MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Senate
FROM: Rummana Khan Hemani
Registrar & Executive Director,
Student Enrollment
RE: Annual Report on Student Discipline

DATE: February 8, 2018

As per Policy S.10, Code of Academic Integrity and Good Conduct, please find enclosed the Annual Report on Student Discipline matters from September 1, 2016 to August 31, 2017.

Academic Discipline Annual report
Annual Student Conduct Report
University Board on Student Discipline
Senate Committee on Disciplinary Appeals

Rummana Khan Hemani
Registrar & Executive Director,
Student Enrollment
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION Senate

FROM Heather Roberts, Associate Registrar Senate and Academic Services (acting)

DATE January 25, 2018

RE: ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE REPORT 2016-2017

The Code of Academic Integrity and Good Conduct requires reporting of academic dishonesty incidents to the Registrar’s office. This report covers terms from September 2016 to August 2017.

There are 44 active Academic Integrity Advisors representing all programs, departments and faculties coordinated by the Academic Integrity Coordinator in the Registrar’s office. The Academic Integrity Advisory Committee reports to the Registrar and 2016-2017 members included: Rebecca Goyan, Donna McGee-Thompson, Kris Nordgren, Rummana Khan-Hemani, Jo Hinchliffe, Rob Gordon, Michael Lockett, and Toby Donaldson.

The Academic Integrity Coordinator in the Registrar’s office collects and compiles data regarding academic dishonesty cases from units across all three campuses. Between September 2016 and August 2017, 251 incident report forms were filed in the Registrar’s office. 41% were related to international students, which was the same as last year. This is a concern as international students made up 18% of the university student body during this time period.

Table 1 lists the most common types of incidents that occur and Table 2 details the breakdown of penalties assigned. Table 3 provides a breakdown of incident reports by Faculty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Incident:</th>
<th>September 2014 to August 2015</th>
<th>September 2015 to August 2016</th>
<th>September 2016 to August 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plagiarism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student submitted a programming assignment that contained code that was copied from an online source.</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student pasted in sentences from a website and claimed that the passages were from book reviews. No references for posted images.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student submitted a paper that was at least 85% plagiarized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cheating on exams or assignments</strong></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student had a cheat sheet hidden in a water bottle during an exam.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student changed the answers on an exam after it was handed back and then informed instructor that there was a marking mistake.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student received “editing” help on an assignment through a paid service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fraud/Misrepresentation</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student submitted falsified medical documents to defer exams</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student lied about attending exam and had another student write the exam on their behalf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 232 327 251
**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penalties</th>
<th>September 2014 to August 2015</th>
<th>September 2015 to August 2016</th>
<th>September 2016 to August 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give the student a warning</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign a grade penalty less harsh than 'F' for the work</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impose a failing mark for the work</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign a grade less harsh than 'FD' for the course</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign a grade of “FD”</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-do the work or do supplementary work</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue a formal reprimand</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Incident Reports September 2014 to August 2015</th>
<th>Incident Reports September 2015 to August 2016</th>
<th>Incident Reports September 2016 to August 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAS</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FASS</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCAT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the policy S10.02 - Principles and Procedures for Student Discipline, "The Registrar and the Associate Vice-President Students or designate must maintain a statistical summary of cases handled through their offices each year, and these data must be included in the Annual Report to Senate on Student Discipline Matters." The Academic Integrity and Good Conduct Office (AIGCO) serves as the designate for the Associate Vice President Students in the response to reports of student misconduct. This report does not include repeated incidents of Academic Dishonesty by the same student (these are included in the accompanying report on Academic Discipline). This report covers the period of September 1, 2016 to August 31, 2017.

The following table and figures provide an overview of the 32 unique incidents deemed to be student misconduct by the AIGCO in this reporting period. The total number of incidents has increased compared to last year (25% increase), potentially due to the position of Student Conduct Coordinator being vacant for two months during the previous reporting period (one day/week coverage during those two months).

Table 1 provides a four-year history of the cases dealt with under Policy S10, categorized by type of incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 – Misconduct Cases by Type from 2013 to 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013/2014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptive or Dangerous Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage, Destruction or Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud and Misuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of University Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms or Other Weapons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorized Entry or Presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misuse of Disciplinary Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 32 cases of student misconduct during this reporting period, 24 (75%) incidents involved domestic students, while 8 (25%) cases involved international students.
Table 2 provides a comparison of incident rates by academic level. According to the 2016-2017 reporting period data, 1st year students accounted for 50% of the cases of misconduct. 19% of cases were students in the final year of their undergraduate degree program. By comparison, no misconduct cases involved graduate students.

**Table 2 – Misconduct Cases by Academic Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Level</th>
<th># of Reported Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Credit</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 provides a summary of the outcomes of the cases of misconduct. Letters of apology and informal resolutions were the most common outcomes. In some cases, more than one outcome was applied.

**Table 3 – Types of Outcomes Applied**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal Resolution</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of Apology</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Reprimand</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred for Professional Assistance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery of Costs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to UBSD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]

Heather Roberts, M.Ed. CCC
Student Conduct Coordinator
Academic Integrity & Good Conduct Office
University Board on Student Discipline

Reporting Period: September 1, 2016 – August 31, 2017

UBSD Membership

Faculty:  V. Gordon Rose (Coordinator), Psychology (January 2009 - December 2018)
          Tony Williams, Biological Sciences (September 2016 – July 2019)
          David Murphy, Communication (May 2014 - April 2020)

Students: Jayme Lewthwaite, Graduate, Science (March 2016 - February 2018)
          Barbara Szymczyk, Undergraduate, Business (September 2015 - December 2017)
          Sara Doulfikar, Undergraduate, French Cohort Program (April 2016 - January 2017)
          Adebola Ige, Graduate, Computing Science (August 2016 - July 2018)

Staff:    Shelley Gair, Graduate Studies (November 2014 - October 2020)
          Harriet Chicoine, Engineering Science (January 2010 - October 2018)

Eleven cases concerning academic dishonesty were submitted to the University Board on Student Discipline in the period covered by the report.

A summary of the cases is attached for information.

V. Gordon Rose
Coordinator, University Board on Student Discipline
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File #</th>
<th>Nature of Offence</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-4</td>
<td>Academic Dishonesty under SFU Policy S 10.01, section 4.1.2(a)(ii) - Copying all or part of an essay or other assignment from an author or other person, including a tutor or student mentor, and presenting the material as the student's original work; and Academic Dishonesty under SFU Policy S 10.01, section 4.1.2(e)(i) - Using, or attempting to use, another student's answers.</td>
<td>The President accepted the unanimous recommendation of the UBSD that the FD be confirmed and that the student receive a one-semester suspension from Simon Fraser University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-5</td>
<td>Academic Dishonesty under SFU Policy S 10.01, 4.1.2(i) - Engaging in misrepresentation, including falsifying documents, to gain a benefit or advantage in a course including the submission of a forged or altered medical certificate or death certificate; and Academic Dishonesty under SFU Policy S 10.01, 4.1.2(h) - Submitting false records or information, in writing or orally, including the falsification of laboratory results or research findings.</td>
<td>The President accepted the recommendation of the UBSD that the FD be entered for the Summer of 2014 and that the student receive a three-semester suspension from Simon Fraser University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-6</td>
<td>Academic Dishonesty under SFU Policy S 10.01, section 4.1.2(a)(iii) - Failing to acknowledge the phrases, sentences or ideas of the author of published and unpublished material that is incorporated into an essay or other assignment.</td>
<td>The UBSD Tribunal denied the student's appeal and upheld the finding of the instructor that the Applicant has committed academic dishonesty. Pursuant to paragraph 3.3 of Policy S10.03, the penalty remains unaltered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-1</td>
<td>Academic Dishonesty under SFU Policy S 10.01, section 4.1.2(c)(iii) - Using course notes or other aids not approved by an Instructor during an examination.</td>
<td>The UBSD Tribunal upheld the student's appeals and overturned the finding of academic dishonesty and directed that their midterm exams be graded and their final grades be altered to reflect those marks and that any record of academic dishonesty based on this incident be deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-6</td>
<td>Academic Dishonesty under SFU Policy S 10.01, section 4.1.2(e) - Using, or attempting to use, another student's answers; Providing answers to other students; Providing answers to other students; Providing answers to other students; Failing to take reasonable measures to protect answers from use by other students.</td>
<td>The UBSD Tribunal upheld the student's appeals and overturned the finding of academic dishonesty and directed that their midterm exams be graded and their final grades be altered to reflect those marks and that any record of academic dishonesty based on this incident be deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8</td>
<td>Academic Dishonesty under SFU Policy S 10.01, section 4.1.2(e) - Using, or attempting to use, another student's answers; Providing answers to other students; Providing answers to other students; Failing to take reasonable measures to protect answers from use by other students.</td>
<td>The UBSD Tribunal upheld the student's appeal and overturned the finding of academic dishonesty and directed that the midterm mark be amended and the final grade be altered to reflect that mark and that any record of academic dishonesty based on this incident be deleted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Senate Committee on Disciplinary Appeals

Reporting Period
September 2016 – August 2017

The Senate Committee on Disciplinary Appeals (SCODA) heard two appeals during the period covered by this report.

SCODA Appeal No. 2017-01 (academic misconduct and plagiarism)

This case involved an honours student who was given an “F” grade on the honour’s project proposal for a series of mis-specified citations and one case of alleged plagiarism. The student appealed directly to the SCODA, and waived the right to have the case heard at UBSD.

The student appealed based on Policy SI0.04, 2.1 (ii), “that a factual error occurred of sufficient magnitude that it may reasonably be said to have altered the outcome of the case against the student”; (iii), “that the penalty imposed on the student is excessive in all the circumstances of the case”; and (iv) “that new, material evidence is available which, despite the exercise of due diligence by the party wishing to appeal, could not have been made available at the time of the hearing giving rise to the appeal.”

SCODA concluded that:

1. The student clearly engaged in “unscholarly” work. More care should have been given to the citations in the proposal. SCODA did not find that this unscholarly work crossed the line of academic misconduct. The best interpretation of the mis-specified citations was a lack of scholarship, and not an intent to cheat. Therefore, “a factual error” had occurred with respect to misconduct or plagiarism.
2. The mark of 0/40 (the highest penalty available) was excessive given the circumstances of the case.

According to Section 10.04, 4.3 (ii) the SCODA overturned the penalty of 0/40 (F) on the proposal and recommended that the student be required to complete the proposal using proper citations, and that the proposal be re-graded by another faculty member in the department.

SCODA Appeal No. 2017-02 (academic misconduct and academic dishonesty)

This case involved a graduate student. The University Board on Student Discipline (UBSD) found that the student’s transcript had been altered to show an “A+” grade in a course where no grade had been yet entered for the course. The UBSD found that the student had not finished the course. Further, the UBSD found that the transcript was submitted by the student in support of a course completion form, graduate progress report, and an application for a Graduate Fellowship.
The student appealed the President’s decision to accept the UBSD’s recommendation of an “FD” grade for the course, and a three-term suspension from SFU.

The student appealed based on Policy S10.04, 2.1 (ii), “that a factual error occurred of sufficient magnitude that it may reasonably be said to have altered the outcome of the case against the student”; and (iii), “that the penalty imposed on the student is excessive in all the circumstances of the case”.

With respect to the suspension the SCODA rejected both arguments presented by the student. The first was a request to revisit the facts of the case, and therefore was considered not relevant to SCODA, which is a standing committee for appeals, and not a fact finding body. The second was a claim that the punishment was unfair. Based on the seriousness of the dishonesty and misconduct, and the actions of UBSD in consulting past decisions and the relevant policy, the SCODA upheld the three term suspension.

In terms of the “FD” grade, the student appealed under the argument that the actions related to the altered transcript took place outside of the course. Furthermore, the student submitted that the altered transcript provided no benefit or advantage for the course, and therefore, the assignment of the grade was in violation of policy.

The SCODA rejected the claim that there was no benefit for the course, given that the altered transcript aided the student in the course completion form, making normal progress, and applying for the graduate fellowship. The SCODA also found that the UBSD acted within the penalty provisions for misconduct (per S10.03 at s. 4.2, and Appendices 1, 2 and 3) in assigning the “FD” grade for the course.

Therefore, the SCODA rejected the student’s appeal of the President’s decision.

SCODA Membership as of August 2017:

Chair: Doug Allen, Department of Economics
Vice-Chair: Jillian McIntosh, Department of Philosophy

Faculty (Regular Member):
Abraham Punnen, Department of Mathematics
Daniel Laitsch, Faculty of Education

Faculty (Alternate Member):
Christian Venhuizen, Beedie School of Business
Senate Committee on Disciplinary Appeals – SCODA
2016-17 Report

Students (Regular Member):
Iman Baharmand, Student Representative
Christine Wang, Student Representative
Kau’I Kelipio, Student Representative

Students (Alternate Member):
Alam Khehra, Student Representative
Erik Sagmoen, Student Representative

Secretary:
Concetta Di Francesco, Senate and Academic Services

[Signature]
Doug Allen, Chair (2016-2017)

Feb 8/18
Date