



# Western Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies

## GRADUATE EDUCATION COUNCIL (GEC)

February 13, 2025

12:00 – 1:30pm

Western Interdisciplinary Research Building (WIRB), Room 3000

[Zoom link](#)

### AGENDA

1. Call to Order K. Siddiqui
2. Land Acknowledgment I. Namukasa
3. Confirmation of Quorum
4. Approval of Draft Minutes – **Exhibit A**
5. Business Arising
6. New Business for Approval

#### 6.1 GEC Academic Policy Committee Business – **Exhibit B**

**Proposal #1: That the Graduate Education Council accept and approve the proposed new members for the 2024-2025 GEC Academic Policy Committee as presented in Exhibit B.**

#### 6.2 GEC Postdoctoral Affairs Advisory Committee Business – **Exhibit C**

**Proposal #2: That the Graduate Education Council accept and approve the proposed new members for the 2024-2025 GEC Postdoctoral Affairs Advisory Committee as presented in Exhibit C.**

#### 6.3 Requests for Relief from Academic Decisions – Policy – **Exhibit D**

**Proposal #3: That the Graduate Education Council approve for recommendation to the Senate Committee on Academic Policy, and Senate that effective September 1, 2025, the Policy on Requests for**



# Western Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies

**Relief from Academic Decisions be introduced as presented in Exhibit D.**

Undergraduate Student Academic Requests for Relief – Procedure (*for information*)

Graduate Student Academic Requests for Relief – Procedure (*for information*)

## 6.3 Scholastic Offences – Policy – **Exhibit E**

**Proposal #4: That the Graduate Education Council approve for recommendation to the Senate Committee on Academic Policy, and Senate that effective September 1, 2025, the Policy on Scholastic Offences be introduced as presented in Exhibit E.**

Undergraduate Student Scholastic Offences – Procedure (*for information*)

Graduate Student Scholastic Offences – Procedure (*for information*)

## 6.4 Senate Review Board Academic Appeals – Policy – **Exhibit F**

**Proposal #5: That the Graduate Education Council approve for recommendation to the Senate Committee on Academic Policy, and Senate that effective September 1, 2025, the Policy on Senate Review Board Academic Appeals be introduced as presented in Exhibit F.**

Senate Review Board Academic Appeals – Procedure (*for information*)

## 6.5 For Information

Feedback Received on Disciplinary Appeals Policies

Current Policy – Graduate Student Academic Appeals

Current Policy – Scholastic Discipline for Graduate Students

## 7. For Discussion

7.1 Summary of Upcoming GEC Membership Vacancies – **Exhibit G**

## 8. Other Business

## 9. Adjournment

**GRADUATE EDUCATION COUNCIL (GEC)**  
**Academic Policy Committee**  
**2024-2025 Membership**

**Ex-officio membership:**

| Name            |                    | Position  |
|-----------------|--------------------|---|
| Ruth Martin     | ex officio (Chair) | Associate Vice-Provosts (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) |
| Lorraine Davies | ex officio         | Associate Vice-Provosts (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) |
| Nica Borradaile | ex officio         | Associate Vice-Provosts (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) |
| Kamran Siddiqui | ex officio         | Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies)            |
| Ken Yeung       | ex officio         | Chair, Senate Committee on Academic Policy                  |

**Elected/Appointed membership:**

| Name                 | Term Expires  | Constituency   | Elected/Appointed By:                           |
|----------------------|---------------|--|---|
| Carolyn McLeod       | ex officio    |  | Faculty of Arts and Humanities                  |
| Kevin Mooney         | ex officio    |  | Don Wright Faculty of Music                     |
| Immaculate Namukasa  | ex officio    |  | Faculty of Education                            |
| Laura Murray         | ex officio    |  | Faculty of Health Sciences                      |
| Anabel Quan-Haase    | ex officio    |  | Faculty of Information and Media Studies        |
| Zoë Sinel            | ex officio    |  | Faculty of Law                                  |
| Darren Meister       | ex officio    |  | Ivey Business School                            |
| Tom Drysdale         | ex officio    |  | Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry       |
| Lars Rehmann         | ex officio    |  | Faculty of Engineering                          |
| Liz Webb             | ex officio    |  | Faculty of Science                              |
| Elizabeth Hayden     | ex officio    |  | Faculty of Social Science                       |
| Brett Potter         | June 30, 2026 | One Graduate Program Chair from an Affiliated University College   | Rotating between Affiliates on a two-year cycle |
| Christopher Circelli | June 30, 2025 | Two Graduate Assistants who are not from the same Faculty and who are members of GEC (two-year cycles, on a rotational basis) ** | Graduate Education Council                      |
| Audrey Yardley-Jones | June 30, 2025 |  | Graduate Education Council                      |
| Alyssa Mengxue Li    | June 30, 2025 | Two graduate students who represent the diversity of graduate programs (one-year cycles, on a rotational basis)                  | Graduate Education Council                      |
| Victoria Warner      | June 30, 2025 | **   | Graduate Education Council                      |

**Additional non-voting members (as required)**

| Name        |  | Position            |
|-------------|--|---------------------|
| Marsha Lace |  | SGPS Staff Resource |

**GRADUATE EDUCATION COUNCIL (GEC)  
Postdoctoral Affairs Advisory Committee  
2024-2025 Membership**

**Ex-officio membership:**

| Name              |                    | Position  |
|-------------------|--------------------|---|
| Mihaela Harmos    | ex officio (Chair) | Postdoctoral Services Coordinator, SGPS                     |
| Kamran Siddiqui   | ex officio         | Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies)            |
| Nica Borradaile   | ex officio         | Associate Vice-Provosts (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) |
| Lorraine Davies   | ex officio         | Associate Vice-Provosts (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) |
| Ruth Martin       | ex officio         | Associate Vice-Provosts (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) |
| Lise Laporte      | ex officio         | Director, Western International (or designate)              |
| Alison Allan      | ex officio         | Three Associate Vice-President, Research (or designate)     |
| Jacquelyn Burkell | ex officio         | Three Associate Vice-President, Research (or designate)     |
| Bryan Neff        | ex officio         | Three Associate Vice-President, Research (or designate)     |

**Elected/Appointed membership:**

| Name                                     | Title   | Constituency                                 | Elected/Appointed By:      |
|--|---|--|----------------------------|
| Manoj Medapati                           | President of the Postdoctoral Association at Western                | Two Postdoctoral Scholars **                 | Graduate Education Council |
| Anoosha Attaran                          | Vice-President, Internal of the Postdoctoral Association at Western |  | Graduate Education Council |
| Tom Drysdale (Schulich)                  | Associate Dean, Graduate  | Four Associate Deans, Graduate **            | Graduate Education Council |
| Laura Murray (Health Sciences)           | Associate Dean, Graduate  |  | Graduate Education Council |
| Lars Rehmann (Engineering)               | Associate Dean, Graduate  |  | Graduate Education Council |
| Elizabeth Webb (Science)                 | Associate Dean, Graduate  |  | Graduate Education Council |
| Jessica Grahm (Brain and Mind Institute) | Acting Chair, Brain and Mind Steering Committee                     | One Director of a Western Research Institute |                            |

*\*\* Every effort must be made to have an equitable and transparent process for identification of candidates, to ensure breadth of disciplinary representation and that the elected/appointed members reflect Western's commitment to Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, Accessibility and Decolonizing-Indigenization.*

## Requests for Relief from Academic Decisions

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Policy Category:</b>                      | Rights and Responsibilities  |
| <b>Subject:</b>                              | Requests for Relief from Academic Decisions  |
| <b>Subsections:</b>                          | Introduction, Definitions, Legal Counsel, Undergraduate Student Requests For Relief From Academic Decisions, Graduate Student Requests For Relief From Academic Decisions, Appeals to SRBA |
| <b>Approving Authority:</b>                  | Senate   |
| <b>Responsible Committee:</b>                | Senate Committee on Academic Policy  |
| <b>Related Procedures:</b>                   | Procedures for Undergraduate Student Academic Requests for Relief,<br>Procedures for Graduate Student Academic Requests for Relief   |
| <b>Officer(s) Responsible for Procedure:</b> | *  |
| <b>Related Policies:</b>                     | <a href="#"><u>Academic Accommodation for Students with Disabilities,</u></a><br>Senate Review Board Academic Appeals<br>Scholastic Offences   |
| <b>Effective Date:</b>                       | TBD  |
| <b>Supersedes:</b>                           | September 2022   |

### **1.00 INTRODUCTION**

Throughout this document, reference to "Dean" is to be interpreted "Dean or their designate or equivalent", and reference to "Department Chair" is to be interpreted "Department Chair or their designate or equivalent." If the matter has been designated by the Dean or Chair to another person, that person is authorized to make the Faculty or Department's final decision on the matter.

## Requests for Relief from Academic Decisions

In a course offered by **Continuing Studies at Western**, “Department Chair” shall be interpreted as “Executive Director of Continuing Studies at Western” and “Faculty Dean” shall be interpreted as “Dean of the partnering Faculty.”

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

This policy is to be read in conjunction with its related procedures.

### **2.00 DEFINITIONS**

**2.01 Reasonable Apprehension of Bias** means that a reasonable and informed person, viewing the matter realistically and practically, would think that it is more likely than not that a decision maker was biased in respect of the decision.

**2.02 University**, for the purposes of this policy, means Western University and its Affiliated University Colleges.

### **3.00 LEGAL COUNSEL**

Legal counsel is not permitted at any stage of the request for relief process prior to the level of the Senate Review Board Academic (SRBA).

### **4.00 UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT REQUESTS FOR RELIEF FROM ACADEMIC DECISIONS**

The University Senate has delegated to Deans the right to waive any academic regulation. The Deans’ rulings in academic matters are final unless overturned or modified on appeal to SRBA.

#### **4.01 Requests for Relief**

Student requests for relief generally fall into one of the following:

Category 1: Requests for relief relating to a specific course (e.g., with respect to a mark, grade, appropriateness of assignments or examinations, or grading practices).

Category 2: Requests for relief in the form of an exemption from a Senate academic regulation (e.g., progression requirements, program eligibility, graduation requirements).

Category 3: Requests for relief from a decision by the Academic Counselling unit or Dean’s Office of the student’s Home Faculty (e.g., regarding academic considerations or academic regulations).

In general, Category 1 includes requests for relief intrinsic to a specific course, while

## Requests for Relief from Academic Decisions

all other categories involve requests for relief related to a particular student and difficulties they may have encountered.

The category of request for relief determines the route followed. As a general principle, a request for relief may only proceed via one pathway. Students in doubt as to the appropriate path for their requests should consult their Dean.

### 4.02 Requests for Relief to Instructor, Department Chair, And Faculty Dean

A student may request that a grade on a particular piece of work, or a final standing in a course or program, be changed; OR a student may request an exemption from a Senate academic regulation. The subject of a request for relief can range from a waiver of progression requirements to accuracy of grades on examinations or assignments. Such a request can include questions of fairness or appropriateness of general grading practices and can be launched regardless of whether a record of the student's work exists.

Submit your request for relief pursuant to the *Procedures for Undergraduate Student Requests for Relief*.

### 4.03 Grounds

The grounds for a request for relief may be one or more of:

- medical or compassionate circumstances,
- extenuating circumstances beyond the student's control,
- reasonable apprehension of bias,
- inaccuracy, or
- unfairness.

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 request for relief.

Note that requests for relief based on medical or compassionate circumstances should in most cases have been made to the student's Dean's Office/Academic Advising unit at the time of the circumstances. Requests for retroactive relief based on such circumstances and which do not involve the fairness of the course itself should be initiated with the Dean's Office/Academic Advising unit of the student's Home Faculty and include a clear explanation of why academic considerations were not requested in a timely manner.

Ignorance of Senate regulations and policies, and particular program requirements and policies, as set out in the Academic Calendar, does not constitute grounds for a request for relief.

### **5.00 GRADUATE STUDENT REQUESTS FOR RELIEF FROM ACADEMIC DECISIONS**

Students may submit a request for relief from an academic decision or ruling to their graduate program and, if unsuccessful, to the Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies). Some decisions may be appealed further to SRBA. The Vice-Provost's rulings in academic matters are final unless overturned or modified on appeal to SRBA.

#### **5.01 Types Of Academic Requests For Relief**

Student requests for relief generally fall into one of the following:

- Category 1: Requests for relief relating to a mark on an examination or on a particular piece of work, or final standing in a specific course (e.g., with respect to appropriateness of assignments, course projects or examinations, or grading practices).
- Category 2: Requests for relief from a ruling of an instructor, program, or academic leader in an academic matter (including but not limited to any academic decision not related to a specific course or grade, including milestones, progression, and theses).

#### **5.02 Grounds of Requests for Relief**

A request for relief must be based on one or more of the following grounds:

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

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 request for relief.

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

Submit your request for relief pursuant to the *Procedures for Graduate Student Academic Requests for Relief*.

### **6.00 APPEAL TO SRBA**



## Requests for Relief from Academic Decisions

A student may have a further right of appeal to SRBA if the decision falls within its jurisdiction. Appeals to SRBA must be made **within six weeks of the date of the Dean's (Undergraduate) or Vice-Provost's (Graduate) decision.**

The decision of the Dean, Vice-Provost or their designate remains in full force and effect unless and until overturned or modified by SRBA.

See the *Senate Review Board Academic Appeals Policy* and *Senate Review Board Academic Appeals Procedures* for further information.

## Undergraduate Student Academic Requests for Relief Procedures

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Governing Policy:</b>                      | Requests for Relief from Academic Decisions   |
| <b>Subsections:</b>                           | Introduction, Requests for Relief Submission Process, Procedures for Requests for Relief, Appeals to SRBA |
| <b>Officer(s) Responsible for Procedures:</b> | *   |
| <b>Effective Date:</b>                        | TBD   |
| <b>Supersedes:</b>                            | *   |

### INTRODUCTION

The University Senate has delegated to Deans the right to waive any academic regulation. The Deans' rulings in academic matters are final unless overturned or modified on appeal to the Senate Review Board Academic (SRBA).

For assistance in filing a request for relief or to learn more about the request for relief and appeals process, contact the Western Ombudsperson's office (\*Email address \_\_\_\_\_)

### **UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT REQUESTS FOR RELIEF OF ACADEMIC DECISIONS**

Requests for relief should be initiated with the office having immediate jurisdiction for the particular requirement or regulation in question.

A decision or ruling remains in effect unless overturned or modified by the individual or body hearing request for relief of that decision or ruling.

Throughout this document, reference to "Dean" is to be interpreted "Dean or their designate or equivalent", and reference to "Department Chair" is to be interpreted "Department Chair or their designate or equivalent."

In a course offered by **Continuing Studies at Western**, "Department Chair" shall be interpreted as "Executive Director of Continuing Studies at Western" and "Faculty Dean" shall be interpreted as "Dean of the partnering Faculty."

*University*, for the purposes of this procedure, means Western & Affiliated University Colleges.

### **REQUESTS FOR RELIEF SUBMISSION PROCESS**

Note: All allegations set out in requests for relief 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 request for relief.

#### **Submitting a Request for Relief based on Category\***

1. Category 1: In the case of a request for relief regarding a specific course not involving medical or compassionate circumstances (see “Grounds” below), the request must be initiated with the appropriate course instructor and will proceed in the order:
  - a) Course instructor (informal consultation)
  - b) Department Chair (submission of written request)
  - c) Faculty Dean (submission of written request)

Normally, a request for relief in a **Certificate-credit or Diploma-credit course** will proceed as set out above. Except as otherwise noted, in cases where a certificate-credit or diploma-credit course is offered by a Faculty with department structure, but is not offered by a particular department, a request for relief will proceed directly from the instructor to the Dean of the Faculty.

2. Category 2: Requests for relief in the form of an exemption from a Senate academic regulation normally begin with the student’s Home Faculty Academic Advisors and proceed to the Faculty Dean if no resolution is reached.
3. Category 3: A request for relief from a decision made by a student’s Faculty Academic Advising unit should be made to the party with direct oversight of that unit, typically the Dean of the student’s Home Faculty.

*\*As set forth in the categories described in the Requests for Relief from Academic Decisions policy.*

Note that requests for relief based on medical or compassionate circumstances should in most cases have been made to the student’s Dean’s Office/Academic Advising unit at the time of the circumstances. Requests for retroactive relief based on such circumstances and which do not involve the fairness of the course itself should be initiated with the Dean’s Office/Academic Advising unit of the student’s Home Faculty and include a clear explanation of why academic considerations were not requested in a timely manner.

## Undergraduate Student Academic Requests for Relief

### Possible examples of relief that can be considered by a Dean (a non-exhaustive list):

1. Waiver of a Senate regulation or requirement.
2. Allowing the opportunity for re-examination or reassessment.
3. Directing the adjustment of a grade on a particular piece of work, e.g., following the report of an independent assessor. [It is possible that a grade may be lowered as a result of reassessment.]
4. Directing the adjustment of grades in the case of a request for relief against general marking or grading practices. [This form of relief does not extend to the re-evaluation of the work submitted.]

Not all types of relief are suitable for any given request. For example, in the absence of an adequate permanent record of the student's work, the only form of relief that might be appropriate would be allowing the opportunity for reassessment.

### PROCEDURES FOR REQUESTS FOR RELIEF

#### Deadlines for Requests for Relief

**Marks:** A request for relief against a mark or grade must be initiated with the instructor as soon as possible after the mark is issued. In the event that the instructor is not available to the student, or fails to act, or if the matter is not resolved satisfactorily with the instructor, a written request for relief must be submitted to the Chair of the department **within three (3) weeks from the date that the mark was issued**. In the case of a final grade in a course, the written request for relief must be submitted to the Chair of the department by the following dates:

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
| January Marks:                          | January 31   |
| April/May Marks:                        | June 30      |
| Interession:                            | July 31      |
| May/June Dentistry Marks:               | July 31      |
| Summer Evening:                         | August 31    |
| Summer Day:                             | September 15 |
| Spring/Summer Distance Studies Courses: | August 31    |

A request for relief against a decision of the Chair must be made to the Dean in writing not later than three (3) weeks after the Chair's decision is issued. All relevant information and documentation must be provided to the Dean with the request for relief.

## Undergraduate Student Academic Requests for Relief

**Program eligibility and progression:** A request for relief against a decision concerning program eligibility must be made to the Chair of the department in writing by June 30. A request against a decision of the Chair must be made to the Dean in writing within three (3) weeks of the Chair's decision being issued. Students requesting a Dean's Waiver of Progression Requirements must do so in writing to the Dean of their Faculty by June 30 (if required to withdraw at the end of April), or within 30 days of the grades becoming available through their Student Center, as posted by the Office of the Registrar (if required to withdraw following any other session).

Notes:

1. In the **Medical Program**, a request for relief against a mark must be initiated with the instructor within four (4) weeks of the mark being approved by the appropriate administrative committee. All other requests for relief must be made within four weeks of the date of the decision giving rise to the request for relief. A request for relief to each successive level of appeal must be made within four weeks of the date of the decision at the prior level.
2. In the **Faculty of Law**, a request for relief against a final grade in a course must be submitted to the Dean by March 1 for First Term Marks; by April 1 for January-intensive Term Marks; and, by June 30 for Spring Term Marks. All other applicable deadlines are as set out above.
3. In the **Ivey Business School**, a request for relief against a mark must be initiated with the instructor within six (6) weeks of the mark being issued. All other requests for relief must be made within six (6) weeks of the date of the decision giving rise to the request for relief. A request for relief to each successive level of appeal must be made within six (6) weeks of the date of the decision at the prior level.

In the case of a request for relief relating to a specific course, a resolution of the problem should first be attempted through informal consultation with the instructor. If the student is dissatisfied with the decision of the instructor, or if the instructor fails to act, or cannot or will not be physically available within a reasonable time period, a written request for relief may be submitted directly to the department Chair or to the Dean in faculties without departmental structure.

Following a request for relief by an undergraduate student to a Department Chair, the student, if not satisfied with the decision of the Chair, may then submit a written request to the Dean of the Faculty in which the course or program was taken. In the case of requests for relief relating to: (a) the grade on a piece of work or final standing in a course or a regulation relating to a specific course, the relevant Dean will be the Dean of the Faculty offering that course; and, (b) enrolment in a specific program, the relevant Dean will be the Dean of the Faculty offering that program.

## **Undergraduate Student Academic Requests for Relief**

A written request need not be lengthy, but should indicate clearly the detailed reasons for the request and the relief requested. All relevant supporting documentation must be attached.

### **APPEALS TO SRBA**

A student may have a right of appeal to the SRBA within six (6) weeks of the date of the Dean's decision. See the SRBA Appeals Policy and Procedures for more information

A Dean's decision remains in full force and effect unless overturned or modified by SRBA.

## Procedures for Graduate Student Academic Request for Relief

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Governing Policy:</b>                      | Requests for Relief from Academic Decisions                           |
| <b>Subsections:</b>                           | Introduction, Requests for Relief Submission Process, Appeals to SRBA |
| <b>Officer(s) Responsible for Procedures:</b> | *   |
| <b>Effective Date:</b>                        | TBD   |
| <b>Supersedes:</b>                            | *   |

---

### **1.00 INTRODUCTION**

The University Senate has delegated to the Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) the right to waive any academic regulation. The Vice-Provosts rulings in academic matters are final unless overturned or modified on appeal to the Senate Review Board Academic (SRBA).

For assistance in filing a request for relief or to learn more about the request for relief and appeals process, you may contact the Office of the Ombudsperson ([ombudsoffice@uwo.ca](mailto:ombudsoffice@uwo.ca)).

Students may submit a request for relief from an academic decision or ruling to their graduate programs and, if unsuccessful, to the Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies).

A decision or ruling remains in effect unless overturned or modified by the individual or body hearing request for relief of that decision or ruling.

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

*University*, for the purposes of this procedure, means Western & Affiliated University Colleges.

### **2.00 REQUEST FOR RELIEF SUBMISSION PROCESS**

Note: All allegations set out in requests for relief 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 request for relief.

#### **2.01 Submitting a Request for Relief at the Course/Program Level**

1. If the request for relief 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 to submit a request for relief to the individual(s) or body designated to hear such requests at the graduate-program level. Students should contact their graduate program to obtain information on the program's request for relief process. A request for relief must be filed **within four (4) weeks of the issuance of the mark or ruling**.
2. For all other requests, a student must initiate the request for relief 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 request for relief process. A request for relief must be filed **within four (4) weeks of the issuance of the mark or ruling**. The deadline for filing a request for relief may be extended at the discretion of the individual(s) or body designated to hear appeals at the graduate-program level.
3. In no circumstances shall the original decision maker(s) whose decision or ruling is under appeal hear a request for relief of that decision or ruling at the program level.
4. In addition to any other information required by individual graduate programs, requests for relief submitted by students should include the following information:
  - a. the matter being appealed
  - b. the grounds for the request
  - c. a clear, detailed explanation of the facts supporting the grounds
  - d. all supporting documentation
  - e. the desired outcome or remedy
5. The designated decision maker shall issue a written decision ("program decision"). In considering a request for relief, the designated decision maker shall review the materials submitted by the student and the program and may obtain such further information as they deem relevant to the request. The



## Procedures For Graduate Student Academic Requests for Relief

decision maker may give the student a reasonable opportunity to meet with them and may meet with such other individuals as they deem necessary.

### 2.02 Submitting a Request for Relief at the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (SGPS) Level

A student may submit a request for relief from the program decision to the Vice-Provost. A request for relief application together with all required documentation, including a copy of the previous decision, must be filed with the Vice-Provost **within four (4) weeks of the issuance of the program decision**. Students may contact the SGPS Office for more information. The required application form can be found online at:

[http://grad.uwo.ca/doc/academic\\_services/appeal/appeal\\_SGPS\\_form.pdf](http://grad.uwo.ca/doc/academic_services/appeal/appeal_SGPS_form.pdf)

The deadline for filing a request for relief may be extended at the discretion of the Vice-Provost.

1. In considering a request for relief, 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 request. The Vice-Provost shall give the student a reasonable opportunity to meet with them and may meet with such other individuals as they deem necessary.
2. The Vice-Provost shall issue a written decision, with reasons.

### APPEALS TO SRBA

A student may have a further right of appeal to SRBA **within six (6) 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.

See the SRBA Appeals Policy and Procedure for further information.

## Scholastic Offences

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Policy Category:</b>                      | Rights and Responsibilities   |
| <b>Subject:</b>                              | Scholastic Offences   |
| <b>Subsections:</b>                          | Introduction, Definitions, Scholastic Offence Discipline for Undergraduate and Graduate Students, Appeals To SRBA                                 |
| <b>Approving Authority:</b>                  | Senate  |
| <b>Responsible Committee:</b>                | Senate Committee on Academic Policy   |
| <b>Related Procedures:</b>                   | Procedures for Undergraduate Scholastic Offences, Procedures for Graduate Scholastic Offences   |
| <b>Officer(s) Responsible for Procedure:</b> | *   |
| <b>Related Policies:</b>                     | <a href="#">Academic Integrity in Research Activities;</a><br>Senate Review Board Academic Appeals<br>Requests for Relief from Academic Decisions |
| <b>Effective Date:</b>                       | TBD   |
| <b>Supersedes:</b>                           | September 2022  |

### **1.00 INTRODUCTION**

Throughout this document, reference to "Dean" is to be interpreted "Dean or their designate or equivalent", and reference to "Department Chair" is to be interpreted "Department Chair or their designate or equivalent." If the matter has been designated by the Dean or Chair to another person, that person is authorized to make the Faculty or Department's final decision on the matter.

In a course offered by **Continuing Studies at Western**, "Department Chair" shall be interpreted as "Executive Director of Continuing Studies at Western" and "Faculty Dean" shall be interpreted as "Dean of the partnering Faculty."

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

This policy is to be read in conjunction with its related procedures.

### **2.00 DEFINITIONS**

**Academic Integrity** is the application of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility at all times to all academic pursuits. It applies to every member of the University Community.

**Faculty**, for the purposes of this procedure, means Faculty, School or Affiliate University College, with the exception of the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.

**Offence Record** contains evidence collected during the investigation of the offence, copies of correspondence with the student, and the decision letter following a scholastic offence.

**Scholastic Offences** are actions that violate academic integrity, prejudice academic standards, and/or undermine the development, delivery, assessment, and integrity of the academic pursuits of any member of the University Community. Scholastic Offences include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Plagiarism, which may be defined as “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, 7<sup>th</sup> ed., p. 1170.

This concept applies with equal force to all submitted work and milestones, including but not limited to drafts, proposals, assignments, laboratory or project reports, diagrams, and computer projects.

Students should consult their instructor, Department Chair, or Dean’s Office for detailed information. In addition, they may seek guidance from a variety of current style manuals available in the University’s libraries. Information about these resources can be found [on](#) the library website.

2. Cheating on an examination or falsifying material subject to academic evaluation.
3. Submitting false or fraudulent assignments or credentials; or falsifying records, transcripts or other academic documents.
4. Submitting false or fraudulent documentation, including but not limited to medical certificates and other supporting documentation.

5. a) Improperly obtaining, through theft, bribery, collusion or otherwise, an examination paper prior to the date and time for writing such an examination.  
  
b) 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 Department, or the Registrar as soon as possible after receiving the paper in question.
6. Impersonating a candidate at an examination or availing oneself of the results of such an impersonation.
7. Intentionally interfering in any way with any person's scholastic work.
8. 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 has been obtained previously or is being sought in another course or program of study in the University or elsewhere.
9. Aiding or abetting any such offence.
10. Any offence identified in writing in advance by Faculties or Departments, University Programs, or Affiliated University Colleges, as necessary to protect or promote academic integrity, or to curtail, manage, or prevent the breach of academic integrity.

**University**, for the purposes of this policy, means Western University and its Affiliated University Colleges.

### **3.00 SCHOLASTIC OFFENCE DISCIPLINE FOR UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE STUDENTS**

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 which 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.

This policy is to be read in conjunction with the *Undergraduate Scholastic Offence Procedures* and *Graduate Scholastic Offence Procedures*.

In addition to any proceedings within the University, evidence of wrongdoing may result in criminal prosecution.

#### **3.01 Investigation of Scholastic Offences**

If a student is suspected of a scholastic offence, the University will investigate and if it is satisfied that the student has committed a scholastic offence it may impose penalties, up to and including expulsion from the University. The procedures that the University will follow are set out in the *Undergraduate Scholastic Offence Procedures* and *Graduate Scholastic Offence Procedures*.

Students may request relief from a finding of a scholastic offence or the penalty imposed for such an offence pursuant to the *Undergraduate Scholastic Offence Procedures* or *Graduate Scholastic Offence Procedures*.

### **3.02 Student Release of Information Concerning Scholastic Offences**

The letters informing a student that they have 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.

### **3.03 Student Offence Record**

A student who commits a scholastic offence acquires an Offence Record.

### **3.04 Penalties**

The University will not treat lightly 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.

## **4.00 APPEAL TO SRBA**

A student may have a right of appeal to SRBA if the decision falls within its jurisdiction. Appeals to SRBA must be made **within six weeks of the date of the Dean's (Undergraduate) or Vice-Provost's (Graduate) decision**.

The decision of the Dean, Vice-Provost or their designate remains in full force and effect unless and until overturned or modified by SRBA.

See the *Senate Review Board Academic Appeals Policy* and *Senate Review Board Academic Appeals Procedures* for further information.



## Undergraduate Scholastic Offences Procedure

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Governing Policy:</b>                      | Scholastic Offences   |
| <b>Subsections:</b>                           | Definitions, Procedures for Scholastic Offences, Penalties, Appeal to SRBA, Offence Record, Release of Information Concerning Scholastic Offences |
| <b>Officer(s) Responsible for Procedures:</b> | *   |
| <b>Effective Date:</b>                        | TBD   |
| <b>Supersedes:</b>                            | *   |

---

### **DEFINITIONS**

**Faculty**, for the purposes of this procedure, means Faculty, School or Affiliate University College, with the exception of the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.

**Offence Record**: contains evidence collected during the investigation of the offence and copies of correspondence with the student.

**University**, for the purposes of this procedure, means Western & Affiliated University Colleges.

### **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.

Throughout this section, reference to "Dean" is to be interpreted "Dean or their designate" (who is usually an Associate Dean) and reference to "Department Chair" is to be interpreted "Department Chair or their designate". If the matter has been designated by the Dean or Chair to another person, that person is authorized to make the Faculty or Department's final decision on the matter.

For assistance in filing a request for relief or to learn more about the request for relief and appeals process, contact the Western Ombudsperson's office (\*Email address\_\_\_\_\_)

### **Part I: Scholastic Offences: Courses**

In most cases, evidence of a possible scholastic offence in a course will have been discovered by, or brought to the attention of, the course instructor. In these situations, the instructor will meet with the student if practicable and appropriate. In all other cases the allegation will be reviewed by the appropriate University official.<sup>1</sup>

The instructor (or other University official) will notify the Department Chair ("Chair") (or, in Faculties without department structure, the Dean of the Faculty) if they decides that there is evidence of a scholastic offence.<sup>2</sup> If the Chair or Dean of the Faculty agrees that there is evidence to support the allegation, they shall proceed as follows:

#### ***Courses In Student's Faculty of Registration ("Home Faculty")***

1. *Faculty with department structure (including the Faculty of Health Sciences):*
  - a) The Chair will advise the student of the allegation and the information supporting the allegation. 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, they will determine the appropriate penalties in consultation with the instructor. The Chair's decision and the penalties imposed by them will be communicated to the student in writing with a copy to the Dean. The letter will advise the student of their right to file a request for relief from this decision to the Dean, the time period by which a request for relief must be filed and will refer the student to the policies governing Student Academic Appeals and Scholastic Offences.
  - b) (i) If the student files a request for relief (see "Requests for Relief" below), the Dean will review the evidence provided by both the department and the student and may investigate further. The Dean will give the student a reasonable opportunity to meet with them before making a decision.

---

<sup>1</sup> In some Faculties the appropriate University official will be the Department Chair or Dean of a Faculty without department structure.

<sup>2</sup> In the case of the BMOS Program, Faculty of Social Science, references to "Chair" shall be interpreted as "Program Director or designate". In the case of courses offered by the Writing, Rhetoric and Professional Communication Program, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, references to "Chair" shall be interpreted as "Coordinator, Writing Program or designate". In the case of the Faculty of Health Sciences, the procedure is identical to the procedure followed in a Faculty with department structure and references to "Chair" shall be interpreted as "School/Program Director or designate".

## Scholastic Discipline for Undergraduate Students

- a. If the Dean is satisfied that the Chair's decision was correct, or in the case of a request for relief from a penalty that the Dean finds to be appropriate, they will deny the request for relief.
- b. If the Dean is satisfied that the Chair's decision was incorrect, or that the penalty was not appropriate, they will grant the request for relief and will overturn or vary the previous decision.
- c. Unless the Dean overturns the finding of a scholastic offence, they will review the penalties imposed by the Chair and may affirm, increase, or reduce those penalties.
  - i. If the Dean is considering additional penalties, they shall first notify the student and give the student a reasonable opportunity to make written submissions on the issue of penalty. The Dean's decision will be communicated to the student in writing with a copy to the Chair.
  - ii. In cases where the Dean does not overturn the scholastic offence decision, the letter also will inform the student if there will be a notation on the academic record, if any policies will be triggered by the penalty, and of their right to appeal the decision to the Senate Review Board Academic (SRBA).
- (ii) If the student does not file a request for relief, the Dean will review the evidence presented and the penalties imposed by the Chair and may investigate further. The Dean may vary and/or impose other penalties.
  - d. If the Dean does not vary the Chair's decision or impose other penalties, their decision will be communicated to the student in writing, with a copy to the Chair. The decision letter will also inform the student whether there will be a notation on the student's academic record, if any policies will be triggered by the penalty. Such a decision is not subject to appeal to the SRBA.
  - e. If the Dean is considering varying the Chair's decision or imposing other penalties, they shall notify the student and give the student a reasonable opportunity to file written submissions on the issue of penalty. The Dean's decision will be communicated to the student in writing, with a copy to the Chair. The decision letter will also inform the student whether there will be a notation on the student's academic record, if any policies will be triggered by the penalty, and will inform the student of their right to appeal the penalties imposed by the Dean to the SRBA.

### 2. *Faculty without department structure:*

The Dean will advise the student of the allegation and the information supporting the allegation. The student will be given a reasonable opportunity to respond and submit evidence, and a reasonable opportunity to meet with the Dean before a decision is made. If the Dean decides that the student has committed a scholastic offence, their will determine the appropriate penalties in consultation with the instructor. The Dean's decision and the penalties imposed by them will be communicated to the student in writing. The letter also will inform the student if there will be a notation on



the academic record, if any policies will be triggered by the penalty, and of their right to appeal the decision to the SRBA.

### ***Courses in Faculty Other Than Faculty of Registration (“Course Faculty”)***

#### ***1. Faculty with department structure (including the Faculty of Health Sciences):***

- a) The Chair 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 Chair before a decision is made. If the Chair decides that the student has committed a scholastic offence, they will determine the appropriate penalties in consultation with the instructor. The Chair’s decision and the penalties imposed by him/her will be communicated to the student in writing with a copy to the Dean of the Course Faculty (“Course Dean”). The letter will advise the student of their right to file a request for relief from this decision to the Course Dean, the time period by which a request for relief must be filed, and will refer the student to the policies governing Student Academic Appeals and Scholastic Offences.
- b) (i) If the student files a request for relief (see “Requests for Relief” below), the Course Dean will review the evidence provided by both the department and the student and may investigate further. The Course Dean will give the student a reasonable opportunity to meet with them before making a decision.
  - a. If the Course Dean is satisfied that the Chair’s decision was correct, or in the case of a request for relief from a penalty that the Dean finds to be appropriate, they will deny the request for relief.
  - b. If the Course Dean is satisfied that the Chair’s decision was incorrect, or that the penalty was not appropriate, they will grant the request for relief and will overturn or vary the previous decision. Unless the Course Dean overturns the finding of a scholastic offence, they will review the penalties imposed by the Chair and may affirm, increase, or reduce those penalties. If the Course Dean is considering additional penalties, they shall first notify the student and give the student a reasonable opportunity to make written submissions on the issue of penalty. The Course Dean’s decision will be communicated to the student in writing with a copy to the Chair.
  - c. In cases where the Dean does not overturn the scholastic offence decision, the letter also will inform the student if there will be a notation on the academic record, if any policies will be triggered by the penalty, that this decision and the decision of the Chair are being referred to the Dean of the Home Faculty (“Home Dean”) who may impose additional penalties, and of their right to appeal the Course Dean’s decision to the SRBA. The Course Dean then will forward all documentation relating to the offence, including copies of the decisions of the Chair and Course Dean, to the Home Dean.

## Scholastic Discipline for Undergraduate Students

- (ii) If the student does not file a request for relief, the Course Dean will review the evidence presented and the penalties imposed by the Chair and may investigate further. The Course Dean may vary and/or impose other penalties.
  - d. If the Course Dean does not vary the Chair's decision or impose other penalties, their decision will be communicated to the student in writing, with a copy to the Chair. The decision letter will also inform the student whether there will be a notation on the student's academic record, if any policies will be triggered by the penalty, and that this decision and the decision of the Chair are being referred to the Home Dean who may impose additional penalties. Such a decision is not subject to appeal to the SRBA.
  - e. If the Course Dean decides to vary the Chair's decision or imposing other penalties, their decision will be communicated to the student in writing with a copy to the Chair. The decision letter will also inform the student whether there will be a notation on the student's academic record, if any policies will be triggered by the penalty, that this decision and the decision of the Chair are being referred to the Home Dean who may impose additional penalties, and will inform the student of their right to appeal the penalties imposed by the Course Dean to the SRBA.
- c) Upon receipt of the decisions of the Chair and Course Dean, the Home Dean will decide if additional penalties are warranted. The Home Dean will review the evidence and may investigate further.
  - a. If the Home Dean does not vary the Chair's or Course Dean's decisions or impose other penalties, their decision will be communicated to the student in writing, with a copy to the Course Dean and the Chair. The decision letter will also inform the student whether there will be a notation on the student's academic record, and if any policies will be triggered by the penalty. Such a decision is not subject to appeal to the SRBA.
  - b. If the Home Dean decides to vary the Course Dean's or Chair's decisions or imposing other penalties, their decision will be communicated to the student in writing with a copy to the Course Dean and the Chair. The decision letter will also inform the student whether there will be a notation on the student's academic record, if any policies will be triggered by the penalty, and will inform the student of their right to appeal the penalties imposed by the Home Dean to the SRBA.

### 2. *Faculty without department structure:*

- a) The Course Dean will advise the student of the allegation and the information supporting the allegation. The student will be given a reasonable opportunity to respond and submit evidence, and a reasonable opportunity to meet with the Dean before a decision is made.

If the Course Dean decides that the student has committed a scholastic offence, they will determine the appropriate penalties in consultation with the instructor.

The Course Dean's decision and the penalties imposed by them will be communicated to the student in writing. The letter will inform the student if there will be a notation on the academic record, if any policies will be triggered by the penalty, that the decision is being referred to the Home Dean who may impose additional penalties, and of his/her right to appeal the Course Dean's decision to the SRBA. The Course Dean then will forward all documentation relating to the offence, including a copy of their decision, to the Home Dean.

- b) Upon receipt of the Course Dean's decision, the Home Dean will proceed in accordance with item 1(c).

### **Requests for Relief**

Requests for relief to a Dean must be submitted in writing within the deadline set out below. The written request need not be lengthy but should state clearly the detailed reasons for the request and the relief requested and include all supporting documentation. A student may request that the Chair's finding that a scholastic offence occurred, and/or the penalties imposed, be set aside or adjusted.

Deadlines: Normally requests for relief must be made in writing within four (4) weeks of a decision being issued although some Faculties have longer deadlines. The letter from the Chair to the student will set out the applicable deadline.

### **Certificate and Diploma-Credit Courses**

An allegation of misconduct in a certificate-credit or diploma-credit course offered within a department, or in a Faculty without department structure, will be handled in accordance with the same procedures set out above for degree-credit courses. (The Writing, Rhetoric and Professional Communication Program, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, is deemed to be a department under this Policy. See footnote 2 above). Otherwise, where the course is not offered by a particular department in a Faculty with department structure, the allegation will be dealt with by the Dean of the Faculty (Part I, #2 above).

An allegation of misconduct in a certificate-credit or diploma-credit course offered by the Western Continuing Studies will be handled in accordance with the procedures set out in Part I, #1 above ("Faculty with department structure").

References to "Chair" shall be interpreted as "Executive Director of Western Continuing Studies" and references to the "Dean" shall be interpreted as "Dean of the partnering Faculty".

### **Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies Courses**

An allegation of misconduct in a course offered by the Department of Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies will be handled in accordance with the procedures set out in Part I, #1 above ("Faculty with department structure"). References to "Dean" shall be interpreted as "Dean of the student's Faculty of registration".

### **Part II: Scholastic Offences: Other**

Where an allegation does not relate to a course, the matter will be referred to the Dean of the student's Home Faculty. If the Dean decides that there is evidence to support the allegation, the Dean will advise the student of the allegation and the information supporting the allegation. The student will be given a reasonable opportunity to respond and submit evidence, and a reasonable opportunity to meet with the Dean before a decision is made. If the Dean decides that the student has committed a scholastic offence, the Dean will determine the appropriate penalties. The Dean's decision and the penalties imposed will be communicated to the student in writing. The letter will inform the student if there will be a notation on the academic record, if any policies will be triggered by the penalty, and of their right to appeal the decision to the SRBA.

### **PENALTIES**

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

- a) Reprimand.
- b) Requirement that the student repeat and resubmit the assignment.
- c) A failing grade in the assignment.
- d) A failing grade in the course in which the offence was committed.
- e) Prohibition of further registration in a course or courses in the Department or Faculty in which the offence occurred.
- f) Failure of the year (applies in certain professional programs).
- g) Suspension from the University for up to, but not more than, three (3) academic years or for a portion of one (1) academic year including the academic session in which the student is currently registered.
- h) Expulsion from the University.

In determining what penalties are warranted in a given case, previous offences within the Faculty, the gravity of the offence, and the need to ensure consistency in standards of discipline across a Faculty will be relevant considerations for a Dean. A Home Dean also will take into account an existing Offence Record.

A notation of the scholastic offence (e.g., "Scholastic Offence recorded in...") may be placed on a student's internal, electronic record for the penalties d), e) and f) at the discretion of the Dean of the Faculty imposing the penalty. Upon successful completion of the student's program, the student may request that the notation be removed. The Dean, after consulting with the relevant Chair in the case of a

## Scholastic Discipline for Undergraduate Students

departmentalized Faculty, will decide whether to grant the request. A notation on the official transcript is recorded for penalties g) and h).

Penalties imposed at the level of the department may range from a reprimand to a failing grade for the course in which the offence was committed.

Penalties f), g) and h) are program decisions that can be imposed only by the Dean of the Home Faculty.

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."

### **APPEAL TO SRBA**

A student may have a right of appeal to SRBA if the decision falls within its jurisdiction. Appeals to SRBA must be made **within six weeks of the date of the Dean's decision**.

The decision of the Dean or their designate remains in full force and effect unless and until overturned or modified by SRBA.

See the *Senate Review Board Academic Appeals Policy* and *Senate Review Board Academic Appeals Procedures* for further information.

### **OFFENCE RECORD**

The offence record will be held in the Dean's Office of the student's home faculty and will be kept separate from the student's academic advising file

If a student is subsequently 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 website:

[https://www.lib.uwo.ca/archives/retention\\_schedules/retention\\_schedules.html](https://www.lib.uwo.ca/archives/retention_schedules/retention_schedules.html)

Apart from the student, no one outside the Dean'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.

### **RELEASE OF INFORMATION CONCERNING SCHOLASTIC OFFENCES**

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

## Scholastic Discipline for Undergraduate Students

sent to the Registrar. If a student transfers to another Faculty, or to an Affiliated University College of this University, the offence record will be transferred to the Dean's Office of that Faculty or College. Otherwise, information may be released with the written permission of the student or if required by 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**

Each Faculty shall submit to the Vice-Provost (Academic Programs) an annual summary of scholastic offences committed by students registered in the Faculty. The summary will set out the nature of the offence and the penalties, with students' names removed. The Vice-Provost (Academic Programs) will compile the information, by Faculty, and report annually to the Senate Committee on Academic Policy and Awards which will forward the report to Senate for information.

## Procedures for Graduate Scholastic Offences

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Governing Policy:</b>                      | Scholastic Offences   |
| <b>Subsections:</b>                           | Procedures for Scholastic Offences, Penalties, Appeal to SRBA, Offence Record |
| <b>Officer(s) Responsible for Procedures:</b> | *   |
| <b>Effective Date:</b>                        | TBD   |
| <b>Supersedes:</b>                            | *   |

---

### **1.00 PROCEDURES FOR SCHOLASTIC OFFENCES**

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

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

For assistance in filing a request for relief or to learn more about the request for relief and appeals process, you may contact the Office of the Ombudsperson ([ombudsoffice@uwo.ca](mailto:ombudsoffice@uwo.ca)).

### **2.00 Part I: Program-Related Offences**

- If evidence of a possible scholastic offence is brought to the attention of, or discovered by, an instructor or member of a student's thesis supervisory committee, normally they will meet with the student to discuss the allegation if practicable and appropriate in a given case.



## Procedures for Graduate Scholastic Discipline

- The student's Chair will be notified if there is evidence of a scholastic offence.

### 2.01 Decision by Chair

- If the Chair agrees that there is evidence to support the allegation they will advise the student of the allegation and the information supporting the allegation.
- 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, they will determine the appropriate penalties in consultation with the instructor or the student's supervisor, as appropriate.
- 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. The letter will also advise the student of their right to submit a request for relief regarding the finding of misconduct and/or any penalties imposed by the Chair to the Vice-Provost.

### 2.02 Request for Relief to Vice-Provost

- A student may submit a request for relief regarding a Chair's finding of misconduct and/or penalties imposed by the Chair to the Vice-Provost. A completed request for relief application together with all supporting documents must be submitted to the Office of the Vice-Provost **within four (4) weeks of the issuance of the Chair's decision**([https://grad.uwo.ca/doc/academic\\_services/appeal/appeal\\_SGPS\\_form.pdf](https://grad.uwo.ca/doc/academic_services/appeal/appeal_SGPS_form.pdf)).
- 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 them 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, they 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. The decision letter will also inform the student whether there will be a notation on the student's academic record, if any



policies will be triggered by the penalty, and will inform the student of their right to appeal a negative decision to the Senate Review Board Academic (SRBA).

### 2.03 Review by Vice-Provost

- If a student does not submit a request for relief regarding 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 does not vary the Chair's decision or impose other penalties, no further action will be taken and there is no right of appeal to SRBA.
- If the Vice-Provost is considering varying the Chair's decision or imposing other penalties, they 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. The decision letter will also inform the student whether there will be a notation on the student's academic record, if any policies will be triggered by the penalty, and will inform the student of their right to appeal the penalties imposed by the Vice-Provost to SRBA.

### 3.00 Part II: 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.
- 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, they will determine the appropriate penalties.
- The Vice-Provost's decision, including the penalties, will be communicated to the student in writing. The letter will inform the student whether there will be a notation on the student's academic record, if any policies will be triggered by the penalty, and of their right to appeal the decision to SRBA.

### **4.00 PENALTIES**

## Procedures for Graduate Scholastic Discipline

A student 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 submitted work.
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 (3) academic years or for a portion of one (1) academic year including the academic session within which the student is currently registered.
7. Expulsion from the University.

A Chair may impose penalties 1 through 4. Only the Vice-Provost may impose penalties 5, 6 and 7.

A Chair also can recommend a more severe penalty (e.g., withdrawal, suspension, expulsion) to the Vice-Provost 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 Chair, 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.\*

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" as per the Senate "Readmission" policy ([https://uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic\\_policies/admission/readmission.pdf](https://uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/admission/readmission.pdf)).

\* For the Senate regulation on removal of suspension and expulsion notations from academic transcripts, see "Transcript Notations" under "Academic Records and Student Transcripts" policy:

[http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic\\_policies/general/records.pdf](http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/general/records.pdf)

### **5.00 APPEAL TO SRBA**

A student may have a right of appeal to SRBA if the decision falls within its jurisdiction. 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 their designate remains in full force and effect unless and until overturned or modified by SRBA.

See the *Senate Review Board Academic Appeals Policy* and *Senate Review Board Academic Appeals Procedures* for further information.

### **6.00 OFFENCE RECORD**

- The Offence Record is held in the Vice-Provost's Office and is kept separate from the student's academic file. If a student is subsequently 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 website:  
[https://www.lib.uwo.ca/archives/retention\\_schedules/retention\\_schedules.html](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.

## Senate Review Board Academic Appeals

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Policy Category:</b>                      | Rights and Responsibilities  |
| <b>Subject:</b>                              | Senate Review Board Academic Appeals   |
| <b>Subsections:</b>                          | Introduction, Definitions, Application for Appeal, Jurisdiction, Relief, Initial SRBA Panel Review, Onus, Oral Hearings, Further Appeal  |
| <b>Approving Authority:</b>                  | Senate   |
| <b>Responsible Committee:</b>                | Senate Committee on Academic Policy  |
| <b>Related Procedures:</b>                   | Procedures for Senate Review Board Academic Appeals  |
| <b>Officer(s) Responsible for Procedure:</b> | *  |
| <b>Related Policies:</b>                     | Scholastic Offences<br>Requests for Relief from Academic Decisions<br><a href="#">Academic Integrity in Research Activities</a> ;<br><a href="#">Academic Accommodation for Students with Disabilities</a> |
| <b>Effective Date:</b>                       | TBD  |
| <b>Supersedes:</b>                           | *  |

### **1.00 INTRODUCTION**

Students may appeal some academic and scholastic disciplinary decisions by a Dean, Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies), or their designate, to the Senate Review Board Academic (SRBA). Previously decided rulings by Deans or the Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) in academic and scholastic disciplinary matters are final unless overturned or modified on appeal to SRBA. SRBA is the final body to which students may appeal certain rulings of Deans or the Vice-Provost in academic matters, and its decisions are final.

References to the Dean in this policy and related procedures, in the case of

graduate students, are to be understood to refer to the Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies).

Note: This policy applies to appeals of Graduate and Undergraduate Academic matters and Scholastic Offence decisions.

SRBA has jurisdiction to hear appeals of certain academic decisions of Deans. The Secretariat shall not accept, and SRBA shall not consider, allegations set out in an Application that fall outside of SRBA's limited jurisdiction.

### **2.00 DEFINITIONS**

**Appellant** – The student who filed the appeal.

**General marking or grading practices** refers to the overall marking or grading structure of a course or an assessment as applied to all students in the course. It does not apply to a mark or grade given to an individual student.

**Party** – the parties to the appeal are the appellant and the respondent.

**Reasonable Apprehension of Bias** means that a reasonable and informed person, viewing the matter realistically and practically, would think that it is more likely than not that a decision maker was biased in respect of the decision under appeal.

**Respondent** – the Dean who made the initial decision that is under appeal in front of the SRBA.

**Scholastic Offences** is defined in the Policy on Scholastic Offences (Link).

**University**, for the purposes of this policy, means Western University and its Affiliated University Colleges.

**Unreasonable**, for the purposes of appeals to SRBA, means the decision is not supported by the evidence provided to the Dean. When determining whether a decision or severity of penalty is unreasonable, SRBA must consider that a high degree of deference is given to the Deans in reaching their decisions. The question posed to SRBA isn't whether someone besides the Dean could have made a different decision, but whether the Dean's decision could have been made by a reasonable person based on the evidence provided to the Dean.

### **3.00 APPEALS AFTER THE COURSE/PROGRAM LEVEL**

3.01 Requests for relief are handled at the course/program level and are subject to the requirements in the policies on *Request for Relief from Academic Decisions* and *Scholastic Offences*.

3.02 Following the issuance of the Dean's written decision for the request for relief, a student may have a further right of appeal to SRBA if the decision falls within the jurisdiction of SRBA.

3.03 Appeals to SRBA must be made **within six (6) weeks** of the date of the Dean's decision. The decision of the Dean or designate remains in full force and effect unless and until overturned or modified by SRBA.

### **4.00 APPLICATION TO APPEAL**

Appeals to SRBA must be made on an Application for Appeal (Application) which must be filed with the University Secretariat **within six (6) weeks of the date of the Dean's decision**. Requirements for the Application are detailed in the SRBA Appeals Procedures.

### **5.00 JURISDICTION**

SRBA has jurisdiction to hear appeals from certain academic decisions of Deans, other than those relating to admission and advanced standing, provided that the student has followed the procedures set out for requesting relief at the earlier levels, and provided that SRBA otherwise has jurisdiction to consider the appeal as set out below.

5.01 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."

5.02 For **other appeals**, a student may apply for an oral hearing before SRBA in the following circumstances:

- A. The Dean fails to follow, or to properly apply, a Senate regulation;
  - a. Students are required to list the policy and detail the alleged error in the Application.
- B. A. New evidence, not available at the time of the earlier decision, has been discovered, which casts doubt on the correctness of the Dean's decision. New evidence will only be considered if:
  - a. through due diligence, it could not have been provided to the Dean before the Dean's decision;
  - b. it is relevant in the sense that if believed, it could reasonably, when taken with the other evidence before the Dean, be expected to have affected the result; and
  - c. it is credible in the sense that it is reasonably capable of belief
- C. The appeal is against general marking or grading practices.
  - a. Students are required to describe the specific marking or grading procedure at issue and identify the concern with the procedure in the

## Senate Review Board Academic Appeals

Application. SRBA will not look for evidence of unfairness or flaws in the design or implementation of the overall marking or grading structure beyond what the appellant identifies.

5.03 In exceptional circumstances, SRBA may agree to an oral hearing of an appeal against a Dean's decision that does not fall within one of the grounds for appeal above, if a student alleges in the Application that there was:

- a. a failure to observe a procedural requirement at the decanal level; or
- b. a reasonable apprehension of bias at the decanal level.

5.04 The following circumstances are outside the SRBA's jurisdiction:

- a. 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;
- b. Appeals falling under the Policy on Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities;
- c. Appeals relating to alleged discrimination; or
- d. Appeals of tuition refund or other financially-related decisions.

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

### **6.00 RELIEF**

Where SRBA grants an appeal, SRBA will grant such relief as it deems appropriate and in accordance with University policy.

### **7.00 INITIAL SRBA PANEL REVIEW**

7.01 For scholastic offence appeals, a student has an automatic 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 resulting from a "scholastic offence."

7.02 An SRBA Panel may, in its discretion, order that an oral hearing be scheduled or deny the appeal based on the grounds and evidence provided in the Application and the Dean's response.

### **8.00 ONUS**

8.01 The onus is on the student to satisfy SRBA that the ruling of the Dean was unreasonable or unsupportable on the evidence before the Dean; or, with respect to a sanction imposed for a "scholastic offence," that the penalty was unreasonable.

8.02 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."

8.03 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 Responsible Conduct of Research, or an appeal against the sanction imposed for such breach.

### **9.00 ORAL HEARINGS**

#### **9.01 RETENTION OF LEGAL COUNSEL**

While legal counsel is not required, a student may retain legal counsel, at their own expense, to represent them in an appeal before SRBA. SRBA also reserves the right to retain counsel.

#### **9.02 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.

#### **9.03 PREVIOUS DECISIONS**

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

#### **9.04 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.

### **10.00 FURTHER APPEAL**

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, as set out in the *SRBA Appeal Procedure*.



## **Senate Review Board Academic Appeals**

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 for Senate Review Board Academic Appeal**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Governing Policy:</b>                      | Appeals to the Senate Review Board Academic   |
| <b>Subsections:</b>                           | Introduction, Application for Appeal, Requests for Reconsideration by Dean, Specific Application Requests, Jurisdiction, Initial SRBA Panel Review Process, Evidence, Scheduling an Oral Hearing, Procedure at Hearings, Further Appeal |
| <b>Officer(s) Responsible for Procedures:</b> |   |
| <b>Effective Date:</b>                        | <b>TBD</b>  |
| <b>Supersedes:</b>                            | *   |

---

### **1.00 INTRODUCTION**

Students may appeal some academic decisions or rulings issued by a Dean to the Senate Review Board Academic (SRBA) in accordance with the appeal procedures set out below. Previously decided rulings by Deans or the Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) in academic and scholastic disciplinary matters are final unless overturned or modified on appeal to SRBA.

These procedures are to be read in conjunction with the Senate Review Board Academic Appeals Policy.

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

Note: This process applies to appeals of Graduate and Undergraduate Academic matters and Scholastic Offence decisions.

For assistance in filing a request for relief or to learn more about the request for relief and appeals process, you may contact the Office of the Ombudsperson ([ombudsoffice@uwo.ca](mailto:ombudsoffice@uwo.ca)).

### **2.00 APPLICATION FOR APPEAL**

## Procedures for Senate Review Board Academic Appeals

Appeals to the SRBA must be made on an Application for Appeal (Application) which must be filed with the University Secretariat ***within six (6) weeks\* of the date of the Dean's decision.***

An application 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.

The Secretariat strongly encourages all parties to electronically file their submissions.

### Details of the Appeal

The Details of the Appeal shall be concise and comply with the following requirements:

- (1) the length shall be no more than ten pages (letter size);
- (2) the spacing shall be at least one and one-half lines apart;
- (3) the font shall be 12-point size; and
- (4) the margins shall not be less than 2.5 cm/1 inch.

The Details of the Appeal shall be organized as follows for each ground for appeal:

- (1) identify the ground for appeal;
- (2) state the argument(s) for each ground;
- (3) describe the relevant evidence to support each argument, including references to consecutively numbered exhibits, if any, that are attached to the Details of the Appeal (e.g., Exhibits 1 – 5).

An Application shall not include any duplicative materials. The Secretariat shall inform a student if their Application does not conform with these requirements and will provide an opportunity for a student to amend their submissions (e.g., remove duplicate materials, reorganize materials).

All allegations must be supported by evidence in the initial Application. A detailed description of the evidence supporting the allegation (including any supporting documentation) must be presented, in writing, as part of the Application.

SRBA appeal applications are available on the University Secretariat website at:

[http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic\\_policies/appeals/SRBA\\_Application.pdf](http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/SRBA_Application.pdf)

### **RECONSIDERATION BY THE DEAN**

After a student has submitted a complete Application, including all supporting documentation, the Secretariat shall notify the Dean of the appeal. The Dean shall be provided an opportunity to reconsider their decision, typically within seven (7) business days of the notification.

### **SPECIFIC APPLICATION REQUESTS**

#### **Request to Exceed Page Limit for the Details of Appeal**

A student may submit a written request to extend the ten-page limit for the Details of the Appeal to a maximum of 15 pages prior to the expiration of the six-week timeline to file a complete Application. The request must be submitted to the Secretariat in the form of a letter addressed to the Chair of SRBA, setting out the reasons for the request. The request will be submitted to the Respondent for a written response.

The request and response will then be submitted to the Chair for a ruling. If the request is granted, a student may timely submit a complete Application, including no more than 15 pages for the Details of Appeal. If the request is denied, a student may timely submit a complete Application, including no more than 10 pages for the Details of Appeal.

#### **Request for a Timeline Extension to File an Application**

A student may submit a written request to extend the six-week timeline to file an Application. The request must be submitted to the Secretariat in the form of a letter addressed to the Chair of SRBA, setting out the reasons for the request. The request must attach a complete Application, including all supporting documentation. The request will be submitted to the Respondent for a written response.

The Appellant's request and the Respondent's response will then be submitted to the Chair for a ruling. If the request is granted, the Application will be accepted. If the request is denied, the Application will not be accepted. Exceptions to the six-week time limit for filing an appeal with SRBA are at the discretion of the Chair of SRBA upon written application by the student (see below).

### **JURISDICTION**

#### **Preliminary Review**

For all appeals, the SRBA Chair will conduct a preliminary review of the submitted information to determine if SRBA has jurisdiction to hear the matter.

1. If the Chair determines SRBA does not have jurisdiction, the Secretariat will provide the student notice of the intent to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction.

## **Procedures for Senate Review Board Academic Appeals**

2. If the Chair determines SRBA does have jurisdiction, the Secretariat will schedule an initial SRBA Panel Review as set out below.

### **Student Jurisdictional Submissions**

If the student wishes to challenge a notice of intent to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, the student may make written submissions with reasons detailing why they believe SRBA has jurisdiction within 10 days of receiving the notice of intention to dismiss.

### **Party Jurisdictional challenge**

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 initial panel hearing.

### **Chair Response**

The Chair, upon receipt of a notice challenging either the determination of jurisdiction or notice of intent to dismiss, or in any other circumstances where it appears there is a question as to whether SRBA has jurisdiction to hear a matter, shall convene a panel to consider such written arguments 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. If submissions are not received, the Chair of SRBA will issue the dismissal of the appeal.

## **INITIAL SRBA PANEL REVIEW PROCESS**

1. A student has an automatic 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. If the Chair determines SRBA has jurisdiction, a panel will convene to consider the written application and supporting documents submitted by the student and the Dean's response.
3. If a student alleges in the Application that there was a failure to observe a procedural requirement at the decanal level, or apprehension of bias at the decanal level, 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. The length of the Dean's response and the student's reply shall be no more than ten pages (letter size), spacing shall be at least one and one-half lines apart, the font shall be 12-point size, and the margins shall not be less than 2.5 cm. If SRBA is not

## Procedures for Senate Review Board Academic Appeals

satisfied on the basis of written documentation that there was a failure to observe a procedural requirement at the decanal level, it will deny the appeal. If SRBA is satisfied that there was a failure to observe a procedural requirement at the decanal level, it may instruct the Dean to reconsider the matter.

4. For all grounds of appeal, the Dean may provide and SRBA will accept a written response from the Dean before proceeding. If the Dean wishes to provide a written response, they must inform the Secretariat within a week of receiving notice of the appeal. 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. The length of the Dean's response and the student's reply shall be no more than ten pages (letter size), spacing shall be at least one and one-half lines apart, the font shall be 12-point size, and the margins shall not be less than 2.5 cm.
5. The Initial SRBA Panel, upon considering only the written application of the student and Dean's response, may in its discretion, order that an oral hearing be scheduled or deny the appeal based on the grounds and evidence provided in the Application and the Dean's response. In making its decision, SRBA will consider the grounds and evidence provided in the Application.
6. If the Application includes evidence that supports a ground for appeal that was not selected on the application, SRBA will consider that additional ground for appeal in addition to any that were selected on the application form.
7. The onus requirements set out in the SRBA Appeals Policy apply to both the Initial SRBA Panel and any oral hearings that follow the initial panel hearing.

### **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 relevant to the grounds for appeal being made and 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

## **Procedures for Senate Review Board Academic Appeals**

serving on the hearing panel by the University Secretariat prior to the date of the hearing.

### **SCHEDULING AN ORAL HEARING**

If the appeal is regarding a scholastic offense or the SRBA panel decides to order a hearing be scheduled, the parties will be contacted to arrange a hearing date. If, following receipt of an application, 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 of the deadline by which they must contact the University Secretariat (within, at most, six months from the date the Application was filed) to arrange a hearing.

If the Appellant cannot be contacted to arrange a hearing date, they 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.

### **Request to Postpone a Scheduled Hearing or Delay the Scheduling of a Hearing**

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 then will be contacted to arrange a hearing date. (If the Appellant cannot be contacted to arrange a hearing date, they 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.

### **Request for Accommodations**

If a student with a disability requires reasonable accommodations to participate in any aspect of the appeal procedures, the student shall timely submit written notice to the Secretariat in the form of a letter addressed to the Chair of SRBA. The Secretariat shall notify Accessible Education and the student of its receipt of the request and offer to share information on hearing procedures, if needed, to assist in Accessible Education's determination of reasonable accommodations for the student. Accessible Education shall provide written notice to the Chair of SRBA and the student regarding its determination. If a student disagrees with the decision of Accessible Education, they shall follow the appeal procedures set out in the "Western University Policy on Academic Accommodation for Students with Disabilities" and provide written notice to the Chair of SRBA that they have initiated the appeal procedures.

### **PROCEDURE AT HEARINGS**

#### ***A. Order of Proceedings***

## Procedures for Senate Review Board Academic Appeals

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



## Procedures for Senate Review Board Academic Appeals

appellant and witnesses. The order of presentation is at the Appellant's discretion.)

10. Reply evidence by the Respondent, if desired, on any new matters raised by the Appellant.
11. Cross-examination of reply witness, followed by questions from SRBA panel members.
12. Summary remarks by the Appellant.
13. Summary remarks by the Respondent.

\* Where the Appellant 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.

In Scholastic Offence cases, the Respondent is required to present its case first to ensure that the SRBA has a full understanding of the nature and extent of the allegations against the Appellant prior to the Appellant presenting their case.

### ***C. Adjournments***

An adjournment of the hearing may be ordered by the Chair when necessary. Convenience to the parties and to the panel members of SRBA will be considered by the Chair when 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 panel members must constitute a quorum.

### ***D. Expedience***

An effort should be made to limit the presentation of non-contentious facts and arguments to 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. 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.)

### ***F. 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.

### **FURTHER APPEAL**

## Procedures for Senate Review Board Academic Appeals

The Chair of Senate (i.e., the President & Vice-Chancellor) will entertain appeals against decisions of SRBA following a hearing 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 (2) weeks of the date of the Reason for 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** and it could not be said that the parties had been accorded a fair hearing.

## **Feedback Received on Disciplinary Appeals Policies**

### **Senate Review Board Academic Appeals– Policy**

#### **8.00 Onus**

- The standard for review for appeals alleging procedural error or reasonable apprehension of bias is provided for in the procedures, but not in the policy. It needs to be listed in the Onus section of the policy, to read:
  - If the student alleges a failure to observe a procedural requirement at the decanal level or a reasonable apprehension of bias at the decanal level, the onus is on the student to satisfy SRBA, on the basis of written documentation, that there was a failure to observe a procedural requirement or reasonable apprehension of bias at the decanal level.
- From Associate Deans
  - Need to clarify the difference between Jurisdiction and the Grounds for Appeal.

### **Requests for Relief – Policy**

#### **4.01 Requests for Relief**

- Clarify Category 1 to include “, or other academic decision conducted by course instructor).”

#### **Note:**

- Editorial feedback received will be incorporated.



## Graduate Student Academic Appeals

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Policy Category:</b>                       | Rights and Responsibilities  |
| <b>Subject:</b>                               | Graduate Student Academic Appeals  |
| <b>Subsections:</b>                           | <a href="#">Graduate Student Appeals of Academic Decisions:</a><br><a href="#">Subject Matter of an Appeal;</a><br><a href="#">Grounds of Appeal;</a><br><a href="#">Appeal Procedure;</a><br><a href="#">Appeals at the Course/Program Level;</a><br><a href="#">Appeals at the SGPS Level;</a><br><a href="#">Appeals to SRBA:</a><br><a href="#">Jurisdiction;</a><br><a href="#">Onus;</a><br><a href="#">Evidence;</a><br><a href="#">Relief;</a><br><a href="#">Application for Hearing;</a><br><a href="#">Further Appeals;</a><br><a href="#">Procedure at Hearings;</a><br><a href="#">SRBA Jurisdiction and Procedures Under the Policy and Procedures for the Conduct of Research</a> |
| <b>Approving Authority:</b>                   | Senate   |
| <b>Responsible Committee:</b>                 | Senate Committee on Academic Policy  |
| <b>Related Procedures:</b>                    | *  |
| <b>Officer(s) Responsible for Procedures:</b> | *  |
| <b>Related Policies:</b>                      | <a href="#">Scholastic Discipline for Graduate Students;</a><br><a href="#">Policy on Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities;</a><br><a href="#">Policy and Procedures for the Conduct of Research</a>   |
| <b>Effective Date:</b>                        | February 2011  |
| <b>Supersedes:</b>                            | *  |

---

### 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 (SRBA). The Vice-Provost's rulings in academic matters are final unless overturned or modified on appeal to the 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".

#### 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.*

### **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 the appeal.

### **Appeals at the SGPS Level**

1. 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](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.

2. 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.
3. The Vice-Provost shall issue a written decision, with reasons, normally within four weeks of receipt of the appeal.
4. 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.
5. SRBA appeal applications are available on the Web at:

[http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic\\_policies/appeals/SRBA\\_Application.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 unsupportable 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](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.





## **Scholastic Discipline for Graduate Students**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Policy Category:</b>                       | Rights and Responsibilities  |
| <b>Subject:</b>                               | Scholastic Discipline for Graduate Students  |
| <b>Subsections:</b>                           | <a href="#">Scholastic Offences; Definition;</a><br><a href="#">Procedures for Scholastic Offences;</a><br><a href="#">Offence Record; Penalties</a> |
| <b>Approving Authority:</b>                   | Senate   |
| <b>Responsible Committee:</b>                 | Senate Committee on Academic Policy  |
| <b>Related Procedures:</b>                    | *  |
| <b>Officer(s) Responsible for Procedures:</b> | *  |
| <b>Related Policies:</b>                      | <a href="#">Academic Records and Student Transcripts</a>   |
| <b>Effective Date:</b>                        | June 2011  |
| <b>Supersedes:</b>                            | *  |

---

### **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, 7<sup>th</sup> 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.
- 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 pretenses.
- 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 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'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 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 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.  
[https://grad.uwo.ca/doc/academic\\_services/appeal/appeal\\_SGPS\\_form.pdf](https://grad.uwo.ca/doc/academic_services/appeal/appeal_SGPS_form.pdf)
  - 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 after receiving the student's 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 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 website:  
[https://www.lib.uwo.ca/archives/retention\\_schedules/retention\\_schedules.html](https://www.lib.uwo.ca/archives/retention_schedules/retention_schedules.html)

## Scholastic Discipline for Graduate Students

- 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.

## Scholastic Discipline for Graduate Students

A student 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, 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."

## Scholastic Discipline for Graduate Students

\* 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](http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/general/records.pdf)



# EXHIBIT G

| GRADUATE EDUCATION COUNCIL (GEC)<br>2024-2025 Membership |              |   |   |
|--|--------------|---|---|
| Elected/Appointed membership:                            |              |   |   |
| Name   | Term Expires | Constituency (* a member of SGPS)   | Elected/Appointed By:                     |
| Robert Stainton  | 30-Jun-25    | Faculty member*   | Faculty of Arts and Humanities            |
| Emily Ansari   | 30-Jun-25    | Faculty member*   | Don Wright Faculty of Music               |
| Marguerite Lengyell                                      | 30-Jun-25    | Faculty member*   | Faculty of Education                      |
| Carrie Anne Marshall                                     | 30-Jun-25    | Faculty member*   | Faculty of Health Sciences                |
| Sarah Smith  | 30-Jun-25    | Faculty member*   | Faculty of Information and Media Studies  |
| Rory Gillis  | 30-Jun-25    | Faculty member*   | Faculty of Law                            |
| <i>vacant</i>  | 30-Jun-25    | Faculty member*   | Ivey Business School                      |
| Dan Hardy  | 30-Jun-25    | Faculty member*   | Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry |
| Dan Langohr  | 30-Jun-25    | Faculty member*   | Faculty of Engineering                    |
| Joseph Gilroy  | 30-Jun-25    | Faculty member*   | Faculty of Science                        |
| John Paul Minda  | 30-Jun-25    | Faculty member*   | Faculty of Social Science                 |
| Mary Helen McMurran                                      | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Chairs (or equivalent from non-departmental faculties)*                                | Faculty of Arts and Humanities            |
| <i>vacant</i>  | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Chairs (or equivalent from non-departmental faculties)*                                | Don Wright Faculty of Music               |
| Julie Byrd   | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Chairs (or equivalent from non-departmental faculties)*                                | Faculty of Education                      |
| Carri Hand   | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Chairs (or equivalent from non-departmental faculties)*                                | Faculty of Health Sciences                |
| Melissa Adler  | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Chairs (or equivalent from non-departmental faculties)*                                | Faculty of Information and Media Studies  |
| <i>vacant</i>  | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Chairs (or equivalent from non-departmental faculties)*                                | Faculty of Law                            |
| Hubert Pun   | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Chairs (or equivalent from non-departmental faculties)*                                | Ivey Business School                      |
| Charlie McKenzie   | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Chairs (or equivalent from non-departmental faculties)*                                | Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry |
| Mohamed Zaki   | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Chairs (or equivalent from non-departmental faculties)*                                | Faculty of Engineering                    |
| Jiandong Ren   | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Chairs (or equivalent from non-departmental faculties)*                                | Faculty of Science                        |
| Jamie Baxter   | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Chairs (or equivalent from non-departmental faculties)*                                | Faculty of Social Science                 |
| Sylvia Kontra  | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Assistant (or comparable role with responsibility for graduate program administration) | Faculty of Arts and Humanities            |
| Audrey Yardley-Jones                                     | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Assistant (or comparable role with responsibility for graduate program administration) | Don Wright Faculty of Music               |
| Brandee Makrakos   | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Assistant (or comparable role with responsibility for graduate program administration) | Faculty of Education                      |
| Jennifer Plaskett  | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Assistant (or comparable role with responsibility for graduate program administration) | Faculty of Health Sciences                |

| Elected/Appointed membership: |              |   |  |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---|--|
| Name                          | Term Expires | Constituency (* a member of SGPS)   | Elected/Appointed By:  |
| Chris Circelli                | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Assistant (or comparable role with responsibility for graduate program administration) | Faculty of Information and Media Studies   |
| Susuana Kwaning               | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Assistant (or comparable role with responsibility for graduate program administration) | Faculty of Law   |
| <i>vacant</i>                 | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Assistant (or comparable role with responsibility for graduate program administration) | Ivey Business School   |
| Jennifer Franco               | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Assistant (or comparable role with responsibility for graduate program administration) | Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry  |
| <i>vacant</i>                 | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Assistant (or comparable role with responsibility for graduate program administration) | Faculty of Engineering   |
| Thao Dang                     | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Assistant (or comparable role with responsibility for graduate program administration) | Faculty of Science   |
| Kara Brown                    | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate Assistant (or comparable role with responsibility for graduate program administration) | Faculty of Social Science  |
| Lisa Viviani                  | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate student  | Faculty of Arts and Humanities   |
| Catherine Birt                | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate student  | Don Wright Faculty of Music  |
| Mengxue Li                    | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate student  | Faculty of Education   |
| Rachel Reynolds               | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate student  | Faculty of Health Sciences   |
| JP Mann                       | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate student  | Faculty of Information and Media Studies   |
| Kaleigh Campbell              | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate student  | Faculty of Law   |
| <i>vacant</i>                 | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate student  | Ivey Business School   |
| Victoria Warner               | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate student  | Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry  |
| Hossein Pouri                 | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate student  | Faculty of Engineering   |
| <i>vacant</i>                 | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate student  | Faculty of Science   |
| Naser Ahmed                   | 30-Jun-25    | Graduate student  | Faculty of Social Science  |
| Juan Manuel Diaz Villasenor   | 30-Jun-25    | Postdoctoral Scholar  | Postdoctoral Association at Western in consultation with Postdoctoral Services Coordinator of the School |