

SENATE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE DISCUSSION
Tuesday, April 2, 2024
Hybrid - POD 250 and Zoom Video Conference

5:00 p.m. Committee of the Whole Discussion: Ethics and Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) in Higher Education

The Vice Chair of Senate, K. Metersky, chaired this section of the meeting.

Opening Remarks – Vice-Chair of Senate, K. Metersky

Good evening. I have the distinct pleasure of leading the committee of the whole discussion tonight. The topic for this evening is entitled [Ethics and Generative Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education](#). We will be joined by three (3) session leads, Dr. Sean Kheraj, Vice Provost Academic, Allyson Miller, Director of the Academic Integrity Office and Curtis Maloley, Director of Teaching Development and Digital Learning. Their presentation will start with an overview of generative artificial intelligence and ethical considerations. Then ethical considerations will be provided for three groups: students, instructors, and researchers. At this point in their presentation we would like to refrain the audience from asking any questions. We will dedicate time at the end of the committee of the whole discussion for thoughts, questions, and reflective thoughts. Over to you, Sean and team.

Dr. Sean Kheraj, Vice-Provost Academic

Thank you, Kateryna, and thanks everybody. I always enjoy these committee of the whole discussions. We're gonna be talking about ethics and generative artificial intelligence in higher education. What we're trying to do in the presentation here is to just set up some of the key issues that have emerged over the past year that we've heard from members of our own community as well as across the sector, and then have an opportunity to break out into smaller groups to have some more specified conversations about three community member types that we've identified having discrete and sometimes unique ethical considerations: students, instructors and researchers. On the next slide, you'll see the agenda for the presentation here and for the whole discussion. We'll start with a general overview of the technology and some of the broader ethical considerations and then focus in on students, instructors and researchers, move into the breakouts, and then we'll have time for a full group discussion and debrief towards the end of the session. I'll turn things over to Allyson to lead us through a bit of an overview of generative, artificial intelligence and ethical considerations.

Allyson Miller, Director, Academic Integrity Office

Hello, everybody. Most of you have probably already heard me talk on this topic many times. So just kind of setting the context for the technology. In November 2022 ChatGPT hit the waves and when it first came out, everybody was really impressed with it, and also quite confident that it was kind of too ignorant to be much of a threat. It did grammatically immaculate work but it was very often inaccurate, didn't connect to the Internet, there were all kinds of problems with it and so we were not quite as concerned. And then now we have GPT-4, which is significantly more powerful. It has larger context windows. So what that means is you can upload several articles and ask it to synthesize those articles. It has file upload ability, you can do Bespoke DIY bots within five minutes. It's connected to the internet, it makes images, and makes videos. You can actually have a conversation with it if you have the app. There are a multitude of other models that are out there that are referenced on the slide. But the main thing to note is just the massive spike in how things have evolved.

Next slide please. This is just an illustration of what happened when I asked Dall-E in January 2023 to give me a picture of a robot writing an essay on a computer. Note the literalness of the image, and on the right, when I asked it in March 2024 for the same, with the same prompt what image was generated.

Dr. Sean Kheraj, Vice-Provost Academic

On the next slide, we've identified some key, broad ethical considerations that actually touch all of the different groups that we're going to talk about today. So we wanted to highlight them off the top. One of the concerns that you may have heard about in terms of the use of a large language model as a generative artificial intelligence tool is bias in training data. So large language models are trained on enormous corpuses of text that are scraped from the internet as well as other digital sources. And the probability model that's used for the output that comes out of a large language model is based on that ingestion of textual data. And so it can inherit any bias that exists within the data. We do in the teaching center caution students and instructors about this potential in terms of the use of large language models in generative AI. This is also true in generative AI that creates images and video as well. You may have seen in the news examples of image generation tools exhibiting bias when you ask for things like a picture of a professor and the kind of person that it will represent as a professor will be reflective of the training data and any bias that's in the training data. Another ethical consideration and concern to highlight is sort of, colloquially called "hallucinations", which are essentially errors. It is actually inaccurate information that a generative AI tool could produce which could lead to the proliferation of misinformation or incorrect information. So it's a low scale risk for an individual who might engage in some sort of embarrassment of presenting inaccurate information to a very high scale risk of perpetuating misinformation or false information. A third concern or ethical consideration to consider is the data, privacy, and intellectual property implications of generative artificial intelligence. For many of the tools that Allyson referenced on the slide, including ChatGPT, Google Gemini, Microsoft's Copilot, they will train the model on any data that gets inputted into it. So the questions that you ask, the text that you paste into a generative artificial intelligence tool can be used for training the model, and in some instances that text could appear in the output of another user. So, if you aren't the owner of the intellectual property that is being submitted to the model and if there are any data, privacy restrictions on the data that you're putting into it, you could be in breach of data privacy rules or intellectual property rules. There are also adverse environmental effects to consider. There's a high level of energy consumption used for the data centers both in the training of large language models as well as the operating of them.

There are also labor considerations and concerns about employment dislocation through the adoption of generative AI and automation of work. There are concerns about the privatization of the knowledge commons, as most of the tools that are being developed are controlled by a very small number of companies. There's maybe about three to four companies that are prominent in this field. So there's some concerns there. And then finally, there's concerns about equity of access. If these tools become essential to a knowledge economy, they have a cost associated with them, and that could lead to a new version of the digital divide in terms of who has access to these tools. And then we'll start to talk about this when we're thinking about students and instructors and researchers of how that equity of access may affect our community in the future. We'll go back to Allyson to talk about the ethical considerations for students.

Allyson Miller, Director, Academic Integrity Office

Next slide, please. So there are actually good things about this technology for students and I think maybe instructors sometimes forget that because they're so worried, and I understand why they're worried. There's some really good opportunities for students in terms of improving their learning with this technology. I mentioned that you could do these Bespoke Bots, you know you can create your own DIY bot. Well, students could create one for a course and really improve their mastery of the material by using this kind of technology to learn. The idea here is that we need to be training students to use it to upskill, not to deskill. So having the bot teach them something, not do something for them. It can really promote active reading. So we've always been asking students to do this, to be active readers, not passive consumers of information. They can engage in a conversation with a text in a way they never could before by uploading that, and actually having a conversation about it. And then they can also create study guides, they can do sample problems, things that can help them get better in their subject matter.

Next slide, please. Obviously, there are lots of ethical concerns over students using this technology. I can say just where we're at right now in the AIO cases are up 33% from last year, and the cases are vastly under reported, and vastly under reported of unauthorized use of AI. We're cresting over peak covid numbers. So academic integrity is a huge issue when it comes to this technology. And then it's worth mentioning that students have concerns about it too. They're excited about how it can lighten their workload, and sometimes not in good ways, but they also have some anxiety, there's some early research. They're worried about what this means for the jobs that they're training for right now. They're worried about the accuracy of the information because they know that it's prone to hallucinations. They do have concerns about privacy. They have concerns about deskilling themselves. It's hard to make those good decisions in crisis moments, like to actually do the hard thing when an assignment is due in an hour. They perceive an unclear policy; I don't think we have an unclear policy, but they perceive an unclear policy at the institutional level in terms of this kind of technology. Also, informed consent, so something to be thinking about. Students should be able to opt out of the technology if they're uncomfortable with it. If instructors are bringing it into the classroom students may actually have ethical concerns about engaging with it. I want to mention and I couldn't even put bullet points under this, but I think there's something to this idea of students using this technology and it damaging the relationship that they should be building with their instructor, as kind of like this in this learning environment. And I just want to put it out there, and then as well, there is, of course, equity of access. If we start using this technology in the classroom, authorized or unauthorized, people who can afford to pay for the model are going to produce better results than the students who can't. And especially if we're mandating use of this. This really disadvantages people who can't afford it.

Dr. Curtis Maloley, Director, Teaching Development and Digital Learning

Okay, we'll jump ahead to the ethical considerations for instructors, and you'll notice there's quite a bit of overlap but I wanted to just draw your attention to the image that we put into the slides. That is a picture from a website called, Contact North. They are an Ontario based distance education network that are connected with all of the different colleges and universities and they are funded by the Ministry of Training Colleges and Universities. So it's publicly funded, not for profit. And you'll notice that the tools they are advertising are AI teaching assistant tools. We've had a chance to play around with these, and they're pretty remarkable. You can create in seconds multiple choice tests for your courses. I did a little experiment with one of my colleagues who is teaching a fourth year cognitive semiotics class, and within seconds we had created the outcomes for the class, the course description, all 12 weeks, and we started to build lesson plans. So there are quite a few potential ethical issues obviously around that.

I'll start with the one at the bottom. If we look at the different collective agreements for TA/GAs, contract lecturers and faculty, a lot of the duties that are in those collective agreements are things that now AI can do in seconds, so definitely some ethical considerations there for us. The first one, quality assurance, I think, is maybe the most pressing one, and will be more pressing than we realize really, really, quickly. The program level outcomes, the kinds of skills and competencies that students need to gain in their programs, AI is a pretty big game changer for that. So one of the things that we're doing a lot of thinking about already is how to support programs to assess the impact of GAI on their field of study. So we can really be thinking about, you know, through the PPR process, but also, perhaps sooner, how we can be addressing what students are actually doing with the content that they're learning in their classes. The role for a professor doesn't change, they are still the subject matter expert. But what we have students do with that subject matter in particular with assessment is probably going to have to change radically. So you know this is a huge consideration that will have many different potential ethical considerations. And tied to that, I don't have it on here but I would have added professional development as being something that I think will carry some type of ethical consideration. You'll all remember, during the pandemic, that the CELT did a lot of work around supporting faculty to get online very quickly and to teach their courses remotely. I think that there's going to be a need for ongoing and continuous professional development around AI literacy for faculty and TA/GAs, for staff across the university and for students. We're really thinking about how to do that at a program specific and faculty specific level as opposed to at a macro level. So that we can tie those questions into the larger program level outcomes and things like that. So quite a few things around professional development and quality assurance go together. Sean mentioned intellectual property, that's a significant one, both for faculty and all their materials. I know in the collective agreement for contract lecturers it talks about their teaching materials. You know, those are things that if a student wants to plug into one of these AI models they can do a lot of fun stuff with. So there's considerations there, there's considerations on the other side as Allyson mentioned about what we do with students' work as well.

And tied to that, duties and responsibilities, the work labor and employment relations. If we go to the next slide I've brought up one very specific one that is already emerging in all kinds of literature, and that is around specifically marking and feedback. With the latest models you can upload huge documents and do analysis of those documents. There are already different vendors that are trying to sell us AI generated writing support and things like that. I know certainly there are instructors that teach, you know, upwards of a thousand students in a semester and you know, we need to be thinking at a policy level about what we can put into these models and what responsibilities instructors have around data, privacy and protection which we've highlighted here. But maybe most importantly, because, as Allyson said, there are a lot of wonderful opportunities for feedback with these technologies. Making sure that we're transparent with students, if and when these technologies are used, that they have options to opt out of those technologies, and that professors have options to opt out of the technologies. There is going to be a lot of policy considerations there. And then certainly, as Sean mentioned as well, bias and accuracy. Even if this was used to give feedback and for grading, there's already research coming out that there are biased outputs, things even around English as additional language learners. So those are things to be considered, and certainly to Allyson's point earlier, the student experience. That relationship with the professor, the mentorship. I know some of us teach huge classes, and that can be challenging. But when we think about what students are coming here for, and how we leverage that technology in a way that enhances the student experience as opposed to takes away from it, I think those are, you know, certainly the highest level considerations for us right now.

Dr. Sean Kheraj, Vice-Provost Academic

So let's highlight some of the ethical considerations for researchers, move on to the next slide. Many of you may have seen this in TorontoMet today this week. This is about one of our own researchers who uses AI in their research. Our research team, led by April Khademi, our Canada research chair in AI for medical imaging is making extraordinary breakthroughs in the diagnosis of breast cancer, using artificial intelligence and medical imaging to make better diagnoses. This is one of many examples of the way in which artificial intelligence tools are changing the way we do research at TMU and across the sector.

Next slide, please. So there are exciting possibilities with this technology, particularly around the analysis of large data sets. One of the things that large language models are very good at doing, is reading large corpuses of text, and then identifying patterns and trends within that body of text, including corpuses of text that are too large for a single person or even a team of people to read. So for myself, as a historical researcher, I can maybe read through seven volumes of a Royal Commissions Report before falling over and going into convulsions of going through so much. An AI large language model can summarize and index those volumes for me within seconds and vastly accelerate my ability to process large amounts of data. It's also quite good at statistical analysis and visualization of data. Again, identifying trends in large data sets that are difficult for people to identify individually through close reading. And then for data scientists and researchers, there's early indications of strong potential for large language models for identifying and reviewing data quality for doing quality assurance and identifying mistakes and errors and data as well as mistakes in code. There are a range of automation of tasks, research tasks that could be facilitated through the use of generative AI, including creating summary notes on large documents, labeling and indexing documents, literature reviews, transcription of audio, optical character recognition even of handwritten text, image recognition and writing code.

Then on the next slide, this is my example of a publication identifying some of the ethical concerns. So this is one of many examples that have come up for the last year of peer reviewed published research that was clearly written with the use of a large language model. So you can see in the first sentence of this article that it reads, "Certainly here is a possible introduction for your topic", colon, and then it proceeds. This raises all kinds of questions about the quality of the publication, how this made it through a peer review, a copy editor, anybody looking at this. But it's a huge risk and a really significant challenge, I think for the research community. So again, there are data privacy and protection considerations to think about, anything that we're putting into a Gen AI tool could be at risk for violating a privacy agreement. For example, if you've got the transcriptions of oral interviews that you conducted with human subjects, it may not be permissible via your research ethics permission to actually use a generative AI model to synthesize the transcripts of those interviews. There are risks around bias and accuracy. As we said, there is prone to inaccuracies which could find their way into your research, so there's some caution to be considered there. And then of course, there's transparency and misrepresentation. So use of generative AI to write research findings is generally prohibited by most publications, or requires explicit transparency by those publications. And the Tri Council is still in the process of developing its advice and guidance on this, though they did strike an ad hoc generative AI panel of experts which we've linked to here, their report back to the Tri Council agencies. We'll expect within the year to get guidance, particularly around the permissible use of Gen AI for the writing of research grants and for the assessment of research grants. And I'll also close the section by saying that there's also a pretty good study on the use of generative AI in peer review as a significant problem in some research fields that they've discovered significant increases in the probability that peer

reviewers are using large language models to review papers submitted for conferences and publication. And then I also wanted to point out our own responsible artificial intelligence initiative which is an NSERC funded initiative here to support training of highly qualified personnel in ethical uses of generative artificial intelligence across a variety of sectors. And then, finally, ethical consideration. Allyson always reminds me that reproducibility is really challenging with generative AI, because it can produce an infinite number of different possible outcomes. It's very difficult to reproduce the outcomes that you generated through a large language model.

So that is a quick rundown of scary things and exciting things to think about.

Breakout Rooms

We want to break everyone out into smaller groups, to have some conversations around the following three questions:

1. Under what conditions would it be appropriate for a student to use GAI tools for learning?
2. Under what conditions would it be appropriate for an instructor to use GAI tools for teaching?
3. Under what conditions would it be appropriate for a researcher to use GAI tools for research purposes?

We'll collect the [groups notes on the Google form](#) so that we can share it back with everybody so you can see what the discussion was, in each of the breakout groups.

I believe we'll now move towards setting up the breakout groups for the folks who are joining us online. And for those of you who are in the room with us today, we have four tables in the middle here that you may now take a place at each table, and we can talk about some of these ethical considerations.

Vice-Chair of Senate, K. Metersky

Thank you for engaging in this breakout room exercise. At this point in the session we would like to welcome any questions, thoughts and reflective comments. As we have approximately 15 minutes left for this part, I would like to start with one question, comment per attendee and once we are done with that round, if we have more time, I can open the space for any follow up questions from those who already had an opportunity to speak. I'm monitoring the room as well as the chat, if anyone wants to get us started with this hot topic

Donna Bell, Secretary of Senate

I know today was specifically about ethics, but if you have questions about artificial intelligence in general, this is also an opportunity to come forward.

C: This was about the discussion question about its appropriate use by instructors. Thanks for the pointer on the AI Tutor Pro. I was just trying it out where you can assess its knowledge by it asking you questions and you answering it, and then looking at how it marked you. So I thought, I'll try it on the topic I teach in physics right now, the momentum principle. So the first two were very good, and the third one is well, you're almost right but not quite, was the AI's response. And what that highlighted to me is the human aspects like you said. I have a particular view on this topic that's unique, I think, or is mine, and sort of you know what makes me who I am as an expert having this view and the AI view is much more generic, or produced by mass. So what it thinks is what a lot of beliefs are out there. There are nuances to this that I see that I want to teach my students, that is not there. So it sort of highlighted that aspect of that and as an instructor, we talked about using AI tools to generate content for our course that we would tailor. That would work, but I think it takes

away from sort of why we are professors and sort of what we bring in that's unique. And I think that's important for us to be aware of.

- A:** A. Miller - I was just going to say that one of the things that I personally worry about is the homogenization of the work that we do, because this is so very good at being generally correct that we're going to end up having everything look the same, everybody sound the same.
- C:** C. Maloley - Our keynote speaker at the Conference this year is Dr. Bonnie Stewart, who is an expert in this area. She refers to it as, "auto tune for knowledge" which I thought was an interesting way to think about it.
- C:** I've been on the NSERC Grants Committee for the last four years and AI is really picking up in my field. But you know it requires quite a bit for modeling, and also predicting many processes and products and the quality aspects. And it is really in the very early stage but many research proposals have been coming in on effective use of AI. It's really an upcoming field but it's not really proven yet, not at all, not yet.
- C:** S. Kheraj - Just a quick comment just to reinforce. Yes, it is a really important area of research. I was just one of the judges in our three minute thesis competition, and Carl was there hosting, and I think over half of the presentations were either using AI tools, analyzing artificial intelligence, assessing it and developing detectors for artificial intelligence.
- C:** We really talked about that balance that AI is here to stay and what can professors do to sort of model responsible use. So thinking about in a classroom, and I know you've talked about this Sean, in a classroom, a professor showing how they've used it to prepare their lecture and the pitfalls of worrying about plagiarism and being thoughtful about stealing somebody's ideas. What does it look like to credit appropriately, what does it look like to do extra research, what does it look like to get a guide of how you might structure something without copying and pasting. But really having professors model that you can use it responsibly and in a good way, because I think I have seen professors use it in a way that's quite, as you showed, can really advance the work without doing the work as you as you folks are talking about. So we really looked at that balance and the role of different entities on campus, including, you know, the VPFA is doing work now to train professors to help train students with the centre for excellence in learning and teaching, and you.
- C:** A question that I found interesting - under what conditions is it appropriate for an administrator or someone involved in governance, like we all are, to be using ChatGPT, or similar technologies. For example, as part of your presentation you showed that you could input a large volume of data yourself, and it can spit out an answer for you. It strikes me that Senate often does this large body of data stuff like periodic program reviews for example. Could you actually generate an output for a periodic program review and possibly have it reviewed by ChatGPT as well. Is that all a possibility, or are we just, you know, ethically precluded from doing things that everybody's going to be doing anyways? Thank you.
- A:** S. Kheraj - It's a great question. We left out administrative and governance uses from the discussion just for time, but it's another area for consideration. I think Allyson and Curtis heard me refer to this as the AI ouroboros once we start assessing AI generated work with AI tools. So really good questions to be asked. What are the ethics of using generative AI to write your self study for your PPR. What are the ethics of the peer reviewers using generative AI to synthesize the self study for their assessment of the program and then to write their assessment of the program. These get back some of the points Allyson just raised about homogenization of the

output, the authenticity or genuine interaction and analysis, and what gets lost in that. I think about the balance in terms of leveraging the tool for best use without crossing that line, and it can be really difficult to know where that line is, between an ethical or an unethical use of the technology.

- C:** I use ChatGPT all the time, actually and so I found it was interesting. So you didn't get a very long list of things that I think are appropriate uses by researchers in the form. One of the things I've noticed that has actually been my biggest concern is, I've had way too many of my students (three PhDs in the last month), who I've had to inform them that ChatGPT does not make their writing better. So they will write the content, and then they will use it as if it's a spell checker and ask it to make it better, and I wind up with the equivalent of instead of what colors this pen, saying the color of a pen is very important, and the color of the ink will determine the color of the pen, and it just talks around and around and around. So it's pretty obvious to find the ChatGPT. But I find that it always just talks around things rather than addressing things. And if our students start learning to think like that, they're doomed. So that was one of my biggest pet peeves is just to have some real clarity. It's the same thing with grammarly giving them garbage and gibberish that they don't think to question. And that's my biggest concern is that students seem to be trusting in the almighty computer and not even thinking about what it's giving them, or whether it's appropriate feedback. And the most creative uses of teaching I've seen is actually from Costin Antonescou in science, who gets the students to draft research grants using ChatGPT and then marks them based on their constructive critique of said grants. And I think that is a really really great way of using it, because it forces the students to really think about limitations of the tool, and maybe they can take that away to other aspects.
- C:** S. Kheraj - We heard similar things at our group table, as well. A mix of uses that feel like they're assisting or enhancing our work, or improving the way that we might engage with material. Like a previous example, the description that you gave us about your engagement with this tool just now is a kind of dialectic that you're having with a computer, but can also stimulate your own thinking, and to help you clarify how you think about a subject. But then we also have these examples of use where, I think, as Curtis said, we are having the tool do the work for us, and that's probably where we end up getting in trouble through the use of these tools is when we're trying to use these as tools to do things for us. I'll also just add quickly, though, that one of the challenges both for students and researchers is there are lots of examples of researchers using these as writing assistance tools for English language learners. So some of the papers that have been published that have been discovered to have used Gen AI are written by English language learners, and it's an assistive tool where you input your research notes to generate the paper with the risks that come along with that as well, and I think we have similar circumstances for students who may not be confident about their writing, and are looking for ways to get writing support and using these as tools for them.
- C:** A. Miller - I just wanna add one thing to the point about supporting students. I think that one of the biggest challenges right now is that all instructors and all Faculties have something like a bit of a responsibility to try to teach AI literacy while they're learning it. Even though it's not their subject matter and maybe they don't even like it, but, we have to have those conversations with students because it's entering every classroom.
- C:** C. Maloley: I'll just reiterate what was said in our group, which I thought was really fantastic. And it builds on that, when we look at the ethical necessity for instructors to do professional development - it's partly about the need to reflect on our own experience of using it, which is something highlighted in the group so that we can actually make effective recommendations to

students to use it well. Because if we're not using the tool ourselves, then we understand it as critique, but we don't understand it as something that we're engaged with. So I thought that was really a great point.

C: Yeah, thanks for the presentation and all the work you do on this folks. I'm wondering if you could expand a bit, generally to talk about how other academic institutions are addressing this. And specifically, do we have any changes that we need to make to our internal capacity to better address AI moving forward.

A: S. Kheraj - Great, I'll use this as an opportunity to plug the Learning and Teaching Conference, which is on May 16th. As Curtis has already said, we have a keynote speaker coming from University of Windsor, Bonnie Stewart, who's going to be talking about generative ethics. This is the title of her talk "Confronting What AI Means for Higher Education." So there will be some opportunity to hear from her about what's happening across the sector. We're also having a panel called "Institutional Responses to Generative Artificial Intelligence and Learning and Teaching" that will feature vice provosts for learning and teaching from York University, University of Toronto, and McMaster, who are going to be sharing what their universities have been doing for the last year and a half around this. It's a mix of a bunch of things. We've been going to monthly sessions, online roundtables with colleagues from across the country on this. There's been a mix of policy updates, new policies, task forces, guidelines, guidances, advisories, etc. We've done a lot. There are very few institutions that have created specific, separate AI policies, most have been doing updates. So for us, we're in the process of updating Policy 60, the Academic Integrity Policy. And hopefully, before the end of this year you'll see some early revisions to that policy that will specifically try to better highlight where artificial intelligence fits in our rules around academic misconduct. And I'll reiterate, as I've said at Senate before, that the academic integrity policy has never permitted the use of any technology for misconduct and it continues that, so the changes will be providing more examples and highlighting where the policy already speaks to these matters.

C: Just two quick points. Something that students have pointed out to me in the past is that the opportunities, sometimes the temptation to use these tools comes from a lack of opportunity to meaningfully work on writing skills within their courses. So I think something we're all going to have to think about collectively is how we now try to reintegrate teaching writing skills to students. It's something that they often have to pursue on their own time. But if we want students to be able to critically read and synthesize and extract data, we're gonna have to teach students what that looks like because it's a skill that not everyone has when they come to university. And one practical thing that I'll just sort of end with that we talked about that was suggested in our group was there's so many different types of courses. It's probably unrealistic to have a consistent approach across every course. But we do have groups or types of courses. Essay based courses, practicum based courses, creative type courses and maybe there could be consistency within those kinds of buckets. And if we had kind of a policy bank of the types of AI policies that might be appropriate in those particular course contexts that instructors could look at or potentially use for the different kinds of courses. Maybe that is a more realistic approach, kind of a blanket one size fits all policy that recognizes that. In a creative course there might be an opportunity to use generative AI responsibly, or if it aligns with industry standards there might be a use case there. So having sort of groups and policies that are appropriate for groups of courses might be an approach.

- C:** C. Maloley - That's a really wonderful suggestion. It's something that we're in the process of doing. We've launched this program which I won't go into detail about. But we're working side by side with different professors who have different kinds of assessments, and then trying to think about how those assessments fit with the technology. And one of those courses is SSH205, the academic writing and research course that so many students take here. So we're really trying to think through what that would look like and I think that's a wonderful suggestion, so thank you.
- C:** S. Kheraj - I just wanted, before we ran out of time to do my last two plugs. I promised Brian Lesser I would mention the IT conference, which is from May 21-23, which will have a keynote speaker from Western University who's one of their AI specialists. So if you're looking to learn more about the technology and how it's affecting IT at universities there'd be an opportunity there. And then OVPA and OVPA are coordinating on a leadership retreat in early June on generative AI and higher education where there'll be more time to have these kinds of conversations as well as opportunities for some hands-on learning activities and learning about the technology in the way it may be affecting learning, teaching research and all the other activities at the university.

Closing Remarks: K. Metersky

Thank you so much, Sean and our lovely panelists, for this evening. In summary, the challenges associated with generative artificial intelligence in higher education implicate all members of our community: students, faculty and staff. They go beyond just concerns about academic misconduct and include a wide range of activities that are central to the mission of the University. Learning, teaching, research, and more, we will need to remain engaged with this issue, as we have done in the past when new information technologies disrupt and change the ways that knowledge is generated, analyzed, and disseminated.

Tuesday, April 2, 2024
Hybrid - POD 250 and Zoom Video Conference

MEMBERS PRESENT:

EX-OFFICIO:

P. Albanese
D. Bell
T. Chan
D. Cramb
T. De Mello
K. Gharabaghi
C. Holmes
G. Hudson
R. Iannacito-Provenzano
S. Kheraj
L. Koechli
C. Kumaradas
M. Lachemi
K. McCausland
J. McMillen
A. Peng
M. Robertson
S. Hodges
S. Zolfaghari

FACULTY:

M. Bergmann
D. Delic
J. El Ali
D. Enns
R. Fair
C. Farnum
A. Ferworn
P. Goldman
E. Ignagni
F. Janabi-Sharifi
C. Jenkins
L. Kolasa
A. Kozlowski
J. McArthur
K. Metersky
M. Moulson
U. Ngwaba
C. O'Brien
D. Oguamanam

STUDENTS:

S. Afshar
N. Almasri
S. Campbell
M. Daniels
P. Fitzpatrick
S. Ifeonu
S. Kalavi
C. Randall
N. Sugunalan
E. Tessema
T. Thomson

**STUDENTS' UNION
REPRESENTATIVES:**

H. Patel
M. Taylor
V. Sullivan

SENATE ASSOCIATES:

K. Brant
J. Cammaert
L. Patterson

ALUMNI:

K. Choi

ABSENT:

O. Akanbi
S. Cellario
J. Dallaire
R. Denning
T. Duever
C. Falzon
J. Fukakusa
C. MacDonald
D. McLane-Davison

K. Mehta
A. Patora
P. Roberts
R. Scenna
K. Train
M. Vahabi
S. Van Dine

REGRETS:

S. Liss
J. Mendoza

6:00 pm Senate Meeting starts

1. Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum
2. Land Acknowledgement
"Toronto is in the 'Dish With One Spoon Territory'. The Dish With One Spoon is a treaty between the Anishinaabe, Mississaugas and Haudenosaunee that bound them to share the territory and protect the land. Subsequent Indigenous Nations and peoples, Europeans and all newcomers have been invited into this treaty in the spirit of peace, friendship and respect."
3. Approval of the Agenda
Motion: *That Senate approve the agenda for the April 2nd, 2024 meeting.*

Moved: K. Metersky; Seconded: T. Chan
Motion Approved
4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
Motion: *That Senate approve the minutes of the March 5th, 2024 meeting.*

Moved: S. Zolfaghari; Seconded: S. Kalavi
Motion Approved
5. Matters Arising from the Minutes - none
6. **Reports**
 - 6.1 **Report of the President**
 - 6.1.1 President's Update

You have a copy of my written report, I would be happy to answer any questions related to the written report. I'd like to start with giving senators a few updates since our last meeting in March.

Chancellor Search Update

I'll start with a brief update on the search for our next Chancellor. As you know, we formed the search committee with three members from Senate and three members from the Board. The search is progressing well. We received a number of strong nominations from our community. Thank you to those of you who submitted nominations to the committee. The committee is in the process of reviewing nominations and we are on track to bringing a recommendation to the Board in the summer to appoint the next Chancellor for our university. For your information. Our current Chancellor, Janice Fukakusa, is going to finish her second term in October of this year, and our plan is to have an installation of our next chance during the October convocations. I will continue to keep you updated on our progress.

Provincial Budget

I want to share a few updates on our budget process. The Province released the provincial budget last week. As expected, there were not a lot of details on the post secondary system in the budget. Why, because prior to that on February 26, the provincial government announced \$1.3 billion in temporary funding over the next three years for the post-secondary education sector. It's important to note that these funds are for 47 institutions - universities and colleges. We are still waiting for more information on eligibility for the funding programs. As a sector, we are in a very volatile financial situation and we

have to adjust to the new reality. The provincial government continues to restrict our domestic enrolment levels. In addition, we are entering our sixth year of a tuition fee framework that decreased fees by 10% below 2018-19 levels and have kept them frozen ever since. The decision by the Government also, during the announcement by the Minister of College and Universities is to keep the tuition fees frozen for the next three years.

We are also facing challenges on the international front due to the announcement from the federal government regarding a visa processing cap for undergraduate international students. We do now know that the provincial plan is to allocate 96% of Ontario's 235,000 foreign student applications to public post-secondary institutions, both colleges and universities, with the remaining 4% to language schools and private universities. We are currently working with the Province to confirm details about our international student allocations. Those numbers should be finalized soon. Despite these challenges, we will continue to be forward looking and support institutional priorities within a responsible budget framework. As we wait for details from the province about what our allocations will be, we are working with a number of assumptions in building our 2024-25 budget which is presented to the Board for approval by the end of April. I will continue to keep you updated.

School of Medicine Update

As part of the provincial budget, the government announced that they will support a new medical school in Vaughan for York University. The medical school would be focusing on primary care. There might be questions about any impact this might have on our medical school and I can assure you that we are on track to open in September 2025 in Brampton. We are progressing very well through the accreditation process and our Provost will share details on that process in her update later in the meeting today. The announcement of the new medical school is very much a testament of the success of our own medical school and the impact it has had on the Peel region and beyond.

U SPORTS Men's Hockey National Championship

In Athletics, I am proud to share that TMU hosted the U SPORTS Men's National Hockey Championship. It was the first time in 27 years that the tournament was held in Toronto, with TMU hosting the elite, four-day tournament. The University of New Brunswick (UNB) won the final game with a 4-0 win over the Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières. In fact, UNB won all their games this year, they had a perfect season. We have also invited former NHL star Eric Lindros to drop the ceremonial puck in the final match. We are also in discussion with Eric Lindros to do some research that is related to brain injuries in collaboration with some faculty members. The TMU Bold opened the tournament on March 14 with a win over the Calgary Dinos. Unfortunately, they lost the bronze medal game to McGill University. We are very proud of the team, finishing fourth in the country and all the staff and volunteers who have worked incredibly hard to make this event a success.

Cybersecurity Training in Malaysia

I also want to share an update on two new initiatives. The first is from the Rogers Cybersecure Catalyst that was announced last week. BlackBerry, with the support of the Rogers Cybersecure Catalyst and the SANS Institute are launching a cybersecurity training and digital capacity-building initiative in Malaysia - Kuala Lumpur. The initiative is aimed at combating cybercrime in the broader region. It will address the critical cybersecurity skills gap in the region and provide individuals and organizations with the knowledge and tools to respond to cyber threats. The project will have a far reaching impact in the entire region including Malaysia, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Laos, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand,

and Vietnam, which represents a significant percentage of the world's population. Almost half of the world's population are in that region.

Digital Twins Project

The second initiative is a partnership with Infrastructure Ontario on the digital twins project. Digital twins are virtual models of a physical object or system, which are continuously updated with data to reflect the most current physical state. The government of Ontario is investing \$5 million to explore the use of digital twins to deliver its public infrastructure projects and they made a specific reference to TMU in the provincial budget. I would like to take a moment to thank our faculty member, Jenn McArthur from the Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science who is leading this project for TMU. Digital twin technology could be used to assess potential issues with water treatment systems and other underground infrastructure. Using this technology, we can run simulations to assess solutions before they are implemented. It has the potential to help keep costs down, manage risks, and mitigate against potential schedule delays. Infrastructure Ontario is partnering with us to leverage our experience with digital twins and explore solutions to help modernize the delivery of public infrastructure. I would like to really thank Jenn McArthur for leading this project.

That's the end of my update. I'm happy to answer any questions.

6.2 Communications Report - none this month

6.3 Report of the Secretary -

6.3.1 2024-2025 Senate Election Results

C: D. Bell - Included with the Senate agenda on pages 18 - 21, are the results of the Senate nomination call out and elections. There are a few categories that are still to be confirmed, which we hope to have completed by the next Senate meeting, and will be presented in May.

6.4 Committee Reports

6.4.1 Report #W2024-3 of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC): S. Kheraj

6.4.1.1. Periodic Program Review for Arts and Contemporary Studies – Faculty of Arts

Motion: That Senate approve the Periodic Program Review for Arts and Contemporary Studies – Faculty of Arts.

Moved: S. Kheraj; Seconded: K. Metersky

Motion Approved

6.4.1.2. Exemption from Policy 2: Undergraduate Curriculum Structure for Undergraduate Medical Education – The Medical School

Motion: That Senate approve the exemption from Policy 2: Undergraduate Curriculum Structure for Undergraduate Medical Education – The Medical School.

Moved: S. Kheraj; Seconded: R. Ravindran

Motion Approved

Q: Given that this is an accreditation issue, so somebody else can get their accreditation body to kind of screw around a bit with their requirements, does that mean that we're gonna have people in Senate coming and asking to be exempted from other Senate policies? Or is this just beyond the pale, it's like a one shot only thing?

A: S. Kheraj - Thanks for the question. I can't predict what will happen in the future. But I can say in the case of this program as well as law, these are undergraduate professional programs that require bachelor's degrees for admission to the program. So the exemption from the program, balance requirements of Policy 2 make sense, just as in the case of law, you will have already fulfilled the breadth requirements in whatever bachelor degree you completed before you were admitted into a law program. This would also be similar for bachelor of education programs that require an existing bachelor degree for completion. With that said, we do have other policy exemptions for programs that have accreditation, including engineering has some policy exemptions as well for accreditation reasons. Each of those are assessed on a case by case basis by the standards committee.

Q: I just want to know, are we going to be changing our view of what policies are based on anybody coming in with an accreditation body, because clearly we create policies to cover basically the entire university. And now we seem to be somewhat cherry picking based on these accreditation bodies. And I think I asked this question at AGPC, but will there be some pushback from the university at some point so that we might actually establish ourselves as setting the rules as opposed to accreditation bodies?

A: S. Kheraj - I think, where it's reasonable. We do speak back to accreditation bodies and there's flexibility there, depending on the circumstances. In this instance the committee saw this as reasonable, given the nature of the program. And again, given the type of program that we're talking about, that students already fulfill the breadth requirements that are expressed in Policy 2 as a precondition of their admissions into the medical education program.

Q: I'm just wondering about how long standing an exemption like this is?. I'm not against this exemption just to be clear, or to this motion, but it's more just a clarity and an understanding how we operate in Senate with the policies. And Sean, you mentioned that there's been other cases of exemptions for accreditation reasons. But when we pass a motion like this, is it just for the longevity of the medical school, or how do we sustain the exemption going forward?

A: S. Kheraj - Good question. All policy exemptions get reviewed through the periodic program review. So every eight years, programs for whatever exemptions they have and variations, those get assessed during the review. If such time in the future the exemption is no longer appropriate, then it may be changed or modified. Or, if the accreditation standards have changed, or the institution's policies have changed.

Q: I just have a question out of curiosity. So does this mean that students who are in second or third year of undergrad are not allowed to apply for TMU's Medical school?

A: One of the conditions for admissions to the medical education program is completion of a bachelor's degree.

Q: For TMU only, right?

A: S. Kheraj - For most medical schools it will require that you have a bachelor's degree before completion. So for TMU's, yes, but maybe not all.

C: For most of Ontario now it's like two years of school. But I just want to clarify that. Thank you.

C: S. Kheraj - And this was in the program proposal that came to Senate last year. Their admissions requirements do require that students have a bachelor's degree.

Q: Just a quick question. So this rule would stay the same right, like the policy, would not be changing?

A: Yes, that's right. So a policy exemption just provides Senate approval that this program doesn't have to abide by the same program balance requirements that are spelled out in Policy 2 for the reasons that are outlined in the Senate package.

6.4.1.3. Honours Designation for the Psychology Program – Faculty of Arts

Motion: That Senate approve the Honours Designation for the Psychology Program – Faculty of Arts.

Moved: S. Kheraj; Seconded: P. Goldman

Motion Approved

Q: Just a clarification about the implementation of this. Will current psychology students graduate with the honors degree, or will it be just the incoming students from now on?

A: S. Kheraj - So I might ask if Stephanie Walsh Matthews might be able to answer this, but as I understand it, it's current students as well as past students. But I can't remember the year how far back we go, so Mohamed, is it possible to have Stephanie answer?

A: S. Walsh-Matthews - For those who are on the current curriculum, so the one that was presented with the honors designation currently reviewed. So what this Senate saw last year. And I, too, can't remember exactly what the date is, but it's fixed to the curriculum and so, whomever has completed the degree according to those curricular requirements can request the honors designation. And moving forward, of course, anybody starting will have the honors designation.

6.4.2. Report #W2024-3 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC) -

R. Iannacito-Provenzano

6.4.2.1. Provost's Update

Opening Remarks

Hello everyone, thank you for joining us today. We're quickly approaching the end of the winter term and it has been of course another busy and productive semester at TMU. I want to thank you all for your continued collaboration.

Academic Plan

I will start today with an update on the academic plan. Consultations continue for the university's academic plan which will go from 2025-2030. They're progressing well and so I'm very grateful to the community, who has been very engaged. We are now in phase two of consultations. A draft preliminary plan will be shared with the TMU community for input in late spring/early summer 2024 as we move towards the fall, where the plan will be brought to Senate for discussion and approval. I look forward to sharing more with you very soon on this process.

School of Medicine

Further to President Lachemi's comments, the School of Medicine has finalized two additional agreements with organizations that will support the school's work. An affiliation agreement with Headwaters Health Care Centre and a student placement agreement with the Region of Peel. These agreements strengthen our efforts to earn accreditation for the MD program from the Committee for the Accreditation of Canadian Medical Schools (CACMS) and to secure government funding. Additionally, recruitment of external community members is underway for several advisory committees for the School of Medicine. These committees will provide valuable guidance to the Dean's Advisory Council regarding several elements of the school's programming. The committees include: The EDI & Communities Committee; The Learner Advisory Committee; and The Postgraduate Medical Education (PGME) Committees. Lastly, the School of Medicine has proudly extended clinical faculty appointments to over 70 distinguished physicians, creating the foundation of our inaugural clinical faculty team. This pivotal group of medical professionals will play a critical role in shaping our institution's future of healthcare education and practice.

Appointments

On to some recent appointments. Announced last week, Dr. Linda Koechli has been appointed the interim dean, The Chang School. Linda assumed the role of acting dean in February 2024, I know she's here tonight, bringing to the position nearly two decades of dedicated service in the TMU community. Throughout her tenure at TMU, Linda has worked to advance innovative, career-relevant and accessible programming for continuous learners. In her various leadership capacities at the Chang School, Linda has overseen the complete lifecycle of certificate program development, delivery and assessment. As Assistant Dean, Programs, she played a pivotal role in shaping and implementing bold and forward-thinking strategies to meet the evolving needs of today's continuous learners. I would like to thank Linda for accepting this interim role and for her continued dedication to The Chang School. She will serve until the search for the new dean is complete. I look forward to sharing more information on the composition of that search committee in the coming weeks.

Next, I am pleased to share the appointment of Shari Hodges, who, I believe, is also with us this evening as the interim University registrar, effective March 13 for a term of six months. Shari joins the Registrar's office from the Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science, where she has most recently held the position of Director Engineering Student Admissions and Recruitment. With over 20 years of dedicated service at TMU, Shari has held progressive leadership roles in FEAS, and in the Yeates School. Her extensive experience provides her with a deep knowledge of the Registrar's office along with expertise in areas such as undergraduate and graduate admissions, marketing and student recruitment, transfer credits, academic advising and curriculum advising. Updates on the search for a permanent Registrar will be provided as they're available.

I'd also like to take this opportunity to thank Robyn Parr for her work and dedication to TMU, and in particular in the OVPS, during her 12 years at the University, we wish her all the best in her new role at U of T.

Learning and Teaching

On the topic of learning and teaching. The Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT), has launched a new Teaching and Learning Through Social Justice Credential. It is designed to support educators in developing and expanding their understanding and skills related to teaching about social justice and equity in the classroom. Participants will engage in reading, designing, evaluating and

sharing a teaching strategy related to social justice. During the winter reading week, 38 students participated in a Faculty of Science course SCI888: Evidence-based Innovation and earned a full course credit. The course was offered by the Science Discovery Zone (SDZ), and asked students to work in interdisciplinary teams to redesign inclusive spaces that address NIMBYism, “not in my back yard,” which is characterized by resident opposition to proposed developments in their local area. Through collaboration with their small groups, students came up with different approaches to the problem and gathered evidence from the community to support a potential solution. At the end of the week, they presented their solutions and explained how they applied evidence-based research.

Budget Process

As President Lachemi noted, we are in the process of developing TMU’s budget for 2024-2025. Consultations are continuing with union groups, student leaders and student unions and the preliminary budget is being prepared. As we move along in the process, as the President mentioned, we’re in a climate with a bit of uncertainty still because we’re lacking some information. More information will be shared with the community.

Those are all of my updates for today. Happy to answer any questions, thank you very much.

6.4.2.2 Retirement of Senate Policy 39: Procedure for Disposing Over a Challenge to a Book or Other Item in Holdings of the Toronto Metropolitan University Library

Motion: That Senate approve the retirement of Senate Policy 39: Procedure for Disposing Over a Challenge to a Book or Other Item in Holdings of the Toronto Metropolitan University Library.

Moved: K. Metersky; Seconded: C. Farnum

Motion Approved

Q: Yes, I have no problem with, you know, eliminating this policy and moving it over to the library. The question actually has to do with why it's a Senate policy in the first place, and why it wasn't a library policy. Do we have any kind of historical notes on that, and why was this was the case?

A: M. Lachemi - I think it's very difficult to ask Mark, who has been with us for a very short period of time.

A: I'm not asking Mark, I'm asking the institution. So we clearly made this policy for a reason and I guess this speaks to some other things as well. I mean, how are we to know that what we're doing hasn't been done in the past if we don't actually have any place recording it?

C: S. Kheraj - I can comment as a historian. I'll just say, you know, probably record keeping practices of the institution were different when the policy was created. So you know, going forward, we have regular minutes kept at Senate and Senate records that we can go back to and access more regularly. But there are probably some deficiencies in record keeping in order to determine how that decision was made. Only another guess, as another person who is new here, is that it was probably a smaller institution, and so, having separate library policies managed by the library was easier to just do centrally when you were a smaller institution. TMU is now double its size of a decade ago and so decentralizing a little bit more probably makes sense.

C: Thank you. So, we don't know.

C: I think I know broadly a little bit of the history. But unfortunately, most of the folks who were around at that time have since retired, but I do know that there was a challenge, I'm going to guess in the

early 80's that provoked, I think a Senate Committee on the issue, and there was a report that was generated. And my guess is that the reasoning is probably reflected in that report, which I don't think is hard to find. I think there's probably still a reference to it somewhere. But yeah, I think the answers will probably be found in that report, but this was before my time so I don't have intimate knowledge of it, but I believe that's where it all started.

C: M. Lachemi - Thank you, Cecile. Donna, maybe we can go back to the history and then report back to Senate at a future meeting.

A: D. Bell - Absolutely, I'd be happy to do that, Mohamed.

C: M. Lachemi - Thank you so much.

6.4.2.3. School of Medicine Council Bylaws – Updated to meet the Committee on Accreditation of Canadian Medical Schools (CACMS) Requirements

Motion: That Senate approve the School of Medicine Council Bylaws – Updated to meet the Committee on Accreditation of Canadian Medical Schools (CACMS) Requirements.

Moved: T. Chan; Seconded: S. Kalavi, R. Ravindran

Motion Approved

7. New Business as Circulated - none

8. Members' Business

Q: This is circling back to the policy exemption that we discussed, and I guess also on the topic of record keeping again. For our current record keeping practices, do we have a place that I could refer to, or other people could refer to for current policy exemptions that are active right now? As part of that question, too, I'm just hoping for more clarification on how the policy exemptions are reviewed in the periodic program review process, is that automatically integrated into the process?

A: D. Bell - Well in terms of policy exemption - I know that that is not something that is currently on the Senate website. If that's something that we need to look at, we can choreograph that with Sean's office. And how it's reviewed in the PPR, I am going to pass that on to Sean.

A: S. Kheraj - Yes, it's a part of the self study. So programs with exemptions and variations have to respond to questions about the exemptions and variations which are then reviewed by the external reviewers when they come to do an assessment of the program, and then they may determine whether there need to be any changes to those exemptions, or if they're still necessary.

Q: So the PPR process covers this exemption business. So do these exemptions have historical reasons for why the exemption was granted attached to them, so that someone new who might be doing a PPR who was not familiar with what happened in, say, 1985, might actually have some data they can work with?

A: S. Kheraj - That's a good question. So the the information in this case, for example, with the School of Medicine would be the Senate documentation of the proposal that came to the standards committee and then what was included in the Senate package and that would be able to be provided to the program if they needed the refresher or the historical information about why the exemption was first granted.

Q: So as we get more of these exemptions, which we seem to be doing as we have a law faculty and a medical faculty which are requesting them. Undoubtedly they'll be more because we've just started right. So when we start with graduate education and medicine and all that stuff. Are they going to be requesting additional things? Are we going to be keeping meticulous records of why things were granted? Because that's going to be key if you're only allowed to make changes after a PPR recommendation.

C: M. Lachemi - Sean, I think this is more of a recommendation than a question. I think we should do that, Sean, can you comment on that.

A: S. Kheraj - Oh, yes and there's processes that exist already in the Curriculum Quality Assurance Office in terms of documenting and keeping record of those exemptions and also ensuring that we're not seeking multiple sequences of exemptions within short timeframes, which is why we usually wait in between the periodic program review cycles to make those kinds of changes.

Q: One more question to follow on, as we have two distinct PPR tracks, one for undergraduate and Chang school, and one for graduate. How do we know that this is going to be consistent through the two PPR processes? Wouldn't it make more sense to actually have one PPR process, perhaps going through the same sets of offices. That would actually keep track of these records. It seems very complex for something that should be rather simple.

A: S. Kheraj - I mean, the current Senate policy delineates responsibility for the program reviews separately between grad and undergraduate programs. So the Vice Provost for graduate studies could maybe respond to this. But currently, that's the process. If it changes in the future, it would come to Senate because we would have to change the Senate policies around that.

9. Consent Agenda -

9.1 2024–2025 Undergraduate Calendar Cycle - Approved Category 2 Changes - no questions or comments

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:57 p.m.