

## Sarah Anderegg

---

**From:** Jonathan Eldridge  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 29, 2023 10:58 AM  
**To:** Jonathan Eldridge  
**Subject:** Summer 2023 Faculty Information & Updates: Periodic Edition  
**Attachments:** What Do Students Think of ChatGPT.pdf; A semester with generative AI.pdf; 4 Steps to Help You Plan for ChatGPT in Your Classroom.pdf

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Dear College of Marin Faculty:

As July approaches, I thought I would check in with a few items.

It's hard not to see the increasing impact of generative AI, including ChatGPT, in myriad forms. I have attached three brief articles that provide a well-rounded view of AI's presence in higher education. They look at both its dangers and utility, as well as hint at what may lie ahead. I encourage you to take a look at some point in advance of fall semester so you can proactively consider the potential implications for your classes.

Also, if you are in the area and want to stop by the Academic Center next Thursday, July 6<sup>th</sup>, we will have a Summer Bridge Graduation luncheon and you are invited to celebrate our new students during this, the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the program. Remarks at 11a.m. in AC 255, lunch to follow.

Finally, I hope you are engaging liberally this summer in whatever brings you joy. I look forward to seeing you the week of August 14<sup>th</sup> for Flex if not at Summer Bridge or elsewhere in the interim.

Best,

Jonathan



**Jonathan Eldridge, Ed.D**  
*Assistant Superintendent/  
Vice President of Student Learning & Success*  
College of Marin  
Office: 415-485-9618  
[jeldridge@marin.edu](mailto:jeldridge@marin.edu)

# 4 Steps to Help You Plan for ChatGPT in Your Classroom

Why you should understand how to teach with AI tools — even if you have no plans to actually use them.

By [Flower Darby](#)

JUNE 27, 2023

The advent of ChatGPT and other generative AI tools is akin to the seismic shifts we experienced when the internet was born or when smartphones became part of our everyday lives. Those inventions initially bewildered and concerned us, but they ended up changing the way we do lots of things — everything? — at work, home, and all spaces in between. So it will be with the new AI.

That analogy comes from a [recent speech](#) by [Vinton G. Cerf](#), vice president and chief internet evangelist at Google. His comment struck a chord, and I've been thinking about it ever since. It offers much-needed perspective at a time when a lot of faculty members are once again bewildered and concerned about an invention that promises to radically alter the way we teach and work.

As an [expert](#) in technology-enabled teaching, I've spent the past few months absorbing and synthesizing higher ed's conversations about generative AI. And yes, I predict we will adjust to ChatGPT as we did with the internet and smartphones, undergoing a process of wrapping our heads around AI tools and learning how to integrate them productively into our professional and personal lives.

How we get to that same level of comfort with AI may well be a rocky road. Certainly in recent months we've seen plenty of alarming headlines — like [this one](#) about the professor who failed all of his students after concluding they used ChatGPT, and [this one](#) and [this one](#), about the degree to which students are already cheating with AI. But judging from the comments I see and hear, many faculty members are still in denial or unaware of how these tools [might affect their own classrooms](#).

What follows are four strategies to help you progress through this wrapping-our-heads-around-AI stage. I would encourage every faculty member to learn to teach with ChatGPT and other such tools as soon as this fall. But my advice here is not just for those of you willing to do so — it's also for those of you who aren't. Because even if you'd rather not bring AI into your courses, you still need to understand how these tools work and be able to speak knowledgeably about them with students.

**Get familiar with generative AI tools.** The only way to do that is to use them. Play around. See how they work. Yet I've had countless conversations with faculty members who say they haven't tried these tools yet and seem intent on keeping their heads stuck deep in the sand. I've also talked with many students who say their professors didn't acknowledge the giant elephant-bot in the room this past spring, simply not mentioning ChatGPT or AI at all. I get it: I've had moments where I've felt stymied by these tools, and tempted to just ignore them. But that attitude won't serve you or your students very well.

If you don't know where to start, read "[What You Need to Know About ChatGPT](#)." Recent essays ([here](#) and [here](#)) on how to adjust your writing assignments to the realities of AI are useful, as is [this Google doc](#) on "classroom policies for AI generative tools" and this [nuanced piece](#) on how AI could be a case of the "rich getting richer" if we don't help students learn to use it. Finally, [this article](#) on what to do while chatbots "mature," written by educator and blogger Ray Schroeder, establishes a useful middle ground between panic and denial. As an initial step forward, Schroeder encourages academics to develop a degree of fluency with these tools by testing them out informally.

It's hard to make careful decisions about how and whether to use something if you have no firsthand knowledge of it. If that's you, consider starting to use chatbots in your day-to-day life. I started by reminding myself, anytime I was about to Google something, to ask ChatGPT (or more accurately, Google Bard, my current favorite). As you play around, you can start thinking through how you might work with AI in your teaching.

**Get ready to talk about it in class.** If you're like many faculty members, you have yet to define your [course policies](#) on AI, which is not surprising given how abruptly it burst on the scene. Plenty of "[skeptics and fans alike](#)" are struggling to frame their own views on the appropriate, ethical, and responsible use of ChatGPT and other tools, and aren't fully prepared to talk with students about this topic. But ready or not, you're going to have to discuss AI with your students in 2023-24.

## **Be honest. Students can learn from your example of transparency, humility, and willingness to learn.**

I've come to believe that faculty members have an ethical obligation to help students prepare for the future of work, a future in which AI will undoubtedly feature prominently. Just last week I spoke with a professor whose daughter has to fire three people on her team because AI can do their jobs better. We *must* help students prepare for an AI-informed workplace. Even if you're not sure what to think about using these tools in your classes, tell students that. Be honest. Students can learn from your example of transparency, humility, and willingness to learn.

A big part of the conversation has to focus on cheating and plagiarism. A recent talk on [academic integrity](#) by [Tricia Bertram Gallant](#), director of the academic-integrity office at the University of California at San Diego, helped me think about how to frame this discussion with students. Cheating isn't new, and neither is "contract cheating" (paper mills and other schemes to pay someone to do your homework), though the latter seems to be growing by leaps and bounds. One way forward is to emphasize how cheaters are only cheating themselves. In her talk, Gallant described a track coach who would tell runners they could ride a scooter around the track, but that that wouldn't make them faster or stronger runners. Think about yourself like that coach, she said. Talk with students about the value of doing the work of learning for themselves instead of outsourcing it to a machine.

Better yet, coach students on the effective use of AI tools related to classwork. I recently had a conversation with a psychology professor who tells his students: “Use these tools to help you understand challenging passages in assigned readings, or to build preliminary foundational knowledge to help you understand more difficult concepts. Don’t use AI to cheat — use it as a tool to help you learn.” That strikes me as a good tone to take for now.

Further, we have an opportunity to help students become upstanding professionals who demonstrate integrity in their work. In this era of remote and hybrid jobs, working in ways that establish trust with your supervisor and team is more important than ever. Why not use a little class time to discuss integrity as students prepare for their future jobs?

**If you suspect students of AI-related cheating, don’t rush to hand out F’s.** Among the most common questions that faculty members are asking about AI: What do I do if I suspect a student cheated with ChatGPT? What if they admit it? Or, what if they don’t admit what seems to be a clear case of AI-enabled dishonesty?

If you think someone has submitted work done by a chatbot, Gallant and other cheating experts recommend you do two things first: (1) Carefully analyze their work, and (2) talk with the student about their writing process. Granted, this approach could be challenging and time-consuming in courses with large enrollments (which is why time-pressed instructors are inclined to hand out a failing grade on the assignment and be done with it). But I would still recommend talking with the student(s) you suspect. Request a short Zoom or phone call to ask a few questions about the student’s work: “How did you come up with the idea for your paper?” or “Tell me more about this argument you’ve proposed here.” Gauge whether they fully understand that using generative AI tools to write their paper was unethical.

If a student admits wrongdoing, you have options to consider:

- Report the incident to your institution’s academic-integrity office. Just keep in mind: This solution might involve paperwork and a long administrative process. (Now would be a great time for institutions to streamline these processes in light of AI).
- Ask the student to resubmit the assignment and show their work. What I mean by “showing their work” is adding comments in a document, explaining their writing process and sources.
- Ask the student what consequence seems fair to them, and create the next steps together. The idea here: Discuss, don’t accuse. At least not as your first step.

If students do not admit to wrongdoing, and you’re pretty sure they cheated, well, that’s a little harder. This past spring an instructor told me about a graduate student whose writing on an assignment was noticeably unlike their previous prose, with strange errors. When confronted, the student denied using AI to generate the work. As it happens, it was a low-stakes assignment and the instructor decided there was no need to press further. But raising the issue at least opened up a teachable moment. Even if they “get away with it” this time, your intervention may keep them from cheating in your class again. And if the behavior persists, you may have to pursue a formal solution.

Ideally in the months ahead, higher-ed institutions and [government agencies](#) will create policies and guidelines on how to deal with cases of chatbot cheating. For now, in these very early days of AI, you'll just have to follow your instincts. In my view, your best bet is to talk with the student(s) in question and decide how to proceed on a case-by-case basis. And maybe the difficulties of dealing with AI-related cheating will prompt some institutions to rethink those large-sized classes.

**If you use plagiarism-detection tools, do so with a hefty degree of caution.** I don't recommend policing your classroom to promote academic integrity, as those efforts can be traumatizing for students and can communicate that they don't belong in your class, thereby widening equity gaps in higher ed.

However, I'm a realist. Plagiarism-detection tools are available (although [not nearly](#) as effective as they initially claimed to be) and plenty of academics will use them (some of these tools [are now marketing themselves](#) as a solution to AI-enabled cheating). Emily Isaacs, a professor of writing at Montclair State University and executive director of its faculty-advancement office, recently wrote in a 700-member email group on [AI in Education](#): "These detection systems are being used and will continue to be used. We need to think about how they can be used as a tool and make the process open and clear for students."

I take the same view of such detection tools as I do of online proctoring. We know that these [proctoring surveillance systems](#) have "[a history of racial bias](#)" and that they disadvantage any students who live with differences related to neurodivergence or to physical or learning disabilities. Likewise, some students have caregiving and work obligations that prevent successful completion of exams while being monitored via webcam. However, we also know that online proctoring might be unavoidable due to accreditation or other requirements.

My recommendation is that you think carefully about the use of AI-detection software, and not simply default to it. Consider other options before automatically concluding that policing students is the only way forward. But if you do decide to use detection software, analyze the results very carefully before accusing students of dishonesty. Better yet, make the results available to students so they can see what's being flagged and revise accordingly before they submit their final work.

We are in uncharted territory. It's hard to know how to proceed with teaching in an AI world. But we are smart, resourceful, and we want the best for our students and their learning outcomes. We will find our way. Give it your time — and attention.

Flower Darby is an associate director of the Teaching for Learning Center at the University of Missouri at Columbia and co-author of *The Norton Guide to Equity-Minded Teaching*, [published in March 2023](#).

# A semester with generative AI

We've been tracking the ways in which ChatGPT and other generative AI tools could be used by students and professors, covering such topics as whether [assessment](#) will need to change and how AI could help or hurt students with [disabilities](#).

Some faculty members enthusiastically embrace a future in which these programs become part of everyday life, because they can help reduce time on routine tasks, function as a personal tutor, or kick start ideas for essays and research papers.

Many — including some of these AI enthusiasts — are deeply worried that students have been handed a powerful tool that comes without a training manual, so there's no way to tell whether it's producing insights or inaccuracies. They also fear that students may become willing to cede the difficult work of critical thinking and analysis in favor of a time-saving device that can churn out a quick discussion post or essay.

These visions of the future run the gamut. But we wanted to know where things stand now. Have classrooms been overrun with AI-produced work, or has ChatGPT been a useful tool? Do students understand what generative AI is and how to use it properly? Are instructors changing how they teach?

We asked. More than 70 people wrote in to describe what they experienced the first semester in a world where these tools have become easily accessible. Here are a few takeaways:

**Obvious cheating with AI was present but not pervasive.** For the most part, professors said they could spot the work that had been AI-generated because, say, the tone was radically different from students' earlier writing, it included material not discussed in class, or it was flat-out wrong in describing or summarizing concepts and content.

Of course, readers also noted that there are ways in which students could have reworked AI-generated text to make it less detectable. That's only likely to be even more true as students become familiar with these tools.

**Figuring out whether students definitely cheated with AI was time consuming.** While AI writing can be easy to spot, faculty members needed to be sure of it if they were going to confront students. Given that nobody has invented a foolproof AI detector, professors said they had to spend a lot of time studying students' writing and looking for other clues. Many used Turnitin's AI detector or some similar application, but treated it as a starting point for further exploration rather than the final word.

**Most professors plan to change their teaching next semester.** One obvious place to start is to have a clear AI-usage policy. Almost 80 percent of respondents plan to do that. This in itself will be tricky to navigate because some instructors don't want students to use any AI and others are OK with responsible

— and transparent — use. About 70 percent also plan to change their assignments to make it harder to cheat with AI, such as doing more work in class.

**Guidance is lacking.** Readers described having to navigate these challenges on their own. They are looking for support in figuring out where the line is between appropriate use and cheating, altering their course design, and helping students understand what these tools are and what they can and can't do well.

Colleges have yet to come to terms with how generative AI will affect undergraduate teaching and learning. That's not surprising, given how recently ChatGPT appeared on the scene. But this summer will be a critical period for many to rethink course design, refashion academic-integrity policies, and create or revise courses to respond to how AI will reshape a varied range of disciplines, including computer science and the arts.

### **Additional AI-Related Resources**

- Ithaka S+R [announced](#) a multi-year research project to assess the AI applications most likely to affect teaching, learning, and research and explore the needs of institutions and faculty members. You can sign up for their mailing list to stay on top of developments.
- This EdSurge [article](#) discusses the Department of Education's recent [report](#) on AI and the future of teaching and learning.
- Ethan Mollick and Lilach Mollick have written a [paper](#) on seven ways AI can be used in the classroom. You can also read a summary of it on Ethan Mollick's Substack, [One Useful Thing](#).
- The Online Learning Consortium's recorded May [webinar](#) on the opportunities and threats of AI in the classroom provides insights into topics such as digital literacy and data privacy.
- You can read [highlights](#) from the *Chronicle's* recent virtual forum on AI and academic integrity.

Beth McMurtrie is a senior writer for *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, where she writes about the future of learning and technology's influence on teaching.

# What Do Students Think of ChatGPT?

Like a lot of you, I have been wondering how students are reacting to the rapid launch of generative AI tools. And I wanted to point you to creative ways in which professors and teaching experts have helped involve them in research and policymaking.

At Kalamazoo College, Autumn Hostetter, a psychology professor, and six of her students surveyed faculty members and students to determine whether they could detect an AI-written essay, and what they thought of the ethics of using various AI tools in writing. You can read their research paper [here](#).

The group gathered three writing samples from students, and one generated by ChatGPT after asking for a 200-word essay responding to the following prompt: “Think about how your personality affects your study habits. Specifically, does being high or low on a particular personality dimension affect how likely you are to engage in active recall when you are studying? Be sure to explain these concepts and provide examples from your life.”

They generated several essays from ChatGPT and chose the one they thought was the best, noting that a student attempting to present the work as their own would likely do the same.

Participants were not told in advance that one essay was AI-generated, but instead were asked to evaluate how well each addressed the prompt. They also rated the writing samples on several dimensions of quality, such as grammar and personal experience, with the AI-generated version often coming out in the middle.

Afterwards they were told that one essay had been written by AI and asked which one they believed it to be. Most students and professors weren’t particularly confident of their guesses, and only 29 percent guessed correctly. One thing that helped improve someone’s detection ability? Having used ChatGPT more frequently.

Cassie Linnertz, a senior and one of the paper’s authors, said she was not surprised by these results. She knew how adept ChatGPT was at mimicking human writing. And a friend who took the survey immediately recognized some common habits — like using “overall” in the summary paragraph — and correctly guessed the AI-written essay. Linnertz’s takeaway: “Professors are going to have to be much more vigilant,” she said, and make sure that what students are producing in class, through writing or discussion, is aligned with what they produce in take-home writing assignments.

Next, participants were asked about a range of scenarios, such as using Grammarly, using AI to make an outline for a paper, using AI to write a section of a paper, looking up a concept on Google and copying it directly into a paper, and using AI to write an entire paper. As expected, commonly used tools like Grammarly were considered the most ethical, while writing a paper entirely with AI was considered the least. But researchers found variation in how people approached the in-between scenarios. Perhaps most interesting: Students and faculty members shared very similar views with each scenario.



MiaFlora Tucci, a senior and another of the authors, said the results suggest that students and professors are likely to find common ground around ethical use of AI, and that involving students in discussions about its ethical uses could be helpful.

There were several scenarios, for example, where both groups saw it more as a tool than a threat. Tucci said that reflects her own experience. In her physical organic chemistry class, for example, she had difficulty understanding a concept described in her textbook. So she copied the paragraph into ChatGPT, asked for a simpler explanation, and once that was clear to her, she confirmed the explanation was accurate using Google. If she had just used Google, she said, she probably would have spent a long time reading through academic papers looking for another explanation of the concept because it was so technical.

\*\*\*

A second case involving students and AI is taking place at College Unbound, a small institution focused on adult learners. Lance Eaton, director of digital pedagogy, created and facilitated two consecutive, eight-week courses running this spring, in which students design and then road test an AI-generative tools policy for the college. (You can read his post outlining the process [here](#).)

“We want students to be as prepared as possible, so they need to be part of that conversation,” he said. “We see our students as fully capable adults who are really enmeshed in complex dynamics in their lives.”

Veronica Machado enrolled in both of the courses. Machado, who works full-time while attending college, is intrigued by the potential of AI tools in her work, which focuses on students who need behavioral and academic support. So she dove into the first course with enthusiasm, spending a lot of time testing out functions.

She and her classmates then got together to discuss what they had learned, and began hammering out a policy that would support responsible use of AI technology.

The [draft policy](#), which provides guidelines for both students and faculty members, states that if students use these tools in their work, they must make clear what portion was generated by the AI tool and which tool they used. Students are also responsible for any negative outcomes from using the tools, such as submitting biased or inaccurate information. “In general,” the policy states, “the ideas and central components of the work should be essentially the work of the student.”

The policy notes that each professor has the right to set their own classroom-usage expectations, which may differ from these guidelines. Faculty, too, must denote if they use AI-generated coursework, and are asked to “keep a relational balance between what they ask of students in terms of how much AI-generative content can show up in student work and in their own work.” In other words, if a professor decides that no more than 25 percent of a student’s work can be generated by AI, then that should hold

true for their coursework as well. They are also not allowed to put students' work into an AI tool to solicit feedback without their consent.

This term, Machado and her classmates are testing how well the guidelines work in practice. While they are going to try to determine how easy it is to distinguish AI content, said Machado, they do not want to make the conversation about stopping students from cheating. "We have to get away from that thought process," she said. "We want people to connect with this new era of AI."

Are you involving students in discussions around AI usage on your campus? Write to me at [beth.mcmurtrie@chronicle.com](mailto:beth.mcmurtrie@chronicle.com) and your example may appear in a future newsletter.

### **AI and Disability**

As instructors think about redesigning elements of their courses to address ChatGPT and other text generators, the question of how this will affect students with disabilities often comes up. In-class assessments, including oral assessments, may present problems for some students, for example. But AI tools could also be a helpful study aid. As one viewer in a recent webinar wrote: "My son has dyslexia. He uses AI as a tool to help organize his thoughts and research into cohesive writing. He says it 'has changed his life.'"

Beth McMurtrie is a senior writer for *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, where she writes about the future of learning and technology's influence on teaching.