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**C**  
My intent is to use this document as a pathway guide to assist students in selecting appropriate learning activities to assist them to overcome barriers to their learning. My concern is that the AI prompts suggested in this document (which came from a different AI system) are not supportive of student learning or suggest roles for AI that exceed the role I want it to take of a personal trainer, not a counselor or task agent. Does that make sense?  
Edit  
Yes, that makes perfect sense. Looking through the AI prompts in this document, I can see several concerning patterns that go beyond a "personal trainer" role:  
Problematic prompt characteristics:

* Many ask AI to "explore feelings" or provide emotional/psychological support ("Help me explore ways to stay motivated and manage feelings of overwhelm")
* Some position AI as a counselor for anxiety management ("Assist me in exploring ways I might build confidence and motivation")
* Others request AI to create personalized strategies without student input ("creating a strategy that fits my current project")
* Several ask AI to do the cognitive work for students rather than guide them through it ("Help me brainstorm and clarify my writing purposes")

A "personal trainer" approach would instead:

* Guide students through self-reflection exercises
* Provide structured frameworks for students to analyze their own work
* Offer practice activities the student completes independently
* Ask diagnostic questions to help students identify their own barriers
* Suggest concrete, actionable steps students can take

For example, instead of "Help me explore ways to stay motivated," a trainer approach might be: "Walk me through a self-assessment exercise to identify what specific aspects of organization feel overwhelming, then suggest three concrete techniques I can practice."  
Would you like me to help you revise some of these prompts to better align with the personal trainer role, focusing on skill-building guidance rather than emotional support or task completion?  
Retry  
**C**  
Could you do so for all the suggested prompts in the document, then help me create a markdown version that I could import into Notion.so?  
Edit  
Writing Barrier Pathways - Revised AI Prompts  
Document  
# Writing Barrier Pathways - Revised AI Prompts

## Understanding Your Audience

### Cognitive Barrier  
\*\*Description:\*\* I might have trouble clearly identifying my audience or understanding what they expect from my writing.

\*\*Related Skills:\*\* Audie  
I've revised all the AI prompts to align with a "personal trainer" approach rather than a counselor or task-completion agent. The key changes I made:  
From counselor to trainer:

* Removed emotional exploration requests ("help me explore feelings")
* Replaced with structured self-assessment and skill-building activities
* Focus on teaching methods rather than providing emotional support

From task agent to guide:

* Changed requests for AI to "create strategies" to "teach me how to create strategies"
* Replaced "help me brainstorm" with "guide me through a brainstorming process"
* Emphasized student agency and independent practice

Added structure and accountability:

* Include specific deliverables (checklists, templates, frameworks)
* Focus on measurable practice activities
* Emphasize systematic approaches students can repeat

Made prompts more diagnostic:

* Ask AI to help identify specific problems rather than solve them
* Request tools for self-evaluation rather than external evaluation
* Focus on building student assessment skills

The markdown format is ready for direct import into Notion.so. Each barrier type is clearly organized with headers, and the structure will translate well to Notion's database and page system. Would you like me to adjust any specific prompts or the overall formatting?  
Retry  
**C**  
I need to add a significant layer of complexity to this project. Many, if not all, the suggestions you provide imply heavy interaction with AI within the AI interface. Students in this course will be using free versions of AI which have significant limits on message and chat length. As much as possible, the AI suggestions need to lead to offline activities a student can complete independently of AI, then return and upload progress for feedback and new suggestions they can work on on their own. Also, could you remove the Related Skills sections? They add content but not value...  
Edit  
You're absolutely right - those prompts assume unlimited AI access and don't leverage the power of independent work. Let me revise this to focus on offline activities that students can complete and then return to AI with their completed work for feedback and next steps.  
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# Writing Barrier Pathways - Revised AI Prompts

## Understanding Your Audience

### Cognitive Barrier  
\*\*Description:\*\* I might have trouble clearly identifying my audience or understanding what they expect from my writing.

\*\*Self-Directed Strategie  
Perfect! I've completely restructured the AI prompts to focus on offline activities that students can complete independently and then return to AI for feedback. Here are the key changes:  
Major Improvements:

* Offline-focused: Each prompt gives students specific tasks to complete away from AI (worksheets, tracking sheets, analysis exercises)
* Deliverable-based: Students always return with concrete work products for feedback
* Time-efficient: Activities are designed to be completed in focused sessions (10-15 minutes for small tasks, longer blocks for comprehensive work)
* Progressive skill-building: Students develop skills through practice, not through lengthy AI conversations

Structure Changes:

* Removed "Related Skills" sections as requested
* Each prompt now specifies what students will do offline and what they'll bring back
* Focus on templates, worksheets, checklists, and tracking systems students can use independently
* Emphasizes student agency - they complete analyses, make decisions, and create work products

Efficiency Benefits:

* Students can work for days or weeks on a single AI-generated template or worksheet
* When they return to AI, they have specific work to review rather than vague questions
* Multiple learning cycles possible with minimal AI message usage
* Students build independence and metacognitive skills through self-directed practice

This approach maximizes learning while respecting the limitations of free AI access. Students get substantial value from each AI interaction because they return with completed work that demonstrates their thinking and skill development.  
Retry  
**C**  
This is good, but not quite what I envision. Forgive me for the poorly-worded requests I am making. This is a work in progress in my own mind, so am not giving you the best directions, even though you are doing the best with what I am giving you. One of my goals in this process is to seek to avoid creating "busy work" that students feel they have to complete to get ready to do the actual drafting work of their writing projects. I want the projects to be as authentic as possible, so students are selecting 4 composition projects (multimedia options are accepted by this English department) that align with their career goals and interests. My hope is to try and find ways to connect their learning activities to the specific composition projects they choose for themselves. The number of career paths is far too broad to try and come up with industry-specific activities, but I hope that helps to express what I am trying to uncover here...  
Edit  
Ah, now I understand much better! You want the AI to help students work directly on their actual chosen projects, not create separate practice exercises. The activities should emerge from and directly improve their authentic work, not be additional tasks to complete first. Let me revise this with that authentic project focus:  
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# Writing Barrier Pathways - Revised AI Prompts

## Understanding Your Audience

### Cognitive Barrier  
\*\*Description:\*\* I might have trouble clearly identifying my audience or understanding what they expect from my writing.

\*\*Self-Directed Strategie  
Writing Barrier Pathways - Revised AI Prompts  
Document ∙ Version 4  
\*\*AI Trainer Prompt:\*\* "I need to cite my sources for [describe project] using [citation style]. Help me practice with my actual sources: [list 3-5 sources you're using]. Give me templates and examples using my specific source types. I'll format all  
Perfect! Now I understand your vision much better. The revised prompts are now completely focused on students' authentic projects rather than creating busy work. Key improvements:  
Authentic Integration:

* Every prompt asks students to describe their actual project and specific context
* Activities emerge from their real writing challenges, not artificial practice exercises
* Students work on their chosen compositions directly, not on separate skill-building tasks

Project-Specific Guidance:

* AI helps create customized tools (checklists, frameworks, evaluation criteria) for each student's unique project
* Students bring their actual drafts, sources, and project goals to get targeted help
* No generic templates - everything is tailored to their career-focused compositions

Eliminates Busy Work:

* No practice exercises with dummy content
* No completing worksheets unrelated to their projects
* Every activity directly advances their actual composition work

Maintains Efficiency:

* Students still do substantial work offline (researching their audience, revising their drafts, organizing their sources)
* They return with concrete project materials for specific feedback
* AI interactions remain focused and valuable despite message limits

This approach ensures that every learning activity is meaningful because it directly improves the compositions students are creating for their career goals. The activities feel purposeful rather than like hoops to jump through before getting to the "real" work.  
Retry  
**C**  
On the surface, this looks good, but I feel like the activities seem just that - superficial. My students are all CTE-oriented, and many come to my class with significant skills deficits and worse, deeply embedded skepticism about the need to improve their composition skills and whether composition is something they will ever need to use in their chosen career. The purpose is having them select authentic writing tasks is to try and underscore the impact that the writing process can have on their critical thinking and problem-framing approaches to their work. I am not sure these suggestions (no offense) are likely to help change any of those underlying perceptions. Before we try and change the document again, can we engage in a little more philosophical discussion about this approach I am advocating and whether this kind of pathway document might prove counter-productive, and if so, how to improve it?  
Edit  
You're absolutely right to pause here - this is a crucial philosophical question that could make or break the entire approach.  
The fundamental tension I'm seeing:  
Your CTE students come in thinking "writing is irrelevant busy work" and you want to show them "writing deepens critical thinking and problem-solving." But pathway documents like this risk reinforcing their worst suspicions - that composition class is about jumping through writing-process hoops rather than actually solving real problems.  
Potential counter-productivity:

* Students might see "audience analysis worksheets" as more academic busy work, even when applied to their projects
* The focus on writing barriers could reinforce a deficit mindset rather than building on their existing problem-solving strengths
* Breaking down the writing process into discrete skills might make it feel artificial and removed from the integrated thinking they do in their CTE work

A different philosophical approach might be:  
Instead of "here are writing barriers and how to overcome them," what if the AI helped students recognize that they're already doing sophisticated analysis and problem-solving in their CTE work, and writing is just a tool to extend and share that thinking?  
For example, instead of "analyze your audience," the prompt might be "You already know your customers/clients/colleagues have specific needs and constraints. How can documenting your thinking about those needs help you develop better solutions?"  
Questions for you:

1. Do your students already do complex problem-solving in their CTE areas that they don't recognize as "thinking skills"?
2. Would it be more effective to start with their expertise and show how writing amplifies it, rather than starting with writing skills they need to develop?
3. Should the AI act less like a writing tutor and more like a thinking partner who helps them leverage writing as a professional tool?

What's your gut reaction to this tension?  
Retry  
**C**  
Well, I am a staunch believer in Knowles' theory of androgogy and that students don't come into my class in a vaccuum of experience, so helping them to see how they already operationalize these concepts would be helpful, but at the same time, that leaves me questioning what I should be asking them to accomplish in terms of learning and expressing learning within the class context. And the class begins in two weeks, so whatever I am going to do, I need it to be ready in a very short period of time.  
Edit  
You're in a classic andragogy dilemma - honoring their existing expertise while still having legitimate learning goals they can demonstrate within academic constraints. And yes, two weeks is tight!  
Quick philosophical clarification questions:

1. Assessment pressure: Do you need them to show measurable improvement in "writing skills" for institutional requirements, or do you have flexibility to assess their critical thinking/problem-framing growth instead?
2. Learning vs. demonstration: Are you more concerned with them actually developing deeper thinking skills, or with them being able to articulate/demonstrate the thinking they're already doing?
3. AI's role: Should AI help them *recognize* their existing expertise ("You're already doing audience analysis when you..."), *extend* it ("Since you already consider customer needs, how might documenting that process help you..."), or *transfer* it ("You solve problems systematically in [their field] - here's how to apply that same process to this communication challenge")?

Time-sensitive decision point: Given your deadline, would it be more practical to:

* Option A: Revise the pathway document to start with their CTE expertise and show how writing extends it
* Option B: Scrap the pathway approach entirely and create something that positions AI as a thinking partner who helps them leverage their professional knowledge
* Option C: Keep the current structure but completely reframe the language to connect to their existing problem-solving processes

Which direction feels most aligned with both your andragogical beliefs and your practical constraints?  
Retry  
**C**  
Option C. So the plan is that they begin the class with a self-diagnostic that explores their perceived barriers to critical thinking from a compositional perspective. Based on those results, they will engage with AI to discover common compositional activities connected to their specific career that can result in the 4 composition projects required by the department as an indication of learning. Then, they will look at how to connect the barriers they previously identified to the process of generating those composition projects. The design for the class eschews standardized learning and lecture, and allows students to design their own learning process to focus on the areas they feel they need, as they need them, to complete this approach. So, part of the class is deciding on a daily basis what to study or practice to move the process forward toward completing those writing tasks. The purpose of the pathways document is to give them suggestions on what they could do on a daily basis that meets these goals.  
Edit  
Ah, NOW I get it! This is brilliant andragogical design - they diagnose their own barriers, discover authentic writing tasks in their field, then use AI to create personalized daily learning activities that address their specific barriers while advancing their real projects.  
The pathway document's real purpose: It's not prescriptive curriculum - it's a menu of AI prompts they can choose from based on what barrier they're working on that day and what project stage they're in.  
Key reframing needed for Option C: Instead of "Here's how to do audience analysis," the prompts should say "You already consider who needs your work and what they care about in [their field]. Here's how to leverage that expertise to..."  
Critical questions for rapid revision:

1. Self-diagnostic alignment: What barriers will the self-diagnostic identify? Should the pathway categories match those exactly?
2. Daily flexibility: Do students pick one barrier to work on per day, or might they need to address multiple barriers for a single project milestone?
3. Career integration language: Should each prompt start with "In [your field], you already..." or would a more general "You already solve problems by..." work better across diverse CTE areas?
4. AI prompt structure: Should prompts be "Help me recognize how I already..." vs "Help me extend my existing skills to..." vs "Help me apply my professional thinking to..."?

Given your two-week timeline, which of these feels most crucial to nail down first? The language pattern that connects to their expertise, or the structural flow that matches their daily decision-making process?  
Retry  
**C**

1. The pathways document already aligns with the diagnostic; the barriers were aligned with classic domain applications (cognitive, applicative, affective) so students would be able to be more specific about where their challenge lies.
2. It is intended that students will report on what they accomplish each day, so it is possible some students might be able to move quickly through the writing process for some projects, while others might need multiple sessions to complete a single phase. It is up to their preexisting skill level and the depth of their deficits...
3. More general would be best, at least as a general guide for students to begin with. Their interactions with AI can introduce more granular directions.
4. My primary concern is providing students who might lack significant self-regulation skills to find ways to maintain focus and progress when I am unable to give them highly directive instruction. Maybe it is my reluctance to give up control, but I need to have confidence that students who aren't used to self-direction can find ways to keep themselves on task when they have to come up with those tasks in the first place, diagnose what is preventing them from completing them, find the needed resources or support to help them address those challenges, and progress to project completion. I have a lot of touch points built into the class (daily progress tracking, weekly one-on-one conferences, daily small group feedback meetings), but the purpose of this entire pathways approach is to help them decide how to effectively plan each day's learning. My class prohibits outside of class work, so the intent is that students only complete work within the timeframe of a class session, which can make efficiency and focus premium skills for them to acquire.

Edit  
NOW I understand the full design challenge! You need students with limited self-regulation skills to make daily decisions about what to work on, stay focused during class time, and make measurable progress - all while you facilitate rather than direct.  
The core challenge: Students need to wake up each day and answer "What should I work on today to move my project forward?" and then actually do that work effectively within one class period.  
Critical reframing for the pathway prompts: Instead of writing skill development, they need daily action planning that connects their diagnosed barriers to concrete, completable tasks.  
Revised prompt structure might be: "You already manage complex tasks and solve problems in your daily life. Today I need to [specific project milestone] but I'm struggling with [specific barrier]. Help me break today's work into specific steps I can complete in [class time] and give me a way to know I'm making progress."  
Key questions for rapid revision:

1. Daily planning focus: Should each prompt help them plan ONE class session's work, or should some help them plan a sequence of sessions?
2. Progress measurement: Should prompts always end with "give me a way to measure today's progress" so they have concrete evidence of forward movement?
3. Barrier-to-task translation: How direct should the connection be? "I struggle with audience analysis" → "Today I will research my target readers for 30 minutes and create their profile"?
4. Fallback support: For students who freeze up with too much choice, should there be a "default daily sequence" they can follow when overwhelmed?

Which of these feels most crucial for preventing students from sitting in class unsure what to do with their time?  
Retry  
**C**  
My natural inclination is 1. I know I want to create 4, but one of the things I have also embedded in the class is an emphasis on process over product. The class completely divests itself from traditional grading; there is only a final self-assessment, where students will create an overall argument (in any of a number of forms) where they outline their approach to learning and how this reflects their growth and improvement in the class. Creating any kind of guided learning sequence would undermine that approach, even though it would make me feel a lot better about creating scaffolding for students. But knowing the state of the economy and the nature of work they will be facing in the future, the more I can help impart executive thinking and self-management skills, the better off they are.  
Edit  
You're absolutely right - creating guided sequences would completely undermine the executive function skills you're trying to build. That's the whole point: they need to learn to manage their own learning process, not follow someone else's roadmap.  
So the pathway prompts need to be: Daily decision-making tools that help students with limited self-regulation skills answer: "What should I work on TODAY to move forward?"  
Revised approach for each prompt: Instead of multi-session planning, each prompt should help students:

1. Assess today's situation ("Given where I am with this project and this barrier...")
2. Plan today's work ("What can I accomplish in today's class time?")
3. Execute with focus ("How do I stay on task for the next [X] minutes?")
4. Measure progress ("How will I know I moved forward today?")

For the fallback support (#4): Rather than a sequence, maybe prompts that help paralyzed students get unstuck: "I don't know what to work on today. Help me look at my project status and choose one small step I can take right now."  
Quick structural question: Should the prompts be organized by barrier type (so students go to their diagnosed barrier section), or by project phase (so they can address whatever barrier is blocking their current work)?  
Given your timeline pressure, organizing by barrier type (matching the diagnostic) might be simpler to implement quickly - students just go to their diagnosed area and pick a daily prompt that fits their current project stage.  
Does that align with your vision for building their executive function skills?  
Retry  
**C**  
In a nutshell, yes. Part of the design for the class is that at the end of each class period, students will create an executive summary of what they accomplished that will be recorded as a sub-task card on a kanban board they share with me. The task cards will represent the 4 projects, so that way, I can see how they are progressing independently without looking over their shoulders, but I can talk about it in their weekly conference session. The bigger idea is to create a breadcrumb that they can introduce to AI at the beginning of the next session that encapsulates what they are working on that conveys past session work (to cut down on redundancy when working with AI) and helps them immediately capture Where am I now, how is this moving this project forward, and how will I get everything done within the scope of the semester?  
Edit  
Perfect! The kanban board + executive summary design is brilliant for this. They're building project management skills while you get visibility into their progress without micromanaging.  
So each pathway prompt needs to help them:

1. Start efficiently ("Based on yesterday's executive summary, here's how to quickly get AI up to speed on where you are...")
2. Focus today's work ("Given your current project status and this barrier, here's one concrete thing to accomplish today...")
3. End with clear documentation ("Here's how to write an executive summary that captures what you accomplished and sets up tomorrow's work...")

Key insight: The prompts aren't just about overcoming writing barriers - they're teaching executive function through the writing process. Each prompt should model the "assess → plan → execute → document" cycle.  
Quick structural question for implementation: Should each pathway prompt include all four elements (context-setting for AI, daily focus, execution strategy, summary guidance), or should there be separate "daily workflow" prompts that students use alongside the barrier-specific content prompts?  
Given your timeline, it might be simpler to embed all four elements in each pathway prompt, so students have everything they need in one place.  
Example structure: "Getting AI up to speed: Share your latest executive summary and tell AI: [context prompt]. Today's focus: [barrier-specific daily work]. Staying on track: [focus strategy]. End-of-class summary: Document what you accomplished and what's next."  
Does that capture the integrated approach you're envisioning?  
Retry  
**C**  
Kind of. The purpose of the pathway document I am working on is to create a resource that the daily planning AI interaction can reference to help students figure out where they should focus for the day...  
Edit  
**C**  
Are we out of space for now?  
Edit  
No, we're not out of space! I can continue.  
I think I was misunderstanding the role of the pathway document. Let me clarify:  
The pathway document = A reference resource that lists AI prompts organized by barrier type  
The daily planning process = Student shares their executive summary with AI, says "I'm struggling with [barrier]," and AI says "Based on your situation, try this prompt from the pathway document..."  
So the pathway document isn't meant to include the daily workflow structure - it's meant to be a menu of focused prompts that AI can recommend based on the student's current barrier and project status.  
Is that right? The student brings their context to AI, AI helps them pick the right pathway prompt for today's work, and then they use that specific prompt to plan their session?  
If so, then the pathway prompts should be laser-focused on addressing the specific barrier through today's authentic project work, without worrying about the broader daily workflow (since AI will handle that part when students share their executive summaries).  
Am I finally understanding the architecture correctly?  
Retry  
[Claude can make mistakes. Please double-check responses.](https://support.anthropic.com/en/articles/8525154-claude-is-providing-incorrect-or-misleading-responses-what-s-going-on)  
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**C**  
Clayn  
Free plan