

# Who Benefits and Who is Excluded? Equity, Access, and Generative Artificial Intelligence

Group Notes on Case Examples

# Instructions

- Provide your group's responses to your case on a single, individual slide after your case's title slide.
- Please do not add your content to the slides of other groups.
- If there are not enough slides for your group to have one, please create a new one after your case's title slide.

Case 1: Do My Students Have Access?

# Group 1

“Are you capable of accessing chat GPT from your device? [[provide link in survey question]”

“Do you have experience with using chat GPT to generate prompts for an academic assignment?”

Alternatives:

Use another AI: Bard, Bing chat, etc

Limitations: colleges might have some AIs blocked

# Group 2

1. "What is your level of comfort with AI tools?"

"Have you ever used a generative AI tool? Give us an example."

"Are you familiar with [tool X] [generative AI]? Describe in a sentence or two what you think this means."

"We plan to use [tool X] in this course. How familiar are you with this tool?"

(multiple choice): Which of the following tools do you consider to be AI?

Recommendation: let students know up front: "We will be using TurnItIn, which now includes an AI check. We encourage you to check your own work using this tool."

Recommendation: include annotation of syllabus as a course requirement, require annotation of the AI portion. \*\* Could do this as a survey question. "Here's the AI policy, what questions do you have since this is new for all of us?"

2. Choose a tool with limited requirements for registration (ie, no phone number). Example: Bing requires Microsoft account, but not a phone number.

List of options for tools students can use rather than requiring a specific one.

Give enough time for students to explore the tools.

Give sufficient time in-class for exploration, have a spare /generic/test account students can use rather than making their own.

If possible, give a way for a student to opt out or work in pairs since some students likely won't mind. Avoid assignments that really require students to use technologies that they may not want to register for.

State on syllabus that tool will be required

Make assignments low-value so that students can opt out if they don't want to share personal information.

# Group 3

## 1. Sample questions:

Tech: What technology/devices do you have? What are you able/willing to bring to class?

Skills: What is your comfort level with gAI such as chatGPT?

## 2. Alternative approaches

- a. Adopt UDL strategies – multiple ways to complete assignment
- b. “Alternative” assessment strategies (ungrading/mastery-based)
- c. Peer support: Peer/near-peer tutoring, peer evaluated work, equitable group work, discussion boards (“post your struggles”), structured group work (Perusall, etc.)
- d. Provide equitable computing resources
- e. “Pull-out” mentoring/tutoring on new tech

# Group 4

- Discussion question 1:
  - What AI tools have you used or tried in the past? If you've used AI before, which tools are you most comfortable with?
  - What technology do you have immediate or easy access to on campus (or at home for remote classes)?
  - "Tool days" for first few days of FYS - learn how to use email, Google/Microsoft, Canvas, etc. Could add how to use AI and establish boundaries for plagiarism.
    - FYS class is taught in a computer lab, so everyone has access to a device. Can help with access issues if students don't have their own laptop/computer.
- Discussion question 2:
  - If an on-campus class, bring students to the library or computer lab for a class session to do the assignment together.
  - Allow students to use alternatives to ChatGPT, such as AI tools that don't require a sign-up process. Provide a list of AI alternatives so students don't have to research options themselves.
  - For students who can't use AI, meet with student one-on-one or during office hours and use ChatGPT on your own computer with them.
- General discussion notes:
  - Asking students more opinion-based questions in class and having them use personal examples to make it harder to plagiarize from AI
  - Noticing a pattern in AI-generated responses

# Case 2: Usage of Generative AI by Multi-Language Learners



## Group 5

- Current Academic Integrity policies are centered around giving credit for original work. However, there are no provisions for assisted AI. The policies themselves need updating.
- Grammar correction is one thing. However, Chat GPT synthesizes sources in a way that may not necessarily help student find their own voice. There is benefit to revising on your own.
- Assistive technology has the potential to replace the cognitive analysis that is the goal of any given assignment.
- Assistive technology has the potential to help with grammar and form, similar to a visit to the writing center. J
- Question: should this type of Chat GPT help be cited? Consensus: yes. Rationale: the writing center will guide student to do their own work and teach along the way. VS a technology that will simply DO it for the student.

# Group 6

## Discussion questions:

1. Academic Integrity: Using AI can violate the school's policy, if it is using a source the instructor doesn't allow, and/or not citing it correctly.
2. Strategies to prevent plagiarism: Get specific in assignment details, with allowable sources, how to cite it, etc. Also, scaffold the assignment so it gets done more piecemeal, so you can observe their process along the way.
3. If you suspect a student of a violation: Talk to the student about the source of their info, & look at it with them. Make sure the info is where they said it was.

# Group 7

Preliminary discussion surrounding experience with AI and teaching.

Question 1 discussion - it depends on the parameters surrounding the assignment itself. What are the class policies?

Question 2 discussion - if the AI is used as a tool, with explanation of how it's used, then it may be acceptable. Discuss and clarify class policies.

Question 3 discussion

## Group 8

1. Based on Cedar Crest/Lehigh policies, these would constitute plagiarism.
2. Asking students to document and/or reflect on the writing/drafting process as a required part of a submitted writing assignment. Maybe using Word Mark-up during the writing process from the very beginning and asking students to submit a “marked-up” copy of final submitted draft to highlight revisions/changes in the writing process. Instructor should provide clear instructions about the use of generative AI and how it relates to plagiarism: when is it acceptable or not.
3. Put prompt in chatbot to see responses. Conversation with student. GPTZero/Turnitin options?

# Case 3: Generative AI as an Assistive Technology

# Group 10

## CASE #2

Thoughts:

Past year: we've used side-by-side comparisons with ChatGPT output as an exercise. What to do about students who deny use of AI tools, but submit work that clearly seems assisted?

This tends to happen in last/final assignments

WHY do students choose to falsify their work (using AI or otherwise)? Fear; inadequacy; precedent from high school; disparity between speaking and writing skills (for ELLs)--> tool use becoming a habit

Potential actions:

- \*Ask students to submit a portfolio of all process documents (including prompts, etc.). Make it clear that you may review these if there are concerns.
- \* Structure course to avoid the end-of-semester panic assignment
- \*Supplement and support writing with face-to-face conversations.
- \*Document, document, document! Make it a natural part of the writing process

# Group 12

## Discussion questions:

1. Come up with a few specific examples of how the student featured in the case could benefit from having generative AI embedded within the tools that they describe.
  - a. Voice/speech to text technology
    - i. Minimum level of accuracy needed to qualify as adequate translation
      1. Challenges with annunciation/accents etc
  - b. Summary to narrated text (lectures) using AI
    - i. Example in video had minimal extraction of information
  
2. How might an instructor embrace equity-minded practices with regards to students' generative AI usage for all learners, inclusive of neurodivergent students and students with disabilities?
  - a. Use of the above technologies can benefit all learners and begin to normalize the use of AI for all learners

# Case 4: Bias Around Students' Usage of Generative AI



# Group 15

- Bias– as 1) input/in the text (available online), 2) output (as our example seems to be)
- LLM trained on large volume of text or other materials generated by humans, and those humans are biased
- That bias will be propagated by the LLM into its responses, this is the real source of bias in the use of these tools that concerns us.

## Group 18- Case 4: Bias Around Students' Usage of Generative AI

- Assumption on the use of genAI Vs not taking position on assumption
- genAI and intention (filling facts) Vs correct again if not target met (more work) eg. Voice text and correction, incorrect and sts bad interpretation attempt by machine
- Voice in context vs machine generalization, correction

### Q2 Group use of GenAI

- Novice to using it to learn and work

### Q3 Stud use of GenAI

- Not knowing much vs Student in stud panel asking more introduction to use

## Group 20

- Responsible for anything that is said in an email regardless of who typed it, if it was sent by that person then they commit to those words
- Mostly experience has been to see the limitations and capacities of the ChatGPT
- We did discuss the benefits of these conversations and how the dehumanization of individuals within writing limits the abilities of the individual to have critical thoughts
- Haven't experienced direct response of students using ChatGPT