

Policy Title: Academic Integrity Policy

Policy ID: 2-201

Approved by: Vice President Academic

Executive(s) Responsible: Vice President Academic

Administrator(s) Responsible: Academic Director(s); Program Manager(s); Quality Assurance Manager

Revision Date: May 10, 2024

Effective Date: July 2, 2024

Next Review Date: July 2, 2029

Background and Scope

Treas Institute is committed to fostering authentic and ethical academic engagement throughout a student's course of study. The College strictly prohibits academic misconduct, but also provide scaffolded learning opportunities for students who may be unfamiliar with the concept and details of academic integrity.

Students, staff and faculty are expected to hold each other accountable to the principles outlined in this policy. Faculty are expected to report gross acts of academic misconduct and exercise their judgment on whether one sanction or another is appropriate. This policy applies to all active students and staff at The College, regardless of their program or year of study. It is designed to ensure a fair and ethical academic environment for all.

Definitions

Academic Misconduct refers to a breach of ethical or institutional standards within an educational setting. It encompasses a range of actions that undermine the integrity and fairness of the learning process and the evaluation of a student's academic performance. It includes, but is not limited to, plagiarism, cheating, fabrication, collusion, forgery, violation of exam rules, falsifying documents or identity.

Artificial Intelligence (AI): Refers to the capacity of a technology which can perform tasks commonly associated with naturally intelligent beings.

Sanctions: An academic penalty or educational requirement applied to the person(s) involved in an academic misconduct.

Types of academic misconduct include but are not limited to:

- Cheating

- Consulting resources for assistance during an assessment that explicitly prohibits this.
- Copying the work of another student during an assessment.
- Plagiarism
 - Intentionally presenting another's work as one's own creation
 - Claiming research, data and conclusions made by others as own's own
 - Using key insights from sources to advance one's own work without proper attribution.
- Improper Citation
 - Failing to cite key details of a source of information used to complete an assessment. Unless otherwise stated, students should follow APA 7th edition writing and citation guidelines.
- Misrepresentation
 - Claiming to be someone else to complete an assessment on another student's behalf. Both the impersonator and the student are subject under this policy.
 - Forging documents (for example, student IDs) to impersonate or access physical or digital resources.
- Unauthorized collaboration
 - Working with others to complete assessments that are explicitly individual and meant to be completed alone.
 - Consulting persons outside of one's assigned team during group work or receiving their aid unless permitted by the faculty.
- Sabotage
 - Hindering other students' work by damaging, altering or destroying their submissions or hampering their ability to participate in assessments.
 - Taking actions to delay or prevent examinations or other assessments digitally or physically.
- Data manipulation
 - Altering data or presenting data in bad faith to promote an alternative narrative or to support arguments/conclusions
 - Adjusting data or its representation/visualization to make it seem there are trends or conclusions to be drawn that are not actually present.
- Aiding or facilitating academic misconduct
 - Taking actions to aid or abet activity which is easily interpreted as academic misconduct.
 - Manipulating others to act on one's behalf to distance oneself from academic misconduct, which one benefits from.
- Unethical Use of Artificial Intelligence
 - Using artificial intelligence in a course without the faculty's explicit permission.
 - Not citing the use of artificial intelligence in creating work submitted for credit.
 - Not fact-checking research generated using artificial intelligence.
 - The submission of work written entirely or substantially by artificial intelligence.

- The Academic Integrity Procedure is regularly updated with recommendations on AI detection tools for faculty to employ in assessing student work.

Purpose of the Policy

This policy promotes and upholds ethical standards in academic settings by setting clear expectations and ensuring that all students are assessed fairly based on their own work and abilities. By establishing standards for academic conduct, the policy fosters a culture where honesty and integrity are valued and practiced.

This policy also establishes the consequences for violating the principles of academic integrity and outlines the reasoning behind these consequences. It clarifies what is expected of students, staff, and faculty regarding academic conduct.

Policy Statements

1. Trebas Institute is committed to educating its students, faculty, and staff regarding the principles of academic integrity as well as the consequences of straying from these principles
2. Students must always adhere to the principles of academic integrity.
 - 2.1. Students who lack clarity about academic integrity and the consequences of misconduct are expected to seek additional information.
3. Sanctions for academic misconduct will be assigned in proportion to the severity and intent of the act, as detailed in the Academic Integrity Procedure. In general, academic misconduct is scaffolded into 4 levels of severity.
 - 3.1. **Minor** misconduct (type 1)
 - 3.1.1. Academic misconduct that affects a small (<5%) assessment and does not impact or involve other members of the class or college community.
 - 3.1.2. Repeated instances of unintentional misuse of sources, which indicate no effort to learn best practices in source citation and research.
 - 3.2. **Moderate** misconduct (type 2)
 - 3.2.1. Reserved for academic misconduct that affects a large assessment (>5%) or that impacts other students or the college community.

- 3.2.2. Academic misconduct during mid-term or final examinations always constitutes Type 2 misconduct.
 - 3.2.3. Repetition of Type 1 misconduct.
 - 3.2.4. Mandatory sanction(s) for type 2 misconduct:
- 3.3. **Major** misconduct (type 3)
- 3.3.1. Typically reserved for serious academic misconduct which significantly impacts other students or the college community.
 - 3.3.2. Sabotage and misrepresentation always constitute type 3 misconduct.
 - 3.3.3. Repetition of type 2 misconduct.
- 3.4. **Severe** misconduct (type 4)
- 3.4.1. Typically reserved for the most extreme academic misconduct. This could include theft of college materials, destruction of property, sabotage or the forgery of student identification.
 - 3.4.2. Repetition of type 3 misconduct
4. Faculty have the right and responsibility to interpret suspected academic misconduct in a way that is appropriate for their students and the course environment.
- 4.1. Faculty should consider leniency for students to practice academic integrity and learn from their mistakes provided that:
 - 4.1.1. An observed misconduct is minor in nature
 - 4.1.2. The student is early in their studies or otherwise new to the discipline/activity
 - 4.1.3. The student has expressed remorse, a desire to learn or a willingness to improve.
 - 4.2. Faculty must have sound reasoning and verifiable evidence to report academic misconduct of types 2 and above.
 - 4.2.1. Examples of verifiable evidence include but are not limited to cheat sheets, witnesses, camera footage and digital access/activity reports.
 - 4.3. Faculty are encouraged to consult the academic integrity procedure, examination guidelines, and their program manager for more information on reporting instances of academic misconduct.

5. Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI)’s Impact on Academic Integrity continually evolves and so too should the college’s stance on its use in an educational setting.

5.1. Faculty, staff, and students should consult The College’s AI guidelines for information regarding expectations for them. The College is committed to updating these guidelines as technologies and industry trends develop.

5.2. Faculty reserve the right to decide whether artificial intelligence is acceptable in their classes. Students must adhere to their faculty’s expectations.

6. Academic Staff Must Report and Record Academic Misconduct

6.1. Faculty must report instances of academic misconduct of types 2 and above.

6.2. Please refer to the academic integrity procedure for the steps involved in reporting and recording academic misconduct.

Related Legislation

- Private Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (PIPEDA)
- Ontario Career Colleges Act, 2005

Document History

Date	Approval/Review/Key Change(s)
March 2024	Reviewed by Katy Edge
May 2024	Reviewed and changed by Arnab Banerjee
July 2024	Revision led by GUS academic excellence