# Academic Integrity Subcommittee

## Minutes of the Meeting of 22 April 2021

Meeting held from 10.00-10.45am via zoom

Present

Members: Johanne Benard, Arts and Science, Kody Klupt (AMS), Tamara Mitterer, SGPS, John Pierce (chair) Cheryl Pulling, School of Nursing,

Observers: Lavonne Hood, Ombudperson, Matthew Mellon, AMS,

Guests: Sue Blake & Gillian Ready, Provost’s Office, Melissa Seal, Legal Counsel

Regrets: Lon Knox, University Secretary, Anthony Lomax, SGPS, Kate Rowbotham, Smith School of Business

Secretary: Claire O’Brien

The chair acknowledged our presence on traditional lands of the Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe peoples. Around Earth Day we can all learn from how Indigenous people have lived on the land and respected it.

1. Agreement on Agenda

It was agreed that the agenda should proceed as circulated.

1. Agreement on Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of 19 March 2021 were agreed as circulated.

3. Chair’s report

John Pierce reported that a new Academic Integrity Co-ordinator has been hired and will join Queen’s on June 1, 2021.

He noted that he had discussed Indigeneity and academic integrity with Associate Vice-Principal (Indigenous Initiatives and Reconciliation), KanonhsyonneJan Hill. Canadian universities are examining how their approach to academic integrity can be informed by Indigenous teachings and ways of knowing. The Indigenous Curriculum and Research Working Group will consider this issue, and it will be brought up at this subcommittee at a future date.

4. Amendments to the Senate Policy on Academic Integrity – Requirements for Faculties and Schools

The subcommittee reviewed and discussed the draft revisions to this document at its previous meeting. The chair noted that further consultation and detailed revision had taken place since that time. He leads a core group of legal counsel, the ombudsperson, and provost’s office staff in making the revisions. The chair updated the committee on new sections and changes, including:

* a new section on “integrity in action”
* procedure on reporting departures to exchange students’ home universities.
* Appeals process aligning with the recently approved Student Academic Appeals Policy. Grounds for appeal are stated clearly. Appeals will not be heard ‘de novo’. If new information comes to light as part of the appeal process, the decision will be referred back to the original decision maker.
* Consultation on a proposed sanction of requirement to withdraw will be with the subcommittee chair, rather than the full subcommittee. The committee’s Terms of Reference will be amended as and when the revised procedures are approved.

The subcommittee’s direction on certain key sections was sought, as well as recommendation for approval of the revised procedures to its parent committees, the Senate Committee on Academic Development (SCAD) and Senate Committee on Academic Procedures (SCAP). If approved by SCAD and SCAP, the revised procedures will be presented to Senate in the fall. If approved there, faculties and schools will be asked to change their regulations to accord with the revised procedures by the end of the 2021-22 academic year. He noted the intention to produce two guides to accompany the procedures; one for students and another for instructors.

The group’s views were requested on a new addition to the section that defines departures from academic integrity; a category of “departure from the core values of academic integrity”. The committee agreed that this was a helpful addition, as it would not be possible to list every way of departing from academic integrity. Members advised the chair to include guidance on categorizing departures in this way in a faculty guide that will accompany the procedures.

The subcommittee considered two alternative versions of the factors used to determine whether a departure is categorized as Level I or Level II. These had been circulated with the agenda. The merits and drawbacks of each approach were discussed. The guiding principles for the subcommittee were ensuring fairness for students, which included being transparent in the factors used to categorize the departure. Members discussed which factors would lead to consistent, proportional categorization. In conclusion, they agreed to recommend the factors outlined in the circulated full version of the revised procedures, rather than the alternate version presented.

The subcommittee agreed to recommended approval of the procedures to SCAD and SCAP.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 10.45am.