

Faculty Discipline Process

2024-2025 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, 2024 to June 30, 2025.

1. Membership

The following Deans or delegates served as AIOs between July 1, 2024 and June 30, 2025:

Nancy McLean	Faculty of Agriculture
Mikiko Terashima	Faculty of Architecture and Planning
Dawn Brandes	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Lindsay Dubois (back up AIO)	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Ayesha Mushtaq	Faculty of Open Learning & Career Development
Saira Akhtar-Alwazeer	Faculty of Open Learning & Career Development
Kate Purcell	Faculty of Open Learning & Career Development
Georgia Klein	College of Sustainability
Carla Heggie	Faculty of Computer Science (FCS AIO chair)
Mike McAllister	Faculty of Computer Science
Andrew Cochran	Faculty of Computer Science
Nauzer Kalyaniwalla	Faculty of Computer Science
Evangelos Milios	Faculty of Computer Science
Alex Brodsky	Faculty of Computer Science (on sabbatical 2024-25)
Sachin Seth	Faculty of Dentistry
Ted Hubbard	Faculty of Engineering
Valerie Chappe	Faculty of Graduate Studies
Nichole Austin	Faculty of Health
Sorayya Askari	Faculty of Health
Marion Brown	Faculty of Health
Sarah Harding	Faculty of Law
Chantelle Falconer	Faculty of Management
Bo Yu	Faculty of Management
Sarah Wells	Faculty of Medicine
Stephen Miller	Faculty of Medicine
Janusz Borycz	Faculty of Science
Roman Smirnov	Faculty of Science
Ryan Snitynsky	Faculty of Science
Jennifer Van Dommelen	Faculty of Science
Tracy Lenfesty	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 5, 2025.

3. Number of Students with Proven Allegations ratified between July 1, 2024 and June 30, 2025

Total number of students with proven allegations ratified: *589

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

Canadian	362
International	167
Permanent Resident	54
Refugee	6

* 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, 2024 and June 30, 2025 there were approximately 72 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	Proven Allegations
	2023-2024	2024-2025
Agriculture	33	28
Architecture and Planning	0	0
Arts and Social Sciences	151	207
Open Learning & Career Development	4	1
College of Sustainability	11	63
Computer Science	310	112
Dentistry	0	0
Engineering	35	39
Grad Studies	4	5
Health	20	35
Law	3	0
Management	36	34
Medicine	5	1
Science	43	50
University of King's College	7	14
Total	662	589

5. Students with Allegations Referred to the SDC (received by Senate between July 1, 2024 and June 30, 2025). Students with Allegations referred to the SDC because:

- | | | |
|----|---|----|
| a) | Student had a prior academic offence on record: | 17 |
| b) | Level of penalty at issue | 1 |
| c) | Student did not attend initial AIO meeting | 6 |
| d) | Student does not accept penalty | 13 |

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

Level of Class	Proven Allegations 2023-2024	Proven Allegations 2024-2025
First year	343	395
Second year	203	98
Third year	73	45
Fourth year	12	18
Fifth year	16	24
Sixth year & above	4	7
Thesis	0	1
Other	11	1
Total	662	589

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	20	0	2	6	0	0	0	28
Architecture & Planning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arts & Social Sciences	179	18	9	1	0	0	0	207
Open Learning & Career Development	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
College of Sustainability	60	3	0	0	0	0	0	63
Computer Science	73	22	10	1	6	0	0	112
Dentistry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering	11	18	6	3	0	1	0	39
Graduate Studies	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	5
Health	5	10	6	3	7	3	1	35
Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Management	11	13	3	0	5	2	0	34
Medicine	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Science	29	8	9	2	2	0	0	50
King's College	7	6	0	1	0	0	0	14
Total	395	98	45	18	24	6	3	589

Allegation	Number of Allegations
Plagiarism	226
Cheating/Copying on assignment/exam/test	83
Unauthorized collaboration	54
Use of unauthorized materials – assignment/exam/test	53
Falsified data	7
Self-plagiarism	2
To gain unearned advantage	1
Aiding in commission of academic offence	4
Submitted work when not sole author	166
Academic Fraud	0

8. Number of different allegations

The number of specific allegations above 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.

9. Common penalties

Penalty	2024-2025
Notation on transcript ¹	115
"F" in course	28
Grade capped for course	3
Reduction of final course grade	39
"0" on the assignment / exam	239
Reduction of grade for assignment / exam	90
Grade of "0" on portion of assignment/ exam	43
Resubmit assignment	31
Warning; reprimand only ²	25
Grade for exam/assignment capped	4
Writing Centre requirement ³	358
Special remedial assignment	0
Writing Centre recommendation	0
Academic Integrity/Ethics Module/Workshop Requirement	293
Mandatory meeting with academic advisor/Seek program support	4

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. The 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