

Senate Discipline Committee (SDC) 2010-2011 Annual Report

The Senate Discipline Committee (SDC) submits the following annual report for 2010-2011.

1. Membership

The following persons served on the SDC between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2011:

Faculty members:

Wayne Garland	Faculty of Dentistry,
Susan Holmes (Chair)	College of Continuing Education
Blyth Archibald	Faculty of Management
Sachin Seth	Faculty of Dentistry
Teresa Cyrus	Faculty of Science
Anne-Marie Ryan	Faculty of Science
Joseph Sadek	Faculty of Medicine
David Hoskin	Faculty of Medicine (from January 2010)
Alan Pinder	Faculty of Science (from January 2010)
Jerry Bannister	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (from September 2010)

Dalhousie Student Union members:

Carly Nicholson	from May 1, 2010
Rob LeForte	from May 1, 2010
Alexander Szumilas	from May 1, 2010
Ben Wedge	from May 1, 2010
Margaret Scrimgoeur	from May 1 2011
Rebekah Oomen	from May 1, 2011
Jonathan Magill	from May 1, 2011
Sarah Bouchard	from May 1, 2011

King's Student Union members:

Nick Stark	from May 1, 2011
David Etherington	from May 1, 2010
Elizabeth Johnson	from May 1, 2010

2. Activities of the SDC

The Committee considers all allegations of academic offences that are not resolved by Faculty Academic Integrity Officers and all breaches of the Code of Student Conduct that are not resolved informally through the Office of the Vice-President, Student Services. In addition to conducting hearings, the SDC meets annually, or as frequently as required, to discuss relevant issues and to provide training to its members. In the past, the Chair of the SDC was an ex officio member of the Senate Committee on Academic Administration Sub-Committee on Academic Integrity (SCAA-AI). These functions will now fall to the new Committee for Learning and Teaching.

The 2010-2011 academic year saw the approval of a new *Terms of Reference* and the development of a *Jurisdiction and Procedures* for the SDC (passed by Senate on March 21 and May 9, 2011, respectively). This was in keeping with the mandate and timeline set forth at the 2010 general

meeting. A notable change in the new *Terms of Reference* is the composition of the SDC, which has been reduced to 7 faculty members and 5 student members.

Previous committee member, Alan Pinder, has moved on to the position of Senate Vice-Chair, (Student Affairs), and will continue to work with the student discipline process in this capacity.

The overall caseload of the Senate Discipline Committee saw a significant increase (from 10 to 20 cases) from the 2009-2010 academic year, as outlined below.

3. Students with Allegations¹ heard by SDC between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2011

Number of Students with Allegations Heard – 20
Number of Students with Pending Allegations – 2 (as of July 1, 2011)

4. Cases² heard by SDC between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2011

Number of Cases Heard – 20
Number of Pending Cases – 2 (as of July 1, 2011)

5. Students with Allegations Heard by SDC between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2011

Number of alleged first time offenders -9
Number of alleged repeat offenders – 11

6. Allegations Received and/or Heard by SDC over last 3 years

Allegations received in 2007-2008 and heard in 2008-2009 – 8
Allegations received in 2008-2009 and heard in 2008-2009 – 14
Total allegations heard in 2008-2009 – 22

Allegations received in 2008-2009 and heard in 2009-2010 – 3
Allegations received in 2009-2010 and heard in 2009-2010 – 7
Total allegations heard in 2009-2010 – 10

Allegations received in 2009-2010 and heard in 2010-2011- 1
Allegations received in 2010-2011 and heard in 2010-2011- 19
Allegations received in 2010-2011 pending a hearing as of July 1, 2011- 2
Total allegations heard in 2010-2011- 20
Total allegations received in 2010/2011-22

¹ An **allegation** refers to an alleged offence against a specific student, including code of student conduct offences.

² A **case** encompasses the entire number of students involved in an alleged offence whose allegations are proceeding before one SDC hearing panel, e.g. a group project involving 4 students would be considered 4 allegations, but **one** case with **one** hearing.

7. Distribution of Students with Allegations Heard by SDC over last 5 years – By Faculty or Administrative Unit

The following chart identifies the number of students with allegations attributable to each Faculty or Administrative Department that were heard by the SDC in the applicable academic year. The numbers relate to classes which are part of a specific Faculty and may not be the Faculty of the instructor or the student.

Faculty or Unit	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Architecture and Planning	1	0	1	0	0
Arts and Social Sciences	18	17	5	5	8
Computer Science	0	1	0	1	1
Dentistry	2	0	0	0	0
Engineering	9	8	3	0	3
Graduate Studies	0	0	0	0	0
Health Professions	13	8	3	1	3
Law	1	3	1	0	0
Management	39	2	3	0	2
Medicine	3	0	1	2	0
Science	39	5	5	1	0
King's College	5	2	0	0	2
Office of the Vice-President, Student Services (Code of Student Conduct)	3	8	0	0	1
Total	133	54	22	10	20

8. Number of Students with Allegations Heard by SDC between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2011 – By Outcome

Proven – 19
 Not Proven – 1
Total – 20

The standard of proof is the balance of probabilities. When an allegation has been proven, this means that the SDC hearing panel has determined that the alleged academic offence is more likely than not to have been committed by the student.

There were no appeals by students to the Senate Discipline Appeal Board during 2010-2011. The last discipline appeal heard was in 2007-2008.

9. Distribution of Students with Allegations Heard by SDC between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2011 – By Level of Class

First year	7	Fifth year	1
Second year	5	Sixth year	1
Third year	3	Code of Conduct	1
Fourth year	2	Total	20

10. Students with Allegations Heard by SDC over last 5 years:

2006-2007 - 133
2007-2008 - 54
2008-2009 - 22
2009-2010 - 10
2010-2011 - 20

11. Faculty Discipline Process Statistics:

Students with Ratified Decisions 2010-2011-191

Students with Ratified Decisions 2009-2010 - 134

Students with Ratified Decisions 2008-2009 – 147

Students with Ratified Decisions 2007-2008 – 113 (September 1, 2007-June 30, 2008)

12. Types of Allegations Heard by SDC between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2011:

a. Plagiarism (excluding unauthorized collaboration)

Number of students with allegations - 15

Number of allegations proven - 15

Number of allegations not proven - 0

b. Cheating on examination or test

Number of students with allegations - 3

Number of allegations proven - 3

Number of allegations not proven – 0

c. Submitted work for credit when not the sole author

Number of students with allegations-1

Number of allegations proven-1

Number of allegations not proven-0

d. Code of Student Conduct

Code cases involve alleged offences of a non-academic nature occurring on University property; for example, assault, property damage, alcohol or drug abuse, forgery.

Number of students with allegations – 1

Number of allegations proven-0

Number of allegations not proven-1

13. Summary of Penalties over last 5 years

The following chart identifies the number of students who received a particular penalty in a given year (last five years). It also outlines the percentage of students who received said penalty, as a percentage of all students with proven allegations. Explanations of some of the penalties are provided below.

A=Number of Students with proven allegations B=Percentage of Total Possible (all proven)											
Penalty ¹	2006-2007		2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	
"0" on all assignments for the class	2	2.2%									
"0" on the assignment / exam	29	32.6%	7	15.6%			4	40.0%	9	47.4%	
"F" in the class	32	36.0%	17	37.8%	8	47.1%	5	50.0%	5	26.3%	
"F" on assignment / exam	5	5.6%	3	6.7%	1	5.9%			1	5.3%	
Expulsion	1	1.1%	1	2.2%							
Notation on transcript	60	67.4%	24	53.3%	7	41.2%	7	70.0%	10	52.6%	
Other penalty ²			13	28.9%	5	29.4%			4	21.1%	
Probation			1	2.2%							
Reduction of final class grade / capped grade for class	29	32.6%	5	11.1%	3	17.6%	2	20.0%	1	5.3%	
Reduction of grade for assignment / exam	8	9.0%					1	10.0%	1	5.3%	
Required to attend 1/2 credit class in Ethics approved by SOS	1	1.1%									
Resubmit assignment	5	5.6%	3	6.7%			1	10.0%	2	10.5%	
Suspension	2	2.2%			1	5.9%					
Warning; reprimand only ³	2	2.2%	1	2.2%	2	11.8%					
Writing Centre requirement	14	15.7%	15	33.3%	8	47.1%			13	68.4%	
Number of allegations (total)	133		54		22		10		20		
Number of allegations (proven)	89		45		17		10		19		
¹ The number of penalties is greater than the number of allegations. Example: An 'F' plus a notation on a transcript.											
² Specifics of penalty outlined in the text of the decision letter.											
³ Any extenuating circumstances would be outlined in the text of the decision letter.											

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, possibly in combination with suspension.

Writing Workshop 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 at the Killam Library.

Suspension: A student may be suspended for a specified time if the case is egregious and/or involves a repeat offence. Suspensions are most frequently for one term or year, to a maximum of 3 years.

Expulsion: Expulsion is rarely applied, and has occurred on only three occasions since the 2005-2006 academic year.

Other penalty: Occasionally it is necessary to tailor penalties to suit the circumstances. For example, a student in the King's Foundation Year Program receives a single grade for the year, so prescribing "F in the class" would be inappropriate. Instead, an overall grade reduction might be prescribed.

No penalty or a warning: A hearing panel may determine that a student has committed an academic offence, but that no penalty or only a warning is appropriate. For example, there may be a number of mitigating factors. However, even when this might occur, the fact that an academic offence has been proven regarding the student will be recorded on the Senate disciplinary case database.

14. Meetings

An Annual General Meeting was held on September 22, 2010, during which the 2009-2010 annual report was approved for presentation at the next meeting of Senate.

This meeting was directly followed by a General Meeting, at which discussion was held on topics such as proposed changes to the *SDC Terms of Reference*, training requirements for committee members and the *Faculty Discipline Procedure Annual Report (2009-2010)*. New SDC members Jerry Bannister, Maggie Lovett, Alexander Szumilas, Ben Wedge, Carly Nicholson, Alan Pinder and David Hoskin were welcomed to the committee for the 2010/2011 academic year.

A training session was held for SDC members on November 10, 2010. Bob Mann presented on the topic of "Fact Finding and Decisions."

15. Acknowledgements

The SDC thanks Natalie Webber, former Coordinator, Discipline and Appeals, for her fine work in coordinating the work of the SDC over the past five years, and wishes her luck in her new position at Dalhousie University.

The SDC further wishes to thank Bob Mann and the Dalhousie Legal Counsel Office for their efforts on the revisions to the *Terms of Reference* and development of the *Jurisdiction and Procedures*.

Respectfully submitted,



Susan Holmes
Chair (2010-2011)
October 11, 2011

