AGENDA

University of Regina | Go far, together.

EXECUTIVE OF COUNCIL

Date: 18 February 2026
To: Executive of Council
From: Glenys Sylvestre, University Secretary
Re: Meeting of 25 February 2026

A meeting of Executive of Council is scheduled for 25 February 2026, 2:30-4:30 p.m. in the Administration Humanities Building, Room 527 (AH 527) and via web conferencing (Zoom). As per Section 4.6.2 of the Council Rules and Regulations, meetings shall be closed except to persons invited to attend and members of Council who chose to attend as guests.

AGENDA

1.   Approval of the Agenda

2.   Approval of the Minutes of 28 January 2026 – *Circulated with the Agenda*

3.   Business Arising from the Minutes

4.   Remarks from the Chair

5.   Report from the University Secretary

6.   Report from Committee(s) of Council
    6.1   Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Studies, Appendix I, pp. 2-6

7.   Graduand Lists
    7.1   Graduand Lists for Approval – Omnibus Motion – *Distributed Confidentially*

7.1.1   Faculty of Arts
7.1.2   Faculty of Business Administration
7.1.3   Faculty of Education
7.1.4   Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

7.1.5   Faculty of Kinesiology and Health Studies
7.1.6   Faculty of Social Work
7.1.7   Centre for Continuing Education

8.   Other Business
    8.1   Provost's Working Group on GenAI and Academic Integrity – Interim Report, *For Information,* Appendix II, pp. 7-20

9.   Reports from Faculties, Academic Units, and Federated Colleges

10.   Adjournment

UNIVERSITY OF REGINA
Executive of Council

Subject: Report from the Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Studies

Item(s) for Decision:

1.   FACULTY OF EDUCATION

1.1   Program Revision – Four-Year Secondary Bachelor of Indigenous Education

> **MOTION:** That the Four-Year Secondary Bachelor of Indigenous Education program be revised, effective 202630.

Four-Year Secondary Bachelor of Indigenous Education Program (120 credit hours)	
Term 1 (Fall)	Term 2 (Winter)
~~One of EIND 205 or INDG 201, 208, 210, 215, 216, 218, 219, 221, 222 (3)~~ ENGL 100 (3) Major (3) Minor (3) Non-education elective (3) **Non-education elective (3)**	EIND 100 (3) **EIND 205 (3)** Major (3) Major (3) Minor (3) ~~Non-education elective (3)~~
Term 3	Term 4
EIND 200 (3) Major (3) Major (3) Minor (3) Minor (3)	Major (3) Major (3) Minor (3) ~~Minor~~ **Non-education elective** (3) Non-education elective (3)
Term 5	**Term 6**
E (major curriculum course) (3) E (minor curriculum course) (3) Major (3) Non-education elective (3) Non-education elective (3)	EIND 350 (3) EPSY 350 (3) E (major educ. Course) (3) E (major instr. Course) (3) Non-education elective (3)
Term 7	Term 8
ED 350 (3) EFLD 051 (0) (0 CRE) ~~EIFA 355 (3)~~ **ECCU 400 (3)** EIND 305 (3) EPSY 322 (3) ~~JS~~ **CRIM** 351 (3)	EFLD 400 (internship) (15)

Notes:
   ~~1.   Number of major and minor courses will vary according to specific major and minor course requirements.~~
   1.   EIND 100 field 7 half days
   2.   EIND 200 field 10 half days
   3.   EIND 350 field seven half days plus one-week block
   4.   EIND 305 field one-week, two-week block in band school
   5. EIND 205 (recommended) may be replaced with INDG 201, 208, 210, 215, 216, 218, 219, 221, or 222	

Rationale:

These changes offer clarity to students. Adding the note to EIND 205 communicates to students both the preferred course to align with program needs and the possible options that might be accepted.

(end of Motion)

1.2 Program Revision – Secondary Bachelor of Indigenous Education, Indigenous Studies Major

MOTION: That the Secondary Bachelor of Indigenous Education, Indigenous Studies Major program be revised, effective 202630.

Secondary Bachelor of Indigenous Education Program Indigenous Studies Major (120 credit hours)	
Term 1 (Fall)	Term 2 (Winter)
One of EIND 205 or INDG 201, 208, 210, 215, 216, 218, 219, 221, 222 (3) ENGL 100 (3) INDG 100 **(Major)** (3) Minor (3) Non-education elective (3) **Non-education elective (3)**	EIND 100 (3) **EIND 205 (3)*** INDG approved elective **(Major)** (3) Minor (3) Non-education elective (3) Non-education elective (3)
Term 3	Term 4
EIND 200 (3) INDG 224 or 225 **(Major)** (3) INDG approved elective **(Major)** (3) Minor (3) Minor (3)	INDG 228 or 229 **(Major)** (3) INDG approved elective **(Major)** (3) Minor (3) Minor **INDG approved elective (Major)** (3) Non-education elective (3)
Term 5	Term 6
EIST 300 (major curriculum course) (3) E (minor curriculum course) (3) INDG approved elective **(Major)** (3) Non-education elective (3) Non-education elective (3)	EIST 350 (3) EIST 400 (3) EIND 350 (3) EPSY 350 (3) Non-education elective (3)
Term 7	Term 8
ED 350 (3) EFLD 051 (0) (OCRE) EIEA 355 (3) **ECCU 400 (3)** EIND 305 (3) EPSY 322 (3) JS **CRIM** 351 (3)	EFLD 400 (internship) (15)
*EIND 205 (Recommended) may be replaced with INDG 201, 208, 210, 215, 216, 218, 219, 221, or 222	

Rationale:

These changes offer clarity to students about which classes constitute the major. Adding the note to EIND 205 communicates to students both the preferred course to align with program needs and the possible options that might be accepted.

(end of Motion)

1.3 Program Revision – Secondary Bachelor of Indigenous Education After Degree

MOTION: That the Secondary Bachelor of Indigenous Education After Degree program be revised, effective 202630.

Secondary Bachelor of Indigenous Education After Degree (BIEAD) (60 credit hours) ~~EIND 100 required for admission~~	
Term 1 (Fall)	Term 2 (Winter)
~~One of EIND 205 or INDG 201, 208, 210, 215, 216, 218, 219, 221, 222 (3)~~ EIND 200 (3) E (major curriculum course) (3) E (minor curriculum course) (3) Non-education elective (3) **Non-education elective (3)**	**EIND 205(3)*** EIND 350 (3) EPSY 350 (3) E (major educ. course) (3) E (major instr. course) (3) ~~Non-education elective (3)~~
Term 3	Term 4
ED 350 (3) EFLD 051 (0) (OCRE) ~~EIEA 355 (3)~~ EIND 305 (3) EPSY 322 (3) ~~JS~~ **CRIM** 351 (3) **ECCU 400 (3)**	EFLD 400 (internship) (15)
*EIND 205 (Recommended) may be replaced with INDG 201, 208, 210, 215, 216, 218, 219, 221, or 222	

Rationale:

These changes offer clarity to the students. EIND 100 is no longer required for program completion. Adding the note to EIND 205 communicates to students both the preferred course to align with program needs and the possible options that might be accepted.

(end of Motion)

1.4 **Admission Requirement and Program Revision – Secondary Bachelor of Indigenous Education After Degree, Visual Arts Major**

> **MOTION:** To revise the Secondary Bachelor of Indigenous Education After Degree, Visual Arts Major program, effective 202630.

Bachelor of Indigenous Education After Degree (BIEAD) Secondary Program Visual Arts Major (60 Credit Hours) ~~EIND 100 Required for Admission~~	
Term 1 (Fall)	Term 2 (Winter)
EVIS 101 or 202 (3) EIND 200 (3) EAE 300 ~~EVIS 326~~ (major curriculum course) (3) E (minor curriculum course) (3) Non-education elective (3)	EAE **400** ~~201~~ (3) EAE 350 (3) EIND 350 (3) EPSY 350 (3) EIND 205* or INDG 201, 208, 210, 215, 216, 218, 219, 221, 222 (3)
Term 3	Term 4
ED 350 (3) EFLD 051 (0) ECCU 400 ~~EIEA 355~~ (3) EIND 305 (3) EPSY 322 (3) ~~JS~~ CRIM 351 (3)	EFLD 400 (internship) (15)
*EIND 205 (Recommended) may be replaced with INDG 201, 208, 210, 215, 216, 218, 219, 221, or 222	

Visual Arts Education Major*	Minor
1. ART or INA 100-400 level (3) 2. Two of ART/ARTH/INA/INAH 100-400 level courses (6) 3. ART 220 or INA 220 (3) 4. ART 221 or INA 221 (3) 5. Three of ART or INA 200-400 level courses (9) Note: Required major curriculum courses EAE 300, EAE 350, and EAE 400.	1. Minor _____ (3) 2. Minor _____ (3) 3. Minor _____ (3) 4. Minor _____ (3) 5. Minor _____ (3) 6. E (minor curriculum course) (3)
*Minimum 24 credit hours of academic course work in major	

Rationale:

These changes ensure that the Visual Arts curriculum classes that are named are appropriate. Adding the Major/Minor planning template will help students see what classes they need to take. EIND 100 is no longer required for program completion. Adding the note to EIND 205 communicates to students both the preferred course to align with program needs and the possible options that might be accepted.

(end of Motion)

1.5   Admission Suspension – Inclusive Education Minor

MOTION: That admission to the Inclusive Education minor be suspended effective 202720 and made historical effective 203220.

Rationale:

Inclusive education is not an area of instruction (such as mathematics or English) but is an approach to teaching, and as such there is difficulty in placing students in field placements for this minor. Both our students and our field partners will be better served by interested students taking the extended certificate in Inclusive Education.

(end of Motion)

Interim Report: The Provost's Working Group on Generative Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity

The public availability of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) from November 2022 created significant challenges as well as opportunities for education institutions. Across universities as well as at the University of Regina, an immediate impact was a steep rise in the number of reported academic misconduct cases involving students' unauthorized use of GenAI tools in assignments. The fast advances in GenAI capabilities and the increasing integration of GenAI into many existing digital teaching/learning related software have had significant ramifications for teaching and learning practices, pedagogies, course assignments, and assessment of student learning. To investigate the actual and potential impact of GenAI on academic integrity in particular and teaching and learning more broadly and to develop appropriate guidelines, policies and resources for supporting faculty and students, Interim Provost and Vice-President (Academic) Dr. david Gregory established a working group in November 2024. The working group is called the Provost's Working Group on Generative Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity (PWG-AIAi). The PWG-AIAi's Terms of Reference is attached to this interim report as Appendix A. The PWG-AIAi has its first meeting in December 2024 and has met monthly since then.

To perform the tasks outlined in the Terms of Reference efficiently, two sub-working groups were created. The first sub-working group was composed of Dr. Nilgün Önder and Dr. Chris Oriet. Their responsibility was to conduct an environmental scan of selected Canadian universities' GenAI guides/policies and relevant resources as related to protecting academic integrity and preventing academic misconduct (see Appendix B for the parameters of the environmental scan). This group also volunteered to develop recommendations for the University of Regina as appropriate, based on the findings from their environmental scan. The second sub-working group included Dr. Alec Couros, Dr. Shannon Dea (replaced by Dr. Michelle Stewart in July 2025), Dr. Orland Hoeber, Mrs. Jasmeet Singh, and Ms. Sarah Stewart. This group undertook the task of creating faculty and student surveys on academic integrity after identifying and examining relevant existing surveys.

The environmental scan working group completed its mandate in April 2025. The group's environmental scan findings and recommendations were discussed and commented on by the PWG-AIAi. After integrating the feedback into their recommendations, Dr. Önder and Dr. Oriet shared a summary of the environmental scan and recommendations with the University of Regina Deans' Council (URDC) and the Associate Deans Academic Group (ADAs) and received further feedback. Appendix C provides the environmental scan

summary and the recommendations. A postscript on the actions taken towards the implementation of several recommendations is also included following each relevant recommendation.

At the time of writing this interim report, the faculty and student survey working group is poised to complete the construction of the two surveys. The draft surveys will be submitted to the PWG-AIAi for further discussion before they are finalized. The PWG-AIAi decided to obtain the Research Ethics Board's approval for the surveys before administering them. A research ethics approval will enable the interested members of the working group as well as other researchers to use the survey results for academic integrity research and scholarly publications. Depending on the timelines of the research ethics approval, the PWG-AIAi plans to conduct both the faculty and student surveys during the Winter 2026 semester. The working group will analyze the survey results to inform its recommendations. As recommended by the environmental scan working group, the surveys will be enhanced by a focus group method. Faculty and student focus groups will be held following the surveys. As a prelude to the focus groups, Dr. Önder and Dr. Oriet are going to facilitate a semi-structured discussion with a group of 15 students on the topic of students' use of GenAI in coursework and studying on 26 November as part of the University's academic integrity week (24-28 November). The results of this discussion will be shared with the PWG-AIAi.

Prepared by Dr. Nilgün Önder on behalf of the PWG-AIAi.

12 November 2025

Appendix A

Provost's Working Group on Generative Artificial Intelligence Technology (AI) and Academic Integrity (Ai)

Preamble:

The increasing prevalence of generative Artificial Intelligence Technology (AI) has implications for all post-secondary institutions in Canada. Implicated are core functions and values of the academy, such as: pedagogy--including teaching and learning practices, learning analytics and student support, distance and online education, assessment and grading of student work, data privacy and security, detection of plagiarism, and the need for professional development of faculty and staff (Al-Zaharani & Alasmari, 2024). AI will impact how we learn, teach, work, live, and make decisions (Slimi, 2023).

The Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) has provided initial guidelines for faculty and instructors at the University of Regina (https://ctl.uregina.ca/generative-ai-at-the-university-of-regina). Included on this website are AI guidelines, sample syllabus statements, and information about the U of R AI Working Group. Through the Academic Integrity Hub (https://academic-integrity.uregina.ca) faculty and students are provided with information concerning academic integrity and academic misconduct. Faculty and students are also directed to the CTL for information about generative AI.

The University of Regina recently and directly experienced the impact of AI on academic integrity (Ai). There was a sudden significant increase in the cases of alleged academic misconduct during the 2024 academic year. Every post-secondary institution in Canada is "finding their way" with respect to AI and its impact on academic integrity. The Provost's Working Group on AIAi addresses matters of concern to the academy at the University of Regina.

Objectives and Outcomes:

1. Conduct an environmental scan of best practices, principles, and policies concerning AIAi within the Canadian academic eco-system.
2. Identify relevant best practices, principles, and policies concerning AIAi relevant to the University of Regina.
3. Identify and recommend resources to support faculty and students in the adoption and use of generative AI at the University of Regina. That is, identify the strengths of AIAi and its "place" within our teaching/learning ecosystem.
4. Engage in a root cause analysis of the sudden surge in alleged academic misconduct at the University of Regina in 2023/2024.

5. Review the survey tool and findings of the McCabe Survey on Academic Integrity.
6. Consider preventative strategies concerning misconduct to assist students and faculty using AIAi.
7. Consult with the Chief Governance Officer and investigating deans regarding current academic misconduct processes.
8. Identify the ethical dimensions concerning the use of AIAi
9. Submit a report to Executive of Council (EOC) based on the findings of the working group (Date to be determined).

Membership:

- Dr. david Gregory, Interim Provost, Chair
- Interim Dean Tobias Sperlich, Faculty of Arts
- Vacant, URSU VP (Student Affairs)
- Dr. Chris Oriet, Associate Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
- Prof. Emily McNair, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programs, Faculty of Business Administration
- Dr. Brian Sterenberg, Council Committee on Academic Mission (CCAM)
- Dr. Charisma Thomson, CCAM
- Dr. Deena Salem, Interim Director, Centre for Teaching and Learning
- Dr. Nilgün Onder, AVP (Academic)
- Mr. Jasmeet Singh, University Communications & Marketing
- Mr. Scott J. Wilson, Luther College
- Dr. Edward Doolittle, First Nations University of Canada
- Mx. Veronica Ramshaw, Library
- Dr. Orland Hoeber, Department Head, Computer Science
- Ms. Sarah Stewart, Administrator, Academic Governance
- Dr. Laurie Sykes Tottenham, Campion College
- Dr. Leta Kingfisher, First Nations University of Canada

Working group supported by the Office of the AVP(Academic), Ms. Kristina Eckel.

_____

Al-Zahrani, A.M., Alasmari, T.M. Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on higher education: The dynamics of ethical, social, and educational implications. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun* **11**, 912 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03432-4

Zouhaier Slimi. The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Higher Education: An Empirical

Appendix B

Parameters for GenAI/AI Environmental Scan

At each university surveyed:
1. Is inappropriate genAI use considered plagiarism, impersonation, cheating, or a special category of its own?
2. What guidance and supports are provided to instructors regarding genAI in relation to academic integrity in students' academic work?
3. What strategies have been undertaken to prevent the misuse of genAI by students?
4. How are genAI detectors addressed?
5. What guidance/policies address transparency statements?
6. What guidance/policies address citing genAI?
7. What is the investigation process for genAI-related misconduct?
8. What discretion do instructors have in investigating/reporting/penalizing misconduct?
9. What is the relative emphasis on the disciplinary process for academic misconduct (punitive/disciplinary vs. educational/formative/*restorative)?
10. What penalties are issued to students found to be inappropriately using genAI in their academic work?

E-scan will focus on nine universities. The selected universities include a mix of comparable universities (U of S, Lethbridge, UVic), three more research-intensive, bigger universities (Queen's, UBC, Waterloo), and three small teaching-focused universities (Mount Allison, Acadia, Mount Royal).

Appendix C

Summary: Environmental Scan on Generative AI and Academic Integrity at the Nine Canadian Universities Reviewed

1. Is inappropriate GenAI use considered academic misconduct?

- **Explicitly Named:**

    - *Queen's University:* "Unauthorized content generation" and plagiarism.

    - *Mount Royal:* Misuse considered plagiarism.

- **Implied Categories Elsewhere:** Plagiarism, unauthorized assistance, "other offenses", or editor misuse.

---

2. Instructor Supports for GenAI & Academic Integrity

- **Common Supports:**

    - Sample syllabus statements

    - Assessment design guidance

    - Ethical integration strategies

    - Workshops and training

- **Leaders in Support:** *UBC, Queen's, USask, Waterloo*

---

3. Strategies to Prevent Student Misuse

- AI use policy in course syllabi

- Citation and transparency guidance

- Online resources, tutorials, and modules

- *USask* and *UBC* provide published, role-specific guidelines

---

4. Use of GenAI Detection Tools

	Clear policy/guideline or statement on AI Detectors?	GenAI detectors allowed?
University of Saskatchewan	Yes	No
University of Victoria	No	No **plagiarism** detection tool allowed
University of Lethbridge	No	
Queen's University	Yes	Strongly discouraged /privacy and reliability concerns
University of British Columbia	Yes	Strongly discouraged / "effectiveness, accuracy, bias, privacy, and intellectual property" concerns
University of Waterloo	Yes	Allowed / cannot rely on AI detection scores as the sole evidence; must inform students of AI detection tool use
University of Mount Allison	No	
Acadia University	No	
Mount Royal University	No, but CTL's website includes a video showing how to use Turnitin's AI detection feature to check for AI generated content.	Unclear
University of Regina	Yes	Turnitin AI detection tool / but no reliance on the AI score as sole evidence

5. Transparency Statements

GenAI transparency statements:

- are explicitly encouraged at USask, UBC, Waterloo

- emphasize disclosing use, citing tools, recording interaction

UWaterloo: AI Disclosure Framework (AID) and an icon system to easily disclose and identify the degree and nature of GenAI use in academic work

6. Citing genAI

- Most universities provide citation guides for multiple styles
- 6 of the universities provide specific guidance/resources on how to cite genAI, typically on library websites.
- 2 smaller universities (Mount Royal and Acadia) have not posted a guide/resource. Mount Allison library links to external sources.
- U of R Archer Library website provides resources on major citation styles, but no specific page or resource on how to cite genAI

7. Investigation of Misconduct

- *Queen's* and *Mount Royal* explicitly mention genAI
- Other institutions apply general misconduct policies
- No university has unique investigative processes for genAI cases

8. Instructor Discretion

- Instructors often initiate investigations
- Scope ranges from full or near full discretion (*Lethbridge – except suspension and expulsion; Mount Allison, Queen's*) to investigating/deciding on minor infractions and/or first offense/and/or admission of wrongdoing (Mount Royal, USask, UBC, Waterloo) to formal reporting requirements only (*UVic, UofR*)
- At eight of the nine universities reviewed, instructors have bigger roles and more discretion than at the U of R. The exception is UVic, which is quite similar to U of R in this respect.

9. Punitive vs. Educative Approaches

- **Punitive:** *Lethbridge, UVic, Waterloo*
- **Predominantly punitive but some educative opportunities:** U of S and Queen's
- **Balanced:** UBC, Acadia (inadequate info), Mount Royal and Mount Allison

Approaches to Academic Integrity

Educational   **Punitive**

	Acadia	U of S	Lethbridge
	UBC	Queen's	U of W
	MR		UVic
	MA		U of R

10. Penalties for GenAI Misuse

- No distinct penalties; addressed under existing categories

- Common penalties:

    o Written reprimands

    o Grade reductions or zero

    o Resubmission of work

    o Suspension or expulsion (for serious/repeat offenses)

- **Formative/Educative options:** Educational assignments, reflective papers, and/or integrity workshops (*UBC, MRU, Mount Allison*)

Original summary generated by ChatGPT (courtesy of Jasmeet Singh)

Table and graph created by Nilgün Önder

Nilgün & Chris reviewed the ChatGPT summary and made corrections and additions

Last updated: 18 May 2025

To: The Provost's AIAi Working Group

From: Chris Oriet & Nilgün Önder

We make the following recommendations based on our environmental scan of nine Canadian universities' academic integrity and GenAI related policies and guides as well as our experiences and observations as academics and academic administrators who are directly involved in academic integrity matters.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Add "*inappropriate use of editorial assistance*" (a) and "*unauthorized content generation*" (b) as additional categories within the academic misconduct policy and penalty guidelines to allow for greater flexibility in penalizing inappropriate use of genAI.**

    a. *Example of inappropriate use of editorial assistance:* In a particular course or assignment, the student was not allowed to use Grammarly but used it; however, the student did not use any genAI tools for content generation and demonstrated a good understanding of the assignment.

    b. *Example of unauthorized content generation*: A student includes the output of a ChatGPT query without acknowledging that the content was generated by a genAI tool.

2. **Develop a process for instructors in consultation with Investigating Deans and other stakeholders to have a greater role in academic misconduct investigations and resolutions. This is to enable them to have more agency and to take more responsibility for protecting academic integrity. Instructors' subject expertise is important especially for identifying unauthorized use of genAI given the fact that genAI detection tools are not reliable and that instructors themselves determine if and in what ways genAI is allowed in student academic work.**

Recommended Procedure: The process for instructors' role should be developed in consultation with instructors, students, Deans, and Associate Deans). The following is a possible process to consider:

Give instructors the <u>option</u> to address the case themselves (within limits) or refer it on to the Associate Dean in cases where that is more appropriate.

a. Instructor (or a designated individual in each faculty) contacts USec to determine whether there is a previous finding of misconduct. If yes, report suspicion to Associate Dean.

b. If no previous offense, the instructor meets with the student and assesses whether the learning objective for the assignment has been undermined by the behaviour.

c. The instructor can dismiss suspicion or issue an academic misconduct finding based on evidence or lack of it and following an exploratory discussion with the student.

d. If issuing a finding, the instructor must decide whether to assign a penalty or allow resubmission of work depending on the nature and extent of the academic misconduct. Options available to instructors should include educative opportunities for students, such as a mandatory workshop on academic integrity and/or a reflective essay.

e. If a penalty is warranted, the instructor must recommend the penalty to Associate Dean.

f. Associate Dean may remove, reduce, or increase the penalty in consultation with the instructor and in accordance with penalty guidelines for academic misconduct.

3. **Develop a guide/resource to assist instructors in discussing academic integrity concerns with students and to help them in deciding whether it is more appropriate for them to address the misconduct or refer the matter to the Associate Dean.**

a. Design the guide/resource with a restorative focus – maintaining good relationships with students as well as upholding the principles of academic integrity.

b. The parameters of instructor discretion must be clearly defined. For example, suspected academic misconduct can be dealt with by the course instructor only in

the cases that meet the following conditions: it is a first offense, the weight of the student assignment in the final grade is no more than a certain percentage (such as 30%), and the penalty cannot be more severe than a grade reduction on the assignment.

   c. An appropriate appeals process needs to be created. It could look like this:

      i. Student may appeal instructor's academic misconduct finding and the resolution implemented to Associate Dean in the first instance.

      ii. If the student is not satisfied with the outcome of the appeal to the Associate Dean, they may appeal the Associate Dean's decision/penalty to CDC.

Postscript to Recommendations 3 & 4: Dr. Önder is working with the Governance Office to explore emerging practices in some U of R Faculties as related to recommendations 3 and 4.

4. **Create an online GenAI Hub**

Store all resources regarding GenAI in one place for instructors and students: policies, guidelines for instructors, tips for using GenAI ethically/effectively, authentic assessment, pros/cons of using generative GenAI, guidelines around when and how to cite AI-generated content. Instead of reposting existing resources, links should be created to the sites where these resources are posted (e.g., link to the CTL's and Library's relevant webpage).

Postscript: An online GenAI Hub is currently under development.

5. **Develop or adopt a genAI disclosure framework and transparency statement for students to clearly declare their use of genAI in their academic work (if allowed by their instructor).**

Instructors should be encouraged to add this framework/transparency statement to their assignment instructions whenever they allow their students to use genAI. The framework/transparency statement should be made available on UR Courses and genAI hub.

Ideally, U of R instructors would adopt a standardized framework (e.g., [a system of icons](#)) that communicates clearly to students to what extent genAI tools can be used in coursework.

Note: The University of Waterloo's "Artificial Intelligence Disclosure Framework" is very helpful.

Postscript: Dr. Oriet and Dr. Önder are developing a genAI use transparency framework to bring to the PWG-AIAi.

6. **In consultation with the Academic Leadership Group, organize student and instructor focus groups to gauge their stance on academic integrity penalties. Based on the outcome, review, and if needed, revise the academic misconduct penalty guidelines.**

7. **Develop an academic integrity community of practice.**

   a. Monthly meetings facilitated alternately by a Dean, Associate Dean, CTL, AVP (Academic) etc.

   b. Open to any member of the university community who wishes to ask questions about academic integrity at the U of R

8. **Create an academic integrity office with a focus on promoting educational opportunities for instructors/students and delivering mandatory education for those found to have committed misconduct with a restorative focus emphasizing impact on others in the university community.**

   a. Failing this, develop resources with an educative focus *as part of the penalty* (no such opportunity currently)

   b. Examples of mandatory activities:

      i. reflection paper on how misconduct affects others in the university community, how they can/will do differently going forward;

      ii. Paper about how the student understands citation, paraphrasing, using others' ideas in their own work, etc. - ideally with feedback given to student;

      iii. Watching a video of a roleplay/actors depicting an incident of misconduct and write about what was done wrong;

      iv. Having student role play, act as "instructor" who has caught a "student" cheating.