

**Smith School of Business
Academic Integrity Panel
Terms of Reference**

Approved by Smith School of Business Faculty Board, June 11, 2024

1. Mandate and Responsibilities

1.1. Mandate

Under the jurisdiction of the Royal Charter of 1841 that established Queen's University, the Senate has responsibility for all academic matters within the University. The Senate delegates the authority for academic integrity to the Senate Committee on Academic Development and Procedures ("SCADP"). SCADP has developed [Queen's Academic Integrity Policy](#) and [Queen's Academic Integrity Procedures: Requirements of Faculties and Schools](#) ("the Procedures") which create responsibilities for faculties and schools to implement policies and practices that are consistent with those documents.

At Smith School of Business, academic integrity matters are the responsibility of the Academic Integrity Lead ("AI Lead") supported by the Academic Integrity Panel ("AIP"). Academic integrity matters include: investigation and adjudication of individual student matters and appeals; adherence to Senate policies and procedures; participation in academic integrity promotion, education, and events; and creation of academic integrity recommendations for stakeholders.

As Smith School of Business is committed to the core values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage, the Academic Integrity Panel plays an important role in *promoting a culture of academic integrity* in the School, as well as *responding to departures* from academic integrity when they occur.

The Academic Integrity Panel, chaired by the Academic Integrity Lead, performs three broad functions:

1. Hearing student appeals of instructor decisions related to academic integrity
2. Investigating and decision-making in some first instance cases, such as: those involving more than one course; those initiating outside a specific course; those unrelated to performance in a course; where an instructor has made such a request given the seriousness or complexity of the matter; where an investigation has been delegated in accordance with the Procedures
3. Participating in the promotion of academic integrity at Smith School of Business.

1.2. Jurisdiction

The Smith Academic Integrity Panel has jurisdiction over academic integrity matters arising from undergraduate programs and professional graduate programs (including degree, diploma, and certificate programs) at Smith School of Business. It does not have jurisdiction over MSc/PhD programs, which are governed by the School of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs.

1.3. Major Responsibilities

1.3.1 The Academic Integrity Panel, chaired by the Academic Integrity Lead, has the following responsibilities: to

1. Be familiar with Queen's and Smith policies and procedures regarding academic integrity

2. Investigate and adjudicate academic integrity cases arising outside a single course or as delegated
3. Hear and adjudicate student appeals of instructor decisions
4. Develop and implement Smith-specific academic integrity practices which align with Senate policies, procedures, and requirements as necessary
5. Provide recommendations on academic integrity concerns, issues, initiatives, and activities
6. Provide a forum for discussion and exchange of information concerning academic integrity
7. Consult with instructors and other relevant stakeholders
8. Participate in the education of community members about academic integrity.

1.4. *Specific Functions*

1.4.1 Investigate and adjudicate academic integrity cases: Cases that: initiate outside one specific course; involve several courses; that are unrelated to performance in a course; or are otherwise not handled by course instructors, will be investigated and adjudicated by the Academic Integrity Panel. Instructors are normally responsible for investigating and deciding matters arising within their courses.

1.4.2 Hear and adjudicate appeals of instructor decisions: Make decisions regarding student appeals of instructor decisions.

1.4.3 Provide advice and recommendations: the AIP will craft recommendations and advice for stakeholders broadly and in relation to specific situations.

1.4.4 Participate in information gathering, sharing, education, and building a culture of academic integrity at Smith: the AIP is committed to enhancing a culture of academic integrity among colleagues and students in the School. It is responsible for sharing information, consulting with colleagues and stakeholders, and proactively contributing to knowledge and commitment to academic integrity in the School.

2. Leadership, Roles, and Membership

2.1. *Academic Integrity Lead (“AI Lead”)*

2.1.1. The Assistant Dean (Academic) is the Academic Integrity Lead in the Smith School of Business. Consistent with [Queen’s Academic Integrity Procedures: Requirements of Faculties and Schools](#) (“the Procedures”) the Academic Integrity Lead is responsible for:

1. Chairing the Academic Integrity Panel
2. Assessing sanctions where referrals have been made by instructors
3. Consulting with other faculties in cross-faculty jurisdiction matters
4. Chairing AIP investigations and decision-making in first instance matters as described in section 1.4.1
5. Chairing AIP hearings of student appeals of instructor decisions
6. Empanelling AIP members to participate in investigations and appeals
7. Recusing themselves from cases where there is a real or perceived conflict of interest, and delegating to an AIP member the role of Chair of such investigations and/or appeals¹
8. Calling and participating in voting matters of the AIP
9. Inviting guests to AIP meetings as appropriate, including stakeholders and students
10. Educational initiatives for students, instructors, and other stakeholders.

2.2. *Academic Integrity Administrator (“AIA”)*

2.2.1. The Assistant Dean (Academic) will appoint an Academic Integrity Administrator. In accordance with the Procedures, the Academic Integrity Administrator is responsible for:

¹ Normally, the AI Lead will chair Academic Integrity Panel investigations and appeals. However, there may be instances such as a real or perceived conflict, involvement in a prior decision, or other situations, where the AI Lead may delegate investigations and adjudication to AI Panelists or, in special circumstances, Special Appointees (see section 2.6.1). The AI Lead may not delegate decision-making to administrators or support staff.

1. Providing information, advice, guidance, and resources to instructors and program staff
2. Providing resources and information to students
3. Ensuring implementation of remedies and sanctions once appeals have been exhausted
4. Maintaining academic integrity and student records according to the Procedures and [Queen's Records Management Policy](#)
5. Academic integrity reporting as required by Senate (section 1.8 of the Procedures)
6. Scheduling and minuting academic integrity cases and appeals
7. Scheduling and minuting AIP meetings.

2.3. *Academic Integrity Panel Membership*

2.3.1. The Academic Integrity Panel will include:

1. A Chair who is the Smith Academic Integrity Lead (Assistant Dean, Academic)
2. A minimum of four additional faculty members as determined by the Associate Dean (Faculty) and the AI Lead, with the option to increase the number of panelists relative to case volume and complexity
3. Alternate members may be appointed to be available for special situations, such as when Panelists are unavailable.

2.3.2. For the purposes of student investigations and appeals:

1. Two AIP members will normally investigate and adjudicate cases
2. The AI Lead will normally chair investigations and appeals, and will empanel one other AIP member to serve on each case
3. Where the AI Lead is unable to participate in a case or appeal, the AI Lead will empanel two AIP members to that case or appeal, and appoint one of the members to act as Chair²
4. In cases of significant complexity, the AI Lead reserves the right to expand the Panel composition as the AI Lead deems necessary.

2.4. *Responsibilities of Academic Integrity Panel Members*

2.4.1. Members will participate actively in AIP matters by:

1. Making themselves available for training, meetings, investigations, hearings, and appeals as their schedules allow
2. Fully preparing for adjudicating matters by thoroughly reviewing evidence and documents in advance of hearings
3. Declaring any conflicts or perceived conflicts of interest and recusing themselves from individual cases if necessary³
4. Voting on matters requiring a vote
5. Reviewing meeting materials as appropriate
6. Participating in working groups and sub-committees, as required
7. Promoting academic integrity in the School more broadly.

2.5. *Term of Membership*

2.5.1. Appointed faculty members will normally commit to three-year terms on a staggered basis to preserve knowledge and experience on the Panel

2.5.2. Former panelists may agree to serve as Panel alternates at the end of their assignments.

² The AI Panel may assign any remedy or sanction available to instructors as set out in section 3.4.2 of [the Procedures](#) as well as any remedy or sanction available to the AI Lead as set out in section 3.4.4.1 of the Procedures.

³ Normally, having taught a student in a class that is not the subject of the appeal is not considered a conflict and does not require that a member recuse themselves. A conflict of interest may be present if: there is a relationship between the AIP member and/or the student and/or the course instructor (such as a consulting or family relationship); the AIP member has an interest in the outcome of the decision; the AIP member has pre-judged the case; the AIP member was involved in an earlier stage of decision-making. In cases where a conflict is unclear, the remaining members of the AIP will determine if the member should be recused.

2.6. *Special Appointees*

- 2.6.1. The AI Lead may appoint short-term advisory or investigative bodies outside of the AIP when the circumstances of a case justify the need for expert advice or capacity beyond the Panel's capabilities
- 2.6.2. Special appointees are subject to the same conflict of interest requirements as the AIP (see footnote 3 and section 3.3).

3. Academic Integrity Panel Meetings

3.1. *Frequency of Academic Integrity Panel Meetings*

Members of the AI Panel will meet to review and discuss academic integrity matters broadly speaking. The term "meeting" is applied to Panel meetings that do not involve specific student investigations or appeals.

1. Meetings will be chaired by the AI Lead and supported by the AIA
2. Meetings will typically be scheduled twice in the Fall and Winter academic terms and once in the spring/summer
3. Additional meetings may be called at the discretion of the AI Lead
4. Agenda and meeting materials will be pre-circulated by the AIA
5. The minutes will be kept and pre-circulated before each meeting by the AIA
6. Should there be a matter requiring a vote, matters will be decided by majority vote (i.e. at least three of five), including that of the AI Lead
7. The Chair may invite non-committee members to address specific issues. All guests are non-voting.

3.2. *Quorum*

1. Quorum for the purpose of decision-making will be three members (note this does not pertain to decision-making involving individual student cases (see section 4 below)). Decisions will be made based on a majority vote of all voting members (i.e. at least three of five)
2. Meetings may be held in the absence of a quorum, but no decisions will be made.

3.3. *Conflict of Interest*

1. Members are expected to declare a conflict of interest if their real or perceived personal interests might be seen to influence their ability to assess any matter before the Panel objectively. They can do so either by personal declaration at the beginning of a meeting or in writing to the Chair. They will be excused from any decisions or cases regarding the matter in question. The declaration and absences will be recorded in the minutes.

4. Hearings and Appeals of Student Cases

4.1 *Policies, Procedures, Practices Governing Hearings and Appeals*

4.1.1 *Adherence to Queen's Policy and Procedures*

1. The AIP will conduct investigations and appeals and communicate decisions in accordance with [Queen's Academic Integrity Policy](#) and [Queen's Academic Integrity Procedures: Requirements of Faculties and Schools](#) and any other applicable policies and procedures of Queen's University and Smith School of Business
2. The AIP will be familiar and make decisions in accordance with the processes, considerations, and jurisdiction of the AI Panel/Lead in the Procedures
3. When Queen's University policies and procedures are changed or updated, the AIP will act and make decisions in accordance with the updated policies and procedures.

4.1.2 *Rules of Procedure*

1. The AI Lead (or AIP delegate) will chair investigations and appeal hearings in accordance with the Procedures
2. Two members of the AIP (normally the Chair and one other member) will conduct investigations and appeal hearings
3. The AIA will attend investigations and hearings for administrative support as directed by the AI Lead
4. All student appeal hearings will be heard in camera, meaning that they are closed to the public and, beyond written notes, will not be recorded in any form
5. The deliberations of the Panel in relation to any individual case are confidential and do not form part of the case file or record of a student matter
6. Policies and procedures related to appeals shall be interpreted liberally to facilitate the just, expeditious, and cost-effective determination of every proceeding on its merits
7. The AI Lead (or AIP delegate) may issue such supplementary rules of procedures as may be necessary to govern the conduct of the investigation or appeal.

4.2 Appeals of AIP Decisions

4.2.1 A student may appeal an AIP's finding of departure from academic integrity, imposition of a remedy or sanction, or both

4.2.2 The grounds for appeal of academic integrity decisions, as set out in the Procedures, include:

1. A breach of procedural fairness
2. That the decision-maker acted without, or exceeded their, jurisdiction

4.2.3 Appeals of decisions of the Academic Integrity Panel or Academic Integrity Lead are made to the Smith Academic Appeals Committee for Smith School of Business students, and to the student's home faculty for non-Smith School of Business students.

5. Reporting and Accountability

5.1 Reporting on AIP Activities

- 5.1.1 The AIA will report academic integrity decisions as required by Senate in the Procedures
- 5.1.2 The AI Lead will report annually to the Smith Faculty Board on the activities of the AIP, including case numbers and other academic integrity initiatives.

6. Record Keeping

6.1 Records shall be kept by the Academic Integrity Administrator as follows:

- 6.1.1 The AIA will maintain a record of AIP meeting Minutes
- 6.1.2 In keeping with the Procedures, the AIA will ensure that Level 2 findings are included in the official student file
- 6.1.3 The AIA will securely maintain a record of Level 1 and 2 findings in the Dean's Office for the length of time set out by the Procedures.