

Faculty Discipline Process

2021-2022 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, 2021 to June 30, 2022.

1. Membership

The following Deans or delegates served as AIOs between July 1, 2021 and June 30, 2022:

Nancy Maclean	Faculty of Agriculture
James Forren	Faculty of Architecture and Planning
Justin Roberts	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Ayesha Mushtaq	Faculty of Open Learning & Career Development
Georgia Klein	College of Sustainability
Alex Brodsky	Faculty of Computer Science
Christian Blouin	Faculty of Computer Science
Khurram Aziz	Faculty of Computer Science
Yannick Marchand	Faculty of Computer Science
Nauzer Kalyaniwalla	Faculty of Computer Science
Gabriella Mosquera	Faculty of Computer Science
Sachin Seth	Faculty of Dentistry
Margaret Walsh	Faculty of Engineering
Valerie Chappe	Faculty of Graduate Studies
Judy Macdonald	Faculty of Health
Catherine Sheffer	Faculty of Health
Catherine Gunn	Faculty of Health
Camille Cameron	Faculty of Law
Carla Heggie	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
Tracy Lenfesty	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 Code of Student 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 (Student Affairs). 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 13, 2022.

3. Number of Students with Proven Allegations ratified between July 1, 2021 and June 30, 2022

Total number of students with proven allegations ratified: *749

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

Canadian	232
International	476
Permanent Resident	40
Landed Immigrant	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, 2021 and June 30, 2022 there were approximately 82 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
	2020-2021	2020-2021 (%)	2021-2022	2021-2022 (%)
Agriculture	57	4.68	16	2.13
Architecture and Planning	1	.08	0	0
Arts and Social Sciences	151	12.41	117	15.62
Faculty of Open Learning & Career Development	7	.58	2	.27
College of Sustainability	62	5.09	42	5.60
Computer Science	403	33.14	292	38.98
Dentistry	0	0	0	0
Engineering	79	6.49	58	7.74
Grad Studies	0	0	5	.667
Health	48	3.95	18	2.40
Law	0	0	5	.667
Management	130	10.69	84	11.21
Medicine	4	.32	0	0
Science	270	22.2	100	13.35
University of King's College	4	.32	10	1.33
Total	1216	100%	749	100%

5. Students with Allegations Referred to the SDC (received by Senate between July 1, 2021 and June 30, 2022). Students with Allegations referred to the SDC because:

a)	Student had a prior academic offence on record:	47
b)	Determination of penalty only (assessment accepted):	0
c)	Student did not attend initial AIO meeting	4
d)	Student does not accept penalty	4

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

Level of Class	Proven Allegations	
	2020-2021	2021-2022
First year	446	364
Second year	518	198
Third year	158	108
Fourth year	40	32
Fifth year	31	23
Sixth year & above	19	21
Thesis	0	0
Other	4	3
Total	1216	749

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	3	4	4	3	0	0	2	16
Architecture & Planning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arts & Social Sciences	75	25	16	1	0	0	0	117
Faculty of Open Learning & Career Development	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
College of Sustainability	36	2	4	0	0	0	0	42
Computer Science	152	83	29	6	11	11	0	292
Dentistry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering	28	11	12	3	4	0	0	58
Graduate Studies	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	5
Health	0	2	5	9	2	0	0	18
Law	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
Management	26	21	19	7	7	4	0	84
Medicine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Science	33	45	19	2	1	0	0	100
King's College	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	10
Total	364	198	108	32	27	17	3	749

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.

Allegation	Number of Allegations
Plagiarism	380
Cheating/Copying on exam/test	99
Unauthorized collaboration	170
Use of unauthorized materials – exam/test	2
Cheating/Copying on assignment	91
Falsified data	2
Self-plagiarism	6
To gain unearned advantage	14
Aiding in commission of academic offence	7

9. Common penalties

Penalty	2020-2021	2021-2022
Notation on transcript ¹	462	286
"F" in course	84	50
Grade capped for course	6	1
Reduction of final course grade	270	204
“0” on the assignment / exam	557	387
Reduction of grade for assignment / exam	279	129
Grade of “0” on portion of assignment/ exam	76	19
Resubmit assignment	49	33
Warning; reprimand only ²	65	48
Grade for exam/assignment capped	17	3
Writing Centre requirement ³	370	216
Special remedial assignment	3	0
Writing Centre recommendation	5	1
Academic Integrity/Ethics Module/Workshop Requirement	312	286
Mandatory meeting with academic advisor/Seek program support	5	2

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.

¹Notation:

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.

²Warning; reprimand only:

An AIO may determine that a student has committed an academic offence, but that a warning and no penalty is appropriate.

³Writing 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.

I would like to thank all Academic Integrity Officers, Faculty and support staff, and Dalhousie Student Advocacy Service (DSAS) volunteers 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, dedication and effort in supporting the Faculty Discipline Process.

Submitted by:

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