I'd like to take a moment to thank our speakers.

Before introducing them, and to thank the teams that have brought this event together.

My office, is that of the Ap. Teaching and learning and the teaching comments, and the office of the Vice Provost Academic have worked closely to create this event this morning.

I won't try to name everyone who works behind the scenes to pull everything together for us this morning, because for sure, knowing me, I'll forget someone.

But I want to take a moment to thank everybody for their tireless work, to pull it all together.

And many thanks to our panelists for taking the time to be with us here today for me in no particular order.

We have Dr. Marcus Brubaker, Dr. Saba Singh, Dr. Robyn, Sutherland Harris, and Dr. Angela Clark, Marcus is an assistant professor of computer Science in Los Angeles School of Engineering at York.

And an affiliate of the vector Institute, which, if you're unaware of unfamiliar with the vector Institute, the world leading AI Research Institute based in Toronto, his research focuses on machine learning and computer vision with an emphasis on generative models and their use in new applications will learn more this morning, I'm sure, about the nature of Chat Gpt.

As a generative model.
Dr. Sava Singh is an assistant professor of digital futures, with the faculty of education at York University as an interdisciplinary scholar and filmmaker working at the nexis of education technology surveillance speculative futures and intersectional marginality, Saba has a strong commitment to community based public scholarship she co-produced the award-winning, screening surveillance series of 4 short films, a public education and knowledge translation project that calls attention to the the potential human consequences of big data surveillance.

Dr. Robin Sutherland Harris is an educational developer in our own teaching.

Comments, where her portfolio bridges, pedagogies of access, equity, diversity, and inclusion, with support for teaching and learning in blended and E learning environments, her current work also focuses on the UN sustainable development goals and pedagogy to support academic integrity, and last, but certainly not least, is Dr. Angela Clark, who is an academic integrity officer in the office of the Vice Provost Academic.

She has worked as an academic integrity practitioner for 7 years, and is the current vice chair of IC.

Angela is working towards her Phd. In higher education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Where are we? Research is focused on Canadian institutions, approaches to academic integrity.

So I introduced Angela as Dr. Angela Clark, but I was a little bit
ahead of myself, and I should say soon to be Doctor Angela Clark, so we'll be watching closely for your success there, Angela, so with that I'd like to conclude

and just reiterate my thanks to everyone who's here this morning.

Everybody who's going to be presenting with us this morning talking to us this morning and and again to everyone who pulled together this incredible event for us.

I'll be listening with rap detention for sure. Thank you for being here.

Thank you, Angela, for the time to speak, and I'll turn it back to you now. Thank you.

Great. Thank you so much. Well!

I'll start off by. I'd like to provide a land acknowledgement so given that this meeting is virtual.

We are all we are all gathered in the same space.

Your university's land. Acknowledgement may not represent the territory you are currently on, and if this is the case, I ask that you each acknowledge the traditional territory that you are on, and its current treaty holders, York University acknowledges its presence on the traditional territory of many indigenous nations.

The area known as Toronto has been caretaken by the Anishinaabic nation. The Houdina, Shawnee Confederacy, and the Huron Wendai.

It is now home to many first nation, Inuit and Metis communities we acknowledge the current treaty holders.

The Mississauga of the credit. First nation. This territory is subject
of the dish with one spoon.

00:05:15.000 --> 00:05:26.000
Wampum belt covenant, an agreement to peaceably share and care for the Great Lakes region.

00:05:26.000 --> 00:05:40.000
So, as we know, generative artificial intelligence tools have recently received much attention in the media, especially regarding how this technology can be used to facilitate academic misconduct.

00:05:40.000 --> 00:05:46.000
At the same time there's been a lot of attention paid to how these tools can be used to educate.

00:05:46.000 --> 00:05:56.000
There are both the challenges and the potential that these tools bring when it comes to engaging our students in learning and considering what it means to work with integrity.

00:05:56.000 --> 00:06:00.000
So today we'll discuss both the challenges and the potential.

00:06:00.000 --> 00:06:08.000
This session includes a panel discussion where we'll answer the questions that you pre submitted to us at the time of registration.

00:06:08.000 --> 00:06:12.000
So lots of great questions were submitted, and we have tab.

00:06:12.000 --> 00:06:17.000
We have tailored the panel session to ensure that we are addressing those questions.

00:06:17.000 --> 00:06:21.000
So a few distinct categories emerge from your questions.

00:06:21.000 --> 00:06:26.000
So you asked for a description of AI technology and tools.

00:06:26.000 --> 00:06:33.000
You ask for ways to reevaluate pedagogy ways, to restructure assessments.

00:06:33.000 --> 00:06:48.000
How to detect. When students have used these tools, you asked about our policy and guidance from York, you asked about some future direction of these AI tools, and you also ask for some best practices for their use.
Now we have quite a large group today, and we wanted to thank you for your participation and for your interest in this topic, because of the group size we have pre selected the panel questions.

But if you have any additional questions, or anything you want to add, please use the chat function, and we'll get to it as soon as we can.

Now, also because of the group size we have muted participants, but we'll provide time for you to discuss the topic in smaller breakout groups.

This will be after the panel discussion, so approximately 1130, or so, and then, after the breakout sessions, we will not be reconvening to debrief.

You can leave right after the breakout session, so I'm going to turn it over to Robin in a second.

But I just wanted to say, before turning it over to Robin, and before the panel session I just wanted to point out that this technology, as we know, is constantly evolving and unfolding and we don't know what the future brings the panel consists of a faculty member from computer science and one who is an expert on digital futures.

We have an educational developer and myself and academic integrity practitioner yet I know we would all hesitate to consider ourselves expert experts on this topic because of its ever evolving nature.

So we're hosting this event as a way to bring the community together to jumpstart conversations and to provide some guidance and food for thought.

So with that I'll turn it over to Robin, who will provide a demo on Chat Gpt.

Thank you, Angela, and it's a pleasure to be here with everyone this morning.
Thanks for coming. So, rather than doing this, live, I have taken some screenshots.

One of the reasons for this is that well, technology in general is always valuable, but also chat Gpt in particular.

Has been of late throttling access to its site quite a bit.

So there's really no guarantee that I would be able to get in there and do the demo live if I had trusted that.

So I did it in advance and took some screenshots.

So this is the basic interface. If you haven't explored Chat Gpt yet, the address is chat.openai.com, and then you have to make a little account.

It's free. They, as you can see down in the corner there's a little upgrade to plus with a little moo thing next to it, so you can now have.

They will not throttle you, and you will always have access, and it will be a bit more high speed if you pay them $20 a month.

So that is kind of already starting to emerge.

But it's still free for use for everyone at the moment.

This is the landing page. And basically right down at the bottom, there's a kind of grayed out text box, and you just type your question or your prompt into that text box.

And you know, a matter of just a few seconds, even if you're not paying for the plus version we'll generate a response for you along the lines of what you indicated, and then, on the left hand side there's that column where right now it just says a plus in a new
chat, and that will store your previous chats there for you.

00:10:13.000 --> 00:10:19.000
So I did a couple of different things. This is the first one that I did.

00:10:19.000 --> 00:10:23.000
I know it might not be easy to read that, depending on the size of your screen.

00:10:23.000 --> 00:10:30.000
But I did one example that was drawn from a course that I taught a few years ago, pre-pandemic, an essay question that was designed for an exam in a Humanities course.

00:10:30.000 --> 00:10:45.000
And so I kind of put in a slightly tweaked version of that essay question into the the text box, and it generated me.

00:10:45.000 --> 00:10:56.000
This quite substantive response all the ones I'm not going to go through in detail and reb the whole response to you, but I have a kind of summary here.

00:10:56.000 --> 00:11:01.000
So, as I said, it's modified slightly from an in-person midterm exam.

00:11:01.000 --> 00:11:16.000
In a first year of global history course. And so the prompt that I gave Chat Gpt was before fever 1,500. The continent of Eurasia was richly transformed by encounters and exchanges discuss the role played by nomadic societies and by disease in these

00:11:16.000 --> 00:11:23.000
transformations. You will want to consider how these factors, both influenced and were influenced by the development of history, right?

00:11:23.000 --> 00:11:45.000
800 words. The response that it generated. I thought if it had been written actually during that originally intended exam kind of session and in person exam setting probably would have been a sort of C plus B minus C kind of response, pretty solid for somebody who's writing drawing in the moment

00:11:45.000 --> 00:11:50.000
on on this kind of spur of things to kind of pull together what they remember from their point.

00:11:50.000 --> 00:11:57.000
Having studied and just needing to get it out there under the pressure
of an in-person exam setting, with no aids allowed.

00:11:57.000 --> 00:11:59.000
If I had given that as a take home exam, or a short essay assignment, it would have been, I think, a.

00:11:59.000 --> 00:12:08.000
D at best, and the reasons for this are the responses. Really, it's pretty overly general.

00:12:08.000 --> 00:12:14.000
It's pretty overly general. It doesn't reference specific, like vocabulary terms, or reading or content.

00:12:14.000 --> 00:12:15.000
From the course. So that would have been a problem kind of for both, preventing it from being at a sort of a level.

00:12:15.000 --> 00:12:38.000
But certainly, if it had been given as a take on, that would be a problem, and it really lacks a strong, some of argument, because that wasn't an explicit instruction necessarily in the direct front, that was given, but is an explicit instruction that we always talk about with our students in history

00:12:38.000 --> 00:12:40.000
courses in particular. I also had it regenerate.

00:12:40.000 --> 00:12:45.000
It's response to, you know. Do it again, and see how different it would be.

00:12:45.000 --> 00:12:54.000
And it was not identical, but it was strikingly similar, so it had a very similar vibe.

00:12:54.000 --> 00:13:03.000
Some of the phrasing was similar. Certainly, if you got to student responses that were that similar, you'd already be having some suspicions as well.

00:13:03.000 --> 00:13:08.000
The second demo. I did was a little bit different. It was more of a kind of personalized reflection on learning in a course context.

00:13:08.000 --> 00:13:20.000
That I am sort of made up about a nursing course.

00:13:20.000 --> 00:13:25.000
So again, this may or may not be on your screen.
So what the prompt that I gave to Chat Gpt was, can you write me a 300 word reflection on what I learned about collaboration in healthcare from a group project to give some context?

The project was to create and present an evidence-based Patient Care Plan.

In response to a case study from a perspective of a nurse working in a cross-disciplinary hospital team.

Our group was mostly great, but one person's contributions were not good enough, and the rest of us had to redo their work.

So this is the kind of the reason I wanted to include this is, this is the kind of personalized reflection on learning that I think many of us have moved more and more towards throughout the course of the pandemic, and this is also something that you know you might incorporate as a kind.

Of low-stakes assessment in a journal like a learning journal, or something on a discussion Forum, for example, as opposed to a more high-stakes assessment as well, and I would say that the response that chat Gpt generated would definitely meet the requirements for a low stakes or a sort of password assignment. It was pretty good, but it was kind of weird.

It was a kind of impersonal or unemotional in a way that just sounded a bit weird to me, but I couldn't totally put my finger on exactly.

Why, again it doesn't. Reference anything that will be specific to the terms, or the reading or the content from the course, or if you had asked students to use a particular framework or model to think about how they were interacting with each other in in their group dynamic.

You know none of that, is there, and when it does sort of talk about you know what I learned about working in teams, and you know what the importance of that.
And health care, and like what I would do differently next time, I would make sure that people were more accountable, and it was kind of big and felt like it was missing the how, when, if this were an actual student, response, I might expect them to say you know, like I would you know, maybe have us.

Check in every 2 weeks, or I would do it. Using this kind of technology, or we would use this framework or you know, there would be, I think, a little bit more of a hint towards the specifics about what the next steps would look like so I think this what these 2 demos kind of show to me.

is that Chat Gpt is pretty good at generating content, but also not perfect, and there are some things that it's that it's quite strong at specifically generating things that are grammatically correct.

And you know it just outputs a whole bunch of text all at once, which is pretty wild to watch it.

Doing in real time. But it's also it's difficult to get a chat.

Gpt. Response that feels like it is connecting meaningfully with the whole context of a course.

And I think that is maybe something take part from a little bit.

So that's my! That's my little demo. Shall I pass it back to you, Andrewa?

Sorry. Yeah, sure. And we're going to. Now go to the panel and thank you for putting up these panel category.

So these are the topics that we're going to be discussing.

And so the first one, a description of AI tools, a AI technology in general. I'm going to pass it on to Marcus to speak to that one.
Sure!

00:16:57.000 --> 00:17:02.000
Angela. Sorry before we do that. Should I stop my screen sharing so it can just be our speakers on the screen.

00:17:02.000 --> 00:17:04.000
That'd be a little nicer for the next. Okay?

00:17:04.000 --> 00:17:11.000
Yeah, I think so. I think that would work. Thank you.

00:17:11.000 --> 00:17:15.000
Okay, great. Well, so first off, thanks to everyone for organizing this, I think it's obviously very topical.

00:17:15.000 --> 00:17:25.000
As a person who kind of works in this space. I feel like every social event that I've gone to in the past several months has had at least one person ask me so what about Chattiept?

00:17:25.000 --> 00:17:39.000
Or some variation thereof so I'm happy to be here, and so the wanted to kick this off a kind of a description of AI technology, the tools like, what is this?

00:17:39.000 --> 00:17:47.000
How do these systems kind of come about so I'm gonna give a really quick overview of that.

00:17:47.000 --> 00:17:50.000
And and I want to start off by saying that unfortunately the term artificial intelligence is a bit of a moving target.

00:17:50.000 --> 00:17:53.000
You know that what is AI is actually not very easy to concretely define.

00:17:53.000 --> 00:18:06.000
It's something that if you ask the question 10 years ago, or 20 years ago, or 50 years ago, you get different answers.

00:18:06.000 --> 00:18:26.000
You get different examples of what systems would be, you know, kind of considered artificial intelligence or not, because, as technology evolves and kind of gets integrated into everyday life, it stops being kind of this magical example of artificial intelligence, and just becomes another tool or behavior of the machines and systems that kind of we
use every day, and you know so there, that said, and I don't particularly like it, for a number of reasons, one of which is that it's not well defined, but the other is that it comes with a lot of very strong kind of social connotations, that come from you know sci-fi, and and just kind of the popular, you know, understanding of artificial intelligence.

You know, we think of movies with Will Smith and things like that. And that's pretty divorced from the reality of what kind of the actual systems that we're using are so I wanna start by that that said, I will use the term AI because it is in wide use. But under protest. So most of what we refer to as AI so chat gpt, and a lot of other examples like that are an example of what's called a machine learning system or machine learning algorithm.

And these are systems that are, you know, traditional computers are built and programmed by giving them very explicit instructions. If your input is X, do y, right? It's think of it as as you know, creating very detailed recipes for how to perform tasks or do things.

And machine learning takes kind of a different approach. We design algorithms that instead of explicitly programming a computer to do X, and in response to some particular situation or some particular input we show it large numbers of examples of possible inputs and and desirable outputs or even undesirable outputs, and we hope that that algorithm will kind of learn from those examples to behave the way we want it to right.

And so there's lots of examples of this, you know. One kind of obvious example that you can think of is language, translation.
For many years people would try to translate languages by very kind of rule-based mechanistic processes, where you, you know, you might look up certain words in the dictionary, and you'd have a French English dictionary sitting on your desk, and and you would look things up and and try to kind of translate that way. In contrast. Most you know, if you've used Google, translate, or anything like that, the way those systems are operate behind the scenes is that they have large amounts of data of documents in both French and English and Spanish and Swahili and whatever other languages, you can think of, and they learn to translate between them, instead of having us an explicit set of rules or an explicit dictionary of terms that gets referenced in the process.

But it's also, you know, slightly more mundane examples might be things like predicting the weather and trying to determine. You know. Make forecasts about what the weather is going to be like, based off of atmosphere conditions and temperature and things like that.

So that's gonna machine learning generally, and chat, Gpt is an example of a machine learning system, is a specific type of machine learning system called a generative model. Which means that it's goal is to really produce produce things that look like it's inputs in essence, produce text. There's lots of other examples of generative models.

So there are generative models that produce images. So these have also gotten some kind of public press recently. For instance, Dolly is an example of a image generative model that can take in that case text prompts and produced images. That kind of line up with that text prompt, and these are, they're actually trained much like what I was describing earlier.
They're often trained on kind of surprisingly simple tasks. They're often trained on kind of surprisingly simple tasks.

So, for instance, a large portion of Chat Gpt is trained by giving a machine learning algorithm a large amount of text and saying, I'm gonna hide some words from you in this sentence predict what word I hit right?

And based on that, it builds up this very rich, very surprisingly accurate model or representation of of languages and and grammar and kind.

Of what natural text looks like. And and it's interesting.

You know, there's been lots of attention to this to the to these models, in the last couple of months, because of the release of Chat Gpt, which seems to have really penetrated, and I think for a lot of people it has felt like it's come out of nowhere as someone in the field. I'll tell you. It hasn't come out of nowhere.

It's been a very kind of long, natural evolution of these sorts of models in, you know, over the past, I mean a long time. Really.

But these sorts of the models that chat Gpt builds on, you know, have been gradually progressing in terms of capabilities.

In the last, you know, rapidly over the last, you know.

5 to 10 years. So that's kind of at a very high level.

What these systems are. You know you've already seen some of the capabilities and what they can do.

You know the demo that Robin just showed you and they can do more than that.
I would encourage you definitely to go, try and play with them yourselves, to get a feel for it, because it's it's hard to.

It's hard to really grasp what they can do until you start kind of really playing with them a bit.

You know, you can ask them to rewrite text.

You can ask them. You know you can say, you know, if it gave you that answer, and you want it to make it sound a little bit more formal, a little bit more personal. You can ask it.

Say, Oh, can you do that again? But make it, you know, a little bit more casual in tone.

Or can you write that again? But add more detail on this part?

And so so these are some of the examples of the kinds of things that these systems can do.

You can also ask it to rewrite your own writing.

I know a lot of people have been doing this, and in kind of my circle on Twitter.

I guess you know they'll write a paragraph of text for a paper or a thesis, or what have you?

And they'll say, Okay, chat gpt, can you take this paragraph and rewrite it and make it?

You know, 10% shorter, or, you know, improve the grammar and clarity of this paragraph, for things like that, and and it will generally be able to do so to some extent or another.

There are definitely limitations of this, you know. I think, that some of these are posted on the Chat Gpt website.
But they're worth reiterating.

There's really no assurances of factual accuracy.

These models will produce text that looks, sounds, reads reasonable.

It will be, you know, very, kind of grammatically correct, so to speak, it doesn't necessarily mean they're true.

When Chat Gpt first came out. There are numerous examples of people asking it to say, Describe how to do.

X, and it will give you, you know, the steps of how to do some specific task, and if you don't know how to do X, in the first place, it might seem like a reasonable thingption of how to do that task.

But if you do know, it will often be wrong and kind of surprising.

And subtle ways. An example actually was that I thought was kind of interesting, was a colleague of mine.

Flies, planes as a hobby on the side, and gliders and so we asked it, how do you perform?

You know, an emergency landing maneuver, or something like that.

And so it gave some instructions that were actually very, very reasonable, except at the very end.

The last instruction, it said, was if this doesn't work, please contact a qualified instructor, or read the reference manual right, which, of course, is not what you want to hear at the end of how to you know connect an emergency maneuver a couple of other things in terms of capabilities.

That I'll comment on, and then I will stop and maybe let some of the other panelists jump into.
So they are very limited to what they're trained on.

If you'll note if you noticed on the screenshot that Robin shared there, there's a little sentence that says it's ability, you know.

It's knowledge of events. After 2021 is limited, which is to say, non-existent.

So if things happened in 2022, for instance, you know the invasion of Ukraine by Russia that would not be something that Cha.

Gpd really knows anything about, because it's not been trained on data up to that.

It's trained primarily on data taken from the web at a particular snapshot.

Particular point in time, and so that includes things like Wikipedia, or whatever.

But it's definitely kind of time, limited. And the other point that I'll throw out here is, it's not just copying output, as you know.

It is producing things that are kind of different or novel.

So it's not like, it's exactly copying text off of existing places in the web.

It's a little unclear in terms of how truly novel the text that it produces is.

But it's definitely not just copying things. And it's going to continue to improve.

And I think this is particularly relevant to everyone here.
That's interested in. How do we respond to it? In an academic context, which is to say that it's not, you know, it's not like it's gonna stall out at this level.

It's not like. I don't think this is maybe getting a little bit ahead of myself here, but I don't think they're going to be easy and reliable ways to detect text generated by these systems.

For instance, at least, not tools that will be effective, you know, for the foreseeable future it might be effective now, but you know the next iteration that comes out in 6 months or a year's time will likely be better, and not be successfully caught by whatever tools get developed.

so I'll stop there. I mean, I don't know if anyone else on the panel wants to kind of jump in, but that's kind of my high-level view of overview of the technology.

I can add a little bit. Thank you so much, Marcus.

That that was great kind of overview of it, and thank you for inviting me to be on this panel.

Robin and Angela.

I think another thing to keep in mind with some of this stuff is, as Marcus said, like artificial intelligence is a bit of a misnomer right like, and that shifts as things move.

And to keep that in mind to some degree, because this is going to give back to you everything that's put in it.

So think about what's put in it as well. Right what?

What do we see very often in terms of what has been fed into Chat Gpt, and what it's drawing from, and to look at that a little critically, like, what what do we see?
A lot on the Internet, like, what are the sources of these things?

And I to also add that there are ways in which I think I believe and correct me. If I'm wrong, Marcus, open.

AI has used content monitors to kind of sift through some of that stuff as well.

And for recent story reporting, I understand that it was underpaid workers in Kenya who were some of the people who were used to kind of sift through what was kind of the data that was fed into this.

So understanding what goes into this also helps us understand what's coming out.

I'd like to say that, you know. It's frustrating that folks that put this out there put it out there, and we all have to kind of bend around it and try to figure out how to deal with it how to live on things around it how to kind of recreate our world around this thing, right? So on the one hand, I want to say, we don't have to accept this.

We can say no, but I know that we're kind of past that point and there are a lot of people who are excited about it, or don't necessarily think through the implications of putting something like this out there.

And people who think about what we can do with it in an unequal society is really hard to kind of grapple with.

So just just a note to say, you know, understanding where this comes from, thinking about it critically, in terms of like, how much of it need we accept?

How do we talk about it? How do we talk to our students about it and to each other about it?

And I'm really excited to have this conversation here, because I think
it's a good starting point to kind of just be like, what is it?

What can we do? How do we deal with this right? How do we think about it?

And you're absolutely right. There was some amount of filtering that was done on, you know, by the people that trained Cha Cha.

Gpt. So in AI in particular, and all, there are a number of other organizations that are producing similar types of models.

They all try to do some amount of filtering of data to try to remove. You know.

Obviously, racist and inappropriate comments and content.

It's never a 100%. And in fact, it, you know, that's one concern about Chat Gpt, is it?

Will, you know it definitely has the ability to simply reproduce a lot of the natural biases that are present in general human humanity. Right?

You know there's no real way to avoid that.

Given the way the systems are trained, and yes, so there!

There have been some cases. There's definitely some very valid questions to be asked about how a lot of that content moderation and filtering was done.

Right.

I don't believe that the Kenyan workers story you're expecting, to, I believe, was actually referring to, which is their image based system.

But but yeah, the issues are definitely present for all of these
Great. Thank you. I think we've examined that first category.

And so let's move on to the next one.

Ways to reevaluate pedagogy.

Thank you. So I think I'm gonna start us off on that one.

So there were a lot of questions that were asked about this in the and the things that were submitted ahead of this session.

A lot of them kind of mentioned that this technology is now a reality of both the educational and the kind of workplace environments.

And many people had questions also about how to use it as a positive engaging, enriching tool in our teaching as opposed to just responding to it out of like kind of fear, or trying to like clamp down on it, and others of course, had questions about how to adapt teaching, in the more short term to respond to the threat to academic integrity, that this all poses.

So I would say, yeah, at some kind of like, at a fairly high level.

Okay, overview. I think these types of tools are, as has been said, is they're not going to simply vanish.

So they're now in many cases already being used in like doing a single workplace settings as tools of the trade in lots of ways, and our students that given us will be better served by learning how to how to use it and evaluate it how to respond to it how do I notice when it's happening. How many critical leaders of it all of this so I think there's a strong case for making use of AI as a teaching and learning tool with the caveat.
I would say that this should be supported with a lot of transparency and openness about the limitations and potential drawbacks of the tech, especially at this early stage, when it's evolving so quickly and we don't necessarily know what those limitations and drawbacks are going to turn into. Broadly speaking, I think my thoughts are.

You know, we would want to make room where we can if we're using these AI tools like Chat Gpt in the classroom to make room for student choice.

So in the using or not using of AI tools for partnership with our students like, they can be very helpful in identifying where they see that it would be most relevant for their learning, or for you know their future ambitions, and also to make room for scaffolding. So not just folding the use of chat, chat, gpt, or another AI tool into a large, you know high-stakes summative project with no really lead-up support.

So making sure that we're gonna be integrating these things that we're actually talking about them and supporting their use and like exploring the complexities of them throughout the course.

But all that said, I think that it can connect deeply with the development of sort of student skills that are really important across all kinds of disciplinary contexts.

So things like analysis and critical thinking and argumentation are all possible.

To kind of highlight, and draw out and play with with chat, gpt, so I guess some ways to think about using using this tool with these tools.

So one of the things it's really good at is generating summaries of ideas and counter arguments to ideas.
So this kind of opens the door for us to think about.

You know, how can we have students justify? Why, one AI summary is stronger than another.

Or to edit an AI. Generated summary, you know, collectively, to do it on the fly in the classroom to address some of these gaps and inaccuracies and inconsistencies that emerge to use the AI to identify the counter arguments, to their own reasoning in order to strengthen their argumentation. So like I, you know, practice this whole theory about, you know, analysis of something related to course learning what does the AI say is a good counter argument, and then how can I think about that and incorporate it into my own reasoning for more disciplinary specific things. I think you know, we can have the AI generate a sample of a disciplinary specific type of work, like, for example, if you were teaching training teachers, maybe a lesson plan, a chunk of code for computer science and use that as a starting point for talking about the improvements that are needed to actually bring it up to the standards of disciplinary writing or disciplinary working.

In your own context, so these are kind of important or useful starting points or conversational openers to to move into deeper conversations about analysis and disciplinary norms.

Another way. I think it can be useful is, you know, for pure feedback or peer review.

If you're doing that with your students and AI generated sample as a starting point for them to review it.

Kind of practice giving feedback to can be helpful, because I think, as we know, students are often a little bit hesitant about how to critique each other's work.

So if they know that you know their test run isn't actually a real
It's a it's an AI tool. Then that can maybe help start that conversation a bit more freely. Chat. Gpt also needs a certain degree of pre-existing knowledge in order to get the desired output right. So you kind of have to know where you want it to end up in order to craft the prompts that will get you there. So there's like often a kind of process of tweaking, and I think that this is kind of a useful and interesting thing to potentially do with students is to have them use the AI themselves to try to create what they think is like an effective analysis of a piece of course content for a key idea in your discipline, and then discuss the process that they that they went through with kind of tweaking and adjusting and kind of massaging their prompt in order to get to what they thought was actually something that was worth kind of worthwhile. The fact that chat Gpt is prone to inaccuracies, I think, it's a really good opportunity to help students become effective fact checkers, which is, you know, a important skill in the modern world in terms of just critical literacy across across the board. So just leaning in on that. And then I think also chat gpt as we kind of hinted, that can be a really helpful kind of tool for writing right? It can be helpful for brainstorming ideas, for outlining structure, for getting over writer's block with the kind of initial blank stage period of writing. So I think you know, we can practice using it in these ways. As a brainstorming tool or an outlining tool with students, so that they understand its limitations in the specific, like disciplinary writing context, that you're working with them and and if you're open
to it, students, I know that this is happening in some institutions and for some

00:38:56.000 --> 00:39:02.000
faculty members. Students can make use of AI as a writing tool for their own work, that they submit.

00:39:02.000 --> 00:39:07.000
Given that there's some kind of process oriented transparency about like.

00:39:07.000 --> 00:39:08.000
What did they use? How to they use it? Where did it influence and change?

00:39:08.000 --> 00:39:16.000
What they were thinking, and you know some citation around how they use the tool as well.

00:39:16.000 --> 00:39:27.000
So I think that's kind of my a few ideas, and if you kind of like a broad, maybe considerations about what are some ways to reevaluate pedagogy.

00:39:27.000 --> 00:39:28.000
And then I think our next topic is restructuring assessments, and we've already cut a kind of maybe started going there.

00:39:28.000 --> 00:39:39.000
But I want to pause, and, you know, invite the other panelists to jump in.

00:39:39.000 --> 00:39:48.000
May I jump in? Thank you, Robin. That was absolutely right like, and I think a couple of people in the comments were also kind of pointing at.

00:39:48.000 --> 00:39:56.000
How do we use this tool and get used to kind of analyze the output as a way to look at good writing, and I think that's a really great point.

00:39:56.000 --> 00:40:07.000
I wanted to bring up a couple of points related to kind of pedagogy, and these might be slightly higher level plans, as opposed to kind of on the ground things which is, if we think about it in some ways.

00:40:07.000 --> 00:40:23.000
This is not too different from our students. Kind of in their rush, trying to get things going to cause hero or going somewhere else to
get existing papers, and then kind of tweaking that to make it more their own as an assignment right?

00:40:23.000 --> 00:40:27.000
So this is another like, it's not. This is not new in the sense of how it's being you might be used or misused in a classroom.

00:40:27.000 --> 00:40:37.000
So it's it's something that we have already been dealing with, and I think we've already started thinking about pedagogically.

00:40:37.000 --> 00:40:49.000
How do we change our approach to this? To encourage students not to do that right, or to create assignments that get students to things to stop and and and keep stuff that's unique and original and thoughtful about some of this stuff?

00:40:49.000 --> 00:40:56.000
And I think that's important too. Right? It's a moment for us to kind of re-examine our pedagogical approaches to teaching something.

00:40:56.000 --> 00:41:04.000
It's like, all right. How do we make it? So that we focus focus focus focus focus on on learning rather than kind of policing.

00:41:04.000 --> 00:41:11.000
Or surveilling our students are trying to be like, are you being bad?

00:41:11.000 --> 00:41:22.000
How do I punish you? Right so we tend to go that punitive direction because we look at it as cheating, and we look at it as kind of trying to work around the constraints that we've laid out for them.

00:41:22.000 --> 00:41:30.000
And while that is still true, I think it is also important to go back to the question of like, what is the conditions that have to be created for students?

00:41:30.000 --> 00:41:34.000
To reach out for these tools to do a thing right. And so this is a huge it's like a big question on a couple of levels, which is like individually as educators.

00:41:34.000 --> 00:41:54.000
How do we create our coursework and our assignments to kind of make sure students are engaging with the content we want them to, and and going through a process of learning rather than trying to just like do a thing for the grade and like I need to get this thing out of the way I need to get my
certification and move on right, so we're battling societal level things, because on the one hand, like in my classroom, I'm like grades are not as important.

I want you to learn. I want you to engage with things. I want you to talk to me about stuff right?

But in the outside world grades are still a thing that they are measured by.

So finding the balance between, that is something we've been doing all along right.

So chat Gptp hasn't changed that context as much as as like we're giving it a lot of importance in that in that thing.

When in actuality, I feel like it's an additional way for students to kind of work around what we're trying to help them do and what they're trying to do in terms of where they where they how they want to construct their lives.

So I think that it's a it's a conversation that's been ongoing.

And this is a new part of it. But it's not a new conversation, and in terms of that I also want to kind of acknowledge the fact that this we work really hard to create, you know, to do that, to make to create work or lesson plans, of courses that are engaging for students and it's it's a lot of work.

And then this thing adds more work right. Our Tas are now going to do more work.

We're going to do more work. Grading has changed like.

So there's so many levels of stuff that seems to be shifting and.
We're all doing a lot and we're not always given the kind of support and time to do that.

Well, so in both senses, where students are going to something quickly, to finish the thing off, because they're so overloaded, and then instructors doing a thing being like either giving into it being like whatever, or being like, okay, I have to spend that much more time to build trust with my students to shift how I'm doing things. And so it's also a structural conversation, which is that, do we have the space and time to really get into and examine our own pedagogical approaches to kind of deal with stuff like this?

And again focus back on, how are we engaging our students? How are we creating of space to learning? And I think building that trust.

It seems like being honest with them, being like. Yes, this tool is out there.

What is it doing? How are we doing it? Also? Having maybe a slightly philosophical question.

For us to say like, Why are you here right? What is it we are doing in this classroom?

And do you think that using this thing is in helping that and kind of having a really honest conversation about that because it's like we are struggling to kind of figure this out?

Unfortunately, we have to. It's like, all right. Now there's a new tool.

Now I have to figure out what that means. What it means to me, because pedagogically, what it means to my students, what's happening?
classroom.

00:44:23.000 --> 00:44:27.000
And I know, like it's shifts and changes how it can be used.

00:44:27.000 --> 00:44:32.000
According to discipline and subject. So it's it's really it's it's an I.

00:44:32.000 --> 00:44:47.000
The best way. I'm not always an optimist, but the best way to approach this would be to be like, here's an opportunity to have a conversation about a lot of things starting with the structural, larger thing of like, how are we as educators supported in this work.

00:44:47.000 --> 00:44:51.000
How are Tas and students supported in this work? How is the, you know?

00:44:51.000 --> 00:45:00.000
So, starting at the higher level, and then coming down to the classroom level and how do we do that?

00:45:00.000 --> 00:45:10.000
And like you were saying Robin, and, as Marca said, like, you know, one of the fears of this for me is misinformation, and how it might be propagated.

00:45:10.000 --> 00:45:19.000
Some more, because when you look at how you pt, what it produces, there's a tone that's an almost authoritative torn as in like, I know what I'm talking about, and that's not true. Right.

00:45:19.000 --> 00:45:28.000
It's it's given that tone. But we need to know not to trust it just because it's other than a particular way.

00:45:28.000 --> 00:45:37.000
And as someone who does a lot of work around critical digital literacy, this gets added to the thing that I need to talk to students about in terms of how do you? How do you find it?

00:45:37.000 --> 00:45:46.000
Right. So we're all looking and saying like, then we're going back to like if you see a thing, how do you go into fact?

00:45:46.000 --> 00:45:55.000
Check it. How do you look at what it's sources?

00:45:55.000 --> 00:46:00.000
How do you kind of, you know? So it's like building skills that are
that were already building and adding this thing into that which is like, alright, here's one more thing that we need to kind of analyze.

00:45:46.000 --> 00:45:56.000
Look at what's going on here. So both in terms of like using it as a tool to help you analyze text, which is kind of fun and cool, but also as a like, has this been generated by this thing.

00:45:56.000 --> 00:45:59.000
And how do we work on trying to figure that out? Not necessarily.

00:45:59.000 --> 00:46:00.000
Just run it through. Another thing to say like this has been 80% probability.

00:46:00.000 --> 00:46:07.000
It was done by human or whatever like that, you know. And that's interesting, too. Right?

00:46:07.000 --> 00:46:10.000
The people who created the things like, oh, we created this thing.

00:46:10.000 --> 00:46:19.000
Here's the tool to figure out how we created a thing, and if it is so, it's like looking at it in that, like an analyzing it and critically looking at everything that's going into this stuff is really important.

00:46:19.000 --> 00:46:24.000
And a good way to get your strengths engaged in a thing as well.

00:46:24.000 --> 00:46:28.000
I think I'll stop there for now.

00:46:28.000 --> 00:46:31.000
I'll just add there, I mean, you know, I'm a computer scientist, not an expert on education.

00:46:31.000 --> 00:46:42.000
Pedagogy, but I will add that I think, as I've thought about this personally, and in the context of, let's say, computer science, education.

00:46:42.000 --> 00:46:46.000
You know, I realize that, you know. Maybe it's a good opportunity for us to think a little about what it is.

00:46:46.000 --> 00:47:01.000
We actually want our students to do and what our students to walk away from in a classroom, you know, and and how we, how we can assess that.
And you know, in a computer science course, we want a student to be able to produce, you know, a piece of software that does something in particular.

You know, chat, gpt, and there's versions of Chat Gpt that are really good at producing Code Github, co-pilot, for instance, if you've if that's of interest.

But you know we want students to be able to use those tools.

You know we want them to know how to use them effectively and proficiently.

And but we want to see the process by which that code is developed.

We want to see the process by which these systems are built more than necessarily, seeing them build, you know yet another, you know.

Hello, world, app, right? Some really simple, you know. Basic application that everybody implement right?

The the value of that is is less and the reason we ask for those assessments right?

It's not because we want that to come out, because we want to know that they they know the process to get from 0 to that output.

And so I think, asking some of those questions. And as we talk, you know about assessments in particular, asking them in the context of the how do we assess that process more than the specific output of the process, it becomes really relevant?

I agree, Marcus, and this might be a segue into the assessment thing, but, like, you know, how are we building assessment on top of each other and complementary and kind of a cumulative in that way, and like having students kind of show all of that it's like a really great
approach. But I agree.

Yeah, me, too. That was actually my first talking point for the assessment item on our thing.

So I guess we can officially move into that which is our third one.

Which was ways to restructure. A assessment I was thinking, Yeah, there's like overlap with the previous question, because, you know, some of the ideas that we've talked about, you could easily kind of use them as an ungraded or low-stakes thing in a classroom context or you could fold them into a more robust assessment. And then there's also the question of detection which I'm seeing kind of cropping up in the chat a little bit, but we will get to that.

I think it's our next question. But yeah, my basic principle for thinking about you know what this does to assessment is that it kind of pushes us towards assessment, not of the yeah.

So assessment of the process, at at least as much as assessment of the final product.

So it's not just enough to look at, you know.

The final research essay. But also we need to connect with students along the way to consider, like the development of what that looks like and all the various component skills that go into that end product like you know, our argumentation use of evidence like you know the deep kind of understanding and bringing of different art scholarly viewpoints together, and all of that stuff that go into the end product.

So I think a lot of us are already doing this already, as educators.

And there's also other like really solid panedagogical reasons to approach assessment this way.
So at least, you know, I think it's not pushing us in a direction that is like pedagogically unfounded in the short term.

I think people have. You know, some.

Concerns about like, what are they gonna do like right now, like this month next month?

Thanks, kind of thing, and I think for that there's some stopgap measures that have been suggested that, you know, if you're in a position where it's not like possible to revamp everything, some have been suggesting asking students to return to sort of more traditional in-person's possible there are some other ideas, like adding a sort of in-class presentation component to a written assignment so they'll need to answer some follow-up questions.

Things like requiring some rough notes, along with the final submission of a paper.

I've encountered some faculty who are, you know, started out the semester, letting all students know, like everyone in the class, that they will be inviting some more, all of them at kind of at random, to have deeper conversations about their work as a sort of a deterrent to using chat gpg, so like, just know that you may be invited to like, have a one on one conversation with me about work at any point.

So I think you know at in all of these cases, like students need a lot of advanced warning.

We can't just spring this kind of stuff on them.

And you also really want to be mindful of potential access and equity issues that can arise.
If you're making these kind of adjustments. So they're not perfect.

But there, I mean it's a kind of short term.

Sort of scramble situation in the longer term.

I think one of the things that this kind of resonates with what you were saying, Saba, that I've been thinking about is just the simplicity of rethinking our grading criteria or bricks, or sort of what we're actually looking for in in terms of assessment to focus more on the types of things that chat gpt is not good at, but that are often more of like the true skills.

And you know, masteries, that we want our students to come out of our classrooms with like things like analysis.

And use of evidence and critical thinking and making. Being able to make these connections with class disciplines and course content and less sort of grading focus on what Chat Gpt is good at.

So like the basic writing and grammar, the kind of summaries, the simple comparisons.

So that's one thing I think that is, is a powerful kind of just shift in perspective.

And then redesigning the assessments themselves to focus on some of these higher order thinking skills where possible, and opening the door to multimodal assessments that do things like incorporate audio video graphics rather than just text alone.

So these are some of the suggestions that are emerging right now, and I think that this is an ongoing thing and it's gonna look different, I think, in every discipline.

And potentially in every classroom. So I mean I'll put a shout out to
the teaching comments.

00:53:01.000 --> 00:53:20.000
This is also the kind of support that we can help with, you know, in terms of like, if you're looking to redesign an assessment of yours thinking about the complexity of the chat Gpt and AI landscape, we're happy to do consultations around that maybe i'll stop

00:53:20.000 --> 00:53:24.000
talking, pass it on to anyone else who wants to weigh in.

00:53:24.000 --> 00:53:34.000
I'll give just a to kind of. Give an example of one possibility here, and I think Robin's absolutely right that this is gonna be very different in every field.

00:53:34.000 --> 00:53:39.000
And I see a lot of people asking questions in the chat and some of those are going to be really, really hard for us to answer in this session.

00:53:39.000 --> 00:53:49.000
But you know, I think when we were talking about this session, and you know, planning for it, you know, one of the things we really wanted to emphasize is this is a starting point.

00:53:49.000 --> 00:54:04.000
And I think what people need to do is, you know, take this, take what we can give you, and we'll obviously try to give you as much as we can, but go back and start having conversations with your colleagues in your areas to try to understand how you can it can you know incorporate

00:54:04.000 --> 00:54:14.000
and respond to this in a discipline appropriate way in the context of you know, computer science, one of the things that we've I've I had already started to do this.

00:54:14.000 --> 00:54:17.000
And I know others have also already started to do this in them courses

00:54:17.000 --> 00:54:24.000
is, you know, computer science.

00:54:24.000 --> 00:54:27.000
We have this idea of version control where we don't just, you know, source code and program.

00:54:27.000 --> 00:54:32.000
You know, programs for computers are not just created out of thin air.
You know, you don't just sit down and write from line one to line a 1 million of a large piece of software.

00:54:32.000 --> 00:54:33.000
You gradually iterate and grow and develop and test.

00:54:33.000 --> 00:54:40.000
And you all these steps, and it's all incremental and if you're doing it right, you're doing it properly, there's a very long, basically audit trail of that process.

00:54:40.000 --> 00:54:46.000
And so, you know, I've already started asking students to not.

00:54:46.000 --> 00:54:49.000
Don't just submit the final results. Submit the entire version.

00:54:49.000 --> 00:55:03.000
History, and and I can go in, and I can verify, you know, because if if they cheated and they just copied some code off the web, then it shows up as just like one giant dump of code, you know, and you can think of similar types of things that might be done with essays and essay writing. Where? You know. Think of asking them to turn on track check changes when they start writing their their essay.

00:55:03.000 --> 00:55:09.000
It's not a perfect solution, right? But it but it's, you know.

00:55:09.000 --> 00:55:10.000
I think that's kind of part of the idea, so that you, as as a as an instructor, or those you know, marking assessments, can kind of see the process by which the final product came into being as opposed to the just the final result itself.

00:55:31.000 --> 00:55:41.000
I think there are a few questions talking about, like large class sizes and tas, and like the amount of labor that's already involved in doing assessment and stuff like that, right?

00:55:41.000 --> 00:55:58.000
And I think there are like 2 or 3 different levels of conversation to have for those, and if, like Marcus saying this may not, we may not be able to get to all of those things in this session, but I think labor is an important conversation to have who has to do it how are they supported

00:55:58.000 --> 00:55:59.000
how many people right like classes, class sizes have gone up.
Tas are have to be trained into doing some of these things in case often students themselves.

So they're already overwork and certain things. Right? So these, I think, are conversations that need to happen at a higher level and at a labor kind of level, and coming together collectively and talking about this and bringing, you know, like getting real supports for these things and that's hard work and it takes time it's not something that happens very quickly and many people don't don't have the time to do that either, right, but we have to do all of these things at one at the same time, if possible, which is like, have those larger conversations with our faculties, and with like administration, and if anyone's listening you know how are we supporting our Tas on our educators, and especially our contingent faculty, like a lot of people, don't have the kinds of resources and supports that they need to do really a lot of work, so that's a very important question to have because and that's in general right Chat.

Gpd. Hasn't made this a new new conversation.

That's a larger competition, anyway, that we're getting to revisit because of this new tool.

That's kind of ostensibly disrupting how we're doing things.

And then there's also, like all right on the ground.

How do we support our Tas and our faculty in doing this?

And those I think those are also important considerations, like what do they have right now?

Do they need time? Do they need more training? Do they need different kinds of support?
And I think those are also super important conversations to have about some of this stuff, and we should have all of them at one time.

And they, you know it's not gonna happen overnight.

I'm this is my first year at York, and I am, you know I'm ostensibly someone who's background is an education technology.

And I think about like, you know, digital futures. And I struggle with e-class. I'll be honest.

It's like, you know, figuring out the logics of this thing and trying to work that out and like teaching.

And all this at one time is a lot. And you know Daniel Becker, who's been helping me, he will attest to the fact that I'm I struggle with it, and it's like that's me someone who I feel should know about this.

Stuff. So you know, understanding that and kind of making the space for that conversation which this is in part of right, which is, it's a it's.

It's also form a solidarity, saying like, yes, we're all in this together.

We're all dealing with this stuff. How do we make a difference and how do we kind of talk to people that need to be talking be like, listen, we need to shift how we're doing some of this because people are burning up.

We're adding, and there's like as technology finds ways to disrupt our work.

We have to find ways of catching up. Unfortunately, we have to catch up with the thing rather than saying like, No, we're not going to take this right now, you know, Silicon Valley's approach, of like, you know, you know.
Break things, or shoot first and ask questions later, is like, is really tiring, because we have to deal with the fallout of that right.

00:58:45.000 --> 00:58:49.000
And it's unfair because it's like, Come on, guys like we, you can't just throw something out there and then have all of a scramble to catch up to it.

00:58:49.000 --> 00:58:51.000
So I think, having those larger conversations about like what is assessment?

00:58:51.000 --> 00:58:59.000
What is waiting? Who's doing it? How much of it are they expected to do?

00:58:59.000 --> 00:59:03.000
How do we support that process? Right? Do we need a hire? More people? Do we need to?

00:59:03.000 --> 00:59:04.000
You know this pay equity, this labor activity, all of these questions are important.

00:59:04.000 --> 00:59:16.000
We should have them, and then also, like, you know, like Robin and Marcus have been saying, we like reevaluating what we want from students. What are we looking for them?

00:59:16.000 --> 00:59:27.000
And what like, I think the the example you had, Marcus, of having you know how you're building a program, and how it starts with online of code and builds up and kind of show your work as it were, right.

00:59:27.000 --> 00:59:41.000
And how do we kind of implement that in our things it's hard to do. But we should make the space and time to do that, and also makes space a time for others to do that with us?

00:59:41.000 --> 00:59:51.000
If I may. Good morning. Everyone I just noticed a couple of questions regarding the new answers of academic integrity, as it relates to AI.

00:59:51.000 --> 01:00:15.000
So I wonder if Angela would have some remarks there around what counts as a breach when we use AI as potentially a contributor to what we are creating and questions around that generally.

01:00:15.000 --> 01:00:24.000
Yeah, so that's a great question we can talk about the policy at this
point policy and supports from your any guidance.

01:00:24.000 --> 01:00:25.000
So okay, I'll I'll get to that first thing I want to share in the chat.

01:00:25.000 --> 01:00:33.000
This link.

01:00:33.000 --> 01:00:36.000
And this thing I'm not sure if you've seen the statement.

01:00:36.000 --> 01:00:46.000
It came out from the Ascp. Recently. And it's basically it's not a policy document, but it's meant to clarify our policy on the use of these tools.

01:00:46.000 --> 01:00:50.000
So in a nutshell.

01:00:50.000 --> 01:00:59.000
You know, if students use AI tools on their coursework and they have not been permitted by the instructor, then this would be considered to be academic misconduct.

01:00:59.000 --> 01:01:21.000
So, according to the policy, more specifically using text generating tools such as Chat gpt, it would be considered cheating under our policy and attempt to gain an imperper advantage on an academic evaluation when it has not been authorized by their instructor and using image generating tools could be considered to be plagiarism as their, you know, such as Dali, or another image generating tool when they're not authorized by their instructor and not attributed to their Creator.

01:01:21.000 --> 01:01:28.000
So you know, working within our existing policy, we were able to account for the use of these tools.

01:01:28.000 --> 01:01:34.000
I've heard from other institutions that that wasn't the case for them.

01:01:34.000 --> 01:01:43.000
But basically, if students are using these tools, it has been permitted, then it's not misconduct.

01:01:43.000 --> 01:01:50.000
If this is the case instructors are encouraged to be quite explicit
about how these tools are used, and how these tools should be acknowledged as well.

01:01:59.000 --> 01:02:00.000
There's no real way yet, you know, thinking about Apa. 7.

01:02:00.000 --> 01:02:12.000
There's no accepted way to acknowledge these tools. So that's a conversation that you could have with your students.

01:02:12.000 --> 01:02:20.000
Students require very clear academic intuition parameters, and they should understand where the boundaries lie.

01:02:20.000 --> 01:02:26.000
You know, when using these tools is permissible, when they must rely on their own resources.

01:02:26.000 --> 01:02:27.000
So instructors are encouraged to provide information about whether you're permitting these tools in different formats.

01:02:27.000 --> 01:02:40.000
So we replication is great in class and e-class on assignment guidelines, and a very good point was made by Marcus about what happens in computer science.

01:02:40.000 --> 01:03:07.000
So students teach them. But version control, if they don't know having them hang on to their draft work. And the research notes is quite important now, more than ever, because you know it could help them use these as evidence to show that they didn't engage in cheating.

01:03:07.000 --> 01:03:12.000
So, yeah, I don't know if that answer the question or not.

01:03:12.000 --> 01:03:19.000
But that's basically your policy.

01:03:19.000 --> 01:03:20.000
Anything. Yeah.

01:03:20.000 --> 01:03:23.000
Angela, did you? You were putting you put a a link in the chat.

01:03:23.000 --> 01:03:26.000
I don't think it showed up.
Oh, sorry! Yes, I'll try that again.

Okay, so that you should see that now. And that is the statement that came from the Asap just just to clarify our policy on this.

So in regards to the question that was asked earlier acknowledgement, how?

How would you have students acknowledge the use of these tools if you are permitting them?

So I think that's an important conversation to have. And just being very explicit in different ways.

And asking them to hang onto to their versions as well, letting them know.

I think Robin alluded to this earlier to that.

Perhaps now you will have more discussions with students. Perhaps you know, breaches will be suspected more often and just kind of lower the stakes and say, you know, I might just I might just be reaching out to you to have a discussion, and it's just that a discussion.

I just want to know, you know, how you prepared this work, what resources you used.

So, yeah, anything to add to that?

I have a I have a question. Mainly because I'm not as familiar with the policy, but in terms of like having that conversation with students.

It's always scary right? Because if you reach out to students, think I noticed, you know, or something they're immediately like, are you gonna drop my grade?

Am I gonna fail? Is this like they get, they get very upset.
And I understand why? Obviously, I'm not saying that that's not.

But like how to? It's having that conversation in a compassionate kind of way.

I think and that's the main thing right? Approaching every compassion and kind of saying like, Look, let's talk about why you did this, and how you do this, and giving them an opportunity to like Redo something or kind of doing it in that way.

Because we really don't want we really shouldn't want to be police right?

We want to be educators and teachers and support our students in the learning that they're doing so, approaching them as we have been like.

And students get so worried about those things and just just wanting to add that when when we do have those conversations to be really thoughtful about it, and that's hard to do as well right like sometimes students are like whatever.

But just like, you know, approaching with compassion. First, I think, is it's what I try to do, and that hopefully kind of takes the edge off their fear because there's a lot of fear involved with them.

Yeah, absolutely. Thank you for that. Sava. Students do get quite stressed out when their instructor says they suspect that breach has occurred.

Also, I'll share some more resources in the chat as well.

There's a website for instructors there's one for students.

And also just to help clarify expectations. There's a document of
statements for that you can use in your syllabus, or that you can use in each in any class as well.

01:06:43.000 --> 01:06:48.000
So there's one that's just been created for this as well.

01:06:48.000 --> 01:06:55.000
So I'll put that in the chat.

01:06:55.000 --> 01:07:04.000
Thank you. I think we've kind of gotten a bit out of order of our planned order of questions, but so should we circle back to talk about detection.

01:07:04.000 --> 01:07:08.000
Yeah, let's do that.

01:07:08.000 --> 01:07:12.000
I'm not sure if, Angela, you or I were going to handle this.

01:07:12.000 --> 01:07:14.000
I'm happy to admit a few comments just from the technical side for detection and this came up in the chat already earlier.

01:07:14.000 --> 01:07:18.000
You know, if you've been following this, you've probably heard about, you know.

01:07:18.000 --> 01:07:30.000
Gbt. 0 and related tools. So there are efforts.

01:07:30.000 --> 01:07:38.000
People are trying to build things that will detect, you know, outputs from Chat Gpt, and kind of related related tools.

01:07:38.000 --> 01:07:50.000
My personal advice is, treat these things with a high degree of care and skepticism.

01:07:50.000 --> 01:07:58.000
I know there's a strong temptation to want to say at the start of your class or not allowed to use Chadgbt, and to run these tools, and then to try to.

01:07:58.000 --> 01:08:03.000
You know flag, you know, flag people that get that get, you know, detected by them.

01:08:03.000 --> 01:08:06.000
But the reality is, these tools have not been well validated.
It's not really obvious that they are not going to simply detect the that they're going to be accurate in any real, meaningful way.

They just haven't gone through any sort of real rigorous assessment.

And so I mean as as a you know, a technical person.

If somebody came to me and said the only evidence that they had for academic misconduct of somebody using Chat Gpt when they weren't supposed to was that one of these tools flagged it.

That would not be evidence enough for me to really believe that that they had done it.

So I would not rely on that as a solution, and at best these tools are a stopping measure.

That the technology for text generation is going is kind of continually improving.

It will continue to improve, in fact, there are machine learning systems that are basically designed to operate by building algorithms that detect fake output and then using those options to improve to produce output that looks less fake that's the way a large class of these generative models actually works and that is really, you know, trying to rely on those in your courses is going to be an arms race, and it may very quickly be, you know, become irrelevant or ineffective as a tool.

So yeah, I'll Angela.

I know you had a few other points in terms of what else is that available?

But at a high level, you know, if these tools are there and you've you want to try to use them. I I wouldn't say don't, but I would just say,
understand that they are very very limited.

Yeah, I echo that as well. There's many false negatives, false positives, for instance, open ais that is accurate only in only detecting 26% of a written test.

Another like a major concern that I have is that some of these detectors work by evaluating the sophistication of a student's writing.

So let's say a student isn't a very sophisticated writer.

They may find themselves being suspected of a breach, and this isn't fair to the student, of course, and it can have negative consequences for them also, I wanted to point out that the technology is is only evolving.

So AI tools are just getting better and better. And so this will lessen the reliability of these detectors because they have to keep trying to catch up, and one more thing privacy concerns regarding student work.

So if you're feeding student work into these detectors, you know, where does it go?

How will it be used? Is this what the student wants? So it brings up all all kinds of concerns as well in that regard.

I just wanted to say, Angela, that's a really important consideration.

I mean this applies to turn it in as well, which is like who owns this data, and what are they doing with it?

Are important questions to ask in general of any of the stuff that we're doing.

And this is part of like some of the words I do is critical digital literacy in terms of understanding what we're putting and where we're putting it, and who gets to use it against us later on, right in some
ways that's kind of what China is doing right it takes your assignments.

01:11:33.000 --> 01:11:35.000
And then, you know, tells you, like years of tool to kind of figure out whether the assignments were not good.

01:11:35.000 --> 01:11:47.000
So there's I think the questions are important, and then what we do those questions and answers is also important in terms of like, how do we approach this?

01:11:47.000 --> 01:11:56.000
And how do we deal with it? Yeah, I'll leave it at that.

01:11:56.000 --> 01:11:59.000
One thing that I do know is that all like, yeah, all of these concerns are very valid.

01:11:59.000 --> 01:12:09.000
I am 100% with you on that, especially with the intellectual property issues of you know, where does the where does the data go?

01:12:09.000 --> 01:12:16.000
Where does the student work? Go? And one of the things about the sort of it seems like there's a new one every day.

01:12:16.000 --> 01:12:35.000
The various web-based detection tools that are kind of popping up all over the place is that they also haven't been through even the kind of bare minimum of like screening processes around these kind of intellectual property issues I know that turn it in is saying that it's going to

01:12:35.000 --> 01:12:39.000
integrate one of these tools and have that rolled out as early as April.

01:12:39.000 --> 01:12:46.000
Possibly. And I know also that university it and learning technology services are kind of, they're on that.

01:12:46.000 --> 01:12:50.000
So it it's and Turniden is already integrated at York.

01:12:50.000 --> 01:13:03.000
So that seems like a thing that is probably coming down the pipeline, and at the very least we can say that once that's integrated with e-class, it will have gone through a procurement process, it will you know there will be some answers about where the data goes and there
probably be, you know, sort of recommended practices for giving students options, you know, for if they don't want their data to go to wherever it goes, once that's unknown quantity.

So that's something just for information.

Yeah, but I just I can't emphasize enough that I don't think we can really rely on detection as a strategy.

Even short term. I think it's fraught and long term. It's definitely.

You know it's definitely going to be a frustrating cat and mouse game.

If that's the way that you want to go. And so I would certainly encourage people to try to think of other ways to respond to it.

I agree with Marcus, and it's you know what.

When we say things like this might be the 80% chance.

It's written by him. What does that mean? What is 80% human mean in this thing?

Because everything like you're saying the data. That's the training data is comes from you.

As in some way right? So it's you know. What has it been trained on?

How does it know grammar? I don't.

It hasn't been trained on like grammar per se, but it's been trained on like you.
ways.

01:14:19.000 --> 01:14:35.000
So I agree, like detection is not like a good way to go and detection is a way that a lot of these companies will use to charge us money to be like year here's a way to take something and give us a bunch of money to do that and then that money takes away from having

01:14:35.000 --> 01:15:02.000
instructors get support or get tas and support. Do I mean like so making those connections and be like, what is what is a smarter way to approach this rather than what's the quick and easy way that we've been told to do this?

01:15:02.000 --> 01:15:07.000
And just to end off this conversation about detection, someone made a really good point.

01:15:07.000 --> 01:15:16.000
Here. It puts us in a terrible relationship with our students as well. So I think that was an excellent point.

01:15:16.000 --> 01:15:27.000
So, yeah, I think, instead of focusing on surveillance and detection, I mean, the best way forward is to talk to students about what's at stake with AI generated text.

01:15:27.000 --> 01:15:34.000
Continue, rethinking building activities and assessments to make both pedagogy and evaluation.

01:15:34.000 --> 01:15:48.000
More specific, more authentic, more experiential, so that AI tools won't be able to produce student work.

01:15:48.000 --> 01:16:09.000
So. Lastly, we can talk about future directions. I mean, no one, of course, knows the future. But we we can trying to take a stab at that.

01:16:09.000 --> 01:16:12.000
I'm gonna volunteered Marcus to gofriends.

01:16:12.000 --> 01:16:29.000
I was just about to do the same for you. Yeah, I look, you know, I think we've hinted at kind of the future of at least the technology throughout the discussion so far already. Quite a bit.

01:16:29.000 --> 01:16:30.000
And I am sympathetic to the fact that this is going to be disruptive.
To a lot of people here, but unfortunately, it's not going away.

I think these generative models are going to continue to improve that's been the history of the technology for the last 20 years, and that it's just been kind of continually getting better and better and better.

And it's ability to create kind of stunning and kind of impressive outputs.

Whether they're text or image or video. And I think we do really just have to think about how these tools can be positively used in our courses in society generally, and how we can mitigate the potential harms.

You know. I think, for instance, on the digital imagery side of things, on the imagery and visual side of things.

These tools are already been taken up to great effect by artists to create really stunning pieces of art and there's there's concern that's out there about.

Is it going to displace or destroy a kind of you know art as a profession?

And maybe it will certainly have an impact. I can't.

I cannot predict that, and I'm not sure how to how to manage that.

I think that's a question that we have to answer.

Kind of as a society, as a social question of what art is to us.

But what I can tell you is that fundamentally people creating you know, digital artists have taken up these tools enthusiastically.

Many of them, and use them not to simply produce some mechanism, you
know mechanistic output of the system, and leave it at that but to take them and use and try to take their own aesthetic and their own ideas and their own.

01:18:19.000 --> 01:18:43.000
You know, preferences to craft it. And I think that's kind of the way we need to look at a lot of these tools because they are going to continue to improve and play probably increasing role in many parts of society, and the economy in our lives.

01:18:43.000 --> 01:18:54.000
Hey? Agree with Marcus in terms of kind of having conversation as a society about what this means for us, and it's frustrating to me to also have to agree that this is something that we have to react to and accept as happening.

01:18:54.000 --> 01:19:11.000
If I'm I mean, I would say we should have a space for saying no, and for resisting or for saying, this is not something we want to do as a society, and also looking at like what potential harms can come in the future, because this has implications outside of education.

01:19:11.000 --> 01:19:35.000
And that is scary, because in in a world, in a world where everyone had equity and access to everything that we needed to live full lives, these things don't have as much of an impact, but in a world where there are people who get to use the for, fun, but then are forced to use it to like access health care and stuff like that. That's not essential. That's not a good thing for our society, right?

01:19:35.000 --> 01:19:36.000
So it's on the one hand, I understand people are like this is exciting.

01:19:36.000 --> 01:19:42.000
We'll be able to offload this we'll be able to do this.

01:19:42.000 --> 01:19:48.000
Will be able to. I understand that. But that excitement needs to be tempered with like.

01:19:48.000 --> 01:19:51.000
Well, who's getting affected badly by this right?

01:19:51.000 --> 01:19:54.000
Who are we stepping on in order to have this cool fun thing?
And that's a thing also to keep in mind when we're creating as educators when we're having conversations about this with our students right?

We can kind of have them think about it more more deeply than just as a tool for cheating or a tool for helping or tool for like analyzing things.

So while we're doing that, it is important to also kind of think about the larger implications of something like this, and who gets impacted and affected by it.

So I think that, like continuing to have these conversations both within our friends or girls, or within our academic circles, or within, like larger, and then remembering to have the conversation about labor, because that is an important conversation, who gets who has to do that labor to you know to kind, of make up for this stuff and I think I had mentioned kind of contingent and contract faculty before this, because a lot of times they work harder for a lot less support and less money.

So how are they being impacted? They don't get talked about in these conversations very often, right?

Like. I'm you know. I mean, I'm first year.

So who knows what my future is? But I do, you know, looking at where we stand in a general hierarchy of a system, and who we can speak to, and how we can speak to things and speak for those of us who will be impacted in negative ways about this stuff, I think that's very important so while

I want to say, like we should resist some of the ways in this, that this, that this stuff can be harmful to us.

But having seen that, that's hard to do, how do we kind of keep those conversations going without necessarily burning everything down, which would also be an answer?
But so I hope like I'm trying to keep hope, and my hope is coming mostly Mariam Kaba says that hope is a discipline, and I take that very seriously, because it's a very hard to have hope in a time like this, not just you know within this context, of what we're talking about here, but just generally globally, and everything that's happening everywhere.

So keeping, you know. Approaching each other with compassion, keeping hope, being like, okay, how can we reassess and support each other in doing some of this work so that it come?

It ends up, being a net positive rather than something that these people behind or hands other people.

Thank you so much for putting this together and I hope it's been useful for everyone that's attended.

And please given us a space to kind of think through, or agree with, or how you with each other, with some of this stuff, so thank you for everyone who's been engaging on the chat as well.

I really appreciate your comments. There!

Great.

Thank you so much, so it's such a great note to end.

Our panel conversation on like the message of like the the maybe arduous, but like wonderful practice of hope and higher education. Yeah.

Yeah, agreed. So a huge thank you to my fellow panelists for the for the really rich and informative discussion.

Thank you as well to the participants for all your great questions and comments in the chat.
I think we met our goal today of encouraging more thought and discussion on this topic.

So in closing these tools, help bring opportunities to students for thinking about.

You know the ethical implications of this technology and university, and beyond.

But at the same time they have the potential to bring students in as valuable learning partners and reframing what we consider to be working with integrity.

So next up are the breakout rooms. So in these rooms you will encounter a prompt that encourages you to share your main concerns about Chat, gpt, or other AI tools within your discipline, specifically including both shortcut and long term concerns.

How can these concerns be mitigated? You'll also encounter a padlet where we ask that one person from your group record.

Some of your main points, so we'll take a minute or 2 and create some breakout rooms and assign you to those.

And Robin has posted a link to the padlet that you can use in these breakout rooms.

So just to repeat what I said earlier. This is the end of the presentation.

Once you're finished with your breakout rooms.

There's there's no reason to come back, because we won't.

We won't be presenting any more content.

I would just add that I do invite people to add their thoughts to the
pad, and this is, you know, it'll be useful information, I think, for everybody to see what everybody else has to offer in this context and then also it will be useful for us in thinking about what types, of future support we might

01:24:23.000 --> 01:24:53.000
be developing and offering to the community. So please share your thoughts in the padlets.

01:25:30.000 --> 01:25:35.000
I'm trying to gauge when it's appropriate to be like.

01:25:35.000 --> 01:25:40.000
Me too!

01:25:40.000 --> 01:25:42.000
We wanna turn off the recording.

01:25:42.000 --> 01:25:46.000
I do?