

Academic Integrity Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Academic Development and Procedures

Meeting 21 October 2024, 1.30-2.50pm

Present: Gavan Watson (chair), Erin Meger, Kelley Packalen, Brian Frank, Katie Zutautas, Sylvie Garabedian, Dreyden George, Emils Matiss, Claire O'Brien (secretary).

Regrets: Norma Barrett, ()-8tr2 (rr)1rrthrrren j.9 (ey).2 (a)k.9 (5017.3 ()JT.6 (M)-).2 (a)l1s4 (B)S7.1 (,)19 ((a)1

The chair welcomed Dr. Erin Meger, a new faculty member representative on the subcommittee.

Subcommittee member Kelley Packalen acts as Special Advisor to the Vice Provost (Teaching and Learning) on academic integrity. She drafted the proposed changes to the AI Procedures that were shared with the subcommittee ahead of the meeting following consultation and discussion over the past 18 months with Academic Integrity Leads and Assistants. Dr. Packalen summarized the four main areas for discussion today:

- 1) Categorization of Findings as Level 1 and Level 2. Associated with this, the length of time that records are maintained.
- 2) Cross-faculty coordination procedures.
- 3) Poteoinvestigation has been removed. Namely, not apply to have the course marked on a pass/fail basis, and not apply for credit standing in the course.

Other more minor edits are proposed throughout the procedures that are outside of these main categories. Dr. Packalen invited subcommittee members to use the comment function to make comments and changes on these in the shared document.

- 1) Categorization of Findings as Level 1 and Level 2.

Dr. Packalen noted an inconsistency in the procedures regarding the categorization of findings. Some faculties have categorized findings as Level 1 for first-time departures and generally more serious offenses, while others have categorized them as Level 2. A student with a second offense at the university career and often years after graduation. Some faculties have categorized findings as Level 1 for first-time departures and generally more serious offenses, while others have categorized them as Level 2. Others began in 2021/2022 when required by the latest revision to the procedures. While criteria for making the decision are included in the procedures, it is the case that some may conclude a finding as Level 1 and some as Level 2 using those same criteria. Some AI Leads

see the categorization as a penalty in itself, and others see it as a rekeeping decision. The

Ç Ç Ç Ç Ç

– Ç Ç Ç Ç Ç 3 > Ç Ç
has worked with, that the current retention period for Level II departures (10 years post-graduation)

consequences in the student's home faculty – for example, impacting their academic progression. However, following the procedural revision, there is now too much consultation. AI Leads support appropriate consultation, but the level of communication required – between AI Leads (usually Associate Deans) – AI Leads support the current proposal (as outlined in the procedure section 5). They all agree that they are to be consulted if a student may fail the course due to a sanction.

Dr. Packalen gave an example from her own Business course, which includes Engineering students. An Engineering student plagiarized in an assignment worth 40% of the course mark. Given the opportunity to resubmit, the student plagiarized again in the resubmitted assignment. A failure in the course would be a reasonable sanction for that behaviour. But Dr. Packalen was aware of other factors; this was the last course the student required in a stream, they had no opportunity to retake it, and it would have stopped them graduating. These are the kinds of scenarios where the home AI Lead would want to be consulted on the sanction.

3) Assignment of Sanction of Failure in the Course, or Sanction that leads to Failure in the Course

There was discussion of how the language 'likely' to fail could be open to interpretation. One way to reduce that would be to set a threshold of course grade reduction that would most likely trigger a course failure – for example, 40%

It was noted that it is rare for instructors to impose a sanction of straight failure (grade of zero) in the failure becomes a likely outcome. AI Leads were clear that they would like to assign the sanction for we must be careful not to treat each of these cases with too much inconsistency.

It was also noted that in a professional program ethical behaviour may be one of the course expectations. In the course, they would fail that expectation and therefore the course. That is more of an academic decision than a sanction or the departure, but the end result for the student is the same.

It was pointed out for instructors to understand the threshold of where the student is at risk of failing, when assigning a sanction. One challenge is what happens when the assigning a sanction. z failing a c253

