WINTER BLITZ / FACILITATOR EDITION

Four weeks.
A project worth sharing.

A practical delivery plan for AI Literacy & Social Cybersecurity 101.

Designed for beginner community learners, working solo or in teams of 2–4. Adapt reading level, tools, and permissions to the group. No paid AI tool is required.

Before the first meeting

- Choose four weekly dates, a 90-minute lab slot, and a separate 45-minute showcase slot. Allow 45 minutes of independent work each week.
- Confirm a host, a feedback moderator/timekeeper, a meeting space, and a private method for learners to share artifacts if needed.
- Choose approved tools. Offer paper, large-print documents, captions, transcripts, keyboard access, and a non-live presentation option.
- Ask about access needs without requiring a diagnosis. For youth groups, follow your organization's consent and safeguarding process.
- Keep showcase attendance and project notes private by default. Obtain separate permission for recording, names, images, and public sharing.
- Decide how you will collect work. The website stores notes only in each learner's browser; it is not a submission system or shared classroom.

Launch brief

> How might we help a specific community make better digital decisions using a resource that is useful, evidence-based, and safer to share?

Offer a choice of guide, poster, short explainer, slide deck, or simple webpage. Keep one project through all four weeks so revisions are visible. Use the fictional event-invitation example when learners need a starting point.

Prerequisite: ability to read or listen to the materials and use a document or paper notebook. Begin with the six-station foundation course as needed; do not make tool accounts a barrier.

Weekly lab: 90 minutes

1. **0–10:** check-in, recap feedback, name the visible outcome.
2. **10–25:** demonstrate one skill using the worked example.

3. **25–75:** build in short cycles; pause halfway for a peer check.
4. **75–90:** record evidence, choose the independent-work task, and rehearse the showcase.

Independent studio: 45 minutes to finish the weekly deliverables and prepare a demo. If a learner misses a lab, send the weekly brief, offer a short check-in, and accept a written or recorded showcase.

WEEK 1 · A PROBLEM WORTH SOLVING

Discover & define

Who could we help, and what would a useful first version do?

> **Your outcome**
>
> Write a clear project brief and compare two AI-assisted drafts against real evidence.

Learn, then build

Start with A1 Understand AI, A2 Ask better, and A3 Check before sharing in the foundation course. Open the foundation course.

1. Choose a real audience: a community group, a learning club, or a fictional local organization. Ask one consenting person about a need, or use the example brief below.
2. Write a one-sentence problem, one intended user, and two success criteria you can observe. Keep the scope small enough to finish in four weeks.
3. Draft a resource yourself or with an approved AI tool. Try two prompts that specify audience, purpose, constraints, and output format. Keep the prompts and describe what changed.
4. Check at least two important claims using original sources. Record the source title, URL, date checked, and what the source actually supports. Label unknowns.
5. Prepare a one-page brief with a rough sketch, two prompt versions, a source log, and a short explanation of the human decisions.

Bring to the showcase

- One-page project brief with audience, problem, scope, and two success criteria
- Two draft/prompt versions with a comparison
- Evidence log for at least two claims; unknowns clearly marked

WEEKLY SHOWCASE

Idea & evidence pitch

Show the need, a rough sketch, one improved prompt, and one claim you checked. Ask the audience: “Would this help the person we chose?”

Peer feedback: Peers name one strength, one unsupported assumption, and one manageable next step.

Revision goal: Choose one peer suggestion and explain how it changes your Week 2 build.

Worked example & practice prompt

A neighborhood club needs a one-page guide for checking suspicious event invitations. Success: a new reader can name two checks in one minute and find the official event link.

> Using this fictional neighborhood club, draft a 120-word event-verification checklist for beginners. Include a clear pause-and-check step. Do not invent event dates, official links, statistics, or quotes. Mark missing facts as [VERIFY].

An AI tool is optional. You can write and compare drafts yourself. Use fictional or approved public material.

Self-check before moving on

- I wrote a focused brief and two observable success criteria.
- I compared two drafts and documented my own decisions.
- I checked two claims and recorded feedback for next week.

WEEK 2 · TURN THE IDEA INTO SOMETHING USEFUL

Make & test

Can someone else use our prototype without us explaining every step?

> **Your outcome**
>
> Build a small prototype and improve it after observing a user try a task.

Learn, then build

Revisit A2 and A3. Use any accessible tool you already have: paper, a document, slides, audio, or a simple webpage. Open the foundation course.

1. Choose a format: a poster and checklist, a three-slide explainer, a captioned one-minute audio/video piece, or a simple webpage. A paper prototype counts.
2. Build version 1 around your two success criteria. Add a clear title, one useful action, readable text, and source attribution.
3. Prepare three tasks for a tester, such as finding the action, explaining a warning in their own words, and locating a source. Ask a consenting peer to try them; record observations without personal details.
4. Separate what the tester did from your interpretation. Note confusing language, missing information, contrast, captions, and mobile readability where applicable.
5. Make version 2. Record at least two changes and the evidence behind each. If no tester is available, run a self-walkthrough and label it as such.

Bring to the showcase

- Working or paper prototype, version 1 and version 2
- Three-task test sheet with observations and tester or self-review label
- Revision log with at least two evidence-based changes

WEEKLY SHOWCASE

Prototype demo

Demonstrate one task in version 2. Show a before/after change and the observation that caused it.

Peer feedback: Peers try one task, describe where they hesitated, and suggest one improvement.

Revision goal: Choose one usability issue and one trust question to investigate in Week 3.

Worked example & practice prompt

The invitation checklist becomes a large-print poster and a phone-friendly document. A tester finds the official-link step but misses the warning about urgent messages, so the team moves that warning nearer the top.

> Review this fictional checklist for clarity. Identify confusing phrases and suggest shorter alternatives. Do not add facts. Explain what a human tester should check.

An AI tool is optional. You can write and compare drafts yourself. Use fictional or approved public material.

Self-check before moving on

- I built a prototype someone can try.
- I recorded three task observations or clearly labeled a self-review.
- I made two changes and explained the evidence behind them.

WEEK 3 · TRUST IS PART OF THE DESIGN

Check & protect

What could mislead or expose our audience, and how can we reduce that risk?

> **Your outcome**
>
> Produce a safety-reviewed prototype with a claim audit and a response checklist.

Learn, then build

Complete B1 Defend accounts, B2 Spot the scam, and B3 Respond & recover. Practice with fictional messages and demonstrations. Open the foundation course.

1. Audit the prototype: check factual claims, source links, image/audio permissions, AI assistance disclosure, and information that should not be public.
2. Map a simple trust problem: an impersonated organizer sends an urgent invitation. Identify who could be affected, what they might do, and what independent check would help.
3. Run a tabletop exercise with a clearly fictional message. Discuss how a reader pauses, verifies through a known route, reports through the official service, and recovers if access is lost. Do not send deceptive messages or collect credentials.
4. Write a one-page safety card: prevention habits, independent verification steps, official reporting/recovery routes, and a trusted support contact category. Use placeholders instead of private contact details.
5. Revise the prototype and record what you removed or corrected. Re-test the user task from Week 2 and state any remaining limitations.

Bring to the showcase

- Claim and privacy audit with corrections and remaining limits
- One-page prevention, verification, and recovery safety card
- Revised prototype and a short tabletop exercise reflection

WEEKLY SHOWCASE

Trust & safety clinic

Show one fictional risk, your verification path, and a change that makes the project safer. Explain a limitation you still have.

Peer feedback: Peers ask: “What is your evidence? What information is unnecessary? Where would I verify this independently?”

Revision goal: Resolve one high-priority issue before preparing the final presentation.

Worked example & practice prompt

The team removes an unverified statistic, labels an AI-created illustration, and replaces a shortened link with a readable official destination. Its mock scenario uses invented names and no real login page.

> For this fictional project, list possible confusion, privacy, or impersonation risks. Suggest questions a reviewer should ask. Do not generate a real phishing message, request credentials, or claim the project is secure.

An AI tool is optional. You can write and compare drafts yourself. Use fictional or approved public material.

Self-check before moving on

- I audited claims, private information, and asset permissions.
- I practiced a fictional verification and recovery scenario.
- I revised the prototype and documented a remaining limitation.

WEEK 4 · MAKE YOUR LEARNING VISIBLE

Finish & showcase

Can we explain what we built, why it helps, and why others should trust it?

> **Your outcome**
>
> Present a finished community resource and an evidence-backed learning portfolio.

Learn, then build

Review the foundation quiz and the project feedback. Choose one weak area to revisit before the showcase. Open the foundation course.

1. Finish the resource and run your two success criteria again. Record the outcome honestly, including anything not yet achieved.
2. Assemble the portfolio: project brief, prompt/draft comparison, source log, prototype revisions, user-test notes, safety card, and final artifact.
3. Prepare a five-slide story: need and audience; solution; evidence and revisions; safety and limitations; next step. Add captions or a transcript for recorded media.
4. Rehearse a three-minute demo. Remove private names, account information, unapproved likenesses, and hidden answer keys from anything shown on screen.
5. Present, collect feedback, and write a reflection: what I learned, what AI helped with, what I decided, and what I will improve next. Public sharing is optional and requires the group’s agreed permission.

Bring to the showcase

- Finished artifact with sources and AI-use disclosure
- Portfolio showing evidence, changes, safety review, and reflection
- Three-minute demo or an accessible written/recorded alternative

WEEKLY SHOWCASE

Winter Blitz community showcase

Use three minutes to explain the need, demonstrate the artifact, show evidence of improvement, and name one limitation. Take one minute of questions and one minute for your next step.

Peer feedback: Peers use the four-part rubric and describe a specific piece of evidence behind each rating.

Revision goal: Choose one follow-up improvement and keep a copy of your portfolio after the program.

Worked example & practice prompt

The final showcase presents a two-page event-verification kit, a before/after poster, a three-task test result, and a short explanation of where AI suggestions were accepted or rejected.

> Help me outline a three-minute presentation using only these project notes. Keep claims tied to evidence, identify missing information, and include a clear statement of human decisions and remaining limitations.

An AI tool is optional. You can write and compare drafts yourself. Use fictional or approved public material.

Self-check before moving on

- I tested the final artifact against my success criteria.
- I assembled my portfolio with sources, disclosure, and safety review.
- I presented or prepared an accessible alternative and wrote my reflection.

SHOWCASE PLAYBOOK

A consistent weekly stage.

Use 45 minutes for up to six projects: 5-minute welcome, six 5-minute project slots, 7-minute reflection, and 3-minute close. Add parallel rooms or another session for larger groups.

Weeks 1–3: 2-minute demo, 2-minute feedback, 1-minute revision commitment. Week 4: 3-minute demo, 1-minute question, 1-minute next step. Teams divide the speaking roles; solo learners can ask the moderator to read questions.

Host opening script

> Welcome to the Winter Blitz showcase. We are here to learn from the work and help the next version. Show what you made, the evidence behind a decision, and something you want feedback on. Ask before recording or sharing anyone's work.

Feedback protocol

1. The maker states the feedback question.
2. Peers describe one specific strength using evidence from the demo.
3. Peers ask one question, then suggest one small improvement.
4. The maker chooses a revision and records why it matters.

Useful

The audience and need are clear. A user can complete the intended task.

Evidence-based

Important claims have sources. Changes are connected to observations, not just preferences.

Responsible

Private information is removed. Asset permissions, AI assistance, verification routes, and limitations are explained.

Clear

The demo is understandable, readable or captioned, and includes a next step.

For each area, give **1: emerging** (not yet shown), **2: developing** (partly shown), or **3: demonstrated** (supported by a concrete example). Add one evidence note and one next step. This is a feedback rubric, not a credential or security certification.

Weekly showcase roster template

Slot	Project / team alias	Presenter / format	Feedback focus
1	_____	_____	_____
2	_____	_____	_____
3	_____	_____	_____
4	_____	_____	_____
5	_____	_____	_____
6	_____	_____	_____

Evidence templates

Project brief

Audience: _____ · Problem: _____ · Artifact: _____
Success criterion 1: _____ · Success criterion 2: _____
In scope: _____ · Out of scope: _____

Claim log

Claim: _____
Original source title and URL: _____
Date checked: _____
What it supports / does not support: _____
Action: keep / correct / remove / mark unknown.

User test

Task: _____ · Expected result: _____
Observed result: _____ · Test type: consenting peer / self-review.
Change made: _____ · Retest result: _____

AI-use disclosure

> I used [tool or manual drafting] to help with [task]. I checked [claims or outputs] using [sources or tests]. I changed or rejected [suggestion] because [reason]. I made the final decisions about [choices].

Showcase reflection

One strength: _____ · One question: _____
One revision: _____ · Evidence I will collect next: _____

Facilitator review & closeout

- Look for evidence of learning across all four weeks, not only polished design. A thoughtful paper prototype can meet the outcomes.
- Use the rubric formatively. Invite revision rather than treating a low rating as a final failure.
- Before public display, check claims, permissions, readable/captioned formats, private information, and the learner's sharing choice.
- Ask learners to export their portfolio, save a copy of their artifact, and name one next skill.
- Record attendance and feedback only through your agreed process. Do not ask learners to put passwords or sensitive records in project notes.

When something goes wrong

No AI access: use manual drafts and the example prompts as a critique exercise. **No peer tester:** label a self-review. **No internet:** use this handbook and a paper artifact, then verify sources when connected. **Storage unavailable:** export notes before leaving the page. **Showcase not accessible:** accept a written or captioned alternative.

Foundation materials

AI Literacy & Social Cybersecurity 101 includes the six learning stations, practice quiz, and source references. The program is educational practice, not a professional certification or a security audit.

Dates, enrollment, recording, submissions, and streaming are arranged by the host. This handbook does not activate those services.