UPEI Generative AI Task Force (GAIT)_ GenAI Syllabus Statement Development Workshop-20240808_103703-Meeting Recording

August 8, 2024, 1:37PM

1h 8m 58s

Scott Cassidy started transcription

Scott Cassidy 0:05
Do very quickly because recordings is about to start.
If not, I guess we'll we'll move ahead.
This is going to be a fairly quick Workshop and it's fairly high level, but what I basically wanted to do today is to try to give a lightning quick introduction for what Generative AI is for folks who might be a little bit unfamiliar with that and talk about its incorporation and teaching and learning.
The idea of necessarily giving you AI star fits all Statement to put into your syllabi because we can't provide you with that and at the end of the day, I don't think we as instructors would actually want that because it's always going to be contextual.
And what my pedagogy is and what best practices from my core standpoint, we would not be the same for any one of you.
It's always gonna be specific to the instructor, so today is really more about presenting some of the the larger questions and considerations and then from some of the materials we've drawn, give you some examples with the idea of potentially being able to adapt those to your own needs.
No.
Here we go.
So the question on everyone's mind, which we just addressed is why did I bother coming to this workshop in the the 1st place?
We already did a bit of a round table and talked about some of your goals in attending this, but really at the end of the day, when we as the gate put it together, the whole idea was to try to develop a more proactive approach to thinking about Generative AI in coursework.
This is something that you know since late 2022 has hit us like a proverbial ton of bricks and early days it's been all too easy to take a very reactive approach, hoping that Generative AI isn't something that we're gonna have to deal with as instructors when it does come up.
Having to then deal with it on a case by case basis.
We would argue that that's not necessarily the best way to do things.
It can be more valuable to really think about how you're going to incorporate and handle GenAI in advance for a wide variety of reasons.
So why is it valuable to take a proactive approach to Generative AI?
And there's a number of reasons that you might want to consider doing this, and hopefully if you've self selecting into this workshop that's already the line on which you're thinking.
But if not, I'd consider this.
Did there we go?
It's a way to make sure that we can more effectively communicate our expectations in general with our students, defining what it is that we expect them to learn, what processes we want them to engage in and community just a better job of communicating in general what our expectations are.
But more than that, it's also a chance for us to engage in some self reflection, the.
Advent of Generative AI has really challenged what it means to to teach at a post secondary level, and it's challenged a lot of our traditional pedagogies.
For example, what does it mean to assess writing in an era of chat, GPT, and that's something that the former Co chair of the AI task force, John McIntyre, who's in the English department.
That's something that he really noted was a struggle was how do we assess the written word?
For example, what what is?
What is pedagogy now so critically engaging with that at the instructor level can help us improve ourselves as instructors at a time when what we're preparing students to enter into in terms of workforce is also changing, which leads us to the Third Point.
I think we do a disservice to our students and maybe to some extent could be derelict in our duties if we are failing to prepare them for the work that they're going to be entering into once they graduate, even if we were to try to put a blanket ban on all Generative AI one, I don't feel that that's a realistic and two, I don't think that's necessarily of service to our student body by engaging, teaching them to engage with Generative AI in a way that is affective and ethical and mindful of some of the issues that.
Come with doing so that can help build technical literacy skills and critical thinking skills that they're going to need once they enter into the workforce.
Here's the other thing.
If we think especially of junior undergraduate students maybe just coming out of high school and they're entering into their first year of post secondary studies, there's often a lot of stigma surrounding the.
The use of Generative AI, it's often something that they have internalized the idea that they have to hide from their instructors, normalizing discussions of Generative I use can help reduce the stigma associated with using it and help people engage with you as an instructor in a way that's more transparent and honest as opposed to treating it like an adversarial relationship.
Finally.
One of my roles in the the McDougal Faculty of Business and I come at this from this lens is I service chair of our academic appeals committee.
And I know that quite often when you're dealing with appeals, whether it has to do with AI use or otherwise, it really goes beyond just that.
Discussing things in advance can often lead to avoiding issues further down the line.
It's sort of an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure when you look at the fact that a lot of unpleasant situations like appeals often arise due to a lack of understanding and a lack of communication.
So being able to be clear about your expectations now could potentially avoid issues further down the line.
So for all of these reasons, it benefits us as instructors to try to take a proactive approach to developing statements or tools for disclosure around Generative AI use.
That makes sense to everybody so far.
Perfect. OK.
Now I I wanna do this fairly quickly only because I know we've already gone around the the virtual table and you've introduced yourself in some of the goals that you have.
But maybe for the next, let's say about 5 minutes, I would love to hear from anyone, so feel free to just come off mute and speak up.
We'll have an open discussion.
What are some of the concerns that you have about Generative AI use in your courses?
And this could span the board.
This could be your concerned about students cheating via Generative AI.
On the other hand, you could be concerned that maybe you're not doing enough to prepare them for using AI effectively.
What?
Whatever your concerns are, I'd love to hear it.
So we can maybe structure discussions around that, but you've all joined us today.
What if you got a Etienne?

Etienne 7:15
Yeah, I guess I'm worried about an all or none.
Uh kind of approach like it's a really great hour.
It's really bad and I I wanna have more understanding so it's not that black and white.

Scott Cassidy 7:27
Right.
Let's Etienne uh. Stephanie.

Stephanie Shaw 7:31
And the uh things again.
One of my concerns is that I just am unfamiliar with it myself and so I'm I know it's here and I know students are using it, so I just want to know and look even for recommendations from yourself or others about for example like how I can check for a I use like a good checking tool, but even just ways to recommend to students on how to use it and so I want to include it in the discussions in my class and not shy away from it.
But I would like to go into it from an educated stance as to what tools I should be using, or could be, say, recommending to my students and then how to check for that in the work that they are providing to me.

Scott Cassidy 8:21
Everything.
Was and I've actually made a note, Ryan, when we get to your piece about some, some of the tools we talk about disclosure, I'd love to come back to Stephanie, question about.
Checking for and detecting AI use and the reasons for maybe a more proactive approach as opposed to a detection approach because I know that's something we've discussed via the task force.
I'm Sasha.
I have you next.

Sasha Nandlal 8:45
Hi, good morning everyone.
So my questions are really based around what we could legally reinforce.
According to the department is that we have in police with our students and just general maritime universities.
So if I could learn a little bit more about, you know, what we have as our backing, that would be great.

Scott Cassidy 9:11
Excession and uh, George, you've got your hand up as well.

George Trevor 9:15
I thank you.
I guess a couple of things.
Like I want to be able to reinforce what a, you know what a tool?
Generative AI can be for organising your thoughts and and and progressing with your research and understanding of certain areas.
But I'm also don't I want to make sure there's a balance between dependence on it and I wanna make sure I wanna see the student voice still come out in, in assignments and writing.
So I guess I'm also looking for are there any assessment practices that that can kind of can exclude AI and and what might those be?

Scott Cassidy 9:56
Alright.
Thanks George.
And I'm not sure if you're familiar with our provisional guidelines.
We do note a few types of assessment modalities that are, I'm not gonna say AI proof because that's fairly unrealistic, but AI resistant, whether it's in person Testing, whether if you're doing written assignments, you make it less about factual information in terms your grading, and you connect it more to processes specific cases you may have discussed in class, for example, things with more of a reflective component.
So we do actually have a few of those outlined.
There's ways to design assessments.
I would challenge you to think about what learning outcomes you want to achieve and assess through them, but there are ways to not AI proof them, but but sort of buffer against potential overdependence on on Generative AI for sure.
I, Susan.

Susan Brown 10:49
Hi, can you hear me?

Scott Cassidy 10:50
Yep, loud and clear.

Susan Brown 10:51
OK.
Thanks for this.
I joined a few minutes late so I missed the introductions.
I teach history at UPEI.
Umm I have been trying to do some reading about assessment options and I shared George's concern.
Umm for I've seen very little that really addresses this in the context of the humanities, where you know centrally what I'm asking students to do is to analyze primary sources.
Or I think my dog is freaking out in the background.
Ohm, I'm asking them to analyze primary sources.
I'm asking them to develop essay arguments in the form of, UMM, outlines and proposals, and I have been very unconvinced by the arguments about, well, what AI kind of get you started on that and then you can refine it and it's like, well, if they don't have the skills to start with, how are they able to evaluate something that AI has generated and say ohh well, this needs to do this and I need to, you know, I need to revise this here.
I've I've yet to see anything kind of convincing about that, and a lot of the kind of AI buffers that you talk about in terms of assignments don't seem to address the kind of Central skills that we're trying to deal with in the humanities.
A lot of it sort of is based on business or social science and the sciences around getting them to use case studies or umm and it anyway, I'm just, I'm really.
I'm really appreciate hearing from people who teach in the humanities and are finding ways to use this in a way that still allows students to actually learn how to organize thoughts.
Learn how to analyze.
Without using AI?
Just as a first stop because I think frankly they just stopped there and they don't have the skills to then refine what AI is done.

Sharon Myers (Guest) 12:51
Done.

Susan Brown 12:56
So I sound a little sonical about it, but I'm really frustrated.
I'm trying to develop, you know, this proactive approach, but I I'd love to find out about some resources particularly that pertain to the humanities. Thanks.

Scott Cassidy 13:09
The No thanks, Susan.
And it's good to know how do you build some of the fundamental skills.
And even if you're trying to take a proactive approach, how do you clearly stipulate what processes you expect students to engage in independently, and why, relative to what would be permissible, for example, to to supplement with AI, which will differ from course?
To course.
Umm, why don't we discuss a little bit about for those who aren't familiar, what is Generative AI?
For very lightning quick summary, and that'll sort of dovetail into some of the general recommendations around how to take a more proactive approach and then that in turn can lead us into some of the resources.
So some many of you may already know this.
Some of you might not, but in case it's helpful, here's a lightning quick summary of Generative AI uh, this really emerged from a few things machine learning, for one, which will often use statistical models to predict data in the late 2000s, we started to see the emergence of what we call deep learning, which drove progress into research in terms of speech recognition, image classification, and help, or natural language processing.
It also comes partly from the work of Andre Markov, who in the early 20th century published a paper that up later.
Really was the foundation for Markov chains.
Uh, but that didn't Chennai.
It's uses a.
If you're seeing one second having some technical issues with one of my monitors, so I'm just gonna unshare my screen and reshare but Generative AI what it basically does is it uses an existing corpus of data to generate new data using a probability distribution.
Don't give me one SEC.
We share my screen there.
Go.
Hearing.
Share.
There we go.
Everyone should be able to see my screen again.
OK, so it GenAI model generates a new data using a probability distribution that it's learned from a corpus of existing data.
You might have heard the term.
Large language models are LM.
That's not all Generative AI.
It's one type of Generative AI which generates novel combinations of text using natural sounding language.
Now what's important is what it's really doing is it's not critically thinking in any capacity, and that's something especially a lot of junior students will get wrong about Generative AI.
They think it's coming up with answers.
What it's doing is it's putting words together based on a corpus of data and statistically predicting the most likely combination of words to go together.
I think it would have been uh Blair Vessey from ITS who uh summed it up this way.
And I thought it was a really effective radio and he said it's basically in some ways a parlor trick that works a lot better than it really should.
But it's not actually thinking necessarily what it's doing.
Is this statistically putting together words?
If you're looking at it LLM that seem to go together based on statistical probability.
So AI tools are constructed by applying machine learning to a data set or sets.
Often these are large, publicly available datasets that do involve copyrighted works, and one of the most contentious issues from an intellectual property perspective around GenAI has been whether that constitutes fair use or whether it's copyright infringement.
There's arguments for or against that the arguments against against it being corporate infringement really hinged on the idea that the use is transformative and therefore generates new content.
However, arguments on the other side suggest that it can produce almost exactly the same content and can compete with what it's drawing the data from.
That the end of the day all this is done using what's called a transformer model in language processing.
What if this does?
Like I said, is it basically weighs the importance of different words in a sequence based on their probability of being together?
So it uses the context to make predictions about what words go together.
If you're looking at language processing, it's not actually coming up with answers or thinking.
The idea of artificial intelligence is a little bit of a misnomer, and that it's not really intelligence in the same sense.
How would anyone from the gate like to build on that?
Or does that something's up pretty well?
I know you've got your hand up.

Noah Mannheiland 18:25
Yes.
So I can just give kind of a brief example.
For instance, if you were to ask an LM to give you a nonfictional biography on Gandalf, it will give you a biography on Gandalf.
But at no point will it tell you that Gandalf is not a real person, because that's not what you asked for.
So those are sort of the limitations of it.
It's very good at saying Pilling a compilation of words together that will make sense in a vacuum, but it will ignore any kind of context and it will give you precisely what you ask for, no matter how kind of ridiculous you asked for it.

Scott Cassidy 19:00
And with you on most of that, Noah, but you're telling the Gandalf isn't real.

Noah Mannheiland 19:05
Scott, right after to have a conversation after this you might want to sit down.

Scott Cassidy 19:08
Yeah, I'll.
I'll get a fresh cup of coffee.
I think that's going to be a A Tarde conversation anyway.
So Charlie and I see you're typing as well.
Yeah, right.
So if knowing that that's what Generative AI is doing, how do we prepare a course syllabus?
Statements regarding genrei in coursework, and there's a few general things to bear in mind.
And then what I'd like to do is I'd like to show with the provisional guidelines, where you can find some sample statements that the university has, and then I might turn the floor over to Ryan, if that's OK with you to discuss some of the resources that you've also put together.
And as I'm going through this, this is something that several members of the gate came up with through discussions.
So Charlene Ryan or or Noah feel free to jump in at any point and build off of anything that I'm saying here.
Ryan, you've got your hand up.

Ryan Drew 20:15
By accident.
Sorry about that.

Scott Cassidy 20:17
Oh no, that that's alright.
OK, so here's some general guidance.

And before we look at any specific tools, just when you are designing, whether you're using one of these statements and adapting it, whether you're developing your own from scratch, what is it worth bearing in mind?
And there's a few points here.
One is especially during the early days, it was very, very tempting to take a tools based perspective on Generative AI use.
And what I mean by that is thinking, is it OK for us to use as Students chat GPT in your course, and if not, what about a different AI tool?
What are the tools that I'm allowed to use versus the tools that I'm not allowed to use?
That's not necessarily the most effective approach to take one, because it puts a large onus on us as instructors to keep abreast of changes in a very, very rapidly changing field that many of us don't have any formal training and necessarily in order to know, OK, what tools do do what exactly.
I would also argue that with AI going the way it is, it's gonna become very, very difficult and necessarily distinguish what might involve an artificial intelligence or indeed even a Generative artificial intelligence component.
What makes more sense is to fall back on what we actually do know very well, which is pedagogy and focus less on what AI tools are allowable and not allowable versus what learning processes are integral to our course.
And our course outcome. Susan, this is something you raised from a humanities perspective, is if there are certain things in terms of writing skills, for example, that are critical to learn in order to show competence and proficiency in this particular course.
It's not necessarily tools that I'm going to put up blanket ban on, but there's certain processes that you have to do yourself and there's some processes you know.
For example, in an upper year business course where that's case based, maybe in terms of refining your writing, we don't mind students using generative AI.
Maybe it's even has a service as an equalising force for students who speak English as an additional language, but that's because our pedagogical outcomes are different, so there's a benefit to focusing on processes as opposed to focusing on specific tools.
Related to this, it's worth shifting from a lens of prohibitions to discussing what is it that you can do as a student.
You know, empowering them to potentially use tools in a way that may help with their learning, whether it's generating test questions, whether it's helping to refine their writing, if writing skills and a technical sense are the core component of your learning outcomes, whatever it happens to be.
But shifting less from a lens of policing to a lens of integrating tools, but doing so in a very mindful way.
And this could even involve potentially having students develop their own policy statements or collaborate with the instructor to develop a policy statement on a I use based on an honest discussion of some of the issues pertaining to it.
And what the learning outcomes for the course are?
Relate again related to this and you'll see there's a sort of a common thread to all of this.
It's worth encouraging dialogue with your students to try to nurture and environment where they feel they can come to you and discuss as opposed to being fearful about how they use technology that doesn't necessarily serve them moving forward, and it also can create an environment where they feel they need to hide things from you.
Whereas a culture of transparency and disclosure can be more effective than one based on fear and sheer prohibition, Charlene, you have your hand up.

Charlene VanLeeuwen 24:25
I think one of the things that goes hand in hand with having this environment is ensuring that we as instructors are also enhancing or working on our own digital literacy around Generative AI so that we can have, umm, informed conversations with students about their use of technology and also tying in and weaving in the pedagogical underpinnings of why or why not.
Umm, we want them to use a particular Generative AI tool or any other tool for that matter to help them in their learning or to encourage them to develop Mastery with the foundations before beginning to use a tool that can be sort of refining or speeding up their processes.
But you know sort of learning to walk before they learn to run.

Scott Cassidy 25:26
That's well put.
So another way to to look at another element I should say of transparent communication is also being transparent in to what extent, if any, you plan to engage with Generative AI as instructor, if indeed you intend to do so.
So for example, if you are using General AI to help develop rubrics or instructions, this is something that should be disclosed as well.
For the sake of transparency, and also to again encourage a culture of disclosure as opposed to to one of plausible deniability.
Finally, and this will lead into some of the tools, consider implementing mechanisms that help facilitate disclosure.
One of the issues that I've run into with my students using generative AI is they intend to disclose their use of it, but they're not quite sure how to do so, and if you don't, I find if you don't make it easy for them to do so in a way that's clear in terms of your expectations, they won't necessarily do it.
So making sure you have some clear mechanism or some clear policy.
But how to cite Generative AI if you require them to show their prompts, make sure that that's clear, but implementing some way to.
Build off of the idea they should be disclosing their use of it to making it easy for them to do so, and clear how they are to do so.
And those are so a few points that general guidance.
Does anyone have any questions or thoughts about any of those?
Thanks.
If not, what are?
What are some of the resources and tools that you might want to to consider?
And there's a few things that are available.
One thing you might be familiar with, and if you're you're not, I'll make you familiar with it right now, is the AI task force has a set of 13 overarching provisional guidelines.
I've seen a Susan saying I can't hear me.
Hey, can other people hear me?
OK, so that it might, it might be your I'm saying this as if she can hear me I'll type it.
And there are some resources and tools that are worth noting, and one of them would be our provisional guidelines.
We've a set of 13 overarching guidelines and with some appendices that are attached to those included in.
Those are some sample syllabus statements that run the gambit from.
Prohibiting the use of Generative AI to allowing it all together to allowing its situationally UM let me share some of those.
Right.
And but I'll also do is I'm also just gonna help Charlene beat me to that.
Uh.
It in the chat there.
So you call.
It can also pull this up if you'd like, but we have 13 provisional guidelines and we also have here Appendix A.
And like I said, there's no one size fits all Syllabus statement that every single instructor can or should apply to every single one of their courses.
These are always going to be starting points that you can then adapt to your particular course, but you can see we have, for example, right from Statement 1.
Genovesi tools could be used without restrictions.
You could include something as simple as students may use generative AI throughout the course in whatever way enhances their learning.
No special documentation or citation is required.
Many of us wouldn't have something that's that permissive, but on the other hand, many of us probably wouldn't have something like 4 either, which is the other extreme Generative AI tools being prohibited.
Umm so for example AI tools are not allowed to assist in any type of preparation or creation of the assignments of the course using AI tools in any ways of violation of academic integrity statement and standards.
Since this course focuses on building your original ideas and critical thinking, using AI tools would compromise the learning process.
Therefore, is prohibited.
Contact your instructor for information, even in a prohibitive statement like this.
Notice that it still explains the rationale if we think from an organizational justice perspective, for example, informational justice perceptions of justice are found to increase when you provide explanation for the rationale behind them.
Now we can see that there are other ways you can include statements.
So what if you don't wanna blanket ban on Generative AI altogether, but you also don't want something that's so permissive that it doesn't require any sort of citation?
And there's no context around when and under which circumstances AI'S allowable.
You might want to start with statements two or three.
So statement two gives an example of using generative AI under specific circumstances.
However, you adapt this things that are worth bearing in mind, and this is where it may be, requires some critical reflection on your end as an instructor in terms of your pedagogical outcomes back there we go, but you should indicate which assignments or require students to use AI because the learning outcomes on different assignments.
As we all know, might not always be exactly the same.
You could indicate which AI tools are used for learning activities.
Like I said, I prefer to take more of a process based approach as opposed to a tools based approach, but you could if you have specific tools you could consider those as well and being clear about that again from an informational justice perspective, what is the purpose for the allowance or prohibition of specific tools or specific processes providing instructions how to get started and instructions of how to engage in AI tools to complete learning activities.
Now, no, I can't say all structures will agree on this, but many of us, I think, would agree that Generative a if it's being used in a formative way to enhance student learning and they're not using it to develop their own assignments.
But they're using it, for example, to develop test questions or improve their understanding.
No.
A lot of us would allow that.
If that's the case, it you could consider Statement 3 so Geneva tools may be used as student learning supports or resources where you're saying students can use AI for some examples editing.
Translating whatever it happens to be, and again this will be specific to your particular learning outcomes.
So all of these could be used as starting points.
All I would say is it's worth being clear in your statement.
Uh, it's also worth making sure that whatever you put in there, it's informed by your pedagogy and you're clear about not just what you're allowing or what you're not allowing, but the specific circumstances and the rationale for for why you're doing that.
And through that, that can help clarify matters for students and can also help protect you in the event of an appeal should you be challenged on your use of Generative AI and the policies you have around that.
Now, Charlene also noted that Jason Hogan had put together a really helpful Moodle book that basically gives an introduction to generative AI for folks who'd like to to learn more about it.
And that link is also in the chat.
Like any questions about that so far, before we talk about some supplementary resources, at which point I'll probably turned over to you Ryan, if that's OK.

Ryan Drew 33:43
Yep.

Scott Cassidy 33:55
In a sense, I've have been very clear or very boring, or both.
It sounds good if you do have questions of, feel free to to ask guys in the chat or you know, coming off mute or we can take a few minutes at the end if anything's percolating that you're not quite ready to ask.
What I might do at this point is stop sharing and Ryan, if you'd like to take over.

Ryan Drew 34:18
Certainly.
I'm really excited to have a few minutes to to chat here.
I think what I'll do is I'll take a couple minutes and talk through a few ideas that contextualize what I will then share on my screen, and a lot of what I'll speak to relates quite closely to what Scott and Charlene have mentioned already.
Umm, I feel compelled to kind of come at this from the perspectives that I've I've heard in the room here as best as I can, and I want to start by talking just very, very briefly about using tools to build your own AI literacy.
Obviously I'm aware that when we talk about the need to develop new knowledge or build new knowledge in an area that might seem uncomfortable or completely new to us like that imposes, you know, restrictions on how much time we have to do things.
It takes us away from other work that we value and that we have been used to taking up the majority for time and attention.
So I get that totally.
I just wanted to start with this bit of a suggestion.
If AI and the topics that we might fascinate some of us on this task force is not of immediate interest or fascination to you, that's completely OK.
Umm, but I might make a suggestion that and take this as you will consider how people in your field or researchers that are doing work in areas that fascinate you are using AI in their practices.
So and the reason I say this is that with Strong contextual awareness, you are putting yourself in an ideal position to start grasping some of these more technical nuances.
For example, capacity like what AI can do and limitations.
What AI cannot do so you know, for example, Peru is your favorite journals for articles that discuss AI in terms that are familiar to you.
And that's also where you're probably gonna start seeing more of this in your in your day to day academic lives.
So for you as teacher or as researcher, when you were selecting a tool to use personally.
Consider the tasks that are at hand.
Like what are you like?
What are your objectives?
Umm, the reality is that there are so many tools popping up all of the time that there is likely a tool that at least is advertised to do what you wanted to do.
So consider first and foremost what you were trying to do, and then seek out tools based on that.
Consider the skills and knowledge that you have and how different tools might help you reach those goals.
And I'll stress here, and I think this is a good message to take through your teaching as well is stressing this the idea of metacognition, or thinking about your thinking, considering how you perceive the tool that you are using, think about large language models like chat, GPT.
Are you perceiving that that chat bot as a logical calculator?
As many are or are you having that sort of more, perhaps conceptual understanding that Scott had shared drawing from a particular data set?
So always consider how you are receiving the function of tools.
I think that's a really kind of underlying premise that's going to be important for these and also before I get into these examples, I'll mention just to kind of echo what Scott had mentioned, assignments that stress process but rather tools that bring process to the forefront are valuable.
So when discussing with students, the tools that they're using encourage the students reflect on skills that they're meant to develop in the course context, and whether or not these tools support that growth, it's and I think this goes to a comment that I heard from one of you about the humanities.
It's not realistic to develop experts in the editing and content creation without experience and experimentation in the medium itself.
So and being able to have that sort of kind of critical reflection on these tools is gonna be super important.
I'll share a really, really quick story.
I have spent a great deal of time trying to develop activities for different learning levels and age groups on how AI tools can, or rather sorry how the function of a I can be communicated through different sort of experiences and experiments and there was one that I recently tried with a group of high school students doing a workshop that involved Students creating their own stories and they did so with plot points and characters that were drawn on sticky notes and put along a kind of almost like a storyboard on a large piece of paper and then.
Stories made sense to each creator, but when they then in silence when and redistributed all of those sticky notes and recompiled their own stories, and then we're asked about authorship, we had a very wide range of sort of perspectives on who owned the the emerging creative productions that had come from this, and that was able to spark really interesting discussions on, well, who is the author?
And people really weren't able to detect where information was coming from.
And so even just like experiments like this have helped kind of develop a bit of literacy on these tools.
Umm, so I'll stress you can't be an expert in every AI tool out there.
New tools overlapping.
Not quite the same abilities.
Mysterious data sets.
They're popping up all the time.
Consider integrating tools that emphasize the students responsibility for content they turn in.
And I'm going to share examples in just a second.
The other thing too is I'm only sharing about four example templates here.
There's an infinite number of these sort of tools that you can develop or build or adapt or edit yourself, and the idea here is that you're starting to create structures that work for you as an instructor, so that it actually potentially puts responsibility where that responsibility should be.
For example, if it's the student's responsibility to ensure ownership and be responsible for the ethical dimensions of what they're turning in, then create structures and tools within your course.
To do that, I'll show you some examples.
The last thing here is just some general miscellaneous comments that I thought would be useful to integrate to consider things like if you are integrating generative AI text generation in your course, use features that are already built into platforms like Moodle for example, or have students create their own formatting standards or conventions that show their process.
So for example, using colored text to indicate if text is product of them only or if it's come from large language model or providing expectations in terms of citations.
APA, Chicago MLA All have published citation guides for how AI should be cited.
As you can expect, those are changing quite rapidly, so it's always good to check in with the latest.
I will now share my screen and talk through a couple example AI teaching tools share content.
You should now see my screen.
Can I just get a quick confirmation that you can see this? Lovely.

Scott Cassidy 41:49
Yep, we can see it, right?

Ryan Drew 41:50
OK so I have 4 examples here.
The first one here takes inspiration actually from Kate denial here.
Who Charlene shared with me just the other day.
This is a template here and we can share this Word document just as an example of a process that would have students actually create their own AI position statement.
Uh, which uh is a rather novel approach, but it puts the kind of onus on the student to learn about AI.
They do this learning that you might not.
Otherwise, I learn in the same way that a student would learn this for, for example it's impact, and then after learning about AI'S impact on labor or privacy or Environment, whatever you so choose to put in here, this Part 2 here prompts the student to create their own position statement indicating how they plan to use AI throughout the course.
Of course, when you have a number of students using different adhering themselves to different standards, that becomes a decision for you and how you would want to manage that.
But it is a structure here that has been used and I'm sure it's will lead to different results.
But another tool here, I've called.
What tool did I use?
A tool for documenting and communicating use of AI tools.
So a tool like this would be knowing that if a student comes up to you and says, can I use substitute the name of chat GPT for something that you might never heard of before?
It might be hard to know right off whether or not that student can use that, because you might not know the function of that tool.
You might not know that you probably do not know where that data is coming from.
I I sort of template approach like this might have Students actually list all of these pertinent information before deciding whether or not and rationalizing whether or not a tool is the appropriate tool for the job.
So even identifying things like controversies or either looking at alternative tools that could achieve the same thing, but why you chose this tool over everything else, this could be the type of document that is then stapled to the back of an essay.
For example, 1/3 tool here.
Uh AI writing feedback tool this again depending on how you so choose to use AI, some people might find value in this.
Other instructors might say absolutely not, but this is a template to potentially provide some improvement to writing.
So for example, if you've decided that you want to focus on the concreteness of your language, and that's your area of focus, you input prompt or sorry.
You input an excerpt of your own writing.
You've solicited feedback from multiple AI tools here as improved versions.
You then provide your own critical response to that, and then make your own improvement based on all of this information.
This is another template you could possibly use, and this one is perhaps one of the more interesting ones that I'll share here.
This is AI representation analysis tool and this is focusing on the fact that a lot of AI that we talk about is not actually just text generation and a lot of the AI that is probably more has the potential to be more deceiving in some ways is the multimedia that content that we don't necessarily realize what we're looking at is not a representation of reality in the way that we think it is.
So photographs in advertisements on social media.
There's a lot and so developing ways to look at different photos that are being generated by software like Daley for example, or deep AI, and then actually I've put down here issues with representation.
So a Students reflection on how these images are misrepresenting, in this case, former President Donald Trump, and how a student might interpret how this could change peoples perceptions in a bigger picture.
All of these fields are completely editable and and there's certainly probably a dozen fields that you might think should be in here or others that you feel like don't need to be in here.
We can provide these sort of editing editable documents for you to take a peek at, but otherwise these are just sample templates and there are a lot more available and yeah, so that that's pretty much what I'll share for now.
I'm trying to think if I've skipped over anything super important or if you have any questions about tools.
If there's one last thing I can stress, it's I think developing a dependency trying to find the ideal perfect tool for you to use and carry through the next 10 years is an unrealistic ask of yourself.
It's more about the way that you interact with and use those tools, so an openness to.
You know, checking in with the latest and greatest and building that into, uh, your own part of your AI literacy is really an important part of all of this.
So I hope that this hasn't been overwhelming.
These templates will be in your hands soon enough if you have questions, I'm happy to take them, otherwise I'll turn it back to Scott.

Scott Cassidy 47:37
Any questions for Ryan?
No.
So coming towards the end of this, I wanted to say a few final words and also just open up the floor to questions.
But before I do that, I know Noah was kind enough to join us as the undergraduate student representative for the AI task force, and I know we have spent most of the last hour talking about the importance of openness and communication, transparency.
Clarity in your course syllabi when it comes to Geneva I, if you don't mind being put on the spot, Noah.
And this is partly because you burst my bubble about Gandalf being real.
We would you mind saying a few words from a student perspective about uh, you were feelings towards the importance of all of this.

Noah Mannholland 48:26
Sure.
Yeah, absolutely.
So I'm also the person who helps students out with academic appeals whenever they need somebody to.
Sort of bounce ideas off or help them go through the process and I can tell you that whenever it comes to AI, kind of the big Bing is the stigma around it and also.
A mixed connection or disconnect in communication between professor and student.
A lot of the times a student will use AI to do something and not fully understand whether they should have done that or what is crossing the line.
Uh, so there is really ultimately regardless of sort of how you feel about AI, the important thing is clarity, particularly clarity in the syllabus, because if I see a student come to me and a student says I used AI for eight different assignments and the last one was flagged.
And I don't know what I did wrong.
It's very easy for me to go into the syllabus and point to the syllabus that says, hey, you're not supposed to use AI for assignments versus Syllabus.
That says you can maybe use AI for assignments or sort of floaty language.
I guess is the best way to put it, so being as clear as possible is helpful for both you and the student, because then the student a feels comfortable talking to you about whether or not they can use AI for a specific tool as opposed to just having it happen in the background and B if the student does make a mistake or do something wrong, it's very easy to go into the syllabus and say, OK, this is where you made an error.
Uh, but if there is nothing about AI, then the student is still going to use AI in your courses.
It's just, it's a thing that's happening.
There's no way around it.
They very much see it as if not a shortcut.
Certainly a way to you know automize a lot of the work.
So making sure that you're as clear as possible what your expectations are about AI, but also acknowledging that a student is always able to talk to you about AI will head off a lot of these problems before they get to the appeals stage.
So I think that's probably the number one thing I wanna try and hammer home is be as clear as possible with your expectations for your students.
If you don't allow AI at all, that's totally cool.

But just make sure you're very upfront with that so that problems are sort of avoided and a student is very clear about what the expectations are going in.
Hopefully that made sense.

Scott Cassidy 50:54
Alright, thank you.
And I'll echo that just from the faculty perspective and in administrative perspective on on appeals is I've been asked before from my from the appeals that I've handled.
But it does it tend to be the student or the faculty member.
Who?
Who's in the wrong?
And I say, well, it depends.
Do students sometimes make appeals that are groundless and frivolous?
Absolutely do instructors sometimes violate university policy?
Absolutely.
Sometimes the vast majority of the time it's actually somewhere in the middle.
It's neither of those things to know was point.
The vast majority of appeals I've seen could have been avoided if there had been clear communication and expectations up front as opposed to it being something that is reactive, that we have to deal with down the line.
So I think it's a really good point to raise.
Generative AI is not the only example where this comes up by any stretch of the imagination, but it's a very good example of where this comes up.
We're coming to the last two minutes here.
UM, but I think it might make sense at this point to maybe open up the floor to any questions.
Final thoughts.
I know this has been kind of a lightning fast session where we've thrown a lot at you.
How are people feeling and do you have any final questions?
Have we clarified matters?
Have we made them more confusing?
Have we started existential crises?
Where?
Where do people stand?
It's.
The I'm Susan.
I see you've got your hand up and perfect. Perfect.

Susan Brown 52:37
Yes, I can hear you again.
Thank you.
Uh.
Another reason I just love Teams not.
I do want to say that.
And you know, I'm probably at one end of the spectrum about.
My intentions to use AI, but I do want to be doing it from a standpoint, making my decisions from a standpoint of understanding it and having some hands on experience with it.
So I would find that helpful and I'm glad that Charlene thinking about perhaps doing some hands on things rather than me in my office faffing around.
I I guess the thing I want to take away from this is.
The need to kind of approach this slowly.
I think you know this question of how overwhelmed faculty are feeling with this that we we got hit by this.
You know, a year or two years ago and suddenly particularly for those of us in the humanities, you our reason for existing kind of got thrown into an existential crisis and, you know, suddenly we're being told you have to learn to this.
You have to adapt to this.
You have to prepare for students and I think that kind of language is then just encourages a kind of resistance on the part of of faculty.
And so I do like the approach of just sort of saying, OK, we just we don't have to solve all this right away.
We need to dip our toes into this.
Understand that, but not sort of feel like, OK, I have to completely revise everything that I've been doing, completely overhaul my syllabi.
Yep. students are gonna use AI in ways that they shouldn't.
It's gonna be fairly obvious often because it'll just look like word salad.
But it's the pressure should not be on faculty to kind of solve all this or have ideal solutions for this.
You know, within a few weeks of term starting.
So I think you know more of a kind of message of, OK, let's figure this out.
Stuff's gonna get through and we'll just take it slowly.
There's never gonna be, you. know, tools will continue to evolve.
So we're never gonna have a firm grasp on it.
Umm, but I you know, this is affecting hundreds of thousands of faculty around the world, and I think we need to kind of take not to be apathetic or throw our hands up in the air.
But also I think to kind of ease off the pressure on ourselves a little bit to have this totally solved and a whole new game plan worked out just to kind of take it slow and and figure it out and not panic about it.

Scott Cassidy 55:33
So I think it's a a great point, Susan.
And and I would agree, I wouldn't use the term apathetic at all.
I think that's simply realistic.
The vast majority of us are not experts on Generative AI, and I don't think we have necessarily the time or the expertise or the capacity to come up with all the answers by ourselves, especially a few weeks before the semester starting.
I think if there's anything to take away from the last hour, it's that there is no one size fits all solution.
Umm, tools are going to keep evolving at an incredibly rapid pace, and we'll just do the best we can trying to to keep up with it.
No longer figuring this all out together at our own pace and really I think the main takeaway is just to be clear where you stand at a given moment and making sure that's clearly communicated and trying to make it a bilateral process and involve the students in that as much as you can as opposed to thinking that you have to come back with all of the answers, which I I don't think is realistic.
And I I don't think it's a pressure we can accept on ourselves as faculty.

Susan Brown 56:40
I just want to say thank you to you, Scott and Ryan and and Noah and the rest of the committee for.
Uh, all the work that you put into this and creating the resources and having the conversation.
So thank you very much.

Scott Cassidy 56:53
But thank you for joining and thank you for your your honesty and your willingness to take, as you said, you were sort of on one side of the spectrum coming into an AI task force hardware, a lot of us have self selected because we have an interest in GenAI and cording to pedagogy.
It's really great to know to hear from a humanities perspective where you have hesitations about it.
So.
So thank you for voicing those as well.

Susan Brown 57:20
Thanks for listening.

Scott Cassidy 57:20
He thank you of course.
And uh, Suzanne, you've got your your hand up.

Suzanne Rath 57:25
Can you hear me now?
I was having.

Scott Cassidy 57:27
Often I, yeah, absolutely welcome.

Suzanne Rath 57:28
OK, great.
I was having mute problems earlier.
Sorry, I wasn't.
I wasn't ghosting you.
Yeah, I wanna reiterate sort of what Susan said and sort of thanking you everyone here for the the resources you've provided.
I can't wait to sort of look through them and sort of pick and choose to develop sort of what I want to say about AI for my for my class in general, then also for specific assignments.
I think that's actually not something I'd really considered where it mean it could be a blanket statement, but also you can relax rules or make rules a little bit more stringent as you see fit for specifics assignments and specific learning objectives.
So I think that's also a very useful perspective to have going into this as well.
So thank you for that, for all those tools.

Scott Cassidy 58:07
I'm very welcome, Suzanne.
And yeah, after the meeting, we'll.
Yeah, I task force folks and I will put together the the resources share them.
So those should be coming up pretty shortly after we finish up here.
Awesome.
Anything else before we we call it a day and let you get on with your weeks.
Not anything, Noah.
Right in, Charlene.
Anything I've missed that we should be covering, Charlene?

Charlene VanLeeuwen 58:39
Maybe what I'll do is just tell people where they can find the recording if they want to come back to either the recording or some of the links.

Scott Cassidy 58:43
But that would be fantastic.
Yep. Umm.

Charlene VanLeeuwen 58:46
So the plan is to post the recording on the instructional resources hub along with the professional guidelines and other resources related to Generative AI.
And I think what we'll also do is add a link or a note on the the landing page for the TLC, just to make it easier for folks to to navigate to the instructional resources hub, which I think is pretty easy, but it is a couple of extra steps.
So if I can eliminate a couple of steps, I think that just makes life easier for everybody to find the resources.

Scott Cassidy 59:28
Perfect.
Thanks, Charlene.
Alright, Noah.

Noah Mannholland 59:35
I'm just wondering if we wanted to touch briefly on AI detection tools.

Scott Cassidy 59:40
We should at the point the point did come up early on.
So the here's another reason, especially from an appeals perspective, why it's useful to use an instructor to make sure that you stipulate your requirements in advance as opposed to detecting AI.
Use that there's ambiguity about whether it's allowable or whether it's not allowable after the fact.
Early on there were, you know, a lot of fuss made about AI detection tools like CPT O for example, with the idea that if you felt a student had engaged in unauthorized use of a generative AI tool, say a large language model, to develop an assay, you could plug it into something like CPT O and it could tell you the likelihood that this was a I produced text.
Students still worry that, umm, these sort of tools might be used in order to substantiate a claim of academic misconduct and a number of instructors do engage in this.
The thing to note is Research currently suggests that these tools are highly unreliable in terms of actually detecting AI generated text.
There's no silver bullet, if you will, to doing this.
Some of the tools are about as accurate as a coin flip, and what this led to when we were updating the professional guidelines, which we've talked about a few times in our meeting today, is putting a proposal forward to to send it, to update the academic regulations, specifically Reg 20 in the undergrad regs around academic integrity, to clearly stipulate that using Generative AI detection tools like CPT O, it doesn't say specific tools, but just AI detection tools cannot be grounds for substantiating a claim of academic some misconduct.
And that's because those tools lead to a number of false positives and false negatives.
At the moment, that's not to say you know tools are evolving, so regulations will evolve, but as it stands, we would not consider it best practice to be using AI detection tools and we put forward the proposal to update the academic regs accordingly to protect students from.
Potential.
false academic integrity charges brought up on based on tools that are not reliable.
But thank you for bringing that up, Noah. Suzanne.

Suzanne Rath 1:02:09
This is actually the question, maybe better for Charlene, the OR even Jason if if we get around to asking him. I just had a thought that the uh academic integrity tutorial on Moodle, it's something that I require students to do as part of sort of an introduction to my class.
And I wonder if there's any AI related questions on that for students to also get another sort of, you know, quick tutorial or explanation through that system.

Charlene VanLeeuwen 1:02:41
We've actually just finished doing a bunch of updating to that Academic Integrity tutorial, and yes, we have included Generative AI as part of the umm, you know, situations that students might encounter where they might be tempted into, you know, making a poor decision that would get them into hot water or a sticky situation.

Suzanne Rath 1:03:04
OK, right.

Charlene VanLeeuwen 1:03:05
So yeah, we have updated the tutorial.

Suzanne Rath 1:03:10
Excellent.
That's great news.

Charlene VanLeeuwen 1:03:11
I think it I think the IT goes live in after Jason gets back from holidays.

Suzanne Rath 1:03:17
Excellent.
Let him.

Charlene VanLeeuwen 1:03:18
He's on holidays this week, so it won't be.

Suzanne Rath 1:03:18
Let him.
Yeah, yeah, he deserves it.

Charlene VanLeeuwen 1:03:21
It won't be. you know, in the next couple of days, but I think pretty soon.

Suzanne Rath 1:03:26
OK. Wonderful.
That's great news.

Scott Cassidy 1:03:30
So thanks Suzanne and Charlene.
Anything else?
Or does that pretty well cover it for now?
Please.
Yeah, 18.

Etienne 1:03:40
Thanks.
I I sat on Senate until last month and one question that came up during discussions on a I recently was that entering somebody's a Students content into an AI detection tool.
Uh is essentially giving that intellectual property to a privately owned company.
Uh, because they they now have it.
Has that come up in discussion at all?

Scott Cassidy 1:04:05
Yeah, absolutely. It has.
Umm so Michele Cudmore from the Privacy Office is a member of the AI Task force and we can come at this from a couple of lenses.
I mean, you're bringing up from an intellectual property lens.
There's also a Privacy lens as well.
Should any personal information about a student be uploaded into an AI tool, it's so uploading students work into a I could be a breach of privacy if you are uploading personal information, even if you're uploading their work, though, there's no guarantee that it's not then going to be used in the training data.
Uh, for the Generative AI tools, so there are ethical considerations.
If, for example, you're using AI to potentially create feedback to give students, which is something I've heard faculty have explored, it's a we don't have hard, firm guidance on exactly what you should do in terms of best practices, but it's a consideration that needs to be made.
Umm, there are professional guidelines, would emphasize Student consent to upload their work to those sort of tools, because especially if you're thinking, well, if we go back to a humanities perspective, for example, the written work that they're doing could then become part of the training data for an AI tool.
And it's being given to a private company, absolutely.
Any anything to add on that for from the other AI task force members?

Charlene VanLeeuwen 1:05:34
There's there's.

Scott Cassidy 1:05:34
If consent issues arrested, yeah.



Charlene VanLeeuwen 1:05:35
Yeah, the consent issues.
You know, if we if we're doing this without getting Student consent and how do we get Student consent because we are obviously in a position of power.

Scott Cassidy 1:05:46
Yep.

Charlene VanLeeuwen 1:05:46
Those are some of the additional considerations that we've asked Michelle to provide us with some advice around, because it's it's really tricky whenever you potentially want to use a generative AI tool and upload student work.
But how do you what?
What happens if a student declines to have their work put into whatever tool?
What are?
What are are there consequences?
Are there is there concerns around potentially the Student feeling coerced to be to to allow an A faculty member to to do this?
There's.
So there's just a whole range of things there.

Scott Cassidy 1:06:34
Uh.
No way.
You've got you raised your hand as well.



Noah Mannholland 1:06:36
Yeah.
I would also say if you were thinking about using AI detection that this wouldn't be something I recommend.
Just putting in the syllabus as kind of a like, uh, you know, it's here.
If you look for it like I would have the conversation with your students very early on that this is something you are thinking about using and asking for consent in both of verbal and written form.
Just so everybody's on the same page. I think there are easily positions where students who don't read the syllabus, which is on them, would find out later that they had been using or their work had been submitted to one of these sites which could prove to be sort of sticky down the road.
So having a very frank and open conversation very early on in the course. I think is the best way to try and you know head this off at the past.
But I I would also say as a student who is both an engineering and an English. I personally am uncomfortable with my work being put into turn it in and my work does not contain a I can tell you that much.
So I I think that many of my fellow students in the humanities in particular would have problems with that.
So being very open with that and ideally flexible in terms of being able to test for AI without using some of these softwares or at least having some kind of trusted conversation would be probably the best way to make this better for everybody.



Scott Cassidy 1:07:59
Thanks Nora.
OK.
Any final thoughts or questions folks?
Twice speak now or hold your peace.
OK.
If not, thank you everyone for for your attention and for the discussion today.
It's really wonderful to connect with folks and to to have a chance to to chat about AI and course syllabi and some of the tools that the task force is compiled.
If you do have any follow up questions, feel free to reach out.
Otherwise, we'll upload all of the content we talked about today and hopefully this will be helpful.
Best of luck with all your course prep and have a great rest of the summer.



Etienne 1:08:43
Thank you.

Scott Cassidy 1:08:44
If I everyone.

Stephanie Shaw 1:08:46
Thank you.



Scott Cassidy stopped transcription