and any project where the scale of the task makes full human execution impractical. Most relevant in computational research, health sciences research synthesis, and digital humanities corpus work. Not for use with confidential or unpublished materials outside an institutionally governed environment.

SENIOR RESEARCHER EXTENSION

PIs running lab-scale or team-scale workflows can add a section on ROLE-BASED ACCESS CONTROL: which team members may run the agent, approve outputs, or modify the specification, and what the escalation path is when the agent produces unexpected behavior.

References

This handbook synthesizes guidance grounded in the attached source report, which draws on the following works. Entries follow APA 7th edition where full bibliographic information was available in the source report; URLs are retained where they were the primary citation form in the original.

American Bar Association. (2024). Formal opinion 512: Generative artificial intelligence tools. https://www.lawnext.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/aba-formal-opinion-512.pdf

American Psychological Association. (2024). Approved policies and guidance for generative AI.

Beel, J., et al. (2025). Independent evaluation of AI Scientist-v2 [Analysis]. University of Galway.

Chelli, M., Descamps, J., Lavoué, V., Trojani, C., Azar, M., Deckert, M., Raynier, J.-L., Clowez, G., Boileau, P., & Ruetsch-Chelli, C. (2024). Hallucination rates and reference accuracy of ChatGPT and Bard for systematic reviews: Comparative analysis. Journal of Medical Internet Research.

Cohen, J. F., & Moher, D. (2025). Generative artificial intelligence and academic writing: Friend or foe? Journal of Clinical Epidemiology.

Committee on Publication Ethics. (2023–2026). Authorship and AI tools; peer-review ethics; AI disclosure initiatives.

Elsevier. (2026). Generative AI policies for journals. https://www.elsevier.com/about/policies-and-standards/generative-ai-policies-for-journals

European Commission / European Research Area Forum. (2025). Living guidelines on the responsible use of generative AI in research.

Flanagin, A., Pirracchio, R., Khera, R., Berkwits, M., Hswen, Y., & Bibbins-Domingo, K. (2024). Reporting use of AI in research and scholarly publication—JAMA Network guidance. JAMA.

Ganjavi, C., Epure, L., Peermohamed, S., et al. (2024). Publishers' and journals' instructions to authors on use of generative artificial intelligence in academic and scientific publishing: Bibliometric analysis. BMJ.

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. (2025–2026). Recommendations and guidance on AI use in manuscripts and peer review.

King's College London. (2025). Generative AI: Guidance for doctoral students, supervisors and examiners.

Kobak, D., et al. (2025). Delving into LLM-assisted writing in biomedical publications through excess vocabulary. Science Advances.

Lee, H.-P., Sarkar, A., Tankelevitch, L., Drosos, I., Rintel, S., Banks, R., & Wilson, N. (2025). The impact of generative AI on critical thinking. Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems.

Liang, W., et al. (2024). Can large language models provide useful feedback on research papers? A large-scale empirical analysis. NEJM AI.

Liang, W., et al. (2024). Monitoring AI-modified content at scale: A case study on the impact of ChatGPT on AI conference peer reviews. ICML.

Lieberum, J.-L., Töws, M., Metzendorf, M.-I., Heilmeyer, F., Siemens, W., Haverkamp, C., Böhringer, D., Meerpohl, J. J., & Eisele-Metzger, A. (2025). Large language models for conducting systematic reviews: On the rise, but not yet ready for use—A scoping review. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology.

Liu, Y., et al. (2026). Benchmarking large language model-based agent systems. npj Digital Medicine.

Luo, X., Tham, Y. C., Giuffrè, M., et al. (2025). Reporting guideline for the use of generative artificial intelligence tools in medical research: The GAMER statement. BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine.

Noy, S., & Zhang, W. (2023). Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. Science.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2026). The agentic AI landscape and its conceptual foundations. https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2026/02/the-agentic-ai-landscape-and-its-conceptual-foundations_a9d4b451/396cf758-en.pdf

Peng, S., Kalliamvakou, E., Cihon, P., & Demirer, M. (2023). The impact of AI on developer productivity. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.06590

Qiao, S., Kang, Y., et al. (2025). Generative AI for thematic analysis in a maternal health study. Health Expectations.

Sakana AI, et al. (2026). AI Scientist-v2: Autonomous research manuscript generation. Nature.

Springer Nature. (2026). Artificial intelligence policy.

Taylor & Francis. (2026). AI policy. https://taylorandfrancis.com/our-policies/ai-policy/

UNESCO. (2023, updated 2026). Guidance for generative AI in education and research.

U.S. National Institutes of Health. (2025). Supporting fairness and originality in NIH research applications. https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-25-132.html

U.S. National Science Foundation. (2023). Use of generative artificial intelligence technology in the NSF merit review process. https://www.nsf.gov/news/notice-to-the-research-community-on-ai

UK Research and Innovation. (2024–2026). Generative artificial intelligence in application and assessment policy.

University of Glasgow. (2026). Generative AI guidance for researchers. https://www.gla.ac.uk/research/strategy/ourpolicies/ai-for-researchers/

Wellcome. (2026). Use of generative AI in grant application processes.

Wiley. (2025–2026). Best practice guidelines on publishing ethics and AI guidance. https://authors.wiley.com/ethics-guidelines/index.html

Resources for Understanding AI Usage in the Research Cycle

Committee on Publication Ethics — AI in Publication Ethics
Best first stop for publication ethics, authorship, disclosure, and integrity. Highly influential across journals.

Resource: https://publicationethics.org/ai

Use for:
- Whether AI can be an author
- Disclosure expectations
- Misconduct concerns
- Reviewer/editor responsibilities

American Psychological Association — Generative AI Guidance
Especially useful across social sciences, education, psychology, and student writing.

Resource: https://apastyle.apa.org/blog/how-to-cite-chatgpt

Use for:
- Citing AI outputs
- Writing with AI
- Academic standards
- Student/researcher transparency

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors
Essential for health sciences and increasingly influential elsewhere.

Resource: https://www.icmje.org/

Use for:
- Authorship
- Accountability
- Disclosure
- Medical manuscript standards

Springer Nature — AI Policy

Resource: https://www.nature.com/nature-portfolio/editorial-policies/ai

Use for:
- Manuscript AI use
- AI-generated images
- Reviewer restrictions

This resource was created using ChatGPT and reviewed by a human. To view the log, see this link.

- Methods disclosures

Elsevier

Resource: https://www.elsevier.com/about/policies-and-standards/generative-ai-policies-for-journals

Use for:
- Article preparation
- AI disclosure
- Peer review confidentiality
- Figure/image rules

Taylor & Francis

Resource: https://taylorandfrancis.com/our-policies/ai-policy/

Use for:
- Required AI statements
- Tool/version disclosures
- Reviewer limitations
- Publishing boundaries

Wiley

Resource: https://authorservices.wiley.com/ethics-guidelines/index.html

Use for:
- Documentation practices
- Research integrity
- Responsible author use
- Transparency norms

National Institutes of Health

Resource: https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-25-132.html

Use for:
- Whether AI-written grant text is allowed
- Originality expectations
- Proposal accountability

National Science Foundation

This resource was created using ChatGPT and reviewed by a human. To view the log, see this link.

Resource: https://www.nsf.gov/news/notice-to-the-research-community-on-ai

Use for:
- Merit review restrictions
- Proposal confidentiality
- Reviewer AI use

UK Research and Innovation

Resource:
https://www.ukri.org/publications/generative-artificial-intelligence-in-application-and-assessment-policy/use-of-generative-artificial-intelligence-in-application-preparation-and-assessment/

Use for:
- Grant writing boundaries
- Assessor bans
- International comparison

BMJ — GAMER Reporting Statement
Major emerging standard for reporting AI in medical research.

Resource: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/40360239/
Use for:
- AI in evidence synthesis
- Reporting standards
- Health research transparency

PubMed — Search AI + Systematic Reviews

Resource:
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/?term=AI+systematic+review+large+language+models

Use for:
- Latest peer-reviewed evidence
- Search/screening/extraction studies
- Reliability evaluations

American Bar Association — Formal Opinion 512
One of the strongest professional-use frameworks for competence, confidentiality, and supervision.

This resource was created using ChatGPT and reviewed by a human. To view the log, see this link.

Resource: https://www.americanbar.org/

Use for:

- High-stakes professional writing
- Confidentiality
- Citation verification
- Human oversight principles

European Commission — Responsible AI in Research

Resource:
https://research-and-innovation.ec.europa.eu/document/download/2b6cf7e5-36ac-41cb-aab5-0d32050143dc_en

Use for:

- Governance models
- Human-in-command principles
- Public-sector research norms

This resource was created using ChatGPT and reviewed by a human. To view the log, see this link.

AI PROMPT LIBRARY

for Education

A curated collection of prompts for faculty, staff,
instructional designers, and academic leaders in higher education



This resource was created and maintained by Lance Eaton. You can sign up for my newsletter: ***AI+Edu=Simplified***. Connect with me on my blog, Twitter, Bluesky, Mastodon, LinkedIn, or YouTube. If you have additional questions, please reach out to me at lance.eaton@gmail.com.

License*: This work is licensed by Lance Eaton under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. You are welcome to reuse this with a Share-Alike CC license and if possible, please let Lance Eaton know.*

Contents

How to Use This Library **3**
1. Accessibility & Inclusive Design **4**
1.1 Reviewing Materials for Accessibility 4
1.2 Adapting Activities & Assignments 5
1.3 Culturally Responsive & Inclusive Content 6
1.4 Multilingual & Multi-Sensory Design 7
2. Course Design & Curriculum Development **7**
2.1 Learning Objectives & Outcomes 8
2.2 Curriculum Alignment & Mapping 9
2.3 Module & Unit Development 9
2.4 Syllabus, Course Guides & Navigation 10
2.5 Content Review & Sequencing 11
3. Teaching & Classroom Practice **11**
3.1 Lesson Planning & Facilitation 11
3.2 Active Learning & Engagement 12
3.3 Reflective Practice & Metacognition 13
3.4 Innovative & Multimodal Pedagogy 14
4. Assessment & Evaluation **14**
4.1 Assignment & Assessment Design 15
4.2 Rubric Development & Calibration 15
4.3 Feedback & Grading Practices 16
4.4 Learning Evidence & Portfolios 17
4.5 Co-Curricular Assessment 17
5. Student Success & Support **18**
5.1 Academic Advising & Coaching 18
5.2 Career Readiness & Planning 19
5.3 Student Communications & FAQs 20
5.4 Student Wellbeing & Belonging 20
6. Strategic & Institutional Work **21**
6.1 Strategic Planning & Effectiveness 21
6.2 Accreditation & Benchmarking 22
6.3 Assessment Reporting & Communication 22
6.4 Policy & Guidelines Development 23
6.5 Grant Strategy & Resource Planning 23
7. Faculty & Staff Development **23**
7.1 Professional Development Programs 24
7.2 Onboarding & Staff Support 24
7.3 AI Integration in Teaching 24
7.4 Event & Workshop Planning 25
8. Open Educational Resources (OER) **25**
8.1 Resource Discovery & Curation 26

8.2 Contextualization & Adaptation 26
8.3 Co-Creation & Innovation 27
8.4 Quality Assurance & Sustainability 28
8.5 Attribution, Licensing & Infrastructure 29

How to Use This Library

This library organizes prompts across eight color-coded categories. Each section opens with a Quick Start template you can adapt immediately, followed by detailed prompts organized by subcategory.

1. **Categories overlap.** A prompt in Assessment may also work for Course Design. Browse adjacent sections.
2. **These are examples to adapt.** Swap out subjects, disciplines, and details freely. Play around with a given prompt.
3. **Brackets [ ] are placeholders.** Replace them with your specific course name, discipline, data, or context.
4. **Expect imperfection.** Retry, redirect, or refine. If the AI drifts, remind it of the original goal.
5. **Push for more.** Ask follow-up questions. Ask "What did you miss?" and have it integrate the gaps.
6. **Ask the AI to improve your prompt.** Try: "Improve this prompt to maximize outputs: [paste prompt]."
7. **Turn AI into an interviewer.** "Interview me with critical questions to help me achieve [goal]. Ask 1 question at a time."
8. **Protect privacy.** When sharing prompts with students, include guidance about not entering personal details.

SECTION 1

Accessibility & Inclusive Design

Reviewing, improving, and creating accessible and inclusive learning experiences for all students.

⚡ **QUICK START TEMPLATE**

"This [content type] relies heavily on [barrier-creating element]. Acting as [accessibility role], create alternatives that work for students with [specific needs]. Include [accommodation types]. Provide [implementation support] with [testing elements]."

1.1 Reviewing Materials for Accessibility

Review Course Materials for Accessibility

"Review the following course materials [paste relevant content] for my [subject] class. Identify any potential accessibility issues and suggest improvements to make the content more inclusive for students with diverse needs, including those with visual, auditory, or cognitive disabilities."

Accessibility Compliance Audit (OER)

"I have a collection of [number] OER resources for my [subject] course that need to meet WCAG 2.1 AA accessibility standards. Acting as an accessibility compliance auditor, evaluate each resource for: screen reader compatibility, keyboard navigation functionality, caption quality and synchronization accuracy, and color contrast measurements. Create a detailed compliance report with pass/fail ratings and priority rankings for fixes."

Screen Reader Optimization

"I have [content type] that needs to be optimized for screen reader users. Acting as an accessibility specialist, review and restructure this content to ensure: proper heading hierarchy, meaningful alt text for all images, logical reading order, and clear link text. Provide a before/after comparison with screen reader testing protocols."

Keyboard Navigation Review

"My interactive [subject] materials rely on mouse-dependent interactions that exclude keyboard-only users. Acting as a keyboard accessibility engineer, redesign these interactions to include: keyboard-navigable alternatives for all functions, visible focus indicators, logical tab order, and shortcut key documentation."

Text-Dense to Cognitively Accessible

"My [subject] reading materials are dense academic text that creates barriers for students with cognitive disabilities or learning differences. Acting as a cognitive accessibility designer, transform this content to use: chunked information with clear headers, visual cues for key concepts, reduced working memory demands, and multiple processing pathways."

1.2 Adapting Activities & Assignments

Analyze Assignments for Accessibility

"Analyze this assignment [paste assignment details] from an accessibility perspective. Suggest alternative formats or modifications that would allow students with different abilities to demonstrate their learning while maintaining the core objectives of the task."

Adapt Activities for Inclusive Participation

"I'm planning a [type of activity] for my [subject] class. Here are the details: [provide activity description]. Generate a list of potential accessibility challenges and suggest modifications or alternatives to make this activity inclusive for students with diverse needs, including those with physical, sensory, or cognitive disabilities."

Adapt for Online/Hybrid Environments

"Review this hands-on class activity for my [subject] course: [paste activity details]. Propose ways to adapt this activity for online or hybrid learning environments while maintaining its core learning objectives and ensuring accessibility for all students, including those with limited internet access or technology."

Flexible Presentation Formats

"Analyze the following in-class presentation assignment: [paste assignment details]. Suggest multiple ways students could present their work that accommodate different abilities and learning preferences while still meeting the assignment's objectives. Include ideas for both in-person and virtual formats."

Visual-Heavy to Multi-Sensory (OER)

"My [subject] course relies heavily on visual content that excludes students with visual impairments. Acting as a multi-sensory education designer, create parallel learning experiences using: audio descriptions and sonification, tactile learning alternatives, verbal and written representations, and peer collaboration formats."

Universal Design Implementation

"My [subject] course uses a single approach for all students. Acting as a universal design implementation specialist, redesign course components to offer: multiple means of representation, multiple means of engagement, and multiple means of action and expression, following UDL principles."

1.3 Culturally Responsive & Inclusive Content

Audit Content for Diversity and Inclusion

"Analyze the diversity and inclusivity of the content in my [subject] syllabus [paste syllabus]. Evaluate the range of perspectives, cultural representations, and global viewpoints included. Recommend ways to make the content more inclusive and representative of diverse experiences."

AI Opportunities Through an Equity Lens

"Leveraging your experience with inclusive pedagogy, antiracist teaching, and universal design for learning, identify the three most significant challenges and the three most significant opportunities that generative AI represents for teaching and learning in the discipline of [Discipline]. Output as a table: (1) challenge or opportunity, (2) why it matters, (3) useful questions for faculty."

Monocultural to Multicultural Examples (OER)

"Our [subject] textbook's examples reflect only [demographic] experiences. Working as a culturally responsive curriculum developer, create alternative example sets that include: diverse family structures, multilingual scenarios, economic situations across income levels, and collectivist cultural perspectives. Provide [number] parallel examples with cultural context notes and discussion prompts."

Historical Perspective Diversification (OER)

"This [subject] resource presents primarily Western perspectives. As a decolonial education specialist, expand these materials to include: Indigenous narratives, non-Western source documents, multiple perspectives on the same events, and challenges to traditional timelines. Create supplementary modules with primary sources and critical thinking exercises."

Bias and Representation Analysis (OER)

"Analyzing my [subject] OER for [type of bias] that may affect [student population]. Working as a bias specialist, examine materials for: representation gaps, alienating language, assumption patterns, and structural biases in content organization. Generate a detailed analysis with instances, impact assessments, and revision suggestions."

1.4 Multilingual & Multi-Sensory Design

Multilingual Support (OER)

"Teaching [subject] to a class where [percentage]% are English language learners with [languages] as first languages. As a multilingual education expert, enhance this [material type] with: key terms in multiple languages, visual vocabulary cards, culturally familiar measurement comparisons, and cognate identification exercises."

Academic to Plain Language (OER)

"My [student population] students find the academic jargon in this [subject] textbook intimidating. Acting as a plain language specialist, transform key chapters to use: everyday vocabulary, shorter sentences, concrete examples, and visual supports. Maintain conceptual rigor while improving accessibility. Provide before/after examples with reading level analysis."

Sonification of Abstract Concepts (OER)

"Developing audio representations of [subject] concepts for visually impaired students and auditory learners. As a data sonification specialist, create sound-based materials including: musical patterns representing different concepts, rhythmic exercises, audio graphs with pitch-based navigation, and collaborative listening exercises."

SECTION 2

Course Design & Curriculum Development

Designing courses, writing objectives, mapping curricula, and building coherent learning experiences.

⚡ **QUICK START TEMPLATE**

"I teach [subject] to [student population]. Acting as a curriculum design specialist, help me [specific design need] that aligns with [learning outcomes/standards]. Provide [deliverable format] with [specific components needed]."

2.1 Learning Objectives & Outcomes

Generate Objectives with Bloom's Taxonomy

"I'm designing a new undergraduate course on [subject]. Based on current trends and job market demands, generate a list of 5-7 specific, measurable learning objectives that align with Bloom's Taxonomy. For each objective, suggest a potential assessment method."

Update Existing Course Objectives

"Review these existing course objectives for my [subject] class: [list objectives]. Considering recent advancements and the need for more inclusive outcomes, propose updates or additions. Explain the rationale behind each suggestion."

Map Course Objectives to Program Outcomes

"Create a matrix that maps course objectives to program-level outcomes for a [subject] degree. Include 5-7 course-specific objectives and 3-5 broader program outcomes. Highlight areas of strong alignment and identify any gaps."

Refine Program Outcomes for Accreditation

"Review the following program learning outcomes [paste outcomes] to align with current accreditation standards and institutional goals. Ensure each outcome is specific, measurable, and actionable. Provide suggestions for refinement with rationale suitable for faculty and accreditation reviewers."

2.2 Curriculum Alignment & Mapping

Assess Objective-to-Assessment Alignment

"Compare these course objectives [list] with the following assessments and activities [list]. Identify areas of strong alignment and misalignment. Suggest adjustments to ensure better coherence."

Evaluate Syllabus-to-Program Alignment

"Review this course syllabus [paste syllabus] and evaluate how well it aligns with the stated program outcomes for [program name]. Highlight strong alignment and suggest ways to address gaps."

Align Weekly Topics to Culminating Assignments

"Analyze the alignment between these weekly topics [list] and the final project requirements [paste details] for my [subject] course. Suggest ways to strengthen the connection."

Map Course-Level to Program-Level Outcomes

"Our department is mapping course-level outcomes to program outcomes for learning progression. Using these [paste course outcomes] and program outcomes [paste], identify misalignments or redundancies. Recommend targeted improvements for both curricular coherence and faculty implementation."

2.3 Module & Unit Development

Design a Multi-Week Module

"Develop an outline for a 4-week module on [topic] for an advanced undergraduate [subject] course. Include weekly themes, key concepts, potential readings, and activities that promote critical thinking and real-world application."

Create an Interdisciplinary Module

"Create a module connecting [subject A] with [subject B]. Propose a 3-week structure exploring the intersection, including learning objectives, content overview, and collaborative project ideas."

Design a Flexible Module Framework

"Design a flexible module framework for [subject] that allows easy updates as the field evolves. Include a template, suggestions for incorporating current events, and strategies for adapting difficulty based on student backgrounds."

Course Module Co-Creation (OER)

"I'm developing a module on [topic] connecting [dimension A] with [dimension B]. Acting as a curriculum co-designer, help create a [duration] module including: opening scenarios, data analysis activities, student-led workshops, and multimedia assignments. Start with an outline; we'll iterate."

2.4 Syllabus, Course Guides & Navigation

Course Guide Template

"Generate a comprehensive course guide template for a [level] [subject] course. Include sections for description, learning outcomes, weekly schedule, assignments, grading policies, and resources. Provide student-friendly language examples."

Interactive Online Course Guide

"Create an interactive course guide outline for an online [subject] course. Suggest ways to make it engaging and user-friendly with multimedia elements, interactive features, and clear navigation."

Quick Start Guide for Students

"Develop a 'Quick Start' guide for students beginning my [subject] course. Focus on the most crucial first-week information: expectations, technology requirements, and tips for success."

Review Syllabus for Missing Elements

"Analyze this syllabus [paste] for missing policies, resources, or information typically included in comprehensive syllabi. Recommend additions that clarify expectations and support student success."

2.5 Content Review & Sequencing

Review Content for Currency

"Review the content outline for my [subject] course [paste]. Assess comprehensiveness, currency, and relevance. Identify outdated information or emerging topics that should be included. Suggest enriching resources or case studies."

Evaluate Sequencing and Scaffolding

"Examine the sequencing and scaffolding in this course schedule [paste]. Assess how topics build upon each other. Suggest reordering or additions to enhance understanding and application."

Identify Course Design Gaps

"Review my course design [provide overview] for [subject] and identify crucial missing elements. Consider: feedback opportunities, real-world application, interdisciplinary connections, and skill development."

SECTION 3

Teaching & Classroom Practice

Lesson planning, active learning, reflective practice, and innovative pedagogies.

⚡ **QUICK START TEMPLATE**

"I'm teaching [topic] to [student population] in a [format] setting. Acting as [pedagogical role], help me design [activity type] that [learning goal]. Include [specific components] with [implementation guidance]."

3.1 Lesson Planning & Facilitation

Evaluate a Lesson Plan

"Evaluate this lesson plan [paste] for a 75-minute session on [topic] in my [subject] course. Assess pacing, variety of activities, and engagement opportunities. Suggest improvements."

Review a Multi-Session Sequence

"Review three class session outlines [provide] covering [topic]. Analyze concept progression, instructional method balance, and cross-session coherence. Recommend improvements."

Evaluate a Flipped Classroom Plan

"Examine this flipped classroom plan [paste details]. Evaluate pre-class activities, in-class exercises, and post-class assessments. Suggest refinements to maximize the flipped model."

Generate Diverse Activity Ideas

"Generate 10 diverse activity ideas for teaching [topic] in [subject]. Include a mix of individual, pair, and group activities. Explain how each supports specific learning outcomes."

Design a Debate Facilitator's Guide

"Generate a facilitator's guide for a debate on [topic] in my [subject] course. Include setup, ground rules, moderation guidance, and debriefing. Provide tips for respectful disagreement and critical thinking."

Implement the Jigsaw Method

"Provide a step-by-step guide for using the jigsaw method to teach [topic] in [subject]. Include content division, group formations, time management, individual accountability, and adaptations for both in-person and online settings."

3.2 Active Learning & Engagement

Multi-Modal Teaching Approaches

"Help me brainstorm interactive ways to teach [difficult concept] in [subject]. Generate 5-7 activity ideas using visual, auditory, and kinesthetic modalities. For each, explain how it addresses common misconceptions."

Real-World Applications

"Propose activities or projects connecting [subject] course content to current industry practices or societal issues. Include ideas for guest speakers, case studies, or simulations."

Gamified Learning Journey (OER)

"Creating a semester-long gamified experience for [subject] to increase engagement. Help develop a quest system including: character development, argument-based challenges, reflection points, and collaborative guild challenges."

Choose-Your-Own-Adventure Learning (OER)

"Create branching narrative experiences for ethical decision-making in [subject]. Develop scenarios with: multiple stakeholder perspectives, technical-ethical tensions, decision trees with consequences, and reflection journals throughout."

3.3 Reflective Practice & Metacognition

Semester-Long Reflective Journal

"Develop a guide for a semester-long reflective journal. Include weekly entry prompts, feedback suggestions, and ideas for tracking student growth. Address both content-related and metacognitive reflection."

Bank of Reflective Questions

"Create a bank of reflective questions encouraging students to evaluate what they've learned, how they've learned it, and how their thinking has changed. Prompt connections between content, prior knowledge, and future application."

Visualize Discussion Thinking

"Create a visual summary (concept map or infographic outline) capturing the main ideas, connections, and evolving thoughts from this discussion [paste transcript or notes]."

3.4 Innovative & Multimodal Pedagogy

Text to Interactive Visual (OER)

"Transform a dense textbook chapter on [topic] into an interactive visual learning experience. Create: animated diagrams, clickable detail components, self-check questions, and a visual summary infographic. Format as a storyboard."

Lecture Notes to Podcast Scripts (OER)

"Transform lecture notes on [topic] into engaging 15-minute podcast episodes. Include: conversational tone with real-world examples, interview-style segments, audio cues for important concepts, and reflection prompts."

Static to Kinesthetic Learning (OER)

"Adapt a theoretical chapter on [topic] for hands-on learners. Include: physical manipulation activities, movement-based memory techniques, workshop-style practice problems, and tactile learning aids with materials lists."

Simulation Scenario Building (OER)

"Create branching simulation scenarios for [subject] including: initial triggers with escalating complexity, stakeholder role assignments, decision points with realistic constraints, and outcome variations based on choices."

Virtual Field Trip Development (OER)

"Design virtual field trips to [locations] for [subject]. Include: 360-degree explorations with hotspot annotations, expert video interviews, artifact examination stations, and student investigation notebooks."

SECTION 4

Assessment & Evaluation

Designing assessments, building rubrics, providing feedback, and evaluating learning.

⚡ **QUICK START TEMPLATE**

"Replacing/Building [traditional assessment] with [innovative approach] for my [course]. Working as [assessment role], design [assessment type] featuring [specific innovations]. Begin with [starting point], building together based on [criteria]."

4.1 Assignment & Assessment Design

Evaluate a Draft Assessment Plan

"Evaluate this assessment plan for [program name] [paste]. Focus on clarity and feasibility of methods, alignment with outcomes, and integration into a continuous improvement cycle."

Student Survey on Critical Thinking

"Develop a student survey assessing critical thinking perceptions in [discipline]. Include 10 Likert-scale items and 3 open-ended questions aligned with program outcomes [paste]. Ensure accessibility for diverse students."

Review an Assessment Instrument

"Review this assessment instrument [paste]. Evaluate alignment with learning outcomes, clarity of questions, and reliability/validity. Suggest revisions for diverse student populations."

Continuous Improvement Cycle Design

"Create a step-by-step outline of a continuous improvement cycle for program-level assessment. Include: goal setting, data collection, analysis, action planning, implementation, and reassessment."

Multiple Assignment Options

"Create three unique assignment options assessing the same learning outcome in [subject]. Each should cater to different learning preferences while maintaining equivalent rigor. Provide a brief rubric for each."

4.2 Rubric Development & Calibration

Create an Analytic Rubric

"Create a rubric for [assignment type] in my [level] [subject] course. Objectives: [list]. Include 4-5 criteria with 3-4 performance levels and clear descriptors aligned with objectives."

Holistic Discussion Rubric

"Generate a holistic rubric for online discussions in [subject]. Assess quality of contributions, peer engagement, and critical thinking. Provide 4 performance levels."

Multi-Part Project Rubric

"Develop an analytic rubric for a multi-part project with these components: [list]. Create separate criteria per component, include weightings, and clear performance descriptors."

Student-Friendly Writing Rubric

"Create a student-friendly writing rubric for [student population] for self-assessment. Break writing into clear criteria reflecting academic and real-world communication skills. Engaging language, actionable feedback. Table format."

Rubric Calibration Session

"Simulate rubric calibration: Apply this rubric [paste] to this student work [paste/describe]. Score each criterion with justification referencing specific descriptors. Compare with typical faculty patterns to inform calibration development."

Peer Review Rubric

"Create a rubric for peer review of research papers. Accessible language, three evaluation levels, asset-based framing. Table format."

4.3 Feedback & Grading Practices

Growth-Oriented Feedback

"Reword these comments [paste] on a student essay in [subject] to be more constructive and growth-oriented while maintaining clarity about areas for improvement. Suggest how the student might act on this feedback."

Analyze End-of-Semester Evaluations

"Analyze these evaluations [paste summary]. Identify patterns, strengths, and improvement opportunities. Suggest 3-5 specific actions to address concerns while building on positives."

Categorize Mid-Semester Feedback

"Categorize these mid-semester feedback responses [paste] into themes. Propose immediate adjustments and longer-term strategies for course enhancement."

Analyze LMS Feedback

"Conduct a detailed overview of student experiences with faculty LMS usage using this feedback [paste]. Highlight concerns, identify positive practices, offer recommendations, and analyze potential biases."

4.4 Learning Evidence & Portfolios

Portfolio Guide for Students

"Create a structured guide for student learning portfolios. Include: required sections (introduction, artifact selection, reflective commentary), acceptable evidence examples, and how each section demonstrates achievement of learning outcomes."

Portfolio Evaluation Rubric

"Create a rubric for evaluating learning portfolios in [discipline]. Include 4-5 criteria (artifact relevance, reflection depth, outcome alignment, presentation quality) with 3-4 performance levels."

AI-Simulated Portfolio Review

"Simulate a review of a student portfolio [paste/describe]. Evaluate artifact-to-outcome alignment and provide student-suitable feedback on strengths, improvements, and suggestions for deeper reflection."

4.5 Co-Curricular Assessment

Map Co-Curricular to Institutional Outcomes

"Map these co-curricular program outcomes [paste] to institutional learning outcomes. Identify where co-curricular activities reinforce or extend academic learning. Recommend integration improvements."

Evaluate Program Impact

"Evaluate this co-curricular program's impact on student development in leadership, communication, or civic engagement [paste details and data]. Present findings suitable for student affairs and academic affairs leadership."

Participation Tracking System

"Design a system for tracking co-curricular participation. Capture key metrics: frequency, activity type, and associated learning outcomes. Show how data could be reported for continuous improvement."

Co-Curricular Reflection Prompts

"Create reflection prompts for co-curricular participants. Help students articulate learning, connect to academic goals, and identify future applications. Open-ended, accessible, aligned with institutional outcomes."

SECTION 5

Student Success & Support

Advising, career development, student-facing communications, and student wellbeing.

⚡ **QUICK START TEMPLATE**

"Acting as a [student support role] at a [institution type], help me create [resource/plan/communication] for [student population] who [specific context]. Include [components] and ensure the tone is [welcoming/empathetic/action-oriented]."

5.1 Academic Advising & Coaching

Advising Scenario Simulation

"Simulate a student on academic probation who is anxious about failing. Take on a specific identity; only share what an advisor would already know. I will interact as the advisor. After 5-7 exchanges, pause to ask if I want feedback."

12-Week Action Plan for Struggling Student

"Create a 12-week action plan for a struggling sophomore [subject] major on academic probation with time-management challenges. Include weekly goals, study strategies, time management techniques, and three self-assessment checkpoints."

GPA Improvement Roadmap

"Generate a month-by-month roadmap for a first-generation student aiming to improve GPA from 2.5 to 3.5. Include study techniques, time management strategies, and campus resource utilization. Validate with contemporary student success research."

Student Success Email Templates

"Create five email templates: welcome, missed session check-in, GPA improvement congratulations, academic struggle support, and end-of-semester reflection. Each 150-200 words with subject lines, personalization, warm tone, and calls to action."

5.2 Career Readiness & Planning

Career Workshop Design

"Design a 2-hour career workshop for final-year students. Include: structure with timing, content on resumes and interviews, professional online presence, interactive elements (mock interviews, peer review), resources, evaluation, and promotion plan."

Career Communications Strategy

"Draft a career center communications strategy for second-year students covering the first two months of Fall. Output as a chronological table with event/communication details, method, and 3-5 next steps each."

Career Coach Interview

"Act as a career coach. Interview me one question at a time about my academics, extracurriculars, and projects. Synthesize findings into a table of marketable skills, recommended industries/jobs, and rankings."

Skills Analyzer Interview

"Interview me about education, volunteering, internships, and employment. Be persistent in drawing out specific examples. Then provide a table of demonstrated skills, their workplace importance, and 1-3 demonstrations."

Behavioral Interview Practice

"You're an expert in [field/industry]. Interview me using motivational and behavioral methods, 1 question at a time. Leverage your expertise and my answers. When done, offer a comprehensive assessment."

5.3 Student Communications & FAQs

FAQ from Transcript

"Create a FAQ document with 5-10 questions and answers from this transcript [paste]. Questions should reflect common confusion; answers should be clear, accessible, and include resources."

FAQ for International Students

"Create a FAQ for international students navigating U.S. academic culture. Generate 8-12 questions on classroom expectations, participation, office hours, and academic integrity. Culturally sensitive answers under 100 words each."

First-Gen Student FAQ and Glossary

"Create a FAQ for first-gen students in six categories (Navigating College Life, Academic Support, Financial Aid, Family Expectations, Career Planning, Support Networks) with 3 questions each. Include a 10-term glossary."

5.4 Student Wellbeing & Belonging

Stress Response Toolkit

"Create a 'Stress Response Toolkit' for university students. Input: [stress triggers], [learning style], [available time], [environment]. Output: three 2-minute techniques, two 5-10 min practices, one 15-20 min strategy, campus adaptations, and a daily integration plan."

Exam Preparation Plan

"Design a 7-day exam prep plan for [subject] using spaced repetition, active recall, and the Feynman Technique. Per day: specific study goal, two 45-minute sessions, a 15-minute break activity, and a 5-minute reflection prompt. Add three day-before review strategies."

SECTION 6

Strategic & Institutional Work

Strategic planning, accreditation, institutional reporting, policy development, and grant strategy.

⚡ **QUICK START TEMPLATE**

"Acting as a strategic advisor for a [institution type], help me [specific institutional task] using [available data/context]. Provide [deliverable type] accessible to [audience] that supports [institutional goal]."

6.1 Strategic Planning & Effectiveness

Action Plan from Assessment Results

"Using these assessment results [paste summary], develop an action plan to improve outcomes in [program/course]. Include goals, responsible individuals, timelines, and success indicators."

Institutional Performance Analysis

"Analyze this dataset of [institution type] performance metrics. Compare with similar institutions on academics, finances, satisfaction, and innovation. Propose strategic questions for the executive team."

Equity Gap Analysis

"Analyze this disaggregated assessment data [paste] for equity gaps across demographics. Identify disparities and propose three targeted strategies grounded in equity-focused best practices."

6.2 Accreditation & Benchmarking

Accreditation Readiness Evaluation

"Using this assessment documentation [paste], evaluate accreditation readiness. Identify evidence gaps, inconsistencies, or missing documentation. Provide an action checklist."

Peer Institution Benchmarking

"Benchmark our program's results against three peer institutions. Highlight where we stand relative to peers and suggest strategic actions for improvement or differentiation."

Accreditation Narrative Draft

"Draft a narrative for an accreditation report based on assessment data and faculty reflections [paste]. Articulate how the program meets learning outcomes, citing trends and improvements."

6.3 Assessment Reporting & Communication

Annual Report Summary

"Draft a one-page assessment summary for our institutional annual report. Highlight achievements, growth areas, and key data for [program]. Language accessible to faculty and administrators."

Communication Strategy for Findings

"Create a communication strategy for sharing assessment findings from [program] with faculty, students, and leadership. Per stakeholder: key messages, preferred channels, and timing."

Assessment Dashboard Design

"List essential data visualizations for an assessment dashboard. Include: student achievement over time, demographic breakdowns, and outcome alignment. Suggest visualization types for each metric."

6.4 Policy & Guidelines Development

AI Use Policy

"Create a comprehensive AI use policy for a higher education institution. Address teaching/learning support, academic integrity, and faculty/student expectations. Boldface decision points and ask follow-up questions."

Institutional Transformation Strategy

"As a strategic advisor, propose strategies for transforming [institution type] into a leading regional hub for [field] education and training. Strategies must be effective, financially viable, and promptly implementable."

6.5 Grant Strategy & Resource Planning

Grant Application Strategy

"Develop a strategic plan for applying to [grant name]. Cover: program overview, timeline, realistic award expectations, workload estimation, collaborative strategy, success factors, and required resources."

Grant Feasibility Analysis Interview

"Walk me through a feasibility analysis interview using at least 3 methods to assess challenges and opportunities of applying for a large grant. Interview me one question at a time, then provide a detailed output."

SECTION 7

Faculty & Staff Development

Professional development programming, onboarding, AI integration support, and event planning.

⚡ **QUICK START TEMPLATE**

"Acting as a faculty development specialist at a [institution type], help me design [program/resource/event] for [audience] focused on [development goal]. Include [specific components] with [implementation details]."

7.1 Professional Development Programs

Part-Time Faculty Online Teaching PD

"Identify 3 effective PD strategies for part-time faculty in asynchronous online teaching. Per strategy: high-impact practice definition, key strategies for rapid acclimatization, implementation examples, and evaluation suggestions."

Faculty Portfolio Development Program

"Design a portfolio development program for part-time faculty to enhance asynchronous online teaching proficiency. Include: objectives, implementation plan, course map, technology integration, ongoing support, and evaluation metrics."

7.2 Onboarding & Staff Support

New Staff Onboarding Plan

"I have a new staff member starting next month. My time decreases from 6-8 hrs/week initially to 2 hrs/week. Interview me to learn about our work and challenges. Then share your onboarding plan piece by piece, asking feasibility at each step. Revise based on my input."

7.3 AI Integration in Teaching

AI Challenges & Opportunities by Discipline

"Identify three challenges and three opportunities that generative AI represents for teaching in [Discipline]. Output as a table: challenge/opportunity, why it matters, and useful questions for faculty."

Student-Facing AI Explanations (OER)

"Develop explanations for students about AI involvement in their learning resources. Include: age-appropriate descriptions, benefits, human expertise role, and critical evaluation encouragement. Design as video scripts, infographic content, and FAQ responses."

7.4 Event & Workshop Planning

Event Planning Checklist

"Create a comprehensive event planning checklist for [event type], including timeline, budget considerations, and assessment methods."

Icebreaker Activities

"Develop 20 engaging icebreaker activities for various events, catering to different group sizes and student demographics."

Post-Event Debriefing Template

"Create a debriefing template for post-event analysis: successes, areas for improvement, and actionable takeaways."

SECTION 8

Open Educational Resources (OER)

Discovering, adapting, creating, reviewing, and sustaining open educational resources.

⚡ **QUICK START TEMPLATE**

"I teach [subject] to [student population] who [relevant context]. Acting as an educational resource specialist, search for OER that [specific pedagogical need]. Provide a structured list of [number] resources with [details needed]. Focus on materials that [constraints]."

8.1 Resource Discovery & Curation

Find Conceptually Aligned Resources

"Acting as an educational resource specialist, search for OER for [subject] using [pedagogical approach]. Provide a structured list of 10 resources with titles, sources, descriptions, and pedagogical approaches."

Pedagogical Approach Matching

"Locate OER for teaching [topic] using problem-based learning, case studies, or simulations. Present in a comparison table: resource name, active learning elements, time requirements, and prerequisites."

Multi-Repository Search

"Search OER Commons, MERLOT, OpenStax, and MIT OCW for [topic] materials. Create a matrix comparing the top 15 resources across: technical depth, prerequisites, hands-on activities, case study diversity, and update recency."

Standards Alignment Gap Analysis

"Analyze available OER for [subject/level] against [standard/framework]. Create a gap analysis showing where resources fall short with recommendations for filling critical gaps."

Learning Pathway Construction

"Design a self-directed learning pathway using exclusively OER for mastering [subject/skill]. Include: prerequisites, resource sequencing, time estimates, and alternatives for different learning preferences."

8.2 Contextualization & Adaptation

Cultural Context Adaptation

"This [subject] resource uses examples from [original context] that don't resonate in [target context]. Transform examples to include [relevant local elements]. Provide [number] substitutions with explanations."

Advanced to Foundational Versions

"Adapt graduate-level OER on [topic] for introductory students. Create: reduced prerequisite assumptions, additional explanatory layers, progressive complexity pathways, and confidence-building exercises."

Single Level to Adaptive Pathways

"My [subject] OER serves one level but students range widely. Create a multi-tiered version: diagnostic pre-assessment, differentiated pathways, flexible pacing, and self-assessment checkpoints."

Semester to Modular Chunks

"Break semester-long [subject] materials into standalone modules: self-contained units, cross-reference systems, prerequisite mapping, and mix-and-match assembly guides."

Synchronous to Asynchronous

"Convert in-person [subject] workshop materials to self-paced online. Include: self-guided instruction, discussion alternatives, automated feedback, and progress tracking."

8.3 Co-Creation & Innovation

Interactive Textbook Chapter

"Collaborate on a chapter about [topic] for introductory [subject]. Include: intuitive metaphors, interactive visualizations, real-world applications, and confidence-building exercises."

Virtual Lab Experiences

"Create virtual lab modules for [subject]: pre-lab safety scenarios, step-by-step virtual procedures, data collection interfaces mimicking real equipment, and post-lab analysis with peer comparison."

Case Study Co-Development

"Develop original case studies featuring [underrepresented context] for [subject]. Include: detailed backgrounds with data, multi-stakeholder perspectives, industry analysis, and teaching notes."

Performance-Based Evaluation

"Design performance-based assessments replacing traditional exams: real-world task simulations, multi-step problem-solving, collaborative challenges, and rubrics for complex skill demonstration."

Intelligent Tutoring System

"Design an AI tutoring component for [subject] OER: knowledge state assessment, adaptive hint generation, misconception diagnosis, and motivational feedback systems."

8.4 Quality Assurance & Sustainability

Pedagogical Soundness Review

"Evaluate OER on [topic] for: alignment with learning sciences, cognitive load management, multimedia learning principles, formative assessment integration, and scaffolding effectiveness. Create a review report."

Content Currency Check

"Analyze [number] OER resources on [topic] for factual currency. Categorize each as current, needs minor updates, or significantly outdated, with specific examples and suggested corrections."

Statistical Claims Validation

"Validate OER statistics: accuracy against original sources, appropriate context use, indicator currency, and proper attribution. Produce a credibility matrix."

Scientific Advancement Monitoring

"Design tracking systems for my open [subject] textbook that scan for: breakthrough publications, regulatory changes, emerging techniques, and obsolete content. Create a monitoring dashboard."

Link Rot Detection

"Develop systems for detecting: broken links, paywall emergence, deprecated resources, and alternatives. Include monitoring scripts with scheduling and automated archive integration."

8.5 Attribution, Licensing & Infrastructure

AI Use Statement

"Write a comprehensive AI use statement for my open [subject] textbook: AI tools and versions used, content AI helped create vs. human-authored, prompts for major generation, and quality control measures."

Human-AI Contribution Mapping

"Create a system to distinguish human expertise from AI assistance in my textbook: paragraph-level attribution, fact-checking responsibilities, creative vs. technical content, and pedagogical decision ownership."

Attribution Chain Documentation

"My OER builds on open resources and adds AI elements. Develop a system showing: original attributions with licenses, human modifications, AI additions, and clear statements for each layer."

Multi-Platform Export

"Create export specifications for sharing interactive [subject] OER across platforms: platform compatibility, fallback options, metadata standards, and accessibility preservation."

Community Contributor Guidelines

"Develop contribution guidelines for educators adapting my open [subject] textbook: quality standards, review processes, attribution requirements, and community code of conduct."

Sustainable Funding Models

"Develop funding models for OER sustainability beyond initial grants: institutional support arguments, community funding, value-added services, and partnership opportunities."