

# Minutes

Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning)

<b>Meeting:</b>	Academic Integrity Subcommittee	<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	Wednesday February 15, 2023 3:00 - 4:00 p.m.
<b>Platform:</b>	Microsoft Teams		
<b>Chair:</b>	John Pierce, Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning)		
<b>Members:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Johanne Benard (Faculty, French Studies)</li> <li>• Brian Frank (Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science)</li> <li>• Vina Li (SGPS Member-at-Large)</li> <li>• Kelley Packalen (Smith School of Business)</li> <li>• Vacancy (AMS student-at-large)</li> </ul>		
<b>Observers:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lon Knox (University Secretary)</li> <li>• Beth Langdon (SGPS President)</li> <li>• Kathryn Morrissey (Intake Coordinator, Ombuds Office)</li> <li>• Heather Trojek ( (j)11Td(1J0 Tc 0 Te)-1 (n)61 (</li> </ul>		



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**