Brenna Clarke Gray:

Hello, and welcome to You Got this!, a podcast about teaching, learning, community, conversation and your digital life made for everyone at Thompson Rivers University. I'm your host, Brenna Clarke Gray coordinator of Educational Technologies, and this podcast is a project of your friends over at Learning Technology and Innovation. I record this podcast in Tk'emlups te Secwepemc within the unseated traditional lands of Secwepemcú'ecw, where I hope to learn and grow in community with all of you. And this week, well, this week has been an honor and a pleasure and, well, let's get into it.

So when I say the word honor here, I don't say it lightly, but I've had the opportunity to spend some time in the last two weeks doing professional development workshops for faculty colleagues in Ukraine who are working to transition their courses to online delivery because of a war zone. And they're leaning on some of the resources that we developed for the initial campus closure pivot at the beginning of COVID. It's wild how useful those resources are in this context, while obviously recognizing that the scale of trauma and hardship is very, very different. But one of the things that really struck me, especially because we've been talking in those sessions about digital modalities and academic integrity, and I'm just really struck by the degree to which we all just want to do a good job for our students.

We all just want to make sure they're learning the material they need to learn and also that they're cared for while doing it. It's just humbling and it was wild because one of our conversations is about academic integrity and part of me is like, "I don't want to care about academic integrity," and another part of me is like, "This is a really big part of a sense of normalcy, both for faculty and learners in difficult times, to know that the work we do and the credentials we award matter." So I've been thinking a lot about the ways in which we frame conversations about authentic assessment and what's possible in difficult circumstances, and my head is just swimming. One thing that was clear is that the worry about ChatGPT transcends borders. Our colleagues in Ukraine are just as concerned about what to do in this AI moment as everyone else, and this is where I transitioned to a bit of a mea culpa.

I know I promised two weeks ago that I was done talking about robots, but it turns out I'm not. I'm hearing so much anxiety from all of you when I have conversations on the help desk or by email or in sessions, and there's this real anxiety about what to do around academic integrity and artificial intelligence. And you know what? I actually know the exact right person for that conversation. I've brought Emilio Porco, our learning strategist for academic integrity, back to the show this week to talk a little bit about how artificial intelligence is going to get handled by the Academic Integrity Committee. I think this is useful info for everyone, and in many ways we're talking about a real back to basics approach. I'll let Emilio take it from here.

So I am back today with Emilio Porco. Emilio, very rare that somebody gets two episodes in one season, so welcome back to the show. Do you want to introduce yourself to folks and remind them of what you do around here?

Emilio Porco:

Sure. I am the learning strategist for academic integrity here at TRU.

Brenna Clarke Gray:

And you're here today because everybody is losing their minds about academic integrity and artificial intelligence, and our team is working hard on support resources for faculty programming for August. We've had a couple of listening sessions, that kind of thing. But I think that a big question that's been coming up is like, "Okay, how do I handle an academic integrity situation involving AI?" So you and I have been emailing back and forth. We've been talking about the lay of the land on this stuff, and I thought maybe the best thing would be for you to come here, talk about it, and then I can use this as a

resource on the website, aieducation.trubox.ca, where we're keeping all this stuff. So I'm going to start with that question. What do you think faculty should know about how to handle an academic integrity case that involves AI?

Emilio Porco:

Well, that's a great question, but it's also somewhat complicated. I'm sure by this point, faculty members have had a chance to play with these technologies, and we're talking about ChatGPT essentially because it's come on the scene and flipped everything on its head. It's dominated my workload for the last two months. I'm a part of Academic Integrity Hour in Canada that's facilitated through Sarah Eaton and it's dominated that conversation for them. But now there are ideas and there are strategies in place. So essentially these technologies have shortcomings, and this has been well documented at this point. It's shown that they're unreliable in providing you with accurate and usable quote, unquote evidence. So in being proactive, faculty members should not approach this with a disciplinary lens. Originally, I would get emails saying, "I think they used an AI. How do I get them?"

But rather, they should be looking at this through an ideological and core education perspective. So a little bit more context. So during Academic Integrity Hour in Canada, a computer science faculty member commented one day and this faculty member said that these tools, translation tools, essentially, they go back to antiquity and they're valid tools, but you have to consider the amount of cognitive offloading that occurs, whether it's large or whether it's small. So expectations and policy have to evolve with technology, and unfortunately, we still have this dichotomy in whether to accept it or whether not to. So this faculty member basically said, "We should be focusing on digital literacy and not academic integrity." From a case perspective, for example, we have nothing in the policy. The only time device is mentioned, it's mentioned once, and it's referring to using your phone in a test, that kind of thing.

So at this point in time, how faculty members should handle this is they're going to have to create the guidelines for using this technology. Academic dishonesty has to align with the current policy, and I know this sounds challenging because I understand faculty workload's already large, it is, but these are the suggestions and the ideas and the literature that have been shared throughout these networks. For example, I looked into these plagiarism checkers as they're commonly called a little bit more. So these tools are designed to identify textual similarities. So they rely on patterns and matching phrases, which explains why when faculty members run their own work through it, an AI will say, "Yes, I wrote this," because they actually write similarly. This has been classified as producing a false positive. So not only that, when you run that same piece, and faculty members have done this, I've done this, when you run that same text through Grammarly, Grammarly will label it as plagiarism-free.

Which one do we trust at this point? Not only that, the most important part, and this is more to your sandbox too, FIPPA, a faculty member cannot upload their student content without their consent. But more importantly, and you've talked about this before in your presentations and in your literature, we don't know what they're doing with the data, and that's a huge, huge concern. And in British Columbia, we actually, from my gathering in the discussions, we actually take FIPPA a little bit more seriously than the other provinces and the literature where faculties and institutions have accepted Turnitin, for example, or ChatGPT running it through the plagiarism checker, they're not Canadian. That is one major difference.

Brenna Clarke Gray:

Yeah, it's important to note too, none of those tools have been through a privacy impact assessment here at TRU. So it's not sanctioned for use to put student work, student data through any of those kind

of tools. And as you point out, Emilio, they don't work. We know that the false positivity rate is high, and everybody's doing all these funny examples. It thinks the Bill of Rights was written by ChatGPT. It thinks the Declaration of Independence was written by ChatGPT. There's a million of these examples out there. Let's put the originality checkers and the AI checkers aside for a second. We're not using those. I'm a faculty member. I think the student has used AI. I don't want them to. What's my case? How do I go about building that case? What do I use for evidence in that scenario?

Emilio Porco:

That's an excellent question and somewhat apropos, because I was in a conversation with a faculty member via email back and forth asking the same question because the faculty member was convinced that most of their class used some sort of assistive technology. So I explained that, "Well, you can't run it through, because A of the false positives and B, FIPPA," so basically, and this is the difficulty, essentially, faculty members have to gather additional evidence to support their claims in the same way evidence has been gathered before ChatGPT. So they basically have to identify specific instances of direct copying or paraphrasing without proper citation, things like that. But again, that's essentially difficult to do because how do you prove that? Now we have cases that are in the queue where, if their only evidence, now that we have this standard, if their only evidence is that, "Yes, I wrote this," or what's another common one? "97% plagiarism detected," things like that, if that's their only piece of evidence, unfortunately they're going to be dismissed.

Brenna Clarke Gray:

So I think this is an important thing. It sounds to me like what we're talking about here is about having preemptive conversations with students about what the expectations are. So not letting ourselves get sideswiped by AI, but talking to students ahead of time. So we've got some sample language on the AI and education website. I'll link to it so people can check it out. What messaging would you like faculty to be sharing with students, whether it's in their syllabi or in their assignment guidelines about working with AI?

Emilio Porco:

So like I said, this has dominated my workload for the last essentially two months. So basically the shared practices are to model, explain to your students and model what's acceptable and what's not from an academic dishonesty perspective, and whatever the faculty member's rationale is, it has to align with the policy. Now, in order to help faculty members, because I know that might seem daunting, I currently have four resources that can assist them in this process and I'll also explain. I went to the ETUG spring workshop last Thursday and Friday, titled The Integration of Digital Literacy, Inclusive Technology, and Academic Integrity. Actually, they had some excellent ideas, which I will relay here. But the four resources I currently have are a document produced by UNESCO, which is a quick start guide to using ChatGPT. I have the Academic Integrity Council of Ontario.

They created a document called Supporting Academic Integrity and Ethical Uses of Artificial Intelligence, and of course, Sarah Eaton, she's produced two. One's called a First Response to Grading and ChatGPT, and the other one's called Teaching and Learning with AI Apps. Perhaps faculty members probably already have these, but I'm in the process of revamping a website, essentially creating an academic integrity website, and all of these resources, all of this information that I have will be in a central location for faculty members to access. But moving on to the workshop, which I thought was excellent, the common takeaways from most of the presenters were, "Digital evolutions happen rapidly." We know that. "Students are a valuable resource in understanding how they use technology." So again,

create a safe space for them. And Sarah in one of her documents said the same thing, "Co-create guidelines." This is normally called student success criteria, and they are essentially a valuable resource.

So that was the general takeaway. Essentially, all presenters were saying something along the same lines, but one presentation in particular, I thought they had a great example as to what they did. So a faculty member teamed up with a student and the faculty member created a mock assignment and basically asked the student, "Show me how you use ChatGPT to solve this." This is writing oriented, mind you, because there's not a lot of ideas being shared with regard to math or computer science or accounting. And I'm assuming because those courses are essentially there's a right answer and a wrong answer. They're essentially black and white. The only strategy that's been suggested that I've heard thus far is going old school, pen to paper, invigilated in class. That's essentially the only one I've heard of. A lot of the literature isn't catered to that.

So from there, showing the student how to use ChatGPT, and I thought this way, the faculty member can determine the level of cognitive offloading that's happening, whether it's acceptable or not acceptable. In another presentation, the presenters, they suggested, you've heard this numerous times now, "Authentic assessments." They did a survey with students and what they found out was essentially this fraud triangle that occurs from an academic integrity and technology perspective. So the first is perceived pressure, which is basically, "If I fail this course, I fail the program." Not necessarily true. And as I see in student comments, that's why they gravitate towards committing academic dishonesty because they feel they've been backed into a corner. Second one, perceived opportunity, which is, "Well, I use Google, so why can't I use ChatGPT?" And really, when you think about ChatGPT, I ask the question, "Has it not evolutionized Google? Kind of functions in the same way, gets a bunch of resources from the same places?

Brenna Clarke Gray:

Well, except for the part where it makes things up. That would be a big difference.

Emilio Porco:

Right. But is there not misinformation on Google?

Brenna Clarke Gray:

No, there is. It's true. I think the concern for me with ChatGPT as a stand-in for a web search, for example, is that we're in this razzle dazzle phase with ChatGPT where people are like, "Oh, I don't use Wikipedia anymore. I just go to ChatGPT or whatever." That doesn't allow for the same kind of recognition of misinformation or generated content.

Emilio Porco:

Funny you should mention that. In another presentation. I thought this was really, really interesting, and I think at least they recognize this is what faculty members need to consider, metacognition. Because this is just it though. So metacognition essentially is like Bloom's taxonomy. It's six steps, creating, evaluating, analyzing, applying, understanding, and remembering. ChatGPT has changed that metacognition, so now the creating component is that. The message essentially was, and again, I know faculty members have a difficult job as it is, basically if you're incorporating ChatGPT, now you're going to have to monitor how their metacognition has changed because essentially it has. And I think that that's really important from an educational standpoint because here's the thing, we know it's not going away and you know students are going to use it. How does this change? And again, in the evaluating and the analyzing component, that's going to have to change as well. Because now as we know, the

misinformation that it produces, trust me, I ran Secwepemc stories through there. Oh my God, it butchered them.

Brenna Clarke Gray:

Well, and this gets into some of the biases that are inherent in the data sets, and listeners to this show have heard me go on about all of this stuff before. So I will pause myself. But I do think we're getting into the next question, which is how advancements in this technology are really changing faculty practice. And one of the things that I've been thinking through is, "Okay, if an instructor allows ChatGPT on an assessment, how do we evaluate," exactly what you're talking about, "that metacognition piece?" What's going to be the standard? And so something that we've been recommending is ask students to hand in screenshots of the prompt and the output, and then ask them to talk to you about how they fact checked it and how they revised it to come up with their final answer. So what kinds of practices are you hoping to see in the way we approach these technologies?

Emilio Porco:

What I do know with regard to that, the ideas that have been shared, faculty members are basically suggesting for there to be more transparency in teaching and learning. When you think about it, students are no longer docile and passive learners. So social media and technology have elicited that inquiry because they often ask, "Why should we care about this?" And I know that sometimes this might seem like a bit somewhat... They say they're entitled, but they're not. They've been exposed to technology their entire lives. They've been born with it at this point. And even they recognize in a [inaudible 00:18:05] fashion that they're not receptacles that you can just merely dump information into. They want to know why. It's not necessarily a bad thing. They just want more context. So again, the suggested practice is authentic assessments, but here's the thing though. How those look depends on the faculty member and you'll still have this dichotomy whether to adapt or to ban it and it's not helping.

So it makes it very difficult in creating a unified approach. The message that's been echoed is to have these discussions with students because faculty members don't have to be tech wizards. Have students show you how they use it. That's the best advice, and then to recognize what these technologies do well and what they do poorly. And I think everyone that's explored with it knows what it does well and what it does poorly. And if you have expertise in a certain subject matter, you'll be able to identify that, "No, this is false." But still, unfortunately, it has created a bit more work for faculty members.

Some faculty members have suggested finding another technology for students to use that's appropriate so you can veer away from this. And they've suggested things like Pebble pad or Photo Voice or having e-portfolios. But essentially they're saying, "Find the correct platform that still engages their metacognition, nurtures their self-efficacy and done in a way," as you just said, "where they can track their thinking process, where they can actually track the process to see, 'Actually, you cheated here.'" It doesn't help in the same way because it creates more work for faculty members to do, but this is the consensus at this point.

Brenna Clarke Gray:

I don't disagree with you at all, and I think that transparency piece is really important. Something I really hope faculty will think about as well is that disclosure and transparency and openness should also extend to the way they make use of these tools. I can definitely see the appeal in using ChatGPT to help generate, say, a student sample essay, for example, when I'm working through a writing exercise with students. And I think whoever and however it's being used, I think we need to have a culture of an open

conversation on campus because as soon as you drive the discourse underground, it doesn't make trust issues better. It doesn't make academic integrity better. So this takes me to just one last question while I have you here, and that is, "Do you notice or are you seeing so far any differences between OL and campus when it comes to these issues? Or is this something that everybody's got to be pretty aware of?"

Emilio Porco:

The short answer is this is something everyone's got to be aware of. However, there's a slight difference with regard to Open Learning and on campus. Open Learning, if I'm to understand correctly, it's in the courses, it's a set curriculum. So essentially faculty members, they assess and they ask student questions. That doesn't allow for a lot of intervention strategies. Not only that, with Open Learning, you're dealing more with individual related exams. Oftentimes, a student, if they get a case filed against them because they can hand in assignments all at once, I can as hand in assignment one, two, and three all at once. Well, they can get three cases filed against them, one, two, three, all at once. Hence, there's no intervention strategies.

Let me just give you some statistics with regard to how this is probably more prevalent and a little more difficult to track in Open Learning. From July 5th, 2021 until April, just last month, total academic integrity cases on campus, there were 259. Open Learning, there were 467. When you're trying to establish criteria and an academic integrity culture on campus, it's somewhat decentralized and everyone has a different definition and different approaches with regard to this topic, with regard to plagiarism, with regard to what academic integrity should look like, and it changes from faculty to faculty. The problem is, "How is a student supposed to navigate that from one faculty to the other when, 'Hey, I can do this in class,' and then another faculty member over to say, 'Well, no, you can't do that here'?"

Brenna Clarke Gray:

Yeah, I think we're going to see a lot of that with generative AI between instructors who are embracing it or even encouraging its use and instructors who are really trying to clamp down on its use.

Emilio Porco:

It's complicated. It's complicated.

Brenna Clarke Gray:

You know what? I actually think that's a perfect place to leave the conversation, Emilio, because it is complicated and there aren't any easy answers here. But I appreciate you coming and spending some time talking to me about this from the perspective of your office and helping faculty get a sense of how to have this conversation with students and how to think about it in terms of the academic integrity committee. So I really appreciate your time today. Thank you so much.

Emilio Porco:

My pleasure. And just one final thing, the individual at the other end of aic@tru.ca is me.

Brenna Clarke Gray:

So it's okay for people to reach out to that email address with questions?

Emilio Porco:

Yes. And again, partnerships too.

Brenna Clarke Gray:

Awesome. Thanks so much for your time.

Emilio Porco:

Thank you, Brenna. My pleasure.

Brenna Clarke Gray:

So that is it for season three, episode 25 of You Got This! As always, if you want to write to us, you can email me. I'm bgray@tru.ca and I'm also on Twitter, @BrennaCGray, and in both cases, that's Gray with an A. All of our show notes and transcripts are posted at yougotthis.trubox.ca. Of course, you can always comment on individual episodes there.

I'm going to leave you today with a Tiny Teaching Tip that hearkens back to what Emilio was talking about and also what I said off the top about this back to basics approach. I think in many ways, the thing we really need to do right now is get a handle on our assignment guidelines. Make sure that we're asking students to do relevant work that connects to what matters to them and then involves the classroom context in ways that AI can't manage.

We've got some sample syllabus language on the website, aieducation.trubox.ca, but I also think we need to be thinking about how our rubrics and our assignment guidelines will stand up to a GPT generated response. The reality is that if we're including personal reflection and classroom context, those are things AI doesn't know anything about. So how can we build that into our assignment guidelines now to proof them against the oncoming flood. As Emilio elucidated, it's going to be difficult to quote, unquote prove academic integrity when it comes to ChatGPT, but it's not difficult to see where ChatGPT fails to meet the guidelines of an assessment. And I think that's the place we need to be focusing our energies right now. Work on that and we'll talk more about it lots, especially in August. Keep an eye out for programming then, but until next time, take care of yourselves and each other and we'll talk really soon. Bye-bye.