

Advisory Committee on Non-Academic Misconduct  
Consultation meeting: AMS Assembly  
Thursday, October 22, 2015

*The AMS President, the Principal and the Provost outlined the context for the session and the series of questions being posed, and encouraged student input through the process, as the advisory committee develops a new Student Code of Conduct and non-academic misconduct system to promote student health, safety and wellness. Codes from other universities are being referred to, to provide us with ideas for strengthening and broadening our code.*

*Suggestions from AMS Assembly members for the new code and system included:*

- *retaining student involvement in the system;*
- *integrating the principles of restorative justice and education in the system;*
- *involving students in the cultural shift;*
- *looking to the Queen's Residences system for its levels of offences, points system and processes for identifying students at risk, and its clarity regarding what body is responsible for responding to each level of offence;*
- *including risk to self/others as one factor in the classification of offences;*
- *protecting student privacy as appropriate;*
- *ensuring robust reporting; and*
- *implementing feedback and assessment mechanisms.*

Advisory Committee on Non-Academic Misconduct  
Consultation meeting: Athletics and Recreation  
Thursday, October 29, 2015

*The committee met with Athletics and Recreation (A&R) staff as well as a group of student-athletes (varsity and intermural) who participate on conduct panels in the A&R system.*

*The committee received an overview of the A&R conduct system and its unique context (e.g. the need for rapid response due to upcoming games, external conduct requirements and sanctions, and variation among students re field-of-play conduct.) Panels always are made up of one student, one coach and one staff; this involvement - by both students and coaches - is considered key by everyone and should be maintained in a new system. Sanctions always integrate three elements: education, community service and loss of privilege. Education and loss of privilege (i.e. game suspensions) are considered most effective. The education component (e.g. a team researching and delivered a presentation on the effects of alcohol on an athlete's body) is shared across teams and helps foster a winning environment and athlete development culture. The system has been effective in eliminating hazing cases in the past three years; the education and loss of privilege sanctions are considered critical to this result.*

*A&R supports the hybrid system recommended by the 2012 conduct system review as it would maintain the current systems and would establish coordination among them as well as a university process that would promote information-sharing to identify students-at-risk, and consistency in sanctions where appropriate.*

Advisory Committee on Non-Academic Misconduct  
Consultation meeting: Residences  
Monday November 2, 2015

*The committee met with Residence Life staff, a senior don, and representatives of RESSOC, the residence student government. The committee was provided with an overview of the residence conduct system.*

*Key components/considerations were identified as including:*

- *Student decision-making for lower-level offences;*
- *Extensive training of student adjudicators;*
- *Administrative oversight and involvement of Residence Life on every case, requiring dedicated staff;*
- *The large volume of offences (hundreds per term).*

*Key suggestions/consideration for the new system included:*

- *Consistency of sanctions across systems;*
- *Progressive and meaningful sanctions;*
- *Student involvement in student conduct processes is beneficial;*
- *The inclusion of education in every sanction, where appropriate, and the continued use of restorative justice;*
- *Effective enforcement mechanisms;*
- *Making 'failure to comply' a higher-level offence to be dealt with by the university;*
- *Clarity in the classification of university-level offences and across component systems;*
- *Central database to allow the university to look across systems to identify students at risk;*
- *Contracts for any sub-delegation of authority to independent organizations;;*
- *Clearly communicating the system pathways to students.*

Advisory Committee on Non-Academic Misconduct  
Consultation meeting: SONAD  
Monday November 9, 2015

*This meeting largely focused on governance in the new NAM system and potential delegation and sub-delegation. The following comments/suggestions included:*

- *If there is no role for Senate and therefore no SONAD, it would be important to ensure there are still discussions about NAM among knowledgeable and responsible managers of the system and overseers.*
- *There should be a mechanism to allow for regular updates/changes to the Code (e.g. offences, sanctions) to respond to the ever-evolving PSE/campus landscape.*
- *NAM processes – fact-finding, adjudication and sanctioning to maintain fairness and consistency- should be distinguished from processes for students-at-risk that may affect sanctions.*
- *Often students who are involved in non-academic misconduct are experiencing academic distress. There was discussion about how the system(s) can identify students in academic trouble, because this would help to paint a picture of the student's situation to those who are*

*adjudicating misconduct; at the same time, how can the system ensure that academic success (as an example) doesn't influence adjudication.*

- *There is a need for clarity among systems, as well as for students-at-risk, and a clear process for cases of non-academic misconduct in an academic setting*
- *Improvements could be made regarding reporting to increase consistency of information reported.*
- *The differences among students need to continue to be recognized – first-year students vs graduate students. There are various jurisdictions because there are particular issues that may come up within specific populations.*

Advisory Committee on Non-Academic Misconduct

Consultation meeting: SGPS

Monday November 24, 2015

*The SGPS President and the Principal provided context for the session and the questions posed, and also encouraged individual comments via email. It was noted that the volume of cases dealt with annually by the SGPS system is very small; in recent years, it has been zero or one.*

*The following comments/suggestions were made:*

- *-increased communications across systems;*
- *-the categorization of offences should be standardized across systems;*
- *-centralized intake and record-keeping is desirable;*
- *-peers can help identify students at risk;*
- *-the inclusion of restorative justice is supported in principle; it should be responsive to the wishes/preferences of the person offended;*
- *-conditions should be part of any agreement with independent bodies running sub-systems and could include mandatory training, an annual review, privacy protections etc.; and*
- *-student involvement in adjudication is important.*

Advisory Committee on Non-Academic Misconduct

Consultation meeting: Senate

December 1, 2015

*The Principal introduced the context and questions. Comments from Senators included:*

- *Senate should have a role in the NAM system, specifically in oversight;*
- *The committee should consider joint oversight by the Senate and the Board of Trustees (QUPC as a precedent);*
- *The system should continue to integrate education and restorative justice principles;*
- *Students should continue to be involved in the system;*
- *A connection between NAM and academic misconduct is supported to identify students at risk;*
- *Confidentiality should be considered.*