

Senate Discipline Committee (SDC)

2017-2018 Annual Report

The Senate Discipline Committee (SDC) submits the following annual report for 2017-2018.

1. Membership

The following persons served on the SDC between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018:

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- Feb 2018)
Robin Parker	Faculty/ University Libraries (from July 2015)
Jure Gantar	Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences (from July 2017)
Erna Snelgrove-Clarke	Faculty of Health (from July 2015)
Matthew Herder	Schulich School of Law (from July 2015- March 2018)
Kyung Lee	Faculty of Management (from March 2018)

Dalhousie Student Union members:

Nick Gear	from 2016
Lisa Hackett	from 2017
Chris Abraham	from 2017
Jordan Premo	from 2017
Masuma Khan	from 2017
Alex Hughes	from 2017

King's Student Union members:

Daniel Whitten	from 2017
Julia Simone-Rutgers	from 2017

Leaving the SDC at the end of this academic year are Jim Power, Matthew Herder, Alex Hughes, Chris Abraham, Jordan Premo and Daniel Whitten. We thank all faculty and student representatives 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.

This past academic year, the Senate and Board of Governors jointly approved a new Sexualized Violence Policy, effectively replacing the portions of the Code of Student Conduct that dealt with those offences. The SDC will have jurisdiction to hear allegations of sexualized violence that are referred to it from the Vice-Provost, Student Affairs. Part of the approval process included amendments to the SDC Jurisdiction and Procedures to give the SDC panels greater authority to protect witnesses in these sensitive cases.

Caseload

The overall caseload (by student) of the Senate Discipline Committee is comparable in the number of cases from 36 in 2016-2017, to 37 cases in 2017-18 as outlined below. The decrease seen from 2015-16 to 2016-17 was the result of a change to the Faculty Discipline Procedures, giving Academic Integrity Officers the right to request permission from the Senate Vice-Chair (Student Affairs) to deal with students with prior offences in appropriate circumstances.

3. Students with Allegations¹ heard by SDC between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018

Number of Students with Allegations Heard: **37**
Number of Students with Pending Allegations: **9**
Number of alleged first time offenders: **16**
Number of alleged repeat offenders: **21**

4. Hearings² held by SDC between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018

Number of Cases Heard: **35**
Number of Pending Cases: **8**

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

Allegations received in 2015-2016 and heard in 2015-2016: 47
Allegations received in 2015-2016 pending a hearing as of July 1, 2016: 11
Total allegations heard in 2015-2016: 47
Total allegations received in 2015-2016: 58

Allegations received in 2016-2017 and heard in 2016-2017: 36
Allegations received in 2016-2017 pending a hearing as of July 1, 2017: 10
Total allegations heard in 2016-2017: 36
Total allegations received in 2016-2017: 46

Allegations received in 2017-2018 and heard in 2017-2018: 37
Allegations received in 2017-2018 pending a hearing as of July 1, 2018: 9
Total allegations heard in 2017-2018: 37
Total allegations received in 2017-2018: 46

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

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

² A **hearing** 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 only **one** hearing.

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 home Faculty of the instructor or the student.

Faculty or Unit	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
Agriculture	0	1	2	1	1
Architecture and Planning	1	0	1	0	1
Arts and Social Sciences	8	7	11	11	7
Computer Science	2	3	1	4	3
Dentistry	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering	3	3	3	0	3
Graduate Studies	0	1	0	0	0
Health	1	4	4	3	1
Law	1	1	0	0	1
Management	8	7	10	5	3
Medicine	1	0	0	0	0
Science	7	10	8	6	7
King's College	1	1	4	2	5
Office of the Vice-President, Student Services (Code of Student Conduct)	0	1	3	4	5
Total	33	39	47	36	37

NOTE: Over the past five years, the number of Code of Student Conduct cases heard by the SDC has increased. These are difficult cases with challenging facts for the SDC to consider. They typically feature higher stakes and students who are considerably more vulnerable than the SDC is asked to handle in cases involving allegations of academic misconduct. Frequently there is a complainant involved who has been victimized. Understandably, this makes for an emotionally taxing exercise for the faculty members and students who serve on these hearing panels. Last year the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee established a work group to consider whether a different judicial process might be more appropriate for non-academic misconduct cases. The work of this group will continue this year.

7. Number of Students with Allegations Heard by SDC between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018 – By Outcome

Proven:	32
Not Proven:	5
Total:	37

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, 2017 and June 30, 2018 – By Course Level

Course Level	Distribution of students with allegations heard by SDC 2015-2016	Distribution of students with allegations heard by SDC 2016-2017	Distribution of students with allegations heard by SDC 2017-2018
1000	17	16	16
2000	13	7	8
3000	10	3	4
4000	3	2	3
5000	1	2	0
6000 & higher	0	0	1
Code of Conduct	3	4	5
Other (non-credit course)	0	2	0
Thesis	0	0	0

General Types of Allegations Heard by SDC between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018:

a. Plagiarism (excluding unauthorized collaboration)

Number of students with allegations: 13
 Number of allegations proven: 12
 Number of allegations not proven: 1

b. Self-plagiarism

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

c. Copying/Copying during test

Number of students with allegations: 7
 Number of allegations proven: 6
 Number of allegations not proven: 1

d. Unauthorized Collaboration

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

e. Code of Conduct (offences against persons)

Number of students with allegations: 4
Number of allegations proven: 3
Number of allegations not proven: 1

f. Code of Conduct (Property offence; unauthorized use of facilities/equip/service)

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

h. Use of unauthorized materials/exam-test

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

i. Cheating on exam/test

Number of students with allegations: 6
Number of allegations proven: 4
Number of allegations not proven: 2

j. Submitted work for credit when one is not sole author

Number of students with allegations: 3
Number of allegations proven: 3
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	2013/ 14	2014/ 15	2015/ 16	2016/ 17	2017/ 18
"0" on the assignment/exam	14	19	21	15	14
"F" in the class	18	3	4	2	7
"F" on assignment/exam		2			
Academic Integrity Module	5	3	2		2
Expulsion	1	2	1	1	2
Meeting with AIO to discuss Academic Integrity					3

Notation on transcript	20	20	29	12	14
Other penalty	1				
Reduction of final class grade/capped grade for class	4	4	3	1	2
Reduction of grade for assignment/exam	2	2	2	3	0
Resubmit assignment	3	3		2	2
Second midterm worth 15% of final grade					
Sessions with a tutor or resource person at the Writing Centre			2	2	2
Submit an additional assignment	1				
Suspension	4	2	7	4	8
Training with HR and Equity Services on Harassment, Sexual Harassment and Consent					2
Warning; reprimand only					
Writing Centre requirement	24	16	23	11	14
Special assignment on integrity	2				
Study for Success Workshop	2				
Failure of Comprehensive exam, permitted second attempt		1			
Dismissal from program		2			
Grade for exam / assignment capped		3	2	1	1
Grade capped for course			2		2
Sanction of probation			1		1
No further on-line credits allowed towards degree at Dal			3		
Failure in course			13	11	3
Guilty of a second offence				1	
Must repeat refining study skills to return to Dalhousie				1	
Prepare an audio recording on animal welfare to educate other students				1	1
No access to animals at Agriculture campus until requirements have been met					1
Complete a self-reflection essay about code of conduct				1	1
Avoid contact with the complainant					1
Counselling on anger management					1
Engage with HR; training on intimate partner violence and healthy relationships					2
Student must take EAP courses					2
Must pay the university restitution fee					1
Probation for rest of studies					1
Will not be able to register for future classes until all conditions are met					2
Writing Centre Recommendation					3
University has right to raise the student's violation of the code for any future code of conduct complaints					2
Number of allegations (total)	33	39	47	36	37
Number of allegations (proven)	31	36	43	33	32

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 seven occasions since the 2013-14 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.

11. 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,



Susan Holmes
Chair (2017-2018)