

PSYC 438 (F23)

Self-Injury and Suicide

Contents

[Basic Course Information](#)

[Acknowledgment of Territory](#)

[Commitment to Equity, Diversity, and Inclusivity](#)

[Teaching Philosophy](#)

[Brief Course Description](#)

[Course Learning Outcomes \(CLOs\)](#)

[Course Materials](#)

[Course Timeline](#)

[Weekly Schedule](#)

[Assessment](#)

[Course Requirements](#)

[Late Policy](#)

[Assessment Learning Outcomes Matrix](#)

[Rubrics](#)

[Grading Scheme](#)

[Accommodations for Disabilities](#)

[Academic Consideration for Students in Extenuating Circumstances](#)

[Academic Integrity](#)

[Copyright of Course Materials](#)

[Sharing Course Information](#)

[Technology Requirements](#)

[Reading List](#)

Basic Course Information

Dates: Fall 2023 (September 11th to December 4th)

Modality: blended (online asynchronous material; on campus seminar)

Pre-requisites: PSYC 203 and PSYC 236

Acknowledgement of Territory

To begin, let us acknowledge that Queen's is situated on traditional Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee territory. We are grateful to be able to live, learn and play on these lands.

To acknowledge this traditional territory is to recognize its longer history, one predating the establishment of the earliest European colonies. It is also to acknowledge this territory's significance for the Indigenous peoples who lived, and continue to live, upon it and whose practices and spiritualities were tied to the land and continue to develop in relationship to the territory and its other inhabitants today. The Kingston Indigenous community continues to reflect the area's Anishinaabek and Haudenosaunee roots. There is also a significant Métis community and there are First people from other Nations across Turtle Island present here today.

To read more about the history of the land, see the Queen's Encyclopedia at

<http://www.queensu.ca/encyclopedia/t/traditional-territories>

Commitment to Equity, Diversity, and Inclusivity

Queen's University recognizes that the values of equity and diversity are vital to and in harmony with its educational mission and standards of excellence. It acknowledges that direct, indirect and systemic discrimination exists within our institutional structures, policies and practices and in our community. These take many forms and work to differentially advantage and disadvantage persons across social identities such as race, ethnicity, disability, gender identity, sexual orientation, faith and socioeconomic status, among other examples.

Queen's is committed to counteracting discrimination in this institution and developing a climate of educational equity that recognizes and respects the equal dignity and worth of all who seek to participate in the life, work and mission of the University. Such a climate is created and maintained by developing a university-wide commitment to and understanding of educational equity, supported by policies, programs, curricula, practices and traditions that facilitate individuals - and equity-seeking groups- free, safe, and full participation.

I espouse the values held above which are described in more detail in the University's [Educational Equity Policy](#). I will create a class environment that is safe and rich for all students and where diverse perspectives and experiences are embraced.

Teaching Philosophy

The *transformational teaching*¹ approach provides the instructional framework for this course's activities and assessments. Transformational teaching aims "to increase students' mastery of key course concepts while transforming their learning-related attitudes, values, beliefs, and skills" (Slavich & Zimbardo, 2012, p. 576). Among transformational teaching's core methods, this course will particularly focus on (a) establishing a shared vision of the course (especially regarding how we discuss course content), (b) providing modeling and mastery experiences, (c) experiential lessons that transcend classroom boundaries, and (d) opportunities for prelection and reflection.

Practically, this means that students will reflect on their individual learning goals for the course, and as a group, we will determine how we can meet our learning goals in a safe and supportive way. Class time will be committed to student-led discussions, problem-solving and/or activities in small groups, and class demonstrations. The instructor will model critical thinking about research findings in suicide science, and students will have many chances to practice this key skill informal in class and in formal assignments. The class takes a formative assessment approach wherein students build skills in early assignments that are required to make the most out of later assignments and activities. Students will be prompted to think about their key takeaways from readings and lectures prior to in-class discussion, and will be given time to reflect on the discussion nearing the end of each class.

¹ Slavich, G. M., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2012). Transformational teaching: Theoretical underpinnings, basic principles, and core methods. *Educational Psychology Review*, 24, 569-608.

Brief Course Description

Why do people intentionally hurt themselves? Humans are instinctively driven (and biologically programmed) to preserve our own lives and avoid harm. Yet, worldwide, more than 800,000 people die by suicide, and many more purposefully hurt themselves without intending to die as a result (i.e., nonsuicidal self-injury [NSSI]).

In this course, students will develop an advanced understanding of the empirical and theoretical literature on self-injurious behaviors, specifically suicide and NSSI. The course will focus on the following broad areas: (a) definition, phenomenology, assessment, and epidemiology; (b) modern theories (e.g., ideation-to-action frameworks for understanding suicide); (c) transdiagnostic risk factors (i.e., social, cognitive-affective, and biological processes); and (d) intervention and prevention

Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)

By the end of this course, you should be able to do the following:

- CL01 Define and differentiate different kinds of suicidal and nonsuicidal thoughts and behaviours
- CL02 Apply knowledge of the etiology and dominant theoretical frameworks of suicide and NSSI to critically evaluate research evidence
- CL03 Identify and analyze key issues in how suicidal and nonsuicidal behaviours are defined, assessed, and treated
- CL04 Understand the impacts that the stigma about self-injurious thoughts and behaviours has on research on self-injurious thoughts and behaviours
- CL05 Debunk common myths about suicide and nonsuicidal self-injury using scientific findings

Course Materials

There is no textbook for this course. Readings for the course will consist of primary empirical articles and review papers. The articles are all available to download from Queen's library. The URL for each of the readings is provided in the reading list (see [Required Reading List](#)). To access the readings, first ensure that you are connected to the Queen's server (either from an on-campus computer, or remotely). Then, simply click on the URL and you will be directed to a page that will allow you to download a copy of the article.

****You must be connected to the Queen's server to receive free downloads of these articles****

All students are required to read the article(s) listed in the [Required Reading List](#). A separate reading list presents articles that are NOT required, but that may be helpful ([Supplemental Reading List](#)). The supplemental readings are a good start for assignments where the expectation is to move beyond the mandatory articles.

Course Timeline

Date	Topics	Readings
Week 1 Sept 11	Definitions. Lived Experience and Stigma	Muehlenkamp et al., 2017; Nock, 2010; Sheehan et al., 2016
Week 2 Sept 18	Epidemiology and Assessment	Blades et al., 2018 Gillies et al., 2018
Week 3 Sept 25	Theories	Hooley & Franklin, 2018 Klonsky et al., 2018
Week 4 Oct 2	Under-Represented Groups Writing Assignment 1 DUE (Oct 6)	McQuaid et al., 2017 Smith et al., 2020
	READING WEEK - NO CLASSES (Oct 9-13)	
Week 5 Oct 16	Suicide Risk Factors I: Mental Disorders. Stress	Alqueza et al., 2021 Stewart et al., 2017
Week 6 Oct 23	Suicide Risk Factors II: Cognition. Neuropsychological Processes	Rosario-Williams et al., 2023 Ruch et al., 2020
Week 7 Oct 30	Suicide Risk Factors III: Reward Processes. Decision-Making Writing Assignment 2 DUE (Oct 30)	Millner et al., 2019 Tsypes et al., 2021
Week 8 Nov 6	NSSI Risk Factors I: Emotion Regulation. Social Factors	Miller et al., 2019 Robinson et al., 2019
Week 9 Nov 13	NSSI Risk Factors II: Pain. Self-Criticism	Fox et al., 2017 Funkhouser et al., 2019
Week 10 Nov 20	Intervention Writing Assignment 3 DUE (Nov 20)	Franklin et al., 2016 McCauley et al., 2018
Week 11 Nov 27	Prevention	Anestis et al., 2020 Bauer et al., 2019
Week 12 Dec 4	Student Presentations "Debunking Myths" Project DUE (Dec 4)	None

Weekly Schedule

Course content for the week (recorded lectures, slides, articles, etc.) will appear on OnQ before the lesson (at the latest, the previous Thursday before at 5PM EST). Students should aim to review course material before class. As part of the "Course Engagement" component of the course (see [Course Requirements](#) below), students should watch pre-recorded lectures, and in some cases, respond to and/or post questions, **before class (by 9AM) on Monday.**

When students are assigned to lead discussions for a class (schedule available on OnQ), they should post their discussion questions directly onto assigned articles with *Feedback Fruits* **before 5PM EST on Friday the week before class.** For example, a student leading discussion in Week 9 (November 13) would make their posts before 5PM EST on Friday, November 10, 2023.

Assessment

Writing Assignments	60%	
Assignment 1	10%	(DUE October 6, 2023 at 5PM)
Assignment 2	20%	(DUE October 30, 2023 at 5PM)
Assignment 3	30%	(DUE November 20, 2023 at 5PM)
Discussion Leader	5%	(schedule on OnQ)
“Debunking Myths” Project	20%	(DUE December 4, 2023)
“Flash Talk”	15%	
Infographic	5%	(group assignments on OnQ)
Course Engagement	15%	
Recorded Videos	5%	(assessed by December 1, 2023)
Posts and In-Class Participation		
Part 1	5%	(assessed by November 3, 2023)
Part 2	5%	(assessed by December 1, 2023)

Course Requirements

1. Writing Assignments (60% of Final Grade)

Three (3) writing assignments, worth 10-30% of students’ final grade, will be assigned throughout the term. These will require students to **BRIEFLY (500 words max)** respond to one or more specific questions. The grading rubric for writing assignments is below.

Criterion	Weight
Clear, accurate, and concise summary of relevant information (e.g., articles)	40%
Synthesize information into a central thesis <i>supported by reviewed evidence</i>	20%
Presenting <i>your own</i> unique ideas and perspectives (i.e., creativity)	20%
Sentence structure, grammar, spelling, etc., and staying <i>within the word limit</i>	10%
Organization, structure, and readability of the assignment	10%

Because Writing Assignments are worth different percentages of the final course grade (10% to 30%), the criteria above are given weights, rather than stating how many grades each criterion is worth. For the first Writing Assignment (worth 10%), the first criterion is worth 4 points (i.e., 40% of the Writing Assignment grade). However, for Writing Assignment 3 (worth 30%), the first criterion is worth 12 points (i.e., 40% of the Writing Assignment grade).

Sources used for Writing Assignments must be cited in text and the full citation should be provided in a reference section immediately following the assignment. **In-text citations and**

reference sections do not count towards the maximum word count. Citation and reference style will not be evaluated; students may use any style they would like provided that there is enough information for the instructor to retrieve the source if needed.

2. Discussion Leader (5% of Final Grade)

Students will lead class discussion for one (1) topic during the semester. They will be randomly assigned this role in one of the classes from Week 3 to 11 inclusive.

Being a discussion leader involves (a) posting a minimum of three (3) questions **on the OnQ assigned readings** using *Feedback Fruits* and (b) leading a small group discussion based on your content/topic area in class. NOTE: Students are encouraged to post more than three (3) questions. If you have posted more than three, please identify the ones that the instructor should use for grading purposes (e.g., with a small note like “for grading” in brackets).

The posted questions must be completed **by 5PM EST on Friday the week before the class in which students are scheduled to lead the small group discussion.** If there is more than one required article, students are still only required to post three (3) questions; these can centre on one of the required articles, or can be spread across multiple articles.

In Weeks 3-11, three to four students will be assigned to the “Discussion Leader” role. To make sure that we do not duplicate questions or discussion themes, students will be assigned one of several Content Areas. Note, below I give examples of very general questions; students are expected to ask **more specific** questions that demonstrate their knowledge of the material. NOTE: these examples apply best to empirical articles.

Content Area / Topic to be Addressed	
Rationale	These types of questions should focus on the Introduction section. For example, questions could touch on some or all of the following themes: (1) what is the principal reason for doing this work and why is it important? (2) how is the research question related to theories of suicide and/or self-injury? (3) what prior research lays the foundation for the current study, and how does the current study add to that prior research?
Methods/Results	These types of questions should focus on the Method and/or Results sections. For example, questions could touch on some or all of the following themes: (1) were the methods appropriate to meeting the research goals? (2) what were the strengths and weaknesses of the authors’ measures of key variables? (3) were statistically significant effects also practically meaningful? (4) how likely are the results to replicate or be confirmed in future studies? What aspects of the methodological approach tell you the results will or will not replicate?

Implications	These types of questions should focus on the Results and/or Discussion sections. For example, questions could touch on some or all of the following themes: (1) what was the main takeaway from the article(s) and why is it important? (2) what was counterintuitive or surprising about the authors' findings and why? (3) what were the main implications for advancing our basic understanding of the nature of self-injurious thoughts and behaviours? (4) what were the main clinical implications?
---------------------	---

Students can view their assigned weeks and content areas on OnQ. Students are permitted to exchange days and/or roles with other students as needed. **However, the instructor must be notified of any changes no later than the end of class on Thursday before the earliest changes will be relevant.** For example, if two students - one presenting in Week 3 and one presenting in Week 6 - exchange spots, the instructor needs to be notified by the end of class on Thursday in Week 2. Please notify the instructor by email so that there is a record.

The grading for the Discussion Leader role will be based on (a) the questions the student posts on *Feedback Fruits*, (b) in-class discussion with their small group, (c) in-class discussion on their topic involving all students. NOTE: the weighting of these facets will be individualized based on the amount of time devoted to (b) and (c) on the assigned week. The grading rubric is below.

Category	Points	Description
Exemplary	4-5	The student demonstrates a deep and comprehensive understanding of course materials. The student integrates readings, lectures, other course material, and outside sources (where applicable). The students' questions are clear and concise. The student engages their group (and the class) in a rich discussion that connects assigned materials to themes across the course. The student generates creative, "outside-of-the-box" discussion.
Accomplished	3	The student demonstrates a strong understanding of course materials for that week. The student somewhat integrates readings, lectures, and other course materials within the week. The students' questions are clear and concise. The student engages their group (and the class) in a discussion that hits on points that are separate from what is written in the target article(s).

Category	Points	Description
Developing	2	The students' questions do not fully address the themes of the content area. The students' questions do not expand beyond the content presented in lectures, readings, and other materials assigned for the week. In small-group and whole class discussions, the student repeats points from the target article(s) and/or recorded lectures, or presents ideas and/or asks questions that are very closely based on information from course materials. Alternatively, the students' questions focus mostly or entirely on generic points. The questions are disorganized; their length and/or organizational structure makes it difficult to identify central points, which inhibits in-class discussion.
Needs Improvement	0-1	The students' questions do not fully address the themes of the content area. The questions and discussion exclusively involve surface level details. The questions repeat what is written in the target article(s) or repeat points made in lectures. Alternatively, or in addition, there is evidence (e.g., factual errors) that the student has not reviewed the course content that they are discussing.

Questions posted on articles in *Feedback Fruits* should be brief, although there is no official minimum or maximum word count. Students can provide some brief context for their question (e.g., 1-2 sentences) if they feel this is needed to enhance clarity (it is not required). The "Content Area / Topic to be Addressed" table above is only a rough guide for students. You do not need to address everything listed in the table for a given content area to craft excellent questions.

Spelling, grammar, syntax, and sentence structure are not part of the grading key. However, students should aim to write clearly so that their ideas shine. If a student is referring to an outside source in a question, please provide enough citation details so that the instructor and other students can follow up on the source if desired.

3. "Debunking Myths" Project (20% of final grade)

Students will be randomly assigned to teams of four to five for the debunking myths project. A list of the group assignments for Fall 2023 is available on OnQ. Together, they will prepare a "flash talk" and accompanying infographic that discuss and challenge a common misunderstanding about self-injurious behaviours. The instructor will assign a myth about self-injurious behaviours in advance. For the "Debunking Myths" Project, the instructor will assign a grade to the group; that is, all members of the group will receive whatever grade the group earns. Students should contact the instructor **before 5PM on Friday, December 1, 2023** if they strongly feel members in the group should be graded separately. The group and the instructor will collaboratively develop an alternative to the group grade.

- a. *Flash Talk (15% of final grade)*. The “flash talk” will be **no more than 10 minutes long** and will include **up to five (5) content slides** (a title slide does not count as a content slide, nor do slides listing works cited in the flash talk). Students will prepare the “flash talk” as though the audience is a group of late teenagers (17-18 years old) and their parents. Students can imagine that the audience has assembled for a community information session about self-injurious thoughts and behaviours; the information session is being offered because of the impacts that suicide and nonsuicidal self-injury have on transitional-aged youth.

The main goal of the flash talk is to share findings from suicide science in an approachable and accurate manner with a non-scientific audience. In service of correcting misinformation about self-injurious thoughts and behaviours, the flash talk should include scientific findings from the course AND the groups’ own literature search/review. The grading rubric for the mock blog post is below.

Criterion	Points
Clearly describing the topic (i.e., the myth) and <i>motivating its importance</i>	2
Appropriateness of the literature (course readings; outside sources) used AND the groups’ <i>demonstrated understanding of research they include</i>	4
Synthesis of the content and demonstrating exactly <i>how it challenges the myth</i>	4
Creativity. The group has a unique perspective and information is delivered in their own “voice” (i.e., not just repeated conclusions from papers reviewed in the course and/or information from the lectures)	2
The appropriateness of the flash talk for the audience (e.g., presentation is engaging and not overly technical; limited use of jargon)	2
Clarity, organization and overall appearance of the slides	1

There will be a brief period (approximately 3 minutes) after the presentation where the audience will be permitted to ask clarification questions. Questions from the instructor will be prioritized, but the floor will be open to other students afterwards.

At the end of their slide deck, students should provide a list of works cited in their presentation. As with Writing Assignments, students may use any style they would like provided that there is enough information for the instructor to retrieve the source if needed. **Students must submit their slides to the instructor by email by the end of class.**

Groups must adhere to the 10 minute time limit. Groups that exceed the time limit will be penalized 10% (i.e., 2 marks) from the overall “Debunking Myths” Project grade.

- b. *Infographic (5% of final grade)*. Students will create a single page infographic to accompany their “flash talk”. The infographic will be presented to the class at the end of the “flash talk” during the question period. The purpose of the infographic is to condense the flash talk so that the key points are highlighted. It is essentially a pithy, eye-catching summary of the content of the group’s “flash talk”. Like the “flash talk”, the infographic should be designed for a non-scientific audience, and students’ should imagine that this would be posted in community and online settings most relevant to transitional-aged youth and their parents. Like the slides for the “flash talk”, the infographic should be emailed to the instructor by the end of class.

Infographics must be in digital form (e.g., PDF, PNG, etc.) but groups can choose any program they would like to create them. Research groups commonly create infographics in PowerPoint or Canva (free to use here: <https://www.canva.com/>). Examples of infographics can be found [here](#). Infographics will be assessed using the following criteria.

Criterion	Points
The infographic “stands alone”. The information is clear and interpretable without hearing the “flash talk”	1
Choice of key points (i.e., using the most salient information from “flash talk”)	2
Appearance (e.g., colours / images; readability; organization)	1
Creativity. Visuals and/or the way the content is delivered is unique.	1

4. Course Engagement (15% of final grade)

The course blends self-paced, asynchronous learning opportunities with in-class discussions. Students will be credited for participating in each of these forms of learning.

- a. *Recorded Videos (5% of final grade)*. Students are expected to watch recorded lectures to supplement in-class discussion. This component is graded as pass/fail. Students who review the video for the week and complete the (very brief) connected activity will receive full credit for that week. An example of a connected activity could be responding to a question from the instructor, completing a poll about lecture content, or posting your own question anywhere in the lecture. Instructions for each week’s video(s) will appear in *Feedback Fruits* and the program will automatically track completion of the video engagement activities. **Students must complete the recorded lecture activity before 9AM on the day of class (Monday) to receive credit.**

Engagement with recorded videos will be evaluated on Weeks 1-11 inclusive. With that said, I understand that some weeks are busier than others. **Consequently, students must only receive a "pass" on 8 of the 11 weeks to receive the full 5% credit.** If students do not complete the engagement activity for 8 recorded lectures, they will receive a fraction of the 5%. As each week is worth approximately 0.625 marks (i.e., $5/8 = 0.625$), missing one full week would result in a score of approximate 4.38% for the Recorded Lecture component of the course.

- b. *Posts and In-Class Participation.* Students are expected to attend every class and, where possible, should notify the instructor in advance if they will be absent. Absences due to any reasonable circumstances and/or due to compliance with public health guidelines will be excused (see [Academic Considerations for Students in Extenuating Circumstances](#)).

In class, students are expected to discuss course content (assigned readings, lectures, and/or other course materials), engage in small-group discussions and activities, and contribute to a safe and respectful class environment. Students can also demonstrate course engagement by interacting with course content on OnQ. For example, students can post discussion threads on assigned articles using *Feedback Fruits* on weeks where they are not a Discussion Leader. Responding to instructor- or student-generated questions on assigned articles is another way to participate. Finally, course engagement involves completing prelection and reflection prompts for some classes.

The instructor will provide brief, informal feedback on Posts and In-Class Participation to students after Week 3. However, participation in these weeks will not be graded. Students will receive graded feedback on Posts and In-Class Participation at the end of Week 7 (Part 1; assessed by November 3, 2023) and Week 11 (Part 2; assessed by December 1, 2023). Part 1 (5%) of the Posts and In-Class Participation grade will be based on Weeks 4-7 (inclusive) and Part 2 (5%) will be based on Weeks 8-11 (inclusive).

The instructor will use the rubric below to evaluate students' contributions to in-class and asynchronous (e.g., online discussions) course activities for each of the Posts and In-Class Participation evaluations.

Category	Points	Description
Exemplary	4-5	The student routinely makes comments on other students' questions/observations and/or asks questions and/or initiates discussions over the course of the term. Comments always or nearly always reflect a strong understanding of the material. The students' contributions reflect an understanding of the themes and controversies in suicide science. The student's comments sometimes shape the overall class discussion.

Accomplished	3	The student routinely makes comments on other students' questions/observations and/or asks questions and/or initiates discussions over the course of the term. More often than not, comments show a strong understanding of the material. The students' comments sometimes extend and enrich overall class discussion.
Developing	2	The student makes a few comments on other students' questions/observations and/or asks questions and/or initiates discussions over the course of the term. Comments rarely expand beyond the basic content of course materials. The students' contributions reflect a surface-level understanding of the course material.
Needs Improvement	0-1	The student rarely or never engages in discussions, whether in-class (small group; whole class) or on OnQ. The student's comments do not exhibit understanding of the course content or engagement with the material.

Late Policy

Writing Assignments have **soft** (listed in the Course Timeline and Assessment sections) and **hard** (72 hours later) deadlines. Students may use the 72 hour extension (the hard deadline) for any Writing Assignment without contacting the instructor. Students are encouraged to meet soft deadlines whenever possible, but any assignment handed in before the hard deadline will be considered. I am committed to accommodating anyone with a compassionate reason (e.g., illness; pressing personal obligation, etc) for turning in assignments late. If these circumstances apply to you, please be in touch with me before the assignment is due, if possible.

If compassionate reasons do not apply, I will deduct 10% for each day that the Written Assignments are late. When students are a *Discussion Leader* for the week (see [Course Requirements](#) above), I will deduct 20% from the grade for this part of the assessment for discussion questions that are posted after 10AM on the Tuesday before class.

Assessment Learning Outcomes Matrix

Course Assessment	CLO1	CLO2	CLO3	CLO4	CLO5
Writing Assignments		X	X		
Discussion Leader	X	X	X	X	
"Debunking Myths" Project		X	X	X	X
Course Engagement	X	X	X	X	X

Rubrics

Marking rubrics have been created to help guide you toward success on assignments, and they highlight key criteria essential to your success. However, marking rubrics are not exhaustive lists of success criteria. The instructor will be providing marks on the assignments using the criteria outlined in the marking rubrics, the instructor also reserves the right to provide feedback that is not always explicitly stated in the marking criteria, should circumstances warrant. Review the marking rubric in detail and connect with the instructor if you have any questions.

Grading Scheme

All components of this course will receive numerical percentage marks. The final grade you receive for the course will be derived by converting your numerical course average to a letter grade according to Queen's Official Grade Conversion Scale:

Queen's Official Grade Conversion Scale

Grade	Numerical Course Average (Range)
A+	90-100
A	85-89
A-	80-84
B+	77-79
B	73-76
B-	70-72
C+	67-69
C	63-66
C-	60-62
D+	57-59
D	53-56
D-	50-52
F	49 and below

Accommodations for Disabilities

Queen's University is committed to achieving full accessibility for people with disabilities. Part of this commitment includes arranging academic accommodations for students with disabilities to ensure they have an equitable opportunity to participate in all their academic activities. The Senate Policy for Accommodations for Students with Disabilities was approved at the [Senate in November 2016](#). If you are a student with a disability and think you may need academic accommodations, you are strongly encouraged to contact the **Queen's Student Accessibility Services (QSAS)** and register as early as possible. For more information, including important deadlines, please visit the [QSAS website](#).

Academic Consideration for Students in Extenuating Circumstances

Academic consideration is a process for the university community to provide a compassionate response to assist students experiencing unforeseen, short-term extenuating circumstances

that may impact or impede a student's ability to complete their academics. This may include but is not limited to:

- Short-term physical or mental health issues (e.g., stomach flu, pneumonia, COVID-19 diagnosis, vaccination, etc.)
- Responses to traumatic events (e.g., Death of a loved one, divorce, sexual assault, social injustice, etc.)
- Requirements by law or public health authorities (e.g., court date, isolation due to COVID-19 exposure, etc.)

Queen's University is committed to providing academic consideration to students experiencing extenuating circumstances. For more information, please see the [Senate Policy on Academic Consideration for Students in Extenuating Circumstances](#).

Each Faculty has developed a protocol to provide a consistent and equitable approach in dealing with requests for academic consideration for students facing extenuating circumstances. Arts and Science undergraduate students can find the Faculty of Arts and Science protocol and the [portal where a request can be submitted](#). Students in other Faculties and Schools who are enrolled in this course should refer to the protocol for their home Faculty.

If you need to request academic consideration for this course, you will be required to provide the name and email address of the instructor/coordinator. Please use the following contact information:

Instructor/Course Coordinator Name: Jeremy Stewart

Instructor/Course Coordinator email address: jeremy.stewart@queensu.ca

Students are encouraged to submit requests as soon as the need becomes apparent and to contact their Professors/Course Coordinators as soon as possible once Consideration has been granted. Any delay in contact may limit the Consideration options available.

For more information on the Academic Consideration process, what is and is not an extenuating circumstance, and to submit an Academic Consideration request, [please see this website](#).

Academic Integrity

Queen's students, faculty, administrators and staff all have responsibilities for upholding the [fundamental values of academic integrity](#); honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility and courage. These values are central to the building, nurturing, and sustaining of an academic community in which all members of the community will thrive. Adherence to the values expressed through academic integrity forms a foundation for the "freedom of inquiry and exchange of ideas" essential to the intellectual life of the University (see the [Senate Report on Principles and Priorities](#)).

Students are responsible for familiarizing themselves with the regulations concerning academic integrity and for ensuring that their assignments and their behaviour conform to the principles

of academic integrity. Information on academic integrity is available in the Arts and Science Calendar (see [Academic Regulation 1](#)), on the [Arts and Science website](#), and from the instructor of this course. Departures from academic integrity include plagiarism, use of unauthorized materials, facilitation, forgery and falsification, and are antithetical to the development of an academic community at Queen's. Given the seriousness of these matters, actions which contravene the regulation on academic integrity carry sanctions that can range from a warning or the loss of grades on an assignment to the failure of a course to a requirement to withdraw from the university.

A departure from academic integrity is any form of academic dishonesty that could result in you, or others, gaining an unearned advantage over other students. It compromises and violates the University's core values of academic integrity. If you are not sure whether something is acceptable or not, always ask your instructor. Here are some examples of departures from academic integrity:

Type of Departure and Definition	Examples
<p>Plagiarism Presenting another's ideas or phrasings as one's own without proper acknowledgement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Copying and pasting from the internet, a printed source, or other resource without proper acknowledgement - Copying from another student - Using direct quotations or large sections of paraphrased material in an assignment without appropriate acknowledgement - Submitting the same piece of work in more than one course without the permission of the instructor(s)
<p>Use of Unauthorized Materials</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possessing or using unauthorized study materials or aids during a test - Copying from another's paper - Unauthorized removal of materials from the library, or deliberate concealment of library materials
<p>Facilitation Enabling another's breach of academic integrity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Making information available to another student - Knowingly allowing one's essay or assignment to be copied by someone else - Buying or selling of term papers or assignments and submitting them as one's own for the purpose of plagiarism
<p>Forgery Submitting counterfeit documents or statements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Creating a transcript or other official document
<p>Falsification</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Altering transcripts or other official documents relating to student records

Misrepresentation of one's self, one's work, or one's relation to the University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impersonating someone in an examination or test - Submitting a take-home examination written, in whole or in part, by someone else - Fabricating or falsifying laboratory or research data
--	--

Acknowledging Sources: Students are responsible for acknowledging the sources that they use. APA style is preferred, although not required. For a primer on APA style, see: https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/apa_style/apa_style_introduction.html.

These websites can help you make sure that you are able to write things in your own words: <https://www.queensu.ca/academicintegrity/students/avoiding-plagiarismcheating>
<https://integrity.mit.edu/handbook/academic-writing/avoiding-plagiarism-paraphrasing>
http://writing.wisc.edu/Handbook/QPA_paraphrase.html

Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tools: Using generative AI writing tools such as ChatGPT in your submitted work is not permitted in this class. This type of use constitutes a Departure from Academic Integrity. Original work, completed wholly by you, is expected to be submitted in this course. The use of an artificial intelligence tool like ChatGPT is not permitted.

Copyright of Course Materials

Course materials created by the course instructor, including all slides, presentations, handouts, tests, exams, and other similar course materials, are the instructor's intellectual property. It is a departure from academic integrity to distribute, publicly post, sell or otherwise disseminate an instructor's course materials or to provide an instructor's course materials to anyone else for distribution (including note sharing sites), posting, sale or other means of dissemination without the instructor's *express consent*. A student who engages in such conduct may be subject to penalty for a departure from academic integrity and may also face adverse legal consequences for infringement of intellectual property rights.

Sharing Course Information

Suicide science is a young subfield and best practices in teaching about suicide and nonsuicidal self-injury are evolving. To disseminate insights and ideas relevant to teaching these topics, some instructors share student responses to activities and/or class discussions with colleagues, or more widely on social media platforms. I may occasionally share the activities we do in class, and your responses to these activities, on social media and/or with colleagues. Individual students will never be identified, and I will only share general class responses. I will not share a student's individual response to any question unless I receive express permission from that student in advance. I anticipate mostly, or exclusively, sharing some activities we do and my own general impressions about how students respond to these activities.

Technology Requirements

To best participate in the course, the following technology specifications are encouraged.

- **Web browsers:** OnQ performs best when using the most recent version of the web browsers, Chrome or Firefox. Safari and Edge are strongly discouraged as these web browsers cause issues with OnQ.
- **Internet speed:** While wired internet connection is encouraged, we recognize that students may be relying on a wireless connection. A minimum download speed of 10 Mbps and up to 20 Mbps for multimedia is recommended. To test your internet speed, <https://www.speedtest.net/>
- **Additional tools:** You will need a PDF reader to access the articles on the reading list. You may also want headphones for recorded lectures and/or recommended website sources (e.g., YouTube videos).

For technology support ranging from setting up your device, issues with onQ to installing software, con-tact ITS Support Centre: <https://www.queensu.ca/its/itsc>

Turnitin Statement: This course uses Turnitin, a third-party application that helps maintain standards of excellence in academic integrity. Normally, students will be required to submit their course assignments through onQ to Turnitin. In doing so, students' work will be included as source documents in the Turnitin reference database, where they will be used solely to detect plagiarism.

Turnitin is a suite of tools that provide instructors with information about the authenticity of submitted work and facilitates the process of grading. Turnitin compares submitted files against its extensive database of content, and produces a similarity report and a similarity score for each assignment. A similarity score is the percentage of a document that is similar to content held within the database. Turnitin does not determine if an instance of plagiarism has occurred. Instead, it gives instructors the information they need to select the authenticity of work as a part of a larger process.

Please read [Turnitin's Privacy Pledge, Privacy Policy, and Terms of Service](#), which govern users' relationship with Turnitin. Also, please note that Turnitin uses cookies and other tracking technologies; however, in its service contract with Queen's, Turnitin has agreed that neither Turnitin nor its third-party partners will use data collected through cookies or other tracking technologies for marketing or advertising purposes. For further information about how you can exercise control over cookies, see [Turnitin's Privacy Policy](#)

Turnitin may provide other services that are not connected to the purpose for which Queen's University has engaged Turnitin. Your independent use of Turnitin's other services is subject solely to Turnitin's Terms of Service and Privacy Policy, and Queen's University has no liability for any independent interaction you choose to have with Turnitin.

Reading List

The required readings for each week are listed below. Supplemental readings, organized by week, can be found [here](#).

Week 1

1. Muehlenkamp, J. J., Brausch, A. M., & Washburn, J. J. (2017). How much is enough? Examining frequency criteria for NSSI disorder in adolescent inpatients. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 85*(6), 611-619. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ccp0000209>
2. Nock, M. K. (2010). Self-injury. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 6*, 339-363. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.121208.131258> (pp. 340-344 only).
3. Sheehan, L. L., Corrigan, P. W., Al-Khouja, M. A., & Stigma of Suicide Research Team. (2016). Stakeholder perspectives on the stigma of suicide attempt survivors. *Crisis, 38*(2), 73 - 81. <https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000413>

Week 2

1. Blades, C. A., Stritzke, W. G., Page, A. C., & Brown, J. D. (2018). The benefits and risks of asking research participants about suicide: A meta-analysis of the impact of exposure to suicide-related content. *Clinical Psychology Review, 64*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2018.07.001>
2. Gillies, D., Christou, M. A., Dixon, A. C., Featherston, O. J., Rapti, I., Garcia-Anguita, A., ... & Christou, P. A. (2018). Prevalence and characteristics of self-harm in adolescents: Meta-analyses of community-based studies 1990–2015. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 57*(10), 733-741. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2018.06.018>

NOTE: Global estimates of suicidal thoughts and behaviours that are reviewed in the recorded lecture and that we will discuss in class are available [here](#).

Week 3

1. Hooley, J. M., & Franklin, J. C. (2018). Why do people hurt themselves? A new conceptual model of nonsuicidal self-injury. *Clinical Psychological Science, 6*(3), 428-451. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702617745641>
2. Klonsky, E. D., Saffer, B. Y., & Bryan, C. J. (2018). Ideation-to-action theories of suicide: A conceptual and empirical update. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 22*, 38-43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsy.2017.07.020>

Week 4

1. McQuaid, R. J., Bombay, A., McInnis, O. A., Humeny, C., Matheson, K., & Anisman, H. (2017). Suicide ideation and attempts among First Nations peoples living on-reserve in Canada: The intergenerational and cumulative effects of Indian residential schools.

Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 62(6), 422-430.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0706743717702075>

2. Smith, D. M., Wang, S. B., Carter, M. L., Fox, K. R., & Hooley, J. M. (2020). Longitudinal predictors of self-injurious thoughts and behaviors in sexual and gender minority adolescents. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 129(1), 114-121.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000483>

READING WEEK - NO CLASSES (October 9-13)

Week 5

1. Alqueza, K. L., Pagliaccio, D., Durham, K., Srinivasan, A., Stewart, J. G., & Auerbach, R. P. (2021). Suicidal thoughts and behaviors among adolescent psychiatric inpatients. *Archives of Suicide Research*. Epub ahead of print: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13811118.2021.1999874>
2. Stewart, J. G., Shields, G. S., Esposito, E. C., Cosby, E. A., Allen, N. B., Slavich, G. M., & Auerbach, R. P. (2019). Life stress and suicide in adolescents. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 47(10), 1707-1722. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-019-00534-5>

Week 6

1. Rosario-Williams, B., Akter, S., Kaur, S., & Miranda, R. (2023). Suicide-related construct accessibility and attention disengagement bias in suicide ideation. *Journal of Psychopathology and Clinical Science*, 132(2), 173–184.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000808>
2. Ruch, D., Sheftall, A. H., Heck, K., McBee-Strayer, S. M., Tissue, J., Reynolds, B., ... & Bridge, J. A. (2020). Neurocognitive vulnerability to youth suicidal behavior. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 131, 119-126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2020.08.032>

Week 7

1. Millner, A. J., den Ouden, H. E. M., Gershman, S. J., Glenn, C. R., Kearns, J. C., Bornstein, A. M., . . . Nock, M. K. (2019). Suicidal thoughts and behaviors are associated with an increased decision-making bias for active responses to escape aversive states. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 128(2), 106-118. <https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000395>
2. Tsydes, A., Owens, M., & Gibb, B. E. (2021). Reward responsiveness in suicide attempters: An EEG/ERP Study. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*, 6(1), 99 - 106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2020.04.003>

Week 8

1. Miller, A. B., Eisenlohr-Moul, T., Glenn, C. R., Turner, B. J., Chapman, A. L., Nock, M. K., & Prinstein, M. J. (2019). Does higher-than-usual stress predict nonsuicidal self-injury? Evidence from two prospective studies in adolescent and emerging adult females. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 60(10), 1076-1084. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13072>

2. Robinson, K., Garisch, J. A., Kingi, T., Brocklesby, M., O'Connell, A., Langlands, R. L., ... & Wilson, M. S. (2019). Reciprocal risk: The longitudinal relationship between emotion regulation and non-suicidal self-injury in adolescents. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 47(2), 325-332. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-018-0450-6>

Week 9

1. Fox, K. R., Toole, K. E., Franklin, J. C., & Hooley, J. M. (2017). Why does nonsuicidal self-injury improve mood? A preliminary test of three hypotheses. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 5(1), 111-121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702616662270>
2. Funkhouser, C. J., Correa, K. A., Carrillo, V. L., Klemballa, D. M., & Shankman, S. A. (2019). The time course of responding to aversiveness in females with a history of non-suicidal self-injury. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 141, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2019.04.008>

Week 10

1. Franklin, J., Fox, K., Franklin, C., Kleiman, E., Ribeiro, J., Jaroszewski, A., ... & Nock, M. (2016). A brief mobile app reduces nonsuicidal and suicidal self-injury: Evidence from three randomized controlled trials. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 84(6), 544-557. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ccp0000093>
2. McCauley, E., Berk, M. S., Asarnow, J. R., Adrian, M., Cohen, J., Korslund, K., ... & Linehan, M. M. (2018). Efficacy of dialectical behavior therapy for adolescents at high risk for suicide: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 75(8), 777-785. DOI: [10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2018.1109](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2018.1109)

Week 11

1. Anestis, M. D., Bryan, C. J., Capron, D. W., & Bryan, A. O. (2020). Lethal means counseling, distribution of cable locks, and safe firearm storage practices among the Mississippi National Guard: A factorial randomized controlled trial, 2018-2020. *American Journal of Public Health*, 111(2), 309-317. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2020.306019>
2. Bauer, B. W., Tucker, R. P., & Capron, D. W. (2019). A nudge in a new direction: Integrating behavioral economic strategies into suicide prevention work. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 7(3), 612-620. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702618809367>

Week 12

Student "flash talks"