

Chat with us:

Exploring the current conversation around ChatGPT and other Large Language Models in Post-Secondary Education



Applied Research project by Janet Ready and Shannon Wall,
Faculty Recreation Studies Department, Langara College
May 2023

This work was written on the ancestral, unceded and occupied territories of the x^wməθk^wəy'əm (Musqueam), Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish), Lkwungen (Songhees and Esquimalt) and Səl'ílwəta? (Tseil-Watuth) nations of the Coast Salish peoples - whose relationship with the land is ancient, primary and enduring. We would like to acknowledge our privilege to be here learning, living and working on these lands.

We are grateful for the knowledge that was shared for this work by faculty at Langara College.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
BACKGROUND	5
KEY ISSUES	6
Conversations with Langara College Faculty	8
1. Approach to AI/Chat GPT in teaching and Learning at Post Secondary	8
2. Critically thinking about AI/Chat GPT	10
3. Biased Information	11
4. Privacy Issues	12
5. Rationale for using or not using AI in teaching	12
6. Strategies that sound good but may not work as planned	13
7. Detection	14
8. If AI does the thinking – then how are students learning?	15
9. How faculty are using it in their teaching / framing it for the students	16
10. Strategies in teaching/learning with AI	17
11. Leadership at Langara	17
Researcher Learning	19
Faculty Roundtable discussion May 1, 2023, action items and notes	21
Resources	23
Appendix A - Homework for faculty in preparation for Roundtable session May 1	25

Executive Summary

The following report is a snapshot in time of our current environment of Chat GPT at Post Secondary. The writers understand that this is a very fast-moving environment with LLMs and AI, ChatGPT being the most used currently within Post Secondary. The purpose of this report was to gather information from current resources (podcasts, webinars, news articles, journal articles) and Langara College faculty to provide curated information to the Recreation Studies Faculty and perspectives of why and how Chat GPT/LLMs could be used responsibly and ethically in our recreation courses and to learn more about its potential in teaching and learning. The writers have tried to provide thoughtful perspectives that encourage a critically informed approach to help instructors navigate this ever-changing landscape. This report, in addition to the ChatGPT presentation from Langara College TCDC, Edtech, Academic Integrity office at the April 17th faculty meeting, and faculty completion of homework, moved us to a Round Table Recreation Studies faculty meeting on May 1st where we talked about how to move forward with a shared understanding as faculty and a critical, consistent approach to how we talk about this and use it with students in our courses.

This report outlines the background of ChatGPT/LLMs, key issues, conversations with faculty at Langara College, resources, and pre-work that faculty completed prior to the May 1st meeting; as well as the agenda, notes and take-aways from that meeting.

It is clear that there is still a lot to discuss when it comes to AI and LLM's, but this research and facilitated discussion got the ball rolling in the right direction for our Recreation faculty, and we look forward to many more discussions around this topic in the future.

Background

In recent years, there have been rapid advancements in the field of Artificial intelligence, including the development of Large Language Models (LLMs) like ChatGPT, Articoolo, Wordsmith, Jarvis, DALL-E, Jasper, CopyAI, Rytr and others. LLMs are artificial intelligence tools that can read, summarize and translate texts and predict future words in a sentence, letting them generate sentences similar to how humans talk and write. The implications of these AI content generators for higher education are vast and can leave instructors feeling overwhelmed. This research project aims to explore the conversation around using LLMs in higher education, and whether we as instructors can or should use them in our courses.

Our belief as faculty researchers is that we may wish to use ChatGPT and other AI applications to support learning and teaching within our Recreation Studies Department at Langara College, but we need to understand more about why they were created and how they are being promoted within the market. This research project provided different perspectives of AI to help the Recreation Studies faculty team to make an informed decision about if/how we could use it within our courses, and how we can help students to work alongside AI in their studies. The researchers aimed to create a shared understanding of the technology and its advantages, disadvantages and barriers. In doing this we are modelling curiosity, humility, adaptation and leadership with new technology. These are all skills that will serve the students well in their work at Langara College and in the field of recreation in the future. If as faculty researchers we accept that there are AI generators and AI writers in the world and our students are using them, and we can use them as well, we move into a more positive position to create conversations about how to responsibly use them and level the playing field so all students have the opportunity to use them if they choose. We also encourage ourselves as faculty to learn how to look for opportunities to engage in more process-focused and critical thinking with the students. This process of learning engages us in deeper learning about how to learn within this new AI environment, and what learning is important for students.

Key Issues

There are many ethical issues surrounding large language models (LLMs) like ChatGPT that have been identified by researchers, policymakers, and others. Here are some of the key ethical concerns:

- **Origins:** ChatGPT was not designed for educational purposes, but to be a general-purpose language model that can generate human-like text and perform a wide range of natural language processing tasks, such as language translation, question answering, text summarization, and more. It was developed by OpenAI to advance natural language processing and to provide a powerful tool for a variety of applications, from chatbots and virtual assistants to automated content creation and customer support. As faculty members, we need to be cognizant of the fact that this is a tool not made explicitly for the education sector, and view it critically as a result.
- **Bias and fairness:** One of the main ethical issues with LLMs is that they can perpetuate and even amplify existing biases in society. These biases can manifest in several ways, such as reinforcing stereotypes, amplifying hate speech, and perpetuating systemic discrimination. This can have serious consequences for marginalised groups, leading to further marginalisation and discrimination.
- **Privacy:** ChatGPT requires vast amounts of data to function effectively, which can raise concerns around privacy and data security. There is a risk that sensitive personal information could be exposed or misused, and that students may not have control over how their data is used or shared.
- **Responsibility and accountability:** ChatGPT can generate large amounts of text that may be difficult to trace back to their source or identify who is responsible for them. This raises concerns around accountability, particularly in cases where the generated text may be harmful or have unintended consequences.
- **Deception and authenticity:** ChatGPT is capable of generating highly convincing fake text, which raises concerns around deception and authenticity. This could be used to spread false information or propaganda, impersonate individuals, or even manipulate public opinion.

- **Intellectual property:** ChatGPT relies heavily on copyrighted material to train their models, which raises questions around intellectual property and fair use. There is a risk that LLMs could be used to infringe on intellectual property rights or undermine the value of creative works.
- **Academic integrity:** Because ChatGPT has the potential to generate text that closely resembles human-generated text, it can be tempting for students to use it to complete assignments or assessments that are meant to be completed independently. As instructors, we will need to set clear guidelines for the use of ChatGPT and other AI in assignments, discussion questions, and online exams.
- **Equity and Access:** Although ChatGPT is currently free for students to use, it will soon be a pay-for-use service. The newest version of ChatGPT (4) is behind a paywall of \$20US/month. This will put students who can't afford to pay at a disadvantage and will create an unequal playing field. It will also make it difficult for instructors to design assignments and DQs for students, understanding that some will be able to use ChatGPT, and some won't.
- **Restricting thinking:** How are we limiting ourselves and our thinking by using tools that build upon known knowledge? What about new knowledge?

Conversations with Langara College Faculty

The following section contains information from conversations with ten faculty in different disciplines at Langara College about AI/ChatGPT. The purpose of these conversations was to gather and share perspectives about how faculty approached Chat/GPT, if and why they used this in their teaching and if they did, how they framed it with the students. This section has been organized into the themes that emerged from these conversations.

Approach to AI/Chat GPT in teaching and Learning at Post Secondary

One consistent thread through all of the conversations was that AI/ChatGPT is not going away, and it is the responsibility of instructors to understand it and work with students to ethically and critically engage with it. The main focus of instructors was on being proactive in understanding and working with this new technology. There was acknowledgement that we are building this in flight and instructors are at various points of the spectrum in understanding this technology and how impacts the learning process in their courses. This is not an educational software designed by teachers for teaching and learning, it is a market software that has a different purpose and different ethical considerations around privacy and information.

The new versions of LLMs and ChatGPT are sophisticated, powerful and fast. Although AI has been around for a while, recent content generators like ChatGPT are increasingly user friendly and it feels like this is a new world for instructors to try to figure out. There was agreement that it is an incredible tool. One instructor said when he started experimenting with ChatGPT he went through stages of disbelief – that it can actually do what it does. Its writing is so good. One instructor asked it to write a policy for college on student attendance. The response was well written and relevant; it lacked the specific context of Langara College but it created a strong starting point. It could be a brilliant foundation for any kind of writing. One of the take home points is that it is going to change how we assess learning and how we use face-to-face time. There may be a need for greater human connection, assessments like oral exams, and open-ended conversations to assess learning. More focus on skilled instructor pedagogy is needed to navigate this new environment.

Many instructors felt that AI/ChatGPT was a catalyst to moving instructors faster in the direction of more authentic assessment, reevaluating assessment and pushing to really understand what learning is, where the value of learning is in the course and how students can show they are learning (having

students produce an artefact of their learning). This AI disruption creates an opportunity to think about why we are assessing the way we are assessing and have conversations about grading for equity. Using authentic assessment, low stakes formative assessment and focusing on the process instead of the product are strategies that instructors said they are using to focus on learning within this ChatGPT environment. Some instructors felt that incorporating AI into their course didn't add value to the course learning and shifted to restricting use through course contracts and agreements. Each discipline had a different approach based on what they were teaching and how that was reflected within the current capability of AI such as ChatGPT. Instructors identified renewed focus on what the learning outcomes in their course were and what they are trying to teach their students. Instructor approach was also dependent on the course delivery model -- whether they were in-class or asynchronous on-line courses.

Approaches to ChatGPT were mixed. There was curiosity, excitement, hesitancy and a desire to learn more. Most instructors agreed that if you are going to embrace it, you need to know what it does and approach it with a curious and critical perspective. Some instructors indicated it has led to high level questions about the role of teachers at Post Secondary, what we are assessing and what we want the students to show that they are learning. One instructor shared that there was excitement in how AI/ChatGPT could create intersections of information and learning that may not yet exist – that maybe there was an opportunity to identify spaces of learning and information within AI that we haven't thought of before.

One instructor shared that he saw it affecting the role and capacity of Edtech departments – emphasizing two roles, one introducing software to instructors, the other a higher-level role, which involved thinking strategically about the role of technology within teaching and learning and playing the role of ethicists as well. Instructors saw the development of Chat GPT increasing the importance of ethics education and conversations with students about academic integrity.

There was agreement that currently students are using it and this needs to be acknowledged by instructors within their courses. Instructors identified the responsibility to lead critically informed conversations about AI with their students, outline how they want it used within the learning environment to create a level playing field and ensure a clear understanding of how students can use it ethically and responsibly.

Some instructors talked about the difference between how humans think and generative AI – as a LLM it chooses the most highly probable words that come next in a statistical algorithm. Is that what we are assessing? Is that what we want students to learn? Should we shift the focus in pedagogy to more

formative learning, building to summative learning, there was awareness that this may be a catalyst to move toward different types of learning such as portfolio learning and self regulated learning.

Instructors acknowledged that understanding AI, examining and updating courses and assessments increase workload and capacity. One instructor talked about the gap between how students are using AI/ChatGPT and instructors' capacity to shift learning and assessment to catch up. Academic integrity violations may increase in this gap, instructors need to be good to themselves in recognizing this and know that it may get bumpy before some instructors can catch up.

Critically thinking about AI/Chat GPT

Within the conversations, there were concerns about use of AI within teaching and learning. Key areas include AI information being biased, privacy issues about asking students to enter information when AI programs are using this information to continue to test the market and grow; and how to assess whether students are doing their own learning. Approaching with a critical lens was a consistent theme within the conversations. Many instructors were actively involved in learning more about ChatGPT through following twitter, podcasts, and news articles.

Biased information

Chat GPT or other AI/LLMs are only as correct as the majority of the information on the internet. One instructor brought up an example of asking AI for an image of a beautiful woman. The image is a white, thin woman. Another example is that ChatGPT was asked to provide information about the best restaurants in a city. Mexican restaurants were placed at the bottom of the list even though their google reviews had high star ratings, because there is a higher probability of "Mexican" having negative connotations in the data, so ChatGPT put them at the bottom of the list. Data that is being used in AI is generally from first world countries, so biases reflect that. AI does not critically assess the data, it generates information based on prediction of the highest used words and phrases.

In our current society, social media perpetuates marginalisation, we overlook that a lot and a Chat GPT tool does not distinguish between discriminatory or inclusive remarks. There is a big concern with blindly accepting this; we as educators need to question it. This is an important note for our Recreation Studies Department to think about. Instructors identified hesitations based on moral and ethical views about using tools to increase marginalisation. There was acknowledgement that not enough is known about AI, algorithms could be used with weighting of discriminatory or inclusive language. Instructors have an important responsibility in making sure students are aware that social media has an impact on

people, systemic discrimination and marginalisation and that the bias within AI could perpetuate this. Instructors should be working with students to critically think about where the data comes from and how it builds on current biases, and marginalisation. Instructors talked about encouraging students to question in a way of good faith, they are welcome to engage if they know what it does. Students should clearly understand that when they use AI, they are contributing to it as well so they are not blindly providing data to social media.

ChatGPT is a hot topic but there is a deeper impetus to critically examine how AI and social media affect policy. How it affects funding for equity and inclusivity. There is currently not a lot of motivation to push those ideas. Another way to tackle these issues within the classroom conversation about AI is having specific content to talk about how technology shapes those values. Questioning social media instead of accepting that it's all equal, all providing knowledge. Students should be learning how and why AI contributes to marginalisation.

Privacy Issues and Access

Privacy issues and ethics of how the information is used by Open AI or other content creators continues to be a fuzzy area and a concern to instructors. Instructors questioned whether they should be asking students to contribute information to AI content creators that is contributing to the market test research. What type of information could be inputted and what type might connect to privacy issues (resumes or other information that may identify the student)?

Questions also came up in the conversations about whether there were privacy issues if students were entering assignment and exam information without asking permission from the instructor.

There was also acknowledgement that there are peak times for usage of ChatGPT and during these times access can be restricted so it may not always be available to students. Furthermore, ChatGPT4 (the newest version of ChatGPT) is behind a paywall with a subscription fee of \$20US/month which leads to questions of equitable access for students.

Rationale for using or not using AI in teaching

Instructors were at various points in using or not using ChatGPT in their courses. It depended on the discipline, course content, and course delivery (on-line asynchronous, mixed mode, or in person). Some instructors adopted the mindset of learning alongside students, asking critical questions about where the information is sourced, how it is created and how it supports or disrupts the learning process for the

student and having conversations with the students about these issues. In some cases students were given choices to use AI or not in their assignments. There was an understanding that faculty cannot know everything about these AI tools as they continue to shift rapidly and there was some grace in the gap between students currently using them and instructors shifting assessments to address this.

Some instructors experimented with using ChatGPT to create lesson plans and found that it was an interesting process to think about. Some instructors who had more applied courses said they use AI in their own field work to create information for websites, emails to clients and create opportunities for students to use it in the same way in their courses to reflect how they could be using it in their work.

Most of the instructors had inputted exam questions and various assessments in their course into ChatGPT to see what the results were and were surprised with the sophistication of the answers (although this did vary based on the discipline). One instructor said he threw every question from midterms and final exams at it to see what it said. The course had an open book midterm, he would see the answers that GPT would put out and for any answer that it got right, he re-worded the question. All instructors said it prompted them to think about their assessments and how students were asked to prove their learning within the course. This prompted them to shift how their assessments were set up, with more focus on the process over the product. If instructors let students use AI in course assignments, students were asked to acknowledge this through citation or through a process of marking up the AI generated content to critically show what was their thinking and what was AI.

Strategies that sound good but may not work as planned

Some of the strategies that have been encouraged for instructors working within this ChatGPT environment include asking students to provide personal examples of the theory, and/or focusing on the scaffolding process between the question and the answer so instructors can see the thinking between the question and the final product. For both of these strategies, ChatGPT does quite well and is getting better in newer versions. One instructor in recreation asked ChatGPT to apply the theory of flow to a personal experience in recreation and ChatGPT provided a thoughtful and very compelling answer applying flow to its recent experience running a marathon. It was completely fictitious but very believable for a recreation student's answer.

Another instructor said a lot depends on what sort of personalization you're asking for, but was surprised at what he found when he entered various question prompts that ask for a concept, theory, or distinction to be explained and then applied to an example from "your own personal experience" or "your own clinical experience". The chat outputs can sometimes be a bit stilted or generic at first, but

that can often be easily fixed. Generic answers can often be made more specific by following up with prompts like "Rewrite, using the first person, or "from the perspective of a Langara College student with clinical practice in Vancouver B.C., Canada.", or asking it to rewrite with even more specific personal details or constraints added in (indeed, this is where ChatGPT truly excels). Stilted answers can often be fixed by following up with prompts like: "Rewrite to sound less stilted." And that's just version 3 of ChatGPT. Version 4 will no doubt be much more impressive.

Another instructor said that in their experience, many popular strategies to work around ChatGPT haven't been thoroughly tested, or they've been tested on very different sorts of questions, or they've been tested at a much earlier stage of the bot's learning curve. Learning from this is to get to know what ChatGPT can do within the content of our own disciplines, and to think about what we want students to learn and how we can assess that learning authentically and with academic integrity.

Another strategy identified is to record audio within assessments (though an instructor said that it can be pretty easy to fake as well). Students can provide a clip of their voice and the bot uses it in the response. This can be done on video as well. Using AI, anyone can create any image doing anything. Even asking someone to do a video post is easily fakeable. There is recognition that some strategies that work now to work around ChatGPT, might not work in a month or two, as newer versions of AI continue to evolve.

Detection

Instructors were aware of various types of ChatGPT detection software but acknowledged that it is hard to identify (there are high amount of false positives)and it is a lot of work to use this strategy, and time may be better spent at the front end of the technology in creating more specific assessments or guiding critical conversations about AI with the students. Many instructors acknowledged that AI continues to get better relative to the detection software so it is a bit futile to focus on this as the only strategy within their courses.

For on-line exams, one instructor said he lets students use the course notes; if students use AI, it is clear within their discipline that it is language used from somewhere else and not reflective of the specific course notes.

Some instructors ask students to complete in class writing samples in the first week of the course and use them to compare to assessments when it is questionable if students used AI in their work. Of course writing can improve, and we hope it does but if there is a radical difference, the instructor has the right to

ask the student about it. It was agreed that academic integrity is a key issue but detection is challenging as ChatGPT includes fake sources. Instructors have followed up with librarians at Langara to track down references that don't exist. At times they have found that the author exists and the journal exists, but the article or that combination doesn't exist.

It was also acknowledged that when ChatGPT doesn't know an answer, it makes up information. Following up with students to ask more specific questions about their answers is another strategy to see if the student does understand the information, but this is a strategy that works better within in-person classes. One instructor includes in the syllabus that if they have any reason to suspect that part/all of what was submitted was written by AI, that they have the option of substituting with an oral assignment.

Instructors also said that if they know the students, then they know what they can write. If students really understand the content they should be able to talk about it with the instructor, in all courses including asynchronous. For in-person classes, more assessments can be done in class so instructors can restrict the use of AI. Chat GPT may have a stronger impact on asynchronous on-line courses where instructors can't talk to students to ensure they understand the concepts. One instructor shifted his midterm and final exams back to in-person on campus instead of on-line to restrict use of AI within the exam.

If AI does the thinking – then how are students learning?

Many instructors acknowledged that AI seems to take the thinking or synthesis out of learning. ChatGPT moves from the question prompt to the answer in seconds. It requires effort to create original writing and that effort and thinking is an important part of education in college. When students use ChatGPT; they are not writing their own original text. If we only approach ChatGPT by embracing it, we are missing the component of original thinking. An instructor shared that even they themselves often think, "I have an hour to write this piece of original work – so I'll just use Chat GPT to get me started, and I can do this more quickly". This can be definitely the thinking of the students. One instructor said, I don't think we can assign original pieces of work and not assume that they won't use Chat GPT. It changes the way that we use our face to face class time. If we want to be sure that students are writing originally then we have to figure out how to assess that. Does it change the focus from creating original writing to editing the writing of ChatGPT? Can we highlight positive case studies of editing ChatGPT to create a hybrid final product?

If AI generators provide the product (the answer to the discussion, study or exam question) how do teachers assess the process?

Looking at how students will be using it in their work and careers

Some instructors in applied courses talked about researching how AI is being used in their field and then providing opportunities for the students to train in using it in that way. Examples include creating marketing text and populating website text content.

How faculty are using it in their teaching / framing it for the students

Some instructors shared a presentation with the students in the first week of this term about AI and ChatGPT, to acknowledge it is out there and lead a conversation about some of the key issues in privacy and ethics, how it could be used in a positive way and how it should not be used. One instructor talked about working to get buy-in for students in the value of doing their own thinking and their own work. How to approach it in a critical way understanding that AI may not be giving you the full picture, and the issues with biased information. Another instructor made it a conversation with the students at the beginning of the course and asked their opinions on how and if they wanted to use it in some of the assessments.

Another instructor said they were very upfront about their approach and gave students the “why” early on; why it is important to do their own thinking and their own work in that discipline. In the first class they talk about the discipline and why they study it. Enfolded into that is the value of the discipline and that it teaches critical thinking skills. They talk about the consequences of outsourcing learning and encourage them to think for themselves and question mindlessly sharing on social media. In this approach they asked students where all of these ideas came from, and asked them to critically assess the ideas, as well as the benefits and disadvantages to outsourcing your ability to synthesize. These conversations were intended to help motivate some of the choices to not use ChatGPT. The instructor felt some students just care about the product – the degree. As an instructor, they can set the course up so they learn the all-important skills of thinking and processing information and valuing the process – and what the cost is to skip that step by using ChatGPT. They lay out the learning outcomes of the course, and let students know what they are missing if they don’t think for themselves, as well as the consequences if they are caught cheating.

The same instructor asked students to sign honour codes for in-person and asynchronous on-line courses. They set it up through Brightspace and students couldn't get graded on any assessments until they checked all the boxes for the honour code. Before every assignment, they include a script that says this is what you are / are not allowed to do, this is what will happen if you don't. The instructor feels this strategy forces it back into the student's conscious awareness. If students use Chat/GPT, they have to do so deliberately. Students can't say they didn't know.

Strategies in teaching/learning with AI

Some instructors talked about using AI to co-create with the students. There was recognition that there is no status quo and we can't return to the way we did things. Recent improvements in AI have opened the box to more questions about how we evaluate and more transparency around learning. This is a work in progress and providing space for students to provide feedback about their experiences with this as well can create opportunities to learn together. A focus on what the tools are and how they can best serve students and how to think critically about the implications of using AI was a common theme.

There was a concern about exams and finding new strategies to ensure that there is integrity in these assessments. Scaffolding assignments isn't always effective due to the rapidly evolving nature of AI. One instructor petitioned to have midterms and finals on campus in person for asynchronous on-line courses and to weight those more. For paper assignments, an instructor used strategies to make it hard for the ChatGPT bot to work. For example, identifying course specific on-line resources that ChatGPT doesn't know about (slide 3 of the ppt presentation or other very specific references). When there is a lot of specific detail, ChatGPT is not good at combining that amount of instructions.

One of the instructors created a video for her class on writing resumes and cover letters. In the video, she asked ChatGPT to create a cover letter for a job posting and tailor it to the resume. The instructor ran the cover letter through ChatGPT a few times, the third iteration was slightly less bad but it didn't have heart or sound like her. She presented this to the students, and they talked about the limitations by walking them through a Socratic method of questioning and critical thinking about using ChatGPT for this. They talked about the results being that it may not sound like you for an important document like a cover letter. The conversation with the students about it was really interesting. In the end they realized that they would still need to rework it even if they use ChatGPT.

Another instructor lets students use ChatGPT to write artist statements and help with website content, not just to write it for them to edit it for them.

Instructors talked about having to look at their courses with a ChatGPT lens and having to approach courses assuming students are using it. It is more problematic to assume that students aren't using it. We need to look at all of the assessments and can't attach the same weight to assessments that students could use ChatGPT. Using more check-in questions with students in class, post lecture understanding questions – asking students, what is the point. Look at how we are weighting assessments in our courses.

One instructor said they make a lot of use of discussion forums in asynchronous courses to train and incentivise students to do things correctly. They provide a topic and question based on a video or the readings – minimum length to reasonably be able to check with an AI detector. Every post has to include a citation from lecture, video, slides – very precise way. There are two purposes to this approach: first, it is hard to get ChatGPT to do everything; and second, if they start doing that, they are incentivized to learn to cite, and engage with the materials. It creates a pathway for them to do this right. This involves a fair amount of policing early on in the course. They provide feedback to students right in the forum so everyone can see it. “Thanks for your post, please be mindful that your post needs to be this amount of words with source.”

Some instructors said ChatGPT could be a good teacher, it helps explain the concept and it was helpful to students who didn't have English as a primary language. It seems to work better than google translate. Instructors who were using ChatGPT in their courses were selective about the courses that they did use it in, and they created a clear frame at the beginning of the course identifying how it could be used. One instructor created a course contract around use of ChatGPT and another instructor had students participate in a conversation about how they wanted to use it in class.

Leadership at Langara

Currently Academic Leadership at Langara College have not talked about the impact of students using ChatGPT/AI. Some instructors felt acknowledgement was required to address the shift in teaching pedagogy to address AI and the additional workload and they didn't feel support from the college leadership. Other instructors felt that no direction provided opportunity for freedom and autonomy in how to navigate this within specific disciplines and courses. Currently faculty and departments seem to be working on their own to create shared understandings or guidelines for using AI within courses. This bottom-up approach seems to be consistent with the culture at Langara College as faculty are navigating it without a lot of support or direction. It is recognized by instructors that this is a big disruption that was preceded by the disruption of the Covid-19 pandemic and faculty are stretched in addressing this rapidly changing AI environment.

Erin from the Student Conduct and Academic Integrity office, Alex from TCDC and Susan from EdTech have created a presentation on AI/ChatGPT and are sharing it with departments at Langara. It seems that the current leadership of conversations about this are coming from these departments. Carmen Larsen (TCDC) recently co-authored a working paper about how faculty are reacting to ChatGPT.

Conclusion

The purpose of this applied research project was to focus the conversation about AI in teaching and learning at Post Secondary for faculty in the Recreation Studies Department. Through this written report, and facilitation of the Roundtable discussion on May 1st, a critical approach and conversation was created to support faculty in understanding and moving forward in this rapidly evolving AI environment.

Researcher Learning:

Shannon Wall : I have really enjoyed the opportunity to explore and wrestle with a topic that has been very much on my mind since it came across our desks last December. Janet and I have spent many hours looking at the topic of AI and LLM's from many different angles, and the sharing of resources and discussions we have had with other faculty have been illuminating.

It has been encouraging to discover that other instructors are also wrestling with how best to approach these new technologies, and I have felt enlivened and inspired by the feeling that we are all in this together, each of us trying in our own way to be better instructors, and to make the learning more relevant and applicable for our students. I think this was the most apparent to me when we gathered together as a Recreation faculty team on May 1st to come to a shared understanding about this topic. I believe that starting a conversation with our team will help us all to navigate the murky waters of AI as time goes on, and I feel grateful that we had this opportunity to do so.

Janet Ready: I have valued the opportunity to learn more about AI and Large Language Models such as ChatGPT within a recreation educator lens through the research and work with Shannon on this project. It is a desired difficulty to learn how to navigate this rapidly evolving technology in my teaching and in my understanding of learning at the Post Secondary level. Sharing this research and learning with the Recreation Studies Faculty at the May 1st session really lifted me up in knowing that we can have a critical and shared understanding of AI within teaching and learning and bring different perspectives to the conversation to help us understand it more deeply. I deeply value being part of a learning organization within our faculty team and committing to being intentional about including new technology in a critical and informed way in our teaching.

This research and learning helps me grow as an instructor and model how to learn and assess new technology with my students and with my colleagues in the Recreation Studies Department. This is an important value I have and helps me be an authentic teacher. I also valued the opportunity to work with Shannon Wall in the Recreation Studies Department on this research project. Her values as an instructor align with mine and I always learn more, ask better questions and just get excited about the work when I partner with her.

Roundtable discussion May 1st, 2023

As part of the applied research project, a roundtable conversation took place on campus from 10am-2pm with all of the Recreation Studies faculty in attendance. The working paper was emailed to faculty one week prior to the session with homework for faculty to do prior to the session (see Appendix A for worksheet). The roundtable discussion was facilitated by Shannon Wall, supported by Janet Ready.

Action items that came from the session.

- All faculty committed to having conversations with their students about ChatGPT at the beginning of the courses, whether that be through a social contract, honour code, sharing critical thinking around the value and challenges of AI within teaching and learning. This included courses in all delivery modes, in-person, mixed mode, and a-synchronous
- All faculty agreed to review their courses with a ChatGPT lens to test assessments and exam questions and adjust them to better connect to student learning and outcomes
- Dan, instructional assistant will update student success resources and upload into Brightspace courses
- Dan to create a video – or use Linked in or another current video – what you need to know about ChatGPT – to include in Brightspace courses
- All faculty will include a statement in the course outline about ChatGPT and the department view on it – this statement will be created by the Department Chair in consultation with faculty
- Instructors are free to invite/not invite students to use ChatGPT in their coursework with the understanding that rationale will be shared with their students about their decision and students understand that each instructor may be approaching it differently within the department

Notes from the Roundtable discussion May 1, 2023

The following information was discussed in the Roundtable and was included to document the conversations. Original documents and photos are included at the following padlet link,

<https://padlet.com/jready4/chat-gpt-recreation-studies-workshop-o1a3uefhi12k6zt>

Important Issues with Chat GPT – identified by faculty

- Students may not realize it is biased information
- Privacy – course content is out there, knowing students used it on exam

- Data mining from ChatGPT/Open AI/ Consent
- Access – discrepancy / Paid subscription
- Don't want to be ChatGPT police – detection takes too much time
- Avoiding Plagiarism – Academic Integrity
- Opens conversation about what we are evaluating in our courses
- Morality/ethics (who's stance is it?) Other tools / our own judgement
- Calculator analogy – does it really work?
- Invigilation of assessments
- Professional application (Academic vs. real world jobs) – equip students
- English as additional language – how does it help them?
- Takes out process of learning (messy middle) critical thinking

Group of faculty brainstorm about how to present/include students in conversation at the beginning of fall 2023 courses.

Courses – RECR 1162 / 1160 / 1170 / 2361 / 2470 / BRM RECR 3230 / 4270 / 3120

- What is Chat GPT – Context / Ethics, Prior assessment of knowledge – Honour code before assignment
- Social contract using ChatGPT as a student – do we allow it to be used in certain circumstances?
- What is cheating – how does it inhibit learning, how to reference // Chat GPT is not mandatory (talk about consent/privacy/data mining)
- Mid-point check in
- Respecting individual instructor approaches
- Marginalisation / bias levelling the playing field – who isn't in those conversations/data? // Classmates – how does your use affect your classmates
- Do we invite it in? How do students reference it?

BRM – Asynchronous courses

- Instructor video – or video from Dan
- Include in an introduction DQ
- Talk about how you might use Chat GPT in courses pros/cons
- Social Contract

Notes – repetition in courses is okay, having all instructors talking about it

Look at increasing the level of conversation with students around Chat GPT depending on what level the course is (Exploring for first year, Developing for second year, Demonstration for third/fourth year)

2nd Faculty Group – Brainstorming about course outline

- We should acknowledge with students that this is a new and exciting tool that is ever changing, and that we are interested in having an ongoing, dynamic conversation with them about it, and that they should play around with them and use them responsibly to see what they can do.
- We need to be clear about what is allowed or not allowed. Using others' words as your own (whether from a book or a website or a LLM) is considered plagiarism, and the use of ChatGPT should not be any different.
- Use of LLM's need to be cited "written with the assistance of..." (ask Library about citation), just as students would do using any source. We will check with Librarians about what they are suggesting students do.
- We can write a sentence in our course outlines that talks about how all assignments and DQ's should cite all sources (including LLM's) APA style.
- Link to handbook in our course outlines – student conduct by the Academic Integrity office.
- We should let students know the process ahead of time for what an instructor will do if they suspect that you have used ChatGPT or LLM to write your assignment; this may deter them from using it broadly or in the place of their own writing.
- We can also discuss with students how our program is about experiential and applied learning, and connecting with community. Doing the "thinking" for themselves in our courses will benefit them later when they are working in the field....if they take shortcuts with LLM's in the program, this may catch up with them in their careers. This ties into how our learning outcomes for our courses help them to succeed in their futures. This tool may help gather information, but will not necessarily benefit you in applying your learning!

Resources:

The following resources were recommended by the instructors that participated in the conversations or were found to be helpful by Shannon and Janet:

Link for ChatGPT <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>

Teaching in Higher Ed. Podcasts:

This is an interesting critical look at ChatGPT and privacy/data ownership issues (Autumn Caines)

<https://teachinginhighered.com/podcast/chatgpt-and-good-intentions-in-higher-ed/>

This podcast is more high level look at AI within post secondary

<https://teachinginhighered.com/podcast/how-artificial-intelligence-is-impacting-higher-education/>

Carmen Larsen TCDC Langara – Working Paper: How are faculty reacting to ChatGPT-

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1yLKwTM4DHOSk3fPiNL8Hf-2OdtCFYI-/view> (this is a really thoughtful overview of a zoom session with Langara and Kwantlen Polytech instructors)

Padlet for Padlet for instructors to continue conversation about ChatGPT - Carmen Larsen TCDC

<https://langara.padlet.org/carmenlarsen1/ideas-experiences-questions-about-generative-ai-in-higher-ed-rrqowtds069n2wqb>

TCDC webpage about AI

<https://iweb.langara.ca/tcdc/expand-my-teaching-and-learning/ai-content-generators/>

Teaching on-line webinar

<https://teachonline.ca/webinar/content-creation-using-ai-how-ai-can-be-used-build-courses-and-learning-experiences>

Artificial Intelligence week, March 2023. Quality and Qualifications Ireland

<https://www.qqi.ie/events/artificial-intelligence-week>

Janelle Shane. 2019. (Book) You Look Like a Thing and I Love You: How Artificial Intelligence Works and Why It's Making the World a Weirder Place. <https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/44286534>

Maha Bali, PhD. Twitter account: https://twitter.com/bali_maha?s=21&t=KOCgfGffaPyrsgqVBxfo2Q

The Social Dilemma. 2020. Netflix documentary <https://www.netflix.com/ca/title/81254224> This documentary-drama hybrid explores the dangerous human impact of social networking, with tech experts sounding the alarm on their own creations.

Joe Feldman. Grading for Equity. 2018 (book). E book in the Langara College Library.

New York Times has good articles about AI and ChatGPT

In addition to the above resources, Royal Roads zoom session on AI and Learning Design in Education Mar 5 . Academic integrity with Artificial Intelligence (AI with AI) - Janet attended

Conversations with Carmen Larsen (TCDC), Ryan Cawsey (HKIN), Dana Maslovat (HKIN), Sandra Friessen (English), Hannah Flostrand (COOP), Erin Hager (Student Conduct, Academic Integrity Office), Eric Stewart (Photography), Caroline Ross (Photography), Kent Schmor (Philosophy).



Before our workshop on May 1st, there are THREE things we would like you to do so that we all come to the session having given some thought to the ever-shifting landscape of AI:

Play with ChatGPT:

Please sign up for a ChatGPT account (<https://chat.openai.com/>) and then play around with it a bit! Put in some of your DQs, exam questions and assignment questions, and see what it spits out. In order to move our discussion around ChatGPT forward, please jot down some notes below and bring your answers to the workshop to discuss.

Let's start with these sentence stubs...

1. **After playing with ChatGPT, I was surprised by...** _____
2. **One thing ChatGPT did really well was...** _____
3. **One thing ChatGPT didn't do very well was...** _____
4. **I realize now that I need to...** _____
5. **As an instructor, I think the three most important issues around ChatGPT are...** _____

Read:

- 1) Read our report about ChatGPT, and also read this article about updating your syllabus: https://medium.com/@rwatkins_7167/updating-your-course-syllabus-for-chatgpt-965f4b57b003 ... **Think about one of your (fall) courses as you read this, and make notes on how you intend to make 3 small changes to that course before September.**

Listen:

3) Listen to this podcast about some of the challenges/drawbacks of Large Language Models, and other interesting thoughts about meaning-making and ChatGPT:

<https://teachinginhighered.com/podcast/chatgpt-and-good-intentions-in-higher-ed/>

...as you listen, pull out 2 or 3 questions that you would like to think/chat more about when we gather on May 1st.

Other thoughts, reflections or observations?...



See you on May 1st, from 10:00-2:00pm in Room C408. Lunch will be provided.

Can't wait to CHAT (and unpack all this and connect and laugh and make mistakes) with you all in person!