

# Faculty Discipline Process 2013-2014 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, 2013 to June 30, 2014.

## 1. Membership

The following Deans or delegates served as AIOs between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2014:

Keltie Jones	Faculty of Agriculture
Christine Macy	Faculty of Architecture and Planning
Gary Kynoch	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Robert Summerby-Murray	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Krista Kesselring	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Denis Riordan	Faculty of Computer Science
Christian Blouin	Faculty of Computer Science
Ronald Bannerman	Faculty of Dentistry
Stephen Kuzak	Faculty of Engineering
Eileen Denovan-Wright	Faculty of Graduate Studies
Katherine Harman	Faculty of Health Professions
Erna Snelgrove-Clarke	Faculty of Health Professions
Kim Brooks	Faculty of Law
Peggy Cunningham	Faculty of Management
Gregory Hebb	Faculty of Management
Vivian Howard	Faculty of Management
Preston Smith	Faculty of Medicine
Daniel Labrie	Faculty of Science
Simon Kow	University of King's College
Dean Jobb	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).

The AIOs met as a group with the SDC to discuss policy issues and training requirements. This joint AIO/SDC meeting occurred on May 15, 2014. Training for AIO’s will occur in the fall term of 2014.

### 3. Number of Students with Proven Allegations ratified between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2014

Total number of students with proven allegations ratified: 313\*

\* 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, 2013 and June 30, 2014 there were 18 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
	2012-2013	2012-2013 (%)	2013-2014	2013-2014 (%)
Agriculture	N/A	N/A	24	7.66
Architecture and Planning	0	0	1	0.32
Arts and Social Sciences	48	27.27	65	20.76
Computer Science	9	5.11	8	2.56
Dentistry	1	0.57	1	0.32
Engineering	9	5.11	17	5.43
Grad Studies	0	0	0	0
Health Professions	14	7.85	11	3.51

Law	1	0.57	3	0.96
Management	35	19.89	85	27.16
Medicine	1	0.57	14	4.47
Science	36	20.45	53	16.93
University of King's College (Arts and Social Sciences only)	22	12.50	31	9.90
<b>Total</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>100%</b>

**5. Students with Allegations Referred to the SDC** (received by Senate between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2014)

Students with Allegations referred to the SDC because:

- a) Student had a prior academic offence on record: 20
- b) Determination of penalty only (assessment accepted): 7
- c) AIO requested matter to be referred to the SDC for another reason: 0

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

Level of Class	Proven Allegations	
	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>First year</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>159</b>
<b>Second year</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Third year</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Fourth year</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Fifth year</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Sixth year &amp; Above</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Thesis</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>313</b>

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

Faculty	1 <sup>st</sup> Year	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year	4 <sup>th</sup> Year	5 <sup>th</sup> Year	6 <sup>th</sup> Year	Other	Total
Agriculture	6	2	12	4	0	0	0	<b>24</b>
Architecture & Planning	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
Arts & Social Sciences	40	15	8	2	0	0	0	<b>65</b>
Computer Science	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	<b>8</b>
Dentistry	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
Engineering	0	2	9	6	0	0	1	<b>17</b>
Graduate Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Health Professions	6	2	1	1	1	0	0	<b>11</b>
Law	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	<b>3</b>
Management	53	11	9	4	3	5	0	<b>85</b>
Medicine	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>14</b>
Science	20	11	20	0	1	1	0	<b>53</b>
King's College	20	6	3	1	0	0	0	<b>31</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>313</b>

## 8. Types of Proven and Ratified 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.

- a) Aiding in the commission of an academic offence: 1
- b) Cheating on exam / test: 18
- c) Copying : 19
- d) Copying/Abetting: 2
- e) Fabrication of information: 3
- f) Inappropriate collaboration: 7
- g) Irregularities in the presentation of data: 1
- h) Misrepresentation: 2
- i) Plagiarism: 175
- j) Self- Plagiarism: 7
- k) Unauthorized collaboration : 70
- l) Use of unauthorized materials : 16

## 9. Penalties

Penalties recommended by Academic Integrity Officers are summarized below. 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.

Penalty	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
"F" in class	2	2	6
"F" on assignment / exam	11	1	1
"0" on the assignment / exam	117	121	188
Assignment to be reassessed	0	1	0
Attend sessions with a Student Services Study Skills Coach	0	0	0
Conditional Penalty	0	2	0
Essay to be graded with ALL plagiarized materials struck out	0	1	0
Grade for exam/assignment capped	16	23	17
Notation on transcript	11	6	8
Reduction of final class grade / capped grade for class	38	30	21
Reduction of grade for assignment / exam	44	26	55
Resubmit assignment	15	8	19
Special assignment on integrity	5	1	0
Submit a special assignment	0	2	0
Warning; reprimand only <sup>2</sup>	14	2	8
Website tutorial	5	11	1
Write an essay to explain wrong doing; what led to the error	4	3	1
Writing Centre requirement	71	75	139
<b>Total of Proven Allegations Ratified in the Year</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>464</b>

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. Courtney Eisener (Coordinator), Jasmine MacDonald (Acting Coordinator) and Mr. Bob Mann (Manager, Discipline & Appeals) for their work supporting the Faculty Discipline Process.

Submitted by :

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