AI Zoom: Boom or Doom?

This project continues on from the Week 2 individual homework. We refer to the theme and the five issue categories and statements within them in the main source essay by Dr. Xiayou He. The group will collectively choose *one* issue and illustrative example from each member, so that each presents a different danger example—on one slide and taking 40–60 seconds of the 6-minute presentation period. Then the group will collectively propose and evaluate at least one potential solution to at least one of the four dangers, tag-teaming aspects of the solution(s) for the final 2–3 minutes.

The presentation is *not* intended to be a debate *between* "doomer" and "full-speed-ahead" camps. Rather, it is a critical evaluation of danger scenarios and of potential solutions. On the latter, the most effective presentations will also include (i) evaluation of obstacles to the solutions and/or (ii) what we can do in the department and university on the whole, from undergrad to faculty levels, to prepare for them. Just saying that e.g. maybe curing cancer is worth high risk is not enough.

Slide Deck, due Week 3 Wed., 11:59pm

Each group's slide deck should include at least (and not too much more than) the following:

- A title slide, identifying the group and its members, and maybe giving a "hook" statement and/or graphic.
- One slide per group member, 3-to-4 in total, illustrating **one** issue and danger example based on that member's week-2 homework.
- At least two collectively-made slides (and say at most four) detailing at least one potential sourced solution to at least one of the issues/statements-or-scenarios-within-an-issue.
- A final slide with member contributions and source citations (any not already fitted on a previous slide).

The solution-finding is intended to come from collective group discussion. At least one proposed solution is required to come from a human published source. There is an **optional** wildcard feature: The group may try to get a second solution **from an AI**, using a detailed issue description **that you collectively specify** in a prompt. If you choose the wildcard, then the ground rules are: (i) you must show the prompt(s) you used, and (ii) your group must include a "15-second critique" of what the AI says. (And don't forget (iii) you still need one human-sourced solution. But note: you may instead ask the AI about that same issue and solution, to see if the AI critiques it.)

Presentations—Week 3 Thu. or Fri.

The presentations will be timed for **6 minutes**. The structure envisions 3–4 minutes of each group member presenting his or her issue slide for 40–60 seconds, then a 2–3 minute final phase shared among group members (where each speaks again in "tag-team" style). This envisions a presentation structure in which each member first speaks individually for 60-odd seconds about their part of the group's chosen issues, then the group tag-teams possible solutions in the final 2 or so minutes.

There will not be time to edit slides during the recitation session. It will be OK, though, to *ad-lib* remarks during your presentation, if a nice point or particular response comes to mind during the proceedings.

Grading: Each group member receives up to **3 pts.** There is the customary global **1 pt.** for participation. The presentation of the individual slide is worth **1 pt.** This is divided into **0.5** for cogent engagement and **0.5** for particular quality. Of the latter 0.5, **0.2** is reserved for a reference to why particular LLM workings (from lecture) give rise to the vulnerability or danger, as was specified on the week-2 written assignment, but it may also be given for a new observation that connects to another issue (whether by another member in the same group or discussion from other presentations). The other particular quality points are for slide vividness and clarity and/or making arguments persuasively.

Then there is **1 pt.** to each member for the collective solution-finding part. This is divided into **0.5** for engagement (contributing to the slide and speaking in the final phase) and **0.5** for particular quality. *It is not necessary for your particular issue to have been addressed by the solution.* The collective points are intended to be the same for each member provided each basically contributed and spoke. The quality points do not require that the proposed solution to be *convincing* of itself, but you should try to make it at least *plausible* and encapsulate it clearly in your 2-or-sop slides. The final **0.2** of the latter **0.5** can be for anchoring a proposed solution to some point in lecture, or critiquing it, or finding a way UB CSE can be relevant, or even the "AI wildcard" option mentioned above.

Some Final Remarks

To reiterate, your proposed solution need not be "convincing." If you can come up with ways that beginning CS students can possibly contribute—besides not cheating with AI—so much the better. But this too is not required, and one basic reason for both caveats is that *your faculty elders don't fully know how to contribute toward solutions either.*

It bears repeating that in both branches of this assignment, you are primarily graded for *engagement*. This means the effort to digest and summarize unfamiliar information, presentation experience, and development of critical thinking. *You are not being graded to come up with correct answers.* There will be enough of that in your other courses—and this assignment in particular doesn't know what the correct answers are. Earnest deviation may be needed more than "the company line." Above all, the assignment's parameters aim at having fun—even amid this most ghastly of topics.