

Faculty Discipline Process

2018-2019 Annual Report

The Vice-Chair (Student Affairs), on behalf of the Academic Integrity Officers (AIOs), submits the following Faculty Discipline Process Annual Report for July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019.

1. Membership

The following Deans or delegates served as AIOs between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2019:

Keltie Jones	Faculty of Agriculture
James Forren	Faculty of Architecture and Planning
Justin Roberts	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Roberta Barker	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (back up AIO)
Ayesha Mushtaq	College of Continuing Education
Jennifer Macdonald	College of Continuing Education (back up AIO)
Steven Mannell	College of Sustainability
Andrew Medeiros	College of Sustainability (new AIO effective April 2019)
Alex Brodsky	Faculty of Computer Science
Christian Blouin	Faculty of Computer Science
Khurram Aziz	Faculty of Computer Science
Raghav Sampangi	Faculty of Computer Science
Angela Siegel	Faculty of Computer Science
Debora Matthews	Faculty of Dentistry
Margaret Walsh	Faculty of Engineering
Eileen Denovan-Wright	Faculty of Graduate Studies
Marty Leonard	Faculty of Graduate Studies
Erna Snelgrove-Clarke	Faculty of Health
Judy Macdonald	Faculty of Health
Catherine Sheffer	Faculty of Health
Camille Cameron	Faculty of Law
Mike Smit	Faculty of Management
Vivian Howard	Faculty of Management (back up AIO)
Darrell White	Faculty of Medicine
Daniel Labrie	Faculty of Science
Janet Hathaway	University of King's College

2. Activities related to the *Faculty Discipline Procedures Concerning Allegations of Academic Offences*

The *Faculty Discipline Procedures Concerning Allegations of Academic Offences* came into effect on September 1, 2007. The Procedures deal with allegations of academic offences and not with alleged violations of the Student Code of Conduct. The purpose of the Procedures is to delegate assessment of certain allegations of academic offences to the Faculty level.

The Academic Integrity Officer of each Faculty is the Dean. However, the Dean may delegate the role of AIO to one or more members of the academic staff of the Faculty. AIOs receive all allegations of academic offences submitted by instructors and the majority of allegations are resolved at the Faculty level. A matter is referred by an AIO to the Senate Discipline Committee (SDC) when the timeline for possible resolution is exceeded, the appropriate penalty is of a greater degree than that which can be recommended by the AIO, or the student does not accept the finding and/or penalty recommended by the AIO. When a student has a prior academic offence on record, the AIO will refer the matter directly to the SDC, unless it is a case of two or more students facing allegations arising from the same fact situation (*common allegation* is further described below).

On a recommendation from the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee, the Senate passed an amendment to the Faculty Discipline Procedures in 2017 such that AIO's now have some discretion with respect to handling prior offence cases. The AIO's must send a request to the Senate Vice- Chair. Once approved, they can meet with the student, recommend a finding and determine a penalty for prior offence cases.

The joint AIO/SDC meeting was held on May 6, 2019, and AIO training took place on January 21, 2019.

3. Number of Students with Proven Allegations ratified between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2019

Total number of students with proven allegations ratified: 746*

Of those allegations ratified, here is a breakdown of students by citizenship status:

Canadian	206
International	516
Permanent Resident	23
Refugee	1

** Refers to cases transferred for ratification of assessment and penalty and cases transferred for ratification of assessment only (determination of penalty by SDC).*

There are cases where an allegation of an academic offence is submitted by an instructor and the AIO determines there is no *prima facie* case, or determines after meeting with the student that the allegation is not proven. Between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2019 there were 17 students facing allegations where AIOs made such determinations. The standard of proof is the “balance of probabilities”. When an allegation has been “proven”, this means that the AIO has determined that the alleged academic offence is more likely than not to have been committed by the student.

4. Distribution of Students with Proven and Ratified Allegations by Faculty

The chart describes the total number of students with proven and ratified allegations broken down by Faculty. The numbers relate to classes that are part of a specific Faculty and may not be the Faculty of the instructor or the student.

Faculty / Unit	Proven Allegations	Percentage of Total	Proven Allegations	Percentage of Total
	2017-2018(%)	2017-2018 (%)	2018-2019 (%)	2018-2019 (%)
Agriculture	21	3.7	20	2.6
Architecture and Planning	1	<1%	0	0
Arts and Social Sciences	102	18.2	84	11.2
College of Continuing Education	6	1.0	6	.80
College of Sustainability	1	<1%	0	0
Computer Science	129	23.1	308	41.29
Dentistry	0	0	0	0
Engineering	0	0	23	3.08
Grad Studies	0	0	2	.27
Health	12	2.1	5	.67
Law	5	<1%	1	.13
Management	94	16.8	89	11.9
Medicine	9	1.6	2	.26
Science	154	27.5	171	22.9
University of King's College (Arts and Social Sciences only)	25	4.4	35	4.7
Total	559	100%	746	100%

5. Students with Allegations Referred to the SDC (received by Senate between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2019)

Students with Allegations referred to the SDC because:

- a) Student had a prior academic offence on record: 15
- b) Determination of penalty only (assessment accepted): 0
- c) AIO requested matter to be referred to the SDC for another reason: 39

6. Distribution of Students with Proven and Ratified Allegations by Level of Class

Level of Class	Proven Allegations	
	2017-2018	2018-2019
First year	316	388
Second year	118	150
Third year	61	128
Fourth year	14	22
Fifth year	29	30
Sixth year & Above	20	21
Thesis	0	0
Other	1	7
Total	559	746

7. Distribution of Students with Proven and Ratified Allegations by Level of Class by Faculty

Faculty	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year	5th Year	6th Year	Other	Total
Agriculture	5	6	5	3	0	0	1	20
Architecture & Planning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arts & Social Sciences	61	20	2	1	0	0	0	84
College of Continuing Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
College of Sustainability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Computer Science	181	17	69	2	19	20	0	308
Dentistry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering	8	1	8	5	0	1	0	23
Graduate Studies	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Health	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	5
Law	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Management	21	48	4	7	9	0	0	89
Medicine	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Science	92	36	39	4	0	0	0	171
King's College	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	35
Total	388	150	128	22	30	21	7	746

8. Number of different allegations

The number of specific allegations is greater than the number of matters ratified, as there can be more than one allegation names by the AIO and accepted by the student.

Allegation	Number of Allegations
Plagiarism	373
Copying/cheating on assignment (online or other source)	157
Unauthorized Collaboration	148
Cheating on exam/test	34
Possession of unauthorized materials (exam/test)	12
Self-plagiarism	10
Aiding in the commission of an academic offence	10
Submitted work for credit when not sole author	4
Attempt to gain unfair advantage	2
Data falsification	1

9. Penalties

Penalty	2017-2018	2018-2019
Notation on transcript	92	196
"F" in course	22	22
Grade capped for course	8	1
Reduction of final course grade	225	260
"0" on the assignment / exam	350	392
Reduction of grade for assignment / exam	45	89
Grade of "0" on portion of assignment/ exam	13	23
Resubmit assignment	21	48
Warning; reprimand only ²	25	19
Grade for exam/assignment capped	46	32
Writing Centre requirement	330	355
Special remedial assignment	1	10
Academic Integrity/Ethics Module/Workshop Requirement	190	102
Rewrite assignment/exam	7	6
Mandatory meeting with academic advisor	4	5
Instructor will grade photocopy of midterm made following the incident as though it were the completed midterm	1	0

Penalties recommended by Academic Integrity Officers are summarized in the table above. The number of penalties is greater than the number of matters ratified, as there can be more than one penalty recommended by the AIO and accepted by the student. For example, one student might

experience both failure of the class and a notation on the transcript. In addition, all proven and ratified allegations are recorded in the confidential discipline database maintained by the University Secretariat. Any subsequent allegation against an individual listed in the database would result in the allegation being automatically referred to the Senate Discipline Committee, except in the case of a common allegation, as specified above. Following is a brief explanation of some of the penalties.

Notation:

A notation of Senate disciplinary action for an academic offence can be placed on a student's transcript for up to five years. Commonly, a notation is between six months and one year. A notation of two or more years is generally applied only in the case of a second or subsequent offence.

Writing Centre requirement:

If the offence involves incorrect citation, the student may be required to attend one of the writing workshops or seminars presented by the Dalhousie Writing Centre.

Warning; reprimand only: An AIO may determine that a student has committed an academic offence, but that a warning and no penalty is appropriate.

I would like to thank all of the Academic Integrity Officers, Faculty and support staff who worked diligently over the past year to ensure the success of the Faculty Discipline Process. Dealing with students who are suspected of having committed an academic offense is a challenging task. The cases are at times complex and time consuming. Looking back on the past year, I am confident that those tasked with upholding standards of academic integrity at Dalhousie are making every effort to be fair and reasonable with students, while at the same time impressing upon students that academic offenses are serious. This is not always an easy balance to maintain.

I would especially like to thank Ms. Kara Miller (Coordinator, Discipline & Appeals) and Mr. Bob Mann (Manager, Discipline & Appeals) for their continued work and effort in supporting the Faculty Discipline Process.

Submitted by :

Tanya Packer, Vice-Chair (Student Affairs)
/klm