Minutes

Meeting:	Academic Integrity Subcommittee	Date & Time:	Tuesday, September 29, 2020 – 2:00 to 3:00 p.m.
Platform:	Via Zoom		
Chair:	John Pierce, Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning)		
Members:	• Johanne Bénard (Faculty, French Studies) • Tamara Mitterer (SGPS Member-at-Large)	• Cheryl Pulling (School of Nursing)	
Observers	• Lavonne Hood (University Ombudsperson)	• Anthony Lomax (SGPS VP Community) • Matthew Mellon (AMS – Commissioner External Advocacy)	
Guest	• Sue Blake (Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal Academic) • Gillian Ready, (Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal Academic) • Melissa Seal (Legal Counsel)		
Regrets Members and Observers	• Kate Rowbotham (Smith School of Business) • Lon Knox (University Secretary)		
Administrative Support	• Peggy Watkin (Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal Academic)		

Before the meeting was called to order, the Chair acknowledged Queen's University's presence on the traditional lands of the Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe.

A round of introductions was made.

Opening			

Agenda

It was agreed to adopt the Agenda as circulated.

Minutes of May 1, 2020

It was agreed to accept the Minutes of May 1, 2020 as circulated.

Business Arising from the Minutes

Technology to Track and Streamline Academic Integrity Offences and Procedures

The Chair reported on a software product called *Advocate* which is being considered as a tool to track and streamline academic integrity offences and procedures. Sue Blake explained that *Advocate* is currently being used by the Division of Student Affairs to manage non-academic misconduct cases. *Advocate* can accommodate the Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning) portfolio piggybacking on the existing non-academic portion by creating an additional "incident type" for academic integrity. The tool will be web-based allowing instructors to go online and initiate a Notice of Investigation. The system would then help to administer and track the offence(s), procedures, and decisions. To address the current lack of coherence associated with how students are treated and the messages they receive, users will have access to standardized templates which could be

customized by each Faculty and School. The tool also has the capacity to streamline annual reporting because all data will be available centrally in a secure location with separate access to subsections for each Faculty and School. The workflow capacity of the software will also support the appeal process. Funds have been requested to hire a central academic integrity manager who would administer the system and support Faculty-based academic integrity administrators.

Next steps include customizing the software and training users.

Update on Academic Integrity App (D2L Tutorial)
The Chair reported that the content of the University of Waterloo's Academic Integrity App has been converted, by the Centre for Teaching and Learning, into an onQ module. Using the share screen function, the Chair demonstrated the tool. The following highlights were recorded:
- The module is divided into sections that correspond to the *International Centre for Academic Integrity Essential Values;*
- Each section includes definitions; scenarios, videos and quizzes;
- Student progress can be tracked through onQ. If used as a remediation tool, students can be assigned the relevant section(s) to complete;
- Plans to pilot the module this fall are under negotiations with the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science. Measures are also being put in place to identify individual instructors who would be willing to incorporate the module into their Winter term onQ course(s);
- Currently, the content of the module is generic and suitable to be used by any Ontario university. Consideration is being given to customizing the modules to include Queen's processes.

All members of the Academic Integrity Subcommittee have been given access to the onQ module. The Chair asked that members review the tool and send any comments/suggestions to [Peggy Watkin](#).

It was noted that the Faculty of Arts and Science has also developed an Academic Integrity module. To ensure consistency, Lavonne Hood offered to reach out to Arts and Science to ask that the Subcommittee be given access.

Chair's Report

COVID-19 Update
The Chair reported that the number of academic integrity infractions has risen at an alarming rate since the beginning of the pandemic. The meeting continued with a discussion on how to assist students and instructors adjust to the new online environment. The following suggestions were recorded:
- Amend Faculty/Schools' regulations so that they adequately address remote instruction environments;
- Ensure that students' expectations and instructors' expectations align, particularly with open book exams;
- Consider alternate forms of assessment. Avoid creating high-stakes situations where students feel they have no option but to cheat;
- Ensure that penalties for departures from academic integrity are reasonable and consistent;
- Provide instructors with general guidelines on alternate forms of assessment/evaluation;
- Provide instructors with general guidelines for Open Book Exams that clearly outline what qualifies as approved material and what is specifically not allowed.

Johanne Bénard offered to share open book exams guidelines that were created in the Department of French Studies.

Update on Review of *Senate Policy – Requirements for Faculties and Schools*

The Chair introduced Gillian Ready who has been hired as a special project manager in the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic). One of Gillian's task is to update the *Senate Policy on Requirements* for *Faculties and Schools*. Once a draft is ready it will be made available to the Academic Integrity Subcommittee, Legal Counsel, and the University Ombudsperson for comment/input.

Level of Offense

With the upcoming revisions to the *Senate Policy – Requirements for Faculties and Schools*, the Chair asked if all Faculties/Schools should be required to adopt level of offenses. There was general agreement that levels should be "recommended" but not required in the Senate policy.

New Business

Guidelines for the Use of Remote Proctoring Tools

The Chair drew attention to the *Guidelines for the Use of Remote Proctoring Tools* circulated with the Agenda. Depending on the software used, remote proctoring involves a camera recording the student as they write their exam. The student is monitored by either a live proctor or artificial intelligence is used to authenticate the student's identity and the exam is recorded. Recordings are reviewed by the proctoring service and are flagged for further review by the Faculties/Schools for potential departures from academic integrity. Ideally, the *Guidelines* should have come to the Academic Integrity Subcommittee first for its input. However, the urgency to transfer to remote learning due to COVID-19 prohibited the desirable sequence of approvals. Subsequent to introducing remote proctoring the University has scrutinized these tools for privacy and security to ensure they meet Queen's standards. However, remote proctoring tools have not endured the same level of analysis concerning academic integrity. Like "Turnitin", the tool can assist in detecting departures from academic integrity, but it cannot determine if a departure has occurred. It is up to the Instructor to exercise their independent and professional judgment if a departure from academic integrity has transpired.

The Chair continued the discussion by pointing out the statement that should be included at the beginning of each remote-proctored exam. The statement lists several actions that would be consider infractions including accessing unauthorized material. To ensure students read the statement it was suggested that students be required to "tick" a box acknowledging they understand the perimeters of a remote proctored exam. If the exam is posted on onQ a time limit of how long students must read/stay on the page (perhaps 30 seconds) could be implemented so that they do not tick the box without reading the statement in their haste to start the exam.

In response to a question, the Chair confirmed that discussions around misidentification and use of biometrics are taking place at the senior leadership level. Because of these potential flaws, the preferred mode is to have a live person proctoring the exam. At the end of Fall term 2020 it is anticipated that the Remote Proctoring Working Group will thoroughly review the efficiency and effectiveness of this mode of administering exams.

The Chair also confirmed that students' concerns around surveillance and privacy are being discussed by the senior leadership team and acknowledged that the University needs to do more work in this area. It has been determined that students are less anxious about writing a remote proctored exam if the instructor

communicates to the students prior to the exam and/or the student is given the opportunity to partake in a practice exam. To aid students, the University is also creating videos about the expectations and perimeters of remote proctor exams. Members of the Subcommittee were encouraged to look at the Office of the University Registrar's [Remote Proctoring](#) webpage which contains a plethora of information.

One amendment to the statement was suggested:

> In the case of online exams **for example**, impersonating another student, copying from another student, making information available to another student about the exam questions or possible answers, communicating with another person during an exam or about an exam during the exam window, or accessing unauthorized materials, including smart devices, are actions in contravention of academic integrity.

It was moved by Cheryl Pulling, seconded by Johanne Bénard, and agreed, to approve the academic integrity section of the *Guidelines for the Use of Remote Proctoring Tools* as amended.

Guidelines for Retention of Video Recordings

The Chair drew attention to the ***Guidelines for the Use of Remote Proctoring Tools*** created by Carolyn Heald, Director of University Records Management and Chief Privacy Officer. The *Guidelines* provide a framework for using video recordings as evidence in an academic integrity investigation and indicate who can have access to the recording. In response to a question it was noted that all Faculties/Schools have record management retention schedules. The *Guidelines* specify that Level II findings are retained for 10 years after the student's graduation, which aligns with current Arts and Science regulations.

It was moved by Johanne Bénard, seconded by Cheryl Pulling, and agreed, to approve the academic integrity section of the *Guidelines for the Retention of Video Recordings.*

Email Templates for Instructor Use

The Chair drew attention to the revised *Email Templates for Instructor Use*. Members were asked to send any revisions/comments directly to Sue Blake.

Other Business

There being no Other Business the meeting adjourned at 3:02 p.m.

Next Meeting: October 29, 2020

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