Faculty Discipline Process
2017-2018 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, 2017 to June 30, 2018.

1. Membership

The following Deans or delegates served as AIOs between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018:

Keltie Jones	Faculty of Agriculture
James Forren	Faculty of Architecture and Planning
Justin Roberts	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Jure Gantar	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (backup AIO)
Ayesha Mushtaq	College of Continuing Education (backup AIO)
Jennifer Macdonald	College of Continuing Education (on leave Feb 2018)
Steven Mannell	College of Sustainability
Alex Brodsky	Faculty of Computer Science
Christian Blouin	Faculty of Computer Science
Khurram Aziz	Faculty of Computer Science (AIO effective April 2018)
Debora Matthew	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
Judy Macdonald	Faculty of Health (on sabbatical Jul 2017- 2018)
Catherine Sheffer	Faculty of Health (AIO effective Jan 2018)
Jacqueline Gahagan	Faculty of Health (AIO effective Jan 2018)
Camille Cameron	Faculty of Law
Maria Pacurar	Faculty of Management
Mike Smit	Faculty of Management
Vivian Howard	Faculty of Management (back up AIO)
Darrell White	Faculty of Medicine
Daniel Labrie	Faculty of Science
Jennifer Adams	University of King's College (Jul 2017- April 2018)
Janet Hathaway	University of King's College (AIO effective April 2018).

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.

The joint AIO/SDC meeting occurred on May 10th, 2018. Joint training on evaluation of penalties & remedies for AIO/SDC members occurred on October 3rd, 2017.

3. Number of Students with Proven Allegations ratified between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018

Total number of students with proven allegations ratified: 559*

* 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, 2017 and June 30, 2018 there were 22 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 2016-2017(%)	Percentage of Total 2016-2017 (%)	Proven Allegations 2017-2018(%)	Percentage of Total 2017-2018 (%)
Agriculture	4	1.00	21	3.7
Architecture and Planning	3	<1%	1	<1%
Arts and Social Sciences	62	15.4	102	18.2
College of Continuing Education	11	2.7	6	1.0
College of Sustainability	4	<1%	1	<1%
Computer Science	51	12.7	129	23.1
Dentistry	0	0	0	0
Engineering	17	4.2	0	0
Grad Studies	1	<1%	0	0
Health	12	2.9	12	2.1
Law	5	1.2	5	<1%
Management	77	19.2	94	16.8
Medicine	0	0	9	1.6
Science	120	29.9	154	27.5
University of King's College (Arts and Social Sciences only)	34	8.4	25	4.4
Total	**401**	**100%**	**559**	**100%**

5. Students with Allegations Referred to the SDC (received by Senate between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018)

Students with Allegations referred to the SDC because:

a) Student had a prior academic offence on record: 25

b) Determination of penalty only (assessment accepted): 0

c) AIO requested matter to be referred to the SDC for another reason: 15

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

Level of Class	Proven Allegations	
	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
First year	**229**	**316**
Second year	**70**	**118**
Third year	**49**	**61**
Fourth year	**19**	**14**
Fifth year	**16**	**29**
Sixth year & Above	**9**	**20**
Thesis	**0**	**0**
Other	**9**	**1**
Total	**401**	**559**

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	7	6	7	0	0	0	1	**21**
Architecture & Planning	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**1**
Arts & Social Sciences	73	15	13	1	0	0	0	**102**
College of Continuing Education	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	**6**
College of Sustainability	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**1**
Computer Science	60	25	16	3	16	9	0	**129**
Dentistry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Graduate Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Health	2	1	1	8	0	0	0	**12**
Law	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	**5**
Management	22	39	15	2	13	3	0	**94**
Medicine	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	**9**
Science	124	20	8	0	0	2	0	**154**
King's College	17	7	1	0	0	0	0	**25**
Total	**315**	**118**	**61**	**14**	**29**	**20**	**1**	**559**

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) Accessory to Plagiarism	1
b) Aided toward cheating on assignment / exam	3
c) Copying/Aided towards copying	123
d) Aiding in commission of academic offence	3
e) Attempting to gain unfair advantage	1
f) Cheating on test/exam	14
g) Cheating/Copying	1
h) Copying a portion of assignment	1
i) Fabrication of information/data	5
j) Gain unearned advantage	8
k) Improper use of secondary sources	2
l) Plagiarism	257
m) Self-plagiarism	11
n) Submitted ghost-written paper	2
o) Submitted work for credit when not sole author	7
p) Unauthorized collaboration	116
q) Unintentional Plagiarism	1
r) Use of unauthorized materials- exam/test	6
s) Using on-line sources	1
t) Violated Copyright	5

9.   Penalties

Penalty	2016-2017	2017-2018
Writing Centre requirement	223	302
Writing Centre recommendation	7	12
"0" on the assignment / exam	242	346
Reduction of grade for assignment / exam	23	42
Reduction of final class grade / capped grade for class	125	225
Resubmit assignment	41	21
Grade of "0" on portion of assignment/ exam	9	13
Warning; reprimand only[2]	14	24
Grade for exam/assignment capped	52	46
Notation on transcript	21	92
"F" in class	0	12
Grade capped for course	0	8
Failure of Course	12	10
"F" on assignment / exam	10	3
Write an essay on wrongdoing and what led to the error	0	1
Academic Integrity Module Requirement	30	141
One-on-one sessions / tutorials with the writing centre	26	6
Extra tutorials to be taken within course	1	0
Rewrite assignment/exam	2	7
Recomplete plagiarized submission	1	0
Recompletion of final draft under test conditions	1	0
Tutorial on APA style/format	2	0
Meet with advisor to discuss finding and impact on program	0	4
Must attend FCS workshop on academic integrity	0	2
Instructor will grade photocopy of midterm made following the incident as though it were the completed midterm	0	1
Grade on midterm to be calculated in final numerical grade	0	1
Failure of thesis	1	0
Penalty dependent on selected marking scheme for the course with 2 options	7	0

Guilty of offence (database record); no penalties applied	0	1
Grading scheme 1 will be used to calculate final numerical grade	1	0
Directed to review portion of course material relating to ethical report writing, proper citation & reference techniques	1	0
Term paper marked as though no plagiarism has occurred	0	3
Must complete ethics workshop	0	47
Grade of "0" on lab questions	0	1
Test/assignment grade to be included in calculation of final numerical grade	0	1
Reweight all other assignments and exams	0	1
Total of Proven Allegations Ratified in the Year	401	559

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 continued work supporting the Faculty Discipline Process.

Submitted by :

Tanya Packer, Vice-Chair (Student Affairs)
/klm