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# Writing Skills Self-Diagnostic Strategies
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**C**  
I am working on a composition course where students use a self diagnostic to identify barriers to their writing skills and then explore a variety of pathways to address those deficiencies based on the learning domain. Question: how might I deal with a student who self diagnoses, either from Dunning Krueger or over preparation, as having no deficiencies to work on?  
Edit  
This is a common challenge in writing instruction, and you're right to anticipate it. Here are several strategies to address students who believe they have no deficiencies:  
Reframe the diagnostic approach: Instead of focusing on "deficiencies," position the exercise as identifying "growth opportunities" or "areas for expansion." This subtle shift reduces defensiveness and appeals to students' desire for advancement rather than remediation.  
Introduce complexity gradually: Present increasingly sophisticated writing tasks during the diagnostic phase. A student confident in basic essay structure might struggle with synthesizing multiple sources, addressing counterarguments, or adapting tone for different audiences. This reveals gaps without direct confrontation.  
Use peer review strategically: Have students review anonymous samples (including some professional writing) alongside their own work. This often helps overconfident students recognize sophistication they hadn't previously noticed, naturally leading to self-reflection about their own writing.  
Implement reflective metacognition: Ask students to articulate their writing process in detail - how they generate ideas, organize thoughts, revise, etc. Students who think they're already skilled often realize they lack systematic approaches when forced to examine their methods explicitly.  
Create aspirational categories: Instead of basic skill areas, include advanced domains like "writing for disciplinary experts," "cross-cultural communication," or "multimedia integration." Even strong writers can identify areas where they'd like to grow.  
Use the "teaching others" approach: Ask these students to mentor struggling peers or create instructional materials. This responsibility often reveals knowledge gaps they hadn't recognized while positioning them as resources rather than remedial cases.  
How does your current diagnostic structure work? Understanding the specific format might help tailor these approaches to your course design.  
Retry  
**C**  
To be honest, I am less concerned about the DK student, as they would quickly demonstrate their overconfidence. Since these self diagnoses are intended to allow for completely independentlearning plans for each student, I don't want to create busywork for superior students while I focus on their struggling peers. I also don't want to force them into the role ofunwilling peer tutor, which is essentially busywork with a different title.  
Edit  
You're absolutely right to avoid those traps. Creating meaningful independent learning for genuinely advanced students requires a different approach entirely.  
Authentic advanced challenges: Design learning pathways that extend beyond typical course boundaries. For instance, if your course covers academic writing, advanced students might explore genre-specific conventions in their intended field, analyze rhetorical strategies in professional publications, or tackle complex multimodal compositions that integrate their disciplinary expertise.  
Self-directed inquiry projects: Allow these students to identify and pursue writing challenges that genuinely interest them - perhaps experimenting with new forms, researching writing in their career field, or developing expertise in areas like grant writing, technical communication, or public scholarship.  
Portfolio depth over breadth: Instead of additional assignments, have them create fewer pieces with significantly more sophisticated revision cycles, incorporating feedback from actual professionals in their field or publishing their work in appropriate venues.  
Metacognitive documentation: Ask them to document and analyze their own writing processes at a research level - essentially conducting a case study of their own development. This creates genuine learning while producing insights that could benefit future iterations of your course.  
Real-world application: Connect them with actual writing needs in the community, internships, or research projects where their skills serve authentic purposes rather than classroom exercises.  
The key is ensuring their pathway genuinely advances their capabilities rather than simply keeping them occupied. What's the scope of writing skills your course typically covers? That might help identify where these authentic extensions could lead.  
Retry  
**C**  
It's an experimental course that eschews traditional academic writing because my students all have a career technical focus, so the writing assignments will be derived by analyzing common wiring tasks in their chosen field in collaboration with an AI agent.  
Edit  
This is fascinating - you're essentially creating a personalized curriculum where each student maps the writing ecosystem of their specific career field. For genuinely advanced students, this opens up some compelling possibilities:  
Genre archaeology: Have them conduct deep analysis of how writing conventions evolved in their field. Why do engineering reports follow certain formats? How did medical documentation develop its current structure? This historical lens often reveals subtleties that even experienced writers haven't considered.  
Cross-industry translation: Challenge them to adapt writing from their field for different audiences - turning technical specifications into client proposals, regulatory documents into training materials, or research findings into policy briefs. This builds sophisticated audience awareness.  
Innovation and disruption analysis: Have them identify where current writing practices in their field are failing or evolving. Are there emerging technologies, changing regulations, or new stakeholder needs that demand different approaches? This positions them as thought leaders rather than just skilled practitioners.  
Systematic workflow development: Instead of just learning to write well, have them create replicable systems for their field - templates, checklists, or AI prompt strategies that could genuinely improve how others in their profession approach writing tasks.  
Industry mentorship documentation: Have them interview professionals about writing challenges and document best practices, creating resources that have real value beyond the classroom.  
Since you're using AI collaboration, advanced students could also push the boundaries of how AI can enhance professional writing in their specific field rather than just using it as a basic tool.  
What career technical areas are your students focusing on? That might suggest some field-specific advanced pathways.  
Retry  
**C**  
There are over 34 different career tracks, so I have to keep the general pathways open, but students all have the ability to make customization recommendations that I cover with them during weekly 1 on 1 student conferences  
Edit  
That's a brilliant structure - the weekly conferences give you the flexibility to truly customize while maintaining manageable pathways. For advanced students in this setup, you could create a few high-level independent tracks that work across all 34 career areas:  
Systems thinking pathway: Have them analyze and optimize the entire communication ecosystem of their field - not just individual documents, but how information flows between stakeholders, where bottlenecks occur, and how writing practices could be systematized for efficiency.  
Innovation research track: Let them investigate emerging trends affecting professional communication in their field - new technologies, regulatory changes, demographic shifts - and develop adaptive writing strategies. This keeps them intellectually engaged while building genuinely useful expertise.  
Teaching/mentorship documentation: Have them create comprehensive guides or training materials for their field's writing practices, but at a level that could actually be used by professional organizations or educational programs.  
Cross-pollination projects: Challenge them to identify successful communication strategies from other fields that could be adapted to theirs - this requires deep understanding of both their own field and sophisticated analytical skills.  
The beauty of your weekly conferences is you can gauge whether they're genuinely thriving with independence or need more structure. You can also spot when a student who initially seemed advanced actually needs more guidance, or when someone who seemed to struggle is ready for more autonomy.  
How long are you planning these independent learning phases to run before reconvening for assessment or adjustment?  
Retry  
**C**  
It is part of the focus of those weekly conferences, I can independently review their work as it appears in shared collaboration spaces (Google docs) and progress tracking (shared kanban board)  
Edit  
That's an elegant monitoring system - the real-time visibility into their work process is invaluable. With that level of ongoing observation, you can probably identify the truly advanced students pretty quickly and adjust their pathways dynamically.  
For those students, the shared spaces become even more powerful because you can:  
Escalate complexity in real-time: When you see them completing tasks efficiently, you can immediately suggest deeper layers - turning a simple procedure documentation into a comparative analysis of different approaches, or expanding a client communication into a multi-stakeholder negotiation framework.  
Leverage the collaboration space strategically: Instead of isolating advanced students, you could have them document their problem-solving process in ways that naturally become resources for others - not forced tutoring, but authentic knowledge creation that happens to be visible to peers.  
Create feedback loops with industry: Since you can see their work developing, you could potentially connect their projects with actual professionals in their field for real-world feedback, turning their advanced work into genuine professional networking opportunities.  
Build portfolio depth: The ongoing visibility lets you guide them toward creating fewer, more sophisticated pieces that demonstrate genuine professional capability rather than just academic completion.  
The kanban board is particularly smart - it makes their self-direction visible and accountable without micromanaging. Are you planning to have different board categories for different complexity levels, or keeping everyone on the same general workflow structure?  
Retry  
**C**  
Same structure. They have to complete 4 wiring projects, though the nature is really open to interpretation. The 4 assignmentsserve as task cards that progress through the stages of the writing process until they arrive at completion. The learning outcomes for the course differ areas four learning related to these stages, as well as elements of theoretical strategy, critical reading, the writing process, source integration, and collaboration. My goal is to allow students to identify barriers to their performance in these areas and to select appropriate activities to help resolve those barriers. The activities they choose to do (i have given them done suggestions) would then be added as subtasks to the writing program they are working on.  
Edit  
Now I see the elegant structure - the writing projects are the through-line, but the real learning happens in the subtasks they select to address their identified barriers. This is sophisticated pedagogical design.  
For genuinely advanced students in this system, the challenge becomes helping them identify meaningful barriers that aren't obvious. They might easily recognize they need to work on "source integration" but miss subtler issues like:  
Process efficiency barriers: "I can write well, but I waste time in the drafting phase" or "My revision process is ineffective despite good final products."  
Situational adaptation barriers: "I write well for familiar audiences but struggle when the stakeholder dynamics are complex" or "I can handle routine communications but freeze when writing high-stakes documents."  
Metacognitive barriers: "I can't articulate why my writing works, which limits my ability to adapt to new genres" or "I don't recognize my own assumptions when writing for diverse audiences."  
Collaborative workflow barriers: "I struggle to maintain quality when working with others" or "I can't effectively guide collaborative writing processes."  
The beauty of your subtask system is that advanced students can pursue genuinely sophisticated activities - conducting ethnographic studies of their field's communication practices, developing AI prompt strategies for complex professional scenarios, or creating systematic approaches to stakeholder analysis.  
During your weekly conferences, you're probably well-positioned to help them recognize these subtler barriers by asking about their process rather than just their products. What kinds of barrier categories are students typically identifying so far?  
Retry  
**C**  
This is all anticipatory, I am in the design phase and haven't run the pilot of the course yet.  
Edit  
Ah, that makes perfect sense - you're thinking through the edge cases before launch, which is smart design work.  
Since you're still in the design phase, you might want to build in some diagnostic mechanisms specifically for identifying these subtler barriers in advanced students. A few possibilities:  
Process reflection prompts: Include questions that force students to examine their assumptions: "Describe a time when your writing didn't achieve the result you expected" or "What aspects of writing in your field do you find most predictable/unpredictable?"  
Comparative analysis tasks: Early diagnostic activities where they analyze expert writing in their field and explain what makes it effective. Advanced students often reveal gaps when they can't articulate why something works.  
Stakeholder complexity scenarios: Present them with multi-audience writing situations during the diagnostic phase. Even confident writers often struggle when they have to balance competing stakeholder needs.  
Self-advocacy challenges: Ask them to identify what writing skills they'll need in 3-5 years that they don't currently possess. This pushes beyond current competence toward genuine growth areas.  
The advantage of designing for this now is you can create diagnostic pathways that naturally surface these subtler barriers rather than trying to coach students into recognizing them later.  
Are you planning to pilot with a smaller group first, or launching with full cohorts across all 34 career tracks?  
Retry  
**C**  
Two separate classes of 24 students (14 traditional students and 10 remedial students). The only distinction between the learning process for the traditional students and the remedial students is that the remedial students have an additional 30 minute workshop two days a week in addition to their regular 2 75 minute class sessions. Students come from an unknown number of didn't trade programs  
Edit  
That's a solid pilot structure - the additional workshop time for remedial students is a nice touch that provides support without stigmatizing them within the main class sessions.  
With 48 students across diverse career tracks, you'll get rich data on how the self-diagnostic and independent pathway system works in practice. A few design considerations for your pilot:  
Diagnostic calibration: You'll quickly learn whether your initial barrier categories capture the real issues students face, or if you need to adjust. The mix of traditional and remedial students will give you good range for testing the diagnostic tool's sensitivity.  
Pathway scaffolding: With such diverse career tracks in a small sample, you'll see which general pathways truly work across fields and which need more customization. This will inform how you structure the weekly conferences.  
Workload management: 48 weekly one-on-ones is substantial - you might discover you need to vary the frequency or format based on student needs, or develop efficient systems for tracking progress across the shared spaces.  
Advanced student emergence: You'll likely identify your genuinely advanced students within the first few weeks, giving you time to test different approaches for keeping them engaged without creating busywork.  
The unknown number of career tracks actually works in your favor - you'll discover which fields have similar writing ecosystems and which need unique approaches, helping you refine the system for broader implementation.  
What's your timeline for the pilot? Are you running it next semester?  
Retry  
**C**  
Starts August 25, so i still have develop tone, but not a lot.  
Edit  
That's tight timing - about 5 weeks to finalize everything. Given your time constraints, you might want to focus on getting the core diagnostic and pathway structure solid rather than trying to perfect every edge case scenario.  
For the advanced student issue specifically, you could start with a simple "growth mindset" framing in your diagnostic - something like asking all students to identify their strongest writing area and then immediately follow with "What's the next level of sophistication you could achieve in this area?" This naturally pushes even confident students toward identifying meaningful challenges.  
You could also build in a "challenge escalation" option from day one - if students complete their selected activities quickly and effectively, they can request more complex alternatives. This lets you handle advanced students reactively rather than trying to anticipate every scenario upfront.  
Since you're piloting, you can also be transparent with students that you're testing the system and invite their feedback on whether the pathways are appropriately challenging. Advanced students often appreciate being part of the design process.  
The weekly conferences will be your safety net - you'll spot issues early and can adjust individual pathways as needed.  
Are you planning to have the diagnostic and initial pathway selection happen in the first week, or spreading it out over the first few class sessions?  
Retry  
**C**  
Over the First week, maybe two weeks of class. Since there are no lectures or due dates embedded in the class, I have a lot more flexibility to do this kind of thing without disrupting established timeliness.  
Edit  
That's brilliant - no fixed deadlines gives you incredible flexibility to let the diagnostic process unfold naturally. Students can really dig into understanding their own writing challenges without the pressure of artificial timelines.  
With that much flexibility, you could even let the diagnostic evolve responsively. Some students might identify their barriers quickly while others need more time and different approaches. The advanced students who initially claim no deficiencies might need that full two weeks to encounter tasks complex enough to reveal their actual growth areas.  
You could also use the staggered diagnostic period to observe students' natural work patterns - some might jump in immediately, others might need more scaffolding, and you'll quickly spot who's genuinely ready for independent challenge versus who's overconfident.  
The no-lecture, no-deadline structure is particularly smart for career technical students who probably appreciate the professional project management approach over traditional academic scheduling.  
Are you planning to introduce the AI collaboration component during the diagnostic phase, or waiting until students have selected their learning pathways? That timing might affect how students assess their own capabilities, especially around research and source integration skills.  
Retry  
image.png  
**C**  
So here is how I am planning on administering everything, which is probably my biggest headscratcher right now. After students articulate their initial learning plan/contract (which isn't a formal document, just a series of stated priorities), they will log into Clickup where I have created a kanban board. The individual task cards in the rows of the board represent the 5 writing assignments (4 writing samples based on authentic professional writing from their career field and 1 summative self-assessment that they draft towards the end of the semester charting their overall growth and progression). Individual. Students will then be able to chart their progression through the writing process (which forms the columns of the board) as they complete that phase of writing for each sample. Daily activities are charted by creating sub-tasks based on the writing sample they are doing. Custom fields inside the tasks and subtasks allow students to indicate which learning outcome they are working with that informs challenges or struggles within that particular writing phase (this comes from the self-diagnostic) and which domain (cognitive, affective, applicative) sums up their difficulties and directs them to the activities they spend each class period doing to help them progress toward completion. Since the boards are shared, I can see their progress at a glance and use that insight to direct our conference sessions. They can plainly see where they stand at any given moment, especially if they are switching from project to project throughout the semester instead of working linearly. I have included custom fields that also allow them to insert narratives about their current progress on any given sub-task as well as indicate when they have concerns that should be addressed in a conference so they don't forget, and breakthroughs when they have particular successes that should be included in the self-assessment. Here's a screen capture of the blank template...  
Edit  
This is really sophisticated - the ClickUp setup gives you incredible visibility into both their process and their thinking. The custom fields for learning outcomes, domains, and narrative reflections are particularly smart because they make the metacognitive work visible and trackable.  
For your advanced student challenge, this system actually provides some elegant solutions:  
The subtask structure becomes self-differentiating. An advanced student working on "source integration" might add subtasks like "analyze rhetorical strategies in competing industry standards" while a struggling student might add "practice basic citation formatting." Same learning outcome, completely different complexity levels.  
The domain classification (cognitive, affective, applicative) will help you spot when advanced students are only working in their comfort zone. A student who only selects cognitive tasks might need nudging toward affective challenges like "writing for hostile audiences" or applicative work like "adapting technical specs for regulatory compliance."  
The breakthrough/concern flags give you real-time insight into their actual challenge level. If an advanced student isn't logging any concerns or struggles, that's a red flag that their subtasks aren't appropriately complex.  
The narrative fields let you coach them toward deeper self-awareness. Instead of just completing tasks, they have to articulate their process, which often reveals gaps they hadn't recognized.  
One question: Are you planning to seed the system with example subtasks for different complexity levels, or letting students generate them entirely independently? Having some aspirational examples might help advanced students recognize what deeper engagement looks like.  
Retry  
**C**  
I would, except I worry that what might be aspirational to a high performing student might be daunting to a student struggling with basic skills. I am putting a lot of weight and expectation that individual student conferences is where this kind of thing can be shared. Additionally, students will be asked to participate in a daily feedback group with their peers, where they can share these kinds of insights and where they each stand in their individual progress. Again, I can't be everything to everyone all the time, so sharing the load with peers, and using AI as a personal coach to help students push themselves seems an elegant way for me to implement all this without having to try and juggle it all myself.  
Edit  
That's exactly right - the distributed support system is much more sustainable and probably more effective than trying to centralize everything through you. The peer feedback groups are particularly smart because students often listen to insights from peers differently than from instructors.  
The AI coaching component is brilliant for the advanced student issue specifically. An AI coach can push a high-performing student toward more sophisticated challenges without you having to constantly monitor and escalate their work. It can also help them recognize when they're coasting or when their self-assessment might be off.  
For the peer feedback groups, you might consider having students occasionally share their breakthrough/concern flags from ClickUp as conversation starters. This could naturally expose advanced students to more complex challenges when they hear peers wrestling with sophisticated problems they hadn't considered.  
The individual conferences become your strategic intervention points rather than your primary delivery mechanism. You can use the ClickUp data to identify when students need course correction - whether that's an advanced student who's not pushing themselves or a struggling student who's biting off more than they can chew.  
This distributed approach also means the system can scale better if you roll it out more broadly after the pilot. You're not dependent on your ability to provide intensive individualized attention to every student.  
How are you planning to structure the peer feedback groups? Random rotation, by career field, by current project phase?  
Retry  
**C**  
Random assignment. I worry about the clear tendency to cluster in career-centric cliques. I plan on looking at how the groups work over the first few weeks, though. My initial thought was to plan on reforming groups at midterm, unless the group has really formed bonds, but I might move that up depending on how things go.  
Edit  
Random assignment is smart - it forces students to explain their work to people outside their field, which often reveals assumptions they didn't realize they were making. That cross-pollination could be especially valuable for advanced students who might be operating on autopilot within their familiar domain.  
The flexibility to reform groups is wise too. You'll probably see some groups gel immediately while others struggle with the cross-field communication. The ClickUp data will help you identify which groups are actually engaging meaningfully versus just going through the motions.  
One unexpected benefit: advanced students from different fields might challenge each other in ways that field-specific groups wouldn't. A high-performing culinary student might push a strong automotive student to think about audience in ways they hadn't considered, and vice versa.  
With your timeline crunch, this peer feedback structure also takes pressure off you to have every detail perfect from day one. The groups can help surface what's working and what needs adjustment in real time.  
The midterm reformation timing makes sense - gives enough time to see genuine group dynamics but not so long that dysfunctional groups drag down the semester. Plus by midterm you'll have solid data on individual student progress patterns to inform any regrouping decisions.  
Are you planning structured prompts for the peer feedback sessions, or letting the groups develop their own rhythm?  
Retry  
**C**  
Mostly self-directed, though I plan on asking individuals if more structure is needed. One of the things I have tried to include in the guided pathways students follow to choose their own writing activities for any given class session is including taking writing samples to share with their groups, so that can help as well.  
Edit  
That's a nice organic approach - the writing samples give them concrete material to discuss without being overly prescriptive about how they use that time. It also means the feedback stays grounded in actual work rather than abstract discussions about process.  
The self-directed structure will probably reveal a lot about group dynamics quickly. Groups that naturally find productive rhythms are likely the ones where students are genuinely engaged with the work, while groups that flounder might indicate students who aren't taking ownership of their learning pathways.  
For advanced students, these peer sessions could become some of their most valuable learning experiences. When they're explaining their sophisticated approaches to peers from different fields, they're forced to articulate what they're doing and why - which often reveals gaps in their own understanding. Plus hearing how others approach similar challenges might expose them to strategies they hadn't considered.  
The beauty of keeping it flexible is that you can adjust based on what you observe in ClickUp and during conferences. If you notice certain groups consistently producing breakthroughs while others seem stuck, you can intervene with more structure where needed without constraining the groups that are working well.  
With five weeks to launch, it sounds like you've got a solid framework that can adapt to whatever your pilot reveals. The key systems are in place to handle the complexity without overwhelming you.  
Retry  
**C**  
So this is an idea that has really gone through a ton of evolution over the past month or so. One of my biggest fears is that "ghosts" of previous draft/iterations of the design might be hiding in my course documentation and layout that could create unnecessary confusion (but,Mr. Lambert, it says right here that...). I'd like to submit the course to you in parts to review to see if these kinds of issues are present, if that's okay.  
Edit  
Absolutely, that's a great idea. Design evolution often leaves those kinds of artifacts behind, and having fresh eyes spot inconsistencies before students encounter them is much better than discovering them during the pilot.  
I'm happy to review sections and look for places where earlier versions might be creating confusion or contradiction. Things like outdated terminology, references to structures you've since changed, or instructions that assume a different workflow than what you've settled on.  
Feel free to send over whatever sections you'd like me to look at. I'll watch for both obvious inconsistencies and subtler issues where the language might not align with your current vision for how the course actually operates.  
What format are you planning to share - course documents, assignment sheets, student-facing materials?  
Retry  
**C**  
It's all student-facing documentation. The one issue is that we will almost certainly run into message limits before we get through everything, so if you could, please create a markdown document that would help us to continue the discussion retaining what we have already discussed as a shortcut.  
Edit  
Career Technical Writing Course Design Summary  
Document  
# Career Technical Writing Course Design Summary

## Course Overview  
- \*\*Experimental composition course\*\* focused on career technical writing  
- \*\*Eschews traditional academic writing\*\* in favor of authentic professional writing tasks  
- \*\*34+ differe  
Perfect! I've created a comprehensive summary that captures our discussion. This should help us continue the conversation efficiently when we hit message limits.  
The summary includes all the key design elements we've discussed, the specific challenges you're trying to solve (especially the advanced student issue), and the solutions you've built into the system. I've also noted the areas where you want me to focus during the document review.  
Ready to start looking at your course documentation whenever you are. Just reference this summary if we need to start fresh in a new conversation.  
Retry  
<h2><strong>Welcome to English 1101 / 1101P A2: Your Writing Journey Begins Here</strong></h2> <p><span style="font-size: 14pt;"><strong><a title="Welcome to English 1101 / 1101P A2: Your Writing Journey Begins Here" href="/courses/7463/pages/welcome-to-english-1101-slash-1101p-a2-your-writing-jour  
pasted  
**C**  
So here is the landing page documentation from Canvas in html format:  
Edit  
Looking at this landing page, I can spot several potential "ghost" issues from previous design iterations:

## **Major Inconsistencies Found:**

1. Assignment Count Mismatch:

* The page mentions "four Writing Assignments"
* But your current design has 4 writing samples + 1 self-assessment = 5 total projects
* This could confuse students about how many projects they're actually completing

2. Terminology Confusion:

* Uses "Writing Assignments" here vs. "writing samples" in your current design
* Students might not understand these refer to the same thing

3. Missing Key Framework Elements:

* No mention of the self-diagnostic process that's central to your design
* No reference to learning domains (cognitive, affective, applicative)
* No explanation of the barrier identification and pathway selection process
* The ClickUp kanban board system isn't mentioned at all

4. Outdated Workflow References:

* References to "Learning Contract" and "Portfolio" suggest an earlier design approach
* The "Guided Progression Pathways & AI Prompts" link hints at your current system but isn't clearly explained

5. Conference System Unclear:

* The scheduling system shows walk-up appointments, but your design emphasizes weekly scheduled conferences
* The peer feedback group process (4:30-4:45) is mentioned but not well explained

## **Recommended Fixes:**

1. Clarify the 5-project structure explicitly
2. Add a clear explanation of the self-diagnostic and independent learning pathway approach
3. Integrate ClickUp references so students understand the project management system
4. Standardize terminology throughout (writing samples vs. assignments)
5. Update the conference description to reflect your weekly scheduled approach
6. Remove or clarify outdated references to portfolios and learning contracts

The overall structure is sound, but students will likely be confused about what they're actually supposed to be doing without these clarifications.  
Retry  
**C**  
Could you draft sample statements for each of the recommended fixes that could fit into the current structure and format of the landing page?  
Edit  
Sample Statements for Landing Page Fixes  
Document  
# Sample Statements for Landing Page Fixes

## 1. Clarify the 5-Project Structure

\*\*Replace this line:\*\*  
> "you will organize your plan for how the rest of the semester will go in terms of sequencing your work around the four Writing Assignments"

\*  
I've drafted sample statements for each of the recommended fixes. These are designed to fit the current HTML structure and tone of your landing page while addressing the key inconsistencies.  
The statements maintain the informal, student-friendly tone while clarifying the core elements of your course design. They can be inserted into the existing structure without requiring major reformatting.  
A few notes on implementation:

* The terminology standardization will require a find-and-replace throughout the document
* The ClickUp explanation might need adjustment based on exactly how you plan to introduce students to that system
* The AI component addition assumes you want to mention it upfront—you might prefer to introduce it more gradually

Would you like me to adjust any of these statements or focus on particular sections?  
Retry  
**C**  
Summarize this conversation in markup?  
Edit  
Career Technical Writing Course Design Summary  
Document ∙ Version 2  
## Document Review Progress

### Landing Page Analysis Completed  
\*\*Major "Ghost" Issues Identified:\*\*  
1. \*\*Assignment count mismatch\*\* - mentions "four Writing Assignments" vs. actual 5 projects (4 samples + 1 self-assessment)  
2. \*\*Terminology confus  
I've updated the summary document with our progress on the landing page review. The key points are captured: we identified 8 major "ghost" issues from previous design iterations and provided specific fixes for each one. The document now reflects where we are in the review process and what still needs to be done.  
Ready for the next section of course documentation whenever you want to continue!  
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