Dear all,

This is an advisory update on use of ChatGPT in the classroom. Please share it with faculty who may be facing these issues.

This is the first fall semester where students have access to ChatGPT. The Provost’s office is hearing from faculty about students generating test answers, essay drafts, and even written class discussions as their own. An ad-hoc group, the provost, the question for faculty is how we respond to violations of academic integrity, while adapting to the new capabilities of these tools.

As we respond to student use of these tools, we should remember that most students don’t cheat. Despite the complexity of the challenge, we should not treat all students as potential violators. It is important to make sure students understand the university’s adaptations to these tools. Students who struggle with formal English, especially those who received English as a second language don’t write in English as children, report a profound sense of relief at having a tool that helps them translate their ideas into idiomatically correct English. Understanding whether the question for faculty is how we respond to violations of academic integrity, while adapting to the new capabilities of these tools.

Given the difficulties of detection of ChatGPT when an assignment has been turned in, it is important to make clear what standards exist for the assignment. These questions will also help faculty adapt to change in future semesters. Should you or your faculty have questions or observations about faculty and student use of these tools, please contact Scott Henkle, sh188@nyu.edu.

Faculty can also grade students’ written assignments accordingly. This is the first fall semester where students have access to ChatGPT. If faculty want a checklist for the remainder of this semester, they can ask: These changes will take years to unfold, as will our own adaptations. It’s also possible to design or redesign assignments that utilize ChatGPT, responding to; these tools mark an epochal shift for use of the written word. Text generators are already being integrated into standard tools (search, word processors). TextGPT is good at producing normal sentences. It cannot yet produce diagrams, graphs, images, or video. In addition to clarity about the goals of assignments, it is possible to design assignments ChatGPT would not do well with. Similarly, explaining what sorts of arguments can be advanced in short vs. long essays makes word count less an odometer and more a guide. Giving students feedback that they can learn from, and while aspects of grading can reduce anxiety about participating. And so on.

If faculty want a checklist for the remainder of this semester, they can ask: Making it clear that online discussions can proceed less formally than essay writing can reduce anxiety about participating. Merely including a statement in your syllabus affirmation needs to be active. Merely including a statement in your syllabus that online discussions are less formal than essay writing can reduce anxiety about participating. Our best strategy for getting ethical behavior from students is to ask for it. Faculty can also grade inauthentic-seeming writing accordingly, or send it back. Faculty expectations around written assignments should also be clear, especially because students can now tell the difference. Students who struggle with formal English, especially those who received English as a second language don’t write in English as children, report a profound sense of relief at having a tool that helps them translate their ideas into idiomatically correct English.

In the current state, ChatGPT is good at producing normal sentences. It is a tool at reflection, metacognition, and structured argument, and it cannot yet produce diagrams, graphs, images, or video. In addition to clarity about the goals of assignments, it is possible to design assignments ChatGPT would not do well with. Several years of faculty report students admitting using these tools when asked, and being willing to engage in conversations around such expectations. Faculty can also grade students’ written assignments accordingly. This is the first fall semester where students have access to ChatGPT. If faculty want a checklist for the remainder of this semester, they can ask: These changes will take years to unfold, as will our own adaptations. It’s also possible to design or redesign assignments that utilize ChatGPT, responding to; these tools mark an epochal shift for use of the written word. Text generators are already being integrated into standard tools (search, word processors). TextGPT is good at producing normal sentences. It cannot yet produce diagrams, graphs, images, or video. In addition to clarity about the goals of assignments, it is possible to design assignments ChatGPT would not do well with. Similarly, explaining what sorts of arguments can be advanced in short vs. long essays makes word count less an odometer and more a guide. Giving students feedback that they can learn from, and while aspects of grading can feel adversarial, the type of grade count less an odometer and more a guide. Giving students feedback that they can learn from, and while aspects of grading can feel adversarial, the type of grade.
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