Cheating Lessons
in the Age of ChatGPT[1]

Cheating: It's Not New (and Not All AI Use Is Cheating)

- Cheating has been going on since long before ChatGPT.

    o James Lang[1] reports that **75 percent** of undergraduate students cheat, although the exact number depends on a variety of factors such as year of surveys, size of institution measured, socioeconomic demographics, etc. Donald McCabe's more recent research (2020) puts the figure at more than 60 percent of undergraduates admitting to cheating.[2]

- Lang argues that cheating is not a problem with individual students, but it is rather a systemic issue where instructors are unintentionally creating **learning environments** that induce cheating.

- According to Lang, "The future of cheating also includes the future of technologies to prevent and reduce cheating, which are constantly evolving in response to new cheating techniques, pushing and pulling at one another uncertainly in an awkward waltz" (Lang 226).[3]

- Recently some instructors, such as Ethan Mollick of the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School, have directly acknowledged the use of AI programs like ChatGPT into their courses. Mollick says students should "tell me what they use ChatGPT for, tell me what they used as prompts to get it to do what they want, and that's all I'm asking from them. We're in a world where this is happening, but now it's just going to be at an even grander scale."[4]

How to Structure Learning Environments to Reduce Cheating and Increase Learning

- Foster **intrinsic motivation** by allowing students to reflect on their own personal learning as much as possible.

- Emphasize **mastery over performance** by allowing students to demonstrate their learning in a variety of ways, as opposed to holding everyone to the same standard on the same task.

---

[1] James M. Lang: Cheating Lessons: Learning from Academic Dishonesty. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013 (Available to UVM faculty and staff through the UVM Libraries: https://researchguides.uvm.edu/sotl.)

[2] International Center for Academic Integrity, (2023). https://academicintegrity.org/resources/facts-and-statistics

[3] See also, "in terms of individual faculty responses to cheating, you should first and foremost follow your institutional policy on reporting cheating students to a central office or officer who can maintain records and prevent students from becoming serial offenders" (Lang 224).

[4] NPR. (January 26, 2023). "'Everybody is cheating': Why this teacher has adopted an open ChatGPT policy."

- Provide students numerous opportunities to demonstrate the learning they have **produced**, rather than fewer and higher-pressure assessments intended to measure learning.

- Instill **self-efficacy** through metacognition by helping students hold themselves accountable for their own learning.

- Celebrate students' production of their **original work** created for a real, public audience because that is a more authentic learning experience.

Key Points about UVM's Academic Dishonesty Policy (updated January 2023)

- UVM's *Code of Academic Integrity* has been recently updated in response to ChatGPT. Now, "Students may not claim as their own work any portion of academic work **that was not completed by the student.**"[5]

- The *Code* also notes, "Course expectations **may vary** from instructor to instructor."

- Since students are expected to follow the rules as outlined by their instructors, it is important for faculty to **make expectations clear** as to whether students may, may not, or are required to use AI for assignments (as well as other expectations regarding academic integrity that are relevant to the course/assignment).

- For more information, follow up with the UVM Center for Student Conduct.

---

[5] UVM Policies: Code of Academic Integrity. https://www.uvm.edu/sites/default/files/UVM-Policies/policies/acadintegrity.pdf