IlLUminate Blog Transcript: The Impact of AI on Universities and Students

Recorded April 3, 2023. Listen to it here.

ANNOUNCER: 00:03	This podcast is brought to you by ilLUminate, the Lehigh business blog. To learn more, please visit us at business.lehigh.edu/news.
JACK CROFT: 00:14	Welcome. I'm Jack Croft, host of the ilLUminate podcast for Lehigh University's College of Business. Today is April 3rd, 2023, and we're talking with Greg Reihman and Cathy Ridings about the implications and possible impact of generative artificial intelligence, or AI, on universities and students. Dr. Reihman is Lehigh University's vice provost for Library and Technology Services. In this role, Greg provides strategic, budgetary and organizational leadership of Lehigh's Library and Technology Services, an organization that includes [Lehigh's Libraries, Technology Services], the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning and Information Security Services. Thank you for being with us on ilLUminate today, Greg.
GREG REIHMAN: 01:01	Hey. Thanks for the invitation. Appreciate it.
CROFT: 01:04	Dr. Ridings is an associate professor in the College of Business' Department of Decision and Technology Analytics, or DATA for short. Her primary research interest is virtual communities, including social networks, social capital, trust, knowledge management, and electronic commerce in this context. She also has secondary research interests in technology adoption and acceptance. Welcome to ilLUminate, Cathy.
RIDINGS: 01:34	Thank you for having me.
CROFT: 01:35	Now, between OpenAI's ChatGPT, which was followed just this month by ChatGPT-4, Google's Bard and Microsoft's Bing, among others, what's known as generative AI has been all over the news recently, and generating considerable debate in the process. I'd like to start with a simple definition of what generative AI is, and I found this one in a recent Reuters news service explainer: *Like other forms of artificial intelligence, generative AI learns how to take actions from past data. It creates brand new content, a text-- an image-- even computer code, based on that training, instead of simply categorizing or identifying data like other AI.* So with that as our working definition, let's start with a survey that was conducted recently by Educause, a non-profit association whose mission is to advance higher education through the use of information technology. And, Greg, I know you're familiar with that as a member of Educause. Now, the greatest concerns about generative AI expressed by higher educational professionals who took the survey were, in order: academic integrity or cheating, which was named by three out of four respondents; overreliance or trust in outputs, which are the search results and contents generated by AI; inaccurate outputs; and AI-generated content becoming indistinguishable from and replacing human content. Each of these were named as one of their greatest concerns by 60% or more of the respondents. So let's start at the top. How concerned are each of you about the threat AI poses to academic integrity at Lehigh and elsewhere? And, Greg, why don't you start with this one?
REIHMAN: 03:34	Okay. I'd be happy to. I want to start with a story about one of my students. So I'm currently teaching a course called Philosophy and Technology. So in addition to my

administrative role at Lehigh, I also teach and research in this space. And when I had my students go out and do some research on their own, as ChatGPT and other generative AI tools were getting a lot of press, I said, "Go do your own research. Go dig into what's happening in this space around generative AI and higher education." And when they came back, there was one student who looked particularly crestfallen. I said, "What's going on?" And she said, "I was surprised that, with this exciting, remarkable transformational technology, that the first thing people are worried about is academic integrity." Now, I want to give credit to-- acknowledgment to this as a concern, because I can understand if-- depending on how you are assessing your students, this can be a real concern. But putting ourselves in the students' shoes, what she said to me was, "Since sixth grade, we've had some way or another of cheating if we chose to do it." And her comment was-- and this may be overly general, but she said, "Those of us in the room are the ones who have chosen not to do that. We could find the answers to the questions that were in the back of the book." There's already essay writing-- essay collection platforms out there. So she was getting at this idea of, like, "Give us a little more credit." And I understand why that might not extend to every student in every situation, but it's the other ones that-- the other elements that Educause pulls out that are more interesting to me around the overreliance or trust in outputs. In other words, if one generative AI generates something that's not useful or not reliable, and we wouldn't want students to ever lean on it-- when are the outputs inaccurate? Right? How can we use this as a brand new tool to help supercharge our research, as opposed to worrying about that it's going to replace our research?

REIHMAN: 05:28   And I think that faculty that approach it that way and talk about this tool with their students and recognize what it can and can't do in your discipline, because it's very discipline-specific, and then encourage students to compare what they can do against what the generative AI tools can do. I know one faculty member who gave an assignment to the students, and then plugged it in the ChatGPT and shared the result. And basically, that was baseline, and said, "If you can't do better than this, then you've got some more work to do." So my advice, I guess, on this is to not pretend that this tool doesn't exist out there. Acknowledge it with your students; talk about it, "How can it be a tool? How can it augment your intelligence and your research?" but not automatically worry that it's going to-- that it's going to replace all the kinds of activities that you most value in what your students do.

RIDINGS: 06:16   I agree with a lot of what Greg said. Honestly, every technological advance brings academic integrity threats. Right? Simply having the internet come online and Google come online were tools that students could use to plagiarize or cheat. So I look at this as yet another technology advance that, sure, students could use to commit academic integrity violations. And as professors, we have to understand what this is and, maybe, redesign our assignments or the way our class is structured so it's not so easy for students to use this. But we do have to be aware of it, and as Greg said, I like to give students credit to hope that they want to learn at Lehigh and produce their own work for me. I'm not going to stick my head in the sand and say, "Ignore it." I'm not going to blanket tell my students not to use it, but instead, look at it as a tool that they could use in a certain way, and I'm going to educate them about that. I think professors always have the opportunity to have assessments in class without outside help or sources that students would be forced to do their own work. But we have to be aware of this as yet another technology that's come out that can threaten

academic integrity, but could also be something the students use to help them produce better work products and better assignments for us.

CROFT: 07:57

All right. Now, Greg, you had mentioned the second leading concern, which, for you, would actually rate ahead of academic integrity, and that's the either overreliance or trust in what comes out of generative AI. What are some of the main concerns you have there with how reliable the information is? Particularly at this stage, I think everybody understands it's probably going to keep getting better.

REIHMAN: 08:27

Yeah. And that's a fair point, Jack. It is going to keep getting better. And so whatever conclusions we draw this month, we're going to have to revisit and draw different ones next month. But the general idea, I would say, is-- there's a word that-- there's a phrase, I should say, that gets, probably, overused in higher education, but maybe underappreciated about critical thinking. Right? Whenever we--

CROFT: 08:47

Right.

REIHMAN: 08:47

--see a source, whether this is-- folks listening to this podcast should double-check everything I say, right-- not take it at-- not take it for a final answer to any of these questions. As Professor Ridings said, when you Google something, the first answer that comes up isn't necessarily the right answer or the best answer. When you read something in an academic article, you don't just default to it and say, "Here's truth." Right? So my worry is that there's this tendency in users-- because we're accustomed to getting fully accurate answers back from a computer. If I use Excel spreadsheet to calculate a sum or run some formula down a column, I don't double-check that. Right? I trust that that's going to give me the right answer. If I've done it-- if I've done it right, right, all that math is going to be good. It's what computers are extraordinarily good at. Right?

CROFT: 09:33

Mm-hmm.

REIHMAN: 09:34

So when that illusion of-- when that trust gets carried over into a new space, because I'm interacting with the same computer-- same interface, I think that's a mistake. Right? And people who have come to ChatGPT with that kind of skepticism very quickly learned the limits of what it's able to do. And again, I don't want to be a naysayer, because there are also truly wonderful things that it can do that will drop your jaw and have you scratch your head and think, "How is this possible? What is this doing?" and, "Wow." We should appreciate those "wow" moments with technology when it arrives. And we should also keep our critical thinking caps on, right, and say, "Hold on. That one's not quite right. That doesn't sound accurate to me." And it doesn't take too long. If you see it as a dialog instead of as a-- ask a question and get an answer, that's a better approach to this. Right? You ask it a question about some subject that you know a lot about, and see what it comes up with, and you'll notice the cracks in what it's able to do. I gave an exercise with my students where I had my students come up with an annotated bibliography. It sounds like an old-school approach there, but an annotated bibliography on research around ChatGPT education or generative AI in education. They came up with some great sources. And then I plugged the same question into ChatGPT, and I challenged them to say, "Compare what you came up with with what it came up with." And they had positive things to say about both. Right? There were different kinds of answers. And the grammar was flawless in ChatGPT; it sounded highly professional-- very polished, very persuasive. And then I pointed out to them that six-- it had given us seven results, and

six of the seven were academic articles that don't actually exist-- some of them in journals that don't actually exist. So that's the biggest--

CROFT: 11:20   Wow.

REIHMAN: 11:21   Yeah. Absolutely. So you can go test this out for yourself. If you have an account on this, ask it to give you some citations on sources on some subject, and then go do some old-fashioned library work and go cross-check those sources. And if you think about the way that this technology works, it's giving you back what is likely to be a true kind of answer that you give it, and in some cases it does a remarkably good job at this. But what it's really giving you is-- these are really good fictional examples of what an article would look like. Right? It's really smart at coming up with this, but it's factually false. In the field they call this "hallucinations," where some other people call it "bullshitting". So excuse the language, Jack. I'm not sure what you're rated on your podcast here, but-- and it's in the sense-- there's actually a philosopher, Harry Frankfurt, who wrote this great book called On Bullshit where he talks about what's worrying about BS is that it doesn't care if it's true or not; it just sounds professional; it sounds right. Right? And we know colleagues like this. Right? We know--

CROFT: 12:22   Yes.

REIHMAN: 12:22   --family like this, who can sound like they know what they're talking about, but they actually don't. But you learn to distrust someone like that. Or you ask follow-up questions, and it's in the follow-up questions that you discover whether that system or person knows what they're talking about. So that's what I would come back to folks with. Come to it with that kind of critical mindset, ask those follow-up questions, cross-check what you get back from it, and in some cases it'll be incredibly helpful. And it'll do research for you faster than you could do that research yourself in some areas. Other kinds of things, it's just not there. And I'll always say, "It's just not there, maybe, yet." Ask me again in six months, Jack. We'll see how it's doing on those.

CROFT: 12:59   Okay. And, Cathy, the things in the AI-generated results that concern you?

RIDINGS: 13:07   A lot of the same things that Greg talked about. The hallucinations are all over the internet. Right? You can Google those and find out things that people have gotten ChatGPT to produce that are just crazy-wrong. I think that students do have to have the skills to evaluate the reputation and credibility of a source. And I make a big point of this in my courses. When I have my students write papers, part of their grade is, when I look at the bibliography, that they have sources on that are credible and have a solid reputation. And I think this is a critical skill that students need to have, and this existed even before ChatGPT. So when they are looking at the output of ChatGPT, they have to ask themself, "Does this seem reasonable?" And that way they can evaluate it. It can't be taken, simply, from ChatGPT, put into assignment, and submit it to a professor. They really have to critically look at it to see if it seems reasonable. A lot of my classes that I teach involve coding where students write their own code, and I do the same thing in those assignments. It's your own code, and when it produces an answer, look at it critically. Does it make sense? Could there be a mistake in your code? Just because there's an output doesn't mean it's right. We have to look at the same-- we have to look at the output of ChatGPT with the same eye.

CROFT: 14:45   Now, following up on that, because I think they seem related to me, at least, that we had a crystal clear example of this just a week-or-so ago where a AI-generated photo showing former president Trump being arrested, even though he hadn't yet even

been indicted, swept over the internet with many people thinking the images were real-- convinced that the former president had been arrested and there were photos of it. So as it becomes increasingly difficult to tell AI-generated content from human content, what issues does that raise for each of you? And, Cathy, why don't you pick up there?

RIDINGS: 15:29

Well, that's a good example. If you're looking at a picture that-- and there's a couple different examples of this as well. You can Google examples where we've changed several pixels in a picture that, to the human eye, the picture doesn't change, but a AI algorithm will think it's something completely different. So this goes to the case where the underlying AI algorithm could be doing things that we aren't aware of, as humans, or that our brains can't process. And it's simply a case, again, of fact-checking and cross-validating pictures or statements. When you see something, saying to yourself, "Is this reasonable? Let me see what else is out there. Let me validate this with reputable sources so I can assess whether this is true or not," again, it's a critical skill that our students need to work on while they're at Lehigh, and develop, so when they get out in the business world they can rely on this.

REIHMAN: 16:40

Yeah. I'll pick up on that and just underscore 100 times what Cathy just said. Seeing has never been believing. Right? And we like to say that seeing is believing, but, what research is all about is going past what seems apparent at first glance. Right? So that's a skill to teach any person. Right? Sometimes the world we see, as we think we see it-- as we think we understand it-- as it's presented to us is mistaken in various ways or is deliberately manipulated in various ways. And so, I mean, you can think of 100 different examples from your own life. I mean, you don't see this as much anymore, but for a period of time we all had that aunt or uncle who would send us the-- forward the hoax emails without cross-checking them first. Right? But anybody who is familiar with that space understands that you just do a quick Google search, and you can probably find a couple moments where this has already been identified as a hoax. Right?

CROFT: 17:39

Mm-hmm.

REIHMAN: 17:40

So I think it's a little bit, also-- you hope that people no longer just buy it, and then amplify it by reposting, retweeting, or sharing it-- that that would be one, I think, area of responsibility. But then I think, given the fact that people do just see something that aligns with what they hope is true and then share it, you, then, also want to elevate people's critical response to that. I mean, it's going to get to the point where any image and any video that you take is going to have to be validated through multiple approaches, and how you do that is going to vary, depending on the type of image it is. Right? If it's a-- there's ways to find out whether Trump actually got indicted. There's ways to find out whether the Pope actually wore that puffy jacket. That was another recent example that was-- interestingly, one of my students brought that up to me as one that-- he said he hadn't been concerned about this until he saw that one. He said, "It was so good, and it was--" somehow, the way it came into his information space, he was persuaded by it. But again, on the internet, we should have that cautionary approach regularly. And then, as Cathy said, we should have some tools for, at least, validating the obvious ones. Right? And I think that can get us a long way where we-- even just that first step of saying, "Pause. Investigate it a little bit, and see what you can find out about this before you take something as true." There will be more complicated ones that are going to get harder than that.

Right? And again, that's what research is about, and sometimes you have to suspend your judgment on things until you can really dig in deeper. But for the most part, I think you can find out relatively, relatively quickly. My bigger worry on that, I think, is that sometimes, right, the-- sometimes a lie sticks in people's heads longer than the truth does. Right?

CROFT: 19:25   Yeah.

REIHMAN: 19:26   So even if it's debunked, people still have that image in their mind. And that can shape opinion; that can shape perspectives, again, on countless things. And that's why we want to-- that's why we want to be able to rely on institutions and other people and conversation and dialog and research to try to get to some place where we feel like-- what is the picture of-- somewhat closer to truth than we might get just by accepting what's out there at first glance.

CROFT: 19:57   In addition to the concerns, Educause also asked higher education professionals about the greatest opportunities related to generative AI use. And clearly, there are some pretty amazing opportunities here, so we do want to talk about some of the positive things to look forward to there, as well. And the top answer selected by 77% of respondents was "improved efficiency of human work" that they think is the greatest opportunity that generative AI offers. But I found it kind of interesting that only 51%, compared to 77%, listed "improved quality of human work" as one of the greatest opportunities. So I find that gap between efficiency and quality of human work to be interesting. And I wonder, what do you think it tells us?

RIDINGS: 20:53   I think the efficiency part means that AI-generated results give both students and faculty and, let's face it, the business world the opportunity to have AI automate repetitive and time-consuming tasks that we all have to do that we don't necessarily like. In my case it's grading. Right? I don't like grading. I don't know any professor that likes grading. I would love to have an AI grade all my student work. But, by the same token, even though the AI could take over these mundane and rote tasks, the AI may not give us the same level of quality, right, that I might put into my grading or another task. It gives me, perhaps, the chance, if the AI's taking over those repetitive tasks, for me to do other things with more time and more attention, so I could be more creative in other things. I think that, as the AI models advance and get better, the quality will get better. And the surveys' results tell us that the AI isn't necessarily the same quality now as humans produce, but I think that will change and the AI quality will get better. But I think people are recognizing that the AI quality of work just isn't exactly the same as human work.

REIHMAN: 22:24   I agree with that. And I think it's that iterative process of using it-- assessing what it can do and what it can't do. And then I would say, on top of that, add, what is it that we still need to rely on a human being to do? So I would, like Cathy-- yes, grading can be very onerous. And I agree that, wouldn't it be great if you had a system that could reliably grade our students' work? But then I think-- I would say, instead, "Have them grade the stuff that it doesn't require the best of what I have to offer." Right? So the best of what I have to offer doesn't come out in grading a multiple choice test. Right? We have Scantrons to do that or automatic online systems to do that. Right? Nobody's concerned about that. But I want to get the highest level work for my students, and that's where the engagement of my brain and my education matters with the engagement of their brain and their education. Right? And to me, just focusing on the educational context-- that's what's exciting. If it can free up more

time for the higher quality writing-- the higher quality work by students and the higher quality feedback and guidance from faculty members, right, we don't have to spend our time giving the same feedback to 100 different students because they made the same calculation problem. Right? That's a waste of my time. It's a waste of the students' time, because it would take a long time to get that feedback. So I would think, for every discipline, if you can identify, what are the "lower level skills" that students do need to pick up on, but they might not require a PhD to give them feedback on how to get better at it? It becomes almost like a mini TA [teaching assistant] that they can very quickly get an answer for. And in conversations with students, that's what a lot of them are using it for already. Can you explain this process to me? How would this apply in this situation? Asking those kinds of questions that, if you had a TA by your side, you would ask them automatically, but we don't have one-on-one TA to student ratios or faculty to student ratios.

REIHMAN: 24:14   So I think filling in that opportunity for quick feedback-- quick, timely adjustment to how a student's learning something, and then freeing up the time for that higher level blank-- whatever that blank is in your discipline, where you really do want to spend your time helping a student with that nuance, where what you have to offer is something that the AI can't offer. That's what's exciting to me about the future of this. I'll just say one other thing, Jack-- because I think you're also talking about in the future of work. Right? And one of my students said--

CROFT: 24:41   Right.

REIHMAN: 24:42   --this the other day-- they said, "If the best we can do is what-- any profession out there, the best that we can do is just what's being done by ChatGPT, well, then, that job's not going to exist anymore in 10 years." And that should worry us, right, because those are some good jobs; those are some jobs that employ creative people. But I think the good companies are going to be the ones that superpower their employees with-- sometimes Chris Dede from the Harvard School of Education likes to flip it and talk about augmented intelligence, right, instead of-- or intelligence augmentation instead of artificial intelligence. Right? So how can we think-- if those are things that this system can do-- this generative AI system can do, then what can I do on top of that that's going to be a value-add that it can't yet do? And I think always operating in that space is going to be where some of the most interesting work gets done.

CROFT: 25:39   Yeah. I like to follow-up on that with Cathy. Because, obviously, as faculty in the business college and business information systems, clearly you must be getting some concern from your students about the future of jobs and business and which ones are going to thrive and which ones might be in danger of disappearing. So what are your thoughts on that?

RIDINGS: 26:04   I think students are recognizing that AI's going to come in and change the workplace. I tell the students, essentially, two things. They should understand the basics of how AI works. A big part of AI has to do with the data that it's trained on, so understanding that that data can have bias and error in it; and if it does, the output could have bias and error. So I think applying AI in business-- they need to understand how the AI works, and they need to know that the data behind the AI is critical. And then knowing that, they can position themselves to use AI in business. And almost all business functions, right, are going to be able to benefit from AI. And the students could be the value-add to the company by knowing how to apply AI in the company. I just came back from a conference where industry professionals were talking about

the use of chatbots. So it was a very specific conference just focused on AI chatbots and AI conversations in many different business contexts. And it was really fascinating talking about how AI's going to permeate all different kinds of business functions in the chatbot area. And our students need to understand how to effectively use AI to manage and lead in business so they could be the business value-add on how to apply AI to the business.

RIDINGS: 27:43   And in addition-- to follow-up on what Greg said, the AI could be used to automate the time-consuming rote things, and they could be-- the students in business could then be freed to do the more interesting value-add things that they didn't have time to do before to advance the business in better ways, because the AI's there to augment their work.

CROFT: 28:13   So those things that Lehigh has emphasized for a very long time now - creativity and critical thinking, as Greg talked about at the beginning - become far more valuable to business, as well as in the academic world.

RIDINGS: 28:29   And actually, whenever I ask employers, when they come to the business school-- and I'm teaching information systems-- business information systems-- majors and analytics majors. And I ask employers, "What are you looking for in students? What kind of skills do you want students to have?" And no one ever says, "I want students to program in Java or program in Python or be able to run a machine learning model." The first thing they always say is, "Critical thinking skills." They want students who are going to have solid problem-solving critical thinking skills. And the second thing they say is, typically, "Communication skills." They want students to be able to effectively communicate. And they are looking, of course, for students who have the technical skills, but that's typically not at the top of their list.

CROFT: 29:24   Right.

REIHMAN: 29:24   Yeah. Pick up on that real quick, and then got to give a plug into Lehigh business for this, right, that that's what we-- that's our promise to students and parents, right, and employers, right, that we're preparing you on both and encouraging people not to be in a full either or thinking. Right? Yes, you have to learn a lot of the technical background. Yes, you have to learn the equations and the models and all of these other things or whatever is in your field, but you can't just be that. Right? You have to be that plus, and that plus comes out in these things that-- communication skills, critical thinking skills, collaborative skills. And just to pick up on what Cathy said, that that, sometimes, is called a black box problem of the AI system. If you, as a company, are relying on the data that gets fed into a system, and it's spitting out answers for you, and you just swallow those whole, you're going to be in trouble. Right? Because it's not a-- again, it's not like summing a column in the spreadsheet. It is much more nuanced than that, and it will, oftentimes, give you back what you want to hear. And it's trained to give you back the most common answer to that question, and, well, sometimes businesses don't want the most common answer to that question. Right? They want something unique. They want something that's customized. They want something that's tailored-- that's responsive to current situations. And that takes a lot more aggregation of information and perspectives and humanistic thinking than the AI systems currently can do. So, again, I think about this when I think about preparing students, let them learn how to use these tools. Let them learn how to use them to deepen what they're able to do, but simultaneously cultivate that voice in their head that says that there are limitations to this. And if I lean too hard on this, I'm not going

to-- I'm not going to be able to do the things that an employer will want. I'm not going to be able to do the things that's the right thing to do to get a good, solid answer-- a good, solid product or whatever it is that we're aiming towards.

CROFT: 31:18   Now, there's one more topic I'd like to make sure we cover before we wrap up here, and that's policies and standards. Universities and colleges across the country are starting to look at this, and I'm just wondering, what is Lehigh's approach to that? Are there policies and standards that need to be addressed with generative AI advancing?

REIHMAN: 31:40   I'll pick up on that one to start. So about 10 years ago, a group of faculty, staff, librarians, technologists got together to ask a similar question around academic integrity and standards around student use. And so we're reconvening a group to look at this to look at, does there need to be a modification in our policy around academic integrity? What counts as appropriate use-- inappropriate use? And then that always has two-- there's always two sides of that coin. One is educating our students around that so they're aware of what's acceptable and-- the easy answer is always, ask your professor, right, because it really is different from course to course, discipline to discipline, professor to professor. And then the other side of that coin is conversations with professors. So at the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning, we work a lot with librarians, instructional technologists, instructional designers to help faculty think through these questions that it might-- for some faculty member, this is what they do; others, this is quite new. So trying to think about, what is an assignment that will tee students up in the right way? What is a way to talk about students and prepare them for this? But in terms of policy, Lehigh hasn't come out with any specific policy. There was an email right at the start of the semester from Provost [Nathan] Urban that hit the tone that I think we're talking about today, which is, this isn't going anywhere. This is a technology in its infancy-- encouraging people to really think about it-- apply it into the disciplines-- talk with students about it-- adjust assignments in order to engage with students on it, but not run away from it or, as Cathy said, not put your head in the sand about it.

REIHMAN: 33:23   Because it's a fact of-- it's a fact of life-- super-powerful technology-- figure out how we can use this to help ourselves get better, as professionals, and help our students get better, as professionals, in a way that's, I guess, with eyes wide open to the limitations. So not overly enthusiastic about it. Sort of a critical open mindedness, I think, is how I would characterize the approach. So the short answer is, no firm policy has been developed around this, but a lot of people have been in conversations about it, even before the arrival of ChatGPT.

RIDINGS: 33:59   I think Lehigh's done a great job. And as another example of where they applied AI in the academic context in turnitin.com, which is a piece of software that we've been using for a while. Greg could tell us exactly how long we've been using it.

REIHMAN: 34:13   Mm-hmm.

RIDINGS: 34:14   But it's software where professors can ask students to turn in their papers, and the software will analyze whether the students plagiarized or not. And when it first was implemented, it was new, and it seemed like the professors were kind of being big brother on the students and, "I'm going to check." But it's become very accepted by the students that professors are going to use it. It's going to check for plagiarism. I'm going to be up-front with you. I'm telling everyone I'm putting my papers through this. I actually set it up so my students could look at the similarity report ahead of

time before it's even due, and they could submit over and over and over. And I think this has become a good success story at Lehigh on a tool that we implemented in the space of academic integrity that's really been successful and, I think, accepted by most of the students.

CROFT: 35:10   I think that probably goes back to the example that Greg opened this with, which was the student saying, "Give us some credit," and, "We're the ones that aren't doing that--" that the students who want to be creative and want their own work to stand out, both now and throughout their lives, are not going to be threatened by that.

REIHMAN: 35:32   And they also want you, as a professor, to be aware of the situation and don't make it easy for someone to slide through if they do choose to. Right? And the things that Cathy was talking about-- talking with your students about this-- using Turnitin-- just revealing to your students that, A, you're aware of this tool, B, it's not the right thing to do in this situation, as you define them, and, C, you're going to ask everybody to submit their work in this way. It just creates a level playing field of expectations that says to the students, "I care enough about it. I value academic integrity, because I value your ideas and I want to prepare you for success, and those other pathways are not pathways forward to success, and let's get to the good stuff. Right? Let's get to the stuff that we're really all here to learn." And as Cathy said, it saves a enormous amount of time for the professors doing what might end up being rote work of doing a Google search or other searches for every sentence that a student says; that would be maddening. So Turnitin is an AI-run system that, very quickly, is able to do this. And I'll say that they are working on a generative AI detector as well. As with everything else, I suspect that will have some efficacy, but it will certainly not be perfect. But I think it's enough to give a heads up to students to say, "We care about this. In this particular assignment, this is not how you're supposed to proceed. And we have these tools in place that are going to help us assure that you and the other students are treated fairly."

CROFT: 36:58   All right. This has been fascinating. And we could go on for much longer, I'm sure, but we're running out of time. So I'd like to thank Cathy and Greg for being with us today. It's been a lot of fun and I've learned a lot.

RIDINGS: 37:13   Thank you.

REIHMAN: 37:14   Yeah. Thanks, Jack. Thanks for hosting it and for sharing perspectives on this topic. Again, this is a revolutionary moment in how we're all thinking about this subject, so I'm sure this won't be the last conversation that folks hear from Lehigh on this topic.

CROFT: 37:30   Cathy Ridings' research has been published in journals such as Journal of Management Information Systems, the Database for Advances in Information Systems, and the Journal of Strategic Information Systems. She teaches courses in electronic commerce, business data management, and business application programming. Greg Reihman has served as point person and pilot tester in explorations of new educational technology at Lehigh such as the integration of digital audio, podcasting, wikis, blogs, discussion boards, virtual realities, and project-based collaborative learning. He also teaches courses in the philosophy department. This podcast is brought to you by ilLUminate, the Lehigh business blog. To hear more podcasts featuring Lehigh business thought leaders, please visit us at business.lehigh.edu/news. And don't forget to follow us on Twitter at Lehigh business. This is Jack Croft, host of the ilLUminae podcast. Thanks for listening.