

<b>Policy Name:</b>	Academic Integrity Policy		
<b>Policy No.</b>	3.5	<b>Approval Authority:</b>	NSCAD Senior Management and Senate, jointly
<b>Volume</b>	3. Office of Academic Affairs and Research	<b>Responsible Party:</b>	Vice-President, (Academic & Research) and Provost
<b>Chapter</b>	5. Academic Integrity Policy	<b>Responsible Office:</b>	Office of Academic Affairs and Research
<b>Originally Issued:</b>	March 7, 2011	<b>Revisions:</b>	September 2021

### Policy Statement

NSCAD University endorses the principles and values of academic integrity in accordance with the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI), a consortium of over 200 colleges and universities around the world. Academic integrity is “a commitment, even in the face of adversity, to five fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. From these values flow principles of behaviour that enable academic communities to translate ideals into action. An academic community flourishes when its members are committed to the five fundamental values.” (ICAI, Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity, 2021.)

As ethical standards are vital to the integrity of a post-secondary education and reflect on the value of one’s earned education, NSCAD University is committed to fostering and maintaining academic integrity and honesty within its university community. The intention of this policy is to outline appropriate, effective and fair responses to allegations of academic and artistic misconduct. As such, all members of the NSCAD community, regardless of their chosen discipline, are expected to be familiar with this policy and to behave in a manner in keeping with the principles and values of both academic and artistic honesty. The Dean, with the assistance of the Academic Integrity Officer, is responsible for maintaining and overseeing this policy and for promoting awareness relating to all academic and artistic standards at NSCAD. This policy refers to all academic and artistic work produced by members of the University community. To preserve the integrity and value of NSCAD University degrees, all allegations of breaches of academic honesty will be responded to with diligence, appropriateness, and fairness.

### Reason for Policy

As all members of the NSCAD University community are required to comply with the highest standards of academic and artistic practices, the purpose of this policy is to promote and outline the procedures required for the appropriate acknowledgement, investigation, management of all allegations of academic and artistic dishonesty.

**Policy Applies to**

All members of the NSCAD University community; including but not limited to faculty, staff, administration, and students.

**Who Should Read this Policy:**

All members of the University community

**Contacts Approval Authority:**

Provost and Senate, jointly: Office of Academic Affairs and Research, 902-494-8125, [academicaffairs@nscad.ca](mailto:academicaffairs@nscad.ca),

<https://navigator.nscad.ca/wordpress/home/academicsadministration/office-of-academic-affairs-research/>

**Definitions:**

**Academic Dishonesty** Any dishonest act, in violation of principles of Academic Integrity, committed by someone in the University community. A dishonest act is any academic, scholarly, artistic, design or research activity wherein plagiarism, fabrication, cheating or sabotage has occurred. This applies to not only students, but to everyone in the University community.

**Academic Integrity** A commitment, even in the face of adversity, to five fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. From these values flow principles of behaviour that enable academic communities to translate ideals into action (ICAI, Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity, 2021.)

**Appropriation** Contemporary artists often “quote”, “sample” or “appropriate” images/sound/text from visual artists, writers, musicians, archives or pop-culture or social media sources. When appropriation is present, it must adhere to the ethical and legal guidelines indicated on the NSCAD Library's copyright guide to fair dealing and appropriation in art:

<https://guides.nscad.ca/copyrightpages/fairdealing>

<https://guides.nscad.ca/copyrightpages/appropriation>

Canadian and international copyright laws set boundaries for the allowable use of this material and students can consult with the University Librarian regarding current copyright legislation. Students should always consult with their instructors or librarians if they have any concerns about whether such "appropriation" constitutes plagiarism or violates principles of academic or intellectual integrity.

**Bad Faith:**

Allegations that are frivolous, vexatious or deliberately and maliciously invented. This is not to be confused with an allegation of a breach of academic integrity made in good faith that is found to be without merit. It is a violation of this policy for any person to make an allegation in bad faith or to influence a procedure under this policy in bad faith. A complainant who is found to

have made a bad faith allegation may be up for disciplinary action as outlined by University procedures.

- Cheating:** Attempting to gain advantage or assistance while engaging in any academic or artistic exercise (such as a test or examination), without permission or acknowledgement.
- Complainant:** The person making the allegation of academic dishonesty. This may be any member of the University Community.
- Fabrication:** The falsification of any data, sources, information, citations or findings produced in an academic or artistic exercise.
- NSCAD Community:** Any person that has a substantial connection to NSCAD University and may include someone who teaches, conducts research, studies or works at NSCAD University, including but not limited to:
1. Full or part time academic staff.
  2. Division Chairs and Program Directors.
  3. Full, part time, continuing, temporary, contract or administrative staff, including senior administration and human resource representatives.
  4. NSCAD University Board of Governors
  5. Students
- Plagiarism:** A form of cheating wherein someone adopts, copies or reproduces someone else's art, scholarly work, research, ideas, words or music, as if it is their own without giving proper acknowledgement of the source, or without receiving permission to use the work if necessary.
- Respondent:** The person to which the allegation of academic dishonesty is directed. This may be any member of the University Community
- Sabotage:** Deliberately destroying, obstructing, inhibiting or damaging something in order to prevent others from completing their work in any academic or artistic exercise.

## The Policy

### 1. Outlining Breaches of Academic Integrity

- 1.1.** For the purposes of this policy, a breach of academic integrity means, but is not limited to, all or any academic, scholarly, artistic and research dishonesty wherein plagiarism, fabrication, cheating or sabotage has occurred. This applies to not only students, but to everyone in the University community.
- 1.2.** For the purposes of this policy, plagiarism includes but is not limited to:
- 1.2.1.** Copying, adopting, or reproducing verbatim the work or portions of the work of another without providing the source of the work, or where it does not adhere to this policy's definition of Appropriation.
  - 1.2.2.** Sources of plagiarism include, but are not limited to, another's words, phrases, original ideas, recordings, images, various digital file formats and data.  
Plagiarized material may be drawn from many sources including, but not limited to websites, databases and other online sources, online term papers, books, articles, image

libraries, email, lectures, or encyclopedias (including online encyclopedias). Refer to NSCAD LibGuides Writing and Citing: <https://guides.nscad.ca/libraryhome/writing> and <https://guides.nscad.ca/copyrightpages>

- 1.2.3. Paraphrasing the work of another or taking an original idea of another and presenting it as one's own work, without providing the source of the work or the idea. This includes but is not limited to:
    - 1.2.3.1. Submitting the work of another person as your own;
    - 1.2.3.2. Writing papers or doing studio projects for another person or allowing them to submit your work as their own;
    - 1.2.3.3. Fabricating information, data, or citations or falsifying documents.
  - 1.3. Breaches of Academic Integrity may take forms other than Plagiarism as defined above, including but not limited to the following (also refer to Appendix A):
    - 1.3.1. Submission of one piece of work in satisfaction of more than one assignment without prior informed consent;
    - 1.3.2. The unauthorized writing of an examination or test for someone else;
    - 1.3.3. The falsification of information, data, or citations in any academic work;
    - 1.3.4. Attempting to obtain or accepting assistance from any other unauthorized person during an examination or test, communicating electronically, or using an electronic communication device with someone for that purpose;
    - 1.3.5. Allowing another student to copy answers during an exam or test;
    - 1.3.6. Obtaining a copy of an examination or test topic for an essay or paper without authorization;
    - 1.3.7. Copying or purchasing an assignment for submission from another student, website or other source other than the student who submits the work;
    - 1.3.8. Using or having in one's possession, materials, art, or technology that is not specifically approved by the instructor during the time one is writing an examination or test;
    - 1.3.9. Failure to give appropriate credit to collaborators, or the listing of others as collaborators who have not contributed to the work.
- 2. Role of the Academic Integrity Officer (AIO)**
- 2.1. The Provost will appoint at least one Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) per year.
  - 2.2. The AIO shall be any member that holds or has held an academic position, which the Provost, at their discretion, believes is best suited to act in the position.
  - 2.3. The AIO is responsible for leading a culture of integrity at NSCAD University, through advice, guidance and education. They are the point of contact for all allegations of breaches of academic integrity. The AIO's responsibility is to respond to all allegations in keeping with this policy and to oversee the process up to the stage of Formal Investigation, at which point the Dean oversees and responds to the allegation.
  - 2.4. When an allegation is made against a faculty member, another member of the faculty (with expertise in the area) will be appointed to assist the AIO in the initial review of the file.
  - 2.5. Breaches of academic integrity alleged against the AIO should be brought directly to the attention of the Dean, wherein the Dean will assume the role of AIO. Similarly, in instances wherein there is an allegation brought against the Dean, the allegation should be brought directly to the attention of the Provost.
  - 2.6. The AIO reports directly to the Dean and acts in the capacity of an Officer .
  - 2.7. The AIO will submit a report to the Dean of all alleged, dismissed and confirmed breaches of Academic Integrity at the end of every semester and a final report at the end of the academic year.
  - 2.8. The AIO's responsibilities are outlined below in Sections 4 to 6.

**2.9.** The AIO will keep a copy of all interviews, correspondence, meeting minutes, evidence, memoranda, reports, etc. in a password-protected file located on secure NSCAD servers for a period of seven (7) years.

**2.9.1.** The AIO will track the seven-year mark for all interviews, correspondence, meeting minutes, evidence, memoranda, reports, etc. and ensure that they are permanently deleted at that point.

**2.9.2.** When a new AIO is appointed, the outgoing AIO will transfer to the password-protected files.

### **3. Reporting Allegations of Breaches**

**3.1.** If a student complainant reports an allegation to a faculty member or Division Chair or Program Director, the faculty or Chair will inform them of the policy and refer them to the AIO.

**3.2.** If the complainant is a faculty member, they will retain the work in question and immediately report the allegation, in writing, to the appropriate Division Chair or Program Director.

**3.3.** If the complainant is a faculty member, they may, at their discretion and in consultation with the Division Chair or Program Director, choose to inform the student respondent(s) of the allegation and request a meeting with them to discuss it.

**3.3.1.** If this meeting results in the complainant withdrawing the allegation, the complainant will notify the Division Chair or Program Director of this in writing.

**3.3.2.** If this meeting does not result in a withdrawal of the allegation, the complainant will provide a written report to the AIO, as per Section 3.6 of this Policy.

**3.3.3.** If the student respondent discloses or admits to the alleged breach of academic integrity, the complainant will send a report to the AIO, as per Section 3.6 of this Policy. This report will note that the student respondent has confirmed the allegation.

**3.4.** If a complainant who is a faculty member chooses not to inform or meet with the student respondent about an allegation, the complainant will report the allegation of a potential breach of academic integrity, in writing to the AIO as per Section 3.6 of this Policy.

**3.5.** Non-faculty and non-student complainants from the NSCAD community will report allegations of a potential breach of academic integrity, in writing, to the AIO as per Sections 3.6.1 to 3.6.4 of this Policy.

**3.6.** The complainant will provide a written report of the allegation of a potential breach of academic integrity to the AIO within 14 (fourteen) business days from the date when the Division Chair or Program Director was informed as per 3.2, copied to the Division Chair or Program Director.

The report shall summarize the evidence of a suspected breach including:

**3.6.1.** The reason for the allegation;

**3.6.2.** A copy of the work alleged to be dishonest;

**3.6.3.** Any other supporting evidence that the complainant has;

**3.6.4.** An indication of whether the complainant has met with the respondent to discuss the allegation, and if so, whether the respondent has admitted to or denied the allegation.

### **4. Procedures for addressing Breaches of Academic Integrity: Preliminary Inquiry**

**4.1.** After an allegation of a potential breach of academic integrity has occurred, the AIO will conduct a preliminary inquiry into the complaint.

**4.2.** The AIO will review the allegation and the written report with respect to the standards for a breach of academic integrity as outlined in Section 1 of this policy.

**4.3.** If the respondent has admitted to the alleged breach, the AIO, in consultation with the involved faculty/ Division Chair and/or Program Director, will write a memorandum to the Dean. The memorandum will include the complainant report (as per Clause 3.6), along with any pertinent information and recommendations for appropriate action and/or penalties in reference to

Appendix A and Appendix B. The Dean will subsequently inform the respondent of action and/or penalties, with a copy sent to Chair or Director.

**4.4.** If the respondent admits guilt to the alleged breach at any time during the Informal or Formal Investigation stage, the AIO will follow the same procedures as specified in 4.3.

**4.5.** The AIO may dismiss the allegation for any of the following reasons:

- a) the allegation is outside the jurisdiction of the University;
- b) the allegation does not present facts that, if proven, would constitute a breach of academic integrity outlined in Section 1 of this policy;
- c) the allegation is frivolous, vexatious or malicious;
- d) the allegation constitutes an abuse of process;
- e) the alleged breach occurred prior to the past 24-month period; or
- f) the allegation is made by a person who is not currently member of the University community.

**4.4.1** If the AIO dismisses an allegation, they will outline the reason(s) in a memorandum to the complainant and respondent, with a copy sent to the Division Chair or Program Director.

## **5. Procedures for addressing Breaches of Academic Integrity: Informal Investigation.**

**5.1** If the findings of the Preliminary Inquiry indicate the allegation of a potential breach of academic integrity may have merit, the AIO will conduct an Informal Investigation.

**5.1.1.** If the allegation of a breach of academic integrity is made against a student in a course in which the student is currently registered, the AIO may instruct the Registrar to freeze the student's registration record pending the conclusion of the Informal Investigation. If the allegation moves to the Formal Investigation, the record will remain frozen until the conclusion of the Formal Investigation. The AIO will notify the Registrar of this conclusion.

**5.1.2.** The AIO will first inform the respondent that an allegation has been made against them and provide them a copy of the written summary report as per Clause 3.5.

**5.1.3.** The AIO will interview the complainant and respondent. The respondent is entitled to representation at this meeting, and may submit their response to the allegation to the AIO in writing within seven (7) business days of this meeting.

**5.1.4.** The AIO will examine the academic or artistic work in question along with any other evidence provided.

**5.1.5.** The AIO will interview all persons who are named by the complainant in their written report as per 3.6 or in the respondent's response to the allegation as per 5.1.3. The AIO may also request information from others within or outside the University community, including persons who are uninvolved but may possess knowledge or expertise about the matter under investigation.

**5.2.** When reviewing allegations, the AIO must determine if the allegation meets BOTH of the following:

**5.2.1.** The allegation meets the standards for a breach of academic integrity as outlined in Section 1 of this policy.

**5.2.2.** There is credible and specific potential evidence of a breach of academic integrity as per the criteria in Clause 5.2.1.

**5.3.** If the allegation does not satisfy both of these requirements, the AIO will dismiss the complaint.

**5.3.1.** The AIO will outline their reasoning for dismissing the allegation in a memorandum to the complainant and the respondent, copied to the Division Chair or Program Director.

**5.3.2.** The AIO may require, as necessary, that the complainant receive training on academic integrity. If so, this requirement will be stated in the memorandum.

- 5.4. If the allegation does satisfy both requirements as outlined in 5.2.1 and 5.2.2, the AIO will deem it necessary to move forward to a Formal Investigation. Within fourteen (14) business days of making this determination, the AIO will write a report to the Dean outlining the findings of the Informal Investigation and why these findings necessitate the move to a Formal Investigation.
- 5.5. If the findings of the Informal Investigation suggest the allegation may be made in bad faith, the AIO will notify the Dean of this in writing. The investigation of the allegation will be suspended until the Dean reviews the evidence that the allegation has been made in bad faith.
  - 5.5.1. If the Dean concludes that the allegation was not made in bad faith, the Dean will move the investigation forward to a Formal Investigation.
  - 5.5.2. If the Dean concludes that the allegation was made in bad faith, the Dean will dismiss the allegation.
  - 5.5.3. A complainant who is found to have made a bad faith allegation may be up for disciplinary action as outlined by university procedures.

## **6. Procedures for Addressing Breaches of Academic Integrity: Formal Investigation and Action**

- 6.1. The purpose of the Formal Investigation is to collect, review and analyze all relevant evidence and reports surrounding the allegation.
- 6.2. Once the AIO has submitted their report to the Dean outlining the findings of the Informal Investigation and why these findings necessitate the move to a Formal Investigation, as specified in 5.4 above, the Dean will take responsibility for overseeing the Formal Investigation.
- 6.3. To initiate a Formal Investigation, the Dean will appoint an ad hoc Investigation Committee to carry out the investigation. This will include at least two (2) individuals, with at least one individual having expertise in the subject in question. The Dean will not sit on this committee.
  - 6.3.1. The Investigation Committee should not include any individual who may be considered to have a conflict of interest, as per NSCAD's Conflict of Interest Policy, and/or has had any prior involvement with the claimant's or respondent's academic or artistic work.
  - 6.3.2. The Dean will inform the respondent, in writing, that the matter has been moved to a Formal Investigation. This notification will also outline the membership of the Investigation Committee and timelines. The respondent may raise concerns or objections about the committee members within three (3) business days of notification, and the Dean must promptly take this into consideration on the basis of conflict of interest as per NSCAD's Conflict of Interest Policy.
  - 6.3.3. Where determined as necessary by the Dean, the Investigation Committee may review prior academic, artistic, or research work by the respondent for instances of breaches of academic integrity.
  - 6.3.4. The Investigation Committee will make every effort to maintain the confidentiality of all materials and evidence related to the inquiry.
  - 6.3.5. The identities of parties related to the Investigation (complainant and respondent) and its findings shall not be disclosed by the members of the Investigation Committee, unless absolutely necessary to carry out the investigation.
  - 6.3.6. However, the Investigation Committee will secure and be given ample opportunity to inspect all documents and evidence it believes is relevant and required to conduct a full and complete investigation, including but not limited to notebooks, data, sketchbooks, assignments and any other scholarly or artistic material.
- 6.4. As the Formal Investigation will serve as the factual basis for any and all disciplinary proceedings, the Investigation Committee must act in an impartial and unbiased manner.
- 6.5. All persons called to participate within the investigation are expected to participate honestly and fully.

- 6.6. The Investigation Committee will make every effort to interview the respondent(s) and complainant(s), as well as any parties named in the complainant's report as per 3.6 or the respondent's response as per 5.1.3.
- 6.7. The Investigation Committee, where necessary, may call witnesses from within or outside of the NSCAD University community whom it believes may have expertise or knowledge about the matters under investigation.
- 6.8. In keeping with the principles outlined in this policy, the respondent has the right to the following:
- 6.9. The right to have a written statement with the allegations outlined in detail before the beginning of the formal investigation.
  - 6.9.1. The right to a full and fair opportunity to defend themselves against the allegations. This includes allowing the respondent to provide evidence and call witnesses that may assist their case.
  - 6.9.2. The right to counsel, and to be accompanied by counsel and/or a representative from any established faculty, student or trade union of which the complainant or respondent is a member, when appearing in front of the Investigation Committee.
  - 6.9.3. The right to a finding determined by majority vote, using evidence in a fair and unbiased manner.
  - 6.9.4. The right to respond with a statement to the final conclusion of the investigation within ten (10) calendar days of receiving a written copy of the report. This statement can include any clarifications or corrections that the respondent feels is necessary to make about the Investigation Committee's final report. The statement must be taken into consideration by the Dean when determining appropriate action.
- 6.10. The Investigation Committee must complete their investigation within one hundred and twenty (120) calendar days from the date that the committee is appointed. If the investigation cannot be completed within this time frame, the Investigation Committee must report to the Dean detailing an acceptable timeline to which the investigation can be completed. The Dean will approve any extensions they deem to be warranted.

## 7. Completion of Formal Investigation

- 7.1 Once the Investigation Committee has completed its formal investigation, it must submit a written report to the Dean. The written report must include:
  - 7.1.1 A statement of the finding of facts and the conclusions drawn from those facts.
  - 7.1.2 A summary of the evidence in which the Investigation Committee relied upon to make its conclusion about the allegation of academic dishonesty.
  - 7.1.3 In the case of student respondents, any recommendations that the Investigation Committee has as to what actions should be taken by the Dean in regard to Appendix A and Appendix B.
  - 7.1.4 In the case of a faculty respondent, and the Investigation Committee finds the faculty member to have breached Academic Integrity as defined in this policy, the Investigation Committee will submit its report to the Dean as per Sections 7.1.1 and 7.1.2. The Dean, in consultation with the Vice-President, Academic and Research, will determine the appropriate actions to be taken.
- 7.2 A copy of the written report must also be provided to the respondent by e-mail with a read receipt.
- 7.3 The respondent has the right to provide any clarifications or concerns surrounding the written report to the Dean within ten (10) business days of receiving the report.
- 7.4 The Dean must review the Investigation Committee's report, conclusions, and recommendations as well as the respondent's corrections and clarifications as outlined in Sections 7.1 and 7.3.



- 7.5** If the Dean finds the report to be lacking in any significant way, the Dean may appoint a new committee or may ask the standing Investigation Committee to supplement their report.
- 7.6** The Dean must accept the Investigation Committee's findings of fact and conclusions of the report, once supplemented.
- 7.7** If the Investigation Committee has concluded that no breach of academic integrity has occurred or that there is not enough evidence to substantiate the allegations, the Dean will notify the respondent and complainant of this conclusion in writing, with a copy to the AIO, Division Chair, Program Director or any other affected individuals.
- 7.8** If allegations are concluded to have been made in bad faith by the complainant, the complainant may be up for disciplinary action as outlined by University procedures.
- 7.9** If the Investigation Committee has concluded that a breach in academic integrity has occurred, the Dean will determine what appropriate actions, including disciplinary action, they will take or recommend to the Provost, in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix A and Appendix B.
- 7.9.1** If the complainant to the allegation was a faculty member, the Dean may, when and where it is possible, consult with the faculty member, Division Chair or Program Director as to the appropriate action to be taken.
- 7.10** At the conclusion that the allegation is substantiated by evidence, the Dean will notify the respondent, in writing, of the decision for the action, with a copy to the AIO, the complainant, Division Chair, Program Director or any other affected individuals.
- 8. Appealing the Decision**
- 8.1.** Any person who has been determined to have committed a breach of academic integrity who believes that the allegations were improperly investigated and/or reviewed may appeal, in writing, to the Provost.
- 8.2.** Any appeal must be made within thirty (30) calendar days of receiving the final report from the Dean.
- 8.3.** In considering an appeal, the Provost must determine whether the proper procedures and standards were executed throughout the review of the allegation.
-

## NSCAD Academic Integrity Policy Appendices

### Appendix A

#### Sanctions Appropriate to Types of Academic Integrity Breaches<sup>1</sup>

NSCAD University recognizes that the promotion and adherence to principles of Academic Integrity is of the utmost importance and is a vital component of education for all NSCAD community members. In order to properly assess breaches of Academic Integrity, four Types/Stages according to severity or degree have been outlined. Each Type/Stage is defined and includes a list of possible breach appropriate sanctions. These lists are not prescriptive, but suggestive: final decisions about appropriate sanctions, are guided by the AI Officer, and ultimately the responsibility of the Dean.

#### **Type 1 Breaches of Academic Integrity:**

Type 1 breach of Academic Integrity involves situations in which the breach is not extensive, stems from a misunderstanding or incomplete understanding of research, visual documentation and citation practices, and/or occurs on a minor portion of an assignment. Examples include:

- Failing to acknowledge working with another person on a studio project or other homework assignment. Asking another person (excluding Writing Centre tutors) to make substantial corrections or alterations to improve an assignment, without prior consent from the instructor.
- Submitting material partially developed for another course without the prior consent of all instructors.
- Failing to cite or give proper acknowledgment to textual, visual or any other sources in an extremely limited section of an assignment. Examples of this might include:
  - A short quotation or paraphrase (no more than 1-2 sentences) without direct citation in the text
  - Misplacement of citation information, where sources are included in the Works Cited or References list, but citations are not made appropriately in the text, or where citations are placed at the end of a paragraph rather than immediately following a direct quotation or paraphrase
  - A single image without formal attribution.

One or more of these sanctions may be chosen for Type 1 Breach:

- Completion of an online module to learn about Academic Integrity, source use and citation.
- Revision and resubmission of the assignment, with or without a grade reduction.
- A make-up assignment on a relevant topic.
- A reduction in the grade of the assignment.

The AIO will refer/report all Type 1 breaches of Academic Integrity cases to the Dean and keep a record of them. Any subsequent breach of Academic Integrity by an individual respondent is expected to be escalated to Type 2 or higher.

<sup>1</sup>Cited with permission from OCAD University Policy on Academic Misconduct Policy.

**Type 2 Breaches of Academic Integrity:**

Type 2 breaches of Academic Integrity are characterized by dishonesty of a more serious nature, or which affects a more significant aspect or portion of the course work. Examples include:

- Committing Type 1 breach after restorative practices have been completed for previous Type 1 breaches of Academic Integrity incidences.
- Copying directly or paraphrasing (to a substantial extent) without acknowledging the textual source immediately following the copy or paraphrase. An example here would be copying or paraphrasing a whole paragraph or multiple sentences of text with no direct citation (though the source may be included in the reference list.)
- Copying visual imagery, forms, designs, concepts, or other artistic representations without acknowledging the source, unless explicitly authorized by the instructor or in the case of demonstrably intentional artistic appropriation.
- In part or fully presenting the work of another as one's own (for minor assignments).
- Allowing another student to copy, borrow or submit an individual student's own work.
- Submitting the same work or major portions thereof to satisfy the requirements of more than one course or assignment without permission from the instructors of the courses
- Receiving assistance from others, such as private tutors, editors, language translators (including translation software), researchers, technical art/design producers, computer programmers, fellow students, or other help that constitutes an essential element in the task, without acknowledging such assistance.
- Collaborating or seeking assistance on a take-home exam without explicit permission from the instructor.

The recommended sanctions for Type 2 breaches of Academic Integrity may include any or all of the following:

- Mandatory completion of an online module to learn about Academic Integrity, source use and citation.
- A significant reduction in the grade of the assignment.
- A grade of zero on the assignment.
- A grade of zero on the assignment and a consequent reduction in the final course grade equivalent to the value of the assignment.

The AIO will report all Type 2 breaches of Academic Integrity cases, including changes to grades if applicable, to the Dean and keep a record of them. Any subsequent similar breaches of Academic Integrity by an individual respondent is expected to be escalated to Type 3 or higher. Student may be placed on probation, with the instance recorded on the transcript.

**Type 3 Breaches of Academic Integrity:**

Type 3 breaches of Academic Integrity entail dishonesty that affects a major or essential portion of work done to meet course requirements and/or involves premeditation; or is preceded by one or more Type 2 violations. Examples include:

- Plagiarizing major portions of a written or visual assignment.

- In part or fully presenting the work of another as one's own, for major assignments.
- Using a purchased writing assignment, essay or other materials; this can include assignments developed using paid tutors where the contribution from the tutor cannot be distinguished from the respondent's work, particularly if this is the second violation of this type.
- Fabricating data or inventing or deliberately altering material (for example, citing sources that do not exist). Using unethical or improper means of acquiring data.
- Copying on examinations.
- Sabotaging or destroying another student's work in an effort to prevent them from completing an assignment.
- Facilitating copying during an examination.
- Using prohibited materials, e.g., books, notes, calculators, or other electronic devices during an examination. Collaborating before an examination to develop methods of exchanging information during an examination and implementation thereof.
- Altering examinations for the purposes of re-grading.
- Acquiring and/or distributing an examination from unauthorized sources prior to the examination.

The normal sanction to be sought for all Type 3 violations or repeated Type 2 violations is a minimum of one semester suspension from the University and a failing grade for the course. A record of the violation and sanction(s) should also be made by the AIO. Repeated Type 3 violation is immediately escalated to Type 4.

#### **Type 4 Breaches of Academic Integrity:**

Type 4 breaches of Academic Integrity represent the most serious breach of Academic Integrity.

Examples include:

- All breaches of Academic Integrity committed after return from suspension for previous breaches of Academic Integrity.
- Breaches of Academic Integrity constituting criminal activity (such as forging a grade form, stealing an examination from an instructor or from a university office, or falsifying a transcript).
- Having a substitute take a class, complete an assignment, take an examination, etc., taking a class, completing an assignment, or taking an examination for someone else.
- Fabrication of evidence, falsification of data, quoting directly or paraphrasing without acknowledging the source, and/or presenting the ideas or technical work of another as one's own within a graduate thesis, in scholarly articles submitted to refereed journals, or in other work represented as one's own as a graduate student.

The normal sanction for all Type 4 breaches of Academic Integrity and a repeat infraction at Type 3 is expulsion from the University. A record of this expulsion will be recorded on the student's transcript

## Appendix B

### NSCAD's Plan for Educational and Restorative Resources and Procedures

NSCAD is firmly committed to a culture of ethical behaviour, trust, honesty and responsibility.

Traditional methods of addressing breaches of academic integrity in post-secondary institutions have involved punitive measures and sanctions, but research indicates that this approach may not lead to any reduction in cases. Best practice in Academic Integrity policies have utilised restorative justice principles as a more proactive and positive approach which can help students understand the importance of academic honesty and learn from their experience. Students who have accepted responsibility for a breach of academic integrity can gain a stronger understanding of what constitutes academic dishonesty and its negative impact on university life, through an educational or training program delivered by the Academic Integrity Officer. Students will gain insight into the importance of academic integrity, of creating trust in the learning community, and acquire resources and measures to support their commitment to integrity and honesty in the classroom and beyond.

As defined by [the International Institute for Restorative Practices](#), restorative practices aim to improve behaviour, reduce offenses, build community by restoring relationships.

Any student who is reported for scholastic dishonesty, accepts responsibility for their actions, has no prior incident of scholastic dishonesty, and is not subject to additional sanctions (such as probation, suspension, or dismissal) is eligible to participate in the restorative practice program. Confidentiality of the student will be respected.

The AIO will develop a restorative practice program which may include dialogue, educational videos and programs, action plans and other measures, including resources being provided from the Writing Centre and Library.

-