SANTA ANA COLLEGE
Academic Senate

Spring 2024 Retreat
AGENDA

Coffee and Conversation *Refreshments provided by SAC Café*	**8:30am – 9:00am**
Preliminaries	**9:00am – 9:20am**
Call to Order	
Land Acknowledgement Statement	
FARSCCD Update	
President's Update	
Senate Business	**9:20am – 10:05am**
Senator/Chair Best Practices	Amberly Chamberlain
Faculty Dues, Awards for Excellence & Senate By-laws	Merari Weber
BoardDocs and Agenda Requests	Andrew Barrios
State Budget Update	Madeline Grant
Senate Committee Updates	**10:05am – 10:50am**
Curriculum and Instruction Council	Madeline Grant
Distance Education Advisory Group	Jaki King
Intersectionality, Race and Social Justice Advisory Group	Annie Knight & Steve Bautista
Break	**10:50am – 10:55am**
Breakout 1: Academic Integrity and AI	**10:55am – 11:55am**
Listening Lunch	**Noon – 12:30pm**
Guided Pathways Update	Tanisha Burrus
Breakout 2: Academic Freedom	**12:30pm – 12:55pm**
Announcements & Adjournment to Break-Out	**12:55pm - 1:00pm**
Senate Retreat Breakout: Course Maximum Workshop *Facilitated by: Suzanne Freeman, Amberly Chamberlain*	**1:00pm – 2:00pm**

Up Next:

February 13, 2024	Academic Senate Meeting with ASCCC Executive Committe Members, Dr. LaTonya Parker and Christopher Howertown	1:30pm – 3:30pm	JSC-219

Academic Integrity in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: The Onus is on Faculty

April 2023

Juan Arzola (/directory/juan-arzola)
ASCCC At-Large Representative

Since the first decade of the twenty-first century, California community colleges have struggled to find a solution to the easy access to information that the Internet has provided. In 2005, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) passed two resolutions, 14.01 and 14.02 [1]. Both resolutions sought to increase faculty's authority to fail a student who has cheated for a course, not just for the assignment in question. In 2007, the ASCCC adopted the paper Promoting and Sustaining an Institutional Climate of Academic Integrity as a sign that faculty were—and continue to be—concerned with "the proliferation of electronic resources" and that "they feel uncertain about their rights and responsibilities as well as about those of their students" (ASCCC, 2007). Numerous ASCCC resolutions and Rostrum articles have continued since that paper was published, but the challenges remain and, in some ways, have become more complex.

For example, a revolutionary tool made headlines in late 2022 and early 2023. ChatGPT is an artificial intelligence powered chatbot that can generate responses based on a prompt that the user inputs. In fact, ChatGPT was able to pass exams given in law school and graduate business courses, although not with exemplary scores (Murphy Kelly, 2023). Unsurprisingly, users of ChatGPT are getting help with homework and other assignments for their classes.

Both in the past and currently, faculty have framed and continue to frame issues of academic integrity through a deficit lens, as unacceptable student behaviors. Resolutions, Rostrum articles, and ASCCC adopted papers have nearly all framed failures of academic integrity as the sole responsibility of students. As such, ASCCC resolutions that have been presented and adopted sought to increase the penalties in order to act as a deterrent. In the juvenile and adult justice system, some have noted that "harsher punishments, such as longer prison sentences, not only do not prevent crime but may actually have the opposite effect" (Knight, 2020). One might ask whether this could also be the case in education when faculty are empowered with the ability to issue a failing grade in a course for a single incident involving academic integrity and whether such actions are creating the actual desired effect. Instead of looking at failures of academic integrity through a deficit lens, one might look at them as an opportunity for faculty to learn to stay, at the very least, well informed.

EDUCATE AND REHABILITATE, NOT CASTIGATE AND ALIENATE

In 1997-98, the academic community was provided with what many considered a formidable tool to help encourage academic integrity. Turnitin ushered in an era where plagiarism could be identified in merely minutes. Nearly twenty years later, a 2015 study found that the majority of study participants held a view that the plagiarism they encountered was treated as unintentional and penalized only what they considered to be extreme versions of intentional plagiarism, which often contradicted the way they presented the concept of plagiarism in their syllabi and their classrooms (Bruton & Childers, 2016). Faculty should take an active role in clarifying and make more explicit in their syllabi what is considered plagiarism in order to help educate and inform students.

One way to better inform students on this issue is to use the tools themselves in class as a teaching tool. Turnitin, ChatGPT, or other artificial intelligence can be used as a tool for teaching and educating students in a number of ways while promoting the value and ethics of academic integrity. The following are a few suggestions:

1. Use Turnitin, ChatGPT, or other artificial intelligence to provide students with additional information and resources. These resources can be used to supplement lectures, readings, and other course materials, providing students with additional information and insights. For example, one could use ChatGPT to provide students with definitions, explanations, and examples related to course concepts.
2. Encourage critical thinking and independent learning. Rather than using Turnitin, ChatGPT, or other artificial intelligence to provide students with answers to specific questions, encourage them to use the tool to explore and expand their understanding of course topics. Encourage them to ask open-ended questions and to use the information provided by ChatGPT to generate their own ideas and perspectives.
3. Emphasize the importance of citation and academic integrity. Make certain that students understand that they are responsible for properly citing any information they receive from ChatGPT or any other source. Emphasize the importance of academic integrity and the consequences of plagiarism.
4. Set clear guidelines for the use of ChatGPT. Provide students with clear guidance and expectations for how they should use ChatGPT. For example, one could specify that ChatGPT should only be used for clarification or additional information and not for answers to graded assignments or assessments. [2]

Turnitin, ChatGPT, and other artificial intelligence tools can be resources for teaching and can be an effective way to enhance student learning as long as they are used responsibly and in a way that emphasizes academic integrity and critical thinking. Academic integrity is essential for the preservation of the academic enterprise and the pursuit of knowledge, as it helps to ensure that academic work is trustworthy, reliable, and of high quality and it promotes a culture of honesty, fairness, and respect in academic communities.

Finally, one might consider the intense focus on students and the deficit thinking that plagues California community colleges. Deficit language and thinking refers to language or thoughts that frame individuals or groups as deficient, inferior, or lacking in some way, often based on stereotypes or biases (Griffin, 2014). It can have negative effects on both individuals and communities and can perpetuate systemic inequalities and injustices. Some might see this type of deficit language and thinking in the past resolutions and Rostrum

articles related to academic dishonesty. As the ASCCC continues to work on its core commitment to inclusion, diversity, equity, anti-racism, and accessibility, the use of deficit language is being critically evaluated to move away from its use.

The landscape that California community colleges find themselves navigating necessitates a new perspective on enduring puzzles. Recognizing the heightened concern the field has developed with these new technologies, and the known and unknown implications for teaching and learning, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges will work to investigate this issue and develop resources to assist the field.

REFERENCES

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (2007). Promoting and Sustaining an Institutional Climate of Academic Integrity. https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/academic-integrity-2007_0.pdf (/sites/default/files/publications/academic-integrity-2007_0.pdf)

Bruton, S. & Childers, D. (2016). The ethics and politics of policing plagiarism: a qualitative study of faculty views on student plagiarism and Turnitin. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 41 (2), 316-330. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02602938.2015.1008981 (https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02602938.2015.1008981)

Griffin, Ashley. (2014, Sept. 22). Questioning the Deficit. The Education Trust. https://edtrust.org/the-equity-line/questioning-deficit/#:~:text=Simply%20asking%20that%20question%20renders,despite%20information%20about%20its' (https://edtrust.org/the-equity-line/questioning-deficit/#:~:text=Simply%20asking%20that%20question%20renders,despite%20information%20about%20its%20harm).

Knight, B. (2020, July 16). Do harsher punishments deter crime? UNSW Newsroom. https://newsroom.unsw.edu.au/news/business-law/do-harsher-punishments-deter-crime (https://newsroom.unsw.edu.au/news/business-law/do-harsher-punishments-deter-crime)

Murphy Kelly, S. (2023, Jan. 26). ChatGPT passes exams from law and business schools. CNN Business, https://www.cnn.com/2023/01/26/tech/chatgpt-passes-exams/index.html (https://www.cnn.com/2023/01/26/tech/chatgpt-passes-exams/index.html)

---

1. Full text of all ASCCC resolutions can be accessed at https://www.asccc.org/resources/resolutions (/resources/resolutions).

2. For more information on the use of artificial intelligence as a teaching tool, see Rose, Jennifer, (2023, Feb 21), "ChatGPT as a teaching tool, not a cheating tool" in Times Higher Education, https://www.timeshighereducation.com/campus/chatgpt-teaching-tool-not-cheating-tool (https://www.timeshighereducation.com/campus/chatgpt-teaching-tool-not-cheating-tool) and Thomas, Paul, (2023, Feb 28), "ChatGPT and a new battle in the citation gauntlet for students and teachers" in Radical

MT. SAC
Mt. San Antonio College

1100 North Grand Avenue
Walnut, CA 91789-1399
909-274-7500
www.mtsac.edu

Artificial Intelligence and Education Guide

Preamble

The Academic Senate Artificial intelligence (AI) and Education Workgroup has created this guide on the dynamic topic of understanding teaching and learning with AI in higher education in the Spring semester of 2023 to provide faculty with beginning guidance on practices to address the use of AI.

AI will continue to have a significant impact on higher education just as the creation of learning tools in the past also altered education. AI tools developed today have the potential of addressing some needs like directly supporting individualized learning for students. However, there are important concerns connected to AI. Perhaps most central are the identified biases in AI algorithms that may result in inaccurate or false content and delivery of educational materials.

Educators must be wary about employing AI systems because the algorithms that power them lack transparency and students need to be educated to understand imperfections of AI, and certainly, the intersection of AI use and plagiarism.

The information to follow has been written to provide clear and concise definitions, tools, and advice. The field of AI is continually developing, and as such, guidance and practices will continue to evolve. In the spirit of sharing information that can support faculty at this moment, the workgroup has prepared this guide.

Brief Summary of What AI Is

What are the Three Types of Artificial Intelligence?

In basic terms, there are three main types of Artificial Intelligence: *narrow artificial intelligence* (or narrow AI), *artificial general intelligence* (or AGI), and *artificial superintelligence* (or ASI). Narrow Artificial Intelligence is when AI is exceptional at one task or a set of related tasks. For instance, it can solve certain math problems, or it can produce in a manner of seconds an essay on almost any topic—with the necessary guardrails set up against sexual or violent content. One can even have a conversation with an AI chat bot. Artificial General Intelligence (AGI) is when a computational system has a high-level intelligence across a range of cognitive tasks. It will appear to have human-like intelligence and be able to master a larger series of tasks. We do not yet have AGI, but some computer scientists believe we are getting closer. After AGI, the next stage for Artificial Intelligence may be ASI, or a superintelligence which will be far greater than that of any human being and beyond almost anything we can imagine.

What is ChatGPT?

On November 30, 2022, ChatGPT (which stands for Generative Pre-Trained Transformers) was released to the public. This form of Artificial Intelligence is *narrow AI*. ChatGPT can generate human-like text from a massive, curated database. This database is not directly hooked up to the Internet, but rather it was trained on a large body of texts from a variety of sources, including academic journals, books,

articles, and some vetted websites. The data it has trained on only goes up to the year 2021, so it is not pulling from more current information from the years 2022 or 2023. In the first 3 months of its release, it acquired 100 million users and is the fastest growing app in human history. Since the initial release, a more powerful version, ChatGPT 4, has been made available. This latest iteration can also code cogently.

What is the concern for Educators?
The concern for educators is how ChatGPT will impact their classes. With this form of AI, students can type in any prompt and AI can create a copyright free, quasi-original essay in seconds not picked up by most plagiarism detectors. There are a couple of AI detectors available to run text through, but these are not foolproof and currently they will not accurately detect text generated from ChatGPT 4. When using ChatGPT, students can tell it specifics, such as write a 600-word essay, include three sources, include certain terms, write it like a 10th grader, make sure it compares key concepts, etc. Statistics show that students across the world are using it to generate essays and to solve homework problems—whether in math, science, humanities, or any other discipline. Some students are using it to find the answers for exam questions. If a student puts in the multiple-choice question with the varied options into ChatGPT, it can generate the right answer far beyond guessing. Interestingly, while the original ChatGPT was able to score a 1020 on the SAT, ChatGPT 4 scores 1410. This illustrates the advancements being made in AI in a short amount of time.

Here is a 17-minute film introducing AI and Education.

Sample Syllabus Language/Classroom Policies
Faculty should consider their goals for the course when choosing syllabus language. A few options are presented below. Regardless of what statement you choose, consider asking students to explicitly acknowledge the syllabus policies, for instance via a syllabus quiz or signed contract.

The simplest syllabus options add a sentence or clause to your existing academic integrity statement, such as *Collaboration with ChatGPT or other AI composition software is not permitted in this course.* Or alternatively, if you want to check on a case-by-case basis: *Please obtain permission from me before collaborating with peers or AI chatbots (like ChatGPT) on assignments for this course.* (language from the Poorvu Center for Teaching and Learning, Yale University).

Somewhat longer options can give students more context for your policy choices, as with the examples below, from The Center for Teaching & Assessment of Learning at the University of Delaware.

- **Use prohibited**
  Students are not allowed to use advanced automated tools (artificial intelligence or machine learning tools such as ChatGPT or Dall-E 2) on assignments in this course. Each student is expected to complete each assignment without substantive assistance from others, including automated tools.
- **Use only with prior permission**
  Students are allowed to use advanced automated tools (artificial intelligence or machine learning tools such as ChatGPT or Dall-E 2) on assignments in this course if instructor permission is obtained in advance. Unless given permission to use those tools, each student is expected to complete each assignment without substantive assistance from others, including automated tools.

- **Use only with acknowledgement**
  Students are allowed to use advanced automated tools (artificial intelligence or machine learning tools such as ChatGPT or Dall-E 2) on assignments in this course if that use is properly documented and credited. For example, text generated using ChatGPT-3 should include a citation such as: "Chat-GPT-3. (YYYY, Month DD of query). "Text of your query." Generated using OpenAI. https://chat.openai.com/" Material generated using other tools should follow a similar citation convention.
- **Use is freely permitted with no acknowledgement**
  Students are allowed to use advanced automated tools (artificial intelligence or machine learning tools such as ChatGPT or Dall-E 2) on assignments in this course; no special documentation or citation is required.

Meaningful policies may refer to standards within your academic discipline. For instance, multiple scientific journals have issued guidelines around AI use for authors.

- **Artificial intelligence (AI).** Text generated from AI, machine learning, or similar algorithmic tools cannot be used in papers published in *Science* journals, nor can the accompanying figures, images, or graphics be the products of such tools, without explicit permission from the editors. In addition, an AI program cannot be an author of a *Science* journal paper. A violation of this policy constitutes scientific misconduct. (*Science* journals)
- Large Language Models (LLMs), such as ChatGPT, do not currently satisfy our authorship criteria. Notably an attribution of authorship carries with it accountability for the work, which cannot be effectively applied to LLMs. Use of an LLM should be properly documented in the Methods section (and if a Methods section is not available, in a suitable alternative part) of the manuscript. (*Nature*)

A more extensive discussion may be appropriate. See, for instance, the example of Juan David Gutiérrez (Universidad del Rosario), which includes extensive discussion of informed, transparent, ethical, and responsible use of AI within an academic course.

As always, the most successful syllabus policies will be those that are clearly explained and well-integrated with the other course materials. Consider updating or changing your assignments to help students understand the drawbacks and challenges of Large Language Models and other AI-generated materials. In particular, helping students develop a sense of ownership for their writing may help to minimize the temptation to use AI in prohibited ways.

Teaching Practices Around AI/How to Monitor

It's suggested that faculty teaching both online and face-to-face employ best practices in establishing expectations for their students when completing assignments. These expectations should be made explicit in instructions for all assignments whether they are turned in in-person or online. It's suggested that policies be stated in **multiple places** in a course (online) and on a syllabus.

Instructions on parameters may include the following:

- Statement(s) on what materials may or may not be used when completing an assessment.
- Referencing the College's policy on Academic Integrity.

- Establishing the consequences for students if they violate these policies (such as requiring a meeting in-person or on Zoom with cameras on, a "0" on the assignment, report to Student Life, etc.)
- State which (if any) AI tools may be used including complex translation tools like *DeepL*, and state how they may be used.

Faculty may also consider designing new assignments that challenge students to critique and analyze ChatGPT and similar AI tools. For instance, students could read primary sources and then compare their understanding with ChatGPT's understanding. Other faculty might consider asking students to explicitly critique the output of AI (e.g., for writing style, factual accuracy, complexity of argument, and so on).

How to Incorporate AI for Faculty

Despite the many challenges AI presents on issues related to academic integrity, there are many ways in which it can be used by faculty to enhance their pedagogy. For example, faculty might use ChatGPT to aid in the lesson planning process. Importantly, ChatGPT does not replace the instructor's planning process but instead helps the instructor by engaging in a collaborative process with the generative technology. For instance, faculty might prompt ChatGPT to assist them with developing a lesson on [insert topic] that meets certain SLOs. Faculty might also prompt ChatGPT to create a list of resources that students can refer to given a specific lesson plan that the instructor has developed. Likewise, faculty can ask ChatGPT to role play as a professor in any given discipline, then prompt it to provide feedback to the lesson plan that the instructor has created. On prompt development for faculty, many more resources are provided at Leon Furze's, "Practical Strategies for ChatGPT in Education":

Faculty might also consider using ChatGPT to update their existing lesson plans with more contemporary resources or literature. In this way, faculty are prompting ChatGPT using their own self-created lesson plans and getting feedback in return. Within the classroom, instructors might also use ChatGPT to break moments of cognitive stagnation. For example, if students are having difficulties understanding [topic/concept] after several tries using different examples, it might be worthwhile to ask ChatGPT or another generative technology to explain [topic/concept] in different ways, specifically for college students. The results of the prompt may help students to understand the topic or concept better.

Generative technologies can also be used for equity. For example, instructors can prompt ChatGPT to use the principles of UDL to update an existing lesson plan, particularly for students with disabilities. Instructors can then use the updated lesson to supplement or revise what is typically offered to students to strengthen inclusivity.

Importantly, the strategies described in this section aim not to replace an instructor or their expertise. Instead, these strategies aim to assist instructors with their everyday work via a process of collaboration with AI. As mentioned previously, Leon Furze's "Practice Strategies for ChatGPT in Education" offers invaluable tools for generative AI prompt development.

AI Apps that are Useful for Faculty

Bing AI - Search
Bing's AI generative technology

Google Bard
Google's AI generative technology

ChatGPT
OpenAI's generative technology

OpenArt
OpenArt's image generation technology

Wolfram|Alpha: Computational Intelligence (wolframalpha.com)
Wolfram Research's computational technology

Home - Packback
AI detection

Elicit
Brainstorming/Research assistant

Conclusion
The strategies and resources presented in this guide aim to help instructors better understand generative technologies and how they can be used in the classroom. This report correctly leaves the decision of whether to use AI in the classroom firmly at the instructor's discretion. The hope is that this guide can be used by faculty by offering sample syllabus language, various teaching practices, and advice on how to cope with AI in education, as well as resources on how faculty can ethically use AI to streamline their own instructional practices. Ultimately, faculty are responsible for developing their own pedagogy – this guide serves simply as an aid.

Resources
Introduction to AI
Articles
- "What is artificial intelligence?" (Brookings Institute)

Books
- *Artificial Intelligence: A Very Short Introduction*
- *Artificial Intelligence for Dummies*

Open Courses
- Elements of AI
- Intro to Artificial Intelligence (Udacity)
- Introduction to Artificial Intelligence (Coursera and IBM)

Websites
- Center for Humane Technology
- US Department of Education: Artificial Intelligence

Videos
- Crash Course: Artificial Intelligence
- The Cyborgian Revolution: A.I. and Education

Select AI Tools

Initial Proposed Language for an "Academic Freedom" component to be included within a proposed <u>new</u> "Faculty Rights" Article to tentatively be added within the FARSCCD Contract…

Academic Freedom

In alignment with RSCCD Board Policy 4030, the District and the Association are committed to free and open inquiry in all matters in the classroom; they agree that all District faculty members shall have the broadest possible latitude to speak, write, listen, challenge, and learn. Except insofar as limitations on that freedom are necessary to the functioning of the District or to the adherence to law, the Parties fully respect and support the freedom of all District faculty members to discuss any matters of academic or public concern. The protections of academic freedom include but are not limited to freedom of inquiry and research, freedom of teaching and instructional methodology, and freedom of expression and publication.

- ***Inquiry:*** Faculty members are entitled to academic freedom in the classroom in discussing their course subject matter and may examine or endorse unpopular or controversial ideas or viewpoints that are relevant to the official course outline of record and student learning. Faculty members should exercise prudent judgment to not introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to the course subject matter as identified within the course outline of record unless done to promote free and open student inquiry within the student learning environment. This does not preclude faculty members from using their professional judgment in discussing other topics with their students when aimed at enhancing student learning and understanding.

- ***Instructional Materials:*** Academic freedom includes the right of faculty to create and to use instructional materials that may be thought-provoking, contain controversial or unpopular ideas, or that challenge prevailing social attitudes so long as they are relevant to the courses they teach and enhance student learning. Faculty members may select or recommend for selection instructional materials and/or course materials presenting all points of view without regard to the gender, race, sexual orientation, gender identity, ethnicity, age, nationality, or the social, political, or religious views of the authors.

- ***Teaching Methodology:*** Faculty members may explore, select, and modify different teaching styles and methods of instruction and determine which methods are best for delivering instruction to students within the framework of the official course outline of record and relevant to student learning.

- ***Textbook Selection:*** Faculty members shall maintain the authority to determine and select course textbooks based upon their professional judgment as consistent with the course outline of record.

- ***Grading:*** Faculty members shall maintain the authority to determine grades based upon professional judgment to the extent mandated by law. Faculty members have a responsibility to base grades solely on considerations that are intellectually relevant to the subject matter as articulated in the official course outline of record, and to describe the basis for grading in the course syllabus.

- ***Scholarly Work:*** Faculty members shall have the freedom to publish, present, or participate in professional scholarship related to their profession to the extent permitted by law, provided their professional scholarship does not interfere with their regular District assigned duties.

- ***Intramural Comments:*** The District shall respect faculty members' right to utilize normal channels of campus communication free of censorship in the collegial expression or discussion of their opinions and viewpoints on matters of college and District policy including during department, college, and/or District meetings and while participating in the governance structure of their college and/or the District.

- ***Extramural Comments:*** The District shall respect the faculty member's right in public life to exercise freedom of speech, freedom of association, freedom of union activity, and freedom to express expert opinions in a public forum. Faculty members who speak or write as private citizens during their non-work time shall have speech rights as permitted by law. When faculty members speak or write publicly as citizens, they shall be free from prior institutional censorship or subsequent discipline by the college or district. Faculty are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. As scholars and education officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should make reasonable effort to be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.

These rights notwithstanding, academic freedom is to be practiced within the parameters of commonly recognized standards of teaching, professional conduct, and applicable policies and laws. In exercising the rights to academic freedom, faculty have a responsibility to engage in teaching and learning that honors and respects the rights of others to hold divergent viewpoints; avoid any exploitation, harassment or discriminatory treatment of students; and avoid engaging in unprotected speech that may reasonably be expected to lead to physical injury to individuals or district facilities and/or the substantial disruption of college classes or activities. Nothing in this article prevents the District from taking disciplinary action against a faculty member for unlawful conduct or for other reasons provided in the Education Code.