

RYERSON UNIVERSITY

AGENDA

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday, April 1, 2003

5:30 p.m. A light dinner will be served in The Commons, Jorgenson Hall, Room A-250.

6:00 p.m. Meeting in The Commons.

- Pages 1-2 **1. President's Report**
1.1 Achievement Report
- Pages 3-11 **2. Report of the Secretary of Academic Council (#W2003-4)**
2.1 Reformatted Policies:
- Policy #61 - *Non-Academic Code of Conduct*
- Policy #46 - *Policy on Grading, Promotions and Academic Standing (GPA Policy)*
Removed Policy:
- Policy #75 - *Recommendations of the Special Committee on Student Complaints*
- Pages 12-13 2.2 Students' Rights and Responsibilities
Motion: *That Academic Council approve the Statement of Students' Rights and Responsibilities.*
- Pages 14-21 **3. The Good of the University**
- Pages 14-21 **4. Minutes of the March 4, 2003 Meeting**
- Pages 22-33 **5. Business arising out of the Minutes**
5.1 **Motion:** *That Academic Council approve the policy on Undergraduate Academic Consideration & Appeals as amended [Policy #134 (attached)].*
- Page 34 5.2 Report on the Composition of the Ad Hoc Committee
Motion: *That Academic Council amend the composition of the Ad Hoc Committee, established to review the feasibility of a Fall semester study period, to include a Dean and a representative from Continuing Education.*
- Pages 35-41 **6. Correspondence**
- Pages 35-41 **7. Reports of Actions and Recommendations of Departmental and Divisional Councils**
7.1 **From Continuing Education:**
a) Certificate name change from "*Certificate in Quantitative Management Methods*" to "*Certificate in Business Analysis*"

- b) Course additions to “*Certificate in Business Analysis*” (Electives)
- c) Certificate name change from “*Certificate in Marketing*” to *Certificate in Marketing Management*”
- d) Course additions to “*Certificate in Marketing Management*” (Electives)
- e) Course changes in Gerontology

Page 42

- 7.2 **From Communication and Design** (*Addendum see pg. 42*):
Course addition in Interior Design (reinstate for 2003/2004; 2004/2005)

Pages 43-47

8. Reports of Committees

- 8.1 Composition & By-Laws Committee (Report #W2003-2):

Motion #1: *That Academic Council amend its By-Laws with respect to the Composition and Terms of Reference of the Academic Council Appeals Committee, formed to combine the current academic Appeals Committee and the Student Discipline Committee.*

Motion #2: *That Academic Council amend its By-Laws with respect to the composition of the Research Ethics Review Board as outlined in this report.*

Motion #3: *That Academic Council amend its By-Laws with respect to the composition of the Awards and Ceremonials Committee as outlined in this report.*

Motion #4: *That Academic Council approve the School of Retail Management School Council By-Laws.*

Page 48

- 8.2 Nominating Committee (Report #W2003-3):

Motion #1: *That Academic Council approve the candidates elected as representatives for 2003-04.*

Motion #2: *That Academic Council approve the nomination, as stated in the report, to complete an unfilled term on the Academic Standards Committee.*

Pages 49-51

- 8.3 Academic Standards Committee (Report #W2003-2):

Motion #1: *That Academic Council approve the proposed degree completion program in Early Childhood Education, subject to the requirements proposed in the report”.*

9. New Business

10. Adjournment

RYERSON UNIVERSITY ACHIEVEMENT REPORT

For the April, 2003 meeting of Academic Council

Peter Hiscocks of Electrical Engineering has won the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers Award for the Support of Women in the Engineering Profession. Among his many activities, Prof. Hiscocks founded the award-winning Women in Engineering Project and Discover Engineering outreach programs at Ryerson.

Events

The annual induction of Ryerson students into the Golden Key Society was held March 17. More than 450 students have accepted the invitation to join the Ryerson Chapter, which extends membership offers to the top 15% of students, based on academic performance. Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs **Michael Dewson** and Nursing Professor **Linda Cooper** were named honorary members of the Society.

On March 6 the Faculty of Community Services held a poster event to disseminate information about the faculty's scholarly, research and creative activities.

Ryerson alumni living in Florida were invited to a reception Feb. 22 in Boca Raton. Chancellor **John Craig Eaton** and President **Claude Lajeunesse** were in attendance.

Charles Zamaria and **Robert Gardner** of Radio and Television Arts co-ordinated a special training event on Canada's arts and cultural sector for trade commissioners and public officials. The three days of workshops and presentations were sponsored by the Canadian Heritage Trade and Investment Directorate of the government of Canada.

The 24-hour VW Beetle push by Engineering students, organized by the Ryerson Engineering Students Society to raise funds for the Hospital for Sick Children, resulted in extensive media coverage, including the *Toronto Star*, *Toronto Sun*, Citytv, CFTO, and Global TV.

Media Coverage

Two Ryerson professors appeared on the Discovery Channel recently to discuss their areas of expertise. **Tim Sly**, Director of the School of Occupational and Public Health, appeared on the program *Health on the Line* Feb. 19 discussing the prevalence of bacteria in food in recent years. And **John Turtle** of Psychology was interviewed Feb. 28 on *Daily Planet* about his research into the reliability of eyewitness testimony.

Marion Coomey of Radio and Television Arts appeared on CTV's *Vicki Gabereau* discussing why people are fascinated by reality TV.

President **Claude Lajeunesse** commented in the Feb. 6 *Financial Post* on a speech by Robert Birgeneau in which the U of T President said that research intensive universities should receive higher funding. President Lajeunesse subsequently wrote a letter to the editor of the *Financial Post* on the subject, which was published Feb. 17.

Dean of Graduate Studies **Maurice Yeates** authored a piece in the February issue of *University Affairs* on the need for a new funding system to improve graduation rates and time-to-completion for doctoral studies.

Myer Siemiatycki of Politics appeared on CBC Toronto's *Canada Now* edition to talk about the fifth anniversary of the City of Toronto's amalgamation.

Hotelier magazine covered the gifts to the School of Hospitality and Tourism Management by Four Seasons Hotels and Resorts and Delta Hotels and Resorts in its February issue.

Retail Management Director **Donna Smith** was quoted extensively in a *Financial Post* story Feb. 17 about the human resource issues facing the retailing sector.

Sociology Professor **Mustafa Koc** appeared Feb 12 on CBC television's *CounterSpin* to talk about the possible impact on civilians of the Iraqi war. And he appeared on CTV's *Newsnet* March 3 discussing the lead up to the war.

David Checkland of Philosophy commented in the *Ottawa Citizen* Feb. 14 on a story about relationships and why people get married.

**Report of the Secretary of Academic Council
#W2003-4
April 1, 2003**

1. The following policies will be updated as a result of the approval of Policy #60: *Student Code of Academic Conduct* at the March 4 meeting.
 - a. Policy #61 – *Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct* – This was part of Policy #60 and is now a separate policy which has been updated to include the changes made at the Academic Council appeal level. Other language has also been updated. The updated version of the policy is attached.
 - b. Policy #46: *Policy on Grading, Promotions and Academic Standing (GPA Policy)* – This policy has been updated to include the grade of “DEF” as approved in the revised *Student Code of Academic Conduct*. The following will be added to section 2.2.2 “other performance designations which may be assigned at the discretion of the teaching Department”:

DEF - an interim grade assigned during the investigation of academic misconduct (as described under the *Student Code of Conduct*). The DEF will be replaced by an official course grade upon resolution of the matter.
2. Removed as Policy – Policy #75 – Recommendations of the Special Committee on Student Complaints.
3. Students’ Rights and Responsibilities – The *Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct* contains some student responsibilities within its text, which have been retained in the reformatted version. The current *Code of Academic Conduct* contains the following sections on Students’ Rights and Responsibilities as part of the preamble:

B. YOUR RIGHTS AS A STUDENT INCLUDE:

1. the right to receive information at the commencement of each course including the instructors name, office location, hours and Ryerson telephone number; a course description; a list of course assignments, tests and approximate deadlines; a marking or evaluation scheme; a statement of the teaching mode(s); a provision that planned alteration in the list of course assignments, tests, approximate deadlines and in the marking or evaluation schemes shall be presented in class prior to being implemented;
2. the right to have academic work judged solely on its merits;
3. the right to appeal final grades and/or academic standing;
4. a right of confidentiality of the student records subject to Ryerson’s promotion regulations and procedures; Ryerson’s research policies and procedures; and the provisions of this Code;
5. the right to participate in University governance through the delegated powers described in the *Ryerson Polytechnic University Statute Law Amendment Act, 1993*;

6. the right to refuse to participate as subjects in research and experiments without penalty; and
7. the right to conduct research and to publish, discuss and exchange findings, subject to published University regulations that may apply.

C. YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS A STUDENT

Ryerson University students (including former students or graduates where appropriate) have the responsibility to abide by the university's policy on student academic misconduct regardless of whether or not the learning program is on or off the Ryerson campus, while faculty, staff and students have the responsibility of creating an environment that discourages misconduct.

The revised *Student Code of Academic Conduct*, approved last month, has removed these sections as it was felt this was an inappropriate location for such statements. Attached is a statement of ***Students' Rights and Responsibilities*** which combine and update those removed from the current *Student Code of Conduct* and the responsibilities which remain in the *Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct*. There have been a few additions and substantive changes:

Rights:

- "Students retain their rights as a citizen" has been changed to "enjoy all rights and freedoms recognized by law"
- "an environment safe and free from unwanted attention" has been changed to "safe, free from harassment and discrimination"
- environment of "mutual respect" has been changed to "mutual respect and civility"
- Added:
 - a right to "an environment which ensures that administrative decisions are made, or actions taken, with fair regard for the known and legitimate interests of students"
 - an environment where adequate measures are taken to protect the security of students on University property;
 - right to complain without fear of reprisal.

Responsibilities:

- Added:
 - treat University facilities and equipment with respect
 - obtain and maintain a Ryerson e-mail account
- changed show your "Ryerson identification card" to "Ryerson identification card or other photographic identification and a copy of your registration form"

These will be published in the *Student Guide* and on the Ryerson website.

Motion: That Academic Council approve the statement of *Students' Rights and Responsibilities*.

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL

STUDENT CODE OF NON-ACADEMIC CONDUCT

Policy Number: 61

Original Approval Date: April 1999 (as part of Policy 60 - Revised Code of Student Conduct and Related Procedures)

Presented By: Linda Grayson, Vice President Administration and Student Affairs and Errol Aspevig, Vice President, Academic

Responsible Office: Vice President, Administration and Student Affairs and Vice President, Academic

Reformatted: March 2003

STUDENT CODE OF NON-ACADEMIC CONDUCT

A. UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PRINCIPLES

The Ryerson Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct ("the Code") reflects an expectation that students conduct themselves in a manner consistent with the educational objectives of the University, in accordance with generally accepted standards of behaviour, and in accordance with published University regulations and policies. At the heart of accepted standards is respect for other members of the Ryerson community. The Code in its entirety is intended to identify behaviour, which the University considers to be inappropriate, to outline the procedures the University will use to respond to such behaviour, and to indicate the possible consequences of such behaviour.

In addition to requiring the highest standards of academic integrity, Ryerson expects its students to conduct themselves appropriately in other ways (e.g. their interaction with other students, staff and faculty). The University is concerned that inappropriate student behaviour may impair its capacity to carry out effectively its educational responsibilities and to fairly serve all students. Accordingly, the Code concerns itself with student behaviour both inside and outside of classroom settings. The Code will also be enforced if a breach of the Code has occurred off-campus, which affects the right of the members of the University community to use and enjoy the University's learning and working environments.

For the purpose of this policy, a "student" is defined as a person registered in an undergraduate or graduate program proceeding toward a degree, a diploma or a certificate at Ryerson University, or otherwise taking credit or non-credit courses offered by the University.

Students retain their **RIGHTS** as a citizen when they become members of the University community. They have the **RESPONSIBILITY** to abide by federal, provincial and municipal statutes in addition to the University's own regulations. The University's interest may cause it to initiate a process pursuant to this policy, whether or not non-University authorities have taken action. The guiding principle is that Ryerson will institute disciplinary proceedings only when Ryerson's interests are affected.

B. RELATION TO OTHER UNIVERSITY POLICIES

Students, as members of the University community, must also be aware of and abide by other University policies and guidelines, such as, but not limited to: The Ryerson Student Code of Academic Conduct; the Fire Evacuation Policy; the Examination Policy; and the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Policy. Under normal circumstances, it is expected that complaints or concerns regarding discrimination and harassment will be addressed under the provisions of the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Policy. There are also policies and/or guidelines in the areas of SRC activities, Residences, the Library, Athletics/Recreation, and Information Technology. Each of these areas may have its own set of procedures, and student rights and responsibilities. Students should contact the respective offices to obtain copies of these documents, as well as to bring forward questions or comments. General enquiries can be referred to the Office of the Secretary of Academic Council.

Under normal circumstances it is expected that complaints or concerns regarding harassment and discrimination on the basis of a prohibited ground of discrimination (e.g. race, sex, sexual orientation, disability, etc.) will be addressed in accordance with the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Policy and Procedures. Questions, complaints and comments concerning such conduct should be directed to the Office of Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Services. However, at its discretion, the

University may decide to address human rights related conduct under the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct where a student's alleged behaviour appears to contravene the regulations under both the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct and the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Policy.

C. REGULATIONS

C1. OFFENSES AGAINST PERSONS

- a. Assault/Threats/Bodily Harm - You have the **RIGHT** to an environment that is safe and free from unwanted attention. You have the **RESPONSIBILITY** to refrain from:
 - i. conduct and activities likely to endanger the health or safety of yourself or another person;
 - ii. assault or the threat of assault to another person; or,
 - iii. behaviour that you know or ought reasonably to know would cause another person to fear bodily harm, or that may endanger personal wellbeing or may obstruct the teaching and/or learning process.
- b. Respect for Others - You have the **RIGHT** to an environment which is characterized by mutual respect. You have the **RESPONSIBILITY** to treat all members of the University with respect [on and off campus] and to refrain from:
 - i. unwelcome or persistent behaviour (e.g. personal harassment) that you know, or ought reasonably to know, would cause another person to feel humiliated, demeaned or intimidated or which may obstruct the teaching, learning and/or work process of another person¹ and which includes, but is not limited to, hazing and aggressive religious recruiting;
 - ii. using the University's computing, telephone, mail and/or other University communication systems to convey nuisance or other objectionable messages which may endanger the personal well-being of another person or which may obstruct the teaching, learning and/or work process of another person.
- c. You also have the **RESPONSIBILITY** to not falsely or maliciously allege charges/offenses under the regulations of this policy.

C2. DISRUPTION

You have the **RIGHT** to an environment that, while safeguarding dissent, is free from interference and disruption. You have the **RESPONSIBILITY** to refrain from behaviour which you know, or ought reasonably to know, obstructs teaching and learning, evaluation, research, administration and other usual or authorized activities of the University.

C3. OFFENSES INVOLVING PROPERTY

a. **Facilities, Telecommunications, Library, Other University Property and Private Property.**

You have the **RIGHT** to the use of University facilities. You have the **RESPONSIBILITY** to:

¹ Personal harassment is persistent and unwelcome behaviour which may humiliate, demean, intimidate, and/or disrupt another person's teaching and/or learning, but which is not based on a prohibited ground of discrimination as defined under Ryerson's Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Policy, i.e., it is unwelcome behaviour directed at an individual but not on the basis of race, sex, sexual orientation, disability, etc.

- i. respect posted hours and limits on entry where such conditions exist;
 - ii. confine smoking only to areas designated for that purpose;
 - iii. not destroy, tamper with, unlawfully access or limit the access of others, remove, possess, or knowingly create a condition which endangers or threatens destruction or damage, of property not your own, including, but not limited to, library materials, computing facilities, telecommunications systems and emergency telephone systems;
 - iv. abide by the University's policy and guidelines related to all University computing and networking facilities²; and
 - v. not remove, possess, maliciously engage, or tamper with University fire protection equipment, or security and safety systems.
- b. **Permits and Identification** - you have the **RIGHT**, upon payment of any required fees, to access facilities as a University community member. You have a **RESPONSIBILITY** not to give, lend or sell your permit or identification to another person, nor to acquire or use meal cards, access cards and keys, University identification, computer identification, or parking permits that are stolen, cancelled, lost, false, altered or expired. On University property, you have the **RESPONSIBILITY** to show your Ryerson identification upon request from Ryerson Security or other University employee.
- c. **Grounds/Facilities** - You have the **RIGHT** to the use of University grounds and facilities. You have the **RESPONSIBILITY** to abide by the University's regulations and policies dealing with residences, the library, athletic/recreational and computing facilities.³ Students have the **RESPONSIBILITY** to evacuate the buildings during fire alarms or other emergencies as instructed by Ryerson Security.

C4. OTHER

- a. Alcohol - You have **RESPONSIBILITY** to abide by the Provincial Liquor License Act, and Provincial and Federal statutes pertaining to alcohol. The possession of liquor by those under the age of 19 is illegal. The consumption or open possession of liquor by those over the age of 19, other than in a residence room or licensed premises, is prohibited.
- b. You have the **RESPONSIBILITY** to abide by Provincial and Federal Statutes pertaining to illegal drugs. The possession, use or trafficking of illegal drugs is prohibited.
- c. Visitors - You have the **RIGHT**, upon compliance with existing sign-in requirements, to have visitors on campus. As their sponsor, you have the personal **RESPONSIBILITY** to ensure that your guests abide by the regulations of this Code.
- d. Firearms and other Weapons - No firearms, any other weapons, firecrackers, gun powder, flammable solvents, or any other forms of explosive or volatile materials are permitted on campus except as authorized by the Assistant Director, Environmental Health and Safety and Security Services.

² Refer also to Ryerson's policies and procedures dealing with Information Technology, available from the offices of Student Services and Computing and Communication Services (CCS) or the Office of the Secretary of Academic Council..

³ Refer to Ryerson's policies and procedures regarding the University's library, residence, athletic/recreational and computing facilities, available from the respective offices or the Office of the Secretary of Academic Council, and the Office of Student Services.

- e. Pets - Pets and other animals are not permitted in University buildings, except as authorized, and with the following exceptions: guide dogs for the blind; and, animals housed in laboratory areas.

D. PENALTIES FOR NON-ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Violations of this Code may result in penalties such as, but not limited to:

- D1.** Warnings, written apologies, a requirement to perform community service, a requirement of restitution, denial of access to specific University facilities, services or activities, restrictions on campus mobility, a fine, a requirement to post a bond for good behaviour, disciplinary probation, suspension, or expulsion.
- D2.** It is recognized that circumstances may arise in which a student's behaviour is judged by the University to be dangerous to other members of the community. If a member of the Ryerson community (staff, faculty, administrator, or student) believes that a student's behaviour is dangerous to others, he or she may call on the assistance of the University's Security Services. Security Services personnel are expected to act in accordance with approved security procedures.
- D3.** In extreme circumstances where the safety or personal well being of community members or the possibility of damaged property is in question, the Assistant Director, Environmental Health and Safety and Security Services. may temporarily bar an individual from campus pending formal resolution of the case.
- D4.** In addition, while suspensions and expulsions may be imposed only by the Academic Council Appeals Committee ("the Committee") after meeting with the student, the Director of Student Services may, pending the convening of the Committee, request that the Assistant Director, Environmental Health and Safety and Security Services bar a student from campus temporarily if, in the opinion of both the Director of Student Services and the Assistant Director, Environmental Health and Safety and Security Services, the safety of other persons or the possibility of damage to the University property, is in question.

E. PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH ALLEGATIONS OF VIOLATIONS OF THIS CODE

- E1.** Complaints must be submitted in writing to the Director of Student Services ("Director"). Complaints must be signed by the complainant as the Director will not take action regarding anonymous complaints.
- E2.** In general, once a written complaint is lodged with the Director, or his/her designate, he/she will determine if an investigation should be conducted. If the Director decides that an investigation should be undertaken, he/she will verbally advise the student who is alleged to have violated the Code (the respondent), of meeting with witnesses and collecting and receiving evidence. If the Director determines through his/her preliminary investigation, that there is insufficient evidence to support the allegation made, he/she will advise the respondent and the investigation will be terminated.
- E3.** Subject to paragraph 2 above, within ten working days of giving notice of his/her intent to investigate, if the Director has concluded that there may be some basis for the complaint based on the evidence collected to this point, he/she will provide the following verbally or in writing to the respondent: the allegation made and the general nature of the complaint or violation and the

evidence collected to date. He/she will also direct that the respondent met with the Director to discuss the matter, if a meeting has not yet taken place.

- E4. Students have the right to bring witnesses or non-legal representation at this stage of the process.
- E5. If a respondent does not respond to the Director's letter or call, the Director will refer the matter to the Academic Council Appeals Committee. The Committee will convene a hearing. The respondent will be notified of the date, time and place of the hearing, and if the respondent does not respond to the Committee's notices or fails to appear at the hearing, the hearing will proceed and a decision will be made in the student's absence. Hearings will be conducted pursuant to the Statutory Powers and Procedures Act.
- E6. If a student does respond to the letter or call from the Director and meets with the Director, the Director will explain the complaint, and indicate the nature of the possible penalty, and will provide the student with a full opportunity to explain what occurred from the respondent's perspective. If a respondent admits the allegation and accepts the penalty, and provided the penalty does not involve suspension or expulsion, the Director will implement the penalty. If the Director determines that no infraction of the policy has occurred, the respondent will be advised of his/her decision in writing.
- E7. If a student denies the allegation and the Director's findings, and/or disagrees with the penalty, the student will be informed in writing of the right to appeal any decision by the Director of Student Services, save and accept the Director's decision to refer the matter to the Committee as per paragraph 3 above. The student may appeal to the Academic Council Appeals Committee within ten working days from the postmarked date shown on the written notification from the Director's decision. Students have the right to legal representation at the hearing before the Committee.
- E8. If the recommended penalty from the Director is formal suspension from the program or expulsion from the University, the Director of Student Services is required to refer the matter to the Committee for a hearing.
- E9. In hearings before the Committee, the Director of Student Services will present the case against the respondent.

F. GENERAL REGULATIONS

- F1. In general, the Director of Student Services will deal with the majority of cases informally.
- F2. The Director will consider false allegations as violations of this Code and an investigation and appropriate action will be undertaken.
- F3. Records of complaints and penalties imposed will be maintained by the Office of the Director of Student Services. Only records of suspensions and expulsions will appear on the student's academic record.

G. APPEALS TO THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL APPEALS COMMITTEE

- G1.** A Hearing Panel of the Academic Council Appeals Committee shall be convened if
- a. the Director of Student Services recommends withdrawal from the program or expulsion from the University;
 - b. the student appeals the decision made by the Director of Student Services
- G2.** Any four members of the Academic Council Appeals Committee, one of whom must be a student, may constitute a Hearing Panel of the Appeals Committee to hear the appeal of a student against a decision of the Director. A quorum shall consist of four members, including the panel chair and at least one student. The Chair may vote in the case of a tie.
- G3.** Both the appellant and the Director of Student Services, who shall be the respondent, may be represented by an agent or legal counsel at this level.
- G4.** Students must submit an appeal to the Secretary of Academic Council within ten (10) working days of receipt of the Director's decision. Forms and instructions for the filing of Appeals can be found at the Registration and Records or Academic Council websites, or are available from the office of the Secretary of Academic Council.
- G5.** The Secretary of Academic Council shall
- a. review the appeal to determine if it meets the criteria for appropriate grounds for an appeal. If it is felt that the grounds are insufficient, the Secretary of Academic Council may inform the Panel and the student that the Panel will review the grounds, and make a determination as to whether it will hear the case. The meeting to review the grounds will be held prior to the scheduled appeal hearing. This may occur on the same day as the Hearing. The decision not to proceed must be unanimous. The student will be informed after that time whether the appeal will be heard. A written rationale for the decision not to proceed must be provided to the student within five (5) working days;
 - b. immediately forward the appeal to the Director of Student Services, who shall reply to the appeal within five (5) working days of receipt. The Registrar must also receive a copy of the appeal;
 - c. establish a Hearing Panel of the Academic Council Appeals Committee and appoint a Hearing Panel Chair (see section G9 for regulations on Conflict of Interest);
 - d. determine, in consultation with the Chair of the Hearing Panel if, given the grounds of the appeal, it is necessary to call other witnesses to be present;
 - e. schedule a hearing based upon the availability of the student and the Director of Student Services. Students must receive at least ten (10) days notice of the date, time and place of the hearing. An appeal may be scheduled with less than ten (10) days notice with the written agreement of both the student and the Director;
 - f. forward all of the submissions for the appeal, including a copy of the student's academic record where relevant, to: all members of the Hearing Panel of the Academic Appeals Committee; the Director of Student Services; the Registrar; the student; and the student's advocate, if any.
- G6.** The hearing shall follow the standard hearing procedure as outlined in the Guide to Appeals available from the Secretary of Academic Council.
- G7.** All Hearings shall be conducted in accordance with the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act (SPPA)*. A copy of the SPPA is available for review in the office of the Secretary of Academic Council.

- G8. Conflict of Interest: A member of a Hearing Panel, a student or the Director of Student Services must disclose any conflict of interest, if known, no less than five (5) days before the hearing. Unless the conflict of interest is resolved, the Panel member shall be replaced. If either party raises a conflict of interest regarding any Panel member(s) once the Hearing has begun, the Hearing Panel will judge the validity of the conflict and will decide on whether the Panel member may sit on the appeal. The Panel member(s) that is challenged may offer a statement but may not take part in the Panel's decision on the conflict. If the Panel member is excused and there is no quorum, the Hearing shall be adjourned and a new hearing scheduled with a new Panel member.
- G9. Burden and Standard of Proof: In a Misconduct appeal the onus is on the University to show that misconduct has occurred and that the penalty assessed or recommended is reasonable and in keeping with the nature of the misconduct. The standard of proof in all decisions shall be "a balance of probabilities." This means that, in order for students to be denied their appeals, the University must show the Panel that it is more likely than not that the original decision was correct.
- G10. Decisions
The Hearing Panel may not require any action contrary to another University policy or collective agreement.
- The Hearing Panel may
- a. deny the appeal.
 - b. grant the appeal
 - c. grant the appeal in part subject to conditions, or attach any conditions to any decision. If the student does not accept the conditions attached, the appeal will be considered as denied.
- G11. The letter to the student, outlining the decision of the Hearing Panel and clearly stating the basis on which the decision was reached, must be sent to the Secretary of Academic Council, who will send a copy to the student by courier (or given personally to the student by prior arrangement) within five (5) working days. The Secretary of Academic Council must send a copy of the decision to the Director of Student Services, the Registrar, and the Dean.
- G12. Decisions of the Academic Council Appeals Committee are final and binding.
- G13. Based upon matters arising at the Hearing, the Hearing Panel or Appeals Officer may make recommendations on procedural or policy matters to the Appeals Committee of Academic Council, the Secretary of Academic Council, a Department/School or Faculty Appeals Committee or Appeals Officer, a Dean or the Registrar's Office.

(March 12/03)

**RYERSON UNIVERSITY
STATEMENT OF STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

As a student at Ryerson University, you have the right to:

- enjoy all rights and freedoms recognized by law;
- a learning environment that is safe, free from harassment and discrimination;
- a learning environment which is characterized by mutual respect and civility;
- a learning environment that, while safeguarding dissent, is free from interference and disruption;
- an environment which ensures that administrative decisions are made, or actions taken, with fair regard for the known and legitimate interests of students;
- an environment where adequate measures are taken to protect the security of students on University property;
- the right to complain without fear of reprisal;
- access facilities as a University community member upon payment of any required fees;
- receive information at the commencement of each course, including:
 - the instructor's name;
 - office location;
 - hours and Ryerson telephone number;
 - a course description;
 - a list of course assignments, tests and approximate deadlines;
 - a marking or evaluation scheme;
 - a statement of the teaching mode(s);
 - a provision that planned alteration in the list of course assignments, tests, approximate deadlines, and in the marking or evaluation schemes shall be presented in class prior to being implemented;
- have academic work judged solely on its merits;
- appeal grades and/or academic standing;
- confidentiality of your student information, records and subject to Ryerson's academic regulations and procedures; Ryerson's research policies and procedures; and the provisions of the Student Code of Academic Conduct and the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct;
- participate in University governance through elected representation to the Department/School Councils, Academic Council and the Board of Governors;
- refuse to participate as subjects in research and experiments without penalty;
- conduct research and to publish, discuss and exchange findings, subject to published University regulations that may apply.

As a student at Ryerson University, you have the responsibility to:

- abide by federal, provincial and municipal statutes in addition to University policy;
- treat all members of the community, including faculty, staff and fellow students, with respect;
- not falsely or maliciously allege charges/offenses under the regulations of the Student Code of Academic Conduct and the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct
- refrain from
 - behaviour, which you know, or ought reasonably to know, obstructs teaching, learning, evaluation, research, administration and the other usual or authorized activities of the University;
 - conduct and activities likely to endanger the health or safety of yourself or another person;
 - assault or the threat of assault to another person; or,
 - behaviour that you know or ought reasonably to know would cause another person to fear bodily harm, or that may endanger personal wellbeing or may obstruct the teaching and/or learning process.
 - unwelcome or persistent behaviour (e.g. personal harassment) that you know, or ought reasonably to know, would cause another person to feel humiliated, demeaned or intimidated or which may obstruct the teaching, learning and/or work process of another person and which includes, but is not limited to, hazing and aggressive religious recruiting;
 - using the university's computing, telephone, mail and/or other university communication systems to convey nuisance or other objectionable messages which may endanger the personal well-being of another person or which may obstruct the teaching, learning and/or work process of another
- treat University facilities and equipment with respect;
- familiarize yourself with relevant University policy, such as the policy on Academic Consideration and Appeals, the Student Code of Academic Conduct, the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct, the Examination Policy, and the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Policy, etc;
- respect posted hours and limits on entry where such conditions exist;
- not destroy, tamper with, unlawfully access or limit the access of others, remove, possess, or knowingly create a condition which endangers or threatens destruction or damage, of property not your own, including, but not limited to, library materials, computing facilities, telecommunications systems and emergency telephone systems;
- abide by the university's policy and guidelines related to all university computing and networking facilities;
- not remove, possess, maliciously engage, or tamper with university fire protection equipment, or security and safety systems.
- to evacuate the buildings during fire alarms or other emergencies as instructed by Ryerson Security.
- obtain and maintain a Ryerson University e-mail account;
- ensure that your guests abide by University policy;
- show your Ryerson identification card, or photographic identification and a copy of your registration form, upon request by Ryerson Security or other Ryerson employee.

MINUTES OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
Tuesday, March 4, 2003

Members Present:

C. Lajeunesse
K. Alnwick
E. Aspevig
M. Dewson
T. Knowlton
C. Matthews
S. Williams
B. Jackson
A. Cross
D. Snyder
J. Cook
M. Mazerolle
A. Pevec
A. Lohi
K. Raahemifar
G. Turcotte
M. Koc
G. Roberts-Fiati
M. Verticchio

S. Boctor
M. Booth
C. Cassidy
L. Grayson
I. Levine
J. Sandys
M. Yeates
M. Barber
A. Furman
K. Marciniac
M. Dowler
G. Meti
D. Smith
J. Welsh
R. Ravindran
J. Dianda
D. Martin
P. George
B. Yoon

C. Desouza
R. Kup
S. Marshall
R. Dutt
T. Nguyen
L. Merali
A. Tam
R. Rodrigues
V. Berkeley
S. Sutherland
E. Trott
J. Monro
L. Lum
D. Heyd
K. Tucker Scott
D. Elder
S. Kumar
F. Salustri
M. Creery

Regrets:

G. Inwood
D. Elder

Members Absent:

M. Potter
R. Walshaw
D. McKessock
S. Cody
M. McCrae

1. President's Report:

1.1 Achievement Report: The President congratulated Ken Marciniac on his election as President of Ryerson.

The President reported on highlights of the Federal Budget which support Initiatives to Strengthen Research and Innovation. The MARs Project, which is focused on commercializable research in health and related areas, has received \$20M. There will be a presentation on the project on March 13. Ryerson is exploring ways to be an active participant in the initiative.

Peter Hiscock is being recognized for his efforts in the recruitment of women in engineering.

1.2 Academic Planning Update: Errol Aspevig reported that he has had six productive consultations with the community, has met with the PPAC and the Academic Planning group, and has received a paper from the RFA concerning the Draft Academic Plan. The thinking that has gone into the original draft plan has evolved as a result of these consultations. A supplement to the plan is being developed which will provide more concrete details. There will be consultation on that supplement. The final report will come to the May meeting of Academic Council.

1.3 Enrolment Update: Gene Logel, Paul Stenton and Keith Alnwick reported. Planning for the double cohort has been ongoing since 1999. The original MTCU projections were based on demographics with the assumption that there would be increased participation, and that the double cohort would occur over 3 years. The projections were updated in early 2002 because applications were more than double what was expected, but these projections continued to assume that the double cohort would be spread over 3 years. Last summer and fall enrolment targets were negotiated. Full funding for undergraduate students (101s) was guaranteed. There was a penalty clause for non-achievement of the target and there was a cap on funding.

The negotiated levels are short of what is needed to accommodate the actual intakes and the targets have been revised again. There is a renegotiation of the intake numbers with MTCU and there is no longer a penalty clause. Ryerson plans to increase by 700-750 students for next year, with increases in all Faculties. Plans are contingent upon SuperBuild funding for the Business building.

Students are making many more application choices than they have in the past. Ryerson has seen a 50% growth as a first choice. The average for the system is 47%. Admissions have been a team effort within the University. There will be a challenge to deal with the increase in both new and upper year students, as well as the increase in CE students. There is already high utilization of large rooms. There are a variety of strategies for meeting the space challenge. Current space utilization will be studied. Large room usage at night will be investigated and the Carleton Cinemas will be used as large space classrooms. There will be a contingency plan for unforeseen enrolment circumstances.

1.4 COU Colleague Report - Don Snyder reported that the double cohort has been the primary item of discussion at the COU Colleague meetings. The committee has met three times this year and presentations have dealt with the digital library, public awareness of quality issues in higher education and graduate programs. The COU disseminates a great deal of information on the Ontario system. The following reports will be available from the Secretary of Academic Council: Briefing Notes of COU (September 2002); COU Resource Document (Sept 2002); the Report of the Auditors on Undergraduate

Program Reviews; University Applicant Survey; Inventory of Physical Facilities of Ontario Universities (2001-2002); Double Cohort Countdown: A Progress Report from Ontario Universities.

The Colleagues' focus has been on what constitutes a good university education and related issues. There has been a lot of information on the double cohort, Ontarians with Disability act, and the younger students. There has been discussion on the relationship between research and teaching and the development of a creative strategy to bring research and teaching into harmony.

2. Report of the Secretary of Academic Council – Diane Schulman reported on the policies eliminated as the result of the approval of the Admissions Policy at the February meeting, and made a clerical correction to that policy as noted in her report.

3. Good of the University – K. Marciniac distributed a letter on the change to the GO Transit student discount. There is a student campaign to stop this change and letters to the GO Transit Board would be appreciated. He also made a brief statement on the Federal budget, and reported that there would be Student Day of Strike and Action against the War in Iraq on March 5 at 4:00 p.m.

E. Trott commended members of the student union for their conduct at a meeting she had attended.

4. Minutes of the February 4, 2003 Meeting.

Motion to approve: S. Williams, seconded by C. Matthews.

Minutes approved.

5. Business Arising out of the Minutes

The Secretary of Academic Council reported on the reasons for the revision of the Appeals Policy and the consultation process. The need for change to the policy was based on basic principles, and was not driven by the number of appeals.

- Appeals take too long. Students are sometimes having final appeals well into the end of the following semester.
- Having three levels of appeal is unusual. The policy requires that a student tell the same story three times to three different people/groups.
- Chairs are put in the position of being problem solvers and then making a judgment on a student's formal appeal. This is unfair to both the Chair and the student.
- Instructors are not required to formally address student's concerns. The Chairs are required to speak for instructors.
- The policy is sometimes difficult to interpret and there is a need for clarification
- Both policies are applied inconsistently. Some departments and Faculties have hearings and committees, some do not.
- Decision makers are not trained in the process.
- The process for Continuing Education students was not spelled out in the policy.

Consultation process:

- There has been ongoing consultation as the document is revised. There have been many responses to the various iterations, and all respondents have been contacted and their concerns

discussed and often incorporated. It made no difference which iteration they responded to, as each was simply a fine tuning of the last.

- There were consultations with Deans, Chairs, Departments, students.

Motion: That Academic Council approve the *Policy on Academic Consideration and Appeals*. E. Aspevig moved and J. Monro seconded.

Discussion:

- A student from the Theatre School stated that there is concern about the de-formalization of the Chairs role in appeals. The current policy works well.
- The Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science stated that while the policy is 10 years old and needs adjustment, it works in FEAS where most of the appeals are from. There are no hearings, but faculty members and the chairs are available. About 10-30% of appeals are granted at first level. About half of the students whose appeals are denied appeal to second level. There are 150 first level (40 granted) and 60 second level (90% standing appeals.- suspended and withdrawn). It took five weeks to respond to the second level appeals. Six were granted and 54 denied. There are now 14 at third level. He believes the proposed policy will increase appeals, confuse the role of the Chair, and increase the workload. It will be too difficult to get all parties together at a hearing.
- A faculty member in the Faculty of Community Services said that she spoke for her colleagues in support of the change. It is an important cultural shift that links the two policies. It is agreed that there are many more cases of appeals in FEAS and they should work to prevent appeals. She believes the Chair is not disempowered and needs to take on the role of problem solver. If one or more Faculties are disadvantaged they need to be given the resources to deal with the need. The role of the facilitator is important.
- The Dean of Communication & Design endorsed the concerns of the Dean of FEAS. The notion of improving appeals is worthy, but he believes the proposed policy will result in the proliferation of appeals. The mechanism will be detached from academic units. There is no way that the process will be timelier in FC&D. There are 40-50 first level appeals in late May or early June, 2-5 to second level appeals, and rarely any third level appeals. Faculty will not volunteer their time in June to sit on committees and instructors and part-timers will not be found. He believes the process will be extended, and will be no fairer. Chairs are most able to deal with issues on appeal. There will need to be more administrative support and teaching release time. Resources would be better spent on other things. There are good things in the policy which can be preserved, but the policy should not change what is done currently.
- One member was concerned that the biggest user of the policy is urging against its use and that some students have expressed concern. She questioned if there is data on the number of appeals.
- A member stated that in the proposed policy Chairs will still be able to deal with the issues as they arise and there will be no need to go to the Dean. A formal piece of paper will not be necessary. Not every student who loses at the first level will go to the Dean and there will be no more appeals than there are now. The number may go down.
- The Dean of Community Services stated that there are many things in the proposed policy that strengthen the appeals process. The linking of the Code of Conduct and the Appeals Policy is good, and the policy is clear on the responsibilities of students and Chairs. The issue is dealing with students fairly. There is no difference in how Chairs deal with a student, the policy simply clarifies their role more articulately. Students are thoughtful enough to support the policy.

- A member of the policy committee state that in the School of Business Management there were about 50 standing appeals. It is hoped that the number of appeals to Academic Council will decrease because students will be dealt with at the front end. The Appeals committee cannot deal with the fact that many appeals are filed out of desperation, but the departments must. Most schools do not formally talk to students. The third level appeal is often the first time students have a chance to talk to anyone about their concerns. If there is nothing new to be presented it is unfair to keep the process going on and on, with students giving the same story and hoping for a miracle. There must be more help for students up front. The appointment of Hearing Officers was included to address the volume issues. There is a conflict when the Chair has to make a decision.
- There is a process for how items such as this policy are brought to Academic Council and there needs to be consideration given when issues are addressed, and the work that has been done. There is speculation on how people will react to the policy. After all of the work meeting the fundamental objectives, the policy should be endorsed and reviewed in a year or two to see how it is working.
- There is concern about over-regulation. The policy should be simplified
- J. Cook, while supporting the policy, was concerned about the considerable degree of opposition and believed that there needs to be a review.

MOTION: That Academic Council recommit the *Policy on Academic Consideration and Appeals*. Moved by J. Cook, seconded by K. Raahemifar.

Motion approved.

MOTION: That Academic Council approve the Student Code of Academic Conduct. Moved by E. Aspevig, seconded by S. Williams

MOTION: That Academic Council recommit the *Student Code of Academic Conduct*. Moved by K. Marciniac. Not seconded.

MOTION: That wording be added to section A1.a regarding the paying of someone to edit and/or proofreading work. Moved by M. Dowler, seconded by E. Trott.

Discussion:

- Allowing for professional editing encourages sloppy writing. An argument can be made that the ideas are not those of the students. Revision is as much a creative activity as is the writing. Students must learn how to express their own ideas.
- Putting a price tag on the process leaves a gaping hole in the issue. Perhaps this could be under the heading of misrepresentation of performance. Students might believe that taking something to the Writing Centre is considered plagiarism. In the Writing Centre students are told to read what they have written.

Amendment defeated.

MOTION: That Section B1.b be changed to include a penalty of a partial or total loss of marks on an assignment. Moved by S. Marshall, seconded, J. Welsh.

Discussion:

- A student member stated that if a student cheats or plagiarizes they deserve to fail the assignment. There needs to be a clear message that cheating is not acceptable.
- A faculty member stated that often plagiarism is more subtle, and the amendment is supported.
- A member of the work group stated that the group had discussed this issue. If an instructor really felt that a student didn't understand what he or she had done, the instructor would craft their own solution. But the policy was meant to send a clear message.

Amendment defeated.

The Motion to approve the Student Code of Academic Conduct was passed.

7. Reports of Actions and Recommendations of Departmental and Divisional Councils – The Vice President, Academic presented the report as outlined in the agenda.

M. Booth, Dean of Continuing Education, reported that CJRT has been working with the Faculty of Arts to review the history courses offered through open college. These will now be offered through distance education.

Report from the School of Graduate Studies: Maurice Yeates reported.

MOTION: That Academic Council approve the submission of the proposal for a *Master of Arts in Immigration and Settlement Studies* to the Ontario Council for Graduate Studies for standard approval. Moved by M. Yeates, seconded by A. Cross

M. Yeates outlined the process by which the program had been extensively reviewed at several levels prior to seeking Academic Council approval for external review. There will be two external reviewers who will visit campus. Myer Siemiatycki and Michael Doucet were introduced to speak for the need for the program and the faculty strength in the area and support for the program.

Motion approved.

MOTION: To approve following changes to the School of Graduate Studies Policy – Policy 142. M. Yeates moved, J. Monro seconded.

The report was presented as outlined in the agenda.

Discussion:

- It was suggested that the Chair of a Master's examining committee should be selected from outside the program. When the Chair is from inside the program, s/he cannot be selected as an examiner. M. Yeates replied that the proposal was to deal with committees in an efficient way at a time when there are many committees working. If a supervisor wishes to have someone else Chair, that can be done.

Motion approved.

There is a further report to academic council from SGS for Academic Council information.

8. Reports of Committees – There were no reports.

9. New Business

MOTION to establish an *ad hoc* committee to review the feasibility of a Fall semester study period: Whereas Ryerson's curriculum has become primarily a semesterized one, and whereas the duration of the Fall and Winter semesters is unfairly unbalanced at present, and in light of the desirability of offering students and faculty an increased opportunity for critical reflection and study, a committee of interested parties be convened to explore the feasibility of introducing a week-long study period into the Fall semester. The committee is charged with reviewing the length of both the Fall and Winter semesters in light of pedagogical needs and the requirements for examination periods, promotion meetings, and grade processing by the Registrar. The committee will be chaired by the Registrar and be made up of two members of faculty, two students, two Chairs, and an ex-officio member of the Registrar's office. The committee will report back to Academic Council at its October 2003 meeting with final decision by Council to be made at the November 20 meeting.

Moved by J. Cook, seconded K.Marciniec.

Discussion:

- There should be an exploration of a reading week in the Fall semester. Students need reflection time and reading beyond the course.
- There is unfairness in the system as work in the Fall semester is done in 13 weeks, in the Winter there are 14 weeks, with a week in the middle.
- There are possible implications for the length of the semester.
- The timing of the final report to Academic Council should be reviewed as it seems to fast.
- Friendly amendment of add “a *maximum* of a week-long study period” .
- In Engineering Faculties, midterm weeks are used for testing. The length of the semester is an important issue. The Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science spoke against the motion.
- Friendly amendment to include one member from each Faculty, including at least 2 Chairs, and no less than 4 student representatives.
- Friendly amendment to include a member of the School of Graduate Studies.
- Friendly amendment to remove the final decision date of November 2003.

Final Motion:

Whereas Ryerson's curriculum has become primarily a semesterized one, and whereas the duration of the Fall and Winter semesters is unfairly unbalanced at present, and in light of the desirability of offering students and faculty an increased opportunity for critical reflection and study, a committee of interested parties be convened to explore the feasibility of introducing a maximum of a week-long study period into the Fall semester. The committee is charged with reviewing the length of both the Fall and Winter semesters in light of pedagogical needs and the requirements for examination periods, promotion meetings, and grade processing by the Registrar. The committee will be chaired by the Registrar and be made up of: one faculty member from each Faculty, including two Chairs; a representative of the School of Graduate Studies; a minimum of four students representing the student body, both full and part-time;

and an *ex officio* member of the Registrar's office. The committee will report back to Academic Council at its October 2003 meeting.

Motion passed.

10. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signature on file)

Diane R. Schulman, PhD
Secretary of Academic Council

DRAFT March 18, 2003

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL

UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC CONSIDERATION AND APPEALS

Policy Number: 134

Approval Date: April 1, 2003

Presented By: Errol Aspevig, Vice President, Academic

Responsible Office: Vice President, Academic

Replaces Policies: Policy 13 – Constitution and Rules of Procedure of the Appeals Committee
Policy 38 – Policies and Procedures on Appeal Deadlines
Policy 134 – Appeals Policy

Implementation Date: Fall 2003

Review Date: Fall 2005

See attached.

RYERSON UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC CONSIDERATION AND APPEALS

Ryerson University is committed to promoting academic success and to ensuring that students' academic records ultimately reflect their academic abilities and accomplishments. The University expects that academic judgments by its faculty will be fair, consistent and objective, and recognizes the need to grant academic consideration, where appropriate, in order to support students who face personal difficulties or events. Academic consideration is the general name given to a number of different alternate arrangements that may be made, dependent upon the circumstances and what is appropriate for both the students and the University, such as the extension of a deadline for an assignment, re-weighting of an exam or assignment because of missed work, the permission to continue on probationary status or the provision of an Aegrotat standing. It should be understood that students can only receive grades which reflect their knowledge of the course material.

This Policy⁴ provides the process by which students may seek academic consideration. It is expected that requests for academic consideration will be made as soon as circumstances arise. The policy also describes the grounds and process by which students may appeal when they believe the academic consideration provided is not appropriate or when they have been unable to informally resolve course-related issues. The University is responsible for dealing with student appeals fairly and must adhere to the timelines established in this policy.

Students should refer to University publications (the Calendars, the Student Guide, and the Academic Council web site) for detailed information on the various types of academic consideration that may be requested; necessary documents such as appeal forms, medical certificates and forms for religious accommodation; and procedural instructions. Students are responsible for reviewing all pertinent information prior to the submission of a formal academic appeal. Incomplete appeals will not be accepted. Students are responsible for ensuring that a formal appeal is submitted by the deadline dates published in the calendar, and must adhere to the timelines established in this policy.

It is the student's responsibility to notify and consult with either the instructor⁵, or the teaching or program department/school, depending on the situation, as soon as circumstances arise that are likely to affect academic performance. (See section I on **Academic Consideration**.) It is also the student's responsibility to attempt to resolve all course related issues with the instructor and then, if necessary, with the Chair/Director⁶ of the teaching department/school as soon as they arise. An appeal may be filed only if the issue cannot be resolved appropriately. (See section IIA on **Grounds for Course Grade Appeal**.)

All issues regarding academic standing should be referred to the Chair/Director of the student's program department/school. (See section IIB on **Grounds for Appeal of Academic Standing**.)

The Academic Appeals process reflects decision-making in an academic environment and, as such, cannot be equated to decision-making in the judicial system. The principles of natural justice and fairness will apply to all decisions made.

I. ACADEMIC CONSIDERATION

IA. GENERAL REGULATIONS

1. Students who have concerns about the grading in a course or course management must normally first discuss them with the instructor as soon as the problem arises.
2. It is the instructor's responsibility to respond when students raise grading or course management issues.
3. When issues are not resolved with an instructor, or when students do not receive a timely response from an instructor, the Chair/Director should be contacted for assistance if students wish to pursue the matter further before launching a formal appeal.

⁴ The "Graduate Student Academic Appeals Policy" applies for the School of Graduate Studies.

⁵ For the purposes of this document, "instructor" shall mean any person who is teaching a course at Ryerson.

⁶ For the purposes of this document, "Chair/Director" shall include Continuing Education Program Directors or the designate of any Chair or Director.

4. If the Chair/Director is the instructor for a course in which an accommodation or alternate arrangement is being requested and the matter cannot be resolved, he or she should request that the Dean appoint an appropriate replacement to act as Chair/Director in the process.
5. It is the Chair/Director's responsibility to be accessible to discuss matters that cannot be resolved between the instructor and the student.
6. Students who are appealing their suspended or withdrawn standing may continue in their program and shall be registered in courses on the basis of a probationary contract until the standing appeal is resolved. Students must pay all appropriate fees. If the appeal is denied and they remain suspended or withdrawn, they will be given a full refund of the fees charged for the program courses in which they enrolled that semester.
7. Students shall be given supervised access to their graded work or final exam, and be permitted to use that work for a reasonable length of time in order to prepare the required explanation for a re-grading request.
8. When necessary, students are responsible for providing all graded work that has been returned and the instructor is responsible for providing all graded work that was not returned to the student.
9. If academic concerns are not resolved with the instructor, or with the Chair/Director, students should consult the specific directions and forms for details on the filing of appeals. These may be found at the Academic Council or Registrar's Office websites. (See section IIC for **Academic Appeals Regulations**.)
- ~~10.~~ In extenuating circumstances, students or university administrators may request an extension be provided by a Chair/Director, Dean or the Secretary of Academic Council, depending upon the level. Decisions will be made in consultation with appropriate parties.
- ~~11.~~ It is the student's responsibility to maintain updated contact information with the Registrar's Office to ensure that all matters related to grades, standings and appeals are properly received.

IB. ALTERNATE ARRANGEMENTS

IB1. Accommodation for Missed Examination and/or Assignment: Religious Observance

Students must have filed the necessary forms for accommodation of religious observance at the beginning of the term. (See policy on **Accommodation of Student Religious Observance Obligations** and related form.)

IB2. Accommodation for Disability

Students should be registered with the Access Centre to acquire assistance in arranging accommodation for a disability.

IB3. Alternate Arrangements for Missed Examination and/or Assignment: Medical or Compassionate

- a. Students shall inform instructors, in advance, when they will be missing an exam, test or assignment deadline for medical or compassionate reasons. When circumstances do not permit this (e.g. in an emergency) the student must inform the instructor as soon as possible. Alternate arrangements may include the setting of a make-up test, transferring the weight of a missed assignment to the final examination or extending a deadline.
- b. Alternate arrangements are based upon the severity of the circumstances and the amount of work missed. Generally, employment commitments will not constitute grounds for academic consideration; however, employment-related issues may be considered as one element of a more complex request for an alternate arrangement.
- c. Students who have acceptable performance in a course but who cannot complete a final examination or assignment due to verifiable medical or compassionate circumstances may submit a petition to Registration and Records, by the deadline published in the calendars, requesting aegrotat (AEG) credit for that course.
- d. Instructors will determine if medical documentation is required for an alternate arrangement based upon the length of the medical condition and the amount and type of the work missed and affected. In the case of illness, a **Ryerson Medical Certificate**, or a letter on letterhead from a physician with the student declaration portion of the Ryerson Medical Certificate attached, is essential for an appeal based on Medical grounds. The Ryerson Medical Certificate and guidelines can be found in the *Student Guide* and at the Registrar's Office and Academic Council web sites. The University may seek verification of medical claims.
- e. It is recognized that compassionate grounds may be hard to document. Nonetheless, students should present as much documentation as possible. For example, a death certificate or notice from a funeral home would be appropriate documentation in the case of a death.

- f. All faculty and staff are required to exercise discretion and adhere to the principles of confidentiality regarding any documentation received.
- g. Unless an “Incomplete” (INC) grade is applicable, the instructor cannot grant extensions beyond the final date for submission of grades as part of an academic consideration.
- h. If an alternate arrangement is not offered, or students do not accept the alternate arrangement offered by an instructor, they may consult with the Chair/Director. If, after this consultation, they still do not accept the alternate arrangement offered, they must document their concern in writing to the Chair/Director and abide by the arrangement to the extent possible. If the test or assignment for which an alternate arrangement has been made becomes a point of contention in the final course grade, the student may appeal the final course grade at the end of the term, on the original medical or compassionate grounds. (See section IIA on **Grounds for Course Grade Appeals**.)
- i. Once an alternate arrangement is accepted, it is final and the grade in the course may not be appealed based upon an allegation of this arrangement being unfair.

IB4. Arrangements for Inability to Complete Term Work in More Than One Course:

- a. If circumstances arise during the semester that affect students’ ability to complete their term work in more than one course, they should consult with the Chair/Director of their program department/school as soon as possible. Failure to do so will jeopardize the ability to provide consideration.
- b. When seeking alternate arrangements, documentation supporting students’ requests must be submitted to their program Chair/ Director, and students must be advised as to what to do on a course-by-course basis as soon as possible. Suggestions may include completing the work in some courses, dropping some courses, requesting extensions of deadlines or requesting grades of “incomplete” (INC). A copy of the suggested arrangement will be kept on record in the department/school.
- c. Each of the student’s instructors must receive an email from the Chair/Director informing him/her that the student will be requesting an alternate arrangement and, if the student requests, the arrangement that has been suggested. Students must contact each instructor to verify that the suggested arrangement is acceptable. Instructors should not require documentation to support the request for an alternate arrangement, as an assessment has already been made.
- d. While it is advisable for students to discuss dropping a course with the instructor, courses may be dropped at the time of the consultation with the Chair/Director. The Chair/Director must inform the involved faculty member that the student has dropped the course. If the drop deadline has passed, approval from the Registrar will be required to drop a course.
- e. If an alternate arrangement is not offered, or students do not accept the alternate arrangement offered, they must document their concern in writing to the Chair/Director and abide by the arrangement to the extent possible. If a test or assignment for which an alternate arrangement has been made becomes a point of contention in the final course grade, the student may appeal the final course grade at the end of the term, on the original medical or compassionate grounds. (See section IIA on **Grounds for Course Grade Appeals**.)

IB5. Advance Consideration of Academic Standing

If, during the semester, students experience medical or compassionate circumstances which may later affect their academic standing, it is the students’ responsibility to bring the situation to the attention of the department/school at the earliest possible time.

IC. GRADE REASSESSMENT

IC1. Merit of Work

- a. At any time during the semester, students who believe that an assignment, test or exam, either in whole or part, has not been appropriately graded must first review their concerns with their instructor within ten (10) working days of

the date when the graded work is returned to the class. It is an instructor's responsibility to return graded work in a timely manner. Grades not questioned within this period will not be reassessed at a later date.

- b. If there is a concern about work returned during the final week of classes, or a final exam or paper, there may not be an opportunity to review the grade with the instructor or to have the work remarked prior to the assignment of a final grade for the course. In this case, a meeting with the instructor should be scheduled as soon as possible. (See section IIA.2 for appeals based on medical grounds and IIA.3 for appeals based on compassionate grounds.)
- c. If an instructor does not agree to review the work or does not respond to the student within five (5) working days, the student may consult the Chair/Director who should assist in resolving the issue and who may initiate a formal reassessment at the earliest possible opportunity.
- d. It is recognized that there are assignments that do not lend themselves to independent re-evaluation, such as presentations or performances. Therefore, these may not be reassessed.
- e. **Reassessment of work by someone other than the instructor**
 - i. The student must submit specific and detailed reasons, in writing to the Chair/Director, as to why the original grade was inappropriate, including any documentary evidence from course notes, textbooks, etc. Asserting that the work deserves more marks or that the student disagrees with the mark is not sufficient support for the reassessment. If the Chair/Director determines that a reassessment is not warranted, he/she may deny that reassessment, and inform the student, in writing, of the reasons and of the right to appeal that decision to the Faculty level⁷ on the grounds of Procedural Error.(See section IIA.5.)
 - ii. Students shall be given supervised access to any graded work that has not been returned or to their final exams, and be permitted to use that work for a reasonable length of time in order to prepare the required explanation for the re-grading request.
 - iii. The instructor will provide to the Chair/Director the grading scheme utilized in evaluating the work.
 - iv. The original graded assignment, test or exam in question must be provided to the Chair/Director by either the student or the instructor.
 - v. A clean copy of the work, with all grading notations deleted indicating the student number but not name, must be provided to the Chair/Director. If it is a paper or assignment, or a test that has been returned to the student, the student must supply the copy. If it is an exam that has not been returned to the student, the instructor must supply the copy.
- f. The work will be remarked by a qualified person other than the original instructor, as determined by the department/school. The department/school may determine if it is more appropriate to remark the entire assignment or only the portions specified by the student. If a partial remarking was requested, the student must be notified of the decision to remark the entire assignment, with an explanation of why the structure of the work warrants such a decision.
- g. If remarking within the university is not possible, another mechanism for reassessment of the material should be arranged. This may include submission to an external assessor.
- h. A reassessment may result in the grade remaining the same, being raised or being lowered. The revised grade cannot be subsequently appealed. If reassessment of the work was not done or has not been done in keeping with this policy, the ground of the appeal is Procedural Error. (See section IIA.5.)

IC2. Calculation Error

- a. If a student believes that there has been a miscalculation of a grade due to an omission, improper addition, etc., the student must contact the instructor to resolve the issue within ten (10) working days of the date when the graded work is returned to the class. It is an instructor's responsibility to return graded work in a timely manner. Grades not questioned within this period will not be recalculated at a later date.
- b. If a recalculation is not done within five (5) working days of the request or the student disagrees with the result, the student must consult with the Chair/Director to assist in resolving the issue as soon as possible.

⁷ All appeals to the Faculty level should be submitted through the office of the Dean of that Faculty.

- c. The grade for the assignment may be higher, lower or the same as the original grade. The revised grade cannot be subsequently appealed.
- d. If recalculation was not done or if an error was made, the ground of the appeal is Procedural Error. (See section IIA.5.)

ID. COURSE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

If at any time during the semester students have concerns about how a course is taught or managed, they should normally first consult with the instructor as soon as the concern arises. If they feel that the matter cannot be discussed with the instructor or if the matter cannot be resolved, students should consult with the Chair/Director.

II. ACADEMIC APPEALS

Academic Appeals are reserved for issues related to grades or academic standings that could not be resolved with an instructor or a Chair/Director. It should be understood that students can only receive grades which reflect their knowledge of the course material.

IIA. GROUNDS FOR COURSE GRADE APPEALS: There are five grounds that may be considered for a grade appeal: Prejudice; Medical; Compassionate; Course Management; and Procedural Error.

IIA1. Prejudice

- a. Claims of prejudice are limited to prohibited grounds as defined by the Ontario Human Rights Code (e.g. race, sex, sexual orientation, disability, etc.). Students who believe their grade has been adversely affected by another form of personal bias or unfair treatment may appeal under the ground of Course Management.
- b. Students must consult with the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Office if filing an appeal on the grounds of prejudice. The Discrimination and Harassment Policy is available on the Ryerson website. That office will do an assessment and make a recommendation to the Chair/Director before the appeal will proceed. This may result in a delay in the appeals process.
- c. If the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Office determines that there is insufficient evidence to support a claim of prejudice on a prohibited ground and the student wishes to proceed on the basis of personal bias or unfair treatment, an appeal may then be filed on the ground of Course Management.
- d. If, during the course of any level of appeal, it is determined that there is a claim of prejudice on a prohibited ground, which was not investigated by the Office of Discrimination and Harassment Prevention, the decision will be delayed until that office has assessed the claim and made a recommendation.

IIA2. Medical

- a. If a medical condition occurs during the term, it is expected that students who wish an alternative arrangement will submit appropriate documentation for work that is missed, and will make alternate arrangements for either a single course or for all courses in that term (See section IB on **Alternate Arrangements**.)
- b. In appeals based on medical grounds, students will be required to submit documentation for the applicable period of time. The documentation should explain the duration of the medical condition and the impact of the medical condition on the students' ability to perform during that period.
- c. Students must submit applicable medical certificates within three (3) working days of an exam to receive consideration for that exam. Documents not submitted within this period will only be accepted under exceptional circumstances.
- d. A **Ryerson Medical Certificate** (See section IB.3.c), or a letter on letterhead from a physician or other relevant health professional with the student declaration portion of the Medical Certificate completed, is required for an appeal on Medical grounds. The University may seek further verification of medical claims.

IIA3. Compassionate

- a. Appeals may be filed on Compassionate grounds when there are events or circumstances beyond the control of and often unforeseen by the student, that seriously impair that student's ability to study, attend classes, prepare papers or write examinations. Instructors should have been informed of these circumstances as soon as they affected a student's ability to complete their work so that alternate arrangements could be made. Failure to have done so may jeopardize the appeal. Alternate arrangements are based upon the severity of the circumstances and the amount of work missed. Generally, employment commitments will not constitute grounds for academic consideration; however, employment-related issues may be considered as one element of a more complex application for consideration.
- b. While it is recognized that compassionate grounds may be hard to document, items such as relevant travel documents, death certificates or notices from a funeral home would be appropriate documentation. It is advisable that students provide as much documentation as possible.
- c. Students must submit applicable documentation within three (3) working days of an exam to receive consideration for that exam. Documents not submitted within this period will only be accepted under exceptional circumstances.

IIA4. Course Management

- a. Appeals may be filed on the ground of Course Management when students believe that a grade has been adversely affected because an instructor has deviated significantly from the course management policies of the University or from the course outline/course management document, or has demonstrated personal bias or unfair treatment.
- b. Students should have brought course management issues to the attention of the instructor and/or the Chair Director when the concern arose. Failure to have done so may jeopardize the appeal.
- c. Where students wish to bring forward evidence that a course was improperly managed, they must provide the course outline/course management document, detail where the deviation occurred and explain how this deviation affected their academic performance.

IIA5. Procedural Error

- a. Appeals may be filed on the ground of Procedural Error when it is believed that there has been an error in the procedure followed in the application of either this policy or any other policy of the University. Appeals granted on this ground will result in rectifying the procedural error. (See section IID.1.d.)
- b. Where students wish to bring forward evidence that an academic regulation or policy was improperly applied or not followed, they should reference both the policy and the alleged error, and explain how this procedural error has affected their academic record. This may include such things as a failure to recalculate a grade or remark an exam, or missing a deadline.

II.B. GROUNDS FOR APPEAL OF ACADEMIC STANDING

Since Academic Standing is determined by students' academic performance, students must provide substantive reasons why their current standing is not appropriate. Standing appeals are generally based on medical or compassionate grounds or procedural error. Requests for changes must have supporting documentation attached.

1. In appeals based on medical grounds, students will be required to submit documentation for the applicable period of time. The documentation should explain the duration of the medical condition, the amount and type of work missed for this time and the impact of the medical condition on the students' ability to perform during that period.
2. Appeals may be filed on Compassionate grounds when there are events or circumstances beyond the control of and often unforeseen by the student, that seriously impair a student's ability to study, attend classes, prepare papers or write examinations. Instructors or Chairs/Directors should have been informed of these circumstances as soon as they affected a student's ability to complete their work so that alternate arrangements could be made. Failure to have done so may jeopardize the appeal. (See section IIA.3 on employment related concerns.)

3. Appeals may be filed on the ground of Procedural Error when it is believed that there has been an error in the procedure followed in the application of either this policy or any other policy of the University.

IIC. ACADEMIC APPEALS REGULATIONS

1. Each department/school must determine who shall respond to student appeals. The Chair or Director, a Department/School Appeals Officer, or a Department/School Appeals Committee may consider appeals at the Department/School level. This information must be provided to students and to the Secretary of Academic Council.
2. Each Faculty must determine who shall respond to student appeals. The Dean, a Faculty Appeals Officer or a Faculty Appeals Committee may consider appeals at the Faculty level. This information must be provided to students and to the Secretary of Academic Council.
3. In cases involving Continuing Education courses that are not housed in a specific Faculty, the Dean of Continuing Education, an Appeals Officer or an Appeals Committee shall consider the appeal. This information must be provided to students and to the Secretary of Academic Council.
4. The Appeals Committee of Academic Council shall hear appeals at the Academic Council level.
5. No member may serve on a Department/School or Faculty Appeals Committee, or as a Department/ School or Faculty Appeals Officer, and concurrently serve on the Academic Council Appeals Committee.
6. All individuals who have responsibility for deciding appeals, including Chairs/Directors, members of Appeals Committees, and all Appeals Officers shall be required to attend training session(s) conducted by the Office of the Secretary of Academic Council prior to making any appeals decisions.
7. Statistics on the type, grounds and outcome of appeals must be reported to the Secretary of Academic Council at the end of each term.

IID ACADEMIC APPEALS

IID.1. Department/School Level Appeals

- a All appeals at the Department/School level must be filed by the deadline stated in the Ryerson Calendars using the forms (and instructions), available on the Academic Council and Registration and Records websites, or from schools and departments. Appeals will normally be submitted in person. In order to ensure that the appropriate person receives an appeal, Fax submissions will only be accepted where prior arrangements have been made. Original documents must follow by mail. All documents to be presented as evidence must be attached to the appeal.
- b Students who do not receive their final grades because of outstanding debt to the University risk missing the deadline for filing an appeal. Grades will not be officially released to students with outstanding debt.
- c If Students are appealing their final course grades they must appeal to the department/school in which the course was taught. If they are appealing their academic standing, they must appeal to their program department/school.
- d Students who have attempted to resolve a Merit of Work or Calculation Error and have not had the matter resolved prior to the appeal deadline, or who have not yet received a response from an instructor or a Chair/Director, and who wish to appeal, may submit a formal appeal on the ground of Procedural Error by the deadline. This appeal may be withdrawn at a later date if the issue is resolved.
- e Students who wish to appeal a final course grade must first consult with the instructor and/or Chair/Director. Students who wish to appeal an academic standing must first consult the Chair/Director. This consultation must occur as soon as possible after their grades and/or notice of academic standing are posted, allowing enough time to meet the deadline for the last date to appeal.
- f If students appeal only an academic standing, it will be deemed that the grade(s) upon which the academic standing was based have been accepted.

- g If students have initiated more than one appeal, it shall be determined whether the various appeals should be heard concurrently or sequentially.
- h If there is both a grade appeal and a standing appeal, students must inform their program department/school of the grade appeal at the time the standing appeal is filed. If the grade appeal is for a course not within the students' department/school, the program department/school-must receive the decision on the grade appeal before the standing appeal can be heard. If both appeals are to the same department/school, the appeals may be considered at the same time.
- i If a grade appeal is delayed because there is an unresolved Merit of Work reassessment or recalculation, the related standing appeal may also be delayed.
- j If there is a concurrent appeal of a charge of academic misconduct, related to a grade or academic standing appeal, the misconduct appeal will be heard first, and the decision, if relevant, forwarded to the appropriate department/school. As per the Student Code of Academic Conduct, a grade of "DEF" may be assigned while a misconduct charge is under investigation.
- k For Continuing Education Courses the CE Program Director shall act as Chair/Director, and shall consult with Program Coordinators or instructors as necessary concerning the appeal.
- l Appeals of final grades submitted as a result of completing an "incomplete" (INC) must be filed within ten (10) working days of the posting of the new grade.
- m The program department/school is not required to consider an appeal of an academic standing if the grade appeal was denied and it was the sole basis of the standing appeal or if the grade appeal was granted and the standing is automatically changed as a result.
- n Students must receive a written response within ten (10) working days of the receipt of the appeal by the department/school. The result of the appeal will be deemed to have been received by the fifth working day following the postmark date on the envelope. Students are responsible for contacting the department/school if they have not received a response in the specified time period.

IID2. Faculty Level Appeals

- a. Appeals must be filed within ten (10) working days of receipt of the decision at the Department/School level and must be based upon one or more of the five grounds listed in section IIA and standing appeals must be based on the grounds found in section IIB. Grade Appeals are filed with the Faculty in which the course is taught and Standing Appeals are filed with the student's program Faculty. Forms and instructions found on the Academic Council and Registration and Records websites, or from the Dean's office, must be utilized.
- b. If the Faculty fails to respond to a student's appeal within the stipulated time period, and there has been no prior agreement between the student and the Dean or delegate to extend the time period, the student is permitted to proceed directly to the Academic Council Appeals Committee.
- c. If students do not proceed within the timeline stipulated, the appeal will be considered terminated. Suspended/withdrawn students will be removed from their courses once the time for the appeal has expired without an appeal being launched.
- d. Students must receive a written response within ten (10) working days of the receipt of the appeal by the Dean. The letter must clearly state the basis on which the decision was reached. The result of the appeal will be deemed to have been received by the fifth working day following the postmark date on the envelope. Students are responsible for contacting the Dean's office if they have not received a response in the specified time period. The Dean's office must send copies of the decision to the instructor, the Chair/Director, the Registrar and the Secretary of Academic Council.

IID3. Appeals to the Academic Council Appeals Committee

- a. Students must submit an appeal to the Secretary of Academic Council within ten (10) working days of receipt of the Faculty Level response. Forms and instructions for the filing of Appeals can be found at the Registration and Records or Academic Council websites, or are available from the office of the Secretary of Academic Council.
- b. Conflict of Interest A member of an Appeals Panel should not have had any prior involvement with the case. A member of a Hearing Panel, a student or an instructor (appellant and respondent) must disclose any conflict of interest, if known, no less than five (5) working days before the hearing. Unless the conflict of interest is resolved, the Panel member shall be replaced. If either party raises a conflict of interest regarding any Panel member(s) once the Hearing has begun, the Hearing Panel will judge the validity of the conflict and will decide on whether the Panel member may sit on the appeal. The Panel member(s) that is challenged may offer a statement but may not take part in the Panel's decision on the conflict. If the Panel member with the conflict is excused and there is no quorum, the Hearing shall be adjourned and a new hearing scheduled with a new Panel member.
- c. Burden and Standard of Proof: In an Academic appeal the onus is on the student to show that the original decision was incorrect. The standard of proof in all decisions shall be "a balance of probabilities." This means that, in order for students to be granted their appeals, they must show the Panel that it is more likely than not that the original decision was incorrect.
- d. The Secretary of Academic Council shall
 - i. review the appeal to determine if it is complete and is within the deadline.
 - ii. immediately forward the appeal to the Chair/Director who shall be the respondent, and who shall reply to the appeal within five (5) working days of receipt, including any documents to be submitted as evidence. The Registrar must also receive a copy of the appeal.
 - iii. establish a Hearing Panel of the Academic Council Appeals Committee and appoint a Hearing Panel Chair. (See section IID.3.c for regulations on Conflict of Interest.)
 - iv. determine, in consultation with the Chair of the Hearing Panel if, given the grounds of the appeal, it is necessary to call the instructor and/or the Chair/Director to be present
 - v. schedule a hearing based upon the availability of the student and the instructor or Chair/Director. Both parties must receive at least ten (10) working days notice of the date, time and place of the hearing. An appeal may be scheduled with less than ten (10) working days notice with the written agreement of both parties.
 - vi. forward all of the submissions for the appeal, including a copy of the student's academic record where relevant, to: all members of the Hearing Panel; the Chair/Director and any instructors who will be attending the hearing; the Registrar; the student; and the student's advocate, if any. Students must receive appeals information related to their Hearing from the Secretary of Academic Council either in person by prior arrangement or by courier. It will be deemed that the information has been received on the date it was picked up or couriered.
- e. All Hearings shall be conducted in accordance with the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act (SPPA)*. A copy of the SPPA is available for review in the office of the Secretary of Academic Council.
- f. Hearing Regulations:
 - i. The Chair/Director shall be the respondent in the appeal, and shall be accompanied, when possible, by relevant faculty.
 - ii. If either party fails to attend the Hearing, the Appeals Committee may proceed in his or her absence.
 - iii. Both parties may bring witnesses, who shall be present at the hearing only while giving testimony, advocates or legal council at this level.
 - iv. The Hearing Panel may adjourn the Hearing when it is required for a fair process.
 - v. An oral Hearing may be open to the public except when the Hearing Panel is of the opinion that matters involving public security may be disclosed or the person disclosing intimate financial or personal matters may be negatively affected by doing so if the public is present.
 - vi. In order to provide advice on the process and information on a student's academic record, the Secretary of Academic Council and a representative of the Registrar's office, respectively, may be present at the Hearing.

g. Decisions

- i. The Hearing Panel may not award a numerical grade, or require any action contrary to another university policy or collective agreement.
- ii. The Hearing Panel may
 - a. deny the appeal.
 - b. grant the appeal
 - c. grant the appeal in part subject to conditions, or attach any conditions to any decision. If the student does not accept the conditions attached, the appeal will be considered as denied.
- iii. The letter to the student, outlining the decision of the Hearing Panel clearly stating the basis on which the decision was reached, must be sent by the Panel Chair to the Secretary of Academic Council, who will send a copy to the student by courier or give a copy personally to the student by prior arrangement within five (5) working days. The Secretary of Academic Council must send a copy of the decision to the Chair, the Dean and the Registrar.
- iv. Decisions of the Appeals Committee of Academic Council are final and binding.
- v. Based upon matters arising at the Hearing, the Hearing Panel or Appeals Officer may make recommendations on procedural or policy matters to the Appeals Committee of Academic Council, the Secretary of Academic Council, a Department/School or Faculty Appeals Committee or Appeals Officer, a Dean or the Registrar's Office.

**Composition of *Ad Hoc* Committee on
Fall Semester Study Break**

Keith Alnwick, Registrar, Chair
John Cook, Chair, English (Arts)
Peter Pille, ITM (Business)
Suanne Kelman, Journalism (Communication & Design)
Jim Mars, Chair, Urban & Regional Planning (Community Services)
Mehmet Zetinoglu, Electrical Engineering, Engineering & Applied Science
Fil Salustri, Graduate Studies
Dawn Little, Associate Registrar
Ryan Rodrigues, Student, Continuing Education
Truc Nguyen, Student, Fashion
Issa Guindo, Student, Business Management
Tania Petrov, Student, Aerospace Engineering

To be approved:
Stalin Boctor, Dean, Engineering & Applied Science
Desmond Glynn, Continuing Education

Initiating School/Department: Continuing Education

Date of Submission: March 18, 2003

Is this the Teaching School/Department, Program School/Department, or both? **Program Department**

Please add extra rows as needed if multiple courses are involved.

(Signature on file) _____
Vice President, Academic

March 20, 2003 _____
Date

Course Code/ Number	Course Title	Nature of Change (Use letters to indicate where provided)				Program(s)/ School(s)/ Department(s) affected and informed of change	Purpose of Change	Minors Affected	Implementation Date
		Hours and Mode	New Course (Y/N)	Re-position(R) Addition (A) Deletion(D)	Required(R) Elective(E) Professional- Elective(PE) Professionally- Related Elective (PRE)				
	Certificate name change from: Certificate in Quantitative Management Methods To Certificate in Business Analysis					School of Business Management	Name change would reflect the new mix of elective courses added to the certificate		Fall 2003
CMKT 423	Marketing Research	3L	N	A	E	Certificate in Quantitative Management Methods	Retain existing four required courses in the certificate and add six new courses to the elective list. This would expand electives to include courses from other functional areas.		Fall 2003
				A					
				A					
CITM 611	Business Information	3L	N		E				
CHTH 102	Systems II	3L	N		E				

(C)MKT 723	Service and Professionalism	3L	N	A	E				
	Services Marketing and Management	3L	N	A	E				
CMGT 402	Introduction to Managerial Economics	3L	N		E				
CCMN 313	Report Writing								

Submission to the Continuing Education Divisional Council

Date: December 11, 2002

Name of Certificate:
Certificate in Quantitative Management Methods

School and Department:
Continuing Education Division

Submitted by:
Doug McKessock, Coordinator, Quantitative Management Methods
Claudette Smith, Program Director, Continuing Education-Business

Subject:
Proposed changes to the Certificate in Quantitative Management Methods

Rationale:
The existing certificate in Quantitative Methods has produced very few graduates in recent years. The focus on QMS alone has not been attractive in an atmosphere where minors are the norm. Even if a student wanted to obtain a part-time degree in the Economics and Management Science major, many of the courses would not be required.

We still believe that there are many students and employers who value an education with strong emphasis on quantitative capabilities in order to improve decision-making and implement research. We are suggesting that we keep the existing four required courses, but expand the electives to include courses from other functional areas. The total number of courses required will remain at eight. As an example, we are including Marketing Research. Astute and interested students would bundle this course with our Research (CQMS 641) and Regression Analysis (CQMS 442) to prepare for diverse careers involving research. Note that the student would need to have the prerequisite, Marketing 100, but nine courses are not prohibitive.

A similar link with Management or Hospitality Quality Service courses and our Quality courses is also possible. Furthermore, our Management Science courses would complement some Management Logistics courses.

Since the courses being considered for addition are more likely to “run”, because of their applicability in other minors, certificates and degrees, accessibility to the certificate will improve. The new potential for focusing on various business functions should in itself generate a vigorous demand. Interestingly enough, the broad choice of courses will appeal to others who want a variety of analytical tools.

As with all new directions, a name change is in order. We believe the name "**Certificate in Business Analysis**" reflects the new mix. It is well linked to a variety of positions across many industries.

Current Certificate:

Required Courses:

CITM 102 Business Information Systems
CMGT 200 Introduction to Management
CQMS 102 Business Statistics I
CQMS 202 Business Statistics II

Electives: (4 courses required)

CQMS 402 Quality Management
CQMS 442 Multiple Regression for Business
CQMS 521 Business Optimization
CQMS 621 Introduction to Quality Control
CQMS 641 Business Research

Recommendations:

1. Change the name to "**Certificate in Business Analysis**"
2. Add the following courses to the Electives Group:
CMKT 423 Marketing Research*
CITM 611 Business Information Systems II (Database as a Decision Support System)
CHTH 102 Service and Professionalism (Service Quality)+
or
(C)MKT 723 Service Marketing and Management+**
CMGT 402 Introduction to Managerial Economics
CCMN 313 Report Writing

*CMKT 100 is a prerequisite
+these courses exclude each other

Note to Electives:

For a Research focus select, CMKT 423, CQMS 442 and 641 and one other.
For a Quality Management focus select, CQMS 402, 621, one of CHTA 102 or CMKT 723 and one other.

Approval:

Approval by C.E. Divisional Council is requested at this time, conditional upon approval by Business Council in January 2003.

Implementation Date:

Fall 2003.

Initiating School/Department: Continuing Education

Date of Submission

Is this the Teaching School/Department, Program School/Department, or both? **Program Department**

Please add extra rows as needed if multiple courses are involved.

(Signature on file)

March 20, 2003

Vice President, Academic

Date

Course Code/ Number	Course Title	Nature of Change (Use letters to indicate where provided)				Program(s)/ School(s)/ Department(s) affected and informed of change	Purpose of Change
		Hours and Mode	New Course (Y/N)	Re-position(R) Addition (A) Deletion(D)	Required(R) Elective(E) Professional-Elective(PE) Professionally-Related Elective (PRE)		
	Name Change: from Certificate in Marketing to Certificate in Marketing Management						Because of the change proposed to the certificate a broader title would be more appropriate
(C)MKT 723	Services Marketing and Management	3 L	N	A	E	School of Business Mgmt.	The addition of this course to the elective list of the certificate will enhance the student's experience and engagement in this program. The student will be responsible for technical development of the marketing plan. The student will be responsible for taking on responsibilities including budgeting.
CACC 100	Introductory Financial Accounting	3L	N	A	E		
CITM 350	Concepts of eBusiness	1 lab 3L	N	A	E		

Submission to the Continuing Education Divisional Council

Date: December 11, 2002

Name of Certificate:
Certificate in Marketing

School and Department:
Continuing Education Division

Submitted by:
Peter Luk, Coordinator, Marketing
Claudette Smith, Program Director, Continuing Education-Business

Subject:
Proposed changes to the Certificate in Marketing.

Rationale:
The proposed changes to the certificate emphasize the skills of people engaged in this industry with responsibilities beyond the technical development of a marketing plan. The completion of this certificate will enable them to take on managerial responsibilities including planning and budgeting and so a broader certificate title is appropriate.
Proposed new name: **Certificate in Marketing Management.**

Additions to Elective Courses:
We propose the addition of the highlighted (in bold) courses to the list of electives in this certificate. These choices have been made on the basis of student feedback information and research on needs and competencies in the industry.

Required Courses (5 courses required)

CMKT 100	Marketing I
CMKT 200	Marketing II
CMKT 423	Marketing Research
CMKT 502	Consumer Behavior
CMKT 504	Effective Persuasion

Electives (3 courses required)

CMKT 403	Marketing Communications I
CMKT 503	Marketing Communications II
CMKT 522	International Marketing
CMKT 530	Internet Marketing
CMKT 621	Business-to-Business Marketing
(C)MKT723	Services Marketing and Management
CACC 100	Introductory Financial Accounting
CQMS 102	Business Statistics I
CITM 350	Concepts of eBusiness

Approval:

Approval by C.E. Divisional Council is requested at this time, conditional upon approval by Business Council in January 2003.

Implementation Date:

Fall 2003

Initiating School/Department: Continuing Education

Date of Submission: March 18, 2003

Is this the Teaching School/Department, Program School/Department, or both? _____

Please add extra rows as needed if multiple courses are involved.

(Signature on file) _____

March 20, 2003

Vice President, Academic

Date

Course Code/#	Course Title	Nature of Change (Use letters to indicate where provided)				Program(s)/ School(s)/ Department(s) affected and informed of change	Purpose of Change	Minors Affected	Implementation Date
		Hrs/Mode	New (Y/N)	Re-position(R) Addition (A) Deletion(D)	Required(R) Elective(E)				
CVGE140	Introduction to Aging Part I	42	N	R		CE & GER	The contents of CVGE 140 & 141 were reviewed by the Gerontology Curriculum Advising Committee and approved February 17.	F2003	
CVGE 141	Introduction to Aging Part II	42	N	R		CE & GER	See above note.	F2003	
CECE 901	Intergenerational Programs	42	N	D		CE & GER	This is being discontinued in the new ECE curriculum. It is replaced by CGER 202 in the Certificate	F2003	
CGER 202	Intergenerational Relationships	42	Y	A		CE & GER	Approved by the Gerontology Curriculum Advising Committee February 17, 2003.	F2003	
CVGE 401	Research and Practice	42	N	D		CE & GER	CVGE 401 is discontinued	F2003	

CGER 205	Research and Practice	42	Y	A		CE & GER	CVGE 401 is replaced by CGER 205 as approved by the Gerontology Curriculum Advising Committee on March 10, 2003		F2003
-----------------	-----------------------	----	---	---	--	----------	---	--	-------

Report of the Composition & By-Laws Committee
#W2003-2
April 1, 2003

1. It is proposed that the current Academic Appeals Committee and the Student Discipline Committee of Academic Council be combined into one Appeals Committee of Academic Council. This restructuring is in keeping with the revised Student Code of Academic Conduct. Currently the Student Discipline Committee hears very few cases. The Appeals Committee has more experience in the hearing process and it is felt that combining these two committees will enhance the appeals process.

1 a) Current Composition and Terms of Reference of the Academic Appeals Committee:

Composition: Twenty-five (25) members: Fifteen (15) faculty representatives, three from each Faculty, with one of the fifteen being a member of graduate studies; one (1) representative from continuing education; the Director of Student Services or designate (1); five (5) students, one representative from each Faculty; one (1) graduate student; one (1) continuing education student; and one (1) additional student.

Terms of Reference: The Appeals Committee will be responsible for assessing academic appeals submitted by undergraduate, continuing education or graduate students who appeal a decision of a Dean/Designate who has denied an appeal involving medical or compassionate grounds, course management; prejudice, misapplication of an academic regulation, Aegrotat standing, and/or academic standing.

1b) Current Composition and Terms of Reference of the Student Discipline Committee:

Composition:

Fifteen (15) members to include: ten faculty (10), two representatives of each Faculty; five (5) students, one from each faculty.

Terms of Reference:

- to act on behalf of Academic Council in responding to issues referred to it under Ryerson's Code of Student Conduct. Five (5) member subcommittees of the whole containing at least one student will be convened in the case of a Student Discipline hearing.

1c) Proposed Composition and Terms of Reference of the Academic Council Appeals Committee:

Composition: Twenty-five (25) members: Fifteen (15) faculty representatives, three from each Faculty; two (2) representatives of Continuing Education (defined by the By-Laws as those who are full-time teaching faculty and who are teaching at least one course in Continuing Education in the year of their election, or who serve on Continuing Education committees, such as the Continuing Education Divisional Council); five (5) students, one from each Faculty; one (1) graduate student; one (1) continuing education student; and one (1) additional student. Members of the Committee may not concurrently be serving in any appeals capacity at the department/school or Faculty level.

Terms of Reference: Hearing Panels of the Appeals Committee of Academic Council shall consist of at least four (4) members of the Committee, at least one (1) of whom must be a student. A quorum shall consist of at least four (4) members, including the Panel Chair and at least one student. The Panel Chair may vote in case of a tie.

Hearing Panels will hear appeals of decisions made at the Faculty level and the Appeals Committee of the School of Graduate Studies on matters related to both the Policy on Academic Consideration and Appeals, the Student Code of Academic Conduct and the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The grounds for such appeals are stated in those Policies.

Hearing Panels will also be convened when Disciplinary Suspension is automatically assigned for a second violation of the Student Code of Academic Conduct, or when Disciplinary Suspension, Disciplinary Withdrawal or Expulsion is recommended.

All Hearings shall be conducted in accordance with the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act (SPPA)* and the guidelines established by the Policies. Hearings shall follow procedures outlined in the Guide to Appeals Hearings, which is available from the Secretary of Academic Council.

All members of the Appeals Committee of Academic Council will be required to attend training sessions(s) conducted by the Office of the Secretary of Academic Council.

Motion #1: *That Academic Council amend its By-Laws with respect to the Composition and Terms of Reference of the Academic Council Appeals Committee, formed to combine the current academic Appeals Committee and the Student Discipline Committee.*

2. Proposed Composition of the Research Ethics Review Board:

A Chair (1), who shall be nominated by the Associate Vice President, Academic, in consultation with the Research Ethics Board; six (6) faculty members, one from each Faculty and one from the School of Graduate Studies; two (2) community members; two (2) undergraduate students; one (1) graduate student; the Associate Vice President, Academic or designate (ex-officio) (1); the Director of the Office of Research Services or designate (ex-officio) (1); ~~(Additional members will be added as required.)~~ **If there is not at least one member who is knowledgeable in the relevant law, an additional member with such expertise may be appointed.**

Motion #2: *That Academic Council amend its By-Laws with respect to the composition of the Research Ethics Review Board as outlined in this report.*

3. Proposed Composition of the Awards and Ceremonials Committee:

Composition: *Fourteen (14) voting* members to include: the President (1); five (5) faculty (one representative of each Faculty/Division); five (5) Deans/Chairs/Directors (one from each Faculty, at least one must be a Chair/Director); two (2) representatives from Continuing Education; Dean of Graduate Studies or designate (1). ***The Registrar shall serve as an ex-officio, non-voting member.***

Motion #3: *That Academic Council amend its By-Laws with respect to the composition of the Awards and Ceremonials Committee as outlined in this report.*

4. School of Retail Management – School Council By Laws (attached)

Motion #4: *That Academic Council approve the School of Retail Management – School Council By-Laws.*

Respectfully submitted,

(Signature on file)

Claude Lajeunesse, Chair of the Committee:

Greg Inwood	Darrick Heyd
David Martin	Ali Lohi
Andrew Furman	Diane Schulman
Gloria Roberts-Fiati	

SCHOOL OF RETAIL MANAGEMENT

PROPOSED SCHOOL COUNCIL BY-LAWS AND PROCEDURES

Council Objectives

The function of the School Council of the School of Retail Management shall be to approve curriculum changes as well as to develop, review and recommend policies relevant to the School in a manner which is consistent with the general policy of the University (ie, Faculty leave requests). Its function is also to contribute to fostering two-way communication between Faculty and the entire student body, not just with student representatives.

On-going annual objectives will be established at the initial meeting in September of each year. The Council may revoke or amend the objectives by a majority vote of the Council at any time. Any proposed changes must be forwarded to each member one week prior to the next meeting of the Council to allow for an adequate review period.

Composition and Voting

The Council shall be composed of the Director of the School, all full-time members of the teaching Faculty and representatives chosen by and from the part time Instructors of the School. At least one (1) part time Instructor shall sit on the School Council. The number of Part Time Instructors on the Council shall be chosen to bring the total of Faculty/Instructor positions on the Council to a minimum of three (3). The Director of the School has voting privileges. The Retail Students' Association Year Representatives will represent the student body on the Council. The School will inform all program students at least one week in advance of the time and location of the representative votes for each year. To serve on the Council, a student representative must have, and maintain, a clear academic standing for the duration of their term.

If a student is unable to fulfil his/her Council obligations as determined by him/herself or by a majority vote of the Council they will no longer be able to serve as the RSA class representative. The RSA will be required to hold an election to fill their vacant position and the subsequent position on the Council.

If a Part Time Instructor is unable to fulfil his/her Council obligations as determined by him/herself or by a majority vote of the Council, a vote will occur with the Part Time Instructors (CUPE members) to vote in a representative.

Council members' voting privileges are noted below. In the event of a tie, the *Director of the School* will have an additional vote to break ties. Voting cannot occur by proxy.

The membership and voting privileges of the School Council are as follows:

<u>Membership</u>	<u>Voting Privilege</u>
Director of the School	2 votes/director
All Full-Time Faculty Members (RFA members)	2 votes/person
Part-Time Instructors (CUPE members – number elected below)	2 votes/person
Students (the representatives of each year will be automatically appointed)	1 votes/rep

The number of faculty on the Council must total to a minimum of three (3). For example, with one Full-Time Faculty, two Part-Time Faculty Members will be required. The Part-Time Faculty on the Council will be elected by the Part-Time Faculty.

The Student Representatives total five (5), one from each of the second, third and fourth years and two (2) from the first year (covering incoming class sections). For voting purposes, only one of the RSA First Year Representatives will have a vote in any term. To accomplish this, the section 001 Representative will have the first year vote in the Fall term, the 002 Representative in the Winter term.

Term of Office - Elections of Student Representatives

The term of office will begin on September 1st, and continue for one year, ending on August 31st. The student representatives are required to discuss and understand their years' issues and opportunities and bring them to the School Council for review.

Responsibilities and Ethical Behaviour

A standard explanation of the responsibilities and ethical behaviours required of Council members is to be given to each member of the Council in September of each year to be signed and returned to the chair signifying understanding of such responsibilities and behaviour.

Quorum

Quorum for School Council meetings will not be less than fifty percent (50%) of the members with voting privileges, with a composition of at least 2 Faculty/Instructors and 2 students present.

Chair of Council

The Director of the School shall act as chair of the School Council. S/he is responsible for preparing the agendas and for conducting meetings.

Minute-Taker/Meeting Secretary

A Minute-Taker will be appointed at the beginning of the commitment and last for one term only. The Minute-Taker will be the RSA First Year Representative who does not have voting privileges in that term. The Minute-Taker will be responsible for recording the proceedings of the meeting and attendance. S/he will forward a copy of the minutes to the Administrative Assistant in the

School of Retail Management. The Administrative Assistant will arrange for proofreading and distribution of the minutes to all Council Members.

Notices of Meeting

A notice in writing (letter or email) of a School Council meeting will be sent to all Council members at least fourteen (14) days prior to the date of a meeting. Each future meeting will be established at the end of the previous one.

Agenda Items

To be included in an upcoming meeting, agenda items must be submitted for consideration at least one week prior to the date of the meeting to the chair. Agendas will be sent out five (5) working days in advance of the meeting.

Amendments

The council may revoke, amend or re-enact these by-laws by a two-thirds vote of the Council at any time. Any proposed changes must be forwarded to each member one week prior to the next meeting of the Council to allow for an adequate review period.

Subcommittees

In adhering to Ryerson's policy requiring a Curriculum Subcommittee, the School operates with the entire School Council serving as the Curriculum Subcommittee, due to the size of the School of Retail Management.

**Report of the Nominating Committee
W2003-3
April 1, 2003**

The following people have been duly elected to Academic Council for either a first or second term by their respective constituencies. Their terms shall begin in Fall 2003.

Motion: That Academic Council approve the candidates elected as representatives for 2003-04.

Faculty of Arts

Faculty

John Cook Chair, English
Michelle Dionne Psychology
Marie Dowler English

Students

Christopher Livett Geography
Sean Marshall Geography

Faculty of Business

Faculty

Katherine Penny Chair, Hospitality & Tourism
Maurice Mazerolle Business Management
Jane Monro Business Management
Alex Pevec ITM

Students

Zaker Khan Business Management
Ben Miu ITM

Faculty of Communication & Design

Faculty

Perry Schneiderman Director, Theatre
Sheila O'Neill Bus & Tech Communication
Bernie Murray Fashion

Students

Robin Dutt Theatre
Benjamin Lewis Image Arts

Faculty of Community Services

Faculty

Lillie Lum Nursing & HSM
Nina-Marie Lister Urban & Regional Planning

Students

Rebecca Nazareth Nutrition
Vashti Campbell Social Work

Faculty of Engineering & Applied Science

Faculty

Ginette Turcotte Chair, Chem. Bio & Chem. Eng
Fil Salustri Mechanical Engineering
David Mason Math, Physics & Computer Science

Students

Ben McClure Industrial Engineering
Moyeed Uddin Ahmed Elec. & Computer Eng.

Continuing Education

Students

Ryan Rodrigues
Stacy Mirowski

Graduate Studies

Students

Mahdi Sabri, Electrical and Computer Engineering
Neda Felorzabihi, Chemical Engineering

Alumni

Jacob Gryn

Motion: That Academic Council approve the following nomination to complete an unfilled term on the Academic Standards Committee: Ron Stagg, Arts representative (History)

Respectfully submitted,

(Signature on file)

Ava Cross, Chair of the Nominating Committee:

Alex Pevec Ken Marciniac
Donna Smith Christine DeSouza
Gloria Roberts-Fiati Kaamran Raahemifar
Stalin Boctor Carla Cassidy

REPORT #W2003-2 OF THE ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE

April 1, 2003

In this report we bring our recommendations on a proposed degree completion program in *Early Childhood Education*.

Additional documentation on this item is available from the Secretary of Academic Council.

Proposed Degree Completion Program in *Early Childhood Education*

The School of Early Childhood Education (ECE) proposes to establish a degree completion program for graduates of an enriched Early Childhood Studies diploma program at George Brown College. In the proposed arrangement, up to forty graduates of the enriched diploma program will be admitted annually to the third year of Ryerson's ECE program.

"Enrichment" in this instance involves two variables.

1. To be admitted to the special George Brown cohort, students will have to satisfy all admission requirements of the Ryerson ECE program. These include OSSD or equivalent, with a minimum of six OAC and/or Grade 12 U/M credits including OAC or Grade 12 U English/Anglais, Grade 11 or higher Mathematics or Science (Biology, Chemistry, or Physics) and/or Grade 11 U or M or Grade 12 U Mathematics or Science.

In addition, applicants must present a valid Red Cross or St. John Ambulance First Aid Certificate, medical documentation o a clear standard two-step T.B. test. Students are required to complete an annual police reference check.

2. As part of their diploma program, students in the special cohort will complete six university level courses approved by Ryerson. Three of these will be professionally-related courses (History of Social Policy in Canada, Introduction to Psychology, and Competent Learner and Reflective Practitioner) taken over and above the standard diploma program. The other three are general education courses that have been approved by Ryerson as lower level liberal studies equivalents. Currently approved courses are The Pleasure of Inquiry: An Introduction to Philosophy, Working in the 21st Century, and Introduction to Canadian Politics.

The standard diploma program includes 32 credits as outlined in the appendix to this report.

Under the terms of this proposal, all graduates of the special cohort will be offered admission to year three of the Ryerson ECE program. Graduation from George Brown College is based on a cumulative GPA of 1.7, or C-. As clear academic standing at Ryerson requires a GPA of 2.0 or higher, students admitted from George Brown with a GPA between 1.7 and 2.0 will be admitted on probationary standing. The School of Early Childhood Education has mechanisms in place for extra academic advising and student counseling that may be required by George Brown entrants.

If approved, this proposal would see graduates of the enriched George Brown program eligible for admission to Ryerson in Fall, 2005.

ASC Evaluation

This proposal involves a number of innovative steps including enrichment of the diploma program's admission requirements and curriculum and the potential for admission to Ryerson of college graduates with a GPA of as

low as 1.7. The ASC has concluded that this experiment is justifiable on academic grounds and worthwhile for its benefits to college graduates. We note that the School of Early Childhood Education has considerable experience with George Brown graduates who have entered Ryerson on a direct entry basis, and that the experience has been extremely positive.

This being said, the committee is of the view that careful monitoring of the initiative is imperative. This is reflected in our recommendation below.

We have some discomfort with the limited selection of courses available to special cohort students to satisfy lower level liberal studies requirements. Three such courses are required and at present only three George Brown courses have been approved as Ryerson liberal studies equivalents.

Recommendation

Having satisfied itself of the academic merit of this proposal, the Academic Standards Committee recommends:

- That Academic Council approve the proposed degree completion program in Early Childhood Education, subject to the following requirements:
- X That additional liberal studies equivalents (approved by Ryerson in the normal manner) be incorporated into the George Brown enriched program no later than Fall, 2004.
- X That the School of Early Childhood Education provide a detailed report on the academic success of students admitted through this initiative. (The report to be submitted annually to the Dean of Community Services, Registrar, and Vice President, Academic for the first three years of student intake, i.e., spring, 2006 - spring, 2008.)
- X That an annual academic review process, with mechanisms for adjustments as warranted, be written into the signed agreement between Ryerson and George Brown College.

Respectfully submitted by

(Signature on file)

Errol Aspevig,
for the committee

K. Alnwick (Registrar)
C. De Souza (student, Food and Nutrition)
I. Engel (Psychology)
Z. Fawaz (Aerospace)
K. Gates (Nursing)
A. Gillis (Mathematics, Physics, and Computer Science)
D. Glynn (Continuing Education)
R. Goldsmith (Geography)
R. Keeble (Urban and Regional Planning)
J. Logan (Information Technology Management)
A. Mitchell (Interior Design)
D. Snyder (Image Arts)
D. Sydor (Business Management)

APPENDIX: PROPOSED GEORGE BROWN CURRICULUM

Year One

Semester 1 (14 weeks)	Semester 2 (14 weeks)
<p>Regular ECE Diploma Program:</p> <p>Infant and Child Development PSY 1056 Health, Safety and Nutrition ECE 1039 Interpersonal Communications ECE 1040 Creative Expressions ECE 1041 Foundations of ECE ECE 1056 Introductory Sociology (<i>mandatory general education course [GBC] = professionally-related course [Ryerson]</i>) Field Practice I ECE 1024 Observation, Planning and Evaluation ECE 1074 Creative Play Workshops ECE 1053</p> <p>University-level course for Degree Completion cohort: History of Social Policy in Canada (<i>professionally-related course</i>) GSSC 1033</p>	<p>Regular ECE Diploma Program</p> <p>Infant and Child Development (cont'd.) PSY 1075 Health, Safety and Nutrition (cont'd.) ECE 1069 Interpersonal Communications (cont'd.) ECE 1070 Creative Expressions (cont'd.) ECE 1071 Foundations of ECE (cont'd.) ECE 1075 Computer Skills and Applications COMP 1082 Field Practice II ECE 1026 Observation, Planning and Evaluation ECE 1076 Creative Play Workshops ECE 1077 General Education elective: GBC generic skills or general education course from list of Ryerson-approved equivalents to Ryerson lower level liberal studies courses for the degree completion cohort</p> <p>University-level course for Degree Completion cohort: Introduction to Psychology (<i>professionally-related course</i>) GSSC</p>

Year 2

Semester 3 (14 weeks)	Semester 4 (14 weeks)
<p><u>Regular ECE Diploma Program</u></p> <p>Children with Special Needs ECE 2028 Working with Families ECE 2029 Curriculum Development ECE 2045 Policy, Advocacy and Legislation ECE 2046 Observation, Planning and Evaluation ECE 1078 Field Practice III ECE 2014 Professional Development Workshop ECE 1079</p> <p>University-level course for Degree Completion cohort: GBC generic skills or general education course from list of Ryerson-approved equivalents to Ryerson lower level liberal studies courses</p>	<p><u>Regular ECE Diploma Program</u></p> <p>General Education Elective (GBC generic skills or general education course from list of Ryerson-approved equivalents to Ryerson lower level liberal studies courses for degree completion cohort) Children with Special Needs (cont'd.) ECE 2049 Working with Families (cont'd.) ECE 2050 Curriculum Development (cont'd.) ECE 2047 Policy, Advocacy and Legislation ECE 2048 Field Practice IV ECE 2017 Professional Development Workshop ECE 1080</p> <p>University-level course for Degree-Completion cohort: Competent Learner and Reflective Practitioner CLD 121 (<i>Ryerson ECE course</i>)</p>