

Members:

Akis Psygkas – Law
Andrew Hawkes – SGPS/Social Science
Arthur Brown – Schulich
Arzie Chant – Engineering
Ayman El Ansary – Engineering
Busra Copuroglu – SGPS/Arts
Carrie Marshall – Health Sciences
Cindi Ryde – Health Sciences
Courtney Harper – Engineering
Dianne Bryant – Health Sciences
Doug Woolford – Science
Emi Iwaizumi – SGPS/Education
Genevieve De Viveiros – French Studies
Hubert Pun – Ivey
Immaculate Namukasa – Education
Jamie Baxter – Social Science
Joanna Blom – Engineering
Joseph Gilroy – Science
Kaleigh Campbell – SGPS/Law
Kamran Siddiqui – Engineering
Karine Dufresne – PAW
Kevin Mooney – Music
Leah Blackwood – SGPS/FIMS
Lina Dagnino – Schulich
Linda Miller – SGPS (Chair)
Lisa Hodgetts – Social Science
Lisa Latif – Registrar's Office Δ
Liz Webb – Science
Lorraine Davies – SGPS
Lyn Purdy – Ivey
Marguerite Lengyell – Education
Matheus Sanita Lima – Science
Matthew Hyginus – SGPS/Ivey
Melanie-Anne Atkins (for A. Haque) – CTL Δ
Melissa Adler – Information & Media Studies
Michael Milde – POLICY Chair
Nandi Bhatia – Arts & Humanities
Pam McKenzie – Information & Media Studies
Peter Donahue – Kings
Robert Glushko – University Librarian
Ruth Martin – SGPS
Seyram Afealete – SGPS/Music
Shabir Razavi – SGPS/Eng
Sharon Wei – Music
Shawn Whitehead – Schulich
Stephen McClatchie – Huron
Tobias Nagl – Arts
Tom Drysdale – Schulich
Tony Adebero – SGPS/Health Sciences
Vasudeva Bhat – PAW
Victor Chu – SGPS/Schulich
Waliu Alaka – SOGS
Yolanda Babenko-Mould – Health Sciences
Zoe Sinel – Law

Δ Non-voting *Regrets

AGENDA

1. Land Acknowledgement
2. Approval of Minutes – April 3, 2023 
3. New Business
 - 3.1. **GEC Academic Policy and Regulations Committee**
 - 3.1.1. Combined PhD Option 
 - 3.1.2. Initial Registration (Registration, Regulation 4.01) 
4. For Consultation
 - 4.1. Consultation Regarding Proposed Changes to:
 - 4.1.1. Senate Academic Policy on Scholastic Discipline for Graduate Students 
 - 4.1.2. Senate Academic Policy on Graduate Student Academic Appeals 
5. For Information
 - 5.1. **SGPS Representatives on Senate Update** 
6. Other Business
7. Adjourn

**Minutes of the Meeting of
Graduate Education Council (GEC)
Monday, April 3, 2023**

The meeting was held at 12:00pm in the Western Interdisciplinary Research Building, Room 3000, and via Zoom.

COUNCILLORS:

Akis Psygkas – Law
Andrew Hawkes – SGPS/Social Science
Arzie Chant – Engineering
Ayman El Ansary – Engineering
Busra Copuroglu – SGPS/Arts
Carrie Marshall – Health Sciences
Cindi Ryde – Health Sciences
Danica Facca – SOGS
Dianne Bryant – Health Sciences
Doug Woolford – Science
Emi Iwaizumi – SGPS/Education
Genevieve De Viveiros – French Studies
Hubert Pun – Ivey
Immaculate Namukasa – Education
Joanna Blom – Engineering
Kaleigh Campbell – SGPS/Law
Kamran Siddiqui – Engineering
Karine Dufresne – PAW

Leah Blackwood – SGPS/FIMS
Lina Dagnino – Schulich
Linda Miller – SGPS (Chair)
Lisa Hodgetts – Social Science
Lisa Latif – Registrar’s Office
Liz Webb – Science
Lorraine Davies – SGPS
Lyn Purdy – Ivey
Matheus Sanita Lima – SGPS/Science
Melanie-Anne Atkins (for A. Haque) – CTL
Melissa Adler – Information & Media Studies
Nandi Bhatia – Arts & Humanities
Pam McKenzie – Information & Media Studies
Peter Donahue – Kings
Robert Glushko – University Librarian
Seyram Afealete – SGPS/Music
Shabir Razavi – SGPS/Eng
Shawn Whitehead – Schulich

Stephen McClatchie – Huron
Tobias Nagl – Arts
Tom Drysdale – Schulich
Tony Adebero – SGPS/Health Sciences
Vasudeva Bhat – PAW
Victor Chu – SGPS/Schulich
Yolanda Babenko-Mould – Health Sciences

OBSERVERS:

Adrian Aguirre Jurado – SGPS
Candace Loosely – SGPS
Chris Circelli – SGPS
Julie Jonkhans – SGPS
Matt Dumouchel – SGPS
Mihaela Harnos – SGPS
Ron Wagler – SGPS

Items/Discussion (Host)	Motion(s)/Action Item(s)
<p>1. Land Acknowledgement Immaculate Namukasa offered a Land Acknowledgement.</p>	
<p>2. Welcome Linda Miller welcomed members.</p>	
<p>3. Minutes of Prior Meeting It was moved by Kamran Siddiqui, seconded by Tom Drysdale, That the minutes of meeting of December 1, 2022, be approved as circulated.</p>	CARRIED
<p>4. New Business</p>	
<p>4.1 GEC Academic Policy and Regulations Committee Lorraine Davies presented the following recommendations from GEC Policy Committee.</p>	
<p>4.1.1 Research and Professional Degree Program Definitions (Programs – Regulation 3.0) It was moved by Kamran Siddiqui, seconded by Arzie Chant, That Graduate Education Council approve and recommend the revision of the Research and Professional Degree Program Definitions (Programs - Regulation 3.0) to the Senate Committee on Academic Policy. Chris Circelli, Program Coordinator (Graduate Program Design), SGPS, reported that the program definitions are needed to guide graduate program innovation and to provide</p>	CARRIED

	Items/Discussion (Host)	Motion(s)/Action Item(s)
	<p>clarity around what differentiates professional and research-based programs. No discussion.</p>	
	<p>4.1.2 Proficiency in English (Admissions – Regulation 2.01)</p> <p>It was moved by Joanna Blom, seconded by Liz Webb,</p> <p>That Graduate Education Council approve and recommend the revision of the Proficiency in English Regulation (Admissions 2.01) to the Senate Committee on Academic Policy.</p> <p>Lorraine Davies shared that current regulations do not accurately reflect the most recent updates to the English Language Proficiency requirements (post-covid) for admission to a graduate program. A brief discussion ensued.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If programs are finding inconsistencies, they can set a higher minimum acceptable score for the IELTS Academic • Programs still have the option to a waive requirement if a student’s score is near the minimum; this is covered under exemptions • We need to remain alert to the English language proficiency requirements and how this aligns with EDIAD 	<p>CARRIED</p>
	<p>4.2 SGPS/Graduate Education Council Constitution</p> <p>It was moved by Arzie Chant, seconded by Kamran Siddiqui,</p> <p>That Graduate Education Council approve and recommend the amended School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies Council Constitution to Senate Operations/Agenda Committee.</p> <p>Linda Miller reviewed the proposed revisions noting several changes have been made to reflect the maturation of SGPS and to more clearly articulate aspects that have been found to be less than clear in practice. Following a brief discussion, members proposed a further addition (see ++ under 4c)</p> <p>“To the extent possible, representatives from Faculties should be elected/appointed by peer constituents.”.</p>	<p>CARRIED</p>
	<p>GEC Committee Terms of Reference</p> <p>It was moved by Arzie Chant, seconded by Kamran Siddiqui,</p> <p>That Graduate Education Council approve the amended Terms of Reference for its Academic Policy Committee, Mentorship Advisory Committee, Postdoctoral Affairs Advisory Committee, and Professional Development Advisory Committee effective May 1, 2023</p> <p>Like the SGPS Constitution, Linda Miller shared that the proposed changes have been made to reflect the maturation of SGPS and to more clearly articulate aspects that have been found to be less than clear in practice. Linda shared that originally and intentionally the Director of the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) was the Chair the Mentorship Advisory Committee. When the Director, CTL returns from their leave, we will be able to confirm the Chair role.</p> <p>Following a brief discussion, members proposed adding a staff member representative to Professional Development Advisory Committee, and Mentorship Advisory Committee.</p>	<p>CARRIED</p>
	<p>5. Other Business</p>	
	<p>5.1 The university and SGPS were applauded for taking a hard look at the graduate student funding issue and for initiating many good steps to address the issue. It was proposed that a working</p>	

Items/Discussion (Host)	Motion(s)/Action Item(s)
<p>group be formed to keep this issue on the front burner and to lobby on campus and at the municipal, provincial, and federal levels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council of Ontario Universities and the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies have been lobbying, but those voices are not enough • The Ontario Graduate Scholarship has not increased in 20 years • It would help to focus on internal scholarships through donor-based funding • Western has always taken the approach of having campus-wide minimum PhD funding; however, Western's equitable minimums across all parts of the university may work to our disadvantage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Following our lead, other universities have offered a guarantee that is not campus-wide; this allows flexibility to have higher minimums in some areas and even more variability at the Master's level • The planning is underway for increased on-campus housing for graduate students; however, individuals are encouraged to also lean on their municipal ward councillors to help improve off-campus housing issues • With thanks to SOGs, the TA unions and faculty support, negotiations to date have helped to bring down costs and opened financial avenues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Student leaders at other universities are using data-driven evidence to figure out ways to better assess how to bring about structural changes at their institutions • Over half of the University of Toronto's increase came out of faculty agreeing to pay more out of their grants which may mean they take on fewer graduate students • All this talk about increasing grad students, the university cannot take on this funding we are going to have fewer graduate students. At Schulich we've maintained our levels but that's on the back of developing professional programs • In the background, current graduate students are being asked tough questions by potential incoming graduate students <p>ACTION: Linda Miller to bring the idea of a Working Group to the Provost</p>	
<p>6. Adjourn</p>	
<p>The meeting adjourned at 1:11pm</p>	<p>Date of next meeting: May 4, 2023 rescheduled to May 2, 2023</p>

Recorded by Ann Hoffer

New Policy – Combined PhD Option

ACTION:	Recommended: Graduate Education Council approve and recommend the introduction of a new policy on Combined PhD option to the Senate Committee on Academic Policy.
<input type="checkbox"/> INFORMATION	
<input type="checkbox"/> UPDATE	
<input type="checkbox"/> DISCUSSION	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> APPROVAL	

BACKGROUND:

Many current and emerging areas of research/professional practice are at the intersection of existing disciplines. Advanced knowledge and research expertise that spans disciplinary boundaries is needed to effectively respond to emerging social and scientific needs. In addition, students are increasingly seeking interdisciplinary opportunities to leverage their research interests and to broaden their career options.

The creation of new interdisciplinary programs would not provide the flexibility or responsiveness to address these growing needs and would limit students to predetermined interdisciplinary needs. Ideally, interdisciplinary graduate education must include the flexibility to support unique combinations of disciplines to enable students to acquire both the depth of disciplinary learning expected at the doctoral level and the synthesis of knowledge across disciplines to produce scholars equipped to focus on increasingly complex challenges.

This combined PhD option will be unique in Canada and will provide an innovative and competitive advantage for Western in the recruitment of outstanding, innovative doctoral candidates.

PROPOSED CHANGE TO CURRENT REGULATION:

See attachments

PRIMARY CONTACT:

Linda Miller ▪ Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) ▪ lmiller@uwo.ca

CONSULTATION:

GEC Academic Policy Committee ▪ April 27, 2023

Graduate Education Council ▪ mmm dd, yyy

ATTACHMENT(S):

[Combined PhD Overview](#)

[Combined PhD Option Guide](#)

Policy Category:

Subject: Combined PhD Option

Subsections:

Approving Authority:

Responsible Committee:

Related Procedures:

**Officer(s) Responsible
for Procedures:**

Related Policies:

Effective Date:

Supersedes:

N.B., Appendix A, at the end of this policy draft, provides a copy of the Combined PhD Degree Agreement form

DEFINITIONS

Western Combined PhD

A Western Combined PhD entails the completion of the combined degree requirements of two Western doctoral programs simultaneously under the supervision of a faculty member from each program.

POLICY

1. Rationale for a Combined PhD Option

- 1.1. Many current and emerging areas of research and professional practice are at the intersection of existing disciplines.
- 1.2. Advanced knowledge and research expertise that spans disciplinary boundaries is needed to effectively respond to emerging cultural, social, and scientific needs.
- 1.3. The creation of new interdisciplinary graduate programs would not provide the flexibility or responsiveness required to address these growing needs.
- 1.4. This option will be unique in Canada and will provide an innovative and competitive advantage for Western and its graduates.

2. Program Structure

- 2.1. The student will have two supervisors - one from each graduate program. In exceptional circumstances, a single supervisor, with doctoral membership in both programs may be approved by SGPS, conditional upon the supervisory committee representing both programs.
- 2.2. One of the two programs will be identified as the "Home Program" for the purpose of registration and administration.
- 2.3. Programs are encouraged to "share" or "merge" some of their usual requirements.
 - For example, a required course in one program can also be counted as an optional or elective course in the second program.
- 2.4. One thesis is to be completed; the thesis must meet the expectations of both programs.

- 2.5. The composition of the examining board for the dissertation will include representation of both participating programs and disciplines.
- Some variation from the usual PhD Examination Board structure may be needed to achieve this; such variation must be approved by SGPS.
- 2.6. The student's individual program (structured to support completion in 4 years) must be determined and agreed upon by the two programs, including:
- All courses to be completed to meet the learning outcomes of both programs
 - The nature and timing of comprehensive(s) to satisfy both programs (if feasible, the comprehensive exam requirements of the two programs can be merged into one exam)
 - Any additional milestones required to meet the learning outcomes of both programs
 - The topic of the dissertation/research

3. Enrolling in a Combined PhD Option

- 3.1. The student is accepted first into a “Home Program” and then requests admission to the “Partnering Program”.
- The student must meet the entrance requirements of both graduate programs and must be admitted by both programs.
- 3.2. Following completion and approval of the “Combined PhD Degree Agreement” and admission to the Partnering Program, the student is transferred into the combined degree program.

- Normally the Combined PhD Agreement will be completed prior to the student's first term of registration but no later than two terms into the student's registration in the Home Program.

3.3. The student must have a supervisor who holds doctoral membership in each of the programs who is willing to supervise the student in the Combined PhD option.

4. Inclusion on Transcripts and Degrees

4.1. One degree/parchment will be awarded; it will list both graduate programs.

4.2. The student's transcript will note registration in both graduate programs, with one degree awarded upon completion of all requirements.

4.3. The student's transcript will read under "Academic Program History":

Program: Home Program

Plan: Combined Doctor of Philosophy
Home Program and Partnering Program

Status: Active in Program (or later, "Completed Program")

4.4. The final degree awarded will appear on the parchment as:

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY, *Home Program and Partnering Program*

APPENDIX A

Combined PhD Degree Agreement Form

	Home Program	Partnering Program	Combined Program
Student Name: _____			
Entrance requirements:			
Duration of degree:			
Supervisory committee structure:			
Course and milestone requirements:			
Comprehensive examination(s) / Candidacy Examination milestones:			
Additional program requirements:			
Thesis requirements:			
Thesis examination committee:			
Supervisor(s):			
Funding and Teaching Assistantship:			

APPROVALS:

Student			
	Student: Name	Student: Signature	Date
Home Program			
	Graduate Chair: Name	Graduate Chair: Signature	Date
Home Program			
	Supervisor: Name	Supervisor: Signature	Date
Partnering Program			
	Graduate Chair: Name	Graduate Chair: Signature	Date
Partnering Program			
	Supervisor: Name	Supervisor: Signature	Date
Home Program			
	Associate Dean-Graduate: Name	Associate Dean-Graduate: Signature	Date
Partnering Program (if different from Home)			
	Associate Dean-Graduate: Name	Associate Dean-Graduate: Signature	Date
SGPS			
	Vice-Provost: Name	Vice-Provost: Signature	Date

PROCEDURE FOR THE POLICY ON COMBINED PHD OPTION: Guideline for Creating PhD Degree Agreement

PREAMBLE

The creation of a Combined PhD Option requires completing the Combined PhD Degree Agreement form. This procedure document serves to clarify and provide guidelines for doing so, as well as to highlight important considerations.

DEFINITIONS

Home Program: For the purposes of the PhD Degree Agreement Form, “Home Program” will refer to the graduate program that has administrative responsibility for the student, including providing work/office space, assignment of GTAs, completion of annual progress reports, etc.

The Home Program is also the “fall-back” program in the event that the student wishes to discontinue in the combined option.

Partnering Program: For the purposes of the PhD Degree Agreement Form, “Partnering Program” will refer to the second graduate program.

PROCEDURE

1. The following table provides comments and additional considerations for each of the subsections of the Combined PhD Degree Agreement form:

Subsection	Comments & considerations
Student name:	(No additional comments)
Entrance requirements:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The student is accepted first into the Home Program and then applies for admission to the Partnering Program.• The student must meet the entrance requirements of both programs and must be admitted by both programs.• If there is a variation from the normal requirements (e.g., if one Program is allowing a variation from their usual requirements), describe the variation.
Duration of degree:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Combined Program duration is 4 years• If the student is expected to exceed the normal 4 year duration with an additional year, describe later in the funding section how the student will be supported financially for the additional year.
Supervisory committee structure:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The structure of the supervisory committee for the Combined Program may vary from the structure of each of the participating program.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Such variation must be clearly described and must be in alignment with SGPS Regulations.
Course and milestone requirements:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List the courses and milestones required for the combined program. Describe how the course requirements of the two programs will be combined or varied. If any courses or milestones will be required beyond the usual requirements of either program, they must be listed, along with any recommended or required timing of when such additional courses or milestones should be completed.
Comprehensive examination(s) / Candidacy Examination milestones:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideally, the student should not be required to complete the comprehensive exam requirements of both programs; Rather, efforts should be made to combine or blend the requirements in a manner that supports the learning expectations of each program while avoiding separate comprehensive examinations.
Additional program requirements:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe how any of the additional requirements from either program may be combined or waived for the Combined Program. In combining or waiving any additional requirements, information should be provided to explain how the learning expectations of the two programs will still be met. Mandatory lab or safety training cannot be waived.
Thesis requirements:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All thesis submission and examination related forms must be completed and submitted to SGPS by the Home Program. Composition and approval of the thesis examination board, the public lecture, and examination date will be administered by the Home Program, in consultation with the Partnering Program.
Thesis examination committee:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to dual degree examination committees, some variation from SGPS Regulations is expected in order to ensure that the examination board appropriate represents the research conducted in the Combined Program; However, it is strongly encouraged that the examination board not include more than one additional member (i.e., the usual PhD examination board includes 4 examiners; the Combined PhD examination board should not exceed 5 members).
Supervisor(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supervisors, one from each program, are required for the combined program. The supervisor from the Home Program will have responsibility for ensuring that annual progress reports are

	submitted via the Home Program and for ensuring that thesis submission and examination forms are submitted to SGPS.
Funding and Teaching Assistantship:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Detail the funding commitments from each Program (eg, GTAships, scholarships, Graduate Fellowships), breaking the details down by year if the funding sources are expected to change on a yearly basis.• Although the Partnering Program should reasonably contribute to the student’s funding package, the Home Program has ultimate responsibility for the student’s funding.

Registration – Initial Registration (Regulation 4.01)

ACTION:	Recommended: Graduate Education Council approve and recommend the revision of the Initial Registration (Regulation 4.01) to the Senate Committee on Academic Policy.
<input type="checkbox"/> INFORMATION	
<input type="checkbox"/> UPDATE	
<input type="checkbox"/> DISCUSSION	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> APPROVAL	

BACKGROUND:

Although the policy has stated that registration can be deferred for one term, recent practice has been that graduate programs have needed to provide registration deferrals for more than one term. Over the past few years, there has been an increase in multiple deferral requests, due to COVID and to the increased time required for international students to obtain study permits; in many such cases, multiple terms of deferral have been required before students have been able to arrive at Western and begin their studies. Although study permit processing times have decreased somewhat, students from some countries continue to experience extended wait times.

While many graduate programs admit new students on a term-by-term basis, other programs are structured in a cohort manner or based on a program design that optimizes starting the program in a particular term, often the Fall term. For these programs, limiting deferrals to only one term would disadvantage the student by requiring them to start the program at a less than optimal time. As such, we propose removing the language in the policy that limits deferrals to one term.

PROPOSED CHANGE TO CURRENT REGULATION:

<p>4.01 INITIAL REGISTRATION</p> <p>A candidate whose application for admission has been approved by the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies must register in the term indicated on the "Offer of Admission". In exceptional circumstances, registration may be deferred for one term, with approval of the program and the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies. The candidate should consult the appropriate program for details about registration.</p>	<p>4.01 INITIAL REGISTRATION</p> <p>A candidate whose application for admission has been approved by the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies must register in the term indicated on the "Offer of Admission". In exceptional circumstances, registration may be deferred with approval of the program and the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies. The candidate should consult the appropriate program for details about registration.</p>
---	--

PRIMARY CONTACT:

Name ▪ Position ▪ email

CONSULTATION:

GEC Academic Policy Committee ▪ April 27, 2023
 Graduate Education Council ▪ mmm dd, yyy

ATTACHMENT(S):

SCHOLASTIC DISCIPLINE FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

Effective July 1, 2008, the Faculty of Graduate Studies became the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, headed by the Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) rather than a Dean. These references have been revised in the following document and all reference to the Vice-Provost are specific to the Vice-Provost (SGPS) unless otherwise stated. As well, references to the Graduate Program Chair have been changed to Graduate Chair.

SCHOLASTIC OFFENCES

Members of the University Community accept a commitment to maintain and uphold the purposes of the University and, in particular, its standards of scholarship. It follows, therefore, that acts of a nature that prejudice the academic standards of the University are offences subject to discipline. Any form of academic dishonesty that undermines the evaluation process, also undermines the integrity of the University's degrees. The University will take all appropriate measures to promote academic integrity and deal appropriately with scholastic offences.

DEFINITION

Scholastic Offences include, but are not limited to, the following examples:

- Plagiarism - the "act or an instance of copying or stealing another's words or ideas and attributing them as one's own." (Excerpted from Black's Law Dictionary, West Group, 1999, 7th ed., p. 1170). This concept applies with equal force to all academic work, including theses, assignments or projects of any kind, comprehensive examinations, laboratory reports, diagrams, and computer projects. Detailed information is available from instructors, Graduate Chairs, or the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies. Students also may consult style manuals held in the University's libraries. See <http://www.lib.uwo.ca/services/styleguides.html>
- Cheating on an examination or falsifying material subject to academic evaluation.
- Submitting false or fraudulent research, assignments or credentials; or falsifying records, transcripts or other academic documents.
- Submitting a false medical or other such certificate under false pretences.
- Improperly obtaining, through theft, bribery, collusion or otherwise, an examination paper prior to the date and time for writing such an examination.
- Unauthorized possession of an examination paper, however obtained, prior to the date and time for writing such an examination, unless the student reports the matter to the instructor, the relevant program, or the Registrar as soon as possible after receiving the paper in question.
- Impersonating a candidate at an examination or availing oneself of the results of such an impersonation.
- Intentionally interfering in any way with any person's scholastic work.
- Submitting for credit in any course or program of study, without the knowledge and *written* approval of the instructor to whom it is submitted, any academic work for which credit previously has been obtained or is being sought in another course or program of study in the University or elsewhere.
- Aiding or abetting any such offence.

Evidence of wrongdoing may result in criminal prosecution in addition to any proceedings within the University.

PROCEDURES FOR SCHOLASTIC OFFENCES

If a student is suspected of cheating, plagiarism or other scholastic offence, the University will investigate and if it is satisfied that the student has committed a scholastic offence it may impose sanctions, up to and including expulsion from the University. The procedures that the University will follow are set out in this section.

Note: Throughout these scholastic offence regulations, reference to "Vice-Provost" is to be interpreted "Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) or his/her designate" (who is usually an Associate Vice-Provost) and reference to "Chair" is to be interpreted "Graduate Chair or his/her designate". If the matter has been designated by the Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) or a Graduate Chair to another person(s), that person(s) is authorized to make the School's or Program's final decision on the matter.

PART I: OFFENCES NOT RELATED TO A PROGRAM

- If an allegation of misconduct does not relate directly to the student's program (e.g., a course or thesis), the allegation will be referred to the Vice-Provost.
- If the Vice-Provost decides that there is evidence to support the allegation, the Vice-Provost will advise the student of the allegation and the information supporting the allegation, normally within one week after the matter has been forwarded to him/her.
- The student will be given a reasonable opportunity to respond and submit evidence, and a reasonable opportunity to meet with the Vice-Provost before a decision is made.
- If the Vice-Provost decides that the student has committed a scholastic offence, he/she will determine the appropriate penalties.
- The Vice-Provost's decision, including the penalties, will be communicated to the student in writing, normally within a reasonable time three weeks after the Vice-Provost advised the student of the allegation. The letter will inform the student whether there will be a notation on the student's academic record and of his/her right to appeal the decision to the Senate Review Board Academic within six weeks of the date of the decision.

PART II: PROGRAM-RELATED OFFENCES

- If evidence of a possible scholastic offence is brought to the attention of, or discovered by, a course instructor or member of a student's thesis supervisory committee, normally he/she will meet with the student to discuss the allegation if practicable and appropriate in a given case.
- The relevant Chair will be notified if there is evidence of a scholastic offence.
- **Decision by Graduate Chair**
 - If the Chair agrees that there is evidence to support the allegation he/she will advise the student of the allegation and the information supporting the allegation, normally within one week after the matter was forwarded to him/her.
 - The student will be given a reasonable opportunity to respond and submit evidence, and a reasonable opportunity to meet with the Chair before a decision is made.
 - If the Chair decides that the student has committed a scholastic offence, he/she will determine the appropriate penalties in consultation with the instructor or the student's supervisor, as appropriate.
 - **The Chair may impose penalties 1 through 7 (see "Penalties" below).**
 - The Chair's decision, including any penalties and any recommended penalties, will be communicated to the student in writing with a copy to the Vice-Provost, normally within a reasonable time three weeks after the Chair advised the student of the allegation. The letter also will advise the student of his/her right to appeal the finding of misconduct and/or any penalties imposed by the Chair to the Vice-Provost, the time period by which the appeal must be filed, and will refer the student to the regulations governing Scholastic Offences in the Graduate Calendar.
- **Appeal to Vice-Provost**
 - A student may appeal a Chair's finding of misconduct and/or penalties imposed by the Chair to the Vice-Provost. A completed appeal application
 - https://grad.uwo.ca/doc/academic_services/appeal/appeal_SGPS_form.pdf together with all supporting documents must be submitted to the Office of the Vice-Provost within three weeks of the issuance of the Chair's decision. **The deadline for filing an appeal may be extended at the discretion of the Vice-Provost.**
 - The Vice-Provost will review the evidence provided by both the student and the Chair and may investigate further. The Vice-Provost will give the student a reasonable opportunity to meet with him/her before making a decision.
 - The Vice-Provost may affirm, vary or overturn any decision made by the Chair and may impose other penalties. If the Vice-Provost is considering imposing a penalty or penalties that were not imposed by the Chair, he or she shall notify the student and give the student a reasonable opportunity to file written submissions on the issue of penalty.
 - The Vice-Provost's decision will be communicated to the student in writing with a copy to the Chair, normally within three weeks a reasonable time after receiving the student's complete appeal. The decision letter will also inform the student whether there will be a notation on the student's academic record, and will inform the student of his/her right to appeal a negative decision to the Senate Review Board Academic within six weeks of the date of the decision.

Note: Legal representation is not permitted at any stage of the appeal process prior to the level of the Senate Review Board Academic.

- **Review by Vice-Provost**

- If a student does not appeal a Chair's decision, the Vice-Provost will review the evidence presented and the penalties imposed by the Chair, if any, and may vary the Chair's penalties and/or impose other penalties.
- If the Vice-Provost is considering imposing a penalty or penalties that were not imposed by the Chair, he/she shall notify the student and give the student a reasonable opportunity to file written submissions on the issue of penalty.
- The Vice-Provost's decision will be communicated to the student in writing, with a copy to the Chair, normally within three weeks a reasonable time after the deadline for filing an appeal.
- The decision letter will also inform the student whether there will be a notation on the student's academic record, and will inform the student of his/her right to appeal the penalties imposed by the Vice-Provost to the Senate Review Board Academic within six weeks of the date of the decision.

OFFENCE RECORD

- A student who commits a scholastic offence acquires an Offence Record. This record contains evidence collected during the investigation of the offence and copies of correspondence with the student.
- The Offence Record is held in the Vice-Provost's Office and is kept separate from the student's academic counselling file. If a student subsequently is found not to have committed the offence in question, the record of that charge will be destroyed in accordance with Western's Records Retention and Disposal Schedules. The Student Affairs records retention and disposal schedule is at the following Web site: https://www.lib.uwo.ca/archives/retention_schedules/retention_schedules.html
- Apart from the student, no one outside the Vice-Provost's Office shall have access to an Offence Record, except in the event of an appeal by the student to SRBA against the decision or the penalty (or penalties) imposed or except as set out in "Release of Information Concerning Scholastic Offences" below.
- **Release of Information Concerning Scholastic Offences**
 - The letters informing a student that he or she has been found to have committed a scholastic offence, and the penalty or penalties imposed are confidential documents. Copies will be sent only to involved parties.
 - In the event that the penalties imposed are to be reflected in the student's academic record, either on the official transcript or the internal electronic record, a copy will be sent to the Registrar.
 - If a student registers in another Faculty, or an Affiliated University College of this University, the Offence Record will be transferred to the Dean's Office of that Faculty or College.
 - In addition, information may be released with the written permission of the student or if required pursuant to a contract, grant, scholarship, agreement, or a court order.
 - Under all other circumstances, the information contained in a student's Offence Record shall be considered confidential and, unless the offence is to be recorded on the student's transcript, no information about the student's Offence Record shall be provided to any person or institution outside the University.
- **Report to Senate**
 - The School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies prepares an annual summary of scholastic offences committed by students registered in the School. The summary sets out the nature of the offence and the penalties, with students' names removed. The Vice-Provost reports this information annually to the Senate Committee on Academic Policy and Awards, which will forward the report to Senate for information.

PENALTIES

The University will treat seriously any incident of academic dishonesty and students should expect significant consequences for their actions. A serious incident or repeated offences may result in a requirement that the student withdraw from the program and/or may result in suspension or expulsion from the University.

A student who has committed guilty of a scholastic offence may be subject to one or more penalties, examples of which are:

1. Reprimand.
2. Requirement that the student repeat and resubmit the assignment.
3. A failing grade in the assignment.
4. A failing grade in the course in which the offence was committed.

5. Withdrawal from the program.
6. Suspension from the University for up to three academic years or for a portion of one academic year including the academic session in which the student is currently registered.
7. Expulsion from the University.

Notes:

- A Graduate Chair may impose penalties 1 through 4.
- Only the Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) may impose penalties 5, 6 and 7.
- A Graduate Chair also can recommend a more severe penalty (e.g., withdrawal, suspension, expulsion) to the Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) in addition to penalty(ies) imposed at the program level.
- In determining what penalties are warranted in a given case, the Vice-Provost will consider the gravity of the offence, any Offence Record, any recommendations of the Graduate Chair's decision, and the need for consistency in standards of discipline across the School.
- The Vice-Provost may require a notation of the scholastic offence (e.g., "Scholastic Offence recorded in...") on a student's internal, electronic record for penalty 4. On the successful completion of the student's program, the student may request that the notation be removed. The Vice-Provost, after consulting with the Graduate Chair, will decide whether to grant the request.
- The penalties of suspension and expulsion are recorded as notations on the student's official transcript.*
- Appeals against the imposition of any penalty will be dealt with in accordance with the procedures set out in "Procedures for Scholastic Offences."
- Students who have been suspended by the University as a result of a scholastic offence must apply for readmission subject to the same conditions that operate for students applying for "Readmission Following Unsatisfactory Performance."

* For the Senate regulation on removal of suspension and expulsion notations from academic transcripts, see "Transcript Notations" under "Academic Records and Student Transcripts":
http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/general/records.pdf

Issued: 2008 09
Rev. 2010 11
Rev. 2011 06

Related Policies and Notes:

Transcript Notations:
http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/general/records.pdf

Graduate Student Academic Appeals

Effective July 1, 2008, the Faculty of Graduate Studies became the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, the head of which is the Vice-Provost (SGPS). References to Graduate Program Chair show now as Graduate Chair

This revised policy was approved by Senate at its meeting of 18 February 2011:

GRADUATE STUDENT APPEALS OF ACADEMIC DECISIONS

Students may appeal an academic decision or ruling in accordance with the appeal procedures set out below. Students have a right to appeal to their graduate programs and, if unsuccessful, to the Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies). Some decisions may be appealed further to the Senate Review Board Academic. The Vice-Provost's rulings in academic matters are final unless overturned or modified on appeal to the Senate Review Board Academic (SRBA).

A decision or ruling remains in effect unless overturned or modified by the individual or body hearing an appeal of that decision or ruling.

Throughout this document, the word "Vice-Provost" means "Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) or designate."

Note: Appeals of Scholastic Offence decisions are not covered under this policy. For the appeal procedure for scholastic offence decisions see "Scholastic Discipline for Graduate Students"
http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/scholastic_discipline_grad.pdf

Subject Matter of an Appeal

Students may appeal:

- a mark on an examination or on a particular piece of work, or final standing in a course
- a ruling of an instructor, program, or administrator in an academic matter

Grounds of Appeal

An appeal must be based on one or more of the following grounds:

- medical or compassionate circumstances
- extenuating circumstances beyond the student's control
- bias
- inaccuracy
- unfairness

Ignorance of Senate regulations and policies, program requirements, and policies as set out in the University's Academic Calendars does not constitute grounds for an appeal.

Appeal Procedure

It is incumbent on students to initiate each step at the earliest opportunity, and on the University officers concerned to act as expeditiously as possible. *Note: Legal counsel is not permitted at any stage of the appeal process prior to the level of the Senate Review Board Academic.*

A. Appeals at the Course/Program Level

1. If the appeal relates to a specific course, a student must first attempt to resolve the matter informally with the course instructor. If the instructor is not available or if the matter is not resolved to the student's satisfaction, the student has a right of appeal to the individual(s) or body designated to hear appeals at the graduate-program level. Students should contact their graduate program to obtain information on the program's appeal process. An appeal must be filed within four weeks of the issuance of the mark or ruling.
2. For all other appeals, a student must initiate the appeal with the individual(s) or body designated to hear appeals at the graduate-program level. Students should contact their graduate program to obtain information on the program's appeal process. An appeal must be filed within four weeks of the issuance of the mark or ruling.

3. In no circumstances shall the original decision maker(s) whose decision or ruling is under appeal hear an appeal of that decision or ruling at the program level.
4. Deadlines for filing appeals may be extended at the discretion of the individual or body hearing student appeals.
5. In addition to any other information required by individual graduate programs, appeals submitted by students should include the following information:
 - the matter being appealed
 - the grounds of appeal
 - a clear and detailed explanation of the facts supporting the grounds of appeal
 - all supporting documentation
 - the desired outcome or remedy
6. The designated decision maker shall issue a written decision ("program decision"), normally within 3 weeks of receipt of a reasonable time after receiving the complete appeal.

B. Appeals at the SGPS level

7. A student may appeal the program decision to the Vice-Provost. An appeal application together with all required documentation, including a copy of the previous decision, must be filed with the Office of the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies within three weeks of the issuance of the program decision. Students should contact the Office of the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies for more information. The required application form can be found online at: http://grad.uwo.ca/doc/academic_services/appeal/appeal_SGPS_form.pdf
The deadline for filing an appeal may be extended at the discretion of the Vice-Provost.
8. In considering an appeal, the Vice-Provost shall review the materials submitted by the student and the program and may obtain such further information as the Vice-Provost deems relevant to the appeal. The Vice-Provost shall give the student a reasonable opportunity to meet with her or him and may meet with such other individuals as she or he deems necessary.
9. The Vice-Provost shall issue a written decision, with reasons, normally within a reasonable time after receiving four weeks of receipt of the complete appeal.
10. A student may have a further right of appeal to the Senate Review Board Academic (SRBA) if the decision falls within the jurisdiction of SRBA. Appeals to SRBA must be made within six weeks of the date of the Vice-Provost's decision. The decision of the Vice-Provost or designate remains in full force and effect unless and until overturned or modified by SRBA.
11. Additional information and SRBA appeal applications are available on the Web at:
http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/appealsgrad.pdf
http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/SRBA_Application.pdf

APPEALS TO SRBA

References to the Dean, in the case of graduate students, are to be understood to refer to the Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies)

Jurisdiction

In addition to jurisdiction conferred upon SRBA by any other Senate regulation or policy, SRBA has jurisdiction to hear appeals from certain academic decisions of Deans, other than those relating to admission and advanced standing, provided that the appellant has followed the procedures set out above for requesting relief at the earlier levels, and provided that SRBA otherwise has jurisdiction to consider the appeal as set out below.

1. For scholastic offence appeals, a student has the right to an oral hearing before SRBA if the appeal is against a finding that the student's conduct amounted to a "scholastic offence" and/or for relief against the penalty imposed by the Dean as a result of a "scholastic offence".

2. For other appeals, a student may apply for an oral hearing before SRBA in the following circumstances:
 - a. the student alleges that there has been a failure to follow, or to properly apply, a Senate regulation; or
 - b. the Dean's decision requires the student to withdraw from a program, from the University or from an Affiliated College; or
 - c. the appeal is against general marking or grading practices; or
 - d. the appeal is against a Dean's decision made with respect to the Policy on Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities.

A panel of SRBA, upon considering only the written application of the student (see [Application for Hearing](#), below), may in its discretion order that an oral hearing be scheduled, or deny the appeal. In making its decision, SRBA will consider the grounds and evidence provided in the Application for Hearing. In the case of 2.a, the student must set out in the Details of the Appeal both the Senate regulation and the alleged error, as well as explain how this error affected the student's academic performance.

3. In exceptional circumstances, SRBA may agree to an oral hearing of an appeal against a Dean's decision that does not fall within #1 or #2 above, if a student alleges in the Application for Hearing that there was a failure to observe a procedural requirement at the decanal level or bias at the decanal level. Such allegations must be supported by evidence. A detailed description of the evidence supporting the allegation (including any supporting documentation) must be presented, in writing, as part of the Application for Hearing. SRBA will request a written response from the Dean before making a decision. The student will be provided with a copy of the Dean's response and will be given the opportunity to reply to it in writing. If SRBA is satisfied on the basis of the written documentation that there was a failure to observe a procedural requirement at the decanal level it may instruct the Dean to reconsider the matter. If the SRBA panel agrees to an oral hearing of an appeal alleging a failure to observe a procedural requirement at the decanal level or bias at the decanal level, the standard onus requirements set out below will apply.

Note: A denial of transfer into a Faculty, School, Affiliated University College or program following a requirement to withdraw from another Faculty, School, Affiliated University College or program at the University may not be appealed to SRBA. The denial of transfer is an admission decision and is therefore outside SRBA's jurisdiction.

If a party wishes to challenge the jurisdiction of SRBA to hear a particular matter, the party must give written notice with reasons to the Chair of SRBA prior to the date of the hearing. The Chair, upon receipt of such notice, or in any other circumstances where it appears to the Chair that there is a question as to whether the SRBA has jurisdiction to hear a matter, may in his/her discretion convene a panel to consider such written arguments as it deems appropriate and decide the issue of jurisdiction. The decision of any such panel shall be binding on any subsequent panel hearing the merits of the appeal.

Onus

1. The onus is on the student to satisfy SRBA that the ruling of the Dean was unreasonable or unsupported on the evidence before the Dean; or, with respect to a sanction imposed for a "scholastic offence", that the penalty was unreasonable.
2. Notwithstanding #1 above, in cases where a Dean made a finding that a student's conduct amounted to a "scholastic offence" and where the student denies either that the acts were committed or that the acts amounted to a "scholastic offence", the onus is on the Dean to satisfy SRBA that the student committed the alleged acts and that the acts amounted to a "scholastic offence".
3. The onus requirements set out in #1 and #2 for an appeal against a finding that a student's conduct amounted to a "scholastic offence" or against the sanction imposed for a scholastic offence, apply mutatis mutandis to an appeal against a finding that there has been a breach of other University policies such as the Policy and Procedures for the Conduct of Research, or an appeal against the sanction imposed for such breach.
4. Where an appeal falls under the Policy on Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities, the onus is on the Faculty to persuade SRBA that the suggested accommodation or accommodations would

compromise the academic integrity of the course or program in light of the essential requirements of that course or program.

Evidence

SRBA will consider only that evidence that was before the Dean whose decision is being appealed. Evidence that was not before the Dean will not be considered unless SRBA determines that it is relevant, significant and could not have been available at an earlier stage through reasonable efforts. If additional documentary evidence is submitted it must be accompanied by a written explanation as to why the evidence is relevant and significant and why it was not previously available. Similarly, if either party intends to call a witness whose evidence was not before the Dean, the party must file with the University Secretariat prior to the hearing a written explanation as to why such evidence is relevant and significant and why it was not previously available.

Copies of all documentation that the parties intend to present at the hearing, together with a copy of the appellant's official transcript of academic record (obtained by the University Secretariat from the Office of the Registrar), will be distributed to both parties (appellant and Dean) and to the members of SRBA serving on the hearing panel by the University Secretariat prior to the date of the hearing.

Relief

In granting an appeal, SRBA will grant such relief as it deems appropriate.

Application for Hearing

Appeals to the SRBA must be made on an Application for Hearing which must be filed with the University Secretariat within six weeks* of the date of the Dean's decision. Exceptions to the six week time limit for filing an appeal with the SRBA are at the discretion of the Chair of SRBA upon written application by the student. An Application for Hearing will not be accepted by the University Secretariat unless the application is complete. A complete application will include the following: details of the appeal, including a description of the matter under appeal and the reasons for challenging the Dean's decision; the requested relief; a copy of the Dean's decision; a copy of the student's letter to the Dean requesting relief, if applicable; and all relevant supporting documentation. Applications for a hearing by the SRBA and further details on hearing procedures may be obtained from the University Secretariat, Room 4101, Stevenson Hall. A request from a party to postpone a scheduled hearing, or to delay scheduling a hearing after an Application has been filed, will be at the discretion of the Chair of SRBA and will be granted only in exceptional circumstances. Such postponement or delay shall not exceed six months. The parties will then be contacted to arrange a hearing date. (If the appellant cannot be contacted to arrange a hearing date, he/she will be notified of the hearing date by registered mail at the address set out in the Application.) SRBA will proceed in the absence of one or more parties if it is satisfied that the parties were notified of the hearing date.

If, following receipt of an Application for Hearing, the University Secretariat is unable to contact the appellant within a reasonable time to schedule a hearing, the appellant will be notified by registered mail at the address on the Application for Hearing of the deadline by which he/she must contact the University Secretariat (six months from the date the Application for Hearing was filed) to arrange a hearing. If the appellant has not contacted the University Secretariat by the specified deadline, the Application and documentation will be returned to the appellant and may not be resubmitted.

The Application for Hearing can be printed from:

http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/SRBA_Application.pdf

* Under the Policy on Academic Accommodation for Students with Disabilities, an appeal to the SRBA must be filed within two weeks of the date of the Dean's decision.

Further Appeals

SRBA is the final level of academic appeal in the University; its decisions in substantive matters, and decisions as to jurisdiction and whether it will hear an appeal, are final. The Chair of Senate (i.e., the President & Vice-Chancellor) will entertain appeals against decisions of SRBA only when a party alleges a serious procedural error by SRBA. An appeal to the Chair of Senate must be filed in writing within two weeks of the date of the Notice of Decision of SRBA. After inviting written arguments from the parties, the

Chair of Senate may order that the matter be re-heard by SRBA if the Chair of Senate is satisfied that, as a result of a serious procedural error by SRBA, the parties did not have an opportunity to present their case in accordance with the Procedure at Hearings (below) and it could not be said that the parties had been accorded a fair hearing.

Decisions which are appealed to the Chair of Senate remain in full force and effect until the appeal is disposed of by the Chair of Senate.

Procedure at Hearings

SRBA will review its jurisdiction to hear the appeal in closed session prior to the commencement of the hearing. (Note: If a party disputes the jurisdiction of SRBA to hear the appeal, the Chair must receive written notice and reasons prior to the date of the hearing. See Jurisdiction above.)

A. ORDER OF PROCEEDINGS

1. Introduction of SRBA members and review of documentation.
2. Opening Statement by appellant (brief description of the grounds for the appeal and the relief requested).
3. Presentation of evidence by appellant.
4. Cross-examination of the appellant by the Faculty representative, followed by questions from SRBA members.
5. Re-examination of the appellant, if desired, on any new matters brought out in cross examination. (The procedure in 3, 4 and 5 is followed for the appellant and witnesses. The order of presentation is at the appellant's discretion.)
6. Opening statement by the Faculty.
7. Presentation of evidence by the Faculty representative.
8. Cross-examination of the Faculty representative by the appellant, followed by questions from SRBA members.
9. Re-examination of the Faculty representative, if desired, on any new matters brought out in cross-examination. (The procedure in 7, 8 and 9 is followed for the Faculty representative and witnesses. The order of presentation is at the Faculty's discretion.)
10. Reply evidence by the appellant, if desired, on any new matters raised by the Faculty.
11. Cross-examination of reply witness, followed by questions from SRBA members.
12. Summary remarks by the Faculty.
13. Summary remarks by the appellant.

B. ORDER OF PROCEEDINGS - Scholastic Offence Appeals*

Where the appeal concerns allegations of a scholastic offence **which are contested** by the appellant, the order of proceedings shall be:

1. Introduction of SRBA members and review of documentation.
2. Opening statement by the Faculty.
3. Presentation of evidence by the Faculty representative.
4. Cross-examination of the Faculty representative by the appellant, followed by questions from SRBA members.
5. Re-examination of the Faculty representative, if desired, on any new matters brought out in cross-examination. (The procedure in 3, 4 and 5 is followed for the Faculty representative and witnesses. The order of presentation is at the Faculty's discretion.)
6. Opening Statement by appellant.
7. Presentation of evidence by appellant.
8. Cross-examination of the appellant by the Faculty representative, followed by questions from SRBA members.
9. Re-examination of the appellant, if desired, on any new matters brought out in cross examination. (The procedure in 7, 8 and 9 is followed for the appellant and witnesses. The order of presentation is at the appellant's discretion.)
10. Reply evidence by the Faculty, if desired, on any new matters raised by the appellant.
11. Cross-examination of reply witness, followed by questions from SRBA members.
12. Summary remarks by the appellant.
13. Summary remarks by the Faculty.

- * Where the student does not contest the allegations of a scholastic offence, but appeals against the sanction(s) imposed, the order of proceedings will be those set out in section "A" above.

Scholastic offences are set out in Senate policy (see Scholastic Discipline in the "Academic Rights and Responsibilities" section of the Calendar). The Faculty is required, in cases of this type, to present its case first in order to ensure that the SRBA has a full understanding of the nature and extent of the allegations against the student prior to the student presenting his or her case.

Where an appeal falls under the Policy on Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities, the onus is on the Faculty to show why the suggested accommodation would compromise the academic integrity of the course; thus, the order of proceedings will be that set out in section "B" above.

Where the appeal concerns allegations of a breach of other University policies such as the Policy and Procedures for the Conduct of Research which are contested by the appellant, the order of proceedings will be that set out in section "B" above. Where the student does not contest the allegations of a breach, but appeals against the sanction(s) imposed, the order of proceedings will be that set out in section "A" above.

C. ADJOURNMENTS

An adjournment of the hearing may be ordered by the Chair when necessary. Convenience to the parties and to the members of SRBA will be considered by the Chair in ordering an adjournment or setting a date for resumption of the hearing but the paramount consideration will be the provision of a fair hearing. In successive sessions, the original SRBA members must constitute a quorum.

D. EXPEDIENCE

An effort should be made to limit the presentation of non-contentious facts and arguments to the SRBA. Time will be saved if the parties are able to agree in advance on as many as possible of the facts relevant to the case. The appellant is encouraged to contact the Dean in this regard prior to the hearing to determine what facts can be agreed upon.

E. RETENTION OF LEGAL COUNSEL

In matters of academic appeal, the right to be represented by legal counsel will be accorded only at the level of SRBA. The Senate Review Board Academic also reserves the right to retain counsel.

F. WITNESSES

The parties may call witnesses to support their case. Witnesses will be invited into the hearing room when called upon to give evidence. (See also the section on Evidence above.)

G. COSTS

The parties must bear all their own legal expenses, if any. SRBA will not order the Faculty to pay all or part of the appellant's costs nor will it order the appellant to pay all or part of the Faculty's costs.

H. PREVIOUS DECISIONS

Each appeal is decided on its merits. A decision of SRBA does not set a precedent.

I. NOTICE OF DECISION

At the conclusion of the hearing, SRBA will deliberate in closed session for the purpose of arriving at a decision. The Notice of Decision will be sent to the parties as soon as possible after a decision is made. A brief written statement of reasons will follow within a reasonable time.

J. OFFICIAL RECORD OF THE APPEAL

The official record of the appeal hearing will consist of all documentation submitted by the parties, the Notice of Decision and the statement of reasons of SRBA. This record will be retained by the University Secretariat for at least one year following the hearing.

SRBA JURISDICTION AND PROCEDURES UNDER THE POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH

For appeals under the Policy and Procedures for the Conduct of Research, SRBA regulations are as follows:

- (a) Jurisdiction: In matters pertaining to the Policy and Procedures for the Conduct of Research, SRBA has jurisdiction to hear appeals of decanal rulings regarding formal complaints of breach of this policy made against student respondents.
- (b) Quorum: The SRBA quorum for hearing an appeal from a decanal ruling in a Policy and Procedures for the Conduct of Research matter is four. Of those four, three members, including the chair, will be voting members; one member, the University Secretary (or designate), will be a non-voting *ex officio* member. The three voting members will be selected in accordance with the usual SRBA procedures. No more than two of the three voting members shall be a graduate or undergraduate student.
- (c) Representation: In an SRBA appeal hearing based on grounds under the Policy and Procedures for the Conduct of Research, the appellant to SRBA is entitled to representation at the appellant's expense and, without restricting the foregoing, the appellant is entitled to seek representation by the University Ombudsperson, as may be appropriate.
- (d) Confidentiality: Any proceedings in relation to a formal complaint under the Policy and Procedures for the Conduct of Research shall be confidential unless one of the parties to the proceeding requests that the proceeding be open to the public. If such a request is made, the proceeding shall be open to the public unless there are compelling reasons that the proceeding remain closed for reasons of public safety, privacy of personal information, or undue prejudice to the proceeding, some other proceeding, or a party or member of the public.
- (e) Onus: The onus requirements set out for an appeal against a finding that a student's conduct amounts to a "scholastic offence" or against the sanction imposed for a scholastic offence (page 3 of the Information Sheet, #1 and #2 under *Onus*), apply *mutatis mutandis* to an appeal against a finding that there has been a breach of other University policies such as the Policy and Procedures for the Conduct of Research, or an appeal against the sanction imposed for such breach.
- (f) Penalties: Upon conviction of a breach of the Policy and Procedures for the Conduct of Research, a student will be subject to any penalty that the SRBA deems appropriate, in light of all the circumstances of the case. Penalties may range from an absolute discharge up to and including suspension or expulsion from the University in the most serious cases.

The Graduate Appeal Application form:

https://grad.uwo.ca/doc/academic_services/appeal/appeal_SGPS_form.pdf

The link to the Ombudsperson's website is <http://www.uwo.ca/ombuds/>

Scholastic Discipline – Graduate Students:

http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/scholastic_discipline_grad.pdf

SRBA Appeal Application form

http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/SRBA_Application.pdf

Policy on Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities:

http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/accommodation_disabilities.pdf

Academic Integrity in Research Activities:

http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/policies_procedures/section7/mapp70.pdf

SGPS Representatives on Senate 2023-24

FACULTY

SGPS – Arts and Humanities	Term to June 30/25:	Alexander Meyer (Classical Studies)
SGPS – Business	Term to June 30/24:	Adam Fremeth
SGPS – Education	Term to June 30/24:	Rachel Heydon
SGPS – Engineering	Term to June 30/25:	Lars Rehmann (Chemical & Biochemical Engineering)
SGPS – Health Sciences	Term to June 30/24:	Treena Orchard (Health Studies)
SGPS – Law/FIMS/Music	Term to June 30/25:	Zoë Sinel (Law)
SGPS – Medicine & Dentistry	Term to June 30/25:	Nica Borradaile (Physiology & Pharmacology)
SGPS – Science	Term to June 30/24:	Benjamin Rubin (Biology)
SGPS – Social Science	Term to June 30/24:	Marc Joanisse (Psychology)
SGPS – At Large	Term to June 30/25:	Grant Campbell (Information and Media Studies)

GRADUATE STUDENTS

Education	Term to June 30/24:	Mara Bordignon
Information and Media Studies	Term to June 30/24:	Hugh Samson
Law	Term to June 30/24:	Joel Welch
Science	Term to June 30/24:	Matheus Sanita Lima