
AI Debate Assignment Example

Assignment Title: Debating AI**Module #:** Week 4

Description: The purpose of this assignment is not to win an argument. It is to stress-test one. You will take a position on a contested digital literacy or citizenship topic, argue it against an AI that will push back with the strongest available counterarguments, and then reflect carefully on what happened. The debate is the exercise. The debrief is the learning. By requiring you to construct a reasoned argument, defend it under pressure, identify where it held and where it broke down, and then examine what your Christian convictions contribute to the question, this assignment operates at the Evaluate and Create levels of Bloom's Taxonomy throughout.

AI Usage Statement: *Include a clear statement describing the level and purpose of AI use in this lesson.*

The AI tool in this assignment is not doing your work. It is your opponent. The quality of your opening position statement, your responsiveness to counterarguments during the debate, and the honesty and depth of your debrief are entirely your own.

Instructions**Step 1: Choose Your Topic**

Select a topic related to the content from this week. Below are some samples directly connected to the Week 4 content on digital literacy, digital citizenship, barriers to implementation, and AI in education.

Sample Debate Topics

- Schools have a legal and moral obligation to teach AI literacy as a required component of K-12 graduation.
- AI-powered detection tools that identify student use of AI in academic work do more harm than good and should not be used.
- Digital citizenship education is more important than traditional content knowledge in preparing students for civic and professional life in the twenty-first century.
- The responsibility for teaching students to use technology safely and ethically lies primarily with schools rather than with parents or platforms.
- Social media platforms that collect behavioral data from users under the age of 18 should be prohibited from operating in school-related contexts.

Step 2: Write Your Opening Position Statement

Before you begin the debate, write a brief opening position statement of one to two paragraphs. This statement should:

- State your position clearly and specifically (not simply agree or disagree, but articulate the exact claim you are defending).
- Provide two to three reasons or pieces of evidence that support your position, drawn from this week's reading, the frameworks, or your professional experience.
- Acknowledge in one sentence the strongest objection to your position, which you will need to address in the debate.

Write this statement before you open the AI tool. It serves as your anchor throughout the debate and will be submitted alongside your transcript.

Step 3: Conduct the Debate

Open an AI tool of your choice. Claude (claude.ai), ChatGPT (chat.openai.com), and Gemini (gemini.google.com) are all appropriate options and are all freely accessible. Begin the debate by pasting the following prompt, then inserting your topic and opening position:

Debate Setup Prompt (copy and paste this into the AI tool)

I am a graduate student in educational technology policy. I want to conduct a structured academic debate with you. I will argue one side of a topic, and I want you to argue the opposing position as forcefully and substantively as you can, using evidence, logic, and counterexamples. Do not agree with me, validate my position, or offer balanced perspectives during the debate. Your job is to challenge my argument at every point. After each of my responses, present the strongest possible counterargument you can construct. We will do at least three exchanges following a debate format:

1. My opening stance/argument
2. gAI Rebuttal
3. My second argument with more evidence
4. gAI Rebuttal
5. My final summary
6. gAI summary

My topic is: [insert your selected topic]

My opening position is: [insert your opening position statement] *Please begin by presenting your strongest opening counterargument.*

Conduct a minimum of three exchanges. An exchange consists of one response from you and one from the AI. Aim for substantive engagement: do not simply repeat your opening statement, but respond directly to each counterargument the AI presents. When the AI raises a challenge you find difficult to answer, push through it rather than conceding or pivoting. That difficulty is valuable data for your debrief.

Copy the full debate transcript before closing the AI session. You will submit it as part of your assignment.

Step 4: Write Your Debrief Reflection

Your debrief reflection is the most important component of this assignment. It must respond to all four of the following prompts.

Required Debrief Prompts

1. Where did the AI challenge your position most effectively? Describe the specific counterargument that gave you the most difficulty and explain how you responded. If your response was not fully satisfying, say so and explain what a better response might have required.
2. Where did your argument hold firm, and what gave it staying power? Identify the specific reasoning, evidence, or values that the AI's counterarguments could not dislodge, and explain why you think those elements were more resilient than others.
3. Where, if anywhere, did the debate cause you to revise, nuance, or complicate your position? Be honest. If your position shifted even slightly, describe how. If it did not shift at all, examine whether that is because your argument is genuinely strong or because you were not fully engaging with the challenge.
4. Where do your Christian convictions shape your view on this topic in ways that a purely utilitarian or policy-based framework does not capture? Specifically, what does your faith contribute to this argument that secular reasoning alone would miss, overlook, or dismiss? This is not an invitation to cite a Bible verse and move on. It is an invitation to think carefully about how a theological commitment to human dignity, truth, community, or justice changes the terms of the debate itself.

Submission Requirements

- Opening position statement (one to two paragraphs, written before the debate)
- Full debate transcript (copied from the AI session, submitted as part of the document)
- Debrief reflection (approximately 600 to 800 words, responding to all four prompts)
- Format: One document, double-spaced, 12-point Arial or Times New Roman, one-inch margins
- APA 7.0 format is required for any sources cited in the debrief

Resources *[Insert links, templates, rubrics, additional resources here]*

Make sure you view the rubric before you begin this learning activity.

AI Debate Rubric	
Criteria	Ratings
Opening Position Statement	Excellent States a clear, specific position with two or three well-supported reasons drawn from course frameworks or professional experience. Acknowledges the strongest counterargument in one sentence. Is written before the debate and reflects genuine advance preparation. 20 to >15 pts Proficient States a clear position with at least two supporting reasons. The counterargument acknowledgment is present though may be vague. Reflects reasonable preparation. 15 to >10 pts Developing States a position but the supporting reasons are general or unsupported. The counterargument acknowledgment may be absent or superficial. 10 to >5 pts Beginning/Not Included Position is vague, undefended, or indistinguishable from a general opinion. Little evidence of preparation before the debate. 5 to >0 pts
Debate	Excellent Engages the AI's counterarguments directly and substantively throughout all exchanges. Arguments evolve in response to challenges rather than simply restating the opening position. At least three exchanges are present and reflect genuine intellectual engagement. The student does not concede prematurely or avoid difficult challenges. 35 to >26.25 pts Proficient Engages counterarguments adequately in most exchanges. Some exchanges may restate rather than develop the argument. Minimum exchange count is met. 26.25 to >17.5 pts Developing Engages some counterarguments but relies heavily on repetition of the opening position. Some exchanges may be superficial or brief. Minimum exchange count may not be met. 17.5 to >8.75 pts Beginning/Not Included Debate is perfunctory, very brief, or does not reflect engagement with the AI's specific counterarguments. Minimum exchange count is not met. 8.75 to >0 pts

AI Debate Rubric	
Criteria	Ratings
Reflection	Excellent Responds to all four prompts with specificity and honesty. Identifies the most difficult counterargument precisely. Reflects genuinely on where the position shifted or held. The faith integration prompt is engaged with theological depth and intellectual seriousness, not with a proof-text or a devotional comment. Reflection demonstrates that the student was genuinely changed by the exercise. 45 to >33.75 pts Proficient Responds to all four prompts with reasonable specificity. Faith integration is present and meaningful, though it may be somewhat general. The reflection demonstrates genuine engagement with the debate experience. 33.75 to >22.5 pts Developing Responds to most prompts, but some responses may be brief, vague, or generic. Faith integration is present but superficial. The reflection may describe the debate without genuinely examining it. 22.5 to >11.25 pts Beginning/Not Included Omits one or more prompts, or responses are too brief to demonstrate reflection. Faith integration is absent or merely decorative. The debrief does not reflect genuine engagement with the assignment. 11.25 to >0 pts