Transcript for Research Speaker Series: Transparent, Detailed, Ethical – An Introduction to the Artificial Intelligence Disclosure (AID) Framework
BCcampus Research Speaker Series session hosted on February 25, 2025
Presenter: Dr. Kari Weaver
Hosts: Gwen Nguyen and Leva Lee

GWEN NGUYEN:
My name is Gwen, and I'm a learning and teaching advisor at BCcampus. Welcome to BCcampus Research Speaker Series session in February 2025, focusing on the Artificial Intelligence disclosure Framework. Just a few housekeeping items before we get started, the whole session will be recorded and you're welcome to keep your camera off and feel free to rename yourself to participant if you prefer. We also enable live captioning for accessibility. So a special thank you goes out to my two incredible teammates, Leva Lee and Kelsey Kilbey. Leva is my incredible partner for this Research Speaker Series project, and Kelsey is providing valuable support behind the scenes for almost all teaching and learning events, webinars and events. So I'd like to begin with a territorial acknowledgment. Today, I join you from my home office located in a place called Gordon Head, Victoria, B.C., and it is situated on the unceded territories of the W̱SÁNEĆ, and Esquimalt Nation of Lekwungen People. So as individuals and as an organization, we continue to learn and be in relationships as we actively respond to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Calls to Action. So it turned out to be a quite nice day here on the island after such a windy and stormy night here. So I wish that you have a joyful and peaceful day wherever you are zooming.

As we gather to discuss the intersection of AI technology and the research in education, it is so important to remember how Indigenous worldviews teach about the value of maintaining authentic connections to our environment and recognizing our interconnection with everything and everyone surrounding us. Please feel free to share your introduction and territorial acknowledgment in the chat if you wish. Typically, we will share the link for the feedback at the end of the session, but recognizing that some of you might have a very tight schedule, might need to pop out at some point before the session ends, Kelsey has helped put the survey link in the chat. So please help us with this short anonymous survey, and your feedback will help share our future professional offerings. Let's get back to our session focus. It is my pleasure to introduce Dr. Kari Weaver. She's the teaching and learning and instructional design librarian at the University of Waterloo Libraries and a sessional faculty member in the Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education at the University of Toronto. Dr. Weaver will introduce us to a newly launched Artificial Intelligence Disclosure Framework. Because AI tools have become more reminiscent and particularly generative AI on large language models, it is becoming more accessible and they use a class education as well as research environments that really requires critical mindful and thoughtful consideration as well as guidelines. During the workshop, Dr. Weaver will work us through some elements of this framework and share some examples of the statements used in the research setting. And then you can have some

questions regarding the implementation of this framework in your setting. So without further delay, please join me in warmly welcome Dr. Weaver for this talk. Thank you.

KARI WEAVER:
Thank you so much. I really appreciate you inviting me to speak today. And I'm just going to share the slides. Hopefully everybody is seeing that. So today, I'm going to talk a little bit about a project that I've been working on and disseminating the Artificial Intelligence Disclosure Framework. But I will also talk about the context and why this was necessary and how this was developed. When I say the context, I mean, where we are with how we're dealing with AI transparency in research and education. I do know that our lovely hosts from BCcampus will be monitoring the chat. If you do have questions as we go along, please feel free to put them in there and then when we get to the end we will make sure that we address them.

I would like to share that I am an employee and a scholar at the University of Waterloo and also live on the lands of the Neutral, Anishinaabeg, and Haudenosaunee Peoples. That land was promised to the Six Nations of the Grand River, which was meant to include the six miles on either side of the Grand River, and as part of the commitment to trust and reconciliation, whenever I'm talking about the AD Framework or generative artificial intelligence or just artificial intelligence, I do think it's necessary to mention that these technologies are not neutral. And they do have a significant impact on the land, both in the space that is taken up to power the servers, the water that is used to cool them, and certainly as worth thinking about Indigenous land rights, that can be significant. A recent study at UC Berkeley found that using a generative artificial intelligence tool to generate one 100-word email was equivalent to the environmental impact of drinking three bottles of bottled water in the energy and fuel that was used to produce those bottled waters for consumption. So with that in mind, my goal in this is, in fact, not to tell people what to do, but to provide guidance when people are opting to use these tools. But I think one of the considerations that should come into play is whether or not that environmental impact and the potential impact on Indigenous land and water rights is something that ethically factors into your decision-making.

With that, I want to talk a little bit about AI disclosure and the overall culture of integrity, which I think is a really important positioning because as artificial intelligence tools have become more broadly available in the last two and a half-ish years, one of the main criticisms in the academic environment has been: Well, students will cheat, how can we maintain a culture of integrity? On the research front, there's been a lot of concern about how to use these tools ethically, maintain participant confidentiality in research settings. So I'm going to start a little bit with academic integrity, and then I'll talk about where we are with research integrity.

So academic integrity is pretty interesting because artificial intelligence use policies tend to be developed at the local, either institutional or programmatic level or they're left specifically to the individual instructor. That's fairly common practice. We're trapped in between this space right now where we have some institutional guidance in some places, and then we have a lot to

figure it out, set your policies yourself in your own courses. To the extent that we have examples, policies are expected to be fairly clear about what is and isn't allowed, but are expected to provide some guidance about how people say that they're using it, which is really what we're talking about when we're talking about disclosure. While disclosure needs some level of consistency, it also needs to be adaptable. What you would disclose in an engineering classroom and what you would disclose as AI use in a literature classroom are going to be different than one another. When we're thinking about how to do this, we need something. Students are taking classes across disciplines. Research is becoming increasingly interdisciplinary, and so we need an approach for disclosure that can work across these contexts and can make sense to folks no matter what they are doing, but can also provide a greater level of detail and clarity.

A very recent study just done or information just shared about two weeks ago, a survey-based study from a researcher coming out of the University of North Texas found that with academic integrity, 96% of students are familiar with their university's academic integrity policy. So they know about academic integrity. About 84% know that platforms like Grammerly Pro have AI built into them to revise writing or might be flagged by AI detection tools. But what is interesting, as well, there was student awareness. Students are still very much unsure of what to do in an academic integrity context, and I would posit that part of that is because researchers, their faculty members, their instructors are also not exactly sure what to do with disclosure of their AI use in a research context. And for me, as a practising librarian and also a sessional faculty member, that connection between the research and the teaching practice is really essential. When we're thinking about AI, those things need to be in alignment with one another, or if they're not, we need to really be able to articulate clearly why they're not in alignment with one another.

So some of the concerns that have been raised when it comes to this culture of integrity or are that artificial intelligence is somehow going to replace all human effort with educational and research tasks. There are certainly questions about copyright and intellectual property violations. Artificial intelligence isn't always accurate and certainly does hallucinate or generate improper citations. In a recent study that I was a co-author on, one of the things that was particularly interesting and complex is that we can see that actually these tools will also generate partially incorrect citations. Citations for things that are real journals and real articles. But the article wasn't published in the journal that it says it was according to the AI tool, that level of detail and specificity is really difficult to navigate because it means as the human, you have to be extremely vigilant. There's also an overall lack of guidance or policy related to graduate supervision. In fact, most of the policies in this area are if you are a graduate supervisor, you should probably have a conversation and maybe figure something out and also don't violate whatever the funding criteria are. So maybe check that out. All of these concerns permeate across those learning and research contexts.

What do we know about where transparency is today?

This is where I focus a little bit more fully on the research side and where things are there. The Committee on Publication Ethics released a position in late 2023 on the use of artificial intelligence tools or large language models in research. The biggest thing, which I have emphasized in bold, is that the position doesn't prevent people or recommend that people do not use AI tools in scholarly publishing. But it does state very clearly that authors who use AI tools in the writing of a manuscript, production of images, or graphical elements of the paper or in the collection and analysis of data must be transparent in disclosing in the materials and methods or similar section of the paper, how the AI tool was used and which tool was used. This is helpful in that it's starting to get in the direction of guidance about what needs to be disclosed and where that disclosure should perhaps go in a manuscript. But it misses a lot of nuance. Not all publications have a materials or method section. Not every publication is empirical research. In fact, many are not. Well, COPE has started to provide some guidance or started to provide some guidance a couple of years ago. The biggest thing that publishers agree very strongly on is that AI tools cannot be listed as an author of a paper.

In 2024, Perkins & Roe took a holistic look at a lot of the editorial and publishing policies that had been developed around GenAI. The most common thing that they found was, again, authorship cannot be assigned to artificial intelligence and must be the sole domain of a human. That doesn't mean that people... That's too many negatives. People can use AI tools, but the disclosure then becomes important. As the author, you are fully accountable for your work if you are using AI tools. While those publisher policies exist, they lack a lot of specificity about the way in which you are supposed to disclose where the disclosure goes, what exactly you should disclose around your work. They say that you must consider implications for privacy, security, and research integrity, but don't go into any level of detail about what those considerations must be. And often use words like "transparency" and "disclosure of AI use," but fail to help provide guidance on how people should actively implement that. There's a lot of conversation happening around AI tools in peer review. Currently most publisher policies in research recommend that AI tools are not used for peer review because it could violate copyright, privacy, or confidentiality required as part of the research ethics process. And right now, the recommendation is: Do not use AI tools for peer review processes. But that said, I was mentioning as we were getting set up for the webinar, that I was at a conference a couple of weeks ago talking about AI disclosure and the AID Framework, which is one that was attended by many of the six major scholarly publishers. And they're certainly moving in the direction. They know there's a lot of desire to use AI tools for peer review, and they're, all of them are actually looking at how they could implement systems for review across their journal titles, I suppose, book titles, but they were really focused on journals that would offer the privacy confidentiality and security protections that people are looking for. So I just wanted to mention I do see the question of all the different kinds of disclosures. I will get to that in what I would recommend. But there's just a lack of clarity about the level of detail of disclosure. It's essentially, I like to describe it as you should disclose your use of AI, but we're not going to tell

you what you should say, how you should say it, where it should go, or what level of detail we expect. Figure it out. And that's really not a great situation for anybody.

The current state of disclosure practices. So a study that was just completed by Kusha, found that around 80% of disclosed AI use relates to text editing and proofreading in currently published literature, Sulman et al. found that disclosure compliance goes up when publishers do have stated policies, even if those policies are not particularly detailed or informative. Only about 5% of authors in that Kusha study disclosed AI use related to direct research tasks like data analysis or programming. Another study by Wang & Zou at the end of last year recommended a three-tiered disclosure approach with zero guidance on what disclosure should include or how it should be structured. Again, policies differ widely across publishers and journals, and one of the other things that has been found is that these policies tend to change. So setting the expectation for what proper disclosure looks like on a journal by journal and a course by course basis is not constructive; it's really something that is not helpful for anybody. Because if you have to keep figuring out the way that you're doing disclosure every time that you're trying to disclose your use, and it's going to look different across every one of those uses, the reality is you're probably going to get to a point where that is one extra thing that you just don't deal with. In fact, we can see when we look across scholarly publishing, that that is what happens. That people are less inclined to practise or engage in disclosure if they're unsure how they have to approach or do that.

That brings us to citation. This is very important because citation in a scholarly research, publishing, and academic context has historically, at least since the late 1700s in Europe, been our approach to disclosing our use of other people's texts, ideas, etc., etc. And citation is particularly important because it makes explicit, makes direct reference to where those ideas or that content is coming from and directs toward a fixed form or output for replicability. If people want to check their work, they can track that down, read what you read and continue to build on that. The guidance for citation comes from the major style manuals and organizations of which there are many, and some citation styles are dictated by individual journals, as we know. But again, they're directing toward a fixed form.

I've been talking for a while. This is a moment for you all to reflect in the chat. Is citation enough for GenAI or AI disclosure? Why or why not? And I'll give everyone just a couple of minutes to put their thoughts in the chat.

We're having a lot of thoughts. Generally, No, no, it's not. We're coming up with a lot of ideas. It's not enough because it doesn't tell us how the tool was. It doesn't tell us about the different applications. There's more information needed. Citation guidelines seem to be inconsistent. We need to know how the tool was used and why it was used. We're thinking about appendices. There's rarely a chunk of AI text to cite like you would other authors. It's either mixed in or used in other ways. If the purpose of citation is to provide a reference to some material, which in the case of AI cannot necessarily be repeated. Perhaps some other approach makes more sense.

We can see the comment that disclosure is a fuller acknowledgment. AI chats can never be reproduced, what would be the point?

The reason that I'm asking this question at this point is that when I had started participating in conversations about AI and teaching and learning in my day job at the University of Waterloo, one of the things that I had been asked to do was to provide guidance on how students and scholars could do citation for GenAI outputs. I wasn't alone in that. That was really the place where things started at a lot of institutions and with a lot of folks in higher education. So I did that work. We were one of the first institutions to get in touch with contacts at many of the major style bodies and provide guidance on AI citation and AI citation more broadly. Then we had a circumstance where we had a small number of graduate students who were in danger of not having their supervisors sign off on their thesis because they had used GenAI and they had followed our institutional guidance. To cite their use, and their supervisors were dissatisfied with that because they didn't understand even if the use was cited how and in what ways and how much work the students had done themselves for their thesis. So I want to reassure everyone, things were worked out. No students were harmed in this situation, and all of the students impacted did eventually graduate with their degrees, before I get into that. But while I was in conversation about this, sorry. That's my fault. While I was in conversation about this. I was actually in a meeting and our main campus administrator, who'd been tasked with overseeing our collective artificial intelligence response, said, I don't think citation is enough. Kari, can you figure something out with this? It set me on actually about a two-month spiral as somebody who has spent a long time thinking about information and citation and documentation practices. I would be taking a walk around campus and find myself muttering under my breath, but what do you mean citation isn't enough? How could citation not be enough? After spiraling for a couple of months, I really started to get to work on this issue and said, Okay, I'm going to accept this. If citation isn't enough, if citation isn't meeting our needs when it comes to artificial intelligence, then what would?

The answer is really attribution. Citation is part of a larger area of attribution practices. Citation is just distinct in that citation has particular rules, standards, and structures associated with it, where attribution practices as a class of how we tell people where we got ideas and came up with things, allow for a greater variety of description and doesn't necessarily have to follow the same level of consistency or specificity as we see in scholarly citation. And when I started thinking about this issue, not just as a citation issue, but really a larger attribution issue, then things definitely became a bit clearer because there was a possibility of developing something that could meet the need, but It needed to be clear in its guidance. It needed to be relatively easy to follow and implement, and it needed to be something that could be somewhat consistently reproduced and structured like citation is, so that people could implement it more easily across contexts. It needed to be something actually against what some of the major publishers were recommending, which was, if you were doing some disclosure attribution to incorporate it into the methods or the material section, because that's not necessarily

appropriate for a lot of the use cases that I was seeing across our scholars, those graduate students, and the undergraduate students with which I work.

So that really led to the project. We're finally there. We have all the contexts of developing the Artificial Intelligence Disclosure Framework. It's named that and I colloquially call it the AID Framework because that is a reminder of what artificial intelligence tools are meant to do in learning and research contexts. They're meant to aid your work, not to replace it.

And so the AID Framework started with that spiral of what do you mean citation isn't enough? Once I finally got past that, it took me about three months to develop the initial draft, about two months locally to do consultations across our teaching and learning experts, our office of research folks, our graduate student, postdoctoral affairs office, our campus committee overseeing this, and because I'm at Waterloo, our a fairly significant number of expert AI researchers to say, Okay, we've developed a framework here. I've developed a framework that articulates some of the various, actually, we hope, all of the various, acceptable uses for artificial intelligence that people would need to disclose. What are we missing? Does this meet needs? I keep scrolling because I'm trying to see the chat. The consultations went very well, made a few changes based on feedback and recommendations, and then developed some supplementary resources and published those to help with implementation. And then in August and September, we did the initial release and have been working throughout the fall term and here in the winter to both implement locally at the University of Waterloo and for me to be here on my tour talking about the AID Framework with you doing widespread dissemination across a higher education, but I'm also doing some work locally with one of our school boards to look at how we can teach and adapt disclosure practices to the secondary environment as well because this is going to be a part of artificial intelligence literacy.

Why do we need this? We need transparent disclosure, but there needs to be some standardization and consistency in how we're doing this, and that standardization and consistency needs to be known and reliable so that you can use the same thing in the classroom as you do with publishing. And so you don't have to change your AI disclosure if you've submitted it to one journal, had it rejected and are going to a different journal with a different publisher for a second round of review after you've made revisions. This is an openly licensed resource so that people can adapt it as needed across contexts. It's meant to work with citation practices. There are some circumstances where there is a direct AI output that should be cited. Something that comes up a lot is when people are using AI tools to generate graphs from their data, for example. That graph is a whole thing and should be cited as a distinct output. And so these things should work together. It also needed to be something that could be used at different education levels, disciplines, and for those different purposes.

What we landed at was a situation where we have 14 headings for the AID Framework of All of the variety of tasks that you might use AI tools for in acceptable fashion at present for learning and research tasks. I say that because people can use it for drafting, drafting their writing, but

that's not considered to be a permissible use according to the academic integrity and publisher policies at present. I will show you some examples here in just a moment. Even the most complex research application in which we have tested this will not use all 14 headings. The only one that is required is the information about the artificial intelligence tool and the rest you select and use if they are applicable to what you are working on.

What does it look like? Here is an example where we were using the institutional instance of Microsoft Copilot. It was used for some conceptualization work to find some relevant journal articles and sources for the project to create a graph, and then to support review editing revision. What is helpful about the AID Framework is that those headings or elements are providing the structure for the disclosure and are helping to guide what people need to disclose. Then there is flexibility in how they describe their use that allows the adaptation across the different applications, disciplines, and contexts. So it doesn't have to necessarily be that complex.

Here is a much more streamlined statement where it was just used in a couple of sections of actually a book chapter I was writing and just to help do some outlining and framing.

You can also use multiple tools with an aid statement. This is an example I did not develop myself, but our local teaching and learning conference recognized that they needed to have an AI policy for the conference and conference proposals, and they used AI to develop the AI policy and wanted to model what appropriate disclosure practices would look like. So I thank them for allowing me to share that.

And here's another implementation related to a code output. This is actually something that you can find in GitHub, and it was some Python code where some AI tools were used for some of the direct coding and troubleshooting pieces of the work. So it doesn't necessarily have to be complex. It can be flexible to a variety of different tasks and outputs and other than disclosing the tool itself. The elements that you include depend a lot on your particular project. Where do we go from here?

Really, where we are is that now with the AID Framework, we have an approach toward standardizing disclosure, but we need to be implementing this more broadly, while it has solved our problem locally at the University of Waterloo. Our scholars have had excellent experiences using this approach in scholarly publishing. In fact, I recently had an article where I wrote the disclosure for the research team using the AID Framework, and the editors at the journal got back to me and said, Hey, that was a really great approach to AI disclosure. How did you come up with that? I directed them to the publication in this work. This is also really critical to the overall uptake and adoption of artificial intelligence because if one of the challenges is people are hesitant about allowing the use of AI because there's a lack of clarity in how much their students are doing and how much they're depending on AI or how much was done by the scholar and how much was done by AI. Then disclosure practice is really the answer toward

addressing this. It's also an opportunity in an educational context. You can actually look at those different elements and have conversations or set policies within individual classrooms about what kinds of use are or are not acceptable. I was just speaking to a faculty member yesterday who looked at the AID Framework and said, Oh, I was going to tell my students not to use AI. But I would be fine if they used it for editing and honestly, like if they want to use it for some visuals for their presentation, as long as they indicate, and disclose that they've used it, that would be fine with me. It really allowed the faculty member to get into the situation where they could more clearly articulate to their students what was and wasn't acceptable use so that they could align the practice with expectation, give their students the opportunity to actually work with AI tools in a way that supported and enhanced the learning rather than detracted from it and didn't put everybody in a situation where it's like that students don't do this, which isn't really realistic going forward.

So that brings me to the end of the overview and I'm happy for questions. I'm just going to scroll up in here. Okay. There were a couple of questions that came in during the presentation. I was just scrolling up. Yeah.

LEVA LEE: Did you find I can help you find this one from Mark Cobett Wilson.

KARI:
I just got. Great. Okay. Do authors need to disclose the type of computer, operating system, editor, Word processing software, image editors, audio editors, video editors? The answer is probably not, but that perhaps changes to the extent that those things become AI-enabled. I don't know that that will always be the case, but that's certainly where we are now. And unless we managed to resolve the issue of AI outputs being fixed and reproducible in some manner, then citation is going to continue to fail us. So we're not going to be able to cite, and we're probably not getting into details of the operating system and so forth. The other thing that I do like to say, occasionally, especially when I've been working with undergraduate students will say, I don't know what the version of this software is, and I'll say fine, then don't include it. Part of the flexibility of this is, you put in as much information as you have, and if it's not enough, you'll get the feedback about that. But at least you know what you're looking to include, if you can. About the HR departments using AI to screen and vet application packages, it depends on the tool that they're using. So actually, many institutions of higher education have one or two tools that AI tools that they've licensed that have gone through security, privacy, and risk assessment as dictated by the individual institution, if they're using that tool, like, I don't think they're actually violating privacy because the tools that typically pass that risk assessment are ones that are not using the institutional data to train the AI system more broadly. But I will say some of the limitations of the way in which these tools work would really concern me with HR departments, especially if we're interested in diversifying the workforce. But yeah. I know. I'm going to scroll down because I know we've gotten. Katherine was saying, Open to AI use but currently banned because you don't know how to rate it. One of the things that you can do, which isn't a full answer to your question. But one of the things you can do is actually grade the

disclosure itself. So how clear and transparent are your students being with their disclosure? Another option is you can incorporate a small reflective piece, which yes, they could use AI to generate, but at some point, if they're going to do that, they're going to do that, and you just have to live with it. There's a certain percentage of students that will, if given the opportunity. It's small, but it exists. But the vast majority of students are really there to learn and they have additional impetus to learn to work with artificial intelligence properly and that they're looking at their future work life and anticipating that this is going to be integrated. Students really have a lot of interest right now in actually engaging with these tools and trying to gain an understanding of best uses. Another option is to include a reflective component where you ask students to reflect on how well did the AI tool actually work and actually help? Did it save time? Did they feel good about using it? And Katherine, jump in.

KATHERINE:
Sorry. Yeah, you know, you can only put so much in the text chat. More, I mean, actually grading the assignment. So say, I've got 100 students, many of them use AI and disclose that. But now am I marking on the same rubric or, you know, that's sort of my issue. I have things in my rubric about writing quality. And so is that now going out the window, that's the real challenge I have. It's great. And if you know, so. I try to take any advice because I am trying to... I don't think it's useful my current approach, which is just like, you can't use it. Because obviously some are, some will, and they're not disclosing that because I banned it and they don't want to get in trouble.

KARI:
So what I would say is I would worry a little less about writing quality or I would maybe redirect some of the writing quality elements to emphasize the development of personal voice. Because one of the things that we do see with these tools is that I like to always say they are linguistically English and culturally American. One of my favourite examples, and I've pulled this up and done this for students repeatedly, is that many of these tools insist that the University of Waterloo has a Carnegie classification, which is an American construct for how we classify the degree-granting status of institutions. Waterloo does not. Like I know what it would be. It's not inaccurate in what it's saying the classification would be, but that's an American construct, and it's an example from my field of education. But it's a really great example of cultural overloadingness that these tools are really presenting. It tends to really flatten a lot of language choices and really limit the development of voice. So by incorporating that, that can be another approach. Just as a suggestion that I've seen be fairly successful. Okay. So Dave, I'm going to move along even though that was a great question.

Dave is asking, why do I think AI is treated so differently from conversations insistence from other humans? The reality is actually with disclosure practices, it's not. One of the challenges that we see in citation is that when you have help and personal communication, we actually treat that thing very differently in citation practices than we do citation of a fixed form output like a book or a journal article. So I would actually say that moving in the direction of using

disclosure for AI brings it into a level of consistency with assistance that we get from other humans. I think the other thing is we're at a place where we're currently trying to get a handle on what these tools and technologies do, and it's something that you can do in secret in your office at home while you're working on this. And so a level of transparency is desirable and required, especially given the kinds of hallucinations and problems and cultural constructs that it can implement or introduce into the learning or research processes. Yeah. Craig was just commenting, At some point, you absolutely have to give attribution. Actually in my publication about the AID Framework, even though I developed the framework myself, some of my colleagues who gave me particularly insightful and detailed feedback, were acknowledged because even though they didn't develop it, my conversations with them really were particularly important to developing this work.

Do we approve any AI checkers? We have an AI checker through Turnitin. It doesn't work very well. You cannot charge a student at the University of Waterloo with an academic integrity policy violation only on the basis of an AI checker. You may include that as part of a packet of a variety of evidence, if you'd like, but our associate deans who handle those complaints largely do not look at those. So yeah. I'll be really honest. Some students will cheat. We've always known that. That was always the case. This is just a different way of doing that. A lot of students, actually, a large number of students are very concerned with learning to work with these tools. Those are the students we're concerned about. Where would I position the statement in OER throughout the resource? Section by section, at the beginning of the acknowledgment statement? What we typically recommend is that people include the AID statement prior to wherever they include their citations. Just before their references, work cited bibliography section, and that would be a consistent location. It could be its own slide in a presentation. It could go right before that in a poster presentation and yeah.

Is there a mandatory faculty professional development at Waterloo on using AI? No. Nothing is ever mandatory at Waterloo unless it's provincially required. So we're a very do-it-yourself institution, and we are very famous for the Waterloo Way, which means whatever everybody else is doing, we're probably going to go in the opposite direction. So no, there isn't currently mandatory faculty professional development. But what has been particularly interesting is that if there is a thing that we have asked faculty to adopt consistently, it has actually been the AID Framework and AI disclosure. We found that that has really solved a lot of problems and addressed a lot of the concerns that people have across these contexts. Yeah. All right. And that brings us right to the end of our time. There are always so many questions. I could talk about AI disclosure for days and have. But thank you, everyone for joining.

GWEN:
Thank you very much, Kari. It's such an engaging and vibrant conversation. Thanks very much, everybody for being with us till now. Please help us with the feedback survey. And there's the last Research Speaker Series session on March 11 on engaging in great practices on research on teaching and learning. We'll see you then, and you can if there's further questions related to

the framework, you could email us or you like Kari directly, and we can go from there. Thank you. Have a great day.