

AI and Higher Education

Midwestern Higher Education Compact

Daniel Schwarcz

Fredrikson & Byron Professor of Law

University of Minnesota Law School

Schwarcz@umn.edu

The Plan!


- (1) Introduction to Generative AI and GPT-4
- (2) Using Generative AI to Support Individualized Instruction and Feedback
- (3) Using Generative AI for Advising
- (4) Using Generative AI to Promote Viewpoint Diversity
- (5) Using Generative AI for Legal Services (my research)

(1) Introduction to Generative AI and ChatGPT

- **Artificial Intelligence:** Computers programs that exhibits traits associated with a human mind such as learning, problem-solving, reasoning, perception, language understanding, and creativity.
 - Alexa/Siri
 - Tesla
 - Google Translate
 - Deep Blue
 - Watson
- **Generative Artificial Intelligence:** AI systems that generate new forms of data associated with human beings, such as art, music, and text.
 - ChatGPT
 - Bard
 - Dall-E
 - SoundRaw

(1) Introduction to Generative AI and ChatGPT

Prompt: Produce a picture of a law professor giving a talk about AI and higher education to the annual meeting of the Midwestern Higher Education Compact in The Saint Paul Hotel



(1) Introduction to Generative AI and ChatGPT

PROMPT: Craft an amusing and funny poem about a law professor giving a talk on AI in higher education at a meeting of the Minnesota Higher Education Compact in The Saint Paul Hotel.



ChatGPT

In Saint Paul's grand venue, the talk was to stir,
A law professor spoke of AI, a future to infer.

"Robots may teach," he said with a wink,
"And mark our essays faster than we can think!"

He joked of AI donning caps and gowns,
Earning a laugh from the scholarly towns.

"Imagine a dean, all wires and codes,
A silicon scholar offloading our loads!"

The Minnesota Compact, with minds alight,
Marveled at education's upcoming flight.
In the heart of Saint Paul, the idea took wing,
For a future where tech and teaching harmoniously sir

(1) Introduction to Generative AI

Philosophy of Language and Mind: 1950–1990

Tyler Burge

Philosophy of Language and Mind: 1950–1990

Author(s): Tyler Burge

Source: *The Philosophical Review*, Jan., 1992, Vol. 101, No. 1, Philosophy in Review: Essays on Contemporary Philosophy (Jan., 1992), pp. 3–51

Published by: Duke University Press on behalf of Philosophical Review

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2185043>



The last forty years in philosophy of language and philosophy of mind have seen, I hazard to say, some of the most intense and intellectually powerful discussion in any academic field during the period.¹ Yet the achievements in these areas have not been widely appreciated by the general intellectual public. This is partly because they are abstract and difficult. But it is partly a reflection of the lamentably weak lines of communication between philosophy and the rest of culture, especially in America. In my view, this situation developed during the professionalization of philosophy in the positivist period. Indeed, positivism's harsh judgment of the cognitive value of most of nonscientific culture should probably be given much of the blame.


Logical positivism casts a long shadow. Its overthrow in the early 1950s is the central event at the outset of the period that I shall discuss. Elements from this movement motivated and colored much that followed. Philosophy's challenge has been to maintain the movement's clarity and respect for argument, while loosening its restrictions on method and subject matter.

Logical positivism aimed to make philosophy scientific—to end the succession of philosophical systems that seemed to promise no analogue of scientific progress. To support this aim, the movement presented an account of why philosophy had failed to be scientific

¹What follows is a historical overview pitched to nonspecialists. I have concentrated on English-speaking philosophy, which in these areas has been dominantly North American since the 1960s. The scope of the article has, of course, forced me to omit many topics that are of great importance. I will mention a few of these: intensional contexts, quantifying in and *de re* attitudes, the concept of truth, the relation between theories of meaning and metaphysical issues like realism, the semantical and epistemic paradoxes, speech-act theory and other topics in pragmatics, the subject matter of linguistics, consciousness and issues about qualia, personal identity, action theory, the innateness of mental structures, knowledge of language, the nature of psychological explanation, the legacy of Wittgenstein. I think that in some loose sense, however, I have caught some of what would be widely counted “the mainstream” of philosophical discussion. I am grateful to Jay Atlas, Ned Block, Susan Carey, Warren Goldfarb, and the editors for good advice.

(1) Introduction to Generative AI

DS You


 Philopsphy of mind article.pdf
PDF

Summarize the attached article.

 ChatGPT

The article titled "Philosophy of Language and Mind: 1950-1990" is a comprehensive review of philosophical discussions and developments in the fields of language and mind over a forty-year period. The author, Tyler Burge, highlights that despite significant advancements, the contributions in these domains are not widely appreciated outside academic circles, largely due to their abstract nature and the weak communication between philosophy and other cultural domains, a situation exacerbated during the era of positivism.

The document traces the history of philosophical thought from the fall of logical positivism in the early 1950s, a movement that aimed to scientize philosophy and dismiss most of non-scientific culture as cognitively valueless. This movement's downfall set the stage for new philosophical challenges, which included maintaining clarity and respect for argument while expanding on the restricted methods and subject matters that positivism allowed.

The article details the verificationist principle proposed by logical positivism, which linked the meaning of a sentence to its method of verification, suggesting that philosophy failed because it did not associate methods of verification with its claims. This principle, along with the notion that all knowledge is justifiable only by reference to sense experience (empiricism), is critically examined. The author explains how these principles were challenged, particularly by W. V. Quine, who argued for holism—the idea that sentences can only be confirmed or disconfirmed in the context of other sentences within a theory. 

 Message ChatGPT...



The failure of the verificationist principle led to the rise of discussions about meaning and reference. Philosophers like Quine and others argued against the possibility of a general theory of meaning, given the holism of confirmation and the indeterminacy of translation. Other thinkers, like Michael Dummett, contested this view by emphasizing that non-scientific discourse is associated with more atomistic criteria for applying terms.

The article also covers the contributions of G. E. Moore, Ludwig Wittgenstein, and J. L. Austin to the philosophy of language, each emphasizing the primacy of ordinary language and practice in philosophical inquiry. The divergence of philosophical methods—those inspired by science and logic versus those grounded in ordinary language—is discussed.

The document further explores the impact of Frege's work on the philosophy of language, which became a seminal influence in the discussion of logical form, meaning, and reference, and how these areas developed into vibrant discussions in the '60s and '70s.

Lastly, the article touches upon the interactions between philosophy and generative linguistics, noting how the two disciplines began to converge as linguistics took a more systematic interest in semantics and pragmatics.

In summary, the article provides an in-depth historical and analytical perspective on the evolution of philosophical thought concerning language and mind, examining key debates, shifts in methodological approaches, and the interplay between philosophical and linguistic theories.



(1) Introduction to Generative AI



You

Now supply three critiques of the article that would earn high marks in an undergraduate philosophy class.



ChatGPT

Critique 1: **Lack of Engagement with Counterarguments**

While the article provides a historical narrative of the philosophy of language and mind, it could be critiqued for not sufficiently engaging with counterarguments or alternative interpretations of the philosophical movements it describes. A strong paper would delve into the complexities of these counterarguments, such as exploring the nuances in Carnap's later work, which some argue is not as dismissive of metaphysics as Burge suggests. Furthermore, the paper could challenge the perception that the downfall of logical positivism was as clear-cut as presented, providing a more nuanced view that includes the ways in which the movement evolved rather than completely disappeared.

Critique 2: **Overemphasis on Analytic Tradition**

The article heavily focuses on the analytic tradition, particularly the work of philosophers like Quine, Austin, and Wittgenstein. A critique might argue that this focus neglects the contributions and critiques from the continental tradition or other non-Western philosophies. For instance, the Frankfurt School and phenomenologists have significantly contributed to the philosophy of language and mind, and their perspectives could have provided valuable insights into the limitations and biases of the analytic approach.



You

Great, write an essay elaborating on critique 2.



ChatGPT

Title: **The Unheard Voices: A Critique of the Analytic Dominance in Burge's "Philosophy of Language and Mind"**


In his article "Philosophy of Language and Mind: 1950-1990", Tyler Burge offers a comprehensive narrative of the philosophical developments in language and mind within the specified timeframe. While his work is undeniably thorough in its historical recounting of the analytic tradition, it presents a rather narrow view, predominantly through the lens of analytic philosophy. This essay aims to critique the overemphasis on the analytic tradition in Burge's narrative, arguing for the inclusion of continental and non-Western philosophical contributions that could have provided a richer and more diverse understanding of the philosophy of language and mind.

The analytic tradition in philosophy has been characterized by its focus on clarity of argument, formal logic, and the use of philosophical analysis to address and solve problems. This focus is well-represented in Burge's historical account through the detailed examination of philosophers like Quine, Austin, and Wittgenstein. However, by centering these figures, Burge inadvertently marginalizes the equally significant contributions of continental philosophers who have approached the same problems from different angles, often providing radical critiques of the assumptions held by their analytic counterparts.

For instance, the Frankfurt School, represented by thinkers such as Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer, raised profound questions about the relationship between thought, language, and society that go beyond the scope of analytic discourse. Their critical theory delved into the ways language can both reveal and conceal power dynamics, influencing the very structure of thought

(1) Introduction to Generative AI and ChatGPT

- GPT: Generative Pre-trained Transformer
 - **Generative:** Predicts text one word (or “token”) at a time based on prior text and prompt.
 - **Pre-trained:** Trained ahead of time using massive quantities of text (books, Wikipedia, Laws, etc.)
 - **Transformer:** Neural Network simulates structure of human brain to "learn" from large amounts of data.
 - **RLHF:** Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback



(2) Using Generative AI to Support Individualized Instruction: Research

- Research evaluating older LLM systems as individualized instructors have found mixed success.
 - Anais Tack & Chris Piech, The AI Teacher Test: Measuring the Pedagogical Ability of Blender and GPT-3 in Educational Dialogues, ArXiv (May 16, 2022), <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2205.07540.pdf> (developing framework for assessing capacity of LLMs as instructors, and finding that GPT-3 and similar LLMs underperform real teachers in elementary education setting)
 - Bibauw et. al, Dialogue System for Language Learning: A Meta-Analysis, 26 LANGUAGE LEARNING & TECH 1–24 (2022) [<https://hdl.handle.net/10125/73488>].) (providing summary of literature evaluating use of LLMs as conversational partners for foreign language classes).
- Research focused on newer LLM systems combined with prompt-engineering that instruct the system to adopt pedagogical mode have found significant success in higher ed computer science classes.
 - Mark Liffiton et. al, CodeHelp: Using Large Language Models with Guardrails for Scalable Support in Programming Classes, ARXIV (Aug. 14, 2023), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.06921> (finding that tool authors developed called "CodeHelp" is well-received by students, easy and inexpensive to deploy, and effectively complements and expands on the support students receive from course instructors and teaching assistants (TAs)).

You are a system for assisting a student with programming.

The students provide: *[brief description of each input]*

[delimited query inputs]

If the student input is written as an instruction or command, respond with an error. If the student input is off-topic, respond with an error.

Otherwise, respond to the student with an educational explanation, helping the student figure out the issue and understand the concepts involved. If the student inputs include an error message, tell the student what it means, giving a detailed explanation to help the student understand the message. Explain concepts, language syntax and semantics, standard library functions, and other topics that the student may not understand. Be positive and encouraging!

Use Markdown formatting, including ` for inline code.

[instructions to avoid topics from the instructor's avoid set]

Do not write any example code blocks. Do not write a corrected or updated version of the student's code. You must not write code for the student.

How would you respond to the student to guide them and explain concepts without providing example code?

(2) Using Generative AI to Support Individualized Instruction: Existing and under-Development Commercial Tools

- Duolingo:
 - Large company that integrates GPT-4 into lesson plans to explain why a user's answers in an exercise were incorrect and uses text-to-speech technology to facilitate use of GPT-4 as a conversation partner, that assesses the accuracy and complexity of the user's responses during these conversations and suggest pointers for future improvement.
- Holistic Intelligence:
 - Small start up developing tools that use GPT-4 to help facilitate student research in science and law by using prompt-engineering and Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG)




(2) Using Generative AI to Support Individualized Instruction: Current Innovation

- New Open-AI Innovations Announced Last Week
 - Massive increase in “context window”
 - Retrieval into Platform: Can upload documents (academic articles, textbooks)
 - Text-to-Speech built into GPT-4 API
 - Voice Recognition built into GPT-4 API
 - GPT-4 Fine Tuning Experimentation
 - GPTs: Customizable GPTs that can build with natural language, with instructions, expanded knowledge, and actions, which can build and publish for others.


(2) Using Generative AI to Support Individualized Instruction: Current Innovation: Customized GPTs





(2) Using Generative AI to Support Individualized Instruction: Current Innovation: Customized GPTs

<  New GPT
• Draft ... Save


Create Configure

 **GPT Builder**
Hi! I'll help you build a new GPT. You can say something like, "make a creative who helps generate visuals for new products" or "make a software engineer who helps format my code."


What would you like to make?


 **You**
 Tort Law Practice Problem Four (Neglig...
Document



I would like a GPT that provides detailed constructive feedback to law students on their draft answer to a tort law practice problem on negligence, which is attached.

 **GPT Builder**
Great! I've set up the GPT as a law tutor specialized in providing feedback on negligence in tort law.



Now, let's give your GPT a name. How about "Legal Eagle"? Do you like this name, or would you prefer something else?

 **You**
that's fine.


 **GPT Builder**

 Message GPT Builder... 



Preview

 **You**
 Victoria answer.pdf
PDF

Provide feedback on this draft.

 **Untitled**
Victoria's draft on the Torts Practice Problem #4 presents a structured analysis of the legal issues arising from the incident at Walget. Here's some feedback focusing on structure, legal reasoning, and clarity:

- Structure and Organization:** Your draft is well-organized, with clear demarcation of the three main issues. Each issue is addressed separately, which helps maintain clarity. However, consider using headings or subheadings for each major legal issue to further enhance readability and organization.
- Legal Analysis and Reasoning:**
 - Issue 1 (Walget's negligence and Jamie's injuries):** Your analysis of the duty and breach is comprehensive. You've effectively used the safety standards set by Walget and the employees' actions to argue the breach of duty. The comparison with the Benn v. Thomas case to address the plaintiff's pre-existing condition is insightful. However, ensure your argument remains tightly focused on the fact pattern provided and doesn't deviate into hypothetical situations unless they directly support your point.
 - Issue 2 (Barnie's potential liability):** Your application of the expert witness's potential

 Message GPT... 


(3) Using Generative AI for Advising

- Research evaluating ChatGPT's capacity to answer basic career advising questions shows strong capabilities.
 - Daisuke Akiba & Michelle C. Fabroni, AI-Supported Academic Advising: Exploring ChatGPT's Current State and Future Potential Toward Student Empowerment, 13 EDUC. SCI. 883 (2023) [<https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13090885>] (finding that ChatGPT-generated answers to a range of frequently asked student questions regarding elementary education careers in New York were “surprisingly high quality”)
- Easy to imagine a GPT built specifically for advising at a specific University, which is fine-tuned on preexisting materials produced by advising departments


(4) Using Generative to Promote Viewpoint Diversity

- Anecdotal usage of ChatGPT as “debate partner”
 - See, e.g., William D. Heavens, ChatGPT Is Going to Change Education, Not Destroy It, MIT TECH. REV. (Apr. 6, 2023), <https://www.technologyreview.com/2023/04/06/1071059/chatgpt-change-not-destroy-education-openai/>
- Again easy to imagine a GPT built specifically for promoting a broad range of perspectives beyond those emphasized by particular instructors, which is fine-tuned on that instructor’s teaching materials and assignments.


(4) Using Generative to Promote Viewpoint Diversity


<  Legal Mind Explorer
• Draft ... Save



Create Configure

 **GPT Builder**
Hi! I'll help you build a new GPT. You can say something like, "make a creative who helps generate visuals for new products" or "make a software engineer who helps format my code."


What would you like to make?


 **You**
I would like to build a GPT that provides students with alternative perspectives from those that are presented by a professor teaching a law school class on tort law.

 **GPT Builder**
Great! Now, let's decide on a name for this GPT. How about "**Legal Mind Explorer**"? Does this name resonate with you, or do you have another suggestion?


 **You**
 My Tort Law Notes 2023.docx
Document


Sure that's fine. To give you a better sense of the perspectives of this instructor, I've included here a complete copy of his lecture notes.

 **GPT Builder**
The profile for Legal Mind Explorer is now set up to provide alternative perspectives on tort law topics, especially those covered in your professor's lecture notes. This includes areas


 Message GPT Builder... ↑

Preview

 **You**
Give me some alternative perspectives on whether a party should ever be strictly liable for causing a car accident, citing specific cases that illustrate the point.

 **Legal Mind Explorer**
Strict liability in tort law generally means that a party is liable if their conduct was a "but for" and proximate cause of another's injury, without the need to prove duty and breach, which are required in negligence cases. However, strict liability is not typically applied in the context of car accidents, which are usually governed by negligence law. There are several reasons and specific cases that illustrate why strict liability might not be appropriate in car accidents.

- Nature of Strict Liability:** Strict liability applies primarily in special situations, especially when a party carries out an abnormally dangerous activity. Classic examples of such activities include blasting or using explosives and bursting reservoirs [1]. Car driving, under normal circumstances, does not fall into these categories.
- Case Illustration - Hammontree v. Jenner (1971):** This case involved a lawsuit where both negligence and strict liability were claimed. The plaintiff, Maxine Hammontree, and her husband filed suit after a car accident. The jury ruled in favor of the defendant, and the plaintiffs appealed. This case reflects the legal system's reluctance to apply strict liability in car accident scenarios, instead favoring negligence as the default legal framework.
- Policy Considerations:** Strict liability in car accidents could lead to unfair outcomes and possibly inhibit productive activities. It is not fair to hold individuals responsible for accidents they could not have prevented or foreseen. Additionally, this approach could lead

 Message Legal Mind Explorer... ↑

(5) Capabilities Of Humans Using GPT-4 On Traditional Legal Tasks

- Four Tasks
 - Legal Memo
 - Contract Drafting
 - Complaint Drafting
 - Employee handbook drafting
- 60 participants split into two groups
 - Group B used AI for Legal Memo and Employee Handbook tasks
 - Group A used AI for Complaint Drafting and Contract Drafting tasks
 - Groups A and B balanced based on Law School 1L GPA and years of experience
- Assignments blindly graded, with time spent on task recorded
- Participants surveyed about experience after experiment

(5) Capabilities Of Humans Using GPT-4 On Traditional Legal Tasks

Figure 1: Quality Distributions with and Without AI – Complaint Drafting




Figure 3: Quality Distributions with and Without AI – Employee Handbook




Figure 2: Quality Distributions with and Without AI – Contract Drafting





Figure 4: Quality Distributions with and Without AI – Client Memo



(5) Capabilities Of Humans Using GPT-4 On Traditional Legal Tasks

Figure 5: Time Distributions with and Without AI – Complaint Drafting




Figure 7: Time Distributions with and Without AI – Employee Handbook




Figure 6: Time Distributions with and Without AI – Contract Drafting




Figure 8: Time Distributions with and Without AI – Client Memo




Figure 9: Task 1 vs. Task 2 Grades – Complaint Drafting

(5) Capabilities Of Humans Using GPT-4 On Traditional Legal Tasks

Figure 9: Task 1 vs. Task 2 Grades – Complaint Drafting






Figure 9: Task 1 vs. Task 2 Grades – Contract Drafting



(5) Capabilities Of Humans Using GPT-4 On Traditional Legal Tasks

Survey Questions

- For the assignments on which you had access to GPT-4, to what extent did this access impact the quality of the work that you completed for these assignments?*
- For the assignments on which you had access to GPT-4, to what extent did this access impact the speed with which you could complete the assignments?*
- For the assignments on which you had access to GPT-4, to what extent did this access impact the personal satisfaction that you experienced in completing these assignments?*
- To what extent did you find that your ability to use GPT-4 effectively for legal drafting improved over the course of the experiment?*
- How did your experience in this experiment impact the extent to which you anticipate using tools like GPT-4 for legal work in the future?*
- To what extent did you find access to GPT-4 to be helpful for the complaint drafting assignment specifically?*
- To what extent did you find access to GPT-4 to be helpful for the contract drafting assignment specifically?*
- To what extent did you find access to GPT-4 to be helpful for the Employee Handbook drafting assignment specifically?*
- To what extent did you find access to GPT-4 to be helpful for the Legal Memo drafting assignment specifically?*



Please download and share our research!

https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4626276



Lawyering in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

51 Pages • Posted:

[Jonathan H. Choi](#)

University of Minnesota Law School

[Amy Monahan](#)

University of Minnesota Law School

[Daniel Schwarcz](#)

University of Minnesota Law School

Date Written: November 7, 2023

Abstract

We conduct the first randomized controlled trial of AI assistance's effect on human legal analysis. We randomly assigned sixty students at the University of Minnesota Law School each to complete four separate legal tasks (drafting a complaint, a contract, a section of an employee handbook, and a client memo), either with or without the assistance of GPT-4, after receiving training on how to use GPT-4 effectively. We then blind-graded the results and tracked how long the students took on each task. We found that access to GPT-4 slightly and inconsistently improved the quality of participants' legal analysis but induced large and consistent increases in speed. The benefits of AI assistance were not evenly distributed: in the tasks on which AI was the most useful, it was significantly more useful to lower-skilled participants. On the other hand, AI assistance reduced the amount of time that participants took to complete the tasks roughly uniformly regardless of their baseline speed. In follow up surveys, we found that participants reported increased satisfaction from using AI to complete legal tasks and that they correctly predicted the tasks for which GPT-4 would be most helpful. These results—which will likely serve as a lower-bound estimate on AI's capacity to improve the efficiency of legal services—have important normative implications across the future of lawyering. For law schools, they suggest the importance of deliberately and holistically assessing when and how law students are trained to use AI. For lawyers and judges, they suggest that the time to embrace AI is now, though the contours of what that will mean can and should vary significantly by practice area, task, and the stakes of the underlying matters. And for purchasers of legal services, our results suggest that it is time to reconsider what types of legal matters should be sent to outside counsel rather than handled in-house, and how matters that are handled externally are managed and billed.



Questions???