



Re: Level 3 Course -- Late February or Early March?

From Youth Horizons Learning <youthhorizonslearning@gmail.com>

Date Sun 1/25/2026 9:09 PM

To Plate, Daniel <DPlate@lindenwood.edu>

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Hi Dr. Plate,

Thank you so much for this thoughtful message — I'm really glad to hear that the structure and direction of Level 3 resonate with you, and I'm excited about the possibility of working together on this.

To respond to your points and share a bit more from our side:

Level 2:

That sounds great. Level 2 is moving forward as planned, and we're currently in the recruitment and outreach phase. Our goal is to launch around mid-February, assuming enrollment progresses as expected.

Level 3:

Your timeline works well for us. We're very flexible on the start date for Level 3, and beginning in mid-March would be completely fine. We'd much rather align the launch with your availability so the course can start strong and be well supported.

Curriculum Development:

I also wanted to clarify a bit how we're thinking about curriculum development overall. In addition to the Speech & Debate Agent project, we're also developing two parallel Level 3-style courses: one focused on AI + Healthcare and another on AI + Finance. Those two tracks are being designed and developed together by two other instructors.

Across all three projects, our current collaboration model looks like this: Youth Horizons (YHL) takes responsibility for designing the overall framework — including the course flow, project structure, learning objectives, and shared templates or supporting materials. Instructors then review, refine, and confirm the academic and technical soundness of the content. Our intention is to handle as much of the upfront structural work as possible, so instructors can focus their time and energy on project delivery, mentorship, and close work with students.

I'd love to hear your thoughts on whether this model feels workable from your perspective, and of course we're very open to adjusting it based on your experience and preferences.

Looking forward to next steps and continuing the conversation.

Best regards,
Bing

On Sun, Jan 25, 2026 at 3:11PM Plate, Daniel <DPlate@lindenwood.edu> wrote:

Hi Bing,

Thank you for the detailed follow-up. I really like the approach you're taking with Level 3 — the modular research structure, the "small research team" framing, and the realistic expectations about what a successful prototype looks like. This is genuinely exciting to me, and I'd like to teach it.

So to confirm where I stand:

Level 2: I'm committed to teaching this in the format we discussed — 12 weeks, 2-hour sessions, Saturday evenings. I'm ready to start whenever students are prepared.

Level 3: I'm also committed to teaching the Speech & Debate Agent project in the format you've proposed (15-16 sessions, 2 hours each, 4 students). The one timing consideration: I have a book manuscript due at the beginning of March, so it would be difficult for me to start Level 3 before the second half of February or early March.

Curriculum Development: You mentioned another instructor is already working on Level 3. I'd be interested in being part of the curriculum development side as well, and I'd actually welcome the chance to start those conversations earlier — even in early February. Connecting with the other instructor or discussing how curriculum development works would help me as I prepare for Level 3 and would ensure what I'm building aligns with what Youth Horizons is aiming for. Within the next month, my book will be done and my bandwidth will open up significantly, but I'm happy to start meeting or emailing about the curriculum side now.

Let me know what makes sense for next steps.

Best,

Dan

From: Youth Horizons Learning <youthhorizonslearning@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, January 25, 2026 12:49 PM

To: Plate, Daniel <DPlate@lindenwood.edu>

Subject: Re: Level 3 Course -- Late February or Early March?

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Hi Dr. Plate,

Thank you again for such a careful and insightful response. I really appreciate your thoughtful analysis, especially around the technical realities of audio and video processing — your caution there is absolutely well-taken.

I wanted to follow up with one clarification that may help further contextualize how we're envisioning the role of the different modules, particularly the delivery (audio/video) component.

Our intention is not that each module functions as a fully independent or self-contained project. Rather, the design goal is for each student to take primary ownership of one module, while still operating within a shared system and a shared research narrative. We actively want there to be "upstream" and "downstream" coordination across modules — for example, how content analysis feeds into feedback generation, or how feedback logic informs practice recommendations.

In that sense, the course is meant to resemble a small research-and-build team, or even a very early-stage startup environment. Each student has a distinct responsibility, but no one is expected to solve the entire problem space alone. The emphasis is less on technical perfection in

any single module and more on how the modules conceptually fit together, how design decisions interact across components, and how a partial or imperfect system can still be evaluated and demonstrated.

With respect to the audio/video delivery module specifically, we see it as a potentially higher-risk, higher-complexity role within the team, not a requirement for every cohort and not something that needs to reach a high level of technical sophistication to be successful. Even a relatively simple or preliminary implementation — or one that clearly documents its limitations — would be entirely acceptable if it meaningfully connects to the broader system.

From our perspective, even arriving at a basic, imperfect, but integrated prototype — where the four modules can be shown working together at a conceptual or minimal functional level — would already constitute a strong outcome. The process of grappling with integration challenges, tradeoffs, and constraints is itself a major part of the educational value we're aiming for.

More broadly, I also wanted to share that we have been actively thinking about the longer-term development of the Level 3 curriculum as a whole. We already have another instructor working with us on advancing this track, and if this direction resonates with you, we would very much welcome your involvement as well.

We are completely open in terms of how such a collaboration might be structured — whether around curriculum design, teaching, advising, or a combination — and we would also appreciate hearing your thoughts on what a reasonable model of collaboration and compensation might look like from your perspective.

Thank you again for engaging with this so thoughtfully. I truly value your perspective, and I'm excited about the possibility of building something meaningful together, should this align with your interests and availability.

Best regards,
Bing
Youth Horizons Learning (YHL)

Plate, Daniel <DPlate@lindenwood.edu> 2026 1 25 6:52
Hi Bing,

One more thing I wanted to mention: over the last five years, curriculum development has been a significant focus of my work. I published a book with Routledge on composition and AI in composition classrooms, and composition, at its core, is argumentation and debate.

I noticed in your proposal that you're thinking about standardizing this Level 3 offering so it can be replicated for future cohorts. That kind of work — modularizing a course, making it scalable and repeatable — is something I find genuinely interesting and have experience with. So beyond teaching the course itself, I'd be very interested in pursuing work where I help with developing and refining that side of the program. If that's something Youth Horizons would value, I'd welcome a conversation about what that could look like. The Level 3 approach has significant potential in the future of education more broadly as AI forces all institutions to re-think the way instruction is provided and students learn best. I think big changes are coming very quickly, and developing models for maximizing the collaboration of AI and humans in learning is the correct approach.

Best,

Dr. Plate



Daniel Plate / Professor of English

Lindenwood University / [209 South Kingshighway • St. Charles, MO 63301](#)

636.949.4362 (o) / [LinkedIn](#) / [Facebook](#) / [Twitter](#) / [lindenwood.edu](#)

From: Youth Horizons Learning <youthhorizonslearning@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, January 24, 2026 8:21 PM

To: Plate, Daniel <DPlate@lindenwood.edu>

Subject: Re: Level 3 Course -- Late February or Early March?

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Hi Dr. Plate,

I hope you've been doing well. I just wanted to briefly follow up on the Level 3 AI+Research project framework I shared with you earlier, centered around the modular Speech & Debate Agent concept.

I completely understand that your schedule is very full, and there's absolutely no pressure at all. I mainly wanted to check in to see whether, from your perspective, this kind of research-oriented, modular design feels academically and practically feasible for high-school students at this level, or whether you see any potential concerns or limitations.

If you feel that this particular structure may not be the best fit, that is completely fine as well — we are very open to adjusting the design or exploring alternative approaches that might align better with your experience and expectations.

Your honest feedback would be incredibly valuable to us, whether that's a quick reaction, a concern you foresee, or even a sense that this might not be the right direction. We truly appreciate your time and perspective.

Thank you again, and I look forward to hearing from you whenever you have a moment.

Best regards,

Bing

Youth Horizons Learning <youthhorizonslearning@gmail.com> 2026 1 22 5:20

Hi Dr. Plate,

Thank you for following up. I actually had some ideas regarding the Level 3 course today; please refer to the following details:

[AI + Research Level 3]

Project Name: Speech & Debate Agent

Modular Research-Based Course Design - Instructor Briefing Document

1. What this course is?

This Level 3 course is designed as a research-based, lab-style AI project, rather than a traditional skills or coding class.

The overarching goal is for students to conduct applied AI research by developing and evaluating modular components of an AI-powered Speech & Debate Coach. Each student works on a different module, but all projects are aligned under a shared research theme, dataset, and evaluation framework.

This course emphasizes:

- Research question formulation
- Methodological decision-making
- Evaluation and comparison
- Clear explanation of results

The final objective is not a polished commercial product, but a well-reasoned research artifact supported by a working prototype.

2. Why "Speech & Debate Agent" is the Core Theme

Speech & Debate is particularly well-suited as a Level 3 research theme because it is:

- Structurally complex (content, delivery, feedback, training)
- Naturally modular
- Evaluation-friendly (rubrics, judges, coaches, transcripts)
- Interdisciplinary (AI, education, communication, cognition)

Rather than asking students to "build an AI agent," we ask them to investigate:

How can AI systems support structured, fair, and effective feedback for student speech and debate performance?

This shared question anchors all student projects.

3. Cohort Structure: One Theme, Multiple Modules

Each Level 3 cohort consists of four students.

- All students share:
- The same global research theme
- The same speech data sources (transcripts, audio, rubrics)
- The same evaluation philosophy
- Each student selects one research module as their primary project focus.

Example Module Directions

- Speech Content Analysis

Identifying argument structure, clarity, and logical completeness

- Speech Delivery Analysis

Extracting and analyzing prosodic features such as pace, pauses, and emphasis

- Judge-Style Feedback Modeling

Comparing AI-generated feedback with human judge or coach feedback

- Personalized Practice Recommendation

Exploring whether AI-driven recommendations improve training outcomes

Although technical approaches may differ, all modules address the same high-level goal: AI-supported feedback and improvement in speech performance.

4. What Makes This a “Research Course” (Not a Coding Class)

Students are not evaluated primarily on:

- Model complexity
- Code sophistication
- Feature completeness

Instead, the course prioritizes:

- Whether the student defined a clear, researchable question
- Whether their methodological choices are reasonable and explainable
- Whether they used an appropriate baseline or comparison
- Whether results are interpreted thoughtfully, including limitations

A simple model with strong reasoning is preferred over a complex system with weak justification.

5. Instructor Role: From “Teacher” to “PI / Lab Lead”

Instructors are not expected to debug code line-by-line or master every technical path.

The instructor’s primary responsibilities are to:

- Guide research question refinement
- Evaluate methodological decisions
- Challenge weak assumptions
- Ensure evaluation logic is sound
- Help students articulate their reasoning clearly

Think of the role as: Principal Investigator leading a small undergraduate-style research lab

6. Weekly Class Structure (2 Hours)

Each session follows a consistent structure designed to manage cognitive load and support multiple directions simultaneously.

Part 1: Shared Research Focus (30–40 minutes)

All students work together on a common research skill, such as:

- Refining research questions
- Designing evaluation metrics
- Interpreting experimental results
- Discussing bias, limitations, or validity

This segment is module-agnostic and method-focused.

Part 2: Structured Module Check-ins (40–50 minutes)

Each student gives a brief, structured update (8–10 minutes) addressing:

1. What they accomplished since last session
2. The key research decision they faced
3. How they plan to validate their next step

Instructor feedback focuses on decision quality, not implementation details.

Part 3: Cross-Module Discussion (20–30 minutes)

Students respond to and critique each other's approaches:

- Comparing definitions of "quality"
- Questioning evaluation choices
- Identifying overlaps or conflicts across modules

The instructor facilitates synthesis rather than delivering extended lectures.

7. Expectations and Boundaries (Important for Sustainability)

To ensure the course remains effective and manageable:

- Instructors are not responsible for full technical debugging
- Students must arrive with specific research questions or decisions, not vague blockers
- All modules must align with the shared evaluation framework
- Progress is measured by research clarity, not feature count

These boundaries are explicit and intentional.

8. Final Student Outcomes

By the end of Level 3, each student will produce:

- A structured AI Research Report
- A functional module-level prototype or demo
- A clear explanation of methods, results, and limitations
- A research-style presentation or poster

Collectively, the cohort forms a modular AI Speech & Debate Coach system, demonstrating

collaborative research design.

9. Why This Design Works (Instructor Perspective)

This structure:

- Reduces instructor cognitive overload
- Encourages peer learning and comparison
- Mirrors authentic academic research environments
- Produces outcomes that are credible to universities and mentors

It is intentionally designed to feel closer to a research seminar or lab than a traditional class.

10. Closing Note to Instructors

This course does not ask instructors to "teach AI tools." It asks them to mentor students in thinking like researchers, using AI as the medium.

If successful, students leave not only with a project, but with a research mindset transferable to future academic work.

Because speech and debate are another core program of our organization, I'm considering bringing this need out directly and positioning it as a Level 3 project. If you think it is technically feasible, this project could be fixed as a standard Level 3 offering: each class would have four students, meet for two hours per session, and likely run for 15 or 16 sessions in total.

If the first cohort runs smoothly, then the course content and implementation process for this Level 3 project can be standardized, making it much simpler to replicate for future cohorts.

I look forward to hearing your thoughts or suggestions on this. Thanks!

Best regards,
Bing

On Thu, Jan 22, 2026 at 9:31AM Plate, Daniel <DPlate@lindenwood.edu> wrote:
Hi Bing,

This is Dan Plate. I'm getting close to having my materials ready for the Level 2 course we've been planning and scheduling.

You mentioned earlier in January some interest in a more project-based, mentor-led Level 3 course. I'm inquiring whether you think there will be demand for that course.

If there is demand, I could see starting a course like that later in February or during March. I'd be curious to hear any thoughts of yours about that offering.

Dr. Plate



Daniel Plate / Professor of English

Lindenwood University / [209 South Kingshighway • St.](#) Charles, MO 63301

636.949.4362 (o) / [LinkedIn](#) / [Facebook](#) / [Twitter](#) / [lindenwood.edu](#)