McGill

MINUTES
Subcommittee on Teaching and Learning
Tuesday, June 13, 2023 (2-3pm)
McLennan Library, room MS-74

Present: Manuel Balán, Farhan Bhanji, Chris Buddle, Adam Finkelstein, Kenyon Gannon, Nathan Hall, Roni Khazaka, Jenn Riley, Nancy St-Pierre (Secretary), Laura Winer (Chair)

Guests: Sandy Hervieux, Lindsay Holmgren, Catherine-Anne Miller, Scott Patterson, Carolyn Samuel

Regrets: Robin Beech, Andrea Creech, Didem Dagdeviren, Jordan Koch, Sujata Madan, Tina Piper, Jennifer Ronholm, Derek Tannis, Tamara Western

1. Administrative
   a. Adoption of the agenda: the agenda was adopted as circulated.
   b. Approval of the minutes, January 18, and March 14, 2023: the minutes were approved as circulated.
   c. Business arising: no business arising was identified.

2. Discussion
   a. Recommendations from the STL AI Working Group

STL members proceeded to discuss and provide feedback on the draft report submitted by the STL AI WG. Below are highlights from that discussion.

Feedback on preamble:
Chris asked for clarification on several items in the preamble:
   1. Did the STL AI WG feel a sense of urgency to either develop resources or communications to the community?
   2. Was an environmental scan conducted?

Laura clarified:
   1. While the STL AI WG did feel a sense of urgency, it also felt that McGill had already lost the opportunity to quickly respond to the implications of generative AI. Instead, members moved toward drafting recommendations that were grounded in principles, measured, and based in governance while respecting the mandate established by STL at its January meeting.
   2. While an environmental scan was not undertaken, it was noted that those resources released by our sister universities were primarily issued from teaching and learning

centres or Dean of Students office. It was noted however that policy recommendations were not as commonly available.

3. Adam added that while policy moves at its own pace, educational resources need to be developed over the summer so that instructors have the resources at their disposal for the Fall term.

Chris noted that waiting for APC approval to move forward with developing resources would engender a too lengthy delay. While APC can review the recommendations at its September meeting, resource development should proceed over the summer; Chris will keep the PVPA's office informed.

The statement from the DoS was reviewed and will need to be adjusted to reflect the following comments:

1. Guidelines for disciplinary officers should be developed: an increase in academic integrity complaints due to suspected use generative AI is anticipated. This will be challenging as it will be more and more difficult to detect its use and disciplinary officers will need guidance for their discussions with students.
2. Chris noted that academic integrity implications will likely be discussed at APC as well so the statement should be stronger.
3. Manuel noted that the Code of Student Conduct is up for review in the next year or so and specific language to address AI concerns may be included.
4. Lindsay, a member of the STL AI WG added that language should be nuanced to ensure that instructors do not feel discouraged to report suspected cases. Lindsay will connect with Robin to re-work this statement.

Feedback on Recommendation 1:
First principle:

1. The tone should be revised as to seem less "preachy"; there are a lot of "should"s. Laura noted that the WG members were deliberate in their use of "should" as it was felt that these statements were essential to the development of a shared understanding.
2. Carolyn suggested that the principles be re-written in the present tense; this may remove the "preachy" feel and make the principles more aspirational and less directive.
3. Roni questioned the statement that academic programs must include education on AI. While we may want to teach students how to use the tools, he was not sure that each program would need to develop programing specific to AI. Adam disagreed and noted that generative AI should be treated at the same level as Sustainability – at a higher level. This technology has the same ability to shake up the system and attention needs to be paid to it in the same way.
4. Manuel questioned whether the onus of responsibility was correctly assigned. For example, the onus in the first principle should be the University not the community.

Second principle:

1. Lindsay explained that this principle was articulated to make it clear that generative AI should be used purposefully and to enhance the education rather than used as a means to save time.

2. It was noted that the STL AI WG did debate its inclusion as this principle should apply to all technology used.
3. Chris suggested that the language be nuanced to reflect that it is a tool amongst a series of available tools and that it has a role to play.

Third principle:
1. This principle seems to assume that generative tools are approved for use while at the moment, no specific tool has been vetted by IT for use. Adam has submitted both ChatGPT and Bing and their approval is now in IT hands.
2. TLS will draft a statement that instructors can include in their course outlines, but the statement can only be added under the "Additional statements" category. These are optional statements that instructors are encouraged to include but are not obligated to include. For a mandatory statement, Senate approval must be received.

Feedback on Recommendation 2:
1. Nathan commented that it was great.
2. No other feedback was received.

In conclusion, Laura confirmed that we have received permission from SSMU to include their Report on Student Opinions and Usage Regarding Generative AI.

Next steps:
1. Lindsay will work with Robin to draft a more specific statement in response to the feedback received.
2. Carolyn will revise the first three principles to reflect the present tense and their aspirational nature.
3. Language will be revised to be less assertive.
4. The revised document will be forwarded to STL for email approval. Once approved, it will be posted to the STL webpage. While it will then be available to the community, no additional feedback will be solicited.
5. Once approved, it will be forwarded to APC for discussion, modification or approval at its September meeting.

Laura thanked the members of the STL AI WG for their contributions and engagement.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3pm.