



2024

Evolving intersections: AI, disability, and academic integrity in higher education

Jafry, Azeezah and Vorstermans, Jessica

Suggested citation:

Jafry, Azeezah and Vorstermans, Jessica (2024) Evolving intersections: AI, disability, and academic integrity in higher education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. ISSN 0271-0633 Available at <https://openresearch.ocadu.ca/id/eprint/4610/>

Open Research is a publicly accessible, curated repository for the preservation and dissemination of scholarly and creative output of the OCAD University community. Material in Open Research is open access and made available via the consent of the author and/or rights holder on a non-exclusive basis.

The OCAD University Library is committed to accessibility as outlined in the [Ontario Human Rights Code](#) and the [Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act \(AODA\)](#) and is working to improve accessibility of the Open Research Repository collection. If you require an accessible version of a repository item contact us at repository@ocadu.ca.

Evolving intersections: AI, disability, and academic integrity in higher education

Azeezah Jafry¹  | Jessica Vorstermans² 

¹OCAD University, Toronto, Canada

²York University, Toronto, Canada

Correspondence

Azeezah Jafry, OCAD University, Toronto, Canada.

Email: ajafry@ocadu.ca

Abstract

In this article, we investigate the critical intersections of AI, academic integrity, and disability in the context of a large undergraduate course. Our aim was to adapt the course to respond to generative AI (GenAI) to avoid entrenching barriers for students, and instead teach them how to use GenAI tools in ways that deepen their learning and uphold academic honesty. Grounded in disability justice and access pedagogies, we outline five design goals centered on guidelines for AI usage, education on responsible AI use, revised assessments, support for teaching assistants (TAs), and accessible materials. These activities are detailed in our methodology. In our findings, we provide a critical reflection of the course adaptation, taking up issues such as varying levels of familiarity with GenAI, students' capacity to engage with course changes, resistance to GenAI, instructors' relational shifts to AI, and feelings of demoralization among the teaching team. We conclude by offering practical recommendations for educators, calling for learning communities to view this disruption as an invitation to listen to disabled students.

AI tools are rapidly changing the landscape of higher education and are being used for teaching and research in ways that are generative for students' learning. However, many responses to AI have been ableist, racist, and rooted in surveillance. In this article, we investigate the critical intersections of AI, academic integrity, and disability in the context of an undergraduate health studies course. We intentionally use the term *disabled students* to call attention to the ways systems and structures perpetuate disablement. Further, we work from Lewis's 2021 definition of ableism which indicates its broad impact: "You don't

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.

© 2024 The Author(s). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC.

have to be disabled to experience ableism.” Recognizing that ableist systems are harmful for all of us, we assert the need for collective responsibility and action to cultivate more generative systems that resist ableism and allow all students to thrive.

This study aimed to adapt course elements to respond to AI, and specifically generative AI (GenAI), to avoid entrenching existing barriers for students and to teach students how to use these tools in ways that deepen their learning and continue to uphold academic integrity. This study contributes to an emerging body of literature on AI in education that critically examines the challenges amidst the rapid release of AI-based tools. Moreover, our research seeks to explore how responsive course design can foster equitable learning opportunities for students and offer evidence-based strategies for educators and students to engage with AI in critical and responsible ways.

First, we review the literature on how AI is being used in higher education and the ethical implications of this use. We focus on the implications for disabled students and communities, and review strategies to respond to AI while upholding academic integrity. We contextualize this research by discussing our own positionalities to this work and provide details about the undergraduate course. We outline the theoretical frameworks we have drawn up including disability justice and access pedagogies and review five design goals we established to adapt and integrate AI in the course. These goals were to define clear expectations and guidelines for AI use, educate students on responsible and ethical usage aligned with academic integrity policies, adapt assessments to respond to AI and resist ableism, support teaching assistants (TAs) in using educative approaches to AI and academic integrity, and adapt the course learning management platform for accessibility. Details of these activities including examples of adapted course policies and assessments are outlined in the methodology. In our findings, we critically reflect on the impact of the AI course adaptation, exploring how students and instructors responded to these changes in the context of the broader postsecondary institution. We conclude by offering practical recommendations for educators to support academic integrity skills and prioritize accessibility in their classroom in ways that balance student and instructor capacity.

RESEARCHER POSITIONALITY

I, Azeezah, am a graduate student with a background in education equity, completing my master's in inclusive design in Toronto. As a South Asian diasporic settler scholar attuned to global crises and calls for land restitution, I have been reflecting about land and belonging. I struggle with the ways that colonial constructs and definitions of belonging have shaped my experiences as a student and scholar. In my research, I confront these issues, including the harm and exclusion of Black, Brown, Indigenous, and disabled students (among others) at the margins of education systems. I also grapple with my thoughts and dreams about how education spaces might be transformed into sites of radical access and community. I see design as an opportunity to do this work and to co-create accessible and equitable education futures with students and learning communities in sustainable and care-full ways (Noddings, 2003).

I, Jessica, am an assistant professor in critical disability studies at York University. I live, research, teach, care, parent, struggle, and do all of the things on these Treaty 13 lands (what is now known as Toronto), which are the subject of the Dish with One Spoon Wampum Belt Covenant, an agreement to peaceably share and care for the Great Lakes region (York University, n.d.). I am a settler scholar who works within and against the colonial university. As I navigate the tenure track of the institution as a mother to two young children, given the work of teaching and learning in times fraught with crisis, I am always brought back to Tuck's (2018) question, “How shall I spend my time when I am not bathing my children?”

(p. 157). This question guides how I am in relation with my students, my pedagogy, and those in the work of teaching with me (TAs, educational developers, and colleagues). How do I want to be in relation in my teaching, in the precious time I have when I am not bathing my children. I am deeply committed to a pedagogy of access, of care, and of relationality. I have been thinking a lot about ways that GenAI has the potential to shift this relationality, and in particular in the designing of assessments in front of this fear of its potential to orient students toward engaging differently with assessment.

We, Azeezah and Jessica, have been collaborating on writing, presenting, pedagogy, and course design in our York University Community of Practice on decolonization, equity, diversity, and inclusion for the last few years of ongoing crisis and upheaval.

LITERATURE REVIEW

AI is a field of computer science focused on creating machines that can perform tasks requiring human intelligence like problem-solving and decision-making. Broadly speaking, AI systems process large amounts of data to identify complex patterns and develop algorithms that allow the system to complete tasks efficiently. Of particular interest in this study is GenAI, a subset of AI that learns from existing data to generate content such as text, images, and audio. Generative models such as ChatGPT (<https://chat.openai.com>) can create original and realistic outputs, and have been gaining prevalence in educational contexts (Sullivan et al., 2023).

ChatGPT is an example of a tool that can support students' learning experiences in multiple ways. For example, this tool and other AI-based chatbots can be used as responsive tutoring systems to provide real-time feedback and guidance by analyzing students' performance, identifying areas of improvement, and suggesting relevant supports. Other areas of AI uptake have been in writing and research. Popular writing tools such as Grammarly (<https://www.grammarly.com>) can assist students with correcting grammar and spelling errors, while tools like Quillbot (<https://quillbot.com>) and Copy.ai (<https://www.copy.ai>) can support paraphrasing and creating essay outlines (Malik et al., 2023). In addition, tools like Notion AI (<https://www.notion.so/product/ai>) can support notetaking and task management. Perplexity AI (<https://www.perplexity.ai/>), Scite (<https://scite.ai/>), and Research Rabbit (<https://www.researchrabbit.ai/>) are examples of tools that can help streamline the research process of foraging, organizing, and summarizing scholarly articles.

Importantly, AI tools can also create pathways to access for disabled and other students. Marino et al. (2023) highlighted AI's transformative potential to support disabled students with daily tasks that may otherwise be difficult due to impairments or injuries. For instance, speech-to-text technology can support students who face challenges with writing. Additionally, language translation tools can be a valuable resource to support English language learners.

Despite these affordances, AI integration in education is nuanced and educators face the complex task of taking it up in ways that are ethical for students. For example, literature on the ethics of AI use has noted significant concerns about surveillance, discrimination, and bias (Evans et al., 2023; Siau & Wang, 2020). These issues have also been historically linked to academic integrity policies in higher education (Brown, 2020). For example, the use of AI-based proctoring software to surveil students has faced criticism for perpetuating racism, ableism, and gender discrimination. AI systems are often trained on datasets with limited representations of race and gender and exclude bodies that do not fit a "normal" standard, including disabled bodies (Gagné, 2023). Because these systems have not been tested with disabled users (Smith & Smith, 2021), they cannot account for the different ways students live and learn and can be punitive against those falling outside of the "norm."

These existing biases in data sets also shape information generated by AI systems, creating issues with ethics and reliability of its use. For example, a study by Pennsylvania State University on 13 AI language models revealed that the models consistently created negative associations with disability-related terms, highlighting explicit and implicit biases in the training data (Venkit & Wilson, 2021). Similarly, AI applications in sectors such as healthcare and policing have been shown to exhibit racial biases that disproportionately disadvantage Black communities (Fountain, 2022). Consequently, reliance on biased data sets and AI-based decisions can create new forms of technological oppression.

Sweetman and Djerbal (2023) critiqued the dominance of Western-centric data in AI training that can exclude or misrepresent non-Western perspectives, histories, and knowledge, bringing into question the fairness of AI systems. They also commented on how some AI models struggle to differentiate between scholarly and nonscholarly sources and have been known to falsify information. These issues create significant concern about AI use in research. The intersection of AI with academic integrity is a critical area for further exploration, bringing challenges like intellectual property, plagiarism, and the ethical use of AI in assessments to the forefront of educational discourse (Kumar et al., 2023). Yet scholars including Henry and Oliver (2022) have cautioned against being hasty to address these issues with more technological surveillance, and instead see this time as an “important opportunity for dialogue that opens up new ethical and pedagogic forms of academic practice” (p. 346).

Educators are increasingly calling for pedagogies that are inclusive, accessible, and trauma aware. These are practices that prioritize trusting students over surveilling them and building equitable and accessible spaces in the classroom. El Sabbagh and Schwarz (2023) offered ways to create these spaces through “interdependent classrooms” (p. 222) that consider an individual student’s learning as connected to every student’s learning. Drawing on the works of Cariaga (2021) and Shalaby (2021), they recommended centering students’ humanity, providing noncarceral and nonpunitive ways for students to engage in learning together, and creating spaces for collective accountability.

To uphold a culture of integrity in classrooms, Gagné (2023) advocated moving away from competitive, isolationist learning environments and instead educating students about the importance of academic integrity as a relational process between themselves and those they are learning alongside. Instructors need to model and clarify expectations of integrity in the classroom. In addition, students need to have meaningful, and multiple, ways to express their learning and meet the learning outcomes of a course (Kumar et al., 2023). Importantly, these differentiated ways of engagement and multiple points of access need to be designed inclusively to ensure full participation and inclusion of disabled students.

Addressing the challenges posed by AI in higher education requires a comprehensive, strategic approach that is not limited to the classroom (Pagaling et al., 2022). Students and educators must engage in conversation to determine ethical standards of AI that do not entrench existing structures of inequity for students. However, as Sweetman and Djerbal (2023) have argued, institutions need to be held accountable to help facilitate these initiatives and be at the forefront of developing digital justice principles to prevent potential harms of these technologies.

CONTEXTUALIZING THIS RESEARCH

In the summer of 2023, Jessica received funding from York University to regulate and adapt her large undergraduate health studies course to new GenAI challenges. The course

enrollment is approximately 150 to 200 students per semester. Jessica's course examines issues in Canada's healthcare system and explores various intersections of inequity and access including disability, status, gender-based violence, food insecurity, and homelessness. She uses case studies to focus on communities at the forefront of struggles for health and equity. The course provides an ideal platform to engage students in critical discussions about AI, particularly focusing on how AI is disrupting social contexts such as education, housing, and healthcare.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

Our work in this space is framed and directed through a pedagogy of care (Goralnik et al., 2012) and access and the methodology of disability justice (Sins Invalid, 2019). A pedagogy of care is one that attends to students as whole people, is rooted in relationality, and refuses extractive and harmful practices in the classroom and learning spaces. A commitment to access means we think and anticipate all bodyminds in all spaces of our teaching and learning. No one can learn if they cannot access spaces of learning; therefore, a commitment to access for all students is necessary. Disability justice is a social movement, a framework for understanding the world, and a methodology for transforming ableist spaces, gifted to the world by disabled, queer and trans, Indigenous, Black, and people of color. It is meant to be an engaged framework to make material changes in institutions and structures of interlocking oppression (Sins Invalid, 2019).

Our study methodology was twofold. First, it involved adapting the course for AI integration, guided by a set of design goals. Then we engaged in critical reflection to understand how AI integration impacts student and instructor experiences within the broader context of the academic institution. Critical reflection is a valuable method in education research, particularly when exploring one's professional practice (Fook, 2011). In this study, we drew upon Morley's (2008) approach to critical reflection, which is centered on an introspective analysis that challenges conventional thinking and practices and examines underlying assumptions in research narratives to reveal contradictions and inconsistencies. This approach values first-person accounts of experiences and collaborative reflection methods to access deeper and more diverse understandings. The critical reflections of the course adaptation are discussed in the findings section.

In the sections to follow, we detail specific activities we undertook to adapt Jessica's undergraduate health studies course for the Fall 2023 and Winter 2024 semesters. Before starting the redesign, Jessica participated in an AI education course with her institution's Teaching Commons. This course provided insights into GenAI, outlined potential harms, and suggested best practices for maintaining academic integrity while enhancing equity, access, and inclusion. The three-week intensive course required instructors to partake in interactive challenges. These included adapting assessments to anticipate GenAI use, revising grading criteria and rubrics (e.g., placing more emphasis on assessments involving applying, analyzing, or evaluating knowledge), exploring AI-supported teaching strategies, and creating opportunities for students to use AI as a learning aid in the course. After preparing the course for the 2023–2024 semesters, Jessica engaged in an ongoing critical reflection process to understand the impact and effectiveness of the adaptation, including discussions with Azeezah. As a part of iterative course check-ins, Jessica also asked students and TAs about their experience; however, these discussions are outside the scope of this article, as we could not arrange ethics in time to report on these data.

DESIGN GOALS

Building on the insights Jessica gained from the AI education, together we established five design goals for her undergraduate course: (a) establishing clear expectations for AI use in the course; (b) creating online modules on the ethical implications and responsible use of AI, aligned with academic honesty policies; (c) supporting TAs with educative approaches to AI and tools to support students' development of academic honesty skills; (d) adapting existing assessments to integrate AI use in critical ways, applying universal design principles to resist ableism; and (e) adapting the course's learning management platform and materials for accessibility.

Establishing clear expectations for academic honesty and AI use

Education scholars have advocated for teaching academic honesty as an ongoing skill that students develop throughout their academic journeys (Eaton, 2023). Therefore, we integrated this approach across the course policies, assessments, and teaching methods. For example, Jessica updated her academic integrity policy in the course syllabus with the intention to review it in depth with students and continue to revisit it in practice with assessments. The revised policy situated academic honesty as a generative and relational process, framing citational practices as conversations that students will have with other people's thoughts, research, and theory. It focused on a commitment to building academic honesty skills over punishment, recognizing the disparities in students' experiences with citation and research before university, and acknowledging that not everyone has access to equal learning opportunities. In addition to guiding students toward institutional tools and programs to avoid academic dishonesty and understand student rights, it offered practical strategies for implementation.

For instance, to support active communication from students, the policy provided clear guidelines on how students could email the teaching team, including expected response times from instructors. Students also had the option to submit assignments early, obtain a similarity report to avoid being flagged for plagiarism, and then resubmit a revised version before the final deadline. To address academic breaches such as plagiarism, the policy promoted a supportive approach: TAs developed a plan with the student to revise and resubmit their work for marks, emphasizing guidance over punishment. Ultimately, the policy sought to create a supportive learning environment where students could practice their academic integrity skills.

The course policies also addressed AI usage, detailing how students would critically engage with and contextualize AI throughout the course by examining ethical implications and strategies to uphold academic integrity. To address AI use in assessments, we included guidelines on appropriate use (where relevant) and clarified that responsible AI use would not incur penalties. For example, students were guided on how to cite AI tools and were required to cite additional sources (scholarly or gray literature, depending on the task) that substantiated the AI-generated information. These guidelines were reinforced in tutorials, where TAs supported students to practice AI and academic integrity skills. Overall, students were instructed to use AI as a supplement to, rather than a replacement for, their research practices.

Creating modules on responsible AI use

We identified tutorials as a space where we could integrate an AI thread of inquiry to take up ethical implications of its use and relate this thread to course topics such as housing, immigration, and education. As outlined previously, we also determined that tutorial time would be used to discuss the responsible use of AI tools in assessments and to practice AI-related skill development. To support this aim, we created a series of eight concise tutorial presentations covering AI equity issues, each accompanied by prompts for student engagement and reflection. Several key questions guided this series:

1. How do AI tools store and use information?
2. How are AI tools managed?
3. Who benefits or is disadvantaged by AI tools?
4. What are the challenges and opportunities in AI-based research and decision-making?
5. How can AI be beneficial, particularly for students?
6. Who is leading the discourse and development of AI, and which voices are missing or underrepresented?

We outlined ethical considerations surrounding AI, including surveillance, privacy concerns, exploitation in dataset management (Rowe, 2023), unpaid user labor in product development, environmental impacts of data storage centers (Li et al., 2023), and biases that perpetuate racism, ableism, and gender discrimination. We also explored the challenges of unreliable and false information and the complexities of attributing knowledge in the age of AI-generated content. In parallel, we explored access and opportunities provided by AI. This included academic support and advanced accessibility tools that are being developed, such as Seeing AI (<https://www.seeingai.com>; Shaikh, 2023) and smartARM (<https://www.smartarm.ca>; Barry, 2023). As we grappled with these tensions of ethics and access, we emphasized the limitations of technology that is designed without considerations of those marginalized by institutions.

Supporting TAs with educative approaches to AI

To support TAs in managing the AI adaptation, we developed a comprehensive tutorial handbook. The handbook not only served as a guide for the course but, crucially, outlined the nonpunitive, educative approach to academic honesty and AI-related policies and how to operationalize them. For example, TAs were guided on using similarity detection tools to identify potential plagiarism and provided with an email template to reach out to students suspected of plagiarism. This template was designed to encourage dialogue, allowing students to understand their missteps, take responsibility, and revise their submissions without impacting their grades or facing harsh penalties.

We also developed sample activities for TAs to engage students in exercising their academic integrity and AI-related skills. One such activity involved students editing their written work with AI. Importantly, this activity was informed by Currie's (2023) work on digital space-making to explore how we could engage with one another and build community online and offline in ways that honored all students. Accordingly, the activity was designed to be single player or multiplayer, based on students' preferences. In the single-player mode, students selected a piece of personal writing they were comfortable sharing and used a GenAI tool like ChatGPT to assist with editing tasks. Examples of these tasks included making grammatical corrections, improving clarity, offering suggestions to

reinforce an argument, summarizing key points, and adapting a writing style in different tones. Students were then encouraged to reflect on the effectiveness of these AI-assisted strategies and their learning. In the multiplayer mode, students in groups decided on a common topic and individually prompted the AI, considering criteria such as word count, tone, and audience. Then, they compared their AI-generated responses to see how different prompts influenced the style and content of the output and reflected on their learning.

Adapting existing assessments to integrate AI use in critical ways

To reduce reliance on GenAI, we redesigned the course assignments to move beyond traditional writing formats. Our approach involved creating short, scaffolded assignments that built on students' skills and understanding of key concepts. The iterative assessments allowed us to balance the course weightage throughout the semester and offer students various opportunities for engagement. Students could choose to work individually or in groups and submit assignments in diverse formats, such as videos, graphics, or written documents.

The course began with reflective assignments on students' roles as researchers. As they progressed, students chose a health issue for detailed study, culminating in a creative output—be it a graphic, podcast, or video—as a part of knowledge mobilization of their research. The course ended with a final hybrid showcase, on Zoom (<https://zoom.us>) and in person that allowed students to present their work to their classroom community in whichever ways they chose to engage.

A specific example of an adapted assessment was the researcher positionality statement. Previously submitted as a written reflection on intersectionality and health, this assignment now required students to create a digital mind map, using tools such as Mural (<https://mural.co>), Miro Board (<https://miro.com>), or Microsoft Word. This map visually represented their lived experiences and intersections, which they could express using photos, videos, audio, or text. Accompanying the mind map, students submitted a short explanation of their positionality. They also had the option to complete the assignment in a group, demonstrating overlapping or distinct intersections.

Another assessment involved land-based learning hosted by a local Indigenous art and storytelling organization, the Sweet Grass Roots collective. This learning was rooted in Indigenous methodologies and interactive activities available in person and recorded for students who joined asynchronously. To reduce GenAI dependency, the Sweet Grass Roots collective developed reflection questions for students that were tied to specific experiences in the land-based learning.

For written assignments, where GenAI usage is more likely, we included detailed guidelines on appropriate uses in the instructions. An example of how we restructured a written assignment to accommodate GenAI was the students' proposal for their final project. Previously, it entailed a comprehensive four- to five-page proposal. Now the assignment was broken down into four distinct, manageable parts, where students could offer short responses to prompt questions, reducing the potential overreliance on GenAI.

Adapting the course learning management platform for accessibility

We situated this course in the radical access that characterized the first two years of the pandemic, thinking actively about how we might resist forgetting about this access and, instead, committing ourselves to creating it. Considering this approach, we created

multiple access points in the course, so that students could move in and out of them according to their needs.

One of our main initiatives was to organize the syllabus to make content, including the course policies, resources, and expectations, clearer and more compatible with screen readers. To ensure the text and media on the course platform were accessible, we created hypertext links, added transcripts for videos, included alternative text for images and banners, and provided course documents in both PDF and Word formats. We also improved the color contrast of course materials to ensure text legibility. To ensure easy access to weekly course materials, we organized each module with relevant lectures, videos, and assignments in one place. Furthermore, we updated the course platform to include clear signaling about hybrid course delivery. This included instructions on how students could participate in the course synchronously—online or in person—or asynchronously online.

Recognizing that the work of access is a collective effort, we invited students into this process through an assessment. We did so by linking the final assignment, the knowledge mobilization output (podcast, video, or graphic), with an access commitment. This commitment was a short document that guided students to research accessibility considerations applicable to their chosen format and outlined the steps they needed to take. Examples of accessibility considerations included audio and video transcripts, closed captioning, alternative text, and good color contrast. Students were encouraged to explain if there were any accessibility criteria they could not meet, outline the reasons why, and reflect on how these accessible formats benefit others.

FINDINGS

After teaching one term of the course, now adapted for GenAI, I (Jessica) spent some time reflecting on how the adaptation went and ways that I understood learning for students, and the teaching team, to have been shifted or impacted. Teaching in ongoing crisis times felt especially heavy in the Fall 2023 academic term. So, this adaptation took place during a particularly difficult time. Students also seemed to be struggling more and attendance was lower than it had been in previous terms. I now take up five themes that I identified over the academic term that stood out as important, or places where other educators might find similarities or divergences: (a) unevenness in TA familiarity with GenAI, (b) student capacity, (c) some students not wanting to use GenAI, (d) relationality shift in new GenAI landscape, and (e) adapting assessments to GenAI made them more complex. My hope is that we, author and reader, can think through them generatively together. If you are an educator, how do these themes resonate for you as you think about GenAI and your own assessments in your courses?

Unevenness in TA familiarity with GenAI

Given that this was a large undergraduate course, the teaching team consisted of the professor and four to eight TAs. What was immediately clear when we met for our pre-semester meeting was the diversity in TAs' knowledge and comfort with GenAI tools such as ChatGPT. Some were using it to design teaching materials and exercises, some were uncomfortable with the rising use of ChatGPT among students in their academic work, and others had never opened ChatGPT and were not thinking about ways it would show up in students' work. Have you opened these conversations with your teaching team? What training or supports are available through your institution to support this learning?

Student capacity

As mentioned above, we used Currie's (2023) invitation to develop single player and multiplayer assignments to build community and collective learning. We took this shifting time of GenAI to think through ways of inviting students to do critical collective work; equity work cannot be done in isolation. There was very little uptake from students on the multiplayer options for assessments. We think this finding reflects a few things: student capacity to engage in collective work that is more laborious in terms of time and negotiating all that comes with group work, little time to do this work in the short hour assigned to tutorials, and the structural determinants of ways students can engage in course work that takes time, when they are juggling full-time employment, care responsibilities, and economic pressures and injustices. What structural pressures are your students facing? The blog post "Teaching the Students We Have, Not the Students We Wish We Had" (Goldrick-Rab & Strommel, 2018) is helpful for all of us as educators to read or revisit.

Some students not wanting to use GenAI

Some students were explicit in their desire to work on their writing and research skills without the use of GenAI. This was an interesting finding for us, as we were intentionally reflecting on using GenAI in academic work and thinking together about what a collaborative GenAI policy could be. Several students said they were not interested in using GenAI and wanted to complete assessments without it, stating that they did not want to develop a dependency on GenAI. We speak further to this idea in the discussion section, about ways this preference might be honored using differentiated assessments. Have you experienced this preference in your teaching, and what are generative ways you are responding to it?

Relationality shift in the new GenAI landscape

Something that I have found myself struggling with in this new landscape of GenAI availability is the shifts in the ways I am about students and their work. For example, I find myself wondering if students have used GenAI to generate their work. This is a shift in my thinking that feels unsettling. I want to discuss this development further with other educators as I question my thinking. Have you experienced this shift? How are you navigating it? I have certainly heard about this shift from TAs, who are on the front lines of it. Strommel's (2016) tweet—"start by trusting students"—has always guided my pedagogy and teaching, and GenAI is, or at least feels as though it is, troubling this trust. The solution is for educators to shift our assessments and teaching to throw off this creeping shadow of GenAI distrust. Our reactions cannot be ones of surveillance and detection to punish. Instead, we must take this moment as a generative one to assess what is working and what is not working in terms of our assessments of learning objectives. The landscape has shifted, and we must engage the pandemic pedagogy flexibility we all learned to address the changes that GenAI are bringing. Are you struggling with this shift, and how is it showing up for you?

Adapting assessments to GenAI made them more complex

When we designed the course adaptation and assessments, some of the assessments did become more complex and time-consuming for students. There were more lengthy steps

to complete and things to consider. This design was done under the assumption that if students were using GenAI to complete parts of the assessments, then the assessments needed to be more robust to assess learning outcomes. After the first term, having heard from some students who did not want to use GenAI in their assignments, we are now thinking about creating differentiated assessments with two tracks: one for students who want to use GenAI and another for students who do not want to use GenAI. What does a two-track model look like for TA grading hours? Do the learning management systems allow for two-track submissions? These are only some of the considerations in this era of the neoliberal university. What structural barriers do you experience in adapting assessments, and how can educators work collaboratively to ensure access for all students?

DISCUSSION

In this section we review our reflections after one term of piloting the new assessments and tutorial materials. As mentioned above, a significant part of our introduction to and teaching with GenAI involved grappling with the ethical implications. We asked students to think about the impact of GenAI use on labor rights for others, environmental impacts, and the ways that GenAI employs epistemic erasure and privileges certain knowledges. So, when students did use GenAI outside the guidelines we provided, it was felt by the teaching team members to be acutely demoralizing. We reflected on this feeling and wanted to think *with* it. We reflected on how one course adaptation is not powerful enough to urge students not to generate assessments using GenAI; the structural pressures in their lives are too large. In short, the pressures that students live with include but are not limited to full-time employment, care work, long commutes, housing, food precarity and injustice, and the pathologies of poverty. These are the very pressures that push students to engage with GenAI. Working enough in one's paid employment to stay in one's home and have enough to eat necessarily takes precedence over completing an assignment that ChatGPT can complete in minutes. Systemic, institutional responses to GenAI are needed, not one-off course adaptations. Higher education institutions need to take on this reimagining assessment challenge in robust and generative ways, ones that are nonpunitive, that are rooted in access, and that prepare students to thrive in today's world.

Using a disability justice approach, we thought through how GenAI might be a generative invitation to engage more fully in differentiated assessments and to renew our commitment to access for all students. Further, we saw it as an opportunity for us to commit fully to creating assessments that have flexibility built in and that allow students to demonstrate their learning in ways that work best for them. In response to the students' lead, we considered having two-track or differentiated assessments for each assessment opportunity, allowing students to choose whether they wanted to complete an assessment adapted for GenAI (where using GenAI skills would be integrated into the assessment) or an assessment where they would not use GenAI.

CONCLUSION

We share the findings and reflections from this study not to dissuade instructors from trying to adapt their courses, but rather to encourage more educators to make this commitment. It is clear that if students have greater capacity to engage in meaningful assessment opportunities across their course load, then they can truly begin to benefit from the access and care afforded by initiatives like course adaptations. At a local level, instructors can engage in various activities to support students and respond to GenAI,

including working on adapting assessments that are relevant to students' lived experiences (Villarroel et al., 2018), engaging in knowledge building and co-creation with students and TAs, and tapping into communities of practice that support individual instructors in a larger community of care (Adams et al., 2023).

As we mentioned in the beginning of this article, we are part of a community of practice that was created to nurture a space in the institution that can support decolonization, equity, diversity, and inclusion in our teaching and learning work. Communities of practice are spaces that can support the kinds of counter-cultural work we discuss throughout this article (Cambridge & Suter, 2005; Johnson, 2022; Wenger, n.d.). Communities of practice can resist the isolationist academic work the academy structures for people and where ableism thrives. We are thinking about the introduction of GenAI as another opportunity to engage in more ethical and just anticolonial practices, such as assessment practices that focus on learning and not merely on colonial, hierarchical practices of grading and sorting students (Strommel, 2023). Work by Currie (2023) on engaging students in learning that relies on mad-positive methods and community building is another site of generative thinking that invites educators to teach to all students for another world.

We are working to meet the disruption of GenAI in the site of higher education as an invitation for educators to listen to disabled students who have long advocated that colonial institutions do not, and have not, served all learners. Long before GenAI, higher education institutions were failing students living at different intersections. We refuse to accept that accessibility should be compromised as a response to GenAI, and we urge everyone to resist any temptations to return to pen-and-paper learning or standardized assessment. These kinds of assessments are exclusionary to many students, including disabled students. Instead, we ask instructors and learning communities to commit to building access for all students in this time of disruption.

ORCID

Azeezah Jafray  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3310-9729>

Jessica Vorstermans  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8563-180X>

REFERENCES

- Adams, S., Tesene, M., Gay, K., Brokos, M., McGuire, A., Rettler-Pagel, T., & Swindell, A. (2023). *Communities of practice in higher education: A playbook for centering equity, digital learning, and continuous improvement*. Every Learner Everywhere. <https://www.everylearnereverywhere.org/resources/communities-of-practice-in-higher-education/>
- Barry, C. (2023, May 18). *AI is strengthening the future of accessibility*. Microsoft News Center Canada. <https://news.microsoft.com/en-ca/2023/05/18/ai-is-strengthening-the-future-of-accessibility/>
- Brown, L. X. Z. (2020, November 16). *How automated test proctoring software discriminates against disabled students*. Centre for Democracy & Technology. <https://cdt.org/insights/how-automated-test-proctoring-software-discriminates-against-disabled-students/>
- Cambridge, D., & Suter, V. (2005). *Community of practice design guide: A step-by-step guide for designing & cultivating communities of practice in higher education*. Educause. <https://library.educause.edu/resources/2005/1/community-of-practice-design-guide-a-stepbystep-guide-for-designing-cultivating-communities-of-practice-in-higher-education>
- Cariaga, S. (2021). Beginning with the body: Strategies on building and defining safety in unsafe schools. In the Education for Liberation Network & Critical Resistance Editorial Collective (Eds.), *Lessons in liberation: An abolitionist toolkit for educators* (pp. 236–243). AK Press.
- Currie, S. M. (2023). *The mad manifesto* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Waterloo. https://uwspace.uwaterloo.ca/bitstream/handle/10012/19689/Currie_Sarah.pdf?sequence=3
- Eaton, S. E. (Ed.). (2023). *Handbook of academic integrity*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-079-7>
- Evans, O., Wale-Awe, O., Osuji, E., Ayoola, O. O., Alenoghena, R., & Adeniji, S. (2023). ChatGPT impacts on access-efficiency, employment, education and ethics: The socio-economics of an AI language model. *BizEcons Quarterly*, 16(1), 1–17.

- El Sabbagh, J., & Schwarz, C. (2023). Classroom communities, pandemic portals: Rethinking solidarity through pedagogy and practice. *Educational Studies*, 59(2), 221–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2023.2169692>
- Fook, J. (2011). Developing critical reflection as a research method. In J. Higgs, A. Titchen, D. Horsfall, & D. Bridges (Eds.), *Creative spaces for qualitative researching* (pp. 55–64). Sense. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6091-761-5_6
- Fountain, J. E. (2022). The moon, the ghetto and artificial intelligence: Reducing systemic racism in computational algorithms. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(2), Article 101645. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2021.101645>
- Gagné, A. (2023). Academic integrity, ableist assessment design, and pedagogies of disclosure. In S. E. Eaton (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (pp. 1–16). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-079-7_134-1
- Goldrick-Rab, S., & Strommel, J. (2018, December 10). Teaching the students we have, not the students we wish we had. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/teaching-the-students-we-have-not-the-students-we-wish-we-had/>
- Goralnik, L., Millenbah, K. F., Nelson, M. P., & Thorp, L. (2012). An environmental pedagogy of care: Emotion, relationships, and experience in higher education ethics learning. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 35(3), 412–428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105382591203500303>
- Henry, J. V., & Oliver, M. (2022). Who will watch the watchmen? The ethico-political arrangements of algorithmic proctoring for academic integrity. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 4, 330–353. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-021-00273-1>
- Johnson, B. (2022, November 15). *Peer learning changes everything—but how to make it work?* Network Weaver. <https://networkweaver.com/peer-learning-changes-everything-but-how-to-make-it-work/>
- Kumar, R., Eaton, S. E., Mindzak, M., & Morrison, R. (2023). Academic integrity and artificial intelligence: An overview. In S. E. Eaton (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (pp. 1–14). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-079-7_153-1
- Lewis, T. (2021). January 2021 working definition of ableism [Blog post]. T.L. Lewis. <https://www.talilalewis.com/blog/january-2021-working-definition-of-ableism>
- Li, P., Yang, J., Islam, M. A., & Ren, S. (2023). Making AI less “thirsty”: Uncovering and addressing the secret water footprint of AI model. arXiv.org. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.03271>
- Malik, A., Khan, M. L., & Hussain, K. (2023). *How is ChatGPT transforming academia? Examining its impact on teaching, research, assessment, and learning*. SSRN. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4413516>
- Marino, M. T., Vasquez, E., Dieker, L., Basham, J., & Blackorby, J. (2023). The future of artificial intelligence in special education technology. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 38(3), 404–416. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01626434231165977>
- Morley, C. (2008). Critical reflection as a research methodology. In P. Liamputtong, & J. Rumbold (Eds.), *Knowing differently: Arts-based and collaborative research methods* (pp. 265–280). Nova Science Publishers.
- Noddings, N. (2003). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). University of California Press.
- Pagaling, R., Eaton, S. E., & McDermott, B. (2022). *Academic integrity: Considerations for accessibility, equity, and inclusion*. Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning Research & Publications. <http://hdl.handle.net/1880/114519>
- Rowe, N. (2023, August 2). ‘It’s destroyed me completely’: Kenyan moderators decry toll of training of AI models. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/aug/02/ai-chatbot-training-human-toll-content-moderator-meta-openai>
- Shaikh, S. (2023, December 4). Seeing AI app launches on android—including new and updated features and new languages. *Microsoft Accessibility Blog*. <https://blogs.microsoft.com/accessibility/seeing-ai-app-launches-on-android-including-new-and-updated-features-and-new-languages/>
- Shalaby, C. (2021). Imagining “classroom management” as an abolitionist project. In the Education for Liberation Network & Critical Resistance Editorial Collective (Eds.), *Lessons in liberation: An abolitionist toolkit for educators* (pp. 104–112). AK Press.
- Siau, K., & Wang, W. (2020). Artificial Intelligence (AI) Ethics: Ethics of AI and Ethical AI. *Journal of Database Management*, 31(2), 74–87. <https://doi.org/10.4018/JDM.2020040105>
- Sins Invalid. (2019). *Skin, tooth and bone—the basis of movement is our people: A disability justice primer* (2nd ed.). Sins Invalid.
- Smith, P., & Smith, L. (2021). Artificial intelligence and disability: Too much promise, yet too little substance? *AI Ethics*, 1, 81–86. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-020-00004-5>
- Strommel, J. [@Jessifer]. (2016, April 30). *Start by trusting students. #4wordpedagogy* [Tweet]. Twitter. <https://twitter.com/Jessifer/status/726424167420145664>
- Strommel, J. (2023). *Undoing the grade: Why we grade, and how to stop*. Hybrid Pedagogy Books.
- Sweetman, R., & Djerbal, Y. (2023, May 25). *ChatGPT? We need to talk about LLMs*. University Affairs. <https://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/in-my-opinion/chatgpt-we-need-to-talk-about-llms/>

- Sullivan, M., Kelly, A., & McLaughlan, P. (2023). ChatGPT in higher education: Considerations for academic integrity and student learning. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 6(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.17>
- Tuck, E. (2018). Biting the university that feeds us. In M. Spooner, & J. McNinch (Eds.), *Dissident knowledge in higher education* (pp. 157). University of Regina Press.
- Venkit, P. N., & Wilson, S. (2021). *Identification of bias against people with disabilities in sentiment analysis and toxicity detection models*. arXiv.org. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.13259>
- Villarroel, V., Bloxham, S., Bruna, D., Bruna, C., & Herrera-Seda, C. (2018). Authentic assessment: Creating a blueprint for course design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(5), 840–854. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1412396>
- Wenger, E. (n.d.). *Cultivating communities of practice: A quick startup guide*. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1v6W9CxyGkentCD9aJ9yzp2pSK2mFzOsa/view>
- York University. (n.d.). *Land Acknowledgment*. York University, Faculty of Liberal Arts & Professional Studies. Retrieved from <https://www.yorku.ca/laps/land-acknowledgement/>

How to cite this article: Jafry, A., & Vorstermans, J. (2024). Evolving intersections: AI, disability, and academic integrity in higher education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20629>

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Azeezah Jafry is a graduate student in the Inclusive Design program at OCAD University.

Jessica Vorstermans is an assistant professor in Critical Disability Studies at York University, School of Health Policy & Management.