



OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR  
Student Services

3200 Maggie Benston TEL 778.782.3108 sfu.ca/students  
Centre FAX 778.782.5732  
8888 University Drive,  
Burnaby, BC  
Canada V5A 1S6

---

**MEMORANDUM**

ATTENTION Senate DATE April 26, 2023  
FROM Tom Nault  
Registrar & Executive Director,  
Student Enrollment  
RE: Annual Report on Academic Student Discipline

---

As per Policy S10.01 Student Academic Integrity, S10.02 University Board on Student Discipline, and S10.03 Senate Committee on Disciplinary Appeals, please find enclosed the Annual Report on Academic Student Discipline matters from September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2022.

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tom Nault', written over a horizontal line.

---

Tom Nault  
Registrar & Executive Director,  
Student Enrollment



MEMORANDUM

---

ATTENTION Senate DATE April 14, 2023

FROM Arlette Stewart  
Coordinator, Academic Integrity  
Senate and Academic Services

RE: Academic Discipline Report 2021-2022

---

The Student Academic Integrity Policy requires the Registrar to maintain a statistical summary of cases that is submitted to Senate annually. This report provides the details of the academic dishonesty reports received between September 01, 2021 and August 31, 2022.

The Academic Integrity Coordinator in the Registrar’s Office collects and compiles data regarding academic dishonesty cases from academic units across all three campuses. There were 538 incident reports filed between September 01, 2021 and August 31, 2022. The 538 reports represent a 33% decrease from the previous year which can be explained by the fact that this reporting period is coincident with the return to in person classes after emergency remote instruction.

International students were involved in 249 (46%) of the 538 cases, which represents a slight change when compared to the previous year (44%). Graduate students were reported in 34 (6%) of the 538 cases, up from 20 in the previous year.

Table 1 provides a breakdown of the reports by type of violation (plagiarism, cheating, fraud/misrepresentation). The breakdown by type shows that the majority of reports are categorized as cheating (66%) compared to those categorized as plagiarism (33%) and fraud/misrepresentation (1%). The shift toward the majority of reports being categorized as cheating is coincident with the shift to emergency remote instruction and that trend has continued after the return to in person classes. Prior to Spring 2020, the percentage of reports categorized as cheating hovered slightly above the 50% mark.

Table 2 details the breakdown of penalties assigned. The penalty of a zero mark for the work was the most common penalty assigned by instructors (66%) followed by a penalty of reduced mark on the work (22%). Cases that are escalated to the Registrar or the Chair can receive an additional penalty consisting of one or more of the following: Formal Reprimand, Grade less harsh than an FD, or an FD grade. For the 2020-2021 reporting period, there were 28 cases where the FD grade was assigned as a penalty, up from 20 cases in the previous year.

Table 3 provides a breakdown of incident reports by Faculty.

**TABLE 1: Type of Incident**

<b>Type of Incident:</b>	September 2018 to August 2019	September 2019 to August 2020	September 2020 to August 2021	September 2021 to August 2022
Plagiarism Examples: - Use of identical sentences without attribution to original source detected using Turnitin. - Minimally changing the wording from content sources with incomplete citation and paraphrasing. - Content from a Youtube video was used mostly verbatim in a term paper without including the video in the bibliography.	155	155	203	179
Cheating on exams or assignments Examples: - Navigating away from Canvas quiz and accessing applications not permitted during the exam held over zoom. - Collaboration with classmates in a “tutoring class” during synchronous online mid-term exam. - Taking photographs of final exam with phone during in-person exam. - Using the assignment of another student who had taken the course in a previous semester. - Accessing Chegg.com for answers during online quiz	196	507	590	355
Fraud/Misrepresentation Examples: - Submitting a falsified Certificate of Illness letter to request a make-up final exam. - Providing a third party one’s SFU username and password which in turn provides full access to edit working documents for SFU courses including stored quizzes and assignments.	6	5	13	4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>667</b>	<b>806</b>	<b>538</b>

**TABLE 2: Assignment of Penalties**

Penalty	September 2018 to August 2019	September 2019 to August 2020	September 2020 to August 2021	September 2021 to August 2022
<b>Assigned by Instructor</b>				
Give the student a warning	24	50	56	41
Re-do the work or do supplementary work	44	35	10	24
Assign a grade penalty less harsh than 'F' for the work	67	113	233	118
Impose a failing mark for the work	214	469	507	355
<b>Assigned by Chair or Registrar</b>				
Issue a formal reprimand	6	4	52	22
Assign a grade less harsh than 'FD' for the course	2	8	32	17
Assign a grade of "FD"	8	20	29	28

Note: Instructors can assign more than one penalty for every incident.

**TABLE 3: Prevalence of academic integrity reports by Faculty**

Faculty	September 2018 to August 2019	September 2019 to August 2020	September 2020 to August 2021	September 2021 to August 2022	Percentage % of reports submitted by Faculty, September 2021 to August 2022
Applied Sciences	78	154	144	113	21
Arts & Social Sciences	168	186	242	178	33
Beedie School of Business	33	54	81	19	4
Communication, Art & Technology	13	25	12	42	8
Education	8	5	7	9	2
Environment	2	29	25	51	9
Health Sciences	5	5	25	27	5
Science	50	209	270	99	18
<b>Total</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>667</b>	<b>806</b>	<b>538</b>	<b>100</b>

# University Board on Student Discipline

**Reporting Period: September 1, 2021 – August 31, 2022**

## UBSD Membership

Faculty: Paul Garfinkel (Coordinator), History (January 2019 – December 2021)  
David Murphy (Coordinator), Communication (May 2014 – August 2023)  
Shivanand Balram, Geography (January 2022 – December 2025)  
Brenda Davison, Mathematics (February 2022 – January 2025)  
Karen Kohfeld, Resource and Environmental Mgmt (February 2019 – January 2022)  
Peter Liljedahl, Education (October 2020 – September 2023)  
Tony Williams, Biological Sciences (September 2016 – June 2022)  
Gregory Baker, Computing Science (February 2021 – May 2024)

Students: Jayme Lewthwaite, Graduate - Science (March 2016 – April 2022)  
Amanda Cronkite, Undergraduate – Business (October 2020 – September 2023)  
Miranda Pinter-Collett, Undergraduate - Arts (October 2020 to September 2021)  
Sophia Dobischok, Undergraduate - Science (September 2018 – September 2022)  
Karmen Gill, Undergraduate – Science (October 2020 – September 2022)  
Livia Poljak, Graduate – Education (October 2020 – September 2023)

Staff: Bettina Cenerelli, Arts & Social Sciences (November 2021 - October 2024)  
Harriet Chicoine, Engineering Science (January 2010 – May 2023)  
Amanda Woodhall, Applied Sciences (November 2021 – October 2024)

Seven cases concerning academic dishonesty were heard by the University Board on Student Discipline in the period covered by the report.

A summary of the cases is attached for information.



David Murphy  
Coordinator, University Board on Student Discipline

## Student Discipline Summary

File #	Nature of Offence	Outcome
21-12	Academic Dishonesty under SFU Policy S 10.01, section 2.3.4 - Submitting as one's original work an essay, project, thesis, presentation, other assignment, or examination, or part thereof, that was purchased or otherwise acquired from another source; section 2.3.3 - Cheating during an examination, including: (e) the unauthorized use of devices, such as mobile phones, to receive or share information pertaining to the examination; (f) the unauthorized access or sharing of information or resources, in any format, pertaining to the examination; section 2.3.6 - Cheating in assignments, projects, examinations, or other forms of evaluation by: (a) using, or attempting to use, another individual's answers; (b) providing questions and/or answers to other individuals.	The President accepted the unanimous recommendation of the UBSD that the grade of FD be confirmed and that the student receive a three-semester suspension from Simon Fraser University.
21-24	Academic Dishonesty under SFU Policy S 10.01, section 2.3.4 - Submitting as one's original work an essay, project, thesis, presentation, other assignment, or examination, or part thereof, that was purchased or otherwise acquired from another source; section 2.3.3 - Cheating during an examination, including: (e) the unauthorized use of devices, such as mobile phones, to receive or share information pertaining to the examination; (f) the unauthorized access or sharing of information or resources, in any format, pertaining to the examination; section 2.3.6 - Cheating in assignments, projects, examinations, or other forms of evaluation by: (a) using, or attempting to use, another individual's answers.	The UBSD denied the student's appeal and upheld the finding of the Instructor that the Applicant committed academic dishonesty. Pursuant to s.6.3 of Policy S10.02, the Tribunal directed that the penalty imposed by the Respondent remain in place.
21-26	Academic Dishonesty under SFU Policy S 10.01, section 2.4.1(a) - Falsification, Misrepresentation, Fraud, or Misuse, the dominant purpose of which is academic advantage, including (iv) submitting a manufactured, forged, altered, or converted document, including a forged or altered medical certificate, death certificate, or travel document to a University official, which the student knows, or ought reasonably to have known, to be altered.	The President accepted the unanimous recommendation of the UBSD that the grade of FD be confirmed and that the student receive a one-semester suspension from Simon Fraser University.
22-1	Academic Dishonesty under SFU Policy S 10.01, section 2.4.1(a) - Falsification, Misrepresentation, Fraud, or Misuse, the dominant purpose of which is academic advantage, including: (iv) submitting a manufactured, forged, altered, or converted document, including a forged or altered medical certificate, death certificate, or travel document to a University official, which the student knows, or ought reasonably to have known, to be altered.	The UBSD Tribunal upheld the student's appeal and overturned the finding of academic dishonesty. Pursuant to s.6.3 of Policy S10.02, the Tribunal directed that the penalty imposed by the Respondent should be removed and any record of dishonesty associated with this incident should be removed from the Applicants' files.

## Student Discipline Summary

File #	Nature of Offence	Outcome
22-2	Academic Dishonesty under SFU Policy S 10.01, section 2.3.1 - Plagiarism, including: (b) 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; section 2.3.3 - Cheating during an examination, including: (f) the unauthorized access or sharing of information or resources, in any format, pertaining to the examination; section 2.3.4 - Submitting as one's original work an essay, project, thesis, presentation, other assignment, or examination, or part thereof, that was purchased or otherwise acquired from another source; 2.3.6 - Cheating in assignments, projects, examinations, or other forms of evaluation by: (a) using, or attempting to use, another individual's answers.	The President accepted the unanimous recommendation of the UBSD that the grade of FD be confirmed and that the student receive a three-semester suspension from Simon Fraser University.
22-3 22-4	Academic Dishonesty under SFU Policy S 10.01, section 2.3.3 - Cheating during an examination, including: (d) the unauthorized possession, use, or sharing of an examination question sheet, an examination answer book, a completed examination or assignment, or other examination material; (e) the unauthorized use of devices, such as mobile phones, to receive or share information pertaining to the examination; (f) the unauthorized access or sharing of information or resources, in any format, pertaining to the examination.	The UBSD denied the student's appeal and upheld the finding of the Instructor that the Applicants committed academic dishonesty. Pursuant to s.6.3 of Policy S10.02, the Tribunal directed that the penalty imposed by the Respondent remain in place.

## **Senate Committee on Disciplinary Appeals**

### **Reporting Period September 2021 to August 2022**

The **Senate Committee on Disciplinary Appeals (SCODA)** heard 7 appeals during the period covered by this report. All hearings were conducted online using Zoom due to COVID-19 pandemic

#### **SCODA Appeal No. 2021-07 (academic misconduct)**

The case involved an undergraduate student appealing their final grade of “C” to SCODA pursuant SCODA’s Policy S10.03, subparagraphs 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3.

The students wrote their midterms and final exams online and in the same house. Before submitting their exams, they exchanged answers and were penalized due to academic integrity.

SCODA found that none of the grounds of appeal raised by the student were met or established. More particularly, with respect to subparagraph 4.1.1 of the SCODA policy, the extent of procedural error in this case was minor and did not meet the threshold of “sufficient magnitude” to have affected the fairness of the process or altered the outcome of the case; (ii) with respect to subparagraph 4.1.2, no factual errors of “sufficient magnitude” occurred that may reasonably be said to have altered the outcome of the case; and (iii) with respect to subparagraph 4.1.3, the penalty imposed on the student was fair and not excessive and took into consideration all mitigating factors.

In the circumstances, SCODA upheld the decision of the department in the assignment of the “C” grade to the student.

#### **SCODA Appeal No. 2021-08 (academic misconduct)**

This case involved undergraduate siblings who were in their first year. The students wrote their midterms and final exams online and in the same house. Before submitting the exams, they exchanged answers and were caught by the instructor and penalized due to academic dishonesty. Both students are appealing their assignment of the “FD” notation.

Initially the students denied their academic dishonesty but later admitted to it. Both students appealed to SCODA on the sole ground in S10.03, subparagraph 4.1.1, namely, “that a procedural error occurred of sufficient magnitude that it may reasonable be said to have affected the fairness of the process or altered the outcome of the case”.

SCODA agreed with the students that a procedural error occurred in that the Chair of the department failed to meet with them prior to the assignment of the FD notation. There was no dispute that the procedural error took place and SCODA agreed with the students that it is



reasonable that the fairness of the process was compromised through this error (citing previous cases 2010-04 and 2010-05).

In the result, based on subparagraph 4.1.1 of the Policy and past precedents, SCODA overturned the “FD” notation and recommended to the registrar that the students be given an “F” grade for the course.

#### **SCODA Appeal No. 2021-09 (academic misconduct)**

This case involved undergraduate siblings who were in their first year. The students wrote their midterms and final exams online and in the same house. Before submitting the exams, they exchanged answers and were caught by the instructor and penalized due to academic dishonesty. Both students are appealing their assignment of the “FD” notation.

Initially the students denied their academic dishonesty but later admitted to it. Both students appealed to SCODA on the sole ground in S10.03, subparagraph 4.1.1, namely, “that a procedural error occurred of sufficient magnitude that it may reasonable be said to have affected the fairness of the process or altered the outcome of the case”.

SCODA agreed with the students that a procedural error occurred in that the Chair of the department failed to meet with them prior to the assignment of the FD notation. There was no dispute that the procedural error took place and SCODA agreed with the students that it is reasonable that the fairness of the process was compromised through this error (citing previous cases 2010-04 and 2010-05).

In the result, based on subparagraph 4.1.1 of the Policy and past precedents, SCODA overturned the “FD” notation and recommended to the registrar that the students be given an “F” grade for the course.

#### **SCODA Appeal No. 2021-10 (academic misconduct)**

This case involved a graduate student enrolled in the MSC Finance program. The student submitted an assignment online that consisted of a front page “checklist” for a future negotiation, followed by five pages of “explanation.” The instructor noticed that the last five pages were identical to another student’s work. The student explained that they submitted the other pages by mistake. The department assigned an FD for the course and the student appealed this penalty based on S10.03, subparagraph 4.1.3, namely, that the penalty imposed on the student is excessive in all the circumstances of the case.

On the balance of probabilities, SCODA found that the misconduct was intentional and upheld the penalty assigned.

**SCODA Appeal No. 2021-11 (academic misconduct)**

Student appealed to SCODA under Policy S10.03, subparagraph 4.1.3 that the penalty imposed on them was excessive in all the circumstances of the case and requested that the Academic Incident Report be removed from their student file with the Registrar’s Office.

Upon learning that the academic incident report is a confidential document and no other member of the SFU community nor the public would have access to it, the student then withdrew their appeal. No action was taken in this case other than holding a meeting to discuss the merits of the report held in confidence by the Registrar

**SCODA Appeal No. 2022-01 (academic misconduct)**

This case involved an undergraduate student with two incidents of misconduct. In Summer 2020 the student used Chegg to post two questions from the final exam and received a zero mark for the exam. Undeterred by the first incident, in Fall 2021 the student, again, used Chegg a second time. After receiving two academic integrity reports, the student then received a letter from the Registrar issuing a formal reprimand and a grade penalty of “F”.

The student appealed the grade penalty based on Policy S10.03, 4.1.3, “that the penalty imposed on the student is excessive in all the circumstances of the case.”

SCODA concluded that the “F” penalty was within the scope of a reasonable penalty for the two offenses and upheld the penalty assigned by the Registrar.

**SCODA Appeal No. 2022-02 (academic misconduct)**

This case involved an undergraduate student with two incidents of misconduct in summer 2021 and spring 2022. Both incidents involved the student using an outside tutor to help them complete course work. The tutor, whatever their motivation, notified the University of this and other students’ academic misconduct. Although two incident reports were submitted on behalf of this student, the first report (summer 2021) was submitted once the spring 2022 term was underway due to information that was made available to the instructor once the term had ended. The late submission of the first report did not provide the student with enough time to reconsider using the outside tutor in the following semester, Spring 2022, because the student did not learn from the first incident to change their behaviour.

Based on the two incident reports the Registrar issued an FD notation for the second incident as pursuant to the rules of the University. The student appealed the grade penalty based on Policy S10.03,subparagraph 4.1.3, “that the penalty imposed on the student is excessive in all the circumstances of the case.”

SCODA found that the student did not receive notice of the first incident in summer 2021 until the spring 2022 term was underway and may have believed that the “help” the tutor was giving was legitimate. Therefore, SCODA recommended that the “FD” notation on the academic record be

Senate Committee on Disciplinary Appeals – SCODA  
September 2021-August 2022

expunged and the instructor restore the “low grade” for the second incident in spring 2022 due to mitigating circumstances described above.

**Members of SCODA**

Chair	Shafik Bhalloo
Faculty Member	Doug Allen
Faculty Member	Daniel Laitsch
Faculty Member	Ingrid Northwood
Faculty Member	Shafik Bhalloo
Faculty Member (Alternative)	Abraham Punnen
Student	Allan Lam
Student	Abhishek Parmar
Student	Elizabeth Meitz
Student (Alternate)	Karan Pathania
Student (Alternate)	Priyanka Dhesa
Secretary (non-voting)	Concetta di Francesco



---

**Shafik Bhalloo, Chair (2022-2023)**

**April 5, 2023**

DATE