

Student Perspectives on the 55%-in-Class Assessment Rule

AUC Student Council 23-24
13th November 2023



Introduction

In response to the rapidly evolving landscape of education and technology, the AUC Student Council conducted a comprehensive survey to gather insights from the student body on the newly introduced 55%-in-class assessment rule. This rule, implemented for the academic year 2023-2024, mandates that a minimum of 55% of all graded assessments occur within the classroom setting. The primary objective of this rule is to address the emerging challenges posed by generative AI tools, such as ChatGPT, to the validity of assessments. Additionally, it aims to provide instructors with the necessary time and support to adapt their courses, learning outcomes, and assessment strategies in light of the influence of generative AI until a policy is implemented on the long term.

In passing, students have raised concerns about the rule's impact on courses, particularly in the Humanities and qualitative Social Sciences, where academic research and writing are paramount. The rule seems to hinder critical thinking nurtured through deep contemplation and multiple drafts, essential components of these disciplines. Additionally, the inconsistency of the rule, particularly in cases like the capstone and CPI reports, raises challenges for uniform application across all courses. Moreover, the stringent enforcement of the 55%-in-class rule jeopardises the quality of education by shifting priorities away from comprehensive content coverage and interactive pedagogies. This shift, compounded by its potential to isolate students from real-world technological demands, may hinder the development of essential skills needed for professional success. Consequently, we felt a survey with clear data was needed to understand how students envision the role and impact of AI in their learning experiences, and assess the 55%-in-class rule.

This report summarises the findings of the survey, which involved 101 respondents. The survey provides insights into respondents' awareness and understanding of the 55%-in-class rule, evaluates its impact on the quality of classes, assessments, engagement with class material, and the validity of diplomas. Additionally, it explores the ethical concerns related to AI usage and gauges students' perspectives on the incorporation of AI in the study program. The survey also includes open-answer responses from students, providing a more nuanced understanding of their experiences and views. Moreover, we present unofficial data collected from an office hour

initiative (Da Box) conducted by the Student Council to inform the need for and the questions of the survey, offering additional insights into the student body's opinions and concerns.

In advocating for a more progressive approach, we encourage embracing the potential of generative AI as a tool for learning and academic growth. We emphasise the need for education on using AI effectively and ethically, supported by critical thinking and fact-checking skills. Ultimately, we urge a reconsideration of the 55%-in-class rule, asserting that it not only undermines the quality of students' diploma, but also creates unnecessary anxiety among students, hindering their thoughtful engagement with assignments and the broader learning experience.

Methodology

The Student Council first asked the student body during their scheduled office hours about their opinion about the 55%-in-class rule and AI in learning. Students put their answers into our new initiative, Da Box. It is important to note that while the individual responses from the student body cannot be incorporated into the formal conclusion of this report, we remain committed to transparency. Therefore, we have prepared an overview of the responses received to offer a glimpse into the perspectives and insights expressed, as these answers informed our further actions.

On October 6th, the Student Council distributed a survey to the student body for two purposes. One primary objective of the survey was to collect student opinions and viewpoints on the 55%-in-class rule. The second goal was to gain a deeper understanding of what students want and expect regarding the integration of AI into the classroom.

The survey involved both quantitative and qualitative data collection. Quantitative data, such as multiple-choice questions, provided numerical insights into the prevalence of certain opinions. Qualitative data, in the form of open-ended questions or comments, allowed students to express their views in their own words, providing contextual information. Questions were framed to gauge whether students find in-class assignments valuable, their concerns or benefits associated with the 55%-in-class rule, their level of trust in AI, and how they envision AI being incorporated into their learning experience.

The survey was anonymous, encouraging students to share their honest opinions without fear of repercussions or judgment. The survey also stated that students should currently be taking at least one AUC class.

After the survey collection period, the Student Council analysed the data, summarising and categorising responses and identifying common themes and patterns.

The purpose of this methodology is not just to collect data but to gather insights that can guide decision-making. These results should be used to formulate recommendations, propose changes, or initiate further discussions with educational stakeholders based on the findings.

Informal Data from Da Box

In the week of September 25, during their office hours, the Student Council asked the student body, "What do you think about the 55%-in-class rule? What is the future of AI in learning? How should we incorporate AI/chatGPT in the classroom?". Although we do not intend to include the answers to this in our conclusion for this report, we wanted to give an overview of these answers for transparency.

From the Da Box answers (see Appendix 3), we can see that students have varied opinions about the 55%-in-class rule. Some feel that in-class assignments are beneficial, particularly for testing understanding of concepts, while others find them unnecessary or even counterproductive. Most importantly, many students express concerns about trust and autonomy. They believe that students should be trusted not to misuse AI for plagiarism and that the rule implies a lack of trust in students' abilities.

With regards to the 55%-in-class rule, some students worry that in-class assignments may negatively impact the quality of their work, as they might be rushed or the assignments might not adequately test their skills. Connected to this, some students express anxiety and stress related to time constraints and the 55%-in-class rule. Moreover, some students highlight concerns regarding accessibility, such as difficulties for individuals with dyslexia or handwritten assignments.

Looking at AI's role in learning, students have different views on the role of AI in learning. Some see it as a useful learning tool, while others question its effectiveness in certain fields and believe it is overemphasised. Many students suggest the need for clear guidelines on how and when to use AI in assignments and assessments and express an interest in learning how to use AI, particularly ChatGPT, efficiently and ethically. Some students suggest that AI should be studied more comprehensively as it becomes increasingly ubiquitous in society.

Survey Results

In total, 101 students participated in the survey. The comprehensive results to the Closed Questions are given in Appendix 1; the written responses to the Open Questions are given in Appendix 2.

Closed Questions Answers

Regarding the utilisation of ChatGPT or similar AI tools for academic purposes, 45 respondents reported occasional use, 28 respondents reported weekly use, 11 respondents reported daily use, and 17 respondents reported no usage.

Concerning awareness of the 55%-in-class rule, 91 out of 101 respondents were aware of the rule, with 16 expressing uncertainty about its specifics, and 10 indicating unawareness of the rule. Observing the implementation of the 55%-in-class rule, 69 respondents acknowledged its implementation, 21 did not, and 11 were unsure if they had noticed it or not.

After explanation of the 55%-in-class rule, when asked to assess the impact of the 55%-in-class rule, 48 respondents perceived a negative impact, with 10 describing it as "extremely negative." 43 respondents stated the impact as "neither positive nor negative," and 10 respondents found the impact positive, with one characterising it as "extremely positive."

Regarding the effect of the 55%-in-class rule on the quality of assessments, 59 participants evaluated it as negative, with 24 describing it as "extremely negative." 26 respondents considered the impact "neither positive nor negative," and 16 respondents viewed the impact as positive, with 3 describing it as "extremely positive."

Assessing the impact on engagement with class material, 51 respondents reported "neither positive nor negative" impact, 33 perceived a negative impact, with 7 characterising it as "extremely negative," and 17 respondents found the impact positive, with 5 describing it as "extremely positive."

Concerns about generative AI impacting the validity of the diploma were expressed by 57 respondents, with 18 responding "definitely not" and 39 responding "probably not." 23 respondents expressed uncertainty ("might or might not"), and 21 respondents anticipated concern, with 17 responding "probably" and 4 responding "definitely."

Regarding ethical implications associated with AI use, 49 respondents expressed concern (36 "probably," 13 "definitely"), 39 respondents were not concerned (31 "probably not," 8 "definitely not"), and 13 respondents were uncertain ("might or might not").

When asked about the incorporation of AI into the study program, 70% of respondents (72) expressed a positive inclination (49 "probably," 23 "definitely"), 15% were opposed (12 "probably not," 3 "definitely not"), and 16% were uncertain ("might or might not").

Open Question Answers

"How has the 55%-in-class rule affected you overall?"

Responses were collected from 55 individuals. The most common answers to this question expressed that there is:

- No significant change;
- A disproportionate negative impact for Humanities students;
- An overall negative impact due to the removal of valuable assignments by teachers due to the rule, heightened time pressure affecting the quality of arguments and engagement with course material, increased stress, and an unfair representation of students' understanding of the subject.

In addition, two respondents highlighted the rule's disregard for the needs of students with disabilities and neuro-divergence, noting that it introduces unnecessary assignments. Only two respondents viewed the impact positively.

"Would you consider Generative AI, such as ChatGPT, a useful tool in your studies? What do you use it for?"

We gathered 71 replies to this question.

The majority of respondents find ChatGPT useful, while five students have not used it and five others do not think it is a useful tool, citing concerns about reliance or perceived unreliability of answers.

Most students use ChatGPT to explain and breakdown concepts (13), to brainstorm for ideas (10), and for summarisation (11). Some students also use ChatGPT for checking grammar and style (3), checking coding assignments (2), support with essay structure and outline (3), or for finding sources and getting support with research (3).

"How would you like AI to be incorporated into your classes in the future?"

There were 45 answers to this question.

Fourteen respondents advocated for teaching students to use AI effectively and making them aware of AI providing inaccurate information. Some suggest mandatory workshops and courses. Three respondents think AI should be treated as any other search tool, and they each compare it

to the way calculators are used in class and for assignments. Two respondents emphasised integrating AI only if suitable for the class. Two people suggest making people cite AI as sources for their assignments. Two people say assignments should be adjusted to AI and one person suggests using non-graded assignments for integrating AI into learning. Four people proposed fostering trust to ensure reports of when and how they use AI, which could also aid teachers in understanding what concepts are unclear and if assignments should be revised. One person suggests using AI to understand concepts and as a virtual tutor, potentially integrating it in SOWISO or MyLab. Another person thinks AI should be used only for editing. Another respondent thinks AI can be used only when the information it provides is easily fact-checkable by the user. One person suggests training students to think critically, as AI cannot do that for them.

"What alternative(s) do you think would be a good substitute for the 55%-in-class rule in order to address the concerns of assessment validity?"

We collected 40 responses to this question. Seven respondents advocate for increased trust in students and emphasise the benefits of fostering a more open environment to address the use of ChatGPT.

Regarding alternatives to the 55%-in-class rule, four individuals assert that no alternative is necessary. Two respondents believe there is no need to address the role of AI in academics, arguing that it cannot substitute students' work and that plagiarism was an issue before the introduction of AI.

Regarding the assessment validity, some students highlighted the availability of programs capable of identifying AI usage. Four respondents propose making students explicitly cite ChatGPT or submit the chat log used for the assignment. One individual suggests a 40% in-class rule, as opposed to the current 55%, while another claims that the use of AI in essays is distinguishable.

In terms of modifying assignments and assessment methods to control ChatGPT and generative AI use, various suggestions emerged from eight respondents. These include making assignments more creative and focused on critical thinking, with an emphasis on tasks that ChatGPT cannot perform. Recommendations include asking students to reflect on personal experiences to connect them to course material. Two respondents state that the specificity of assignments makes it harder for students to use ChatGPT. Three respondents propose teaching awareness and effective utilisation of ChatGPT and other generative AI tools. Other suggestions involve incorporating more presentations, centring assignments around course materials, and encouraging students to analyse and compare AI-generated responses with their own work. Two respondents suggest assignments where teachers are aware that students may use ChatGPT for a portion but not the entire assessment. Two people note the efficacy of presentations and roundtable discussions in Humanities courses, negating the need for additional in-person

assessments. One respondent suggests different rules for various subjects, while another proposes creating ChatGPT-proof assignments. Additionally, two respondents recommend more frequent draft submissions, meetings with teachers, or the submission of structures or outlines to ensure students are actively working on assignments. One person emphasises that if students can produce exceptional essays using ChatGPT, their contribution to the assignment's arguments and structure is still significant. This respondent argues that the assessment is not entirely determined by ChatGPT. Finally, one respondent suggests that enhancing courses to make them more interesting could reduce students' inclination to use ChatGPT for assignments.

Analysis

While the majority of respondents were aware of the 55%-in-class rule, a notable portion remained uncertain about its specifics, indicating a lack of awareness regarding its existence and implementation, or a limited understanding of its implications. This highlights the importance of clear communication and comprehensive understanding among students to foster a smooth transition. The data reveals nuanced views on the rule's impact. While a notable proportion perceives a negative influence on the quality of classes, assessments, and engagement with class material, a significant number express neutrality or find no significant change. This suggests that individual experiences and perspectives vary widely, primarily across majors.

Looking at the majors, most of the neutral and positive influences of the rule are seen in the Sciences. Some mention an increased focus on participation due to in-class assignments, offering a positive incentive for active engagement. However, the overall effect on assessments is mixed, with some expressing uncertainty about how the rule might influence future assignments. The transition from digital to paper coding exams in some computer science classes poses unique challenges for students accustomed to coding on laptops.

However, in Social Sciences, concerns arise regarding the rule's impact on the development of critical thinking skills and the depth of analysis in assignments. Students worry that the rule might result in more exams and fewer assignments, which may not align with the preferred learning methods in social sciences disciplines with concerns about the potential lack of real-world applicability of exams. Social Sciences students express a desire for a balance between in-class assessments and assignments that allow for more extensive exploration of topics, emphasising the importance of diverse assessment methods.

Humanities majors appear to be particularly affected by the 55%-in-class rule. Many Humanities students report a disproportionate negative impact, emphasising challenges such as the removal of valuable assignments, heightened time pressure, and difficulties in producing nuanced arguments. The limited time frames of in-class assessments clash with the intricate nature of humanities assignments, characterised by the need for thoughtful reflection, nuanced analysis, and the development of complex arguments. This shift is perceived as compromising the quality of their work, hindering their ability to practice and refine essential writing skills, and constraining opportunities for creativity in presenting diverse perspectives. Consequently, Humanities students argue that the rule results in an unfair reflection of their understanding, as the timed, in-class setting does not allow for the depth of exploration integral to their coursework. Concerns then arise about the potential impact on future opportunities, given the importance of writing skills in many humanities-related professions. Overall, the dissatisfaction centres on the perceived mismatch between the nature of humanities education and the constraints imposed by the new assessment rule.

Across disciplines, there are common themes. The shift to more in-class independent work is noted, leading to concerns about altered dynamics and an increased workload, particularly in certain months. There is a perceptible shift away from traditional research and writing, with some expressing concerns about the reduction in academic challenge and the potential negative impact on learning outcomes. Addressing the distinctive needs of Humanities and Social Sciences education emerges as a crucial consideration for refining the impact of the 55%-in-class rule in this academic domain.

Ethical implications associated with AI use are also raised by a significant portion of the respondents, indicating a need for ethical guidelines and considerations. The majority of students find generative AI, such as ChatGPT, to be a useful tool in their studies. However, there are concerns about overreliance and scepticism about the quality of generated answers, emphasising the need for a balanced approach to integrating AI into the learning process.

Most respondents express support for incorporating AI into the study program, suggesting a recognition of AI's potential benefits. Recommendations for integrating AI into education include teaching students effective use, mandatory workshops, and treating AI as a tool comparable to calculators. They also emphasise building trust and fostering an open environment, implementing more creative assignments, introducing specific guidelines, subject-specific rules, and enhancing courses to make them more engaging.

Recommendations

Considering the insights from respondents, we recommend an adaptation of the 55%-in-class rule and a stronger push towards adaptation of our current policy in light of generative AI. Acknowledging the nuanced nature of this dialogue, our aim is to enhance existing policies constructively, prioritising student well-being and equitable treatment. With these recommendations, we hope to stress the importance of including the student voice in these discussions, given its absence during the rule's formulation.

In terms of adaptations of the 55%-in-class rule:

- Recognise the diversity of academic disciplines and consider implementing subject-specific rules or guidelines to accommodate the varying needs and assessment methods across majors. The implementation of a %-in-class rule should be tailor-made to accommodate the unique characteristics of Humanities and Social Sciences education, considering the importance of creative assignments, critical thinking, and personal reflection. AUC could think about introducing a range, where teachers can choose the percentage in light of their specific course, instead of a one-size-fits-all rule.
- Encourage diverse assessment methods that go beyond in-class assignments, allowing for a balance between real-time engagement and assignments that foster deep exploration of topics. Design assignments, such as reflections on class material, that challenge students to engage deeply, making it less reliant on AI-generated content.
- Foster an environment of trust between students and educators, allowing for open reporting of AI usage, aiding in understanding student needs, and ensuring academic integrity. Some students express a willingness to be more honest about their use of AI if there is a greater sense of trust. Open communication helps dispel fears of wrongful accusations and fosters an environment of honesty and collaboration.

In terms of the future of AI in the classroom:

- In the future, establish clear communication channels to ensure all students fully understand any rule that gets newly implemented, addressing uncertainties and fostering transparency. Communication should be concise, easily accessible, and specific.
- Actively incorporate AI into the study program, treating it as a valuable learning tool. This can involve integrating AI into assignments and course work, aligning with student suggestions.
 - Develop clear ethical guidelines for AI usage, ensuring students are aware of responsible AI practices and potential implications for assessment validity.
 - Implement mandatory workshops or courses to educate students on effective and ethical AI use, emphasising awareness of potential inaccuracies and limitations.
 - Integrate AI-friendly assignments that align with the educational objectives, recognising the role of AI in certain tasks. During this exploration, non-graded assignments could be used for integrating AI into the learning process.

- Encourage transparent practices, allowing students to cite ChatGPT or use it for specific parts of assignments, acknowledging its role in the learning process.

In conclusion, a crucial recommendation that emerges from this analysis is the avoidance of a blanket approach to rules. Instead, there is a compelling need to tailor regulations based on the distinctive needs and assessment methodologies of different majors, subjects, or even individual courses. This approach acknowledges the diverse nature of academic disciplines and allows for a more nuanced, effective, and fair integration of rules and guidelines. This way, AUC can navigate the challenges posed by generative AI tools and ensure the continued validity and quality of assessments. To achieve this, collaboration with faculty members is essential, ensuring that their experiences and concerns are recognized and addressed, as the enforcement of the 55%-in-class rule also presents significant challenges for them. The current enforcement not only impacts students but also places an undue burden on teachers, forcing them to make difficult choices between content coverage and assessment. However, beyond rule adaptation, a critical question emerges: which particular skills form the core of our educational priorities, and, accordingly, which assignments are most effective in nurturing these skills?

APPENDIX 1: Survey Answers to the Closed Questions

	Option	Number of votes
Are you student or staff?	Students	101
	Staff	0
If you're a student, what is your year?	1st	34
	2nd	41
	3rd	25
	4th	1
What major do you study or teach?	Humanities	30
	Social Sciences	37
	Sciences	33
Have you ever used ChatGPT or similar AI tools for academic purposes? If yes, how frequently?	Yes, I use it every day.	11
	Yes, I use it weekly.	28
	Yes, I use it occasionally.	45
	No.	17
Are you aware of the 55% in-class rule?	No.	10
	I've heard of it, but I'm not sure what it is.	16
	Yes.	75
Have you noticed the implementation of the 55% in-class rule?	No.	21
	Yes.	69
	I don't know.	11
How would you evaluate the effect of the 55%-in class rule on the quality of your classes?	Extremely negative.	10
	Somewhat negative.	38
	Neither negative nor positive.	43
	Somewhat positive.	9
	Extremely positive.	1
How would you evaluate the effect of the 55%-in class rule on the quality of your assessments?	Extremely negative.	24
	Somewhat negative.	34
	Neither negative nor positive.	26
	Somewhat positive.	13
	Extremely positive.	3
How would you evaluate the effect of the 55%-in class rule on the engagement with the class material?	Extremely negative.	7
	Somewhat negative.	26
	Neither negative nor positive.	51

	Somewhat positive.	12
	Extremely positive.	5
Are you worried the presence of Generative AI will effect the validity of the diploma (in the sense that it would be viewed in a negative way)?	Definitely not.	18
	Probably not.	39
	Might or might not.	23
	Probably yes.	17
	Definitely yes.	4
Are you concerned about the potential ethical implications associated with the use of AI in education?	Definitely not.	8
	Probably not.	31
	Might or might not.	13
	Probably yes.	36
	Definitely yes.	13
Do you think AI should be incorporated in the study programme?	Definitely not.	3
	Probably not.	12
	Might or might not.	16
	Probably yes.	48
	Definitely yes.	22

APPENDIX 2: Survey Answers to the Open Questions

How has the 55%-in class rule affected you overall?

1. It has changed my assessments from take home essays or exams to in class which I find very different as I prefer to have a bit more time to properly do something and not have to rush through a paper for most of my assessments.
2. Mainly assignments like writing a paper during class time have made me feel much more stressed, as we normally get the time to develop our thoughts. I find that this kind of in-class assessment in particular does not allow you to engage optimally with the learning materials and generates an unfair reflection of one's understanding, as time pressure is strongly increased.
3. More in class assessments means less actual lecture time.
4. Coming from IB it has not really affected me that much since I find it very similar to what I've already done :)
5. Humanities exams are always far harder to do and writing a good essay in an hour and a half is an impossible task. It feels like this rule needlessly punished only humanities students as all of our courses necessarily have written assignments
6. Since I take mostly Computer Science classes the rule does not really make sense for these type of Assignments. Our Data Structure class went as far as having our exams on paper (60% of our grade), but since for every class and every homework assignment we code on our laptops, the exams will be the first time we need to do on paper coding.
7. It hasn't because a big part of my grade is still dependent on the work I do outside of the classroom, such as exams.
8. I think I'm not able to perform as well in in-class assessments. Therefore, I feel like they don't reflect my knowledge on the topic in the best way possible (especially taking into consideration the way that university studies are formulated etc.)
9. No
10. I'm a first year so I can't really compare the before and after, nevertheless I think that the 55%-in class rule does help. In obligatory courses that I have no interest in (like AWS) I wasn't as active in class, but having to hand in an exercise we do in class is a good incentive for me to get things done.
11. It does not allow for work at home for some courses at all and some teachers mentioned they had to get rid of important and useful for learning assignments just because of this rule..
12. I cannot express my knowledge or opinions about topics in the course.
13. Very negatively
14. Not much - most of my classes are already exam-based
15. I haven't really noticed it. Most of my assessment have been exams since first year.
16. 55%
17. As a humanities student all my assessments the past 3 years have been papers written at home, it's what I'm good at. Now my assessments are turned into in-class assignments, which causes me to have to study material in advance and write under time pressure, limiting me in the quality and development of my arguments and my papers and adding additional stress to my assignments.
18. So far, not really, im just worried about upcoming assignments
19. I haven't noticed
20. Badly
21. I feel distrusted as a student, but my main issue is how this can potentially affect my future. As a

humanities student, I mainly focus on producing text, and my ability to practice that has been taken away. I have so far not had the opportunity to write anything for class longer than 200 words.

22. I feel that as I major in sciences most if not all of my classes already had 55% or more of my grade assessed in class as it's mostly exams so I don't feel it has affected me very much.

23. Because of this rule, as a humanities student I am forced to write essays limited by the space and time of the classroom and therefore lacking depth and the time necessary for the analysis of the assignment and texts it involves. Furthermore, in such circumstances there are much more "what ifs" as "what if someone feels distracted that day?" "what if someone generally doesn't write as fast as others, and 1,5h is not enough for them to write a coherent paper?" This rule is significantly harmful for the humanities students, as it is impossible to prove our knowledge through such limited resources.

24. I am not a fan of it, because many assessments have had to be changed in order to fulfil this rule, and the teachers themselves are not happy with having to change the assessments, as they had carefully reasoned why we are assessed in their specific ways. Also, participation in class has gained more percentage of the grade in order to fulfil the requirement and this is not very good in my opinion because it doesn't reflect a students capabilities.

25. It doesn't fit assessments of my major.

26. I havent noticed it...

27. I haven't really noticed it yet, but I feel like for social sciences it might make the quality of the exams worse, as they are less applicable to the real work.

28. Positive

29. As of now it hasn't

30. it hasn't

31. I think it's very dumb, and it's negatively affected me that it's not in the as&p but they're acting like it is

32. Does not take into consideration students with disabilities at all

33. i feel like it has very badly affected my education, there is no room to develop academic writing skills whatsoever

34. It doesn't make sense to me for essay based subjects such as academic writing skills, that relies on assignments.

35. i am not a fan of it to be honest, since many tasks take more time for me personally, now i'm limited to the amount of class time. another important aspect is the increase in exams and decrease in assignments that i enjoyed particularly due to more creativity and more critical thinking skills being applied in at home assignments.

36. As of in right now, I haven't really noticed any changes. I haven't had any in class assessments so far so I don't know yet how they area going to affect.

37. Hard to say at the beginning of the semester but I do think it is a shame that teachers get less freedom in designing their assignments and that will be a negative effect.

38. Very negatively. I feel distrusted.

39. As a Humanities student, it is really negative for my assessments because the main goal is usually to demonstrate an understanding, not recite the lesson in 1h30. I feel like it severely impacts HUM & some SSC students disproportionately more than the SCI students, and was rushed without considering the impacts on those that don't study Sciences.

40. For now, not much since I haven't had to submit any in-class assignment yet.

41. it has taken away opportunities to be graded on essays about the actual course material, which is crucial in humanities, and now i have to do more presentations and they count for more

42. It has pushed more assignment towards November and December, meaning the workload will be very

high then.

43. It has meant that I have to do more exams that require memorization rather than essays that require well thought reasoning.

44. It just results in us doing more seemingly pointless tasks during class time

45. I think it decreased the quality of my work, especially within the humanities courses I'm taking.

46. way more in class assignments that weren't as well thought out as take home assignments like essays

47. It is annoying because I heard teachers say it makes them get rid of useful assignments people could just do at home such as canvas quizzes or graded summaries, also take home exams are gone and there's then more pressure in class

48. If anything, it's made courses easier, via an increased participation grade or more presentations, or less teaching time but more in-class independent work time, etc. Made it easier to get a good grade and removed a lot of academic challenge (and therefore also a lot of learning).

49. I think it does not make sense for social sciences to make 55% of the assessments online because we have different types of assignments compared to sciences. We don't have many exams but have paper. Now we have more exams but that is not the best way of learning in the social sciences discipline. Also, we have to do more presentations which is bad because now a lot of time in class is spent on presentations because everyone has to do 2 presentations which is not as useful.

50. Personally I prefer working on things in my own time in a quiet place and with this rule this isn't possible for most of my assignments. I feel more pressured to complete them within a specific time frame which often leads to me rushing with assignments.

51. It does not allow humanities students to hone their skills in at home research, and instead prones a sort of automatic synthesis of in-class readings.

52. We have significantly less and worse assignments across the board, classes are less fulfilling than last year as no longer based primarily on research and writing. In-class assignments are stressful, and not only unhelpful but also actively detrimental to the flow of classes and learning in the humanities

53. It adds a new form of stress. Especially for humanities classes, since most of those classes require writing and in class essays are definitely not a good solution.

54. Worries me because I prefer to take-home essays that I can spend more time crafting to my standard.

55. Assignments in my courses previously done in a take home form or essays have now been moved to in class without changing the actual assignments or the emphasis of the teaching. There are somewhat different things you focus on for an in class exam than for a take home exam.

"Would you consider Generative AI, such as ChatGPT, a useful tool in your studies? What do you use it for?"

1. I used it to make summaries

2. yes, to help make my text have a more academic tone and check for grammar

3. I don't use it, but I can easily imagine it to be helpful for extra explanations or paraphrasing

4. Yes, for example to take increase the level of my English and write more academically

5. It is useful, giving ideas, structures, and explanations

6. I think it is useful, I use it to simplify complex texts by copying and pasting it in after reading it however, I do think this may affect my ability to understand complex texts.

7. Yes, I use it for grammar checking, prospective grading of sections of my work and for helping to generate essay titles

8. I think it can be very useful if used in the right way. I mostly use it to brainstorm ideas or subtopics for

essays, or in case of coding I try to clean my code with it and find little errors that I couldn't otherwise find.

9. Yes

10. I consider it useful because it helps me understand certain concepts, although I still do have to be critical of what I read because it's not always accurate and I actually have used it less recently because of its incompetence in solving certain problems.

11. Yes, writing skills (brings non-native english speaker to the same level with the native-speakers)

12. Personally I don't use it, but I do recognize that it can be used in productive ways.

13. Not really. I use it to mess around

14. I was recently introduced to search rabbit, which I really like using. I have used chatgpt to generate data for a database so that I can test my queries and functions. I do think chatgpt (and other generative AI) is a useful tool, and I'm sure I could do a lot more with it than I do know, but I find it hard to adjust to big technological advances.

15. I think it is an insanely useful tool and part of our future no matter in what exact direction we will be going in. I use it to help me explain concepts, test myself, use it to improve arguments by arguing against it, use it to create sample questions to test my knowledge, etc.

16. Yes for summarizing and generating ideas

17. I find it extremely useful. It clarifies concepts and topics which I think is a great tool for preparing for exams. When I don't understand complex theoretical concepts and don't feel like spending ages looking for a YouTube video to explain it to me in simple words, I can use AI to simplify and break down the concept for me.

18. I stay away from using it to do assignments, but I use it frequently while studying and getting ready for class, clarifying stuff

19. Yes. To get information faster and more easily and summarize some of the topics of my readings

20. I use it to explain steps to solving certain math problems. But it doesn't work usually.

21. yes - i use it for answering specific questions as well as providing me with overviews of certain topics

22. For explaining concepts more simply, which helps to delete any confusions

23. Haven't really used it

24. Yes, I use it for summarizing, as an extensive search engine for niche topics and making outlines etc.

25. Streamlining my writing, summarising and paraphrasing readings, asking for feedback

26. Yes. Proof reading and brainstorming

27. I have only ever used it to rephrase a sentence, I guess it could be useful to generate ideas as well

28. Personally, I have not used it, but from my peers I know that it is useful for making outlines, and generating start off points. Also editing out grammar errors.

29. Yes, I don't use it often but I mostly have used it as a search engine when I want to understand complex ideas or phenomena, or when the definition given online didn't help

30. Yes, I think it is extremely useful even as a personal tutor. When I have doubts on a subject I ask chat gpt and it feels like someone is explaining it to me in person. It also helps getting unstuck with problems or simply seeing things from a different perspective. It has changed the way we use the internet too.

31. Haven't used it.

32. Yes, for some resources or explanations of certain problems. It can save a lot of time

33. Yes, but only when used in moderation and for idea generation or summarization. I think once it is used to produce whole texts, it can be considered plagiarism.

34. Yes, explain difficult parts of readings. Help me memorise... there so many creative ways to use chat gpt to enhance study sessions, you just have to use it well though.

35. Yes it is very useful

36. yes very useful. I use it to help debug my code and also help me understand things that I don't understand.
37. No. Use your brain or collaborate w others
38. yes i think it can be used in a productive way, i am not the biggest fan personally but i feel like its use is quite misunderstood
39. I use it to answer academic questions sometimes because it is often more focused on what I'm asking than Google. I would really not want AI to be incorporated in the curriculum however, because I think I would rely too heavily on ChatGPT and not trust my own writing and thoughts as much, which would limit creativity.
40. Yes and no: I use it to check my knowledge or ask it to explain things, but every now and then the answers it generates (including mathematical ones) are wrong.
41. to clarify concepts, take notes
42. It helps when you don't feel creative. Also it can help with sounding profound summarize articles, mostly
43. Sometimes yes but I found it to be disappointing almost every time I have used it. Maybe because I don't know how to properly use it yet.
45. Yes. I use it to explain things to me
46. Yes, I use it to start writing. More as suggestions
47. Explaining material
48. Yes, for summarising ideas, giving prompts, helping with writers' block...
49. I think it is useful to brainstorm, find sources and proof read when writing academic papers.
50. Yes I believe it is useful when you get stuck on your normal research. I use it mainly in giving me guidance. 51. For any essay at least in the sciences you need to source everything perfectly anyways so using chat gpt alone won't cut it
52. i use it to help see if my original ideas for essays could provide a good essay, to suggest titles when i am not feeling creative, or to summarize concepts or texts when i am in a hurry
53. Yes. It is useful for summarizing readings, simplifying assignments and easing the workload when it is intense.
54. I would use it to help me research and grasp concepts that I would have struggled with
55. i think it's useful to summarize long texts
56. Yes. It is useful to find topics for papers or to get a rough overview of a subject.
57. I think it is useful, personally I find it helpful to for example quickly check programming assignments for possible mistakes.
58. yes, it can help come up with ideas if you're stuck, it can phrase things in a nice way if you cant completely get the wording right yourself
59. Yes, for generating ideas, asking to add more information to a sentence - it can be wrong but if yiu're smart and check everything and rephrase it (with another AI tool, lol) then I think its totally fine to use it
60. I use it to get a better understanding of some concepts or explore a topic in a wider context
61. I don't think it's that useful, sometimes I use it to summarise readings that I either found confusing or ran out of time to do.
62. Yes sometimes it can be useful to get a start on researching a specific topic and narrowing down ideas. I also think it is used in very small ways such as quickly checking a calculation or fixing grammar at least that is how I use it.
63. I believe that generative AI can and should be used as a tool, especially within research-based academics. Students are aware of the shaky validity of its production, it will not "write our papers for us".

Instead, its capacities for synthesis and classification may be extremely useful, for example to organize large amounts of readings and annotations in preparation for a paper. If used at an advanced level, this could also be used to show the interlinks between classes, their interdisciplinary. A student may realize that similar themes are approached in their classes, and hence approach one same reading in a variety of different ways. In other words: it could be used to create a database of readings used within AUC, showing where and with what themes they are applicable.

64. I don't think Chat GPT is more useful tool than any search engine. It may be useful to automatize and increase efficiency of research and editing, but little more than that. The very few times I have tried it it has output very mediocre pieces of writing that could hardly be compared to my own writing.

65. It can be useful when you don't understand something, AI can answer questions or summarize texts for better understanding. But I've never used it to write essays or complete other assignments.

66. I use it for all my classes as a tool to help me organize my ideas and sometimes even to help explain me certain concepts

67. Summarise text

68. I use it to aid and speed up assignments that would otherwise take me longer (such as reading wordy articles, or summarizing texts so I can understand it better) but never to generate my own original writing.

69. I don't use it and I don't want to use it

70. yes

71. Yes, I think it is useful as an editor regarding grammar, spelling, and word use. It can also give good ideas on structure. I don't use it for content

"How would you like AI to be incorporated into your classes in the future?"

1. To be taught how to use it constructively

2. Perhaps within non-graded assignments like reading questions

3. I think it should be incorporated because a) there is no way of avoiding it and b) it remains an extremely useful tool and will bring increasingly reliable. I think we should incorporate techniques for using AI properly (this isn't done right now and can complicate certain assignments/the validity of our diploma)

4. I think it's a good idea for the student to let the teacher know in which exercises, situation they used ChatGPT for as it's also a signal for the professor that a certain concept/theory hasn't been understood completely by everyone and that is why a student had to use ChatGPT. It would create more trust-oriented learning environment in my opinion.

5. I don't think it should be incorporated necessarily, but it's useful to acknowledge how to cite it as a source in case someone wants to use it. Furthermore, creating an open and positive environment towards use of AI will encourage students to be honest about using it.

6. The only way AI could be useful in my current classes is if we learned how to learn from it, which would be very hard to achieve considering the unreliability of its answers. The main problem with the modern generative AIs is that they're good enough to often provide good answers, helping making major time cuts in work, but not good enough to ensure the correctness of the answers. Therefore when students choose the advantage over the disadvantage they have a high risk of ending up misinformed. So in my opinion AI should mainly be used in academia for tasks that the user is already knowledgeable enough in so that they are not fooled by the mistakes of the generated answers. But that has had low applicability in my courses so far, and in other majors everything becomes very subjective so I see how it becomes a pain in the to make sense of it

7. I'm not sure how but I think the most important part is that we get comfortable in using it. Not to sound cringy but generative AI will only advance in the future and as students I think it's important to be able to use it accordingly in our studies now and jobs later.
8. I think we should have the ability to use it, as well as be encouraged by the teachers to make use of AI. I also think teachers in current time should be knowledgeable of AI as it's a fundamental part of our future. If people do not learn how to utilize the power of AI they will fall behind in the workforce and later in their career
9. Not sure
10. AI cannot generate well argued opinions, therefore I think we should be taught how to use it in a way that we can use it for understanding and comprehension, but we use our own academic argumentation skills and be aware of the fact that AI cannot cite sources accurately.
11. Using it to expand our knowledge, not cheating. It all comes down to one's conscience which is very difficult to control for authorities
12. I would like professors to see AI as a useful study/research tool
13. I think we should see it as necessary, as it is going to change our jobs as academics and writers. We need to learn and have the opportunity to work with it rather than avoid it. I will be lacking these skills now since AUC is telling me I cannot use it while the outside world is learning rapidly how to incorporate it
14. Learning to use it effectively, analysing its results, training to think critically
15. Just not much, I don't think it is as much of a big deal as AUC thinks it is
16. In a way that allows us to learn how to use it to our advantage and to make the most out of it. It's a tool that has several purposes and it would be weird to reject the idea of something that makes our lives easier. Sorry a bit vague but just in a way that allows us to learn how to use it, just as a side exercise not
17. I think we should not run away from the fact that ChatGPT and other AI exist. When pocket calculators came about, many people were scared that people would forget to do maths, however people still learned how to use this new technology to their advantage, and people haven't forgotten how to do simple math right? The same will happen with ChatGPT. It would be useful if the university, instead of making us flee from AI, gave us the necessary tools to use it to our advantage and comprehend its workings. One possible solution would be to give mandatory workshops or courses on AI and programming. I think it is vital for people to understand how AI works so that they are not taken advantage of by the few people that make it.
18. Learn how to use it in an efficient way. If you can't beat them, join them
19. I'm not sure
20. ChatGPT assignments. Learn how to really use it and the limits it has.
21. Taught how to use it effectively.
22. Not at all. I won't use it
23. Just at the very least for its existence to not be fully ignored
24. As a useful tool to check understanding of concepts. Maybe incorporated into learning platforms such as SOWISO or MyLab as a virtual tutor for practice questions.
25. Showing us how we can use it to properly get ideas for assignments and informing everyone of the unreliability of AI
26. I would like to have a class or a course on how to use it instead of assuming that we know how to do so.
27. Only if it suits in the class. The way it has been included before was redundant. On how to use it, students know it better than teachers. But about the future and structure behind it, there is a lot to learn.
28. Change the assignments. ChatGPT is here so might as well adapt

29. Not particularly
30. Well, I think instead of throwing such a bad light at it. I think it is important to get shown how to use it effectively. Ai will only get more and more used. I kinda see it as a new google in a way or another
31. Teach students how to use it responsibly, and especially when not to use it.
32. i do not see how it could be incorporated well
33. I think we should be taught how to use it, what key words/instructions to use and how to make it useful for our studies. (Eg. Find sources)
34. By teaching us how to use it as a research tool that can help us reach much further and delve in greater depth into the topics we are studying, like the internet was.
35. Actually teaching us ways in which it can be helpful/dangerous in research rather than mystifying/ignoring it.
36. If we reference it - we can use it
37. Depends on the study. Could be used to study society based on what the Large Language Model puts out. 38. For programming courses, it could be used to increase programming efficiency, etc.
39. I would like for teachers to treat it just as any other online tool like online calculators or spell checks. I don't think it would be useful to create assignments specifically meant to be completed with AI.
40. I dont think there's a way to incorporate it other than going back to writing-based assignments and acknowledging the use of ai in general.
41. I don't think we need AI in the classroom.
42. I think AI could be used as a tool similarly to a calculator. It could help open up more time to focus on other aspects and dive deeper into a class
43. It's not going anywhere, so we're going to have to find ways to accept it. I think we need to trust students to report when they do use it to help - and to encourage that, not punish them when it is used.
44. Preferably not at all
45. I would limit the use if it to being an editing tool- similar to grammarly but just mire effective

"What alternative(s) do you think would be a good substitute for the 55% in-class rule in order to address the concerns of assessment validity?"

1. Like I mentioned previously, a more open and accepting environment/conversation on the use of AI would mean that students are honest about using it. This will mean that there would be minimal or no need for the 55% rule, since students would cite AI accordingly.
2. ~_(\`)/ Glad I'm in Sciences so I don't have to worry about all of this
3. No clue
4. Creating assessments where one can utilize ai, and to imprecise their understanding and not necessarily be able to do the entire assessment with ai
5. Trust
6. Disregard this rule and allow us to do more than 55% of assignments out of class time. Instead teach us and make us aware of AI's ability.
7. I dont know
8. Change the structure of assessments to rely on students ability to synthesize multiple pieces of literature at once, make creative arguments—things that chat gpt does not do well.
9. not sure - i think the more specific the assignment is (or if it relates to a current event), the use of ai to plagiarize the assignment would be impossible

10. That's a big question... having to use AI and analysing and comparing it to our own thoughts and work maybe?
11. I don't know, but it definitely needs to change (let me write essays!)
12. Having a way to see the chat with the AI to see how it was used. But this would have to be done in a way where all the chat needs to be submitted and this is hard to enforce
13. There are many programs already able to detect AI influences in a text
14. Warn pupils that a chat GPT detector will be used or give homework problems that cannot be easily inserted into chat GPT. It is important to be able to trust students, as we are adults that are interested in learning and out education, not just about getting a grade. Also maybe have more open book examinations and use plagiarism detection tools.
15. I feel like it's an OK rule
16. I think the assignments need to be made in such a way that using chat GPT won't necessarily give you a good grade. Critical thinking, for example, is essential.
17. assignments that cannot be cheated with AI. such as increasing the specificity of the assignment.
18. Cheating existed before AI
19. I do not believe it is possible to write a good paper using chat GPT so I do not think any anti-AI rule should be implemented, I believe teachers should just focus on grading papers in a way that provides useful feedback
20. For essay-based subjects, require more frequent draft submissions so teachers can ensure there's consistency. Invest in good AI checkers (just like plagiarism checkers). Continue to require a link to the ChatGPT conversation (the prompt script etc) if ChatGPT was used at all
21. Essays or homework where you cannot physically get a good grade with AI or graded knowing AI is going to be used (so somewhat higher/different standard)
22. applying even more creative thinking to assignments done at home, i.e. being tasked with us implementing the theory we are taught in our assignments
23. Talks about it in your first year and faith that students are here to learn, not to let chat GPT get their diploma for you
24. Make students aware of the detection softwares of generative AI (which might already exist on Canvas), and give a firm policy on its usage for each subject and in which scenarios it is allowed.
25. I don't know
26. Teaching people on how to use it effectively
27. trusting the students, enhancing the courses so that it is interesting and not attractive to use chatGPT, asking deeper questions for require deeper thinking, or encouraging students to use personal experiences more in essays
28. I think that although AI can help with summarizing and making the language sound better, along with some easy tasks, it has a lot of limitations that would come across if you submit an assignment using (mostly) ChatGPT.
29. Presentations, essays + AI checks (or, god forbid, trust on the students), essay-based exams...
30. I don't know if there are any technological solutions to ensure that it won't be used when not allowed.
31. The return of regular essays/at home assessments, especially within the humanities major
32. 40%
33. AUC has been saying they have tools to detect AI. If that's not true or if it doesn't detect paraphrased text - it's the students' problem if they use it or not... I think the 55% rule is useless. I also know people who used chatGPT also to write essays in class, so it doesn't change much.
34. We need a complete re-thinking of how we do assignments. More creativity-based assignments (who

needs a standard 5-paragraph essay when ChatGPT can do that?) Why not have assignments like stories, poems, speeches, annotated ChatGPT essays, work with other mediums such as making videos, etc. Also we need to shift focus more to presentation skills. Presentations should be given more weight and graded more harshly, and creativity within presentations should also be emphasised, as well as speaking/oral discussion skills.

35. Making assessments more creative and require integration of class content.

36. I think that a computer free classroom may be beneficial for some, but a hindrance to others who may suffer from physical or learning disabilities. There should be more fluidity in it's application. I also believe that if physical readers are to be mandatory in class, then they should be payed for by the institution, or a fund should be created for all students to be able to access the same resources. Otherwise, this creates a clear financial demarcation between those who can afford a computer-free class (in a university that asks us to have a computer of our own) and those who cannot.

37. There is absolutely no ethical issue since AI is not able of reproducing real creative output. If someone uses AI tools in writing to produce an excellent paper the person still deserves substantially the same merit. AI on its own is simply not capable of producing anything but mediocrity and most humanities students find it rather unhelpful. It is at best an aid, not a writer. The 55% rule has had a far worse effect on education this semester than AI could ever.

38. I've heard AUC already uses tools to check if something is AI created. I also think that teachers could include requirements in essays that cannot be made by AI, eg reflecting on personal experience in relation to the class.

39. Allowing the use of AI, but only when the student clearly states how they used it and what they used it for, so the grades of those who don't use it are not negatively affected

40. I think writing assignments don't have to be moved in to the classroom. I think more focus on the process of writing would be smart. For example making us hand in a structure before hand maybe have one interview in the process then lecturers can get a good feeling of whether or not the student has done research and can discuss and defend his arguments

Thank you for your input! All responses will be kept confidential, and the findings will be used in future decisions about how to work with AI in an educational environment. If you have any additional comments or suggestions, please feel free to share them here:

1. Thank you for making this survey visible on the student council insta!
2. I think this is a great initiative :)!!!
3. Overall, I hope that it's taken into consideration how in-class assessments affect students and the quality of their work/exam results. In my opinion, the scope of university studies are not accommodated for in-class assessments and therefore this rule will have negative implications for students!
4. AI is useful and inevitable. It needs to be viewed as the tool it is and not scapegoated as the bane of education. If we use AI as the tool it is, we can do so much more than we ever could.
5. I think institutions need to really understand that they MUST incorporate AI to set us up well for potential work environments. Generative AI is now a fact of life and they need to teach us how to use it ethically, fairly and in a way that doesn't compromise academic integrity. Not doing so / denying its significance will only open doors to using AI to cheat and/or set us back as students
6. Great job stuco <3
7. I think the 55% rule will have a huge impact on humanities majors, due to the time and resources being

taken away. How much is it actually worth to write an essay within an hour and a half with no reference to the actual papers you're writing about?

8. With ChatGPT, students who graduate from AUC will have to show that their degree still maintains value, and therefore we need to figure out a way to build resilience to GenAI, whether that be through incorporating it in our education or through working more on other types of skills, such as speaking and other mediums like video, art, etc. A focus aimed far more at policing AI usage in the education system is a less valuable path to take.

9. Please, I crave papers

10. [...] annoys the hell out of me because every single AWS class he mentions how fantastic AI is and how we should all use it and he just completely disregards any ethical/environmental concerns that some of my classmates and I have, and I feel like our grades might be affected negatively if we don't use it, but we don't want to use it, so that's kinda a problem

APPENDIX 3: Da Box Answers

What do you think about the 55% in-class rule? What is the future of AI in learning? How should we incorporate AI/chatGPT in the classroom?

1. In sciences, I think exams are very relevant and should stay along with home projects. in the rest, in class assignments don't feel as necessary.
2. For the advanced courses could help to see how to use it [AI] professionally. for the basic courses, we should see how to explain concepts, and maybe use it for more complex subjects.
3. It should be [AI in learning] :)
4. I didn't notice the difference [55%-in-class rule]. As a science major, AI is useless but if used properly useful.
5. I believe the use of AI should be restrained as much as possible in order for students to combine developing crucial cognitive capacities (even summarising an essay is a mental process of understanding and creating cohesiveness/links). In-class assignments can be valuable, although if they come at the cost of final essays written at home, then they are not, since I believe those tasks really allow us to put our knowledge into use and develop our own concepts.
6. They are so afraid of AI that they refuse to recognize that the problem is not technology but how we understand education. They make us participate in these panopticon type in class assignments but I don't even use AI! If they can't trust students, rather than policing them, they should change their pedagogical practices!!
7. Bullshit [55%-in-class rule]. I love writing papers. I'm done with exams, I'm not in high school.
8. I don't like in-class assignments if they're as long as the ones we have to do outside of class. If they are shorter that's better.
9. I think that students should be trusted to not plagiarise using AI for essays. We're adults and we pay a lot of money to be here - we respect our education.
10. In-class assignments are inefficient with students' time and could lead to enforcing the attendance policy against students' wishes.
11. I don't like in-class assignments because it means we do non-graded in-class presentations which end up being rushed and a poor use of class time.
12. I think the 55% rule is dumb and unproductive.
13. In humanities a lot, you don't need in class assignments. Really weird 55% rule.
14. In a way I'm okay with it [55%-in class rule], though I'm worried we'll have less lecture time. This means I'll have to figure out more things on my own instead of listening to the lecturer's explanation!
15. It [55%-in class rule] gives me infantilization. I feel like as long as the class is interesting, then students are motivated to not use AI. Making the 55% rule gives off the idea that students cannot be trusted, which establishes a negative relationship between AUC and

the students.

16. They are a good exercise to present your own knowledge to the class and also a good replacement for homework.
17. I understand why the teachers would need this from us, I don't mind, I don't see it as lack of trust just necessity but I would like to see progress towards including AI in education. Time constraints could be stressful too.
18. Yes, I think it [AI] should because it can be a useful learning tool, I also think by putting so much attention on it makes it a bigger deal than it actually is.
19. Make common-room looks work the same as the bike sheds.
20. I believe is well-constructed [55%-in class rule], they are actually quite nice :) not essays though.
21. I think there has been a massive over-exaggeration over dangers of AI in a classroom. I think writing essays in class will be damaging to quality as it will be rushed and won't be a true test of ability. You can't use AI to write a good academic paper anyway so why the extreme measures?
22. For some classes it's [55%-in class rule] good, for others it really doesn't make sense (social sciences).
23. Additional course/sessions on how to properly prompt chatGPT, for effective help/guidance.
24. Fair enough but a bit stressful [55%-in class rule]. The time constraint doesn't allow me to reach my full potential. nonetheless, I understand the necessity for some in class assessments. Just 55% is maybe a lot!
25. I hate that we have to do in-class assignments. ChatGPT wasn't even a major part of assignments before, and now we are forced to do more. Interacting with random people makes for disappointing results.
26. We should learn how to use ChatGPT in a smart/efficient way, instead of using it to plagiarise.
27. I think there needs to be a focus on the difference AI has on different fields especially when looking at LLM. For example in physics, maths, logic, LLM are bad, they create a lot of untrue statements. In fact, LLMs are just another tool like calculators and google and a tool used stupidly yields stupid results. I think we are overdoing it because AI is trendy.
28. I think in-class assignments are useful for testing how much we understand certain concepts without help from the internet. AI is a useful tool for learning and it should be endorsed for its skills.
29. Have guidelines on how/when we can use it.
30. I love in-class assignments because they take away some of "formalities" of papers (formatting, citation, etc.) → more interactive and discussion-based / inspiration.
31. Anti AI, I don't really care. Assignments are assignments. but I'm probably saying this cause I'm scared.
32. Like the concept but make it [incorporation of AI] clear, like create assignments!
33. ChatGPT is valid - useful for extra info, ..., it should stop being demonised.

34. In humanities it is difficult to come up with an argument in an hour. we need thinking time.
35. Everyone should understand how chat GPT works and be taught basics of programming and machine learning.
36. I think it's [incorporation of AI] a great idea especially now that AI is so ubiquitous in our society. :)
37. Make AI the object of studies more?
38. Okay [55%-in class rule] if done properly, could make students more anxious and less performative.
39. Un-necessary [55%-in class rule]. also nor great for people who have dyslexia or have a hard time with handwritten stuff. and if we keep our computers to do stuff in class then what's the point of doing it in class.
40. I do not use AI.
41. No bueno.
42. I don't like it [55%-in class rule]. Will impact the quality of my work in a negative way. And I feel a lot of distrust between us and the teachers.
43. I love [55%-in class rule] <3 less work at home.