

THE DEFENSIBLE PROMPT CHALLENGE

A README-style practice deck for 21 interdisciplinary teams

READ. COPY. RUN. COMPARE. AUDIT. REVISE.

AI for Humanities, Social Sciences & Law FDP

60

MINUTES

21

TEAMS

4

DIFFICULTY LEVELS

How to use this deck

Your team can work without waiting for repeated facilitator instructions.

1

Find your Group and table

Sit at the table matching your Group Number. Your names and starting roles are printed on that Group slide.

2

Assign three rotating roles

Prompt Writer • Disciplinary Expert • Evidence Auditor

3

Run L1 → L2 → L3

Do not skip levels. Save every output.

4

Exchange and audit

A neighbouring team applies the L4 Red-Team questions.

5

Revise and submit

Show what changed—and what still needs verification.

Seven sections in this practice deck

Follow the sequence. Team cards appear in Section 5.

01

Know the cohort

Why this workshop is interdisciplinary

02

Understand the challenge

What makes a prompt defensible

03

Find your zone, table & roles

How 21 groups sit, start and rotate roles

04

Follow the 60-minute sequence

Four progressive prompt levels

05

Open your Group Challenge Card

21 group-specific research tasks

06

Use discipline-specific methods

Verbs, sources and output designs

07

Submit safely and visibly

Safeguards, scoring and exit ticket

01 Know the cohort

The design reflects 62 unique participants across Law, English, Sociology, International Languages, Political Science and History.

READ → RUN → COMPARE → AUDIT → REVISE

Why this format fits your cohort

The activity balances disciplinary diversity with mixed AI confidence.

DISCIPLINE MIX • 62 PARTICIPANTS

**31**

LAW

31

NON-LAW

Detailed AI survey (33 responses)

- Most are occasional or first-stage users
- Hallucination and fake citations dominate concerns
- Free tools are the norm
- Better prompting + verification are the top needs

Design implications

The session must be easy to enter, discipline-sensitive and difficult to finish carelessly.

MIXED TEAMS

Combine Law and non-Law participants so each prompt is challenged from more than one disciplinary angle.

VISIBLE PROGRESSION

Everyone sees how an answer changes from a broad question to a controlled research instruction.

VERIFICATION INSIDE THE PROMPT

Accuracy is not a warning added later. It is built into sources, constraints and audit labels.

ONE COMMON WORKBENCH

Do not spend the 60 minutes teaching several tools. The intellectual method is the focus.

02 Understand the challenge

Your goal is not to produce the longest answer. Your goal is to produce an answer that can survive academic scrutiny.

READ → RUN → COMPARE → AUDIT → REVISE

The Defensible Prompt Challenge

Central question: Can this AI-generated answer survive scholarly scrutiny?

A DEFENSIBLE PROMPT CREATES

- ✓ Clear research purpose
- ✓ Disciplinary concepts
- ✓ Controlled source base
- ✓ Useful output structure
- ✓ Explicit uncertainty

A WEAK PROMPT OFTEN HIDES

- ! Polished but generic prose
- ! Invented citations or facts
- ! Hidden assumptions
- ! Missing stakeholders
- ! False certainty

What counts as success

The winning team is the one that can explain the improvement—not merely display a good-looking answer.

2

Research clarity

2

Disciplinary depth

2

**Use of supplied
evidence**

2

**Hallucination
control**

2

**Recognition of
limits / missing
voices**

Score out of 10. A team may score highly even when its final answer remains uncertain—provided the uncertainty is identified honestly.

03

Find your zone, table & rotating roles

Seven pods contain three groups each. Sit at the table matching your Group Number, then work independently and peer-review within the pod.

READ → RUN → COMPARE → AUDIT → REVISE

Seven seating pods: zone, tables & themes

Find your Pod letter, room zone and Group/Table number before opening the challenge card.

A

Gender, Dignity & VulnerabilityFront Left
Tables 01–03

E

Culture, IP & LanguageMiddle Right
Tables 13–15

B

Justice, Testimony & AccessFront Centre
Tables 04–06

F

Institutions, Regulation & CorrectionsRear Left
Tables 16–18

C

Environment, Labour & AccountabilityFront Right
Tables 07–09

G

Equality, Archives & Research IntegrityRear Right
Tables 19–21

D

Technology, Democracy & CrimeMiddle Left
Tables 10–12

Three roles—rotate after every round

No one person should control the keyboard for all four levels.

1

PROMPT WRITER

Runs the prompt, saves outputs and applies revisions.

ASK: Did I tell the system exactly what work to perform?

2

DISCIPLINARY EXPERT

Checks concepts, framing, interpretation and missing perspectives.

ASK: Does this sound like serious work in our discipline?

3

EVIDENCE AUDITOR

Tracks claims, sources, uncertainty, bias and fabricated detail.

ASK: What can be verified—and what cannot?

04 Follow the 60-minute sequence

Four rounds move from a broad question to a source-controlled prompt, followed by peer review and revision.

READ → RUN → COMPARE → AUDIT → REVISE

The 60-minute run sheet

Start immediately when the timer begins. Save each version before moving on.

00–06	Read instructions	Assign roles and open the Team slide.
06–14	Round 1 • Explorer	Run the broad prompt. Mark one useful idea and three weaknesses.
14–24	Round 2 • Analyst	Add concepts, comparison, stakeholders and structure.
24–38	Round 3 • Research-Grade	Use IDRCTOC, supplied sources, constraints and uncertainty labels.
38–50	Round 4 • Red Team	Exchange outputs, attack unsupported claims, then revise.
50–57	Pod Challenge	Select the clearest improvement—not the longest answer.
57–60	Exit Ticket	State what changed and what still requires verification.

Four difficulty levels

Do not jump directly to Level 3. The comparison is the learning.

L1

EXPLORER

Open the terrain. Expect breadth, generic prose and unsupported detail.

"Explain..."

L2

ANALYST

Add disciplinary concepts, comparison, stakeholders and stronger verbs.

"Compare..."

L3

**RESEARCH-GRA
DE**

Control role, sources, task, output, constraints and uncertainty.

"Using only..."

L4

RED TEAM

Attack the output for evidence gaps, hidden assumptions and false certainty.

"Audit..."

IDRCTOC: the research-grade scaffold

Use as many elements as the task requires. The order may change.

I **Intent**

What intellectual purpose?

D **Domain**

Which discipline / subfield?

R **Role**

What scholarly position?

C **Context**

Which supplied material?

T **Task**

What precise operation?

O **Output**

What usable structure?

C **Constraint**

What must not happen?

**A longer prompt is not automatically better.
A controlled prompt is better.**

Use three evidence labels

These labels stop polished language from hiding uncertainty.

SUPPORTED

Directly traceable to the supplied material.

INFERRED

A reasonable interpretation—but not stated directly.

VERIFY

Requires a primary source or independent check.

Example: "The source explicitly states X" → SUPPORTED
"The wording may indicate Y" → INFERRED
"This policy reduced harm by 30%" → VERIFY

Compare outputs—do not merely read them

Complete this five-line comparison before moving to the next round.

1 What became more specific?

2 Which concept changed the answer most?

3 Which claim still lacks evidence?

4 Which voice or stakeholder remains absent?

5 What instruction should be added next?

05

Open your Group Challenge Card

Each seating pod contains three ready-to-run research tasks. Go directly to your Group number and Table label.

READ → RUN → COMPARE → AUDIT → REVISE

Gender, Dignity & Vulnerability

Groups 01–03 • Tables 01–03 • Sit in the Front Left zone; exchange audits inside the pod.

G01 • T01

Deepfakes, consent and women's dignity

G02 • T02

Acid-attack crimes, gendered violence and public narratives

G03 • T03

Consent, POSH law and changing social norms

When the timer begins: open your Group slide, confirm the names and starting roles, then run Level 1 immediately.

Deepfakes, Consent & Women's Dignity

How do deepfakes create gender-specific harms, and how should those harms be analysed?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain how deepfakes affect the dignity of women.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Analyse deepfakes through privacy, consent, reputation and gendered harm. Separate individual, social and legal consequences.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are a feminist legal and media-studies researcher. Using only the supplied extracts, compare the perspectives of the affected woman, the platform, the state and the public. Produce a stakeholder table, a 250-word interpretation and three research questions. Do not invent laws, cases, quotations or statistics.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Which claims lack evidence? Whose voice is missing? Does the answer treat all women's experiences as identical? Does it confuse legal rules with ethical judgments?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

Acid-Attack Crimes & Public Narratives

How do legal records, news reports and public narratives frame survivors, violence and agency?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain acid-attack crimes and their representation in public narratives.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Compare legal, media and survivor-centred narratives through dignity, agency, stigma and responsibility.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are a feminist legal and media researcher. Use only the supplied legal extract, news report and survivor testimony. Produce a source-framing-voice-omission matrix and a 250-word analysis. Separate description from interpretation; do not invent facts, cases or motives.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Does the answer sensationalise violence? Is survivor agency lost? Are legal and media claims conflated? Which factual detail still requires verification?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

Consent, POSH Law & Changing Social Norms

How do legal rules on consent interact with workplace power and changing social norms?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain consent and POSH law in India.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Analyse consent through workplace hierarchy, coercion, silence, retaliation and social norms. Distinguish legal compliance from lived experience.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are a workplace-law and sociology researcher. Use only the supplied statute extract, institutional policy and scenario. Produce a concept-evidence-ambiguity table, a 250-word analysis and three further questions. Do not provide legal conclusions beyond the supplied material.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Does the answer treat absence of refusal as consent? Are power differences ignored? Are legal duties invented? Is one scenario being over-generalised?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

Justice, Testimony & Access

Groups 04–06 • Tables 04–06 • Sit in the Front Centre zone; exchange audits inside the pod.

G04 • T04

Witness protection in child-trafficking cases

G05 • T05

Child-witness testimony, memory and narrative credibility

G06 • T06

Disability law and access to justice

When the timer begins: open your Group slide, confirm the names and starting roles, then run Level 1 immediately.

Witness Protection in Child-Trafficking Cases

Do existing protection mechanisms address the needs of child witnesses?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain witness protection in child-trafficking cases in India.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Analyse witness protection through confidentiality, participation, psychological safety and procedural fairness. Separate legal design from implementation.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are a child-rights and criminal-justice researcher. Use only the supplied legal and policy extracts. Identify protection duties, implementation gaps and questions that require field evidence. Output: provision-evidence-gap table, 250-word analysis and three further research questions. Do not invent cases or sections.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Is every legal claim traceable? Are children treated as passive victims? What implementation claim requires empirical evidence? Is certainty greater than the sources allow?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

Child-Witness Testimony & Narrative Credibility

How should memory, age and narrative inconsistency be interpreted without prejudging credibility?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain the challenges involved in child-witness testimony.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Analyse memory, suggestibility, trauma, age-appropriate communication and credibility. Distinguish inconsistency from deliberate falsehood.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are a child-rights, evidence-law and psychology researcher. Use only the supplied testimony, procedure note and research summary. Produce a claim-source-risk-safeguard table and a 250-word analysis. Do not diagnose trauma, invent case law or assume that memory gaps prove unreliability.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Is an adult standard being applied to the child? Are memory gaps treated as lies? Which claim needs empirical support? Are protection and reliability being confused?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

Disability Law & Access to Justice

Does the system treat disability as a rights issue or a welfare issue?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain disability law and access to justice.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Compare rights-based and welfare-based approaches. Analyse accessibility, reasonable accommodation, intersectionality and institutional barriers.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are a disability-studies and legal researcher. Use the supplied extracts as primary material. Compare the experiences of persons with disabilities, courts, lawyers and public institutions. Produce a barrier-right-remedy matrix and a short critical analysis. Do not assume that one disability experience represents all.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Is the language paternalistic? Are invisible disabilities ignored? Which barriers are documented and which are inferred? Is "access" defined too narrowly?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

Environment, Labour & Accountability

Groups 07–09 • Tables 07–09 • Sit in the Front Right zone; exchange audits inside the pod.

G07 • T07

Environmental compensation and the experiences of affected communities

G08 • T08

Climate change, public participation and environmental decision-making

G09 • T09

Labour law and wage protection for unorganised construction workers

When the timer begins: open your Group slide, confirm the names and starting roles, then run Level 1 immediately.

Environmental Compensation & Community Experience

How should compensation account for ecological loss, livelihood, health and community experience?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain how compensation is determined for environmental harm.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Compare legal principles, quantifiable loss, lived impacts, restorative justice and intergenerational harm.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are an environmental-law and socio-legal researcher. Use only the supplied legal extract, assessment report and community testimony. Produce a harm-evidence-valuation-remedy matrix and a 250-word critique. Label claims as supported, inferred or requiring verification; do not invent figures or cases.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Are only monetisable harms recognised? Which community voices are absent? Is causation assumed? Does the answer confuse compensation with ecological restoration?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

Climate Change & Public Participation

When does participation meaningfully shape climate and environmental decisions?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain public participation in climate and environmental decision-making.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Analyse access to information, consultation, representation, procedural justice and local knowledge. Distinguish participation from actual influence.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are an environmental-policy and public-law researcher. Use only the supplied policy, hearing and community extracts. Produce a stage-actor-evidence-influence table, a 250-word interpretation and three research gaps. Do not invent hearings, cases or statistics.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Is consultation being mistaken for influence? Which affected groups are absent? What implementation claim lacks evidence? Does the answer recognise local knowledge?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

Labour Law & Wage Protection

Where does the gap arise between statutory protection and actual payment practice?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain wage protection for unorganised construction workers.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Distinguish statutory rules, enforcement mechanisms and workers' lived experiences. Compare the roles of workers, contractors and the state.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are a labour-law and socio-legal researcher. Using only the supplied statute extract and field-note excerpt, identify wage rules, compliance risks, enforcement gaps and power imbalances. Output: law-practice-evidence table plus a 250-word interpretation. Mark every field claim as observed, reported or requiring verification.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Are law-on-paper and actual practice being confused? Are workers' voices represented? Which claim requires primary legal verification? Is wage theft being inferred without evidence?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

Technology, Democracy & Crime

Groups 10–12 • Tables 10–12 • Sit in the Middle Left zone; exchange audits inside the pod.

G10 • T10

Algorithmic bias and democratic governance

G11 • T11

Social-media radicalisation and criminal behaviour

G12 • T12

AI tools in criminal forensic investigation

When the timer begins: open your Group slide, confirm the names and starting roles, then run Level 1 immediately.

Algorithmic Bias & Democratic Governance

How can algorithmic systems affect participation, representation and accountability?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain algorithmic bias in democratic governance.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Analyse impacts on participation, representation, transparency and accountability. Compare citizen, government and technology-company perspectives.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are a political-theory and technology-governance researcher. Use only the supplied policy and case extracts. Distinguish documented harms, plausible risks and open questions. Output: stakeholder matrix, 250-word evaluation and three governance safeguards. Do not treat possible risks as established facts.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Which harms are documented and which are speculative? Who can challenge a decision? Is transparency treated as sufficient accountability? Which stakeholder is missing?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

Social Media, Radicalisation & Criminal Behaviour

What can research responsibly claim about the relationship between platforms and radicalisation?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain how social media causes radicalisation and criminal behaviour.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Analyse the relationship at individual, community, platform and institutional levels. Distinguish correlation, mechanism and causation.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are a criminology and digital-society researcher. Use only the supplied studies. For each claim, identify evidence type, strength and limitation. Produce a claim-evidence-caution table and a 250-word synthesis. Do not convert correlation into causation.

L4

RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Where does the answer overstate causation? Are platform effects separated from social context? Which evidence is weak or indirect? Is one pathway treated as universal?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

AI Tools in Criminal Forensic Investigation

What can AI legitimately contribute to forensic investigation, and where must human and legal control remain?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain how AI tools may be used in criminal forensic investigation.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Analyse possible uses across evidence collection, pattern detection, chain of custody, bias, explainability and admissibility.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are a criminology and forensic-governance researcher. Use only the supplied technical, policy and case extracts. Produce a use-evidence-risk-oversight matrix and a 250-word evaluation. Distinguish current practice, pilot use and speculation; do not invent tools, cases or accuracy statistics.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Is technical capability being mistaken for actual deployment? Are chain of custody and due process addressed? Which accuracy claim lacks evidence? Who bears responsibility for error?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

Culture, IP & Language

Groups 13–15 • Tables 13–15 • Sit in the Middle Right zone; exchange audits inside the pod.

G13 • T13

Copyright and traditional cultural expressions

G14 • T14

Digital biopiracy and ownership of knowledge

G15 • T15

Translating legal and cultural concepts with AI

When the timer begins: open your Group slide, confirm the names and starting roles, then run Level 1 immediately.

Copyright & Traditional Cultural Expressions

Can individual ownership frameworks protect collectively held cultural expressions?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain copyright issues involving traditional cultural expressions.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Compare ownership, custodianship, communal authorship, digitisation and AI training. Identify tensions between legal and cultural frameworks.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are an IP-law and cultural-rights researcher. Use only the supplied legal and community-source extracts. Produce a rights-holder-risk-remedy matrix and a 250-word critique of where conventional copyright categories fail. Do not invent community practices or legal provisions.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Is collective custodianship reduced to individual ownership? Is consent assumed? Which legal claim needs verification? Does the answer speak for a community without evidence?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

Digital Biopiracy & Ownership of Knowledge

Who may control digitised biological and traditional knowledge, and how can extraction be prevented?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain digital biopiracy and ownership of traditional knowledge.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Analyse access, consent, attribution, benefit-sharing, database control and community knowledge.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are an IP-law and indigenous-knowledge researcher. Use only the supplied legal, community and platform extracts. Produce a stakeholder-knowledge-risk-remedy matrix and a 250-word critique. Do not invent community practices, ownership claims or legal provisions.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Is collectively held knowledge forced into individual ownership categories? Is public availability treated as consent? Who benefits? Which proposed remedy is actually supported?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

Translating Legal & Cultural Concepts with AI

What is lost or transformed when AI translates concepts that have no exact equivalent?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Use AI to translate the supplied legal and cultural terms into the target language.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Compare two translation options through legal precision, register, cultural meaning, gender and ambiguity.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are a legal translator and sociolinguist. Use only the supplied passages. Produce two translation options, annotate five difficult decisions, create a short glossary and recommend context-specific usage. Preserve ambiguity and mark uncertain terms; do not claim false one-to-one equivalence.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Has the translation flattened ambiguity, changed agency or erased gendered meaning? Is legal precision preserved? Which term needs consultation with a human language expert?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

Institutions, Regulation & Corrections

Groups 16–18 • Tables 16–18 • Sit in the Rear Left zone; exchange audits inside the pod.

G16 • T16

Energy law, human needs and public accountability

G17 • T17

Technology, surveillance and prisoners' rights

G18 • T18

AI and the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016

When the timer begins: open your Group slide, confirm the names and starting roles, then run Level 1 immediately.

Energy Law, Human Needs & Accountability

How should energy decisions balance access, affordability, sustainability and public accountability?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain the relationship between energy law, human needs and public accountability.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Analyse human need versus want, energy justice, affordability, environmental cost and institutional responsibility.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are an energy-law and public-policy researcher. Use only the supplied statute, policy and community extracts. Produce an interest-evidence-trade-off-accountability matrix, a 250-word evaluation and three verification needs. Do not invent tariffs, statistics, cases or policy outcomes.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Who defines a human need? Are vulnerable consumers visible? Are public and private responsibilities separated? Which empirical claim lacks evidence?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

Technology, Surveillance & Prisoners' Rights

When does prison technology improve safety, and when does it deepen surveillance and control?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain the use of technology and surveillance in prisons.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Analyse privacy, dignity, proportionality, due process, rehabilitation and discrimination.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are a prison-law and criminology researcher. Use only the supplied policy, legal and testimony extracts. Produce a technology-purpose-rights risk-safeguard matrix and a 250-word analysis. Distinguish documented use from proposed use; do not invent tools, cases or outcomes.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Are safety claims accepted without evidence? Is meaningful consent possible? Which groups face disproportionate risk? Does the answer confuse control with rehabilitation?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

AI & the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016

How might AI affect insolvency decision-making without weakening fairness and accountability?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain possible uses of AI under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Analyse claims verification, valuation, creditor classification, bias, transparency and professional responsibility.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are an insolvency-law and AI-governance researcher. Use only the supplied provisions, process notes and case extract. Produce a process-stage-AI-use-benefit-risk-human-approval matrix and a 250-word evaluation. Do not invent sections, judgments or accuracy claims.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Is automation assumed to be lawful? Can errors be challenged? Is confidential data protected? Which task still requires professional judgment and human approval?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

Equality, Archives & Research Integrity

Groups 19–21 • Tables 19–21 • Sit in the Rear Right zone; exchange audits inside the pod.

G19 • T19

EWS reservation and substantive equality

G20 • T20

AI-assisted historical archives and missing voices in Medieval Bengal

G21 • T21

Detecting fabricated citations and unsupported claims in AI-assisted research

When the timer begins: open your Group slide, confirm the names and starting roles, then run Level 1 immediately.

EWS Reservation & Substantive Equality

How should economic disadvantage be related to equality, representation and redistribution?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain EWS reservation in India.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Analyse EWS reservation through formal equality, substantive equality, representation and redistribution. Distinguish constitutional argument from empirical outcome.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are a constitutional-law and political-theory researcher. Use the supplied legal extracts only. Map competing arguments, assumptions and unresolved empirical questions. Output: argument-principle-evidence table, balanced synthesis and three questions for further research. Do not invent judgments or statistics.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Are constitutional principles and policy outcomes being conflated? Which argument lacks evidence? Are caste and economic disadvantage treated as interchangeable? Is the synthesis genuinely balanced?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

AI-Assisted Archives & Missing Voices in Medieval Bengal

How can AI help read archives without reproducing archival silence, OCR error or anachronism?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Explain how AI can assist research on historical archives of Medieval Bengal.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Compare official and vernacular sources through digitisation gaps, OCR and translation errors, provenance and missing social groups.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are a historian and digital-humanities researcher. Use only the supplied archive metadata, official extract and vernacular extract. Produce a source-provenance-voice-AI-risk matrix, a 250-word interpretation and three archival questions. Do not add rulers, dates or events; label OCR and translation uncertainty.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Is the archive treated as complete? Has the model filled gaps with plausible invention? Are modern categories imposed anachronistically? Which voices remain structurally absent?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

Detecting Fabricated Citations & Unsupported Claims

How can a research team use AI without accepting invented references or unsupported synthesis?

L1 EXPLORER — COPY & RUN

Generate a short literature overview on your topic and suggest five references.

L2 ANALYST — ADD A DISCIPLINARY LENS

Inspect every reference and major claim. Classify each as verified, unverified, apparently fabricated or unsupported.

L3 RESEARCH-GRADE — CONTROL ROLE, SOURCES & OUTPUT

You are a research-integrity auditor. Use only the verified bibliographic records and supplied excerpts. Produce a claim-source-status-action table and organise the verified literature by theme, method and gap. Do not add references or findings; mark missing information explicitly.

L4 RED TEAM — ATTACK THE OUTPUT

Does every citation resolve to a real source? Do claims match the cited material? Are titles, authors, years and identifiers consistent? Which synthesis claim has no direct support?

SAVE FOUR ITEMS: ① L1 output ② L2 output ③ L3 output ④ one correction made after the audit

06

Use discipline-specific methods

Different disciplines ask different questions of evidence. Use the vocabulary and source habits of your field.

READ → RUN → COMPARE → AUDIT → REVISE

Choose stronger academic verbs

Replace generic requests with operations that produce inspectable scholarly work.

Explain



Compare two representations

Discuss



Evaluate competing arguments

Tell me about



Distinguish evidence from inference

Write on



Map stakeholders and assumptions

Give references



Organise verified records

Summarise



Identify gaps, limits and counter-readings

Discipline-specific source questions

Use the column that best matches your Group topic.

LAW

What is the authority?
Is it statute, judgment, policy or commentary?
Is law-on-paper confused with implementation?

HISTORY

Who produced the source?
For which audience?
What is absent or anachronistically inferred?

LITERATURE / LANGUAGE

What formal feature supports the interpretation?
What changes in translation?
Is ambiguity being erased?

SOCIAL / POLITICAL SCIENCE

What evidence supports causation?
Which stakeholder or institution is missing?
Can the finding be generalised?

07 Submit safely and visibly

Do not hide uncertainty. Do not upload confidential material. Show the revision trail.

READ → RUN → COMPARE → AUDIT → REVISE

Safeguards before you paste anything

The workshop uses academic material—not confidential or restricted data.

DO NOT UPLOAD

- ✗ Unpublished interviews or identifiable field data
- ✗ Student records, marks or personal information
- ✗ Confidential case files or client information
- ✗ Copyrighted documents you are not permitted to upload

SAFE FOR THIS PRACTICE

- ✓ Short verified extracts supplied for the activity
- ✓ Public statutes, policies and archival passages
- ✓ Your own paraphrased research question
- ✓ Anonymised or fictional examples for practice

Submit one compact evidence trail

Your submission should make the learning visible in under two minutes.

1 Original L1 prompt + one weakness

4 One unsupported claim identified by the Red Team

2 Improved L2 prompt + one visible improvement

5 One correction made after the audit

3 Final L3 IDRCTOC prompt

6 One point that still requires external verification

Pod Challenge: 45-second presentation

Do not read the whole prompt. Explain the intellectual change.

"Our first prompt produced _____.
We added _____.
The output improved because _____.
We would still verify _____."

JUDGES LOOK FOR

clarity • disciplinary depth • source control • hallucination control • acknowledged limits

Exit ticket

Complete both lines before leaving the workbench.

The most important element we added to our prompt was...

Before using the AI answer in teaching or research, we will verify...

**A strong researcher is not the person who gets the fastest answer.
It is the person who can explain what the answer is allowed to claim.**