Taryn Lough and Toni Samek:

Canadian University Social Software Guidelines and Academic Freedom: An Alarming Labour Trend

Abstract:

An analysis of first-stage social software guidelines of nine Canadian universities conducted in the 2012-13 academic year with the aim to reveal limits to academic freedom. Carleton University's guidelines serve as the anchor case, while those of eight other institutions are included to signify a national trend. Implications for this work are central to academic labour. In as much as academic staff have custody and control of all records they create, except records created in and for administrative capacity, these guidelines are interpreted to be alarming. Across the guidelines, framing of social media use by academic staff (even for personal use) as representative of the university assumes academic staff should have an undying loyalty to their institution. The guidelines are read as obvious attempts to control rather than merely guide, and speak to the nature of institutional overreach in the related names of reputation (brand), responsibility (authoritarianism), safety (paternalistically understood and enforced), and the free marketplace of [the right] ideas.

Agenda:

Authors:

Taryn Lough, MLIS:

- Youth Librarian, Teen Services
- ☎ 780-975-7249, ✉ tlough@ualberta.ca

Toni Samek, PhD:

- Professor, School of Library and Information Studies, 3-20 Rutherford South, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2J4
- ☎ (780) 492-0179 , ✉ toni.samek@ualberta.ca, 💻 tonisamek.wordpress.com
- Relevant publications:
  - Anthony Worman and Toni Samek. (2011). *"Digital labour shortage: A new divide in library and information studies education?" Information, Society & Justice*. Vol. 4. No. 2, December 2011. Pages 71-82.
  - *Toni Samek. (2010). "Teaching Information Ethics in Higher Education: A Crash Course in Academic Labour". International Review of Information Ethics. Vol. 14 (December 2010). Pages 4-9.*
  - Toni Samek. (2007). "Librarians and Information Justice". *Academic Matters: The Journal of Higher Education* (October 2007): 24-25.

ISSN 1614-1687

Authors' Note: *The authors wish to thank Dr. Len Findlay and Dr. Jim Turk for their support of this work and their helpful suggestions for framing the findings*

This work analyses first-stage social software guidelines of nine Canadian universities with the aim of revealing limits to academic freedom. The guidelines selected for study were those that were publicly accessible through Canadian university websites in summer 2012, namely those of: Carleton University, Memorial University, Queen's University, Ryerson University, University of British Columbia, University of Manitoba, University of Regina, University of Toronto, and Wilfrid Laurier University. Some of the guidelines (e.g., those of Carleton University) have since been refined or developed; others appear largely unchanged. The analysis was performed in the 2012-2013 academic year, both with the intention to publish a scholarly article thus filling a gap in global scholarship on the production and implementation of social media policy in higher education, as well as to influence future policy in Canadian higher education. Carleton University's guidelines, as at play in 2012 in the nation's capital, are used as the anchor case, while those of eight other institutions are included to reinforce the points raised and to signify a national trend. To this end, the work concludes with a table showing the full picture of threats to academic freedom that emerged from the study. Implications for this work are central to academic labour. In as much as academic staff have custody and control of all records they create, except records created in and for an administrative capacity, these guidelines are interpreted to be especially wrong and alarming. Across the guidelines, framing of social media use by academic staff (even for personal use) as representative of the university assumes academic staff should have an undying loyalty to their institution. The guidelines attempt to blur what is appropriate in what space, revealing a repressive impulse on the part of university administrations. These *guidelines* are read as obvious attempts to control rather than merely guide, and speak to the nature of institutional over-reach in the related names of reputation (brand), responsibility (authoritarianism), safety (paternalistically understood and enforced), and the free marketplace of [the right] ideas.

Literature Review

The intention with the literature review was to find work concerned with the construction, implementation, and consequences of social media guidelines in higher education. More specifically, we were curious to see if any published work was invested in unpacking what the implications of higher education social media guidelines are for academic freedom. The literature review search was limited to English language and translated documents retrieved from the University of Alberta Library system; however, the overall search extended to public domain documents identified through Google.

The search began widely to first acquire a sense of what types of scholarship were being produced on social software and higher education in general. Works consulted that encompassed social software and higher education did not date back past the 2005-2006 academic year, as this is the time in which current popular social media platforms were born. This approach provided the opportunity to have a general sense of what aspects of social media's relationship with higher education have interested researchers since the rise of now ubiquitous media, such as Facebook and Twitter. Much of the work consulted that fit within the broad search of *"social media" AND "higher education"* focused on pedagogy surrounding integrating social media into learning. Subsequent search strings used in an attempt to unearth works related to higher education and social media guidelines included some of the following phrasing: *"social media" AND "university guidelines"; "social media guidelines" AND "higher education";* and, *"university policy" AND "social media".* After conducting these searches, material found was organized into three broad categories: (1) academic staff social media guidelines in higher education (Chretien, et al., 2010; Garber, 2011; Kelly, 2012), (2) student social media guidelines in higher education (Williams, Field, and James, 2011; Sanderson, 2011), and (3) social media, university marketing, and recruitment (Botha, Elsamari, Farshid, Pitt, 2011; Pikalek, 2010; Wandel, 2008; Zaliskaite-Jakste, Kubykaite, 2012).

Searches pertaining specifically to the implications of higher education social media guidelines for academic freedom were conducted next. Sample search strings utilized include the following: *"social media guidelines" AND "academic freedom"; "media policies" AND "freedom of speech"; and, "social media policy" AND "academic freedom".* In terms of finding work that spoke directly to university social media guidelines and academic

freedom, the search only produced one pure hit. McNeil's (2012) scholarship strongly parallels our own in both execution and purpose. He examined the social media policies of fourteen universities in the United Kingdom. He states "At worst, some of the social media policies analysed place serious constraints on academic autonomy and the possibilities for innovation, openness and sharing" (p. 153). Furthermore, he comments his analysis of these social media guidelines exists primarily to "highlight the potential tensions between the academic ideals of openness and the freedom to act and to write as we see fit with social media policies that limit our academic autonomy" (p. 161). He also argues these social media policies are "mainly about enhancing "brands" and protecting institutional reputation" (p. 152) which affirmed our belief that Canadian policies are couched in university branding and risk management. The sentiment of uneasy feelings about university branding trumping academic freedom is echoed by others (Brass, Rowe, 2009; Rowe, Brass, 2011). Wandel (2007) and Garber (2011) also speak to the trepidation of university faculty who have expressed concern over the relationship between their participation in social media and freedom of speech due to strict university sanctioned guidelines.

Analysis

Because the guidelines adopted at Carleton University in Ottawa were the first to raise concern with the Canadian Association of University Teachers' (CAUT) Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, this analysis section uses Carleton University as the anchor case and then shows how the other eight Canadian university guidelines studied reinforce grave concerns with respect to limits to academic freedom. We include the Carleton University guidelines in the Appendix exactly as they appeared on the Carleton University website at the time we began our study in summer 2012. The guidelines have since been refined (and in our opinion improved). The guidelines of the other eight institutions are not included as appendices, due to article length constraints. However, readers should feel free to contact the authors for full text of the guidelines (again as were available at the outset of our study).

The purview of Carleton University's "Social Media Guidelines", as documented in 2012, is couched in terms of publicity, marketing and branding. For example, they state: "These social media guidelines are intended to share Carleton's expectations of you when using social media on behalf of the University; and to support your use of social media in contributing to the University's online presence. These guidelines are intended to assist you in your professional use of social media and to remind you to consider your reputations and Carleton's when sharing information." But in actuality, the guidelines frame multiple conditions for academic work and clearly cross the academic freedom line in key respects, including in teaching, research and service.

A key failing of Carleton University's social media guidelines, as launched, with respect to academic freedom is how they bump up against multiple core values in higher education – values that are inextricably linked to academic freedom (e.g., collegiality, transparency). To illustrate this point, 10 examples of CAUT general policy are shown below to run counter to Carleton University's initial guidelines. CAUT general policy is used in this work as a testing ground for the strength of the social software guidelines in Canadian universities because CAUT mints leading national policy on academic labour. "Founded in 1951, CAUT is the national academic professionals, CAUT is an outspoken defender of academic freedom and works actively in the public interest to improve the quality and accessibility of post-secondary education in Canada."[121]

Example 1: CAUT's Policy Statement on Collegiality[122] asserts "Collegiality does not mean congeniality or civility." Meanwhile Carleton University's guidelines state unreasonable use of social media includes: "Using University resources to access or post any material that is fraudulent, harassing, threatening, bullying, embarrassing, sexually explicit, profane, obscene, racist, sexist, intimidating, defamatory or otherwise inappropriate or unlawful." We argue an academic engaging in public intellectualism with the use of social media tools about an "embarrassing" decision made by the University administration should be protected by academic freedom. The guidelines state "Carleton does not want to discourage or limit your personal expression or online activities.

121 Canadian Association of University Teachers website. Accessed 2 April 2014. http://www.caut.ca/about-us

122 CAUT Policy Statement on Collegiality. Accessed 2 April 2014. http://www.caut.ca/about-us/caut-policy/lists/general-caut-policies/policy-statement-on-collegiality

However, you should recognize the potential for damage to be caused (either directly or indirectly) to the University or your department in certain circumstances via your personal use of social media if you can be identified as a Carleton employee". Nevertheless, the guidelines also instruct academics to "be polite and respectful." In an era of competitive internationalization in higher education, we ask who defines those terms and according to what cultural protocols.

Example 2: CAUT's Policy Statement on Academic Freedom[123] asserts "Academic freedom includes the right, without restriction by prescribed doctrine, to freedom to teach and discuss; freedom to carry out research and disseminate and publish the results thereof; freedom to produce and perform creative works; freedom to engage in service to the institution and the community; freedom to express one's opinion about the institution, its administration, and the system in which one works; freedom to acquire, preserve, and provide access to documentary material in all formats; and freedom to participate in professional and representative academic bodies. Academic freedom always entails freedom from institutional censorship." Meanwhile, the guidelines state "Carleton University is committed to academic freedom of speech", but do not provide a more expansive definition of academic freedom. This presents a loophole of sorts. For example, the guidelines include the suggestion that "If you happen to get a message sent to you from a member of the press via Social media, consider consulting with University Communications before responding." It is also recommended that employees avoid "making any comment or posting any material that might cause damage to the university's reputation." We wonder about possible *subtle* consequences for a Carleton University academic who acts on his or her professional right to critique the University without first consulting with the University.

Example 3: CAUT's Policy Statement on Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications[124] asserts "The rights of academic staff to exercise their academic freedom do not vary according to the medium in which they are exercised. These rights are as essential to academic activities undertaken electronically as to those undertaken in speech, writing, and/or other media." This phrasing puts the existence of the guidelines into question on a most fundamental level.

Example 4: CAUT's Policy Statement on Academic Freedom for Academic Administrators[125] asserts" The exercise of academic freedom serves the common good of society and should not be constrained by appeals to such notions as loyalty to administrative leadership, cabinet solidarity, management rights, commitment to a team, or speaking with one voice." It also stresses "The academic freedom of academic staff continues indivisible and undiminished in all academic and public settings, whether or not these settings are aligned primarily with teaching, research, administration, community service, institutional policy, or public policy." Meanwhile the guidelines "recommend that you avoid: implying that you are authorized to speak as a representative of the university; using your Carleton email address; using or disclosing any confidential information obtained in your capacity as an employee; making any comment or posting any material that might cause damage to the university's reputation." The CAUT policy and the guidelines are out of sync on numerous counts here, perhaps most importantly with respect to academic freedom in public settings, such as social media spaces.

Example 5: CAUT's Policy Statement on Distance Education[126] asserts "Academic staff members shall have the freedom to select and use those teaching and support materials which he/she believes to be appropriate, including the freedom to use or not to use any specific technique or technology." The guidelines state they "are intended to share Carleton's expectations of you when using social media on behalf of the University; and to support your use of social media in contributing to the University's online presence. These guidelines are meant for anyone working for the University and either using social media on behalf the University, or using social

123 CAUT's Policy Statement on Academic Freedom. Accessed 2 April 2014. http://www.caut.ca/about-us/caut-policy/lists/caut-policy-statements/policy-statement-on-academic-freedom

124 CAUT's Policy Statement on Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications. Accessed 2 April 2014. http://www.caut.ca/about-us/caut-policy/lists/caut-policy-statements/policy-statement-on-academic-freedom-and-electronic-communications

125 CAUT's Policy Statement on Academic Freedom for Academic Administrators. Accessed 2 April 2014. http://www.caut.ca/about-us/caut-policy/lists/general-caut-policies/policy-statement-on-academic-freedom-for-academic-administrators

126 CAUT's Policy Statement on Distance Education. Accessed 2 April 2014. http://www.caut.ca/about-us/caut-policy/lists/general-caut-policies/policy-statement-on-distance-education

media personally but identifiable online as a University employee". While the term teaching is not mentioned in the guidelines, we assume Carleton University academics will opt to use social media in distance education courses (at minimum). Within that activity, they will want to exercise their academic freedom with respect to course resources, which may include social media (e.g., a blog), as well as with respect to the intellectual instructional content they post using social media (e.g. teaching comments posted to a course blog).

Example 6: CAUT's Policy Statement on Academic Freedom and Artistic Expression[127] asserts that artistic expression "merits the same assurance of academic freedom as is accorded to other scholarly and teaching activities" and "Since academic staff and student presentations to the public are integral to teaching, learning and scholarship in the arts, these presentations should be protected by the principle of academic freedom." The guidelines do not specifically address artistic expression. This could create vulnerability for Carleton University academics. For example, an electronic form of a satirical poster or a short video clip produced by a professor (or fellow academic) critiquing an aspect of Carleton University "business" for the purposes of scholarship and/or teaching and learning could bleed into the parameters of what Carleton University deems to be embarrassing. Again, from an academic freedom and labour standpoint, what are the consequences? Could a university teacher face discipline under a code of conduct policy in this scenario?

Example 7: CAUT's Policy Statement on Defamation Actions Arising out of Academic Activity[128] asserts "Academic freedom is essential to the fundamental purposes of post-secondary education institutions. It is essential that academic freedom not be restricted by the threat of legal action for defamation. Academic staff associations and post-secondary employers should promote a culture in which differences of opinion are debated and discussed without resort to litigation." The guidelines state "Carleton does not want to discourage or limit your personal expression or online activities. However, you should recognize the potential for damage to be caused (either directly or indirectly) to the University or your department in certain circumstances via your personal use of social media if you can be identified as a Carleton employee". One should worry about the possibility Carleton University's position on defamation might escalate when a person (e.g., representative of the University or a department) is referenced in the context of social media. Obviously, legal counsel is the final arbiter here.

Example 8: CAUT's Policy Statement on Scholarly Communication[129] asserts scholarly communication "is a public good that should not be limited by commercial or private interests or restrictive institutional policies. Any such limitations threaten academic freedom by restricting the dissemination and discussion of scholarly activity", and "Academic staff should establish and support credible non-commercial fora such as institutional repositories for peer review and distribution of research." We might anticipate that Carleton University academics produce an electronic scholarly communication venue that bumps up against what Carleton University develops as licensing guidelines that are part of the university's copyright policies.

Example 9: CAUT's Policy Statement on Professional Rights and Responsibilities[130] asserts "Academic staff have the right to promote and guide student participation in class discussions as they see fit within the framework of human rights and professional standards." We can foresee a scenario in which, for example, a teacher and a class of engineering students are debating, in a social software context, the merits of a Carleton University policy (e.g., related to patents). There is a potential problem here if the University administration deems someone's comments unflattering. Furthermore, this is problematic for the privacy and security of scholars at risk online. Online course participation leaves a trail in the form of a digital tattoo.

127 CAUT's Policy Statement on Academic Freedom and Artistic Expression. Accessed 2 April 2014. http://www.caut.ca/about-us/caut-policy/lists/general-caut-policies/policy-statement-on-academic-freedom-and-artistic-expression

128 CAUT Policy Statement on Defamation Actions Arising out of Academic Activity. Accessed 2 April 2014. http://www.caut.ca/about-us/caut-policy/lists/general-caut-policies/policy-statement-on-defamation-actions-arising-out-of-academic-activities

129 CAUT's Policy Statement on Scholarly Communication. Accessed 2 April 2014. http://www.caut.ca/about-us/caut-policy/lists/caut-policy-statements/policy-statement-on-scholarly-communication

130 CAUT's Policy Statement on Professional Rights and Responsibilities. Accessed 2 April 2014. http://www.caut.ca/about-us/caut-policy/lists/caut-policy-statements/policy-statement-on-professional-rights-and-responsibilities-

Example 10: CAUT's Policy Statement on Openness and Transparency in Post-Secondary Institutions[131] asserts "Universities and colleges that receive public funds either from provincial governments or the Government of Canada through direct grants, student loans, scholarship programs, or other means of direct or indirect transfers have an obligation to use those funds in a responsible way. Universities and colleges must be accountable for their trusteeship of these public monies. Accountability demands openness and transparency. Universities and colleges must be open to public scrutiny, open in their accounts, open in their governance, policies and administration, open in their debates, and open in their decision-making processes. Openness and transparency must be the normal operating procedure for universities and colleges." Is it reasonable, then, the guidelines are so prescriptive in what they encourage academics to avoid?

Table

The following table reflects the key terms/phrases of concern identified in terms of infringements on academic freedom for academic staff using social media for both professional and personal purposes. This data is gathered from absorbing the publicly accessible (in summer 2012) social media guidelines of nine postsecondary institutions in Canada, namely: Carleton University, Memorial University, Queen's University, Ryerson University, University of British Columbia, University of Manitoba, University of Regina, University of Toronto, and Wilfrid Laurier University. Some of the threats to academic staff identified are representative of all nine institutions studied (especially those associated with university branding), while others are not as typical. However, while some language has been extracted directly from the analysed documents, other points are the result of a brief 'summary' of themes that permeated multiple documents. As stated at the outset of this article, we went into this study aiming "to reveal limits to academic" embedded in the language of the guidelines. Thus our identification and interpretation of threats found are what we report in the table. To be clear, were we bias to find threats? Yes. Did we find threats? Yes.

The summary points are identified and organized into four emerging themes: (1) university branding, (2) explicit censorship, (3) risk management and privacy concerns, and (4) freedom of speech and 'action.' The "Implications" column is indicative of the authors' interpretations of how these social media guidelines pose a threat to academic freedom. They are firmly rooted in the authors' personal-professional beliefs in the paramount importance of the free flow of information in the academic enterprise – within the framework of the law and recognizing the right to participate in law reform.

Broad Emerging Themes	***Examples and/or Summary***	***Implications***
University Branding	• advance institutional mandate, promote values of institution • manage reputation of institution • follow visual identity guidelines • social media as marketing tool • consult university before speaking with the media	**Social media has resulted in the pervasive idea participation in these spaces can ultimately result in the erasure of the boundaries between private and public. However, the reiteration of framing social media use by academic staff (even for personal use) solely as "representative of the university" assumes academic staff should have an undying**

131 CAUT's Policy Statement on Openness and Transparency in Post-Secondary Institutions. Accessed 2 April 2014. http://www.caut.ca/about-us/caut-policy/lists/general-caut-policies/policy-statement-on-openness-and-transparency-in-post-secondary-institutions

	• representative of university	**loyalty to their institution, and implicitly suggests being critical of one's institution in any context is problematic. Furthermore, social media is now integral to the exchange of ideas and learning. Should academic staff not be able to engage in these dialogues for a myriad of reasons and utilize them to their full potential (e.g., without feeling inextricably fatefully linked to their institution)?**
Explicit Censorship	• remove potentially problematic content posted by public • administration reserves right to remove content	**What message does academic staff AND students receive if content they post on university sanctioned social media sites are removed because they are deemed controversial (overt sexism, racism, homophobia, hate speech as exceptions)? What message does the university send to the public regarding the value of intellectual freedom in Canada if comments are removed? How is it determined what bodies in the university hold the authoritative power to remove content? How does this skew the perspective the university puts out if it ultimately comes from one subjective experience? [Also applies directly to next section.]**
Risk Management & Privacy Concerns	• use disclaimer statement on personal social media sites • administration reserves right to all passwords of social media sites directly affiliated with an institution • if social media policy is breached, administration reserves right to change passwords	**Conceptualizes academic staff primarily as potential threats to the institution (harkens back to university branding) as opposed to integral components to a learning culture. Instils fear of serious repercussions and censure for undermining guidelines. University is positioned as an institution with *complete control* over any output into flow of**

	• do not attach university email to personal social media sites • be mindful of who you follow/friend on social media • have a vested interest in a topic? disclose it • check in with management/admin if unsure whether what you want to post is appropriate	**information that is at all affiliated with the university. Results in the need for discussions regarding *freedom of association*. Implies the university ultimately usurps control over academic staff records that exist within a digital social space, an action framed by what is 'best for the institution'. An erosion of and threat to academic freedom.**
Freedom of Speech & 'Action'	• do not discuss or endorse political or religious attachments • do not discuss legal matters • avoid controversial topics • manage tone of posts • do not criticize other institutions • take time to 'cool down' before responding to anything online that causes passionate emotions • restrain if you have strong opinions • ensure what is posted online would also be said in a classroom, presented at conference • use good judgement • carefully choose profile picture	**Constructs an organizational culture rooted in self-surveillance, policing, and self-censorship which bleeds into personal life. Inhibits critical thinking process in moments of potential greatness in terms of contributing to invaluable discussions (e.g., potentially 'controversial' social justice/human rights issues). Makes it almost impossible for academic staff to negotiate what is appropriate in what space re: professional vs. private (can this even exist?). Are academic staff ultimately expected to assume the role of neutral automatons?**

Conclusion

In his 2011 monograph, *The Fall of Faculty: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why It Matters*, Benjamin Ginsberg comments "As in so many other realms, one should never underestimate the prevalence of mindless administrative mimicry enshrined under the rubric of best practices. Should we be surprised or upset to learn, for example, the University of Florida's Internet use code, outlawing behaviour that "would include but not be limited to the use of abusive or otherwise objectionable language and/or materials in either public or private messages," is echoed by Alvernia college's policy banning behaviour that "would include but not be limited to the use of obscene, abusive or otherwise objectionable language and/or materials in either public or private messages?" Perhaps college administrators believe if they are going to violate student and faculty First Amendment rights, their conduct is justified if they are merely copying some other school's violation of the Constitution." (118). National policy discussion on social media guidelines at Canadian universities is in order, so there is opportunity to curtail the earliest alarming trends identified at nine Canadian universities. The negative development signifies a labour virus attacking the health of academic freedom in Canadian higher education.

As stated at the outset of this work, the guidelines selected for study were those that were publicly accessible through Canadian university websites in summer 2012. Some of the guidelines (including those of Carleton University) have since been refined or developed; others appear largely unchanged. Changes warrant close and continued analysis.

The benefit of this study is how it identifies and documents the adoption of social media guidelines in Canadian higher education, thus reflecting the initial thrust in implementation of this development by university administrations. The implications for academic freedom are, in our interpretation, undeniably negative, suggesting authoritarian management of university branding and marketing trumped protection of academic freedom in the shift into 21st century academic labour. An important area for future inquiry is to replicate this study, taking into account changes in social media guidelines' directives. It would also be beneficial to examine guidelines at Canadian universities in addition to those nine institutions studied here. Finally, there is obvious merit in comparing and contrasting the Canadian picture to the international arena.

Appendix

Carleton University

ORIGINAL

Social Media Guidelines

***Important Authors' Note**: The below language is exactly what was posted on the Carleton University website at the start of our study in 2012. The guidelines have since been refined (and in our opinion improved). Of interest, Carleton University indicates it is currently developing a fuller 'social media strategy'. For more information, see: http://carleton.ca/socialmedia/social-media-guidelines/ (accessed 28 June 2014).*

--

These social media guidelines are intended to share Carleton's expectations of you when using social media on behalf of the University; and to support your use of social media in contributing to the University's online presence.

These guidelines are meant for anyone working for the University and either using social media on behalf the University, or using social media personally but identifiable online as a University employee.

What is Social Media?

Social media is a catch phrase for internet-based services and sites, such as Facebook, Twitter, Linkedin, YouTube, Foursquare, and blogs. These services and sites share these common attributes:

- **Easy sharing of content** which can lead to exponential dissemination…
- **A sense of community** through targeted audiences, focused subject matter…
- **Engagement** through polls, comments, metrics, alerts for new content…
- **Readily accessible** via smart phones, tablets, laptops, public computers…
- **Low-cost or free** but a large time commitment on the part of your social media account manager.

What is Social Media @ Carleton?

Carleton University currently uses a wide variety of social media tools. As an institution, we maintain numerous Twitter feeds, Facebook pages, YouTube channels, and blogs.

Carleton's online presence supports the University in attracting, recruiting, and retaining students, faculty, and staff. The backbone of the University's online presence is delivered through Carleton's CMS (the content management system) which hosts the public websites of the various departments, faculties, and administrative & research units.

Carleton CMS incorporates components of Social Media: RSS feeds, YouTube-hosted videos, and blogs. University Communications, Faculty Communication Officers, and selected units augment their online presence with additional Social Media services such as Twitter feeds and Facebook pages.

Carleton University is committed to academic freedom of speech. These guidelines are intended to assist you in your professional use of social media and to remind you to consider your reputations and Carleton's when sharing information.

The Office of the Associate Vice-President (Students and Enrolment) provides leadership and support for the use of Social Media at Carleton.

Source: http://www2.carleton.ca/socialmedia/social-media-guidelines/

Home / Social Media Guidelines / Tips on Managing Carleton and Personal Accounts

Using social media on behalf of Carleton

1. Register your Social Media site (e.g. Twitter ID, FaceBook page, …) on Carleton's Official Social Media Directory.
2. Avoid posting anything online that could bring the University or yourself into disrepute. *e.g. do not let the fact that because Social Media is fast, easy, and inexpensive lull you into letting your professional guard down.*
3. Assume that anything you post could last forever, whether it's a Twitter response to a student or a comment on a FaceBook page. *e.g. Twitter content is archived by the US Library of Congress, and even deleted pages can live on in Google caches or in WayBackMachine.org archives.*
4. Conduct yourself in Social Media as you would conduct business on behalf of the University in any other public setting. Your postings should be guided by Carleton policies.
5. If you happen to get a message sent to you from a member of the press via Social media, consider consulting with University Communications before responding.

If you have a Personal online presence

Carleton does not want to discourage or limit your personal expression or online activities. However, you should recognize the potential for damage to be caused (either directly or indirectly) to the University or your department in certain circumstances via your personal use of social media if you can be identified as a Carleton employee.

1. Avoid confusion between your personal and on-behalf-of-Carleton online identities. *e.g. do not use 'Carleton' as a portion of your personal online name.*
2. Where your comments or profile can identify you as a Carleton employee:
    1. only disclose and discuss publicly available information;
    2. ensure that all content published is accurate;
    3. expressly state that the views are your own;
    4. be polite and respectful;
    5. adhere to the Terms of Use of the relevant social media platform/website.

It is recommended that you avoid:

1. implying that you are authorized to speak as a representative of the university;
2. using your Carleton email address;
3. using or disclosing any confidential information obtained in your capacity as an employee;
4. making any comment or posting any material that might cause damage to the university's reputation.

Examples of reasonable use:

1. re-Tweeting content from official Carleton accounts on your personal Twitter account;
2. Updating Facebook status and posting messages during a lunch break;

Example of unreasonable use:

1. Using University resources to access or post any material that is fraudulent, harassing, threatening, bullying, embarrassing, sexually explicit, profane, obscene, racist, sexist, intimidating, defamatory or otherwise inappropriate or unlawful.

University Policies

- Acceptable Use Policy for IT
- Carleton University Privacy Policies
- Carleton University Human Rights Policy
- Visual Identity Policy
- Web Content Policy

References

Botha, E.1, Elsamari., M.2 Farshid, and L.3 Pitt: "How Sociable? An Exploratory Study Of University Brand Visibility In Social Media." South African Journal of Business Management. 42.2 2011. 43-51

Chretien, Katherine C. et al.: "Social Media Policies at US Medical Schools." Medical Education Online. 15.1 2010. 1-8

Enders, Naulayne, and Heidi Wineland: "Writing a Social Media Policy for Your Library."Kentucky Libraries. 76.1 2012. 16-19

Esyin Chew, et al.: "Get Out Of Myspace!." Computers & Education. 54.3 2010. 776-782

Farkas, Meredith: "Governing Social Media." American Libraries. 40.12 2009. 35

Garber, Michelle Brooks: "Social Media Policy on Campus: A Case Study of the Development and Implementation of a Social Media Policy for University Administrators, Faculty, and Staff." ProQuest LLC 2011

Ginsberg, Benjamin: The Fall of Faculty: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why It Matters. New York/Oxford University Press 2011.

Hamada, Basyouni Ibrahim: "Communication Revolution and Academic Freedom." Journal Of Arab & Muslim Media Research. 3.1/2 2010. 37-58

Ho, Catherine: "Keeping tabs on college athletes." Washington Post, The. 10/14 2011

Kelly, Matthew: "Minimising Risk From Social Media." Education Journal. 139 2012. 5

Kroski, Ellyssa: "Should Your Library Have a Social Media Policy?." School Library Journal. 55.10 2009, 44-46

McNeil, Tony: "Don't affect the share price: social media policy in higher education as management." Research in Learning Technology. 20 2012.http://www.researchinlearningtechnology.net/index.php/rlt/article/view/19194/html

Pikalek, Amy J: "Navigating the Social Media Learning Curve." Continuing Higher Education Review. 74 2010. 150-160

Sachs, Dianna E., Edward J. Eckel, and Kathleen A. Langan: "Striking a Balance: Effective Use of Facebook in an Academic Library." Internet Reference Services Quarterly. 16.1/2 2011. 35-54

Sanderson, Jimmy: "To Tweet Or Not To Tweet: Exploring Division I Athletic Departments' Social-Media Policies." International Journal Of Sport Communication. 4.4 2011. 492-513

Web Distance Education Reports: "Facebook: Some Implications for Academic Freedom, Intellectual Property, and Education." 13.24 2009. 4-6

Williams, Jennifer, Carinda Feild, and Kristina James: "The Effects Of A Social Media Policy On Pharmacy Students' Facebook Security Settings." American Journal OfPharmaceutical Education. 75.9 2011. 177

Zaliskaite-Jakste, Ligita, and Rita Kuvykaite: "Implementation of Communication in Social Media by Promoting Studies at Higher Education Institutions." Engineering Economics. 23.2 2012. 174-88

Additional Work

Rowe, David: "We take academic freedom quite seriously': How university media offices manage academic public communication." International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics." 7.1 2011. Not available through U of A. Link about article: http://www.intellectbooks.co.uk/journals/view-Article,id=11023/