

Senate Discipline Committee (SDC)

2014-2015 Annual Report

The Senate Discipline Committee (SDC) submits the following annual report for 2014-2015.

1. Membership

The following persons served on the SDC between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015:

Faculty members:

Susan Holmes (Chair)	College of Continuing Education (from May 2006)
Andrew Warkentin	Faculty of Engineering (from March 2014)
Jim Power	Faculty of Management (from July 2012)
Bruce Archibald	Schulich School of Law (from July 2013)
Jerry Bannister	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (from September 2010)
A. Randall Olson	Faculty of Agriculture (from July 2013)
Brenda Sabo	Faculty of Health Professions (from July 2013)
Roman Smirnov	Faculty of Mathematics & Statistics (from July 2014)

Dalhousie Student Union members:

Ali Calladine	from May 1, 2014
Andrew Bucci	from May 1, 2014
Dylan Letendre	from May 1, 2014
Taylor Quinn	from May 1, 2014

King's Student Union members:

Aidan McNally	from May 1, 2014
Eleanor Hornbeck	from May 1, 2014

Previous committee members: Jerry Bannister, Bruce Archibald, Roman Smirnov, Brenda Sabo, Ali Calladine, Andrew Bucci, Taylor Quinn, Aidan McNally and Eleanor Hornbeck have moved on and will no longer serve on the SDC. We thank them for their outstanding support this past year.

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.

The current year, 2014-2015, saw continued development regarding enforcement of penalties ordered by the SDC and Faculty AIOs. It has been a long-standing practice of the

SDC to recommend, where appropriate, that offending students undergo some remedial training in order to learn best practices and avoid committing offences in the future. This often takes the form of a recommendation that a student attend a Writing Centre workshop on writing a research paper or on intellectual honesty, but study skills and time management workshops offered by Dalhousie Student Services have also been utilized.

Caseload

The overall caseload (by student) of the Senate Discipline Committee saw an increase in the number of cases from 33 students in the 2013-2014 academic year to 39 students in 2014-2015 academic year, as outlined below.

3. Students with Allegations¹ heard by SDC between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015

Number of Students with Allegations Heard: **39**
Number of Students with Pending Allegations: **11**
Number of alleged first time offenders: **18**
Number of alleged repeat offenders: **21**

4. Cases² heard by SDC between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015

Number of Cases Heard: **33**
Number of Pending Cases: **11**

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

Allegations received in 2011-2012 and heard in 2012-2013: 1
Allegations received in 2012-2013 and heard in 2012-2013: 30
Total allegations heard in 2012-2013: 31

Allegations received in 2013-2014 and heard in 2013-2014: 33
Allegations received in 2013-2014 pending a hearing as of July 1, 2014: 8
Total allegations heard in 2013-2014: 33
Total allegations received in 2013-2014: 41

Allegations received in 2014-2015 and heard in 2014-2015: 39
Allegations received in 2014-2015 pending a hearing as of July 1, 2015: 11
Total allegations heard in 2014-2015: 39
Total allegations received in 2014-2015: 50

6. 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

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.

numbers relate to classes which are part of a specific Faculty and may not be the home Faculty of the instructor or the student.

Faculty or Unit	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
Agriculture	0	0	0	0	1
Architecture and Planning	0	0	0	1	0
Arts and Social Sciences	8	2	7	8	7
Computer Science	1	2	0	2	3
Dentistry	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering	3	6	5	3	3
Graduate Studies	0	1	0	0	1
Health Professions	3	1	4	1	4
Law	0	0	0	1	1
Management	2	6	10	8	7
Medicine	0	0	0	1	0
Science	0	2	1	7	10
King's College	2	4	4	1	1
Office of the Vice-President, Student Services (Code of Student Conduct)	1	1	0	0	1
Total	20	25	31	33	39

7. Number of Students with Allegations Heard by SDC between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015 – By Outcome

Proven: 36
Not Proven: 3

Total: 39

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.

8. Distribution of Students with Allegations Heard by SDC between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015 – By Level of Class

First year 21	Fifth year 1	Thesis 1
Second year 2	Sixth year & higher 2	
Third year 5	Code of Conduct 1	
Fourth year 5	Other (non-credit course) 1	

9. Types of Allegations Heard by SDC between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015:

a. Plagiarism (excluding unauthorized collaboration)

Number of students with allegations: 16
Number of allegations proven: 16
Number of allegations not proven: 0

b. Plagiarism/ Engaging with a third party

Number of students with allegations: 1
Number of allegations proven: 1
Number of allegations not proven: 0

c. Cheating/ Copying

Number of students with allegations: 1
Number of allegations proven: 1
Number of allegations not proven: 0

d. Cheating on Examination or Test

Number of students with allegations: 8
Number of allegations proven: 6
Number of allegations not proven: 2

e. Colluding on Exam/ Academic Fraud

Number of students with allegations: 3
Number of allegations proven: 3
Number of allegations not proven: 0

f. Code of Conduct : Possession of Weapon, Offence against person:

Number of students with allegations: 1
Number of allegations proven: 1
Number of allegations not proven: 0

g. Unauthorized Collaboration

Number of students with allegations: 3
Number of allegations proven: 3
Number of allegations not proven: 0

h. Self-Plagiarism

Number of students with allegations: 1
Number of allegations proven: 1

Number of allegations not proven: 0

i. Inappropriate Collaboration

Number of students with allegations: 4

Number of allegations proven: 3

Number of allegations not proven: 1

j. Falsified Data

Number of students with allegations: 1

Number of allegations proven: 1

Number of allegations not proven: 0

10. Summary of Penalties over the last 5 years

The following chart identifies the number of students who received a particular penalty in a given year (last five years). Explanations of some of the penalties are provided below.

Penalty	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
"0" on the assignment/exam		4	12	14	19
"F" in the class	8	5	9	18	3
"F" on assignment/exam	1				2
Academic Integrity Module			3	5	3
Expulsion				1	2
Meeting with AIO to discuss Academic Integrity			1		
Notation on transcript	7	7	7	20	20
Other penalty	5			1	
Reduction of final class grade/capped grade for class	3	2	3	4	4
Reduction of grade for assignment/exam		1	2	2	2
Resubmit assignment		1		3	3
Second midterm worth 15% of final grade			2		
Sessions with a tutor at the Writing Centre			3		
Submit an additional assignment				1	
Suspension	1		4	4	2
Warning; reprimand only	2				
Writing Centre requirement	8		12	24	16
Special assignment on integrity			1	2	
Study for Success Workshop			2	2	
Failure of Comprehensive exam, permitted second attempt					1
Dismissal from program					2
Grade for exam / assignment capped					3
Number of allegations (total)	20	25	31	33	39
Number of allegations (proven)	19	25	23	31	36

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 or a demonstrable lack of competency in research and writing to required academic standards, 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 five occasions since the 2005-2006 academic year. This most recent academic year 2014-15 included two expulsions from the university.

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.

11. Training

The Senate Discipline Committee met on February 24th, 2015 for training sessions. The training focused on scenarios that may arise before SDC panels, and were used to illustrate some of the best practices (and a few missteps) for future hearing panels to consider. Hearing-related issues such as procedural errors, difficult witnesses and conflict management were discussed, among others. Sessions such as this are helpful for the SDC, since not all members of the SDC serve on every hearing panel and there are always situations that can serve as good "learning moments" that were only experienced by a handful of members. A thank you to Bob Mann for providing relevant and interesting training sessions that are well-attended by Committee members.

12. Acknowledgements

The SDC further wishes to thank Bob Mann and Kara Miller for their support on all aspects of the Committee's activity.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Susan Holmes". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Susan Holmes
Chair (2014-2015)