

PHYS/GLBL 280  
Writing Lab 02/23/2026

# Discussion of RPPv1

If you have received a HOLD, you must meet with a TA.  
Everyone must have a finalized and approved topic  
BEFORE spring break

# RPPv2

- Revise: Fix the mistakes from RPPv1 using your TA's feedback.
- Expand: Grow your proposal into a more detailed plan.
- New Goal: Move from a simple idea to a structured research paper.

# RPPv2

- Introduction: Write your opening paragraph (must include your thesis).
- Conclusion: Write your closing paragraph (must include your recommendation).
- Expanded Outline: Increase your outline to at least 7 bullet points.
- Annotated References: Have at least 6 sources total.

# RPPv2

- AI Use is OPTIONAL: You do not have to use AI.
- Drafting First: You MUST write your Introduction, Conclusion, and new outline points by yourself before opening ChatGPT.
- AI as a Reviewer: Use AI only to analyze your logic, check your transitions, or find new papers. AI is your co-pilot, not the writer
- Mandatory Disclosure: You MUST include an "AI Disclosure Statement" in your submission, even if you did not use AI.
- Share Your Links: If you used AI, you must provide the direct links to your chat logs in your Writer's Memo.
- Show Your Work: We need to see your prompts and how you interacted with the AI.

# RPPv2

- **Verify Everything:** AI often invents fake facts, fake treaties, and fake books.
- **Your Responsibility:** You must check every source and fact the AI gives you.
- **Heavy Penalties:** Using a hallucinated (fake) source or fact is a major academic error and will result in lost points.

# RPPv2

In Writer's Memo:

I. Share the link(s) to your AI-prompt(s).

II. Write a paragraph describing how your thinking developed since RPPv1 based on TA feedback.

III. Write a paragraph describing how AI-tools were used in revising the introduction, conclusion, and outline.

IV. Discuss the verification process for your new references. Were there false references (hallucinations) suggested by your AI-tool?

V. Justify your final choice of revisions and additions.

# RPPv2

Your electronic submission must include:

1. Your RPPv2

2. AI disclosure (If you are not using AI, you must declare this with an AI disclosure)

3. Your writer's memo for RPPv2

· Note: Writer's memos and AI disclosure statements do not count toward an assignment's length requirement.

4. **\*\*submission must be in one file\*\***

# RPPv2

If you received a second HOLD, meet with your Writing Lab TA: Like RPPv1, your RPPv2 will be evaluated and marked either acceptable (PASS) or unacceptable (HOLD) based on your revised research question, thesis statement, and/or references. If you received a second HOLD, you must meet with your writing lab TA to discuss how to revise your proposal to make it acceptable.

# RPPv2

26p280 RPPv2 Rubric:

No writer's memo: -30

RPPv2 submitted late: -15

Features:	Description:	Range	Comments on student paper for each feature (noting problems and strengths):
<b>Research question and thesis statement quality</b>	<p>If RPPv1 was marked acceptable (PASS), the research question and thesis statement are similar to RPPv1.</p> <p>If RPPv1 was marked unacceptable (HOLD), the research question and thesis statement have been substantially revised and reflect the discussion between student and TA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Research question has a well-defined problem to investigate (-5%)</li> <li>- Thesis statement appropriately answers the research question (-5%)</li> <li>- Both are narrowed appropriately and have potential for technical and policy aspects (-5%)</li> </ul>	<p>15%</p> <p>High</p> <p>Mid</p> <p>Low</p>	
<b>Quality of Introduction</b>	<p>The thesis statement is clearly identifiable (-3%)</p> <p>The introduction properly reflects the research question (-3%)</p> <p>The introduction is narrowed appropriately (-3%)</p> <p><b>It has potential for both technical and policy aspects (no need for 50/50) (-3%)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The introduction is appropriate for use in the research paper (-5%)</li> </ul>	<p>15%</p> <p>High</p> <p>Mid</p> <p>Low</p>	

# RPPv2

<b>Outline quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The outline reflects chosen role (political scientist vs engineer) (-5%)</li><li>• Sentence-type outline (-3%)</li><li>• Logical, clear, well formatted (-3%)</li><li>• Each bullet point is clearly linked to a source in the references section by having a citation after it. (-3%)</li><li>• Outline is extended from RPPv1, with at least 7 bullet points (-3%)</li></ul>	15%	
<b>Quality of Conclusion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The recommendation is clearly identifiable. (-5%)</li><li>• The conclusion is appropriate for use in the research paper. (-5%)</li></ul>	10%	
<b>Appropriate references, annotated bibliography, and paper length</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• At least 6 sources with at least one relevant book, chapter from a book, or peer-reviewed paper</li><li>• No more than two assigned readings</li><li>• No more than two newspaper articles (these only from high-quality papers)</li><li>• Documents are from reputable sources and cited as such</li><li>• Citations are in American Psychological Association (APA) style, as specified by IJOIS</li><li>• Proposal is single-spaced and 1-1.5 pages with additional separate pages for references.</li><li>• Each reference is annotated with a 1-2 sentence description of how the reference is relevant and how it will be used in the research paper.</li></ul>	20%	

# RPPv2

Copy editing & use of standard language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Accurate use of APA style for in-text references and reference list</li></ul>	5% High  Mid  Low	
Use of AI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>AI Disclosure &amp; Prompt Links:</b> The Writer's Memo includes a clear AI disclosure statement and valid, accessible links to the AI chat logs.</li><li>• <b>Zero Hallucinations (Verification):</b> All facts and references are strictly verified. No hallucinated, fake, or fabricated sources/information are used in the proposal or reference list.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ 10% deducted for each fabricated source.</li></ul></li></ul>	20% High  Mid  Low	
<b>Overall Comments:</b>			

# RE3v1

Due Wednesday, February 25, at 10pm

## **Scenario**

A group of incoming members of Congress would like to revisit the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, more commonly known as the Iran nuclear deal, from which the U.S. withdrew in May 2018. These new members of Congress have asked the Congressional Research Service (CRS) to provide a report on the scientific background necessary to understand certain aspects of the deal. CRS is charged with "providing timely, objective, and authoritative research" and "insightful and comprehensive analysis...Congress relies on CRS to marshal interdisciplinary resources, encourage critical thinking and create innovative frameworks to help legislators form sound policies, reach decisions on a host of difficult issues and address their constituents' concerns and needs" (About CRS).

# RE3v1

As the analyst at the CRS assigned to fulfill this request, you will write a 1.5–2 page report (single-spaced) that

1. begins with a brief summary,
2. provides an introduction that discusses some of the most important nuclear-explosive nuclides,
3. describes the science and reasons about its implications (see below for more detail about required body sections), and
4. concludes with a brief explanation of why restricting the availability of nuclear explosive nuclides is the most effective way to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

# RE3v1

The body of the report should include the following sections, which may be presented in any order:

- A section that describes (a) the isotope requirements for making a uranium weapon, (b) the technologies available to produce uranium that meets these requirements, (c) the particular technology that is currently favored, and (d) the simplest way to create a nuclear explosion using weapons-grade uranium (a-d may be presented in any order).
- A section that describes (a) the usually quoted isotope requirements for making a plutonium weapon, (b) the technologies used to produce plutonium that meets these requirements, and (c) how to create a nuclear explosion using weapons-grade plutonium (a-c may be presented in any order).
- A section that explains (a) why the production method that is optimal for producing weapons-grade plutonium is incompatible with efficient power generation and (b) why it is more difficult to make a bomb using reactor-grade plutonium than using weapons-grade plutonium. Indicate whether it is possible to create a nuclear explosion using reactor-grade plutonium (a-b may be presented in any order)

# RE3v1

Required procedure for the use of AI tools in this assignment

1. Begin your analysis by using your AI tool to generate a response to point 4 of the Scenario section.
2. Prepare your own standalone answers (no AI use) to points 2 and 3 of the scenario section.
3. Use your AI tool to revise and refine your responses to points 2 and 3 of the scenario section.
4. Provide the revised paragraphs to your AI tool, along with one or both CRS examples (for stylistic reference) and any relevant documents from the reference materials. Then, ask the AI tool to generate revised responses to points 1 and 4 of the Scenario section.
5. Prepare the final version of RE3v1.

Please note: The AI prompts and AI outputs are all to be included in the writer's memo.

# RE3v1

## Writer's Memo:

- 3-5 questions for your peer review partner to respond to
- Both your response and the AI-tool's to the points 2 and 3 of the scenario section
- The initial and contextualized response of your AI tool to point 4 of the scenario section
- Both your draft and the AI draft
- A complete log of all AI prompts and responses
- Brief answers to the following questions:
  - Did the AI-tool make any factual/technical mistakes in its explanations?
  - A brief analysis of the differences between your own draft revision and the AI draft revision. You might comment on the overall structure, factual correctness, style, use of vocabulary (e.g. use of professional arms control terms).
  - Which aspects of your own draft do you prefer over the AI draft?

# RE3v1

## **Content Learning Goals:**

1. Learn the isotope requirements for uranium and plutonium weapons and the technologies currently available to meet these requirements.
2. Learn how to create a nuclear explosion with uranium and plutonium weapons.
3. Learn how reactor-grade plutonium compares to weapons-grade plutonium in terms of power generation and potential for nuclear explosion.
4. Understand why restricting the availability of nuclear explosive nuclides is the most effective way to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.
5. Explore the use of AI in summarizing general technical content.

# RE3v1

## **Writing Learning Goals:**

1. Learn course concepts by writing about them.
2. Learn and practice conforming to the Phys 280 style and formatting guidelines.
3. Practice assuming a professional role and style (in this case, an analyst for CRS).
4. Practice analyzing and adapting to different writing situations and genres for responding to them.
5. Practice the use of AI-tools for organizing, drafting, and styling writing.
6. Develop a sense of audience and editorial awareness as a writer through peer review

# RE3v1

## Required Essay 3, Peer Review of RE3v1

### Electronic submission due Sunday Mar. 8 at 10pm

This assignment has a peer review component. You will be asked to review a peer's RE3v1 by (1) addressing the questions contained in their writer's memo (describe above) and (2) making at least two substantive comments on their RE3v1, preferably using the review feature of Microsoft Word. These comments can address an issue with content, style, or grammar; they could also praise an exceptional aspect of the paper. Your partner will be assigned via email after you submit RE3v1, and you will discuss your review with your partner in the TBD Writing Lab.

In the email assigning your peer review partner, you'll also receive instructions for finding their RE3v1 submission. You will be asked to email your peer review to your partner at the end of your Mar. 6 Writing Lab.

As stated in the RE3v1 rubric, peer review is worth 15% of your RE3v1 grade

# The Peacemaker

- 1997 film
- Rogue soldiers steal ten Soviet nuclear warheads from a train
- US Special Operations recover all but one of the warheads
- Intelligence reveals that an individual plans to bomb UN headquarters in NYC
- The two main characters, Devoe and Dr. Kelly, find the bomb and attempt to disarm it
- [The Peacemaker \(9/9\) Movie CLIP - Blowing Up the Bomb \(1997\) HD](#)

# The Peacemaker

## Discussion

- What did we see?
- Were the two main characters successful? Why?
- What are the effects of the explosion? Do we expect the main characters to survive?