
MINUTES

Subcommittee on Teaching and Learning

Wednesday, January 18, 2022 (1:00pm – 2:00pm)

Remotely through Zoom

Present: Manuel Balán, Robin Beech, Farhan Bhanji, Christopher Bundle, Andrea Creech, Catherine Dupressoir (Acting Secretary), Adam Finkelstein, Nathan Hall, Roni Khazaka, Jordan Koch, Leigh Korey, Jennifer Ronholm, Giosina Rota (for Tina Piper), Derek Tannis, Tamara Western, Laura Winer (Chair)

Regrets: Didem Dagdeviren, Tina Piper, Jenn Riley, Nancy St-Pierre, Brittany Williams

Guests: Alexander Liepins, Carolyn Samuel

1. *Administrative (10 min)*

- a. Welcome and introductions
- b. Adoption of the agenda: agenda was adopted as circulated
- c. Approval of the minutes, May 4, 2022: the minutes were adopted but not circulated
- d. Business arising: no business arising was identified

2. *Discussion*

a. *Impact of AI writing tools on assessment (Laura Winer & Adam Finkelstein)*

Given the growing popularity of AI tools of which Chat GPT is one example, a discussion of their impact on assessment was held. In particular, the subcommittee was asked for their comments on:

- Strategies to move the discussion forward,
- What are the potential teaching and learning implications vis a vis assessment and academic integrity,
- Brainstorming of immediate, short-term and long-term goals

Following a presentation (shared with STL following the meeting), discussion ensued; below are highlights along with broader themes identified.

i. **Academic integrity & Student Code of Conduct**

- Of major concern is violations to the Student Code of Conduct. While there is some urgency to the discussion, any changes to the Code of Conduct will require consultation with students and instructors. Any discussion will be led by the Dean of Students and should involve students and the Writing Centre.
- Some questions raised include how to detect a student using a bot in their work, and what the consequences should be. The University's plagiarism article defines plagiarism

as using another **person's** work. The article states that students cannot submit answers that were fabricated. This does not specifically include the use of AI, but the definition of a fabricated answer could be stretched.

- It is important to manage our expectations about the ability to accurately detect if students are using AI in their assessments. As the technology that detects the use AI is not reliable, giving both false negatives and false positives, we should instead look at assessments themselves and focus on the process of writing. To protect students and instructors, caution is strongly encouraged when using detectors.

ii. **Impact on learning & assessment of learning**

- Should Oral exams be covered in the current assessment policy? What is the proper way to use oral exams in assessments?
- A short-term goal would be to develop mechanisms for adapting assessments, ex. less take-home exams/assessments.
- A long-term goal concerns how to assess student's writing. If all writing assessments from lower and mid-level courses are removed, how can instructors teach students to write and develop the related thinking skills? It is important students continue to learn to think for themselves. Since this tool creates custom made articles on demand, students should be able to read it, learn from it, cite it, but not copy it.
- Are there ways for instructors to implement AI tools in their assessment?
- To deter students from using AI tools, instructors could ask for personal opinions and examples in writing assessments. However, a bot can also create "personal" examples.
- Many students use this tool to save time. However, some students are not using it, for fear of getting in trouble.
- The students should clearly indicate which parts of an assessment were copied from an AI tool. The assessor would then be able to decide if the student receives a 0 for the work or if using AI is part of the assessment.

iii. **General Comments**

- AI writing tools do not impact all fields in the same way; the effect may be heterogenous, therefore care needs to be taken when making broad statements about the impacts of these tools.
- These tools can move fields forward. Demonizing or being afraid of this tool is worrisome.

iv. **Action**

- Laura, Chris and Robin will discuss short-term steps and forward recommendations to APC for discussion
- Members are to let Laura know by end of day Friday if they would like to be a part of the working group that will be tackling the medium to longer term questions raised. In addition, they will signal if additional people should be part of this working group.