

Higher Education's Thoughtful Response to Robot Writing

[studiosity.com/studentsfirst](https://www.studiosity.com/studentsfirst)

Transcript

- Attribution: The speakers and the Symposium must be credited or referenced:

For example:

Speaker Name/s, (2023, February 7). *Studiosity Students First Symposium: Higher Education's Thoughtful Response to Robot Writing*, [Webinar]. Studiosity.
<https://www.studiosity.com/studentsfirst>

- Non Commercial: The conversation can be used for non-commercial purposes only.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:00:08] Good morning, everyone. My name is Judyth Sachs. I'm Chief Academic Officer from Studiosity, and this is our first webinar for 2023. And what a beauty it is. But before I begin, I would like to acknowledge that I am hosting this online conversation from the lands of the Cammeraygal people. I also acknowledge the Traditional Custodians of the various lands on which you will work today, and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people participating in this meeting, and First Nations people across Canada and the Maori people of New Zealand. I pay my respects to Elders past and present, and celebrate the diversity of Aboriginal peoples and their ongoing cultures and connections to the lands and waters of New South Wales and elsewhere in Australia and across the broad expanses of Canada and New Zealand.

[00:00:57] I also want to specifically welcome colleagues who are listening late at night in Canada and a little bit later in the morning from New Zealand. So I'd like to start off with a couple of observations and before I do that, we have 1,672 people that have registered for the webinar today, which is by far three times larger than any webinar that we've had before. So clearly this might be something that is of interest to people in the sector.

[00:01:24] So I'd like to make a couple of comments, observations. I wouldn't be surprised if [ChatGPT] was the word of 2023 or in fact by December it could be so 'old hat' that people will think what was ChatCTP? It's all, it's yesterday's. Who knows? Second point is every day there is some mention about AI in general and chatCPT in the media feeds and social media sites. The first response two weeks ago was that of a moral panic. The end of universities as we know them was imminent.

[00:01:59] So some of this reactive heat has subsided now and there is more informed and reflective debate on what this new technology means. This week there are seven several webinars already being run. So one point that I want to make that makes this this webinar different from others, we are not talking about the technology of ChatGPT. We

are talking about the impact that this has on learning and teaching and assessment. And that's what our focus will be today and identify what the opportunities are. But what are some of the areas of concern that people might have. So today's organised: introduction, I'm nearly there. I'll ask each member of the panel questions that relate to their expertise and experience, and then questions will be taken from the audience and at the end I will try to bring it together in 5 minutes. But given that my training, original training was in anthropology and I was, did work in ethnography, there are three questions I have actually realised guide how I navigate the world and so I want the panel members to actually introduce themselves and reflect on from their discipline, these questions.

First question: what's happening, what is happening here for this, what is happening for this issue to be relevant now? What's *really* happening? And what does it mean for universities and students? So if I can start with Julia, could you introduce yourselves and just make a response to those those questions?

Dr Julia Christensen Hughes [00:03:31] Thank you, Judyth. I'm delighted to be on with with everyone here today. This is such an important issue. So I'm President of Yorkville University, Canada's largest private university. My own background is in organisational behaviour, so I have a natural fascination for the behaviour of organisations and the people in it. In terms of what's happening here. Is this a profound assault on the Academy or is this a natural evolution of the sort of the technological revolution that we've been experiencing forever? I do think it is profound, yet a natural, a natural next step. And I for one, I'm excited about this actually. I think the questions that ChatGPT and other forms of artificial intelligence present causes us to question much more deeply than I think we have in the past, what is the role of the faculty and what is it that we want students to learn in terms of their knowledge, skills and values? How do we facilitate that learning and how do we assess it? So I think this is going to cause us all to reflect deeply and ensure we put in place the very best learning opportunities for our students. And that's exactly what we have underway at Yorkville University right now. We've embraced some signature learning outcomes. We are going to be articulating signature learning pedagogies and signature approaches to assessment, focusing on authentic assessment that we feel are going to support our students and prepare them for this brave new world.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:05:15] Thank you. Giselle.

Prof Giselle Byrnes [00:05:18] Oh, Kia ora koutou. And greetings from Aotearoa New Zealand. I'm the Provost here at Massey University, Te Kunenga Ki Pūrehuroa. And the context here, Judyth and panelists, and indeed guests, has been, I think, less one of moral panic and actually leaping to thinking about what we need to do to keep ahead of this rapidly moving technology, whether it's ChatGPT or it's another kind of artificial intelligence. And I think for those of us in institutions like universities, there's a couple of challenges. One is the the immediate semester starts in a matter of weeks. Assessment structures and rubrics are usually set. How can we ensure that we're putting the right support and development opportunities around our faculty, our teaching staff to give them confidence? How can we communicate to our students in terms of what academic integrity means? And so many of us are quickly reviewing our policies around that. But I also think there's a longer term piece that we need to get our heads around. And it's - I'm putting here my historians hat on, I'm trained as a historian. So from a disciplinary perspective, I think in Malcolm Gladwell's terms, this is a bit of a "tipping point" moment

for universities. We really need to think hard about what we want students to learn, what teachers teach. And I would argue for much, much more emphasis on graduate attributes, skills, those higher order skills that we talk about all the time, and how do we really redesign assessment to speak to the acquisition of those skills rather than the content and the focus on information? And I know many of us have been on that journey for some time. So just a few quick thoughts from me Judyth, kia ora.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:06:59] Thank you. Theo. I'm going around the screen. So, Rowena, you're last for no other reason, except I'm going clockwise.

Prof Theo Farrell [00:07:10] Thanks, Judyth. And it's a real pleasure to be joining in this symposium from Dharawal Country. And I'd like to begin by acknowledging the traditional custodians of the lands in which the University of Wollongong is situated, and pay my respects to Elders past, present and emerging, and also pay my respects to any First Nations colleagues who are joining us on this symposium. I very much agree with Giselle, actually. So I think there is sort of a short term set of measures that we are focussed on because we're racing in to term in Australia just like New Zealand. And obviously what's happened now is an AI tool has come into general use, very wide use, and therefore we want to make sure we have appropriate measures in place to protect academic integrity. And there are challenges there. There's no question about it, because we you know, there's a lot of written pieces we need to do around and looking at assessment redesign and we're just not going to be able to do that in a very short space of time. But I also agree with Giselle that it's a much longer term play here, which is very exciting and very interesting. I think all of us on the call and many, many attending the symposium today, our institutions have a common mission, which is to prepare and empower students for their futures. And we've known for many years that the future is going to be profoundly reshaped by AI automation technologies. And so it's been pretty well signposted, actually. And so this is a good example of how we have to get on with the business of reshaping our higher education offerings and to better prepare our students for the future. So I'm sure we're going to get to these these discussions today. But for me, it's it's less of a panic. I just don't think that's there's some short term things that we just need to put in place. It's more around - it's a very exciting moment, actually in higher education. There's lots of opportunity here and I'm really looking forward to how we can get into realising those opportunities for our students and support our staff to do that.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:09:05] Rowena.

Prof Rowena Harper [00:09:08] Hi. I'm coming from Noongar country in Western Australia - Boorlo - a place many of you would know as Perth. Thinking about your questions Judyth, what is happening. I think artificial intelligence has been lurking on the periphery for most unis for some time, but I think ChatGPT has really been that tipping point. I think someone's used that phrase already. It's really crossed a threshold that really forces us to look at this technology and really incorporate it into what we how we function as universities to our learning, teaching and our research. What's really happening? I think that's an interesting ethnographic question. I think I, I think I read a really fantastic post by Jason Lodge from UQ on LinkedIn, and he pointed to this fantastic paper which talked about the fact that we we tend we really need to start distinguishing better between learning, that is actual learning that's happened and performance, and we've historically assessed students via artefacts: essays, reports, etc., through which we infer that learning has actually happened. And what we're now seeing

with ChatGPT is a tool that can replicate the artefact pretty successfully, so we're really going to need to step up our assessment approaches to better assess learning itself and not just the artefact. And we really need to try and work harder to better observe learning, support learning and assess the learning process, and not just products, you know, which which are not really going to be a good proxy for that process anymore. So I think what's happening here is that we're really confronting our kind of historical use of the artefact as a form of assessment, and we might see that in the longer term start to sort of fade away as a form of assessment. And what does it mean for universities and students? I think I think I'm hearing lots of people start to talk about collaborative intelligence, which is the recognition that the future will involve humans and machines working together, you know, the intersection of human learning and machine learning. And so I think this is really an opportunity for universities to focus on those really uniquely human skills that we need to develop more powerfully in students. Empathy, communication, teamwork, problem identification, and problem solving. It's really our opportunity to to really lift those up and elevate those in the curriculum in the way we teach and assess.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:11:38] Right. Great start. Thank you. There are already a number of questions. Just. Just a couple of short ones. Could you please indicate to people the title of the Malcolm Gladwell book?

Prof Giselle Byrnes [00:11:50] Oh, it's the "Tipping Point". Yeah. Yeah, it's a it's an oldie but goodie, as they say. I can't I can't remember the date of publication, but the term is often used just to signify a moment of crisis and opportunity when we can really leverage something that is new. Yeah.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:12:12] Okay. Thank you. And, Julia, could you tell expand on what you mean by signature learning pedagogies?

Dr Julia Christensen Hughes [00:12:20] Yeah. So, um, well, beginning with the signature learning outcomes that we've articulated and actually they reflect a lot of the items that Rowena was listing there. So what is it we, we want our students to be able to know, do and value? And then to be very thoughtful and creative about the learning experiences that we provide our students. So how do we facilitate their learning? This is all about becoming much more intentional and creative and Rowena I really liked what you were saying about the artefacts. I think we've used artefacts as a proxy for learning without really unpacking for the students. How do we set them up for success with deep learning? So a student here is provide me with a paper on this topic rather than us deliberately breaking that task apart and giving student feedback at every step of the way. It's the same as when we assign students to do a project out in the local community. Do we teach them how to enter and exit the community professionally? All the steps that need to be in place for them to maximise their learning from that. So I just don't think that we have been sufficiently thoughtful. We've made too many assumptions that when we assign work that all of this learning is going to occur. So I think we have to become much more specific about, again, what we want our students to know, do, and value; be very creative, very deliberate about how we facilitate their learning, and then make sure that the assessment is valid. You know, universities are full of researchers that are supposed to know about sort of evidence-based decision making. And I'm not convinced that we bring the same level of sophistication to assessing our students in their learning as we do to the other aspects of our scholarly work. The other point I just wanted to quickly make, because I was absolutely fascinated to read this week that both

Elsevier and Springer Nature have considered this question. It seems that a number of faculty were submitting papers and listing ChatGPT as a co-author, and they have ruled that that's not acceptable because ChatGPT or artificial intelligence can't be held accountable for the quality of the work, but that the use of ChatGPT as a tool, as a research tool must be acknowledged. And I was really fascinated by that. I think that that can give us some comfort. But to suggest, I think one of the really important skills students are going to have to learn is to be critical of what they read, to perhaps bring forward more editorial skills of looking at what has ChatGPT produced, if they had a question. And I think that it could share with them some structure, some interesting information, but then they need to critically assess that so that they could bring that work forward and then, you know, really develop their skills of information literacy to be a savvy consumer of information. So again, I think we've had academics, people working in our teaching centres, educational developers and instructional designers asking these questions forever. And I just we can't ignore them any longer. And that's why I'm excited about this. It's an opportunity to get really serious about student learning and to understand our own role in facilitating and assessing that.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:16:02] There's a question here for you, Rowena from Caroline Burleigh Porter. And it goes like this: "Many of the, in inverted commas, "alternative assignments" that are proposed as a way of dealing with ChatGPT: oral exams, projects with multistep components, are not feasible in large classes for those without sufficient competent support from teaching assistants and/or part time faculty and others who do not have much time. In addition, designing these new alternatives is time consuming, especially for part time faculty and other lower paid marginalised faculty. How do we balance this with deep learning and higher order thinking that we ideally want students to do in order to generally learn? And then I might get your response to that, Theo, because you're interested in short term and long term.

Prof Rowena Harper [00:16:52] That is. I'm so glad you posed that question. That is an absolutely fantastic question because I really actually think it gets to the crux of the issue. For some time, particularly since contract cheating really came to the fore as an academic integrity issue, there's been a really intensive focus in universities on assessment security and within our current structures where in every single unit we have probably at least three assessment points, at most universities, staff put an enormous amount of work into securing every single assessment point in a unit, every single assessment point in a course. And increasingly, that's becoming unsustainable. I look at some of the advice that's given to academic staff for how to secure assessment tasks, and I think it's unsustainable. And we know that a lot of that is not really explicitly recognised in things like workload models. For some time, a lot of educational researchers and academic integrity researchers have been pointing to programmatic assessment as a really useful way to kind of step out of this unsustainable system that this kind of rod we're making for our own back, if you like, around assessment security. And so programmatic assessment really entails fewer summative assessment points. Those assessment points you do have in a course, are highly authentic and invested with lots of resources, but really high quality, valid assessment. And then all your other resources that would typically go into lots of other summative assessment points go into actual teaching practice. Formative feedback, developmental feedback for students. There's some really interesting models of this happening around the world. I'm not aware of anywhere where it's really yet happening at scale, I think because the kind of structural inertia within universities makes it very difficult. But I'm sort of hopeful that this is a moment where we might actually really begin to seriously look at programmatic

assessment. So because it would address all those issues that were raised in that very good question.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:18:53] Thanks, Rowena. Theo.

Prof Theo Farrell [00:18:57] Thanks, Judyth. I'm just. Just before I pick up on this really interesting discussion that Rowena's kicked off, just to come back on and add to what Julia was saying, it was quite interesting in the nature editorial was how there's not really just simply the issue of of the ethical the ethical competence of ChatGPT, but also the fact that it doesn't actually write, it doesn't construct. So all it does is generate patterns as the nature article puts it, editorial, all it does is generate patterns of words based on statistical associations. And that's why sometimes it generates these fantastic howlers, you know, when it produces these answers. And so in that sense, you know, ChatGPT is not, it doesn't have the creative agency that a human has. And and I think this gets to we're in an interesting moment around part of how we can support and empower our students for their futures is helping them understand what can be expected of these AI tools. What do these tools do and what do they not do? And I suspect one of the challenges that we have in terms of overall preparing the general population and for the future that awaits us, is upskilling everybody to understand how to use AI in an ethically responsible way and to get the best of AI, but also to understand the limitations of AI. So in fact, that's part of one of the challenges we probably all face, which is how we provide that foundational knowledge.

Prof Theo Farrell [00:20:21] In terms of I think Rowena raised a really interesting point around, look, it's an opportunity for us to take a step back and think about assessment in a more deliberative way at a course level or programmatic level. And and this is where I mean, I personally think that, you know, certainly universities and my university, many universities are full of colleagues who are really passionate around learning and teaching, really committed to doing the best for their students. We all have to recognise that, certainly in Australia and New Zealand and many other countries, our academic colleagues have just been through a couple of really challenging years where we've asked a lot of them. Many have upskilled. Many have transformed what they've delivered through integration of digital technologies and we've kept on. A lot of that digital transformation has been locked in and is now obviously improving the experience of students. And now with ChatGPT, there's probably a sense that many academics are probably breathing a bit of a sigh of, Oh my gosh, now again, we have to lean in and once again redesign what we do. And so I think as academic leaders, we have to recognise the burden that's now falling on academic labour and support our and support our staff to be really empathetic in that. And at the same time, it is an exciting moment and perhaps it's thinking about things deliberately, as Rowena is saying, So how can we think about the mix? Where do we, where do we put the emphasis on protecting academic integrity, but where else do we put the emphasis in terms of innovation, particularly around authentic assessment? I mean, that's obviously been on the radar for ages. It's just it's quite difficult to do authentic assessment, and it's resource intensive, but thinking at a course level where at a course level, we can assure the academic integrity of assessment of learning outcomes and where we could do more creative stuff, more interesting stuff perhaps in some respects. And so it's about the balance of things. And broadly speaking, it's it's probably the case. I know from my own experience going back decades, it was always been the case that we over-assess, that we perhaps don't explain enough to students about the purpose of assessments. And so, again, as part of this very genuine engagement with students to help understand why they're

doing this assessment, how it helps them develop skills and and in that process, ourselves, thinking about, you know, where can we in in a in a resource efficient way protect academic integrity but also do some creative stuff that leverages the opportunities that AI provide, understanding what we can expect from AI and what we cannot expect from AI.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:22:52] Thank you. Can we just stick on this assessment piece? Because there's a question here from Carrie Chessels. She. She asked, "do you think faculty will increasingly rely on exams rather than invest the effort and time to develop a greater focus on authentic assessment practices. Assessment as for and learning of?" I'll open that up to anyone.

Prof Rowena Harper [00:23:17] I might kick off briefly, if that's okay. I think I can see that in the short term, in some discipline areas, they might need to fall back temporarily on exams while they think this through. But I actually think I actually think there is a desire among all the staff I've talked to to move towards more authentic assessment rather than back away from it, back towards exams. So my sense is that that's not a significant risk. I also think just the optics of falling back to exams. I mean, I think there's already a lot of discourse out there globally around the ongoing relevance of universities. I just think, do we want to remain relevant? I think the I think exams are play a role in us, in us, in our decisions. I think around how to position ourselves as really contemporary and relevant and speaking to what's happening in the world.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:24:21] Anyone else want to respond to that question? Giselle.

Prof Giselle Byrnes [00:24:26] Kia ora Judyth. Yeah, just two points. I mean, just going back to Rowena's comment about the complementarity between human skills and robots, and the importance of then recognising teaching and designing assessment around metacognitive skills and in the school curriculum, here in Aotearoa New Zealand, students have been encouraged for many years to engage in that kind of reflective practice in terms of how they're learning, what they're learning. And I think that we need to really push that further.

Prof Giselle Byrnes [00:24:58] The second point is around the programmatic assessment authentic assessment, and so on. Yes, in the past we've placed too much emphasis on the stacking of points or grades within a course or unit. And, you know, moving to pass-fail systems, we have disciplines here at my university that offers a pass-fail approach, which actually focuses much, much less on the acquisition of grades and much more on the formative process of learning. So I think I think we've got to really look in the mirror and ask ourselves some hard questions about that. But to question Judyth about the assessment piece and how we need to to keep amending what we do and reflecting on how that is actually preparing our students for the world beyond university. I mean, the reality is that AI is with us in every aspect of our lives. So I think is a huge challenge for universities globally to really think about what the purpose of education is. And it will impact research, as you've said Julia. So actually adopting that kind of critical, sceptical, self-reflective lens and take that approach, I think that's the best gift that we can give our students. Now, the impact that has then on our teachers, short term, I mentioned, you know, a couple of weeks runway to the start of semester one. Exams seem like an easy option to go back to, but it's and I do say go back because I think we made great strides forward, particularly those of us who have been distance providers for a long, long time like my university. I think exams have their place.

Absolutely. But let's not lose the momentum and the innovation that we have turned ourselves inside out for over the last three years. And let's keep challenging ourselves. You know, let's take that challenge that we push to our students, which is to challenge ourselves to be a learning community and to really leverage this moment to redefine what we mean by university so that as you say, Rowena, we are relevant because there are those big questions that are being asked out there at the moment. Kia ora.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:27:07] Julia.

Dr Julia Christensen Hughes [00:27:08] Yes. Thank you. So, yeah, I agree with all of these points. I think it's interesting if we reflect on Bloom's taxonomy. Right. There's there's some things we just need our students to know to be considered competent in a particular discipline or field like facts that they don't have to look at their phone for. But that just simply come to mind. And I think if you look at the flipped classroom model, then some quizzing can kind of quickly assess, do they have the basics? Then they can, you know, move on and do more complicated work and collaborative work in in class. I think one of the one of the opportunities that Yorkville has to to excel in that regard is that we're committed to very small classes. Most of our classes are around 20 students. So there is the opportunity for faculty to facilitate learning and in classrooms that if you had two or 300 students, for example, wouldn't be possible. But but in classrooms, I'm excited to see us use more of debate and presentations. So if a student has worked on a paper, then they present it and they can answer questions about it. That can help assess to what extent the student really understands, you know, the various aspects that they've written about. So I think that that's important. The other thing is, if you think of Boyer's forms of scholarship, my understanding of ChatGPT is that what it's really doing, you might think of this scholarship of integration. It's sort of reading those patterns of words that have been made available to it. Now, it's interesting. It doesn't have access, as I understand it, sort of behind the firewall of of university libraries. It has to be open access or sort of deliberately fed these patterns so that scholarship of of integration, but scholarship of discovery, scholarship of application, that's where we can involve our students in collecting data or applying something to their own lived experience. And I might add, right in the first person I read recently that what ChatGPT is really good at doing is mimicking the third person writing that makes it sound like no human was involved. I think the challenge for all of us is how do we embrace our humanity, have our students embrace their humanity in the learning process, and then apply what they're learning to their own lives. And I think that's some of the answer, and that's what we can create, that learning context and that assessment context in the classroom and beyond exams that can only test to it to a certain extent.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:29:55] Thank you. Theo, you've got your hand up.

Prof Theo Farrell [00:29:58] Yeah. Hi. So a couple of things, actually. I mean, one is obviously really terrific opportunities if you can teach in small classroom settings, this is fabulous. You can do all sorts of things. I think the challenge in some universities in Australia would be one of them is that we've got many classes that are very large, there's hundreds of students. And so then I think this is the challenge because the academic staff are obviously having just to manage a very large workload and now they're facing obviously they pardon me, they're now they're facing the challenge of having to innovate. And so there was a good point in the chat about how one of the things that AI also will help with, of course, and automation, is helping academics manage that very large workload. So as we're focusing on ChatGPT over here and we're

really concerned around its potential impact on academic integrity, there's some lateral benefits that can be realised quite quickly around how we can generate tools that enable academics to support very large numbers of students. In fact, it's something that we're doing and many other universities are probably doing. So there's multiple applications in AI here that enable us to offer a personalised experience to students at scale. That's and I think that's revolutionising the kind of the behind the scenes and support that universities can provide to students. A couple of points I did want to make, by the way, around both a drag on innovation and I think a driver of innovation. A drag of innovation is going to be I, I strongly suspect, the accrediting bodies, certainly in the Australian context. And so these are, you know, understandable professional bodies that do require students to graduate with quite a lot of knowledge. They want that to be absolutely assured. And they that could result in a push back towards more traditional forms of assessment. And that's going to be a I think, a quite well quite quite a degree of effort by universities to work with professional bodies to enable us to continue to innovate in assessment and assure accrediting bodies that students are graduating with necessary knowledge. So I think that's a piece of work that's going to be necessary for academic leaders working with our disciplinary colleagues. And the driver of innovation is going to be what happens next. So interesting, The New York Times reporting on ChatGPT, which is that's old tech. So the stuff that was the tool that was launched in November was, I believe, about one or two years old and it's not actually the new tech. So OpenAI was developing ChatGPT 4, but they weren't ready to launch it and they rushed ChatGPT 3.5 into market. So quite quickly there's going to be a new version. And of course we've all read about the \$10 billion investment in Microsoft in OpenAI we're probably going to have ChatGPT, a version of it integrated into Microsoft's suite of tools. We know Google has declared Code Red, so they're going to be rushing the development of AI. So I anticipate in 23 and 24 we're going to see a whole range of new generative AI tools with increasing capacity. And right now, to be honest, I don't know about colleagues. I'm sure you've all tried it, but if you actually get get ChatGPT to write an essay, as I've done in my in my area, you can see quite quickly how it's been - it's it's not a very good essay. And I think the ability for us to detect use of ChatGPT. I think it's reasonable at the moment, but these tools will develop very quickly. So that's going to drive innovation for us because basically if we don't innovate, we're going to engage in this race that we will lose between academic integrity and a new these new tools. So we have to go forward and embrace them. And that's where we get this kind of challenge of, for instance, you know, on the third to half of our courses, which are somehow subject to accreditation, I think we do need to work with the accrediting bodies to make them understand that there is no choice but to go forward. But I think that's going to be a complicated and quite timely engagement with accrediting bodies to bring them on this journey.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:34:03] Thanks. Thanks Theo. Because Rowena also had her hand up.

Prof Rowena Harper [00:34:09] Thanks I just wanted to circling back to the question that kicked this off, which was around exams. I think there is one critical thing that that if unis did go back to exams that they would miss. So that the use of exams in this context is really to try to prevent or prohibit the use of ChatGPT. But but if we do that as a strategy, students would actually learn how to use it. And I think in the learning how to use it, we've talked about a lot of things. We've talked about the importance of information, literacies, critical literacies, etc. in the learning to use ChatGPT. But I think there's also a really significant ethical dimension to learning about how to use ChatGPT

and its strengths and weaknesses. And also its kind of threats. And I do think our students are kind of ready for that. I mean, I think our students are really attuned in now, I think, to the ethics of what they use and consume everyday. They know where their coffee beans come from, they know where their furniture comes from, where their clothing comes from. They're tuned into issues like fast fashion, single use plastic. They're tuned in to things like worker exploitation and other social justice issues. And I think I think students are therefore quite concerned about integrity in its broadest sense. And so I think there's I think we do need to do better in universities at actually connecting students' concerns about integrity to how knowledge gets made and to how information gets generated. I think if we can connect those issues of information and knowledge to the broader social discourse around integrity, that that we will that will be an important step forward. I think for us, we can do that.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:35:52] Thank you. Assessments come up quite a few times in terms of the questions, so I'm going to throw this one out by, throw this to you not throw it out, from Kylie. "Programmatic assessment, authentic assessment, assessment for learning. These are all good ideas that have been around for a long time. But based on recent discourse, we seem to be unsatisfied with the progress we've made in higher education towards these ideals. And the question is why? Or, can you explain why this has happened?" Who wants to put their hand up for that one. Thanks Rowena.

Prof Rowena Harper [00:36:27] For me, I think it's those structural challenges that I mentioned briefly earlier. The way that we tend to take course learning outcomes and we unbundle them, fragment them down into unit learning outcomes, and the unit learning outcomes we then unbundle and fragment into assessment tasks. And we the way that we kind of organise units of learning and courses of learning within universities is we still do that in quite a siloed way, even though we try to engage in course-level mapping of learning outcome development, and course-level planning of assessments, once the semester gets underway, units of learning are very much managed by a unit coordinator and we tend to do the same thing not just with learning outcomes, but with budgets, with workloads, etc.. And so I do think that tackling some of these bigger challenges around trying to move towards programmatic assessment, authentic assessment, all those good practices we've listed, I think those things are constrained by some of those structural features of how universities actually work day to day. So I think we've got to tackle those. At the same time, we have to tackle the way financial flows work inside universities and we've got to tackle how we do workload allocation.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:37:42] Look there's another question here that is also an interesting one from Mark Israel, "Assuming that students will use AI tools such as GPT, how do we develop students' understanding of what their responsibilities are for the integrity of what they include within an assignment?" And Rowena you might like to you know, this is your area of specialisation. Do you want to make a start? And then we'll get others to respond.

Prof Rowena Harper [00:38:12] Could I just get you to repeat the question again Judyth?

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:38:14] Assuming that students will use AI tools such as GPT. How do we develop students' understandings of what their responsibilities are for the integrity of what they include within an assignment?

Prof Rowena Harper [00:38:27] I think partnering with your libraries and academic skills team I think is a good place to start. These are teams that for many years have been teaching information literacies have been teaching academic literacies. So I think embedding the development of those skills in that in the curriculum is critical. Taking an educative approach to this. Teaching students what the strengths weaknesses are of ChatGPT, how it can and can't be used as a tool, how it should and shouldn't be used as a tool in each discipline area, because each discipline is different. So I think there are teams in your universities who can help you with this, and I think partnering across institution is a good place to start there.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:39:11] Okay. Anybody else want to make a.

Prof Theo Farrell [00:39:15] I'd just offer a couple of...

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:39:15] No Julia put a hand up.

Dr Julia Christensen Hughes [00:39:17] Sorry. Sorry. Yeah. So some of our graduate programs, students learn asynchronous asynchronously and so they spend a lot of time reading things and posting their responses. And one of the ideas that we're beginning to play with is the notion that they would co annotate something that had been written in terms of challenging it and assessing it, working on it together. And I think that that would be a great opportunity for some kind of text that had been created from GPT. I know that and I've been watching in the chat. A lot of people are saying, but it's on a path and it will quickly and dramatically improve and I certainly accept that point. But some of the challenges that I read about it is it actually reflects the biases that are already embedded in a lot of information that's available on the Internet. And so as an example. ChatGPT was asked to give advice to a faculty member who had a student who was struggling in their course. Once they asked the question as if the instructor was a male. And then they asked it again, as if the instructor was a female when ChatGPT thought the instructor was a man, the advice essentially was for him to just tell the student to pull up his socks and get on with it. When it was a female, the advice was to offer to meet in office hours to provide all of this, you know, sort of additional encouragement and empathetic response. So I just use that as one example to again, make the point that it is imperfect, it reflects what's out there without judgement. It's not actually thinking. It's putting together patterns of words. And so I think by presenting our students or having them play with it and then together critiquing it and again that's back to that, becoming a savvy consumer of things that are written. I think that just the recent pandemic has shown us how, how much under threat the Academy is in terms of science and evidence. And we need all of our students to be equipped right, to be savvy consumers of information to turn that into knowledge, to have confidence in what they know. And so I think that there's so many things we can be doing. And I absolutely agree with the points being made and all the resources that are available on our campuses to help with that. So both inside and outside the classroom.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:42:02] Giselle, and then we'll have ...

Prof Giselle Byrnes [00:42:05] Kia ora. Thank you, Judyth. So I was just coming back to an earlier comment. We expect our academic faculty to be flying an aircraft while they're building it at the same time. We do that all the time, and leaders like us expect colleagues to spin on a dime. Pivot is one of the most overused words in our language I think, from the last couple of years. And I just want to pick up Thea's observation from a

couple of comments ago, and it loops into the question that was asked about why doesn't authentic assessment take hold? Why doesn't programmatic assessment stick? And it's because assessment is a part of a much more complex ecosystem. So I think it actually behoves those of us in leadership positions to cut through some of the bureaucracy that we've created for ourselves. We were liberated through COVID to be able to do this, and I suspect there's been a bit of a swing of the pendulum back to some of those processes, back to the sort of ritual and custom that we were comforted by. But actually I think it's about making swift decisions, giving real clarity to our academic teaching colleagues and to students, and really thinking about how we have the responsibility as leaders to try and shield teaching academics from the bureaucratic rain that they cope with every single day. So, you know, I'm constantly telling myself, you know, it's a great idea, you know, to keep the university innovating, to keep us ahead. But then what is the impact on our teachers in the classroom? So I think authentic assessment and the programmatic assessment and the other things that have been talked about here today - fabulous ideas. But I think the challenge is for us, how do we really start to lead? How can we speak directly to students about the nature of information and knowledge, as Rowena has been saying? You know, how do we square the circle in our communications? How do we really give that clarity of expectation? So that's what I'm challenging myself with. Kia ora.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:44:16] Thank you. Theo.

Prof Theo Farrell [00:44:18] Thanks, Judyth. Yeah. Just to pick up a few points from previous, I think Julia's spot on around the ethics issue. And this really is a moment now to obviously engage in in that discussion which other colleagues mentioned beforehand. I mean, I think Rowena's point I think you made it really, which is really fabulous about connecting these issues around integrity and ethics back to the broader social concerns that our students are bringing with them into university. I couldn't agree more, actually. In the area that I work on, which is is defence policy, military affairs. There's a ton of research on the ethics of AI and the use of AI in warfare because it's endemic in warfare now. And so there's a large body of academic work actually on the on the ethical use of AI, and I'm sure likewise in health and so forth. So it's a very rich stream that we can tap and we can bring in to also our teaching practice. So it's a it's actually an important and good moment for us in the university sector to really ponder and think in the broader sense around the ethics of AI. And it's one of the ways that we as anchor institutions in our societies are going to help shape a positive future for all as we move towards an age of automation. On this issue, and also I think there's a really interesting point which both Rowena and Giselle are talking about around the structure that we have in our universities of courses, courses and units, it's very structured how we deliver education offerings to our students. And so my university we've got hundreds of courses and it's built up over time obviously. We could be at a moment in time where we, because of new technologies that are coming on stream, we could be moving to a much more flexible mode of how students package their learning, their learning and their learning journeys. And so I would predict the next few years we're going to move perhaps to our existing structure of hundreds of courses and and, you know, to perhaps a fewer number of courses and technology enabling students to curate their own learning journey. I mean it's already happening in the private sector. And AI is going to power this. So in fact, we are probably had a moment where we're not really seeing the impact of AI round the around how it's helping students access content and with the implications for academic integrity, but AI is probably going to transform our future structuring and delivery of of of education offerings. And in that context, Giselle's point is critical. So the thing

that's going to slow us down to leverage technology to provide better opportunities for our students is our bureaucratic structures and our regulation. Partly it's down to our university cultures, partly it's down to external regulations. Regulators. Somebody previously in the chat made a really good observation with respect to accrediting bodies around how it's going to be a lot of cultural work actually, and cultural change, working with our external regulators and accrediting bodies and in our own university communities to really reimagine the future. You know, can we imagine a future where we empower student choice, we guide but empower student choice, and we liberate students to be able to actually curate their learning journeys too. Because the bottom line is there's a whole set of jobs that are coming down the line that right now we can't even imagine. But they're going to happen, you know.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:47:32] So we've got a couple of other people whose hands are up and there are a whole lot of questions that I'm trying to curate.

Prof Theo Farrell [00:47:40] Fair dues, fair enough.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:47:42] Rowena.

Prof Rowena Harper [00:47:43] Thanks. Yeah, I completely agree. In the long term, I think that at the TEQSA conference last year, the student panel was fantastic and all three students on that panel talked about the importance of being able to curate aspects of their own learning in their course, for getting them where they are today. So I so I completely agree in the long term.

Prof Rowena Harper [00:48:02] Thinking, too, in the short term just on that question of how we teach students. One of the things we're encouraging staff at ECU to do is get AI in some form into your marking criteria and assessment rubrics to give yourself an opportunity to give students feedback on their use of it. At ECU, we're following the approach of many other universities where we're acknowledging that students are likely to be trying to use ChatGPT in their assessments this semester. And we're requiring that if they do, they acknowledge it through some kind of citation acknowledgement, which we're giving them advice on at the moment. But we keep reminding staff that if a student uses ChatGPT in their assignment and they acknowledge it, it doesn't mean that it's a high quality assignment. It doesn't mean they have to pass. It might not be academic misconduct, but we have to distinguish between misconduct and a passing assignment. So incorporating into your rubrics and marking criteria is really good way just to start having that conversation with students.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:49:00] So we've got a question here from Deborah. "Using an anthropological analogy, students are moving from making pottery by hand to using the pottery wheel. New skills will be needed to use the tool effectively while still understanding the contents of the material used to create the artefact. So what new skills do you think using the tool will be needed to meet the learning outcomes through chatGPT?" Who it wants to take that one? Julia?

Dr Julia Christensen Hughes [00:49:32] Yeah, thanks. I think maybe a starting point is just to consider the profound ways in which all kinds of professions are being changed. And I'm thinking of if you were a student in a law school, for example, and it wasn't that many years ago that those students had to graduate, being prepared to look through all kinds of case law, synthesise something and come up with a recommendation. And now

it can happen instantly or or I'm thinking of journalism students or students in in marketing, that artificial intelligence, you know, the Internet even prior. I mean, all of this is revolutionising the workplace. And what students need to be able to know how to do to be fully competent. So I think we just have to move that back into the universities. And of course, our role isn't just to prepare students for for careers, but but lives of of meaning and purpose. And and so it is a host of things we want them to learn. But I think if we if we really can understand how profoundly the workplace is changing and use that right, I think we're going to have to engage more effectively with employers and the professions and and partner with them bringing that into our classes. But I would just want to reinforce the point several others have made earlier, that I absolutely understand that this has really profound implications for the role of the faculty and the skills they need to have and what do they need to feel confident in. And so I think one of the biggest implications of all of this is: what do we do to support our faculty? To help them continue to develop the skills that they need and also what what needs to happen in our graduate education programs that are preparing the future professoriate and that they can then bring bring this into their to their undergraduate classrooms. So I guess I'm just seeing a lot a lot of thinking, collaboration, partnering and skills development going on for all of us.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:51:50] Rowena.

Prof Rowena Harper [00:51:54] I think the pottery wheel is a really interesting analogy because I think for students - and I've done one pottery class in my life, but the student's really going to need to learn what can a pottery wheel help me do more efficiently and more effectively? And what do I need to continue doing by hand? The analogy works in lots of ways. I think in terms of I think students are really going to need to learn in relation to artificial intelligence and particularly these kind of algorithmic or machine learning tools that generate information. They're going to need to learn in much more depth what's under the hood. So how do those tools work? What information sources do they draw from? How do I know they're credible? They're really going to need to take those sort of critical information literacies to the next level by really learning how these tools function, because that's an important part of assessing the veracity of what comes out of them, their outputs. I think they're also going to need to learn to analyse very critically the quality of the outputs, what the outputs do and don't do. So if we think about what ChatGPT can do, it's designed, as we've said, to basically generate the most statistically likely responses to a prompt. And so it's not very good at divergent thinking. It's going to give you the most likely answer. So where do how can we use chatGPT as a kind of leaping off point for creativity? You know, looking at what did ChatGPT not think of? What's missing? How can we build on what's come out of the tool? It's really good at lists and it's really good at summarising. So what other formats of writing do we need to teach students? I think writing will remain an absolutely vital skill, it's not going away. We need to teach students to be powerful writers. When we hear from employers what the number one skill they look for is in graduates, it's communication, and writing is a really powerful tool for getting things done in a workplace. Think about persuasive writing. Think about the ability to argue, the ability to reassure, the ability to inspire through a piece of writing. So AI tools might get better at doing that over time. But students will still need the ability to assess the output of any tool against their purpose. What are they trying to achieve with a particular audience in a particular context to solve a particular problem? So it's that thinking of what's under the hood, but also what's coming out of it and being able to critically reflect on it and build on it is going to be the key skill set.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:54:39] Giselle.

Prof Giselle Byrnes [00:54:40] Oh, Kia ora. Yeah. Look at very similar response for me, I love the pottery analogy, so thank you to the person who volunteered that. I'm going to come back to graduate attributes. So the kind of higher level metacognitive skills that we say that we assess and that we develop in our graduates, you know, leadership, teamwork, you know, all of those things that used to be called 'soft skills', completely erroneously, because they are really the things that make us human. And going back to that theme of complementarity in regards to the question that was asked, I think that's where we should be focusing. So what can the robots do? What can the robots not do? What are the weaknesses or the pitfalls and the limitations of that? What does it mean to be human in the learning enterprise and endeavour? And I'm also struck by and I'm not a technical person, but I'm struck by the limitations of a tool like ChatGPT. It has a massive database, but it is it is finite. It cuts off at a certain point in time. And as others have noted, it's it's generative. It's it's an algorithm that matches statistically relevant facts. It doesn't actually go that next level one plus one equals three. So, you know, I think encouraging that scepticism in a healthy way, that's the purpose of education. And I would also add that from a Aotearoa New Zealand perspective there are huge questions about big data, about data sovereignty, about who owns it, about you know, all of that kind of stuff, the ethics of it that I don't think we've really touched on as yet, but I think they're big debates that are coming and we must have them. Kia ora.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:56:23] Thank you. There's a question here from Aaron Tan, and he's playing the devil's advocate. Will we accept AI as our colleague in the faculty? And if so, how do we train people to work with AI in the future? Which takes up the point that you made Julia about preparing staff to be able to support students. So who wants to respond to Aaron's provocation? Giselle.

Prof Giselle Byrnes [00:56:54] Kia ora, Yeah, thanks for the question. Terrific question. You know, I think in part we've touched on this and that, you know, where's the accountability for it? And I think probably there might be a nightmare scenario that many academics might be imagining, which is, you know, why don't administrators or leaders just fill the academy with bots? You know, there's a way to climb up the rankings. There's a way to, you know, really be productive. Why have teaching assistants when we can have AI bots? I think it comes back to and I absolutely hope that doesn't happen, that's a total nightmare. Then it comes back to, what does it mean to be human? And what are those skills that our students need to learn that our researchers value because it's the way they collaborate in research units and with industry and in the wider communities whom we are here to service? And I think it's that human piece that we need to be really sharp about defining and actually narrating and communicating so that the external world outside the university campus understands what we do a vis a vis the robots and the AI. So I don't think that's going to happen. But I think, again, the onus is on us to communicate why not.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:58:11] Julia.

Dr Julia Christensen Hughes [00:58:15] Thank you. So I just wanted to pick up on something Giselle said, because I actually think that in terms of academic integrity. So I'm looking at this thinking, AI meets AI, right, artificial intelligence and academic integrity. That in terms of the sort of the temptation to cheat, if you will, I wonder to

what extent that might hold more true for faculty than for students. I was reading a piece today that showed that it was some finance faculty, and by feeding in 200 abstracts from recent finance papers that it was able to produce work that made it through peer review and would have been accepted. And so I think to me, as part of this discussion, we also have to think about how we have assessed faculty and this the whole sort of publication game. I'm going to say that in quotation marks, where it seems to me like the number of publications has started to count more than the quality of the work in some quarters. And I think driven by metrics that, you know, rank in universities and rank in different business schools, for example, I've done some work in that area. I actually think then as well as talking about authentic assessment of students, we might want to consider authentic assessment of the faculty and and really understand the faculty members role in terms of the creation and dissemination of knowledge with impact. I'd like to see faculty rewarded more for working in partnership with organisations contributing to development of policy and improvement of society. There's been a proliferation of journals around the world. If people can't get peer reviewers anymore, there's so much work that needs to be done in that regard. I'm actually quite concerned about the reputation of the Academy writ large in terms of both the work of the faculty and the degrees we confer. So I just wanted to throw that in as well. I think I think we've got we've got a lot of thinking to do about publication in general.

Prof Judyth Sachs [01:00:40] And I'm afraid our time is up. And what a great statement to finish on. And I think we have our work ahead of us. But the thing that I would really picked up is the intersection of human learning and machine learning, and the soft skills that are required to learn in universities is a good starting point. So so thank you for that Rowena. At our best, we had a thousand people who signed on, which is remarkable. So I'm sure that this will be a topic that we'll be discussing in future. And thank you all. And I wish you all a safe and healthy day. And I'll see you the next time.

Dr Julia Christensen Hughes [01:01:16] Thanks very much.