LSU

Faculty Senate

Ad Hoc Faculty Senate GAI Committee Meeting
16 May 2025
1:00 pm, 135F Thomas Boyd Hall

Minutes of the Meeting

Attendance
- **Present**: Parampreet Singh (Chair), Inessa Bazayev, Fabio Capra Ribeiro, Alexander Lee, Tracy Norton, Michelle Osborn, Trevor Paul, Aimee Self Pittman, and Mayank Tyagi
- **Absent**: Seungwon Yang (Secretary), Jason Jamerson
- **Guests:** Les Butler (Chemistry), Christopher Rovee (English), Ingmar Schoegl (Mechanical & Industrial Engineering)

The ninth meeting of the Ad Hoc Faculty Senate GAI Committee convened at 1:05 pm on May 16, 2025, in room 135F of Thomas Boyd Hall at the LSU campus, with the Chair being present. Osborn served as secretary. No public comments were offered. Tyagi made a motion to approve the minutes. The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

Chairs Updates
Singh briefly discussed plans for committee work during the Summer.

Osborn made a motion to suspend the rules and take up **AI software costs** as the first item of business. The motion was unanimously approved.

AI software costs- Butler described AI use in one of his courses and the issue of costs related to including it, in addition to other course materials. Butler and the committee discussed options to deal with these rising costs, including a proposal to develop a policy with OAA to provide oversight for the costs of materials for courses. Discussions will continue.

Osborn made a motion to suspend the rules and take up **Grammarly** as the first item of new business. The motion was unanimously approved.

Grammarly- Two faculty presented opposing views on the use of Grammarly in higher education. On the affirmative side, Norton, an expert in Grammarly, presented her use of Grammarly in legal writing courses at the LSU Law School and gave a live demo of Grammarly. While teaching writing is not the point of her course, the students were weak in basic writing skills. She found current tools to be highly ineffective but found Grammarly to be something that could do what needed to be done and with pedagogical relevance. Norton described Grammarly as an instructional partner that aligns with best practices in writing instruction (formative feedback, scaffolded revision, student autonomy); reinforces what instructors teach without replacing them; and empowers students to take ownership of their writing process. She suggested that it provides adaptive, contextualized learning when used appropriately. She also described in depth how here students use Grammarly: she requires pre-revision and post-revision reports from each student for each assignment. Longitudinal reports allow students

and instructors to gauge progressive changes. She sees Grammarly as having campus-wide advantages. For students it removed barriers to clarity and professionalism in writing and provides 24/7 support on any platform; all while building transferable writing and communication skills. For faculty, there is less time spent on grading mechanics so that the focus can be on assessing critical thinking skills.

On the negative side, Rovee provided the opposing view of the cons of Grammarly use. While not an expert in Grammarly, he is an expert in teaching writing and he and his teaching assistants have encountered Grammarly use in both large general ed classes and more specialized classes. Tasked with training undergradaute students in communication, writing, and analytical skills, Rovee described the quick progression of Grammarly (and more loosely GAI) use in the last three years as rampant and uncontrollable, to the point that students did not trust themselves to write a paper without Grammarly, and could not answer questions in class without first consulting chatGPT. Rovee found that turning lots of students into SAA for cheating was a time-consuming process and disheartening exercise, he then changed his class so that AI use was not feasible. These changes included: completing the SAA module on academic integrity as a first assignment, requiring the Oxford edition of the text (so that all citations were consistent), and adding a new assignment that required students to go to the library to review, describe, and compare a different edition to their Oxford edition. He also provided testimonies from students and teaching assistants that demonstrated that students do not trust the authority of their educators and instead view Grammarly as an authority; and students do not trust themselves to write or proofread without Grammarly. Based on his experiences and the testimonials, he sees Grammarly, and GAI use in general, as hobbling the development of our students. When forced to write in class without assistance, the students are actually really good writers; but they don't think so. He doesn't like what it does to their writing and their confidence but feels that bigger issue is that they do not recognize authenticity and knowledge.

Schoegl provided a faculty view that while faculty are classically trained to survive without AI crutches; without that training, our students may not be able to distinguish good from bad and will lose their own voice.

A lively discussion ensued with the committee and guests. Further discussion included i. concerns of ensuring that our students are trained in both ethical and appropriate use of GAI use and also understanding its limitations; ii. Supporting faculty in using or not using GAI as is appropriate for their specific courses; iii. ensuring that our students are well-developed in critical thinking and classical skills, and the ability to recognize knowledge, in addition to being familiar with Grammarly and other GAI technologies.

In summation, the critical embrace of AI and GAI tools, including Grammarly, is necessary. The committee would like to hear such presentations from more faculty. Discussions will continue with the goal of developing a proposal for how the university can support the LSU community with this critical embrace.

Because there is unfinished business, Singh will send out a scheduling poll to see if it is possible to meet one more time before Summer.

Osborn made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 3:21 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Osborn,
Member of FS GAI Committee
Secretary of Faculty Senate
Executive Committee