

RESEARCH & ACADEMIC WRITING SKILLS

Grado en Administración de Empresas / Bachelor in Business
Administration BBA SEP-2026 RESn-NBA.1.M.H1

Area Humanities

Number of sessions: 30

Academic year: 26-27

Degree course: FIRST

Number of credits: 6.0

Semester: 1º

Category: BASIC

Language: English

Professor: **MICHELLE ROCHE RODRÍGUEZ**

E-mail: mroche@faculty.ie.edu

Michelle holds a PhD in Interdisciplinary Gender Studies from Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (Cum Laude, 2022) and an M.A. in Humanities and Social Thought from New York University. She earned her B.A. in Social Communication from Universidad Católica Andrés Bello in Caracas, Venezuela, and has developed her academic career at the intersection of Cultural Studies, literary and narrative theory, gender studies, and writing pedagogy.

She has taught undergraduate and graduate courses in literary studies, creative writing, gender studies, narrative analysis, and academic writing since 2021 at institutions including Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Universidad de Sevilla, and Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Until July 2026, she served as Interim Professor of Cultural Studies at Universidad Nebrija. She joins IE School of Humanities in September 2026 as Adjunct Professor of Research & Academic Writing Skills. Michelle approaches writing as a craft rather than a talent —something that is built through practice, revision, and honest engagement with ideas— and works closely with her students so they can develop the tools to think, research, and communicate on their own terms.

Alongside her academic work, she is an recognized novelist, essayist, and literary critic. She is the author of the novel *Malasangre* (Anagrama, 2020, finalist for the Celsius and Kelvin 505 Awards) and *Gente decente* (Francisco Ayala Prize, 2017), among other titles. She contributes regularly to leading Spanish and Latin American cultural publications such as *Babelia* (El País), *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos*, *TURIA*, and *Revista de la Universidad de México*. Her

research explores narrative, identity, power, feminist thought, and contemporary Latin American cultural production from a transnational and interdisciplinary perspective.

Office Hours

Office hours will be on request. Please contact at:

mroche@faculty.ie.edu

SUBJECT DESCRIPTION

Research & Academic Writing Skills (RAWS) develops three interconnected competencies essential for academic and professional success:

- Critical Thinking
- Research Literacy
- Effective Communication

The course treats writing not merely as a final product but as a process involving questioning, researching, evaluating, synthesizing, communicating, revising, and reflecting.

It is designed to help students make the transition from the writing they were doing before university to the writing that will be expected of them in academic and professional settings.

A central component of the course is the strategic, appropriate, and ethical use of Artificial Intelligence (AI). Students learn not only how to use AI tools effectively, but also how to evaluate, verify, question, and challenge AI-generated outputs.

The course is structured around a progression from:

Thinking # Research # Writing # Applying # Communicating

Students engage with academic, professional, and public-facing forms of communication through three major projects:

- Academic Argumentative Essay
- Business Proposal

- Op-Ed

The course incorporates scaffolded written and oral/video-based activities designed to strengthen understanding, synthesis, communication, and ownership of ideas.

A note from your professor:

Welcome to RAWS. I am glad to be your professor this semester, and I want to begin by sharing how I think about the work we are about to do together.

Writing is not a gift reserved for a few; it is a craft that anyone can learn by working at it seriously. In this section of RAWS, we will treat every assignment as a small laboratory—a space to test ideas, examine evidence, argue with rigor, and revise without fear—so that by the end of the semester you can approach any writing task knowing what questions to ask yourself before you begin.

I come to this classroom as both a scholar and a working writer. Alongside my academic career, I am a novelist, essayist, and literary critic. I know these registers—the academic, the professional, and the public—from the inside, and I will share that experience with you throughout the course.

Because you are studying Business Administration, we will pay particular attention to how the same idea changes shape when it addresses an academic audience, a professional client, or the general public. Learning to move between these three registers is one of the most valuable skills you can take with you into your career.

Artificial Intelligence will be a constant companion in our work, but always under one principle: AI assists, you author. We will use these tools to think better, not to think less.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

By the end of this course, students will have developed a coherent set of skills across five interconnected areas. Progress in one reinforces progress in the others: research feeds critical thinking, critical thinking shapes writing, and writing demands communication—ethically and thoughtfully mediated by AI. Upon completing this course, students will be able to:

Research & Information Literacy

- Locate and evaluate credible sources
- Distinguish between strong and weak evidence

- Conduct academic and professional research efficiently
- Integrate sources appropriately using APA conventions
- Evaluate AI-generated information critically

Critical Thinking

- Understand how critical thinking works
- Develop focused and researchable questions
- Analyze arguments and evidence
- Identify logical fallacies, biases, and weaknesses in reasoning
- Evaluate claims generated by humans and AI systems

Writing & Communication

- Produce structured academic and professional texts
- Adapt writing to different audiences and purposes
- Develop coherent arguments supported by evidence
- Communicate clearly, concisely, and persuasively

AI & Prompting

- Design effective prompts
- Use AI as a support tool rather than a substitute for thinking
- Critically evaluate AI outputs
- Apply AI ethically and transparently

Oral Communication & Synthesis

- Explain ideas clearly in spoken form

- Synthesize research under time constraints
- Adapt communication across written and spoken formats
- Present arguments effectively to different audiences
- Demonstrate ownership and understanding of their work
- Develop skills relevant to presentations, thesis defenses, interviews, pitches, and professional communication contexts

TEACHING METHODOLOGY

Teaching Methodology

RAWS is a practical, workshop-based course. Students learn and improve through writing, discussion, research, revision, peer interaction, instructor feedback, AI-supported activities, and oral and video-based communication tasks. The course combines individual and collaborative work with workshops, Socratic discussions, presentations, oral and video assessments, and writing assignments.

Oral and video-based assessments complement discussions and written work by requiring students to synthesize, explain, defend, and communicate ideas to an audience. These activities are not evaluated on production quality or technical sophistication, but rather on understanding, organization, audience awareness, communication effectiveness, and ownership of ideas.

Video-based assessment may be implemented through assignments such as the 3MT Video Argumentative Essay and the Video Op-Ed. Equivalent oral assessment formats may be used when appropriate, provided they achieve comparable learning outcomes.

Pedagogical Principles

RAWS is guided by four interrelated convictions that shape how the classroom works day to day: active participation, Socratic dialogue, writing as a tool for critical thinking, and revision as the core of learning. In practice, these convictions translate into regular in-class discussions, debates, and a curated selection of readings drawn from contemporary fiction and essay writing, which serve as our common ground for discussion, analysis, and modeling of style. These four convictions align directly with the five pedagogical principles of the course:

1. Active Learning

Students learn by doing rather than by passively receiving information. In practice, this means that most of our class time is spent thinking out loud, writing under time constraints, holding structured debates on the readings, and testing ideas together. Attendance matters, but presence matters more: showing up to a RAWs session means being ready to contribute, question, and take intellectual risks in front of others.

2. Scaffolded Development

Major assignments are supported by smaller tasks that progressively develop skills and understanding. We approach writing as a tool for thinking, not only as a way to report conclusions already reached. To sharpen that practice, we will read short works of contemporary fiction and essays alongside our assignments—not as literary objects to be admired, but as living examples of how skilled writers build arguments, handle evidence, structure prose, and address different audiences. Every scaffolded task—topic proposal, annotated bibliography, interview design, video pitch—is designed so that the act of writing sharpens the argument, forces evidence to the surface, and reveals what the writer does not yet know.

3. Feedback-Driven Improvement

Students receive feedback (collective and individual) throughout the semester. In this section, revision is treated as the core of learning, not as an optional polish at the end. No first draft is a finished draft: every text is expected to grow through instructor comments, peer review, and self-editing. Learning to revise—to cut, restructure, defend, or abandon parts of one's own writing—is one of the most important skills students will take from this course.

4. Responsible AI Integration

Students learn to use AI critically, appropriately, transparently, and ethically. We treat AI-generated content as one more voice at the seminar table: useful, sometimes surprising, and always subject to questioning. The Socratic habit of asking why, on what evidence, and compared to what applies as strictly to an AI output as to any published source.

5. Multiple Modes of Communication

Students demonstrate learning through written, oral, visual, and digital formats. In this section, Socratic dialogue is the connective tissue across all of them: whether we are workshopping an essay, defending a business proposal, debating a reading, or recording a 3MT video, the same underlying practice applies — examining a claim from multiple angles, listening carefully to counterarguments, and refining one's position in public.

The following distribution reflects the workshop-based nature of RAWS. In-class time is balanced between short lectures, structured discussions, and applied exercises, while the largest share of student time is invested in individual reading, writing, and revision —the core practices through which the course's learning objectives are achieved.

Learning Activity	Weighting	Estimated time a student should dedicate to prepare for and participate in
Lectures	10.0 %	15.0 hours
Discussions	20.0 %	30.0 hours
Exercises in class, Asynchronous sessions, Field Work	20.0 %	30.0 hours
Group work	14.7 %	22.0 hours
Individual studying	35.3 %	53.0 hours
TOTAL	100.0 %	150.0 hours

AI POLICY

AI POLICY

1. IE University's Framework on AI in Learning

At IE University, learning is not just about results —it is about the journey, personal growth, and the pursuit of mastery. Students are the primary agents in their own education, and are expected to take full ownership of that journey: acquiring fundamental knowledge, shaping critical thinking, and developing the judgment needed to thrive in an ever-evolving environment.

AI tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, Copilot, and others can be valuable partners in this journey, but how and why students use them matters. IE encourages the critical and responsible exploration of AI to deepen learning, not to bypass it. Students are expected to:

- Explore the appropriate and ethical use of AI to support and challenge —not replace— their thinking.
- Develop digital literacy and advanced AI collaboration skills for the workplace.

- Understand the broader implications of AI: energy and water consumption, inequity of access, the digital divide, and the biased "reality" and hallucinations these systems may produce.
- Faculty may restrict or prohibit AI in specific assignments to support skill-building in research, critical thinking, academic writing, and synthesis. These are intentional "AI-free zones", and must be respected. Misuse will be considered academic misconduct.

2. RAWS Course Policy — What Applies in This Section

AI assists. You author.

Students remain fully responsible for the accuracy, integrity, quality, and originality of all submitted work. The IE University Student Guidelines on AI (July 2025) apply fully in this course. Adapted to RAWS, they operate as follows:

DO	DON'T
Use AI to brainstorm, outline, or explore research questions.	Submit unedited AI-generated content as your own work.
Use AI to revise language, tone, or clarity, and to proofread.	Present AI-generated reasoning as independent analysis.
Use AI to test your ideas, get feedback, or simulate discussions.	Use AI to avoid engaging with your readings, writing, or team projects.
Ask AI to quiz you or offer alternative perspectives on a topic.	Use AI to generate content on a topic you do not understand.
Critically evaluate every AI output and verify facts, statistics, and sources independently.	Trust AI at face value: hallucinations and bias are still common.
Adapt AI-generated content so that final submissions reflect your own reasoning.	Use fabricated or unverifiable sources produced by AI.

Transparently document and reflect on your AI use.	Fail to disclose or document AI use when required.
--	--

Please note: The appropriateness of AI use may vary by assignment and module.

Required documentation

All major assignments permitting or requiring AI use must include:

- **AI Use Log** — a table listing: tool used, purpose, what AI generated, what the student changed/accepted/rejected, and why.
- **AI Reflection Paragraph** — written by the student, addressing where AI helped, where it failed, what was rejected or modified, and what was learned. If AI was permitted but ultimately not used, this decision should be explained here.
- **AI Documentation Link (optional)** — a shared document with key prompts, outputs, and notes on what was retained, revised, or rejected.

Academic integrity

Using AI transparently and responsibly will not result in a grade penalty. Misrepresentation, misuse, or failure to disclose required AI use may constitute academic misconduct and will be handled under IE's academic integrity policies.

Rule of thumb: If you cannot explain how something was produced, why it was included, or why you believe it is accurate, do not submit it.

Further reference: For the full institutional framework, please consult the [IE University Student Guidelines on AI \(July 2025\)](#) and the [IE Policies on Artificial Intelligence](#).

A note from your professor:

In RAWs, I want you to think of AI as a thinking partner, not a ghostwriter. Use it to sharpen your questions, test your assumptions, and stress-test your drafts—but never to replace the moment when you sit with a difficult idea and figure out what

you actually think about it. That moment is not an obstacle to skip; it is the whole point of the course.

Remember: AI is one more voice at the seminar table. Like any other voice, it deserves to be listened to, questioned, contrasted with other sources, and, when necessary, respectfully disagreed with. If you can explain and defend every decision behind your text —why this argument, why this source, why this word—you are using AI well. If you cannot, pause and rebuild rather than submit work you cannot own.

The AI Use Log and the AI Reflection Paragraph are not bureaucratic add-ons. They are among the most instructive parts of the process, because they force you to look at your own thinking from the outside. Take them seriously and they will make you a sharper writer.

PROGRAM

SESSION 1 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

Diagnostic & Group Calibration: Introduction to RAWs, calibration of the group's writing baseline, and shared setting of expectations for the semester.

In-class activities include a walk-through of the syllabus and a diagnostic writing exercise to see how each student writes today, so we can measure progress.

Homework:

- Read the full syllabus.
- Bring to S2 a written 200-word response to the question: What does “critical thinking” mean to you today, before this course begins?
- AI use level: AI-free zone. The diagnostic must reflect the student's current abilities without assistance.

SESSION 2 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

MODULE 0 — Critical Thinking, AI & Prompting

Focus of the module: How critical thinking works + effective prompting as the foundation of everything that follows.

S2 Critical Thinking & AI

We will discuss what critical thinking actually is—and what it is not—in an age when AI can produce fluent-sounding answers on demand. Students will be introduced to logical fallacies, biases, and the difference between argument and opinion. We will also examine the key operations of critical thinking: analyzing, evaluating, inferring, and questioning.

Article: On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots (FAccT '21, March 3–10, 2021, Virtual Event, Canada)

In-class activities:

- Debate (20 min): small groups compare their 200-word homework responses and negotiate a shared definition of critical thinking; each group defends its version.
- Fallacy hunt (30 min): in pairs, students identify logical fallacies in a small selection of AI-generated paragraphs prepared by the instructor.
- Group synthesis: what did AI get right, what did it get wrong, and how did we know the difference?

AI use level: Level 2 (guided use). Students are asked to generate AI content in order to critique it.

Suggested reading before class:

Read at least Sections 1–5 (pp. 610–615) and Section 8 (“Conclusion,” p. 619) from Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021), “On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big?” #. We will not address Sections 6 and 7 in S2, but we will return to them in S3. See the reading material listed under S2.

Homework:

- Come to S3 with one AI-generated paragraph on a topic of interest and three critical questions you would ask about it.

SESSION 3 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S3 Flipped Classroom on AI — Activation

Hands-on activation of AI tools. Students bring their own prompts and outputs; the class functions as a shared laboratory.

In-class activities:

- Show-and-tell round (30 min): each student presents their AI paragraph and the three critical questions from homework; the class evaluates prompt quality, output quality, and questioning quality.
- Prompt lab (40 min): structured exercise on prompt engineering. Same topic, different prompts, comparative outputs. What changes when we change the prompt?
- Discussion: When does AI actually help you think? When does it think for you?
- Remedy against the “Stochastic Parrots”: Applying critical thinking to AI.
- Brief introduction to the AI Use Log template that will accompany major assignments.

AI use level: Level 3 (open, with documentation).

Reading before class:

- Read the remaining sections of Bender et al. (2021), *“On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big?”* (pp. 616–623).

Homework:

- Draft a first version of the AI Use Log documenting the prompts and outputs generated in class.

SESSION 4 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S4 AI, Prompting & Intro to Academic Writing and Research

First contact with academic writing conventions and the shape of an academic argument. We will discuss how effective critical thinking helps you to make an academic argument. Also, we will talk about the uses of effective prompting in research, and its parallel with research questions. A good prompt and a good research question ask the same thing: what exactly do I want to know, and from whom?

Also, we will talk about the Academic Argumentative Essay project, deliverables, and timeline.

In-class activities:

- Make three groups and discuss Ambrose Bierce's short stories. Ask yourselves: What are they about? How do they relate to what we have learned about critical thinking? Why is it important to read them now?
- Workshop (30 min): in pairs, students convert three vague topic ideas into (a) a strong research question and (b) a strong prompt. Comparative discussion.
- Introduction to academic writing conventions: register, evidence, citation, argumentative structure.

AI use level: Level 2 (guided use). AI may be used to test and refine research questions, but not to draft argumentative content.

Reading before class:

Choose one of the following 3-min-reading short stories by Ambrose Bierce, to discuss next class. Better if you read them all :

"A man with two lives"

"One summer night", or:

"A Wireless Message".

Bierce, A. (n.d.). *A man with two lives; A wireless message; One summer night*. Short Edition. Retrieved from <https://short-edition.com/en/classic/author/ambrose-bierce>

Homework:

- Brainstorm 3 possible topics for the Argumentative Essay
- Draft a preliminary research question for each topic.

Other / Complementary Documentation: A man with two lives; A wireless message; One summer night (N/C)

SESSION 5 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

MODULE 1 — Academic Argumentative Writing

In this module focus, we will be focusing on building structured arguments, from research question to finished essay, and to 3-minute video defense.

S5 Research: Organization, Finding & Citing Sources (APA)

We will get to know academic research as a structured process: where credible sources live, how to organize them, and why citation is not a formality but a form of thinking. The main focus of this session will be the research funnel (from broad topic # to focused question # to keywords # resources).

AI use level: Level 2 (guided use). AI may be used to test whether a research question is too broad or too narrow, but not to generate sources.

In-class activities:

- Possible IE Library guided tour (30 min): presentation of e-resources relevant to RAWS (EBSCOhost, JSTOR, Factiva, ProQuest). Live search demo with a sample topic. (To be coordinated in advance with the IE Library team.)
- Applied exercise (20 min): in pairs, students conduct a first search on one of their brainstormed topics and identify three sources of different quality. Group discussion: how do we know which is strongest?
- Introduction to APA 7 basics: reference vs. in-text citation. Handout distributed.

Reading before class:

Recommended (optional): Hyman, G. & Schulman, M. (2015). Thinking on the Page, Chapter 11 ("Research"). Available on Blackboard.

-

AI use level: Level 2 (guided use). AI may be used to test whether a research question is too broad or too narrow, but not to generate sources.

Homework:

- Refine the three preliminary topics from S4 based on today's searches.
- Bring to S6 (asynch) the topic proposal with one draft research question per topic.

SESSION 6 (ASYNCHRONOUS)

We will be focusing on brainstorming and formulation of the research question that will drive the semester's main essay.

AI use level: Level 2 (guided use). Documented use required.

Reading before class:

Hyman, G. & Schulman, M. (2015). Thinking on the Page, Chapter 5 ("Asking Questions, Generating Ideas"). Available on Blackboard. Purpose: practical toolkit to move from a broad topic to a strong research question. Directly supports the Topic Proposal deliverable.

-

Deliverable (submitted via Blackboard):

- Topic Proposal (500 words) including:
- The chosen topic and why it matters to the student.
- Three possible research questions on the topic.
- One "final" research question selected among the three, with a short justification.
- Three preliminary sources (with full APA references).
- AI Use Log + AI Reflection Paragraph if AI was used at any stage.

Instructor feedback: Individual written feedback via Blackboard within one week, focused on the viability of the research question.

SESSION 7 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

We will focus on how to integrate other voices into your own argument without losing your own. The ethics and craft of the three moves — quote, paraphrase, summarize or QPS — and when each is appropriate.

AI use level: Level 1 (limited use). QPS is a foundational skill that must be developed by hand.

In-class activities:

- **Hands-on workshop:** students receive a single dense paragraph and must produce (a) a direct quotation, (b) a paraphrase, (c) a summary, all correctly cited in APA. Peer exchange and instructor feedback.

Reading before class:

- A short excerpt (~2 pages) selected by the instructor from a peer-reviewed article on any topic — to be used as raw material for the workshop.
- Recommended (optional): Hyman, G. & Schulman, M. (2015). Thinking on the Page, Chapter 3 ("Doing Analysis"). Available on Blackboard.

Homework:

Return to the three preliminary sources from the Topic Proposal and produce, for each, a paraphrase + a summary + one selected quote. Bring to S8.

SESSION 8 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S8 Essay Structure & Thesis Statements

We will focus on how an academic argument is built, by addressing the anatomy of an argumentative essay — thesis, mapping, evidence, counter-argument, synthesis. the main question we will answer in this session is: What makes a thesis actually arguable?

In-class activities:

- Reverse-engineering workshop (35 min): in groups, students map the assigned reading — What is the thesis? Where does it appear? How is the argument organized? What is the strongest piece of evidence?
- Group synthesis on the board.
- Thesis lab (20 min): each student writes three versions of a thesis statement for their own essay, from weak to strong. Peer critique in pairs.

AI use level: Level 2 (guided use). AI may be used to stress-test thesis statements ("what would a critic say against this?"), not to draft them.

Reading before class:

- Hyman, G. & Schulman, M. (2015). Thinking on the Page, Chapter 4 ("What Is an Essay?") — required. Also, Chapter 9 ("Claim Drafts") is recommended (optional). Available on Blackboard. Purpose: conceptual framework of the academic essay. This is the "operating manual" for the model text below.
- Will Storr, The Science of Storytelling (2019), Chapter 2 ("The Flawed Self"). Purpose: model of how a strong thesis is defended through cumulative evidence — the concepts from Hyman & Schulman put into practice.

Homework:

Write a first version of your thesis statement for the Argumentative Essay. Bring to S9.

Book Chapters: The science of Storytelling (N/C)

SESSION 9 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S9 Introductions & Conclusions

We will focus on how an essay opens and how it closes — the two places where a reader decides whether to trust the writer. We will learn the typology of introductions (hook, context, thesis) and conclusions (synthesis, implications, opening). Be prepared to debate if first sentences really matter.

In-class activities:

Comparative reading workshop: in groups, students analyze the openings and closings of the assigned Zadie Smith essay and of two anonymized student essays from previous years. What works, what does not, and why?

Writing sprint and in-class peer exchange. Writing sprint (20 min): each student writes an introduction and a conclusion for their own essay based on the current thesis statement. In-class peer exchange.

AI use level: Level 2 (guided use). AI may be used to explore alternative openings /closings, but the final version must be written by the student.

Reading before class:

One short essay from: Smith, Z. (2018). *Feel free: essays*. Penguin Books.

Homework:

Read and annotate three peer-reviewed articles on the essay topic in preparation for the Annotated Bibliography (Asynch 2) due at S10.

Book Chapters: Feel Free (N/C)

SESSION 10 (ASYNCHRONOUS)

S10 Asynchronous Task 2 — Annotated Bibliography

We will focus on the research base of the essay. The AB is the moment where the student demonstrates control over sources.

Deliverable (submitted via Blackboard):

Annotated Bibliography with minimum 6 sources:

- Full APA reference for each source.
- A 150-word annotation per source covering: (a) main argument, (b) type of evidence used, (c) relevance to the student's essay, (d) limitations.
- At least three sources must be peer-reviewed academic articles.
- Maximum one source may be AI-generated summary of a real article (documented).
- AI Use Log + Reflection Paragraph.

AI use level: Level 2 (guided use). AI may be used to check the quality of annotations, not to write them.

SESSION 11 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S11 Argumentation, Evidence & Steel-Manning Debate

We will focus on how to build an argument that resists scrutiny — and how to genuinely understand the argument on the other side.

AI use level: Level 2 (guided use). AI may help research the opposing position or stress-test arguments, but not draft the pre-debate piece or the reflection.

In-class activities:

- Brief intro (5 min): rules of the steel-manning debate. Reminder: we argue to think, not to win. Distribution of the observer rubric.
- Simultaneous group preparation (15 min): the class is organized into 3 groups of 10 (5 vs 5 per topic). Each subgroup prepares 3 arguments + 3 supporting sources + 1 anticipated counter-argument. The instructor circulates and coaches.
- Three consecutive debates (15 min each · 45 min total):
 - Debate 1 · Topic A: 5 vs 5 · opening statements (2 min per side) # rebuttals (1.5 min per side) # moderated cross-questions (6 min) # closing statements (1 min per side).
 - Debate 2 · Topic B: same format.
 - Debate 3 · Topic C: same format.
- The 20 non-debating students take structured notes using the observer rubric.
- Individual reflection + whole-group debrief (10 min): "What did I understand about the other side that I did not understand before?" Brief oral synthesis.

Reading before class:

Pre-debate written piece (300–400 words) submitted 48 hours before class, defending the position the student actually holds.

Homework:

- After-Debate Reflection (400 words): which counter-argument was strongest, how did it shift your position, and how will you integrate it into your Argumentative Essay?
- Produce a first full draft of the Argumentative Essay (1.500–2.000 words). Bring to S12.

Technical note: MATERIAL 1 · Pre-Debate Piece (N/C)

Technical note: MATERIAL 2 · Observer Rubric (N/C)

Technical note: MATERIAL 3 · After-Debate Reflection (N/C)

SESSION 12 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S12 · Style

Style is not decoration, it is a way of thinking. In this session we will learn what style is and is not. Also we will learn sentence-level choices and their argumentative consequences. Economy, precision, rhythm, register.

In-class activities:

- Bierce close-reading workshop (30 min): paragraph-by-paragraph analysis of the assigned tale. What does Bierce cut? What does he leave in? How does an acidic, tight prose argue even in fiction?
- Rewriting sprint (25 min): each student picks one paragraph from their own first draft (produced as homework for S11) and rewrites it three times: (a) shorter by 30%, (b) with stronger verbs, (c) with a completely different rhythm. Peer exchange.
- AI as style tester (15 min): students run one paragraph through AI to compare stylistic revisions; discussion on what AI does well and where it flattens voice.
- AI use level: Level 3 (open with documentation). Explicit stylistic experimentation with AI is encouraged in this session, precisely to observe its limits.

Reading before class:

Bierce, A. (n.d.). A man with two lives; A wireless message; One summer night. Short Édition. Retrieved from <https://short-edition.com/en/classic/author/ambrose-bierce>

Homework:

Revise the first full draft applying today's style principles. Bring updated draft to S13.

SESSION 13 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S13 Workshop: APA Format & Last-Minute Reminders

the focus in this session will be APA in action: formal presentation, and last-minute doubts.

In-class activities:

- APA “laboratory”: students bring their essays with all in-text citations and reference list; instructor and peers diagnose and fix APA problems live. Common errors are noted on the board.
- Cross-analysis of the assigned reading: how does a peer-reviewed article of this type handle citation, references, and formal presentation? What can students imitate?
- Q&A round: open floor for final questions on formatting, deadlines, submission, Turnitin, and required AI documentation.
- Turnitin protocol reminder: the essay will be submitted via Turnitin; flagged results will be reviewed with the professor.

Reading before class:

- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big? #. FAccT '21. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922> — read sections 4, 5, and 6 only.
- Model of formal academic writing (real APA-formatted references in action).

Homework:

- Final revision of the essay incorporating APA corrections + all feedback received.
- AI use level: Level 2 (guided use). AI may be used for proofreading, not for content changes at this stage.

SESSION 14 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S14 Wrapping up Academic Writing & the Argumentative Essay

In this session we will focus on the consolidation and preparation for the 3MT video. The transition from written argument to spoken argument. we will begin by having a whole-group synthesis on what have we learned in Module 1. Also, we will build together a mind map of key concepts.

In-class activities:

- Introduction to the 3MT format (Three Minute Thesis): origin, examples, evaluation criteria. Viewing of two model 3MT videos + brief group critique.
- Elevator-pitch lab: each student presents their essay's central argument in 90 seconds to a peer. Peer gives immediate feedback: what came through, what got lost, what surprised.
- Script sprint: each student drafts a first version of the 3MT script.

AI use level: Level 2 (guided use). AI may be used to test the script's clarity, not to generate the script.

Reading/watching before class:

- Zakaria, F. (2026, June 26). To beat socialists and populists, liberalism must get radical. The Washington Post. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2026/06/27/why-liberalism-is-losing-socialists-populists/>
- CNN. (2026, July 4). The two deep failures of modern liberalism | Fareed's take [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tTpwVCC2So>

Homework:

- Prepare and record the 3MT Video Argumentative Essay (Asynch 3), due at S15.
- Submit the final Argumentative Essay via Turnitin by the announced deadline.

Article: To beat socialists and populists, liberalism must get radical. (N/C)

Multimedia Material: The two deep failures of modern liberalism | Fareed's take [Video]. YouTube. (N/C)

SESSION 15 (ASYNCHRONOUS)

S15 · Asynchronous Task 3 — 3MT Video Argumentative Essay

This is an individual video-based synthesis of the essay's central argument. Please, beware that the focus of the evaluation is understanding, organization, audience awareness, communication effectiveness, and ownership of ideas, not production quality or technical sophistication.

Deliverable (submitted via Screencastify Submit or equivalent, linked in Blackboard):

- 3-minute video in which the student:
- States the research question.
- Presents the thesis.
- Offers the single strongest piece of evidence.
- Anticipates and responds to the strongest counter-argument (drawing on Steel-Manning Debate insights).
- Closes with the implications of the argument.
- One-page script (also uploaded).
- AI Use Log and Reflection Paragraph.

AI use level: Level 2 (guided use). Documented use required.

Submission: Argumentative Essay (25% of course grade) — deadline set at S14.

SESSION 16 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

MODULE 2 — Professional Writing & Business Proposal

The focus of this module focus is moving from academic to professional writing. We will learn about persuasion, audience, evidence, and structure in the service of action, and not only demonstration.

AI use: Level 3 (Open Collaboration). Students are encouraged to collaborate with AI across the writing, research, and design process, always with mandatory documentation (this means: AI Use Log and Reflection Paragraph).

Final deliverables:

- Business Proposal (20% of course grade), submitted at S23.
- Video Pitch (Asynch 5), submitted at S23.

- Alien Entrepreneurs Pitch performed in class at S24.

S16 From Academic to Professional Writing: Business Module Intro (Business Proposals)

This session marks the pivot from academic to professional writing. We will explore what changes when we stop writing to demonstrate understanding and start writing to move a reader to action, debate whether all professional writing is ultimately persuasion, and examine the six shifts that define the transition: audience, purpose, structure, tone, evidence, and call to action.

We will discuss what a business proposal actually contains, and why each section exists. Also, we will study the standard structure of a business proposal: executive summary, problem statement, proposed solution, methodology, timeline, budget, expected outcomes, appendices. What each section does, what it does not do.

AI use: Level 3 Open Collaboration. Students are encouraged to collaborate with AI across the writing, research, and design process, always with mandatory documentation (this means: AI Use Log, and reflection paragraph).

In-class activities:

- Comparative reading workshop (30 min): in groups, students compare a paragraph from the Argumentative Essay just submitted (their own or a peer's, anonymized) with a paragraph from the Graeber reading. What is preserved? What changes? What would need to change if the same content became a business document?
- Bridge to the module: presentation of the Business Proposal project, the Video Pitch (Asynch 5), the Alien Entrepreneurs Pitch (S24), deliverables, and timeline.

Reading before class:

- Graeber, D. (2013, August). On the phenomenon of bullshit jobs: A work rant. Strike! Magazine, 3. <https://strikemag.org/bullshit-jobs/>
- Recommended (optional): Hyman & Schulman, Thinking on the Page (2015), Chapter 6 ("Idea Threads"). Purpose: practical toolkit to link scattered ideas into a coherent argumentative thread, critical for a proposal that must move from problem to solution to action.

Homework:

- Brainstorm three possible topics for the Business Proposal. Each topic must respond to a real problem worth solving, with an identifiable audience and stakeholder. Bring to S17.
- Executive summary lab: each student drafts a first executive summary (250 words max) for their favorite of the three topics brainstormed. Peer exchange in pairs: does the summary make the reader want to read the rest?
- Announcement of Asynch Task 4 (Business Proposal Topic and Preliminary Research), due at S18.

Article: On the phenomenon of bullshit jobs: A work rant. (N/C)

SESSION 17 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S17 Critical Thinking: Fake News and Statistics

In this session we will learn how to detect, avoid, and dismantle unreliable data before using it in professional writing. We will study the typology of misinformation—fabrication, manipulation, selection bias, decontextualization, and statistical distortion—and introduce Cialdini's principles of influence as a diagnostic lens for spotting manipulation: Reciprocity, Commitment & Consistency, Social Proof, Authority, Liking, Scarcity, and Unity. This session also marks the kick-off of the semester-long Alien Entrepreneurs group project.

AI use level: 3.

In-class activities:

- Opening exercise: “Spot the fake.” Students receive a set of statistics and headlines (some real, some fabricated, some misleading — including AI-generated ones). Individual guesses # group discussion on how they knew.
 - **Alien Entrepreneurs kick-off:** Groups of students are formed, and each is introduced to the **Alien Entrepreneurs project**. They will step into the shoes of alien entrepreneurs planning to establish a business on Earth, and will conduct qualitative interviews (S19–S20), a quantitative survey (S21–S22), prepare a slideshow (S22), and deliver a 5–6 min live group pitch in S24.
- 1) Each group creates a shared Google Doc with all members' names and shares it with the instructor. All project work will live in that document. 2) In-class brainstorming (DIY first): each group begins to identify a business concept for their alien venture on Earth. The concept must be unique — no more alien nightclubs, no more alien cafés (used as an example). Groups discuss what makes their concept distinctive and appealing to Earthlings.

Reading before class:

- Cialdini, R. B. (2001). Harnessing the science of persuasion. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(9), 72–79. (posted on Blackboard).
- Newman, N., Ross Arguedas, A., Robertson, C. T., Fletcher, R., & Nielsen, R. K. (2026). Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2026 — Executive Summary only. <https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/digital-news-report/2026/dnr-executive-summary>
- Word Document: Alien Entrepreneurs 2026 - Qualitative Interview, Quantitative Survey & Group Pitch
- Recommended (optional): PRSA Misinformation & Disinformation Toolkit. <https://www.prsa.org/professional-development/prsa-resources/misinformation>

Homework:

- Prepare Asynchronous Task 4 (Business Proposal Brief) for S18.
- Alien Entrepreneurs (group): continue brainstorming the business concept in the shared Google Doc. Come to S19 with a defined concept and a first draft of what makes it unique
- Audit any statistic or claim already collected for the Business Proposal — is every source credible? Would it survive a fact-checker?WA

Practical Case: Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2026 (29bdcc65-c534-4a09-85c8-f09389529d53)

Article: HARNESSING THE SCIENCE OF PERSUASION (HBR ONPOINT ENHANCED EDITION) (7915-PDF-ENG)

Multimedia Material: PRSA Misinformation & Disinformation Toolkit. (N/C)

Technical note: ALIEN ENTREPRENEURS RAWS 2026 (Getting started) (N/C)

SESSION 18 (ASYNCHRONOUS)

S18 Asynchronous Task 4 — Business Proposal Topic

Individual work defining the Business Proposal project and gathering the first evidence base.

Deliverable (submitted via Blackboard)

- Business Proposal Brief (600 words) including:

- o Problem statement (2–3 sentences) — what problem does this proposal address?
- o Audience & stakeholders (2–3 sentences) — who receives this proposal, and why should they act on it?
- Preliminary proposed solution (100 words).
- Executive summary draft (v.1) (250 words).
- Three preliminary sources with full APA references — a mix of at least one academic source, one industry/professional source (HBR, McKinsey, industry report), and one primary source (interview, survey, direct observation).
- AI Use Log + AI Reflection Paragraph.

Instructor feedback: Individual written feedback via Blackboard within one week.

SESSION 19 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S19 Qualitative Research: Theory & Methodology

In this session we will learn how to generate primary qualitative evidence and master the art of asking the right question. We will examine what qualitative research is and is not, when it is appropriate for a business proposal, and the ethical basics that frame it: consent, anonymity, and honesty about the purpose of the interview.

AI use level: 3

In-class activities:

- Interview design workshop: in pairs, students design a 5-question semi-structured interview guide for their individual Business Proposal topic. Peer critique: are the questions leading? Open? Answerable?

· Alien Entrepreneurs:

Interview design (30 min): each group of 3–4 uses the shared Google Doc to design their group interview guide of 4–6 open-ended questions for the Alien Entrepreneurs project. Instructor circulates to review and refine.

Finalize business concept in the shared Google Doc.

Draft the 4–6 open-ended interview questions the whole group will use to interview Earthlings.

AI may be used to test and refine interview questions. For the group project: TOTAL transparency required. Mandatory AI Use Log + Reflection Paragraph in the annex of the group's Google Doc.

Confirm the Google Doc is shared with the instructor.

Reading before class:

- Imperial College London. (n.d.). Best practice for interviews. Centre for Higher Education Research and Scholarship. <https://www.imperial.ac.uk/education-research/evaluation/tools-and-resources-for-evaluation/interviews/best-practice-for-interviews/>
- Purpose: tips on how to conduct a semi-structured interview well; directly relevant to the Alien Entrepreneurs group project.
- Interview protocol: New residents focus group. (n.d.). [Interview protocol, unpublished document].

Homework:

- Individual: refine your own interview guide.
- **Alien Entrepreneurs (group)**: finalize the 4–6 group interview questions. Each group member will conduct 2 interviews using these questions before S20 (with a classmate from another group, playing alien/Earthling roles alternately). Interviews must be voice-recorded with prior consent.

Other / Complementary Documentation: Interview protocol (N/C)

Multimedia Material: Best practice for interviews (Centre for Higher Education Research and Scholarship) (N/C)

SESSION 20 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S20 Applied Qualitative Research Workshop

This session moves from interview to evidence. We will practice how to extract insight from qualitative data, quote and paraphrase responsibly, cite sources in APA within a business document, and translate human voices into professional argument —always with careful attention to the ethical use of others' words.

In-class activities:

Interview debrief: in small groups, students share what their interviews revealed. What surprised them? What confirmed the hypothesis? What contradicted it?

Alien Entrepreneurs (Interview transcription & analysis): groups work on their Google Doc to transcribe interviews (AI transcription permitted with documentation) and write a group summary of findings answering the reflection prompts.

Alien Entrepreneurs (group project) Part 1 due

- Deliverable in the shared Google Doc:
- Business concept (defined and justified).
- Interview guide (4–6 open-ended questions).
- Full transcripts of all interviews conducted (with subject name, date, time).
- Group summary of findings.
- Reflection answering: What was the best/most effective question? The least useful? What question did you not ask that you should have? Did you ask any question you should not have? Are the results useful/conclusive? Do they support your project's intention?
- Grade: 20 pts (6% of course grade).

Homework:

- Individual: continue drafting the Business Proposal.
- Alien Entrepreneurs (group): finalize Part 1 deliverable in Google Doc by end of week.

SESSION 21 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S21 Quantitative Research — Working with Data

We will study the types of quantitative evidence relevant to business writing (descriptive statistics, industry data, market research, benchmarking). Also, we will

learn where to find them (IE Library: Statista, Euromonitor Passport, Factiva, Bloomberg). Live demo.

AI use level: 3.

In-class activities:

Data hunt workshop: in pairs, students search for one credible statistic that supports (or challenges) their individual Business Proposal argument. Peer critique of source quality.

Alien Entrepreneurs: Survey design theory (30 min): groups begin designing their Google Forms survey (8–10 closed-ended questions) for the Alien Entrepreneurs project. Focus on question design: clarity, avoidance of leading questions, mix of multiple choice

- Draft first version of the Google Forms survey (8–10 questions) in the group's Google Doc; prepare to deploy in S22.

Reading before class:

USC Libraries. (n.d.). Qualitative methods. In Organizing your social sciences research paper. University of Southern California. <https://libguides.usc.edu/writingguide/qualitative>

Purpose: overview of qualitative methodology and its role in academic and professional research.

Homework:

- Individual: integrate at least two quantitative sources into the Business Proposal draft. Bring to S22.
- Alien Entrepreneurs (group): finalize survey design; be ready to deploy in S22.

Technical note: Qualitative methods. In Organizing your social sciences research paper (University of Southern California) (f0ebb5d9-ce86-4e81-87a9-efcc3d809deb)

SESSION 22 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S22 Applied Quantitative Research Workshop

This session moves from quantitative theory to applied practice. We will work with real data—including our own survey results—to interpret findings, present them visually, and translate numbers into the argument of a business proposal, always

with careful attention to the ethical use of statistics and to what the numbers can and cannot say.

AI use level: 3

In-class activities:

- Data debrief: groups bring the first responses from their Alien Entrepreneurs survey. Live check-in: how many responses so far? Any surprises? Any question that is not working?

Applied workshop:

Individual Business Proposal: each student takes the two quantitative sources integrated in the previous session and produces (a) one clean table + (b) one clean graph for their Business Proposal. Peer critique of clarity and honesty.

Alien Entrepreneurs: groups continue collecting responses (target: 20+ by end of week), fill out other groups' surveys, and begin drafting the pitch slides in the shared Google Doc.

- Continue survey deployment to minimum 20 respondents.
- Fill out other groups' surveys in reciprocity.
- Begin pitch slides in the shared Google Doc (business concept, qualitative findings from Part 1, preliminary quantitative findings from Part 2 in progress).

Homework:

Individual: finalize the Business Proposal draft (2.000–2.500 words) for submission at S23. Include the polished table and graph produced today.

Alien Entrepreneurs (group): collect at least 20 survey responses by end of week; analyze data via Google Forms graphs, and Google Sheet export; complete slides.

SESSION 23 (ASYNCHRONOUS)

S23 Individual Business Proposal and Survey Questions Submission

Submission of individual deliverables and finalization of Alien Entrepreneurs slides for the live pitch.

AI use level: 3.

In-class activities:

- Intro to the Video Pitch format (Asynch 5): through-line, hook, structure, timing (based on Anderson).
- **Script sprint:** each student drafts a first version of their Video Pitch script.
- **Alien Entrepreneurs data workshop:** groups analyze survey data (Google Forms graphs + Sheets export), integrate findings into their pitch slides. Instructor reviews slides live.
 - o Submit in the shared Google Doc:
 - o Google Form link.
 - o Survey questions.
 - o Data analysis (graphs + Sheet export).
 - o Interpretation: does the data support or challenge initial assumptions? How is the concept refined?
 - o AI Use Log + Reflection Paragraph (annex).

Grade: 20 pts (6% of course grade).

Reading before class:

Anderson, C. (2016). TED Talks, Chapters 6 ("Through-Line") and 15 ("Preparation Process"): <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/bibliotecaie-ebooks/reader.action?docID=29437226&c=RVBVQg&ppg=1>

Individual deliverables due (Asynch 5)

(a) Business Proposal (20% of course grade): 2,000–2,500 words; standard structure; minimum 6 sources (2 academic + 2 professional + 1 primary + 1 quantitative); Turnitin; AI Use Log + Reflection mandatory.

(b) Video Pitch (3 min): It must include a hook, the problem, the solution, and a call to action. One-page script should be uploaded with the AI Use Log and reflection, if used.

Homework

Alien Entrepreneurs (group): rehearse the live pitch for S24. Every member must speak.

Book Chapters: Anderson, C. (2016). TED Talks, Chapters 6 ("Through-Line") and 15 ("Preparation Process") (N/C)

SESSION 24 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S24 Wrapping up the Business Module (Alien Entrepreneurs Pitch)

This is the culmination of the module, integrating qualitative and quantitative research with persuasive communication in a 5–6 minute performance.

AI use level: 1.

In-class activities (Business Proposal submission and discussion)

- Live pitches: each group of 3–4 delivers a 5–6 min pitch with slides. All members must speak. 1-min Q&A after each pitch from "alien investors" + instructor.
- Debrief: what worked and why? Which pitch was most persuasive?

Alien Entrepreneurs Part 3 delivered:

- 5–6 min live group pitch with slides.
- Structure: introduction · problem/opportunity · solution (features + benefits) · market potential + competitive landscape · call to action.
- Evaluation criteria (10 pts)

Criterion	Points
Clarity of message	2

Content (product details, market understanding, argument) 2

Persuasiveness / Argumentation 2

Presentation (delivery, tone, nonverbal) 2

Originality & Creativity 2

Grade: 10 pts (3% of course grade).

Total Alien Entrepreneurs project grade: 50 pts internal (15% of course grade).

Homework

- Individual reflection paragraph (300 words): "What did I learn about persuasion by pitching and by watching my classmates pitch?" Submitted via Blackboard within 3 days.

SESSION 25 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S25 Writing for Larger Audiences (Op-Eds)

In this session we will make the transition from academic and professional writing to public-facing writing. What an op-ed is, who reads it, and why it works.

AI use level: 3.

In-class activities

- Module map: from expert to public voice; what changes in audience, tone, evidence.
- Anatomy of an op-ed: hook, thesis, argument, counterargument, kicker. Length and register.

- NYT close read: one recent op-ed, dissected live.

Reading before class:

- Flores, A. R. *"Latino Americans Are in Shock. Can Democrats Finally Do Something?"* *The New York Times*, Opinion (2026). <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/07/17/opinion/latino-voter-democrats-immigration-trump.html>
- Seglin, J. L. (2018). *How to write an op-ed or column*. Harvard Kennedy School, Shorenstein Center on Media, Politics and Public Policy, Communications Program. https://www.hks.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/Academic%20Dean's%20Office/communications_program/digital_resources/new_js_how_to_oped_2_pgs_10_28_18.pdf

Homework:

Submit 3 candidate op-ed topics in the Blackboard forum before S26.

Article: "Latino Americans Are in Shock. Can Democrats Finally Do Something?" The New York Times, Opinion (2026) (N/C)

Article: How to write an op-ed or column (Harvard Kennedy School)

SESSION 26 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S26 Op-Eds: Critical Reading Workshop (Socratic Circle)

We will learn to read op-eds critically. Distinguish argument from opinion, evidence from assertion, persuasion from manipulation.

AI use level: 3.

In-class activities

Socratic Circle setup: protocol handout distributed and explained (inner circle discusses, outer circle observes, then rotate).

- Socratic Circle round 1: discussion of assigned op-ed.
- Rotation plus round 2: outer circle moves in; discussion of op-ed.
- Debrief: what made each argument work — or fail?

Reading before class:

- Dionne, E. J. Jr. "The Democrats' 'Capitalism vs. Socialism' Debate Is Beyond Useless." The New York Times, Opinion (2026). <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/07/19/opinion/democrats-capitalism-socialism.html>
- Zakaria, F. "To beat socialists and populists, liberalism must get radical." The Washington Post, Opinion (June 26, 2026). On Blackboard.
- Socratic Circle handout: https://www.corndancer.com/tunes/tunes_print/soccirc.pdf

Homework

Finalize op-ed topic and submit a one-paragraph pitch (thesis + intended audience + why now) in Blackboard.

Article: "The Democrats' 'Capitalism vs. Socialism' Debate Is Beyond Useless." The New York Times, Opinion (2026). (The New York Times, Opinion (2026).)

Technical note: Socratic Circles (N/C)

SESSION 27 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S27 Rhetoric & Persuasion (Cialdini)

In this session we will discuss the mechanics of persuasion. How Cialdini's six principles show up in op-eds, ads, speeches, and how to use them ethically.

AI use level: 3.

In-class activities:

Concept intro: Cialdini's 6 principles: Reciprocity, commitment/consistency, social proof, liking, authority, and scarcity.

Rhetorical toolkit: Definitions of ethos, pathos, and logos revisited in the op-ed context.

Applied analysis: pairs identify Cialdini principles, and rhetorical appeals in two op-eds; short report-back.

Ethics micro-discussion: persuasion vs. manipulation.

Reading before class:

Cialdini, R. (2007/2021). *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion*, chapters on Reciprocity, Social Proof, and Authority. On Blackboard.

Homework

Draft the op-ed's hook and thesis (150 words max). Bring to S28.

SESSION 28 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S28 Storytelling & Op-Ed Workshop

If story is what makes an argument stick, we must draft, revise, and peer-review the op-ed in class accordingly to this idea.

AI use level: 3.

In-class activities

- Story spine: anecdote as entry point; the "one person, one moment" opening.
- Writing sprint: each student drafts the first 300 words of their op-ed.
- Peer review round: pairs exchange drafts using a short feedback sheet (thesis clear? hook strong? evidence real?).
- Live edits: instructor reads 2–3 volunteer openings; group feedback.

Reading before class:

Szalavitz, M. "I've Struggled With Addiction. I'm Staying Away From A.I. Chatbots." *The New York Times*, Opinion (2026). <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/07/19/opinion/ai-attention-social-media-attachment.html>

Homework:

Continue drafting the op-ed. Prepare for Asynch 6 (S29).

Article: "I've Struggled With Addiction. I'm Staying Away From A.I. Chatbots." The New York Times, Opinion (2026). (N/C)

SESSION 29 (ASYNCHRONOUS)

S29 Asynchronous Task 6 (Video Op-Ed)

Finish the written op-ed (1,000 words) for S30 submission. Complete peer reviews of 2 classmates' drafts in Blackboard before S30.

Individual deliverable (Asynch 6)

- Video Op-Ed (3 min): hook · thesis · argument · call to action. Uploaded to Blackboard.
- One-page script also uploaded.
- AI Use Log + Reflection Paragraph mandatory.

Grade: Video Op-Ed = 4% of course grade.

Homework

Finish the written op-ed (1,000 words) for S30 submission. Complete peer reviews of 2 classmates' drafts in Blackboard before S30.

AI use level: 3 and 1. This means: open collaboration for script drafting and AI-free zone for the on-camera performance. The delivery must be the student's own voice, no AI-generated voiceover or avatar.

SESSION 30 (LIVE IN-PERSON)

S30 Wrapping up Op-Ed & RAWS (Op-Ed Submission)

Op-Ed Submission and peer review.

AI use level: 3

In-class activities

- Submission check: final checklist — word count, sources, AI Use Log, peer-review completion.

- Public reading: 4–5 volunteer students read their op-ed openings aloud; short Q&A.
- Peer review hand in. On Blackboard.
- RAWs debrief: What did we learn across the 3 modules? (From academic, business and public voice).

Individual deliverable due

- Written Op-Ed (1,000 words), with minimum 3 sources cited in-text. Must be submitted via Blackboard.
- AI Use Log + Reflection Paragraph mandatory.
- Confirmation that both peer reviews were completed.

Peer-Review Rubric (1% of course grade)

Each reviewer earns up to 1 point based on the quality of the feedback they give to their peer.

# Criterion	What you're looking for	Points
1 Specificity	Comments point to concrete passages, sentences, or claims — not vague reactions ("nice work", "unclear"). At least 2 specific references to the peer's text.	0.33
2 Constructiveness	Feedback identifies at least one strength and one area for improvement, with an actionable suggestion (what to change and how).	0.33
Engagement 3 with argument /evidence	Reviewer addresses the substance — the argument, evidence, or structure — not just surface issues (grammar, formatting).	0.34

Grading shortcut (3-level scale per criterion):

Full points — clearly meets the criterion.

Half — partially meets it (generic or thin).

Zero — absent or off-topic.

Optional one-line self-check for students (paste into the assignment brief):

"Before submitting your peer review, make sure you've (1) quoted or pointed to specific passages, (2) named one strength and one thing to improve with a concrete suggestion, and (3) engaged with the argument or evidence — not just the writing style."

Grade:

- Written Op-Ed = 10% of course grade.
- Peer review (2 peers, completion + quality of feedback) = 1% of course grade.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Disclaimer: The assessment method may be subject to modifications. Should changes occur, students will be notified on the first day of class and provided with a written document detailing the modifications.

EVALUATION

Active Participation & Engagement 15 %

Homework & Classwork 10%

Continuous Assessment 20%

Includes:

- # Scaffolded tasks
- # In-class exercises
- # Workshops

AI reflection activities

Oral/video-based assessments

Academic Argumentative Essay 20%

3MT Video Argumentative Essay 5%

Business Proposal (Individual) 10%

Op-Ed (written) 10%

Op-Ed Video 10%

ASSESSMENT PHILOSOPHY

RAWS evaluates more than written products. Assessment seeks evidence of:

Critical thinking

Research competence

Communication ability

Audience awareness

Ethical AI use

Ownership of ideas

The combination of written work and oral/video-based assessments provides a fuller picture of student learning than either format alone and reflects communication demands students will encounter in both academic and professional environments.¹ Argumentative EssayVideo10%

criteria	percentage	Learning Objectives	Comments
3MT Video Argumentative Essay	5 %		
Academic Argumentative Essay	20 %		
Continuous Assessment	20 %		Scaffolded tasks, in-class exercises, workshops, AI reflection activities, and oral-based assessments
Homework and classwork	10 %		Preparation for class (readings, materials), professionalism (deadlines, formatting, complete AI logs), teamwork and peer-review activities, and Alien Entrepreneurs.
Business			

Proposal	10 %		
Op-Ed	10 %		
Active Participation & Engagement	15 %		Attendance & punctuality (per IE norm). Reminder: >20% absences = automatic Fail per IE policy.
Op-Ed Video	10 %		

RE-SIT / RE-TAKE POLICY

*Each student has **four** chances to pass any given course distributed over two consecutive academic years: ordinary call exams and extraordinary call exams (re-sits) in June/July.*

Resits: *Students failing the course in the ordinary call (during the semester) will have to re-sit the exam in June/July.*

*Those students who have not complied with the **80% attendance rule** during the semester will fail both calls for this Academic Year (ordinary and extraordinary) and will have to re-take the course (i.e., re-enroll) the following Academic Year, by paying the corresponding extra cost.*

*The June/July re-sit exam will consist of a comprehensive exam. Your final grade for the course will depend on the performance in this exam only; continuous evaluation over the semester will not be taken into consideration. Students will have to achieve the minimum passing grade of 5 and can obtain a maximum grade of **8.0 (out of 10.0)** in the re-sit exam.*

Retakers: *Students who failed the subject in a previous Academic Year and are now re-enrolled as re-takers in a course will need to check the syllabus of the assigned professor, as well as contact the professor individually, regarding the specific evaluation criteria for them as retakers in the course during that semester (ordinary call of that Academic Year). The maximum grade that may be obtained in the retake exam (3rd call) is 10.0*

*Retake students in undergraduate programs are **generally** not required to attend classes; **however, certain courses may still apply attendance requirements depending on the course methodology or specific learning objectives**. Each syllabus clearly indicates whether attendance is mandatory or not for retake students. Therefore, it's always the student's responsibility to make sure to **check the syllabus for the specific conditions for retake students** and to **contact the professor at the start of the semester** in order to find out what is required of him/her to best prepare for the retake and to pass the course. This is very important since each professor has his/her own specific requirements.*

BEHAVIOR RULES

Please, check the University's Academic Integrity Policy [here](#). The Program Director may provide further indications.

ATTENDANCE POLICY

Please, check the University's Attendance Policy [here](#). The Program Director may provide further indications.

ETHICAL POLICY

Please, check the University's Student Code of conduct [here](#). The Program Director may provide further indications.