

AI Usage Declaration and Prompt Log

Evidence Deck and Learning Conversations

Unit	INOVM0028 The Role of AI in Digital Innovation
Team name or number	Team F3 – No Bad Ideas
Student names	Qiu Qilin, Yueyuan Fan, Lan Zhang, Shenglin Yan, Rongjun Gao, Shuhan Lei
Assessment year	2026–27

Purpose

Use this shared template to record significant use of generative AI during your project. The record supports transparent, responsible practice and helps you explain your own decisions. AI use is optional and does not attract extra marks.

Permitted AI Usage Level

Category 3 Selective Use Permitted

You may use AI tools for clearly defined supporting tasks:

- early idea generation and exploring alternative approaches
- summarising your own notes or source material as a study aid
- organising project material
- creating exploratory text, images, code or prototype content
- checking spelling, grammar and clarity in work you have written

You must not:

- use AI to replace your own research, analysis, evaluation, reflection or project decisions
- invent evidence, sources, project activity or individual contributions
- copy AI output into the submission without checking, adapting and taking responsibility for it
- prepare or read from AI-generated scripts during a Learning Conversation

AI Usage Declaration and Prompt Log

Student Declaration

We confirm that significant use of generative AI in developing this work is recorded below. We remain responsible for the accuracy, evidence and decisions in the submitted work, and each student is prepared to explain their own use and judgement in a Learning Conversation.

Student names	Qiu Qilin, Yueyuan Fan, Lan Zhang, Shenglin Yan, Rongjun Gao, Shuhan Lei
Date	
Confirmation	We have checked this record before submission.

How to Complete the Prompt Log

Keep one shared team log throughout the project. Record significant uses that influenced the work, not every spelling correction or routine search. Name the student who used the tool, summarise the prompt or task, and explain what the team accepted, changed or rejected. Do not paste long AI outputs into this document.

Add a concise summary of significant AI use to the Evidence Deck or include this completed log through the submission method specified on Blackboard. Follow your unit assessment sheet if it gives more specific instructions.

Prompt Log

Date	Used by	AI tool	Prompt or task	Output summary	What we accepted, changed or rejected
Week 1	Team (all)	ChatGPT, DeepSeek, Gemini, Claude	Seminar exercise: same prompts across several LLMs, then beginner → intermediate → expert (PICKSE) prompts on AI in video production.	Answers differed in style and accuracy: ChatGPT cautious, DeepSeek fast but with factual errors, Gemini good at summaries but sometimes misread intent.	Not used as project content. Each of us wrote our own reflection and three principles for AI use on the whiteboard; Ron's comparison links are on the board.
29 Sep	Team (several members, incl. Rongjun Gao and Lan Zhang)	ChatGPT, DeepSeek	PICKSE prompt with the VEED case study attached: list at least 10 ethical risks of AI at VEED.	Five separate answers with 12–15 risks each.	Compared the five answers and merged overlapping risks into 10. We placed each one in the Product / Design / Manufacture and Specific / Generic grid ourselves; environmental footprint and geopolitical speculation were not kept as separate items.
1 Oct	Rongjun Gao	ChatGPT (Codex)	Organise the five AI answers and our	Draft spreadsheet with short	Used as a discussion draft for

			notes into one table of 10 ethical concerns.	explanations and source numbers.	the classroom ethics grid. Classifications were checked against the seminar's category definitions; AI wording shortened.
Week 3	Team	ChatGPT, Claude	Stage 3: widen our list of VEED's problems beyond what we found in the case study.	Extra possible challenges (strategy, competition, AI cost, adoption).	Kept only problems the case study supports; rejected the rest. The High / Medium / Low AI-suitability ratings are our own.
Week 4	Yueyuan Fan; Shuhan Lei	Course Custom GPT personas (Maya, Sabba)	Mom Test interviews with the simulated customer (Maya) and CEO (Sabba) about recent behaviour.	Simulated answers, e.g. feedback and approval problems affect about 60–70% of Maya's projects.	Treated as AI-simulated evidence and labelled as such. Used to challenge our assumption that editing speed is the main problem; still needs checking with real users.
18 Oct	Rongjun Gao	Claude (Anthropic)	Draft the Share-your-insights table and two persona slides in the tutor's templates from our interview notes and the VEED case study.	Draft insights table and two persona slides.	Drafts kept only as reference. The team's own whiteboard personas (Maya Chen, Sabba) and problem statement are the final versions.
20 Oct	Rongjun Gao	Claude (Anthropic)	Read our three Teams whiteboard exports, evidence files and course slides; draft a week-by-week record of who led what, a whiteboard to-do list and a course folder index.	Weekly contribution summary (EN/中文), to-do list, course folder with READMEs.	Used as an organising aid only. The who-led-what lines are a reasonable spread of shared work, not a record: each member checks and corrects their own lines. Ron corrected facts the AI got wrong (Freya = Yueyuan Fan; only Lan visited the garden; Nirone left the team).

AI Usage Declaration and Prompt Log

Prompt Log Continued

Date	Used by	AI tool	Prompt or task	Output summary	What we accepted, changed or rejected

Learning Conversations

Tutors may ask how AI influenced the project, what you accepted or rejected, how you checked the output, and what risks or limitations you identified. Respond in your own words and distinguish your own contribution from the tool's output.

Do not bring, display, present or use the Evidence Deck during either Learning Conversation. Do not use this prompt log as a script. You may use brief bullet-point cue notes in line with the Learning Conversations Preparation Worksheet.

Final Check

- Significant AI use is recorded clearly and attributed to the correct student or team.
- Sources, evidence and factual claims have been checked independently.
- AI has supported, not replaced, the thinking being assessed.
- The record matches the AI rules in the unit assessment sheet.