

# Minutes



Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning)

<b>Meeting:</b>	Academic Integrity Subcommittee	<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	Monday, December 2, 2019 2:00 – 3:30 p.m.
<b>Room:</b>	Richardson Hall Room 215		
<b>Chair:</b>	John Pierce, Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning)		
<b>Members:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ryan Adlem (SGPS - VP Professional)</li> <li>Bronwyn Bjorkman (Languages, Literatures and Cultures)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cheryl Pulling (School of Nursing)</li> <li>Vacancy (AMS student-at-large)</li> </ul>	
<b>Observers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jeremy Ambraska (SGPS – President)</li> <li>David Bath (AMS – Commissioner External Advocacy)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lavonne Hood (University Ombudsman)</li> <li>Lon Knox (University Secretary)</li> </ul>	
<b>Administrative Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peggy Watkin (Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal Academic)</li> </ul>		
<b>Regrets</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jeremy Ambraska (SGPS President)</li> <li>David Bath (AMS – Commissioner External Advocacy)</li> </ul>		

Before the meeting was called to order, the chair acknowledged Queen’s University’s presence on the traditional lands of the Haudenosaunee and Anishnaabe.

<b>Opening</b>
<p><b>1. <u>Agenda</u></b> It was agreed to adopt the Agenda as circulated. There were no additions or amendments.</p>
<p><b>2. <u>Minutes of September 24, 2019</u></b> It was agreed to accept the Minutes of September 24, 2019 as circulated. There were no errors or omissions.</p>
<b>3. Business Arising from the Minutes</b>
<p><b><u>Student Access to Student Information in onQ</u></b> The Chair reported that he had spoken to Carolyn Heald (Chief Privacy Officer) regarding concerns that students registered in a course posted in onQ have access to the class list and their classmates’ email addresses. Carolyn Heald stated that she had no privacy concerns about this access because onQ can be considered public space, analogous to a physical classroom. In addition, access to the class list and students’ emails facilitates group work. It was also noted that students’ email addresses are available in Outlook. The Chair agreed that the present situation leaves the personal information stored in onQ to misuse (e.g. spam) but the current benefits out weight the risks.</p>

### **SSHRC Research Project**

The Chair reported that he had contacted the principal investigators of the research project on students' experience and academic integrity. The Academic Integrity Subcommittee will not see the survey before distribution in March 2020. However, the results will be shared with this body. Kate Rowbotham stated that if requested, the results of the earlier Smith School of Business survey could be shared with the Subcommittee.

### **Standard Letter for Instructors re: Intellectual Property Violations**

The Chair reported that he has not have time to speak to the University Counsel about creating a standard letter from instructors to outside enterprises demanding that their unauthorized course materials be removed from the company's website.

## **4. Chair's Report**

### **Senate Action**

The chair reported that at the October 29<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting an amendment to the *Academic Integrity Procedures – Requirements of Faculties and Schools* policy was approved. Unauthorized use of Intellectual Property is now an official academic integrity offence. The intention of the amendment is to address the substantial growth in the number of instances of students uploading course materials to note sharing websites and/or providing course materials to commercial study prep. In order to give due notice to students and instructors, the new offence will be activated as of September 2020.

The wording of the amendment is as follows:

#### **Intellectual Property**

**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. Example: student uploading course materials to note sharing websites without instructor's permission; student providing course materials to commercial study prep services that have not been sanctioned by the University.**

## **5. New Business**

### ***i. Final Report on Annual Academic Integrity***

The Chair drew attention to the *Final Report on Annual Academic Integrity* document, written by Michael Niven a former student intern in Teaching and Learning. The most requested amendments to the annual report template were:

- Changing the template from paper to a fillable online form;
- Including space to record if an offence was discovered by using Turnitin; and,
- Modifying the template to include space for comments.

There were no comments or questions.

### ***ii. Review of Faculty/Schools Procedures and Practices Alignment with the Senate Policy on Academic Integrity –Requirements of Faculties and Schools***

The meeting continued with a discussion about the lack of alignment between the Senate Policy on Academic Integrity and the individual faculties and schools policies. There was general agreement that there should be no deviation between the Senate policy definitions and the faculties and schools definitions. Preferably, in the future, the Academic Integrity Subcommittee would have the authority to approve any variations to a faculty/school's policy.

Reflecting on professional and/or accredited programs the question was raised whether these programs required a separate academic integrity policy. In some circumstances, serious departures from academic integrity can result with professional bodies applying sanctions that transcend the academic integrity senate policy. For example, students can be temporarily required to withdraw from Queen’s for an academic integrity offence but a professional body could expel the student permanently from the profession. The Chair reminded members that for individual cases of a breach of academic integrity, in which no appeal has been brought to the University Student Appeals Board, and the recommended sanction is a requirement to withdraw, the Senate Committee on Academic Procedures (SCAP) must review the case. In these circumstances, the Chair suggested that the review of the case should come to this body, rather than SCAP, because of its expertise and knowledge about academic integrity.

There was a brief discussion regarding the addition of “Contract Cheating” as an offence. This could involve both paid (e.g. hiring an outside company/individual to write a paper and submitting it as one’s own) and unpaid (e.g. a parent, friend or sibling write a paper and submitting it as one’s own) offences. In addition, Kate Rowbotham suggested that more clarity is required around findings of forgery and/or falsification and what constitutes unauthorized collaboration.

### **iii. 2018-2019 Academic Integrity Case Summary**

The Chair drew attention to the 2018-2019 Academic Integrity Case Summary circulated with the Agenda. He noted that the data will be presented to Senate by SCAP in January 2020. The Academic Integrity Subcommittee will comment on the data at a future meeting.

### **iv. Finding of a Departure from Academic Integrity Template**

The meeting continued with a discussion about the draft template entitled *Finding of a Departure from Academic Integrity*. Ideally, all academic integrity forms/templates would be standardized and could be found on one university-wide landing page.

In order to alleviate student anxiety, it was suggested the *Finding of a Departure from Academic Integrity* form include a preamble that explains what the finding means, what the student should do, what the consequences may be and what rights the student has. From experience, Subcommittee members noted that often students would panic and automatically assume that they will be required to withdraw from the university. The Chair noted that a draft *Investigation of a Departure from Academic Integrity* template would be prepared for review at the February 2020 meeting.

### **v. Queen’s Logo/Watermark on Exams**

The Chair noted that a student member of SCAD had suggested that a Queen’s logo or watermark be added to all paper copy of exams. The logo/watermark would make it easier to prove if someone decided to partake in intellectual property theft. There was general agreement that this idea should be explored further with the exams office.

## **6. Other Business**

During the meeting, Lavonne Hood raised the issue of students reaching out to the University Ombudsperson’s Office as their first point of contact once they have received a notice of investigation. Due to lack of resources and faculty advisors, it has become impossible for the Ombudsperson’s Office to assist most students. Students are encouraged to read the relevant faculty/school policy and if they still have questions then they should contact the Ombudsperson’s Office. Lavonne Hood stated that her Office would continue to concentrate on the most serious

and/or complex cases of academic integrity. It was acknowledged that individual faculty/school academic integrity websites need updating to include a faculty/school academic integrity contact person and to instruct students to read the policy before reaching out to the University Ombudsperson.

There being no Other Business, the meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

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