

 **MINUTES**

**Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Meeting:** | **Academic Integrity Roundtable**  | **Date & Time:** | **Monday, March 18th 2019, 2.00pm-3.30pm** |
| **Room:** | Room 315 Richardson Hall  |
| **Chair:** | John Pierce (Special Advisor to the Provost on Teaching and Learning) |
| **Members Present:** | * Diane Beauchemin (SCAP Delegate)
* Katie Phillips (Arts & Science)
* Monica Corbett (School of Graduate Studies)
* Susan Korba (Student Affairs)
 | * Harry Smith (Smith School of Business)
* Zack (AMS Delegate)
* Nancy Somers (Law)
* Anna Taylor (BISC )
 |
| **Members’ Regrets**  | * Rebecca Carnevale (Education)
* Leslie Flynn(Health Sciences)
 | * Atul Jaiswal (SGPS Delegate)
* Marianna Kontopoulo (FEAS Delegate)
 |
| **Observers’****Regrets**  | * Heather Cole (University Ombudsman)
* Tyler Morrison (President SGPS)
* Julia Gollner (AMS Academic Affairs Commissioner)
* Lavonne Hood (University Secretary)
 | * Sue Fostaty-Young (Centre for Teaching and Learning)
* Nasser Saleh (University Librarian Delegate)
 |
| **Administrative****Support** | * Tanya Iakobson (Office of the Provost & Vice-Principal Academic)
 | * Peggy Watkin (Office of the Provost & Vice-Principal Academic)
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Discussion Item** |
| 1. **Adoption of the Agenda**

It was moved by Diane Beauchemin, seconded by Susan Korba, and agreed to adopt the Agenda as circulated.  |
| 1. **Approval of the Minutes**

Edits were requested to section 5, second bullet. The sentence will now read:“This is a concern because a formal letter creates a paper trail even when all other materials on the case **have been destroyed “**It was moved by Susan Korba, seconded by Nancy Somers, and agreed to approve the Minutes of October 19th, 2018 as circulated. |
| 1. **Chair’s Report**

**i. Update on circulation of the note-sharing emails** The Chair provided the group with an update on the circulation of the note-sharing emails to students and faculty. These memos can be accessed via the [Academic Integrity Central](https://www.queensu.ca/academicintegrity/general-information/intellectual-property) website. Concern was raised about how information will be shared to incoming students regarding these risks. Members suggested adding the information to the default onQ template. **ii. Working Group to Review Academic Integrity Annual Case Summary** The Chair noted the creation of a new Academic Integrity Working Group chaired by Kate Rowbotham. The purpose of the group will be to review the AI data collected annually from Faculties and Schools. The Working Group will make recommendations for a revised template for the collection of data. Membership of the group has yet to be confirmed, but the goal is to keep the working group quite small. The representative from the BISC mentioned that they have never participated in the annual survey and it would be helpful to assess the BISC results in comparison with the main campus.**iii. Academic Integrity Intervention Stickers** The Chair drew attention to the printed intervention stickers and distributed them. It was noted that these stickers can be appended to flyers/advertisements for tutoring companies that prey on student's anxiety regarding academic success. Some of the outcomes of the stickers have already been revealed. The Chair mentioned that he was contacted by staff at *CourseCram* who stated that they were unaware of the problematic nature of their services. The representative indicated that he would inform his staff fully about Queen’s University’s concerns. Some of the posters with stickers placed on them have been removed and not replaced. Please contact the Academic Integrity email address for more stickers.**iv. Adoption of University of Waterloo’s Academic Integrity App.**The Chair spoke to the possibility of adopting an Academic Integrity App from the University of Waterloo. Information about the app can be found [here.](https://academicintegrity.org/blog/using-mobile-technology-to-educate-students-about-academic-integrity/) It was reported that the base cost for adopting the Waterloo app for use at Queen's is $10,000.00. This would customize the application with Queen's branding. For additional costs, the app can be programed to track students who have completed the quizzes. Also, a customized app will have the capacity to issue e-certificates for students who have completed the course. The option of hosting the app on the iOS app store and Google Play Store is available.The app could be a positive investment as it could be adopted quickly. The members of the group were urged to talk to faculty members and staff to gain ideas about the use of the app, and assess interest in their particular area of the University. The representative from the BISC voiced her support for this investment. The representative from SASS would like to have a conversation about the potential uses of this tool. The Chair highlighted the opportunity to implement the app in first-year courses as a proactive method in teaching academic integrity values.  |
| 1. **Business Arising from the Minutes**

**i. Update on progress to align the Faculty/School’s AI procedures and practices to the *Senate Policy on Academic Integrity-Requirements of Faculties and Schools*** The Chair expressed his concerns regarding de novo hearings as they relate to departures of academic integrity. These concerns include people interpreting legal phrasing in different ways and the inconsistency this wording has caused. This policy is being reviewed with the help of legal counsel. The Chair invited discussion regarding whether or not the University should retain the option of de novo hearings. Members of the group mention the reluctance individuals may feel in overturning a previous decision because of the confrontation it may cause. It was reiterated that the second decision maker should clearly articulate the reasons for choosing to overturn the decision. Members also voiced the concern that students or instructors may feel the need to provide new supporting materials when part of a de novo hearing.The group agreed that there is a wide spread problem of instructors not taking the time to learn the terms and process of academic integrity at Queen's. Often training for academic integrity panel members and/or individual instructors is lacking cause inconsistences with how students are treated. It was agreed to return to the issue of de novo hearings at a future Roundtable. **ii. Amendment to the Interim Policy on Booking University Space** The Chair noted his attendance at the Policy Advisory Subcommittee meeting on the 20th of February 2019. Prior to this, he met with Kim Murphy who suggested a small change in language for clarification:***Academic*** *events or ~~academic~~ services (such as exam preparation, tutorial activities, etc.) provided by organizations not affiliated with or approved by Queen’s University.* This amendment was adopted along with other changes to the Space Booking Policy. The revised policy has now been posted for a two-week consultation period before it can go for final approval by the Vice-Principal Operations Committee (VPOC). The amendment will be distributed through the AI policy contacts and posted on the central AI website. To create a wider distribution, members suggested using listservs or faculty email lists.  |
| 1. **New Business**

**i. Academic Integrity and the Unauthorized Use of Intellectual Property** The Chair drew attention to the Ryerson University policy document attached to the agenda package. It was noted that the Senate Policy on Academic Integrity does not include a position on the unauthorized use of Intellectual Property. The Academic Integrity subcommittee is recommending the following amendment to the policy: **Use of intellectual property of others for sale or profit or distribution for unfair academic, personal or professional advantage without the authorization of the owner of the material.**This amendment will need both SCAD and SCAP approval before it can be sent to Senate for final approval.  |
| 1. **Other Business**

The issue of adopting iThenticate, a plagiarism detection software, was raised. The Chair stated that he needed to do more research on its capability. He noted that the software is more adaptable in the United States because the states take an opposite view of Intellectual Property. In the USA IP belongs to the institution. In Canada IP belongs to the individual instructor.Heather Cole, Interim University Ombudsperson was not present to speak about the USAB recommendation for a university-wide sanction on forgery. Harry Smith noted that USAB’s ruling was intended to prompt the University to look seriously at grave departures from academic integrity, such as forgery, and to think about appropriate campus-wide sanctions. There being no Other Business the meeting adjourned at 3:08 p.m.  |
| Next meeting: TBD |

Queen’s University is situated on the territory of the Haudenosaunee & Anishinaabek