# Explanation of change from 22 September 2016 to 1 November 2016 version of the Report of the Academic Integrity Working Group

One change has been made to the report from the version considered by SCAD and SCAP for information. The change was made to ensure consistency in defining academic integrity throughout the report. In the 22 September 2016 version that the committee considered for information, Motion II read as follows:

> *Motion II: that Senate endorse the following definition of Academic Integrity and that this definition be prominently included henceforth in the relevant section of all academic*

*constituted by the five core fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility (see* <span style="background-color: yellow">                     </span>

# Report of the Academic Integrity Working Group

The recommendations arising from these areas of concern are organized under three main headings:

## Policy and Procedures

**RECOMMENDATION**: That Senate pass a motion prohibiting the commercial tutoring, exam preparation businesses, and student essay "mills" disguised as academic support services from operating or advertising on campus.

# Report of the Academic Integrity Working Group

## Background

Renewal of the policies, procedures, and practices of what was then called "academic dishonesty" began with the establishment of a Senate Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity in 2003. Reporting to SCAD, the Sub-Committee reviewed practices across Queen's in light of the widespread transition from a focus on academic dishonesty and punishment, to the emerging concept of academic integrity with its alternate focus on remediation, proactive education, and more explicit emphasis on the central values and practices of an academic community.

After an interim Report presented to Senate in 2005 and extensive follow-up consultation, the "Final Report of the Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity" was approved by Senate on 26 January 2006. Three motions were accepted at that meeting:

Motion I: that Senate accept the Final Report of the SCAD Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity.

Motion II: that Senate endorse the definition of Academic Integrity as set out in Appendix A, and that this definition be prominently included henceforth in the relevant section of all academic calendars issued by Queen's University:

Motion III: that the Vice Principal (Academic) be empowered to form an advisory working group or ad hoc committee to pursue and direct the recommendations put forward by the Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity.

These motions set the stage for further review of policies, procedures, and practices across all Faculties. The University Academic Integrity Officer, Jim Lee, and his assistant, Charles Sumbler led and coordinated a consultative process from which emerged a new "Senate Policy on Academic Integrity Procedures—Requirements of Faculties & Schools," which was approved by Senate on 23 October 2008. This policy on the "Requirements of Faculties & Schools" acted as a set of standard procedures guiding each Faculty in the construction of an academic integrity framework for regulations and procedures. The document was then amended at Senate on 24 October 2011 to take into account the interdisciplinary registration of students in courses. After this work was completed, Jim Lee was appointed Vice-Provost (International) until his departure on October 31st 2013 to take up the role of Vice Chancellor International at McQuarie University in Australia.

## Methodology for the Review and Report

The Academic Integrity Working Group began meeting in November 2015 and included the following members, all of whom had significant previous experience with the development of academic integrity at Queen's:

John Pierce, Professor, Department of English (Chair)
Jane Emrich, SCAD member
Scott Lamoureux, SCAP member
Atul Jaiswal, SGPS representative
Tyler Lively, Academic Affairs Commissioner, AMS
Denise Stockley, Scholar in Higher Education
Claire O'Brien, Office of the Provost (administrative support)

The Working Group was tasked with reporting to the Vice Provost (Teaching and Learning), the Senate Committee on Academic Development and the Senate Committee on Academic Procedures by the beginning of the 2016-17 academic cycle. Given that the range of matters represented within the area of academic integrity are quite large, the terms of reference were narrowed in scope to allow for this initial report. The terms of reference are as follows:

> Review current state of academic integrity policies and practices at Queen's with a view to ensuring these polices are consistent, relevant, and aligned with best practices;
> The work of the review should be considered preliminary to the determination of the need for a larger-scale review of policies and practices.

In addition, the Working Group began with a fixed set of objectives:

> Develop specific recommendations for SCAP and SCAD on short-term and long-term enhancement or changes to the academic integrity policies and practices at Queen's
> Among these recommendations, priority should be given the following areas of concern:
> - o amending Queen's academic integrity policy to bring it into alignment with the principles outlined in the "Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity" produced by the Centre for Academic Integrity;
> - o ensuring consistency among specific or localized academic integrity policy documents at Queen's (including particularly the recent "Senate Policy on Integrity in Research" (2015) and other relevant recent integrity policies) to the overall Senate policy on academic integrity (2006);
> - o taking into account new challenges to integrity provided by online learning and social media; ensuring alignment between academic integrity policies at Queen's and recent legislation on copyright.
> - o addressing further issues that may arise from the review.

While using these objectives as a starting point and as guidelines for managing the scope of the review, the Working Group also drew in other matters as related to these and as raised by members of the academic community.

The Working Group heard directly from the Secretariat, the Ombudsman, and Research Services. The Chair also held meetings with representatives from the Copyright Office, the Centre of

consistent with the Senate document on "Requirements of Faculties & Schools" and the "Senate policy on Student Appeals, Rights, and Discipline" (SARD).  The connection of academic integrity with the SARD document, a policy statement that foreground the importance of procedural fairness, helps to anchor academic integrity within the principles of natural justice. In these areas, the institution as a whole has been, in the main, successful in consistently implementing these aspects of academic integrity.

The following recommendations are intended to bring current policies and procedures into conformity with current practices.

basic statement could additionally be modified to add any specific matters relevant to each Faculty, School, Department, or academic unit.

To this end, the implementation of onQ across campus offers a unique opportunity to facilitate the inclusion of this statement with the creation of each individual course. A section of the onQ template includes a section on "University and Course Policies" which can be prepopulated with the university policy on academic integrity. The standardized statement can then be added to by individual Faculties, Schools, Departments, or other academic units with additional information on academic integrity relevant to the particular area or discipline of study.

The Working Group offers the following suggested wording for a standardized statement:

> Queen's students, faculty, administrators and staff therefore all have responsibilities for supporting and upholding the fundamental values of academic integrity. Academic integrity is constituted by the five core fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility (see www.academicintegrity.org) and by the quality of courage. These values and qualities are central to the building, nurturing and sustaining of an academic community in which all members of the community will thrive. Adherence to the values expressed through academic integrity forms a foundation for the "freedom of inquiry and exchange of ideas" essential to the intellectual life of the University.
>
> Students are responsible for familiarizing themselves with and adhering to the regulations concerning academic integrity. General information on academic integrity is available at Academic Integrity @ Queen's University, along with Faculty or School specific information. Departures from academic integrity include, but are not limited to, plagiarism, use of unauthorized materials, facilitation, forgery and falsification. Actions which contravene the regulation on academic integrity carry sanctions that can range

Forgery;
Facilitation; and
Falsification.

As our introduction notes, these are consistently listed by all Faculties and Schools, with the exception of the School of Business which adds "Unauthorized Collaboration." The list has served well so far in covering a wide range of infractions. The past decade has seen the massive impact of social media on education. Internet connectivity has opened up new methods of exchanging materials and ideas in ways that were not imagined at the time the policy was first developed. In reviewing the various uses of social media and the constantly changing nature of these interactive mechanisms, the Working Group is aware that there is not a direct way to address all the potential variations in the abuse of social media in the educational environment. The uploading of course materials to sites such as "Course Hero" or "OneClass" without the instructor's permission, for instance, constitutes a violation of copyright and may be addressed through formal legal means, but such actions should also be addressed within the academic community of Queen's as a violation of trust and a lack of respect for the instructor-student relationship. Ultimately, it seems necessary to articulate new categories of offences which capture the new means by which the fundamental values of academic integrity can be undermined or breached. Any such articulation must be sufficiently precise so as to be guide to compliance and enforcement, but flexible enough to deal with a range of forms of media, new methods of course delivery, and different forms of communication of information. It is possible that future discussions of academic integrity should consider the addition of a new category of departure.


At this point in time, the Working Group suggests that the lists of defined departures from academic integrity include wording to the effect that "departures from academic integrity include, but are not limited to, the following…." The proviso "but are not limited to" should be present to make explicit that the list of violations is not exhaustive.

rates of pay. While in many cases, they may make an initial discovery of a potential departure from academic integrity, they also should not be called upon to be involved in the processes of investigation, finding, and sanction which follow. Exam Proctors are also a critical component of ensuring academic integrity is guarded in formal exam settings. Like TAs, they will be involved in an initial observation about a potential departure from academic integrity, and in the current system, a Proctor will write a report sent forward to the Faculty or School and then to the instructor. The Working Group believes strongly that the Proctor's involvement should not move beyond this initial stage, and the written report is then to be investigated by the primary instructor for the course. Proctors should not be involved in follow-up investigations or integrity hearings.

> **Recommendation:** That the management of academic integrity policies and the adjudication of departures from academic integrity within a course be managed by the primary instructor or course coordinator and that therefore TAs not be required to be directly involved in hearings related to academic integrity.

Similar concerns arise in the case of Adjuncts and Teaching Fellows. In these cases, the primary instructor has full academic responsibility for the course, and therefore the adjudication of integrity issues resides with these instructors. However, two areas of concern arise. To begin with, first-time Adjuncts or Teaching Fellows may not have the full background or experience to deal with academic integrity procedures. Second, since they are on a time-specific contract, they may not be able to complete an investigation within the limits of their contracts. The Working Group suggests that provision be made for support for instructors working in these contexts. Ideally, the academic unit or program in which these individuals teach should identify an academic integrity support person available for consultation should a departure arise and that individual should also have the capacity to take over the case should the Adjunct or Teaching Fellow be unable to complete the investigation, finding (if there is one), and sanction. In considering the support for these particular instructors, the Working Group suggests it would be advisable for the support person to be present to advise these instructors throughout the process.

> **Recommendation**: Academic Units or programs employing Adjuncts, Teaching Fellows, and other temporary instructors identify an individual to provide direct support for these instructors where an investigation of a departure from academic integrity takes place.

## 1.5.  Establishment of Formal Policy on the Presence of Commercial Enterprises on Campus that Violate Standards of Academic Integrity

The 2006 Report to SCAD noted the emergence of for-profit "commercial tutoring and exam preparation businesses" on campus. These organizations were discovered to actively advertise on campus, unfairly charge students for course materials, and engage in violation of copyright regulations by reposting or reselling course-copyrighted materials.  Since that time, such activities have only expanded, and the above recommendation is designed to make a formal motion to empower instructors and the university to act on these matters. Even in the current year, advertising for "OneClass" an internet-based company in the business of reposting instructor materials without permission and supplying essay materials was allowed to advertise

in Mackintosh Corry Hall. A motion at Senate would establish clearly establish the University's position on such operations.

Consistent with the initial recommendation the 2006 Report, this motion also requires that the University pursue a series of concrete actions. The university should

"Take action against any organization that attempts to use the intellectual property of

academic integrity within each Faculty or School. This resource individual can serve as a contact point for inquiries by instructors or students and a potential connection for cross-faculty discussions and initiatives.

> **RECOMMENDATION**: That each Faculty or School designate an individual (or specific email address) that can be advertised centrally on the University academic integrity site as a contact for information on practices and procedures for dealing with

use of the plagiarism detection tool Turnitin.com." Laurie Ross, the Executive Director of the School of Business states that "Faculty are discovering AI cases that would have gone

*Having a central body in place to address these matters would help to improve consistency among faculties in how cases are handled, provide a better means for regular and standard reporting, lead to fairer and more consistent outcomes for students, provide better data collection for reporting statistics and facilitate a smoother and more transparent process for hearing appeals concerning academic integrity issues.*

In light of its review, the Working Group strongly agrees with this statement and sees the need to coordinate current and forward-looking policies and practices as essential to maintaining the quality of the academic environment and to mitigating the risks associated with ignoring academic integrity. Building on suggestions made by Ms. Everson, the Group notes that coordination is essential to

> Manage existing AI policies (for example – policy on cell phones in exam halls, protocol for students using washrooms during exams, information collected on exam incident reports, etc)
> Research new tools and resources available to assist instructors with AI issues (such as Turn-It-In)
> Maintain a central, university-wide AI record and statistics
> Facilitate communication among all the faculty contacts and central offices, such as the Exams Office
> Provide reporting and record keeping guidelines to faculty contacts
> Provide ongoing training and education in AI policies and practices to staff, instructors and TAs
> Provide education and awareness programs and resources to faculties, instructors and students
> Provide guidance and advice to Faculty contacts for more complicated cased and cross-faculty cases, reporting questions, interpretation of policies and best practices, AI appeals

The Working Group recommends that the type of coordination described above may be optimally achieved through two initia