

Tab 1

Name: Caitlin

September 2, 2025

Author & Title: 'College Students have Already Changed Forever' by Ian Bogost			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: Most college students have been using AI since they started; it is being used to free up time	There are many things that exist that some deem helpful (i.e. drugs)-this doesn't mean you have to use them. A student could use AI for the campus committees, to organize and generate emails and things-which would free up time to read papers on your own so you are able to get your personal reaction to the paper instead of the AI summary.	It does make the students quoted sound a bit lazy; they figure if AI exists then why not use it. The students quoted mentioned only using it for certain tasks but i know as an undergrad the temptation to use it for everything would be very high,, it's too easily accessible.	I suppose it's too early to know how this is affecting college grads and their job placement or job performance?
Mid: <i>"For students who have access to AI, an education is what you make of it."</i>	I think over time, as more is understood about AI there will be more emphasis on the integrity of it; how it's not your voice or your thoughts. Also, the importance of letting students know the environmental impact as Prof. Rochschild did-it is a moral/ethical issue on many fronts.	I doubt most professors are oblivious to how widespread AI is, the author does not give them enough credit. They know about it but are reluctant to change. The ways higher education responds to AI and alters curriculum will determine a lot for the future of	Would it be more beneficial to increase classroom discussion and then have papers written based on the discussion from class? That might be more difficult to use AI for. This would mean students wouldn't have to participate fully in the discussion if they are not able/comfortable.

		education and workplace use of AI.	
End: <i>“The classroom experience was suffering even before AI came onto the scene.”</i>	Similar to consumerism, politics, and job training-education is prone to stagnation in its embrace of anything new (especially technology). Many teachers and administrators may become comfortable and slow to change. With good reason, it is difficult to rework an entire curriculum year after year. With the massive shift AI has brought it is frightening the lack of change that has come with it in education, especially higher education.	It’s all so tricky. If professors want to devote more time to research then they use AI. But how do they use, or not use, AI to develop curriculum to fit in an AI world.	What else besides money and systemic change can help classrooms adapt to AI? Is it something we will have to wait and see as we do our best to change deeply rooted college curriculum?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Author & Title: “15 Times to use AI, and 5 Not to” by Ethan Mollick

Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: <i>“it can be transformative yet must be approached with skepticism, powerful yet prone to subtle failures, essential for some tasks yet actively harmful for others”</i>	I tend to think laziness when reading about the ways AI is used. I know it is not, it is using the tools at hand. It is efficient. But with a relatively new tool, with risks and benefits still being discovered, I’m hesitant to laud it just yet.	Why use this artificial intelligence when you have your own intelligence.	Does it actually make your work better or do you just think it makes it better? Is there benefit in the confidence that it may instill?
Mid: <i>“Increasing and decreasing complexity of documents so that people can understand them.”</i> (#4 on first section)	I can see the positives when reading and you have very specific questions about the background or specifics that can’t be found by googling or having to read one or more other papers—or with something very technical like coding.	However, the rate of error seems higher with coding. Which processes can use AI to handle, and possibly improve, the rate of error.	I wonder about the novelty of this, if everyone is using AI, where is the creative thinking, unique problem solving that is beneficial to a new business?
End: <i>“You need to use AI enough to understand these risks.”</i> (#3 in second part)	I know I’m not the only one who doesn’t feel they fully understand AI. It may be prudent to refrain from using AI for anything especially important until we understand it better (although this may be assumed by the author).	As the reader I would have benefitted from having this quote in the beginning and ending with the quote I placed in the ‘early’ box. The biggest takeaway is to understand it before we use it.	What can AI do better than humans? Besides being faster at giving answers.

AI Employed/Specifically How: None

Author & Title: “Refusing GenAI in Writing Studies: A Quickstart Guide” by Jennifer Sano-Franchini, Megan McIntyre, and Maggie Fernandes

Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: <i>“we must recognize the harms that will result when writing is primarily treated as a tool to transcribe answers, including its implications for critical thinking, democratic decision-making, and linguistic variation and expression.”</i>	Not only is AI deleting cultural dialects, the creators decide which tools to use which then places a narrower world view on the results	GenAI will never stand up as a substitute for actual human thought	We are putting a lot of weight on an artificial output that is created by imperfect humans guided by their own ideologies but more so by corporate funding. Is that how we want to go forward as writers, as community members-placing higher value on the output of AI than on human creative thought?
Mid: <i>“it is important to consider what...led to the development of these technologies, including the differences between technologies designed to solve specific problems and meet specific needs...versus those designed to meet the goals of corporate capitalism.”</i>	The data centers are built near lower income and minority populations who see the negative environmental effects more than the majority who are actually using the technology. This is a problem in many instances with large corporations	This is an important time to be looking at why these technologies were created, how they are being used, and how they can impact individual jobs and education.	Who uses AI the most? Is it those in the tech industry? How much of its use is driven by purely financial gains?

	placing the environmental burden on lower income neighborhoods		
End: Implementations of regulations need to be quick not 'slow and meaningful'	Students are using AI whether faculty want to or not, so the regulations need to be swift at first and then slow and meaningful to develop better ways of incorporating it into academic life.	A lot of the hesitation comes from the unknown of AI, it has come on quickly resulting in very little regulation	What is being done to implement regulations in higher ed? In public K-12? What regulations have they put in place already and are they temporary as they continue to develop better regulations?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Author & Title: "The CCCC and Refusing AI: A Rebuttal" by Joe Essid			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: <i>"an industry expert claims that AI firms are misleading the press and public about how rapidly their models are improving."</i>	Although this may be helpful we do not know if this is being done and cannot stand by while someone figures out how fast or slow AI is being developed. AI is being widely used now so now is the time to act on it	This would be beneficial as it would allow more time for implementation of adequate regulations but I do think most institutions are being proactive about their approach to AI	We don't yet know which approach to AI regulation in education is most beneficial. As with any other new technology only time can tell. Will this be as good AI can get? Or will it get far worse? Or will it land somewhere in between.

Mid: <i>“best use means employing AI wisely, reflectively, and ethically.”</i>	Teaching students to use AI is top priority (after educators being trained and learning it for themselves). Within that teaching is the disclaimer that it is an ever evolving technology that will require constant revision to how we use it	Once we know how to use it we can aim our usage to minimize the environmental damage, I’ve not used them myself but I’ve heard of mistral, llama, and ollama that apparently use less energy or can be used offline	How else can we reduce the damage to the environment? Are the companies developing AI devoting as much time to this aspect as they do to the data?
End: <i>“noted how AI creates new content, for good or ill; our prior networked technologies merely shared existing information”</i>	I see the pros in terms of helping disadvantaged individuals but the tech companies making these don’t seem to have that as a priority but more of a marketing tactic	Those of us who are reluctant to use AI (because of our reluctance to support big tech further destroying our natural resources)-how can we use it to promote efforts for good?	Is it actually new content or just different combinations of existing data?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Name: Caitlin

September 9, 2025

Author & Title: Mollick, E. " A Guide to Prompting AI (For What It Is Worth) "			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: <i>"Work with the AI, rather than trying to issue a single command that does everything you want. The more you experiment, the better off you are."</i>	I do wonder if the work put into creating the perfect prompt and guiding the AI through all the specific parameters is any more efficient than doing your own research? I understand that AI can potentially create something higher quality, more precise, or turn out a higher quantity in a shorter amount of time but many of us are able to do this with the help of the internet and a library. I also see the perspective that creating a complex prompt <i>is</i> putting in the work.	Similar to what Dario Gil said, "don't just be a user, be an AI content creator." Although I think his point was to create your own AI, I think it applies here too. If you can't make your own AI then make sure to test over and over the one you are using.	Did 'prompt influencing' arise from someone seeing the potential dollar signs or did it come before and has developed into a way to make money? How does this affect where we are on a playing field-do those who use AI generate better work in school or employment? Is my paper worse because I didn't use AI?

Mid: “The AI will make up information that it does not have access to. There is some evidence that asking it to show its work, or its sources, reduces that risk somewhat.”	This is reinforcing my hesitancy to use AI. It could make up information? How is that helpful? Of the millions of people using AI how many of them realize this could happen-how many are double checking? I can't imagine it is very many. From what the students said in the Bogost article from last week, they are using it to save time. Which leads me to believe they are not double checking the AI output.	This is also something that was discussed in the IBM video-how AI doesn't tell us how they got to that conclusion. It is somewhat comforting to know we can ask the AI to give sources but we then have to check and make sure the data did, in fact, come from those sources.	This gap of information, 'it does not have access to,' is that because it wasn't included in its data set or how does it not have access? Have undergrad students figured out how to prompt or are they putting in what they want and using what comes of it?
End: Even prompting doesn't make up for the human voice. But it does show how it could be helpful for different areas/groups other than just saving time.	It is funny how the last paragraph Mollick wrote with AI prompting actually sounded like a robot compared to the first part of the article.	This has me thinking about who else might benefit from AI. We talk in class about helping those with disabilities such as autism. But I've been thinking about those who may not be able to write a paper due to developmental delays. Could they learn to use AI, to prompt it to help them write and create content for whatever they are interested or might want to work	Will learning more about the positive aspects of AI convince me to use it in my life? Or will learning more about it increase my skepticism and potential fear?

		on. It is interesting to think about the goodwill possibilities of AI.	
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Author & Title: Giray, L. " <u>Prompt Engineering with ChatGPT: A Guide for Academic Writers.</u> "			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: "The librarian, or in this case, the language model, becomes adept at understanding and utilizing the prompts to provide relevant and accurate information."	Giray mentions language translation at the beginning which is a use of AI I can see a lot of benefits from. For some reason this article does not give me the same anxiety the Mollick one did-is it the voice/attitude of each that makes the difference? Did AI actually write the Giray article attempting to convince reluctant AI users to want to use AI?	As mentioned in my synthesis of Mollick about who might benefit from AI-language translation is a good example of this helping people such as immigrants, students, translators, etc.	Is AI simply reducing tasks (i.e. language translation) that used to be valuable and fostered connection? Or is it broadening the scope of connection through language translation?

Mid: "Ambiguity, bias reinforcement, overfitting, lack of context, ethical considerations, unintended side effects, and unrealistic dependency on model limitations are key challenges."	The contextual prompt seems most beneficial to me as it is using base information to guide the answer. I see this method being an essential part in eliminating the pitfalls Giray mentions.	I think back to the students questioned in Bogost's article and wonder how many of these pitfalls they encounter as they do their course work. I know I would have a hard time crafting questions that do not include them. I keep going back to just using your brain because my brain would be frustrated trying to come up with the perfect prompt.	What was Giray's purpose in coming up with instructive and question-answer prompts as separate techniques? They both seem to guide AI to center the answer around a specific-what nuance am I missing?
End: "Prompt engineering acts as a form of programming, granting you the ability to provide clear instructions and automate processes through prompts."	Without taking an AI class I fear many AI users don't understand the importance of learning how to use AI and checking the sources. This can lead to the AI hallucinations being used in school/work or other info being used incorrectly.	I am encouraged that each of the articles we have read this week and last have in some way emphasized the importance of learning how to use AI or practicing with AI.	Do AI programs have any instructions on how to prompt when users are starting out? Do the programs have support, or could they ask AI to help them craft a response? Using AI to help you use AI?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Part I of II

Name: Caitlin Robinson

The best academic writing starts with a question, not an answer. This exercise will get you ready to test an AI in class and do some thinking about the final presentation.

Download this form as Word or text. Bring with you to class Tuesday and copy/paste it into the end of your journal. It will count as part of your participation grade.

Your job: *Imagine that you had to present for 10 minutes next week on an AI-related topic of your choice. Your audience would be us in the class, some SPCS administrators, and a few faculty.*

1. *Describe your topic in a couple of sentences:*
How can we reduce our environmental impact while using AI? Are there certain tools or developers that are focusing on this problem?
2. *Why did you pick this topic?* I am reluctant to use AI because I am studying environmental sustainability. I have learned a little about the amount of water used and the emissions from data center construction and use. I would like to know what is being done about what I feel is a big problem.
3. *What do you still need to know about your topic?* How much energy is being used by data centers in the United States? What kind of energy is used? Where the water being used it coming from and if there is an alternative source of water?
4. *How do you think AI might help?* My pessimistic self says that AI cannot help me. But I'm sure it can point me in the right direction to find the answers I'm looking for. It could help me find sources for research being done into this.
5. Give me **four prompts** for the AI, one of each type, using Giray's examples to guide you:
 - Instructive Prompt: "Identify the type of energy being used to power AI data centers in the United States and how it compares to energy used by factories in the United States that make batteries"
 - Question-Answer Prompt: "How are AI developers working to reduce the energy used by the AI data centers?"
 - Contextual Prompt: "Considering we are not able to control how much energy is used by AI to answer a prompt, how can individuals using AI adjust how we use it to use less energy? Are there specific AI programs that use less energy than others?"
 - Mixed Prompt: "With the media scrutiny of the amount of water used at the data centers to answer a singular AI prompt, how do we know how much water is actually being used and is this information available to AI users by developers?"

1. *What risks do your prompts run, if any, with the pitfalls that Giray's article discusses?* I'm not sure my prompts would come up with the answers I intended. They may be too vague or need more background to get specific answers.

Name: Caitlin

September 16, 2025

Author & Title: Asimov, A. <u>The Three Laws of Robotics</u>			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: "In <i>Foundation's Triumph</i> different robot factions interpret the Laws in a wide variety of ways, seemingly ringing every possible permutation upon the Three Laws' ambiguities."	This article talks about the different interpretations of the laws by different authors. I think it's interesting because the robots' actions are being written by humans so it is impossible to eliminate the human way of thinking with emotion.	This reminds me of working out the best prompt for AI to get the answer you want. It is also reminding me of the "Refusing GenAI in Writing Studies" article because they argue that we have to recognize the faults in AI and not depend on it as we would other humans.	Who was the first author to portray robots as killers in science fiction? Why did this narrative spread so widely in books and movies?

Mid: "Robots and artificial intelligences do not inherently contain or obey the Three Laws; their human creators must choose to program them in, and devise a means to do so."	Similar to above we know the AI cannot interpret data as we would because they lack human emotion. More questions than answers in this particular subject area.	At first I thought of nature v nurture but AI has no inherent traits or instincts-they are all put in by a human. So is it programmer v user? The user has to interpret what has been programmed and adjust according to what it needs from the AI?	Are we responsible enough as humans to program AI ethically? How will this be regulated when ethics can be interpreted so broadly by individual humans? How are programmers including, or not, data that will help AI be ethical?
End: "The development of AI is a business, and businesses are notoriously uninterested in fundamental safeguards — especially philosophic ones. A few quick examples: the tobacco industry, the automotive industry, the nuclear industry. Not one of these has said...that fundamental safeguards are necessary, every one of them has resisted externally imposed safeguards, and none has accepted an absolute edict against ever causing harm to humans."-Robert J. Sawyer	This is a very interesting point because it is true that there are industries that cause harm to humans and make a lot of money from it. However, humans do not live by a common moral code-humans have freedom to choose however they wish. There is nothing holding them back, not even physical barriers or force can stop a human from making a choice.	I suppose it makes sense to compare AI companies such as Apple and Google to big tobacco or energy companies because the main goal is to make money. And as generic and cliché as it may be, the other main goal, although never spoken aloud, is to gain power. These large organizations are able to frame it as they are helping people, they use profit to promote foundations or 'green' initiatives to	Is there a sort of code, like HIPAA for medical, that exists in the AI world for developers to abide by? And if there is one or multiple, how is it enforced (or not)? Will this become another tobacco industry that makes billions of dollars while causing harm? Will they have to battle anti-AI activists advocating for more regulations to protect people?

		have a friendlier facade. Of course this is generalized but every large company has an example of these exact techniques.	
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Author & Title: Prisznyák, A. " Ethical AI ."			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: "However, the question of machine ethics is also a question of cultural ethics. Based on in-depth interviews conducted in seven industries, the author reveals that ethical considerations are not yet taken into account in the development of AI systems" (Prisznyák, p. 163).	Interesting to see the definition of AI over time and how they are all saying the same thing with slight nuances-seems to evolve from human intelligence to intelligence being mechanized.	I can't even imagine how hard it is and is going to be to regulate the ethical side of AI. We can't agree on what kinds of books kids should have access to-how in the world are we going to agree on how massive amounts of data can be used to give those same kids answers to any questions they want.	Do large developers have their own set of ethics they implement for those programming? Do smaller developers in the US have to abide by any sort of code of ethics and if so, can anyone using AI access it?

Mid: “Despite the sporadic appearance of research into ethical AI, the first conference discussing the ethical issues of AI was only organised in 2016” (Prisznyák, p. 168).	Various countries and global committees have come up with guidelines for ethical use of AI. However, everyone could come up with whatever they want-it matters more if the guidelines are 1) followed 2) enforced and 3) how they would be enforced or regulated. They are simply guidelines and not policies that must be adhered to.	The article talks about the idea of AI being around for a while, since the 40’s-and with it has come talk of the ethics but, as was discussed with the Asimov’s Law of Robotics, not much has been done about it.	What is taking so long? Is it just the sea of opinions around AI? The different cultural beliefs around AI? Probably all of the above and many more differences of opinion coming together on a difficult and still new topic.
End: “Although the ethics principles of artificial intelligence are not legally binding, they supplement legally binding regulations and provide guidance on how to promote ethics standards through “self”-governance in organisations” (Prisznyák, p. 169).	To me there needs to be something similar to HIPAA developed as a code of conduct for AI developers. Learning that there isn’t one of these that exist universally is not encouraging as an AI skeptic. The other big thing I’m thinking of is the relationship between ethical standards and the impact AI has on emissions and water use. How might those work together?	I do wish that Malcolm Gladwell had gone off script a bit and asked Dario Gil about the ethical side. It’s not something I had thought of but now I can’t stop thinking about it and wondering how someone like Dario Gil would answer a question about ethics.	What can we do as students to promote ethical use of and development of AI? Is it a policy we can promote? Are there certain AI programs that have ethical standards that we can support over others?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None, although I do believe many of the questions I ask could be answered by AI, I feel okay not knowing the answer to every question.			

Author & Title: Yujie Sun, Y. et al. "[AI Hallucination: Towards a Comprehensive Classification of Distorted Information in Artificial Intelligence-Generated Content.](#)"

Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: "With its inherent advantages of high efficiency and low cost, AIGC has been gradually applied in education, media, healthcare, finance, and entertainment"	I can see its use in each of these areas. Now that I've read about AI ethics, I can't help but wonder about all the different ethical concerns present in each of these industries.	My partner and I have both worked primarily in healthcare and most recently have heard from practitioners wanting to use it to chart, since that is the most time-consuming part of their job. However, the cost of AI programs to do this is not something most healthcare companies want to spend on.	I see AI use in business as being another way to get ahead of the competition. Will AI use be another thing that hurts small business or will they be able to implement it to their advantage?
Mid: "Unfortunately, human feedback tends to be subjective and inconsistent, making it difficult for the system to discern reliable feedback. Consequently, this can mislead the learning process of the system, leading it to incorporate and utilize inaccurate information, thereby	Am I reading this correctly that any user can mislead AI to learn incorrect information? And the AI will absorb it into the system-nothing is built into its programming to stop this misinformation from becoming part of the data set?	This is definitely something Malcolm Gladwell should have asked Dario Gil-although Gil's publicist would never have allowed it. This also goes back to having some sort of ethical standard-to regulate what information AI can 'learn.'	What have developers said about this issue? Is there a safeguard against misinformation being fed to AI?

providing users with misinformation.”			
End: “This research serves as a cautionary guide, advising individuals to approach artificial intelligence tools with a balanced perspective. It emphasizes the importance of avoiding excessive reliance on these tools and encourages users to exercise rational judgment based on prudent utilization. “	It’s all coming back to-check your work, check the sources, check everything for errors. But also, do we do that with books? Not really, we read a textbook and we take it as word-sometimes we may double check with another source (I’m sure professors and professionals probably fact check books more often than students)-but students are told the information in their text is fact, when in reality it was written by imperfect humans and data changes all the time.	This is what we’ve read in many of the articles and I think it’s such an important point that it should be emphasized in everything we read.	A specific example may be publishers. Authors publishing books have their books edited and checked by many people. Is there additional checking being done now that many are using AI to help write? Again with ethical standards, are there rules in place when publishing certain types of books such as non-fiction or textbooks that guard against use of AI or specific use of AI content?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Caitlin, Kenny, Dylan, William

Ethical Rules:

1. AI must avoid knowingly conveying information which will definitely lead to damaging a user.
2. Input from users cannot be included in AI dataset without verifying from user consensus to prevent misinformation and hallucination
3. AI answers and decisions should be explainable for humans to understand where the logic for the answer came from

4. Diversify programmers to prevent bias in dataset
5. The collection and use of data by AI must protect an individual's privacy and individual information. AI also must be resilient to prevent any attack on the system.

Als used: Claude, Perplexity, DeepSeek, Grok

Which gave the best advice? Why? Grok was more wordy, Perplexity gives sources without having to ask

Revised Rules:

1. AI must avoid knowingly conveying information which will reasonably risk causing harm (Perplexity)
2. Input from users cannot be included in AI dataset without verifying from user's explicit informed consent to prevent misinformation and hallucination (Deep Seek)
3. AI answers and decisions should be explainable for humans to understand where the logic for the answer came from (Dylan Deep Seek validated)
4. Diversify programmers and datasets to prevent bias in dataset (Perplexity)
5. AI must comply with privacy laws and maintain robust cybersecurity against attacks. (Grok)

Discussion: How did AI feedback reshape what you wrote? Why? Which AI(s) gave the best advice? Why?

Any dissenting opinions among group members? If so, why?

September 23, 2025

Author & Title: Altman, S. " The Gentle Singularity ." 10 June 2025.			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: “the gains to quality of life from AI driving faster scientific progress and increased productivity will be enormous; the future can be vastly better than the present. Scientific progress is the biggest driver of overall progress; it’s hugely exciting to think about how much more we could have.”	This whole article reads like an AGI ad, which is not surprising coming from the CEO of OpenAI. But because of that it was very uncomfortable to read. His claims come off as delusional. His use of superlatives gives his writing the tone of an over eager teen.	Similar to Dario Gil’s interview, talking about the positives of AI without going into the dangers.	How much more of what? More sustainable energy? That would be great. Better quality of life? That is asking a lot of technology, if history has anything to say, more technology will not bring better quality of life. Also, did AI write this?
Mid: “In the 2030s, intelligence and energy—ideas, and the ability to make ideas happen—are going to become wildly abundant. These two have been the fundamental limiters on human progress...with abundant intelligence and energy (and good governance), we can theoretically have anything else.”	Good governance is the key phrase here and a huge factor that will play into his idea of making sure AGI is accessible to everyone. I do not see the distribution of access to AI happening fairly. Just as with most tech, historically the wealthy have first access and then find a way to limit the access to lower classes.	I do think it is interesting given our discussion last week, that he did not once mention ethics in AI. Interesting but not surprising, as we discovered figuring out the ethics of AI are extremely difficult, even AI itself couldn’t agree on how the ethics should be phrased.	Is he so consumed by the sparkle of AGI he can’t see the flaws in his statements? Or am I too pessimistic to see the benefits of a future with superintelligence? Also, can someone explain what the title of this blog post means?

End: “If we have to make the first million humanoid robots the old-fashioned way, but then they can operate the entire supply chain...to build more robots, which can build more chip fabrication facilities, data centers, etc, then the rate of progress will obviously be quite different.”	This sounds truly terrifying. Our planet cannot sustain this kind of overabundance. Unless AGI can harness the energy of the moon, I don’t see how earth’s resources could handle this type of robot workforce.	I wonder if the authors of <i>Refusing GenAI in Writing Studies</i> would change their recommendations based on this blog. If they would say, let’s use AGI to make sure AGI doesn’t become a wealthy man's tool for building robot armies.	Who is this blog post aimed at? Is he trying to get people excited about the prospect of AGI? Is it simply meant to be marketing?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Author & Title: Roose, K ["Why I'm Feeling the A.G.I."](#) 14 March 2025, *The New York Times*.

Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: "I believe that over the next decade, powerful A.I. will generate trillions of dollars...and tilt the balance of political and military power toward the nations that control it — and that most governments and big corporations already view this as obvious, as evidenced by the huge sums of money they're spending to get there first."	So much money has already gone into AI, those who've spent expect to get their money back and much more.	This is more realistic than Altman's piece just talking about how it is fantasy to believe that AI will be used equitably. It's already been divided between open and closed source with the closed touting better results but those usually cost money.	If foreign countries can hack into other countries' tech, what would something like superintelligence in the hands of a country like Russia do to the balance of power?
Mid: "Maybe A.I. progress will hit a bottleneck we weren't expecting — an energy shortage that prevents A.I. companies from building bigger data centers, or limited access to the powerful chips used to train A.I. models. "	There are already shortages of chips and controversy over how, where, and with what they are manufactured.	Sam Altman wrote about there being no limit to AGI's path. But the amount of energy needed to fulfill his aspirations is not something the earth can handle with the population continually growing and our path to renewable energy being constantly backpedaled.	Are those developing AGI working to prevent these types of bottlenecks? What are they working on-alternate sources of energy? Or just a different method of storing data?

End: “If we’re in denial — or if we’re simply not paying attention — we could lose the chance to shape this technology when it matters most.”	I guess I’ve not been paying close enough attention-but I am glad to take this class to at least get a sense for what AI (AGI) is and where it is going.	This is very similar to many pieces we have read-we have to pay attention and be aware of what AI is doing or we will fall behind. Those in positions of power are putting so much money toward this, that alone should encourage us to do our part to make sure AI is equitable and policies benefit the entire population and not just the uber wealthy.	Whether we take an Altman perspective (over excited) or a Roose perspective (wary but focused) how can we steer it to be an equitable tool everyone can use?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Author & Title: Reisner A. " Chatbots are Cheating on their Benchmark Tests." 5 March 2025, <i>The Atlantic</i> .			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early:“there is growing evidence that progress is slowing down ...This is troubling, given that the promise of advancement has become a political issue; massive amounts of land, power, and money have been earmarked to drive the technology forward.”	I would not want to be an AGI developer right now, the pressure to get to that superintelligence place is massive especially with billions of dollars on the line.	The Karma article “ <i>Just How Bad Would an AI bubble Be?</i> ” Goes into how much money has been put into AI and the disaster it would be if it crashed since so much of the U.S. economy is depending on it right now.	Will they get to the superintelligence they claim? Or will they reach a peak and call that the super intelligence they were aiming for even if it does not live up to the claims?

Mid: "With casual use, ChatGPT does appear to be "figuring out" the answers to your queries. But is that what's happening, or is it just very hard to come up with questions that aren't in its unfathomably massive training corpora?"	I think it is the latter. It has been programmed with an immense amount of data-I don't think a human would be able to think of a question it couldn't answer, that didn't incorporate human emotion.	This reminds me of Asimov's three laws and how robots are not able to be programmed with authentic human emotion.	Are there AI's that are only trained in specific datasets? For example, they do not include certain data to force the AI to come up with an answer within certain parameters?
End: "AI companies have yet to discover how to make a profit from building foundation models."	I'm sure many people are working on how to make a profit from this technology and many have ideas. My worry is those ideas will increase discrimination, disinformation, and violence.	We have seen this from social media and it is not hard to compare the rise of hate crimes and discrimination to the rise of social media.	Currently, is most profit from AI coming from subscriptions? Or is there not much profit because they are expecting the technology to boost profit in the long run?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Author & Title: Karma, R. "Just How Bad Would an AI Bubble Be?" 7 September 2025, *The Atlantic*.

Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: "Even the most advanced systems make small mistakes or slightly misunderstand directions, requiring a human to carefully review their work and make changes where needed."	So those who used to be doing what the AI is doing will be monitoring the AI to make sure it doesn't make mistakes. That seems like the type of job people would not stay at as a career.	This goes back to learning how to prompt and making sure to check the sources of what the AI generates.	Will the amount of mistakes go down as the technology progresses or will the types of mistakes change with the progression?
Mid: "And the study focused on expert developers, whereas the biggest productivity gains could come from enhancing—or replacing—the capabilities of less experienced workers."	Where will lower level jobs come from after AI takes over those that don't require advanced experience—such as customer service for teenagers or those right out of college.	I'm thinking about when the internet was new and some jobs were replaced but other jobs came about to fill the gaps. Maybe more jobs were created because of the creation of the tech sector. In the case of AI, I don't think as many have been or will be created because many of those already working in tech just switched over to AI.	When AGI has taken over some jobs, what new jobs (besides AI babysitters), will come about to fill the gap in the job market?

End: “An AI-bubble crash could be different. AI-related investments have already surpassed the level that telecom hit at the peak of the dot-com boom as a share of the economy. In the first half of this year, business spending on AI added more to GDP growth than all consumer spending <i>combined</i> .”	I wonder where this data came from but I do believe that a lot of money has been invested. I suppose it would make sense that the AI boom is keeping us from a recession due to tariffs and unemployment.	What they are saying is the AI crash would potentially be much worse than the Dotcom crash. This is slightly terrifying but there is too much to be terrified of at this time in history that I’m choosing not to add this to the list.	With the AI leaders saying they will have AGI in the next 5 or so years, is that when investors expect to see a return? And if they don’t it could cause the crash? I wonder if Sam Altman has given his investors a timeline or if that has meticulously been missing from discussions?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

September 30, 2025

Author & Title: Tremayne-Pengelly, A. " <u>A.I. Data Centers Are Emitting Nearly as Much Greenhouse Gases As Commercial Airlines.</u> "			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: “A ChatGPT query, for example, uses <u>nearly 10 times</u> more electricity than a <u>Google</u> search”	It’s interesting because the only way AI has made so much progress is because we can’t see the damage in person as we are using it. When we type tiny words on our phone we can’t see the 900 acre data center	Thinking of Mollick’s guide to prompting, he talks about continually refining the question and using AI a lot. This is important to learning how to use it but then you are	What determines the amount of energy used-more words=more energy? More detailed question=more energy? Specific phrases or

	using enough energy to power a million homes.	also using so much more energy.	refinements=more energy?
Mid: "Soaring emissions linked to A.I.-related data center use has caused Big Tech companies to fall 'off the track with their sustainability pledges,'"	Do these companies see this surge as temporary-that once they are able to get AI up and running they can return to their goals to lower emissions? Or do they see it as necessary and so they will adjust their sustainability pledges because AI is so important?	Unfortunately now that AI is out there and so many are using it, I don't think all the data coming out on the high emissions are going to deter people. Especially those using it for their business.	Do any of the existing and in progress data centers have the capability to switch to solar or another power source at some point? Are the newer ones being integrated with more renewable energy?
End: "Google, Microsoft and Amazon have all formed nuclear energy partnerships in recent months."	This is concerning because I do not believe that nuclear power is much better than fossil fuels. Although there has been a lot of improvement, truly renewable sources of energy (solar, hydro, and geothermal) need to be used especially if the construction of massive data centers continues.	This is one of the ethics I thought about from Prisznyák's article. What energy is used to power the AI should also be part of the ethics. Using the world's resources and polluting the earth is not ethical.	What is the argument against Google, Microsoft, and Amazon not using renewable energy—cost? Politics? Access? There are excellent arguments against all three of those being an excuse.
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Author & Title: Perrigo, B. " OpenAI Used Kenyan Workers on Less Than \$2 Per Hour to Make ChatGPT Less Toxic. "			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know

Early: “It was only by building an additional AI-powered safety mechanism that OpenAI would be able to rein in that harm”	I am trying to figure out if OpenAI knew this problem existed when it released it for public use-I assume they tested it extensively before release but maybe my assumptions are wrong.	This article does remind me of Asimov’s robot laws-I understand they have to safeguard against these things showing up in AI. I’m just trying to figure out if there could have been a different way-maybe they were rushing to get it out there and could have created this AI without exposing workers to the graphic content.	Is there a way they could have built the mechanism without using humans to view content? Since this was written in 2023, are companies still using human workers to sift through graphic/illegal content?
Mid: “Sama markets itself as an “ethical AI” company and claims to have helped lift more than <u>50,000</u> people out of poverty.”	There is a lot of this that happens in the global south. A company comes in from the global north to ‘help’ and ends up actually hurting the people and economy more either by exposing them to harmful substances (or content) or by forcing them to go into debt (e.g. pesticides, micro loans)	I actually read about Sama’s founder, Leila Janah , on Wikipedia and the original vision for the company was admirable. She did a lot of great work but died from cancer in 2020. It’s hard to know how much of the work they are doing is really impactful.	They lifted them out of poverty, and have they remained out of poverty? Since Sama cut their contract they had to let workers go, what else are they contracting with to help the people in Kenya?

End: "...for all its glamor, AI often relies on hidden human labor in the Global South that can often be damaging and exploitative. These invisible workers remain on the margins even as their work contributes to billion-dollar industries."	I can't think of another way to remove the harmful content on the internet from being included in AI datasets but I know it is not ethical to expose people from another country to these things. It doesn't matter how much they were paid or how much they had access to mental health-they didn't want those images on there for a reason so why expose anyone to them.	As mentioned in the previous article, we don't see what really goes into this technology, this is a prime example-how many people would use OpenAI if they knew what those workers in Kenya had to endure to get us our AI content free of harm.	Did these workers receive any sort of compensation for the mental trauma? What safeguards have been put in place for AI companies outsourcing this type of work?
---	--	--	--

AI Employed/Specifically How: None

Author & Title: Reisner, A. "[The Unbelievable Scale of AI's Pirated-Books Problem](#)" and "[AI Giant Anthropic to Pay \\$1.5 bn Over Pirated Books](#)"

Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: "Meta and OpenAI have both argued in court that it's 'fair use' to train their generative-AI models on copyrighted work without a license,	They wanted to get the information without waiting to pay for each book and they knew if they licensed they wouldn't be able to use the 'fair use' excuse. It may be fair use but it is not ethical. You can't use books that are from a pirated site to fill your database of a tech that	I get it, business is about growing quickly, it's about making money and being smart about where money is spent. But thinking about the article exposing OpenAI's use of the Sama company-where do the ethics come	Now that Anthropic has to pay \$1.5 billion and delete the books from the database, what has been done about the other companies that have used pirated books in their AI? Since

because LLMs 'transform' the original material into new work."	is valued at \$183 billion (and growing). I can see both sides but I do not think it is ethical to use the books without paying the authors who spent so much time and energy on them and who made a pittance on them compared to what AI gets.	into play in business. Is it looked at as, 'let's see if we can get away with it with some loopholes we found' or 'we don't see a problem with what we are doing as long as we make money?'	the District court said using the books to build AI is fair use, they just couldn't retain them in a library-how will authors be credited or compensated for their works being used to train AI?
Mid: "But that fine also went unpaid, and so far authorities have been largely unable to constrain the spread of these libraries online. Seventeen years after its creation, LibGen continues to grow."	Not only could the pirated material have been accessed by others (which is illegal under copyright law), LibGen has not paid any of the fines or been shut down. I understand the use of these for those who don't have access to the wealth of knowledge (how it began) but there has to be a limit so the information is not abused, as it already has been.	It is interesting he brought up the point about it being owned by Russia-is there any concern that a foreign agent could use this mode to spread harmful information?	Didn't they crack down on pirated music because the musicians were upset? Is this similar or different because of the difference between audio and written work?

End: "This decontextualizes knowledge, prevents humans from collaborating, and makes it harder for writers and researchers to build a reputation and engage in healthy intellectual debate."	I wonder if this will be another area that will see job loss-in publishing/journalism/editing/magazines/newspapers. Those all seem like fertile ground for AI to take over human tasks.	I know the creators of these AI would all have great arguments against this quote (as they did in the article saying AI will make scientific advancements) but it is a question we have been confronted with throughout the course. How do we use AI to help but not overtake all our methods of creativity and originality?	I assume authors are using AI now, how is it affecting the work and what are publishers noticing? Will we notice if a book was written by or partially by AI?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Author & Title: Singer, N. "Goodbye, \$165,000 Tech Jobs. Student Coders Seek Work at Chipotle."			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know

Early: “Since the early 2010s, a parade of billionaires, tech executives and even U.S. presidents has urged young people to learn coding, arguing that the tech skills would help bolster students’ job prospects as well as the economy. Tech companies promised computer science graduates high salaries and all manner of perks.”	It is almost as if the tech giants wanted to recruit as many as they could early on to help get this technology going and find those people who would help them get there fastest. I would guess they knew there would be a sort of tech job bubble that would burst once the new technology broke through. They now have to divert all the money to expanding AI/developing AGI, instead of toward coders.	This reminds me of the Karma article from last week-which jobs will be eliminated and what jobs (if any) will be created to fill the gaps. Or maybe we just need to trust Sam Altman that AGI will change the world and we won’t have to work because we will all be rich with AGI!	Will computer science programs shift focus to AI coding? Will there be a downtick in the number of students who graduate with computer science degrees?
Mid: “Last year, the number of undergraduates majoring in the field topped 170,000 in the United States — more than double the number in 2014, according to the Computing Research Association”	This graph is interesting to see how unemployment has changed, updated to 2025. The rates they gave for computer science/engineering in the article looks like they are from 2023.	I did not major in anything tech but it took me many applications/interviews before finally finding a job (as a receptionist) almost 2 years after graduating. I empathize with them as at least humans looked at my applications.	What other jobs could these applicants look for with their skills? Jobs like teaching or making apps/websites for businesses?

End: “companies inundated with applicants are using A.I. systems to automatically scan résumés and reject candidates.”	No one is actually looking at the applications. I think there is good reason to have something to weed out some of the applications but there also has to be some human eyes to find the top candidates.	It is a huge problem in tech but because of government cutbacks there is difficulty finding jobs in most industries. Many healthcare companies also have hiring freezes, even for nurses that are usually in high demand. Teachers are always needed but there are major drawbacks to that, e.g. living wage.	How does the AI work that is used to go through applications? Is it programmed to look for certain keywords or set to certain qualifications?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Q: How can I optimize my search prompt to lower energy use on AI? less than 300 words

To optimize an AI search prompt for lower energy use, focus on crafting clear, concise, and well-structured prompts that minimize the computational load and avoid unnecessary iterations. Here are key strategies:

1. Be specific and detailed: Instead of vague questions, use precise instructions that clearly define what you want, which reduces back-and-forth queries and avoids producing overly broad or irrelevant answers.
2. Limit prompt length: Shorter prompts reduce token processing in AI models, saving energy. Studies indicate halving prompt length can cut prompt-related energy consumption by about 5%, and shortening responses yields even greater savings.
3. Request concise output formats: Ask for responses in specific formats (e.g., lists, tables) that make answers easier to interpret quickly, which reduces the need for further queries.
4. Provide relevant context and examples: Including pertinent context enables the AI to generate accurate answers faster, reducing iterations and computational waste.
5. Plan your queries thoughtfully: Avoid isolated “thank you” or filler prompts; batch questions and tasks strategically to reduce repeated activation of AI models.

6. Avoid overly complex or computationally heavy requests: Use simpler models for straightforward tasks or specify the type of AI model if possible.

These steps improve prompt efficiency, lowering energy use per query and contributing to sustainable AI usage. According to recent research, optimized prompts may reduce energy consumption substantially while maintaining quality, helping lower the carbon footprint of AI interactions. (Approx. 260 words)

October 7, 2025

Author & Title: Alexander, B. " The Rise of the AI Intermediary Layer "			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: “developers will need to do a lot of work to convince people to entrust parts of their lives to this ecosystem.”	I’m trying to see how the intermediary layer plays into the future of AI and how we use it. As I learn about AI, I trust it a little more but I don’t trust other things. I am left to wonder what has been done by AI, how do we tell and in what cases does it matter?	Thinking of Singer’s article, at some point could the intermediary layer be a place for some of those tech jobs lost?	How will developers gain public trust without being able to show exactly where their data goes and the safeguards in place? Will it have to be a marketing tactic?
Mid: “The business model for the intermediary layer might not justify investment...Cultural outrage might still its growth, with participating in the layer becoming a bridge too far.	Maybe I’m not grasping the author’s intent but I see intermediary layers as the supply chain of AI. Isn’t it the natural progression of a new technology for people to take advantage of its benefits to benefit themselves and their work?	Thinking of the Karma article on an AI bubble crash-it talks about how AI makes mistakes and humans have to correct it. In the intermediary layers, how will mistakes be caught before being sent to the next user? It does seem like the	Could the intermediary layer work to increase the risk of an AI bubble crash?

		probability of error rises using the intermediary layer.	
End: "Yet if it succeeds, if more and more of us inhabit the intermediary layer through various parts of our lives, we might not talk about it as such. It might fade into the cultural background, just becoming part of the world,"	I've said it before and I will say it again that I can see this happening but I hope it comes after we figure out how to regulate AI and understand how it works and how to best use it.	This is exactly what Dario Gil said as he wrapped up his interview with Malcolm Gladwell-'When AI is at its best is when we don't even notice it is there.'	What are other examples of intermediary layers we use in our everyday lives?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Author & Title: Mollick, E. " Real AI Agents and Real Work "			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: "...the next generation of AI models should beat human experts on average in this test. Does that mean AI is ready to replace human jobs?...No...what was being measured was not jobs but tasks. Our	The tasks took about 4-7 hours for the humans to complete but it didn't mention how long it took AI.	We've talked about how AI is getting better at not hallucinating or having errors in its results. However, when we start having AI replicate work and that work has an error (either human or AI created) then the replicated error gets passed on. This happens all the time with human work but most of the time another human catches	How did they choose the tasks to be able to compare AI work to human work?

jobs consist of many tasks.”		it. It becomes a problem when we get to be complacent and rely on AI too much.	
Mid: “AI doing one or more of these tasks does not replace my entire job, <u>it shifts what I do</u> . And as long as AI is jagged in its abilities, and cannot substitute for all the complex work of human interaction, it cannot easily replace jobs as a whole”	I do think we will see a shift in jobs, and some jobs lost to AI, but more so our jobs will all have an element of AI we have to use. Even jobs like manual labor or those not using technology as essential tools.	I think Bogost’s article is a good example of this shift. College students are learning which tasks they can use it for to see time and which are not good substitutes for their own work.	Since AI has gotten better at detecting errors-how was this done? Did developers change how they trained the AI or did they train the AI from its own errors?
End: “Reproducing research may be an AI task, not a job, but it...also might change an entire field of human endeavor dramatically. What makes this possible? AI agents have gotten much better, very quickly.”	I think as a researcher in the STEM fields this would be a welcome advancement. Think of the rate scientists could work to discover new formulas or disease agents.	I do hope that as AI tasks get better that the energy used to perform those tasks goes down-that they are able to figure out ways to lower energy use. Otherwise, Altman’s robots are going to use up all of our resources.	How are scientists, scholars, mathematicians, researchers, etc using this AI progress currently? Have there already been breakthroughs because of the use of AI in these fields?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Author & Title: Autor, D. & Manyika, J. "[A Better Way to Think about AI](#)."

Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: "in some domains...where full automation is not currently achievable, where human expertise remains indispensable or a necessary fail-safe, tools should be designed to collaborate—to amplify human expertise, not to keep it on ice"	Making the best decision does not come from merely looking at data or facts, it comes from so much more that a human mind is able to decipher and AI is not currently able to. As shown by the examples of the protein structure, cancer diagnosis and others-experts collaborating with AI produces better results.	The AI tools that are mentioned in this article are not ones used by the general public-remembering that I won't be using one of these highly advanced AI tools to do my class work brings a different perspective to the picture. We use the simple (often free) versions of AI. They cannot collaborate with as much detail and precision as the tools being used by experts in the advanced scientific fields.	Is someone working on a collaborative tool for students? One that will allow students to think for themselves while working with the AI to come to a conclusion about whatever paper they are working on? To decrease the risk of cognitive offloading?

Mid: "What makes AI such a potent collaborator is that it is not like us. A modern AI system can ingest thousands of medical journals, millions of legal filings, or decades of maintenance logs...It offers breadth of experience that crosses domains and the capacity to recognize subtle patterns, interpolate among facts, and make new predictions."	This article did an excellent job of highlighting positive collaborations but what about collaborations that have resulted in negative outcomes-violence, fraud, scams, other crimes? I know they were trying to point out that jumping to automation too fast is the risk but I'm sure there are negative collaborations as well.	The press release for the Nobel Prize for protein structure was interesting. It said: "AlphaFold2 has been used by more than two million people from 190 countries. Among a myriad of scientific applications, researchers can now better understand antibiotic resistance and create images of enzymes that can decompose plastic." I am encouraged by this but my mind still tends to wonder what might be happening on the other end of the spectrum. Or maybe the darkest part of AI is its extensive use of energy and water.	I know that humans are collaborating with AI to help commit crimes, is there data on crimes being committed with the aid of AI?
End: "When AI systems can perform tasks previously assigned to research assistants, surgical residents , and pilots, the opportunities for apprenticeship and learning-by-doing disappear. This threatens the future talent pipeline, as most	This is an important factor to consider when thinking of the future of jobs. I think of trade jobs that are already declining due to not enough people going into the trades, choosing college instead. But also, will AI be the mentor to the human apprentices? Can we really learn something as	Thinking about the previous article (Mollick-Real AI Agents and Real Work) I'm not sure AI can do those jobs well enough to replace humans. They mentioned the risk is too great to completely replace humans with AI in many sectors including medicine and flying. But also humans bring a different perspective that is unique, one that AI cannot replicate-yet.	When looking at trade jobs (plumbing, electric, carpentry, welding, etc.) has there been any indication that AI could take these jobs-have those in these fields started to use AI in their work or to teach others how to do it? Will we see a decline in tradespeople's

occupations rely on experiential learning”	complicated as electrical work or surgery from an AI?		ability to get jobs-similar to those in computer science?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

November 3, 2025

Author & Title: Student scripts and podcasts			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: Student scripts were preferable to AI generated script	The student scripts were so unique and creative. I much preferred the original scripts.	The first script about the grandma and the puzzle was so endearing. Then I listened to the podcast and it was boring. The podcast generated by Professor Essid about Asimov’s laws and AGI was more like a podcast than some of the students.	Does having a paid account create a better podcast-with more human characteristics?
Mid: The podcasts don’t sound like traditional podcasts, more like voice to text translation	Podcasts are successful because they are entertaining and informative-the hosts are good at engaging the audience and telling stories in ways that make us want to keep listening.	Without the emotions of humans, I would not consider these podcasts as the essence of podcasts is the feeling you are hanging out with friends.	Why did the AI podcast not have more of a back and forth like a traditional podcast-it just sounded like two robots taking turns reading from a prompter.

End: AI changed so much from the students original scripts, taking out any voice or personality	I would have preferred the AI just read the original script so that the voice would have remained. It would have created something more akin to an actual podcast.	In the article "A Better Way to Think about AI" it talks about the importance of understanding human-AI collaboration. I think in this case there could be an adjustment in how the students collaborate with AI-maybe to brainstorm ideas and help correct the script but then use the student's written script for the actual AI. I can see AI helping if there is information that is missing to the story or if more clarification is needed.	It seems on eleven labs there is an option for text to voice-would that be more like a podcast, if they use the human produced script? Are we doing this assignment to show the difference between human produced creative writing and AI produced?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Author & Title: Emperado, L. " <u>How to Create a Podcast with AI.</u> "			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: "This step used to require manual editing or full production teams. Now, AI automates most of it."	It's interesting how much AI can do that used to require multiple different people with different skills. They give you the option to upload it to a service like Spotify which is surprising to me-anyone with a computer can now upload anything they want to Spotify. I suppose it is like Youtube in that way.	I do wonder how long it will be before anyone with a computer is able to upload shows to streaming services... I like how eleven labs gives the option to clone your own voice, I tried it and it was fairly close although very creepy.	What is branded voice customization as offered by Jasper? How much time and effort is put into making the podcast not sound like AI compared to doing it without AI?

Mid: “Don’t overedit your podcast, otherwise, they will sound robotic. Over-polishing can strip out natural pauses, vocal quirks, and emotional nuance — the very things that make your voice sound human. Aim for clarity, not perfection.”	This shows a potential flaw in the use of AI. If you edit it too much then it will sound like AI which is ironic since the whole point is to sound like you didn’t use AI.	This article has me thinking of Singer’s article on AI and jobs. What jobs will be replaced or lost with this new way to generate podcasts? Also, since it looks like you can also create videos, vlogs, webisodes, music, among others how will this affect those job markets? New jobs might be created for those able to work with AI-who know how to create these products using AI.	What new jobs could be created in the entertainment industry? How big will this new industry of AI generated material become? Or will something else come along to replace it? Or will it not gain as big of an audience as human produced content?
End: “A human editor still reviews the output to ensure it aligns with Bartlett’s style and brand voice.”	The three examples of podcasts are very impressive. I like the use of AI to help someone who can’t speak-and it sounds very good. Also that podcast still uses the actual voice of the guest (I think) which helps with keeping the human voice intact.	They mention the importance of “maintaining personality and tone consistency is key to keeping your audience engaged”-which is exactly what I mentioned was lacking in the student podcasts.	Does the personality and tone consistency come from the script, the prompting, the quality of the AI or all of these?
AI Employed/Specifically How: Tested the use of voice cloning on Elevenlabs to see how accurate it is.			

November 18, 2025

Caitlin Robinson

Author & Title: Baxter, C. " AI Art: The End of Creativity or The Start of a New Movement? "			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: "Humans are just as prone to behaving like machines, repeating old behaviours and getting bogged down with rules, like a painter or musician locked into a particular style."	This is a positive spin on AI art and it has me embracing it more. As humans we sometimes need something to push ourselves out of our creative boxes and be challenged. That is what something like Ai-da is doing. There will be people for and against AI art and that is also part of the process.	Similar to Mollick's article , AI doesn't necessarily replace artists or their jobs but it might shift how they do their art, it can bring about a different form of creativity for artists to experiment with.	What will art look like in 20 years? Will it be lauded and revered as it has been or will it be similar to the food or fashion industries with cheap processed versions and ultra high end, exclusive versions? It seems to me art currently has a narrower range of quality but may be expanded with AI-but expanding more toward the cheap end or the exclusive end?
Mid: "There is another argument at the heart of this issue too. The machine-learning processes used to train generative AI algorithms may be a creative process in themselves."	They compare it to how people didn't like the idea of a camera-didn't consider it art. So maybe what will happen is that AI art will become its own genre, separate from fine art or art done by human hands. I can see this happening and artists continuing to be successful, a lot of people will still want	I look at the art done by Ai-da on the website and it is very impressive and even beautiful. For all the negative AI outputs we have read about this semester this actually gives me hope that some interesting creative pieces could come out of it as well.	Are there more robots like Ai-da? Or are there some in development?

	and appreciate art done by humans.		
End: "It all comes down to intent, this is 'what truly distinguishes the creativity of the human and the machine...No machine is driven to express itself creatively. It is prompted by the intention of the human.'"	However, in the video about Ai-da they do say it is thinking for itself about how to create the art-no humans are coming up with the images-it is creating them from its robot eyes.	This reminds of the discussion we had on ethics and Asimov's three laws of robotics. It is difficult to define ethics for something like AI because they are programmed by humans and humans themselves don't have a set of universal moral ethics. We have suggestions that many follow but each person is allowed to make choices as they wish.	How does this translate to the programming of something like Ai-da? What ethics were, or weren't programmed? Will there ever be an international code of ethics for AI art?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Author & Title: Web site for the AI artist Ai-Da			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know

Early: “Ai-Da, the machine with AI capacities, highlights those tensions: bringing to the forefront the complexity of our interacting digital and physical worlds”	Overall I am a bit frightened of Ai-da but also impressed. She does have her own style-it’s kind of deconstructed realism-looks real but with a pixelated aspect. Exactly what I would expect from AI generated work.	After watching the video from the Baxter article about Ai-da, it is amazing that someone created that. They talk about how she is actually thinking up the approach to the pieces, so even though a human created her she is using her own thought process to create the art.	It just goes back to how do we define original work? How do we define who the artist is?
Mid: “Ai-Da unveiled her portrait of King Charles III at the UK Mission, United Nations, on 8th July 2025. Titled “Algorithm King”, the portrait was approved by Buckingham Palace, and she became the first robot ever to paint the monarch.”	The portrait is interesting and impressive how it is textured and 3D. But it still looks like it was done with AI-maybe that is the point? It looks too perfect for someone to have done it as their own art-it looks like a bunch of different portraits of him were mashed into one-which essentially is what Ai-da did.	Are all those computer science grads (Singer) going to go into art instead?	Has the success of Ai-da started a new business boom?
End: videos of Ai-da’s performance art	These videos were over the top for me but I’ve never had a great appreciation for that style of performing art. It just reiterated our strange need to humanize something that is not close to human.	The more I see the art and read about Ai-da, the more unsure I am of it all. It almost seems silly because they are taking what is essentially a giant doll around to all these places like the UN and Buckingham Palace.	Is it just human nature to want everything living or inanimate to have human characteristics? What is our fascination with this? Is that art?

AI Employed/Specifically How: None, Ai-da and its developers use enough of it for everyone.

Caitlin Robinson

November 18, 2025

AI Podcast Reflection

After working with ElevenLabs to create a podcast I learned a lot about the tool but left feeling unimpressed and increasingly skeptical toward its general use. I can see this would be very useful for specific tasks or jobs that require tedious audio output. Since I do not have a lot of experience with audio technology, I found it to be frustrating. I tried out 5-10 different voices and found one that seemed to work well. Finding the second voice and fine tuning it took a lot of time. Small changes in one paragraph such as adding a comma, would change the tone of voice of the whole paragraph after regenerating. The same voice with the same settings would say words differently, especially the acronym AI. I had to experiment with putting periods or quotations around it so the voice would not separate the letters or merge them with the surrounding words.

I adjusted my prompt and generated a new podcast six times because I was not happy with how the script came out. I kept adding to the prompt hoping it would create a better script. My main issue was the script sounded too basic; I added articles and websites with great information and the podcast would come back with silly lines like “did you know one AI query uses as much water as a shower?” That was not what I wanted my podcast to be about; I wanted it to go more in depth. After talking with my group, it seems like if we are to use the most basic level of ElevenLabs (\$5/month) we would need to use multiple AI tools such as Perplexity, DeepSeek or LyricWinter to create a script and podcast that sounds like it was produced professionally and not by a student. Which is another frustrating aspect-if you pay more you get a better tool. I thought Sam Altman said that AI would be the great equalizer but it is still separating us into economic groups with those paying more able to get the best voices and the most advanced tools-what would happen if there were no membership levels and everyone had the same access to AI?

In Autor and Manyika's article, *A Better Way to Think about AI*, they talk about the importance of creating AI tools that work with people, not do the work for them. I think ElevenLabs is a good example of this type of tool. It helped me generate the podcast, but I still had to contribute time to making sure the prompt and voices matched the tone I wanted to present.

November 25, 2025

Author & Title: Alexander, B. "[Teaching with AI: the Cloister and the Starship](#)"

Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: "There is the argument that we should or even must teach with and about AI for various reasons"	I think that's the problem is we are divided on whether it should be used or taught or both or none so I think figuring out a system where students and professors have a choice is important at this stage not forcing anyone to go either way.	It's so new to everyone still we are all figuring out how it works into our study and our daily lives, and that will continue to change as it changes. We really don't know if this time next year millions more will be using it or millions less will. Although Dario Gil and Sam Altman hope and pray millions more will fall under its spell.	It would be interesting to see a spreadsheet of the different academic approaches different universities have taken toward AI-have more embraced or banned it? Or have most landed somewhere in between?
Mid: "The high tech is for working on digital audio, video, images, and so on; the low is the story circle time, when participants share their progress in a round table setting, emphasizing their humanity and shared learning."	This is a good framework for teachers: being clear about when tech is to be used and saving time and space for talking without distractions from any technology. Time to connect with other humans face to face.	This reminds me of Autor and Manyika's article, how they talk about there needs to be tools that are designed for human collaboration so even when the students are in the high tech zones they are collaborating together with the tools.	Will this approach divide students even more? Or will it bring students closer to having a set place to connect without technology?

End: "Looking ahead, I think a good number of academics and institutions may adopt this model, but not using those names."	I'm sure there are so many varying ways universities are approaching AI. I don't believe it is possible to have a universal standard but I do think it's important that students and teachers maintain the ability to choose whether they use it or not.	I recently heard Mount Holyoke College allows students and professors to opt in or out of using AI-they made it a choice which is something the cluster/starship also does to an extent.	Will AI policies become a part of college decision making? If one university decides to opt out of using it altogether will it get a different group of students than another university who goes full in?
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			

Author & Title: Chen, B. " How AI and Social Media Contribute to 'Brain Rot.' "			
Summary	Analysis	Synthesis	Need to Know
Early: "More research urgently needs to be done, she said, on how A.I. affects people's ability to hold on to information."	Yet another aspect I hadn't thought about-information retention-if we are constantly looking things up then we'll never remember them on our own.	Thinking back to the article Refusing GenAI in Writing Studies , at the time I did think they were being too strict on their view of AI and how it could hurt us. They talk about the difference between using the technology for beneficial things like disabilities or specific tasks but it is more widespread and uncontrolled than ever. Seeing the effects of AI on our kids I do think there needs to be massive regulation. But unfortunately as with social media, there	What will happen to our memories? Will AI developers make an AGI that can contain all our memories so we don't have to worry about retention?

		is too much money involved so if regulation does come there is a good chance it will be weak.	
Mid: “the only safe conclusion is that every hour a child spends scrolling through the apps takes time away from more enriching activities like reading and sleeping”	It’s so simple but so true that every moment kids are spending on a screen is time they are not moving their bodies or even getting rest as it is not restful to the body to watch a show. It is frustrating as a parent who tries to give my kids balance when they hear all their friends get to watch more or get to have a phone or a social media account.	I have wondered how my kids are introduced to AI in school. They attend a public elementary school and just last week my son said he made a podcast with AI on Barracudas. It was an interesting feeling knowing my son in third grade had the same assignment I did in graduate school. Although his teacher generated the podcasts for them.	This is still a new technology, we are essentially learning at the same rate no matter age or education level. Could this impact job seekers? Will employers look at AI skills as essential or will they look at it as a detriment depending on the job?
End: “the problem with those tools was that they transformed what was once an active process in your brain — perusing through links and clicking on a credible source to read — into a passive one	One of the studies showed that the students who wrote without any online access and then wrote again using AI had higher brain activity. It seems like a simple answer, have them do a lot of the work before letting them use the internet. But it’s the same question we have talked about in class, how do teachers regulate this when most students have their own	In Ian Bogost’s article he says “ <i>For students who have access to AI, an education is what you make of it.</i> ” But it seems like students have little choice these days. AI is there and they assume it is there to make their lives easier and to help them do ‘better’ work. I know when I was a teenager I didn’t care what adults told me was good or bad for me-I did what I wanted (and suffered whatever consequences).	Do kids in high school have computer classes or are they taught internet search techniques? If not, that seems an essential lesson to learn before starting a job or especially starting college.

by automating all of that.”	phones and computers with access to AI.		
AI Employed/Specifically How: None			