

Minutes



Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning)

Meeting:	Academic Integrity Subcommittee	Date & Time:	Wednesday February 15, 2023 3:00 - 4:00 p.m.
Platform:	Microsoft Teams		
Chair:	John Pierce, Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning)		
Members:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Johanne Benard (Faculty, French Studies) Brian Frank (Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vina Li (SGPS Member-at-Large) Kelley Packalen (Smith School of Business) Vacancy (AMS student-at-large) 	
Observers:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lon Knox (University Secretary) Beth Langdon (SGPS President) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kathryn Morrissey (Intake Coordinator, Ombuds Office) Heather Trojek (Associate University Ombudsperson) 	
Guests:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lisa Newton (University Counsel) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Melissa Seal (University Counsel) 	
Regrets:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sahiba Gulati (AMS – Commissioner External Advocacy) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
Administrative Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claire O'Brien (Provost's Office) 		

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

Opening

1) Agenda

It was agreed to switch the order of items 5 and 6, then to adopt the agenda.

2) Minutes of March 7, 2022

It was agreed to accept the minutes of March 7, 2022 as circulated.

3) Chair's Report

- The revised academic integrity procedures state that the chair of this subcommittee must approve any proposed sanction of requirement to withdraw (RTW) for academic integrity reasons. From March 1, 2022 until now, the chair has been asked to approve a proposed RTW sanction 6 times. 5 proposed sanctions were approved. The sixth was under review at the time of the meeting. *Secretary's note: subsequently approved.*
- The Academic Integrity Coordinator in the Provost's Office, in position during 2021-2022, left Queen's and was not replaced due to budgetary pressures. The Provost's Office has hired Dr. Kelley Packalen as

a part-time Special Advisor to the Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning) on Academic Integrity from February-July 2023.

- A review of academic notations on the transcript is underway. This work has revealed faculties are taking different approaches to removal of the RTW for academic integrity reasons notation once a student returns to Queen's. The Transcript Review Working Group will review this, then this subcommittee. (The Senate policy on this issue is available [here](#)).

4) Departures from Academic Integrity, 2021-2022

The subcommittee made the same request as last year: members would like to understand more about why students are cheating. Greater detail in the reporting of departures may facilitate this understanding (further discussion would be needed on what would be helpful to collect). K. Packalen noted she has two sets of data on this topic from Queen's students.

H. Trojek noted that students are sometimes unsure what is happening following an investigation. A notice of dismissal should routinely be sent to a student if a notice of investigation does not result in a finding of departure from academic integrity.

Action: The Chair would like to look at practice on this across the University. Training for instructors may help.

There were fewer appeals of departures from academic integrity in 2021-2022 than in previous years. J. Benard noted a similar trend in the Faculty of Arts and Science for general (non-AI related) academic appeals. The reasons for the decrease are not known. The introduction of necessary grounds for appeal in the 2021 Academic Integrity Procedures may have contributed; however AI leads have reported finding the grounds for appeal a difficult area to navigate, therefore most appeals are being heard as they would have been before 2021.

5) Faculty and School Compliance with revised Academic Integrity Procedures

M. Seal reported that compliance was reviewed in the Fall term 2022. Some faculties and schools have amended earlier regulations policies to align with the revised procedures and some have yet to do so. K. Packalen described how she had developed the notice and finding form templates that accompanied the procedures for the Smith School of Business. These forms act as a guidebook and a template for instructors simultaneously. They provide more clarity to students on the investigation and decision-making process. The notice of dismissal form is included. The Ombuds office reported that these forms are proving helpful; students understand them better and they elicit more consistent and accurate information. The Chair has asked Dr. Packalen to work with AI leads to make these forms (or a customized version if needed) available across faculties and schools.

Action: the Provost's Office will post the forms on its academic integrity [website](#) once fully developed.

The Chair gave an update on the feasibility of the use of Advocate as a centralized software platform for handling departures from academic integrity. After investigation, the Provost's Office identified that one or more staff members would likely need to administer all the notices of investigation and findings of departure from AI on behalf of instructors. University-wide adoption of Advocate was not pursued. The Faculty of Arts and Science is investigating whether to pilot use of Advocate within the Faculty.

The issue of students dropping a course in which they have a finding of departure from AI was discussed. Students are notified on the notice of investigation that they are not allowed to drop a course while an investigation is in progress, or if a finding is made in that course. However, it is difficult to track whether they are attempting to drop the course, and some students do manage to drop a course in this scenario.

Action: A request was made for the Provost's Office to work with the Registrar's Office to create or adapt a mechanism in Peoplesoft to prevent students from dropping a course in this situation. Follow-up would be needed to get the flag/block removed if the finding was successfully appealed.

6) Report from Ombuds Office on Academic Integrity Issues from Student Perspective

- A large majority of the students who contact the Ombuds office do so about academic integrity. Of those students, around half have received a notice of investigation, and half have received a finding of departure from academic integrity.
- When the office's website was updated, the number of students contacting the office decreased.
- Many of the students take responsibility for the departure from AI. The most common issue they raise is the severity of the sanction. There is rarely a reason given on the finding form for why this sanction has been imposed; some rationale may help students understand and accept the sanction. Students main concerns are around prospects for the future and financial implications of a departure. It may be useful to state on the notice of investigation that only very few departures are noted on the student transcript.
- The office sees some inconsistency in sanctioning and assignment of Level 1 and 2 findings between, and within, faculties and schools. While concerned, members agreed differential sanctioning may be justified, for example, in a professional program that adheres to professional conduct standards as well as the Academic Integrity procedures. It was suggested that further clarification (possibly through training) is needed on Level 1 and 2 findings.

Action: Education for instructors and AI leads on sanctioning should be developed. This would include factors to consider when deciding on a sanction, importance of communicating a clear rationale for the sanction, and awareness raising on possibly unintended consequences of sanctioning (e.g., failure on assignment may lead to failure on course, and possibly, requirement to withdraw on academic grounds).

7) Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity

Queen's will not ban the use of generative artificial intelligence by students. Inappropriate use of these tools would constitute a departure from academic integrity, as it is a misrepresentation of students' work. The Chair is developing a statement on this and welcomed input on this topic from members.

8) Other Business

There was no time for other business. The meeting was adjourned at 4.05pm

Next meeting: Fall Term 2023, date and time tbd