



Pwyllgor / Committee: Pwyllgor Gwella Academaidd – Academic Enhancement Committee

16/05/2023

Teitl / Title: Generative AI update

Awdur / Author: Mary Jacob, LTEU, IS

I'w gyflwyno yn y cyfarfod gan / To be presented at the meeting by: Mary Jacob

Dyddiad / Date: 26/04/2023

1. Rhowch restr o'r atodiadau os gwelwch yn dda / Please list attachments

n/a

2. Prif bwyntiau / Key points

1. The Turnitin AI detector tools has been enabled, so we need to let staff know they can use it for red flags about AI use but not for conclusive evidence.
2. We recognise the need to develop standard wording for assignment cover sheets.
3. The biggest risks for students are academic integrity, using false information, and bypassing the learning process due to relying on AI-generated content.
4. Our best advice for staff is to be clear with your students about what is acceptable and what isn't, as well as the reasons behind each assessment. Emphasise how carrying out the assignments will enable students to learn.
5. AI literacy will be increasingly important for both staff and students.
6. The UAP regulation has been updated and new wording distributed by Registry.
7. AI applications available to the public are developing rapidly. Other AI tools beyond ChatGPT are available with more anticipated. Generative AI is being embedded in Office 365.
8. Our materials are available on the [Generative AI webpage](#).

3. Y camau sy'n ofynnol gan y pwyllgor / Action required by committee:

Ensure that departments in each Faculty have conversations with their teaching staff and that key messages are transmitted to students as appropriate.

Creation of Generative AI Working Group

In response to discussion at AEC and input from Tim Woods, we have created a working group to coordinate the university response. The group has the following members:

- Steve Atherton, School of Education and Academic Integrity Officer
- Elizabeth Manners, AberSU
- Anna Cole, Registry
- Anita Saycell, Academic Engagement, Information Services, Sarah Gwenlan as alternate
- Alex Taylor and Gil Greengros, Psychology
- Neil Mac Parthalain, Computer Science
- Panna Karlinger, School of Education
- Mary Jacob, LTEU Information Services, serving as Working Group Chair

The group has collaborated on a guidance document for staff, available on the [LTEU Training Resources](#) webpage. We are currently discussing updates to the web page and guidance document for next academic year as well as training for both staff and students. Please see the [LTEU blog](#) for a forthcoming post with expanded advice for marking. We are waiting for translation and anticipate that the blog post will be published by the May AEC meeting.

We disseminated the staff guidance document via departmental Directors of Learning and Teaching and Associate Deans. Recognising that there is no 'one size fits all' approach, the aim is for each department to work out consistent ways to talk about generative AI with their students, appropriate for their disciplines and teaching contexts.

The AberSU has surveyed students and will be updating their [UAP guidance for students](#).

At Academic Board, Steve Atherton presented revised wording for the [Regulation on Unacceptable Academic Practice \(UAP\)](#) to address the unethical use of generative AI for student coursework. Registry has widely disseminated the new wording and Mary has added that information to the [Generative AI section](#) of the LTEU webpage.

Overview of ChatGPT and Generative AI

In December 2022, a new tool for generative Artificial Intelligence (AI-assisted writing) was introduced. There has been a great deal of discussion in the media and across the global HE sector about the risks and implications of this for assessed student work.

Tools such as ChatGPT can write computer code, essays, reports, poems, business plans, responses to exam questions, and more in just a few minutes. Opinions in the higher education sector range from utopian to dystopian. Some feel it may mean the end of giving students writing assignments. Others feel that it could open up new opportunities to promote critical thinking and deep learning, possibly moving to an 'ungrading' model. Some wish to police students, using AI to catch cheating, but this is likely to fail because the AI evolves quickly and students will be able to avoid detection. Some have suggested that staff use AI to generate feedback on students' work. Others note that this suggestion has serious risks as AI-generated feedback is likely to discourage original thinking and tend towards a generic approach rather than detailed feedback closely based on what students have written.

The implications of AI such as ChatGPT on student assessment are significant. Our university has already updated the UAP regulation. Longer-term goals include reconsidering assessment design, as other institutions are currently doing.

Key points

- **How it works** - Generative AI tools are not 'intelligent' but sophisticated predictive text tools that have been trained on vast amounts of data from the internet and other sources.
- **Can bypass learning** –
 - Use of these tools to write assignments can circumvent learning. It is possible for a student to submit an essay for a good mark without learning anything at all.
 - Generative AI can write computer code or give good answers to medical examination questions, but to what extent are we happy with a 'good' answer if the student isn't able to write the code or answer the question themselves?
 - Generative AI is already having an impact on contract cheating companies. This situation is currently developing and we don't know the full implications yet.
- **Can be false or misleading** –
 - The information presented as 'facts' in AI-generated text is often incorrect or misleading.
 - Generated citations look plausible but often are 'hallucinated' or fake (e.g. the journal is real but doesn't have the article cited).
- **AI detection tools cannot provide conclusive evidence** – They can only provide red flags for further checking.
- **Banning is not likely to be effective** - Some universities and schools initially blocked ChatGPT on campus, but this is not likely to be effective, because students can access it from off-campus.
- **It is likely to become pervasive very quickly** –
 - It has received so much press that many students are already aware of it.
 - Microsoft is incorporating this technology into Microsoft products, including the Bing search and Office 365.
 - Other companies such as Google are rapidly deploying their own tools.

Actions for Semester 2, AY2022/23

1. **Updated UAP guidelines** - Redefined definition of unacceptable academic practice to include the unethical use of AI in assignments
2. **Designed guidance for teaching staff** to be used in conjunction with the [QAA briefing](#):
3. **Consider what we tell students about assessment**, e.g.
 - a. Focus on the learning process of doing the assignment
 - b. Use course materials from Aspire reading list and other library resources
 - c. Go beyond repeating facts to demonstrate what they learned
 - d. Be specific, avoid overly-general statements
 - e. Give concrete examples, etc.
4. **Use marking strategies to follow up on red flags**, e.g.
 - a. Chase up unfamiliar references to see if the article is real and appropriate
 - b. Look for concrete examples, not vague generalities
 - c. Check factual information

Things to consider in the longer term

1. Reconsider the purpose and design of assessment overall, incorporating authentic assessment where appropriate.
2. Review and update learning outcomes to make them more task-based and less content-based as appropriate.
3. Redesign some assessments incorporating process writing, patchwork text, reflection.
4. Require a verbal element to some coursework where appropriate.
5. Use AI as a tool to educate students in critical thinking during in-class sessions. See examples from the sector (e.g. [Digitally-Enhanced Education Webinars](#)) for ideas.
6. For disciplines where use of AI is likely to be part of the workplace, provide in-class training on how to use it well. This will need to be highly discipline specific.
7. It will be impossible to completely prevent AI use in assignments. We need to train students and staff to use appropriately.

Selected resource list

1. Anthony, P. (11/1/2023), [AI and Higher Education: Is it time to re-think teaching and assessment?](#), *Education Directorate, University of Kent*
2. Bates, T. (2/1/2023), [Playing with ChatGPT: now I'm scared \(a little\)](#), *Online Learning and Distance Education Resources*
3. Bruff, D. (5/1/2023), [A Bigger, Badder Clippy: Enhancing Student Learning with AI Writing Tools](#), *Agile Learning: Derek Bruff's blog on teaching and learning*
4. Compton, M. (10/1/2023), [Who's Afraid of ChatGPT?](#), *Teachers going Gradeless blog*
5. D'Agostino, S. (12/1/2023), [ChatGPT Advice Academics Can Use Now](#), *Inside Higher Education*
6. Forsyth, R. (5/1/2023), [ChatGPT: What should educators do next?](#), *Assessment in Higher Education blog*
7. Jisc [National Centre for AI in Tertiary Education blog](#)
8. Kovanovic, V. (15/12/2022), [The dawn of AI has come, and its implications for education couldn't be more significant](#), *The Conversation*
9. Maloy, R. W., Trust, T., Butler, A. & Xu, C. (n.d.), 9. [Teacher and Student Guide to Analyzing AI Writing Tools \(e.g., ChatGPT\)](#), *Critical Media Literacy and Civic Learning*
10. Mills, Anna (2/2/2023), [What to do about AI text generators? Next steps for educators](#), *National Academic Integrity Network, QQI*
11. National Academic Integrity Network (3/2/2023), [What to do about AI text generators? Next steps for educators](#) (1-hour video), *Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI)*
12. Phipps, Lawrie (27/3/2023), [Means. Motive, Opportunity: A Composite Narrative about Academic Misconduct](#), *Jisc National Centre for AI in Tertiary Education*
13. QAA (22/3/2023), [ChatGPT: To Ban or Not Ban?](#) (1-hour video), *QAAtube*. **We highly recommend watching Michael Webb's 8-minute explanation** in plain English about how AI detectors work, what they can and cannot do.
14. QAA (30/1/2023), [The rise of artificial intelligence software and potential risks for academic integrity: A QAA briefing paper for higher education providers](#), *QAA News*
15. Stanley, G. (n.d.), [Approaches to Process Writing](#), *British Council Teaching English*
16. UCL Arena Centre (4/1/2023), [Designing assessment for academic integrity](#) "Evidence-based recommendations for designing teaching, student support and assessment in the era of

digital assessment and artificial intelligence with the aim of developing good academic practice.”, *Teaching Toolkits UCL Arena Centre*

17. University of Kent Digitally Enhanced Education Webinar series (16/3/2023), [Teaching with ChatGPT: Examples of Practice](#) (video playlist)
18. Webb, Michael (17/3/2023), [AI writing detectors – concepts and considerations](#), *Jisc National Centre for AI in Tertiary Education*. He notes: “**AI detectors cannot prove conclusively that text was written by AI.**”