

An Interview with Jeffery Washburn and Jennifer McCutchen

Interview by Julia M. Gossard

Transcribed by Kaylee Jo Stocks

Utah State University

Introduction: In January 2024, Critical Humanities published “AI Meets AI: ChatGPT as a Pedagogical Tool to Teach American Indian History” from Jeffrey Washburn and Jennifer McCutchen. The following interview expands on the ideas covered in their article and provides additional thoughts for our readers on the growth and future of AI, especially as it relates to the history of marginalized peoples.

Julia Gossard: Thank you both for joining me. What do you teach at your institutions, and what is your interest level in generative AI and large language models? Let’s start with you, Jennifer.

Jennifer McCutchen: I’m an assistant professor at the University of St. Thomas, which is in St. Paul, Minnesota. Before coming to St. Thomas, in 2022 I taught for 3 years at the University of Southern Maine, which was in Portland, and I earned my PhD in 2019 from TCU in Fort Worth, Texas. I am currently filling the line of early American history at St. Thomas. But I also teach courses in Native American history and gender history. The scope of the courses that I teach are Colonial America, American Revolution, and Native American history. And I have classes that are cross-listed with women and gender studies.

As a researcher, I pretty firmly describe myself as an ethnohistorian. I’m very interested in culture, political economy, and how those things shaped Indigenous life in the years before and during the American Revolution. Specifically, I use gunpowder as a lens to explore cultural adaptation, persistence, and culture change among Creek men during this revolutionary period. I highlight the uniqueness of gunpowder as a commodity because, unlike guns which were reusable and repairable, gunpowder had to be imported from Europe. It was not reusable, and so it was constantly a source that was in demand by both colonial settlers and Native American men. The fact that it was constantly in demand and had to be imported really shaped culture, diplomacy, negotiation, etc. So, I’m always trying to highlight the role of Native peoples or marginalized individuals as being active participants in shaping the worlds in which they lived. Take the American Revolution, for example. My students think they’re going to come into this class, and they’re going to know what we’re going to talk about because they either took AP US history or they’re just very familiar with this narrative of patriots and loyalists. I’m always trying to find ways to say, “Let’s complicate that narrative. Let’s look at the patriots, and how some of the things that they did were not very patriotic or humane. Let’s talk about tarring and feathering and how that’s a pretty gruesome practice. Or let’s look at Native peoples, women, African Americans, enslaved peoples and talk about how their participation in the Revolution and in the formation of the early American Republic really shaped a lot of systemic and structural issues. And how those systemic and structural issues from the founding shaped the course of history moving forward.”

So for me, tying it back to this idea of AI and the use of large language models, I’m always trying to get students to think critically about the past and think about those narratives that are not necessarily dominant in US History, and how our understanding of and the narrative of US History changes by looking at the information that we have available to us through a critical lens. Tying that back to AI, and the use of ChatGPT in the classroom, I think that’s what we really tried to get at with these projects, and our article was about how ChatGPT can be a great resource. But we have to look at the information that it produces with a critical lens, and

© 2024 Gossard

Teaching History, 49(1)

DOI: 10.33043/642z52d9g

Distributed with CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 License.

if we look at it critically, then what are we going to uncover? Information? Research? All of these things?

Jeff Washburn: I'm Jeff Washburn. I'm an Assistant Professor of History at the University of Texas Permian Basin over in the western side of Texas. I've been here since I accepted the job in March 2020. I received my PhD from the University of Mississippi in 2020. We've connected through our work, which focuses on Indigenous perspectives inside the American Southeast. I focus a little bit more west – in Mississippi with the Chickasaws. And I focus on the importance of geography and leadership within my own research.

I'm wrapping up a course on Colonial American history right now. I teach the American Revolution, the early American Republic, and I've taught the very first courses on Native American history in the history of my university over the last couple of years. It's very similar when it comes to course material and what we're looking at for our research, which made it a really good meeting place when we started talking about how we wanted to incorporate large language models into our classroom. We want to incorporate this new technology in a way that still emphasizes the importance of different communities inside the classroom and marginalized communities inside our research. Sometimes, we see inherent biases within these new large language models in generative AI, and it oftentimes becomes problematic with how it identifies and understands the perspectives of both Indigenous history and other people of color in American history.

When it comes to my interest level in large language models, I've never considered myself to be tech-savvy. That's never been my focus with this, but the fact is that when it came to our classroom, it was going to be something that our students would either know about or would come to terms with inside of other classes or in their working environment later on. I felt like it was an inherent responsibility for us as educators to teach our students some of the ethical underpinnings of this, the problematic aspects, how we can still use it, and the right to say no. That was something that really was important and has continued in research when it comes to using generative AI and large language models inside the classroom.

Julia Gossard: Thank you both. I want to talk about the journal article you co-wrote for *Critical Humanities*, "AI Meets AI: ChatGPT as a Pedagogical Tool to Teach American Indian History." You discuss the creation of different assignments and assessments with these large language models, specifically dealing with Indigenous and Native American history. One of the main points you make in this article is that the rise of LLMs like ChatGPT or Google's Bard has created "an inherent urgency for instructors of Native American history." Can you explain what this urgency is, why it exists, and some of the ways that you and your students have sought to overcome the challenges posed by this?

Jennifer McCutchen: It goes back to when I think about my own pedagogy. As we talk about in the article, these LLMs – ChatGPT, Bard – are only as good as the information they're working with because that's how they learn. If they are producing knowledge that our students are going to access, and that knowledge is based on inaccurate material or source material that is out there on the internet, it's only going to perpetuate these Eurocentric narratives and these racial biases that we, as instructors of Native American history or larger African American and non-Eurocentric history, are trying to combat. The urgency for us as instructors of Native history is to make sure that students aren't taking that biased information that ChatGPT or other LLMs are producing at face value. We don't want students to take that information and say, well, this is what ChatGPT produced. It has to be correct, or it has to be right, so this is what I'm going to take as gospel or take at face value.

The plagiarism issue for us in academia is always going to be there. It's always going to be a problem. But it's also about teaching students to think critically and analytically about what information is on Wikipedia. What information is accessible via Google, what information is on Tiktok or Youtube? It's another exercise in teaching students to say this is information that is out there and accessible to you. But how do you think about that

information based on what we're learning in class about Indigenous peoples or other members of marginalized communities? Do you take this information from ChatGPT, TikTok, or other media sources at face value? Or are you going to use the breadth of knowledge that you're gaining as a college student to think about this information in this source base?

More critically, I think there's an inherent urgency in ethnic studies, area studies, and Native American studies to really get students to understand this whole larger concept. It's our pedagogical aim in these classes to debunk myths about US History from Eurocentric narratives and push back against those narratives that have really shaped a lot of students dominant understanding of what American history is. So, the inherent urgency for me is to create projects and assignments that incorporate ChatGPT or other forms of media or information and teach students to look at those language and media models more critically.

Jeff Washburn: I'm glad that you mentioned the Wikipedia aspect with this, too, Jen, because I think we have this moment right now to both confront and discuss this with our students in an open and honest way. It's important for us to remember that both we, as instructors and students, are still figuring this out, and we still don't know. We're still trying to figure out all this material and how we're going to be using it. In the classroom, there are different perspectives on how we can possibly use it, or how it's problematic, or how it's a boogeyman. But this is an opportunity for us to really be at the forefront of this and how we can explain it to our students. I think that's really cool and awesome, especially when it comes to the inherent urgency for Native perspectives.

Actually, both Jen and I have had a textbook analysis project inside of our classes, where our students have broken down 2 or 3 different chapters from a high school or a lower-level history course on how it incorporates Native perspectives. From those we can already see that, oftentimes, Native peoples are at the very beginning of history and then just fall off when it comes to those perspectives. We're seeing better work when it comes to the inclusion of Native peoples, but as scholars have shown, it's not just simply the fact of including Native peoples into a narrative, but including Indigenous perspectives and identities and cultural reasonings into this work. If ChatGPT is gleaning and sifting and scraping all this information from millions and millions of pages of material, oftentimes, it's scraping from all of these different sources that do not understand, heighten, or look at Native perspectives. So, it leads to a greater disappearance of this.

Jen and I are not the first people who have done this. In fact, there are dozens of scholars who have been working on this for years. Folks like Meredith Broussard, Safiya Noble, Timnit Gibrú, have all been identifying these issues when it comes to AI for a long time. It's something that is not just simply for early American history. When we were talking about thinking about Native peoples for American history by bringing them into an Indigenous present or an Indigenous future, this is something that many different tribal communities are considering right now. In fact, there is an article from *Indian Country Today* talking about this controversy when it comes to a European company who use the Navajo term for beautiful without their terminology for it, and they created AI-constructed photographs of the Navajo for this. The Navajo turned around like, yeah, that's not us. That's not our work. There's concerns about digital sovereignty that scholars like Joseph Robertson, up in South Dakota with the Wokini initiative, have been focusing on. This is an important perspective for us, not just for thinking about the past but also the present, for how Indigenous communities are considered. As scholars of Native American history, we need to make sure that we confront these inherent biases.

Julia Gossard: One of the things that students don't necessarily have the knowledge to grasp right now is where ChatGPT is gathering its data. But it's not going into the peer-reviewed publications that we all know and look for behind JSTOR's paywall. So, the emphasis on critical thinking is such an important juncture to really teach that source evaluation. Thinking carefully about how knowledge is produced. Who's reproducing it? And how do we push back against that Eurocentrism? Both in the past and, Jeff, as you're saying, too, towards the future as

well.

So, what are the assessments that you created with LLMs to intentionally center these Native American voices and perspectives?

Jeff Washburn: When we were writing this article, David Chang (University of Minnesota) mentioned a “tool of theft to talk about theft,” and I absolutely love that concept. For the first time, this is an opportunity for students to see there are inherent issues when it comes to looking at Native perspectives or cultural biases within our history and understanding that larger historiography. Oftentimes, it’s front and center. It’s blatantly obvious with these large language models, and it becomes something that we can use as a teaching tool. One way that we used it is this idea of a pedagogical punching bag. The idea that we can kind of beat up on it sometimes and use it for peer to peer review. We would generate essays on the books that we’re reading, or tools like Perusall for our readings, or survey courses, and it’s a chance for students to really engage in the deconstruction of the Eurocentric biases within it. This comes into the idea of breaking it down to students and illustrating the fact that this is not Artificial Intelligence. This is a large language model. This is what it does. This is how it is created. This is basically fancy mad libs. Another scholar has called it spicy auto correct. It’s very much the idea that this is not something outside of their realm. They can combat and critique it, and that often turns into some really good conversations in ways that maybe students would be a little bit nervous about engaging with in peer-to-peer review or critiquing something that was written by a scholar who’s been doing this, for, you know, 20, 30, 40, 50 years. It gives them an opportunity to go toe to toe and really let loose. We mentioned in the article some of the ways that students would specifically attack the Eurocentric biases we see within this generative material, and it’s been cool to see.

For survey students, we would have threads on Perusall where there were 10-15 students on the same thread saying, yeah, I didn’t see this perspective on African enslavement, on Indigenous removal, on the importance of Mexican Americans when thinking about manifest destiny. I’ve started to incorporate a few other ways to teach different skills that are so important within the history profession, like outlines and editing. I’ve got a colleague here by the name of Amin Davoodi who has done some amazing work using it as an editing tool for foreign language students. It gives us an opportunity to have students engage at a higher level and gain a foundation of the minimum of what we’re seeing. How can we build off of it? How can we incorporate Indigenous voices so they don’t feel like they have to repeat what ChatGPT already generates? And they can use that as a stepping stone to move forward.

Julia Gossard: That sounds really interesting.

Jeff Washburn: Jen was the person who got me into it, and it’s been really helpful. This is one of those things that we’ve been thinking about when it comes to generative AI and large language models. There are ways we can go about teaching that are not going to be exciting for students. And there are ways that are going to engage with them in a way that isn’t saying, “I don’t trust you and I’m not going to include discussion boards, because I think you’re just going to throw it into Chat AI.” Instead, it’s giving us another form of assessment that gets students excited in a way that maybe a discussion board won’t.

Jennifer McCutchen: For me, one of the things I learned from writing across the curriculum training, which I’m sure you have at your university, too, is students are more responsive to low stakes assignments than they are to high stakes assignments. This is, especially for an online class, the perfect low stakes writing assignment because it allows students to stream of consciousness what they’re thinking about while reading. I structure it in my classes by providing them with opportunities to make comments or interactions on a personal reading. Each individual comment or interaction is not worth that many points, but by the end of the semester, it comprises a

pretty large chunk of their grade. The low stakes aspect of it is great because students end up writing what they're thinking in the moment, and it's not like that big canvas discussion board where they ultimately write what they think I, as the instructor, want to hear. So it's just more natural and fluid. I really love it for that aspect, too.

Julia Gossard: That's great to know. What do you think are the biggest takeaways from these assessments for your students? What are your own as instructors?

Jennifer McCutchen: My takeaways and the students' were very similar. My students, when they were writing their evaluations at the end of the semester, were grateful that I incorporated ChatGPT, because what they had been hearing from their other instructors all semester was like, no, no, no, no, no! You can't do that. You can't do this. Don't use it, it's bad. So, they realized that, when used in the right way, it can be very helpful and innovative. But, we need to learn how to use it the right way for it to be useful and assist the learning process. Generally, I think my students enjoyed experimenting with it, and enjoyed learning more about how ChatGPT and other LLMs work. I was grateful they were willing to use it and go on this experiment with me as an instructor. I even had a student at one point say, "If Dr. McCutchen keeps one project in this class the next time she teaches it, keep the ChatGPT Assignment, because that was really cool."

So, I think students appreciated that instead of being told no, my class took a step out there and said, "Let's collaborate on this together. I'm going to learn about it alongside you, and we're going to see what the final outcome of learning is." The students got out of it what I wanted them to get out of it, which was that we have to do some leg work. If we're going to use ChatGPT, we can't just say ChatGPT produced this response. This is obviously correct, and I'm going to turn this in as an answer to whatever assignment McCutchen assigned. Really, it clicked with them that there are a lot of inherent biases. There are a lot of problems with using this LLM. If I can think critically about what's being produced, then I'm doing what a historian does, which is take information, think critically about it, and then come to my own conclusions. So, I think to answer this question, both the students and I felt the same way about ChatGPT and using it through these models of assignments. And I think it was successful because of that.

Jeff Washburn: Yeah, when it came to the article for this, we finished reviewing for Jen's course and went through the IRB process for her. I was the person who did most of the writing to incorporate the comments from Perusall. It was very similar to what I found with my courses so far, and like what Jen was talking about. I had one student who told me they were planning on going into teaching, and they were very doom and gloom about it because of what they were hearing about ChatGPT as the end of education as we know it and all that kind of stuff from all these different networks. To confront it and see that it's not as big of a boogeyman gave them confidence to teach inside of other classrooms. One thing that I'm taking away from this now is teaching students the concept of consent. That becomes so important both for our classes and later on wherever they're working, because ChatGPT and other large language models are proliferating in a lot of different fields. Having that context of how they can work with it and what is problematic about it turns into the opportunity for them to say yes or no inside and outside the classroom.

The last thing I want to mention is that there's an inherent boost of confidence in students. It gave them an opportunity to say, "Okay, I know this material, and I know how to critique, and I know how to have a conversation with this material in a way that this machine that has gleaned from millions of pages can't actually add that context to it." I think that if you are incorporating it and saying, "Okay, we are all learning about this together. This is an open conversation. These are the reasons why. I want to see your writing, your editing, and your expertise on this because there are still issues with these programs." It gives students confidence to go into it and say, "Okay, I see some of these problems. I see some of these issues." I had a student of mine actually ask me to incorporate more large language model material into our survey class this semester, and we had some

opportunity to engage with it a little bit more.

Julia Gossard: It's cool when they really like it. And then they think about how they could expand this even further. I always find that really gratifying.

So, how are you two planning to teach with LLMs in the future?

Jeff Washburn: I'm currently working on a new article project for this last semester. I've tried to address large language models throughout the course, both through different assessment possibilities and different skill-based activities, and seeing how we can incorporate it into thinking about editing, creation of outlines, discussing historiography, etc. It's something new that has been fun. And again, I'm still learning. Thankfully, my students have gone along for the ride with me. But it's something that I'm still working with.

The other thing, too, is to think about different forms of workarounds. And I'm not saying this is the idea of looking on with suspicion. But this is an opportunity for us to think ethically and to think about how. Basically, the fact that ChatGPT and other large language models are not going to replace the important aspects of what it means to be a writer, what it means to critically analyze, what it means to think about evidence. So, find new ways to encourage that type of writing. We've talked about different forms of assessment, but finding workarounds that are exciting for students and are not inherently focused on, "I do not trust you." Let's find new and exciting ways together to think about these assignments. Of course, things like Unessays or other projects are always something we've been thinking about. Learning is something else with it. There are other new opportunities for us to think about assessments or how to encourage critical analysis inside of our classes. I don't believe it's going to destroy anything we're doing in the classroom, but instead it's encouraging us to think outside the box a little bit, and that's not a bad thing.

Jennifer McCutchen: Yeah, Jeff, you mentioned a couple of things that are definitely on my brain as well as I think about the fall semester. I'm teaching a Senior Capstone Seminar in the fall. So, I'm definitely thinking about how I can use ChatGPT or LLMs to teach students. How can we look at historiography, or construct an annotated bibliography? How can we strengthen our writing skills by looking at what ChatGPT does not do well? One of the things I have conversations with both my students and colleagues about is the plagiarism aspect of ChatGPT. It's hard to determine if a student has used ChatGPT to plagiarize. But one of the things that my colleagues and I remind each other of, and that we remind students of, too, when we have to have this tough conversation about plagiarism, is that ChatGPT doesn't do a good job of writing. It doesn't produce well-written material, and it's not going to produce a well-written historical paper if you're relying on it for your end of semester essay. So, thinking about those things when I teach the Capstone in the fall will be really useful, and I'm hoping that I can structure some low stakes assignments around that.

The other thing I'm hoping to do, that Jeff mentioned, is reacting to the past and game-based learning activities. As part of those reacting games, students are required to do research for a specific role or a specific faction, and I notice, especially at the survey level, students really struggle with that research aspect of it. Oftentimes, they end up just regurgitating what is already outlined for them in the game book or in the role sheet that they're given. I haven't figured out a way to do this yet, but I'm interested in how we can use ChatGPT or other LLMs to facilitate student research. If we can nudge them along on the research process, and ChatGPT is a way that's gonna successfully allow them to jump off and do the research on their own, then I'd love to find ways to be able to do that.

Julia Gossard: I just got finished last week teaching our Senior Capstone course here, and I did a couple of these small assignments using ChatGPT. One of them was brainstorming. Basically, you go through the process, and then you use ChatGPT to help you refine further. I was really surprised that I had a class of 15, and only 2 chose

to do it that way. I anticipated that everyone would choose that route, and it was the opposite. I asked them why, and a lot of them were like, well, I'm an expert now in this particular historical concept and idea. I'm a senior. I've been studying it this whole time. Why would I need ChatGPT to help me? That was not the answer I thought was going to happen there, but it seemed to work really well. One of the things I did, too, was once they had their rough thesis statements, I had them think in terms of, how would you evaluate this? Could you make this stronger, even just playing with some wording in order to make it more argumentative or more based in this? That seemed to help. Even if ChatGPT didn't give them better wording, it incentivized them to think more intentionally about the wording. It was a great way to have them experiment with it in a low stakes way. That also let them know I was okay with them using it in this capacity, but don't you try to write your whole essay with this thing.

Jennifer McCutchen: For sure, and that is what Jeff and I are both trying to get at. There are ways that ChatGPT can improve your writing, or if you have this great idea but you don't know how to articulate it, ChatGPT can help you with that, and we want to encourage that. But yeah, don't you dare submit a 25-page research paper produced by ChatGPT because we will figure it out.

Jeff Washburn: No, I definitely did stuff like that this semester. Sometimes the suggestions from ChatGPT just aren't good. It was fun to do something different with it.

The place that I've seen students using LLMs the most has been with editing. Basically, they see it as grammar, especially if they're using Grammarly, with this idea of accepting all edits there. I had a fun discussion with my students about the inherent issues of accepting all of this material as an editing agency. But again, a colleague of mine has been using it for English and foreign language students, and that has been a great opportunity for them because they can direct ChatGPT to give suggestions on what to change. Then, they just have to go through and make the changes like you would with Grammarly.

The other thing is that a lot of students don't know much about this still, or if they do, they're nervous about the idea of cheating. I think that we've kind of exploded in our minds the possibility of every single student using it, when in reality, they're just as new and confused about it as we are sometimes. We should walk through with them and explain to them what it is, what the tools are, what the problems are with it, and then show them what it can be used for. Oftentimes, I'm pretty enthusiastic just learning about it and understanding when and where it can't be used.

There's another part with it, too, and I've joked about this. Have you seen Abbott Elementary? I'm on the episode where they're jumping from desk to desk. I always think about that when it comes to something new. The fact is that as soon as a bunch of teachers are like, "We know about this, we're really excited to use this." Some students are just going to be like, oh, the teachers are using it. Never mind. It's kind of like Facebook, or Twitter, or any of these different social media platforms.

I have colleagues who enthusiastically use it, and I have others who don't trust it at all and send it to different checkers like Turnitin. When it comes to large language models, these measures are not good. Especially where I'm coming from at an Hispanic serving institution. There have been studies that show it inherently flags folks who have English as a second language more than any other group. It falsely flags them with it. And again, it breeds that issue of distrust. We've got all these different kinds of arguments across the spectrum at our school, and what that means is that most of the students have no clue. The regulations, requirements, and expectations for each class are a moving goalpost, and that can be scary for them. So, if we can provide them the tools to be conversant in it, then they can use it to talk to their professors ahead of time, and to be open and honest because we're open and honest with them – with our students. This creates an opportunity for collaboration rather than

distrust.

Julia Gossard: Absolutely. That segues nicely into the last question. In the article, you mentioned that one of your chief concerns when creating these assessments was the ethics and privacy of LLMs. I'm wondering if you can discuss these concerns a bit more, especially for those who may be interested in designing assessments that have students submit their intellectual property to LLMs.

Jeff Washburn: This is actually something that I'm really big about when it comes to talking with my students. The idea of consent. Explaining to them that anything they submit to an LLM they're giving away. You're giving away your intellectual property for free. AI is going to learn from that. And then it's going to package it off, and it's going to get smarter and make a profit off what you're doing. You are providing free labor. It's a labor issue, and I explained that to my students. There are inherent copyright issues that are still ongoing, with many different folks opening lawsuits against these different large language models because of the act of consent. I know that other scholars talk about the inherent issues when it comes to an environmental or personal impact for these different projects. When it comes to my different assignments, it is almost always generated material from me that they're interacting with. I had an opportunity for them to use it this last semester, but these assignments had opt-outs. If they did not want to use it, I would generate it for them. We have a footnote inside our article from the Algorithmic Justice League talking about affirmative consent. I repeat that to my students and walk them through the fact that this is a tool of theft. So, I'm very open and honest with them about what it can and can't do. That's something that I'm very proactive about.

On the other side, communication is so key to how we understand this. Not just simply with the idea of designing assessments, but also in how we trust or support our students, and how we communicate this material to them. I don't think that large language models are something that we should ever simply jump into using just because they're the new fad. They should not be something that we jump into without providing detailed information to our students about the problems, the benefits, and what can happen. Even if you pay for the versions like ChatGPT 4, or whatever it is, they can still use your intellectual property. The only way you can keep that is if you purchase an institutional sandbox version of it, and then they can't scrape and use your material. But again, I don't think that most universities are paying \$25,000 for that right now.

When it comes to it, communication is key. Whenever you're providing it, it needs to have some kind of opt-out, and you need to be very cognizant of what you want to use with it. When I was talking to my colleague about this, he talked about the fact that technology does not make you a better teacher. It simply amplifies who you are as a teacher. When it comes to using ChatGPT, it's similar to how we create these different assessments. It should not be oh, this is a brand new tool or fad. It think critically about how it aligns with your learning objectives, how you can debrief your students, how you can introduce this material, and why you're introducing this material to the students.

Jennifer McCutchen: That was so great. My approach to ethics with my students is mirrored in what Jeff has said because he's taught me so much about it. As a teacher, I never want to put students in a position where they feel uncomfortable. Whether that's talking about sensitive materials in class, or using these large language models that, like Jeff said, are a tool of theft. So, I tried to create assignments where I was the one producing the ChatGPT generated materials and then disseminating that out to students. But in the future, as we talk about incorporating this stuff into the capstone or in other upper level courses, I always want to put that option out there that there is a Plan B, and if you don't feel comfortable putting your intellectual property into ChatGPT, work with me, and I'll do it for you. Come to my office hours, we'll work on this together. Email me what you would like to have ChatGPT look at, and I can put it in there for you. I'm happy to be the middle man because of these really big questions about ethics that we don't have the answers to yet.

Julia Gossard: Fabulous. Is there anything you want to share with our readers?

Jennifer McCutchen: I just want to thank Jeff for being the mastermind of this whole article and project and inviting me to be a part of it. I feel really grateful. I learned so much from him. I'm glad to be here talking about it and working with Jeff, and doing some more cool stuff with ChatGPT in the future.

Jeff Washburn: Well, Jen is so kind, and it's been a wonderful process to see the feedback, from my students and also from Jen. We also did want to mention our project went through the Bright Institute at Knox College. They provided incredibly helpful feedback to allow this work. This is not just something that the two of us have created. This is something that well over a dozen scholars took a look at the work, provided feedback, and challenged us to think about this in different ways. Hopefully, we can continue to adjust. One of the reasons I want to think about this, and one of the reasons I am very invested is the agency of us as instructors. Right now, we are in a situation where the concern oftentimes is how teaching is viewed from an outside perspective, and if ChatGPT or other large language models can just take the responsibilities of teaching or writing or assessments. One of the reasons why I'm engaging with this so much is to make sure that, if there are outside forces that encourage me to incorporate things into my classroom, I understand it enough that I can tell them. I can incorporate that in, rather than either blindly believing or blindly rejecting, and that goes back to the idea of agency for our classes. It's not just for students. It's also for us.

Jennifer McCutchen: I know we mentioned this in our article, but our students are amazing. Every time that Jeff and I would talk and meet and compare notes, we would talk about how our students are amazing for going on this journey with us and being okay with us experimenting in class. Just to reiterate that we could not have done any of this without our students at our respective universities. That is my final thing that I would like to say.

Julia Gossard: Well, that's a great way to close it out. Thank you both.