

**Transcript for FLO Panel: From Resistance to Rethinking Teaching and Learning with OpenAI
BCcampus FLO Panel recorded on February 3, 2026**

Moderator: Helena Prins

Presenter: Gwen Nguyen

Panelists: Elizabeth Childs, Jessica Rizk, Neil Fassina, Sharon Stein

HELENA PRINS:

Good morning, everyone. It is my wonderful privilege to welcome you all to our panel discussion today From Resistance to Rethinking Teaching and Learning with Open AI. My name is Helena Prins, and I'll be your moderator today. I have been an advisor on the Learning and Teaching team here at BCcampus for about six years, and I feel so fortunate to be in this role. Now, before I introduce you to our esteemed panelists, I am delighted to be joined by my very thoughtful and brilliant colleague, Dr. Gwen Nguyen, who's also the author of our wonderful GenAI Toolkit, and we put the link in the chat for you as well. I have asked Gwen to just set the stage for us. Like, how did we get to this topic today? And why is this such an important topic for us to host this panel? So, Gwen, I'm going to hand it over to you.

GWEN NGUYEN:

Thank you, Helena. I will do the traditional way, not very innovative, but I will share my slides and we start from there. Oh yeah, my task today is to set the stage for this panel, which is designed with the task of supporting educators and faculty and leaders moving beyond the simple bans or embraced narrative towards rethinking and a more human-centred led approach when we approach, you know, those technology advancements. I like to start with my positionality. Like Helena said, I'm Gwen, and I'm also an advisor on the Teaching and Learning team at BCcampus, and I'm joining you from my home office in a place known as Gordon Head in Victoria, also on the unceded territories of the Lekwungen People. So this photo was the one that I took on the walk to the beach near my home. But it also pretty much captures how I feel most of the time when I find myself at the intersections of, you know, like, AI and other technology advancement, as well as the educational shift. So yeah.

So I start with, you know, like a bit of a light story. Back in 2012 when I was teaching in Japan. So I asked my Japanese college students to visualize the language classroom in the next 10 years. And those photos that you see on the slides are the photos of the emerging existence of the bot teachers. And my students also share that, you know, they want to be in the classroom to welcome them at the beginning of the class, to support them with the home. And to help them with further explanation. So I was super shocked at that time and sad as well. And of course, I worry about my career. But it didn't really worry me much at that time. But 10 years after that, in November 2022, when ChatGPT came around and gained really certain fame among our communities. And then I immediately thought of that assignment that I had with my students. And so, you know, the very first thing that I thought was my students imagination actually came to life.

So to be honest like anybody else, I do feel lost, but I also care. I care about my students and the communities that I have opportunity to engage with. So with that said, I come to this work mainly from education, starting with classroom teaching and learning rather than from technology. So I use those tools in my work to support me with editing because I'm a non-native English educator and learner and user so I also use those tools, you know, occasionally to help me bring some new directions in design and learning, especially when I'm stuck. However, I don't embrace any specific GenAI tools, and I don't promote any specific tools in any of my sessions. So I approach GenAI from, you know, learner and educator. I'm curious in learning about what those tools can do, cannot do, and what it means in teaching and learning. And in my role as the teaching and learning advisor, so I take the responsibility of digging things up and to learn how those to actually work to research and reflect on how those tools impact our educational landscape and to support other faculties to make informed decisions around those tools and to share their values, you know, with learners.

So at the end of 2024 with a lot of support from the BCcampus team, from Communications to Teaching and Learning team reviewing my work. So I developed this toolkit with the hope that it can inspire and support, you know, educators wherever they are in the facings, you know, those GenAI tools in the teaching and learning. Understand more in finding ways to integrate those tools in the teaching practice. So it is more than just the collection of GenAI tools. But in these resources, I share, you know, the foundational understanding of those tools, and I share, you know, how the educators can through the hands-on approaches that explore those tools in what way that they can communicate with the learners or with other peers around, you know, like how to make the course expectation more explicit, how to rethink assessment design and how to communicate boundaries with the students. What are some of the GenAI updates and how to respond with that? So since then, you know, our team has been trying to bring this work to the community, make the space for the sustained conversation around this because I believe that these are not the decisions anyone should make alone and we cannot make it alone. And these are not the decisions that are signed and sealed. So yeah, we still, you know, need to go on with that.

So before we hear our panelists, you know, like those questions, I think I want to get a quick snapshot of the water that we are swimming in so that our panelists can actually, you know, respond to what present and matter in the room today. So I invite you to share, you know, some of the narratives around AI and with this Mentimeter.

So if you go to menti.com com and the code is there, I believe that, you know, our support team can share that code in the chat again. And then I invite us to participate in these quick two questions.

So for the two questions, you can see the screen. We're going to do one question for 1 minute for each question. The very first one could be what common narratives around AI are you hearing? I have a couple of screens here, but maybe if I couldn't get caught up with the chat, maybe Helena and the support team can help. Here we see on the Mentimeter cheating. It's for

cheating. Yeah, a lot of cheating. Environmental impact. That's good to hear. It makes students lazy, cognitive performance. They will replace 97 of the jobs. Yeah. Job destroying, economy wrecking is very dangerous. It's making us dumber. The students use AI inappropriately. A lot of educators share how the students use it in an unauthorized manner. Yeah, it's good to see the environmental impact appear here as well. Everyone needs to learn to use it for the future. We can see dependency on AI, about job loss, some of those the stealing of data, the cognitive offloading. Thank you so much for sharing. About the misinformation as well. Yeah. Yeah. So here, yeah, we also see a mixture of narratives around AI around here, embrace it because it's not going anywhere. Here we will see the embracing narratives of that we could be better off without it. Yeah, thank you for sharing. So, with that, maybe I invite you to do the second one.

If you can post two words in this spot, one shows how you feel in the context and another one is what you most feel is needed to move forward. Another word, one is feeling, another is the support needed. For example, uncertainty and maybe we need more examples of case uses. Here we see an anchor curious, daunting, seems like people are pushing more towards the feelings, and it's okay. Yeah. Uncertainty and maybe some examples of shame. Yeah, apprehensive. Hopefully library support. Yeah, thank you for sharing that. Frustration, curious. Thank you. Thank you very much. I think even in a quick scan that we can see the narrative circulating around here, the mixture of it, and actually the real human experience undermining those answers, so that is good. Yeah, thank you very much. Frustrated, daunting. And we definitely will screenshot and when I share this slide deck later with you all, I will capture this. But thank you again for sharing this. I will turn off this and then let's go back to this one quickly.

We also heard from our audience, some of the highlights in the survey before the registration, that a lot of people want to understand the sweet spot between ban and embrace so that they can move forward in working with other learners. Like keeping the human aspect at the centre. How do we do that in teaching and learning? They want to see more discussions around AI ethics, and I'm sure that the panelists will tackle those parts in our conversation today.

I want to frame it a little bit further. So is AI inevitable? And I want to share, you know, rather than the story of inevitable AI because this story actually quietly takes out the human agency in it. It reduced some of that pop.

So, you know, one of the articles that Helena and I've been, you know, discussing since last December and, you know, the reference is right there. In these articles, they said that we should get beyond the AI is inevitable narratives because when we think about AI, we think about, like if it is inevitable, then we think more about... we cannot think about it as a web of stakeholders and power. So we see that developer investor users and subjects, all the teachers and learners in that. And we don't think more about the harms of AI, for example, some copyright, some water demands or high energy. So the ways to counter those narratives is to resist, to refuse, to reclaim, and to re-imagine.

So in other words, the way that we can imagine it for big question. The first one, when we talk about resisting AI, we think about what might be actually putting at risk for learning, for equity, for labour, for trust, if we don't slow down, and then refusing AI. So in what way that we can identify and set some red boundaries for AI in education, and reclaiming is more about how can we ensure that our educational purposes still remain as our main driver. For our joys and re-imagine as mean, how could we design teaching and learning around the people and the values underpinning it. So in another word, the future of AI is actually a collective choice, before I hand it over to Helena and our panelists, I like to end it with a really hopeful note with a quote from Joy Buolamwini in a book that is my favourite. And she said that "If you have a face, you have a place in the conversation." I guess that is the reason why you are all here today "and the decisions are increasingly being shaped by advancing technology that sits under the umbrella of artificial intelligence." Thank you.

HELENA:

Thank you, Gwen. I told you she's brilliant and she's thoughtful and you've really captured that article so well and I've shared a PDF in the chat. So panelists, we've got our work cut out for ourselves here. Thank you, Gwen, for that Menti. It gave us a sense of what people are concerned about, what they might be excited about. There were a few new terms in there as well. So without further ado, I will introduce you to our panel, and I've actually asked them to introduce themselves and to also start by sharing from their lens, what is one shift that they are seeing and how educators or institutions are responding to GenAI right now. And I've told them we'll go alphabetically. So that means Dr. Elizabeth Child, who's not in B.C. right now. She's far away. You can tell them about that, Elizabeth She's a professor in the School of Education and Technology at Royal Roads University. And let's hear from you, Elizabeth.

ELIZABETH CHILDS:

Thank you so much, Helena, I don't know about any of you, but I was quite happy just to listen to Gwen go on and on. It was fantastic. I'm 8 hours ahead of you right now, so it's also getting to that point where this is just lovely. It's like a bedtime story. Thank you all for making time for this today. I'm really honoured to be part of this panel. I work at Royal Roads University and have been in this role since 2015, but prior to that, before the pandemic found this space of online learning, I did a lot of work in blended and online learning as a consultant for institutions, for companies, both nationally and internationally. Now I work as professor and program head in the School of Education and Technology at Royal Roads. And I also have had the privilege to work with BCcampus on a project called Opterna, which is where I'll frame most of my contributions today. You'll get to hear a little bit about that as well. And I know Helena asked us to talk about one shift, and I think I've got two, but I'll keep them very short. One shift that I'm seeing in work with faculty, primarily at Royal Roads, we have associate faculty, other places call them sessionals, is we still have that continuum of complete rejection and abhorrence all the way through to experimentation. But what I'm seeing now is much more, perhaps innovative and critical experimentation that's happening on that end of the spectrum. Where it's more than just, okay, how do I take my old assignment and modify it so that students can't AI it. It's much more in leaning into that space of what could I do now? Which

reminds me of the Waybacks when we first had learning management systems and we made cafeterias in the learning management system. Then we were surprised that students didn't go online to discuss in the cafeteria forum. I think what I'm seeing now with the AI space is more faculty not using it as the cafeteria and actually trying to lean into what possibilities could be. I think the other quick one that I'm seeing is more faculty asking to step back and say, wait a minute, it's actually not about the support I need to use AI. It's about what are we doing in post-secondary right now? Where are we landing on people and values and the purpose of post-secondary? Then how might AI be a space that we include or not? Those would be my two comments there, and I'll turn it over to the next panelist.

HELENA:

Thank you, Elizabeth. That's great. And, Chris asked in the check, What are we doing? Maybe it's rhetorical, but we'll see if we have some answers today. Next up is Dr. Jessica Rizk. She's a senior research associate at what was previously known as the Conference Board of Canada, but now very recently changed their name to Signal49 Research. Over to you, Jessica.

JESSICA RIZK:

Thank you so much, Helena. I'm also very honoured to be part of the panel today. As Helena mentioned, formerly Conference Board of Canada, I'm at Signal49 Research. I lead a lot of national work on skills and workforce readiness. For those of you who don't know, Signal49 is a nonprofit research organization. We work across Canada, so we're national. Much of my current portfolio right now is looking at how educators, students, and institutions are navigating GenAI in real time. I would also like to add, aside from my role being in the research and policy space for a number of years, I've also spent over a decade as a K to 12 teacher. I also currently teach at the post-secondary level as well. And maybe most importantly, I have a child who just entered JK, so they just entered the system. So when I think about skill development, the future work, and AI related skills, I think about it from four-year-olds all the way up to 24-year-old and I feel like this is a topic that's near and dear to my heart because now I'm invested. I have a child in the system, so we got to get this right. But from my combined lens, I think the biggest shift that I'm seeing from our research and what the data is saying is that we seem to optimistically, and I'm going to echo what Elizabeth was saying here a bit, moving away from seeing GenAI as this cheating problem, although I saw cheating come up multiple times. But we're really trying to think of it more as an assessment design problem. I think early on when AI introduced itself, we heard in some of our previous research, a few years old, which is outdated now, that educators had no training, institutions didn't have clear guidelines, but students were using it anyways, and that created a lot of fear and guesswork. But what we're seeing now is that more and more educators are thinking, okay, let's step back. If AI can complete this assignment, then is the issue the student or is it really the assignment? I think that shift now is opening up to a lot more constructive conversations about what are we trying to assess? What's the purpose? How are we valuing process? How do we build transparency into the teaching? We've heard from institutions that they're also quite aware of just how uneven this readiness is across Canada. We've seen some programs are really leading, they're experimenting, others feel stuck. And underneath it all is this concern around, what does it

even mean to be AI literate? What does AI literacy even mean? What does that mean for today's graduating student to be AI literate? These are questions I think we're all grappling with. But I think the encouraging shift is that we're asking these deeper questions. We're really thinking more about design and purpose and what does meaningful student work and instruction and pedagogy look like in an AI-infused world. I'll stop there and pass over to the next one.

HELENA: Thank you. Thank you, Jessica. I like that there's some overlap too between yours and Elizabeth. So next up, we have Dr. Neil Fassina and we are so thrilled to have someone from the admin team here, president at Okanagan College. Neil, we are very curious to hear more from you as well.

NEIL FASSINA:

Thanks, Helena and again, thanks to everyone for being here. I'm pleased to be part of this. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Whatever part of the world you happen to be in. As Helena said, I currently serve as the president of Okanagan College, sitting in Kelowna today. But the shift I'm going to talk about is actually based on my time over a couple of different presidencies. By background, I was the president of Athabaska University before I came to Okanagan College. I think what I'm seeing as a shift is actually it leans a little bit into what Jessica was saying around just rethinking about the role of AI. If we go back, recognizing that AI was born in the 50s and 60s around trying to create rule-based environments, then you move forward, you started to get a little bit more data intensity, a little bit more compute power. Mid 2010s, late 2010s, the conversation at AU was around augmented intelligence, not artificial intelligence, knowing that we weren't quite there yet. We were still working on that machine learning environment. So the question became is, well, how do we embed this? How do we take advantage of this? Because it wasn't moving fast yet, right. It was still coming on kind of in a slow role. Whereas, I think the shift that I'm seeing now is effectively in the speed of change. So that shift from machine learning into LLMs and now starting to move into the generative side of things, and I say just moving into the generative side because we're still training on LLMs, the speed of change in the GenAI space has exceeded now the speed of change in post-secondary. And so we are regrettably, in some cases, taking a traditional approach to a new effectively existential threat, which I'll talk about later on today. I say this tongue in cheek, please don't quote me on it. We better create a committee to decide on when we can get together to think about what we're going to do about GenAI. By the time we've come up with a solution, the question we were asking is obsolete, right? So we're now moving into this place where we're creating uncertainty and the unknown, which in effect creates entrenchment in old traditions, which is natural human behaviour. It's not a bad thing, but we have to recognize that that's what we're doing to be able to get out of it. And so I think the shift that I'm seeing more than anything is that on a global scale, we're actually seeing a handful of institutions, either established ones or actually start up ones, start from the point of rethinking AI or sorry, rethinking post-secondary in the realm of AI rather than trying to figure out how AI is going to move into post-secondary. The mind shift has gone from how do I de-risk the post-secondary environment to how do I rethink and experiment the post-secondary environment. It's starting

to see that rollover in some cases and looking forward to chatting about it more. One other thing, Gwen, I couldn't help but notice that one of your robot teachers was robot from the government. I'm starting to worry about where those robots are coming from now.

HELENA:

Thank you so much, Neil, for that and yeah, very big shift that you've identified for sure. Now, the last panelist I want to introduce you to, certainly not the least is Dr. Sharon Stein. She's associate professor of Higher Education and the professor of Climate Complexity and Coloniality in the Department of Educational Studies at the University of British Columbia. So, Sharon, we are very glad that you could join us today. Tell us a little bit about what you bring to this and the shift you've noticed.

SHARON STEIN:

Great. Thank you so much for having me. I think what I have to say will complement some of what my fellow speakers have said. I think one of the biggest things I observe about our responses to AI is that in many ways, these responses are not just about AI. They're also how we think and feel about this moment that we find ourselves in, not only in terms of the challenges facing higher education, but the wider systemic crisis or what I prefer to call systemic consequence. I'll share a link to that in a second. I think we don't always recognize or acknowledge it, but in this context, AI is often something of a mirror and of course, also an amplifier of many of the challenges we already face. So questions about the relevance of higher ed, questions about equity, questions about what is actually the role of higher education in a deeply uncertain time. I think in this context, AI becomes a focus point also because it gives us something very concrete to focus our attention on and we feel like maybe we can have some agency, whether it's adoption or refusal or something in between but that often ends up that many of us are winging this and navigating it alone and figuring out how we want to respond. And I think that's also why we see such a range of responses from faculty and students. And while there's something really generative about this diversity of responses, one of the implications is a lot of confusion, a lot of contradiction, a breakdown in trust, especially from the perspective of students, who I've heard many students noting that they feel really stressed that they're going to be accused of cheating with AI, even if they didn't use it at all. So I think we need more spaces for sober conversations where we can bring our different perspectives and most of our institutions have not yet created these spaces. But I do think there's a possibility there, if we can figure out how to do that, that the muscles we build for navigating AI together could also be muscles that we use for navigating this wider systemic shift that we're also within.

HELENA:

Thank you so much, Sharon, yes, I hear that desire for spaces for sober conversations. That's what I told some of the panelists ahead of time, too. That's kind of what we see as our role here at BCcampus is to create and hold this space. We don't have all the answers. That's why we have some excellent panelists. But really, we hope that this is an opportunity for conversation. So let's dive into that conversation, and please, audience, feel invited as a panelist to put your

thoughts in the chat. The panelists will also respond to some questions in the chat. If we don't get time to do that verbally. If you put it in the chat, someone will respond to you. So we're going to start with you, Sharon and just kind of think about ethics beyond just cheating. Let's unpack the ethical considerations institutions should be grappling with beyond student misconduct. I'm wondering how equity, access, coloniality, and environmental impact factor into GenAI decisions?

SHARON:

Well, this is something we can do a whole panel on, right? So there's no doubt that the arrival of AI in higher ed raises this full slate of ethical questions beyond just academic integrity. And, you know, this is, you know, about the reproduction of racial bias, the risk of state and corporate surveillance, the naturalization of Western knowledge systems, the non-consensual scraping of data, including from Indigenous communities who are very concerned about protecting their intellectual property, you know, the ecological impacts of AI. But I think, as is my tendency, I'd like to zoom out and, you know, emphasize that all of these concerns were pre-existing concerns about higher education, right? And much like humans, AI systems are shaped by the wider political, economic, and epistemological systems that they're trained in. So none of these concerns is new and they're not inherent to AI, but they're a product of the systems from which most AI that we're using currently emerges. So I think we're missing a bigger picture if we only address questions of coloniality, equity, ecological impact in AI without then situating it within these larger systems that our institutions are also embedded in and have been embedded in since their beginnings, right? It can be, I think, tempting to fix it on the harms of AI because it feels more manageable, right? It's one thing we can focus on. But eradicating bias in AI, if it were even possible, doesn't eradicate bias in faculty. Boycotting AI because of its ecological impacts doesn't address the wider fact that we have an entire political economic system premised on an unsustainable engagement with the natural world. How do we be honest about the risks and harms of AI specifically without exceptionalizing them? That I think is part of what is behind the work that I'm doing about earth-aligned AI. I've been speaking about it actually more like AI as a partner in earth-aligned education. But the idea, I think, is partly to offer an alternative to this notion of human-centred AI, which it's a useful framing because we often think if we're not centring humans, then we're allowing AI to be at the centre or we're allowing corporations to be at the centre. But I also spent a lot of my career challenging human centrism or human exceptionalism of mainstream higher ed. If we centre humans, we're often diminishing the more-than-human-beings that we also coexist with. Also, of course, many Black and Indigenous scholars have pointed out that the very notion of the human that we often use in the humanities or in universities is a default to this supposedly universal human that excludes non-Western communities. I think one of the things too, I want to highlight is the work of the Indigenous-led Abundant Intelligences Project, which challenges the Eurocentrism and anthropocentrism of mainstream AI and asks how AI systems can be put into this circle of human and more-than-human relationships. So an earth-aligned AI approach would of course carry the extractive traces of whatever AI systems it was created with. But there's also this notion that we could repurpose AI to accompany us and AI itself in unlearning the colonial habits that we've inherited from these systems. So I want to make one last point.

Which is that AI is not only a threat to equity, and I think the Abundant Intelligence Project is an example of that. But there are communities and individuals using AI as a means of navigating and subverting existing inequitable structures. So racialized faculty may be using AI to draft a diplomatic response to an extractive request that they serve on every equity community in the university or multilingual students using it to scaffold their assignments in English-dominated contexts or students with disabilities using AI to bridge accessibility gaps. So here, AI becomes a strategy of harm reduction, which doesn't erase its risks, but it complicates the narrative of AI as harmful. And I often see that sometimes these uses of AI are also pathologized, right? So I think we have to ask who's deciding what is authentic labour participation? Who decides what the legitimate uses of a technology are? Because sometimes the biggest critiques of AI come from people like me who have been benefiting from inequitable systems for a long time. And now we see people who are using those technologies to try and speak back to that and we're not sort of acknowledging that that's an effort to kind of an adaptive response to an unequal system. So I'll leave it there, and I'll share in the chat my recent op ed about thinking beyond just cheating.

HELENA:

Thank you, Sharon. Yes, we look forward to getting that article to learn also more a little bit about your earth-aligned approach. I wonder if any of the panelists wants to respond. I definitely hear attention around what are some of the concerns, but also recognizing that there are some benefits to using AI. That's a very rudimentary summarization of what you just said, Sharon, but any panelists want to respond to that? I think you've left us speechless. Oh Neil..

NEIL:

Yeah, I wonder if I can just chime in a little bit. And Sharon, an awesome toss-out to really get thinking. I wonder how in your view of how you just brought that perspective to the table, how do you deal with the concept of speed versus need to have those deep philosophical questions?

SHARON:

Well, no, I was just kidding. I don't have any answers. But I do know that I feel like some people and I have been in this position myself are waiting for it to calm down before we enter the fray and it's like, it's never going to stop. It's just going to get more intense. At some point, we just have to dive in knowing we're going to be lost, knowing we're going to be confused, but feeling like, Okay, we're in this together, and we're going to figure it out or feel it out collectively and not wait for the moment when the time is right because it's never going to be right.

HELENA:

Thank you for that, Sharon. And I see a question in the chat by Andrew Arun, Is ownership and governance of the technologies a proper concern of the post-secondary sector? Or are we really just talking about, sorry chat just moved faster. Or are we really just talking about the ethics of how we use it rather than the socio-political environment? And it leads into the next question that I have for Elizabeth. So, Elizabeth, what do you think? Do you think public post-

secondary institutions should be more discerning about AI partnerships? And if so, what does this ethical discernment look like in practice?

ELIZABETH:

Well, that's a mouthful to do. I actually and it connects, Neil, to your question and Sharon, what you're saying. I think we have these big questions and I agree with you, Sharon, some people are waiting for this train to stop and it's just not going to stop, we just have to dive in. I think that's maybe where I can contribute from that point, both there and to the ethical piece around the BCcampus project. Because as my daughter constantly tells me, Mama, it doesn't have to be perfect. It's not that deep, just start. I think that's really wise advice from a 13-year-old given all of the other things that go around that, is you do just have to start somewhere and so in the BCcampus project, we really wrestled with what is ethical AI in the context of this study companion that was being built with open generative AI, knowing that it would be used hopefully by faculty and students with a Socratic method, with all of the things that you hope to build into this thing, recognizing that you can hope and then it will evolve. And so what does that ethics piece look like? Paula, maybe if you wouldn't mind popping that PowerPoint in here. It's from a presentation we did in the fall, but you'll be able to see a diagram and we purposely put it out there as a draft because I don't think we can definitively say, Okay, these are the ethics that you need to adopt. There are lots of people who are writing about that right now and their work is very informative and thought-provoking. But this is so contextual that when we try to take it and use it with respect to the Opterna Project. We really had to tease out, okay, wait a minute. Within the confines of this project, within the scope of what we're able to do and the box we're able to play in, now what does ethical AI mean? What decisions do we make as a result of that? For example, we made decisions around how many textbooks would be ingested into the tool because we wanted to have a minimal environmental footprint, but also be able to meet the need, Neil, to your point for speed and ability for people to use it right away. What do we expect student data? What would happen in this tool? Are we making a choice where people are going to be tracked or not? Of course, the choice was made. We're not going to track students, but then that has ramifications for faculty being able to see things on the back end that could help with their course design and course improvements. Each decision has this ripple effect and being able to, I think it comes back to where we started, being able to know what your values are. And what it is that you're attempting to do with these values for all those people in your circle, humans, the non-humans, the environment that you're creating together, this ecosystem, that starts to take the big theoretical ethics of AI and make it tangible, practical, and not that deep. You can actually have a place to start. I think that's the real important piece here is if we sit on the sidelines, we will be on the sidelines and it's comfortable there, it's uncomfortable there, and it's really uncomfortable when you roll up your sleeves and just start something. But without that, we have no way of knowing, is this a path we can keep going on? Do we need to change it? What are the advantages of this? What are the risks? I would offer that forward.

HELENA:

What an excellent example of a localized way of navigating with all the ethical considerations. I thank you for that, Elizabeth, and thank you, Paula, who put some links in the chat so that those who want to can go look a little bit more deeply into that. And again, there's a question in the chat that I'm going to link, and Neil, you're going to have to answer both kind of what the question in the chat is and what my question to you is because I think Julian is alluding to what I'm also asking you. He's asking you and Sharon, is the speed accelerationism, growth narrative around AI inevitable? I don't know how big or influential the movement is, but there seems to be a lot there seem to be lots of people arguing we should slow down and even as Neil Salvin says move towards digital degrowth, does he have a role in this? So my question to you was kind of related to the speed that you also introduce when you introduce yourself, but the tension, given all these ethical concerns and considerations, how do you, specifically as a leader in post-secondary, navigate this tension that exists among us, right? Those who feel strongly about keeping AI out of our classrooms and perhaps those who are very eagerly embracing it. Big question.

NEIL:

I appreciate the opportunity and Julian, I'll promise to try to answer your question. Heidi, you tossed in a note earlier on about how people like me are going to have to make some hard decisions. Before I launch into answering the questions a bit, though, I just want to throw out the caveat. For the record, I have 100 bad ideas before breakfast. So what I'm going to talk about right now is just thoughts. I have no claim on being right, but rather just perspectives. And I think to dive into that question around the tension, I think that tension is actually based on our current understanding and design of higher education, right? So as a result, we see AI entering our world as either a threat. You saw that in some of the Menti stuff around the frequency that we're cheating or an enhancer. We're using it to be able to try and move us forward in a faster pace. I would liken it to, I go back to the time where I was in a classroom. We started to see laptops show up in classrooms. We started to see cell phones show up in classrooms and we were doing things like shutting off Wi-Fi in classrooms to prevent people from cheating. Now, I would encourage people to find me a classroom or a learning environment that doesn't have a cell phone or doesn't have a laptop. So those technologies came in, and we sort of got over that cheating piece. I think the difference this time, though, is that the technology that we're facing is actually existential, right? It's actually questioning our value proposition faster than we think it is. So I'm of the perspective that if we continue to believe that post-secondary is where we pursue, synthesize, and convey knowledge in a fixed environment at a fixed pace for a fixed outcome, then we're frankly at risk of obsolescence. I think that is a significant risk for us as an industry. And so I'm of the mind that rather than focusing on the tension, let's flip the question. And that is what is the role of post-secondary in the world of GenAI where we can start actually getting at some of those questions that Sharon was really throwing around that are much more philosophical in nature than how do I prevent someone from cheating using AI, which is a very tactical environment. But if I flip it around to this world that we're walking into, we're facing a space in which many of the technical fields that we're used to working in are functionally ready to disappear. And in the absence of advanced robotics, which will likely be on the horizon, I think the focus becomes much more

into the space of hands-on environment and I'll tease that apart a little bit more. Application because our industry partners and employer partners are asking for AI literacy despite the fact that none of us might actually know what that actually means yet. Integration and experience because, let's be real, GenAI is still built on large language models, and again, caveat, it's not all like this, but garbage in garbage out, that if, you know, in a world or an era in which our general population is bombarded by opinion from which they have to try to distinguish the facts from that opinion, those opinions are the pieces they're feeding into these large language models. You start to discover why I appreciate it's not the right word, but why you see AI engines hallucinating, producing what would arguably be fact in the absence of actual fact because they've been taught or rewarded to create answers. I actually look at this as effectively a realm of the renaissance of the humanities, putting the person back into the technology, trying to reinvent what it means to be that humanistic environment. I think if we're not making that shift, the product that we're offering effectively becomes less valuable. And I reflect back and you look at sort of the history of post-secondary over time. Post-secondary has always adapted to meet the needs of society. The difference is how fast things are changing, right? So when we went from divinity to the humanities, we had 300 years to adapt. When we went from the humanities to the technical, we had 30 years to adapt. Now that we're going from the technical to GenAI, we've got three years to adapt, right? That is a magnitude of 10 every time you come down. So the problem is that the cycle speed exceeds our transformational speed, right? And so, you know, we've got to move into a world as higher education where we stop using the term, this is the way it's always been done. For two reasons. Number one, it's never true because if you look at a university 400 years ago, it is not the university of today, so it's not always the way it's been done, but it's also going to entrench us into a commitment to obsolescence. My question as an administrator in this world is how do we retain our values as a post-secondary environment without retaining our baggage as it were. We can't hold on to the past but we can hold onto our values, so how do we make that switch? Let me just get to the two questions that were in the chat. First off, Julian, can we slow things down and does post-secondary have a role in it? I think the answer to the latter half of it is yes. I think the answer to the former half of it is, could we even try in a world that is trying to commoditize and weaponize this solution. I fear that post-secondary could stand on a pillar as long as we want and say, Crew, we need to slow down. We've got some ethical questions to answer. But the reality is that the broader society is just not going to do that because there's alternative motives at stake here, and it's not about how do we create the most ethical AI? That's not the primary motive. Right? So what is post-secondary's role in that world that is moving that fast? Would be how I flip that question. Then Heidie you threw in a comment earlier in the chat around administrators being forced to effectively make hard choices between AI and humans. Sure. I mean, you can see that starting to play out in the headlines completely outside of post-secondary with Amazon ditching 15,000 jobs in favour of AI agents. But I come back to the statement that I made at the very start of this piece is that question of AI versus human assumes that we have the same structure that we have today. I think the actual thing that we're going to have to deal with, administrators and faculty, the entire team members alike is, what does the structure look like tomorrow? And what is the role of AI in it, and what is the role of the human in it, rather than what is the trade-off between AI and human today in the

structure that we have today? I think the question is actually more complex than that trade-off question might suggest. But Helena, I'm hoping I've answered some of the questions, but I think they will be back.

HELENA:

Yeah, thank you for attempting to answer what is a difficult question. And I still feel the tension of, yes, things are happening at speed, but there are instructors in the classroom right now that has to make sense of it. They are the ones facing the students. They don't want to necessarily cause harm, so how do we support faculty who are then in front of the classroom while the train is running fast, while we acknowledge there's bigger questions to have, there's still this practical piece of being in the classroom right now while all of that's happening. So I welcome suggestions, even from the audience in the chat. I do want to turn it over to Jessica to just respond, perhaps to what Neil has said or to some of the comments and concerns you've seen in the Menti and this question. How does this all align with your research, like, from a national lens with what you've seen? Does it align? Are there things that we're missing?

JESSICA:

Yeah, I think Neil said it best: what does this structure look like now in the age of AI? It's less about trying to make AI fit in. It's really about, and I've heard this echoed a few times, rethinking what is the purpose of post-secondary? What is our role as instructors who are supposed to prepare students for the workforce or to be citizens? What is our role really? I can speak to our national research, and I think one of the clearest things that we're beginning to see is that this conversation and I alluded to this earlier is really allowing us to rethink some of those basic assumptions that we had about writing, about assessment. What does it look like now in the age of AI? I think for a long time, we thought that it was essential, especially for writing-heavy disciplines like no tools allowed. But in our data, what we're seeing is that educators and students are showing that, again, students are using AI right now for very superficial ways, I would say low-stakes way, they're brainstorming. They're getting unstuck. But they're not really getting into it. I think what would be the ultimate goal of AI is those deep questions, ethical reasoning, the critical thinking. But again, we're seeing expectations are unclear, which means originality now is becoming less about avoiding tools, but more about the quality of judgment. What are students really accepting? What are they rejecting from AI? But how do they shape that into their own thinking? It's just a very interesting again, shift because I think it's really flipping this whole post-secondary institution on its head. Now we're looking into more about the final product. How do we... Sorry, we're moving away from relying on the final product. We want to put more emphasis on now the process, which I think for a long time, in post-secondary. Here's your final assignment, this is what you need to do. Now it's a lot more about how are we getting to that point? When we spoke with leaders in our research, they've said that again, if AI can produce polished texts in a few seconds, then that final artifact, that piece of information is not allowing us to know much about how a student actually reasoned through a task. That's a critical piece now is, again, I'd say it's probably disruptive the most for writing-heavy disciplines where your essay or final product or whatever it might be has traditionally been used to act as that main part of main evidence of your learning. Whether

that's a final paper or whatever it is, that's usually what you submit to show your learning. But now that's a question is, how do we get there? I think if we ask more questions around that. But again, it's that shift that narrative shift. And there's also the equity dimension that's come up in our research because guidelines are really inconsistent across courses. We see that students with more confidence, more digital access can experiment a bit more freely, while others, particularly those from more equity-seeking groups tend to hold back because, again, they're scared, they don't want to do something wrong, and I've seen this as well in the fourth year classes that I teach. On day one, I'll say who here has used GenAI whatever for your assignments or for your coursework? And a lot of them just look like deers in headlights. Nobody wants to be the first person to say, yeah, I use it. A lot of them will just openly say, You know what? I don't want to go there. I don't want to touch it because I don't know what my institutional policy is. I don't know what the faculty expectations are. Some of them will say, I've had faculty who'll say, you're not allowed to use it and they just go on more of that fear-based principle. So I think the data showing that obviously clear shared principles help level that playing field. I really think AI is pushing us to think to clarify what do we value, again, in post-secondary, whether it's in writing, whether in designing assessments that actually can show us how to make thinking visible and how to make sure our expectations are equitable and transparent so that we remove that fear factor. But I feel like it's forcing us to rethink again what the purpose of post-secondary really is.

HELENA:

Yes. Thank you. It seems we come back to that quite a bit in this conversation, redefining our purpose. So yeah, Elizabeth, you want to respond.

ELIZABETH:

Not directly respond, but I think I'll just build from that a little bit. I'm curious also to hear Sharon and Neil and Jessica, where this lands for you. But Helena, you ask, so then what are the practical suggestions for faculty right now doing the teaching? They're out there, they're doing this work. This is not their job, right? They're teaching research service. That's where their focus is. And so what do they do? They've got a lot to learn. They've got a lot going on and I think some of what I've seen to be really valuable is just to remind them that they know this, lean into your teaching, do what you tell your learners to do every day. Be a learner, be curious, ask questions, remain open to having your thinking challenged, be willing to change, to modify your viewpoint, to recognize that you might not be the expert in the room and that is totally okay because we're all learning. I mean, this sounds like a RAH-RAH, but what I'm meaning by saying this is inviting people to step into that place of being a reflective beginner again. That is super hard when you're an adult to do anyway. Never mind, if you're trying to learn how to ski or you're trying to learn how to use AI in your class. It's really hard to be a brand new beginner in something as an adult. It also requires you to be super brave and we're asking them to do this at speed. Neil to your point in an environment that has some very physical constraints to it, not a lot of resourcing to support this. In this context, Sharon, that you shared about this is that amplification of everything else that's going on. We really are asking faculty to step into a space

very quickly. And get comfortable being a brand new person, being a brand new beginner in this space without a lot of support, and the support of their faculty, their network, perhaps seeing their students as co-creators in this space together. That would be a great opportunity to do. But all of this requires a level of engagement, commitment, and bravery that needs to be supported somehow. I'm curious, Neil, Sharon, Jessica, how what I'm rambling on about lands with you and where you see that support coming from?

HELENA:

Yeah, so, Neil, let's hear from you and then Sharon and I want you to invite you back in as well.

NEIL:

Thanks, Helena. Awesome question, Elizabeth. And I'm going to echo you a little bit and use my own personal experience a little bit. At the start, Jessica talked about. She's got a vested interest in it because she's got a child entering JK. I've got one in second year and one that's a month away from starting post-secondary. So that change, the need for speed is definitely there. But I think back to the time that I joked about earlier around cell phones entering the environment, even then the speed of that change was so slow. For those of you who remember, when you used to have to text, you had to press the number three times to get the letter you wanted. Now we're in this world, it's just moving so quickly. I would lean into that comment, Elizabeth, around opening up to being a learner. Because I look at my two kids. They know more about GenAI than I could ever fathom. Because it's more like it's more ubiquitous to their world than it is to mine. And so I'm actually now having to lean in to talk to people about, okay, well, what do you use it for? So I can guess what you use it for, but I don't actually know. And then on the flip side of that is, how could I then not only become a learner and become open to not necessarily being the one that knows sort of the most within that space. But then how do I flip it back onto the learner to say, how do I create a world of authenticity, right? Because I think that the piece that's lost in GenAI is authenticity. Authenticity and thinking, authenticity and creativity, authenticity. So how do I create an environment where the student is forced to bring their authentic self to the table as compared to the GenAI supported self to the table?

HELENA:

Sharon, do you want to jump in there? How do we create this world of authenticity? What can we do for faculty development that supports educators and doing just that? Any ideas?

SHARON:

Well, I appreciate much of what my fellow panelists have said, and I think just one word that comes to mind is humility. And I think it's really hard. It's not just that we're adults and we feel like we should know, but we are faculty members, we're researchers. We assume that our whole purpose and value is in having the answers and knowing. So admitting that we don't know is very difficult for many of us. But when I do that with my students, not just about AI, but about anything, I generally get a very positive response of, like, I don't know, you don't know, This is new for all of us. Let's figure it out together or not, but we will learn something in the

process. I think also, one thing I want to highlight and I don't want to say too much because I feel like I've already spoken a lot, but is that fear that is behind the mirror of the epistemic arrogance is a fear of not knowing, of not being the expert, of being irrelevant. And I do think we should actually spend some time looking at that fear, what is behind it, and how can we make space for it without allowing it to dictate our decision. So I think if we can spend a bit more time individually and collectively, looking at what is actually driving our responses to AI, whether that's embrace or rejection or something in between, that will also give us a better sense of what is the work we need to do to figure this out together? What is the personal unlearning that I might need to do in order to allow myself to make the space for that inquiry. And again, I don't think as much institutional... Well, there's limits on the institutional guidance that we do have some institutions that have none. As Neil said, it becomes irrelevant even before it's released. But I think if we could take more time to ask ourselves those difficult questions and be more comfortable with this comfort with uncertainty and complexity, it would go a long way in deepening our engagement and our learning in this. So in that spirit, I'm going to share in the chat kind of workbook that is a draft that is not just for faculty, but I think I had faculty in mind of how we can stay with the trouble of AI and thinking through the layers of what's our affective response? How does this relate to the temporality we see ourselves in? How does this relate to questions of equity? I just wanted to share it with the group, and there's a link there to offer feedback on the draft as well.

HELENA:

Thank you for sharing your resources so generously. I really appreciate it. I see a question in the chat that I'm going to pose to the panel, but also anyone in the audience can answer. It's from Andrew. He's asking, Is authentic AI proof assessment always more labour intensive? The pushback I see where I work is that it just takes too long to redesign and then to assess new types of assessment. What are others doing to help faculty to redesign their assessments given the lack of resources to do so? Yeah, we're certainly interested to help Andrew with that question. Anyone from the panel wants to go first, and we could also invite someone from the audience to raise their hand. Elizabeth.

ELIZABETH:

Andrew, that's a great question and I can jump in on that and offer an example. Because, yes, you often hear that and I've certainly experienced it myself when I was first playing around with assessment and AI and Hakuli and I were co-teaching and we decided at the end of that course that was quite possibly the most assessment of assessment we had ever done and we were never doing that again. The challenge was we had tried to take a traditional assignment and make it more interesting and to some extent, try to AI-proof it at the time. And so we stayed in the box, right? And by staying in the box, we made so much more work for ourselves. And what I see a faculty doing is we're moving the box and thinking about assessment very differently, which to Jessica's point about co-creation can be quite wide open. So I have an example of a faculty member who works in the MA of Tourism and Hospitality Management, and part of those students are creating a plan for this hospitality situation. And so he worked with a local large language model and created that. That did take some time, support from our Center of

Teaching and Educational Technologies created that, and then the students interface with that local, so on the computer, not large out there in the big open space, that local LLM to basically have the LLM ask them questions about their plan that they've created. In that back and forth that happens, the plan gets revised, reflection happens, and the course is an ongoing conversation course. I think that's been, in talking to that faculty member, yes, there was some initial conceptualizing and to be quite frank, I think part of what was done in that phase was, I need to redesign this. AI, can you help me? Can you put on your hat of an instructional designer? Here are the parameters of the course, age group, blah, blah, blah. What are some options just to get some ideas going and then a rip on those ideas to come up with where they've landed now. I think there's some magic in that in the sense that there was a creative spark somewhere along that conversation that resulted in this assessment piece. Now it's something that students are finding very helpful and also intruding back to this local large language model. One option to consider. I'll put a link actually in which Harper from BCcampus did an excellent post in the fall about how do you actually use offline LLMs in your work as a faculty. I'll put that link in the chat too, but I'm curious how others have seen this taken up.

HELENA: Anyone of the panelists want to add?

JESSICA:

I can add. This is more from Jessica as an educator not Jessica the researcher, but something that I've been trying to do in my role as an instructor, but also heard from other faculty is sometimes it's just making one small step that will move keep the human work at the centre. So like, yes, I think in an ideal world, we really need to revamp and really rethink about assessment, but I think that task has seemed very daunting and can be off putting. It's like you know what? It's just too much, everyone's overworked and tired. It's a lot to think to redo, but sometimes just one small shift is a good way to start. I echo what everyone on the panel said so far, just being co-creators, co-learners, stepping back and saying, You know what, let's just be transparent, I think also is just a good place to start. How do you guys use AI in your classroom? How have you been told to use it? That's something that again, not a researcher hat, instructor hat that I've asked students on day one and been transparent. This is how I think you should use it. This is how you should use it in my class and these are the ways I think you should use it. These are the ways you should not. We walk through it. I think even just having students use it with you in class and if I teach sociology and it's like, Hey, we're doing a final paper. Let's use it in class, prompt it. What are the questions you're going to ask? What did you ask the tool? Maybe to come up with a research question. This is what you kept? This is what you changed here, why? I think just having students talk through that process, whether they submit something to you or just have that conversation in class about how you can use it. I think it's a good place to start. I mean, maybe I'm wrong, but I think it's again, I think it gets that transparency piece, I think it gets at the critical thinking piece, you need to work through ideas. I think too many students I don't want to say that they assume, but a lot of students don't want to use ChatGPT again because their fear of getting in trouble, but also a lot of them forget that it's not always accurate and there is a lot of critical thinking that goes into that and I think

having those discussions in class and figuring it out together is a great place to start. It's such an important place to start.

HELENA:

Thanks for bringing that up, Jessica. I don't know who watched CBC last week. There was an excerpt on the Province of Quebec. They've done some research on how students are using AI, and it's a big stat of maybe 70% of students using AI inappropriately or using AI, but then 30% admitting to using it inappropriately. And then they spoke to some students, and one student said, I always see the statements in my course outline that I shouldn't use AI. I've been there seven months and no one has spoken to me about it. So I feel that is that call for having conversations in the classroom. I think that's one way maybe of what Neil called environment that's transparent, right? Authentic, sorry, you said authentic environments. Gwen spoke about transparency in the chat. So yeah, I think having those conversations is an important starting point, for sure. See, there's some more comments in the chat.

JESSICA:

I also liked what Gwen said earlier. I liked it at the beginning. She said "I feel lost, but I care." It was really important. I think if you care, you might feel lost. I'm like, that's okay. I can also share, I don't know if for there yet if we want to get there, but from the research I have, we have some insights into what we're hearing works in terms of faculty piloting and going through AI initiatives, but you let me know...

HELENA: Absolutely. Let's get there.

JESSICA:

Okay. Awesome. So what we're seeing in the data, this is what we're hearing again across Canada, is that the approaches that seem to work best are the ones that are low stakes, contextual, practical. We're hearing that more and more. Again, people on this webinar, it will be interesting to hear if it resonates with them, but we've been hearing that it's less about what is AI? Is it good? We are way past that now, what we are hearing people actually tell me how I can use it. Give me some sample assignments, templates, design specific examples. But above all, the interesting thing that came out of our research was time, again, this is a utopian, this is a nice to have, but that a lot of leaders, faculty within institutions just want time to experiment without the fear of doing something wrong. We heard that. Yeah, it's nice to have. Wouldn't it be nice if everyone had extra time to play around with the tools and figure out how to best use it. But since that's not always possible, we heard repeatedly that peer to peer learning was one of the strongest levels for building confidence amongst faculty, especially when trying to figure out how to use it. Seeing a colleague within your department or outside doing something new and whether that worked or not, seeing someone do it and fail, is a good way to reduce anxiety. It made people feel like there was less of a high-risk leap because so and so is doing this, having those peer-to-peer groups, having that room for experimentation was something that was super important. And I think I talked about it earlier, just from the same way that the students felt that there was a lack of transparency that caused a lot of frustration and fear. We actually

heard as well that faculty felt overwhelmed because of the lack of consistent and clear guidelines. Because expectations around AI vary so widely. Some institutions are further ahead and having strategic policies and making it clear; others they're unsure. That also created a lot of tension and fear amongst faculty as well. But we heard that the most effective institutions were the ones who took more of a principles-at-the-centre, flexibility-at-the-edges approach. They had a set values here at Institution X. Here's how we think about AI in regards to equity, privacy, transparency. But it was high level, but it allowed departments and instructors to adapt the specifics to their context. That's just the things that I think have come out of our work that might be interesting to folks here. We found it works best when it's really grounded in real teaching practice, not like this abstract thing, but that support is really important. You need to have the co-creation. I think with your students, but also with the peers was a big one, but there needs to be some backing of institutional clarity that's not overly prescriptive. I think that's the key piece here.

HELENA: Thank you for responding.

ELIZABETH:

Jessica, I love what you're bringing into this conversation because it reminds me of the Wayback Machine. About 35 years ago when we were all struggling to figure out, how do we do PD for educators? And I was doing my dissertation and I thought, Why has the literature been talking about this for 40 years? And they're saying the same thing and we're still not doing it? So there's a moment when you were speaking. I was like, Okay, so now how many years has that been? Oh, dear. [laughs] But I think what that does show us is that there are some consistent things here and there are consistent ways that we can try to help support educators, whether it's K to 12 or higher ed educators or corporate trainers to improve their practice over time. I'm just going to jump back to Neil's point again. The challenge is the time window and the change acceleration is so short. That's where we have to be adaptive in terms of the support that's provided. I think that's where it's really contextual. I mean, there are institutions across B.C. and beyond that are doing some amazing work in this space to try to support their faculty. The work Lucas Wright and his folks are doing at UBC, there's lots happening at KPU. There's lots happening in places I don't even know. Yet, of course, what BCcampus does. So in some ways, we're spoiled for choice. Now how does a faculty lean into the place where they can get that little bit that they need right now just enough just in time. I think that's part of our collective tension right now is we need it to be contextual, but we also have so much out there. It's adding one more cognitive overload piece to faculty who just want to know what am I doing? How do I do this tomorrow? I think that's part of the tension in the professional learning space that we can name it, but we haven't quite figured out how to work with it yet.

HELENA:

Thank you for that, Elizabeth, I do want to pipe up that at BCcampus, we are trying to fill some kind of gap in this. We are not just uncritically supporting and embracing AI, but we see our role as not only bringing people together for conversation, but also supporting faculty in their need to know how to use it appropriately, how to rethink their assessment. We have a session

coming up on Thursday about that. So please do look at our event space, and I'll ask Paula, who's with us today as support to put the link in the chat. I can't believe we're at 12:15. We have 15 minutes left, and I did want to give each panelist just an opportunity for kind of a final word of wisdom, if you'd like. Not too much pressure, I hope, but what's one question, principle or practice that you think educators should carry forward as they navigate GenAI from this conversation we had today. And we'll go in reverse alphabetical order. So we'll start with you, Sharon.

SHARON:

I think the question I would leave with or pose on leaving is what does this technology reveal to us about what's already unraveling in higher education? And how can we respond not just to AI, but to that wider shift in ways that are not rushing to fix things or go back to an old normal, but we are actually allowing ourselves to feel this shift to unlearn what is no longer useful and relevant. And also repair the harms that have been done by our institutions for a long time that AI can exacerbate or could potentially be a partner in helping to address. So if we can stay with the complexities of AI itself and the complexities that AI makes visible without trying to resolve it immediately or restore some romanticized vision of the past, then I think we're already on our way to a different educational future. I will put it in the chat. One little experiment of trying to develop some GPTs that support this shift. They're on Open AI because that was the way to experiment with this, which is deeply problematic. But as an artistic experiment, I'll share that in the chat of just trying to also ask how can we relate to AI differently? Because if we treat it extractively, that just reproduces the extractive way we treat everything, and if we could practise relating to it in a more reciprocal, respectful way, that could also help us with all other relationships that we have to be building in our institutions.

HELENA: Thank you so much, Sharon. Neil?

NEIL:

I'm just trying to think of a parting word of wisdom. I'm struggling with one. The one that comes to mind though, that I think I'll share is we've got to realize that this is a team sport, not an individual sport. While institutions are inherently collective in their macro-level goals as higher education places of higher education, they are inherently individualistic. I think from both administration as well as from a faculty perspective, I think there's an opportunity to shift that lens. From the administration side, it's about how do we change the resource allocations to support a team-based environment and from a classroom side of perspective is how do individuals release the anxiety or the weight sitting on their shoulders that they have to be responsible for absolutely everything that happens in their classroom. And how do we actually make that a team sport so that everyone is feeling supported going through and the supports are there to go through this environment. You know, it allows us to focus much more on the questions that Sharon's mentioning both in her closing comments as well as very much in the opening statements that she was making. Rather than on the day to day, how am I going to deal with what happened on a Tuesday at 10:30 problems? And I think that shift from individualistic to team sport is probably one of those ways to do it.

HELENA:

Thank you. I definitely think in times, the precarious time that we find ourselves in this team sport, collaboration, gathering, sharing of resources would benefit us all. Thank you. Next is Jessica.

JESSICA:

Thank you. I love that, Neil, and I think that's so key that we forget that sometimes. I was actually just out in B.C. at a K to 12 summit that was looking at AI integration. That was one of the key things that was echoed in that space was that it wasn't just like a teacher problem. It was IT, it was admin, it was curriculum. There were so many people involved in the ecosystem to move forward in AI innovation. I think, I really do think that's key and that's actually something that we are going to look at in our next round of research is that we're actually going to start looking at institutions that serve as grid case studies for AI innovation and look at that ecosystem and how that entire group of people have come together to build on an AI innovation, move that forward. If anybody here this is the a little shout-out that is doing some innovative work in this space, please do connect with me because this is something that we're interested in and thinking about is again, moving away from this lone wolf or the lone champion of an institution, really an AI, but more of this collective approach. I love that. But well, I would say, to my fellow millennials out there, my favourite millennial icon, Miss Frizzle. I don't know if people on the call remember Miss Frizzle, but her famous line was Take chances, make mistakes, and get messy. I always think about that line and honestly, I think that's exactly the mindset that we should have when it comes to thinking about how to use GenAI in this space. So yeah, take chances, make mistakes, get messy. But if there's a principle I think to leave you with, and I've said this a few times, it would be to again, design for process, not product. I think we need to figure out the way in which we can leverage AI to really show a learner's judgment, their curiosity, those small intellectual moves that really truly make meaning learningful and that build into those skill sets that we hear over and over are important, the creative thinking, the ethical reasoning, the judgment. That's the key piece that we should be focused on. I think obviously this all matters, but really, what our research is showing and something I think is really important and we need to think about that because we don't really have a shared definition of AI literacy yet, that obviously causes a lot of confusion and frustration. We've heard that it's ambiguous, it's consistent, it's a moving target. But I think rather than be waiting for this perfect definition or just things to align, we can start by strengthening the again, the thinking, the reflection, the process skills that will endure no matter how the technology advances because it's a moving target for us to try to keep up with technology at the rate of change is probably impossible. I would say to give, if you're in an instructor educator role, to give yourself, give your students, give the people that you work with permission to experiment if possible, but start small. If it's just something that's one small AI awareness assessment, one guideline, be transparent, one reflection on process. I think that's just key, just start. As I think Elizabeth said, you got to start. If we stay curious, and I love that. I think it was Elizabeth who said to stay curious rather than just perfect. I think we can move through this with that curiosity and the care that Gwen said earlier, it's okay to feel lost,

but I think when we care about our students and not the best, I think that's what we need to do, stay curious and care. I'll stop there.

HELENA: Thank you, Jessica. And all the way from Portugal, final words from you, Elizabeth.

ELIZABETH:

Oh dear, no pressure. So yes, yes, yes, everything that has been said. I think, as you were all speaking and I was nodding my head and I would think, yes. I think the other piece and it builds on the humility piece, Sharon, that you shared, which I think is critical, it's a huge privilege to be in any of the roles that we're in right now at this time. With that comes responsibility. I think our responsibility is to step up and model the types of behaviours, the types of reactions, the types of engagement that we want our students to be able to go, Oh, yeah, remember when they had that thing, it was AI and it was a big struggle and it was 20 years ago or some, remember, it was a while ago. Remember those people that did some really cool work and helped us get where we are because we're now benefiting from all the ripples of the little bits that you're doing in your work. We want them to be able to look back and raise their hands and say, Thank goodness, thank you. And so that really means for us to step in and to lean in in the uncomfortableness, in the difficulties, in the unknowns, in this rapidly changing fraying system that is decomposing and we're creating something else. I think it is that, not to put too heavy a pressure on. As my daughter says, you know, it's not that deep, mama. But there's a part of it that is the responsibility piece, that's the important piece. And so I think it connects that values and purpose we've been talking about. It also connects that curiosity and humility and then of course, just being kind because this is one of those journeys that's not going to be quick and it's not going to be easy and that's okay because it's not this individual taking the step. It's all of us taking that step together.

HELENA:

Thank you. Well said, Elizabeth. And I see in the chat, I've invited our attendees to also share their final question, principal, comment, takeaway as we move forward. And so I would like to honour them by reading some of their responses as well. Derek, be a learner in community with others. From Chris, if you remove the human from one part of the equation, you need to replace it somewhere else. From Gwen, we see, sorry, now the chats moving so fast. I'd also start small, continuing learning with me, Helena and others offer what I can and go into this fight with desperate hope that we'll win. Thank you for that, Gwen. Joanna, vulnerability is one of our greatest strengths as a teacher. I absolutely love that. You're not alone with AI and your questions, there is a community. From Lydia, we are all continuing to learn together. The previous one was a day from Noori. Thank you. And from Shelly, Design for process, not product. Thank you to all the attendees who have participated in that invitation. I'd like to thank all our wonderful panelists for bringing your insights today. I don't think we have perfect answers, but we've heard some very important things. I think, let's take up the challenge of this as a team sport that we can all collaborate. I have one small example of even someone Adina Gray is with TRU. Elizabeth, when you mentioned all the different institutions doing good work. She's a champion there. She created it almost like a show and share that it's very informal. You

create a Zoom room and people come where people are sharing the things that they're doing in different faculties, right, different disciplines might have different challenges. So yeah, just start informally, the Tobin-plus-one approach for UDL worked really well. So if it's overwhelming in this AI world, let's incorporate that plus one. So thank you everyone for being here. I don't think the conversation is done yet. Let's take it into the hallways, at our institutions and have it there as well. And I invite you to follow up with us. I invite you to write the survey to give us some thoughts and ideas for next topics. And with that, I wish you a wonderful Tuesday afternoon.