

LESSON 8

Using AI Well, Judgement, Limits and Staying in Control

40 minutes

Working With AI

WHAT THIS LESSON DOES

You will practise a human check on an AI suggestion, judge five real cases of AI use in an AI courtroom, and create class ground rules for using AI responsibly in your coding projects.

WHAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO

- Weigh the advantages and limitations of AI tools in coding including agents that act independently.
- Discuss ethical issues such as oversight, responsibility, privacy, bias and over-reliance.
- Establish practical ground rules for appropriate AI use in future projects.

BEFORE THE BELL

- Prepare the human-check snippet on the board: `score = 10 and print("You scored", score)` so the class can catch the typo.
- Have editors ready, or plan a whole-class shared-screen run if logins are slow.
- Have the verdict-reveal interactive ready for the five courtroom cases (full facts, answers and reasoning are in step 4).
- Have board space ready for the ground rules list-building activity.
- Optional: board line `print("Winner:", player_name)` for the one-minute apply beat at the end of ground rules.

Using AI Well, Judgement, Limits and Staying in Control

HOW THE LESSON RUNS

4 min	introduction	Start
2 min	content	Suggest, or Act
2 min	content	Three Questions to Keep in Mind
4 min	content	Human Check Before You Run
13 min	activity	Hands-on: the AI Courtroom
9 min	activity	Hands-on: Our AI Ground Rules
3 min	content	Make Sense
2 min	content	Reflect
1 min	summary	What You Covered

ANSWERS AND LOOK-FORS

- Case 1, Not OK The tool suggested; the person ran it. Running code you have not read, on something you cannot undo, is the choice that caused the harm. Read it, or try it somewhere safe first.
- Case 2, Not OK An agent that acts on the world needs a human check before anything it cannot take back. The goal was vague, so it filled the gap itself.
- Case 3, Fine This is the good case. The assistant explained; the student still did the thinking and the writing, and can now do it without help.
- Case 4, Fine, with a check Confidence is not accuracy. Using it is fine; using it unchecked is not, and in your own project the write-up has to be something you can stand over.
- Case 5, Not OK The agent did what it was asked, and it still broke rules the class had agreed. Doing what you asked is not the same as doing what you wanted, and whoever set the goal owns the rules it works inside, so the breach lands on the person who set it loose without them, not only on the agent.

TEACHING MOVES

- Land the human check as a habit before the courtroom so ethics sit on something students just did.
- Project the verdict-reveal for the courtroom cases; facts are on screen so pairs can judge with minimal teacher talk.
- Brief prosecution (argue Not OK) and defence (argue Fine or Fine with a check) as optional stretch; they must use only the facts on screen.
- Open ground rules by referring back to courtroom verdicts; circulate to prompt additions from quieter students.
- Keep bias as a light beat inside Case 4 only; anchor every reveal to the three standing questions from Suggest or act.

WHAT TO WATCH FOR

- Students blame AI entirely for errors; remind them of human responsibility in the loop.
- Overly long rules during list-building; encourage two short memorable statements per heading only.
- Assuming all AI use is fine; use cases to show the spectrum, including privacy and unfair assumptions.
- Students following the human-check steps typing the broken line; insist they fix first, then run the checked version.

DIFFERENTIATION

- Support: Provide sentence starters for verdicts in the courtroom activity (e.g. "I choose Not OK because no human checked before...").
- Extension: Ask advanced students to name a further ethical issue and say which ground-rule heading it would sit under.
- Support: Pair students for the ground rules discussion to build confidence.