





appeal will not be heard if it does not meet the grounds for appeal. Another change is that if new information comes to light at the appeal stage, the case will be referred back to the original decision maker (usually the instructor) to reconsider in light of the new information. There may be cases where new information only comes out at an appeal hearing and it may not be practical at that stage to send the departure back to the original decision maker:

All leads who are applying the sanction for second time or more serious departures will need to be aware that they are not reviewing the finding on an appeal basis at that time. Rather, they are focusing on the appropriate sanction.

Discussion on retention and information being shared with exchange students' home institutions were discussed.

The chair outlined the next steps for the revised procedures, approval by the Senate Committees on Academic Development and Academic Procedures, then by Senate in the fall. He invited members to send him any further comments on the procedures after the meeting.

The chair invited comments on the guidelines that had been circulated with the agenda. There was agreement to leave the guidelines as circulated.

The planned demonstration of the Advocate system for online handling of investigation and findings of departure from academic integrity could not proceed due to technical issues. Sue Blake explained that the provost's office is exploring the use of this online platform to help streamline workload for instructors. It is currently used in cases of non-academic misconduct. His