THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Office of the Senate
Brock Hall | 2016 - 1874 East Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1

Phone 604 822 5239
Fax 604 822 5945
www.senate.ubc.ca

SENATE TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

19 November 2025 2:03 – 3:31 p.m.
Brock Commons South, Room 4002 / via Zoom

Attendance: Marina Adshade, Simon Bates, Kareem Hassib, Andre Ivanov, Kin Lo, Robbie Morrison, Laura Moss (Chair), Zarifa Nawar, Richard Spencer, HsingChi vonBergmann

Senate Staff: Lindsey Kovacevic

Regrets: Amin Adibi, Elisa Baniassad, Ainsley Carry, Christina Hendricks, James Stewart, Joely Viveiros

---

CALL TO ORDER AND TERRITORIAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The meeting of the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee was called to order at 2:03 p.m. by L. Moss, Chair. A territorial acknowledgement was given.

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion: That the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee adopt the 19 November 2025 meeting agenda.

Approved by general consent.

2. MINUTES OF 15 OCTOBER 2025 MEETING

Motion: That the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee approve the 15 October 2025 meeting minutes as presented.

Approved by general consent.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Student Experience of Instruction (SEI) Working Group Report

S. Bates will present the SEI Working Group Report for information at tonight's meeting of the Vancouver Senate.

Office of the Senate
Brock Hall | 2016 - 1874 East Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1

Phone 604 822 5239
Fax 604 822 5945
www.senate.ubc.ca

4. PRIORITIES FROM NEW MEMBERS

Z. Narwar noted that K. Hassib had previously raised several student priorities at an earlier meeting, including the inclusion of AI guidelines on course syllabi, the implementation of mid-course feedback, reconsideration of the add/drop and course withdrawal deadlines, and the pilot of a centralized examination database. She proposed bringing the examination database discussion forward at an upcoming meeting.

5. PRESENTATION ON COURSE ASSESSMENT AND AI

S. Bates reported that course assessment and artificial intelligence (AI) had been identified by students as a priority issue. L. Moss emphasized the need to clarify the role of this committee, noting that multiple groups across campus are already engaged in work related to AI. She underscored the importance of coordinating existing efforts, avoiding duplication, and identifying how the committee can best support faculty, students, and staff.

S. Bates noted that much of the current work on AI occurs within central units and faculties, and that the purpose of the presentation was to initiate discussion within the Senate context.

S. Bates shared insights from his presentations on AI delivered to faculties and external audiences, during which he polls participants on their perceptions of AI. He observed a broad range of views among faculty members regarding optimism about AI's potential to enhance learning, alongside significant concern about its potential to erode key learning skills.

S. Bates reported on a survey of UBC students conducted at the end of 2024, which found that the majority of students use generative AI tools several times per week for personal learning or as part of their coursework. He noted that while institutions may establish rules governing the use of AI in assessments, it is not possible to control how students use these tools in their broader learning and daily lives.

Survey results indicated that most students either do not know, or know for only a few of their courses, whether AI use is permitted. Students expressed a desire for consistent guidance on AI use; however, S. Bates noted that a blanket policy is impractical, as decisions about whether, how, and where AI tools may be used depend on individual course design and disciplinary context. At a minimum, expectations should be clearly articulated in course syllabi. This issue intersects with academic integrity, and a flowchart developed by the Academic Integrity Hub (AIH) is available to help students determine whether they can use these tools in their courses.

With respect to assessment changes, S. Bates observed that educators have primarily implemented discursive rather than structural changes. Discursive changes involve revised instructions or guidelines and rely on voluntary student compliance, while structural changes alter the mechanics or format of assessment tasks. Structural changes are more challenging, as they require rethinking entire assessment strategies, and faculty may be teaching multiple courses per term.

Office of the Senate
Brock Hall | 2016 - 1874 East Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1

Phone 604 822 5239
Fax 604 822 5945
www.senate.ubc.ca

S. Bates emphasized that AI has implications at all levels of the institution. At the faculty and departmental levels, there needs to be ongoing conversations about degree outcomes and how they are shifting as AI becomes increasingly embedded into everything. Assessment redesign in an era of AI requires iterative processes of learning, experimentation, and collaboration, supported by mechanisms that allow for sharing successes and failures across units.

S. Bates noted that resources related to AI and assessment, including events and recorded sessions, are available through the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology at ai.ctlt.ubc.ca/.

He further observed that while opinions and experiences with AI tools vary widely, these tools are rapidly becoming general-purpose technologies. Engaging with the issue of AI and assessment does not mean it has to be fully embraced; spaces where AI is intentionally excluded remain equally important.

Students were identified as key partners in this work, as they can help surface diverse perspectives and uses of AI. A cross-campus graduate and undergraduate student generative AI council has been established to represent the student perspective. S. Bates emphasized the need for institutional infrastructure, privacy protections, training, and dialogue, noting that these responsibilities cannot rest solely with individual faculty members.

R. Spencer thanked S. Bates for the informative presentation, noting that it focused primarily on generative AI and large language models. He highlighted a gap in attention to other forms of AI that may enhance learning with fewer concerns related to assessment or long-term learning outcomes. He emphasized that AI presents not only challenges but also significant opportunities, citing long-standing work at Carnegie Mellon University where learning specialists, technologists, and designers have come together to produce interactive online courses that attempt to pick up on the student's learning style. He noted the potential for technology to improve efficiency and reduce the cost of education.

Z. Narwar raised concerns regarding academic integrity when course syllabi lack clear statements on acceptable AI use, requiring students to make assumptions. She noted that the AMS Advocacy group has observed an increase in misconduct cases in this age of AI. She emphasized the importance of addressing guidance via syllabi. Z. Narwar also observed that some instructors are returning to timed, in-person examinations in response to AI, raising questions about accessibility and disability accommodations, and whether this may lead to an increase in accommodation requests. S. Bates acknowledged that this shift reflects efforts to ensure assessments represent students' own work, but noted the need to balance such approaches with considerations of what is authentic within the discipline. There are tradeoffs.

H. von Bergmann expressed agreement with R. Spencer regarding opportunities beyond generative AI and suggested that the Teaching and Learning Committee, in collaboration with S. Bates' team, explore ways AI could support faculty, such as providing feedback writing multiple choice questions. She noted ongoing developments in the health sciences, including the use of applications to support prescribing, while highlighting intellectual property and data governance concerns.

S. Bates noted that these comments reflected the need for differentiated approaches that fit a local need. He indicated that UBC is providing support in this area and that work is underway to develop a

Office of the Senate
Brock Hall | 2016 - 1874 East Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1

Phone 604 822 5239
Fax 604 822 5945
www.senate.ubc.ca

general-purpose platform to enable adaptive tutoring and assessment development. He noted that he is currently working with the executive and the Board on this initiative.

6. AI GUIDELINES ON COURSE SYLLABI

L. Moss asked the Committee to consider whether a recommendation could be made to the Senate Academic Policy Committee to add wording related to AI guidelines on course syllabi to Policy V-130: *Content and Distribution of Course Syllabi*. She noted that the use of AI is evolving rapidly, while policy approval processes move more slowly, and emphasized the desirability of language that would not require frequent updates.

Z. Narwar suggested that, ideally, information that is generally applicable at UBC would be identified and made mandatory for inclusion in course syllabi. She noted that any additional, course-specific rules regarding AI use would also need to be clearly stated.

In response to a comment from M. Adshade regarding the lack of explicit academic integrity guidance on syllabi, S. Bates observed that existing language on academic misconduct often does not help students understand what acting with integrity looks like for a particular assessment.

K. Hassib agreed that promoting existing resources is valuable, but emphasized the importance of taking proactive measures. He supported adding an explicit requirement to the policy that syllabi clarify whether and how AI may be used for assessments, assignments, and examinations.

R. Morrison inquired as to whether faculty would be ready to make these changes should the policy be updated. S. Bates responsed that example language could be provided, as has been done for other syllabus components, that is not binding but helps instructors to think about the level of detail that is needed. He emphasized that the objective is to ensure students have a clear understanding of assessment expectations, including permitted tools, grading weight, and how to avoid academic integrity violations.

M. Adshade noted that in Economics, required syllabus statements are revised and annually, including statements on academic integrity and AI. She noted that the AI statement specifies that AI use is not permitted unless explicitly authorized by the instructor in writing.

Z. Narwar reiterated the need for a clear statement on AI use within course syllabi, noting that while information may exist elsewhere, students are not always aware that they need to consult additional sources. L. Moss asked the Committee to consider recommending to the Senate Academic Policy Committee that syllabi include mandatory statements on both AI use and academic integrity. K. Hassib added that the use of neutral language in the policy would not prevent departments from developing their own guidelines, and would allow instructors to tailor expectations to their courses. S. Bates agreed, noting the importance of allowing instructor choice and aligment with departmental or program expectations.

The Committee recommended adding two new points to the end of Section 7 of Policy V-130.

Office of the Senate
Brock Hall | 2016 - 1874 East Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1

Phone 604 822 5239
Fax 604 822 5945
www.senate.ubc.ca

Motion: *That the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee recommend to the Senate Academic Policy Committee two new content areas to Section 7 of Policy V-130: Content and Distribution of Course Syllabi as follows:*
"k. A statement on academic integrity that informs the student of expectations in the course and potential outcomes if misconduct is suspected.

l. A statement on artificial intelligence (AI) usage in assessments that clarifies how the use of AI is permitted or not permitted."

Carried.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

R. Spencer suggested asking CTLT to produce an annual report on the impact of AI on teaching and learning about UBC. A discussion about this will be included on a future agenda.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:31 p.m.