

1

We're gonna go ahead and start. My name is Alex Leiseca. I'm the new Communications Assistant here at Atla. Thank you for joining us today. I'm excited to be here. This is my first webinar. So thank you for your patience. And I am excited to welcome Steve Jung, who's going to talk to us today about AI and how it can impact the future of the library.

2

So we're going to use the chat box for any questions or comments that you might have. Because we're using the webinar format, it sometimes gets a little tricky to have participants speak. So if you have any questions, just pop it in the chat. And we will try to get to them as we go. And there will also be a little bit of time at the end for some q&a. So we will try to answer as many questions as possible throughout the presentation. So we have Steve Jung, who is the Associate Director of Library Services at Hope International University. And he used to be at the library at APU. And now he is at Hope. So we are excited to hear what he has to say about AI since it is such a hot topic. And I know everyone is excited to talk about it.

3

While Awesome, thank you very much. I do want to say thank you to to Jamie and to Alex and also to Atla for allowing me to, to do this. This is a great thing. And I'm really thrilled to be here. Let me just go ahead and share the screen. And Alex does it. Are there black boxes? Or are we clear right now.

4

There's one at the top.

6

And it just got a bit smaller?

7

Well, hopefully that disappears. All righty. So today, we're going to be talking about artificial intelligence, academic integrity and the role of the library. I gave a version of this to my own faculty just a couple of weeks ago. And originally it was scheduled to be about 20 to 30 minutes, 20 minutes or so it turned out to be 55. With all the questions, I've added content. So I hope to respect our time, I really do hope that the 30 minutes will hopefully be enough to to allow me to see what's going on. Trying to get through the material, I know that I'm not going to get through all of it with the amount of time and attention that it deserves. But I do want to respect our time. So this is the outline of where we're going. First I'm going to talk about the threat what is AI generated text, I am inserting time for one or two questions about AI itself. And hopefully Jamie or Alex, I guess will be able to pull a couple of questions from the chat at that point. I then need to talk about the problems for classroom faculty and for higher education. And I'm trying to separate those two in the sense of classroom faculty, and how we as libraries help our classroom faculty. And then for higher education. What does this really mean for academic integrity? I then move to some suggestions for higher education. And I'm gonna guess at that point, I'm probably going to be pushing the time limit. But really the solution is

for classroom faculty. I have eight, eight solutions for classroom faculty that can be used by themselves or in conjunction with one another. And I actually have a link to a website where all of those are listed and explained in more detail. So if we don't get through step four, we'll at least get to q&a and I'll show you where those things are. Alright, so I am now moving to what is the threat. So a bot is trained, sometimes referred to as fed various sources and it learns content and language, parts of the program learn grammar, and I use that in the loosest way possible. Other parts learn and we're putting in air quotes, facts, and other parts learn how to put it together. Now when I say grammar, it's not that the bot is trained nouns and verbs it learns that but also syntax how to form a sentence. It also learns how to form a paragraph by an introductory statement, a thesis statement argumentation, concluding sentence, it learns the grammar of an essay how to write an essay. Also with what it's been trained, it understands the flow of a conversation the back and forth between two people for good or for bad depending on its training. Other parts learn the facts. Now bots are trained using what's freely available and or is cheaply available. And so some of the facts are really good, solid facts. Others are facts and it can hold two opposing ideas and believe both of them because as a bot, it doesn't have a moral compass, it doesn't evaluate, which is more true than not. And so it can hold both things as facts. And again, the last part of the program really is how does it put these things together. Currently, these AI programs are trained offline, they're fed, they're raised, and then they're put online and, and allowed to do their job. They're not fed or seated other large data dumps once they're live and online. So once a program is online, it doesn't learn anything new, it doesn't gain from its experiences, at least at this point. The program is complete. Once it's put online. We used to use the quote, garbage in garbage out. And that explains why most AI is accused of being racist, sexist, and rude. They are typically seeded with a lot of freely available social media like Twitter and Reddit. So when you have garbage in some of the conversations in Reddit and Twitter, you're going to get garbage out. We have examples of there was a newspaper reporter who was interacting with the chat bot. And you know, towards the end of the conversation, the chat bot is saying things like, you know, leave your wife, you love me? Where did it get that kind of kind of concept? Well, because it was trained on Twitter and read it, it understands what would be considered an attraction, conversation. That writer basically started with Hi, my name is so and so what's your name? What do you like? What are your interests and so the bot recognized the beginning of a conversation, that grammar of that conversation, and recognize that this is a flirtation type conversation. And so it went in that direction. You have other times where you've heard things that aren't necessarily rude. Because it understands a Twitter conversation, when two or three people or two people are back and forth in a conversation, you know, questioning each other, by about the fifth time somebody's writing in all caps, because somebody's angry, you know, two more comp, two more parts of that conversation and somebody's calling, you know, name calling, you know, a few more comments, and then somebody's calling somebody else, you know, you're, you know, a communist or a fascist, you know, and it just gets goes off rail. So these hallucinations, as they're calling them, are actually just the fact that the AI is following what it's been trained, it's following the grammar of certain types of conversations. So that's,

that explains part of what's going on there with some of that garbage in garbage out kind of idea. AI Artificial Intelligent bots, have been writing for a few years now. Many clickbait websites, and social media posts are actually generated by AI. Many bots are used for chat purposes, automated customer service kind of idea, which is much better than a static Help button on a webpage. In fact, if you come across any sort of, you know, these are the 10 best movies ever. More than likely that was actually written by an AI bot. The bot making the news most recently is chat GPT. We went live in November, based on GPT. Three, it is a third generation AI and I don't even understand what that means just that it's knows how to do a lot of things. It was trained on Wikipedia. So it actually has an encyclopedia of knowledge. It also was trained mostly for grammar, but Reddit and Twitter. But it accepts some of those things as facts as well. And originally chat GPT was trained on two ebook sets. More than likely, as a librarian, knowing what's out there, it's freely available ebooks, it was probably trained on something like Project Gutenberg, and probably something like the Hathi Trust. So it has a huge amount of reading in what we might consider classic literature. But not necessarily as much current chat GPT which was released two days ago, appears to have the same training materials, it's just improved some of its display and and how input for for working with people. GPT four is the basis for chat being which some people have access to now but that will be more available in the future. There's another program known as Jasper AI, which is based on chat GPT are on GPT three. And Jasper actually is used by I think something like 10,000 companies for producing bulk emails and social media posts for those companies. So it's out there, it's been out there and we're just becoming more aware of it. And I can produce original memes, social media posts, emails Coding for websites and programs, poetry but various types, comic strips, paintings, recipes and essays. It's kind of scary. So at this point I'm, if Alex, if we've had any questions about AI itself, that would be great.

8

I saw that Sue raised her hand. There's no questions in the chat. Just something by Kelly saying how fascinating is which I totally agree with you Kelly. is a little scary.

9

Okay, Sue, if you can type that fast enough. And Alex can read it, that'd be great.

10

If I'll keep an eye on until we get to the next section.

11

Sounds good. So now we move into the idea of the problems of AI for the classroom faculty in higher education. And this is really talking about what does this mean for us at an institution? So problems with AI for classroom faculty, I see four major issues. The work produced by AI will pass all plagiarism checkers, the AI creates original work. So it'll pass any plagiarism checker, turn it in.com Grammarly vericite Any of the any of those plagiarism checkers you have, it's going to pass because it's not plagiarizing. It's actually creating original work based on what it knows. Second issue, it writes in One Voice I'll I'll be it somewhat

awkwardly. It writes like a student. And I say that having taught 20 years at an undergraduate institution working with a lot of freshmen and sophomore, it writes like a student. Some of it is good work and coherent. Other parts that make you scratch your head and say, What are you trying to say? It already writes passable five paragraph essays and so forth. GPT. Four, can pass the LSAT and even a bar exam. So we know that it's capable of writing, and some of it's actually going to be quite good. Problem number three, it makes up real looking citations. It knows how to create citations, so it creates properly formatted citations. But as of now, they're still complete fabrications. So a couple of weeks ago I was working on I thought I would try playing with chat GPT. So I had it write a rough draft or an outline, a rough draft and a final essay on technology in Mary Shelley's Frankenstein, it wrote reasonably reasonably well. It wrote the outline rough draft final draft was very similar to the rough draft, but it did okay. It had I asked for it to include MLA citation. So it actually had one in text citation that I saw. And then it produced a reference page with two citations. And this is where it gets really scary. They were both properly formatted MLA. The first one was an edition of Mary Shelley's Frankenstein, it had proper, everything was there, everything was proper. And in fact, the editor and the publisher were correct for different versions or different editions of Mary Shelley's Frankenstein. The problem was, this was not an actual edition, edited by that person. It was completely made up. The second citation was in a chapter in an edited volume. The editor, completely appropriate the publisher completely appropriate. The author of the chapter had written other chapters written other books on Frankenstein and technology and some of that that time period as well. The title of the chapter was excellent. The problem was the entire book was made up, no such chapter existed, and that book was never written. So it can make things up, it can make up properly formatted citations. And the scary thing is, is it had the proper editors and authors for the subject. That was really scary. The fourth problem for classroom faculty is the existing AI detectors are just algorithms based on coherence and repetition, coherence and the idea of does it make sense? Is it following traditional formats? And is it is it reasonable writing? Again, this is this goes back to the grammar aspect of an AI bot. That's not a problem. The repetition? Yes, the AI tends to be repetitious. About half the time that I had it write something for me. And the final paragraph started with in conclusion or in summary it's still a judgment call. It's not 100% accurate. The issue with the Before I think for higher education for the classroom faculty, is if we have ESL students, students who are working from another language, where they might actually use something like Google Translate to translate some of their thoughts or some of their ideas, it's going to come across as mechanical writing. And that's going to be part of an issue for faculty, as we put things through, and it comes up as, hey, this is 70% Ai, or that's their guess, well, it might actually be an ESL student and some of their writing. So things to look for. No problems with AI for higher education. I think this is kind of the bigger picture stuff. Students can pass graduate without being personally responsible for the work being turned in. I know that this is already an issue. And it's going to get worse, students will pass or graduate with with without developing critical thinking skills needed for life and work. The fact that they can program an AI or prompt an AI doesn't mean critical thinking. And that doesn't mean that they're

actually going to be able to, to process things for work. And I think that's going to be downright scary. And for us, I think one of the big issues that we have to deal with is that plural current plagiarism statements are not strong or broad enough for meeting the issue with AI. Turning in an AI paper is a form of fraud or cheating. Yes, it doesn't exactly fit plagiarism. Plagiarism definitions don't necessarily fit. Typically plagiarism will talk about theft. This is not theft, or it'll talk about work and what that means and the work of another person. And so those are those are the issues. Why plagiarism doesn't seem to be sufficient. Please, or in depth definitions sometimes mentioned theft. This is not theft, as the boss is given or the bot is giving what was asked of it, there is no theft involved. This isn't a theft of intellectual property, this just appears to be the bot giving you back an answer. In some sense, it's kind of like using a calculator, you plug in two plus two and hit the equal sign. And what the bot gives you is the answer. It's something along those lines. Plagiarism plagiarism is often Wow, terrible there. Plagiarism is often described as the work of another or work of another person, it can be argued that this is not the work of just the bot. But a collaboration with the bot to produce the final product, the student works to get the AI to write, it's true, it takes a back and forth, it takes time, it takes effort for the bot to produce something that's reasonable. And any student with any intelligence is also going to edit what's been written so that the student is going to have to work to turn it in one of these papers. Lastly, plagiarism is oftentimes idea tied to the idea of the work of someone else. And I you know, there's philosophical issues about what to do with AI when it comes into existence, I'm not going to be the person to assign personhood to the bot. Nothing has passed a modified Turing test as of yet. But still, it's got some incredible ideas and does do some thinking. But again, I'm not going to apply personhood to the bot. So what we really have, what is produced is a collaboration a back and forth between the AI and the student, we end up with a writ paper written by two authors. The student provides prompts and moves the creative AI in the right direction, but together, they write the paper, the total amount of student involvement is not much but there is some, again, a good student, a smart student, would modify what's what's the AI produces. So what we have is form of fraud. The student falsely claiming something as their own, in order to gain something grade. The problem being that the student gains no knowledge or critical thinking by turning in that work. And those, those are our biggest issues with, with with what this means for schooling. Additional comments about collaboration, and this is, this is where I'm wanting to work with higher ed. Since 2011. And the Leahy Smith, America Invents Act, the inventor is defined as an individual or individuals. So that was us legislation. Individual was defined by the US Supreme Court in 2012 in a lawsuit Mohammed versus the Palestinian Authority, bunch of numbers that I know identifies the case, as a human being or a person so an individual is a human being a person. The two modifying each other and that's, that's part of our problem. The Fowler versus Vidal What is a patent lawsuit that was dismissed because the quote unquote inventor was not a natural person a quote unquote human being as an intended or interpreted by the patent office or the Patent Act, a federal appeals court agreed that personhood is essential to applying for patents. And again, this is why I focus on human being aspect and struggle to apply personhood to an AI.

12

So that was a patent issue about being a human being has to be the the, the inventor or the holder of the patent salary versus Perlmutter, same Falor, but now against the head of the Copyright Office. So the Copyright Office is a defending the idea that a work must have human authorship. So both the patent office and the Copyright Office seem to be working with the idea that the AI can be listed as a collaborator, but not listed as the responsible party, the AI can be listed as inventor or co author, but is not the owner of the patent, or copyright. Now, for us in higher ed, the issue, the issue really has to do with the student turning in a paper than is turning in a paper that has a collaborator. And we ought to keep this this idea of collaborator, who's not a human being is not a person. And so we need to keep those things in mind as we continue down this step of how do we define these statements, these academic integrity statements? Now I have time for a few questions before we move to some suggestions and solutions. Alex, do you have any questions that have come through?

13

Yes, we have two questions. One was asking, Do we know any more about the new products by turn it in, etc, that are written just to catch AI? Right.

14

So anything that's coming out right now, there are there are AI detectors, and again, they're looking for coherence and repetition? It's, it's a mathematical thing. How much of it looks and is written like a human being? Our problem is this. These AIS, the current AIS, have been trained using Twitter and Reddit. So it writes poorly in cases, but it still writes like a natural human being normally would write, having bid said fed 10s of 1000s, hundreds of 1000s of ebooks. It also writes like a polished writer, can. So any of these kinds of AI detectors, even what's going to happen with Turnitin and Grammarly, and such, these AI detectors are still going to be based on an algorithm on does this right? based on a percentage does this write more like a human being would? Or is it writing more like a bot producing material? And that is that is to an extent, I hate to say guesswork, but really is just trying to figure out what's working out. The other aspect again, is those AI detectors are looking for repetition. I know we have students who are repetitive, but the AI has a formula. This is how a five paragraph essay works. This is how a paragraph, an argumentative paragraph works. And so it's going to follow a formulaic this is what it should be for writing and turning in things. So that's actually going to be probably the bigger clue than the coherence part. I don't know specifically about turn it in. But that's what the AI detectors currently are doing.

15

And the second question, the second question was how do you feel about the possibility of incorporating chat GPT into the classroom? I attended another webinar and the presenter mentioned this as a way to circumnavigate the plagiarism.

16

So I'm actually okay with AI, I think. I think at some point in the future, we're going to be viewing it more as a tool. In certain classes, it will make more sense than in other classes. My first thought back in November was, this would be amazing. If I had a composition class, we're on the first day of class, I would say, Hey, everybody, I'm going to load up this chat GPT. I'm going to program it in, and I'm going to have it produced an essay, and we're going to spend the next three weeks changing it so that it's better. So you would teach students how to edit themselves, you would teach students how to create citations, you would teach them how to do research to replace the fake facts and fake citations. So yeah, there is room for it in the academy. The question is, how and when is it going to happen? And I really it's a matter of how are we going to do it that's ethical and promotes the goals of the course and the university. I think those are the big things and I'll talk a little bit more about that in just a second. Do we have time for one more? Maybe

17

How's it for now? Okay,

18

that'll let me get to some suggestions. So I kind of have this in reverse order. So now I'm going with suggestions for higher education, and then solutions for the classroom. I don't I mean, this was supposed to be 30 minutes, and I see that I'm down to the final five, I am going to go over, and I apologize for that. But at the same time, you came to watch this to hopefully get some of these things. So I am going to spend a few minutes here on suggestions for higher education. This first one is way above my paygrade suggestion, one change the focus of the university, or at least one of our marketing efforts. And I think this is, again above my paygrade. But I think it's important, we ought to think of the university as focusing on critical thinking. It's one of the things we do, and teaching personal responsibility. Most of us within Atla are from a religious institutions. So we want to talk about the ethics, the morals, what's what's involved here. And so personal responsibility is one of those things. The student, this is part of our problem, the student is typically focused on getting through classes in school, just to get the piece of paper at the end. This is especially true at undergraduate institutions, they want to get a degree just to get a high paying job. For the last 20 years we have marketed everybody should go to college. Because the earning difference between a college educated person and somebody without a college education, such everybody should go get a college education. And so we have focused so much on go to school in order to get a high paying job. It was even reinforced during the Obama administration with the creation of the college scorecard, where it talked about this is how much it cost to go to that school. This is what the average indebtedness was. And then they also had this is the average starting salary of a graduate from this institution. So we focused again on Hey, that's a cheap school, but I will make a lot of money. And that's, that's a, that's a huge problem. We need to change that script. It is not about going to school, get the paper and earn money. But go to school, get an education, gain critical thinking, gain knowledge, gain skills, then demonstrate responsibility, earn respect, get better jobs and earn more money, we need to talk about you're here to get an education, that paper just says that you finished, you're here to get an

education gained critical thinking knowledge and skills for your job. Again, way above my paygrade. But for those of you who are, you know, can speak with Dean's can speak with the academic cabinets. Those are the ideas that we needed to be stressing. For the rest of us who are who are more in the classroom. Like I said, this is kind of above what we do. The goal of a university education is or should be not a degree, the paper itself, but an education. They are very different things with very different goals. If we focus on education, then we can focus on intellectual pursuits and that a student that cheats isn't cheating a system they are but but themselves. Yes, it has to do with personal responsibility. The intellectual contribution of the student is what we're supposed to be grading, what we should be checking for and what we should be promoting. The student that plagiarizes or buys a paper or turns in a paper produced by AI is cheating themselves by not getting an education. And I think that's, that's our first suggestion. Focus again, on the idea of you're here for an education, you're not here for the piece of paper. Can now I'll get off my, my pulpit and get back to reality here. My second suggestion here. Every academic integrity policy, that I'm aware of all of them have some sort of plagiarism statement. Some of them have cheating statements, we need to include within that a collaboration statement. I don't know of any schools that have them if they do great. But here we need to talk about a collaboration statement. Our policies need to emphasize personal responsibility that the individual student is responsible for what gets turned in. It is their composition, their thoughts in their words, that may include the words thoughts and data from others, but properly attributed to them. If the student wants their name on the transcripts, and on that degree, then the work must be theirs. Their writing their research is about how they contribute to the scholarly conversation. That's a major goal of a university education, the student learns from others and then contributes, they join the conversation. Notice I'm throwing in the language from the ACRL framework, the scholarly conversation, scholarship is conversation. That's because academic academic integrity is intimately tied to information literacy, especially there and talking about that conversation. Collaboration statement should encompass at these these three ideas. Grades should be based on the core quality and quantity of the work done by each student or author. And each part of a collaboration, maybe even down to the sentence shouldn't be identifiable as to whose ideas are whose and who wrote what. And that's easily checked with Google Docs and Microsoft Word you can track changes, or even students can list it as a comment i Student A wrote this student B wrote this. I mentioned those two because this is not just about AI. Those actually often do with group projects. I worked here at at Azusa Pacific for 20 years, and we would often meet with business students. And in their final year, their final classes, they had major group projects, and you would have four or five students in these projects. And you would often have one student who would slough off who would have to be carried by the rest, and all of this. And really, it needed to be individual students given individual grades for the work that they did. And so part of this has to do with collaboration as in group projects, but even these ideas of each part of the collaboration should be identifiable, that would be perfect for an AI. Because if a student just uses ai 80 90% of it is coming from the AI. If I had a student who turned in a paper that was only 20% of their own work, teaching Biblical studies, you fail my



class. Now, step three, though, or or idea number three, the amount of work allowed by the AI will be up to the instructor and the nature of the work. Working with economics instructors, sometimes with a macro economics or micro economics instructor, they work with case studies, or they do gamification. They do kind of like, how does this work? What would happen to this company? If you could do that with the AI? Now, if a company has, you know, so much in assets, inflation does this and then, you know, market X does this, you can see, they can program it, and it will tell you what would happen based on general rules of economics. Maybe a paper like that could be 80%, ai and 20%. Student. So really, that that amount is going to depend on the instructor and the nature of that work. But absolutely, I think we need collaboration statements. That's actually probably one of my biggest things that I would push for is a collaboration statement. And as we understand AI is producing collaboration. Suggestion three, and this is my final suggestion for higher ed, at the university, the academy kind of idea, there absolutely needs to be an AI statement. For now AI is being treated like treated like Wikipedia was at the beginning, forbidden until we figure it out and how we can use it and I'm absolutely at that point. Eventually AI will be a tool that may be used in the classroom. Some people have already figured it out. I don't know how I would use it in Biblical studies, but I know other disciplines, it's it's doable, there are things that can be done. Some have already figured out ways to incorporate it in in assignments, we just need to figure out how to use it ethically. And in ways that advance the educational purpose of the course or the university. I don't believe in using it just for novelty. I think it should promote the educational purposes the goals the SOLs SLOs for, for for assignments. So an AI statement should include in my I'm gonna say pro AI opinion, these four ideas. Number one, AI shouldn't be allowed and encouraged in courses where the instructor chooses to use it. This is based upon the academic freedom of the classroom instructor. That instructor gets to choose textbooks gets to choose what lecture material, they get to choose assessments how to how to assess their learning, if they choose to use AI in the classroom, that's up to them. And I think that should be allowed. We to AI is only allowed when explicitly stated in the instructions by the faculty member. When in doubt, the answers AI cannot be used. I think that's a great blanket statement for for this point. If a student thinks they can do it, they might do it. But if we tell them it's not allowed unless it appears in your instructions, I think that's one of the safest things. Right now. I know that there were student There were papers turned in last fall in November in December where this statement would have put a halt to some of that. I know that currently in this semester, the spring semester there are already papers that are being turned in that violate this concept and I think this absolutely needs to be in there as soon as possible. I'm gonna skip down to number four and then come back to three number four, possibly allowed as a computer aide for accessibility purposes.

19

We allow Google Translate We allow calculators, we allow Excel spreadsheets that can be programmed with macros to be used in an accounting class. So we do allow computer A's. So maybe for students in some sort of 504 type ideas, some sort of Academic Success Program, where it's deemed as necessary, I think that's that should be possibly allowed.

And number three here, this is a temporary statement, as a few years from now, AI will be viewed more as a tool, I hope that'd be my understanding anyways. And this idea, these four ideas must be revisited, often, at least for the next decade or so. If a university doesn't have these two statements, a collaboration statement and an AI statement in right now, they should by fall? If not, we're going to have a lot of problems. Even so, it should be reviewed revisited two years from now, three years from now. And then three years after that, so that we can keep up with how is it used? How can it be used? How should it be denied? Okay, so those are my thoughts on for the university. And now I come to this idea of solutions for the classroom, which is really what can we as as library faculty, how can we help our, our faculty with well, we help them with how to how to to defuse plagiarism, how to find resources, how to, these are some ways to do that. And for the sake of time, I'm going to rush through these and I apologize for that. But I am going to point out to a website that has them all listed and has them explained in more detail. And again, these can be used as individual ideas, or they can be used in collaboration with one another, by it by an instructor. All of these things by themselves will make it difficult for a student to use AI to turn in a paper. And so I'm going to read through this list, I'm going to scroll down to one page where I describe one of these, and then I'll get to a website. So there was so the first one require a rough draft being turned in early. Now, if it's in the student's handwriting, perfect, it didn't come from Ai. Maybe if they copy, there are ways around to require a reference page turned in early. Again, AI is making up citations. So if you require a reference page that might cause problems for the AI require more formats of information. So AI has been exposed to wikipedians exposed to the web. I recently heard that chat, being chat actually had access to Google Scholar. If that's true, we're all in a lot of trouble for that. But the idea is require things like interviews, surveys, anything that involves human contact is going to throw the AI off require formats of information that are typically used. gold standard for some disciplines is that peer reviewed article hath and required to use dict certain dictionaries or encyclopedias, especially if they're subject specific. Those things typically aren't freely available. It's behind a paywall. A I can't get to it. Requires search strategy turned in as part of the assignment. Have the student write down? How did you find this resource? If it's done as a footnote, two to three sentences, I went to the database, I use these keywords and this limiter. Cool, that that's something that the bot can't do. And it proves that the student was involved in the research. Number five require resources from libraries licensed databases. And And again, this goes to the idea the bot doesn't have access to what's behind a paywall. So using something that comes from a licensed database, and it's going to cause a problem for him for the AI require evaluation of sources, form annotations, footnotes or appendix. So have the student evaluate is this current? Is that source relevant to what we're doing? Is that source authoritative? What makes them authoritative? And if the student is using resources that the AI provided? How are they sure that it fits those things, they're gonna have to go and do some of the research. Again, this is causing problems for the student. And when you cause problems for the student, they might discover it'd be easier if I actually wrote the paper. Required notes, turn in with the paper, have the student highlight articles with important ideas, have them you know, turn in handwritten notes, whatever.

Again, that's going to cause problems for the AI. And lastly, use one of the detectors out there. So those are the solutions and I'm just going to show you what these slides talk about here. This one I actually like this one requires search strategy, turning And as part of the assignment, so this can be used in upper division or as a grad student, you require that the student write out a detailed search strategy for some electronic resources used in an appendix, what database what keywords and what limiters did they use, and then they evaluate the efficacy of that search strategy, what worked in what could have improved their search. So it requires you the instructor or the instructor to read and evaluate their thoughts on the process. Again, this beats the bot because the bot doesn't necessarily have access to some of those databases. And they're not going to be able to evaluate that would have to be entirely written by the student. And so those are just some ways to to beat the bots. And again, that's going to be the issue is how do we how do we postpone the bots taking over? How do we stop the Bots for now. So on this little page here, this is a link to this presentation. This is a website that I have that has this presentation is entirely there. The website also has instructions written out. So the QR code takes you to this website. So just one second, I'm going to show you that website. At least I hope to. And it's pause the screenshare let me get back to it.

20

And hopefully you see beating the AI bots. So this is this page basically goes through. This first presentation here is the wording the chat bots and AI. And that's what I gave to my faculty just two weeks ago. Here is this entire presentation, the entire 30 slides that I just went through. And so if you wanted to read some of those solutions in more detail, they're right there, you can download it as well. Here's my two comments about the academic integrity policies and the collaboration statement AI statement. There are the instructions for the eight solutions. And down below are actually instructions, lines to be put into a syllabus. Some cases, there are examples. And in other cases, it's actually rubric included as well. So all of these are freely available, feel free to use that website, in anything that's available there. So let me go ahead. I'm going to I'm gonna go to chat, and I'm going to insert that link to that site if you weren't able to get the QR code. Oh, goodness. Alright. So Alex, I saw that there were a few chats. Are there questions that we can answer at this point?

21

Not at the moment, but I'm guessing that they will start pouring it.

22

Okay. So I see that somebody couldn't read the QR code because there was a bar on top of it. Yeah, I saw that too. Sorry about that. When you create the QR code, I'm not thinking of the zoom bar on top. But that that website that I put in is the URL for that for that website. Again, thank you for your patience. Thank you for for sticking around. I know I said 30 minutes plus plus time. So went a little over, but I hope it was worth it. We see that. I did put the link here. Let me see if I can do that again. Yeah, there we go. It's a it's a Google site that I made several years ago for an SPL conference and updated with a page just for for AI

23

we do have a question that says have you seen any of these strategies implemented in classes so far? And if so, any feedback on how it went?

24

Well, in the sense, yes. Because basically those all of those assignments were there, il assignments, they're just information literacy assignments that I think in collaboration can can cause problems for for a student trying to cheat with AI. You know, things like doing an evaluation, either using something like a crap form or something like that, that in itself causes problems for an AI because it's producing resources that don't exist, or in some cases, they do exist, and the student would have to go find it, read it and evaluate it. So there's, there's some of those things should work pretty well. Where do we go to experiment with Chat GPT? Well, actually, so it's open ai.com I believe it is. Open AI is the company that created G GPT, three and 412 and three, four, and also created The Chat GPT some days you can get on some days, there's a line of people trying to use it. But yeah, a open ai.com I believe is the website. If not, you could try it probably try Jasper, just Google Jasper AI. That's another one. They allow free, limited free time. And then subscriptions and things like that.

25

In the strategies to defeat the bots, the strategies for the classroom, the last one was AI. AI, plagiarism checkers, AI checkers. There are several that are out. Some are actually designed for chat GPT. So those are actually listed in that last slide, as well.

26

Hope this means that people are madly trying to write a lot, but

27

the presentation was just so comprehensive.

28

I'm sorry, it went by it felt like I covered a lot. Yeah.

29

Well, thank you everyone for joining. We will send a copy of the video with the transcription via email in the next few days. And thank you so much, Steve, for sharing this information with us. And hopefully, AI technology is used for more good than harm going forward. So thank you and have a good rest of your day, everybody.

30

Thank you all very much.