

Hot Topics Class Activity Plan

Objectives:

- Analyze: Critically examine the ethical implications of technological tools used in various fields. (***This class theme was Digital Rhetoric***)
- Research: Gather evidence and resources to support arguments.
- Collaborate: Work effectively in teams to plan and deliver persuasive arguments.
- Argue: Construct structured and compelling arguments using the Toulmin model.
- Listen: Actively engage with opposing viewpoints and respect diverse perspectives.

Activity Timeline:

1. Team Formation (5 minutes):

- Divide students into two teams (approximately equal size).
- Encourage creative team names!
- 3-4 volunteers serve as timekeepers/judges.

2. Resolution Selection (10 minutes):

- Flip a coin to determine "Pro" and "Con" sides.
- Review the presented resolutions: (***These are just examples!***)
 - DataRobot as a contraindication for public health education (Health)
 - Applicant Tracking Systems as the new "Good Ol' Boys Club" (Gender)
 - Artificial intelligence "essence" and its political implications
 - OpenArt as Gen Z's participation trophy (Art and AI)
 - "Perfection is the enemy of greatness" in the context of AI and Music
- Con/Neg team strikes first, then teams eliminate resolutions until one remains.

3. Planning & Research (20 minutes):

- Teams choose roles within their group (speakers, researchers, writers, etc.).
- Utilize any relevant resources:
 - Course reading list
 - Provided links to articles and video
 - Google Doc with AI resources
 - Purdue Owl handout on Toulmin arguments

- Develop arguments following the Toulmin model:
 - Claim: State the team's position on the chosen resolution.
 - Data: Present evidence and reasoning to support the claim.
 - Warrant: Explain how the data justifies the claim.
 - Backings: Provide additional support for the warrant (e.g., statistics, expert opinions).
 - Rebuttal: Anticipate opposing arguments and prepare counter-arguments.
- 4. Debate (40 minutes):**
 - Each team presents their arguments in structured order (opening, main points, rebuttal, closing).
 - Use clear and concise language while maintaining ethical communication.
 - Focus on respectful engagement with the opposing team.
- 5. Judge Deliberation & Feedback (15 minutes):**
 - Judges evaluate each team's research, argument structure, delivery, and adherence to ethical debating principles.
 - Judges provide constructive feedback to both teams.
- 6. Reflection (10 minutes):**
 - Class discussion:
 - What were the strengths and weaknesses of each team's arguments?
 - How were the ethical implications of technology effectively addressed?
 - What challenges did teams face in constructing their arguments?
 - What lessons can we draw from this activity about the responsible use of technology?

Extension Activities:

- Have students research and create their own debate resolutions related to their major.

Scoring:

Below are the scoring criteria we will use. (This is from the IPDA Debate Association)

Judges: You should complete [this ballot \(here it is as a Google doc\)](#)

Take notes as you listen. (I can print out 3 for you, unless it's easier to do digitally. If you choose to complete them digitally, make sure you each download your own copy.) The unspoken courtesy is that anything below a 30 is considered poor, unless there is flagrant behavior. Judges cannot deliberate. It can be a 2-1 win.

- [**Judge's Ballot**](#)