MINUTES

Meeting:	Academic Integrity Roundtable	Date & Time:	Wednesday, December 6, 2017 – 12:30 – 2:00 p.m.
Room:	Watson Hall Room 122		
Chair:	John Pierce (Professor, Department of English Language and Literature)		
Members Present:	- Diane Beauchemin (SCAP Delegate) - Rebecca Carnevale (Education) - Heather Cole (Law) - Haley Everson (Arts & Science) - Leslie Flynn (Health Sciences) - Atul Jaiswal (SGPS Delegate)		- Susan Korba (Student Affairs) - Kelley Packalen (Smith School of Business) - Jenn Stephenson (SCAD Delegate) - Marta Straznicky (School of Graduate Studies)
Members Regrets	Lynann Clapham (FEAS)		Carla Namkung (AMS Delegate)
Observers Present	- Victoria Lewarne (AMS Academic Affairs Commissioner) - Sue Fostaty-Young (Centre for Teaching and Learning)		Harry Smith (University Ombudsman)
Observers Regrets	- Adan Grotsky (President SGPS) - Lon Knox (University Secretary)		Nasser Saleh (University Librarian Delegate)
Administrative Support	Michael Niven (Office of the Provost & Vice-Principal Academic)		Peggy Watkin (Office of the Provost & Vice-Principal Academic)

Discussion Item
1. **Welcome & Introductions** The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made.
2. **Adoption of the Agenda** **It was moved by Diane Beauchemin, seconded by Marta Straznicky, and agreed to adopt the Agenda as amended.**
3. **Chair's Report** The chair began his report by noting that nothing substantial has been done on a university-wide level to coordinate and promote academic integrity at Queen's since 2006. This lack of attention has resulted in a number of gaps in our systems and exposure of the university to a number of risks. The creation of the AI Roundtable and the SCAD/SCAP Subcommittee is an attempt by the administration to rectify this void. The chair noted that responsibility for academic integrity falls under the jurisdiction of the Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning).

The chair highlighted the role that individual faculty members play in academic integrity issues and noted that under the guidance of university legal counsel two faculties have recently updated their AI processes. The chair emphasized that it will be important that the overarching Senate procedural document be revised to stay in pace with developments at the faculty/school level.

The chair reported on a recent meeting of the Academic Integrity Council of Ontario (AICO) hosted by Ryerson University. AICO provides a forum for academic-integrity practitioners to share information and to promote academic integrity best practices in Ontario universities. The meeting highlighted current trends regarding breaches of academic integrity including: contract cheating, new technologies and social media including Facebook. He noted that province-wide all universities are struggling with keeping up with new and innovative ways that students are breaching academic integrity.

The chair spoke to the recent launch of the text-matching platform *Turnitin*. He noted a number of legal and logistical challenges associated with *Turnitin* and stressed the urgency for the development of policy and procedures to guide students and faculty who use the tool.

Actions: Regularly review the Academic Integrity Senate Policy and Procedures document (every five-years). Next review to begin in 2018-2019 academic year.

Academic Integrity Subcommittee to draft *Turnitin* guidelines for students and faculty.

4. **Terms of Reference (Academic Integrity Subcommittee and Academic Integrity Roundtable)**
   The chair stated that the Roundtable was created as an information-sharing and advisory forum for those who are intimately involved in the implementation and operation of the university's academic integrity systems. The AI Roundtable reports directly to the joint SCAD/SCAP AI Subcommittee. The Subcommittee is required to share information with the Roundtable on matters relating to academic integrity policy and practice, education and training. The only cross connection in the membership of the two groups is the chair. In response to a question, the chair noted that there is no conflict of interest with a member of the AI Roundtable also serving on their faculty/school's AI committee.

5. **Report of the Academic Integrity Working Group**
   The chair drew attention to the *Academic Integrity Working Group* report that was approved by Senate in April 2017. He noted that the largest gap is awareness and education, hence the creation of the AI Roundtable and the AI Subcommittee. Other recommendations in the category of awareness and education is the designation by each faculty and school of a contact person for dealing with integrity issues and the creation of a module to educate undergraduate students on the principles and practices of academic integrity at Queen's.

   Another important recommendation is that adjudication of departures from academic integrity within a course be managed by the primary instructor or course coordinator and that TAs not be required to be directly involved in hearings related to academic integrity. It was noted that dissemination of the *Academic Integrity Working Group* report and recommendations has not been uniform across the university.

   The meeting continued with a discussion about the academic integrity policy statement and ways to ensure all students are aware and understand their responsibilities.

   Action: Chair to write faculty deans, with c.c. to Roundtable members, to remind them that: all

faculties/schools must maintain an Academic Integrity landing page with common content; that all course syllabi must contain the standardized academic integrity definition; and, all faculties/schools must designate an individual or specify a designated email address that can be advertised on the University's Academic Integrity website so individuals can enquire about integrity issues within a specific faculty/school.

6. **Roundtable Discussion**

During the roundtable discussion the following future agenda items were suggested: guidelines for sanctions; quantitative vs. qualitative courses; burden of proof; influence of social media; assignment design; addressing student skills deficits; cultural differences; protocols; AI 101 course; devaluing of a Queen's degree if integrity is diminished; and, integration of research integrity and academic integrity.

7. **Academic Integrity Website (including landing pages for Faculties/Schools)**

The chair noted that work is being done on updating the current academic integrity website. It is proposed that each faculty and school maintain an academic integrity landing page that will have some common content including: general policy statement; general faculty-specific statement on AI; information for students; information for instructors; contact person; and, faculty academic regulations on AI. It was suggested that the landing pages also include: information about cross-faculty jurisdiction; relevant forms; link to the Ombudsperson, Student Success, Centre for Teaching and Learning and Library websites; and, a section on FAQ.

Action: Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) to update central Academic Integrity website.

8. **Other Business**
There being no Other Business the meeting adjourned at 1:54 p.m.

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