Status: draft — grounds in `handoff/context/c4sight-schools-positioning-and-pricing.md`, `handoff/context/c4sight-schools-sessions-and-lessons.md` (Spine B, senior secondary), `deliverables/activities/interactive-activities-and-tool-spec.md` (A.9 What Stays Human?), and `deliverables/tangibles/curriculum-alignment-matrix.md` (§9, Years 9–10). Public preview pack — PDF-ready once the open questions at the end are settled.

Your Move

Study, integrity, and the future they're actually walking into — for Years 10–12

Series 4 of 5 · Senior Secondary (Years 10–12) · Free preview — C4Sight

This pack is yours to keep and share with your staff. Inside: what the series is, one complete group exercise you can run this week — the Automation Map, with the full card deck included — and an honest account of what the full session adds.

What this series is

The core question: *What does this mean for your study, your integrity, and your future?*

Senior students don't need another awareness talk. They are already using these tools, they have already heard both "you're all doomed" and "it's all hype", and their marks are on the line right now. This series treats them like the adults they nearly are:

1. **The real tool, used properly.** A live demonstration of AI as a genuine study and thinking aid, done responsibly — not a slide about it. Watch it happen, then talk about where the line is.
2. **Assessment integrity, honestly.** What schools are actually doing, where the line actually sits, and why "the detector will catch you" is a lie that helps nobody. This matters to them because their marks depend on it.
3. **The future of work, framed.** Not doom. What actually changes, what stays stubbornly human, and how to be the person who uses the tool rather than the person the tool replaces. Every provocation we show comes with its counter-argument — nothing bleak is ever left hanging.
4. **Pathways.** What this opens, not just what it closes. Which skills hold their value. Our practitioner's own path is the live example: he builds AI systems for commercial clients *and* he is a UWA JD (law) student — and both halves matter.

The anchor activity of the full session is SHIP IT: the presenter builds a real, working automation live, in front of the room, on a task the students pick. Not a demo video. A working thing, made in minutes, with the choices narrated — including the safety and governance choices. That is the moment "AI will change work" stops being a headline and becomes something they watched happen.

Our integrity stance, in one line: detectors do not work; design beats detection. We say it to students and staff alike, because pretending otherwise breeds either false confidence or quiet cynicism — and because a mark that depends on a detector's verdict is a mark nobody can defend. The honest version of this conversation is the one that changes behaviour.

Two people deliver it. A working AI practitioner and a registered teacher, in the room together. The two-person model is not an overhead — it is the product.

The safety promise — in every C4Sight session, without exception

- No student devices required, and no student ever touches an AI tool.
- No student data entered into any system — ever.
- No student images captured, generated or uploaded.
- A school staff member present throughout.
- Where a camera is used, it frames objects — never faces.
- Everything runs on our own device and connection, never your school network. The live classifier is fully offline.

Run this yourself: the Automation Map

A group exercise for one class period. Everything you need — including the full task-card deck — is in this pack. No technology required at any point.

Year levels	10–12 (works unchanged in a careers class; adaptation notes below)
Time	30 minutes core · 15-minute compressed version (steps 1–3 with six cards per group) · full period with the "your move" round
Group	Groups of 3–4, then whole class
Materials	The card deck below, printed and cut up (one set per group, 6–8 cards each, or one whole-class set); three labels for a wall or whiteboard; sticky notes or tape; blank cards for step 5
The point	The honest answer to "will AI take my job?" is neither yes nor no — it's *which tasks move, and which stay human*. Students build that answer themselves instead of being told it.

Set up

Post three labels across a wall, whiteboard or floor, left to right, as a spectrum:

> **A MACHINE CAN DO THIS TODAY ←——— IT'S COMPLICATED ———→ STAYS HUMAN (FOR NOW)**

Deal each group a hand of task cards. The deck is deliberately shuffled — do not sort it first.

The card deck (print and cut)

These are **tasks, not job titles** — that distinction is the whole exercise. Whole jobs rarely automate; tasks do.

#	Task card	#	Task card
1	Mark 90 multiple-choice tests	13	Tutor a struggling student in fractions
2	Reassure a frightened patient	14	Route thirty delivery vans across a city
3	Transcribe a recorded interview	15	Tell a family bad news with compassion — and be accountable for it
4	Argue a novel case in court	16	Write a product description for an online shop
5	Sort 10,000 photos by what's in them	17	Notice a quiet kid is having a bad day
6	Give feedback a struggling student will actually hear	18	Draft a standard rental agreement
7	Summarise a 40-page report	19	Design a kitchen renovation with a fussy client
8	Calm a crying toddler	20	Answer "where's my order?" a thousand times a day
9	Drive a truck on a highway	21	Hold a team together after a bad loss
10	Compose a jingle	22	Spot a known pattern on a medical scan
11	Decide who gets a scholarship	23	Write a news story about last night's council meeting
12	Translate a restaurant menu	24	Negotiate peace between two feuding mates

There is no answer key, deliberately. The contested cards are the lesson, and honest placements shift every year — which is itself the lesson. If a group demands the "right answer", that is the exercise working.

How to run it

1. **Set the frame (2 min).** Say it straight: *"Nobody in this room will be replaced by a robot with your name on it. But some of the tasks inside every job are moving. Your cards are tasks, not jobs. Place each one on the spectrum — and be ready to defend it."*
2. **Groups place their cards (8 min).** Each group maps its hand and must be able to justify every placement in one sentence. Disagreement inside a group is good; make them resolve it or place the card at "it's complicated" *with a reason*.
3. **Interrogate the middle (8 min).** Bring the class to the wall. Skip the easy ends — go straight to the contested middle. For each contested card ask: *"What exactly is the human doing in this task that's hard to hand over?"* Draw out the real answers: judgement, trust, accountability, care, handling situations nobody has seen before.
4. **The re-frame (4 min).** Point at the wall and say the true thing: *"Notice that almost no whole job walked to the machine side. Tasks did. The person who hands the machine the tasks it's good at — and keeps the human ones — isn't replaced. They're amplified."* Then the honest counter-argument to the doom headlines: whole categories of work exist today that nobody could name twenty years ago, and that will happen again.
5. **The "your move" round (8 min).** Each student takes a blank card and writes a job they're genuinely considering. Underneath, they break it into four or five tasks — then map *their own tasks* on the spectrum. Close with the question that gives the series its name: *"Which of these tasks will you*

hand over? Which will you keep? And what does that tell you about what to get good at now?" Exit slip: **one skill I'm doubling down on.**

The spoken teaching point (say it out loud, at step 4)

> *"The question was never 'will a robot take my job?' It's 'which of my tasks will I hand over, and which stay mine?' The people who thrive aren't the ones who avoid the tool. They're the ones who decide what to give it and what to keep. That's your move."*

Facilitator notes on the richest cards

- **"Mark 90 multiple-choice tests"** — automated for decades. Useful for calibration: automation isn't new, and the sky has not fallen yet.
- **"Reassure a frightened patient"** — the deepest well. What is actually happening there? Trust, presence, accountability. Who would they *want* doing it?
- **"Drive a truck on a highway"** — promised as imminent for over a decade, still contested. A live example of predictions running ahead of reality.
- **"Compose a jingle"** — genuinely capable today, which stings for creative students. So what's left? The brief, the taste, the judgement of *which* jingle, and the accountability for shipping it.
- **"Decide who gets a scholarship"** — a machine *can* rank applicants today; the room usually decides it *shouldn't* decide alone. That's the difference between "can" and "should", and it's the bridge to governance.

If it stalls

- **The room goes fatalistic ("machines will do all of it").** Don't argue. Hand them card 15 — *"tell a family bad news with compassion, and be accountable for it"* — and ask: *"Who signs their name to this? Who do you want to?"* The discussion restarts itself.
- **The room goes dismissive ("AI can't do anything real").** Hand them cards 7, 12 and 22 — tasks it demonstrably does today — and let the evidence do the arguing.
- **Groups finish fast.** Add the time dimension: *"Now move any card to where you think it sits in five years — and justify the move."*
- **Someone asks "so is using AI on my assignment cheating?"** Don't dodge: it depends on what the task allows, and clear rules beat guesswork. That conversation — where the line is, and why detectors can't police it — is exactly what the full session does properly.

Adaptation

- **Year 10 / careers class:** run step 5 against their work-experience placements or subject selections — "which subjects build the tasks that stay human?"
- **Year 12:** compress steps 1–4 and give the time to step 5; the exit slip becomes a genuine pathways reflection.
- **Staff meeting version:** swap the deck for teaching tasks (write a rubric, differentiate a passage, notice a struggling kid, decide a contested grade). It becomes a staffroom conversation about which parts of teaching to hand over — and which never to. (That version is the heart of our Staff PD.)

What the full session adds (honestly)

The Automation Map is a complete lesson, and you can run it without us forever. Here is what changes when we're in the room:

In this pack	In the full session
Tasks placed on a wall	**The SHIP IT moment:** a real, working automation built live, in minutes, on a task the room picks — the students watch "a machine can do this today" actually happen, with every choice narrated
The future of work discussed	The framed provocation done properly: the strongest "you're doomed" argument shown, paused, and answered — never left hanging
The integrity question deferred	The integrity conversation had in full: why detectors do not work, what schools are doing instead, and what honest AI use looks like for *their* assessments — delivered as design, not threat
A teacher facilitating	Two presenters: a practitioner who builds these systems for paying clients, and a registered teacher — with the practitioner's own path (commercial AI work + UWA law) as the live pathways case study
One exercise	The full four-beat arc: the tool used properly, integrity, futures, pathways
This pack	A teacher resource pack you keep: primer, teacher-facing run sheets, framed video links with discussion questions, post-session activities and the curriculum mapping

Where it sits in the curriculum

An incursion **connects to and enriches** the curriculum — it does not deliver a descriptor to the achievement standard, and we won't pretend otherwise. For Year 10, the series speaks most directly to (Australian Curriculum v9, Digital Technologies):

Code	Descriptor	How this series connects
`AC9TDI10P10`	evaluate existing and student solutions against the design criteria, user stories, possible future impact and opportunities for enterprise	The Automation Map *is* this evaluation: future impact and enterprise opportunity, argued card by card.
`AC9TDI10P14`	apply the Australian Privacy Principles to critique and manage the digital footprint that existing systems and student solutions collect	The governance beat: where data goes, who is accountable, and what a regulated profession can and cannot hand to a tool.
`AC9TDI10P02`	analyse and visualise data interactively using a range of software, including spreadsheets and databases, to draw conclusions and make predictions by identifying trends and outliers	The "real tool, used properly" study-aid demonstration.

For **Years 11–12**, the Australian Curriculum v9 bands end at Year 10; this series connects instead to WACE course contexts and to career-education and pathways learning, and most heavily to the

general capabilities carried through from Level 6: **Critical and Creative Thinking**, **Ethical Understanding**, and **Personal and Social capability**. The series is also built to be consistent with the **Australian Framework for Generative AI in Schools** — particularly its *Teaching and Learning* (academic integrity), *Human and Social Wellbeing*, and *Accountability* principles.

The full descriptor-by-descriptor mapping lives in the C4Sight Curriculum Alignment Matrix, which every student-facing booking receives.

Bring the full series to your school

All prices exclude GST · Perth metro · two presenters unless noted.

Format	What it is	Reaches	Price
Single Year Group	2 × 60 min sessions (one presenter)	Up to 60	**$950**
Half Day	3 sessions	Up to 90	**$1,750**
Full Day	5 sessions + a free 45-min after-school staff briefing	Up to 150	**$2,850**
Term Program	6 weekly sessions with one year group, ending in a student showcase	One year group	**$7,500**

Single Year Group, Half Day and Full Day bookings include the teacher resource pack. For senior cohorts, many schools pair the student day with **Staff PD ($2,200, or $3,400 extended)** — the assessment-integrity redesign lands best when students and staff hear the same honest story — and the whole-school questions it raises are what our **AI Policy Engagement (from $5,500)** exists to answer.

Or start free

Book the free 30-minute Taster. One class or a short assembly, one presenter, no cost. The rules: one per school, ever; a decision-maker (Principal, Deputy, HOLA or Digital Technologies coordinator) in the room; and it ends with a scheduled conversation about where AI fits at your school.

→ **caleb@c4studios.com.au · c4studios.com.au**

Who you'd be booking. We don't ask you to take claims on faith. What you can check for yourself: we run a Perth studio building AI automation for commercial clients — real, current work. Our practitioner is a UWA JD (law) student, so the governance, copyright and regulation content is genuine, not borrowed. We produce the C4Sight explainer series — public work you can watch before you book. And we deliver alongside a TRBWA-registered teacher.

C4Sight is a C4 Studios venture · Caleb Scott · ABN 26 477 523 297 · Perth, WA

Open questions for Caleb

1. **Years 11–12 mapping depth.** AC v9 stops at Year 10, so this pack keeps 11–12 at capability/pathways level. Do you want a WACE course-level mapping commissioned (e.g. for Applied Information

Technology / Computer Science contexts) as part of the alignment matrix, or is capability-level honest and sufficient for the public pack?

2. **No answer key — confirm the design.** The card deck deliberately ships without an answer key, with the facilitator notes carrying the confidence instead. Some teachers will ask for one. Confirm you're happy to hold the line (I think the ambiguity is the pedagogy), or I add a "typical placements, argued" appendix.
3. **Years 9–10 code verification.** The three codes above are quoted from the alignment matrix (§9), which the editorial review flags as still needing the pre-print verification pass against the live ACARA v9 text. Standing task before this pack is exported to PDF.