

ACADEMIC COUNCIL REPORT

ACTION REQUESTED:

Recommendation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion/Direction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Information	<input type="checkbox"/>

DATE: 22 September 2020

FROM: Susan L. Forbes, PhD

SUBJECT: Updated Academic Integrity Policy

COMMITTEE MANDATE:

- In accordance with Article 1.1(f) of By-law No. 2, Academic Council has the delegated authority to establish and implement academic policy instruments, which is also reflected in the university's Policy Framework.
- The Academic Integrity Policy documents are being presented to Academic Council for consultation.

BACKGROUND/CONTEXT & RATIONALE:

In September 2019, I was asked to continue the work of the Academic Integrity Taskforce in order to prepare a policy draft for discussion by the Senior Administrative Team (SAT). The consultation process involved meeting with decanal representatives from each Faculty, as well as a representative of the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies as key stakeholders of the proposed policy. Additional consultations were held with the Academic Advisors, Ontario Tech Student Union, Library, Registrar, and Student Life. These latter sessions were held as each group has either a direct or a tangential role related to the implementation of the policy and/or its related procedures. Each cohort was provided a set of questions to consider in reviewing the draft policy, based on their relationship to academic integrity.

The Faculty-based questions were designed to get a deeper understanding of what was happening at that level. Previous consultations grouped representatives from all Faculties together, a process that yielded some evidence of similar and different practices. This "group" approach it did not allow for in-depth understanding or illumination of Faculty-specific concerns.

Most of the other stakeholders consulted in 2019-2020 were not included in earlier discussions. The exception being Academic Advisors; however, not all those individuals attended the town halls. Their collective experience shed valuable insights into processes related to dealing with academic misconduct.

The attached document provides an historical overview, as well as a summary of key findings, recommendations, and proposed next steps.

RESOURCES REQUIRED:

None

CONSULTATION AND APPROVAL:

Please see the attached report for full details.

The consultation builds on three (3) previous Academic Integrity (AI) initiatives at the University:

- ***Academic Integrity at UOIT (2013)*** – Report by Dr. Bill Muirhead and Joe Stokes (updated 2014)
- ***Academic Integrity Project Report (2015)*** – Report by Dr. Alyson King
- ***Academic Integrity Taskforce (AIT) (2019)*** – Chaired by Dr. Rupinder Brar

The latest consultation involved meeting with decanal representatives from each Faculty, as well as a representative of the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies. Additional consultations were held with the Academic Advisors, Ontario Tech Student Union, Library, Registrar, and Student Life.

Main Findings

Faculty-based Processes

- All Faculties have Academic Integrity committees and have two (2) levels of offenses (major/minor), however, the level used to differentiate these varies
- Adjudication varies by Faculty
- All Faculties rely on instructors to initiate claims of misconduct and most have them deal with minor offenses
- Role of Academic Advisors vary by Faculty and range from no involvement to serving as advocate for the student involved

Regulations Followed

- All Faculties follow regulations outlined in the University Calendar
- Some Faculties include additional regulations (e.g. policies from regulated bodies)
- School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies has their own policy

Reporting Mechanism

- Reporting and related record-keeping varies by Faculty (e.g. online form, reported through Academic Advisors, records managed by one (1) staff)
- Most report all offenses to the Registrar's Office

Tracking Practices

- Primary mechanism includes either recording information in a spreadsheet or Google form
- Consultation across Faculties to check for prior offenses is done informally via email or telephone contact

Professional Unsuitability

- Professional conduct based on regulatory/accreditation bodies is not an issue in all Faculties or for all programs within a given Faculty

- All Faculties agreed that *professionalism* was an important attribute for all students (e.g. behaving in a way that demonstrates respect for others, responsibility, personal integrity, etc. (Adapted from <https://www.uvic.ca/engineering/assets/docs/professional-behaviour.pdf>)

Suggested Best Practices

- Education on Academic Integrity for students **and** instructors
- Restorative justice approach for dealing with confirmed cases of misconduct
- Improved pedagogical practices (e.g. structured assignments, frequent assignment reminders)
- Target first-year students through enhanced education, mandatory training

Additional Feedback

- Some key definitions missing (e.g. collusion, bibliography padding)
- Lack of clear examples in some sections (e.g. Section 9)
- Numbering/bullet systems needs to be changed
- Training and reference guides would be beneficial
- Mandatory training with acknowledgement (e.g. microcredentials, badges)

Changes Made Following Undergraduate Studies Committee Consultation

- Adding examples to strengthen definitions, concepts, etc.
- Changing words to be consistent with current University practices
- Changing words to clarify/strengthen concepts, statements, etc.
- General revisions to language/words to enhance clarity
- Reference to sanctions/penalties noted in the course syllabus
- Deleting redundant clauses
- Adding language that reflects the blended learning experience
- Reference to hold being placed on potential graduating student records (Procedure only)

Revisions not made tended to reflect the following:

- Where the suggested revisions did not capture the nuances of a statement (e.g. dishonest vs inappropriate)
- Where suggested revisions focused on discipline specific practice as this is a university-wide document
- Revisions related to self-plagiarism and not referencing one's own published work as this document applies to both undergraduate and graduate students who may, in fact, have publications
- Reference to unearned advantage - this is part of the definition section
- Section 15.2.2 - suggested revision refers to the work in question being stolen from another student, however, earlier discussions on this clause related this to group work and students knowingly allowing another student to plagiarize work
- Section 18.1.8 - nowhere in Section 18 does it identify major or minor sanctions

Statement requiring consideration:

- Section 3 Scope and Authority, specifically 3.1 - "This policy applies to the conduct, Academic Work, and documentation submitted to the University by all current and **Former Students.**"

- This last portion is new and the question was raised regarding whether we can actually do anything about students who have graduated. This will have to be reviewed, however, there have been instances where academic misconduct was caught "after the fact" resulting in a loss of a degree. Here's a link to such an issue <https://www.turnitin.com/blog/no-statute-of-limitations-on-plagiarism>

Key Recommendations

- Need to clarify role of Academic Advisors
- Need for standardized process with respect to minor/major offenses that align with University regulations
- Develop a standardized online form for all instructors
- Need to establish a standardized, online tracking system (e.g. within Banner)
- Professional unsuitability needs to be a separate policy and should include professionalism for all students, along with Faculty-specific guidelines based on regulatory/accreditation body requirements
- Procedures, including communication procedures, related to handling alleged cases of misconduct needs to be a separate document
- Education modules for all stakeholders

Follow-up Steps

- Rewrote the draft "Academic Integrity and Professional Suitability Policy, Procedures, and Directive" based on feedback received from stakeholders
 - Ensured additional examples were provided, reviewed, and revised definitions
 - Ensured that all related policies, regulations, and legislation (where relevant) were identified
 - Shared revised draft with all stakeholders who were consulted to ensure feedback accurately reflected
- Provided revised draft to SAT for review and additional comments
- Forwarded final drafts to the Office of the University Secretary and General Council for final review and adherence to approval process

NEXT STEPS:

- Presentation to USC and GSC for recommendation
- Return to Academic Council for approval
- Develop a standalone professional unsuitability policy, with related procedures document and communications strategy
 - Establish a working group with one (1) representative from each Faculty to develop a Professionalism and Professional Suitability policy with related procedures
 - Ask for representation from the Office of the University Secretary and General Council to help guide process from the beginning
 - Follow same consultation process as used in 2019-2020 on proposed new policy and procedures
 - Revise accordingly and share with SAT
- Forward all final drafts to the Office of the University Secretary and General Council for final review and adherence to approval process

SUPPORTING REFERENCE MATERIALS:

- *Academic Integrity Follow-Up Consultation Report* (Forbes, 2020) – attached
- Academic Integrity Policy Draft
- Academic Integrity Violation Procedures Draft

Academic Integrity Follow-Up Consultation



Originality Matters: Don't Plagiarize

Originality Matters: Don't Plagiarize. Reproduced from <https://www.slideshare.net/MadelineOcampo/madeline-ocampo-portfolio-66196450> by M. Ocampo. Retrieved February 13, 2020

Prepared by Susan L. Forbes, PhD
Manager, Teaching and Learning Centre
February 2020

Introduction

Ocampo's work captures the essence of plagiarism. As she noted,

...I wanted to communicate the essential meaning of plagiarism: stealing other people's original work and framing it as your own. Therefore, I designed an array of papers with one in the middle made up of "stolen" pieces of original papers...Those pieces are subtracted from the surrounding papers, each with a unique color that represents their originality. (Source: <https://www.slideshare.net/MadelineOcampo/madeline-ocampo-portfolio-66196450>)

This image also conveys the complexity of Academic Integrity (AI) as there is more to it than just plagiarism. This report summarizes historical and more recent analysis and consultations related to AI challenges and opportunities for the University community. Finally, the report concludes with recommendations for next steps.

Academic Integrity at Ontario Tech – A Background Review

The University community conducted two studies on AI between 2013 and 2015. The following is a summary of their respective key findings/recommendations.

Academic Integrity at UOIT (2013) – Report by Dr. Bill Muirhead and Joe Stokes (with 2014 update).

Report Summary: The Muirhead and Stokes report compared known national data on academic misconduct to the then University context (e.g. reported incidents). Their report also summarized the University's academic misconduct processes and provided suggestions/recommendations for the future.

Key Findings/Recommendations:

- Shift the adjudication of all misconduct cases to the Faculty Academic Integrity Committees (FAIC)
 - FAICs would allow for faculty-specific resolutions and processes
- Establish a campus-wide advisory group of FAICs chairs to ensure consistent implementation of the University Academic Integrity policy
 - The proposed advisory group would report to the Associate Provost, Academic and be a conduit for information sharing
- Create a subcommittee from the FAIC advisory group to address academic data standards, reporting issues, and development and implementation of a University-wide reporting mechanism
- Develop a training and awareness plan for faculty and students
 - The proposed plan would include web-based tools and presence, embedding AI awareness into first year orientations, and increasing training of instructors and teaching assistants
- Update the current policy in the Academic Calendar to include penalty ranges by misconduct types, as well as create an accountability framework for faculty-based misconduct resolution

- Start preliminary discussions with Graduate Studies to develop an AI model that identifies differences in graduate-level education and related expectations

Academic Integrity Project Report (2015) – Report by Dr. Alyson King

Report Summary: The King project explored the processes University stakeholders (e.g. instructors, academic advisors) used in dealing with academic misconduct, as well as identifying needs related to educating students on academic integrity, and comparing those factors to the national landscape. The project evaluated the University's efforts based on the *Academic Integrity Rating Systems* (AIRS) developed by the International Center for Academic Integrity (<https://www.academicintegrity.org/academic-integrity-rating-system-ai/>).

King's analysis scored the University (322 pts) at a Silver Level (300-599), indicative of a recognition that academic integrity is important but not an institutional priority. The latter assessment was based on the limited number of practices, processes, and/or structures implemented to address the issue of academic misconduct (see full report for details).

The AIRS outcome was partially addressed by the project group who developed five (5) educational modules for the Academic Integrity website and wrote/updated AI handbooks for instructors and students. Both of these undertakings also included additional resources (e.g. tip sheets, quizzes, etc.). Finally, the project initiative developed a list of potential violations, relevant sanctions, and misconduct case studies.

Key Findings/Recommendations:

- Establish a dedicated Academic Integrity Office/team
 - Would allow for coordination of policies, procedures, and resources
 - Would also provide support for a standardized/consistent approach to dealing with Academic Integrity campus-wide
- Communications Strategy
 - Develop and implement communication approach informing all stakeholders of AI policies and adjudication processes
- Relevant Resources
 - Ensure AI resources are available to all stakeholders and are kept current
- Buy-in by faculty members and students
 - To be successful, all key stakeholders (particular instructors and students) must value the importance of Academic Integrity
 - AI must also be a University-wide priority
 - Transparency and inclusivity critical to changing the culture
 - Student voice must be heard in developing the AI policy and related procedures
 - Student Association could be involved in student-centred integrity initiatives and have a role on related committees, etc.
- Develop an evaluation mechanism/process to obtain feedback from stakeholders who have been through the academic misconduct process
 - Create a feedback mechanism for students/instructors, as well as a process for reviewing such feedback with the goal of developing recommendations based on that feedback

Academic Integrity Taskforce (AIT) (2019) – Chaired by Dr. Rupinder Brar

Taskforce Summary: The AIT was tasked with revising the current Academic Integrity policy. In doing so, the Taskforce conducted two (2) “town hall” meetings with stakeholders to identify the context and perceptions related to AI at Ontario Tech. Additionally, staff assigned to the group reviewed external academic integrity practices to inform the revision of Ontario Tech’s policy.

The Taskforce’s efforts resulted in the following:

- Developed a document entitled “Academic Integrity and Professional Suitability Policy, Procedures, and Directive”
- Initiated development of Academic Integrity website and identified related educational resources
- Brainstormed a long-term plan for cultural change around academic integrity

Key Findings/Recommendations:

Policy

- Create outcome guidelines for academic misconduct in collaboration with the Provost and chairs of the Faculty Academic Integrity Committees
 - This should include sanction guidelines and items to be considered when determining sanctions
- Create educational resources for understanding and interpreting the policy and educational modules that can be used as sanctions
- Create consistent and central system for reporting incidents of academic misconduct for data analysis
- Identify key messages to be used in messaging to the external community about academic integrity

Education

- Create educational videos and/or modules regarding academic integrity, its importance, and Ontario Tech University’s approach to academic integrity
- Develop training plan for faculty and Faculty Academic Integrity Committees
- Develop awareness plan for faculty and students

Academic Integrity Follow-up Consultations (2019-20) – Facilitated by Dr. Susan L. Forbes

Consultation Summary: In September 2019, Susan Forbes was asked to continue the work of the Taskforce in order to prepare a policy draft for discussion by the Senior Administrative Team (SAT). The consultation process involved meeting with decanal representatives from each Faculty, as well as a representative of the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies as key stakeholders of the proposed policy. Additional consultations were held with the Academic Advisors, Ontario Tech Student Union, Library, Registrar, and Student Life. These latter sessions were held as each group has either a direct or a tangential role related to the implementation of the policy and/or its related procedures. Each cohort was provided a set of questions to consider in reviewing the draft policy, based on their relationship to academic integrity.

The Faculty-based questions were designed to get a deeper understanding of what was happening at that level. Previous consultations grouped representatives from all Faculties together, a process that yielded some evidence of similar and different practices. This “group” approach it did not allow for in-depth understanding or illumination of Faculty-specific concerns.

Most of the other stakeholders (noted above) were not included in earlier discussions. The exception was Academic Advisors; however, not all attended the town halls. Their collective experience shed valuable insights into processes related to dealing with academic misconduct. The following section highlights the main findings of the latest consultations, followed by key recommendations and proposed next steps.

Main Findings by Focus

Faculty-based Processes

- All faculties have Academic Integrity committees and have two (2) levels of offenses (major/minor), however, the level used to differentiate these varies
- Adjudication varies by Faculty
- All faculties rely on instructors to initiate claims of misconduct and most have them deal with minor offenses
- Role of Academic Advisors vary by Faculty and range from no involvement to serving as advocate for the student involved

Regulations Followed

- All Faculties follow regulations outlined in the University Calendar
- Some Faculties include additional regulations (e.g. policies from regulated bodies)
- School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies has their own policy

Reporting Mechanism

- Reporting and related record-keeping varies by Faculty (e.g. online form, reported through Academic Advisors, records managed by one (1) staff)
- Most report all offenses to the Registrar's Office

Tracking Practices

- Primary mechanism include either recording information in a spreadsheet or Google form
- Consultation across Faculties to check for prior offenses is done informally via email or telephone contact

Professional Unsuitability

- Professional conduct based on regulatory/accreditation bodies is not an issue in all Faculties or for all programs within a given Faculty
- All Faculties agreed that *professionalism* was an important attribute for all students (e.g. behaving in a way that demonstrates respect for others, responsibility, personal integrity, etc. (Adapted from <https://www.uvic.ca/engineering/assets/docs/professional-behaviour.pdf>)

Suggested Best Practices

- Education on Academic Integrity for students **and** instructors
- Restorative justice approach for dealing with confirmed cases of misconduct
- Improved pedagogical practices (e.g. structured assignments, frequent assignment reminders)

- Target first-year students through enhanced education, mandatory training

Additional Feedback

- Some key definitions missing (e.g. collusion, bibliography padding)
- Lack of clear examples in some sections (e.g. Section 9)
- Numbering/bullet systems needs to be changed
- Training and reference guides would be beneficial
- Mandatory training with acknowledgement (e.g. microcredentials, badges)

Key Recommendations

- Need to clarify role of Academic Advisors
- Need for standardized process with respect to minor/major offenses that align with University regulations
- Develop a standardized online form for all instructors
- Need to establish a standardized, online tracking system (e.g. within Banner)
- Professional unsuitability needs to be a separate policy and should include professionalism for all students, along with Faculty-specific guidelines based on regulatory/accreditation body requirements
- Procedures, including communication procedures, related to handling alleged cases of misconduct needs to be a separate document
- Education modules for all stakeholders

Proposed Next Steps

- Rewriting the draft “Academic Integrity and Professional Suitability Policy, Procedures, and Directive” based on feedback received from stakeholders
 - Ensure additional examples are provided, review and revise definitions
 - Ensure that all related policies, regulations, and legislation (where relevant) are identified
 - Share revised draft with all stakeholders who were consulted to ensure feedback accurately reflected
- Provide revised draft to SAT for review and additional comments
- Develop a standalone professional unsuitability policy, with related procedures document and communications strategy
 - Establish a working group with one (1) representative from each Faculty to develop a Professionalism and Professional Suitability policy with related procedures
 - Ask for representation from the Office of the University Secretary and General Council to help guide process from the beginning
 - Follow same consultation process as used in 2019-2020 on proposed new policy and procedures
 - Revise accordingly and share with SAT
- Forward all final drafts to the Office of the University Secretary and General Council for final review and adherence to approval process



Classification Number	
Framework Category	
Approving Authority	
Policy Owner	Provost and Vice-President Academic
Approval Date	DRAFT FOR REVIEW
Review Date	
Supersedes	

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

1. Preamble

The teaching and learning relationship is central to the education mandate of the University. This relationship relies on honesty, fairness, and mutual respect for the aims and principles of the pursuit of education. All University Members share a responsibility to maintain the integrity of this relationship through adherence to and promotion of the fundamental values of Academic Integrity: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage (<https://www.academicintegrity.org/fundamental-values/>).

“Academic Integrity” refers to honest and ethical behaviours in the pursuit of research, education, and scholarly activities. The University promotes a culture based on the fundamental values of Academic Integrity that is sustained by a balance between:

- Education about the values and behaviours consistent with Academic Integrity; and,
- The disciplinary measures necessary for those who violate its fundamental values through breaches of Academic Integrity.

Academic Misconduct undermines academic integrity, the goals and principles of education, good scholarship, damages the teaching and learning relationship, disrupts the activities of the University, and compromises external relations with the broader community (e.g. internships, placements).

Where a breach of Academic Integrity is suspected, the University must treat the matter with a level of seriousness that reflects the importance attached to academic honesty and integrity at all universities. In the interest of protecting the fundamental values of Academic Integrity, students who exhibit behaviours contrary to the standards of Academic Integrity will be disciplined in accordance with this Policy and its related Procedures.

This Policy and the related Procedures ensure the rights and fair treatment of all University Members regarding the response to suspected acts of Academic Misconduct.

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of the Academic Integrity Policy is to establish, encourage and protect the ethical principles and conditions required for authentic and meaningful education, scholarship, and research.

2. DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this Policy, the following definitions apply:

“Academic Dishonesty” refers to any act or omission occurring in or as part of a course that violates academic integrity standards. These dishonest or negligent acts result or could result in an advantage to the student alleged to have committed the misconduct or to someone who directly obtains an unearned academic advantage as a result of the conduct of the student.

“Academic Integrity” refers to honest and ethical behaviour in the pursuit of research, education, and scholarship. It is based in the fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage.

“Academic Integrity Committee” refers to a committee appointed to review allegations submitted for formal resolution. The Faculty-based committee consists of a representative of the Dean or Registrar and two (2) members of the Academic Staff. Where the Respondent is a graduate student, the two (2) members will be Graduate Academic Staff.

“Academic Misconduct” refers to activities, not associated with a specific course, that violate the principles of Academic Integrity defined in this Policy.

“Academic Staff” refers to an individual holding an appointment as a faculty member, teaching faculty member, or sessional/part-time instructor.

“Academic Work” refers to any task assigned by a course Instructor for the purposes of evaluation and/or feedback, including but not limited to research, examinations, and coursework including drafts.

“Allegation” refers to an unsubstantiated report or complaint to be investigated of behaviour that is contrary to the fundamental values or standards of Academic Integrity or Professional Suitability.

“Applicant” means an individual who has submitted an application for admission to the University.

“Working Day” means any day, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, statutory holidays, and university closures, on which business can be conducted.

“Cheating” refers to obtaining an unfair advantage in any coursework requiring submission or completion for assessment purposes. This also includes resubmitting work previously assessed in another course.

“Collusion” involves people (e.g. 2 or more) working together on academic/coursework that has been clearly restricted to an individual (e.g. noted in the assignment instructions, course syllabus) for purposes of submission and grading. This may involve other Ontario Tech students or anyone external to the University.

“Contract Cheating” refers to students having others, either paid or unpaid, to complete their coursework. This may include but not limited to purchasing essays or other written work (e.g., lab reports, assignments, technical reports, theses, dissertations).

“Course Instructor” refers to the individual assigned to teach a course, including Research Supervisors.

“Coursework” refers to written, oral, or practical work completed by a student during a course for purposes of assessment and achieving a grade or final mark.

“Evidence” means any information gathered to establish the facts of alleged cases of Academic Misconduct. This information may include, but is not limited to, the work submitted by the student for

assessment, original source of information (e.g. plagiarized work), any communication related to the student's work, as well as any documentation communicating the University Policy on academic integrity.

"Examination" refers to a formal form of testing to assess the level of Students' knowledge, ability, skills, comprehension, application, analysis, and/or synthesis of the subject matter in a course of study. This includes, but is not limited to in-person, online, take-home, practical, and laboratory activities.

"Honesty" means a refusal to lie or cheat in any way.

"Learning Management System" refers to web-based technology platform used to deliver online or e-learning.

"Policy" refers to the Academic Misconduct Policy.

"Procedural Irregularity" refers to an unfair or improper application of this Policy.

"Research Supervisor" means the Academic Staff appointed to guide an undergraduate, graduate, or post-doctoral student through research related to a thesis, dissertation, or other research project.

"Scholarly Activities" refers to any work or product, in any form, submitted as part of a credit or non-credit course, projects, essays, labs, field trips, theses, dissertations, practicums, internships, or placements.

"Student" refers to any of the following: a person who has applied for admission to the University; any individual currently enrolled in any course (credit or non-credit) or program of study, including undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate, a visiting, exchange, or special audit student admitted for purposes of taking a course or conducting research, or anyone who was registered as a student at the time of the alleged act of Academic Misconduct.

"Suspension" means a time-limited sanction where a Student may not register, and loses the right to attend lectures, write Examinations, and receive payment from University sources. Courses taken elsewhere during the period of suspension are not eligible for transfer credit.

"University Member" means any individual who is:

- Employed by the University;
- Registered as a student, in accordance with the academic regulations of the University;
- Holding an appointment with the University, including paid, unpaid, and/or honorific appointments; and/or
- Is otherwise subject to University policies by virtue of the requirements of a specific policy (e.g. Booking and Use of University Space) and/or the terms of an agreement or contract.

"Unfair Advantage" refers to a situation that may result in a student gaining an unearned or unfair benefit in their academic matters, such as their academic work, academic record, or academic progress.

3. SCOPE AND AUTHORITY

- 3.1. This Policy applies to conduct, Academic Work, and documentation submitted to the University by all current and Former Students.

Commented [SF1]: Question was raised regarding the University's authority to apply this to former students. This will need to be reviewed by the USGC Office.

- 3.2. Applicants to the University are subject to this policy. Dishonesty in an application to the University is considered an act of Academic Misconduct.
- 3.3. Former Students whose actions facilitate an act of Academic Misconduct in current Students are subject to review and possible sanctions under this Policy.
- 3.4. This Policy applies to conduct that may occur on the University campuses and online as well as conduct not on a University campus but that has a real and substantial academic connection to the University (e.g. practicum placements, internships, field trips, etc.)
- 3.5. Where a Student's conduct in an incident includes behaviours that are both academic and non-academic in nature, the Student may be subject to disciplinary procedures under related policies, including the Student Conduct Policy. In this circumstance, a single disciplinary process will be invoked that will cover the resolution of both the academic and non-academic behaviours.
- 3.6. This Policy also applies to any institutions federated or affiliated with the University, where the University and the institution in question, with respect to the premises, facilities, equipment, services, activities, Students, and other members, have agreed upon such inclusion.
- 3.7. A lack of familiarity with the University's Policy and related Procedures on Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct on the part of the Student does not constitute a defence against its application.
- 3.8. All Students are responsible for their actions and for clarifying expectations with their Course Instructor or Faculty where they are uncertain.
- 3.9. Students are expected to complete Academic Work individually unless the instructor indicates otherwise.

4. Research Responsibilities

- 4.1. Students at any level of study taking part in independent or guided research, whether for academic or non-academic purposes, are also responsible for familiarizing themselves with and adhering to the Responsible Conduct of Research and Scholarship policy and related policy instruments.

5. Authority

- 5.1. The Provost and Vice-President, Academic or successor thereof, is the Policy Owner and is responsible for overseeing the implementation, administration, and interpretation of this Policy.
- 5.2. The Provost and Vice-President, Academic is responsible for establishing and overseeing procedural aspects and protocols related to Academic Integrity, Student conduct and the enforcement of Student discipline.
- 5.3. The Faculty Deans, Registrar, and Dean of the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies are responsible for ensuring that established protocols are carried out appropriately within their areas of responsibility, and for delegating responsibility for implementing procedures and carrying out inquiries of Allegations of Academic Misconduct.

6. Standards of Academic Integrity

- 6.1. With relation to the teaching and learning relationship, students are expected to exhibit behaviours that promote and uphold a culture of Academic Integrity. These behaviours may include, but are not limited to:

- a) Completing one's own work;
- b) Understanding and following the appropriate citation method in regard to the use of quotation marks and paraphrasing;
- c) Collaborating only when allowed by the instructor
- d) Acknowledging the contribution of others through proper citing/referencing (i.e. giving credit);
- e) Ensuring that one's own work is not used by others unless approved by the instructor (e.g. group work);
- f) Acting ethically and with integrity while completing Academic Work, conducting research, and in the reporting of research results; and
- g) Following published Examination rules, instructions, and protocols.

7. Responsibilities

7.1. All University Members are responsible for:

- a) fostering and maintaining a culture of Academic Integrity;
- b) familiarizing themselves with this Policy, related Procedures, and policy instruments;
- c) reporting incidents of suspected Academic Misconduct and Professional Unsuitability to the relevant authority;
- d) cooperating in the review of Allegations of Academic Misconduct and Professional Unsuitability as outlined by the Academic Misconduct and Professional Unsuitability Procedures;
- e) adhering to the values and principles of Academic Integrity and Professional Suitability in all Academic Activities.

7.2. Academic Integrity Committees (including Faculty, Graduate and Admissions Academic Integrity Committees) are responsible for:

- 7.2.1. conducting inquiries regarding Allegations of Academic Misconduct fairly as per the Academic Misconduct Procedures;
- 7.2.2. ensuring the Student has a fair opportunity to review and respond to all Allegations, including any evidence under consideration;
- 7.2.3. recommending a resolution to Allegations of Academic Misconduct heard by the Academic Integrity Committee to the appropriate Dean, or Registrar.

7.3. The Academic Appeals Committee is responsible for:

- 7.3.1. conducting hearings regarding appeals of violations of the standards of Academic Integrity and Professional Suitability after all formal processes have been exhausted at the faculty level, where new **Evidence** exists that was not reasonably available at the time of the original decision that, if considered, would likely have altered the outcome of the decision; and/or a **Procedural Irregularity** occurred in the original consideration of the case that affected the outcome of the decision.

7.4. The Provost and Vice-President, Academic is responsible for:

- a) maintenance of the Academic Misconduct and Professional Unsuitability Policy;
- b) reinforcing and modelling the University's commitment to Academic Integrity and its fundamental values;

7.5. The Provost and Vice-President, Academic's designate is responsible for:

- 7.5.1. disseminating information and resources that promote an atmosphere of Academic Integrity;
 - 7.5.2. providing access to education about Academic Integrity to all members of the University community.
- 7.6. Faculty Deans, the Dean of the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, and the Registrar are responsible for:
- 7.6.1. Modelling behaviour consistent with Academic Integrity;
 - 7.6.2. reviewing recommendations of the Academic Integrity Committee and determining resolutions to Allegations of Academic Misconduct.
- 7.7. Course Instructors and Research Supervisors are responsible for:
- a) detecting, investigating, and reporting suspected acts of Academic Misconduct;
 - b) utilizing educational strategies that promote the values of Academic Integrity and encourage ethical and honest behaviour in Students;
 - c) utilizing educational strategies that promote acceptable professional conduct in Students enrolled in programs leading to professional certification;
 - d) modelling behaviour consistent with Academic Integrity and its fundamental values;
 - e) modelling behaviour and professional practices consistent with Professional Suitability in programs leading to professional certification;
 - f) outlining expectations for academically honest behaviour at the beginning of the course, including information about referencing sources and appropriate collaboration;
 - g) developing course outlines that clearly describe the expectations of Students regarding Academic Integrity;
 - h) include information regarding the use of any phrase-matching software in their course outline and announce the use of this software during the first lecture of the course;
 - i) providing links on the Learning Management System to information regarding Academic Integrity within the first week of classes.
- 7.8. Teaching and research assistants are responsible for:
- a) detecting and reporting suspected acts of Academic Misconduct and Professional Unsuitability to the relevant Course Instructor;
 - b) utilizing educational strategies that promote the values of Academic Integrity and encourage honest behaviours in Students;
 - c) utilizing educational strategies that promote acceptable professional conduct in Students enrolled in programs leading to professional certification;
 - d) modelling behaviour consistent with Academic Integrity and its fundamental values;
 - e) modelling behaviour and professional practices consistent with Professional Suitability in programs leading to professional certification;
 - f) adhering to Academic Integrity and ethical behaviour expectations in research;
 - g) following the expectations of Course Instructors about appropriate academic behaviour.
- 7.9. Students (undergraduate and graduate) are responsible for:
- a) clarifying expectations with Course Instructors and Research Supervisors as needed;
 - b) adhering to Academic Integrity and ethical behaviour expectations in research;

- c) adhering to the standards of Professional Suitability in programs leading to professional certification;
- d) taking reasonable precautions to protect their work from being used by others;
- e) following the expectations outlined by Course Instructors about appropriate academic behaviour.

ACTS OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

8. **“Academic Misconduct”** refers to activities, not associated with a specific course, that violate the principles of Academic Integrity defined in this Policy.

The focus of Academic Integrity is on understanding and upholding the fundamental values of Academic Integrity rather than avoiding specific acts of Academic Misconduct. However, all University Members must have a consistent understanding and interpretation of what constitutes an act of Academic Misconduct as it relates to the enforcement of this Policy.

To ensure clarity, the University sets out categories and definitions of acts of Academic Misconduct. These are meant to provide a common set of terms so that University Members have a shared understanding about Academic Misconduct and can communicate effectively about Academic Misconduct. Categories are not mutually exclusive and should not be interpreted as an exhaustive list of possible acts or admissions of Academic Misconduct.

The following sections describe acts of Academic Misconduct:

9. Plagiarism and Improper Citation

9.1. Plagiarism is presenting another person’s intellectual property as your own. Plagiarism can be intentional (i.e. a deliberate act) or unintentional. It is possible to “self-plagiarize.” This involves submitting your work from one course to another without permission of the instructor. This constitutes an act of academic misconduct.

- 9.2.** Intellectual property includes, but is not limited to ideas, wording, images/photographs, artwork, designs, lecture slides, code, music, videos, audio and digital files, articles, essays, research, lab results, computer software, Internet resources, and other works.

- 9.3.** Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to:

- Submitting someone else’s work, in whole or in part, as one’s own.
- Including quotes from others without appropriate citations, reference, and/or indication of verbatim phrases with the appropriate use of quotation marks.
- Closely paraphrasing another’s work without citation and/or reference.
- Submitting work done in collaboration with others as one’s own without acknowledgement of the contributions of others.

- 9.4.** Reusing work previously submitted for a course or published without proper citation or reference, or permission of the current instructor. Self-plagiarism can include presenting the paper in whole or in part for assessment

- 9.5. Improper citation and reference:** purposely dishonest or inappropriate citation (e.g. in the body of the paper) and/or reference (e.g. at the end of the document).

- 9.6.** Improper citation and reference include, but is not limited to:

- 9.6.1.** Bibliography or reference list padding (e.g. including works that were not con.
- 9.6.2.** Citing a false source (e.g. citing a non-existent source).

9.6.3. Neglecting to cite your own previous work where citation would be considered appropriate for any other source.

9.7. Examples of improper citation include, but are not limited to:

- Citing and/or referencing of materials not used in the creation of the Academic Work;
- Citing and/or referencing a primary source or originating article when the primary or originating article was not accessed (e.g. original work cited in another source but presented as if it had been consulted/used);
- Citing and/or referencing fictitious materials in Academic Work;
- Incorrectly attributing material to an author when it belongs to a different author;
- Neglecting to cite one's own previous work.

10. Cheating

10.1. **Cheating** refers to any deceptive action whereby a Student misrepresents their mastery of information necessary to complete Academic Work.

10.2. Cheating includes, but is not limited to:

10.2.1. Unauthorized collaboration.

10.2.2. Possession of unauthorized aids.

10.2.3. Consultation with an unauthorized person during a test, Examination, or other evaluation.

10.2.4. Copying another's work.

10.2.5. Submitting another's work as one's own.

10.2.6. Unauthorized resubmission of work.

10.2.7. Submission of work when a major portion has been previously submitted or is being submitted for another course, without the expressed permission of all instructors involved.

10.2.8. Preparing, buying, selling, accepting, or giving away Academic Work, in whole or in part, with the expectation that these works will be submitted, in whole or in part, by a Student(s) other than the author for the purposes of grading.

10.2.9. Violation of the Procedures for Final Examination Administration.

10.3. Examples of cheating include, but are not limited to:

- Copying another's Academic Work, test, Examination, or other evaluation;
- Contract cheating;
- Collusion;
- Allowing a third party to edit and/or alter a take-home test, examination, or other evaluation without the expressed permission of the Course Instructor or otherwise implicitly implied (e.g. Student Accessibility Services, Writing Centre);
- Accessing an electronic device (e.g. cell phone, ear buds, smart watch/glasses), regardless of the reason, during a test, Examination, or other evaluation without the expressed permission of the Course Instructor;
- Accessing unauthorized Internet or hardcopy sources during a test, Examination, or other evaluation;
- Violating the Procedures for Final Examination Administration.

11. Falsification and Misrepresentation

- 11.1. Falsification:** altering or modifying a genuine document or creating a false document for the purpose of misleading or deceiving.
- 11.2. Misrepresentation:** giving a false or misleading account, verbally or otherwise, including through the omission of relevant information or documentation.
- 11.3.** Misrepresentation and falsification include, but are not limited to:
- 11.3.1.** Impersonating another Student or allowing oneself to be impersonated for purposes of taking Examinations or carrying out laboratory or other Academic Activities.
 - 11.3.2.** Falsifying academic records, including tests and Examinations, or submitting false credentials for purpose of gaining admission to a program, course, placement, or internship or for any other purpose.
 - 11.3.3.** Misrepresentation of facts, whether written or oral, which may have an effect on academic evaluation. This includes making fraudulent health claims, obtaining medical or other certificates under false pretences, or altering certificates for the purpose of misrepresentation.
 - 11.3.4.** Fabrication or falsification of information, citation, data, or result excluding honest error, conflicting data, or difference in interpretation.
 - 11.3.5.** Providing a false record (example: signature) for attendance or on any document related to the submission of Academic Work where the signature is used as proof of authenticity or participation in an Academic Activity.
 - 11.3.6.** Withholding documentation and/or relevant information to mislead or gain an unfair and unearned advantage.
 - 11.3.7.** Resubmission of altered Academic Work after it has already been evaluated.
- 11.4.** Examples of misrepresentation and falsification include, but are not limited to:
- Altering a genuine Medical Statement or creating a false Medical Statement to support an academic appeal and/or application;
 - Giving false information (example: symptoms) for the purposes of obtaining a Medical Statement from a physician;
 - Falsifying a University transcript, certificate, and/or degree parchment;
 - Altering a grade recorded on an evaluated piece of Academic Work and requesting the grade to be changed;
 - Altering or creating false research or lab data;
 - Having someone impersonate one's self during an examination;
 - Omitting relevant information from an appeal and/or application for the purpose of improving the possibility that the appeal and/or application will be granted.

12. Improper Access and Improper Dissemination

- 12.1. Improper access:** improperly obtaining confidential and/or copyrighted information and/or documents to gain an unfair and unearned advantage in Academic Work.
- 12.2. Improper dissemination:** posting, publishing, giving away, selling, or otherwise making public information, documents, or data that involved the work of others without their expressed permission and/or where it ought to be reasonably assumed that the information is confidential and/or copyrighted.
- 12.3.** Improper access and improper dissemination include, but are not limited to:
- 12.3.1.** Obtaining Examination papers, tests, or similar materials by improper means and/or use or distribution of such materials to others.
 - 12.3.2.** Unauthorized dissemination of copyrighted work and documents.

- 12.3.3. Preparing, buying, selling, accepting, or giving away Academic Work, in whole or in part, with the expectation that these works will be submitted, in whole or in part, by another Student(s) for the purposes of grading.
- 12.3.4. Abuse of confidentiality: sharing unpublished data or drafts of articles for publication without the expressed permission of the author(s).
- 12.4. Examples of improper access and improper dissemination include, but are not limited to:
 - Posting slides, lecture notes, assignments/Coursework, tests/Examinations, and other documents prepared by a Course Instructor on a note sharing site without their expressed permission;
 - Obtaining a copy of an answer key, test, examination, or other Academic Work by improper means (e.g. computer hacking).

13. Improper Research Practices

- 13.1. **Improper Research Practices:** dishonest acts committed in the pursuit of completing research that result in an unfair and unearned academic advantage.
- 13.2. Improper Research Practices include, but are not limited to:
 - 13.2.1. Violation of health and safety regulations in a laboratory or other setting.
 - 13.2.2. Deliberate destruction of or tampering with one's own or another's research data, human or animal research subjects, or other Academic Work related to research.
 - 13.2.3. Failure to comply with University policy, relevant federal or provincial statutes or regulations for the protection of researchers, human participants or the health and safety of the public welfare of animals.
 - 13.2.4. Fabrication or falsification of information, citation, data, or result excluding honest error, conflicting data, or difference in interpretation.
- 13.3. Examples of improper research practices include, but are not limited to:
 - Attending a laboratory while intoxicated;
 - Falsifying research/experiment data;
 - Altering experiment results.

14. Obstruction and Interference

- 14.1. **Obstruction:** preventing another's progress or the progress of one's self in Academic Work through improper means (e.g. not in compliance with accept standards).
- 14.2. **Interference:** committing acts that impede or hinder another's progress or the progress of one's self in their own Academic Work through improper means.
- 14.3. Obstruction and interference include, but are not limited to:
 - 14.3.1. Unreasonable infringement on the freedom of other members of the academic community (e.g., disrupting Examinations, harassing, intimidating, or threatening others).
 - 14.3.2. Deliberate destruction of or tampering with one's own or another's research data, human or animal research subjects, or other Academic Work.
 - 14.3.3. Removing, altering, misusing, or destroying University property to obstruct the Academic Work of others or one's self.
- 14.4. Examples of obstruction and interference include, but are not limited to:
 - Removing pages from library materials thereby preventing access of these materials by other Students.

- Tampering with lab equipment for the purpose of gaining an extension on a lab report or research project;
- Alter the academic work or experiment results of another without their knowledge and/or consent.

15. Assisting in the Violation of the Standards of Academic Integrity

- 15.1. Assisting in the violation of the standards of Academic Integrity:** knowingly aiding and abetting others in an act of Academic Misconduct. This includes acts or omissions where an individual ought reasonably to have known they were assisting in a violation.
- 15.2.** Assisting in the violation of the standards of Academic Integrity includes, but is not limited to:
- 15.2.1.** Allowing one's own Academic Work to be copied.
 - 15.2.2.** Failing to take precautions, reasonable in the circumstances, to protect Academic Work from being used inappropriately by other Students.
 - 15.2.3.** Preparing, selling, or giving away Academic Work, in whole or in part, with the expectation that another Student will submit these works, in whole or in part, for the purposes of grading.
- 15.3.** Examples of assisting in the violation of the standards of Academic Integrity include, but are not limited to:
- Giving another Student a completed assignment, either in whole or in part, with or without the intention for the recipient to copy the material.
 - Signing an attendance sheet used for the purposes of tracking attendance and/or participation for a Student other than one's self.

16. Other

- 16.1.** Other dishonest acts that cannot be categorized as plagiarism and improper citation, cheating, falsification and misrepresentation, improper access and improper dissemination, improper research practices, obstruction and interference, or assisting in the violation of the standards of Academic Integrity, that result or could result in an unfair and unearned academic advantage.
- 16.2.** Other acts of Academic Misconduct include, but are not limited to:
- 16.2.1.** Any unlisted act that does not uphold the fundamental values of Academic Integrity.
 - 16.2.2.** Attempting to commit a listed or unlisted act of Academic Misconduct.

ALLEGATIONS OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

17. Allegations of Academic Misconduct

- 17.1.** The Office of the Provost will set out detailed Procedures to address Allegations of Academic Misconduct. The principles of administrative fairness and the University's Fair Processes Policy will guide the Procedures.
- 17.2.** Where an Allegation of Academic Misconduct involves more than one Student (e.g. group work), each Student represents an individual Allegation of Academic Misconduct. Each Student will be met with individually in determine the facts surrounding the Allegation.

SANCTIONS FOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

18. Sanctions for Academic Misconduct

- 18.1.** Under this Policy, Students found to have engaged in an act of Academic Misconduct may have one or more of the following sanctions imposed upon them. Sanctions include, but are not limited to the following:
- 18.1.1.** Penalties identified by the instructor in the course syllabus;
 - 18.1.2.** Written reprimand;
 - 18.1.3.** Resubmission of the piece of Academic Work with the potential of a reduction in grade;
 - 18.1.4.** Mandatory participation in an educational activity (e.g. Academic Integrity Tutorial);
 - 18.1.5.** Remedial Academic Activity that is comparable to, but does not exceed, the level of work entailed in the initial assignment or activity;
 - 18.1.6.** Submission of a failing grade for the Academic Work;
 - 18.1.7.** Submission of a failing grade for the course;
 - 18.1.8.** Submission of a failing grade for the course with a notation on the Student's official transcript;
 - 18.1.9.** Disciplinary probation for a period not less than one (1) term (fall or winter) and up to the remainder of the Student's registration in their current level of study as deemed appropriate;
 - 18.1.10.** Restraining orders or monetary restitution where appropriate in the case of threats, harassment, or damage to property;
 - 18.1.11.** Suspension from attendance in a course, a program, a Faculty, or the University, for a period not less than one (1) term (fall or winter) and not exceeding three (3) years as deemed appropriate with a notation on the Student's official transcript. The conditions of Suspension will specify the length of time such notice will remain on the Student's transcript.
 - 18.1.12.** Permanent dismissal from a program, a Faculty, or the University with a notation on the Student's official transcript;
 - 18.1.13.** Expunging of grades or revoking of degrees with a notation on the Student's official transcript;
 - 18.1.14.** Other such sanctions as deemed appropriate.
- 18.2.** The severity of the sanction(s) will consider contextual factors, including but not limited to:
- 18.2.1.** the nature of the offence;
 - 18.2.2.** the Student's past record of academic conduct;
 - 18.2.3.** the level of responsibility taken by the Student;
 - 18.2.4.** the level of the Student's intent;
 - 18.2.5.** the level of the Student's academic experience;
 - 18.2.6.** aggravating and mitigating factors;
 - 18.2.7.** whether the work is considered a major milestone for the Student's program (examples: capstone, thesis, major project); and
 - 18.2.8.** other relevant considerations as deemed appropriate.
- 18.3.** Sanctions should take into consideration the balance between education and disciplinary measures as often as possible.
- 18.4.** Students responsible for committing successive acts of Academic Misconduct and/or Professional Unsuitability will receive increasingly severe sanctions.

- 18.5. In the event of non-compliance with a sanction that requires the Student's participation, an appropriate alternative sanction that does not require the Student's cooperation will be enforced.
- 18.6. Where a sanction includes submission of a failing grade for a course, the Student will not be permitted to withdraw from the course and no tuition refund will be granted.
- 18.7. Where the sanction imposed involves a specified period where a Student cannot register for courses at the University, courses taken elsewhere during this specified period are not eligible for transfer credit.
- 18.8. A Student demonstrating Professional Unsuitability may be immediately suspended from any practicum, fieldwork, or similar activity at the discretion of the responsible Dean pending a final decision.

19. Transcript notations

- 19.1. Transcript notations for Academic Misconduct will include the following range of notations:
 - 19.1.1. grade of F assigned for [course number] for academic misconduct;
 - 19.1.2. suspended for academic misconduct for [dates of suspension]; and
 - 19.1.3. suspended for professional unsuitability [dates of suspension];
 - 19.1.4. permanently dismissed for academic misconduct;
 - 19.1.5. permanently dismissed for professional unsuitability.
- 19.2. Transcript notations will normally be recorded on the Student's academic transcript for a minimum of two (2) years.
 - 19.2.1. A student may apply to the Academic Appeals Committee to have a notice of suspension and/or transcription notation expunged from their academic record after a minimum of two (2) years from the last recorded act of Academic Misconduct or Professional Unsuitability. If the appeal is granted, the Office of the Registrar will be notified to remove the notification.
- 19.3. Transcript notations for students who are suspended or dismissed for Professional Unsuitability or permanently dismissed for Academic Misconduct will remain on their academic record and cannot be appealed.

MONITORING AND REVIEW

- 20. This Policy will be reviewed as necessary and at least every three year. The Provost and Vice-President, Academic, or successor thereof, is responsible to monitor and review this Policy.

RELEVANT LEGISLATION

- 21. This section intentionally left blank.

RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES & DOCUMENTS

- 22. Academic Misconduct Procedures
 - Directives for the Appropriate Use of Phrase-Matching Software
 - Fair Processes Policy
 - Student Conduct Policy
 - Health and Safety Policy
 - Procedures for Final Examination Administration

Research Ethics Policy
Responsible Conduct of Research and Scholarship Policy and Procedures
Care and Use of Animals in Research and Teaching
Conflict of Interest in Research
Professionalism and Professional Conduct Policy (under development)

ENDNOTES

23. Acknowledgements: The University of Ontario Institute of Technology recognizes the following institutions, whose related policies served as a foundation in the development of this Policy: Brock University, Carleton University, McMaster University, Ryerson University, the University of Toronto, the University of Windsor, and the International Center for Academic Integrity.



Classification	<i>To be assigned by Policy Office</i>
Parent Policy	
Framework Category	<i>To be assigned by Policy Office</i>
Approving Authority	<i>To be assigned by Policy Office</i>
Policy Owner	Provost and Vice-President Academic
Approval Date	
Review Date	
Supersedes	

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY PROCEDURES

PURPOSE

1. The purpose of these Procedures is to set out a fair and transparent process for investigating and resolving Allegations of Academic Integrity violations.

DEFINITIONS

2. For the purposes of these Procedures the following definitions apply:

“Academic Dishonesty” refers to any act or omission occurring in or as part of a course that violates academic integrity standards. These dishonest or negligent acts result or could result in an advantage to the student alleged to have committed the misconduct or to someone who directly obtains an unearned academic advantage as a result of the conduct of the student.

“Academic Integrity” refers to honest and ethical behaviour in the pursuit of research, education, and scholarship. Fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage are the foundation of Academic Integrity.

“Academic Integrity Committee” refers to a committee appointed to review allegations submitted for formal resolution. The Faculty-based committee consists of a representative of the Dean or Registrar and two (2) members of the Academic Staff. Where the Respondent is a graduate student, the two (2) members will be Graduate Academic Staff.

“Academic Misconduct” refers to activities, not associated with a specific course, that violate the principles of Academic Integrity defined in this Policy.

“Academic Staff” refers to an individual holding an appointment as a faculty member, teaching faculty member, or sessional/part-time instructor.

“Academic Work” refers to any task assigned by a course Instructor for the purposes of evaluation and/or feedback, including but not limited to research, examinations, and coursework including drafts.

“Allegation” refers to an unsubstantiated report or complaint to be investigated of behaviour that is contrary to the fundamental values or standards of Academic Integrity.

“Applicant” means an individual who has submitted an application for admission to the University.

“Working Day” means any day, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, statutory holidays, and university closures, on which business can be conducted.

“Cheating” refers to obtaining an unfair advantage in any coursework requiring submission or completion for assessment purposes. This also includes resubmitting work previously assessed in another course.

“Collusion” involves people working together on academic/coursework that has been clearly restricted to an individual (e.g. noted in the assignment instructions, course syllabus) for purposes of submission and grading. This may involve other Ontario Tech students or anyone external to the University.

“Conflict of Interest” means a situation in which a person has a personal interest that conflicts, might conflict or may be perceived to conflict with the interests of the University. Conflicts of interest may arise in relation to personal matters including, but not limited to:

- a) Directorships or other employment;
- b) Interests in business enterprises or professional practices;
- c) Share ownership;
- d) Beneficial interests in trusts;
- e) Existing professional or personal associations with the University;
- f) Professional associations or relationships with other organizations;
- g) Personal associations with other groups or associations, or
- h) Personal or family relationships.

Examination” refers to a formal form of testing to assess the level of Students’ knowledge, ability, skills, comprehension, application, analysis, and/or synthesis of the subject matter in a course of study. This includes, but is not limited to in-person, online, take-home, practical, and laboratory activities.

“Honesty” means a refusal to lie or cheat in any way.

“Learning Management System” refers to web-based technology platform used to deliver online or eLearning.

“Policy” refers to the Academic Misconduct Policy.

“Procedural Irregularity” refers to an unfair or improper application of this Policy.

“Research Supervisor” means the Academic Staff appointed to guide an undergraduate, graduate, or post-doctoral student through research related to a thesis, dissertation, or other research project.

“Respondent” means a Student who is alleged to have engaged in an act of Academic Misconduct.

“Scholarly Activities” refers to any work or product, in any form, submitted as part of a credit or non-credit course, projects, essays, labs, field trips, theses, dissertations, practicums, internships, or placements.

“Student” refers to any of the following:

- A person who has applied for admission to the University;
- Any individual currently enrolled in any course (credit or non-credit) or program of study, including undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate, a visiting, exchange, or special audit student admitted for purposes of taking a course or conducting research;

- Or anyone who was registered as a student at the time of the alleged act of Academic Misconduct.

“Suspension” means a time-limited sanction where a Student may not register, and loses the right to attend lectures, write Examinations, and receive payment from University sources. Courses taken elsewhere during the period of suspension are not eligible for transfer credit.

“University Member” means any individual who is:

- Employed by the University;
- Registered as a student, in accordance with the academic regulations of the University;
- Holding an appointment with the University, including paid, unpaid, and/or honorific appointments; and/or
- Is otherwise subject to University policies by virtue of the requirements of a specific policy (e.g. Booking and Use of University Space) and/or the terms of an agreement or contract.

“Unfair Advantage” refers to a situation that may result in a student gaining an unearned or unfair benefit in their academic matters, such as their academic work, academic record, or academic progress.

“University Representative” refers to the staff member responsible for investigating and reporting suspected acts of Academic Misconduct related to the requests and documentation processed by the University office they are employed by.

SCOPE AND AUTHORITY

3. These Procedures apply to the investigation and sanctions related to alleged violations of the Academic Integrity Policy.
4. The Provost and Vice-President, Academic, or successor thereof, is the Policy Owner and is responsible for overseeing the implementation, administration, and interpretation of these Procedures.

PROCEDURES

5. General

- 5.1. Respondents are presumed innocent unless and until the contrary is established.
- 5.2. All communications to current Ontario Tech University students and requests for information required under these Procedures will be delivered by email to an Ontariotechu.net or Ontariotechu.ca account, as applicable.
 - a) Emails will be deemed received on the day they are sent. All Ontario Tech University students are required to monitor their Ontariotechu.net or Ontariotechu.ca accounts regularly, including during examination periods.
 - b) A Student’s failure to monitor their Ontario Tech email account will not give rise to any right of appeal under these Procedures.

- 5.3.** Where an allegation is regarding conduct in a course, the Respondent will not be permitted to withdraw voluntarily from the course in which the offence was alleged to have been committed until the Allegation is resolved. Where a Respondent wishes to withdraw from a course where an Allegation is under investigation, they may submit a formal request to the Office of the Registrar prior to the deadline to withdraw from the course. If the resolution of the Allegation does not require the Respondent to remain in the course, the Office of the Registrar will process the request to withdraw from the course in accordance with the date the request was submitted.

6. Initiation of Investigation

- 6.1. Investigation Initiated by a Complaint of Academic Misconduct:** Any person who has reason to believe that a Student engaged in an act of Academic Misconduct in Academic Work, or in submitting documentation to the University may bring forward a complaint to the relevant Course Instructor or a University Representative where the Academic Work or documentation was submitted.
- 6.2. University Initiated Investigations of Academic Misconduct:** Academic Staff, Research Supervisors, and University Representatives who detect a suspected act of Academic Misconduct in Academic Work or submitted documentation have the authority to initiate an investigation.

7. Review of Allegation

- 7.1.** The relevant Academic Staff, Research Supervisor, or University Representative (“Reviewer”) will conduct an initial review of the Allegation to determine whether to pursue a resolution. The Reviewer may gather additional information and documentation regarding the specific Allegation, including consulting with any person they deem necessary to assessing the validity of the specific Allegation, with the exception of the Respondent.
- 7.2.** The Reviewer will determine whether to pursue a resolution regarding an Allegation. In making the decision they will consider whether:
- a)** The Allegation, if true, would constitute a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy, and;
 - b)** There is sufficient evidence to pursue an investigation.
- 7.3. Sufficient Evidence:** If the Reviewer determines that there is sufficient evidence to warrant further investigation, they will make a decision to pursue either a formal or informal resolution as outlined in these Procedures.
- 7.4. Insufficient Evidence:** If the Reviewer determines that there is not sufficient evidence to warrant further investigation, they will determine that further investigation will not be pursued.

- 8. Verification of Record of Academic Misconduct.** If a Reviewer determines there is sufficient evidence to pursue a resolution, they will contact the Dean’s Office of the Faculty where the alleged violation of Academic Integrity occurred or the Faculty in which the Student is enrolled, where

applicable, to request a verification of the Respondent's history of Academic Integrity violations. The history of Academic Integrity violations will contribute to the decision whether to pursue a formal or informal resolution and/or the determination of any imposed sanctions, if applicable.

8.1. Undergraduate students:

- a) The Faculty Dean's office will contact the Office of the Registrar with the Respondent's name and Student ID to request that the Respondent's record be checked for any previous record of Academic Integrity violations and that a registration hold be placed on the Student's account. NOTE: If a student has applied to graduate, that graduation will be on hold until the matter under review is resolved.
- b) The Office of the Registrar will add a registration hold to the Student's account and inform the Faculty Dean's office of any previous record of Academic Integrity violations for the Student.
- c) The Faculty Dean's office will inform the Reviewer whether the Respondent has a previous record of Academic Integrity violations on file.

8.2. Graduate students:

- a) The Faculty Dean's office will contact the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies with the Respondent's name and Student ID to request that the Respondent's record be checked for any previous record of Academic Integrity violations at the graduate-level and that a registration hold be placed on the Respondent's account.
- b) The School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies will add a registration hold to the Respondent's account and inform the Faculty Dean's office of any previous record of Academic Integrity violation at the graduate level for the Respondent.
- c) The Faculty Dean's office will inform the Reviewer whether the Respondent has a previous record of Academic Misconduct at the graduate-level, where applicable, on file.

9. Determination of Process

9.1. The Reviewer will refer the Allegation to the formal resolution process where:

- a) The Respondent is a graduate or postdoctoral student;
- b) The Allegation is a complaint of Academic Integrity violation and does not meet the eligibility requirements for the informal resolution process per section 9.2 of these Procedures; or,
- c) The Academic Staff or Respondent refers the Allegation to the formal resolution process.

9.2. Eligibility for Informal Resolution Process: A Course Instructor can elect to pursue an informal resolution with respect to an Allegation of Academic Integrity violation only if:

- a) The Respondent does not have a previous record of an Academic Integrity violation.
- b) The Allegation is regarding Coursework (i.e. is not for a test or examination); and
- c) The Coursework at issue is worth 25 per cent or less of the final grade in the course.

9.3. In the context of an Allegation regarding multiple Respondents (example: group work) where one Respondent does not meet the eligibility requirements for informal resolution, all Respondent's associated with the Allegation will be referred to the formal resolution process.

10. Informal Resolution Process

10.1. Allegations of Academic Integrity violation can only be resolved informally where the Respondent:

- a) Admits to committing the violation of Academic Integrity; and
- b) Consents to the sanction proposed by the Course Instructor.

10.2. At any point during the informal resolution process, the Course Instructor or Respondent may refer the Allegation to the formal resolution process.

10.3. Procedure

- a) **Notification of Allegation:** The Course Instructor will notify the Respondent, in writing via the Respondent's Ontariotechu.net or Ontariotechu.ca email account, of the Allegation of Academic Misconduct. The Course Instructor will also invite the Respondent to a meeting to hear the Respondent's response to the Allegation.

The Respondent has five (5) Working Days to prepare a response and should reply to the Course Instructor's email with their intention to attend the meeting during that time. If the Respondent does not respond to the notification within five (5) Business Days, the Allegation will be referred to the formal resolution process.

- b) **Meeting with the Respondent:** The purpose of the meeting is to:
 - Provide the Respondent a fair opportunity to respond to the Allegation;
 - clarify the circumstances surrounding the Allegation;
 - Allow the Course Instructor to determine whether or not an act of Academic Misconduct has been committed;
 - Pursue an informal resolution to the Allegation; and
 - Educate the Respondent of the importance and value of Academic Integrity and their responsibilities regarding Academic Integrity.

10.4. Outcome of the Informal Resolution Process: The informal resolution process may result in one of the following outcomes:

- a) **No finding of Academic Misconduct:** If the Course Instructor determines that it is more likely than not, based on the presented evidence and information, that the Respondent did not engage in the alleged act of Academic Misconduct, they will inform the Respondent of their decision in writing to the Student's Ontariotechu.net or Ontariotechu.ca address and end the investigation.
- b) **No agreement on an Informal Resolution is reached:** If the Course Instructor determines it is more likely than not, based on the presented evidence and information, that the Respondent engaged in the alleged act of Academic Misconduct and the Respondent does not admit to committing the act of Academic Misconduct, consent to the sanction proposed by the Course instructor, or attend the meeting; or if the Course Instructor believes a sanction other than the sanctions listed in section 21.1.a-21.1.e of the Academic Integrity Policy may be merited, then the Allegation will be referred to the formal resolution process.
- c) **Agreement on an informal resolution is reached:** If the Course Instructor determines it is more likely than not, based on the presented evidence and information, that the Respondent engaged in the alleged act of Academic Misconduct and the Respondent admits to committing the act of Academic Misconduct and consents to the sanction proposed by the Course Instructor, the report is completed and signed by the Course Instructor and Respondent. The report and supporting evidence are submitted to the Faculty Dean's office and the Faculty Dean's office submits the report to the Office of the Registrar.

Where the imposed sanction requires the Student's participation, the following information will also be included in the record containing the resolution: a deadline for completing the imposed sanction, any action required by the student to demonstrate completion of the sanction, and an alternative sanction, which does not require the Student's participation, that will be imposed in the case of non-compliance with the original sanction and/or deadline.

- 10.5. The sanction imposed by the Course Instructor for an informal resolution will only consist of one (1) or more of the sanctions listed in 21.1.a-21.1.e of the Academic Integrity Policy.
- 10.6. Acts of Academic Misconduct resolved through the informal resolution process are not eligible for appeal.

Formal Resolution Process

11. Report of Allegation

11.1. Undergraduate students

- a) **For Allegations that involve documentation regarding admission to a program:** the Reviewer will report the Allegation and submit all relevant documentation and information to the Office of the Registrar.

- b) **For all other Allegations:** The Reviewer will report the Allegation and submit all relevant documentation and information to the Dean's office of the Faculty where the alleged act of Academic Misconduct occurred. Where an Allegation of Academic Misconduct involves documentation associated with courses from multiple Faculties or is not associated with a course, the Reviewer will report the Allegation to the Dean's office of the Faculty in which the Student is enrolled.

11.2. Graduate students

- a) **For Allegations that involve documentation regarding admission to a program:** The Reviewer will report the Allegation and submit all relevant documentation and information to the Dean of the Faculty where the alleged act of Academic Misconduct occurred. The Dean's office of the respective Faculty will inform the Dean of the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies' office.
- b) **For all other Allegations:** The Reviewer will report the Allegation and submit all relevant documentation and information to the Dean of the Faculty where the alleged act of Academic Misconduct occurred. The Dean's office of the respective Faculty will inform the Dean of the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies' office. The latter will inform the Dean of the relevant Faculty of any Academic Staff involved in the Allegation.
- c) If an Allegation is regarding an alleged act of Academic Misconduct that occurred within a course, then the responsible Dean for the allegation is the Dean for the Faculty that offers the course.
- d) In the case of Allegations in research and scholarship, there will be an appropriate level of inquiry, consistent with the University's policy on Integrity in Research and Scholarship, into the matter prior to the submission of a report on the Allegation.

12. Academic Integrity Committee

- 12.1.** The responsible Dean or Registrar will convene an Academic Integrity Committee to conduct an inquiry regarding the Allegation and recommend an outcome and sanction, where applicable. The Committee will be comprised of a designate of the responsible Dean or Registrar and two members of the responsible Faculty's Academic Staff.
- 12.2.** Where the Respondent is a graduate Student, the Academic Staff will be members of the graduate Academic Staff.
- 12.3.** Where the Allegation involves documentation regarding admission to a program, the Academic Staff members will be members of the Faculty that offers the program.
- 12.4.** Should there be more than one Dean involved, they will establish which Dean will be responsible for addressing the Allegation. If the Deans or Deans' designates cannot

agree on the who is responsible for addressing the Allegation, the Provost or Provost's designate will decide which Dean is responsible for addressing the Allegation.

- 12.5. Conflict of Interest (COI):** Any Academic Integrity Committee member aware of any real, potential, or **perceived** Conflict of Interest that would put into question either the independence, impartiality, and objectiveness that the Member is obliged to exercise in the performance of her/his duties, or the ability of the Member to act in the best interest of the University, must inform the Dean or Dean's designate upon discovery. The Dean or Dean's designate will take steps to resolve the COI, in accordance with applicable University policies, employment policies, and/or agreements.

13. Notification of Allegation

- 13.1.** The Academic Integrity Committee responsible for resolving the Allegation will inform the Respondent, in writing to their Ontariotechu.net or Ontariotechu.ca email account, that they are the subject of an inquiry. This notice will include the following information:
- a) A description of the of the Allegation(s) made against the Respondent, including the relevant policy statement;
 - b) The Respondent's rights and responsibilities, including the Respondent's right to have a support person in attendance during any meeting(s) with the Academic Integrity Committee;
 - c) The possible sanctions;
 - d) A copy of the submitted evidence; and
 - e) An invitation to meet with the Academic Integrity Committee to respond to the Allegation.
- 13.2.** Where it is not possible to share evidence with the Respondent via email, the Faculty will inform the Respondent of an alternative opportunity to review the evidence prior to meeting with the Academic Integrity Committee.
- 13.3.** The Respondent may have a support person present during the meeting, provided 48 hours advance written notice is given of the identity of the support person.
- a) The role of a support person is to provide moral support. During the interview, a support person will be permitted to speak and ask questions regarding the investigation process, but will not be permitted to make legal submissions or arguments on behalf of the individual, or to disrupt the interview. In any event, individuals who are being interviewed must answer the interview questions themselves.
- 13.4.** The Respondent has five (5) Working Days to prepare a response and should reply to the Academic Integrity Committee's email with their intention to attend the meeting during that time.

- a) Where the work at issue is considered a major milestone for the Student's program (examples: capstone, thesis, major project), the Respondent may request an extension to prepare a response to an Allegation provided at least 48 hours advance notice of the request for an extension is provided. The Faculty will only approve such requests where the request is reasonable in the circumstances.

13.5. If a Respondent fails to attend a scheduled meeting with the Academic Integrity Committee, the Academic Integrity Committee may complete the investigation without the Respondent's input.

14. Inquiry

14.1. The Academic Integrity Committee responsible for conducting an inquiry to address the Allegation will schedule a meeting with the Respondent to hear their response, gather any additional relevant documentation and/or information, and review the Allegation and determine a recommended resolution. At this meeting the Academic Integrity Committee will:

- a) Explain the purpose and expectations of the meeting;
- b) Inform the Respondent of their rights and responsibilities;
- c) State the Allegation made against the Respondent;
- d) Present and review all evidence related to the Allegation;
- e) Provide the Respondent a fair opportunity to respond to the Allegation and provide any documentation and/or information in response to the Allegation;
- f) Facilitate any discussion required to understand the circumstances surrounding the Allegation and/or conditions that may impact any sanctions imposed; and
- g) Answer any of the Respondent's questions about process.

14.2. The Academic Integrity Committee will make its recommendation in writing to the appropriate Dean or the Registrar within ten (10) Working Days of the inquiry.

15. Outcome of Inquiry. At the conclusion of the inquiry, the Academic Integrity Committee may determine one of the following outcomes:

15.1. No finding of Academic Misconduct: If the Academic Integrity Committee determines that, based on the presented evidence and information, it is more likely than not that the Respondent did not engage in the alleged act of Academic Misconduct, they will recommend to dismiss the Allegation on such terms and conditions as they feel appropriate to the responsible Dean or Registrar.

15.2. Finding of Academic Misconduct: If the Academic Integrity Committee determines that it is more likely than not, based on the presented evidence and information, that the Respondent engaged in the alleged act of Academic Misconduct, they will recommend a finding of Academic Misconduct and sanction(s) to the responsible Dean or Registrar.

16. Decision-Making Process

- 16.1. Decisions regarding the commission of an act of Academic will be determined using the balance of probabilities as the standard of proof.
- 16.2. In cases where the recommended resolution to an act of Academic Misconduct includes the expunging of grades, the revoking of degrees, suspension and/or dismissal of the Respondent, and the responsible Dean is not the Dean of the Faculty in which the Student is enrolled or is the Registrar, the responsible Dean or Registrar and the Dean of the Faculty in which the Student is enrolled must consult and agree on the sanctions imposed for the offence. For graduate Students, the Dean of the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, must also be consulted and agree on the sanctions imposed for the offence. If the Registrar and/or applicable Deans cannot agree on the sanction, the final resolution will rest with the Provost or Provost's designate.

17. Notification of Resolution

- 17.1. The Academic Integrity Committee responsible for reviewing an Allegation must include the following information in the record containing the resolution: the Respondent's name, Student ID, the Allegation, the documentation and information gathered during the investigation, the mitigating factors considered, the Academic Integrity Committee's findings, the sanction(s) imposed, if applicable, and appeal information.
 - a) Where the imposed sanction(s) requires the Student's participation, the following information will also be included in the record containing the resolution: a deadline for completing the imposed sanction, any action required by the student to demonstrate completion of the sanction, and an alternative sanction, which does not require the Student's participation, that will be imposed in the case of non-compliance with the original sanction and/or deadline.
- 17.2. **Undergraduate students:** The responsible Dean or Registrar, or their designate, will notify the Respondent, the Office of the Registrar, and any other relevant parties of the resolution in writing.
- 17.3. **Graduate students:** The responsible Dean, or their designate, will notify the Respondent, the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, and any other relevant parties of the resolution in writing.

18. Appeal Process

- 18.1. **For undergraduate students:** The decisions of the Faculty's or Office of the Registrar's Academic Integrity Committees under the Academic Integrity Policy may be appealed to the Academic Appeals Committee, in accordance with the Appeals to the Academic Appeals Committee [Academic Regulation](#) of the Undergraduate Academic Calendar.
- 18.2. **For graduate students:** The decisions of the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee under the Academic Integrity Policy may be appealed to the Graduate Studies Committee

of Academic Council, in accordance with the Academic Conduct- Appeals [Academic Regulation](#) of the Graduate Academic Calendar.

19. Records

- 19.1. Undergraduate students:** A record of all Allegations resolved through the formal resolution process and all Allegations resulting in a sanction through the informal resolution process, along with details of the resolution, will be entered into the central academic records kept by the Office of the Registrar.
- 19.2. Graduate students:** A record of all Allegations, along with details of the resolution, will be entered into the central academic records kept by the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.
- 19.3.** A record of the Academic Misconduct will only be recorded on the transcript where the sanction includes a notation on the transcript.
- 19.4.** All records will be retained in compliance with the Records Classification and Retention Schedule.

20. Reporting

- 20.1.** The Faculties and School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies are responsible for recording the statistics on Academic Misconduct. These statistics will be provided to the Provost and Vice President, Academic in an annual report without attribution to identifying student information.

21. Confidentiality

- 21.1.** The University is bound by the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA) and its own Access to Information and Protection of Privacy policy. Information, documentation, and/or evidence collected in the administration of this policy may be accessed, submitted to, and/or reviewed by University Members as needed for the purpose of their position. All University Members will respect and maintain other University Members' right to confidentiality and privacy.

MONITORING AND REVIEW

- 22.** These Procedures will be reviewed as necessary and at least every three years. The Provost and Vice President, Academic, or successor thereof, is responsible to monitor and review these Procedures.

RELEVANT LEGISLATION

- 23.** If no associated legislation use the text "This section intentionally left blank."

RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES & DOCUMENTS

- 24.** Academic Integrity Policy
Directives for the Appropriate Use of Phrase-Matching Software

Fair Processes Policy
Student Conduct Policy
Health and Safety Policy
Research Ethics Policy
Responsible Conduct of Research and Scholarship Policy and Procedures

DRAFT