Date for the diary: Next meeting: Sept 9th, 10.00-13.00

1. **Welcome and Review of April 15th meeting note**
The Chair opened the meeting.
He then
- invited the members to comment on the note of the April 15th plenary meeting. This was passed without any comments or proposed revisions;
- welcomed two new NAIN members: Derrie Murray (ICOS) replacing Laura Harmon; Russell Lachlan as an additional member for DBS (it was noted that the NAIN now has a total of 87 members assuming the same number of SU representatives will join for 2021-22);
- thanked Kevin McStravock (USI Education Officer and VP) on behalf of the network for his work for the NAIN since its establishment in Nov 2019 and for leading WG#3. His significant contribution to the NAIN work was acknowledged.
- thanked all the SU representatives who are now stepping down and acknowledged the central importance of their active contributions to the development of the NAIN, by ensuring the student voice was and is heard in any NAIN work.

2. **Update from Working Group 1**
This was led by the Deputy Chair of WG 1. The apologies of the Chair of WG 1 were conveyed to the meeting.
WG 1 new members were introduced to the meeting and thanked for joining the group: Eva Juhl (MTU Cork campus) and Michael Hall (MTU Kerry campus).
An update of the work of WG 1 re the development of A Framework for the Investigation of Academic Misconduct was given. This gave an update on the work of each of the three sub-groups (each one led by a WG 1 member) focusing on the three strands. Please see WG 1 Update Slides 4 and 5 for full information on this (attached at Appendix 1).
The Deputy Chair and the Lead for WG 2 sub-group on classifying and recording academic misconduct are due to meet to review any overlaps and how they might distinguish or amalgamate some of their work.

It was reiterated that this work is envisaged to support institutions in reviewing, revising or modifying their approaches and processes. It is not intended to prescribe any particular approach.

The Chair made the point that institutions should be thinking already on how they incorporate NAIN outputs into their local policies, including the upcoming outputs from this group. It would be beneficial for institutional representatives to relay back to the NAIN what the institutions have found particularly useful / helpful.

3. Update from Working Group 2
The lead for sub-group 1 gave an update on their work – see WG 2 Update Slides 3-6 for the full picture of what is envisaged (see attached at appendix 1). The recommendation of the sub-group is that HEIs should discuss adopting a consistent, sector-wide approach or methodology as part of their institutional systems for recording instances of misconduct, using the NAIN lexicon terminology.

The group is working on producing a draft recording / reporting template which is simple to use, user-friendly, and practical. Sub-group 2 presented the analysis of the collated data of the HEI survey requesting information on current academic integrity initiatives taking place in NAIN HEIs – see Slides 7–16 (attached at Appendix 1). It was observed that many HEIs (17/31) are using Epigeum resources to educate and inform staff and students. The pilot of the Staff Survey instrument was reported to be taking place in MTU with the results to be reported at the next plenary / working group meeting with a view to NAIN-wide implementation.

4. Update from Working Group 3
A pre-recorded presentation by the outgoing Chair, Kevin McStravock, of WG 3 was played. In the recording, the outgoing Chair highlighted the key issues raised by students in terms of effective messaging:

- Student focus groups told us that messages aren’t reaching students. There is a need to better understand the mechanisms for disseminating messages through institutions.
- Look at effective orientation practice within institutions and how some of this messaging could be built into orientation, whilst understanding that orientation isn’t the only vehicle for disseminating this information.
- Need for research to be undertaken on institutional calendars and identify potential pinch points e.g. orientation, end of semester, exams.

He also highlighted the three new WG 3 sub-groups being established to look at:

- Calendar of Academic Activity
• Implementation Plan
• Digital Assets

The incoming co-chairs referred to the development of materials for the start of the next academic year for students to use. The NAIN Chair thanked Kevin and brought attention to the thank you messages in the chat. It was affirmed that achieving academic integrity is all about changing the culture amongst students.

5. Update on QQI Regulatory Activities
The QQI Project lead highlighted the establishment of a new ENQA working group on academic integrity, due to have its first meeting at the end of June. QQI is a member of the group. A probable objective for the group is revising the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) to ensure greater explicit focus on academic integrity. The working group had. ENQA had circulated three questions to members in advance of the meeting, which QQI is now seeking input on from HEIs to ensure that the national input to the working group reflects national needs and objectives:

• What do you see as the biggest threat to academic integrity within your jurisdiction?
• What are the current main activities in relation to promoting academic integrity?
•expectations for the activities of the working group (e.g. areas of focus, possible outputs)?

Members were invited to submit any comments on these questions to QQI at academicintegrity@qqi.ie by Friday 25th June 2021.

NAIN members were informed that QQI has observed advertisements recruiting writers for assignment writing services. A suggestion was made that students, in particular postgraduate students, should be advised about the dangers of engaging with employment offers in companies like these. Deirdre confirmed that any individual who facilitates a student to cheat is committing an offence. It is clear that there is a range of risks for postgraduate students and academics in getting involved in this type of service.

A question was asked if there was any evidence if academics in precarious employment being drawn into this type of activity. The response was that evidence of this in developing countries but there is no official data from the UK or Ireland. The issue of artificial intelligence engines that can create essays was also highlighted. It was stated that this type of misconduct is on the EU radar currently. The use of language in the adverts (want to help), the types of assessment delivered by HEIs, both create what looks like an attractive option to students.
6. Terms of Reference 2021-22
The Chair provided an overview of the updated and revised ToRs and highlighted the new member organisations included in these. The revised ToRs were approved.

7. The Second National Academic Integrity Week, Oct 20th-24th
The NAIN Coordinator advised that a template would be circulated after the meeting for members to record their proposed talks and other plans for the National Academic Integrity Week. Members were requested to return these by July 28th.

8. NFETL proposal
The Chair talked through the 3 proposals for development on which the NFETL funding can be spent. The key proposal is the design of an online toolkit for HEIs to use re informing and educating staff in academic integrity. This is proposed to be a core set of tools which can be added to and customized by each HEI according to their needs and context.

There will a workshop (repeated 3 times) by the developer, with audiences of middle managers, Registrar and NAIN members. The purpose of the workshops is to introduce the national HEI academic integrity toolkit to a cross-section of HEI staff including middle and senior management. An identified developer will be approached to see if they can lead on this work.

An editor/ reviewer(s) role has been identified for any working group produced documents and one person of two identified has been approached. He has indicated availability in August if needed.

Some money has been earmarked for webinar fees if needed – thinking of Sept 9th (see AOB).

9. AOB
a) The Chair reported on his presentation on the work of the NAIN to the NFRI. A slide deck put together by the Chair was used.
NB: subsequent to this meeting these slides were circulated to all NAIN members for use in their institutions when presenting on the NAIN work.
b) It was reported that as part of the NSTeP programme, it is intended to include training on academic integrity for class reps.
c) An official launch is planned for the NAIN outputs in early September with a webinar. The date for this is Sept 9th 10.00-13.00.
d) The next plenary meeting will take place on Sept 9th AM.
e) QQI have taken on a researcher to produce a report on e-proctoring. The Coordinator will provide support to this. This report will be considered by the NAIN in the Autumn.