

RYERSON UNIVERSITY

AGENDA

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday, January 25, 2005

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

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

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| Pages 1-3 | 1. President's Report
1.1 Ryerson Achievement Report |
| Pages 4-9 | 2. Report of the Secretary of Academic Council (#W2005-1)
2.1 Academic Council Elections |
| | 3. The Good of the University |
| Pages 10-14 | 4. Minutes:
4.1 Minutes of the December 7, 2004 Meeting |
| Page 15
Page 16 | 5. Business arising from the Minutes
5.1 Correction: Course changes in School of Fashion
5.2 Correction: Academic Standards Report #F2004-3 (Academic variations in School of Nursing) |
| | 6. Correspondence |
| | 7. Reports of Actions and Recommendations of Departmental and Divisional Councils |
| Pages 17-20 | 8. Reports of Committees
8.1 Report #W2005-1 of the Composition and By-Laws Committee
8.1.1 <u>Motion#1:</u> <i>That Academic Council approve the change to the By-Laws with respect to the order of the agenda (Section 5.1).</i>
8.1.2 <u>Motion #2:</u> <i>That Academic Council approve the change to the By-Laws with respect to the dismissal of members for non-attendance (section 2.6.4).</i>
8.1.3 <u>Motion #3:</u> <i>That Academic Council approve the change to the Terms of Reference and Composition of the Learning & Teaching Committee (Section 3.6.11).</i> |

8.1.4 **Motion #4:** *That the implementation of the change in composition and mandate of the Learning & Teaching Committee be phased in as outlined.*

8.1.5 **Motion #5:** *That Academic Council approve the change to the composition of the Research Ethics Board (Section 3.6.14).*

Pages 21-26

8.2 Report #W2005-1 of the Learning & Teaching Committee

Pages 27-42

8.3 Report #W2005-1 of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to review the Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy

9. New Business

10. Adjournment

RYERSON ACHIEVEMENT REPORT

For the February 2005 meeting of Academic Council

Events

Ryerson held a special memorial event January 10 for community members to reflect on the tsunami disaster in southern Asia. Speakers and readers included **Andre Goh** of Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Services, **Mehru Ali** of Early Childhood Education, and **Marion Coomey** of Radio and Television Arts. Music was provided by **Acting students** from the Theatre School, led by faculty member **David Walden**.

Commemorative events on campus to mark the anniversary of the Dec. 6 Montreal massacre included a panel on the Intersections Between Violence and Marginalization in our Society featuring **Catherine Frazee**, Co-Director, Ryerson RBC Institute for Disability Studies, Research, and Education; **Akua Benjamin**, Director, School of Social Work; and **Judy Rebick**, CAW-Sam Gindin Chair in Social Justice and Democracy.

Monica McKay, Co-ordinator, Aboriginal Student Services led a talking circle; **Jennifer Brayton** of Sociology discussed media and violence; and there was a ceremony in the Quad by the Tree of Hope. On the evening of Dec. 6, a fundraising dinner was held to support student projects on preventing violence, with keynote speaker Sharon Rosenberg of the University of Alberta, who has written extensively on the memorialization of the Montreal massacre.

Certificates were presented to 18 Millennium Scholarship Award winners at a ceremony hosted by President **Claude Lajeunesse** Nov. 26.

The President's annual holiday celebration was held in the Centre for Computing and Engineering Dec. 14 with faculty, staff and students attending.

At a Golden Key Honour Society ceremony Nov. 22, **Marilynn Booth**, Dean of The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education, was inducted as an honorary member of the Society. President **Claude Lajeunesse** spoke at the event.

In the Media

A letter by President **Claude Lajeunesse** appeared in the *Toronto Star* Dec. 28 detailing Ryerson's key points to the Rae Review on Postsecondary education.

Registrar **Keith Alnwick** was quoted in *Metroland* newspapers Dec. 23 about the criteria used to evaluate applicants to university.

Grace-Edward Kalabuzi of Criminal Justice was quoted in a *Toronto Star* story Dec. 31 about a study that shows concentrations of poverty in particular Toronto neighborhoods.

John Miller of Journalism was quoted in a *Globe and Mail* story Jan. 5 on the success of *Metro*, the free commuter tabloid in Toronto. Prof. Miller also appeared on CPAC-TV Dec. 17, which broadcast his presentation before the Senate committee on transport and communications as the committee discussed the current state of the media industry.

Ida Berger of Business Management commented in the Dec. 18 *National Post* on Christmas-time retail spending.

Faculty of Communication and Design Dean **Ira Levine** was quoted in the Nov. 18 *Toronto Star* on the popularity of the Journalism program among high school applicants, and the number of jobs available to grads of the Graphic Communications Management program.

Interim Chair of Journalism **Suanne Kelman** appeared on *Global News* Nov. 16 discussing why the media covers missing person cases in some instances and not others. She appeared on TVO's *Studio 2* Nov. 22 on the increasing presence of religion in global politics.

Vince Carlin of Journalism testified in the contempt of court case involving a *Hamilton Spectator* reporter. His testimony was covered extensively in the print media and he appeared on CBC Radio's *The World at Six* Dec. 2 commenting on the case.

Rena Mendelson of Nutrition was quoted in a Canadian Press story about the launch of the Canadian Council of Food and Nutrition, an advocacy group on nutrition policy matters. Dr. Mendelson is chair of the Board. Dr. Mendelson also appeared on *Canada Now* in Toronto, Peterborough, and Atlantic Canada on the same subject. And she appeared on *Goldhawk* on Rogers television discussing obesity and its impact on the health care system.

The *Daily Commercial News* published a lengthy feature on the construction projects on the Ryerson campus in its Nov. 16 edition.

Lisa Anderson of Ryerson's Women in Engineering program was quoted in the Dec. 6 *Globe and Mail* and the Dec. 7 *Toronto Sun* about the difficulties in attracting female students to engineering. She appeared on CBC Radio's *Here and Now* Dec. 6, CBC Ottawa's regional news, and the national edition of *Canada at Five* on CBC Radio.

Jennifer Brayton of Sociology appeared on *Toronto 1* commenting on the case of a woman 'addicted' to her cell phone.

Ken Jones, director of the Centre for the Study of Commercial Activity, appeared on ROB TV *Business Morning* Dec. 9 discussing the state of department stores in Canada. He was also quoted in a Canadian Press story Dec. 15 on how consumers may have less choice with the concentration of retailers.

Jean Golden of Sociology appeared on OMNI TV Dec. 6 as an expert commentator in a news feature dealing with interracial couples.

Anthony Hutchinson of Social Work appeared on CBC's *The National* in December. The program was broadcast live from Malvern, a community where Prof. Hutchinson has studied young people's ideas on community safety, health and the role of youth.

Office of Public Affairs, Ryerson University

TO: Deans, Chairs and Directors, Departmental and Administrative Assistants

CC: C. Lajeunesse, E. Aspevig, L. Grayson, M. Dewson, J. Sandys, A. Sarsfield, K. Alnwick,
D. Glynn, *Ryersonian*, *Eyeopener*

FROM: Dr. Diane R. Schulman, Secretary of Academic Council

DATE: January 3, 2005

RE: ACADEMIC COUNCIL ELECTIONS

Attached are the revised *Guidelines for Academic Council Elections* including standard nomination forms. **Elections to Academic Council will be held in February.** Please consult the timeline for the exact dates for nominations and elections (attached).

NOTE: STUDENT ELECTIONS (EXCEPT FOR THE RyeSAC, CESAR AND CONTINUING EDUCATION REPRESENTATIVES) ARE HELD ON-LINE. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT STUDENT NOMINATION FORMS BE SENT TO MY OFFICE BY FEBRUARY 4 SO THAT ELECTRONIC BALLOTS CAN BE CREATED.

FACULTY AND CHAIR/DIRECTOR ELECTIONS WILL BE HELD BY THE FACULTIES.

The composition of Academic Council is as follows:

- **Chair/Director representatives (5):** One from each Faculty, elected by and from the Chairs/Directors in that Faculty
- **Faculty representatives (20):** Four from each Faculty, elected by and from the full-time members of that Faculty.
- **Continuing Education faculty representatives (5):** One from each Division, who are full-time teaching faculty and who are teaching at least one course in that Continuing Education Division in the year of their election, or who serve on Continuing Education committees such as the Continuing Education Divisional Council. The election of Continuing Education representatives will be coordinated by the Division of Continuing Education, but the actual voting will take place along with the regular Faculty elections. Please see the guidelines for the election details.
- **Ryerson Faculty Association (RFA) (1):** One RFA representative, specifically elected to the position, as determined by the RFA, who is eligible to serve on Academic Council as defined by the Ryerson Act.
- **Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) (1):** One CUPE representative, specifically elected to the position, as determined by CUPE, who is eligible to serve on Academic Council as defined by the Ryerson Act.
- **Student representatives (10):** Two from each of the five Faculties, elected by and from students registered in that Faculty. (see eligibility)
- **Continuing Education Student representatives (2):** Two elected by and from those students enrolled in a Continuing Education course creditable to a degree, diploma or certificate program, and not enrolled in an undergraduate or graduate program.
- **Graduate student representatives (2):** Two representatives elected by and from those students of the University enrolled in a graduate studies program
- **Ryerson Students' Administrative Council (RyeSAC) representative (1):** One representative who is duly elected to the position as specified in the By-Laws of RyeSAC.
- **Continuing Education Students' Association of Ryerson (CESAR) representative (1):** one

representative who is duly elected to the position as specified in the By-Laws of CESAR.

Each Dean will receive a list of current members of Academic Council and their statuses. Faculty members who are in the middle of the two-year term shall be assumed to be completing that term. Faculty members who are completing their first two-year term may be nominated for a second two-year term. Students who are completing their first one-year term may be nominated for a second one-year term.

GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC COUNCIL ELECTIONS 2005

For the purposes of this document “Chair” means “Chair or Director” and “Department” means “Department or School”.

1. TIMELINE

E-Mail message to Students on Elections:	Monday, January 17, 2005
Nominations Open:	Monday, January 24, 2005
Orientation Meeting for student candidates:	Monday, January 31, 2005
Nominations Close:	Wednesday, February 2, 2005
Names of nominees forwarded by Chair to Dean	Thursday, February 3, 2005
Copies of nomination forms forwarded by Dean to Secretary of Academic Council	Friday, February 4, 2005
E-Mail message to Students announcing candidates	Monday, February 7, 2005
Student Voter Eligibility lists verified by Registrar’s Office	Wednesday, February 9, 2005
On-Line Student voting (8:00 a.m. – 9:00 p.m.)	Monday, February 14 – Friday, February 18, 2005
Faculty/Chair vote (10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.)	Monday, February 14, 2005
Faculty/Chair results to Secretary of Academic Council:	Friday, February 18, 2005
Verification of Student On-Line Votes	Monday, February 21, 2005

2. ELECTORAL RESPONSIBILITIES

- a. The **Secretary of Academic Council** shall, as Chief Electoral Officer:
 - i. set the timeline for Academic Council elections;
 - ii. provide all Deans and Chairs with instructions on the conduct of elections, as well as copies of standard student and faculty nomination forms;
 - iii. provide standard nomination forms to both the RyeSAC and CESAR offices;
 - iv. co-ordinate the central dissemination of information about the election, primarily through an e-mail notice to all students and an e-mail notice on the A-Update listserv. Election proclamation posters will be displayed on campus and advertisements will be placed in student newspapers;
 - v. provide copies of a basic information sheet for students about Academic Council;
 - vi. convene an orientation session for student candidates;
 - vii. coordinate the posting of student ballots on the Ryerson website;
 - viii. verify the results of on-line student voting;
 - ix. receive results of faculty/chair elections from the Deans; and
 - x. report election results, including the number of votes received by each candidate, and the total number of votes cast for each position, to Academic Council.

- b. Each of the **Deans of the Five Faculties** will be responsible for the election of (**see timelines for dates**):
 - i. two student representatives of the Faculty and shall:
 - a. collect verified nomination forms from the departments;
 - b. forward nomination forms to the Secretary of Academic Council within 2 days of the close of nominations;
 - c. announce student candidates by means of an e-mail memorandum and poster at least one week prior to elections;
 - ii. one Chair/Director and four faculty representatives from the Faculty, and shall:
 - a. establish guidelines for the allocation of the five Academic Council positions and report them to the Secretary of Academic Council;
 - b. monitor and conduct the election of the Chair/Director representative;
 - c. ensure that all faculty are informed of the election, including nomination procedures and voting arrangements;
 - d. forward all faculty and chair/director nomination forms to the Secretary of Academic Council;
 - e. announce the candidates for the faculty representative positions, including constituencies, if any;
 - f. announce arrangements for all-candidate student and faculty meetings, if required by the candidates;
 - g. prepare and distribute sufficient copies of ballots for each faculty position to appropriate departments;
 - h. review procedures for administration of elections with the chairs/directors;
 - i. in cases where the constituency includes more than one department, collate final tallies of votes;
 - j. collate and report the election results, including the names of candidates (by constituency) and the total number of votes received by each, to the Secretary of Academic Council.

- c. Each **Chair/Director** shall(**see timelines for dates**):
 - i. process student and faculty nomination forms, verifying eligibility to run for office;
 - ii. forward all nomination forms to the Dean;
 - iii. determine voting eligibility of faculty;
 - iv. provide one central departmental polling facility for faculty voting, and administer the elections in accordance with the rules set out below;
 - v. select persons to staff polling place for the designated time, assuring constant coverage
 - vi. review election procedures with polling place staff;
 - vii. assure that appropriate ballots have been received from the Dean;

- viii. assure that a list of eligible faculty and a ballot have been received from the Dean of Continuing Education;
 - ix. forward the completed Continuing Education ballots to the Dean of Continuing Education;
 - x. tally the other ballots as established in the rules below;
 - xi. report the results of the vote to the Dean.
- d. The **Dean of Continuing Education** shall be responsible for the election of (**see timelines for dates**):
- i. two student representatives and shall:
 - a. collect verified nomination forms from students;
 - b. forward the names of student nominees to CESAR and nomination forms to the Secretary of Academic Council;
 - c. ensure that elections for student representatives are conducted by CESAR at the same time as the CESAR elections
 - d. forward the results of the election, including the number of votes received by each candidate, to the Secretary of Academic Council.
 - ii. five C.E. faculty representatives and shall
 - a. prepare lists of eligible faculty voters and candidates from each department;
 - b. solicit nominations from the eligible candidates for the positions from each of the Faculties;
 - c. forward copies of the nomination forms to the Secretary of Academic Council;
 - d. prepare a ballot for each Faculty, listing all of the nominees from that Faculty;
 - e. forward the list of eligible voters and the appropriate ballot to each department by the deadline set in the timeline, so that election for Continuing Education representative can be held concurrently with the election of the Faculty representatives;
 - f. collect the completed ballots from the departments and tally the votes as established in the rules below;
 - g. report the results, including the number of votes received by each candidate (by constituency) to the Secretary of Academic Council.
- e. The **Dean of the School of Graduate Studies** shall be responsible for the election of two graduate students and shall (**see timelines for dates**):
- i. collect verified nomination forms from the departments;
 - ii. forward the names of student nominees to the Secretary of Academic Council;
 - iii. announce student candidates by means of an e-mail memorandum and poster at least one week prior to elections;
- f. **RFA, CUPE, RyeSAC and CESAR** shall each conduct elections for their representative by and from their eligible constituencies and report the results to the Secretary of Academic Council immediately following their elections.
- g. The **Alumni Director** shall solicit nominations for two alumni representatives, eligible as defined below, and shall hold elections in a manner agreed upon with the Secretary of Academic Council.

2. VOTER AND CANDIDATE ELIGIBILITY

- a. **Chair and Faculty** candidate and voter eligibility:
Faculty representatives: According to the Ryerson Act representatives must be “full-time employees of the University whose principal duty is the performance of the teaching function or research function of the University”. Continuing Education representatives must meet these criteria and be deemed eligible by the Dean of Continuing Education.
- b. **Student** candidate and voter eligibility:
 - i. Students registered in an undergraduate program or course of study in a Faculty, leading to a degree or diploma of the University, are eligible to be candidates or nominators and voters in that Faculty. Students registered in a graduate program are similarly eligible in the School of

Graduate Studies. Students who have not registered in any courses for the past three semesters are not eligible.

- ii. Students enrolled in a Continuing Education course creditable to a degree, diploma or certificate program, and not enrolled in an undergraduate or graduate program, are eligible to be candidates or nominators and voters in the School of Continuing Education.

c. **Alumni** candidate and voter eligibility:

“Persons who have received degrees, diplomas or certificates from Ryerson Institute of Technology, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, Ryerson Polytechnic University or Ryerson University and who are no longer registered as students.”

4 RULES FOR THE CONDUCT OF ELECTIONS OF STUDENTS TO COUNCIL

a. Pre-election activities

- i. A memorandum should be issued to students via the official Ryerson e-mail system prior to the opening of nominations. It should contain the dates of Academic Council elections, the date for the opening of nominations, the date nominations close, and where further information and nomination forms can be obtained. Campaigning should also be addressed.
- ii. Interested students (or faculty) should discuss election matters with their Chair or Dean. If they have further questions they may be referred to the Secretary of Academic Council. They should also be informed of the Nominee Orientation meeting as scheduled in the timeline.
- iii. The Secretary of Academic Council must receive a copy of all nomination forms, which have been date-stamped upon receipt in the department offices.
- iv. A second memorandum will be issued via the official Ryerson e-mail system immediately after the close of nominations. It will identify the candidates; list the dates of the elections and the on-line voting procedure.

b. Campaigning

- i. All candidates are to be given equal opportunity to campaign. No candidate may allow or condone any actions to destroy, deface, move, cover or remove signs, banners, or any form of publicity installed by other candidates or supporters.
- ii. Campaigning or canvassing may not commence until nominations have closed.
- iii. E-mail, voicemail or other electronic solicitations or promptings are prohibited at all times.

c. Student On-Line Voting

- i. Computer and Communications Services (CCS) shall coordinate the process of putting student ballots on the Ryerson website (ROWS).
- ii. Students will be notified of the dates and times of the vote, as well as the candidates, through their Ryerson official e-mail account.
- iii. Only students certified as eligible by the Office of the Registrar on the Wednesday of the week preceding the election shall be eligible to vote.
- iv. Students will log onto the election site using their official student number and PAC, and they shall be presented with a ballot for their Faculty only.
- v. Once a student has posted a vote, they will not be permitted to post another vote.
- vi. Voting shall be from Monday through Friday, from 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.

d. Election Results

- i. The results of the election will be established electronically in the Office of the Secretary of Academic Council, with the assistance of a representative of CCS. If a candidate wishes to have one examiner present to witness the validation, the Secretary of Academic Council must be notified at least three (3) working days in advance. Examiners must have written authorization from the candidate they represent. Candidates may not act as examiners.
- ii. The Deans shall be notified immediately of the results of the student elections.
- iii. Once all candidates have been notified, the names of those elected shall be posted on the

- Academic Council website, and all students shall be notified via e-mail.
- iv.** A report including the number of votes received by each candidate will be prepared for Academic Council.
 - v.** In the event that two or more candidates receive the same number of votes, the winner will be determined by means of either a coin toss (for two candidates) or a dice toss (for more than two candidates). The toss will be administered by the Secretary of Academic Council and the results shall be final.
- e. Appeals**
- i.** The Secretary of Academic Council shall hear any grievances which may arise in the electoral process.
 - ii.** If the Secretary of Academic Council deems it necessary, a committee will be convened to deal with any grievances.

MINUTES OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
Tuesday, December 7, 2004

Members Present:			
Ex-Officio:	Faculty:		Students:
K. Alnwick	H. Alighanbari	M. Malone	D. Ayub
E. Aspevig	J. P. Boudreau	D. Mason	A. Bridges
S. Boctor	D. Checkland	M. Mazerolle	F. Gorospe
M. Booth	S. Cody	D. McKessock	I. Guindo
C. Cassidy	J. Dianda	G. Mothersill	L. Islam
M. Dewson	M. Dionne	B. Murray	K. Medri
L. Grayson	M. Dowler	M. Nicholson	S. Norrie
A. Kahan	D. Elder	C. O'Brien	T. Nguyen
T. Knowlton	C. Evans	S. O'Neill	R. Rose
C. Lajeunesse	M. Greig	S. Rosen	V. Tighe
P. Stenton	R. Hudyma	F. Salustri	T. Spencer
S. Williams	A. Johnson	P. Schneiderman	
M. Yeates	N. Lister	D. Shipley	
	A. Lohi	K. Tucker Scott	
Regrets:	Absent:		Alumni:
M. Anecchini		R. Akhavan	J. Gryn
C. Farrell		F. Duerden	L. Merali
A. Jurczak		D. Mahoney	
A. Ladhani		K. Penny	
I. Levine			
C. Matthews			
S. Mirowski			
Z. Murphy			
J. Sandys			

1. President's Report

President Lajeunesse informed members that there was an addendum to the agenda. He congratulated the team in Interior Design for achieving accreditation and announced that the Board has approved the financial viability of the graduate program in Public Policy and Administration. The Rae Commission hearings are to be held tomorrow (December 8) and there will be faculty, students, alumni, staff and a member of the Board representing Ryerson. Ryerson's three major key issues will be covered.

The bursting of a sprinkler head caused the flood in the Centre for Computer Science and Engineering, and the water damage went from the fourth floor to the basement. Renovation to walls and ceilings will begin tomorrow and equipment has been replaced.

The holiday party will be held on December 14, from 3:00-5:00 p.m., on the lower floor of the Engineering building.

2. Report of the Secretary of Academic Council

No report.

3. Good of the University

M. Dowler announced that on Saturday, December 11, the Oakham House Choir will perform Mozart's Requiem.

Nora Farrell presented the Ombudsperson's report for Academic Council's information. The report was distributed with the agenda and will be circulated throughout the campus. She announced that Diane Dyson is leaving Ryerson for work with the United Way. She thanked the members of the Ombudsperson Committee for their help and acknowledged those who respond to her in a timely way. She recognizes the effort and courage it takes for some people to bring complaints forward. The Secretary thanked Nora for the assistance she has provided on the formulation of Academic Council policies.

4. Minutes of the Meeting

Approval of the Minutes of the October 5, 2004 meeting

Moved by F. Gorospe, seconded by D. Mason

It was noted that there was an error on page 5, which should read "Motion approved."

Motion approved

5. Business Arising

None

6. Correspondence

There was no correspondence.

7. Reports of Actions and Recommendations of Departmental and Divisional Councils

E. Aspevig presented reports from the Faculties of Arts, Business, Communication and Design (including an addendum for course changes in Business and Technical Communication, and Graphics Communication Management), Community Services (including a school name change from "Food and Nutrition" to "Nutrition and Food"), Engineering and Applied Science (including

an addendum from Chemistry and Biology and from Contemporary Science) and Continuing Education (certificate programs).

C. Evans noted that, on the Chemistry and Biology course change forms (page 44 in the agenda), the second cell from the top (in the Purpose of Change column) should be attached to CHY104. This was a misprint. He also noted that the first course changes are relevant to CABS (the current program) and the second set to Contemporary Science. The second set of changes in the various streams correct problems with prerequisites and provide more choices for students.

In the course change forms for the School of Fashion, A. Mackay clarified that the course code FFC032 will become FFC33A and FFC33B in the new Student Administration System.

It was clarified that Politics course deletions for the School of Journalism, which state that the courses are not appropriate for Journalism, should more accurately state that they are replaced with other courses.

It was asked if there are limits in the course hours of elective courses. It was responded that there is flexibility in the number of hours assigned to a course, and that this is a matter of academic judgement.

8. Reports of Committees

8.1 Report of the Nominating Committee

Motion: That Academic Council approve the nominations as presented in the report.

Moved by M. Dionne, seconded by S. Williams

Motion approved.

8.2 Report of the School of Graduate Studies Council

M. Yeates reported that a Ryerson number is to be attached to a York course in the Communication and Culture program.

8.3 Report of the Academic Standards Committee

E. Aspevig moved and called on M. Zeytinoglu to present the report.

8.3.1 Motion #1: That Academic Council approve the revised admission requirements to the International Economics and Finance Program.

Seconded by C. Evans

The Committee recommended that the department consider working with the Math department in the development of a Math course for the program, in light of the change to the admission criteria. J. Dianda asked how recommendations of the Standards Committee are followed up, and what happens if the department decides not to accept the recommendation. E. Aspevig replied that the Economics department would review the Math recommendation and consider what was proposed in good faith, and that the department should make its own determination in this matter.

Motion approved.

8.3.2 Motion #2: That Academic Council approve the revised admission requirements to the Early Childhood Education program.

Seconded by S. Williams

Motion approved.

8.3.3 Motion #3: That Academic Council approve the full-time Midwifery Program.

Seconded by K. Tucker Scott

Motion approved.

8.3.4 Motion #4: That Academic Council approve the proposed dual-stream curriculum in the Early Childhood Education Program.

(An erratum was attached to the addendum circulated to Council.)

Seconded by S. Williams

Motion approved.

8.3.5 Motion #5: That Academic Council approve the table of professional electives for the Politics and Governance program.

Seconded by C. Cassidy

Motion approved.

8.3.6 Motion #6: That Academic Council approve the proposed revisions to the academic standing variations in the nursing programs administered by the School of Nursing.

Seconded by K. Tucker Scott

The text of the current Academic Standing variations is clarified.

It was asked what is substantially different from the current statement. It was replied that the statement is tightening up the current language in the calendar. It was further asked if a student could technically be put on probation in their last semester and be eligible to graduate. It was replied that a C is needed to graduate.

Motion approved.

8.3.7 Motion #7: That Academic Council approve the proposed revisions to the academic standing variations in the Theatre Acting and Theatre Dance programs.

Seconded by P. Schneiderman

The changes are the result of semesterization of the current program, and are consistent with the current variations.

Motion approved.

8.3.8 Motion #8: That Academic Council approve the degree name of Bachelor of Applied Science (Nutrition and Food) for students graduating from the Nutrition and Food program offered and administered by the School of Nutrition.

Seconded S. Williams

Motion approved.

9 New Business

No new business.

10 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Diane R. Schulman, PhD.
Secretary of Academic Council

INITIATING SCHOOL/DEPARTMENT: School of Fashion

Date of Submission: December 7, 2004

(Correction: reference for original submission: December 7, 2004 Academic Council Agenda, page 29)

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

Provost and Vice-President Academic

Date

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

Course Code/ Number	Course Title	Nature of Change									Program(s) / School(s) / Department(s)/ Continuing Education affected and informed of change	Purpose of Change	Minors Affected	Implementation Date
		Hours and Mode	New Course (Y/N)	Check one ✓			Check one ✓							
				Re-position	Addition	Deletion	Required	Elective	Professional Elective	Professionally-Related Elective				
FFC 33A/B (2 sem)	Typography and Graphic Workflow	3 Lab	Y	X			R				FHSO 03 Fashion	New course added to accommodate the increase in student numbers. Students will now choose either FFC 32A & FFC 32B – Fashion Promotion (formerly FFC 032) or FFC 33A and FFC 33B – Typography and Graphic Workflow (new)		

December 16, 2004

Dr. Diane Schulman
Secretary to Academic Council

The Ryerson School of Nursing requests that the following items be placed on the agenda for the meeting of Academic Council, Tuesday, January 25, 2005.

1. The December 7, 2004 of Academic Standard meeting cited an error in the script in item 6 of the School's academic variations.

The corrected script should read as follows:

All nursing theory courses must be completed within five years of the prerequisite professional course. (For example, no more than five years can elapse between completion of Year 1 professional courses and enrolment in Year 2 professional courses.)

2. Graduation Requirement Variation

In addition to fulfilling the graduation requirements listed above, students in all nursing program are required to have attained a minimum grade of C in all nursing theory courses (NUR, NSE, PAT NUC).

I will attend the committee meeting to present further clarification.

Dr. Kileen Tucker Scott
Interim Director
Ryerson School of Nursing

Report of the Composition and By-Laws Committee
#W2005-1
January 25, 2005

The Composition and By-Laws Committee met on January 7, 2005 and approved the following motions for submission to Academic Council for its approval.

Amendments to the By-Laws of Academic Council

1. Motion: That Academic Council approve the following change to the By-Laws with respect to the order of the agenda (Section 5.1).

Current By-Law section

5.1 The Agenda of each meeting shall contain, after the time and place of the meeting, in this order:

5.1.1 President's Report

5.1.2 The Good of the University

5.1.3 Report of the Secretary of Academic Council

5.1.4 Business Carried Forward From Previous Meeting

5.1.5 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

5.1.6 Business Arising out of the Minutes

5.1.7 Correspondence

5.1.8 Reports of Actions and Recommendations of Departmental and Divisional Councils

5.1.9 Reports of Committees

5.1.10 New Business

5.1.11 Adjournment

Proposed Addition:

The Secretary, upon approval of the Chair, may make minor changes to the order of the published agenda. Any member may call for a vote on the change of order at the beginning of the meeting.

Rationale: It is sometimes necessary to present a specific report or motion prior to another report or motion as the second depends upon the first. If there is any objection to a change in the agenda order, Academic Council can vote to return to the order specified in the By-Laws.

2. Motion: That Academic Council approve the following change to the By-Laws with respect to the dismissal of members for non-attendance (section 2.6.4).

Current By-Laws

2.6.4 A member of Academic Council, who fails to attend two consecutive meetings of Council or three in total for the year, without notice to the Secretary, shall automatically cease to be a Council member. A member who misses four meetings, even with notice, shall cease to be a member. The same rule shall apply to committee service. A vacancy so created will be filled in accordance with the provisions above.

Proposed Amendment

2.6.4 A member of Academic Council, who fails to attend two consecutive meetings without notice to the Secretary, or three in total for the year, shall automatically cease to be a Council member. The same rule shall apply to committee service. A vacancy so created will be filled in accordance with the provisions above.

Rationale: As Academic Council meets only eight (or sometimes seven, depending upon the calendar) times a year, the Committee believes that, in order to ensure appropriate representation of a member's constituency, the number of allowed absences prior to the appointment of a new representative should be changed as outlined.

3. Motion: That Academic Council approve the following change to the Terms of Reference and Composition of the Learning & Teaching Committee (Section 3.6.11).

Current Composition and Terms of Reference

3.6.11 Learning and Teaching Committee

Composition: Twenty-one (21) members to include: five (5) faculty, one from each Faculty; one (1) faculty representative from graduate studies; one (1) librarian; the Director of Student Services (1); two representatives from Student Development and Counselling (2); one (1) student representative from each Faculty; one (1) student from Graduate Studies; one (1) continuing education student, the Chair or delegate from GREET (1); one (1) representative from Continuing Education; one (1) representative from the Digital Media Projects Office; and the Learning and Teaching Director (1), who shall serve as chair. A member of Academic Council should serve as Vice Chair.

Terms of Reference: The mandate of the Learning and Teaching Committee is:

- the identification of existing activities and the encouragement of the development of new initiatives and structures as these relate to student learning, student educational experience, and the comprehensive educational environment at Ryerson. The Committee will implement its mandate by:
 - identifying and considering actions to promote more effective learning and teaching;
 - ensuring its currency with respect to the changing characteristics of students and faculty in relation to the promotion of effective teaching and learning; and
 - recommending initiatives to improve the effectiveness of teaching and learning;
- The Committee will implement its responsibilities through:
 - the liaison and consultation with other members of the University in the areas as noted above;
 - discussions within the Learning and Teaching Committee; and
 - the annual presentation of recommendations to Academic Council.

Proposed Composition and Terms of Reference

Composition: Nineteen (19) members to include: six (6) Faculty Associates, one from each Faculty and one from Continuing Education; one (1) librarian; two (2) representatives from Student Services; seven (7) student representatives, one from each Faculty, one from the School of Graduate Studies, and one from Continuing Education; one (1) representative from the Digital Media Projects Office; the Director of the Learning and Teaching Office (1) (*ex-officio* non-voting); and the Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs (1) who shall serve as chair.

Terms of Reference

The Learning and Teaching Committee will use a collaborative model to identify, prioritize and act upon issues from across the university related to the promotion of an effective and comprehensive educational environment.

The mandate of the committee is to:

- establish a strategic agenda based upon the input of all committee constituencies;
- share relevant information and concerns;
- research and evaluate issues where appropriate;
- identify resources within the university to address learning and teaching issues;
- identify and communicate best practices guidelines related to learning and teaching issues;
- initiate activities that address specific issues where appropriate;
- develop and make academic policy recommendations to Academic Council; and
- develop standing committees as appropriate.

The Committee members shall serve as communication liaisons between their constituents and the Committee.

Rationale: The report of the *ad hoc* Learning & Teaching Office Review Committee, tabled at the December, 2004 meeting of Academic Council, outlined a restructuring of that office to include Teaching Associates from each of the Faculties and Continuing Education, and stated that an evaluation of the mandate and composition of the Learning and Teaching Committee of Academic Council would be undertaken. Currently, the Director of the LTO chairs the L&T Committee, and the relationship of the Committee to that Office is unclear. The L&T Committee believes that the proposed structure and terms of reference, in which the Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs would chair the committee and the Teaching Associates would be members, would better serve the needs of Academic Council. This structure is parallel to the existing structure of the SRC Committee, which is chaired by the Associate Vice President, Academic.

4. Motion: That the implementation of the change in composition and mandate of the Learning & Teaching Committee be phased in as outlined.

The Committee would begin to work on its revised mandate as soon as it is approved. The change in composition of the Committee would need to be phased in, as Faculty Associates have not yet been appointed. It is suggested that, except for the addition of the Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs, who shall assume the duties of Chair upon approval, the composition of the Committee remain as it is until Fall 2005.

5. Motion: That Academic Council approve the following change to the composition of the Research Ethics Board (Section 3.6.14).

Current COMPOSITION:

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). If there is not at least one member who is knowledgeable in the relevant law, an additional member with such expertise may be appointed.

Proposed COMPOSITION:

A Chair (1), who shall be nominated by the Associate Vice President, Academic, in consultation with the Research Ethics Board; nine (9) faculty members, one representing each Faculty, one from each of the three Faculties responsible for the largest number of protocols submitted to the REB, and one representing the School of Graduate Studies; three (3) 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). If there is not at least one member who is knowledgeable in the relevant law, an additional member with such expertise may be appointed.

Rationale: The motion passed by the REB is follows:

“In order to cope better with the increased workload, the REB should increase its membership to include three new Members at Large, one from each of the Faculties currently responsible for the largest numbers of submissions. An additional community representative should also be added to maintain the proper balance, as indicated by the TCPS. These new members are to be added to the REB as soon as practical.”

Respectfully submitted,

Claude Lajeunesse, Chair (for the Committee)

Michelle Dionne
Carlyle Farrell
Bernie Murray
Dan Mahoney
Fil Salustri
Ali Lohi
Tara Spencer
Michael Anecchini
Diane Schulman (non-voting)

W2005-1

Report of the Learning and Teaching Committee

The issue of Academic Integrity is currently being discussed on most university campuses across North America. In 2002, Ryerson University conducted an online Academic Integrity Survey. Student response to this survey indicated that students expect the university, people and policies, will provide support for honest academic work and, where necessary, penalty for academic misconduct.

The Learning and Teaching Committee of Academic Council responded to this issue by striking a sub-committee to investigate how processes which support Academic Integrity could be better integrated into the Ryerson culture.

The proposed Academic Integrity Model is submitted as a guide to the strengthening of awareness and implementation of new practices that will help to ensure the integrity of a Ryerson education. It provides information that will be relevant to students, faculty, and the parents and family of Ryerson students. It also designates roles and responsibilities for specific areas of the university.

This model has been reviewed by the Academic Planning Group and is submitted to Academic Council for information. Implementation is underway.

Respectfully submitted,

**Judy Britnell
Chair, Learning and Teaching Committee**

Ryerson University Academic Integrity Model

“Intellectual freedom and honesty are essential to the sharing and development of knowledge. In order to demonstrate Ryerson’s adherence to these fundamental values, all members of the community must exhibit integrity in their teaching, learning, research, evaluation, and personal behaviour.”¹ In order to promote this community value, the Learning & Teaching Committee of Academic Council has developed an Academic Integrity Model for the University.

“Academic Integrity is a commitment, even in the face of adversity, to five fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility. From these values flow principles of behavior that enable academic communities to translate ideals into action.”² The Ryerson Student Code of Academic Conduct defines Academic Dishonesty as plagiarism, cheating, misrepresentation of personal performance, and submission of false information. Faculty, students and parents all need education, resources and a clear understanding of their role in ensuring the integrity of a Ryerson education.

Ryerson will develop a clear “brand” which will be a recognizable symbol of its commitment to academic integrity. This brand will be featured on all print and web integrity initiatives and will serve as a reminder to the community. Academic Integrity will become an institutional responsibility, supported by the administration beginning at the highest level, and by the policies of Academic Council.

Research Findings

In October 2002, Ryerson participated in an online Academic Integrity Survey, administered by Dr. Donald McCabe of the Center for Academic Integrity at Rutgers University. There were 868 student responses (about equally distributed between the four years of study, with 57% of them females and 43% males), 100 faculty responses, and 15 TA responses to the Ryerson survey. While the response to the Academic Integrity Survey was not as large as would be liked, the results do highlight a few key areas. It is interesting to compare the results with the literature and with the combined responses of 2,526 undergraduates from twelve different United States schools including two large public universities, one large private, three medium private, five small private and one public two year college, and with those of the survey done at eleven Canadian Universities. Overall, the responses of Ryerson students tend to be very similar to those of both surveys, and conform quite well to what is reported in the literature. It is important to note that many, in fact, most of the responding students report that they have never cheated.

The key concerns which arose can be summarized as follows³:

- **Expectations:** Data from the survey responses of first-year students confirms that these students expect things at the university to be different from high school. Overwhelmingly they believe that:
 - university faculty take cheating more seriously than their high school teachers did;
 - that students will be more likely to get caught at the university (only 14% believed that cheaters would get caught in high school while 52% believe they would be caught at the university);
 - and that those students who are caught cheating at the university will be given significant penalties (only 43% of students believed that a significant penalty would be imposed at the high school while 83% believed there would be a significant penalty at the university).

- **Assessment:** Students who do not feel that they are being honestly assessed tend to cheat. This includes:
 - Feeling they are being asked to memorize material and that they are not true assessments of what they know.

¹ Ryerson University Student Code of Academic Conduct, approved March 4, 2003.

² “*The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity*”, The Center for Academic Integrity”, October 1999, p.4.

³ The categories used here are similar to those identified at the University of Guelph, which completed a similar survey. It is interesting to note that the general concerns arising at Guelph are almost identical to those raised at Ryerson.

- Knowing that faculty do not change exams or assignments from year to year.
- Feeling that some assignments are just “busy work” and lacking the time to complete them.
- Feeling that cheating is being ignored in a testing situation.
- Education: Both faculty and students feel that there is a need for concerted education on issues related to academic integrity such as:
 - Information on University policy on academic integrity for the faculty and students, with orientation programs and wider dissemination.
 - Education for faculty on how to deter and detect plagiarism.
 - Education for students on how to avoid plagiarism.
- Invigilation: Both faculty and students say that cheating is much too easy. All agree that rooms are too crowded. Students are aware of cheating that invigilators do not detect, and believe that invigilation needs to be more rigorous. When the invigilators do not pay attention it sends a message that they do not care about cheating.
- Policies and Penalties: Most respondents believe that the penalties for cheating need to fit the circumstance, but that there need to be clear and effective penalties. Students believe that the penalties are not being applied by the faculty, and that those students who do not cheat are disadvantaged. Faculty do not seem to apply penalties consistently and many fail to report the incidents or to carry through on their suspicions.
- University Support: Faculty believe that they are not fully supported by administration when they bring a charge of academic misconduct against a student. They would like to see the policies more consistently applied. Students believe that the failure to penalize students who cheat reinforces the notion that a degree is just a way to get a job and any way one can get a degree is acceptable.

Based on the above findings, Ryerson has established the following Academic Integrity Model.

Students

Students entering Ryerson University are enthusiastic and eager to learn. The university experience is new for them and research shows that they expect that academic integrity is a core value which will be seriously upheld. They often lack the knowledge of what is expected of them in the completion of assignments. Education and awareness are critical early in their academic careers. The University must provide resources which allow them to meet the expectations.

Research also shows that students are more likely to cheat when they are under pressure to produce. Effective time management skills are essential to university success.

The following initiatives will promote academic integrity for students:

- Student Services will incorporate academic integrity in the following:
 - Introduction of Academic Integrity at new student orientation program through a video production and on-line resources for incoming students;
 - Learning Success seminars including sessions on time management and test taking and in class presentations as appropriate;
 - Inclusion in student leadership training and Student Service events as appropriate;
 - Inclusion in the “Discover Ryerson” sessions; and
 - Provision of the Academic Integrity Seminar as part of the penalty process for academic misconduct.
- Library resources for students will include:
 - Stand-alone and course -integrated workshops on the ethical and legal use of information sources, including proper referencing;
 - sessions on the use of the Library’s bibliographic management software, *RefWorks*; and
 - distribution of branded bookmarks and other related materials that promote academic integrity and the Ryerson Academic Integrity website.

- The Writing Centre will
 - assist students who have not properly cited their work;
 - provide lectures to individual classes on proper citation; and
 - provide citation resources on their website.
- The Digital Media Project Office will coordinate the development of an Academic Integrity website. The content of the website will be monitored by the Academic Integrity Sub-Committee of the Learning & Teaching Committee (see section below on *Institutionalizing Academic Integrity*). The website will have a section for students which will contain:
 - an interactive, engaging and informative tutorial, with a certificate of completion, which can be assigned to students by instructors⁴;
 - links to Student Services support sessions and services;
 - a link to a citation style guide; and
 - a link to Library support services.
- Academic Council will:
 - revise the Student Code of Academic Conduct as appropriate;
 - ensure that the Code is published in University calendars and student guides;
 - ensure that Course Management Policy regulations on the development of department/school integrity policies are upheld; and
 - remind students, through a group e-mail, of their obligation to academic integrity prior to final exams.

Faculty

First and foremost, faculty must model the behaviour. Research shows that students are least likely to cheat on assignments which they find genuine and on exams which reflect more than a simple memorization of facts. Faculty must also have clear and strong policy guidelines and processes to follow, and must be supported in their efforts to appropriately penalize students. In this age of internet access, faculty must be provided with resources to both educate students and to assist in determining when academic dishonesty has occurred.

The following initiatives will assist faculty in the promotion of academic integrity:

- The Academic Integrity website which will be developed will contain a section for students (see above), including both a tutorial which can be assigned as a course requirement and resources for students.
- The Academic Integrity website will contain a section for faculty which will include resources and links;
- The Library will:
 - provide workshops and individual consultations for faculty and instructors on the development and design of course assignments that promote academic integrity and prevent plagiarism;
 - hold sessions on the use of the Library's bibliographic management software, *RefWorks*; and
 - collaborate with faculty in development and teaching of curriculum that incorporates the Association of College & Research Libraries Information Literacy Competency Standards (including the ethical and legal use of information) into first year student success courses and other courses upon request.
- The Learning & Teaching Office will:
 - promote seminars and discussion forums on academic integrity issues; and
 - identify best practices information and articles to be included in the Academic Integrity website.
- The Secretary of Academic Council will:
 - provide orientation sessions to faculty and decision makers on, and assist faculty in the interpretation and enforcement of, the Student Code of Academic Conduct;

⁴ Initially this tutorial will be developed such that it can be assigned by individual instructors. Once the site has been assessed, there will be discussion of making the completion of the tutorial mandatory for all entering students.

- subscribe to the services of Turnitin.com and, through the Learning & Teaching Office, provide training sessions on its use;
- circulate the guidelines for final exam invigilation each semester; and
- ensure that academic policies are consistent with the values of academic integrity.

Administration

The Ryerson Administration believes that the academic integrity of the University is of the utmost importance, and will work to ensure that policies, procedures, and resources will be in place to ensure that the core integrity values are upheld. The Administration will:

- Provide education on, and enforcement of, the Student Code of Academic Conduct.
- Ensure that there is an Academic Integrity focus at the Department/School and Faculty level and that necessary policies and procedures are developed and followed.
- Uphold the Examination Policy including the provision of sufficient invigilators for examinations.
- Communicate policies and procedures to the faculty and academic administration through the use of the Academic Update listserv.

Parents and Family

Students who come to the university for the first time must have the support of their parents and other family members. Again, research shows that strong support by family is essential in general for student success. It is important that they be aware of the need for students to manage their time, the difference in university expectations from those in high school and the study and assignment requirements for students at the university level. Academic integrity depends on students having sufficient time for their studies and families must understand this obligation. In addition, the core integrity value must be part of the families understanding of the university culture.

Toward this end, the following initiatives will be instituted for parents and families:

- Include a section for parents on how academic integrity can be supported in "Discover Ryerson," a program for students and their families;
- A section of the Academic Integrity website will be developed for parents to explain what is expected of students and how they can assist them.

Institutionalizing Academic Integrity

In order to institutionalize the process, the sub-committee recommends that ongoing responsibility be delegated as follows:

- Library – As part of his or her portfolio, a Librarian should be charged with Academic Integrity issues including: maintaining and developing the content of the websites in conjunction with the Academic Integrity sub-committee (see below) ensuring that the resources are updated; developing and coordinating workshops offered by the Library, or in partnership with other campus services, (e.g. the Writing Centre), which focus on the ethical and legal use of information sources and proper citation methods; and ensuring that any publicity of AI issues in the Library (e.g. bookmarks) is current.
- Learning & Teaching Office – As part of his or her portfolio, one of the Faculty Associates should be charged with initiatives related to Academic Integrity, including the liaison with the Librarian charged with maintenance of website content, including a list of "best practices."
- Student Services – That one member of the Student Programs team, as part of his or her portfolio, be charged with ensuring that students are properly oriented to Ryerson's core integrity values both in first year and on an ongoing basis.
- Academic Council – The Secretary of Academic Council is charged with the maintenance of university policy in regard to Academic Integrity issues, interpretation and communication of those policies.

- Digital Media Projects – As part of his or her portfolio, one member of the Digital Media Projects will be assigned to maintain and produce the Academic Integrity websites.

The above designates (Librarian, LTO Faculty Associate, Student Services representative, Secretary fo Academic Council and DMP representative) will form an *Academic Integrity sub-committee of the Learning and Teaching Committee*, which will be Chaired by the Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs. This committee will be charged with collaborating with the Digital Media Projects Office on the development and maintenance of the Academic Integrity website and with publicity and education on Academic Integrity.

Development of the Model

The above model was developed by an *ad hoc* sub-committee of the Learning and Teaching Committee, consisting of Linda Cooper, Wendy Freeman, Tanya Lewis, Don Kinder and Diane Schulman. It builds upon existing initiatives and develops a longer term strategy for the future integration of Academic Integrity into the Ryerson culture. Don and Linda have agreed to work on the content development for the websites, Wendy will work on the actual website development, Tanya will interface with all the areas of Student Services to see what is and what can be integrated into student programs, and Diane will continue policy development and communication, including one e-mail to students and one to all invigilators just prior to final exams on their responsibilities.

The Model was approved by the Learning & Teaching Committee of Academic Council, and presented to Academic Council on January 25, 2005. Members of the Committee were:

Judy Britnell
Maxine Laine
Don Kinder
Sheila O'Neill
Rosemarie Volpe
Tanya Lewis
Wendy Freeman
Diane Schulman
Linda Kowal
Klass Kraay
Deirdre Taylor
Sholem Dolgoy
Linda Cooper
Anne Johnson
Christopher Livett
Candace Clarke
Anya Taraboulsky
Tasha Jammehdiabadi
Moyeed Uddin Ahmed
Zulfiqar Ali Khowaja
Stacey Mirowski

**Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to Review the
Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy
January 25, 2005**

The *Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy* (Policy 134) was approved by Academic Council on April 1, 2003, and was to be reviewed in Fall 2005. It was believed, however, that an earlier review was warranted to correct some inconsistencies and formatting issues. In addition, it was important to incorporate Academic Council Appeals Committee rules on the dismissal of appeals directly into the policy.

The proposed amended policy is attached with additions and deletions noted. The current policy, without notation, can be found at www.ryerson.ca/acadcouncil/.

Motion: That Academic Council approve the amendments to the *Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy* as presented.

Members of Committee:

Jim Dianda, Chair, Faculty of Arts Appeals Committee

Gillian Mothersill, Chair, Academic Council Appeals Committee

Dawn Little, Associate Registrar

Diane Schulman, Secretary of Academic Council and Director, Office of the Provost and Vice President Academic

Consultant:

Nora Farrell, Ombudsperson

**RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL
UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC CONSIDERATION AND APPEALS**

Policy Number: 134 (a)

Initial Approval Date: April 1, 2003

Revision Approved: January 25, 2005

Presented By: Errol Aspevig, Provost and Vice President Academic

Responsible Office: Provost and Vice President Academic

Implementation Date: Fall 2005

Review Date: Fall 2007, or sooner at the request of the Provost

Reviewed By: *Ad Hoc* Review Committee: J. Dianda, D. Little,
G. Mothersill, D. Schulman, Consultant: N. Farrell

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 Policy⁵ 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 resolve course-related issues with their instructors⁶. 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.

All issues regarding academic standing should be referred to the Chair/Director⁷ of the student's program department/school (see section IIC on **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

⁵ The "Graduate Student Academic Appeals Policy" applies for the School of Graduate Studies.

⁶ For the purposes of this document, "instructor" shall mean any person who is teaching a course at Ryerson.

⁷ For the purposes of this document, "Chair/Director" shall include Continuing Education Program Directors or the designate of any Chair or Director.

IA. GENERAL REGULATIONS

1. It is the student's responsibility to notify and consult with either the instructor, or the Chair/Director of the teaching or program department/school, depending on the situation, as soon as circumstances arise that are likely to affect academic performance.
2. It is the student's responsibility to attempt to resolve all course related issues with the instructor as soon as they arise, and then, if necessary, with the Chair/Director⁸ of the teaching department/school. Failure to do so may jeopardize the success of an appeal made at a later date.
3. When issues are not resolved with an instructor, or when a student does not receive a timely response from an instructor, the Chair/Director must be contacted for assistance if the student wishes to pursue the matter further before launching a formal appeal.
4. An appeal may be filed only if the issue cannot be resolved appropriately with the instructor or Chair/Director (see section IIB on **Grounds for Course Grade Appeal**).
5. It is the instructor's responsibility to respond in a timely fashion when students raise grading or course management issues.
6. 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.
7. It is the Chair/Director's responsibility to be accessible to discuss matters that cannot be resolved between the instructor and the student.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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 IID for **Academic Appeals Regulations**).
11. **Appeals not filed by the published deadlines will normally not be accepted. In extenuating circumstances, students or university administrators may request that a Chair/Director, Dean, or the Secretary of Academic Council, depending upon the level, provide an extension (see Section III).**
12. It is the student's responsibility to maintain updated contact information with the University to ensure that all information related to grades, standings and appeals are properly received. Ryerson program students are required to maintain a Ryerson e-mail

⁸ For the purposes of this document, "Chair/Director" shall include Continuing Education Program Directors or the designate of any Chair or Director.

address (see Policy 157: Establishment of Student E-Mail Accounts for Official University Communication).

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, or for final exams, as soon as the exam schedule is posted (see policy on **Accommodation of Student Religious Observance Obligations** and related form).

IB2. Accommodation for Disability

Students who wish to utilize Access Centre accommodations must present Access Centre documentation to the instructor prior to a graded assignment, test or exam, according to Access Centre Policies and Procedures, otherwise an appeal based on not receiving an accommodation may be dismissed (see section III).

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, the student must inform the instructor as soon as reasonably 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 are either not offered an alternate arrangement or who do not accept the alternate arrangement offered by an instructor, 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 IIC on **Grounds for Course Grade Appeals**).

- c. Instructors will determine if medical documentation is required for an alternate arrangement based upon the duration 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 websites. The University may seek verification of medical claims.
- d. 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.
- e. All faculty and staff are required to exercise discretion and adhere to the principles of confidentiality regarding any documentation received.
- f. Normally a student who misses a final exam will be given an incomplete (INC) and given a make-up exam as soon as possible within the four-month completion period.
- 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. Once an alternate arrangement is accepted, it is final unless subsequent events interfere with the fulfillment of that alternate arrangement, and the grade in the course may not be appealed based upon an allegation of the original arrangement being unfair.

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

- a. Students who are unable to complete their term work in more than one course, due to circumstances that arise during the semester, 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 and to launch a future appeal.
- b. When seeking alternate arrangements, students must submit supporting documentation to their program Chair/Director. The Chair/Director should advise students 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 promptly 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 to the instructor. Instructors should not require documentation to support the request for an alternate arrangement, as the Chair/Director has already made an assessment.
- 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.

IB5. Advance Consideration of Academic Standing

If, during the semester, students experience medical or compassionate circumstances that 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. Regrading 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. An instructor may require a written request for regrading, stating why the work warrants a higher grade. It is not acceptable for students to request a higher grade without justification based on the merit of the work.
- c. If there is a concern about work returned during the final week of classes, or a final paper or exam, there might 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 that case, a meeting with the instructor should be scheduled as soon as possible.

- d. If an instructor does not agree to review the work, does not provide sufficient rationale for not reviewing 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 (see section IC1.f).
- e. 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.
- f. **Reassessment of work by someone other than the instructor**
 - i. If a student does not accept an instructor's regrading of the work and wishes to request a formal regrading, he/she must submit specific and detailed reasons, in writing to the Chair/Director, as to why the original grade was inappropriate, including any 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 level⁹ on the grounds of Procedural Error (see section IIB.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. Either the student or the instructor must provide the original graded assignment, test, or exam in question, to the Chair/Director.
 - 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.
- g. 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 portions in addition to those specified by the student. If a partial remarking was requested, the student must be notified in writing of the decision to remark other portions prior to the remarking, with an explanation of why the structure of the work warrants such a decision. The student may decide to rescind his or her request for regrading.

⁹ All appeals to the Faculty level should be submitted through the office of the Dean of that Faculty.

- h. 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.
- i. A reassessment may result in the grade remaining the same, being raised or being lowered, and the reassessed grade becomes the official grade for that work. 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 IIB.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.
- c. The grade for the assignment may be higher, lower or the same as the original grade and the reassessed grade becomes the official grade for that work. The revised grade cannot be subsequently appealed.
- d. If recalculation was not done or was not in keeping with the policy, the ground of the appeal is Procedural Error (see section IIB.5).

ID. COURSE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

Students who have concerns about how a course is taught or managed 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. Failure to do so may jeopardize an appeal.

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. Students will only receive grades which reflect their knowledge of the course material. With the exception of Procedural Error, no new grounds may be introduced at subsequent levels.

IIA. APPEALS DURING THE TERM – Appeals may be initiated at any time during the term by following the process below.

IIB. 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.

IIB1. 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 may have been prejudice on a prohibited ground, which was not investigated by the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Office, it will be referred to that Office and the decision will be delayed until that office has assessed the claim and made a recommendation.

IIB2. Medical

- a. If a medical condition occurs during the term, it is expected that students who need an alternative arrangement for meeting academic obligations 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**). **Alternate arrangements are based upon the severity of the circumstances and the amount of work missed.**
- b. Students must submit a fully completed **Ryerson Medical Certificate**, or a letter on letterhead containing all of the information required by the medical certificate, signed by an appropriate regulated health professional 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 student's ability to perform during that period. Where circumstances do not permit this, the student must inform the

instructor as soon as reasonably possible. The University may seek further verification of medical claims.

- c. Students must submit applicable medical certificates within three (3) working days of any test, exam or assignment due date to receive consideration for that work. Documents not submitted within this period will only be accepted under exceptional circumstances.

IIB3. 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 meet academic obligations. 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 sometimes be hard to document, items such as relevant travel documents, death certificates or notices from a funeral home, letters from counsellors, therapists, or religious or community leaders would be appropriate documentation. It is advisable that students provide as much documentation as possible. **Where circumstances do not permit this, the student must inform the instructor as soon as reasonably possible***
- c. Students must submit applicable documentation within three (3) working days of a test, exam or assignment deadline to receive consideration for that work. Where circumstances do not permit this, documentation must be submitted as soon as reasonably possible.

IIB4. 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, 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. Students must provide the course outline when it is relevant to their appeal,, detail where the significant deviation, or personal bias or unfair treatment¹⁰ occurred and explain how their academic performance was affected.

IIB5. 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 applicable policy of the University. Appeals granted on this ground will rectify the procedural error.
- b. Where students claim that an academic regulation or policy was improperly applied or not followed, they must 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 when a response deadline has been missed.

IIC. 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 reasons or procedural error. Requests for changes must have supporting documentation attached. Students should normally have consulted with the Chair/Director as soon as the situation that affected their academic performance arose.

- 1. In appeals based on medical reasons, students are required to submit documentation for the applicable period of time. The documentation must explain the duration of the medical condition and the impact of the medical condition on the students' ability to meet academic obligations during that period.
- 2. Appeals may be based on compassionate reasons when there are events or circumstances beyond the control of and often unforeseen by the student, that seriously impair a student's ability to meet academic obligations. Instructors or

¹⁰ Any concerns about personal bias or unfair treatment regardless of whether or not the student's academic performance has been affected should be brought to the Chair/Director's attention at the earliest possible opportunity.

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 IIB.3 on employment related concerns).

3. Appeals may be based on 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 applicable policy of the University.

IID. 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. Current 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. Current 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. Current 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. In some situations appeals may be dismissed (not accepted) at the Faculty of Academic Council levels. (See section III.)
6. Anyone who chairs an appeals committee at any level may not serve on an appeals committee at any other level.
7. Conflict of Interest: A member of any 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.

8. **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.
9. 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.
10. Statistics on the type, grounds and outcome of appeals must be reported to the Secretary of Academic Council at the end of each term.
11. No academic appeal may result in the granting of a numerical grade.
12. If a student initiates more than one appeal, the decision maker at any level may determine if the appeals should be heard concurrently or sequentially.
13. If an appeal of a charge of academic misconduct is related to a concurrent 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.

III ACADEMIC APPEALS PROCEDURES

III.1. Department/School Level Appeals

- a. All appeals at the Department/School level must be filed by the deadline stated in the Ryerson Calendars¹¹ 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 or e-mail 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.

¹¹ Note that undergraduate and Continuing Education appeal deadlines differ, and the appropriate calendar should be consulted for information.

- b.** 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.
- c.** Students who have attempted to have work reassessed or grades recalculated 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.
- d.** Students who wish to appeal a final course grade must first consult with the instructor and/or Chair/Director. Students appealing 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.
- e.** If a student appeals only an academic standing, it will be deemed that the grade(s) upon which the academic standing was based have been accepted.
- f.** If a student has initiated more than one appeal, the Chair/Director or designate shall determine whether the various appeals should be heard concurrently or sequentially.
- g.** 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.
- h.** If a grade appeal is delayed because there is an unresolved reassessment or recalculation, the related standing appeal may also be delayed.
- i.** If an appeal of a charge of academic misconduct is related to a concurrent 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.
- j.** 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.

- k.** 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. Students are responsible for periodically checking for the posting of the grade. Appeals deadlines may be extended for grades not posted in a timely manner.
- l.** 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.
- m.** The department/school must respond to the student in writing within ten (10) working days of the receipt of the appeal whether the appeal was granted or denied. The letter must clearly state the basis on which the decision was reached. Students should indicate if they wish to pick up the decision in person or have the decision e-mailed, faxed or sent by mail. If the appeal decision is mailed, it will be deemed received by the fifth working day following the postmark date on the envelope. E-mailed responses will be deemed received on the date sent. Students are responsible for contacting the department/school if they have not received a response in the specified time period.
- n. Decisions:**
 - i. The Chair/Director or designate may not award a numerical grade, or require any action contrary to a university policy or collective agreement.
 - ii. The Chair/Director or designate may
 - a. deny the appeal
 - b. grant the appeal
 - c. grant or deny the appeal in part subject to conditions, or attaché any conditions to any decision. If the student does not accept the conditions attached, the appeal will be considered denied

IIE2. 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 complete. Forms and instructions found on the Academic Council and Registration and Records websites, or from the Dean’s office, must be utilized. Except for Procedural Error, the grounds for an appeal should be the same as those claimed at the Department/School level. Grade Appeals are filed with the Faculty in which the course is taught and Standing Appeals are filed with the student’s program Faculty. Appeals will normally be submitted in person. In order to ensure that the appropriate person receives the appeal, fax or e-mail submissions will only be accepted when 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. 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 a student does 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. In some situations appeals may be dismissed (not accepted) at this level (see section III).
- e. The Faculty must respond to the student in writing within ten (10) working days of the receipt of the appeal. The letter must clearly state the basis on which the decision was reached. Students should indicate if they wish to pick up the decision in person or have the decision e-mailed, faxed or sent by mail. If the appeal decision is mailed, it will be deemed received by the fifth working day following the postmark date on the envelope. E-mailed decisions will be deemed received on the date the e-mail is sent. 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.
- f. **Decisions:**
 - i. The Dean or designate may not award a numerical grade, or require any action contrary to a university policy or collective agreement.
 - ii. The Dean or designate may
 - a. deny the appeal
 - b. grant the appeal
 - c. grant or deny the appeal in part subject to conditions. If the student does not accept the conditions attached, the appeal will be considered denied

III.E3. 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. Appeals will normally be submitted in person. In order to ensure that the appropriate person receives the appeal, fax or e-mail submissions will only be accepted when 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. The Secretary of Academic Council shall:
- i. review the appeal to determine if it is complete and is within the deadline;
 - ii. in some situations, give the student notice of dismissal (non-acceptance) of the appeal (see section III);
 - iii. immediately, forward the appeal to the Chair/Director and, if applicable, the Department/School Appeals Officer or the Chair of the Department/School Appeals Committee. The Chair/Director shall, upon receipt, inform the Secretary of Academic Council who shall be the respondent. The respondent shall reply to the appeal in writing to the Secretary of Academic Council within five (5) working days of receipt, including any documents to be submitted as evidence. **A copy of the relevant course outline(s) must be submitted for all grade appeals, and where possible, student's grades in each component of the course.** The Registrar must also receive a copy of the appeal;
 - iv. 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);
 - v. determine, in consultation with the Associate Registrar, if the student's academic record is pertinent to the appeal;
 - vi. 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;
 - vii. 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; and
 - viii. 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.
- c. 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.
- d. Hearing Regulations:

- i. The Chair/Director shall be the respondent in the appeal, and shall be accompanied, when possible, by relevant faculty, who shall attend to respond to any questions.
- ii. Both parties may bring witnesses, who shall normally be present at the hearing only while giving testimony. Students may bring one representative or advocate (including legal counsel) at this level.
- iii. Unless the committee is informed of an emergency situation, if either party, a representative or advocate, or witness fails to attend the Hearing, the Appeals Committee will proceed in his or her absence.
- 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.

e. 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 or deny the appeal in part subject to conditions. 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 the means specified by the student 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.

III. Dismissal of Appeals

A. Circumstances for dismissal

1. Submission past the deadline.
2. Incomplete submissions, or submission forms improperly completed.
3. Missing an exam and/or assignment for religious observance (Section IB.1):
If a student
did not file appropriate forms at the beginning of the semester or as soon as the final exam
schedule is posted, cannot appeal at a later date based on religious observance (see
Policy: Accommodation of Student Religious Obligations)
4. Accommodation for Disability (Section IB.2): A student who has been granted an accommodation from the Access Centre, but has not requested that accommodation from his or her instructor, may not claim the accommodation after-the-fact, or base an appeal on the grounds that the accommodation was not given.
5. Regrading (Section IC1) or Recalculation (Section IC2): Grade re-assessments are not grounds for an academic appeal. Students are required to review grade concerns with the instructor within ten (10) working days of when the graded work is returned to the class or by the appeal deadline if it is a final exam or paper. If the instructor does not agree to review the work or does not respond within five (5) working days, a student should consult the Chair/Director. The only appeal permitted regarding quality of work is if the re-assessment of the work was not done or has not been done in keeping with the policy. The ground for this type of appeal is Procedural Error (Section IIB.5). There is no appeal of the new grade received - it may go up or down or remain the same.
6. **Prejudice (Section IIB1)** – If the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Office has found that there has been no prejudice on a prohibited ground, continuation on the ground or Prejudice will be dismissed.
7. **Medical (Section IIB2)** – Documentation must be submitted within three days of a missed test or exam, or graded assignment deadline, or as soon as reasonably possible. It is expected that students will consult with a physician at the time of their illness. Appeals can be dismissed if the medical certificate is not submitted in a timely way, if it does not cover the period of time in question, or if there is no medical documentation submitted with an appeal based on medical grounds.

B. Dismissal at the Department/School level

1. Only appeals which are not filed by the deadline date found in University calendars, or which are not complete or filed on the appropriate forms may be dismissed (not accepted) at the Department/School level.

2. If there are extenuating circumstances (medical/compassionate) that prevent a student from meeting the deadlines a student may request an extension from the Chair/Director. Supporting documentation may be required.
3. Students should be notified in writing of the dismissal of the appeal.
4. There is no further appeal unless it is based on Procedural Error

C. Dismissal at the Faculty Level

1. If an appeal is dismissed (not accepted) at the Faculty level, the Dean or designate must give the student written notice of the intent to dismiss the appeal and the reasons for the dismissal.
2. Students have five (5) working days to provide a written response as to why the appeal should not be dismissed, addressing the reasons stated in the notice of intent to dismiss.
3. If the student responds, the Dean should forward all documents to Academic Council to be reviewed by a panel of the Academic Council Appeals Committee, which will decide if the appeal will be dismissed or proceed.
4. The Secretary of Academic Council will inform the Dean and the student of the decision in writing.
5. There is no further appeal unless it is based on Procedural Error.

D. Dismissal at the Academic Council Level

1. If an appeal is dismissed (not accepted) at the Academic Council level, a student must be given a written notice of intent to dismiss the appeal and the reasons for the dismissal.
2. Students have five (5) working days to provide a written response as to why the appeal should not be dismissed, addressing the reasons stated in the notice of intent to dismiss.
3. If the student responds, the documentation will be reviewed by a panel of the Academic Council Appeals Committee, which will decide if the appeal will be dismissed or proceed.
4. The student will be informed in writing of the decision.
5. There is no further appeal.