

Faculty Discipline Process

2015-2016 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, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

1. Membership

The following Deans or delegates served as AIOs between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016:

Keltie Jones	Faculty of Agriculture
Christine Macy	Faculty of Architecture and Planning
James Forren	Faculty of Architecture and Planning
Christopher Helland	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Krista Kesselring	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Alex Brodsky	Faculty of Computer Science
Christian Blouin	Faculty of Computer Science
James Blustein	Faculty of Computer Science
Ronald Bannerman	Faculty of Dentistry
Donald Jones	Faculty of Engineering
Eileen Denovan-Wright	Faculty of Graduate Studies
Marty Leonard	Faculty of Graduate Studies
Erna Snelgrove-Clarke	Faculty of Health Professions
Brenda Merritt	Faculty of Health Professions
Camille Cameron	Faculty of Law
Scott Comber	Faculty of Management
Vivian Howard	Faculty of Management
Darrell White	Faculty of Medicine
Daniel Labrie	Faculty of Science
Simon Kow	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 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. There was also discussion with respect to a new sharepoint system which will be implemented this Fall 2016. This will make for a smoother process for filing allegations and uploading the necessary Forms. AIO's across all faculties are in favor of this new system.

This joint AIO/SDC meeting occurred on June 27th, 2016. Training for the AIO's will occur in the fall term of 2016.

3. Number of Students with Proven Allegations ratified between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016

Total number of students with proven allegations ratified: 316*

** 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, 2015 and June 30, 2016 there were 29 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
	2014-2015	2014-2015 (%)	2015-2016(%)	2015-2016 (%)
Agriculture	28	10.8	5	1.5
Architecture and Planning	6	2.3	14	4.4
Arts and Social Sciences	91	35	81	25.6
Computer Science	17	6.5	24	7.6
Dentistry	1	<1%	3	<1%
Engineering	1	<1%	17	5.3
Grad Studies	0	0	4	1.2
Health Professions	15	5.8	14	4.4
Law	2	<1%	0	0
Management	49	18.8	61	19.3
Medicine	0	0	1	<1%
Science	40	15.4	55	17.4
University of King's College (Arts and Social Sciences only)	10	3.9	37	11.7
Total	260	100%	316	100%

5. Students with Allegations Referred to the SDC (received by Senate between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016)

Students with Allegations referred to the SDC because:

- a) Student had a prior academic offence on record: 31
- b) Determination of penalty only (assessment accepted): 2
- c) AIO requested matter to be referred to the SDC for another reason: 14

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

Level of Class	Proven Allegations	
	2014-2015	2015-2016
First year	132	115
Second year	52	57
Third year	47	109
Fourth year	12	16
Fifth year	8	4
Sixth year & Above	9	13
Thesis	0	0
Other	0	2
Total	260	316

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

Faculty	1 st Year	2 nd Year	3 rd Year	4 th Year	5 th Year	6 th Year	Other	Total
Agriculture	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	5
Architecture & Planning	5	7	1	1	0	0	0	14
Arts & Social Sciences	10	7	64	0	0	0	0	81
Computer Science	15	2	2	1	0	4	0	24
Dentistry	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Engineering	2	0	8	5	0	0	2	17
Graduate Studies	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	4
Health Professions	7	3	1	2	1	0	0	14
Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Management	20	13	19	0	3	6	0	61
Medicine	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Science	28	10	13	3	1	0	0	55
King's College	25	12	0	0	0	0	0	37
Total	115	56	109	16	5	10	5	316

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
a) Plagiarism	227
b) Cheating on text/exam	20
c) Copying	17
d) Unauthorized Collaboration	11
e) Plagiarism/ Unauthorized Collaboration	8
f) Copying/ cheating on assignment	8
g) Inappropriate Collaboration	4
h) Aiding in commission of an academic offence	3
i) Falsification of data	3
j) Use of unauthorized materials on test/exam	3
k) Self- plagiarism	2
l) Aiding in the commission of an academic offence//Plagiarism	2
m) Submission of ghost-written paper	2
n) Wrote test for another student	2
o) Plagiarism/ self- plagiarism/unauthorized collaboration	1
p) Use of unauthorized materials- other	1
q) Submitted work that was prepared by another person	1
r) Misrepresentation of data	1
s) Academic Dishonesty	1
t) Aiding/ Abetting	1
Total number of allegations:	318

9. Penalties

Penalty	2014-2015	2015-2016
Writing Centre requirement	139	176
“0” on the assignment / exam	132	186
Reduction of grade for assignment / exam	50	25
Reduction of final class grade / capped grade for class	25	36
Resubmit assignment	18	13
Grade of “0” on portion of assignment/ exam	18	3
Warning; reprimand only ²	15	17
Grade for exam/assignment capped	12	38

Notation on transcript	11	23
"F" in class	6	4
Meeting with professor to discuss acceptable / unacceptable collaboration	6	0
Grade capped for course	3	4
Failure of Course	2	11
"F" on assignment / exam	2	7
Deduction toward final numerical grade	1	5
Letter of apology to Professor	1	1
Assignment mark to be included into calculation of final grade	1	0
Final grade will be the average of two other assignments	1	0
Meet with professor to register for course in current term	1	0
Submit additional assignment	1	0
Submit draft revision of assignment to writing centre for feedback	1	0
Grade of zero on term portfolio	1	0
Coordinate meeting with instructor for resubmit	1	0
Must work with personal counselor until graduation	1	0
Complete Academic Integrity Modules	0	5
One-on-one sessions with a tutor at writing centre	0	2
Rewrite assignment/exam	0	2
Tutorial on APA format	0	2
Opportunity to resubmit MSc thesis for examination	0	1
Opportunity to pass course on certain conditions	0	1
Must complete the FGS "mygradskills" on-line module	0	1
Must download lecture notes and study them	0	1
Failure of thesis	0	1
Seek assistance to learn about resources available through an academic advisor	0	1
Final grade decreased by one grade increment	0	1
Provide self-citations and write a report	0	1
Final numerical grade cannot be less than 50%	0	1
Final grade calculated as per course syllabus	0	1
Term paper marked as though no plagiarism has occurred	0	1
Total of Proven Allegations Ratified in the Year	449	571

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 work supporting the Faculty Discipline Process.

Submitted by :

Katherine Harman, Vice-Chair (Student Affairs)
/klm