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Overview

• Brief review of current Academic Honesty process in Faculty of Health (based on existing Senate Policy on Academic Honesty (2005))

• [https://secretariat-policies.info.yorku.ca/policies/academic-honesty-senate-policy-on/](https://secretariat-policies.info.yorku.ca/policies/academic-honesty-senate-policy-on/)

• Brief review of proposed Academic Honestly process (as per the revised Senate Policy currently under consultation)

• Highlights of report on proposed Policy from FoH Standing Committee on Examinations and Academic Standards (CEAS)
Clarification of Terms

**Person of Primary Responsibility (PPR)** coordinates implementation of Policy/activities of PPR delegates
- Associate Dean (AD) of Students

**PPR designate**—delegated authority re Academic Conduct matters
- UPD or GPD

- **OSAS** (Office of Student and Academic Services in Faculty of Health)

**Committee on Examinations and Academic Standards (CEAS)-Standing Committee** reports to Faculty Council

**Faculty Appeals Committee (FAC)**
- Responsible for considering appeals for CD, PPR or PPR designate decisions in relation to this policy
- Committee must be recognized by Faculty Council as body responsible for appeals related to Policy
- Structure aligns with current CEAS Subcommittee on Academic Honesty Panel Hearings
Current AH Process: Exploratory Meetings held for all Suspected Breaches

At unit level, all suspected breaches are handled independently from one another; neither CD, nor UPD is made aware of second offence on record

CD notifies UPD of potential breach

UPD consults with CD, reviews evidence; Notifies RO to put hold on student record
Schedules Exploratory Meeting (EM)
CD, UPD, admin assistant attend EM; summary notes taken; added to file
Present evidence to student; student has opportunity to speak to charge
CD & UPD make recommendation re breach and/or penalty (Maximum penalty: Failure in Course/Permanent Grade of Record)

File to OSAS/Chair of CEAS

OSAS checks for previous breach on record

CEAS Chair reviews all files from units, Provides oversight on recommended breach/penalty:
Either finalizes decision on breach/penalty; OR
Escalates to panel hearing if student:
- does not attend EM;
- does not agree to breach/penalty;
- has previous offence on record; or
- if recommended penalty greater than Failure in Course/Permanent Grade of Record

File closed or
CEAS/OSAS report outcome to CD; student; RO notified to lift hold
File stored by OSAS

AH Panel Hearing (Subcommittee of CEAS)
Panel comprised of minimum three members: one may be student member
AD is Faculty Presenter—reviews evidence; calls witnesses; presents case; makes recommendations re breach and/or penalty
Student has opportunity to respond
Panel determines decision/penalty; Dean’s Office communicates written decision to student; unit; RO to lift hold; File stored by OSAS

File stored by OSAS
Proposed AH Process with option for CD Direct Resolution (revised Senate Policy)

**UPD** proceeds with investigation
- Sends student evidence for charge
- Student written response/ may opt for meeting

**UPD** decides on sanction
- Student can appeal to FAC within 10 days

**UPD** can manage:
- High volume cases
- Previous breaches

Has wide range of sanctions available

---

**CD** notifies UPD of potential student breach of AH Policy
- UPD checks with OSAS re previous breach on record

**CD** opts to proceed with resolution
- Sends student evidence for charge
- Student written response/ may opt for meeting

**CD** decides on sanction
- Student can appeal to FAC within 10 days

**CD** can manage:
- First offence
- Assessment maximum 30%
- Plagiarism or cheating only

Maximum sanction: Zero on assessment

---

**Faculty Appeals Committee**
- (currently CEAS subcommittee panel hearing)
- 3-member panel adjudication committee, (minimum two Faculty)
- Student has opportunity to respond
- Panel hearings:
  - all student appeals of CD or UPD decisions
  - complex cases
- Sanctions include suspension, expulsion, withholding, rescission of degree

Dean’s Office communicates written decision to student; unit; RO to lift hold; file stored in OSAS
- Student can appeal to Senate Appeals Committee within 30 days

CD/UPD resolutions offer the potential for bias to be introduced when UPD checks with OSAS for previous breach on record; currently neither CD nor UPD is made aware of previous breach
High-level Goals of Revised Senate Policy

• Adapting to new realities in the academic conduct landscape
• Streamlining investigation procedures: encouraging formal resolution, aligning with principles of procedural fairness, natural justice
• Providing enhanced flexibility on sanctions
• Clarifying language; minimizing legalistic terminology
• Enhancing University-wide consistency re procedures, documentation, record-keeping protocols.
Adapting to New Realities

- High-volume misconduct procedures enhance timely response
- Zoom increases convenience/access
- Greater recognition of technological advances have increased methods for committing breaches
Streamlining Response: CD Resolution

**Potential Benefits**

- May improve reporting/timely management of breaches
- Could improve transparency by providing evidence for suspected breach to student in writing, inviting response in 10 days

**Potential Challenges**

- If more CDs opt to report/manage resolution, potential for increased volume of breaches
- Concerns re need for increased administrative support for unit/Faculty levels (e.g., UPD involvement; redacting files; timelines)
- Potential to introduce bias into decision-making at unit level) (notification of previous offence to CD/UPD)
- Question oversight role for CEAS chair
Flexibility of Sanctions
Language and Terminology

**Flexibility of sanctions**
- Expanded options, flexibility of lower-level sanctions
- Shifting categories of breaches (fraudulent conduct)
- Educational remedy vs disciplinary sanctions:
  Educational development opportunities (e.g. opportunity to expand current options to module/discussion session)

**Language**
- Overall language is clear; minimizes legalistic terminology
- Useful definitions
Consistency re Procedures, Documentation, Record-keeping Protocols

**CEAS**

- Recommend that CEAS (Standing Committee of Faculty of Health) continues to be involved rather than Petitions (OSAS)

- CEAS focus is academic standards, thus appropriate to manage:
  - 8.4 Disputing result of investigation;
  - 4.5 Imposing suspension/expulsion;
  - 4.9 Waiving transcript notation

**Petitions Appeals Committee**

- Focus of Petitions (through OSAS):

- Student requests to waive a Faculty regulation or deadline (late withdrawal from course; take courses on overload)

- Existing CEAS subcommittee on academic panel hearings align with Faculty Appeals Committee (FAC)

- Opportunity for CEAS to refine AH procedures (e.g., reporting; AD role; PPR designate)
Questions?

Your feedback appreciated!

Written feedback to Secretary of ASCP at hbarron@yorku.ca by April 30, 2021