S.25-180

SFU OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND VICE-PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC

8888 University Drive,
Burnaby, BC
Canada V5A 1S6

TEL: 778.782.6654

avpacad@sfu.ca
www.sfu.ca/vpacademic

MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION	Senate	DATE	October 16, 2025
FROM	Paul Kingsbury, Chair Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL)	PAGES	1/26
RE:	Learning & Teaching with Artificial Intelligence Guidelines		

At its meeting on October 8, 2025, SCUTL reviewed and unanimously approved the Learning & Teaching with Artificial Intelligence Guidelines.

Motion: That Senate approve the Learning & Teaching with Artificial Intelligence Guidelines at Simon Fraser University.

SFU OFFICE OF THE VICE-PROVOST, LEARNING & TEACHING

Learning & Teaching with Artificial Intelligence Guidelines

October 16, 2025

Table of Contents

Background

This document was drafted and approved by the Artificial Intelligence Learning and Teaching Task Force (AILTTF), which was launched in September 2024 in response to Senate's call for university-level guidelines on Artificial Intelligence (AI) use for learning and teaching[1]. The AILTTF was part of SFU's overarching AI Strategy Committee which is comprised of three other areas: Research, Operations, and External Engagement. A key goal for the AILTTF was to provide institutional guidance for when and how to use AI, as well as support for the learning and teaching community composed of undergraduate and graduate students, faculty instructors, sessional instructors and teaching assistants, university staff who support learning and teaching, as well as academic leaders within schools, programs, departments, and Faculties. The AILTTF, which included faculty, graduate students, and staff was chaired by Paul Kingsbury (AVPLT), advised by Parsa Rajabi, and comprised of five subcommittees:

1. **Academic Integrity** (co-chaired by Agata Becalska and Arlette Stewart, Kevin O'Neil co-chaired until December 31, 2024).
2. **Governance and Ethics** (co-chaired by Dai Heide and Eryn Holbrook).
3. **Graduate Studies** (co-chaired by Amir Shabani and Pamela Stern)
4. **Impact Assessment and Communication** (co-chaired by Diana Cukierman and Lana Newton, Kanthi Jayasundera co-chaired until January 15).
5. **Pedagogy and Teaching Innovation** (co-chaired by Megan Robertson and Parm Gill).

The work of the five subcommittees and the AILTTF was assisted by the leadership operational team of Fabiana Rassier, Shreyashi Sanyal, and, during summer 2024, Varundeep Chahal. Between September 2024 and May 2025, the Task Force met 12 times in tandem with the subcommittees' meetings with the following goals:

1. Develop Artificial Intelligence principles and guidelines that address students' and instructors' uncertainties and concerns over academic integrity, governance, data privacy, intellectual property rights, inequities, as well as the safe, accountable and transparent uses and expectations of Artificial Intelligence in teaching and learning practices.

2. Make recommendations on the development of processes and the provision of resources including broad foundational training for instructors and students on the acceptable uses of Artificial Intelligence in various disciplinary contexts, oversight and operational support for the introduction of AI technologies into classrooms, and a governance structure that can guide university decisions and policy amendments amidst the changing landscape of Artificial Intelligence technologies.

3. Suggest requirements for transparency statements on the uses of Artificial Intelligence in research, exams, assignments, and theses and the provision of AI training available for graduate students and supervisors.

[1] S.24-90 Memorandum submitted to Senate by the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL), "Generative Artificial Intelligence Policy Motion," on May 23, 2024. Prepared by a SCUTL subcommittee, chaired by Parsa Rajabi; passed Senate meeting June 10th, 2024.

This document was authored through the collective work of all five subcommittees of the AILTTF, as well as extensive internal and external consultation. Internal feedback and discussion were facilitated through engagement with Deans, Associate Deans, Department Chairs and Directors, Student Services, the Library, Archives and Records Management , the Centre for Accessible Learning, the Indigenous Student Centre, the Centre for Educational Excellence, the Learning Experiences Assessment and Planning unit, the Office of the University Registrar, and senate committees (SCUS, SCUTL, SGSC), as well as many more contributors across the university community. External feedback was also sought from representative groups including the TSSU, SFUFA, GSS, and SFSS. The work was also informed and inspired by guidelines and frameworks developed at other leading institutions including University of British Columbia, University of Victoria, the University of Toronto, the University of Calgary, the University of Michigan, Stanford, Harvard, Northeastern University, the University of Arizona, the University of Sydney, the University of California, and many others worldwide. Final edits to the document were undertaken by Paul Kingsbury (AVPLT) and AILTTF advisor Parsa Rajabi with the assistance of ChatGPT Pro.

Terms

Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to computer systems designed to perform tasks or generate outputs that typically require human intelligence, such as reasoning, problem-solving, learning, decision-making, or natural language understanding. **Generative AI** (GenAI) is a specialized type of AI capable of creating original content, such as text, images, audio, or other media forms, traditionally produced through human cognitive processes. It operates primarily by leveraging advanced machine learning models trained on extensive datasets, enabling it to recognize patterns and generate novel outputs. **Large Language Models** (LLM) are a far-reaching technology that allow users to access generative AI models for a wide range of queries. The complexity of the queries they can handle often mirrors the level of difficulty found in university homework, assignments, and exams.

The term “Artificial Intelligence,” or abbreviation “AI” is used in this document rather than “generative AI” following the suggestion made in S.24-90 that “generative” be dropped from the motion wording because of the rapidly changing nature of AI and likely obsolescence of the term in the future.”

Challenges

Despite AI’s startling new and powerful capabilities, many teaching and learning challenges are borne out of the intensification of existing challenges rather than the generation of new ones. Exemplary here is the Academic Integrity sub-committee’s finding that the availability of AI tools did not create entirely new problems. Rather, the ubiquitous nature of AI tools only served to exacerbate existing vulnerabilities in the functioning of the academic integrity system, and limitations on how SFU defines and enforces academic integrity. The recommendations of the subcommittees attempt to address these larger concerns, as well as home in on the task of updating the Student Academic Integrity policy S10.01 and associated guidance to clarify foundational principles of academic integrity and how AI use may violate them.

Of course, AI introduces new challenges as well. The rapid and uncertain pace of technological development makes it difficult to establish policies that remain relevant over time. Additionally, the

usefulness of AI tools for teaching and learning varies considerably across disciplines and educational levels, further complicating efforts to create cohesive guidance. Instructors and students also bring a wide range of perspectives, understandings, and experiences of using AI, resulting in diverse and sometimes conflicting attitudes toward its use. As such, we must navigate the complexities of when and how to appropriately incorporate AI tools in ways that respect the diverse needs and goals of our programs, students, and instructors. Guidelines must guide and empower, rather than constrain or compel how conversations might proceed at Faculty, unit, and classroom levels. Empowerment is particularly important when considering the realities of workload pressures and time constraints for many instructors.

Development & Consultation

The principles and guidelines below will be formally launched after consultation with faculty and students including relevant representative groups (e.g. SFUFA, TSSU, SFSS, GSS, ISC), Senate committees (SCUS, SCUTL, SGSC), and academic leadership (e.g. Deans, Chairs and Directors). Once feedback has been received from these stakeholders, the principles and guidelines will be finalized and submitted to the Senate committees for approval. In parallel, these guidelines will introduce a series of updates aligned with forthcoming amendments to the Student Academic Integrity policy S10.01, ensuring consistency across institutional policy frameworks (see Appendix I).

To remain responsive to the evolving landscape of AI, it is essential that the guidelines undergo scheduled reviews and timely updates. This requires ongoing monitoring and evaluation of AI's impact on teaching and learning, coordinated support and collaboration within the teaching community, and clear, sustained communication across the university. This will involve:

1. Setting up mechanisms in AVPLT units for continuous evaluation of AI's impact on student engagement, educational goals, leading to ongoing refinement and adaptation of AI guidance.
2. Expanding AI-related resources and training through AVPLT units to help instructors apply AI tools in constructive, responsible, and pedagogically sound ways that strengthen student learning and skill building.
3. Dedicating the AVPLT office and its units to the deployment of resources and SFU Central Communications to key messaging and the navigation of AI guidelines.

Principles

The following principles seek to uphold the mission of the university amidst the perils and possibilities of AI. These principles support pedagogies of curiosity, accountability, independent thinking, and problem-solving in learning environments that uphold academic integrity, foster inclusivity, and align with university policies and legal requirements. Pedagogical goals and values must precede and support the use of AI technology. The guidance in this document is intended to provide clarity and boundaries to incite fruitful discussions that can begin by defining shared instructional values, educational goals for courses and departments, and the intended learning experiences that students are expected to develop and demonstrate. It is important to think of AI as one of many tools that can enhance pedagogy (i.e. not a required component for effective teaching).

1. For the Greater Good

Artificial Intelligence is transforming how we learn and work. At SFU, we recognize its equity, and environmental challenges and commit to preparing future problem-solvers for the greater good of education, research, and society.

We wish to make clear that all uses of AI in teaching, learning, and research must prioritize accountable and transparent decision-making, responsible practices, and the educational benefit of our community.

Sustainability

AI systems require significantly more electricity than typical digital technologies, placing substantial strain on energy resources and impacting sustainability at the intersection of ecology, economy, and society. In keeping with SFU's commitments to sustainability and climate, we pledge to:

- Evaluate and transparently communicate the environmental impacts of AI technologies.
- Limit AI integration to applications that provide clear educational value and benefits to the broader academic community.
- Continuously consider more sustainable alternatives or practices, balancing innovation with responsible resource management.

Indigenous Reciprocity

Respect for Indigenous history, languages, and cultures is fundamental and must guide how knowledge is collected, represented, and shared. In alignment with our commitments to reconciliation and Indigenous collaboration, SFU asks we:

- Actively consult with Indigenous communities and governing bodies before engaging with AI tools that directly involve or relate to Indigenous knowledges.
- Recognize and respect that Indigenous ways of knowing and being, traditional practices, and cultural protocols may not inherently align with AI usage.
- Uphold Indigenous data sovereignty by ensuring all AI-related activities and courses involving Indigenous data, content, materials, or participation follow the guidance of Indigenous communities and align with OCAP principles. Where appropriate, obtain explicit consent, and always respect their sovereignty over data and intellectual property.

Responsible Integration

Artificial Intelligence may be integrated into SFU's teaching and learning environments in ways that are thoughtful, intentional, and consistent with institutional values. Responsible integration of AI requires accountable and transparent practices that reflect on its environmental, pedagogical, and social implications. Members of the SFU community are expected to:

- Prioritize safety, privacy, fairness, and inclusivity in all uses of AI for instruction, assessment, and academic support.
- Clearly assess and communicate the intended benefits and potential limitations of AI tools within specific educational and disciplinary contexts.
- Exercise care and deliberation when exploring unfamiliar AI applications, ensuring their use aligns with course goals, disciplinary standards, and SFU's broader academic mission.

2. Academic Integrity

Members of the academic community produce original work, cite sources accurately, and uphold fairness and honesty in their teaching, learning, and research.

Academic integrity in the context of AI use requires that all members of the academic community produce original work, cite sources accurately, and uphold fairness and honesty in their teaching, learning, and research. Because AI tools are trained on large, often undocumented corpuses of data (without the knowledge of the authors), users may unintentionally plagiarize the ideas or words of others. To mitigate this risk, students and instructors must validate and take ownership of AI-generated content and ensure proper attribution.

When AI tools are used (e.g., for outlining or editing), students and instructors should disclose how the tool was used and cite it appropriately, for example, in an acknowledgements section or teaching practices to model transparency. Student disclosures about not using AI may be appropriate when an instructor has said AI is not permitted. All instructional uses of AI must comply with privacy legislation, institutional policy, and copyright law, including FIPPA and SFU's student academic integrity policy (S10.01).

3. Uphold Privacy

Secure the privacy of our teaching and learning community by thoroughly assessing the potential risks of Artificial Intelligence tools.

Protecting the privacy and security of our university community is essential when integrating AI into teaching and learning at SFU. All AI tools must undergo SFU's Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) and receive institutional approval before they are used for instructional purposes.

The PIA will inform students and instructors when their data will be collected or used within AI systems, and explicit consent must be required. Data input into AI tools should be limited where possible to only what is necessary, avoiding sensitive personal information unless specifically approved. Clear communication regarding how data is managed, stored, and protected is required.

4. Equitable Access

Enhance learning by helping students leverage and benefit from Artificial Intelligence tools regardless of differences in language, identity, ability, or other demographic and socio-economic factors.

In delivering an AI-enhanced education, the university should endeavour to remove barriers to access, wherever possible. Ensuring that students have equal access to AI tools promotes fairness and inclusivity and helps to bridge the digital divide. In instances where AI use is permitted, students should be able to easily access and use the tools required to complete their coursework. When designing AI-enabled courses, instructors should recommend free or university-funded tools. Students who do not wish to use AI tools for the completion of their course work should be given alternatives that foster an equivalent learning experience, where reasonable and feasible (see also "7. Disciplinary Contexts" below). For learning activities, instructors should be sensitive to students' distinct ethical and cultural contexts by understanding that some students may have legitimate reasons for wishing to refrain from using AI.

5. Transparency

Transparency in expectations for Artificial Intelligence use fosters a culture of trust, promotes fairness, and clarity in cases of misuse.

Transparency is a key factor in building trust between instructors and students. When expectations regarding the permissible or restricted use of AI are clear, students can make informed decisions about their course work. A transparent approach to acceptable AI usage in the classroom fosters a culture of trust, promotes fairness and responsibility, and helps avoid negative repercussions. Instructors should be clear about their expectations for student use of AI tools in completion of their coursework and describe any alternatives, if available. Regardless of whether students are encouraged, discouraged, or prohibited from using AI, instructors should be explicit in their syllabi and other student-facing course materials about the purpose of asking students to engage in activities and assignments and pointing to how these align with learning and assessment.

6. Academic Freedom

Empowering instructors by promoting understandings of responsible Artificial Intelligence practices as defined by university policy, provincial and federal law.

Academic Freedom is a core principle that ensures instructors have substantial autonomy regarding teaching methods, course content, assessments, and instructional tools, including AI. Academic freedom is, however, constrained by provincial, federal law and university policy. Instructors must ensure that their decisions concerning the use of AI for instructional purposes are consistent with these constraints and follow best practices.

7. Disciplinary Contexts

A thoughtful process for when and how to use Artificial Intelligence can be facilitated by involving open discussions within and between disciplines.

This document does not strive to formulate a one-size-fits-all approach to AI at SFU. Different research, and disciplinary communities will likely have different expectations for the use of AI tools. In addition, different academic units at SFU and individual supervisory committees will make different determinations about the legitimate, pedagogically sound, and appropriate uses of AI tools. Deciding when and how to use AI should be a thoughtful process, involving open discussions within disciplines and between disciplines to promote informed interdisciplinary approaches to AI.

Guidelines

The below guidelines are intended to serve as practical, flexible tools that support instructors and students by thoughtfully and transparently ~~i~~ntegrating AI into teaching and learning. Rather than prescribing rigid rules, they offer strategies that are informed by and articulate how the above principles can be achieved. We have identified three guideline areas because they directly speak to the needs, concerns, and responsibilities of three primary teaching and learning community members: instructors, undergraduate students, and graduate students.

Teaching & AI Guidelines

The following guidelines are designed to help you, as an instructor at SFU, make informed decisions about whether and how to integrate AI into your teaching. Recognizing there is no one-size-fits-all approach, the guidelines offer practical directions to help you use AI responsibly and effectively in your classes.

AI Selection

- Your use of any AI tools in your teaching remains optional, unless it is a curriculum requirement.
- Clearly communicate your expectations regarding AI use in each assignment and in the classroom to your students in the syllabus, during first day of class, and at intervals throughout the semester.
    - Provide explicit details about instructor use, student assessments, and assignments involving AI.
    - Where possible, offer students guidance on how AI tools are being used within your field, discipline, or relevant professional contexts to help them understand the practical implications and potential benefits or drawbacks.
    - Be open with students about any use of AI in preparing teaching materials to promote a transparent learning environment.
- Engage learners in open conversations about AI use and academic integrity in various learning contexts and at multiple points throughout the learning experience.
- Do not use AI detectors for grading decisions or academic misconduct investigations because they are unreliable, biased, and may unintentionally compromise students' learning and well-being. Any form of detection (AI or otherwise) is subject to the "balance of probabilities" test.
    - In addition, AI tools require a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) and informed student consent. Inputting student work into these tools without consent could violate both privacy legislation (if done without authority) and copyright protections.

Academic Integrity

- Approach academic integrity holistically by considering and addressing the reasons why students use AI tools in ways that are not permitted (i.e., build in AI literacy, clear guidelines, and other pedagogical strategies).
- Establish explicit expectations about when, how, and if AI may be used for specific assignments and activities.
- When AI is not permitted, you should review the existing curriculum and course pedagogy to redesign and/or move assessments into the classroom to ensure the course educational goals will not be compromised by prohibited use of AI.

- When AI use is permitted, ensure your students understand they are responsible for verifying the accuracy of AI generated content.
- Guide students to always disclose the use of AI and reference the nature of that use in assignments, exams, and research papers (e.g., in the "acknowledgement section").
- Promote understanding of AI tools' limitations, biases, and ethical considerations and explain the purpose of using AI in assessments/assignments.
- In cases where there is reasonable evidence of a violation of course or assignment expectations, begin by having a conversation with the student about your concerns before reporting them in accordance with academic integrity procedures, which uses a "balance of probabilities" standard.
- Provide students with sample language on how to acknowledge AI use (e.g., permitted, limited, or prohibited) so expectations are concrete and consistent.

Privacy, Copyright, and Consent

- Ensure you use AI tools approved by SFU in ways that protect student's privacy, data security, and intellectual property. Verify that these tools support effective teaching practices, disciplinary standards, and institutional policies by confirming they've undergone necessary reviews, such as a PIA.
- Students should always be clearly informed when their data will be collected or used within AI systems, and explicit student consent must be obtained to protect both privacy and copyright rights of students. Data input into AI tools must be limited to only what is necessary, avoiding sensitive personal information unless specifically approved.

AI Adoption

- Select AI tools that are relevant and align with AI use in students' field, discipline or potential workplace.
- Select AI tools that do not create barriers (i.e., costs, service availably) for learners or instructors.
- Choose freely available (or open source) AI tools, or ensure the cost is in line with SFU's values and policies.
- Prioritize the use of institutionally supported AI tools or ones that are intuitive, accessible, and designed for a diverse student body (i.e., consider various cultures, different knowledge systems, multi-lingual, neurodivergent and learners with differing abilities).
    - Ensure that AI tools are compatible with assistive technologies (e.g., screen readers) and meet accessibility standards.
- Consider the number and complexity of AI tools in the context of all educational technology in a course to avoid cognitive overload.

Assignments and Assessment

- Regardless of whether AI use is permitted or not, design assessments and learning activities which emphasize human-centered approaches that focus on "process", not "product" to enable students' thinking and learning. Refer to the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework for further information on what this entails.
- Adapt grading practices and rubrics to assess critical engagement rather than just content accuracy.
- Approved AI tools can be used to improve the grading process by providing timely, detailed and personalized feedback on assignments, however, the instructor/teaching assistants must be responsible for all feedback and grading and not rely on AI as the only source of feedback for students.
- Be mindful of generative media (images, audio, code, video). Make explicit whether these outputs are allowed in assignments and guide students on how to evaluate and credit them responsibly.

Pedagogical Considerations

- Foster critical thinking by encouraging deep analysis and reflection both with and beyond AI-generated content.
- Apply pedagogical approaches that encourage students to achieve a higher level of learning with AI assistance than without (i.e., critically analyze AI-generated content for accuracy, bias, and ethical implications; use AI for concept clarification and summarization but develop personal insights before completing assignments).
- When its capabilities permit, you can implement approved AI tools to help personalize the content focus and level of challenge for each student.
- Instructors are encouraged to consult the Centre for Educational Excellence (CEE) for resources, sample syllabus language, and workshops on AI in teaching.
- Remember that AI should augment—not replace—core teaching practices and your professional judgment.

Resources and Support

- Centre for Educational Excellence (CEE) Generative AI in Teaching and AI Writing Tools
- Student Services Using Generative AI
- Archives and Record Management and Copyright office for copyright and privacy support.

Learning & AI Guidelines

These guidelines help you, as an SFU student, understand how to responsibly, transparently, and effectively use AI in your coursework. They clarify how to maintain academic integrity, protect your privacy and data security, and thoughtfully engage with AI-generated content. Recognizing that courses and programs have different expectations, always refer to your instructor's guidance and course syllabus, and when in doubt, seek clarification before using AI tools.

Using AI and Upholding Academic Integrity

- Always follow AI-use guidelines explicitly stated by your instructor in your course syllabus and assignments.
- If the guidelines are unclear or absent, ask your instructor before using AI tools.
- Always transparently disclose and accurately cite AI-generated content in your submissions, as directed by your instructor. Refer to SFU-approved citation resources for appropriate practices.
- AI can be used to support your learning, never as a substitute for your own critical thinking or analysis.
- Maintain academic rigor when using AI. Do not accept AI-generated content at face value, as these tools are known to produce inaccurate information. Always verify facts and sources against trusted academic materials before submitting your work. You are responsible for all submitted work, including ensuring it does not inadvertently involve plagiarism or violate copyright laws (e.g., Canada Copyright Act) or university Intellectual Property (R30.03) and Copyright policies (R30.04).
- Do not rely on AI detectors, as these tools can be unreliable, biased and may unintentionally comprise your learning and well-being. AI detectors cannot be used for grading decisions or academic misconduct investigations.
- Keep clear records of your AI prompts, outputs, and modifications to ensure proper citation and accountability.

Privacy and Data Security

- Use AI tools explicitly approved by your instructor as deemed appropriate within the course's disciplinary context.
- Be aware that inputting your (or your peers') original academic work into AI tools can result in unintended sharing or distribution. Only do so if explicitly directed by your instructor.
- Protect your privacy when using AI tools. Do not share your or others' personal details, confidential information, or sensitive data (and others') with AI applications that are not vetted or provided by SFU. Always safeguard personal data and follow responsible AI use as stated in your course syllabus.
- Promptly discuss any privacy or data security concerns with your instructor.

- Respect copyright and intellectual property when using AI tools. If in doubt, consult your instructor and SFU's copyright for students guidelines.

Accessibility and Responsibility

- If AI use or a specific AI tool is required in your course and you face accessibility challenges or other barriers, promptly inform your instructor to discuss suitable accommodations or alternative solutions.
- Actively participate in course activities and assignments designed to critically evaluate AI-generated content, assessing its accuracy, biases, stereotypes, and potential discriminatory information, especially concerning sensitive cultural or social issues.
- Respect your classmates' personal, or cultural choices regarding their use of AI, especially in course components that require collaboration such as group projects.
- Use AI in a manner that respects Indigenous cultural protocols and data sovereignty. Do not submit or generate content involving Indigenous knowledge or sensitive cultural data without proper authority. Be mindful that AI models may produce biased or harmful representations of cultural groups; students are expected to actively avoid reinforcing stereotypes or misuse of cultural information.

Critical AI Literacy

- Avoid overreliance on AI tools, ensuring you build independent analytical, critical thinking, and creative skills necessary for your academic growth and future career.
- Strengthen your AI literacy by actively engaging with SFU-provided resources, workshops, and training, ensuring you understand the capabilities, limitations, and use them responsibly and knowledgeably.
- Participate actively in course activities aimed at strengthening your ability to critically evaluate AI-generated content.
- Reflect on potential biases, inaccuracies, and implications of AI outputs as part of your coursework.
- Foster critical thinking by actively critiquing and improving AI-generated information.
- Actively reflect on and choose AI tools sparingly and only when they provide clear educational benefits to minimize ecological impact, aligning your usage with SFU's sustainability and climate commitments.

Graduate Students & AI Guidelines

These guidelines help you, as a SFU graduate student, responsibly use AI in your research and thesis work. Given the specialized nature of graduate studies, always consult with your supervisor and supervisory committee regarding AI usage to ensure your decisions align with disciplinary standards, academic integrity, and privacy requirements. AI use in your coursework should follow the "Learning & AI" guidelines. Further detailed guidelines specific to research and publications using AI will be made available soon from the AI Research Task Force.

Using AI and Upholding Academic Integrity

- Discuss the use of AI tools with your direct supervisor and, if necessary, your supervisory committee. Additionally, complete any AI training required by your department, faculty, or the Faculty of Graduate Studies.
- Transparently disclose and accurately cite AI-generated content in your thesis and/or journal articles either in an acknowledgements or a methods section. An AI disclosure page for thesis template is coming soon.
- Never use AI as a replacement for your own critical thinking, creativity, or originality, but instead only to support your research and analysis, as permitted by your supervisor.
- Always verify the accuracy and credibility of AI-generated content before including it in your thesis or other writing/research material, as you remain responsible for the submitted work.
- Clearly document and justify your use of AI tools, explaining specifically how they were integrated into your research design, data collection, analysis, and writing processes.
- Avoid relying on AI detectors to check originality due to their unreliability and biases; always independently review your work carefully and seek the guidance of your supervisor and/or supervisory committee members.

Privacy, Data Security, and Intellectual Property

- Only use AI tools explicitly approved by your supervisor as deemed appropriate within your disciplinary context.
- Do not upload sensitive, confidential, or proprietary information (including research data or participant details) into AI platforms.
- Clearly inform research participants if AI tools will be used to record or analyze their data. Ensure they understand how the tools will be used and obtain explicit informed consent in accordance with SFU's ethics protocol.
- Protect your intellectual property by refraining from inputting unpublished findings or original ideas into AI services without appropriate safeguards.
- Respect copyright laws and ensure AI-generated materials do not unintentionally infringe intellectual property rights. If in doubt, consult your supervisor and SFU's copyright for students guidelines.

Accessibility and Responsibility

- Critically evaluate AI-generated content to identify and address potential biases, stereotypes, or discriminatory information, particularly regarding marginalized or people in vulnerable situations or culturally sensitive topics.
- Respect Indigenous data sovereignty; obtain appropriate authorization and adhere to community protocols when using Indigenous knowledge or data.
- Promptly inform your supervisory committee if required AI tools present accessibility, financial, or technical barriers, to discuss suitable accommodations or alternative solutions.
- Be respectful of your collaborators' personal, or cultural decisions regarding AI use, especially in research.

Critical AI Literacy

- Strengthen your AI literacy by actively engaging with SFU-provided resources, workshops, and departmental training to better understand AI capabilities, and limitations.
- Critically evaluate AI-generated content, addressing potential inaccuracies, and biases relevant to your research.
- Ensure AI use aligns with your research objectives without bypassing essential methodological skills or educational goals.
- Foster critical thinking by actively critiquing, validating, and improving upon AI-generated information, rather than passively accepting it.
- Reflect thoughtfully on the environmental impacts of AI, choosing tools sparingly and only when they provide clear research benefits to minimize ecological impact, aligning your usage with SFU's sustainability commitments.

AI Framework for Unit Leaders

As a unit leader (e.g. department chair, school or program director, graduate or undergraduate program chair) you are responsible for guiding how your area responds to the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in teaching and learning. SFU recognizes that the use of AI will differ across disciplines, programs, and pedagogical approaches. In alignment with the AI Teaching and Learning principle ***Disciplinary Contexts***, the university acknowledges that a single, standardized policy cannot account for the diverse expectations, values, and practices found across academic units. This guideline is designed to support you in leading a structured and inclusive process to develop AI guidance that reflects your unit's unique disciplinary context and instructional goals.

Available Resources

The following institutional supports are available to assist you in developing and implementing your AI guidelines:

Academic Integrity Hub (Proposed)
If established, this office will serve as a centralized academic integrity resource. It will be responsible for hosting mandatory academic integrity training modules for students, developing resources for instructors handling AI-related misconduct, providing consultation on complex cases, and coordinating messaging and programming across departments.

Centre for Educational Excellence (CEE)
The CEE supports academic units by offering individual consultations for course or assessment design, department-level workshops on AI and inclusive teaching practices, and custom programming to support the implementation of new teaching policies or instructional changes.

Centre for Accessible Learning (CAL)
The Centre for Accessible Learning supports instructors and departments in ensuring that learning environments and course design accommodate students with disabilities. CAL can provide guidance on how AI tools and policies intersect with academic accommodations, and how to address equity concerns when AI use may pose barriers for some learners. Units are encouraged to consult CAL when developing AI guidelines to ensure accessibility is integrated into instructional planning.

Learning Experiences Assessment and Planning (LEAP)
LEAP is tasked with the continuous evaluation of AI's impact on the learning and teaching community leading to ongoing refinement and adaptation of AI guidance. This group can also work with academic units to evaluate the impact of local policies and analyze AI's effect on student learning.

Archives and Records Management and Copyright Office
The two offices support the university in its records management, compliance with Freedom of Information, Copyright policies and Protection of Privacy legislation.

Transforming Inquiry into Learning and Teaching (TILT)
TILT focuses on the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). This group can work with instructors to design inquiry for pedagogical innovations of AI.

Communications & Marketing
The Learning and Teaching portfolio within SFU's Communication & Marketing team builds awareness and understanding of educational policies and initiatives and impacts. This group can work with stakeholders to communicate AI guidance across the university and within academic units.

Understanding the Current AI Guidelines and Decision Framework

Before developing your unit's policy, it is important to understand SFU's current institution-wide guidance. The Learning and Teaching AI Guidelines are structured around three groups in the academic community:

Teaching & AI
These guidelines are designed to help instructors make informed decisions about whether, when, and how to incorporate AI tools into their teaching. They offer practical strategies for aligning AI use with course educational goals, redesigning assessments to account for AI-generated work, and clearly communicating expectations to students. The guidelines also address considerations such as tool selection, transparency in instructional practices, academic integrity, and adherence to privacy legislation. Instructors are encouraged to reflect on how AI can either enhance or complicate learning and to set appropriate boundaries that support critical thinking and originality.

Learning & AI
These guidelines help students understand how to use AI in their academic work responsibly, and in compliance with institutional expectations. They provide clarity on what constitutes acceptable use in different contexts and emphasize students' responsibility to disclose AI use, verify outputs, and maintain academic integrity. Topics include citing AI-generated content, understanding data privacy implications, avoiding overreliance on AI tools, and respecting intellectual property rights. The guidelines also remind students that course-level rules may vary, and that they are expected to follow the specific guidance provided by their instructors.

Graduate Student & AI
These guidelines focus on the use of AI tools in graduate research, thesis and project writing, and academic publishing. They recognize that graduate-level work often involves more complex questions about authorship, originality, research ethics, and data protection. The guidelines emphasize that any use of AI in research must comply with departmental and Faculty of Graduate Studies policies and approved by a student's supervisor or supervisory committee. Graduate students are expected to understand how AI may intersect with methodological choices, disciplinary standards, and institutional policies around data security, Indigenous data sovereignty, and academic publishing. These guidelines serve as a foundation for thoughtful, transparent, and discipline-appropriate decision-making at the graduate level.

Using These Guidelines in Your Unit
As a unit leader, you are expected to use the institutional guidelines as a foundation when creating local policies. You should adapt these baseline expectations to your program's disciplinary context and pedagogical goals. Your department's policy should clearly define what AI use is permitted, restricted, or encouraged in coursework, and how instructors and students are expected to follow these expectations. These guidelines are living documents and should be reviewed and updated regularly in response to emerging technologies, teaching practices, and student needs.

Decision Framework: A Deep Reflection Tool
The Decision Framework provides a structured method for units to reflect on their academic values and teaching goals when deciding how to implement AI policies. The framework seeks to promote critical reflections via the following questions: Are AI tools allowed in your courses? Based on your answer, it prompts a set of guiding questions across five core domains. These questions help departments consider the practical, and pedagogical implications of their AI decisions.

Key Questions to Guide Your Unit's AI Planning:

- *What educational goals matter most in our courses, and how does AI support or undermine them?*
- *How is AI currently used in our field, and what expectations do students bring from industry or research?*
- *Are all students equally able to access and use the AI tools we allow, or would some be unfairly disadvantaged?*
- *How will instructors redesign assessments, assignments, or feedback processes to reflect our position on AI?*
- *What privacy, copyright, and institutional policies apply to the tools and practices we're considering?*
- *Have we assessed potential risks of AI tools by contacting SFU's Archive and Records Management Office or considered using frameworks such as the Government of Canada's Algorithmic Impact Assessment tool?*
- *Have (existing or new) instructors been given the guidance and resources they need to implement our decisions consistently?*

Implementation Process

Step 1: Understand your local context
Begin by reviewing how AI is currently being used in your unit. You may want to review recent syllabi, survey instructors and students about their experiences, or audit assessment types across courses. You can work with LEAP to develop and analyze surveys or other tools for collecting data. The goal is to build a shared understanding of your starting point before making decisions.

Step 2: Facilitate informed, inclusive discussions
Bring together students (undergraduate and graduate), instructors, advisors, teaching assistants, and graduate supervisors to explore how AI should be used or restricted in your unit. These discussions should surface disciplinary norms, identify pedagogical concerns, and raise questions about privacy, access, or ethics. You should document the outcomes of these discussions and use the Decision Framework to support and guide your planning.

Step 3: Draft and approve your unit's AI guidelines
Based on your consultations, develop a written document that outlines your unit's policy. It is recommended that this policy includes a short rationale for your approach; clear expectations for instructors on how to communicate AI rules; guidance for students on disclosure, citation, and academic integrity; and any special considerations for graduate students working on research or theses. The document should also include sample syllabus statements and a plan for periodic review and revision. The Centre of Educational Excellence (CEE) can assist with developing syllabus language, while Learning Experiences Assessment and Planning (LEAP) can support the design of a review and revision process. Finally, ensure your local policy aligns with SFU's academic regulations, privacy protocols, and AI guidelines.

Step 4: Put the guidelines into practice
Once your policy is ready, support instructors as they apply it. This may involve revising syllabi, redesigning assessments, or clarifying expectations with students. You should encourage instructors to consult the CEE for additional support and consider assigning faculty lead(s) to coordinate implementation and collect feedback. You may also want to establish a process for updating the policy based on feedback or new developments.

Monitoring and Evaluation

SFU has begun to incorporate AI-related questions in the Course Experience Survey (CES). These questions will allow students to reflect on whether AI use was clearly explained and appropriately integrated into the course.

Departments are encouraged to review these responses regularly. It is recommended to use feedback from the CES and internal discussions to improve your unit's guidelines and instructional practices. If you identify successful strategies or challenges worth sharing, report them to the Office of the Vice-Provost, Learning and Teaching. This will contribute to a broader university-wide understanding of how AI is being used in learning and teaching.

AI Resource Requests

To effectively implement SFU's institutional AI Guidelines across all academic units, additional resources are needed to support course redesign, policy integration, staff training, and student preparedness. Dedicated resources are needed to promote teaching best practices for AI and addressing common questions from instructors, researchers, and students, such as "Is this activity I am planning appropriate?" and "How can I customize these tools for a more secure and effective learning experience?" These requests are grounded in feedback from the AI Learning and Teaching Task Force (AILTTF) and reflect the operational gaps identified during the rollout of the AI Teaching and Learning Principles & Guidelines. The requested investments will ensure equitable, scalable, and responsible implementation of AI practices aligned with SFU's academic mission and strategic priorities.

Provide Adequate Resources for the Centre for Educational Excellence (CEE)
The CEE will serve as the university-wide hub for supporting AI-integrated course (re)design and pedagogical adaptation. As demand grows across faculties, additional staff with relevant expertise and technical resources are needed to provide timely, equitable support to instructors and academic units.

Establish an Academic Integrity Hub
A centralized hub can effectively address evolving challenges related to AI and academic misconduct. The hub will manage training, case consultation, and cross-unit coordination, reducing the current administrative burden on instructors and departments.

Develop a Mandatory AI Literacy Course for Incoming Students
Early, consistent education is needed to ensure all new students understand the responsible, as well as the various disciplinary-specific and course-level uses of AI tools. A university-wide course would standardize expectations and reduce academic integrity risks.

AI Literacy Training for Instructors and Teaching Assistants
Instructors and TAs require targeted professional development to responsibly integrate or restrict AI use in their teaching. Workshops, guides, and consultations will enable informed, discipline-sensitive decisions and effective communication with students.

AI Literacy Training for Unit Staff (e.g., Academic Advisors, Teaching Support Staff)
Staff who support students and instructors, particularly academic advisors and program assistants, must be equipped to answer AI-related questions, refer students to appropriate resources, and support consistent messaging across the institution.

Streamlined Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) Process for AI Tools
Instructors and departments need timely decisions on whether AI tools meet SFU's privacy standards. A simplified, more transparent, and well-supported PIA process will accelerate innovation while maintaining compliance and reducing workload bottlenecks.

Funding to Support AI Education Research (Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), Pilot Studies, Evaluation)

To support evidence-informed implementation of SFU's AI guidelines, we recommend dedicated funding for research on AI's role in teaching and learning. This could include pilot projects, evaluations within specific disciplines, and studies focused on equity, accessibility, and ethics. Supporting this work through TILT or targeted SoTL funding will help SFU refine practices over time, strengthen cross-unit collaboration, and contribute meaningfully to national conversations on educational innovation.

Support for Interdisciplinary AI Teaching and Research Initiatives

There is a growing need to connect departments with deep AI expertise (e.g., Computer Science, Mechatronics, Mathematics, Statistics, etc.) with non-technical and professional disciplines (e.g., Health Sciences, Education, Business, Communication, Environment) to co-develop AI-related curriculum, research projects, and applied teaching tools. Seed funding or coordination support for interdisciplinary initiatives will foster scalable partnerships, expand applied AI literacy across faculties, and strengthen SFU's leadership in responsible and cross-sector AI innovation.

Appendix

Recommended changes to Academic Integrity S10.01 policy and procedures

Background

The Academic Integrity sub-committee was tasked by the AILTTF to address the following: develop guidelines and policies that address academic integrity issues related to Artificial Intelligence (AI), such as plagiarism, cheating and misuse of AI tools; work with faculties and academic units to implement and monitor these policies; provide guidance on transparency and academic honesty in AI usage for both students and instructors.

A policy update to the S10.01 Student Academic Integrity policy is one important step in providing guidance on academic integrity issues related to AI, but a policy update by itself would be insufficient to address problems associated with the implementation of the policy. The sub-committee has met over a dozen times since September 2024, and it started to become apparent that the availability of AI tools did not create entirely new problems. Rather, the ubiquitous nature of AI tools only served to exacerbate existing vulnerabilities in the functioning of the academic integrity disciplinary system.

The S10.01 policy and associated procedures consist of three documents: the S10.01 Student Academic Integrity Policy that outlines the purpose and principles for student discipline, the Procedures that describes the process to be followed and the responsibilities of decision-makers (Instructor, Chair Registrar), and the Schedule A that lists forms of academic dishonesty and misconduct. The sub-committee is submitting changes only to the main policy section and the Schedule A to clarify the question raised in the original motion to Senate: "When would generative AI be considered a violation of the policy?"

The sub-committee is recommending a phased approach. **Phase One** recommends updates that would provide clarity on standards of academic integrity within the generative AI context. No changes to the Procedures are recommended in this phase as that would likely require a change in the roles and responsibilities of the main parties (Instructor, Chair, Registrar) in the process of student discipline. This phased approach is also intended to provide clarity on academic integrity disciplinary matters as it relates to AI as soon as possible. Adoption of the Phase One policy recommendations (see below) should not detract from the importance of attending to the concerns around the implementation of the Procedures that have existed prior to the onset of AI.

Phase Two would include changes to the S10.01 Procedures that is aimed at addressing concerns around under-reporting academic dishonesty violations, which is closely linked to issues of instructor workload and to a lesser extent, linked to instructor training. This would require much further consultation, and a re-organization of responsibilities related to student discipline.

Phase One: Clarify use of AI within the S10.01 policy

Completed tasks of sub-committee:

1. The S10.01 policy includes an updated definition of academic integrity and new language on what behaviours typify academic integrity. Rather than describing academic integrity in terms of what is prohibited, the new description lists actions that typify academic integrity with affirmative language. This is intended to move the narrative away from *whether* AI (or any tool) is permissible to a narrative on *how* it can be used. New definitions have been added for: Artificial Intelligence, Procedural Fairness, Academic Integrity.

2. The S10.01 Forms of Academic Dishonesty document now specifically lists examples of inappropriate use of AI.

3. Resources for the community: Recognizing that the S10.01 policy is primarily a down-stream and reactive measure to combat concerns around academic integrity violations, the sub-committee worked on building some resources:
   a. The existing suggestions for sample syllabus language have been expanded. A callout to faculty members was successful in collecting over 16 samples which can be used as exemplars for the broader community. This can be shared with the community through the AILTTF.
   b. The committee collected a series of handouts/ slide decks that provide information to instructors on various stages of the academic disciplinary process: "detecting" violations in light of the policy requirement to satisfy a balance of probabilities test, tips on holding a disciplinary meeting with a student, an overview of the reporting process, slide deck to introduce academic integrity to students at the start of a class, and a customizable slide deck to discuss various aspects of academic integrity depending on the nature of the problems affecting certain courses.
   c. New Canvas module in the academic integrity tutorial: A new module on "Can I use artificial intelligence in my courses?" has been created. It will be added to the existing Academic Integrity tutorial and linked to academic integrity website hosted by Student Services. The text for that module is included in the folder.

Phase Two: Recommendations for future amendments to S10.01

If the S10.01 policy provides clearer guidance on the standard of academic integrity and when AI should not be used in academic work, the next step would attend to problems with the implementation of the procedures (i.e. the reporting of violations).

Problems:

1. The model of academic integrity at SFU relies on instructors to be the first-level decision makers for academic integrity violations. This means that much of the administrative burden of addressing concerns with students, filing reports and managing appeals falls to the instructor. A single case takes several hours to resolve. Inevitably, this means that any instances of "mass cheating" go unreported. The academic integrity procedures were never suited to support the reporting of widespread cheating in a class due to instructor workload issues, but in the new context of AI this problem is exacerbated.

2. There is a spectrum of needs for instructors and students as it relates to academic integrity. Though it is possible for instructors to find good information and support to resolve academic integrity concerns, it is not always clear which unit to approach for help. Supporting a culture of academic integrity requires attending to upstream solutions (e.g. via the Centre for Educational Excellence's assistance with course design, effective communication strategies that orient students toward scholarly norms) and downstream responses such as effective management of student discipline and student appeals. Good information does exist, but it is spread across units. What is lacking is having the information in an easily accessible format at an intuitively findable location. Currently at SFU there is no "Academic Integrity Office" with a clear mandate to address this wide spectrum of needs.

3. The S10.01 student academic integrity policy is primarily a guide for student discipline. Its processes follow a traditional adversarial model of resolving disputes, where safeguards for students are put in place via procedural fairness requirements. As it stands, there is no imperative for an educative approach, though instructors certainly can and do use these disciplinary mechanisms as the proverbial "teachable moment." There is an opportunity for change toward more systematically embedding an educative outcome within the disciplinary approach.

Recommendations

Changes to S10.01 Procedure

1. Include a new procedure that allows for an alternative diversionary process for students in cases where it is a first-time violation, the student takes responsibility for the violation, and the instructor agrees that the diversionary process is appropriate. A diversionary process is an addition to, not a replacement for the existing adversarial model; but it does have components of a restorative justice model. This recommendation would serve to move the S 10.01 policy toward having an educative function. Depending on the design of this process, it is likely to also reduce instructor workload because it removes the adversarial nature of the process and can create provisions for delegation to other staff who can focus on education (like the Back on Track program for students on academic probation).

2. The existing Procedures already provide some provisions to delegate responsibilities. Consider expanding the provisions to delegate responsibilities when:
   a. The Instructor is a sessional instructor.
   b. The unit Chair/Director determines that there is a concern of widespread cheating in a course.

3. Update the role of the Academic Integrity Advisor (AIA) and consider making this an elected service role. Currently, the Academic Integrity Advisor position is held by a faculty member, and the function of the AIA is to support Instructors and Chairs with handling cases of academic dishonesty. Most departments appoint one advisor, and sometimes the person who holds the AIA position is also the Undergraduate Chair. Making this an elected position will give more visibility to the position as an academic integrity resource and potentially address some of the problems with disseminating information at the department level. An expanded role for the AIA could include supporting instances of widespread cheating or attending to cases where a Sessional Instructor is no longer available.

Coordination and Communications

4. There are many ways to change the procedures to attend to the problem of instructor workload and the associated under-reporting of violations. The challenge is to know who to shift the work to. If the above recommendations to S 10.01 procedures are put into place, it would be helpful to have an umbrella unit that could house matters pertaining to academic integrity which could both directly and indirectly serve to reduce the incidents of academic dishonesty. A potential Academic Integrity Hub could be responsible for:
   a. Managing students through a diversionary option and offering some educational programming
   b. Develop a curriculum and implement academic integrity programming that is aimed at the student population.
   c. Provide training on S10.01 to decision makers, including the departmental Academic Integrity Advisor positions who are a valuable conduit to disseminate best practice to faculty colleagues. This would build on the existing ties between the Registrar's Office and academic units.
   d. Build on existing relationships and collaborate with CEE to deliver support that encourage proactive measures to prevent academic dishonesty
   e. Act as a point to address new issues as they arise; an Academic Integrity Hub could coordinate as needed with the various units that in the past have been called in to support a response (from Campus Services to IT).