



General Faculties Council
Campus Law Review Committee
Approved Minutes

Thursday, September 22, 2011
3-15, UHALL
9:30 am – 11:00 am

ATTENDEES:

Steven Penney - Chair, Chris Hackett (Delegate), Frank Robinson, Al Belanger (Delegate), Jayson MacLean, Tamara Korassa, Colten Yamagishi (Delegate), Elaine Geddes, Adrienne Wright, Jess Ann Gordon, Iva Spence, Garry Bodnar (Coordinator and Scribe)

PRESENTERS AND GUESTS:

Chris Hackett, Discipline Officer, Office of Student Judicial Affairs
Marion Haggarty-France, University Secretary
Steven Penney, Chair, GFC Campus Law Review Committee
Frank Robinson, Vice-Provost and Dean of Students
Iva Spence, Appeals Coordinator, University Governance

OPENING SESSION

1. Approval of the Agenda

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

The Chair welcomed members to the first GFC CLRC meeting of the new Academic Year; spoke to his role, over the coming year, as the Committee Chair; and asked members to do a 'round-table' of introductions.

Members agreed to the Agenda, as circulated.

2. Approval of the Open Session Minutes of April 28, 2011

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Motion: Geddes/Robinson

THAT the GFC Campus Law Review Committee approve the Open Session Minutes of April 28, 2011.

CARRIED

3. Comments from the Chair

The Chair had no additional comments.

4. Orientation and Kick-off (no documents)

Presenters: Steven Penney, Chair, GFC Campus Law Review Committee; Marion Haggarty-France, University Secretary; Garry Bodnar, Director of General Faculties Council Services and Secretary to GFC

Purpose of the Proposal: To provide new and continuing members of the GFC Campus Law Review Committee (CLRC) with an (annual) orientation to the legislative and administrative frameworks in which this standing committee of General Faculties Council (GFC) will operate during the Academic Year 2011-2012.

Discussion:

Ms Haggarty-France welcomed members to the new academic year and provided a general overview of the orientation process undertaken by University Governance.

Mr Bodnar provided a formal orientation, aided by a web-based presentation, to members, highlighting the following: the *Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA)*; various GFC and GFC Standing Committee Terms of Reference, including those for GFC CLRC; samples of GFC CLRC Agendas, Minutes, and Outlines of Issue; and other relevant resource documentation upon which members can draw as they perform their duties on GFC CLRC.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

5. Academic Integrity Task Force Report

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenters: Chris Hackett, Discipline Officer, Office of Student Judicial Affairs; Frank Robinson, Vice-Provost and Dean of Students

Purpose of the Proposal: To provide the report and recommendations made by the Academic Integrity Task Force, based on responses to the academic integrity survey of October/November, 2010. The hope is to begin a discussion on the various recommendations made by the Task Force, as contained in their report.

Discussion:

Mr Hackett introduced the Report to members. He spoke to the background that had led to the work undertaken by the Academic Integrity Task Force; the membership of the Task Force, intended to represent all key institutional stakeholders with interest in issues related to academic integrity and discipline; the logistics associated with conducting the Academic Integrity Survey over the past year; the high participation rate of those responding to the Survey; the process of gathering data to support both the Survey and the resulting report; the final results attained, based on the Survey, and the manner which these results would be rolled up into a national survey on the same topics; and the short-, medium-, and long-term recommendations, as set out in the Report, that grew out of the Survey results. He noted that three major institutional risks had been identified by the Task Force, based on the Survey findings: the alienation students and staff felt from the University's discipline system and the fundamental lack of understanding they had of what was involved in this system; the need for better educative processes on discipline-related matters for both students and staff; and the considerable impact of technology on academic integrity issues. Mr Hackett concluded his remarks by indicating that he and other Task Force members were eager to engage as many people at the University as possible in the issues/recommendations laid out in the Report and to move forward on said recommendations in a positive

and constructive manner.

Mr Hackett also clarified for members the Task Force's intention behind Recommendation #9. He indicated that a recent article in *The Gateway* had suggested the Task Force was recommending the University adopt the electronic detection resource 'turnitin.com'—this was not the case, he said, but instead members felt that careful, systematic review of these types of resources should be carried out before any decisions were made to either employ or not employ them. He noted, as well, that Survey results indicated that very few people were aware of the annual publication of institutional discipline statistics that appeared in *The Gateway*, thereby undermining their usefulness.

During the ensuing discussion, the presenters addressed questions and comments from members including, but not limited to, the following: clarification was sought on the rationale underpinning Recommendation #10, with concern expressed on how this recommendation would be implemented and the amount of staff and financial resources that its implementation would require, and whether or not its deployment would vary from Faculty to Faculty; a member strongly advocated for the involvement of students in any decision-making that potentially could lead to the use of on-line resources such as 'turnitin.com'; a member stated there was a need to ensure that something concrete came out of the recommendations contained within the Report and sought clarification on the Task Force's plans for implementation of said recommendations and who would oversee the progress made towards accomplishing these goals and ambitions; and there was a need to better educate the University community on institutional discipline matters and on how both students and staff could be engaged in meaningful discussion on the range of academic integrity issues confronting the University.

Mr Hackett thanked members for their comments and indicated he would welcome any additional feedback they may have on the Task Force's findings.

6. Update on Implementation of the Restorative Justice System in University of Alberta Residences

There were no documents.

Presenter: Chris Hackett, Discipline Officer, Office of Student Judicial Affairs

Purpose of the Proposal: For discussion/information.

Discussion:

Mr Hackett provided members with a brief update on the implementation this past Spring of the University's new restorative justice system in the Residences. He spoke to the extensive training provided to those participant in the system and the continuing consultation that was occurring around its implementation.

During the ensuing discussion, the presenter addressed questions and comments from members including, but not limited to, the following: information was sought on when the first case under the new system would be heard (or had been heard); whether or not 'refresher' courses would be provided on an on-going basis to those involved in restorative justice; and what systems were in place to support the system, now and into the future.

7. Report from the Appeals Coordinator on the Development of Proposals for Consideration by the GFC Campus Law Review Committee (CLRC)

There were no documents.

Presenter: Iva Spence, Appeals Coordinator, University Governance

Purpose of the Proposal: For discussion/information.

Discussion:

Ms Spence provided members with a brief update on the proposals relating to the varying University codes of conduct and appeal regulations she anticipated University Governance would bring forward to GFC CLRC throughout the Fall and Winter, 2011-2012, for members' consideration. Dr Robinson augmented Ms Spence's comments by identifying several other issues he thought might be raised at upcoming GFC CLRC meetings by the Office of the Dean of Students.

8. Question Period

There were no questions.

INFORMATION ITEMS

9. Items Approved by the GFC Campus Law Review Committee by E-Mail Ballots

There were no items to date.

10. Information Items Forwarded to Committee Members Between Meetings

There were no items to date.

CLOSING SESSION

11. Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 10:55 am.