

**Senate Discipline Committee (SDC)  
2018-2019 Annual Report**

---

The Senate Discipline Committee (SDC) submits the following annual report for 2018-2019.

**1. Membership** (between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2019):

**Faculty members:**

Susan Holmes (Chair)	College of Continuing Education (from May 2006)
Andrew Warkentin	Faculty of Engineering (from March 2014)
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)
Kyung Lee	Faculty of Management (from March 2018)
Ammar Sarhan	Faculty of Science (from July 2018)
Victoria Allen	Faculty of Medicine (from July 2018)

**Dalhousie Student Union members:**

Nick Gear	from 2016
Lisa Hackett	from 2017
Masuma Khan	from 2017
Alex Hughes	from 2017
Dong Ngo	from 2018
Jesuseyi Fasuyi	from 2018
Bashar Alazemi	from 2018
Amaan Kazmi	from 2018

Leaving the SDC at the end of this academic year are Erna Snelgrove-Clarke, Masuma Khan and Lisa Hackett. We thank all faculty and student representatives for their outstanding support and dedication this past year.

**2. Jurisdiction**

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.

Last 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. In 2018-19, the SDC applied its jurisdiction to hear allegations of sexualized violence referred to it from the Vice-Provost, Student Affairs.

### 3. Caseload

**Total Allegations<sup>1</sup>** 46

**Total Hearings<sup>2</sup>** 43

First time offenders: 18

Repeat offenders: 28

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.

<b>Faculty or Unit</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>	<b>2017-2018</b>	<b>2018-2019</b>
Agriculture	1	2	1	1	0
Architecture and Planning	0	1	0	1	0
Arts and Social Sciences	7	11	11	7	7
Computer Science	3	1	4	3	11
Dentistry	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering	3	3	0	3	0
Graduate Studies	1	0	0	0	0
Health	4	4	3	1	0
Law	1	0	0	1	0
Management	7	10	5	3	5
Medicine	0	0	0	0	3
Science	10	8	6	7	16
King's College	1	4	2	5	1
Code of Conduct / Sexualized Violence Policy	1	3	4	5	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>46</b>

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. The

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

<sup>2</sup> 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.

Senate Learning and Teaching Committee has established a work group to consider whether a different judicial process might be more appropriate for non-academic misconduct cases, and this work will continue (and hopefully conclude) in the 2019-2020 academic year.

#### 4. Student Statistics

##### a) Outcome

Proven: 42  
Not Proven: 4

**Total: 46**

NOTE: The standard of proof is the balance of probabilities. An allegation is considered proven when a panel of the SDC, having reviewed and deliberated over the evidence before it, concludes that it is more likely than not that the student in question committed the alleged offence.

##### b) Citizenship status:

Canadian: 17  
International: 26  
Permanent Resident: 3

##### c) Course Level

Level	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
1000	16	16	22
2000	7	8	11
3000	3	4	9
4000	2	3	1
5000	2	0	0
6000+	0	1	0
Other	2	0	0

#### 5. Allegations by Type

Plagiarism /Copying	20	(2 unproven)
Self-plagiarism	2	
Unauthorized Collaboration	4	
Cheating on exam/test	11	(1 unproven)
Unauthorized materials in an exam	1	
Submitted work that is not one's own	2	
Irregular procedures to gain an unfair advantage	3	
Code of Conduct (offences against persons)	1	
Breach of Sexualized Violence Policy	2	

## 6. Penalties

NOTE: More than one penalty may be ordered against a student for the same offence (i.e. Resubmit assignment *and* capped grade on assignment).  
Explanations of common penalties are provided below.

Warning only	1
"0" on the assignment/exam	13
Reduction/capped grade for assignment/exam	5
Resubmit assignment	2
Reduction of final class grade/capped grade for class	9
"F" in the class	16
EAP/ESL course requirement	3
Writing Centre Requirement	21
Notation on transcript	25
Mandatory meeting with AIO/Advisor	6
Suspension	8
Probation	1
Mandatory HRES Training	3
Complete a self-reflection essay about behavior/conduct	1
Limits on contact with complainant	5
Limits on access to campus	3
Limits on student privileges	1

### **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.

The Writing Centre has become a well-used support for students who require further guidance in their writing, researching and citation skills. In the last 5 years, there have been 78 writing centre requirements ordered by the SDC alone, with an additional 1181 recommended by Academic Integrity Officers at the Faculty Discipline level.

**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.

**7. 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 (2018-2019)