

Explanation of change from 22 September 2016 to 1 November 2016 version of the Report of the Academic Integrity Working Group

One change has been made to the report from the version considered by SCAD and SCAP for information. The change was made to ensure consistency in defining academic integrity throughout the report. In the 22 September 2016 version that the committee considered for information, Motion II read as follows:

Motion II: that Senate endorse the following definition of Academic Integrity and that this definition be prominently included henceforth in the relevant section of all academic calendars issued by Queen's University:

" Academic integrity is constituted by the five core fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility (as articulated by the Centre for Academic Integrity, Duke University; see www.academicintegrity.org) all of which are central to the building, nurturing and sustaining of an academic community in which all members of the community will thrive. Adherence to the values expressed through academic integrity forms a foundation for the "freedom of inquiry and exchange of ideas" essential to the intellectual life of the University (see <http://www.queensu.ca/secretariat/senate/policies/princpri/>) Queen's students, faculty, administrators and staff therefore all have ethical responsibilities for supporting and upholding the fundamental values of academic integrity."

In the 1 November version submitted for approval by SCAD and SCAP, the above text has been replaced by the following:

Motion II: that Senate endorse the definition of Academic Integrity as set out in Appendix A, and that this definition be prominently included henceforth in the relevant section of all academic calendars issued by Queen's University.

Appendix A contains the following definition of academic integrity (the main change is highlighted here for clarity).

Queen's University is dedicated to creating a scholarly community free to explore a range of ideas, to build and advance knowledge, and to share the ideas and knowledge that emerge from a range of intellectual pursuits.

Queen's students, faculty, administrators and staff therefore all have responsibilities for supporting and upholding the fundamental values of academic integrity. Academic integrity is

constituted by the five core fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility (see <http://www.academicintegrity.org/ica/home.php>) and by the quality of courage. These values and qualities are central to the building, nurturing and sustaining of an academic community in which all members of the community will thrive. Adherence to the values expressed through academic integrity forms a foundation for the "freedom of inquiry and exchange of ideas" essential to the intellectual life of the University.

Report of the Academic Integrity Working Group

Executive Summary

The report of the Academic Integrity Policy Working Group to SCAD and SCAP is the result of a review of current policies, practices, and procedures at Queen's undertaken during the 2015-2016 academic year. The group members, John Pierce, Jane Emrich, Scott Lamoureux, Atul Jaiswal, Denise Stockley, Tyler Lively and Leah Brockie reviewed all Queen's documents related to academic integrity. In addition, the Working Group heard from a wide range of stakeholders including the University Secretariat, University Ombudsman, Copyright Officer, Centre for Teaching and Learning, Vice-Principal (Research), Library, Teaching and Learning Specialist Librarian and the School of Graduate Studies.

Two documents in particular offered important points of departure for the review. The first is "The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity" document (revised edition) produced by the International Centre for Academic Integrity. It provides the high level, widely shared principles upon which academic integrity is based in over 250 institutions in 19 countries. The second important document is a local one, the 2006 "Final Report of the Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity." This document contains the last review of academic integrity on the Queen's campus, was instrumental in the development of integrity policies and practices on campus, and is the most recent assessment of academic integrity at Queen's. This report served as a benchmark from which to measure the development of academic integrity policies, practices, and procedures at Queen's.

In the course of the review, the Working Group determined that significant progress has been made since 2006 in terms of the development of policies, procedures, and practices, all of which are remarkably consistent among the Faculties and Schools across Queen's. These developments have been guided by the "Senate Policy on Academic Integrity Procedures—Requirements of Faculties and Schools," approved by Senate in 2008 and amended in 2010 and 2011. However, the Group also noted several areas for improvement. In its review of academic integrity, the Working Group identified several areas for concern, including a

- Lack of progress particularly in areas of awareness and education, since the last formal review in 2006;
- An increasing lack of coordination among Faculties and Schools;
- The limited sense of forward-looking direction in developing and enhancing the culture of academic integrity;
- Lack of risk management in the area of academic integrity.

The recommendations arising from these areas of concern are organized under three main headings:

Policy and Procedures

Recommendations on policy and procedure are designed to ensure that Queen's continues to develop, maintain, and support clear, fair, and effective policies, procedures and practices on academic integrity;

Awareness and Education

Recommendations in the area of awareness and education enhance the culture of academic integrity on campus, promote positive aspects of academic integrity and educate all members of the university community on standards that are effectively integrated into the educational environment;

Review and Renew

Academic integrity exists within an educational environment which is constantly evolving and therefore requires regular review, renewal, and revitalization of the effectiveness and currency of approaches to academic integrity.

The Recommendations

Policy and Procedures

RECOMMENDATION: That Senate adopt a modified policy on academic integrity.

RECOMMENDATION: That Senate pass a motion requiring a formal statement concerning the inclusion of a standardized definition of academic integrity on all course syllabi.

RECOMMENDATION: That lists of departures from academic integrity include the qualification that “departures from academic integrity include, but are not limited to, the following....”

RECOMMENDATION: That the management of academic integrity policies and the adjudication of departures from academic integrity within a course be managed by the primary instructor or course coordinator and that therefore TAs not be required to be directly involved in hearings related to academic integrity.

RECOMMENDATION: Academic Units or programs employing Adjuncts, Teaching Fellows, and other temporary instructors identify an individual to provide direct support for these instructors where an investigation of a departure from academic integrity takes place.

RECOMMENDATION: That Senate pass a motion prohibiting the commercial tutoring, exam preparation businesses, and student essay "mills" disguised as academic support services from operating or advertising on campus.

Education and Awareness

RECOMMENDATION: That each Faculty or School designate an individual (or specific email address) that can be advertised centrally on the University academic integrity site as a contact for information on practices and procedures for dealing with integrity issues in that Faculty or School

RECOMMENDATION: That the University develop an online module designed to educate undergraduate students on the principles and practices of academic integrity at Queen's.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Centre for Teaching and Learning develop educational programs and documents for instructors.

Review and Renew

RECOMMENDATION: That the new academic integrity policy be reviewed within the next five years and at least by 2018-19.

RECOMMENDATION: That Queen's invest in plagiarism detection software for Campus use.

RECOMMENDATION: A full audit of activities and practices related to academic integrity across the campus be made.

RECOMMENDATION: Consider the establishment of an ongoing subcommittee on academic integrity assigned to report periodically to SCAD and SCAP on developments related to academic integrity.

RECOMMENDATION: Consider the reestablishment of an Academic Integrity Officer.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning) collate a report to Senate on progress on these academic integrity recommendations one year after this report is accepted.

Report of the Academic Integrity Working Group

1 November 2016 version for approval by SCAD and SCAP

Background

Renewal of the policies, procedures, and practices of what was then called "academic dishonesty" began with the establishment of a Senate Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity in 2003. Reporting to SCAD, the Sub-Committee reviewed practices across Queen's in light of the widespread transition from a focus on academic dishonesty and punishment, to the emerging concept of academic integrity with its alternate focus on remediation, proactive education, and more explicit emphasis on the central values and practices of an academic community.

After an interim Report presented to Senate in 2005 and extensive follow-up consultation, the "Final Report of the Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity" was approved by Senate on 26 January 2006. Three motions were accepted at that meeting:

Motion I: that Senate accept the Final Report of the SCAD Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity.

Motion II: that Senate endorse the definition of Academic Integrity as set out in Appendix A, and that this definition be prominently included henceforth in the relevant section of all academic calendars issued by Queen's University:

Motion III: that the Vice Principal (Academic) be empowered to form an advisory working group or ad hoc committee to pursue and direct the recommendations put forward by the Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity.

These motions set the stage for further review of policies, procedures, and practices across all Faculties. The University Academic Integrity Officer, Jim Lee, and his assistant, Charles Sumbler led and coordinated a consultative process from which emerged a new "Senate Policy on Academic Integrity Procedures—Requirements of Faculties & Schools," which was approved by Senate on 23 October 2008. This policy on the "Requirements of Faculties & Schools" acted as a set of standard procedures guiding each Faculty in the construction of an academic integrity framework for regulations and procedures. The document was then amended at Senate on 24 October 2011 to take into account the interdisciplinary registration of students in courses. After this work was completed, Jim Lee was appointed Vice-Provost (International) until his departure on October 31st 2013 to take up the role of Vice Chancellor International at McQuarie University in Australia.

Methodology for the Review and Report

The Academic Integrity Working Group began meeting in November 2015 and included the following members, all of whom had significant previous experience with the development of academic integrity at Queen's:

John Pierce, Professor, Department of English (Chair)
 Jane Emrich, SCAD member
 Scott Lamoureux, SCAP member
 Atul Jaiswal, SGPS representative
 Tyler Lively, Academic Affairs Commissioner, AMS
 Denise Stockley, Scholar in Higher Education
 Claire O'Brien, Office of the Provost (administrative support)

The Working Group was tasked with reporting to the Vice Provost (Teaching and Learning), the Senate Committee on Academic Development and the Senate Committee on Academic Procedures by the beginning of the 2016-17 academic cycle. Given that the range of matters represented within the area of academic integrity are quite large, the terms of reference were narrowed in scope to allow for this initial report. The terms of reference are as follows:

- Review current state of academic integrity policies and practices at Queen's with a view to ensuring these policies are consistent, relevant, and aligned with best practices;
- The work of the review should be considered preliminary to the determination of the need for a larger-scale review of policies and practices.

In addition, the Working Group began with a fixed set of objectives:

- Develop specific recommendations for SCAP and SCAD on short-term and long-term enhancement or changes to the academic integrity policies and practices at Queen's
- Among these recommendations, priority should be given the following areas of concern:
 - amending Queen's academic integrity policy to bring it into alignment with the principles outlined in the "Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity" produced by the Centre for Academic Integrity;
 - ensuring consistency among specific or localized academic integrity policy documents at Queen's (including particularly the recent "Senate Policy on Integrity in Research" (2015) and other relevant recent integrity policies) to the overall Senate policy on academic integrity (2006);
 - taking into account new challenges to integrity provided by online learning and social media; ensuring alignment between academic integrity policies at Queen's and recent legislation on copyright.
 - addressing further issues that may arise from the review.

While using these objectives as a starting point and as guidelines for managing the scope of the review, the Working Group also drew in other matters as related to these and as raised by members of the academic community.

The Working Group heard directly from the Secretariat, the Ombudsman, and Research Services. The Chair also held meetings with representatives from the Copyright Office, the Centre of Teaching and Learning, and from Associate Deans and Directors of various Faculties and Schools. This consultation with key stakeholders was not exhaustive; however, the work of the committee was considered preliminary to any fuller review. The Group also engaged in an extensive review of documents at the Senate and Faculty and School levels related to academic integrity on campus.

Of critical importance to the work of review is *The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity* document produced by the International Center for Academic Integrity (edited by T. Fishman). The first edition of this document provided a foundation for the development of the academic integrity policies and practices at Queen's and the new document, in a second edition, offers important revisions to the basic premises of academic integrity. The International Centre for Academic Integrity includes "1,200 members at 250 institutions in 19 countries on 6 continents" (*Fundamental Values* "Preface to the Second Edition") and thus offers connection to a global community with academic interests in academic integrity. Besides offering a sense of the essential elements in integrity policies, the document also includes a section on "Developing Effective Academic Integrity Programs" which sets out the basic steps for developing successful academic integrity policies, procedures, and practices. These steps provided a framework for the review of academic integrity at Queen's and were adapted by the Working Group as follows:

1. Develop and publicize clear, fair, academic integrity policies, procedures, and statements that can be effectively understood and consistently implemented.
2. Educate all members of the community about academic integrity standards so that expectations are well understood.
3. Promote positive aspects of academic integrity amongst all segments of the campus community. Promotional activities should include discussions of the fundamental values, development of ethical decision-making capacities, and highlighting the link between academic integrity and broader ethical concerns.
4. Practice the actions described in campus policies consistently and fairly. Provide support to those who follow the policies and uphold standards.
5. Develop, explain, and administer equitable, transparent systems for addressing departures from academic integrity.
6. Stay abreast of current developments in technology and educational practices in order to anticipate increased risks and address potential problems.
7. Regularly assess the effectiveness of academic integrity policies, procedures, and practices. Revise and revitalize as necessary to update and improve.

The Working Group has used these recommendations to structure the areas of investigation covered in this review. The recommendations which follow have been organized under three main headings:

1. Policy and Procedures: Develop clear, fair, and effective policies, procedures and practices on academic integrity;

2. Awareness and Education: Promote positive aspects of academic integrity and educate all members of the university community on standards that are effectively integrated into the educational environment;
3. Review and Renew: Regularly review, renew, and revitalize effectiveness and currency of approaches to academic integrity

Analysis and Discussion

In its review of academic integrity, the Working Group concluded there were several major areas of concern:

- Lack of progress particularly in areas of awareness and education, since the last formal review in 2006;
- An increasing lack of coordination among Faculties and Schools;
- The limited sense of forward-looking direction in academic integrity;
- Lack of risk management in the area of academic integrity

While challenges surrounding academic integrity are not directly included as a "Risk Issue" in the "Queen's University Risk Review Summary", failure to adhere to the principles of academic integrity, to promote it as a central interest of the University, and to maintain and coordinate relevant policies and practices constitute a significant threat to the academic quality of the programs and degrees at the institution and potentially to the reputation of Queen's.

Many of the recommendations are designed to engage all involved in the educational and research mission of the university in developing strategies for safeguarding academic integrity and managing risks associated with ignoring this fundamental value.

1. Policy and Procedures: Develop clear, fair, and effective policies, procedures and practices on academic integrity

In the wake of the adoption of an academic integrity policy by Senate in 2006, the "Final Report of the Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity (2006), and the "Senate Policy on Academic Integrity Procedures--Requirements of Faculties & Schools" (2008), each Faculty has developed academic integrity policies, procedures, and statements that are, for the most part, consistent. The Faculties of Arts and Science, Applied Science, Commerce, Law, Education, Graduate Studies, and Nursing all set out the five fundamental values of academic integrity as the basis for their policies, all have the same five categories of departure from academic integrity--plagiarism, use of unauthorized materials, facilitation, falsification and forgery have procedures which are

consistent with the Senate document on "Requirements of Faculties & Schools" and the "Senate policy on Student Appeals, Rights, and Discipline" (SARD). The connection of academic integrity with the SARD document, a policy statement that foreground the importance of procedural fairness, helps to anchor academic integrity within the principles of natural justice. In these areas, the institution as a whole has been, in the main, successful in consistently implementing these aspects of academic integrity.

The following recommendations are intended to bring current policies and procedures into conformity with current practices.

1.1. Revision of the Current Senate Academic Integrity Policy

As part of its terms of reference, the Academic Integrity Working Group has reviewed the current Queen's policy to ensure it is consistent with recent developments in the area of academic integrity and with other academic integrity policies at Queen's. In the first instance, the Working Group reviewed the "Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity" document produced by the Centre for Academic Integrity, the basic document upon which the previous academic integrity policy was founded.

A second edition of that document was created in 2012 and contains some modification of the definitions of the five fundamental values along with the addition of "Courage" which the document describes as "less a value than a quality or capacity."

The Working Group endorses the changes from the 2012 document since they strengthen the connection of academic integrity with the idea of a "community of integrity" that brings all members of the university together in a common goal of practicing and protecting academic integrity. Further, the quality of "courage" speaks to individual learners who "commit to the quality of their education by holding themselves and their fellow learners to the highest standards of academic integrity even when doing so involves risk of negative consequences or reprisal." The group noted that the recent Senate Policy on Integrity in Research (2015) has adopted the more recent articulation, which includes "courage".

Appendix A contains a revised version of the academic integrity policy.

RECOMMENDATION: That Senate adopt a modified policy on academic integrity.

1.2. Inclusion of Formal Statement on Academic Integrity on Course Syllabi

The 2006 Report brought forward a Senate motion stating that a standard definition of academic integrity be included in "the relevant section of all academic calendars issued by Queen's" (p. 22). This action has been carried out by all Faculties and Schools. Many of these Faculties and Schools require that this standardized statement also appear on course syllabi; however, this practice has not been systematically applied by all. The next logical step in the process of educating all members of the community and in promoting academic integrity widely and consistently would be a motion to require such a statement to be part of all course syllabi. The

basic statement could additionally be modified to add any specific matters relevant to each Faculty, School, Department, or academic unit.

To this end, the implementation of onQ across campus offers a unique opportunity to facilitate the inclusion of this statement with the creation of each individual course. A section of the onQ template includes a section on “University and Course Policies” which can be prepopulated with the university policy on academic integrity. The standardized statement can then be added to by individual Faculties, Schools, Departments, or other academic units with additional information on academic integrity relevant to the particular area or discipline of study.

The Working Group offers the following suggested wording for a standardized statement:

Queen’s students, faculty, administrators and staff therefore all have responsibilities for supporting and upholding the fundamental values of academic integrity. Academic integrity is constituted by the five core fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility (see www.academicintegrity.org) and by the quality of courage. These values and qualities are central to the building, nurturing and sustaining of an academic community in which all members of the community will thrive. Adherence to the values expressed through academic integrity forms a foundation for the "freedom of inquiry and exchange of ideas" essential to the intellectual life of the University.

Students are responsible for familiarizing themselves with and adhering to the regulations concerning academic integrity. General information on academic integrity is available at Academic Integrity @ Queen's University, along with Faculty or School specific information. Departures from academic integrity include, but are not limited to, plagiarism, use of unauthorized materials, facilitation, forgery and falsification. Actions which contravene the regulation on academic integrity carry sanctions that can range from a warning, to loss of grades on an assignment, to failure of a course, to requirement to withdraw from the university.

The Working Group notes that individual Faculties, Schools, academic units, and programs may wish to add material on academic integrity specific to their particular discipline should that additional information be important in educating students about specific integrity requirements.

RECOMMENDATION: That Senate pass a motion requiring a formal statement concerning the inclusion of a standardized academic integrity on all course syllabi.

1.3. [Modification of List of Departures from Academic Integrity](#)

The current examples or categories of violations of academic integrity include the following:

- Plagiarism;
- Use of Unauthorized Materials;

- Forgery;
- Facilitation; and
- Falsification.

As our introduction notes, these are consistently listed by all Faculties and Schools, with the exception of the School of Business which adds “Unauthorized Collaboration.” The list has served well so far in covering a wide range of infractions. The past decade has seen the massive impact of social media on education. Internet connectivity has opened up new methods of exchanging materials and ideas in ways that were not imagined at the time the policy was first developed. In reviewing the various uses of social media and the constantly changing nature of these interactive mechanisms, the Working Group is aware that there is not a direct way to address all the potential variations in the abuse of social media in the educational environment. The uploading of course materials to sites such as “Course Hero” or “OneClass” without the instructor’s permission, for instance, constitutes a violation of copyright and may be addressed through formal legal means, but such actions should also be addressed within the academic community of Queen’s as a violation of trust and a lack of respect for the instructor-student relationship. Ultimately, it seems necessary to articulate new categories of offences which capture the new means by which the fundamental values of academic integrity can be undermined or breached. Any such articulation must be sufficiently precise so as to be guide to compliance and enforcement, but flexible enough to deal with a range of forms of media, new methods of course delivery, and different forms of communication of information. It is possible that future discussions of academic integrity should consider the addition of a new category of departure.

At this point in time, the Working Group suggests that the lists of defined departures from academic integrity include wording to the effect that “departures from academic integrity include, but are not limited to, the following....” The proviso “but are not limited to” should be present to make explicit that the list of violations is not exhaustive.

Recommendation: That lists of departures from academic integrity include the qualification that “departures from academic integrity include, but are not limited to, the following....”

1.4. Clarification of Role of Instructors in Matters of Academic Integrity

The role of TAs and other education support persons, such as exam proctors, in academic integrity procedures has not been clearly defined within University documents. Anecdotal evidence suggests that there are practices ranging from full involvement of a Tutorial Assistant in all aspects of an investigation, from discovery to investigation to finding to appeals, in other areas the primary instructor takes over investigations immediately after a discovery of a potential departure from academic integrity emerges. In considering these different practices, the Working Group concluded that there should be standardized practices and that these practices should respect the specific roles of all individuals supporting the primary instructor in delivery of an academic course. TAs, for instance, are on limited contracts with specified duties and hourly

rates of pay. While in many cases, they may make an initial discovery of a potential departure from academic integrity, they also should not be called upon to be involved in the processes of investigation, finding, and sanction which follow. Exam Proctors are also a critical component of ensuring academic integrity is guarded in formal exam settings. Like TAs, they will be involved in an initial observation about a potential departure from academic integrity, and in the current system, a Proctor will write a report sent forward to the Faculty or School and then to the instructor. The Working Group believes strongly that the Proctor's involvement should not move beyond this initial stage, and the written report is then to be investigated by the primary instructor for the course. Proctors should not be involved in follow-up investigations or integrity hearings.

Recommendation: That the management of academic integrity policies and the adjudication of departures from academic integrity within a course be managed by the primary instructor or course coordinator and that therefore TAs not be required to be directly involved in hearings related to academic integrity.

Similar concerns arise in the case of Adjuncts and Teaching Fellows. In these cases, the primary instructor has full academic responsibility for the course, and therefore the adjudication of integrity issues resides with these instructors. However, two areas of concern arise. To begin with, first-time Adjuncts or Teaching Fellows may not have the full background or experience to deal with academic integrity procedures. Second, since they are on a time-specific contract, they may not be able to complete an investigation within the limits of their contracts. The Working Group suggests that provision be made for support for instructors working in these contexts. Ideally, the academic unit or program in which these individuals teach should identify an academic integrity support person available for consultation should a departure arise and that individual should also have the capacity to take over the case should the Adjunct or Teaching Fellow be unable to complete the investigation, finding (if there is one), and sanction. In considering the support for these particular instructors, the Working Group suggests it would be advisable for the support person to be present to advise these instructors throughout the process.

Recommendation: Academic Units or programs employing Adjuncts, Teaching Fellows, and other temporary instructors identify an individual to provide direct support for these instructors where an investigation of a departure from academic integrity takes place.

1.5. Establishment of Formal Policy on the Presence of Commercial Enterprises on Campus that Violate Standards of Academic Integrity

The 2006 Report to SCAD noted the emergence of for-profit "commercial tutoring and exam preparation businesses" on campus. These organizations were discovered to actively advertise on campus, unfairly charge students for course materials, and engage in violation of copyright regulations by reposting or reselling course-copyrighted materials. Since that time, such activities have only expanded, and the above recommendation is designed to make a formal motion to empower instructors and the university to act on these matters. Even in the current year, advertising for "OneClass" an internet-based company in the business of reposting instructor materials without permission and supplying essay materials was allowed to advertise

in Mackintosh Corry Hall. A motion at Senate would establish clearly establish the University's position on such operations.

Consistent with the initial recommendation the 2006 Report, this motion also requires that the University pursue a series of concrete actions. The university should

- "Take action against any organization that attempts to use the intellectual property of members of the Queen's community"
- Take action against any organization that makes "improper use of the Queen's name;
- "Inform Teaching Assistants of the conflict of interest should they be involved in tutoring students in the same course for which the University has hired them"; and
- "Alert students to the unregulated nature of the services offered" (Report 21)

RECOMMENDATION: That Senate pass a motion prohibiting the commercial tutoring, exam preparation businesses, and student essay "mills" disguised as academic support services from operating or advertising on campus.

2. Education and Awareness: Promote positive aspects of academic integrity and educate all members of the university community on standards that are effectively integrated into the educational environment

While the policy and procedures related to academic integrity have been developed consistently with the trajectory outlined in the Senate reports of 2006 and 2008, the publicizing of these policies, procedures, and statements has been less well executed. While individual instructors often include some discussion of academic integrity in their classes, there is little direct evidence of significant ongoing educational sessions at the university, Faculty or academic unit level for students and instructors on academic integrity. Moreover, the support for instructors and students in gaining an understanding of academic integrity is extremely limited. There is anecdotal evidence to suggest that some instructors and students may not understand academic integrity fully, especially given the complexity of some processes. In the following sections, the Working Group makes recommendations for enhancing the development of a culture of academic integrity at Queen's.

2.1. Update and Enhance Central Academic Integrity Website

The [AcademicIntegrity@Queen's](#) web site was designed as "a platform to discuss and promote the values of Academic Integrity within the Queen's community." While it still contains valuable information for instructors and students, it has not been regularly maintained and could be enhanced to include additional information on academic integrity on campus and the resources to support the promulgation of a culture of integrity. It also could be further developed to be a shared resource for instructors and students listing contacts in each Faculty or School. While there are currently links to the regulations in each Faculty or School, the Working Group recommends that the site list a contact point for information on

academic integrity within each Faculty or School. This resource individual can serve as a contact point for inquiries by instructors or students and a potential connection for cross-faculty discussions and initiatives.

RECOMMENDATION: That each Faculty or School designate an individual (or specific email address) that can be advertised centrally on the University academic integrity site as a contact for information on practices and procedures for dealing with integrity issues in that Faculty or School

2.2. Development of online model on academic integrity for undergraduate education

The School of Graduate Studies developed an online module that takes graduate students through the principles and policies of academic integrity, particularly from the perspective of advanced studies. The Working Group believes that a similar model designed for undergraduates would be a useful way of introducing students to the principles of academic integrity and to the policies and expectations at work across Queen's University. In its ideal form, the module could have several components. A general, introductory component could outline the general principles of academic integrity and the interests expressed through the Senate-level policy. Over time additional components could be developed in accord with the specific requirements of Faculties, Schools, and academic units. These modules would have the benefit of offering a foundation for education on academic integrity, but in different forms, they could be used for remediation in cases of departures from academic integrity. Where a finding of plagiarism was made, for instance, a student could be required to complete modules perhaps on the specific infraction or on the larger issues connected with academic integrity. Thus the development of such online modules could have both a proactive and remedial use.

Recommendation: That the University develop an online module designed to educate undergraduate students on the principles and practices of academic integrity at Queen's.

2.3. Development of educational supports for instructors

Instructors, Teaching Fellows, Teaching Assistants, and all others involved in the educational mission of Queen's play a crucial role in fostering a culture of academic integrity. The Report by the Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity recommended a series of educational supports for instructors, but unfortunately, few of these have come to fruition. The idea of "a broad range of faculty development programs" designed to help instructors introduce "academic elements into their teaching" was suggested, but it is not clear these programs are in place. Additionally, the notion of a set of "guidelines in handbook form to be made available to all instructors, Teaching Fellows and Teaching Assistants" was recommended, but that support too has not emerged.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Centre for Teaching and Learning develop educational programs and documents for instructors.

3. Review and Renew: Regularly review, renew, and revitalize effectiveness and currency of approaches to academic integrity

3.1. Regular Review of Academic Integrity Policy

The “Policy Development Guide” recommends that the “default” for regular review of Senate policies is “five years.” A review of the policies, practices, and procedures has not taken place since the work of the SCAD Sub-Committee in 2006. The Working Group was concerned about this fact, and recommends not only that a review take place within the next three years but that consideration be given to a shortened timeline for a review of the policy.

RECOMMENDATION: That the new academic integrity policy be reviewed within the next five years and at least by 2018-19.

3.2. Adoption of Plagiarism-Detection Software

There has been extensive discussion and assessment of the use of plagiarism-detection software since 2006, and the Working Group recommends Queen's proceed with a university-wide site license. There are several reasons for moving in this direction. First, the use of such software allows for a standardized approach to the assessment of integrity in assignments. Currently, many instructors will hope to recognize departures from academic integrity based on memory of source material or the evaluation of stylistic changes within assignments that signal the presence of unacknowledged material. Follow up on these suspicions takes the form of google searches of specific words or phrases. Unfortunately, this method depends to some degree on the expertise of the individual marker or on chance. When it comes to larger classes in particular, this approach to assessing integrity is also not entirely equitable since it is difficult, if not in some cases almost impossible, to search each student's work with the same degree of depth and rigor. The use of plagiarism-detection software allows for a more systematic and even-handed approach in which all student work is assessed for integrity in the same manner.

Moreover, the time spent in tracking down plagiarism using Google or other search engines is not cost effective. The financial cost of the time spent by instructors and TAs across all Faculties searching for possible departures would amount to a significant expenditure. Even though the licensing fees for plagiarism software are substantial, these instruments would in the end lead to significant savings in time and money. Instructors and TAs could better spend this time on regular instruction and on educating students about how to produce work aligned with the practices and of academic integrity.

Finally, current versions of plagiarism-detection software include mechanisms which allow students to submit and assess the integrity of their own work. This kind of functionality further recommends the adoption of software since it allows student to proactively self-assess the academic integrity of their own work. Finally, in reviewing the Academic Integrity Case Summary for 2014-1015, the Working Group noted that the School of Business reports a significant increase in cases (from 23 to 74) based on what they describe as a "more widespread

use of the plagiarism detection tool Turnitin.com." Laurie Ross, the Executive Director of the School of Business states that "Faculty are discovering AI cases that would have gone undetected in the past" and that this fact "is raising awareness of AI among students and faculty, which is a positive step to shifting the culture." The two outcomes of discovering departures and raising awareness are essential elements the Working Group sees as central to the pursuit of academic integrity at Queen's.

RECOMMENDATION: That Queen's invest in plagiarism detection software for Campus use.

3.3. Survey of Current Practices and Attitudes to Academic Integrity at Queen's

Under the mandate of the current Working Group, there was not sufficient scope for fully assessing the overall culture of academic integrity experienced by students and instructors across the campus. The Group identified two basic areas for inquiry. The first concerns awareness of the basic premises of academic integrity among faculty and students and extends to an audit of the range of departures from academic integrity on campus. The second area for investigation would look at ways to improve the academic integrity processes based on input from instructors and students. These investigations might be undertaken through campus-wide surveys, but focus groups or faculty, school, or academic unit level meetings might also provide useful information. In addition, the Cyclical Program Reviews include a section on academic integrity in specific programs, and that information might be collated to get a sense of how integrity is implemented at the program level. Ideally, data from all these types of surveys could be gathered on a regular basis and usefully supplied at the time of regular policy and practice reviews.

RECOMMENDATION: A full audit of activities and practices related to academic integrity across the campus be made.

3.4. Establishment of a Standing Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity and Reestablishment of the Academic Integrity Officer

Even this relatively brief review of academic integrity at Queen's has revealed the extent and complexity of a concept which underlies all aspects of learning, teaching, and research. Moreover, the comparison of the current state of academic integrity in the University compared with the objectives and recommendation set out in the 2006 "Final Report of the Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity" demonstrates that, while important progress has been made in the development of policies and practices, the regular monitoring of these policies and practices and the development of educational and support services related to integrity have not been optimal. The Working Group attempted to evaluate the progress made on the 2006 report recommendations. The results of this assessment are contained in Appendix B.

In a submission to the Working Group, Haley Everson, an Administrative Assistant in the Faculty of Arts and Science charged with managing the reporting and recording of academic integrity materials, notes that

Having a central body in place to address these matters would help to improve consistency among faculties in how cases are handled, provide a better means for regular and standard reporting, lead to fairer and more consistent outcomes for students, provide better data collection for reporting statistics and facilitate a smoother and more transparent process for hearing appeals concerning academic integrity issues.

In light of its review, the Working Group strongly agrees with this statement and sees the need to coordinate current and forward-looking policies and practices as essential to maintaining the quality of the academic environment and to mitigating the risks associated with ignoring academic integrity. Building on suggestions made by Ms. Everson, the Group notes that coordination is essential to

- Manage existing AI policies (for example – policy on cell phones in exam halls, protocol for students using washrooms during exams, information collected on exam incident reports, etc)
- Research new tools and resources available to assist instructors with AI issues (such as Turn-It-In)
- Maintain a central, university-wide AI record and statistics
- Facilitate communication among all the faculty contacts and central offices, such as the Exams Office
- Provide reporting and record keeping guidelines to faculty contacts
- Provide ongoing training and education in AI policies and practices to staff, instructors and TAs
- Provide education and awareness programs and resources to faculties, instructors and students
- Provide guidance and advice to Faculty contacts for more complicated cases and cross-faculty cases, reporting questions, interpretation of policies and best practices, AI appeals

The Working Group recommends that the type of coordination described above may be optimally achieved through two initiatives: the creation of a Senate-level subcommittee of SCAD and SCAP and the appointment of an Academic Integrity Officer.

The establishment of a sub-committee should be created to maintain, motivate, and coordinate academic integrity initiatives, policies, procedures and practices at Queen's. Further, the Working Group asserts that this sub-committee should be a Senate-level committee reporting to SCAD and SCAP. Academic integrity is a foundational academic concept supporting learning, teaching, and research across all academic disciplines. Ultimately, it incorporates policy and practice, education and awareness, and regular review and renewal into the academic environment, and Senate is the body which has ultimate jurisdiction over these elements. Moreover, a sub-committee of this type could be charged with coordinating and overseeing the implementation of the recommendation contained in this report and looking forward to further developing a culture of academic integrity on the campus.

It is recommended that the sub-committee itself be kept relatively small, with representatives, ideally with some engagement with academic integrity matters, from SCAP, SCAD, AMS,

SGPS. It is also important that the committee include members with direct experience of working with academic integrity matters in the classroom environment. It would also be useful to include the representative guests from areas such as the University Secretariat, the University Ombudsman, the Centre for Teaching and Learning, the Copyright Officer, the Vice Principal, Research, the Library, ITS, and the School of Graduate Studies as needed.

Such a sub-committee might meet once or twice per term (or as needed) and report to SCAD, SCAP, and Senate on the state and progress of academic integrity initiatives on campus.

RECOMMENDATION: Consider the establishment of an ongoing subcommittee on academic integrity assigned to report periodically to SCAD and SCAP on developments related to academic integrity.

If established, the Sub-Committee should consider the reestablishment of a centralized office, resource, or individual to coordinate academic integrity issues. The Working Group has heard that even Faculties and Schools are seeking support in terms of expertise on academic integrity and on the consistency of practices and policies across the university. Academic integrity cases themselves present ongoing complexities, and direct access to a specific coordinating resource person or office would help support the Faculties and Schools in their work in this area. This need for support is necessary not only for individuals within Faculties but also for cross-Faculty jurisdiction cases. An Academic Integrity Officer could coordinate meetings among important stakeholders, including Associate Deans and Directors of Faculties and Schools to hear the concerns of those managing the integrity procedures and to coordinate university responses to these concerns.

RECOMMENDATION: Consider the reestablishment of an Academic Integrity Officer.

3.5 Regular Progress Update

The Working Group recommends that a report be made to Senate, one year after this report is accepted, on progress to date.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning) collate a report to Senate on progress on these academic integrity recommendations one year after this report is accepted.



ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

Category:	<i>Leave this blank; a category will be assigned</i>
Approval:	<i>The University Secretary, on the advice of the Policy Advisory Subcommittee, will identify the appropriate approval body(ies), e.g. Board of Trustees, Senate, VPOC, other</i>
Responsibility:	<i>Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning)</i>
Date:	<i>Date initially approved: Date of last revision:</i>

Definitions:

Purpose/Reason for Policy:

The purpose of this policy is to establish the principles of academic integrity in support of the student learning experience in the Queen's community.

Scope of this Policy:

The overall approach to academic integrity should encompass the entire academic and broader learning environment (on campus and online) but not directly attempt to exert control over the non-academic environment.

[For the background to the development of this policy statement and a list of recommendations for future action, please see also "[Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity - Report to the Senate Committee on Academic Development \(SCAD\)](#)" (PDF*, 172 KB). Additional information can be found at the Academic Integrity @ Queen's web site <http://www.queensu.ca/academicintegrity/>.

The following documents provide a context for the Senate policy on academic integrity:

- Subcommittee on Academic Integrity—Report to the Senate Academic Development (2006);
- Senate Policy on Academic Integrity - Requirements of Faculties and Schools;
- Faculty Jurisdiction with Respect to Student Appeals of Academic Decisions;
- Senate Policy on Student Appeals, Rights and Discipline;

- Senate Policy on Integrity in Research. Integrity issues related to research activities are covered by the Integrity in Research policy. Additional information on academic integrity can be found at the Academic Integrity@Queen's web site: <http://www.queensu.ca/academicintegrity/>.

Policy Statement:

Queen's University is dedicated to creating a scholarly community free to explore a range of ideas, to build and advance knowledge, and to share the ideas and knowledge that emerge from a range of intellectual pursuits.

Queen's students, faculty, administrators and staff therefore all have responsibilities for supporting and upholding the fundamental values of academic integrity. Academic integrity is constituted by the five core fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility (see <http://www.academicintegrity.org/icai/home.php>) and by the quality of courage. These values and qualities are central to the building, nurturing and sustaining of an academic community in which all members of the community will thrive. Adherence to the values expressed through academic integrity forms a foundation for the "freedom of inquiry and exchange of ideas" essential to the intellectual life of the University.

The following statements from "The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity" (2nd edition), developed by the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI), contextualize these values and qualities:

1. **Honesty** Academic communities of integrity advance the quest for truth and knowledge through intellectual and personal honesty in learning, teaching, research, and service.
2. **Trust** Academic communities of integrity both foster and rely upon climates of mutual trust. Climates of trust encourage and support the free exchange of ideas which in turn allows scholarly inquiry to reach its fullest potential.
3. **Fairness** Academic communities of integrity establish clear and transparent expectations, standards, and practices to support fairness in the interactions of students, faculty, and administrators.
4. **Respect** Academic communities of integrity value the interactive, cooperative, participatory nature of learning. They honor, value, and consider diverse opinions and ideas.
5. **Responsibility** Academic communities of integrity rest upon foundations of personal accountability coupled with the willingness of individuals and groups to lead by example, uphold mutually agreed-upon standards, and take action when they encounter wrongdoing.
6. **Courage** To develop and sustain communities of integrity, it takes more than simply believing in the fundamental values. Translating the values from talking points into action—standing up for them in the face of pressure and adversity—requires determination, commitment, and courage.

Students are responsible for familiarizing themselves with and adhering to the regulations concerning academic integrity. General information on academic integrity is available at Academic Integrity @ Queen's University, along with Faculty or School specific information. Departures from academic integrity include, but are not limited to, plagiarism, use of

unauthorized materials, facilitation, forgery and falsification. Actions which contravene the regulation on academic integrity carry sanctions that can range from a warning, to loss of grades on an assignment, to failure of a course, to requirement to withdraw from the university.

Responsibilities:

The Senate Committee on Academic Development (SCAD) and the Senate Committee on Academic Procedures (SCAP) have complementary roles in developing the policy and practice of academic integrity.

SCAD is responsible for oversight and articulation of the Senate Policy on Academic Integrity.

SCAP is responsible for approval and review of practices which implement and contextualize policies on academic integrity.

Each Faculty is responsible for implementing a set of procedures and practices consistent with this policy and with the Senate Policy on Academic Integrity - Requirements of Faculties and Schools.

<i>Contact Officer</i>	
<i>Date for Next Review</i>	<i>Year/Month/Day</i>
<i>Related Policies, Procedures and Guidelines</i>	
<i>Policies Superseded by This Policy</i>	<i>Academic Integrity Policy Statement, January 26 2006 (below)</i>

Policy to be superseded by this policy: Academic Integrity Policy Statement

Approved by Senate January 26, 2006

Academic integrity is constituted by the five core fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility (as articulated by the Centre for Academic Integrity, Clemson University; see www.academicintegrity.org) all of which are central to the building, nurturing and sustaining of an academic community in which all members of the community will thrive. Adherence to the values expressed through academic integrity forms a foundation for the "freedom of inquiry and exchange of ideas" essential to the intellectual life of the University (see [Report on Principles and Priorities](#)) Queen's students, faculty, administrators and staff therefore all have ethical responsibilities for supporting and upholding the fundamental values of academic integrity.

For the background to the development of this policy statement and a list of recommendations for future action, please see also "[Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity - Report to the Senate Committee on Academic Development \(SCAD\)](#)" (PDF*, 172 KB). Additional information can be found at the Academic Integrity @ Queen's web site <http://www.queensu.ca/academicintegrity/>.

APPENDIX B: 2016 Status Update on Recommendations from 2006 Report to Senate of SCAD Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity

Recommendation	Category	Responsible body	Achieved?
<p>Initial exposure to the Queen’s culture of academic integrity should occur during Orientation period. Changes to be made as appropriate to the Goals of Orientation (approved by Senate in 2002) and to orientation activity policy.</p>	<p>Awareness</p>	<p>Senate orientation activities review board</p>	<p>No. According to University Secretariat website, the Goals of Orientation have not been updated since the version approved by Senate in 2002.</p> <p>Unsure of status re: orientation activity policy. Inclusion of academic integrity messages in orientation week may vary by faculty.</p>
<p>Graduate students should be engaged when they arrive on campus; focus both on their role as teaching assistants and on issues related to their own graduate work</p>	<p>Awareness</p>	<p>School of Graduate Studies and Centre for Teaching and Learning</p>	<p>Mygradskills module on academic integrity is made available to new graduate students.</p>
<p>Initiate campus debate on issues related to academic integrity through a variety of focus groups, town hall meetings etc. Use of campus media and publications.</p>	<p>Awareness</p>	<p>None listed</p>	<p>No consultations have occurred on a campus wide basis.</p>
<p>Make available to all students a comprehensive definition of plagiarism and clear guidelines on how to avoid plagiarism in their work</p>	<p>Education</p>	<p>Writing Centre SASS</p>	<p>The writing centre provides a guide to plagiarism on its website, which includes a definition.</p> <p>This is promoted to undergraduate students during orientation week when they</p>

			<p>receive a guided tour of the writing centre from a member of staff.</p> <p>Many individual instructors undertake discussions of academic integrity in class time.</p>
<p>Include in all courses an educational component which addresses expectations regarding academic honesty and avoiding plagiarism, especially in “grey” areas</p>	Education	Department heads	<p>Not aware of systematic coverage of all courses. In a study of 25 cyclical program review self-study documents, 13 units indicated that they provide online/in-person modules on academic integrity. This includes the mygradskills module.</p>
<p>Offer a broad range of faculty development programs through the CTL including for instructors, teaching fellows and teaching assistants</p>	Education	CTL	<p>No.</p> <p>The CTL offers a wide range of services but no programs specifically focused on academic integrity.</p>
<p>Educate instructors, teaching fellows and teaching assistants on definitions and procedures related to academic dishonesty (suggestion of a handbook to be made available to all the above).</p>	Education	Department heads and office of the provost.	<p>University procedures on academic integrity are communicated by department heads at the beginning of the year in many but not necessarily all departments. In a sample of 25 cyclical program</p>

2006 Report to Senate of SCAD Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity: 2016 Status Update on Recommendations

			<p>review self-study documents, 18 reported this happening.</p> <p>The provost's office operates a website with resources on academic integrity.</p> <p>Handbook has not been developed.</p>
Consider introduction of comprehensive "University 101" course for first year undergrad students to prepare them for academic success, to include AI.	Education	None listed	No.
Overall approach to AI should encompass entire academic and broader learning environment but not directly attempt to exert control over non-academic environment.	Policies and Procedures	None listed	<p>Yes.</p> <p>As experiential learning and undergraduate research opportunities increase, procedures and practices will need to evolve to encompass these learning experiences.</p>
Consider adoption of "honour code" (value system) to be introduced to students at time of recruitment/admission. Highlight this regularly in implicit and explicit ways.	Policies and Procedures	Orientation leaders and faculty.	Academic integrity features during orientation week, no honour code.
SCAP should review existing policies on academic dishonesty and consider viability of a single university-wide policy with faculty-specific additions as needed. Goal = consistency and commonality of practice across faculties.	Policies and Procedures	SCAP	<p>Yes.</p> <p>A Senate policy statement on academic integrity was adopted in 2006.</p> <p>Faculties developed procedures based on the Senate Policy on Academic Integrity Procedures which are</p>

			in many respects closely aligned across the University.
Benefits and liabilities of plagiarism detection devices such as turnitin software be fully examined, and university-wide consultation undertaken, prior to a recommendation on whether Queen's should adopt such a tool.	Policies and Procedures	None listed	Certain schools and departments, including the Smith school, implemented Turnitin. In 2016 a decision was taken to purchase a university-wide licence for turnitin.com
Confirm that commercial tutoring and exam preparation businesses will not be permitted to operate on Queen's campus; take all necessary steps to ensure this is the case. Alert students to unregulated nature of services offered. Take action against any organization that attempts to use the intellectual property of any member of Queen's community or improper use of Queen's name. Inform TAs of conflict of interest in tutoring students in same course they are hired to teach.	Policies and Procedures	None listed	Incomplete.
Office of the Vice-Principal (Academic) will have responsibility in the broadest sense for the promotion of the values of academic integrity at Queen's.	Policies and Procedures	Provost's office	Active promotion has not occurred since departure of Academic Integrity Advisor to the Provost in 2012.