

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY REGULATIONS

Enquiries concerning these regulations should be made to the Bachelor of Health Sciences (BHSc) program office.

BHSc regulations are constantly being reviewed and may change at any time. Current operating regulations will be made available on the Bachelor of Health Sciences webpage.

In all regulations that refer to The Academic Integrity Lead, the BHSc Program has appointed the **BHSc Associate Director (Studies)**. In all regulations that refer to the Academic Integrity Administrator, the BHSc Program has appointed the Programs Manager.

1. Introductory Matters

1.1 Purposes and Scope of Procedures

The Queen's University Senate Policy on Academic Integrity (<https://www.queensu.ca/secretariat/policies/senate/academic-integrity-policy/>) ("the Policy") states that students, faculty, and staff have responsibilities to support and uphold the fundamental values of academic integrity: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility and courage.

These Procedures of general application will primarily be used by those who are responsible for implementing academic integrity procedures in the Faculties and Schools.

Additional guidelines and resources for instructors and students are available on the Queen's Academic Integrity website (<https://www.queensu.ca/academicintegrity/>).

The purposes of the Procedures are to:

- affirm the University's dedication to the values of academic integrity and the seriousness with which it treats departures;
- protect the academic integrity of the University and the value of its courses, programs, and degrees;
- explain the responsibilities of students, instructors, and staff;
- ensure the rights of students are protected; and
- ensure consistency among Faculties and Schools and the equitable treatment of students.

The Policy and these Procedures apply to all members of the Queen's University community including students, instructors, and staff. They govern all assessed academic activities that receive acknowledgement from the University.

Proceedings under these Procedures are also governed by the Policy, any applicable rules of the Faculty/School and of Senate and the University, and the principles of procedural fairness.

Each Faculty and School may implement supplementary procedures consistent with these Procedures.

1.2 Procedural Fairness

Proceedings must respect the rights and ensure the fair treatment of students and meet the standards of procedural fairness.

The Procedures are to be applied flexibly, in a manner and with the degree of formality appropriate in an educational environment and commensurate with the seriousness of the case itself.

The student must:

- know the nature of any allegations and the basis and evidence for them;
- have a meaningful opportunity to present a response in writing or in person; and
- have an opportunity to appeal when appropriate.

The decision-maker must:

- be free from bias or the reasonable apprehension of bias;
- make and communicate decisions in writing in a timely way; and
- provide clear reasons for decisions, based on evidence and consistent with all academic regulations.

"Decision-makers" include all those responsible under these Procedures for:

- deciding whether a departure from academic integrity occurred;
- deciding on a remedy or sanction; and
- deciding an appeal.

1.3 Evidence

Evidence in proceedings, whether written or oral, must be relevant and reliable. It should be based, when possible, on first-hand information.

1.4 Confidentiality

The identity of a student may only be disclosed to others when allowed by the student or required under these Procedures. The instructor must reasonably safeguard the student's identity throughout the process.

An instructor must not supply to a student any documentation related to an investigation that contains information related to another student, unless such information is necessary for the student to understand



and meaningfully respond to an allegation. If information related to another student is necessary for this purpose, the instructor shall consult with their Faculty/School Academic Integrity (AI) Administrator (see section 1.6.1 (p. 2)) to ensure that appropriate privacy safeguards are in place prior to distributing the information.

Records of proceedings and their outcomes may only be created, compiled or retained as required under these Procedures.

1.5 Timing

When time limits are not provided in these Procedures, participants must take the required actions as expeditiously as reasonably possible.

When time limits are provided, those limits may only be exceeded when reasonably required in exceptional circumstances.

A time limit stated in "business days" does not include weekends, statutory holidays, the annual holiday shutdown period, or any other day when the University is closed.

1.6 Administrative Requirements of Faculties and Schools

1.6.1 Academic Integrity Administrator

Each Faculty/School must appoint an Academic Integrity Administrator ("the AI Administrator"), who will carry out responsibilities, including providing advice to instructors and maintaining records, as required in these Procedures.

1.6.2 Academic Integrity Lead and Academic Integrity Appeal Panel

Each Faculty/School must also appoint an Academic Integrity Lead ("the AI Lead"), an Academic Integrity Appeal Panel ("the AI Appeal Panel"), or both. The AI Lead, who is typically an Associate Dean or Director, will carry out responsibilities, including providing advice, reviewing and investigating matters, determining remedies and sanctions, and conducting appeals, as required in these Procedures.

When a Faculty/School does not have an AI Lead, the AI Appeal Panel will carry out these responsibilities. The AI Appeal Panel is headed by a Chair, and will consider appeals, as required in these Procedures (see section 4 (p. 10)).

The AI Lead and/or the AI Appeal Panel Chair may delegate administrative but not decision-making responsibilities.

1.6.3 The Official Student File

All physical and digital documents and materials in the possession of the University that relate to the academic career of a student shall be placed in an Official File established for that student and maintained in physical or

digital format in the Office of the student's home Faculty or School.

The documents constituting the Official File shall be the paper or digital originals, or authentic copies. The Official File may be used in decisions respecting the academic standing and progress of the student toward graduation.

The Official File shall contain only material pertaining to the academic career of the student. The documents and materials retained shall include, but are not limited to, academic transcripts, academic advisement reports, applications for Letters of Permission, statements of transfer credit, academic advising notes, academic appeal documents, email correspondence, requests for academic consideration, academic integrity records required by these Procedures and registration and enrolment reports.

None of the contents of the Official File shall be released or made available to any person without the consent of the student, except when permitted by these Procedures or when required for official University administrative purposes.

1.7 Maintenance, Retention, Release and Destruction of Records

Each Faculty/School AI Administrator must maintain the records required under these Procedures for the purposes of possible further actions or appeals, the annual report and other uses permitted by University regulations.

Each Faculty/School AI Administrator must ensure that the relevant records are filed, retained, released and destroyed only as provided in these Procedures and other University regulations, and in accordance with the University's authorized Records Retention Schedules (<http://records-retention.library.queensu.ca/directory-records.php>) (Section OP4000/5000 Student Records Management).

When there is a finding of a departure from academic integrity categorized as Level I (see section 3.4.3 (p. 8)), the Faculty/School AI Administrator must create and maintain a file. Information in such files may only be released as permitted or required by these Procedures or when there is a future finding with respect to the same student (see section 3.3 (p. 6)). These records are destroyed upon the student's graduation.

When there is a finding of a departure from academic integrity categorized as Level II (see section 3.4.3 (p. 8)), the Faculty/School AI Administrator must ensure that the relevant documents are added to the Official File established for the student in the Faculty/School Office (see section 1.6.3 (p. 2)). Such information may only be released as permitted or required by these Procedures or by other



University regulations, or with the student's consent. These records are destroyed 10 years after the student's graduation.

Records of academic integrity investigations, findings, remedies and sanctions, or appeals may not be retained in any other files maintained by the instructor, department, or Faculty/School.

1.8 Annual Reports

Each Faculty/School AI Administrator must report annually to the Academic Integrity Subcommittee on the number and type of academic integrity matters in the Faculty/School and their outcomes, using the Faculty/School Annual Academic Integrity Report form.

The Academic Integrity Subcommittee will make an annual report to Senate based on the Faculty/School annual reports.

1.9 Graduation during Investigation, Appeal or Withdrawal Period

No student may graduate while their conduct is the subject of an ongoing academic integrity investigation or appeal, even if academic credit for the course(s) under investigation is not required to complete the degree. When an investigation is initiated during a student's final year of study or involves a course required to graduate, the Faculty or School shall make reasonable attempts to expedite the investigation and appeal process before the expected convocation date.

No student who has been required to withdraw due to a departure from academic integrity may apply to graduate during the withdrawal period.

2. Types of Departures from Academic Integrity

2.1 Integrity in Action: The Core Values

Queen's University is dedicated to creating a scholarly community free to explore a range of ideas, to build and advance knowledge and to share the ideas and knowledge that emerge from a range of intellectual pursuits. Each core value of academic integrity, as defined in the Senate Academic Integrity Policy, gives rise to and supports the next.

Honesty appears in presenting one's own academic work, whether in the context of an examination, written assignment, laboratory or seminar presentation. It is in researching one's own work for course assignments. It is also present in faithfully reporting laboratory results even when they do not conform to an original hypothesis. Further, honesty is present in acknowledging dependence on the ideas or words of another and in distinguishing one's own ideas and thoughts from other sources.

Trust exists in an environment in which one's own ideas can be expressed without fear of ridicule or fear that someone else will take credit for them.

Fairness appears in the proper and full acknowledgement of the contributions of collaborators in group projects and in the full participation of partners in collaborative projects.

Respect, in a general sense, is part of an intellectual community that recognizes the participatory nature of the learning process and honours and respects a wide range of opinions and ideas. However, "respect" appears in a very particular sense when students attend class, pay attention, contribute to discussion and submit papers on time; instructors "show respect by taking students' ideas seriously, by recognizing them as individuals, helping them develop their ideas, providing full and honest feedback on their work, and valuing their perspectives and their goals" ("The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity (<https://www.academicintegrity.org/fundamental-values/>)", 3rd Edition, p. 8).

Ultimately, responsibility is both personal and collective and engages students, administrators, faculty and staff in creating and maintaining a learning environment supported by and supporting academic integrity.

Courage "differs from the preceding values by being more a quality or capacity of character – the capacity to act in accordance with one's values despite fear" ("The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity (<https://www.academicintegrity.org/fundamental-values/>)", 3rd edition, p. 10). Courage is displayed by students who make choices and integrous decisions that are followed by action, even in the face of peer pressure to cheat, copy another's material, provide their own work to others to facilitate cheating, or otherwise represent themselves dishonestly.

Students also display courage by acknowledging prior wrongdoing and taking proactive measures to rectify any associated negative impact.

All of these values are not merely abstract but are expressed in and reinforced by the University's policies and practices.

2.2 Departures from Academic Integrity

As outlined in "Integrity in Action: The Core Values" (section 2.1 (p. 3)), the six fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage support the entire educational experience of the University. Adhering to these values in all academic work ensures the value of the degree, the integrity of the institution and the integrity of individual achievement. Contravening any of these values compromises the integrity of the student's experience



in completing academic work, working with peers, and interacting with instructors.

Some examples of specific conduct and actions that may constitute departures from academic integrity are listed below. The list is not exhaustive, as other conduct and actions may also be found to be departures.

“Conduct” may include any actions or oral or written statements that may give rise to concerns about a possible departure from academic integrity, or taking steps in furtherance of a plan to engage in a departure from academic integrity.

“Work” may include essays, papers, assignments, journal entries, tests, examinations, laboratory reports or results, or any other product of academic work.

2.2.1 Departure from the Core Values of Academic Integrity

In addition to the specific types of departures from academic integrity listed below, “Departure from the Core Values of Academic Integrity” encompasses a range of conduct and infractions. Any acts that deviate from the core values of academic integrity (section 2.1 (p. 3)) that do not fall under the specific categories listed below may be categorized under this broader heading.

In the educational context, there is, for instance, trust that students will abide by the core values of academic integrity and not violate these values or attempt to violate this trust.

Therefore, attempts at plagiarism, facilitation, and other departures are as much a threat to academic integrity as submitting a plagiarized paper or working with a peer to undermine integrity. Honesty plays a role in exchanges with instructors and peers, especially in a professionalized setting, where authentic self-representation and truthfulness are essential.

Investigations and findings under this broad category will cite one or more of these six values and indicate how the activity contravenes these values and compromises the integrity of the educational experience. “The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity (<https://www.academicintegrity.org/fundamental-values/>)” (3rd edition) developed by the International Centre for Academic Integrity provides guidance on the meaning of these six values in relation to the educational experience.

2.2.2 Plagiarism

Plagiarism involves presenting ideas, words or work, created by others or by technological assistance, as if they are one's own or without proper attribution/citation. Self-plagiarism is also a departure from academic integrity. Self-plagiarism refers to the practice of submitting the same work, in whole

or in part, for credit in two or more courses, or in the same course more than once, without the prior written permission of the instructor. Self-plagiarism can also include presenting one's own previously published work as though it were new.

Examples: copying or using quotations or paraphrasing material from a print or other source, including the internet and output from artificial intelligence, without proper acknowledgement; copying another student's work; submitting the same piece of work in more than one course without permission.

2.2.3 Unauthorized Content Generation

Unauthorized content generation is the production of academic work, in whole or in part, for academic credit, progression, or award, using unapproved or undeclared human or technological assistance. Examples: Response generation from artificial intelligence including, but not limited to, text-, image-, code-, or video-generating artificial intelligence tools; submitting assignments to online forums or websites for generating solutions.

2.2.4 Contract Cheating

Contract cheating is a form of plagiarism that involves outsourcing academic work to a third-party including, but not limited to, a commercial provider, current or former student, family member or acquaintance, and submitting the work as the student's own.

Examples: purchasing a term paper or assignment to be submitted as one's own; submitting essays or assignments that have been obtained from homework sites, essay mills, tutor sites, friends, family members or classmates.

2.2.5 Use of Unauthorized Materials

Use of unauthorized materials involves using or possessing unauthorized materials or obtaining unauthorized assistance in any academic examination or test, or in connection with any other form of academic work.

Examples: Using or possessing unauthorized written material or an electronic device with memory and/or web access such as a calculator, cell phone or smart watch that is not permitted during a test or examination; copying another student's test or examination answer; receiving answers from an exam or test bank website.

2.2.6 Deception

Deception involves misrepresenting the accuracy of information, the authenticity of a document, one's self, one's work, or one's relation to the University.

Examples: creating or causing to be created and/or submitting any falsified official academic document, including a transcript; altering any official academic documents,

including transcripts; creating and/or submitting any falsified medical note; altering any information on documentation provided by a third party (such as a date); impersonating someone in a test or examination or allowing someone to impersonate you; fabricating or falsifying laboratory or research data; using another person's credentials or representing yourself as having credentials that are not rightfully yours.

2.2.7 Facilitation

Facilitation involves enabling another student's breach of academic integrity.

Examples: allowing academic work to be copied by another student for submission as that student's work; selling academic work; making information available to another student about the exam questions or possible answers during an online or take-home exam window.

2.2.8 Unauthorized Use of Intellectual Property

Using the intellectual property of another for academic, personal, or professional advantage without the authorization of the owner.

Examples: uploading course materials to a note-sharing website without the instructor's permission; providing course materials to a commercial study-prep service not sanctioned by the University; distributing, publicly posting, selling or otherwise disseminating an instructor's course materials or providing an instructor's course materials to anyone else for distribution, posting, sale or other means of dissemination, without the instructor's express consent.

2.2.9 Unauthorized Collaboration

Unauthorized collaboration involves working with others, without the specific permission of the instructor, on academic work that will be submitted for a grade.

Examples: working with others on in-class or take-home tests, papers, or homework assignments that are meant to be completed individually; communicating with another person during an exam or about an exam during the exam window.

2.2.10 Failure to Abide by Academic Rules

Failing to abide by Faculty/School or University academic rules and regulations.

Examples: failing to follow rules imposed by course instructors, or others (for example, teaching assistants, guest or substitute instructors), regarding the preparation, writing, and submission of academic work; failing to follow rules set out by instructors or the Exams Office in the writing of tests and examinations; failing to follow regulations governing ethics reviews; failing to comply with assigned remedies

and sanctions resulting from a departure from academic integrity; unauthorized removal of materials from a library.

3. Instructor Process: Sequence of Events

3.1 Review of Documents

3.1.1 Delegation of Investigation

In most cases, the course instructor investigates a possible departure from academic integrity and decides the finding.

However, when an instructor is unable to investigate and/or decide the finding, the Associate Director (Studies) may delegate the responsibility to another individual with appropriate subject matter expertise.

In these Procedures, all references to an "instructor" include such a delegate.

3.1.2 Initial Collection

To begin investigating a possible departure from academic integrity, the instructor shall assemble all documents related to the case. Such documents may include:

- the work submitted by the student for academic credit;
- the source(s) from which the work submitted by the student is apparently derived;
- instructions describing the nature of the work to be done;
- the course syllabus;
- any email between instructor and student relating to the work;
- documents alleged to be altered; and
- documents used by the instructor or the Program stating policies on departures from academic integrity.

3.1.3 Guidance for Instructors

While collecting evidence (see section 1.3 (p. 1)), the instructor is encouraged to seek guidance from the Undergraduate Chair, Head, Director, or appropriate Department/Faculty/School delegate concerning matters relating to departures from academic integrity and, as needed, from the University's Legal Counsel regarding the specifics of the case, or from the Office of the Ombudsperson concerning University policy and procedures more generally.

3.1.4 Dismissal of Investigation

If, after a careful review of the evidence collected during the initial collection of evidence, the instructor determines that there is insufficient evidence to continue with the investigation of a possible departure from academic integrity, the case will be dismissed. All documents related to the case must be destroyed and the student shall not be informed of the instructor's investigation.



3.2 Engaging with the Student

3.2.1 Notification by the Instructor

If, after their initial collection of evidence, the instructor determines that there is sufficient evidence to continue with the investigation of a possible departure from academic integrity, the instructor must use the "Notice of Investigation of a Possible Departure from Academic Integrity" form ("the NOI") to notify the student of the alleged departure from academic integrity. The following information shall be included in the NOI and sent by email to the student's Queen's email account:

- the evidence on which the investigation is based, including all documents upon which the instructor will rely;
- the possible remedies and sanctions as outlined below;
- the student's right to respond to the investigation by meeting with the instructor or by providing a written response;
- the student's right to have representation in any response to the investigation; and
- the Faculty/School resources available for consultation and the information on the website of the Office of the University Ombudsperson about student rights and responsibilities and University policies and procedures.

The student is not entitled to receive any notes or other documents created by the instructor to aid in the investigation except as required to permit the student to understand and respond to the allegations.

3.2.2 Response from the Student

Within 10 business days of the date that the NOI was emailed to the student, the student must respond to the NOI, indicating either the wish to meet with the instructor (see section 3.2.3 (p. 6)) or their election to provide a written response (see section 3.2.4 (p. 6)).

3.2.3 Meeting with the Student

If the student elects to meet with the instructor, the instructor shall determine whether the meeting will be in person, by telephone, or by video/audio conference. The instructor shall ask who, if anyone, will be present at the meeting with the student.

The instructor shall schedule a meeting as soon as possible.

The student has the right to know what material will be considered, and that at the meeting, the student will have the opportunity to respond to the evidence related to the alleged departure. The student is required to bring to the meeting copies of all documents on which they intend to rely in responding to the alleged departure.

At the meeting, the student may have a support person present, who may be a friend or family member, or an

advisor or other professional, to provide emotional support and assistance. The support person may not be directly involved in the case, for example as a witness, and may not advocate on behalf of the student.

The instructor may also have an advisor present on behalf of the BHS program who, if the instructor wishes, may take on the limited role of chairing the meeting and/or providing clarification of the procedures related to investigations of possible departures from academic integrity.

3.2.4 Written Response from the Student

If the student does not wish to meet, the student may submit a written response to the instructor no later than five business days after the student responds to the Notice of Investigation indicating their election to submit a written response.

The response must include a detailed explanation of the student's case and all relevant documents in the student's possession on which they intend to rely, such as copies of earlier drafts of the work in question.

3.2.5 Final Investigation Steps

If the instructor receives new information about the alleged departure before issuing a finding, the instructor must disclose that information to the student and give them the option to respond to it, by way of a written submission, which must be submitted to the instructor no later than 5 business days after the student was informed of the new information.

If the student does not wish to attend a meeting or make any written response to the NOI, the instructor shall make a decision based on the available evidence.

3.3 Deciding the Finding or Dismissal

The instructor shall decide whether to make a finding of a departure from academic integrity or to dismiss the case based on:

- the applicable rules, regulations, policies and procedures, related to academic integrity;
- the evidence that was considered;
- the arguments made by the student; and
- their own assessment of the relative credibility and strength of the evidence.

At this point in the investigation, the instructor is not entitled to know about any previous departure(s) from academic integrity by the student, and any previous departure is not relevant to the finding.

3.3.1 Dismissal

If, after a careful review of the evidence and consideration of the response by the student, the instructor determines

that a finding of departure from academic integrity is not supported, the case shall be dismissed.

The instructor must use the “Notice of Dismissal of Alleged Departure from Academic Integrity” form (“the Dismissal form”) to inform the student that the investigation has been dismissed.

The Dismissal form shall be forwarded to the Program AI Administrator to be maintained for reporting purposes only.

The student shall not be identified on the form. All other documents related to the case must be destroyed.

3.3.2 Deciding the Finding of a Departure from Academic Integrity

If, after a careful review of the evidence and consideration of the response by the student, the instructor determines that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that it is more likely than not (i.e. on a “balance of probabilities”) that a departure from academic integrity occurred, the instructor must complete a “Finding of a Departure from Academic Integrity” form (“the Finding form”) and will need to follow the steps below to determine an appropriate remedy or sanction.

3.3.2.1 Contact the Program AI Administrator

Where there is a finding of departure from academic integrity, the instructor shall contact the Program AI Administrator to determine whether a record of a previous finding of a departure from academic integrity by the student exists. If a record exists, the AI Administrator shall inform the instructor. The instructor shall then indicate on the Finding form that:

- the departure is categorized as Level II (see section 3.4.3 (p. 8)); and
- the case is being referred to the Faculty/School for the assignment of an appropriate remedy or sanction (see section 3.4.4 (p. 9)).

The instructor shall then email the Finding form to the student (see section 3.5 (p. 9)).

3.4 Deciding the Remedy or Sanction

If the Program AI Administrator confirms there is no record of a previous finding of a departure from academic integrity by the student, the instructor shall decide a remedy or sanction from those available to the instructor (see section 3.4.2 (p. 8)) or refer the matter to the Program AI Lead to determine an appropriate remedy or sanction (see section 3.4.4 (p. 9)).

The remedy or sanction must be meaningful to ensure that students understand the importance of academic integrity to the academic community at Queen's and its vital importance in maintaining the integrity of degrees granted by the University. A remedy or sanction must also preserve fairness

amongst students in a course or program. The instructor may contact the BHSc Program Office for information about the remedies or sanctions imposed in similar previous cases.

3.4.1 Factors to Consider

The instructor shall consider several factors in deciding the appropriate remedy or sanction. Careful consideration of the factors listed below will help to ensure that the remedy or sanction is fair, reasonable, and proportionate to the gravity of the departure found.

Factors that should be considered in deciding a remedy or sanction include:

- the extent and seriousness of the departure;
- any educational measures that may be undertaken to ensure that the student understands the departure and what should have been the appropriate conduct in such circumstances;
- the value of the academic work in relation to the overall grade for the course;
- the experience of the student (for example, a first-year or an upper-year student; a student experienced in the discipline or a student in an elective course);
- any mitigating and/or aggravating circumstances; and
- possible direct injury to another student or the institution.

3.4.1.1 Mitigating Circumstances

Although mitigating circumstances do not exonerate or excuse a student from the finding of a departure from academic integrity, such circumstances should be taken into account to ensure that the remedy or sanction is reasonable and appropriate. The onus is on the student to provide evidence of such mitigating circumstances. Examples of mitigating circumstances that may be relevant include:

- documented evidence from an appropriate health care professional of factors directly compromising the student's capacity to understand or adhere to the standards of academic integrity at the time of the departure;
- prompt admission to the alleged departure from academic integrity by the student and expression of contrition and willingness to undertake educative remedies; or
- evidence that reasonable steps were not taken to bring the standards and expectations regarding academic integrity to the attention of the student (for example, expectations were not included in the course syllabus).

3.4.1.2 Aggravating Circumstances

Aggravating circumstances may also have an impact on the appropriate and reasonable remedy or sanction and should also be taken into account. Examples of aggravating



circumstances that may be relevant include, but are not limited to:

- evidence of a deliberate attempt to gain advantage;
- evidence of an active attempt to conceal the departure;
- the departure has been committed by an upper-year student who ought to be familiar with the expectations for academic integrity in the discipline, department and/or Faculty/School;
- conduct that intimidates others or provokes misconduct by others; or
- direct harm to another student or to the University.

3.4.2 Range of Remedies and Sanctions that may be Imposed by the Instructor

The remedy or sanction should reflect the extent and gravity of the departure from academic integrity and should be consistent with the remedies or sanctions imposed in similar previous cases in the Department/Faculty/School.

The instructor may impose one or more of a range of remedies or sanctions including:

- an oral or written warning that such infractions constitute unacceptable behaviour;
- a learning experience involving rewriting or revising the original work within a stipulated period of time;
- the submission of new or other work within a stipulated period of time;
- the deduction of partial or total loss of marks for the work or exam;
- a deduction of a percentage of the final grade in the course; or
- a failing grade (down to a grade of zero) in the course.

If the remedy or sanction affects the student's grade in the course, the student may NOT drop the course regardless of the drop deadlines, and the student may be reinstated in the course if the course was dropped prior to the finding being decided.

3.4.3 Categorizing the Departure

In deciding an appropriate remedy or sanction, instructors are asked to distinguish between minor (Level I) and major (Level II) departures from academic integrity.

Records of Level I findings are maintained by the Program for use only if there is a future finding of a departure by the same student. Records of Level II findings form part of the student's Official File in the Program Office and are retained for 10 years after the student's graduation. This practice of separating a Level I departure from the student's Official File balances remediation and sanction. Sanctions are necessary when there are findings of major or multiple departures

from academic integrity, but remedies that seek to educate students about academic integrity may be allowed for minor departures without punitive sanctions.

Instructors shall categorize the departure as either Level I or II based on the guidelines below in light of their familiarity with the case and the surrounding circumstances, using informed judgment and reasonable discretion. Instructors should consider the individual factor or relevant combination of factors in deciding the level of the departure. It is not necessary that all factors be considered. Instructors are encouraged to obtain advice from the Faculty/School about the categorization of the departure.

3.4.3.1 Level I Considerations

Instructors may be guided by a combination of the following and similar factors when categorizing the departure as Level I:

- this is the first finding of a departure from academic integrity by the student;
- the departure is related to academic work that does not count for a significant proportion of the course grade;
- the sanction will not necessarily result in a failure in the course;
- the student is at an early stage of their academic career, especially a first-year student; or
- the student has little or no experience in a course in the Department (for example, a first-time experience in a particular department).

3.4.3.2 Level II Considerations

If there is a record of a previous departure(s) from academic integrity by the student, any subsequent departures are automatically categorized as Level II departures. The case must then be referred to the Program for a remedy or sanction to be decided.

Instructors may be guided by a combination of the following and similar factors, as well as any aggravating circumstances (see section 3.4.1.2 (p. 7)), when categorizing the departure as Level II:

- the departure is related to academic work that counts for a significant proportion of the course grade;
- the sanction will result in a failure in the course;
- the student is in an upper year and has taken several previous courses in the discipline (for example, a fourth-year student in a concentration course);
- significant and unacknowledged use of one or more sources is involved;
- significant departure from professionalism or accreditation standards is involved;

- the incident involves more than one type of departure ;
- direct damage to the integrity of the student's program or the integrity of the University is involved; or
- direct negative impact on other students is involved (for example, stealing another student's academic work).

3.4.4 Referral of the Case to the Faculty/School

The instructor must refer the case to the Program AI Lead (see section 1.6.2 (p. 2)) to decide the remedy or sanction, if:

- there is a record of a previous finding of a departure from academic integrity on file in the Program Office; or
- after the instructor considers all the factors above in assessing the gravity of the departure, they believe that a more serious sanction than those that may be imposed by an instructor (see section 3.4.2 (p. 8)) is warranted.

When a case is referred by the instructor, the role of the Program AI Lead is to review and consider the factors of the case only as they relate to the decision of an appropriate remedy or sanction. The Program AI Lead must not re-consider the instructor's decision on the finding of the departure.

When referring a case, the instructor shall indicate on the Finding form that the case is being referred to the Program for the assignment of an appropriate remedy or sanction and email the Finding form to the student (see section 3.5 (p. 9)).

All original documents related to the case, including the submitted work and any relevant correspondence, and the Notice of Investigation and the Finding forms, shall be forwarded to the Program AI Administrator to be considered by the Faculty/School AI Lead in determining an appropriate remedy or sanction. No documentation may be retained by the instructor or placed in a departmental student file.

3.4.4.1 Range of Remedies and Sanctions that may be Imposed by the Program AI Lead

The Program AI Lead may impose any of the remedies or sanctions available to the instructor (see section 3.4.2 (p. 8)) as well as the following sanctions:

- an official written warning that the penalty for a subsequent offence could be a requirement to withdraw from the University for a specified minimum period of time;
- the rescinding of University- or Faculty-awarded scholarships, prizes and/or bursaries;
- a requirement to withdraw from the University for a specified minimum period of time; or
- the revocation or rescinding of a degree.

3.4.4.2 Requirement to Withdraw or Rescinding of a Degree

When the Program AI Lead determines that a requirement to withdraw from the University or the rescinding of a degree is the appropriate sanction, the AI Lead must consult with the Chair of the Academic Integrity Subcommittee to ensure that such sanctions are imposed consistently across the University.

If the Chair of the Academic Integrity Subcommittee is satisfied that the proposed sanction is in accordance with University standards, the AI Lead shall notify the student in writing of the sanction and include the reasons for the decision (see section 3.5 (p. 9)).

Following the deadline to appeal the sanction, or after all avenues of appeal have been exhausted and the requirement to withdraw or rescinding of a degree is confirmed, the Program AI Lead shall forward the requirement to withdraw from the University, or the rescinding of the degree, to:

- the Office of the University Registrar for the notation to be added to the student's transcript; and
- the University Secretariat, who will notify the student of the final decision.

If the Chair of the Academic Integrity Subcommittee is not satisfied that the proposed sanction is in accordance with University standards, the AI Lead shall re-consider and adjust the proposed sanction.

3.5 Informing the Student

3.5.1 Finding and Remedy or Sanction by Instructor

If the instructor decides that the finding warrants a remedy or sanction within the scope of those available to the instructor (see section 3.4.2 (p. 8)), and the case is not being referred to the Program, the instructor must complete the Finding form and email it to the student's Queen's email account to inform the student of the outcome of the investigation.

The completed form supplies the student with the following information:

- the details of the finding of a departure from academic integrity;
- the reasons for the finding and the evidence upon which the finding is based;
- whether the departure is categorized as Level I or Level II and the applicable provisions in section 1.7 with respect to the retention and release of records;
- the remedy(ies) or sanction(s);
- the reasons for the remedy(ies) or sanction(s), including any mitigating or aggravating circumstances;



- the student's right to appeal the finding and/or the remedy or sanction to the Program;
- the deadline for appealing to the Program;
- the Faculty/School resources available for consultation and the information on the website of the Office of the University Ombudsperson about student rights and responsibilities and University policies and procedures; and
- if the student is studying at Queen's on an exchange program or on a Letter of Permission and the departure is categorized as Level II, or if the student is in a collaborative degree program offered jointly with another post-secondary institution (the "partner institution"), that the student's home university or the partner institution, as applicable, will be notified of the finding and remedy or sanction if the finding is confirmed after all avenues of appeal have expired or been exhausted (see section 3.6 (p. 10)).

3.5.2 Finding by Instructor with Referral for Remedy or Sanction

When a case is referred to the Program AI Lead for the assignment of a remedy or sanction, the instructor must complete the Finding form to provide the details of the finding, the reasons for the finding, the evidence upon which the finding was made, and the categorization of the departure as Level I or Level II, and email the Finding form to the student's Queen's email account to inform the student of the outcome of the investigation and the referral of the case to the Program for the assignment of the remedy or sanction.

The AI Lead shall decide the remedy or sanction and must inform the student and the instructor in writing of the following:

- the remedy(ies) or sanction(s);
- the reasons for the remedy(ies) or sanction(s), including any mitigating or aggravating circumstances;
- the student's right to appeal the finding and/or the remedy(ies) or sanction(s);
- the deadline for appealing;
- the Program resources available for consultation and the information on the website of the Office of the University Ombudsperson about student rights and responsibilities and University policies and procedures; and
- if the student is studying at Queen's on an exchange program or on a Letter of Permission and the departure is categorized as Level II, or if the student is in a collaborative degree program offered jointly with another post-secondary institution (the "partner institution"), that the student's home university or the partner institution, as applicable, will be notified of the finding and remedy or sanction if the finding is confirmed after all avenues of

appeal have expired or been exhausted (see section 3.6 (p. 10)).

3.6 Procedures with Respect to Exchange, Letter of Permission and Collaborative Students

3.6.1 Students from Other Post-Secondary Institutions

After a finding of a Level II departure from academic integrity by a student who is studying at Queen's on an official exchange program or as a visiting student on a Letter of Permission, when all avenues of appeal have expired or been exhausted and if the finding is confirmed, the Program AI Administrator shall forward a copy of the Finding form to the student's home university Faculty or Program Office.

3.6.2 Queen's Students Attending Other Post-Secondary Institutions

Information received about a finding of a departure from academic integrity by a Queen's student who is studying on an official exchange program or at another post-secondary institution on a Letter of Permission, or who is registered in a collaborative degree program offered jointly with a partner institution, shall be disclosed to the student's home Faculty/School. The severity of any departure shall be assessed by the BHSc Program AI Lead as the equivalent of a Level I or a Level II departure and a record of the departure shall be retained in the appropriate file (see section 1.7 (p. 2)) in the Program Office. Any finding of a departure from academic integrity at a partner institution shall not result in the imposition of any further remedy or sanction. However, it shall be taken into consideration as if the finding was made under these Procedures if there is a subsequent finding of a departure from academic integrity by the student at Queen's.

3.7 Retention of Documents and Records

All original documents related to an academic integrity investigation, including the submitted work, correspondence, a written response from the student, and the Notice of Investigation and Finding forms, must be forwarded to the Program AI Administrator to be filed, maintained and released as required under section 1.7 (p. 2).

No documents or materials may be retained by the instructor or in a departmental student file.

4. Appeals

A student may appeal a finding of a departure from academic integrity, or the imposition of a remedy or sanction, or both.

4.1 Grounds for Appeal

The grounds for submitting an appeal are limited to cases in which:

1. The decision-maker whose decision is being appealed failed to act in accordance with the rules of procedural fairness. A breach of procedural fairness includes failing to:
 - permit a student to be heard by an unbiased decision-maker;
 - follow applicable rules, regulations, or University policy, in a way that adversely affected a student's right to a fair process;
 - make a reasonable decision. A "reasonable" decision is one that is rational in that its findings are based on evidence, thought out and supported by facts and logical inferences from findings of fact. To be reasonable, the decision must contain adequate reasons for the conclusions. A decision should not be overturned if it falls within a range of possible, acceptable outcomes. If the decision is "reasonable", the decision-maker deciding the appeal is not permitted to substitute their opinion for that of the decision-maker whose decision is under appeal.
 - a. The decision-maker whose decision is being appealed acted without, or exceeded their, jurisdiction.

4.2 Levels of Appeal

Each Faculty/School regulation or procedure with respect to academic integrity matters shall set out the levels of appeal for that Faculty/School (see Appendix 6.3).

In addition to the level(s) of appeal within the BHSc Program, the Senate Student Academic Appeals Policy establishes the University Student Appeal Board ("the USAB"), with jurisdiction to hear appeals of the final academic integrity decision made within the Program.

4.3 First Level of Appeal to the BHSc Program

A student may appeal an instructor's finding of a departure from academic integrity, the remedy or sanction, or both, to the BHSc Associate Director (Studies) (see section 1.6.2 (p. 2)) (the "appeal decision-maker").

4.3.1 Submitting an Appeal

Appeals must be submitted to the BHSc Program AI Administrator within 10 business days of the date that the Finding form was emailed to the student by the instructor.

If the decision on remedy or sanction was referred to the AI Lead (see section 3.4.4 (p. 9)), the appeal cannot be submitted until a remedy or sanction is assigned. In such cases, the appeal must be submitted within 10 business days of the date that the notice of the remedy or sanction imposed was emailed to the student by the AI Lead.

The student's appeal submission must clearly state whether the student is appealing the finding, the remedy or sanction, or both. The student must explain the reason(s) for their appeal, based on one or more of the Grounds for Appeal set out in section 4.1 (p. 10). The submission must include the Finding form, the remedy or sanction decision (if separate from the Finding form) and any other documents necessary to establish the grounds for the appeal.

If the student does not wish to meet with the appeal decision-maker and the instructor, the student must so indicate in their appeal submission, and the appeal shall then proceed based on the written submissions.

4.3.2 Initial Review by the Appeal Decision-Maker

The appeal decision-maker shall review the student's appeal submission and determine if it contains new evidence that, through no fault or omission of the student, was not known by or available to the student when the prior decision was made. No other new evidence shall be permitted.

4.3.2.1 Appeal Contains New Permitted Evidence

If a student's appeal contains new evidence that is permitted, the appeal decision-maker shall have no jurisdiction over the appeal and shall send the matter back to the previous decision-maker for reconsideration, unless:

- the delay of sending the matter to the prior decision-maker would be unduly prejudicial to the student; or
- the student's new evidence clearly demonstrates bias in the prior proceeding that otherwise cannot be remedied.

4.3.2.2 Appeal Contains No New Evidence

If the student's appeal contains no new or permitted evidence, the appeal decision-maker shall provide the instructor with a copy of the student's appeal submission and the instructor shall have an opportunity to provide a written response to the student's appeal within 10 business days.

The student must be provided with any response material from the instructor and shall have at least 5 business days to review this material before a meeting is held, or, if the student indicated that they do not want to meet, they shall have 5 business days after receiving the instructor's response material to make additional written submissions to the appeal decision-maker.

4.3.3 Meeting with the Student

In most cases the appeal decision-maker will convene a meeting with the student, the instructor, and any witnesses, to conduct a thorough review of the evidence.

If a meeting will be held, the AI Administrator shall schedule it as soon as reasonably possible. The student and the



instructor may have a support person (see section 3.2.3) (p. 6) or an advisor present at the meeting.

The AI Administrator shall ask who, if anyone, will be present with the student, and advise the student whether anyone will be present with the instructor. The AI Administrator shall also advise the student what material will be considered at the meeting.

The student and instructor shall have the opportunity to respond to the evidence orally at the meeting.

4.3.4 Deciding the Appeal

After a careful review of the evidence, the appeal decision-maker, can:

- maintain or overturn the instructor's finding, if the student appealed the finding; and/or
- maintain or modify the remedy or sanction, if the student appealed the remedy or sanction.

In making decisions, the appeal decision-maker should recognize that primary responsibility for making decisions about individual students rests with those who are closest to them, who can fairly compare students to other students in similar positions, and who have knowledge of the context in which the decision is made. As such, if a finding of a departure from academic integrity is upheld on appeal, the judgment of the academic unit regarding the appropriate remedy or sanction should be respected by the appeal decision-maker unless the remedy or sanction is unreasonable in the circumstances.

4.3.5 Informing the Student and the Instructor

Within 20 business days of the date upon which the appeal is considered complete, the appeal decision-maker must provide the student with a written decision, which shall include:

- a statement of the issues under review;
- a summary of the arguments and evidence presented;
- whether the finding will be maintained or overturned and/or whether the remedy or sanction will be maintained or modified;
- the reasons for the decision;
- if necessary, a statement of how the decision will be implemented;
- the student's right to appeal the decision, with an explanation of the next level of appeal and information or resources to consult about the process for filing an appeal; and

- the information on the website of the Office of the University Ombudsperson about student rights and responsibilities and University policies and procedures.

When the appeal decision-maker determines that a modification to a requirement to withdraw from the University or the rescinding of a degree is appropriate, the appeal decision-maker shall provide the Chair of the Academic Integrity Subcommittee with a copy of the decision.

The appeal decision-maker shall also inform the instructor of the outcome of the appeal and provide them with a copy of the decision.

All relevant documents related to the appeal, including the submitted work, correspondence, the Notice of Investigation and Finding forms, and the decision, must be forwarded to the AI Administrator to be placed in the appropriate BHSc Program Office file, and maintained and released in accordance with these Procedures and the University's authorized Records Retention Schedules (see section 1.7 (p. 2)).

4.4 Second Level of Appeal to the BHSc Program

A student may appeal the decision of the Associate Director (Studies) to the Board of Studies (second-level appeal decision-maker) within 10 business days of the date that the first appeal decision was emailed to the student, using the process set out in section 4.3 (p. 11).

When the decision-maker to whom the appeal would normally be made was involved in making the previous decision, the student may appeal the decision to the University Student Appeal Board.

4.5 Appeal of Program Decisions to the University Student Appeal Board

A student may appeal the final appeal decision from the BHSc Program to the University Student Appeal Board ("the USAB").

The student may appeal a decision related to a finding of a departure from academic integrity, a remedy or sanction, or both.

4.5.1 Submission of the Appeal

Appeals must be submitted to the USAB within two weeks after the date that the last decision of the BHSc Program was emailed to the student. During exam or holiday periods the Chair of the USAB will normally grant an extension of time for filing an appeal but only if the student submitted a written extension request to the Chair of the USAB within the original time limit for filing an appeal.

The student may appeal to the USAB based on one or more of the Grounds for Appeal to USAB stipulated in the Senate

Student Academic Appeals Policy (<https://www.queensu.ca/secretariat/policies/senate/student-academic-appeals-policy/>). The student must follow the Starting an Appeal procedure set out in the Rules of Procedure for the University Student Appeal Board (<https://www.queensu.ca/secretariat/rules-procedure-usab-0/>).

The Office of the University Ombudsperson can provide guidance to the student with respect to the appeal process for the USAB.

The instructor or appeal decision-maker may consult with the University's Legal Counsel about responding to an appeal to the USAB.

5. Cross-Faculty Jurisdiction

If a student is enrolled in a course that is offered by a Faculty/School (the "course Faculty") that is not the same as the Faculty/School in which the student is registered (the "home Faculty"), instructors and Faculties/Schools shall follow the procedures as defined in this section.

5.1 Investigation and Deciding the Finding

The initial investigation of a departure from academic integrity and any referral of an academic integrity case shall be conducted by the instructor of the course and follow the academic integrity regulations of the course Faculty.

If the instructor determines that there is sufficient and persuasive evidence to make a finding of a departure from academic integrity, the instructor must complete a Finding form, categorize the departure as Level I or Level II (see section 3.4.3 (p. 8)) and contact the course Faculty AI Lead to determine an appropriate remedy or sanction.

All original documents related to the case, including submitted work and any relevant correspondence, as well as the Notice of Investigation and the Finding forms, must be forwarded to the course Faculty AI Administrator to be considered by the course Faculty AI Lead in determining an appropriate remedy or sanction. No documentation may be retained by the instructor or placed in a departmental student file.

5.2 Deciding the Remedy or Sanction

The course Faculty AI Lead shall contact the student's home Faculty AI Lead to disclose the finding and consult on an appropriate sanction. As part of this consultation, the course Faculty AI Lead shall consider:

- whether a record of a previous finding of a departure from academic integrity by the student exists in either the course or home Faculty records;

- any mitigating circumstances (see section 3.4.1.1 (p. 7)); and
- any aggravating circumstances (see section 3.4.1.2 (p. 7)).

After consultation with the student's home Faculty AI Lead, the course Faculty AI Lead shall decide the remedy or sanction and advise the instructor of the decision.

5.3 Informing the Student

The instructor must complete the Finding form and email it to the student's Queen's email account to inform the student of the outcome of the investigation and the referral to the course Faculty for the assignment of an appropriate remedy or sanction. The course Faculty AI Lead must then inform the student, the instructor and the home Faculty of the remedy or sanction imposed, including all required information (see section 3.5 (p. 9)).

When the course Faculty AI Lead determines that a requirement to withdraw from the University or the rescinding of a degree is the appropriate sanction, the course Faculty AI Lead shall consult with the Chair of the Academic Integrity Subcommittee to ensure that such sanctions are imposed consistently across the University (see section 3.4.4.2 (p. 9)).

5.4 Appeals

A finding of a departure from academic integrity and/or a remedy or sanction related to a course that is offered by a Faculty/School that is not the student's home Faculty may be appealed to the student's home Faculty, in accordance with section 4.3 (p. 11).

5.4.1 Input from the Course Faculty

A designate from the course Faculty may provide information related to the case to the home Faculty appeal decision-maker and may attend meetings as required. The home Faculty appeal decision-maker must notify the student and the course Faculty AI Lead, of all decisions. The course Faculty AI Lead shall communicate these decisions to the instructor.

The Board of Studies serves as the final body of academic appeal in the BHSc program on matters related to departure from academic integrity determined by the Associate Director (Studies).