



FOR INFORMATION

PUBLIC

OPEN SESSION

TO: Academic Board

SPONSOR: Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life

CONTACT INFO: 416 946 0812 edith.hillan@utoronto.ca

PRESENTER: See Sponsor

CONTACT INFO: See Sponsor

DATE: November 14, 2013 for November 21, 2013

AGENDA ITEM: 7a

ITEM IDENTIFICATION: Provost's Annual Report on Cases of Academic Discipline 2012-13

JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:

The *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1995* requires the Provost to report annually in statistical format on cases of academic discipline to Academic Board.

GOVERNANCE PATH:

1. **Academic Board [for information] (November 21, 2013)**

PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:

On November 22, 2012, the Academic Board received the Annual Report on Cases of Academic Discipline for 2011-12.

HIGHLIGHTS:

Each year divisions are asked to report on cases disposed of under Section C of the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*. Information is also collected for the number of cases which come before the University Tribunal. This year's report is presented in the format introduced a number of years ago, which improves the clarity and reliability of the data. For reporting purposes the reporting year corresponds to the academic year - that is from July 1st - June 30th. Resolution of a case refers to the event which concludes the proceedings under the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* within the University. The data is collated based on the academic year in which a case is closed, and where it is closed – the division or the Tribunal.

The report provides a summary of both divisional and University Tribunal Cases for the years from 2006-07 to 2012-13. The overall number of cases of academic misconduct handled at the

divisional level is slightly higher than in the previous reporting year. Plagiarism and use of unauthorized aids continue to be the most common offences.

At the Tribunal level, charges were laid in 46 new cases, which exceed the number seen in any previous year. Thirty-nine cases sent to the Tribunal were resolved during the 2012-13 academic year. Nineteen of these cases were sent back to the decanal level or resolved by minutes of settlement. It should be noted that even though the data shows 35 cases as being carried forward, some of these have been resolved but will be reported in the next reporting year, while others have been heard and are either awaiting a decision, a confirmation of expulsion or are in the process of being appealed.

In relation to timeliness, divisions were asked to provide information about the length of time between an allegation of an academic offence at the divisional level and either the date of resolution of the case or the date that the case was forwarded to the Provost's Office. In relation to the timeliness at the University Tribunal level, the Office of Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances (ADFG Office) routinely monitors the time between the date of charges being laid to the date of a hearing and also the time to the issuance of the decision, and works with the Senior Chair to help move the process forward.

It should be noted that the ADFG Office set in place a process known as the signing of Orders, whereby the decision made at the time of a hearing and any sanctions to be applied, are conveyed to the student immediately following the hearing. This also allows the appeal process to start from the time the Order is issued. Both of these time frames (time to issue of Order and time to issue of decision) are presented in the **Summary of University Tribunal cases** (Appendix B). The time between charges being laid and the issuance of an Order is an important measure of timeliness for the purposes of this report.

As can be seen in Table 3A of the **Summary of Divisional Academic Discipline Cases** (Appendix A), 95% of divisional cases are resolved within a 6 month time frame. At the Tribunal level, just over half of the cases were resolved within 6 months of charges being laid, with 90% having either an Order or written reasons issued within 9 months (Appendix B : **Summary of University Tribunal Cases** Tables 6a and 6b).

Over the last six years there has been a general upward trend in the total number of cases of academic misconduct handled by the divisions and University Tribunal. However, it should be noted that the Report contains raw data – counts of offences and offenders – rather than normalized data and the trend is mitigated to some degree by the growth in the University's enrolment and improvements in the University's means of detecting and handling cases of academic misconduct.

The University continues to take a proactive approach to academic integrity issues. In June 2011 a new *Provostial Advisory Group on Academic Integrity* was established to consider broader academic integrity education and policy issues, including University-wide consistency of approach and application where appropriate. The Group is co-chaired by the Vice-Provost

Academic Programs, the Vice-Provost Faculty and Academic Life, and the Vice-Provost Students and includes senior academic administrators with responsibility for academic integrity issues from academic divisions. The group has met every two months throughout the academic year to discuss university wide issues related to academic integrity. A sub-group of the Advisory Group has finished a draft of a central consolidated academic integrity website as a resource for students and faculty throughout the University.

The Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation (CTSI) hosts both an on-campus resource centre and an Academic Integrity website which bring together materials and resources for faculty, students and TAs (www.utoronto.ca/academicintegrity). The CTSI also runs a variety of workshops and information sessions on a range of topics related to the promotion of academic integrity. Workshops are also organized centrally to assist those responsible for administering the *Code* at the divisional level. These efforts are augmented by a wide variety of educational initiatives within the divisions that are designed specifically to raise awareness of the importance of academic integrity and to help promote the divisions' commitment to prevention.

The University is also committed to transparency, procedural fairness and a high quality of decision making throughout its academic integrity processes. The divisional academic integrity officers and Dean's Designates with the support and advice of the Provost's Office, as well as the ADFG Office, continue to make process improvements and develop protocols related to investigating, resolving, scheduling, tracking and issuing decisions. This helps ensure appropriate and timely resolution at all levels. The ADFG Office launched a new web site which aids in providing education and information to the University community, while the Tribunal, under the guidance of the Senior Chair, now uses Rules of Procedure to help clarify and provide greater transparency to the processes.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial implications.

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED:

- Appendix A: Summary of Divisional Academic Discipline Cases 2012-2013
- Appendix B: Summary of University Tribunal Cases 2012-2013

Provost's Annual Report on Cases of Academic Discipline

Appendix A: Summary of Divisional Academic Discipline Cases 2012-2013

Table 1: Number of Student Offenders by Division (only where sanction is imposed)

Division	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012 - 13
Applied Science & Engineering	123	147	115	133	178	135	206
Arts & Science	385	398	383	415	386	380	394
Dentistry	3	6	1	1	2	1	1
Graduate Studies	23	11	14	22	21	13	22
Law	1	1	0	5	1	2	0
Medicine	0	0	0	0	4	1	2
Music	2	2	5	5	3	2	4
Nursing	8	8	2	2	4	4	0
OISE / UT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pharmacy	4	1	2	7	161	8	5
Kinesiology and Physical Education	7	N/A	0	12	12	12	3
U of T Mississauga	118	176	270	234	331	387	303
U of T Scarborough	107	126	85	76	130	155	205
Total	781	876	877	912	1233	1100	1145

Table 2: Number of Offences by Type

Charge Code	Charge Text	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
B.i.1(a)	Forgery (documents, not transcripts)	16	17	43	22	24	40	25
B.i.1(b)	Unauthorized aid	248	280	313	348	552	387	412
B.i.1(c)	Personation	0	4	2	2	16	14	5
B.i.1(d)	Plagiarism	465	450	488	504	584	602	625
B.i.1(e)	Re-submission of work	7	8	10	13	14	16	16
B.i.1(f)	Concoction	2	26	0	0	3	2	5
B.i.3(a)	Forgery (academic records)	0	5	0	0	1	10	0
B.i.3(b)	Cheating for academic advantage	43	86	21	23	39	29	57
Total		781	876	877	912	1233	1100	1145

Table 3A: Timeliness between Charges Laid and Case Resolved

Year July 1-June 30	Time between Charges Laid and Case Resolved		
	Within 6 months	Within 9 months	Total
2010-11	98%	2%	100%
2011-12	97%	1.9%	98.9%
2012-13	95%	3.4%	98.4%

Table 3B: Timeliness for 2012-2013

	2012-13		
Division	Time between Charges Laid and Case Resolved		
	6 months	9 months	Total
Applied Science & Engineering	100%	0%	100%
Arts & Science	97 %	2%	99%
Dentistry	100%	0%	100%
Graduate Studies	100%	0%	100%
Law	0%	0%	100%
Medicine	100%	0%	100%
Music	100%	0%	100%
Nursing	0%	0%	100%
OISE / UT	0%	0%	100%
Pharmacy	100%	0%	100%
Physical Education & Health	100%	0%	100%
U of T Mississauga	94%	6%	100%
U of T Scarborough	90%	3.8%	93.8%
Total	95%	3.4%	98.4%

Provost's Annual Report on Cases of Academic Discipline

Appendix B: Summary of University Tribunal Cases 2012-2013

Table 1: Overview of Open Cases

Year July 1-June 30	Cases Carried Forward charges laid before July 1	New Cases charges laid	Total Open Cases	Cases Resolved	Cases Carried Forward
2006-07	25	24	49	19	28
2007-08	28	21	49	23	26
2008-09	26	38	64	25	39
2009-10	39	38	77	51	26
2010-11	26	35	61	33	28
2011-12	28	29	57	29	28
2012-13	28	46	74	39*	35**

*These include cases that were returned to the decanal level/settled.

** The cases carried forward are not all active as some were closed after June 30th.

Table 2: Number of Cases by Final Outcome

Outcome	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Acquittal	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Degree Recall	0	4	1	0	0	1	0
Expulsion from University	6	4	3	13	10	7	6
Suspension	4	8	13	23	14	13	13
Returned to Decanal Level / Minutes of Settlement	9	7	8	14	9	7	19

Table 3: Number of Cases Appealed

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13*
Total	2	1	0	0	1	1	2

* Some other cases were appealed during this period but they will be recorded in the year the decision is issued.

Table 4: Number of Offences by Type

Charge Code	Charge Text	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13*
B.i.1(a)	Forgery (documents, not transcripts)	5	8	17	22	29	35	52
B.i.1(b)	Unauthorized aid	6	24	7	18	13	16	12
B.i.1(c)	Personation	0	1	3	0	7	7	1
B.i.1(d)	Plagiarism	16	35	19	25	19	15	29
B.i.1(e)	Re-submission of work	0	4	0	0	0	0	1
B.i.1(f)	Concoction	3	8	5	5	6	2	7
B.i.3(a)	Forgery (academic records)	5	8	7	23	21	13	5
B.i.3(b)	Cheating for academic advantage	6	22	2	7	7	0	12
B.ii.1(a).ii	Aiding or assisting another							2
B.ii.2	Intent to commit offence							1

*These include offences that went back to the decanal level. For the Tribunal level we do not choose the primary offence, but rather, count all offences for which the Tribunal found an individual guilty.

Table 5: Number of Offenders by Division

Division	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13*
Applied Science & Engineering	0	1	1	0	2	3	3
Arts & Science	9	12	12	24	14	12	11
Dentistry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate Studies	1	2	0	3	2	3	3
Law	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Medicine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Music	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nursing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OISE / UT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pharmacy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Physical Education & Health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
U of T Mississauga	6	3	7	18	11	2	10
U of T Scarborough	3	4	5	5	4	9	12

* These include offenders whose cases went back to decanal level for resolution/settled.

Table 6a: Timeliness between Charges Laid and Order Issued

Year July 1-June 30	Time between Charges Laid and Order Issued*		
	Within 6 months	Within 9 months	Total
2009-10	24%	24%	48%
2010-11	77%	9%	86%
2011-12	56%	13%	69%
2012-13	62%	28%	90%

* This does not include offenders whose cases went back to decanal level for resolution or were settled but does include decisions that were appealed.

Table 6b: Timeliness between Charges Laid and Decision Issued

Year July 1-June 30	Time between Charges Laid and Decision Issued*		
	Within 6 months	Within 9 months	Total
2008-09**	19%	13%	32%
2009-10	26%	23%	49%
2010-11	45%	32%	77%
2011-12	18%	50%	68%
2012-13	30%	40%	70%

* This does not include offenders whose cases went back to decanal level for resolution or were settled but does include decisions that were appealed.

** The process of signing orders was created in 2009-10, and it was partially to address the issue of timeliness.

NOTE: When combined (e.g. in 90% of cases), either a decision or an order was issued within 9 months.