

 **MINUTES**

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Meeting:** | **Academic Integrity Roundtable**  | **Date & Time:** | **Friday, October 19th 2018 from 11.30am-1.00pm** |
| **Room:** | Room 118 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)
 | * Laurie Ross (Smith School of Business)
* Marianna Kontopoulo (FEAS Delegate)
* Nancy Somers (Law)
 |
| **Members’ Regrets**  | * Michael Adams (Health Sciences)
* Rebecca Carnevale (Education)
* Haley Everson (Arts & Sciences)
* Susan Korba (Student Affairs)
* Atul Jaiswal (SGPS Delegate)
 | * Carla Namkung (AMS Delegate)
* Jenn Stephenson (SCAD Delegate)
* Marta Straznicky (School of Graduate Studies)
* Anna Taylor (BISC )
 |
| **Observers Present** | * Julia Gollner (AMS Academic Affairs Commissioner)
* Lavonne Hood (University Secretary)
 | * Nasser Saleh (University Librarian Delegate)
 |
| **Observers’****Regrets**  | * Heather Cole (University Ombudsman)
* Tyler Morrison (President SGPS)
 | * Sue Fostaty-Young (Centre for Teaching and Learning)
 |
| **Guests**  | * Mark Swartz (Copyright Manager, Queen’s Library)
* Harry Smith (Smith School of Business)
 |
| **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 Laurie Ross, and agreed to adopt the Agenda as circulated.**  |
| 1. **Approval of the Minutes**

**It was moved by Diane Beauchemin, seconded by Laurie Ross, and agreed to approve the Minutes of February 23, 2018 as circulated.**  |
| 1. **Chair’s Report**

*Annual Report to SCAD/SCAP* The chair drew attention to the Academic Integrity Subcommittee’s annual report to SCAD and SCAP. It was noted that the subcommittee spent a lot of time on the university-wide launch of *Turnitin*. The chair asked for suggestions from the group about how to improve training for *Turnitin* and how to spread the word that the platform is ready for use It was noted that in addition to the future action items listed in the report, work on the review of the *Senate Policy on Academic Integrity Procedures – Requirements for Faculties and Schools* will continue. Because this document forms the basis of all individual faculty and school policies, this review needs to be completed before a review of the individual faculty and school processes and procedures documents can proceed. *Course Creation Tool (Daylight)*The chair reported that a new course creation tool was launched in September for *onQ*. The *Instructor’s Conditions of Use* has been preloaded into *onQ* and instructors must agree to the conditions before they can access *Turnitin*. There is also a new module, located under university and course policies, informing students about the conditions of use for *Turnitin*. Unfortunately, if a course has been rolled over year-after-year and predates the installation of *Turnitin*, the message will not be preloaded. Members from the Roundtable reported that use of *Turnitin* has expanded and because of this, faculties and schools are reporting a higher number of academic integrity cases. There was concern raised that there may not be enough resources to handle this increased case load.It was noted that Queen’s University has a 3-year contract with *Turnitin*. When it is time to renew the contract the chair stated that the Roundtable may be consulted regarding renewing the license. Laurie Ross, e Smith School of Business, expressed interest in rolling Smith’s license into the Queen’s wide contract when it is time to renew.  |
| * **Business Arising from the Minutes**

**The chair addressed a number of action items recorded in the February 23, 2018 Minutes. The following highlights were recorded:** * The chair reported that the Smith School of Business is covered in the university-wide contract for *Turnitin*. Going forward*, Turnitin* will not be willing to license individual entities. It was noted that *Turnitin* is not designed to meet the needs of researchers and graduate students. There is a plagiarism detection software on the market called *Ithenticate* that is designed to be used by researchers but currently Queen’s does not have a license for this service. The chair notified the Roundtable that he will be contacting a colleague at the University of Waterloo to find out how they authorize individual students or research projects to use the text matching tool. The chair has proposed amendments to the *Senate Space Management* policy and it was brought forward to the Academic Integrity Subcommittee early this month. However, no decision could be made because of lack of quorum. This action item to be carried forward.
* The chair reported that instead of creating a *Turnitin* guide, an *Instructor Conditions of Use* document was developed, which answered many of the common questions.
* The chair informed the Roundtable that the review of the Academic Integrity Policy would be discussed latter on at this meeting.
 |
| 1. **Sharing Course Materials and Tutoring Services**

The chair welcomed Mark Swartz and invited him to speak about the implications of uploading course materials to note-sharing websites or providing course materials to commercial study prep services. Drawing attention to the memo circulated with the agenda it was noted that the purpose of the communication was to ultimately warn students about the consequences of reselling intellectual property and to inform staff and faculty about these issues. During discussion the following highlights were recorded:* It is important that students are informed formally about the implication of uploading the intellectual property of their instructors;
* Students have been reaching out to the faculties about whether or not they can be employed by these services, which shows a lack of available information;
* It was suggested to look for other ways to reach out to students, like using social media applications (*Twitter*);
* The chair will look into creating a single slide to disseminate to instructors to be used during their first class outlining the memo;
* Many faculties have standardized syllabi, there is an opportunity to add this into the syllabus;
* Commercial study prep services are becoming more aggressive and litigious. To avoid legal complications Queen’s will not refer to these companies by name;
* Often, it is not innate to students that sharing their instructors material is inappropriate because of how normal it is for their generation to share information through social media;
* It was suggested that a multi-pronged approach to communicate with stakeholders is needed to education the campus about academic integrity, copyright and intellectual property issues. Legitimate tutoring services like SASS or AMS funded services provide students with academic support and are not identified with commercial study prep services.

 The goal is to have the memo circulated in the next couple weeks. It will be sent to all students from John Pierce, as part of his new role - Special Advisor to the Provost on Teaching and Learning. Members were invited to send any comments or concerns about the memo to the chair. |
| 1. **Review of Faculty/Schools Procedures and Practices Alignments with the *Senate Policy on Academic Integrity- Requirements of Faculties and Schools***

Jill Scott, Vice-Provost Teaching and Learning, has expressed concern about the alignment across faculties/schools in dealing with breaches of academic integrity. In order to mitigate risk, all faculties and schools should follow a regulated plan outlined in the Senate policy. However, because of a consistently changing landscape, there have been divergences from these regulations. Using a PowerPoint presentation, John Pierced spoke to draft flowcharts that outline a common process for all faculties and schools. He noted that all procedures should be based on the principles of natural justice and due process. The five mutual elements of any academic integrity case includes: investigation; engagement with student; decision about finding; deciding sanction; and, informing students. . After the PowerPoint presentation a discussion took place. The following suggestions and comments are recorded here:* There needs to be standardized elements of how a student is informed about an investigation. Possibly, create a sample form with all the required elements;
* The group engaged in a discussion about whether or not a formal letter is necessary upon dismissal of a case. This is a concern because a formal letter creates a paper trail even when all other materials on the case have been destroyed

SCAD and SCAP will also be reviewing the procedures and practices and how they align with the Senate policy. |
| 1. **Academic Integrity Website**

Prior to the meeting, members were invited to surf the updated academic integrity website. The chair noted the continued effort to establish a standard academic integrity landing page for each of the faculties and schools. The chair will continue to liaise with academic integrity representatives to complete this task. Members were encouraged to send any updates/typos/suggestions to Tanya Iakobson.  |
| 1. **Other Business**
2. **Communications from the Office of the University Ombudsman- Consistency of Sanctions**

The chair drew attention to the communication from the Office of the University Ombudsman regarding USAB’s recommendation that the university-wide sanction for forgery should be a requirement to withdraw for a period of one-year. It was noted that best practices do not advocate for commonly imposed penalties and requirements to withdraw are not easy to impose. Concern was raised about the harshness of this sanction for a first offence and the harmful repercussions it would have on the student. The chair reported that Dr. Heather Cole, in her new role of University Ombudsman, will continue to investigate the details of the case that prompted USAB to make their recommendation.1. **Academic Integrity Case Summary 2016-17**

The chair drew attention to the academic integrity case summary from 2016-17 circulated with the agenda. The data for this report is requested annually from faculties and schools by SCAP. The template used to collect the data includes space to record the number and type of academic integrity issues or cases dealt with. The summary is provided to SCAP and then Senate, normally in November, for information. The chair informed the group of the Academic Integrity Subcommittee’s decision to take a more active role in commenting on and analyzing the data. The AI Subcommittee agreed that the report contained valuable information that can be used in the promotion of academic integrity. It was suggested that the form for the collection of data should be revised. A possible new addition to the template is to record the number of cases that are dismissed. It was suggested that when analyzing the report it will be important to breakdown the types of departures so the university can address the lack of education on a particular offence. Consideration was also given to the correlation between the introduction of *Turnitin* and the number of departures recorded.There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 12:53 p.m.  |
| Next meeting: Monday, March 18th 2019 from 2.00pm-3.00pm |
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