First Negative

Greetings, Judge Memmott, I am Thomas, one of your negative speakers for today's round. It is without dispute that AI writing tools have become widely available to students. Tools of this nature, most commonly ChatGPT, have been used not just to strengthen a student's paper, but even to write it completely. The current status quo dictates that no AI writing, save for grammatical corrections, is acceptable as student original work. We will prove that it is time to change this status quo, as AI tools could actually strengthen an essay and assist in making that student's clear thinking more visible. For further clarification, the current status quo prohibits all AI composition. The only AI that is currently allowed by the current status quo is in the form of grammatical correction, which is not AI composition. The new status quo that my associate and I will present will allow for AI compositions in the form of revision. This means that the new status quo would allow AI to suggest re-writes and additional writing based on the student's rough draft, which may be used verbatim. Allow us to demonstrate how a hasty generalization made by high schools and universities alike to disregard all AI writing, no matter the context.

Before demonstrating this, however, it is important that we clearly define the terms which we will utilize, and in addition to that, we credit Dr. Postma—who is the CEO and President of Kepler Education, dedicating his career to education and lifelong learning, along with getting a Ph.D. in Humanities w/ concentration in Literature, and being on the Consortium of Classical Educators—for providing us with an interview. AI, or Artificial Intelligence, is a computer algorithm that has been trained upon human creativity—text and images—to compose text or images in such a way that it appears human. Student original work consists of work, assembled by the student, that accurately represents their authentic objective for the paper. Writing, as defined by Dr. Postma, is clear thinking made visible. AI revisions refer to revisions which are

executed on a pre-developed essay by the student which do not jeopardize the structure of the essay, but instead offer improvements.

The current status quo which prohibits all AI composition is detrimental to the work which the student is attempting to create. For example, a student spending all of their time developing their idea into a rough draft, the content of which can be revised by AI, will develop an essay that makes their thinking visible more clearly than a student who has sacrificed that development time to create the most appealing wording. Because, referring to Dr. Postma, "good writing is clear thinking made visible," and student original work is defined as "work, assembled by the student, that accurately represents their authentic objective for the paper," the student who implemented AI to assist in revisions achieved an essay that fits the criteria of student original writing more completely. Therefore, this current status quo is unjustly inhibiting a student's ability to compose the best original work that they can, which is what is expected of them.

Additionally, I will introduce an injustice in regards to the way we deal with AI plagiarism. Although the common understanding of plagiarism now would have us believe that to use the ideas or words of another without proper citation is robbery, this is quite a new interpretation which became prevalent in the enlightenment. Words and ideas were not seen as intellectual property, but rather a piece of knowledge to be built upon. Works from the medieval period such as *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English people* were, and still are considered to be great original works. And indeed they are great original works. We can see how Bede has taken ideas, concepts, and histories and built his work with them. We do not flag Bede for plagiarism, nor should we. If we apply this thinking to AI, we can see, provided that the work can stand without the use of AI, it is not plagiarism.

The prohibition of AI revision causes a myriad of harmful consequences for students. The most apparent consequence is the effect on grades. Colleges such as John Hopkin's University, Northeastern University, and Iowa State University have implemented Turnitin AI detection software to deal with AI use on a large scale, rather than on a case by case basis. Because AI revisions are currently prohibited, this leaves students unable to be graded based on the merit of their original ideas, but instead disregarded because of the means by which they got there.

The second harm caused by this prohibition is that it redirects the focus of a long paper from fully diving into an idea to worrying about word count. When asked about this topic, Dr. Postma suggested, "If there is a way that AI can be employed to free us up to do the human thinking, I think there's an acceptable place for it, but if we hope that it will replace our human thinking we will be disappointed." The importance of the writing is that it is the product of that human thinking, but when we prohibit AI composition, in many cases we are preventing further growth of that writing. For example, if my objective was to develop an essay which demonstrates the deterioration of entertainment in ten pages, it would better serve the essay's ability to relate my ideas, if I used AI to revise my rough draft. By handing my essay to an AI to revise and subsequently accepting and rejecting revisions, I am not compromising the originality of my work, but rather allowing myself to further develop the actual content of the writing. Therefore, the status quo is harmful because it hinders the further development of that student's original thought by prohibiting revisions which would make their clear thinking more visible.

It is important to address how education should adapt to the increasing abilities and availability of AI. While it is important to create boundaries in order to preserve student original work, it is also important that we do not overlook the ways in which AI composition can be used to strengthen student work without compromising its originality. The benefits of AI in writing

are paramount to understanding the issue, but equally paramount are the harms and injustices created by the status quo. By refusing to grow past this over-generalization, we are stifling the purpose of education, which is the cultivation of wisdom.

Second Negative

Refutation

The resolution that we propose is one that acknowledges both the potential benefits and harms of AI use in writing. We propose that we allow AI composition in the form of **revisions** to be accepted and graded as student original work. We do not condemn the use of AI detection software, but we do propose that educators not use it to generally ban all work which uses AI and flag it as plagiarism, but rather that educators should accept AI composition in the form of revisions once the student has demonstrated their capability to revise on their own. Not only would this resolution bring justice to the current rules—inhibiting the ability of students to create their best work, in addition to mislabeling AI as plagiarism—this resolution would also contribute to the development of the student, the development of education, and the availability of services.

I will further explain these benefits, starting with the development of the student. As colleges are reaching over a hundred thousand students, the approach to college education has transformed from one in which the student is evaluated and developed as an individual to one in which the student is a number whose value and success are equivalent to said number. Students, feeling decreasingly significant to their college, have adapted their approach to school in a similar way. Where once, to a student, education meant discipleship, it is now assigned a number value that dictates pass or fail. But why is this relevant to a debate about AI being accepted as

student original work? Would AI not further the problem by giving these students an easy way out of their homework? Perhaps if we were to allow full essay compositions solely from a ten word prompt this would become an issue. But the resolution we propose actually furthers the development of these students by promoting original thought. By removing the check-list of tedious and repetitive revisions from the student's plate, that student is now able to spend his time on the human element of the essay, which is the original thought. The result is a more fleshed out essay from a student who fully understands the topic which their essay addresses. Now I am not saying that students should be allowed to use AI for revisions all the time, students should first show mastery of revisions and writing in their earlier years of education—like in middle or high school. Once a student has mastery of this it is just busy work, this time could be spent on developing their ideas and researching if they were to use AI to help them revise or refine their rough draft. As it says in Proverbs 14:4 "Where there are no oxen, the manger is clean, but abundant crops come by the strength of the ox." AI is a tool to be used, to create an essay that is not only well-thought-out by the student, but refined, while not using AI to help can still result in an excellent essay, the tool will help you along. Now, we recognize that some students will still try to use AI to create it from scratch, but we strongly emphasize this is not acceptable, this is dishonest and doesn't help you learn. As it says in Proverbs 14:3, "By the mouth of a fool comes a rod for his back, but the lips of the wise will preserve them." Those who use AI to write it for them are fools, but those who use it to refine are wise. Therefore, if we are to claim that we are educating students, which is to say that we are developing them in wisdom, then we must allow them to move past menial tasks such as revision, provided they have demonstrated adequate ability, and instead focus on their intellectual skills.

This brings me to my second point, which is the development of education. If we allow AI to take care of these repetitive tasks, not only do we stop bottle-necking their ability to grow, but we stop bottle-necking the ability for our education system to grow. A small crack such as allowing AI revisions to be accepted as student original work, we open our education system up to use judgment to advance with AI as it develops, rather than disregarding it as a whole because of some of its potential harms. Legalizing revisions will begin to add some much-needed nuance to the discussion of AI in education, and open the door for further exploration. Although we may not yet know what advancements are in store, our education system should be kept as up-to-date as possible, because it is what develops all young people.

Finally, AI is similar to a content or copy editor, both of which are used in professional writing. When asked about this, Dr. Postma said, "If someone is to be thoughtful and use AI as a tool, consider someone who is going to write a book. They're going to work with a content editor, and they're going to work with a copy editor. The writer presents, 'here are my ideas, here's the big picture,' and then the content editor is going to help him structure it, and present it in a way that it makes sense to the audience. AI tools can do some of that work for us and I think that can be very helpful." To summarize what Dr. Postma says here, when correctly implemented, AI can function in the role of assistants used by professional writers. Furthermore, this is beneficial to all because it increases the availability of such services to virtually every writer, at no cost. Why should we gate-keep these writing services which are used by professionals from students who are attempting to emulate those professionals?

In summary, AI compositions in the form of revisions should be permitted because it is in the best interest of the development of students and the education system, and it allows students access to the professional services used by writers.

Third Negative

Rebuttal

We propose that AI composition be allowed in the form of AI revisions for students who have demonstrated their ability to revise on their own. This will allow them to develop further in their ability to think clearly and lead to works that more accurately, visibly, and completely convey the original thinking done by the student. This issue is vital to the development of students, and if ignored, will disallow a continued growth in education by bottle-necking the potential of students. We intend to change the status quo in order that originality and integrity will be preserved in writing without throwing out the advancements that AI could provide for our education system. For the best interest of our students and future leaders, don't throw the baby out with the bath.