**Activity 4.2: The Prompt Diagnosis Challenge**

**Duration & Format**  
**Duration:** 10–12 minutes | **Format:** Small Groups or Pairs (2–4 participants)  
**Objective:** Identify and correct poorly constructed prompts by analysing structure, tone, and purpose — and collaboratively rewriting them into clear, contextual, and effective prompts for professional AI use.

**Purpose**

This exercise develops diagnostic skills in prompt evaluation — the ability to spot vague, overloaded, or unfocused prompts before they lead to weak AI outputs.  
By improving flawed examples, participants learn to *think like editors*: critically, purposefully, and strategically.

**Learning Outcomes**

Participants will be able to:

* Diagnose structural and contextual weaknesses in prompts.
* Explain why poor wording or missing details degrade AI output quality.
* Apply best-practice principles (role, context, format, tone) in revisions.
* Evaluate prompts critically to achieve more predictable, professional results.

**Materials Needed**

* Access to a generative AI tool (ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude, etc.)
* Printed or shared worksheet containing the examples below.
* Space to record group analyses and rewritten prompts.

**Instructions**

| **Step** | **Action** | **Focus & Goal** | **Time** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Step 1 | Review each example prompt | Read through all examples carefully as a group. | 2 min |
| Step 2 | Diagnose the Weaknesses | Identify specific issues: vagueness, overload, missing context, tone mismatch, unclear goals. | 3 min |
| Step 3 | Rewrite for Improvement | Use prompt engineering principles (Role, Context, Instruction, Format) to make each clearer and more targeted. | 4 min |
| Step 4 | Share & Reflect | Groups present one example: describe what was wrong and how they fixed it. | 3 min |

**Reflective & Discussion Questions**

1. Which flaws (vagueness, overload, missing context, tone mismatch) were most common, and why do they produce weak AI responses?
2. How did specifying *role, audience,* or *format* in your rewrite change the quality and focus of the output?
3. In your professional context, what types of prompts are most at risk of being “underdefined”?
4. What steps could you take in your workflow to ensure clarity and context before prompting AI?

**Facilitator Tips & Key Takeaway**

* Please review the **4.2 Example sheet** for the prompt examples.
* **Encourage reasoning, not perfection.** The goal is not to find “the best” rewrite, but to articulate *why* each change improves precision.
* **Draw parallels to professional writing.** The same clarity that makes good business communication also makes strong prompts.
* **Key Takeaway:** Effective prompting is a communication skill — diagnosing weak prompts and refining them deliberately leads to consistent, high-quality AI collaboration.
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