

# Faculty Discipline Process 2019-2020 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, 2019 to June 30, 2020.

## 1. Membership

The following Deans or delegates served as AIOs between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020:

Nancy Maclean	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)
Andrew Medeiros	College of Sustainability
Alex Brodsky	Faculty of Computer Science
Christian Blouin	Faculty of Computer Science
Khurram Aziz	Faculty of Computer Science
Raghav Sampangi	Faculty of Computer Science
Yannick Marchand	Faculty of Computer Science
Debora Matthews	Faculty of Dentistry
Margaret Walsh	Faculty of Engineering
Fiona Black	Faculty of Graduate Studies
Marty Leonard	Faculty of Graduate Studies
Judy Macdonald	Faculty of Health
Catherine Sheffer	Faculty of Health
Catherine Gunn	Faculty of Health
Camille Cameron	Faculty of Law
Mike Smit	Faculty of Management
Dominika Wranik	Faculty of Management
Valerie Trifts	Faculty of Management
Wenjun Zhang	Faculty of Management
Darrell White	Faculty of Medicine
Catherine Boulatoff	Faculty of Science
Claudio Slamovits	Faculty of Science
Mindy McCarville	Faculty of Science
Lawrence Plug	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 AIOs now have some discretion with respect to handling prior offence cases. The AIOs 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 7, 2020.

### **3. Number of Students with Proven Allegations ratified between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020**

Total number of students with proven allegations ratified: 597\*

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

Canadian	190
International	379
Permanent Resident	27
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, 2019 and June 30, 2020 there were approximately 30 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
	2018-2019 (%)	2018-2019 (%)	2019-2020 (%)	2019-2020 (%)
Agriculture	20	2.6	30	5.9
Architecture and Planning	0	0	0	0
Arts and Social Sciences	84	11.2	72	12.06
College of Continuing Education	6	.80	2	.33
College of Sustainability	0	0	14	2.3
Computer Science	308	41.29	242	40.53
Dentistry	0	0	0	0
Engineering	23	3.08	31	5.19
Grad Studies	2	.27	0	0
Health	5	.67	31	5.19
Law	1	.13	0	0
Management	89	11.9	50	8.37
Medicine	2	.26	3	.50
Science	171	22.9	94	15.74
University of King's College	35	4.7	28	4.69
<b>Total</b>	<b>746</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>597</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### 5. Students with Allegations Referred to the SDC (received by Senate between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020). Students with Allegations referred to the SDC because:

- a) Student had a prior academic offence on record: 12
- b) Determination of penalty only (assessment accepted): 1
- c) AIO requested matter to be referred to the SDC for another reason: 5
- d) Student does not accept penalty: 22
- e) Code offence: 1

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

Level of Class	Proven Allegations	
	2018-2019	2019-2020
<b>First year</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>333</b>
<b>Second year</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>Third year</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>Fourth year</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Fifth year</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Sixth year &amp; Above</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Thesis</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Other</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>746</b>	<b>597</b>

**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	10	2	16	2	0	0	0	<b>30</b>
Architecture & Planning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Arts & Social Sciences	51	17	4	0	0	0	0	<b>72</b>
College of Continuing Education	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	<b>2</b>
College of Sustainability	11	0	3	0	0	0	0	<b>14</b>
Computer Science	142	37	35	5	12	11	0	<b>242</b>
Dentistry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Engineering	20	0	3	6	0	2	0	<b>31</b>
Graduate Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Health	5	5	9	6	5	0	1	<b>31</b>
Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Management	24	6	12	1	5	2	0	<b>50</b>
Medicine	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>3</b>
Science	45	30	12	2	5	0	0	<b>94</b>
King's College	22	6	0	0	0	0	0	<b>28</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>597</b>

## 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 named by the AIO and accepted by the student.

<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Number of Allegations</b>
Plagiarism	384
Cheating on exam/test	83
Unauthorized collaboration	68
Use of unauthorized materials – exam/test	16
Cheating/Copying	14
Cheating on assignment	12
Falsified data	9
Self-plagiarism	6
Gain unearned advantage	5
Aiding in commission of academic offence	8
Improper Citation	2
Had another student write and submit exam	1

## 9. Common Penalties

<b>Penalty</b>	<b>2018-2019</b>	<b>2019-2020</b>
Notation on transcript	196	201
"F" in course	22	37
Grade capped for course	1	12
Reduction of final course grade	260	141
“0” on the assignment / exam	392	275
Reduction of grade for assignment / exam	89	99
Grade of “0” on portion of assignment/ exam	23	48
Resubmit assignment	48	25
Warning; reprimand only <sup>2</sup>	19	60
Grade for exam/assignment capped	32	15
Writing Centre requirement	355	234
Special remedial assignment	10	2
Academic Integrity/Ethics Module/Workshop Requirement	102	81
Rewrite assignment/exam	6	1
Mandatory meeting with academic advisor	5	1
Future exams/test must include close proctoring	0	1

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 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 offence 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 offences 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 :

Dr. Maria Pacurar, Vice-Chair (Student Affairs)  
/klm