AI kan hjælpe menneskelige evner ind i uddannelserne igen

Rasmus Hage Dalland, redaktør REVY

Temaet var ny teknologi, da medlemmer af DFFU mødtes til årsmøde i Middelfart i oktober. Til at åbne de spændende diskussioner, som den hastige udvikling og brug af værktøjer med kunstig intelligens lægger op til, var ph.d. i filosofi og ekspert i akademisk integritet Tricia Bertram Gallant inviteret hele vejen fra University of California San Diego. Hun fortalte om, hvordan kunstig intelligens udfordrer den akademiske integritet, men også hvordan de nye værktøjer kan hjælpe os med at få fokus tilbage på de menneskelige egenskaber og evner i vores uddannelsesmiljøer. REVY har spurgt Gallant om den kunstige intelligens' rolle i uddannelsesmiljøet, og om hun er bekymret eller håbefuld for fremtidens brug af de nye teknologier.

Broadly speaking, how does Generative AI challenge the academic integrity?

GenAI challenges academic integrity because it presents very real temptations and opportunities for students to quickly, easily and cheaply offload their thinking, learning and doing to machines. Obviously, if students offload the very thing on which they are being evaluated, and they are not transparent about that offloading, then this invalidates the assessment and therefore undermines academic integrity.

We have always used aid and tools in learning – what make the new AI tools so different?

You're right, we have always used aids and tools in learning. And I don't think, actually, that AI tools are that different. Like other tools, the calculator, the internet, AI tools can be used in ways that either aid or undermine learning. AI tools are cheap, quick, and easy to access and use just like the internet. AI tools present themselves as authoritative and valid, just like the calculator. Note I said 'present themselves as'; they are not actually as valid since they confabulate. So, like other tools, these machines can either be used ethically or unethically. I think they 'feel' different now because they are new, and we have fuzzy memories about having to adopt to earlier technologies. And they are also fundamentally different because, unlike other tools, GenAI tools learn and evolve, and they can be customized and personalized to each specific learner. So, they have real power in fundamentally shifting our notions of what is learning, what is teaching, and what should be assessed – and how.

One of your points at your talk in Middelfart was that students use GenAI tools to improve their performance – that is, their grades – not for learning or mastering a subject. Do AI tools put our ability to learn or interest in learning at risk?

↑ **Foto:** Tricia Bertram Gallant åbnede DFFU's årsmøde i Middelfart med en talk om, hvordan AI-værktøjer bliver brugt i uddannelsessystemet, og hvordan de udfordrer den akademiske integritet.

They might. We don't quite know yet since the tools are new and research is just starting to come out about that, and so far the research results seem mixed. However, as many of my colleagues have stated, friction or struggle is necessary for learning, but yet the point of AI is to reduce friction – to make everything easier. So, how can AI amplify versus hinder learning? I think that learning can be amplified by carefully designed AI tools and crafted lesson plans, but if a student is just using a generic AI tool such as ChatGPT on their own without guidance, then the more likely result is a hindering of learning. For example, of the students I've spoken to, they are not reading the assigned texts and instead asking ChatGPT to summarize the readings. Since ChatGPT makes up information, there's a definite learning loss there.

You say that learning is about friction or struggle – how do we learn to appreciate that in an era, where AI tools can give quick help and answers to almost everything in no time?

I think humans love to learn, but we need support to help us through the struggle of learning. Picture a child learning to ride a bike. They can't or at least most can't just get on a bike and learn to ride it on their own. They need someone beside them, supporting them, cheering them on, guiding them. However, in the 21st century university, especially the large ones, we don't have sufficient supports for students as they struggle in their learning. Why not? First, students are often struggling when we're not available – like at 2 am! Second, we don't have a one-to-one coach to learner ratio, like most of us likely did when learning how to ride a bike. So, universities need to find a way to support university students through the struggle of learning like we do with kids learning how to ride a bike. Perhaps that's through leveraging AI to provide 24/7 learning support to students. Perhaps that's by moving away from our paternalistic model of higher education that tells students what courses they have to take and when, towards using AI to help us create individualized learning and learning pathways. Perhaps it's creating more human-to-human mentoring programs with faculty, staff and students participating as mentors. All of these strategies could enhance students' intrinsic motivation to learn and engage in the struggle of learning, while resisting the temptations and opportunities to cheat.

→

According to you, the quick adoption of AI tools without AI literacy creates problems – which steps should be taken in our educational systems in order to improve the AI literacy? Or to slow down the adoption?

I don't think we can slow down adoption, but we do need to provide all incoming students with an AI literacy module/tutorial and then hopefully weave further education throughout the curriculum as it relates to specific topics or disciplines.

At your talk in Middelfart, you said that we have been decentering humanity in education for a long time – what do you mean by that?

My comment was made in reference to the industrialization of higher education over the last half of the 20th century and continuing into the 21st century. Higher education industrialization refers to us adopting values like efficiency, scalability, standardization, and output over values like good pedagogy, integrity, and learning. As a result, our classes have become larger, we've made changes based on consumer demand, we've created more contingent rather than full-time faculty positions, and we're driven by quantifiable performance indicators, such as grades, time to degree, and graduation rates, rather than indicators of learning and personal or professional growth of our students. By its very definition, industrialization de-centers humanity because it decreases personal interactions, focuses on students as customers rather than learners, and prescribes rigid 'learning paths' that reduce student agency and autonomy.

Now, you believe the task is to recenter humanity in education by integrating rather than resisting AI – what are the human skills we need to get back in our educational system and how can AI help us?

The durable human skills include every thing that AI can't do or only pretends to be able to do – reasoning, feeling, critical thinking, empathy, contextual understanding, emotional intelligence, creativity, decision-making, and intuition, to name a few. Now, this is just speculation, but I'm wondering if AI can help us recenter these human skills by enabling faculty and staff – the humans who can coach and mentor our students – to offload some administrative work so that they have more time to interact with students one-to-one or in small groups. Freeing humans up from administrative tasks so they have time to spend with other humans, that sounds like a promising development to me.

> **I'm not sure we actually 'needed' these tools and given their issues – confabulation, environmental costs, intellectual property concerns – they seem to be poised to be more damaging than helpful**

Blå bog

Tricia Bertram Gallant, er ph.d. i filosofi og direktør for Academic Integrity Office på UC San Diego. Hun er forfatter til bogen Academic Integrity in the Twenty-First Century: A Teaching and Learning Imperative (Jossey-Bass, 2008), medforfatter på bogen Cheating in School: What We Know and What We Can Do (Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), og redaktør på flere andre bøger om akademisk integritet.

Kilde: academicintegrity.org

Are you mostly worried or optimistic about the future use of AI in education – and why?

Oh gosh. Good question! Realistically optimistic I svuppose, but that's my nature. I'm always skeptical but hopeful when it comes to anything that disrupts the current way of doing or thinking. I'm skeptical of the AI itself, specifically its ability to more positively than negatively impact the world. I'm not sure we actually 'needed' these tools and given their issues – confabulation, environmental costs, intellectual property concerns – they seem to be poised to be more damaging than helpful. However, I'm hopeful that this disruption will finally cause higher education to realize that it needs to be different. We need to be places where humans come to interact, to learn from each other, to engage actively in building their human durable skills. We can do that with AI on the side perhaps, but the humans and the human experience must also be central.