



## WGI Philosophy Statement Regarding AI Summaries

### Navigating the New Digital Landscape

CompetitionSuite has recently introduced AI-powered features designed to summarize judge feedback and provide interactive insights. While WGI recognizes these tools as a modern convenience for synthesizing feedback, they must be approached with a clear understanding of their benefits and limitations. To maintain the educational integrity of our activity, we have established the following philosophy regarding the use of AI.

### The "Human-First" Principle

There is no substitute for the authentic, real-time commentary of a judge. Adjudication is a pedagogical conversation that relies on a "shared reality" between the judge and the group's staff.

- **Critique Requirement:** All groups are still **required** to listen to the original judge commentary files in their entirety prior to attending critique. AI summaries are a supplementary resource, not a substitute.
- **The "Authentic Word" Rule:** AI summaries are a secondary, automated interpretation. Relying on them risks missing the tonal nuance and specific instructional intent that can only be found in the judge's own voice.

### Accuracy, Context, and Hallucinations

AI lacks the intuition and pedagogical understanding of a trained adjudicator, instructor, or designer. We have found that AI summaries frequently struggle with:

- **Audio Misunderstandings:** The complex audio environment of our performance space often causes the AI to mishear phonemes. A judge saying "The clarity is lacking" may be transcribed as "The color is lasting," leading to a complete misinterpretation of intent.
- **Terminology Confusion:** AI lacks activity-specific knowledge. It may struggle to understand or interpret terms common to our activity that may not match literal dictionary definitions.
- **Sheet Context Gap:** AI tools are not anchored in our sheet's *Points of Comparison* or *Considerations*. These attributes form the "shared contract" between judge and staff; without this framework, the AI may fail to categorize feedback within its proper context.
- **Loss of Tonal Nuance:** AI summaries are "flat." A judge's voice carries vital information; the difference between a gentle suggestion and a critical programmatic flaw is often found in their inflection, not just their words or a transcript.

- **False Correlation & Prioritization:** AI often seeks to link unrelated ideas or to prioritize a long comment about a minor detail over a short, yet significant, structural observation simply because the former contains more words.

### Where AI Can Provide Value

When treated as a supplement, AI can serve as a helpful assistant for information recall and workflow efficiency:

- **Critique "Cheat Sheet":** Use the summary during critique to quickly recall major points after you've already listened to the full recording.
- **Rehearsal Templating:** Use the "Actionable Feedback" as a jumping-off point for your rehearsal plan, vetting it against the audio and your own intuition.
- **Searchable Indexing:** Use the AI Chat to find specific moments instantly. Asking, "Where did the judge mention the timing rub?" can save minutes of manual scrubbing.

### The Bottom Line

AI is an excellent tool for *indexing* a conversation, but the judge's audio remains the **sole source of truth**. Use AI tools to stay organized and distill information, but please keep your ears and your rehearsal priorities grounded in the original recording.