



MD Program

Terms of Reference, for Implementing Queen's Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures

Academic Integrity Lead and Administrator

Student Conduct Component: Policy # SC-06 v2

Supersedes & Replaces: All prior versions of the MD Program Academic Integrity Policy

Approved by MD-PEC: September 24, 2026

Approved by SOMAC: October 20, 2026

Approved by Faculty Board: pending

Revision:

Effective Date: September 24, 2026

1. Mandate

- 1.1. 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 authority for academic integrity to the Senate Committee on Academic Development and Procedures ("SCADP"). SCADP has developed the *Queen's Academic Integrity Policy* and the *Queen's Academic Integrity Procedures: Requirements of Faculties and Schools* ("the Procedures"), which create responsibilities for faculties and schools to implement policies and practices consistent with those documents.
- 1.2. In the MD Program, academic integrity matters are the responsibility of the Academic Integrity Lead ("AI Lead"), supported by the Academic Integrity Administrator ("AI Administrator"). The AI Lead and AI Administrator carry out their responsibilities in accordance with the Queen's Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures.
- 1.3. Academic integrity matters include the investigation and adjudication of individual student cases; adherence to Senate policies and procedures; and participation in academic integrity promotion and education.
- 1.4. The MD Program is committed to the core values of academic integrity – honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage – and recognizes that these values are integral not only to the academic program but to the professional standards expected of those entering the medical profession.

2. Jurisdiction and Scope

- 2.1. These Terms of Reference apply to departures from academic integrity arising from the MD Program at Queen's University.
- 2.2. These Terms of Reference are to be read in conjunction with the Queen's Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures. Consistent with Section 1.1 of the Queen's Academic Integrity Procedures, where there

are discrepancies between these Terms of Reference and the Procedures, the Procedures take precedence.

- 2.3. Certain conduct that constitutes a departure from academic integrity may also raise concerns under the *MD Program Student Professionalism Policy*. In such cases, students may be subject to consequences under both the academic integrity procedures and the *MD Program Student Professionalism Policy*. The relationship between these two sets of policies is described in Section 5 of these Terms of Reference.

2.4. *External Regulatory Reporting Requirements*

2.4.1. Students, faculty, and administrators in the MD Program should be aware that external agencies and partners such as provincial and territorial physician regulating bodies, affiliated hospitals, affiliated practices, health care institutions and related agencies in and with which students work and learn, may have reporting requirements with respect to academic integrity. There are also reporting requirements within the Medical Student Performance Report (MSPR) submitted to the Canadian Residency Matching Service (CaRMS) for application to Post Graduate Residency Training in Canada. The MSPR is a standardized template for all Canadian Medical Schools. These requirements may apply particularly in cases involving serious departures from academic integrity that raise concerns about a student's competence or capacity in a clinical or educational setting; that involve conduct falling below the professional and ethical standards expected of those entering the medical profession in interactions with patients, their families, supervisors, or colleagues; or that otherwise involve conduct that raises questions about the student's fitness to practice medicine.

2.4.2. Nothing in these Terms of Reference or in the Procedures limits or overrides the obligations of the MD Program or its administrators to comply with applicable external regulatory reporting requirements.

3. Roles and Responsibilities

3.1. *Academic Integrity Lead*

3.1.1. The Associate Dean, MD Program is the Academic Integrity Lead for the MD Program. The AI Lead carries out responsibilities as required by the Procedures, including:

- a. Reviewing evidence referred by Course Directors and determining whether sufficient evidence exists to continue with an investigation of a possible departure from academic integrity;
- b. Carrying out all investigation, finding, sanctioning, and student notification responsibilities following referral from a Course Director, in accordance with Sections 3.2 through 3.5 of the Procedures;
- c. Consulting with the Vice Provost (Teaching & Learning) when a requirement to withdraw from the University is under consideration, in accordance with Section 3.4.3.2 of the Procedures;
- d. Assessing, following the conclusion of an AI investigation, whether any aspect of the conduct also raises concerns under the *MD Program Student Professionalism Policy*, in accordance with Section 5 of these Terms of Reference;

- e. Supporting educational initiatives related to academic integrity for students and Course Directors

3.1.2. If, for any reason — including but not limited to conflict of interest, leave, or capacity — the Associate Dean, MD Program is unable to carry out their responsibilities as AI Lead, the Associate Dean, MD Program (or their designate) will identify an appropriate alternate decisionmaker who will fulfil the role of AI Lead.; and

3.2. *Academic Integrity Administrator*

3.2.1. The Associate Dean, MD Program will appoint an Academic Integrity Administrator. The AI Administrator carries out responsibilities as required by the Procedures, including:

- a. Providing information, advice, guidance, and resources to Course Directors and program staff regarding academic integrity processes;
- b. Providing information and resources to students;
- c. Ensuring the implementation of sanctions once all avenues of appeal have been exhausted;
- d. Maintaining academic integrity records in accordance with Section 1.7 of the Procedures and the MD Program Records Policy;
- e. Reporting academic integrity matters annually as required under Section 1.8 of the Procedures; and
- f. Scheduling academic integrity proceedings and maintaining records thereof.

4. **Investigation Process**

4.1. *Role of Course Directors*

- 4.1.1. For the purposes of these Terms of Reference and the Procedures, Course Directors are considered the instructors of record for courses in the MD Program.
- 4.1.2. Course Directors are responsible for the initial collection of evidence in cases of possible departure from academic integrity, consistent with Section 3.1.2 of the Procedures. Course Directors may consult with the AI Administrator and/or AI Lead during this initial stage.
- 4.1.3. If, following the initial collection of evidence, a Course Director determines that there is insufficient evidence to continue with an investigation, the case will be dismissed in accordance with Section 3.1.4 of the Procedures. All documents related to the case must be destroyed, and the student shall not be informed of the investigation.
- 4.1.4. When a Course Director has assembled sufficient evidence to indicate there may have been a departure from academic integrity, they shall submit all evidence to the AI Lead, who will assume responsibility for all subsequent steps in the process. The Course Director will not retain any documentation. If new evidence arises later, the Course Director will submit that evidence to the AI Lead and will not retain any documentation.

4.2. *Role of the AI Lead*

- 4.2.1. Upon receiving a referral from a Course Director, the AI Lead will review the documentation and carry out all subsequent steps in the investigation in accordance with Sections 3.2 through 3.5 of the Procedures.

5. Relationship with the MD Program Student Professionalism Policy

5.1. General Principle

- 5.1.1. Certain conduct that constitutes a departure from academic integrity may also raise concerns under the *MD Program Student Professionalism Policy* ("the Professionalism Policy"). Where this occurs, students may face consequences under both the Academic Integrity process and the Professionalism Policy. These Terms of Reference govern only the academic integrity aspects of such conduct.
- 5.1.2. The Associate Dean, MD Program serves as both the AI Lead under these Terms of Reference and as the intake point for professionalism concerns under the Professionalism Policy. This enables coordinated handling of cases that engage both policies without duplicating the investigative process.

5.2. Sequencing

- 5.2.1. Where conduct raises concerns under both these Terms of Reference and the Professionalism Policy, the AI investigation will proceed and reach its outcome – whether there is a finding or dismissal – before any referral to the Professionalism Committee Panel commences. This sequencing ensures that the Panel can rely on the factual findings of the AI investigation as conclusive evidence in accordance with the Student Professionalism Policy. The handling of Level I professionalism concerns, which do not involve Panel proceedings, is addressed separately in Section 5.2.2.a
- 5.2.2. The AI Lead will assess whether the conduct may also raise professionalism concerns at the outset of the AI investigation. Where the AI Lead identifies potential professionalism concerns at that stage, the student will be informed in writing at the time the NOI is issued. This notification does not constitute a formal finding or determination under the Professionalism Policy; it ensures that the student has complete information about the potential range of implications of the conduct under review.
 - a. Where the AI Lead identifies at the outset that the conduct may warrant treatment as a Level I professionalism concern, the NOI will reflect this and the AI investigation meeting will be structured to provide the student with the opportunity to respond to both the AI concern and the potential Level I professionalism concern simultaneously. Because Level I professionalism concerns are addressed directly by the Associate Dean without Panel involvement, no separate professionalism meeting is required. Where the AI Lead makes a finding following that meeting and determines that the conduct warrants treatment as a Level I professionalism concern, the AI Lead shall make a final determination on sanction for both the departure from academic integrity and the professionalism concern, taking into account the definition and principles associated with Level I concerns as set out in the Student Professionalism Policy. The

AI sanction and the Level I professionalism outcome will be communicated to the student simultaneously.

- b. Where the AI Lead has made a finding that a departure from academic integrity has occurred, and the AI Lead determines that the conduct raises professionalism concerns that may not be appropriately addressed as a Level I concern, the AI Lead will formally refer the matter to the MD Program Professionalism Committee in accordance with the Student Professionalism Policy. The student will receive written notice of the referral and of the AI finding at that time and will be advised that the AI sanction will be determined and communicated simultaneously with the professionalism outcome once the Professionalism Committee process is complete. The student will have the opportunity to respond to the professionalism aspects of the concern before the Panel in accordance with the Professionalism Policy. The Professionalism Committee shall make a recommendation to the Associate Dean of the MD Program regarding the classification of the professionalism concern and the appropriate remedial action or sanction. As AI Lead, the Associate Dean of the MD Program retains final decision-making authority under both policies and will communicate the AI sanction and the professionalism outcome to the student simultaneously following the conclusion of the Professionalism Committee process.

5.3. *Treatment of AI Findings in Professionalism Proceedings*

- 5.3.1. Where the conduct that was the subject of the AI investigation also raises professionalism concerns, the factual findings of the AI investigation shall be treated as conclusive for those overlapping elements by the decisionmaker under the Professionalism Policy. No re-investigation of those elements is required.
- 5.3.2. As the Associate Dean of the MD Program is the AI Lead, as well as the intake person for professionalism concerns, and is the final decision maker under both policies, both matters will be decided upon simultaneously.
- 5.3.3. Where an AI investigation has been dismissed, the evidence destruction requirements of the Procedures apply. Any professionalism concerns identified by the AI Lead arising from the same conduct will be addressed entirely under the Professionalism Policy.

5.4. *Communication with Students*

- 5.4.1. Where the AI Lead determines that conduct giving rise to an AI finding also raises professionalism concerns, the student will receive written notification of both the AI outcome and the professionalism outcome simultaneously.
- 5.4.2. The AI outcome will be communicated using the standard forms required by the Procedures. The professionalism notification will be communicated in accordance with the Professionalism Policy. These are distinct communications governed by their respective policies, however delivered simultaneously.

6. **Sanctions**

- 6.1. Sanctions will be determined by the AI Lead in accordance with Sections 3.4 and 3.4.3.1 of the Procedures.

7. Appeals

7.1. *First Level of Appeal: Faculty of Health Sciences Student Appeal Board*

- 7.1.1. Once a final decision, including sanction, has been issued by the AI Lead, the student may appeal a finding of a departure from academic integrity, the imposition of a sanction, or both, to the Faculty of Health Sciences Student Appeal Board ("the Appeal Board"). Appeals must be submitted to the AI Administrator using the Appeal Form for Departures from Academic Integrity.
- 7.1.2. Because the AI Lead is responsible for all first-instance decisions in the MD Program, all appeals proceed directly to the Faculty of Health Sciences Student Appeal Board as the first level of appeal.
- 7.1.3. If a finding is made under both the Academic Integrity and Professionalism Policy, the student can appeal the findings and/or sanctions of one process or both. The combined appeal shall proceed directly to the Faculty of Health Sciences Student Appeal Board as the first level of appeal.
- 7.1.4. Appeals are subject to the grounds, timelines, and procedures set out in Section 4 of the Procedures.

7.2. *Second Level of Appeal: University Student Appeal Board*

- 7.2.1. A student may appeal the final decision of the Faculty of Health Sciences Student Appeal Board to the University Student Appeal Board ("USAB") in accordance with Section 4.5 of the Procedures.

8. Reporting and Accountability

- 8.1. The AI Administrator will report annually to the Academic Integrity Subcommittee on the number and type of academic integrity matters in the MD Program and their outcomes, using the Faculty/School Annual Academic Integrity Report form, as required under Section 1.8 of the Procedures.

9. Record Keeping

- 9.1. Records shall be kept by the AI Administrator in accordance with Section 1.7 of the Procedures.
- 9.2. No documents or materials related to academic integrity investigations may be retained by Course Directors or in any departmental student file.

10. Review of Terms of Reference

- 10.1. These Terms of Reference will be reviewed at least every three years, and more frequently as necessary, to ensure continued alignment with the Procedures and the needs of the MD Program.
- 10.2. Proposed changes to these Terms of Reference will be submitted for approval in accordance with the MD Program's governance processes.