

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
SENATE MEETING AGENDA

Tuesday, March 4, 2008

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

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

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| Pages 1-5 | 1. President's Report
1.1 President's Update
1.2 Presentation of the Governor General's Silver Medal |
| Pages 6-9 | 1.3 Ryerson Achievement Report |
| Pages 10-12 | 2. Report of the Secretary of Senate
2.1 Senate Election Results |
| | 3. The Good of the University |
| Pages 13-17 | 4. Minutes:
4.1 Minutes of the January 29, 2008 Meeting |
| Page 18 | 5. Business arising from the Minutes
5.1 Motion on Examination Scheduling |
| | 6. Correspondence |
| | 7. Reports of Actions and Recommendations of Departmental and Divisional Councils |
| Pages 19-29 | 8. Reports of Committees
8.1 Report of the Senate Appeals Committee on Review of the Student Code of Academic Conduct, Policy #60 |
| Pages 30-40 | 8.2 Report of the <i>Ad hoc</i> Committee to Review the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct, Policy #61 |
| Page 41 | 9. New Business
9.1 Revision of Policy #157 – “Establishment of Student Email Accounts for Official University Communication” (the Email Policy)
9.1.1 <u>Motion:</u> <i>That Senate approve revisions to Policy #157 - the Email Policy</i> |
| | 10. Adjournment |

Ryerson University Senate

President's Update for the meeting of: March 4th, 2008

Convocation 2008 – I am pleased to share the list of honorary doctorate recipients for both the Spring and Fall Convocations (see below). This year we have an exceptional group of colleagues, and every phone call has been a delight, with nominees making a point of saying how proud they are to accept the honour. Thank you to everyone involved in preparing the nominations, and to the Awards and Ceremonials Committee for its work. The Committee is now a distinctively academic committee, chaired by the Provost & Vice-President Academic and including a number of faculty members. Following last year's success, the Convocation address at several ceremonies will be delivered by Ryerson teachers and scholars.

Spring 2008 Convocation

FEAS	Lofti Asker Zadeh Peter Busby	BUSINESS	Dominic D'Allesandro
ARTS	Brenda Milner	COMMUNITY SERVICES	Margaret Norrie McCain Janet Rosenberg

Fall 2008 Convocation

BUSINESS	Brian Segal
----------	-------------

Varsity Athletics – For the first time in history, five teams from Ryerson made it to the Canadian Interuniversity Sport (CIS) playoffs. I asked for a table showing our playoff record, and include the results going back to 1987-88 as an indication of the measure of this outstanding achievement.

2007-08: Men's Basketball (MBB), Women's Basketball (WBB), Men's Soccer (MSO) Women's Soccer (WSO), Men's Volleyball (MVB)	
2006-07: MVB, WSO	1996-97: MBB, MVB
2005-06: MVB	1995-96: MSO, WBB, MBB, MVB
2004-05: WBB, MVB, WVB	1994-95: MSO, MBB
2003-04: MSO, MVB	1993-94: MSO, MBB
2002-03: MSO, MBB	1992-93: MBB
2001-02: WBB, MBB, MHK, WVB	1991-92: WBB
2000-01: MBB, WVB	1990-91: none
1999-00: WBB, MBB, WVB	1989-90: MVB
1998-99: WBB, MBB	1988-89: MHK, MVB
1997-98: WBB, MBB	1987-88: none

The university supports Varsity Athletics as an important part of community spirit and reputation, and we are very proud of all our teams. Of note this year are the Men's Hockey team which, despite missing the playoffs, finished the season with the second highest point total in team history; and the Women's Hockey team, which is a new team going through its CIS probationary year with flying colours, currently with an undefeated streak of 16 games. Our recruitment efforts combine attention to academic achievement and athletic talent, and we are attracting increasing involvement and backing from students, families, alumni, and sponsors.

The “Adopt-a-Team” program launched this year raised \$30,000 and we continue to keep our eyes open for opportunities that will help us improve our facilities for both the Varsity program, and for recreation and intramural programs. Special thanks and appreciation go to Vice Provost Students, Dr. Zouheir Fawaz, and Acting Director of Sports & Recreation Jean Kennedy for their dedicated work with Admissions, academic units and administrative services. Congratulations and thanks go to all the players and coaches for their great effort. *Go Rams!*

Budget 2008-09 Consultations – Members of the community have been provided opportunities to learn the context for this year’s budget, as well as asking questions and providing input, with two Budget Town Halls on January 31st and February 12th. Special thanks to Paul Stenton, Associate Vice President University Planning, and his colleagues for preparing the presentation and taking notes on responses to ensure that the budget takes account of expressed priorities and concerns. Budget consultations are taking place across campus with university groups and decision-makers.

Master Plan and Capital Initiatives – On February 11th I joined a panel on the television phone-in show *Goldhawk LIVE*, with our Master Planners and Gary Wright, Acting Director of Planning for the City of Toronto. The topic of discussion was closing Gould Street, an idea that is capturing the public imagination and finding support everywhere. It was especially interesting to realize that more and more people who love our city are seeing Ryerson as the catalyst promoting the “People First” agenda as a challenge to build a better community. The leadership of our students, and the RSU, is noticeable and having an impact, and this momentum owes a great deal to the Master Plan, as a grounding and context-builder for articles like the January 28th column by Christopher Hume in the *Toronto Star* (attached).

University as City Builder – I am pleased to report three items for information of Senate:

- *DiverseCity* – I am honoured to have been asked to join the Steering Committee of *DiverseCity: The Toronto Leadership Project*, an initiative led jointly by the Toronto City Summit Alliance and The Maytree Foundation to help public and private constituencies more clearly reflect the diversity of our communities in their leadership appointments.
- *University as a Civic Partner Conference* – With City Councillor Kyle Rae, I attended this conference in Phoenix, Arizona from February 14th -16th to learn more about universities and cities working together in cooperative ways to make significant progress on their distinct and mutual goals. There was a lot to learn but it was interesting that, in many areas, our strategies as an urban university were much in line with what Councillor Rae and I heard as best practice.
- *University, College, Community Collaboration Forum (UC3)* – On March 11th Ryerson is hosting an event in conjunction with the “Review of the Roots of Youth Violence” co-chaired by the Hon. Roy McMurtry and Alvin Curling. University and college presidents and senior administrators are being invited to hear from community leaders Frances Lankin, United Way of Greater Toronto; Derek Ballantyne, Toronto Community Housing; Sue Corke, City of Toronto; Nation Cheong, Youth Challenge Fund; and representatives of the Grass Roots Youth Collaborative – and to discuss the contributions we can make to finding a solution. Ryerson involvement is being led by Rona Abramovitch, Advisor on Outreach

and Access, and I am honoured to have signed the letter of invitation along with the Co-Chairs of the Review.

Government Relations –

Ministry of Finance – On January 21st I appeared at the 2008 pre-Budget consultations at the request of the Minister of Finance and as part of the university system advocacy campaign. In my remarks I stressed the importance of having ‘Round 2’ of Reaching Higher, to sustain increased levels of support in the service of government priorities in student success and quality improvement.

Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration – We were very proud to receive a letter from the Hon. Michael Chan advising that Ryerson has been awarded a total of \$2.8 million for Bridge Training for Internationally Trained Individuals, to support the work being done with dietitians, social work professionals, and the Prior Learning and Competency Assessments Systems program. Leadership being shown by colleagues in the G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education is making an important difference in the lives of newcomers to Canada, and advancing the reputation of Ryerson.

Training, Colleges and Universities – On January 29th Ryerson received \$6.8 million as part of an announcement by the Hon. John Milloy of a \$200 million government investment to support infrastructure at Ontario postsecondary institutions, with a focus on projects aimed at energy efficiency, campus safety and security, and renewal of existing infrastructure. Funding allocations are based on established assessments of each institution's needs, and Ryerson is considering where the resources will best be put to use.

Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care – As part of the strategic study funded by government, representatives of St. Michael’s Hospital, Ryerson University, and George Brown College, along with Sick Kids Hospital, met with the Ministries of Health & Long-Term Care and Training, Colleges and Universities to discuss our shared academic objectives and learn from government how closer collaboration could advance public priorities and goals. These consultations are very positive and productive, and we will continue to develop our ideas together.

President’s Congratulations

- ❖ *January 7, 2008 – The Engineering Institute of Canada announced the selection of Dr. Bin Wu (Electrical & Computer Engineering) and Prof. Alistair MacKenzie (Architectural Science) as 2008 EIC Fellows, to be inducted on March 1st as part of Canada Engineering Week.*
- ❖ *January 22, 2008 – The film I Met the Walrus by former New Media student Josh Raskin earned an Oscar nomination in the Animated Short Film category; also involved in the film were Alex Kurina (Image Arts '04) and Prof. Finlay Braithwaite (School of Radio & Television Arts).*
- ❖ *January 22, 2008 – Four Seasons Hotels and Resorts, led by Chairman and CEO Isadore Sharp (Arch.Sci. '52, Alumni Achievement Award, Honorary Doctorate, Honorary Chair of the Ryerson Invest in Futures campaign) was named by Fortune Magazine as one of the “100 Best Companies to Work For” for the 11th consecutive year, the only Canadian company to make the list.*

- ❖ *January 23, 2008 – Suzanne Briggs (Geog. Analysis, CIS Academic All-Canadian, Women’s Varsity Soccer) represented Ryerson as our outstanding scholar-athlete at the Fifth Annual OUA Women of Influence Luncheon.*
- ❖ *January 24, 2008 – Hamed Basseri, undergraduate Medical Physics, was chosen the recipient of the TRIUMF 2008 Summer Research Award for the Ontario region, one of only five scholarships across Canada (the other four regions are the Atlantic Provinces, Quebec, Prairies, and B.C.)*
- ❖ *January 26-27, 2008 – The Ryerson team won the 25th Anniversary Award for Most Spirited Delegation at the 2008 Residence Life Conference hosted by the University of Western Ontario.*
- ❖ *February 12, 2008 – RBC received the Conference Board of Canada/Spencer Stuart 2008 National Award in Governance in the Private Sector. Janice Fukakusa, RBC Chief Financial Officer, is Chair of the Finance Committee, Ryerson Board of Governors.*
- ❖ *February 14, 2008 – A Ryerson team of Civil Engineering students placed 2nd among twenty-one competing teams in the American Concrete Institute (ACI) Concrete Construction competition. Ryerson was one of 6 finalists and team members (Anthony Guadagnoli, Alex Caruana, Frank Cesario, and Peter Mikhaleiko) will attend the ACI convention in Los Angeles in March 2008.*
- ❖ *February 14, 2008 – Men’s Varsity Volleyball player Greg McDonald was named to the Ontario University Athletics (OUA) All-Star Rookie team.*
- ❖ *Research grants:*
 - *On January 17th, the 6th annual NSERC luncheon recognized Ryerson faculty and researchers who have contributed to a five-fold increase over the past decade, from 38 awards in 1998 to 177 awards in 2007. The increasing emphasis on research intensity was acknowledged and celebrated at the event by Dr. Adel Sedra, Dean, Faculty of Engineering at the University of Waterloo, and Chair of an NSERC Discovery Grants Program Review Committee, and by Barbara Muir, Director, Information, Communications and Manufacturing Division, NSERC Research Partnerships Programs Directorate.*
 - *Michael Kolios, Dr. Jahan Tavakkoli, and Dr. Bill Whelan (Physics) have received \$1,221,231 as the Ryerson part of a proposal funded by the Ontario Research Fund Research Excellence (ORF-RE) program entitled “Focused Ultrasound Devices for Noninvasive Surgery and Drug Delivery” headed by Dr. Kullervo Hynynen at Sunnybrook Hospital, with the University Health Network and the Thunder Bay Regional Health Sciences Centre.*
 - *The School of Image Arts received SSHRC funding in support of the conference Toronto/Montreal/Lille: Together Elsewhere, the third iteration of a collaboration among leading centres of art education and production in Canada and internationally.*
 - *Dr. Xiao-Ping Zhang (Electrical and Computer Engineering) has received \$125,000 for one year from the NSERC I2I (Idea to Innovation) Fund for his project “An Intelligent Information Retrieval and Processing System for Financial Databases, working with Wall*

Street financial professionals, marketing experts, and financial economists from the University of Chicago.

- *Dr. Mustafa Warith (Civil Engineering), together with project team members from the University of Ottawa, received funding from the Ontario Research Fund (ORF) for their proposal “Integrated Sludge and Solid Waste Management Solutions”; this \$3 million project is being supported by a contribution of \$1 million cash/in-kind from the industrial partner, \$1 million over five years from ORF divided between the two research teams, and \$1 million in-kind by the researchers.*
- *On February 11th the Ontario Metropolis Centre (CERIS), a collaborative research partnership between Ryerson University, University of Toronto and York University was awarded \$1.5 million in funding over five years from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) and Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC), for continuing research on immigration and settlement issues in Canadian society.*

RYERSON ACHIEVEMENT REPORT

A sampling of achievements and appearances in the media by members of the Ryerson Community for the March 2008 meeting of Senate.

Events

Ryerson announced on Jan. 18 that the University had acquired the former Sam the Record man location at the corner of Yonge and Gould Streets, and three additional properties, in order to provide space for programs and services urgently needed by students, including more student study space, and an expanded Student Learning Centre. Ryerson has purchased the Sam's property directly from the Sniderman family, along with two additional properties the family owned on the Ryerson campus: a small office building at 110 Bond Street, and a parking lot on the west side of Church Street north of Dundas. Ryerson has also acquired a fourth property at 351-353 Yonge St, a former Future Shop retail outlet adjacent to Sam's. The total value of the four properties is \$40 million.

The Hon. Dalton McGuinty, Premier of Ontario and The Hon. George Smitherman, Minister of Health and Long-Term Care, visited Ryerson Jan. 24 to announce an investment of \$45 million in a new Student Learning Centre, to be built on the site of the former Sam the Record Man property at Yonge and Gould.

Ryerson announced Feb. 11 that the University is receiving \$6.8 million from the Government of Ontario for campus renewal projects aimed at energy efficiency, safety and security, and infrastructure improvements. The funding is part of a recently announced \$200-million investment at all of Ontario's publicly-funded colleges and universities.

Members of the figure skating team, men's and women's hockey teams, the Concrete Toboggan team and others helped present the Ice Carnival in snowy conditions on February 12.

Media Appearances

President Sheldon Levy spoke to the *Toronto Star*, *Toronto Sun* and *Metro News* about Ryerson's acquisition of the Yonge Street properties.

President Levy was quoted in the *Globe and Mail* about the appeal of green studies for prospective students.

President Levy was interviewed on CBC Radio *As It Happens* about **Ernie the hot dog vendor's** impact on the Ryerson community.

President Levy appeared on Rogers Television's *Goldhawk Live* as part of a panel discussion on the challenges ahead for the city of Toronto regarding the creation and preservation of public spaces.

Ryerson's announcement that the University had acquired the former Sam the Record Man property and three other properties generated a good deal of media coverage. The news was reported in:

- Print media: The *National Post*, *Toronto Star*, *Toronto Sun*, *Metro News*, *London Free Press*, *Owen Sound Packet-Times*
- Broadcast media: CBC Radio Two's Regional and Midday News, AM640, CHFI, 1050 CHUM, EZ Rock, CFRB, CBC Radio's *Here and Now*, Radio Canada Première Chaîne, CFTO News at Noon, Global News at Noon, CityNews at Noon, CBC News at Six, and CKCO-TV.
- Online: CBC.ca, Academica.ca

The *Record*, the *Toronto Star*, CBC Radio's *Here and Now*, Global News, CFTR-AM and Sirius Satellite Radio reported on the provincial government's announcement of \$45 million toward a new, state-of-the-art Student Learning Centre for Ryerson.

CBC Television's News at Six, CBC Radio Two's Regional News and CBC Radio's *Here and Now* reported on a memorial for **Ernie the hot dog vendor**.

Paul Knox, Chair, School of Journalism, was interviewed by the *National Post* regarding the closing of the *Halifax Daily News*.

Grace-Edward Galabuzi, Politics and Public Administration, commented on the Toronto District School Board's decision regarding an Afrocentric alternative school during a news conference at Queen's Park. Prof. Galabuzi was quoted extensively in the *Sudbury Star*, *Globe and Mail*, *Standard* (St. Catharines), *Index Education*, CBC News, *Toronto Star*, *National Post* and *Toronto Star*, as well as in an editorial in the *Daily Observer*.

Myer Siemiatycki, Politics and Public Administration, compared political campaigning to advertising, in the *North Bay Nugget*.

Greg Elmer was interviewed by CTV Newsnet about the role of new media in the U.S. presidential primaries and appeared on CBC Newsworld discussing the influence of the Internet on the US election. He also commented in the *Vancouver Sun* on the influence of social networking sites like YouTube and Facebook on Canadian politics. He discussed the Facebook phenomenon in the *Winnipeg Sun*, the *Welland Tribune*, and on CHML's *The Bill Kelly Show*.

Judy Rebick, Politics and Public Administration, was interviewed on CBC Radio's *Metro Morning* about the American presidential primaries.

Anne McNeilly, Journalism, commented in the *Prince George Citizen* on the media coverage surrounding the death of actor Heath Ledger.

The *Toronto Sun* profiled the Hospitality and Tourism Management program, quoting **David Martin**, Ted Rogers School of Management.

The *Toronto Sun* profiled Journalism alumna **Zarqa Nawaz**, creator of the CBC television show *Little Mosque on the Prairie*, who spoke about her Ryerson studies.

Metro profiled the Ted Rogers School of Management's new MBA program specializing in retail and commercial development, quoting **Wendy Cukier** and **Michael Brooks**.

An opinion piece by Derek O. Northwood in the *Windsor Star* on the topic of the University of Windsor's Centre for Engineering Innovation mentioned Ryerson.

The *Record* reported that **Murray Pomerance**, Sociology, would give a lecture about actor Johnny Depp at Bishop's University as part of a special lecture series.

Diana Ning, Ryerson University Coordinator of International Services, spoke to SUN-TV about Ryerson's action plan to help international students find work.

Alex Gillis, Journalism, appeared on BRAVO's *Arts and Minds*, discussing plagiarism.

Rob Wilson, Ted Rogers School of Management, spoke to CBC Radio about why telecommunications companies like Bell and Rogers want people to "bundle up".

Suanne Kelman, Journalism, took part in a panel discussion about women and political power on TVO's *The Agenda*.

Judy Finlay, Child and Youth Care, published a comment piece in the *Toronto Star* about the harsh reality of northern reserves. She also spoke to CBC Radio Two about the North South Partnership for Children Initiative.

Professor Emeritus **Marvyn Novick**, Social Work, commented in the *Toronto Star* about the need for the government to implement a strategy to help the needy.

Kathy McCormick, Image Arts, spoke to CBC Radio about her upcoming photography exhibition.

Patrice Dutil, Politics and Public Administration, appeared on CBC Radio discussing the City of Toronto's balanced budget, and appeared as part of a panel on CJBC-AM.

Novae Res Ubis reported on Ryerson's new master of planning program, quoting **Sandeep Agrawal**, Urban and Regional Planning.

Robert Burley, Image Arts, spoke to the *Hamilton Spectator* about the future of Kodak in the age of digital images.

Judy Rebick, Politics and Public Administration, was quoted in a *Toronto Star* article about off-site retreats and gender discrimination in the workplace.

The *Stratford Beacon-Herald* profiled alumna **Janet Sellery**, who is the Health and Safety Manager for the Stratford Festival and Safety Manager of the Year.

The *Victoria Times-Colonist* profiled alumna **Kristen Bond** and her wearable artwork designs.

Gordon Pon, Social Work, published a letter to the editor in the *Toronto Star* in response to an article on the recent safe schools report.

David Schlanger, Ted Rogers School of Business Management, was quoted in the *National Post* on the topic of matching a product to customers' desires through critical feedback and fine-tuning. He commented in a separate *Post* article about counting your pennies before counting your lucky stars.

Andrew Laursen, Chemistry and Biology, writes a weekly environmental column in *Metro News*.

The *Vancouver Province* and *Vancouver Sun* profiled student and stand-up comic **Sabrina Jalees**.

The *Calgary Herald* published tips on using venetian blinds and maximizing energy, culled from the November Research News release distributed by Public Affairs.

Myer Siemiatycki, Immigration and Settlement Studies, was quoted in the *Guelph Mercury* about the likelihood of Canada electing a black prime minister.

A *National Post* article on downtown Yonge Street quoted **Michael Doucet**, Geographic Analysis.

A Global News segment on the surge in university applications mentioned Ryerson.

The *Toronto Star* profiled alumna **Kendra Francis**, who competed on the Canadian version of the *Project Runway* reality television show.

CHCH reported in several newscasts that Ryerson will partner with Burlington's Joseph Brant Memorial Hospital to address the nursing shortage through a new program.

A *Globe and Mail* article on universities bracing for a huge influx of students mentioned Ryerson's strong growth.

The *Stratford Beacon-Herald* reported that Ryerson is a partner in a new specialized art program at a Stratford high school.

AM640's *John Oakley Show*, the *Toronto Sun* and *Peterborough Examiner* spoke to **Wendy Cukier**, Ted Rogers School of Management, about a proposed ban on handguns.

The *Toronto Sun* featured The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education in an article on schools responding to trends with in-demand programs. The article included comments by Chang School Dean **Anita Shilton**.

The *Sault Star* reported on a memorial for Fashion student **Adele Turcotte** held at St. Mary's College.

Ryerson student **Shawn Haywood** was quoted in a *Toronto Sun* article about GO Train service.

Prepared by the Office of Public Affairs.

**Report of the Secretary of Senate
#W2007-1 - March 4, 2008**

The results of the Senate Elections (Students and Faculty) for 2008-2009 are listed below.

STUDENT ELECTION RESULTS
(*Candidates elected)

1306 - Total ballots submitted

2144 - Total votes cast

<u>CANDIDATES</u>	<u># OF VOTES RECEIVED</u>	<u>DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL</u>
FACULTY OF ARTS:		
*Merit Abadir	42	Criminal Justice
*Darius Sookram	44	Politics
Christopher Wright	26	Arts & Contemporary Studies
(Declined to vote)	4	
FACULTY OF COMMUNICATION AND DESIGN:		
*Carl Gouldson	11	Journalism
*Katie Zeppieri	13	Radio & Television Arts
(Declined to vote)	2	
FACULTY OF COMMUNITY SERVICES:		
Kateryna Aksenchuk	32	Nursing
Christine Demetriades	11	Social Work
Susan Lamola	50	Urban & Regional Planning
*Mohamed Malik	69	Social Work
*Shakera Martin	75	Occ. Health & Safety
Katherine Mckay	18	Social Work
(Declined to vote)	3	
FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, ARCHITECTURE AND SCIENCE:		
Matthew De Caires	30	Industrial Engineering
*Ken Chadha	106	Industrial Engineering
Salman Omar	66	Aerospace Engineering
*Paul Yoon	103	Aerospace Engineering
(Declined to vote)	6	

.../2

G. RAYMOND CHANG SCHOOL OF CONTINUING EDUCATION:

Nicholas Francis	17	Public Administration
*Jason McIntosh	71	Human Resources Management
*Hennessey Don Mwendwa	53	Public Administration
(Declined to vote)	1	

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

*Asif Sharif	16	Mechanical Engineering
*Charles Sule	15	Envir. Appl. Science & Mgmt.
(Declined to vote)	1	

TED ROGERS SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT:

Andrea Belvedere	157	Business Management
Arzan Bharucha	160	Business Management
Cyesha Forde	137	Business Management
Osman Hamid	137	Business Management
*Melissa Piacente	207	Business Management
Isaac Daniel Villacis	63	Business Management (Finance)
Frank Whitestone	145	Business Management
*Natasha Williams	239	Business Management
(Declined to vote)	14	

FACULTY/CHAIR ELECTION RESULTS

<u>FACULTY</u>	<u>CANDIDATE</u>	<u>DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL</u>
ARTS	Neil Thomlinson John Turtle	Politics (Chair) Psychology
BUSINESS	Youcef Derbal Murtaza Haider	Information Technology Management Retail Management
COMMUNICATION & DESIGN	TBA	
COMMUNITY SERVICES	Pat Corson Mary McAllister	Early Childhood Education Nursing
ENGINEERING, ARCHITECTURE & SCIENCE	Ahmed El-Rabbany George Kapelos	Civil Engineering Architectural Science
CONTINUING EDUCATION	Robert Hudyma Yew-Thong Leong Annick Mitchell Carol Stuart Alex Wellington	Ted Rogers School of Management Engineering, Architecture and Science Communication and Design Community Services Arts

MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING

TUESDAY, JANUARY 29, 2008

Members Present:

Ex-Officio:

K. Alnwick
S. Boctor
M. Dewson
D. Doz
Z. Fawaz
U. George
L. Grayson
K. Jones
A. Kahan
M. Lefebvre
S. Levy
A. Shepard
A. Shilton
P. Stenton
A. Venetsanopoulos

Faculty:

P. Albanese
D. Androutsos
M. Antony
I. Baitz
J. P. Boudreau
V. Chan
D. Checkland
P. Corson
D. Elder
C. Farrell
P. Goldman
M. Greig
R. Hudyma
R. Keeble
D. Lee

Y. T. Leong
D. Mason
A. Matthews David
M. McAllister
A. Mitchell
Z. Murphy
J. Norrie
M. Panitch
R. Ravindran
D. Rose
S. Rosen
A. Singh
C. Stuart
D. Tucker
K. Webb

Students:

G. Alivio
S. Abdelgadir
A. Bahadur
T. Hassan
H. Kere
M. Levine
E. Moss
R. Sadjadi

Alumni:

A. Walker

Regrets:

C. Cassidy
G. R. Chang
T. Dewan
O. Falou
J. Lassaline
T. Schwerdtfeger
D. Sydor
M. Yeates

Absent:

S. Dhebar
S. Ghebresslassie
S. Omer
H. Otieno
R. Rose
M. Stanton
T. Whitfield

1. President's Report –

Applications from the Guelph Application Centre indicate that the system was up 4.8. Ryerson is up 12.5 % and first-year choices are up as well. We are second only to U of T in applications. Given the relative size, this is incredible. This is due to the academic reputation of the university.

Ryerson received a \$500,000 grant from Sunnybrook hospital in Inter-professional health care competition for the Stroke Network. The Chang School won \$2.8M for the Internationally-educated professionals program. K. Jones reported on the MBA Games which involve academics, spirit and athletics. Last year, we came third, and this year we came first in academics and spirit, and third in athletics. Josh Raskin, the Director of “I Met the Walrus”, and a New Media 2004 Ryerson graduate, was nominated for an academy award in the animated short film category.

The President reported that the Sam the Record Man's and Future Shop sites, the property on Bond and on Church Streets were purchased. The Premier gave Ryerson \$45M to assist with building a library on Yonge Street. Today, Ryerson received \$6.8M in funding.

2. Report of the Secretary of Senate

The Secretary reported on Elections.

3. The Good of the University – A. Mitchell chaired.

D. Checkland gave a handout on sabbaticals, which he reviewed. He asked if there is a role for Senate in the articulation of the reason for sabbaticals. These are normally for SRC, and result in such things as publications. He is concerned about the loss of some of the other rationales for sabbaticals, which are to provide opportunity for reflection, re-orientation and re-organization of SRC agendas in other directions. Another rationale is a re-orientation that is not as specific, but just to allow a time for something different. In practice, sabbaticals are in danger of becoming unimportant. He has no particular agenda in raising the issue, but if it is a shift solely for SRC, that should be made clear.

D. Elder reported that the contract for CUPE I included a provision for reimbursement for professional development, and members have still not gotten a procedure for reimbursement. There is still an issue about paying TAs and GAs in a timely fashion. The President said that he did not know about this in advance and could not respond, but the matter would be looked into.

D. Mason stated that this is not the first time that the pay issue has been raised. The President stated that he did not know if it is the same issue as before or just the same symptom. M. Dewson stated that there was communication about the critical requirement to get information to HR in a timely way, but there are still some delays in submission of information. There is no disagreement that the issues need to be resolved.

4. Minutes of the December 4, 2007 meeting.

Motion to approve the Minutes of the December 4, 2007 meeting:

D. Mason, M. Levine seconded

Motion approved.

5. Business Arising from the Minutes -

5.1 Report on the Special Senate Meeting –

Notes were distributed. The Provost thanked Senators for attending, and found it a most stimulating and engaged meeting. The comments are a summary of the notes from each facilitator. These will have influence on the Academic Plan. He summarized some of the categories that were addressed. There was a student Town Hall just before Senate meeting, which was attended by about 40 students. There will be additional cluster groups in the next few weeks. Further input is requested. A. Mitchell commented that the facility that we are in may be one reason that there is not a lot of interaction based on the physical setup of the room.

5.2 Motion on Examination Scheduling -

D. Mason asked that this item be moved to New Business, until after discussion of item 8.1.1.

6. Correspondence -

There was no correspondence.

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

There were no reports.

8. Reports of Committees -

8.1 Report of the *Ad hoc* GPA Review Committee:

Z. Fawaz presented. D. Schulman was commended for leading the committee and keeping them on time and on task. He thanked the *ad hoc* committee, the Learning and Teaching Committee, and the APG. The office of the Vice Provost Students was established to support the Report on Student Engagement and Experience. It was clear to him that a revision of the Grading, Promotion and Standing policy would support this effort. The Provost agreed, and changes are proposed to be put in place for the Fall 2008 term.

The changes bring Ryerson in line with other Canadian universities, with standing based on GPA alone. The changes will compel us to pay additional attention to students who encounter difficulties; there is a clear desire to do this. There will be students who, despite interventions, will have difficulties, and the proposed changes help students get “de-invested” from a program in which they cannot succeed. He related the story of a very successful student who benefited from not being suspended after an unsuccessful first semester.

8.1.1 Motion: *That Senate approve the revisions to Policy 46, The Grading, Promotion and Academic Standing Policy as presented for implementation for Fall 2008.*

A. Fawaz moved and S. Abdelgadir seconded.

V. Chan asked about probationary contracts. It was clarified that changes are not being made to individual program practices on probationary contracts. The spirit is for additional support. V. Chan asked about 2.5.c.i. It was clarified that the policy does not override existing policy in Engineering.

D. Mason stated that it is unclear why someone would be “Required to Withdraw” after the Fall term. He asked that, in paragraph F2.4.3, the word “normally” should be replaced with “otherwise”. The friendly amendment was accepted. It was clarified that a student can be “Required to Withdraw” for failure to meet a probationary contract. It was also clarified that it is up to the department to electronically log probationary contracts.

J. Norrie stated that, there should not be a minimum policy that is disabled by subsequent policies at the local level, as these are unfair to students. C. Stuart asked if it is possible for a part-time student to have a limit on the number of terms they can be on Probation. It was clarified that there is not. She further asked about the application of CE courses to a program. K. Alnwick stated that CE courses can apply to a degree. Currently, suspended students can enroll in up to two courses per term, and have them credited to their program. This is changed. Z. Fawaz stated that the policy is geared to giving all the support necessary to allow students to succeed. But once they have failed in this effort, they need time to de-invest in the program. In the current policy, this was the “second chance” of sorts. Now they need to serve a time out, and then approach the program for reinstatement if they still wish to continue. The statement of understanding, while on suspension, is no longer part of the policy. Reinstatement will be at the discretion of the program admission committee, and there will be a variety of follow-up on the details.

J. Norrie stated that courses taken while on suspension allowed students to show their ability as part of the requirement for reinstatement. It was asked how schools would decide about reinstatement. K. Alnwick stated that it is clear that some schools will want to see performance before reinstatement. There have been extensive discussions on this to look at strategies to enable Faculty-based approaches.

It was agreed to remove Institute on Page 10. The title of the policy should include “Undergraduate”.

S. Abdelgadir stated that students appreciate the changes proposed to support students. These changes are beneficial to students.

Motion approved.

8.2 Report of the Senate Academic Standards Committee –

8.2.1 Motion: *That Senate approve the Periodic Program Review of the Computer Engineering program with the recommendations listed in the ASC Evaluation section.*

A. Shepard moved and A. Mitchell seconded.

M. Zeytinoglu stated that the report is the assessment of the Computer Engineering Program. The results of the accreditation visit and their assessment report is used as part of the program review, along with supplemental material to meet the PPR policy requirements. The report includes a recommendation to approve the review.

J. P. Boudreau asked about the developmental plan and the category of curriculum. It was clarified that some of the curricular changes have already been implemented at the undergraduate level. J. P. Boudreau asked if a review requests changes, what the timeline

is for implementation of the changes?. The President asked if this question could be passed on to the Dean of Graduate Studies. This program review is on the undergraduate program.

Motion approved.

9. New Business –

Motion on Examination Scheduling:

D. Mason asked A. Shepard about his notion of the progress toward a more rational period of grading. The Provost responded that the new GPA policy will change what happens at the end of the Fall semester. There will be no need to review student standings. Given this, for most years there will be extra time for grading. For two out of seven years, it is still difficult. It was agreed that there would be a discussion of ways to deal with the scenarios for those years.

Based on this, D. Mason asked to leave the motion on the table until the next meeting, so that there could be further discussion before the next meeting.

10. Meeting adjourned 7:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane R. Schulman, Ph.D.
Secretary of Senate

MOTION RE EXAMINATION SCHEDULING

WHEREAS: Faculty, students and Senate have made repeated pleas, requests, and demands for a more reasonable time period and schedule for exams and deadlines for providing grades; and

WHEREAS: Current examination practices at Ryerson mean students often have 2 and 3 exams in a 2-day period leading to stress and inadequate preparation; and

WHEREAS: The faculty involved in marking late-schedule exams in time for the grade deadlines find it so arduous that some of them have changed the form of their exams or even eliminated exams against their better academic judgement; and

WHEREAS: The continuation of the unacceptable scheduling implies that administrators are unable or unwilling to remedy the situation; and

WHEREAS: The current examination situation is at risk of putting the entire examination process into disrepute; and

WHEREAS: The foregoing necessarily lead one to conclude that there are structural, systemic, or other extraordinary causes for this situation;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Senate strike an *ad hoc* committee composed of the Registrar, the Provost or Vice-Provost, Faculty Affairs, four faculty, and one student, to examine the assumptions, issues, and problems that lead to the current unfortunate examination situation, and report back to the March Senate meeting with recommendations to resolve the problem.

Moved by: Dave Mason

November 28, 2007

Report of the Senate Appeals Committee
W2008-1
March 4, 2008

This report presents a recommended revision of Senate Policy 60, the *Student Code of Academic Conduct* based upon the recommendations of an *ad hoc* committee consisting of D. Bell, J. Dianda, D. Heyd, S. Laskin, A. Levin, D. Schulman, E. Shelton, and N. Farrell (consultant). The proposed policy is attached and the current policy may be found at <http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/policies/pol60.pdf>.

The policy has been reorganized to make it easier to access information and use the policy. In some cases language has been updated to clarify the policy's intent. The following outlines the substantive changes to the policy (Sections listed refer to the proposed policy.):

Section A: Academic Misconduct

1. Students' responsibility has been clarified.
2. The distinction between misconduct in a course and outside a course has been eliminated for the sake of clarity, and sections A, B and C of the current policy have been combined.

Section B: Penalties for Academic Misconduct

1. Penalties and Consequences have been reorganized to first define the penalties and then describe their assignment and consequences.
2. Section B2b: The minimum penalty for academic misconduct outside of a course is defined as the Academic Integrity Tutorial.
3. Section B4.a.ii.f: It is clarified that students who are placed on Disciplinary Suspension are automatically reinstated in their program after the period of suspension has been served.
4. Section B4.a.iv: Expulsion from the University is clarified.
5. Section B4.b.viii: It is noted that students can also be charged with non-academic misconduct. This is consistent with the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct.

Section C: Appeals Process

1. The section has been reorganized to make it easier to use.
2. Section C3: In order to ensure timeliness, where there are undue delays on the part of the University, the Academic Integrity Officer may dismiss charges.
3. Section C4: Appeals Committees have been more clearly established.
4. 4. Section C7.c: The powers of the Faculty and Senate Appeals Committees to assign penalties have been clarified.

Section D: General Regulations

1. Section D6: It is clarified that if, after meeting with a student about a suspicion of misconduct and deciding not to charge the student, an instructor may not subsequently charge the student unless new evidence has been found or received.
2. Section D7: It is noted that if academic misconduct is found during the process of regrading work, all of the provisions of the Code apply.

A motion will be presented at the April, 2008 Senate meeting to approve the Student Code of Academic Conduct as revised.

Respectfully submitted,

Darrick Heyd, Chair (for the Committee)
Senate Appeals Committee

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

STUDENT CODE OF ACADEMIC CONDUCT

Policy Number: 60

Approval Date: March, 2008

Original Approval Date: March 4, 2003
(Amended October 2003, January 2004, April 2006)

Procedural Review June, 2007 (Annual)

Presented By: Senate Appeals Committee

Responsible Office: Provost and Vice President Academic

Review Committee 2008: D. Bell, J. Dianda, D. Heyd, S. Laskin, A. Levin, D. Schulman.
E. Shelton
Consultant: N. Farrell

Implementation Date: Fall 2008

Review Date: Fall 2011

POLICY INDEX	Page
A. ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT	1
A1. Academic Dishonesty	1
a. Plagiarism	1
b. Cheating	2
c. Misrepresentation of personal identity or performance	2
d. Submission of false information	2
A2. Contributing to Academic Misconduct	2
A3. Damaging or tampering with the scholarly environment	2
A4. Unauthorized copying or use of copyrighted materials	2
A5. Violations of departmental policies on professional behaviour	3
A6. Violations of specific departmental or course requirements	3
B. PENALTIES AND CONSEQUENCES FOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT	3
B1. Definitions	3
a. Disciplinary Notice (DN)	3
b. Disciplinary Suspension (DS)	3
c. Disciplinary Withdrawal (DW)	3
d. Expulsion	3
B2. Assignment of Penalties	3
a. Within a course	3
b. Outside a course	4
	4
B3. Conditions	
	4
B4. Consequences	4
a. Academic record	5
b. Other consequences	
	5
C. APPEALS PROCESS	
C1. Filing and appeal	6
C2. Student Registration during appeal process	6
C3. Timeliness	6
C4. Conflict of Interest	6
C5. Appeals Committees	6
a. Training	6
b. Membership on committees	6
c. Faculty Appeals Committees (Undergraduate)	6
d. Graduate Appeals Committee	6
e. Continuing Education Appeals Committee	6
f. Registrar's Appeals Committee	7
g. Senate Appeals Committee	7
h. Hearing Panels	7
C6. Hearing	7
C7. Decision	7
D. GENERAL REGULATIONS	8
D1. Notification	8
D2. Dropping a course	8
D3. Deferred Grade (DEF)	8
D4. Meetings to discuss suspicion of Academic Misconduct	8
D5. Reduction of potential for bias	8
D6. Evidence of Misconduct	8
D7. Re-assessment of work by someone other than the instructor	8
D8. Verification	8
D9. Audio and video recording	8
D10. Procedures	8

PROCEDURES INDEX	Page
I. SUSPICION OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT	9
A. Consultation	9
B. Notification	9
C. Impartiality	9
D. Discussion and Decision	9
D1. Facilitated Discussion with Academic Integrity Officer	9
D2. Discussion (Without Academic Integrity Officer)	10
E. Academic Integrity Tutorial	11
E1. Academic Integrity Tutorial assigned as a result of Academic Misconduct	11
E2. Academic Integrity Tutorial assigned solely for educative purposes with no charge of Academic Misconduct	11
II SUSPICION OF NON- COURSE RELATED ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT	11
A. Documents (including portfolios and presentations)	11
A1. On application to Ryerson	11
A2. Documents issued by Ryerson	12
A3. Submission of false documents in an appeal hearing	12
A4. Other documents or information	12
B. Damaging or Tampering with the Scholarly Environment or Contributing to Academic Misconduct or Unauthorized Copying or Use of Copyrighted Materials	12
III. STUDENT REGISTRATION DURING APPEAL HEARING PROCESS	12
IV. APPEALS AND AUTOMATIC HEARING: FACULTY APPEALS COMMITTEES	13
A. Appeals	13
B. Automatic Hearings	13
C. Representation/Support	13
D. Submissions and Documentation	13
D1. Appeals	13
a. Student Responsibility	13
b. Instructor Responsibility	13
D2. Automatic Hearings	13
a. Academic Integrity Officer Responsibility	13
b. Student Responsibility	13
c. Instructor and Chair/Director Responsibility	13
E. Pre-Hearing procedures	14
F. Hearing Procedures	14
G. Decision	14
V. APPEALS AND AUTOMATIC HEARINGS: SENATE APPEALS COMMITTEE	15
A. Appeals	15
B. Automatic Hearings	15
C. Representation/Support	15
D. Submissions and Documentation	15
D1. Appeals	15
a. Student Responsibility	15
b. Chair of the Faculty Appeals Committee and Instructor Responsibility	15
D2. Automatic Hearings	16
a. Academic Integrity Officer Responsibility	16
b. Student Responsibility	16
c. Chair of the Faculty Appeals Committee Responsibility	16
E. Pre-Hearing procedures	16
F. Hearing Regulations	16
G. Decision	17

RYERSON UNIVERSITY STUDENT CODE OF ACADEMIC CONDUCT

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.

The Ryerson University Code of Academic Conduct applies to the academic activities, both on and off campus, of all students (graduate, undergraduate and continuing education) enrolled in courses at the University. Ryerson students are responsible for familiarizing themselves with this policy.

The Ryerson Student Code of Academic Conduct (the Code) defines academic misconduct, the processes the University will follow when academic misconduct is suspected, and the consequences that can be imposed if students are found to be guilty of misconduct.

It is imperative that all members of the community abide by the Code in order to maintain an environment that is consistent with the values and behaviour we espouse. Instructors¹ and staff members have a responsibility to take action if they suspect the Code has been violated. Students who have any concerns about academic integrity should discuss them with the Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) or the appropriate instructor if applicable.

The University recognizes the gravity of a charge of academic misconduct and is committed to handling the disposition of such charges in a respectful, timely and thoughtful manner. The University will apply this policy in a manner that is consistent with the principles of natural justice and the rights of students to a timely and fair assessment of their academic performance.

A. ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Academic misconduct includes actions that have a negative effect on the integrity of the learning environment. Offences of this nature are unacceptable. As academic misconduct can take many forms the following examples are provided for descriptive purposes and are not intended to constitute an exhaustive list.

It is expected that students will familiarize themselves with the actions that are defined as academic misconduct and academic dishonesty by the University. As a result, students will be expected to demonstrate that knowledge when engaging in academic activities by citing sources correctly, collaborating appropriately, etc. Students who are unclear about what might be considered academic misconduct should consult their instructor or the Academic Integrity Officer.

While most academic misconduct is related to a specific course, members of the Ryerson Community such as the Registrar, faculty other than those teaching a specific course, invigilators and staff, may suspect that students have committed academic misconduct. They should report their concern to the most appropriate Chair/Director, or, if in doubt, they may consult with the Academic Integrity Officer on the appropriate course of action.

¹ For the purposes of this document, "instructor" shall mean any person who is teaching a course at Ryerson.

A1. Academic Dishonesty: Academic dishonesty is any deliberate attempt to gain advantage by deceiving faculty, placement managers/coordinators, preceptors or other professionals who are mentoring students, other students or the University administration. Academic dishonesty may involve an individual or a group, and includes but is not limited to the following offences:

a. Plagiarism - claiming the words, ideas, artistry, drawings, images or data of another person as if they were your own. This includes:

- i. copying another person's work (including information found on the Internet and unpublished materials) without appropriate referencing;
- ii. presenting someone else's work, opinions or theories as if they are your own;
- iii. presenting another's substantial compositional changes to an assignment as your own;
- iv. working collaboratively without permission of the instructor on an assignment, and then submitting it as if it was created solely by you; or
- v. submitting the same work, in whole or in part, for credit in two or more courses, or in the same course more than once, without the prior written permission of the instructor(s).

b. Cheating

- i. using materials or aids not expressly allowed by the instructor in an examination or test;
- ii. copying another person's answer(s) to an examination or test question; copying another person's answers to individually assigned projects;
- iii. consulting with another person or unauthorized materials outside of an examination room during the examination period (e.g. discussing an exam or consulting materials during an emergency evacuation or when permitted to use a washroom);
- iv. improperly submitting an answer to a test or examination question completed, in whole or part, outside the examination room unless specifically permitted by the examination format;
- v. resubmitting altered test or examination work after it has already been evaluated;
- vi. presenting falsified or fabricated material, including research results; or
- vii. improperly obtaining, through deceit, theft, bribery, collusion or otherwise, access to examination paper(s) or set of questions, or other confidential information.

c. Misrepresentation of personal identity or performance

- i. submitting stolen or purchased assignments or research;
- ii. impersonating someone or having someone impersonate you in person, in writing or electronically. Both the impersonator and the individual impersonated (if aware of the impersonation) are subject to a penalty;
- iii. Falsely identifying oneself or misrepresenting one's personal performance outside of a particular course, in a course in which one is not officially enrolled, or in the admissions process (e.g. submission of portfolios, essays); or
- iv. withholding or altering academic information, transcripts or documents..

d. Submission of false information

- i. submitting altered, forged or falsified medical or other certificate or document for academic consideration, or making false claims for such consideration;
- ii. submitting false statements, documents or claims in the request for academic consideration, academic appeals or the academic misconduct process;
- iii. submitting false academic credentials to the University; or
- iv. altering, in any way, documents issued by the University.

A2. Contributing to Academic Misconduct - knowingly assisting someone to commit any form of academic misconduct is itself academic misconduct. This may include, but is not limited to:

- a. offering, giving or selling essays or other assignments with the knowledge that these works will likely be subsequently submitted for assessment;
- b. allowing work to be copied during an examination, test or for other assignments;
- c. offering, giving or selling answers to tests or exams; or
- d. unauthorized sharing of examination questions and/or answers.

A3. Damaging, Tampering or Interfering with the Scholarly Environment – obstructing and/or disturbing the academic activities of others. This involves altering the academic work of others in order to gain academic advantage. [Some types of damaging or tampering fall under the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct (Policy 61)].

Examples of this include:

- a. tampering with experiments or laboratory assignments;
- b. altering or destroying artistic or creative works such as drawings or films;
- c. removing, altering, misusing or destroying University property to obstruct the work of others;
- d. stealing or tampering with any course related material; or
- e. tampering with library materials

A4. Unauthorized Copying or Use of Copyrighted Materials – failing to abide by the Copyright Act and/or the University's license agreement with Access, the Canadian Copyright licensing agency regarding the copying and use of textbooks, software, and other copyrighted materials (see the Ryerson Library website or the Access website for details).

A5. Violations of Departmental Policies on Professional Behaviour – exhibiting unprofessional behaviour in field placements and practicums as outlined in department/school Student Codes of Professional Conduct.

A6. Violations of Specific Departmental or Course Requirements - In their course outlines, instructors may, in order to ensure Academic Integrity, include additional specific requirements that are consistent with this policy. Any additions must be published in course outlines and or student handbooks.

B. PENALTIES AND CONSEQUENCES FOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

B.1. Definitions (Further information is found in section B4.)

- a. **Disciplinary Notice (DN)** - Students who have been found to have committed academic misconduct will automatically have a Disciplinary Notice (DN) placed on their academic record and official transcript. A DN is not a penalty that is decided upon, it is a consequence of any finding of misconduct. The assignment of a DN may not be appealed.
- b. **Disciplinary Suspension (DS)** - Undergraduate or continuing education students who receive a second DN will normally be placed on Disciplinary Suspension (DS) for a period of from one term to two years. (See Procedures for exceptions.) This penalty may also be recommended by an instructor or Chair/Director. The designation DS shall be placed on the academic record and official transcript.
 - i. DS is not equivalent to Academic Suspension as described in the *Policy on Grading*,

Promotion and Academic Standing. No courses may be taken at Ryerson, including at The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education, during the period of Disciplinary Suspension.

- ii. For continuing education students, suspension will result in the student being prohibited from enrolling in any courses at Ryerson during the period specified by the Appeals Committee students will result in Disciplinary Withdrawal from the program.
- c. Disciplinary Withdrawal (DW)** - An instructor or Chair/Director may recommend that a student be assigned a Disciplinary Withdrawal (DW). Students who are assigned a DW for academic misconduct shall be withdrawn from the University for a period of at least two years. No courses may be taken at Ryerson, including at The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education. A student who is assigned a DW may not apply to the same program/certificate but may apply to any other program/certificate after serving the specified period of withdrawal and after meeting specific conditions established by the Senate Appeals Committee.
- d. Expulsion** - Students who are expelled from the University shall not be allowed to register or enrol in any course or program of the University. Expulsion shall be permanently noted on a student's academic record and official transcript. All decisions to expel a student are ultimately made by the Senate Appeals Committee.

B.2. Assignment of Penalties: Although students may commit similar infractions, the circumstances surrounding these infractions may vary. The penalty imposed shall take into account the specific circumstances. Once it has been determined that academic misconduct has occurred, a formal charge must be filed and one or more of the following penalties must be imposed or recommended by the instructor or Chair/Director: (See Procedures for the format of the notification.) In addition to a penalty, students may be assigned the educational component of the Academic Integrity Tutorial (See procedures section IE.)

a. Within a course:

- i. The minimum penalty for academic misconduct on any assignment or other form of evaluation is a mark of zero for the work. As a consequence of any determination of misconduct, a DN will be placed on the student's academic record and official transcript (see above);
- ii. A grade of "F" in a course (may be assigned by the instructor);
- iii. Disciplinary Suspension (DS)
 - a. may only be recommended by the instructor or Chair/Director; or
 - b. may only be assigned by Faculty Appeals Committee² or Senate Appeals Committee.
 - c. not applicable to graduate students
- iv. Disciplinary Withdrawn (DW)
 - a. may only be recommended by the instructor, Chair/Director, or Faculty Appeals Committee; or
 - b. may only be assigned by Senate Appeals Committee.
- v. Expulsion
 - a. may only be recommended by the instructor, Chair/Director, or Faculty Appeals Committee; or
 - b. may only be assigned by Senate Appeals Committee.
- vi. Rescinding of a degree, diploma or certificate
 - a. may only be recommended by the instructor, Chair/Director, or Faculty

² For the purposes of this document, references to the "Faculty" Appeals Committee shall include the School of Graduate Studies Appeals Committee where graduate students are concerned, and the G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education Appeals Committee where appropriate..

- Appeals Committee; or
 - b. may only be assigned by Senate Appeals Committee
 - vii. Requirement to replace damaged or destroyed materials
 - a. may be recommended by the instructor or Chair/Director: or
 - b. may be assigned by Faculty Appeals Committee;
 - viii. Removal from a co-op program option, placement, internship or practicum, either permanently or temporarily
 - ix. A requirement to participate in the mandatory component of the Academic Integrity Tutorial in conjunction with another penalty³.
- b. Outside of a course:** All of the above penalties except a “0” on a piece of work and an “F” in a course may be applied. The minimum penalty is the assignment of the mandatory component of the Academic Integrity Tutorial, and the DN will be placed on the student’s academic record and official transcript.

B3. Conditions – The Faculty Appeals Committee or the Senate Appeals Committee may impose such conditions as may be warranted (e.g. counselling). The Academic Integrity Officer will monitor the implementation of such conditions.

B4. Consequences

a. Academic Record

i. Disciplinary Notice (DN)

- a. The DN notation shall remain until a student graduates, or for eight (8) years for undergraduate students and for four (4) years for graduate students, whichever comes first. Students who subsequently graduate from another post-secondary institution may petition the Registrar’s Office to have the notation removed.
- b. Students who receive a DN in the first half of their program or certificate, and who have no subsequent misconducts, may petition the Chair/Director in the last year of their program to have the DN removed from their record. Part-time program students may petition for the removal of the DN one calendar year after completing the first half of their program. The removal of the DN is at the discretion of the Chair/Director and this decision may not be appealed. If the student commits subsequent academic misconduct, the DN will be reinstated.
- c. Students not enrolled in degrees or certificates who are taking courses, or a series of courses, for professional or personal purposes, may request, in writing to the Chair/Director or Chang School Program Director (as appropriate), that a DN be removed from their record after one calendar year from the end of the semester in which it was assigned. The DN will not be removed if a student applies to a Ryerson program within that year.

ii. Disciplinary Suspension (DS)

- a. There shall be an automatic hearing of the Faculty Appeals Committee of the Faculty in which the student is enrolled. If there is a recommendation of a DS by an instructor or Chair/Director, or if there is an assignment of a DS based upon a second charge of misconduct,
- b. The length of the suspension is determined by the Faculty Appeals Committee or the Senate Appeals Committee and may be recommended by the instructor or Chair/Director.
- c. The notation shall remain until students graduate, or for eight (8) years, whichever

³ If after reviewing the matter, a decision maker determines that a charge of Academic Misconduct is not warranted, the educational component of the Academic Integrity Tutorial may be assigned to educate the student in order to prevent similar circumstances from arising in the future.

comes first. Students who subsequently graduate from another post-secondary institution may petition the Registrar's Office to have the notation removed. Continuing education students and part-time degree students may petition the Registrar to remove the DS two years after the period of suspension has been served.

- d. Course work taken elsewhere during the period of Disciplinary Suspension will not be credited towards GPA calculations, Academic Standing or graduation requirements within the student's program.
 - e. If the DS is assigned during the semester, students will be permitted to complete the courses in which they are enrolled, and the suspension will become effective at the end of the semester.
 - f. A student who is assigned a DS is automatically reinstated into his or her program or may apply to any other program or certificate after serving the specified period of suspension and after meeting any specified conditions established by the Appeals Committee.
- iii. **Disciplinary Withdrawal (DW)**
- a. There shall be an automatic hearing of the Faculty Appeals Committee of the Faculty in which the student is enrolled.
 - b. The length of the Disciplinary Withdrawal may be recommended by the Chair/Director or by the Faculty Appeals Committee and it is ultimately determined by the Senate Appeals Committee.
 - c. No courses may be taken at Ryerson, including at The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education, during the period of Disciplinary Withdrawal. Course work taken elsewhere during this period will not be credited towards GPA calculations, Academic Standing or graduation requirements within any Ryerson program.
 - d. For continuing education students, Disciplinary Withdrawal will result in the student being prohibited from enrolling in any courses at Ryerson during the specified period, and from enrolling in certificate programs or courses as recommended by the Faculty Appeals Committee.
 - e. DW is permanently noted on a student's record.
- iv. **Expulsion**
- a. There will be an automatic hearing of the Senate Appeals Committee when an undergraduate or continuing education student has had a third academic misconduct or a previous DS or DW and/or Expulsion has been recommended by a Faculty Appeals Committee.
 - b. Expulsions are effective immediately upon the Senate Appeals Committee decision.
 - c. Expulsions are permanently noted on a student's record.

b. Other Consequences

- i. If students receive funding such as, but not limited to, stipends, scholarships, bursaries or OSAP managed by Ryerson, the Ryerson Student Financial Assistance office and the Assistant Registrar, and Graduate Studies, where appropriate, will be notified when academic misconduct has been determined.
- ii. Previously assigned grades for the course in question may be amended.
- iii. Students' graduation may be delayed.
- iv. Previously awarded certificates, diplomas or degrees may be revoked by the Senate Appeals Committee.

- v. The University may be required to inform outside parties whose interests may have been adversely affected by the academic misconduct.
- vi. In the case of forged official documents, the Association of Registrars of Universities and Colleges of Canada (ARUCC) will be notified by the Registrar's Office.
- vii. In some instances, criminal charges may be sought.
- viii. Where warranted, students may also be charged with Non-Academic Misconduct.

C. APPEALS PROCESS

Students may appeal charges and/or penalties to the appropriate Faculty Appeals Committee and then, under some circumstances, to the Senate Appeals Committee.

C1. Filing an Appeal

- a. Students may appeal charges of Academic Misconduct or the penalties to a Faculty Appeals Committee.
 - i. Appeals related to a specific course should be submitted to the Appeals Committee of the Faculty in which the course was taught.
 - ii. Appeals of charges outside of a course will be heard by whichever Appeals Committee is appropriate.
- b. Appeals must be filed in writing and must normally be submitted in person as outlined in the procedures associated with this policy. Only complete appeals will be accepted.
- c. Students must receive advance notice of the scheduling of the hearing and all documentation that will be considered at the hearing from the Dean or the Secretary of Senate. It will be assumed that the information has been received on the date it was picked up or couriered.
- d. When there is an automatic hearing at the Faculty or Senate levels, students are required to provide a written response to the Notice of Hearing using the appropriate form found on the Senate website. If the student does not submit the form, the hearing will proceed based on the available information.

C2. Student Registration during Appeal Process

Students may remain in class and may register for courses while their case is under appeal. If students are charged at the end of a semester and, due to the timing of the charge, a hearing cannot be scheduled until the next semester, students may register for courses and continue in their program until a final decision is rendered. If the decision results in a DS, a DW or Expulsion being imposed, the student will normally be dropped from all courses and the fees refunded. However, the Panel will have the discretion to determine whether the penalty will come into effect at the end of the previous term or at the end of the term in which the student is currently enrolled.

C3. Timeliness

Every effort will be made to ensure these proceedings are handled in an expeditious manner. Students may contact the Academic Integrity Officer when they are concerned about delays in the process. The AIO may dismiss charges when the University unduly delays the process.

C4. Conflict of Interest:

- a. No member of an Appeals Panel should have had any prior involvement with the case.
- b. A member of a Hearing Panel, the student or instructor must disclose any conflict of interest, if known, no less than five (5) days before the hearing. Unless the conflict of interest is resolved, the Panel member shall be replaced.
- c. If either party raises a conflict of interest regarding any Panel member(s) once the Hearing has begun, the Hearing Panel will judge the extent and validity of the conflict and will decide whether the Panel member may sit on the appeal. The Panel member(s) that is challenged may offer a statement but may not take part in the Panel's decision on the conflict. If the Panel member is excused and there is no quorum, the Hearing may be adjourned and a new hearing scheduled, or may be held without that Panel member if both parties agree.
- d. No member of the panel which heard a charge of academic misconduct against a student may serve on a panel hearing a subsequent charge against that student. Normally, members of a hearing panel may not serve on a subsequent panel which is deciding upon a penalty only.

C5. Appeals Committees

- a. All members of Appeals Committees shall be required to attend annual training session(s) conducted by the office of the Secretary of Senate.
- b. No member may serve concurrently on two Appeals Committees.
- c. Faculty Appeals Committee (Undergraduate): The Dean of each of the Faculties shall establish a Faculty Appeals Committee, comprised of faculty representatives of the departments, schools and programs in that Faculty, from which Hearing Panels will be composed.
- d. Graduate Appeals Committee: The Dean of Graduate Studies shall establish a School of Graduate Studies Appeals Committee, comprised of faculty representatives and students of the graduate programs from which Hearing Panels will be composed.
- e. Continuing Education Appeals Committee: The Dean of the G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education shall establish an Appeals Committee comprised of three (3) faculty and/or Program Directors representing the programs in the Chang School. for appeals in courses or certificates that are not housed in a specific Faculty or for non-course related academic misconduct,
- f. Registrar's Appeals Committee: The Registrar shall establish an Appeals Committee comprised of three (3) members of the Registrariat for appeals outside of a course that are deemed to be the responsibility of the Registrar's Office.
- g. Senate Appeals Committee: The Senate Appeals Committee, as established by the Senate By Laws, shall hear appeals of the decisions of the Faculty Appeals Committees.
- h. **Hearing Panels**
 - i. **Faculty/Continuing Education:** Panels consist of at least three (3) faculty members from different schools/departments if possible. It shall be decided in advance which member will lead the hearing and write the decision.
 - ii. **Senate/Graduate:** Panels consist of at least four (4) members, at least one of whom must be a student. A quorum shall consist of four (4) members, including the panel chair and at least one student. The Chair may vote in the case of a tie.

C6. Hearing

- a. Hearings shall follow the standard hearing procedure as outlined in the Guide to Academic Appeals available from the Secretary of Senate.

- b. 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 Senate.
- c. If there is both an appeal of a charge or penalty and an automatic hearing, a panel must be convened to hear the appeal before a second panel can be convened, if necessary, for the automatic hearing.
- d. If there is an appeal of a charge of academic misconduct which affects a grade or academic standing appeal, the misconduct appeal will be heard before the academic appeal. Once a decision has been reached on the misconduct, the appropriate school/department/program should be notified so that the academic appeal can proceed. (Note: The academic appeal should not proceed until changes to the academic record resulting from the misconduct hearing, if any, are made.)
- e. If there is group misconduct, appeals shall normally be heard by the same panel, either individually or in a group. Students may request an opportunity to be heard separately.
- f. If either the student or the instructor (Chair/Director) fails to attend the Hearing, and there are no extenuating circumstances, the Faculty Appeals Committee may proceed in his or her absence.
- g. If a student or instructor cannot be present at a hearing for legitimate reasons, the hearing may be postponed.
- h. In exceptional circumstances when a member of the panel cannot attend, the requirement for a quorum can be waived if both parties agree.

C7. Decision

- a. Burden and Standard of Proof: In a Misconduct appeal the onus is on the University (e.g. instructor, Chair/Director, Appeals Committee Chair) to show that misconduct has occurred and that the penalty assessed or recommended is reasonable and in keeping with the nature of the misconduct. The standard of proof in all decisions shall be “a balance of probabilities.” This means that, in order for students to be denied their appeals, it must be shown that it is more likely than not that the student committed academic misconduct.
- b. The Chair of a Faculty Appeals Committee Panel must forward a copy of all appeals decisions to the student, instructor, Chair/Director, Dean, Academic Integrity Officer, and Registrar. Appeal decisions of the Senate Appeals Committee will be sent, in addition, to the Chair of the Faculty Appeals Committee.
- c. In exceptional circumstances, if new evidence is presented in an appeal or automatic hearing by the instructor, the Faculty Appeals Committee may assign a penalty higher than the one recommended by the instructor or Chair/Director.
- d. The Academic Integrity Officer will:
 - i. review all Appeals Committee decisions and bring those which are inconsistent to the attention of the appropriate parties; and
 - ii. maintain statistics on Academic Misconduct and report these, in a non-identifying manner, to the Deans on an annual basis.

D. GENERAL REGULATIONS

D1. Notification: Students must be notified of a suspicion of academic misconduct in a confidential and timely manner. Students will receive all notifications via their Ryerson email address. There are specific procedures for notification in the Procedures Section following this Policy.

D2. Dropping a course: Students may not drop a course in which there is a suspicion of academic misconduct. If a student drops the course, the Registrar's office will re-register the student in that course until a decision is reached.

- a. If academic misconduct is found and a grade of "F" is assigned for the course, that grade shall remain on the student's record and the notation DN will be assigned. If academic misconduct is found and only a grade of "0" is assigned for the work, the student may drop the course in accordance with the published deadline.

D3. Deferred grade (DEF): If a final grade for the course must be given while the charge of misconduct is under investigation, a grade of DEF (Deferred) will be assigned. The Registrar must be notified if a DEF grade is required. A final grade must be assigned within one month of the assignment of the DEF.

D4. Meetings to Discuss Suspicion of Academic Misconduct: Meetings to discuss a suspicion of academic misconduct are to be non-adversarial dialogues to determine the facts of the situation. Procedures for such meetings must reflect this basic principle. (See Procedures for the ways in which discussions must be held.) If a student fails to attend a scheduled meeting and does not contact the instructor or facilitator to reschedule the meeting, the instructor shall proceed without the student's input.

D5. Reduction of Potential for Bias: No decision maker in the process should have knowledge of previous charges of misconduct against the student. If such knowledge is unavoidable, it should be disregarded in the decision making process. Procedures for the appeal of charges of misconduct must reflect this basic principle.

D6. Evidence of Misconduct:

- a. Instructors must be prepared to present the evidence for their suspicion at their scheduled meeting with the student(s). Students may bring, or be asked to bring, rough notes, drafts or other documents.
- b. If an instructor suspects academic misconduct and raises that suspicion with a student and decides not to charge a student, he or she may not subsequently change his or her mind and charge the student with academic misconduct.
- c. If evidence is discovered more than four weeks after a final grade has been assigned for the course, the instructor may present that evidence, in a non-identifying way, to the Faculty Appeals Committee to request permission to notify the student of a suspicion of Academic Misconduct. The Faculty Appeals Committee will determine whether notification to the student would be reasonable given the circumstances and the amount of time that has passed. The Committee must provide its decision in writing to the instructor.

D7. Re-assessment of work by someone other than the original instructor: All of the provisions of this policy will apply to work which is regraded (See Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy .and Graduate Student Academic Appeals Policy.)

D8. Verification: Documents may be verified by the office of the Chair/Director, the Dean or Senate.

D9. Audio and Video Recording: Discussions and Hearings may not be audio or video recorded.

D10. Procedures related to this policy shall be established by the Office of the Provost and Vice President Academic in consultation with the Academic Integrity Office and shall be published annually at the start of the academic year. Published procedures shall be in effect for that academic year. Interpretation of the procedures shall be the responsibility of the Academic Integrity Officer.

STUDENT CODE OF ACADEMIC CONDUCT PROCEDURES

I. SUSPICION OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

A. Consultation: Any member of the Ryerson community may consult with the Academic Integrity Officer or their Chair/Director on any academic misconduct procedure or concern. The Academic Integrity Officer (AIO), or the Chair/Director who is being consulted, is neither an advocate for students or faculty nor a decision maker in the process. Students may also consult with the Ombudsperson, Student Services, or a student advocate from RSU or CESAR.

B. Notification

1. If an instructor (or a Chair/Director if the suspected academic misconduct occurs outside of a course) suspects academic misconduct, he or she, or the AIO if requested to do so (See Procedures Section ID1), will send notification, using the templates available from the AIO, to the student of the date and time of the meeting to discuss the suspicion.
2. Notification will be sent to the student on his or her Ryerson email account, which, as per University policy, is the official means of communication with students. A copy of the Notification should be sent to the Registrar and the AIO so that the student is prevented from dropping the course.
3. While instructors may consult with a Chair/Director if need be, it is required that the discussion about a suspicion be limited to the student and the instructor involved, and a facilitator or agreed upon third party. The Chair/Director should not be part of the meeting.
4. The meeting should normally be held within five (5) working days of the notice. If the student cannot attend at that time, it is his or her obligation to contact the instructor in a timely way to make arrangements for a mutually agreed upon time. If the student fails to contact the instructor and/or fails to attend the meeting, the instructor will make a decision without benefit of input from the student.
5. If misconduct in group work is suspected, it must be determined through the discussion process below, which of the group members is involved. Only those students in the group who have committed academic misconduct will be penalized. The instructor will determine an appropriate means of evaluating the work of those students not involved in the misconduct on the work.

C. Impartiality

1. The instructor should not have information regarding any previous offences before a meeting is held or a recommendation is made. If there is such previous knowledge, the instructor should disregard this information.
2. Any third party who has been involved in the discussion or determination of whether academic misconduct has occurred may not serve on a Faculty Appeals Committee panel or Senate Appeals Committee panel for any hearing on the case.

D. Discussion and Decision: The discussion between the instructor and the student may be held in one of two ways.

1. Facilitated Discussion (with Academic Integrity Officer)

- a. If requested by either the instructor or the student, the Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) or designate will set up and facilitate the meeting to assist with a fair and focused discussion about what may have occurred. Instructors must be prepared to

- present the evidence in support of their suspicion at the Facilitated Discussion with the student(s). Students may bring rough notes, drafts or other documents to the discussion.
- b. If group misconduct (as defined in Policy section B2) is suspected, the AIO must be contacted to assist in determining a fair process. Students may be called in for a discussion of the suspicion as a group or individually. Students may request an individual meeting. As only those students in the group who have committed academic misconduct will be penalized, the instructor will determine an appropriate means of evaluating the work on the assignment of those students not involved in the misconduct.
 - c. If two or more students are involved in a suspicion of academic misconduct, other than in a group project, the AIO must be contacted to assist in determining a fair process.
 - d. The instructor (or Chair/Director) who reported the suspicion, the student(s) believed to have violated the policy and the Facilitator are the only participants in a Facilitated Discussion.
 - e. The Summary of Facilitated Discussion Form must be completed by the Facilitator and signed by the student and the instructor. If either the instructor or the student disagrees with the content of the summary, he or she should note the disagreement on the form.
 - f. **Decision**
 - i. If the instructor agrees that there has been no misconduct, the Summary of Discussion form may be destroyed at the student's request, or will be confidentially retained for one year by the AIO. The instructor may assign the Academic Integrity Tutorial for educative purposes. (See Procedures Section IE.2)
 - ii. If academic misconduct has been determined, the minimum penalty which can be assigned is a "0" on the work. A Disciplinary Notice (DN) will be assigned (See Policy Section D3). The Academic Integrity Tutorial (See Procedures Section IE) may also be assigned, if relevant. The instructor may also assign an "F" in the course and may recommend a higher penalty [Disciplinary Suspension (DS), Disciplinary Withdrawal (DW), or Expulsion for undergraduates or continuing education students and DW or Expulsion for graduate students] (See Policy Section D3).
 - iii. If a penalty greater than an "F" in the course is recommended, there will be an automatic hearing of either the Faculty Appeals Committee or School of Graduate Studies Appeals Committee (See Procedures Section IVB.1).
 - iv. If the student wishes to subsequently rescind admission of misconduct and/or acceptance of a penalty greater than a "0" on the work, he or she must inform the AIO in writing within five (5) working days of the meeting. An appeal must be filed within ten (10) working days of the rescission. If an appeal is not filed by the deadline, the original decision will stand.
 - v. If the penalty is not accepted, the penalty will be assigned by the instructor and the student may submit an appeal to the Faculty Appeals Committee within ten (10) working days of the meeting.
 - vi. The AIO will send a copy of the decision letter to the student, the instructor, the Associate Registrar, the Chair of the student's program department/school (or CE Program Director for CE students not enrolled in a program), and the Chair/Director of the teaching department/school (if different from the program department/school).

2. Discussion (without Academic Integrity Officer)

- a. The meeting should be conducted as an open dialogue for the purpose of discussing the instructor's concerns. The instructor may question students about their writing style and knowledge of the content of the work in question. Subsequent meetings may be scheduled to bring forth other information.
- b. If group misconduct (as defined in Policy Section B2) is suspected, the Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) must be contacted to assist in determining a fair process. Students may be called in for a discussion of the suspicion as a group or individually. Students may request an individual meeting. As only those students in the group who have committed academic misconduct will be penalized, the instructor will determine an appropriate means of evaluating the work on the assignment of those students not involved in the misconduct.
- c. If two or more students are involved in a suspicion of academic misconduct, other than in a group project, the AIO must be contacted to assist in determining a fair process.
- d. A mutually agreed-upon third party may be present to take notes on the discussion. As this is an informal discussion, neither the student nor the instructor will have an advocate in attendance. The Chair/Director may not be the third party as s/he should be available for consultation with both parties.
- e. The Summary of Discussion Form (available on the Senate website – www.ryerson.ca/senate) must be completed by one of the parties at the meeting and signed by all persons present. If either the instructor or the student disagrees with the content of the summary, he or she should note the disagreement on the form.
- f. **Decision:** Within five (5) working days of the final meeting on the matter, an instructor must determine whether to charge the student with academic misconduct.
 - i. If the instructor agrees that there has been no misconduct, the student should be so notified in writing, and a copy of the notification sent to the AIO and the Associate Registrar. The Summary of Discussion form will be destroyed at the request of the student, or sent to the AIO and confidentially retained for one year. The instructor may assign the Academic Integrity Tutorial for educative purposes. (See Procedures Section IE.2)
 - ii. If there is a charge, the instructor must communicate the charge of misconduct and the penalty in writing, utilizing the template letter available from the AIO, to the student, with a copy to the AIO, the Associate Registrar and the student's program department (and teaching department if different from the program department) (See Policy Section E1). A copy of the Summary of Discussion Form must also be included.
 - iii. If it has been determined that there has been misconduct, the instructor must assign the minimum penalty of a "0" for the work, and may additionally assign an "F" in the course and/or the Academic Integrity Tutorial. A DN will be entered on the student's academic record.
 - iv. If a penalty greater than an "F" in the course is recommended (DS, DW, or Expulsion for undergraduates or continuing education students and DW or Expulsion for graduate students), there will be an automatic hearing of either the Faculty Appeals Committee or School of Graduate Studies Appeals Committee (See Procedures Section IVB1). After receipt of the decision letter, the AIO will inform the Committee of this requirement.

E. Academic Integrity Tutorial: If the Academic Integrity Tutorial (AIT) is assigned, the referral form should be completed by the instructor, indicating the particular workshops which are required and the date by which the Tutorial must be completed. The form must be

copied to the AIO. Generally the length of time for completion is 4-6 weeks, not including university closures. It is the student's responsibility to register for the required workshops as indicated on the form.

1. Academic Integrity Tutorial assigned as a result of a charge of Academic Misconduct

- a. If a student is charged with misconduct and the AIT is assigned, the 'Fundamentals of Academic Integrity Workshop' is mandatory. Up to an additional three workshops which are relevant to the charge may also be assigned.
- b. If the student files an appeal of the charge, the completion date will be adjusted accordingly.
- c. Students who, due to extenuating circumstances, are unable to complete the AIT by the completion date, must contact the Academic Integrity Officer (AIO), who may extend the deadline.
- d. If the AIT has not been completed by the specified date, and there has been no extension provided by the AIO, the undergraduate student shall be placed on Disciplinary Suspension for one term, and the graduate student shall be referred to the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) Appeals Committee. The AIO will notify the Registrar, and the student's department/school, which will then notify the student. The student may appeal the AIO's decision not to grant an extension to the Faculty Appeals Committee or to the SGS Appeals Committee which will decide on the penalty.
- e. The AIO will be informed by the workshop instructor when each workshop has been completed.

2. Academic Integrity Tutorial assigned solely for educative purposes with no charge of misconduct

- a. Normally, students may only be assigned the Academic Integrity Tutorial once without being charged with misconduct. In some circumstances an instructor may assign additional AIT workshops if warranted. Students must indicate on the referral form that they have not completed the tutorial before, and a record of these assignments will be kept by the AIO. An instructor may verify with the AIO whether a student has previously been assigned the AIT.
- b. Completion of the AIT becomes a course requirement, and if the student fails to complete the AIT, the instructor will assign a grade of INC for the course. When the AIT is completed, the AIO will inform the instructor.

F. Submission of the same work in two courses - If it has been determined that a student has submitted the same work inappropriately in two courses in the same semester, the two instructors should consult.

- a. It must be determined which of the assignments was submitted first. The one submitted second should receive the grade of zero. If the two assignments are submitted at the same time, the one which has the highest weight should receive the grade of zero. If both have the same weight, the instructors should determine which assignment receives the penalty.
- b. If the circumstances include additional misconduct (e.g. plagiarism), the instructors may apply a penalty in both courses.

II. SUSPICION OF NON-COURSE RELATED ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

A. Documents (Including portfolios and presentations)

- 1. On application to the University:** The submission of any false documents (e.g. transcripts, essays, portfolios, and letters of recommendation) or information considered in the admissions process will result in the following:

- a. If determined before the start of classes through an administrative review conducted by the Undergraduate Admissions Office, the Registrar will revoke the student's Offer of Admission. If classes have begun the Registrar will revoke eligibility. The student may appeal to the Registrar based upon the charge being unfounded.
- b. If determined before the start of classes through an administrative review conducted by the Graduate Admissions Office, the Dean of Graduate Studies will revoke the student's Offer of Admission. If classes have begun the Dean will revoke eligibility. The student may appeal to the Dean based upon the charge being unfounded.
- c. If it is determined after the start of classes by the department/school/program that a submission (portfolio, essay, etc.) upon which admission to the program was based is not the work of the student, the student will be charged with academic misconduct with a recommended penalty of Disciplinary Withdrawal. The student may appeal the decision to the Faculty Appeals Committee or School of Graduate Studies Appeals Committee and subsequently to the Senate Appeals Committee on the same grounds and timelines as any other appeal to those Committees. There will be an automatic hearing at both levels regarding the Disciplinary Withdrawal, even if the student does not appeal.
- d. The Association of Registrars of Universities and Colleges of Canada (ARUCC) will be notified if it is determined that misconduct has occurred.

2. Documents issued by Ryerson: The alteration of documents issued by Ryerson, such as degrees, official transcripts, and grades, will result in the following:

- a. **Current undergraduate student:** After discussion with the student, the Registrar may charge the student with misconduct and recommend a penalty of Expulsion. This charge may be appealed to the Registrar's Appeal Committee and, if necessary, to the Senate Appeals Committee. There will be an automatic hearing of the Registrar's Appeals Committee (not including the Registrar) and the Senate Appeals Committee on the penalty of Expulsion.
- b. **Current graduate student:** After discussion with the student, the Dean may recommend a penalty of Expulsion. This may be appealed to the School of Graduate Studies Appeals Committee and, if necessary, to the Senate Appeals Committee. There will be an automatic hearing of the Senate Appeals Committee on the penalty.
- c. **Former student:** The Registrar may revoke any degree, diploma or certificate, and notify any company or institution which has requested or is requesting verification of the document. This penalty may be appealed to the Registrar's Appeal Committee and, if necessary, to the Senate Appeals Committee.

3. Submission of False Documents in an Appeal or Hearing: If it is suspected that a false document has been submitted in an academic or academic misconduct hearing, and that hearing is already in progress, the panel should consider the following in its deliberations:

- a. If the document in question is essential to the matter being appealed, the panel should not render a decision, and a fair process should be established, in consultation with the Secretary of Senate, to determine the veracity of the document.
 - i. If the document is found to be valid, the panel can reconvene and render its decision.

- ii. If the document is found to be falsified, the Chair of the Panel may bring charges of academic misconduct against the student. If the charge is appealed, a separate hearing will be held to hear the appeal of the charge related to the falsified document.
 - iii. Upon resolution of the charge of misconduct for the submission of a false document, a new panel will be formed to hear the original charge.
 - c. If the document in question is determined not to be essential to the decision, and if all members of the panel believe they can render their decision without consideration of the document in question, the panel can render its decision.
 - d. The Chair of an appeals panel at any level may bring a charge of academic misconduct for a false document submitted as part of any appeal or hearing. (See Procedures Section IIA.3)
- 4. Other Documents or Information;** Documents (e.g. medical documents) may be verified by the office of the Chair/Director, the Dean or Senate, depending on the level of submission. Instructors should have documents verified by their Chair/Director. A charge of misconduct for a false document may be brought by the Chair/Director, Dean or Senate Appeals Committee.

B. Damaging or Tampering with the Scholarly Environment or Contributing to Academic Misconduct or Unauthorized Copying or Use of Copyrighted Materials: Any member of the Ryerson community who suspects any of these types of academic misconduct (See Policy Sections A2, A3 and A4) should inform the Academic Integrity Officer, who will determine the appropriate person to be consulted.

C. Cheating on a test or exam: As there are elements of the Examination Policy related to the integrity of tests and examinations, faculty and students are responsible for knowing the procedures in that policy. Both copying and allowing work to be copied during a test or examination shall constitute cheating. Immediate steps to prevent further cheating will be taken when an invigilator or instructor suspects cheating on a test or exam. If it is suspected after an exam has been given that cheating has occurred, an instructor must follow the procedures outlined in this policy

D. Compromised integrity of assignments, projects, papers or tests – (e.g., answers to an exam have been circulated) - The AIO must be contacted to ensure fairness and consistency is being maintained throughout the University.

IV. APPEALS AND AUTOMATIC HEARINGS: FACULTY APPEALS COMMITTEE.

A. Appeals

1. The student may appeal the charge or a penalty greater than a “0” on the work.
2. There can be no appeal of the charge if the student has admitted academic misconduct in a Facilitated Discussion with the Academic Integrity Officer and has not rescinded that agreement within five (5) working days of that Facilitated Discussion.
3. If the charge of misconduct is not being appealed, there can be no appeal of the assignment of a DN or the minimum penalty of a “0” on the work. Such appeals will not be accepted at any level.

B. Automatic Hearings: A hearing must be automatically scheduled when:

1. there has been a recommended penalty higher than an “F” in the course;
2. a matter is referred to the Committee on a charge of academic misconduct outside of a course; or
3. a penalty hearing is required because a student has a previous misconduct on his or her record.

C. Representation/Support: Representation by legal counsel is not permitted at the Faculty appeal level; however students may bring an advocate who is not legal counsel. Students are encouraged to seek assistance from an advocate from RSU or CESAR. Students may also consult with the Ombudsperson or Student Services. Students may bring a support person, who may not participate in the Hearing.

D. Submissions and Documentation

1. Appeals

- a. **Student Responsibility:** A Faculty Appeals Committee Academic Misconduct Appeal Form must be filed by the student within ten (10) working days from receipt of the decision letter. The student must: address, in writing, specific points about why the decision was not fair or appropriate; submit all documentation pertinent to the case, including letters of explanation and all evidence; and provide the names of any witnesses or agents.
- b. **Instructor Responsibility:** The instructor shall respond to the student appeal in writing and submit all relevant documentation to the Faculty Appeals Committee.

2. Automatic Hearings

- a. **Academic Integrity Office Responsibility:** The student will be notified by the Academic Integrity Office of the intent to schedule an automatic hearing for one of the reasons noted in Procedures Section IVB. If the hearing is for a second charge of misconduct, this notice will not be sent until after the ten (10) working days allowed for a student appeal of the second charge. If the student appeals the charge and/or the penalty, the automatic hearing will not occur until after that appeal has been heard.
- b. **Student Responsibility**
 - i. A Response to Notice of Automatic Hearing Form should be filed by the student with the Dean of his or her program Faculty (or with the Dean of the Chang School for students registered only in continuing education classes and not registered in a program) within ten (10) working days of receipt of the Notice. Even if the form is not submitted, the hearing will proceed. If the student does not appear for the hearing, the Panel will make its decision without input from the student.
 - ii. If the hearing is because of a recommendation of a penalty higher than an “F” in the course, or a charge outside of a course, the student should submit: a letter of explanation; all letters and evidence related to the matter; and the names of any witnesses or agents.
 - iii. If the hearing is to determine the penalty related to a second (or third) academic misconduct, the student should submit: a letter explaining any request regarding the penalty; all of the previous decision letters related to the misconduct charges; and the names of any witnesses or agents.
- c. **Instructor and Chair/Director Responsibility**
 - i. If the hearing is because of an instructor’s recommendation of a penalty greater than an “F” in the course, the instructor must state, in writing, the reason for the recommended penalty and provide all of the relevant evidence to the Committee in advance. He or she must be present at the hearing. If the hearing is because of a

charge outside of a course, the person bringing the charge must provide this documentation and attend the hearing.

- ii. If the hearing is to determine the penalty related to a second (or third) charge of misconduct, the Chair/Director of the student's program should review the student's submission and provide, in writing to the Faculty Appeals Committee prior to the hearing, a recommendation for a penalty, including a recommended length of Disciplinary Suspension or a recommendation for Disciplinary Withdrawal or Expulsion. The Chair/Director, or designate, should be present at the hearing, and may call instructors or previous Panel Chairs as witnesses.

E. Pre-Hearing Procedures

1. The Faculty Appeals Committee must schedule a hearing as soon as possible, normally within ten (10) working days of receipt of the appeals documents, based upon the availability of the student and the instructor or Chair/Director. Students must receive at least ten (10) days notice of the date, time and place of the hearing. An appeal may be scheduled with less than ten (10) days notice with the written agreement of both the student and instructor, if applicable.
2. If the Faculty Appeals Committee 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 to extend the time period, the student should contact the Academic Integrity Officer.
3. A Hearing Panel will be established consisting of at least three (3) members of the Faculty Appeals Committee, from different departments/schools if possible, who have no conflict of interest with the student or instructor. (See Policy Section E1.s and Section E2.e for regulations on Conflict of Interest.) Members of the Panel should not be members of the instructor's or student's department/ school/program.
4. The AIO should obtain an updated copy of the student's official academic record for reference only, and this record should not be distributed with the appeals information.
5. The Faculty Appeals Committee shall distribute a Notice of Hearing indicating the date, time and place of the hearing and the names of the panel members, copies of the student's appeal, and the instructor's/Chair's/Director's response, to: the members of the Hearing Panel; the instructor and/or Chair/Director; the student; the student's advocate, if any; and the Academic Integrity Office. (See Policy Section E1.k for regulations on student receipt of appeals information).
6. The Hearing shall follow the standard hearing procedure as outlined in the Guide to Academic Appeals available from the Secretary of Senate.

F. Hearing Regulations

1. If either the student or the instructor (Chair/Director) fails to attend the Hearing, and there are no extenuating circumstances, the Faculty Appeals Committee may proceed in his or her absence.
2. Witnesses called by either side shall be present at the Hearing only while giving testimony, but may remain after their testimony with the agreement of all parties. Hearings will not be postponed if a witness or advocate fails to appear.
3. The Panel may adjourn the Hearing when it is required for a fair process.
4. A Hearing is open to the public except when the 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. The appellant, respondent or a panel member may request that the hearing be closed. Members of the public may not participate in, or in any way disrupt, the hearing. Any

member of the public, or the support person, may be removed from the hearing by the Panel.

5. The Academic Integrity Officer or designate (for the purpose of providing advice on procedural issues) may be present at the Hearing.
6. Once a decision has been reached, Panel members are responsible for the confidential shredding of all documents in their possession related to the appeal. The complete original copy of the appeal shall be retained and held in confidence by the Faculty Appeals Committee; and the Academic Integrity Officer and the Registrar shall confidentially retain copies of the decision letter.

G. Decision (see Policy Section D1 for specifics on penalties and Policy Section E1.t for Burden and Standard of Proof):

1. Decisions are made by majority vote of the Panel *in camera*.
2. The Panel Chair votes only in the case of a tie.
3. The Hearing Panel may not award any numerical grade except the minimum penalty of a “0” on the work, or an “F” in the course.
4. The Hearing Panel may:
 - a. deny the appeal;
 - b. grant the appeal and attach any conditions (If the student does not agree to the conditions, the appeal shall be considered denied.);
 - c. maintain or reduce the penalty of an “F” in the course to a “0” on the work (Note: If academic misconduct is found the minimum penalty is a “0” on the work and a DN on the academic record is automatic and may not be removed by the Panel. (See Policy Section D3.a.i for information on when this notation can be removed);
 - d. assign or remove the requirement for the Academic Integrity Tutorial;
 - e. maintain or overturn an automatically assigned Disciplinary Suspension for a second offence and, if maintained, determine the length of that suspension, from one term to two years. (See Policy Section D3.a.ii.) (The Spring/Summer term is not considered a term of suspension for full-time undergraduate students, and suspended students may not take courses in this term.);
 - f. decide upon a recommended penalty as follows:
 - i. accept the recommendation for Disciplinary Suspension from his or her program (or, in the case of a CE student, prohibition from registration) and determine the length of the suspension, from one term to two years, for a first offence;
 - ii. accept the recommendation for Disciplinary Withdrawal from the program, and determine the period of at least two years during which the student may not apply to any Ryerson program or certificate (See Policy Section D3.a.iii) and refer the case to the Senate Appeals Committee;
 - iii. accept the recommendation of Expulsion from the University and refer the case to the Senate Appeals Committee; or
 - iv. in exceptional circumstances, if new evidence is presented in an appeal or an automatic hearing by the instructor, may assign a higher penalty than the one recommended by the instructor or Chair/Director.
5. The letter to the student, utilizing the format available from the AIO, outlining the decision of the Hearing Panel shall be sent to the student’s Ryerson email address within five (5) working days of the Hearing, and must clearly state the basis on which the decision was reached. A signed copy of the letter will be available to the student from the Office of the Dean. A copy of the decision will be sent to the instructor, the Chair/Director, the Dean, the Registrar and the Academic Integrity Officer. If the student does not receive the decision within this time, he or she should contact the Academic Integrity Officer.

6. If there is a recommendation of Withdrawal or Expulsion, the Chair of the Hearing Panel must inform the AIO of the need to schedule an automatic hearing of the Senate Appeals Committee.
7. Based upon matters arising at the Hearing, the Hearing Panel may make recommendations to departments/schools/programs, Faculties or the Senate Appeals Committee on procedural or policy matters.

V. APPEALS AND AUTOMATIC HEARINGS: SENATE APPEALS COMMITTEE

A. Appeals: A student may appeal the decision made by the Faculty Appeals Committee, based on one of the following grounds:

1. there is new evidence that was not available at the time of the first hearing which has a reasonable possibility of affecting the decision;
2. there was a substantial procedural error which could have affected the outcome; or
3. inadequate weight was given to the evidence provided.

B. Automatic Hearings: An automatic hearing of the Senate Appeals Committee will be scheduled when the Faculty Appeals Committee recommends Disciplinary Withdrawal or Expulsion.

C. Representation/Support: Students are encouraged to seek assistance from an advocate from RSU or CESAR. Students may also consult with the Ombudsperson or Student Services. Representation by legal counsel is permitted at the Senate appeal level. Students may bring a support person, who may not participate in the Hearing.

D. Submissions and Documentation

1. Appeals

- a. **Student Responsibility:** Students must submit a Senate Academic Misconduct Appeals Form to the Secretary of Senate within ten (10) working days of receipt of the Faculty Appeals Committee decision. The student must provide, in writing, a detailed explanation as to why the Appeals Committee should consider the case. Forms and instructions for the filing of appeals can be found at the Senate website, or are available from the Office of the Secretary of Senate. The Secretary of Senate shall forward the appeal to the Academic Integrity Officer.
- b. **Chair of the Faculty Appeals Committee and Instructor Responsibility:** The Chair of the Faculty Appeals Committee Hearing Panel and the instructor (or the person who brought the original charge) shall be co-respondents to the appeal, and should both submit letters of response to the student's appeal. If they wish, they may consult and submit one letter of response.

2. Automatic Hearings

- a. **Academic Integrity Office Responsibility:** The student will be notified by the Academic Integrity Office of the intent to schedule an automatic hearing. If appropriate, this notice will not be sent until after the ten (10) working days allowed for a student appeal of the charge. If the student appeals the charge, the automatic hearing will not occur until after that appeal has been heard.
- b. **Student Responsibility:**
 - i. A Response to the Notice of Automatic Hearing Form should be filed by the student with the Secretary of Senate within ten (10) working days of receipt of the Notice. Even if the form is not submitted, the hearing will proceed. If the student does not appear for the hearing, the Panel will make its decision without input from the student.

- ii. The student should submit: a letter explaining any request regarding the penalty, all of the previous decision letters related to the misconduct charges, and indicate the names of any witnesses or agents on the appeal form
- c. **Chair of the Faculty Appeals Committee Responsibility:** The Chair of the Faculty Appeals Committee Hearing Panel is the respondent and should respond to the student's submission and be present at the hearing. The Chair may call the instructor or the Chair of the student's Department/School to be a witness in the hearing.

E. Pre-Hearing Procedures: The Secretary of Senate shall:

1. review the appeal to determine if it meets the criteria for appropriate grounds for an appeal. If it is believed that the criteria for an appeal have not been met, the Secretary will convene a Senate Appeals Committee Panel to review the appeal as soon as possible to determine if the case should be heard. The student will be informed in writing of the reasons for the review. A written decision will be provided to the student within five (5) working days of the review. If the decision is to not hear the case, there is no further action on the appeal;
2. forward the appeal to the Chair of the Hearing Panel of the Faculty Appeals Committee. The respondent(s) (see Procedures Section VD.1.b and VD.2.c) should reply to the appeal within five (5) working days of receipt of the appeal. The Registrar must also receive a copy of the appeal;
3. establish a Hearing Panel of the Senate Appeals Committee and appoint a Hearing Panel Chair (see Policy Section E1.s for regulations on Conflict of Interest);
4. schedule a hearing based upon the availability of the student and the respondent(s), normally within ten (10) working days. Students must receive at least ten (10) days notice of the date, time and place of the hearing. An appeal may be scheduled with less than ten (10) days notice with the written agreement of both the student and instructor;
5. forward all of the submissions for the appeal to: all members of the Hearing Panel of the Senate Appeals Committee; the respondent(s); involved faculty members and/or Chairs/Directors; the Registrar; the student (see Policy Section E1.k for regulations on student receipt of appeals information); and the student's advocate or legal counsel, if any.
6. The Secretary of Senate should obtain a copy of the student's academic record for reference in the hearing if necessary.

F. Hearing Regulations:

1. If either the student or the respondent(s) fails to attend the Hearing, and there are no extenuating circumstances, the Senate Appeals Committee may proceed in his or her absence. If there are extenuating circumstances, the Panel may decide to reconvene the hearing at a later time.
2. Witnesses called by either side shall be present at the Hearing only while giving testimony, but may remain after their testimony with the agreement of all parties. Hearings will not be postponed if a witness or advocate fails to appear.
3. The Panel may adjourn the Hearing when it is required for a fair process.
4. A Hearing is open to the public except when the 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. The appellant, respondent or a panel member may request that the hearing be closed. Members of the public may not participate in, or in any way disrupt, the hearing. Any member of the public, or the support person, may be removed from the hearing by the Panel.
5. The Academic Integrity Officer or designate, and/or the Secretary of Senate (for the purpose of providing advice on procedural issues) may be present at the Hearing.

6. Once a decision has been reached, Panel members are responsible for the confidential shredding of all documents in their possession related to the appeal. The complete original copy of the appeal shall be retained and held in confidence by the Secretary of Senate; and the Academic Integrity Officer and the Registrar shall confidentially retain copies of the decision.

G. Decision (See Policy Section D1 for specifics on penalties and Policy Section E1.t for Burden and Standard of Proof.)

1. Decisions are made by majority vote of the Panel *in camera*.
2. The Panel Chair votes only in the case of a tie.
3. The Hearing Panel may not award any numerical grade except the minimum penalty of a “0” on the work, or an “F” in the course.
4. The Hearing Panel may:
 - a. deny the appeal;
 - b. grant the appeal and attach any conditions. If the student does not agree to the conditions the appeal is considered denied;
 - c. maintain or reduce the penalty (Note: If academic misconduct is found the minimum penalty is a “0” on the work and a DN on the academic record is automatic and may not be removed);
 - d. maintain or overturn a Disciplinary Suspension for a second offence and, if maintained, determine whether to uphold or reduce the length of the suspension determined by the Faculty Appeals Committee;
 - e. accept or deny the recommendation for Disciplinary Suspension of the student from his or her program (or, in the case of a CE student, prohibition from registration) for a first offence and decide whether to uphold or reduce the length of the suspension determined by the Faculty Appeals Committee;
 - f. accept or deny the recommendation for Disciplinary Withdrawal and decide whether to maintain or reduce the period during which the student may not apply to a program or certificate; or
 - g. accept or deny the recommendation for Expulsion from the University.
5. The letter to the student, utilizing the format available from the AIO, outlining the decision of the Hearing Panel shall be sent to the student’s Ryerson email address within five (5) working days of the Hearing, and must clearly state the basis on which the decision was reached. A signed copy of the letter will be available to the student from the office of the Senate. The Secretary of Senate must send a copy of the decision to the Chair of the Faculty Appeals Panel, the respondent(s), the AIO, the Registrar, and the Dean of the student’s program Faculty.
6. Once a decision has been reached, Panel members are responsible for the confidential shredding of all documents in their possession related to the appeal. The complete original appeal shall be confidentially retained by the Senate Appeals Committee, and the Academic Integrity Officer and the Registrar shall confidentially retain copies of the decision letter.
7. Based upon matters arising at the Hearing, the Hearing Panel may make recommendations on procedural or policy matters to the Senate Appeals Committee, a Faculty Appeals Committee or Appeals Officer, a Dean, the Registrar’s Office or a department/ school/program.
8. Decisions of the Senate Appeals Committee are final and binding.

Report to Senate of the
Ad hoc Committee to Review the
Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct
March 4, 2008

At the April 4, 2007 meeting of Senate (Academic Council), the President asked that the Vice Provost Students establish a committee to review the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct. In response to that request, a committee was formed consisting of: D. Bowden, Educational Equity Officer, Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Services; D. Brecher, Coordinator, Centre for Student Development and Counseling; A. Bridges, Student Member of Senate Appeals, Arts and Contemporary Studies; M. Creery, Director of Student Services; Z. Fawaz, Vice Provost Students; J. Hanigsberg, University General Counsel and Secretary of the Board; H. Kere, VP Education, RSU; M. Levine, Student Senator, Ted Rogers School of Management; J. Lewis, Associate Director, Centre for Environmental Health, Safety and Security Management; D. Mason, President, RFA; J. Offenbeck, Former RSU Student Issues and Advocacy Coordinator; D. Schulman, Director, Office of the Provost and Vice President Academic and Secretary of Senate; T. Schwerdtfeger, Student Senator, Urban and Regional Planning; E. Shelton, Students Rights Coordinator, CESAR; and A. Whiteside, Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Officer. The committee was joined in January 2008 by: N. Loreto, President, RSU; G. Alivio, President, CESAR; and K. Neale, RSU Students Issues and Advocacy Coordinator. N. Farrell, Ombudsperson, acted as a very helpful consultant throughout. The Committee started meeting on June 15, 2007.

Context:

Ryerson's has both a *Student Code of Academic Conduct* (SCAC) and a *Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct* (SCNAC). The SCNAC was originally part of a combined 1988 policy which encompassed both academic and non-academic conduct which was reviewed in 1999. In 2003 the two policies were separated. The changes made to the SCNAC at that time were largely related to appeals procedures, but the basic process of dealing with non-academic misconduct was left to the Director of Student Services as it had been in the original 1988 policy. When the original process for dealing with non-academic misconduct was developed, Ryerson was a much smaller place. Today, the position of Director of Student Services has expanded, as has the student body. The nature of misconduct has changed and the scope of the need has grown.

In response to the need to immediately deal with critical cases that affect the safety of the Ryerson community, the Assessment of Behavioural Risk Team (ABR) was developed, and, as recent events on university and college campuses prove, its role has become essential. The ABR Team receives referrals from anyone on campus and works to immediately put plans in place to deal with the safety issues while ensuring that the student gets appropriate support. The ABR Team proposed the establishment of the position of Student Conduct Officer (SCO) to assist with this process, including education and appropriate case management and follow-up. In the writing of the proposed SCNAC, it became clear that the SCO would play a vital role in managing

student conduct incidents, whether they be referred to the ABR Team or not. The SCNAC establishes the SCO as the one point of contact for all concerns about student non-academic conduct so that Ryerson can try to avoid allowing students who exhibit risky behaviour to “fall through the cracks”.

The Committee reviewed the conduct codes of a wide variety of universities and met regularly to discuss issues and drafts. The Committee consulted with the Senate Appeals Committee, which is charged with the ultimate enforcement of the policy, and received very helpful input.

Policy elements:

Actions under the SCNAC are based on complaints made by members of the Ryerson community, initially to the SCO who is charged with responding in an appropriate manner. The basic principles under which the SCNAC has been established and should be enforced are described. Offences and penalties which can be assigned are clearly outlined. Penalties for more minor offences are left to the discretion of the SCO, as they are currently left to the Director of Student Services. For more major offences, penalties which may have academic consequences for the student can be recommended by the SCO to the Vice Provost Students, and in the most significant cases, from the Vice Provost Students to the Senate Appeals Committee.

An appeals process, including a final appeal to the Senate Appeals Committee, is put in place. Establishing procedures which support the SCNAC is the responsibility of the Vice Provost Students. Procedures are not part of the policy, and as with the SCAC, they must be reviewed and published annually.

The Committee is submitting this report and proposed policy for discussion, and will make a motion to approve the Code at the April 1, 2008 meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Z. Fawaz, Vice Provost Students
for the Committee

**RYERSON UNIVERSITY
STUDENT CODE OF NON-ACADEMIC CONDUCT**

Table of Contents

POLICY INDEX		PAGE
I.	POLICY	1
A.	STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES	1
B.	APPLICATION OF POLICY	2
1.	On Campus	2
2.	Off Campus in Certain Circumstances	2
3.	Offences Conducted within Social or Other Computer Networks	2
4.	Persons Covered by this Code	2
5.	Relationship to Other Policies and Principles	2
a.	Peaceful Assemblies and Freedom of Expression	2
b.	Code Does Not Supersede Other Policies	2
c.	Civil or Criminal Proceedings	3
C.	OFFENCES PROHIBITED UNDER THIS CODE	3
D.	REMEDIES AND PENALTIES	4
1.	Penalties decided by the Conduct Officer	5
2.	Penalties decided by the Vice Provost, Students	5
3.	Penalties decided by the Senate Appeals Committee	6
E.	APPEALS	6
F.	INTERIM MEASURES	7
1.	Disruption of Instructional Activities	7
2.	Urgent Situations and Risk to On-going Personal Safety	7
G.	POWER TO CREATE PROCEDURES UNDER HIS CODE	7
APPENDIX A: DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSESSMENT OF BEHAVIOURAL RISK TEAM		8

I. POLICY

A. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Ryerson University is a learning community of students, faculty and staff, committed to providing a civil and safe environment which is respectful of the rights, responsibilities, well-being and dignity of all of its members.

The Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct (“Code”) reflects an expectation that students will conduct themselves in a manner consistent with the educational mission of the University, in accordance with generally accepted standards of behaviour and University regulations and policies, and in compliance with federal, provincial and municipal laws, including professional codes of ethics that govern students who are members of some regulated professions.

The Code outlines, in a non-exhaustive manner, actions which the University considers to be non-academic misconduct offences and the range of remedies and/or penalties which may be imposed. The principles of the policy are generally educational and whenever appropriate, the University encourages informal resolution of minor incidents, and the recommendation of services both in the University and the community to help students meet their needs and cope with the stresses that may be a part of their university experience. Students must realize that, when necessary, penalties will be imposed to ensure an acceptable community standard is maintained.

The Code also recognizes that, in some circumstances, there is a need to act quickly when students pose an imminent danger to themselves or others. The Assessment of Behavioural Risk Team (“ABRT”) is a group of experts from a wide variety of campus areas who address urgent issues that arise at the intersection of mental health, security and academic concerns. The ABRT may assist with the determination of the need for action or the imposition of remedies or penalties under this Code.

The Student Conduct Officer (“Conduct Officer”) has a key responsibility in the management of issues related to non-academic student conduct. The Conduct Officer is the point of first referral for all complaints regarding student conduct expediting resolutions as appropriate, either by recommending and negotiating informal resolutions, or by initiating formal proceedings through this Code. The Conduct Officer acts as a conduit for all student conduct issues in order to proactively deal with students who may be at risk to self or others.

The Conduct Officer is responsible for providing advice to the Vice Provost, Students and guidance to the University regarding the prevention of and response to student behaviour on campus. The Conduct Officer takes a proactive role in assessing the University’s policies and practices related to critical student behaviour incidents, including aggressive and violent behaviour and issues of safety and security, recommending changes to policy and practice, and provides education and outreach for staff, faculty and administration. The Conduct Officer serves as a core member of the ABRT, providing expertise, gathering and analysing information, making recommendations on appropriate actions and communicating with appropriate parties.

This Code applies to non-academic conduct. Academic conduct is governed by the Student Code of Academic Conduct, Senate Policy 60.

Ryerson students are responsible for familiarizing themselves with this Code.

B. APPLICATION OF POLICY

Non-Academic misconduct penalties, as outlined in section D, may be applied in the following cases:

1. On Campus

This Code applies to all conduct which takes place on University land and premises either rented or owned or using University owned or run property or equipment including, but not limited to, telephones, computers and computer networks.

2. Off Campus in Certain Circumstances

This Policy applies to the conduct of students: when acting as delegates; claiming to be formal representatives of Ryerson University; as members of a class; as student participants at a Ryerson University sponsored event off campus; including exchange students studying at Ryerson University.

3. Offences Conducted Online

Conduct that would otherwise constitute an offence (see section C) under this Code that is conducted online may be addressed under this Code.

4. Persons Covered by this Code

- a. Currently enrolled students: Special, graduate, undergraduate, audit and continuing education students enrolled either full-time or part-time in courses, either credit or non-credit, of the University;
- b. Students active in a program but not currently enrolled in classes: students who are active in a program but not currently enrolled in classes including students who have been assigned a Required to Withdraw academic standing.
- c. Former Students: if the person was a Student at the time of the alleged violation of the Code. If any proceedings under this code cannot be initiated or completed because a person against whom a complaint has been filed is no longer a Student as defined in this section, the proceeding may continue if the person becomes a Student again.

Penalties levied against a former Student shall be noted on the person's record and the person shall not be permitted to register for any course or courses at the University until such time as the penalty imposed has been fulfilled.

5. Relationship to Other Policies and Principles

a. Peaceful Assemblies and Freedom of Expression

Nothing in this code shall be construed to prohibit peaceful assemblies and demonstrations, lawful picketing, or to inhibit freedom of expression.

b. Code Does Not Supersede Other Policies

Nothing in this Code shall replace or supersede any complaint, grievance or appeal procedure set out in any collective agreement to which the University is a party, the Student Code of Academic Conduct, or other University policies.

When conduct may violate multiple policies the Conduct Officer will assess how best to proceed to ensure a fair, expeditious and, where possible, streamlined approach.

Selected other related policies are identified in Appendix A attached to this Code.

c. Civil or Criminal Proceedings

Conduct that constitutes a breach of the Criminal Code or other statute, or that would give rise to a civil claim or action, should ordinarily be dealt with by the appropriate criminal or civil proceedings. In most cases formal resolution by the University of any allegations, which are the subject of a court proceeding will be suspended until the resolution of that proceeding.

In cases in which criminal or civil proceedings have not been taken or would not adequately protect the University's interests, the University reserves the right to proceed with discipline under this Code.

C. OFFENCES PROHIBITED UNDER THIS CODE

The offences described in this Code are not intended to be exhaustive, but to provide reasonable parameters that will guide students in their actions.

1. Disruption of Learning and Teaching - Students shall not behave in disruptive ways that interfere with learning and teaching.
2. Malicious or Defamatory Material –Students shall not distribute malicious or defamatory materials about faculty, staff or students.
3. Threats and Harm to Health and Safety –Students shall not endanger or threaten the health and safety of faculty, staff or students or encourage others to threaten or harm faculty, staff or students.
4. Unauthorized Entry and/or Presence - Students shall not enter, use or let someone else use private areas of the University without permission and must leave those premises if asked to do so by University staff.
5. Theft, Damage and Destruction of property - Students shall not steal, damage or destroy property of the University or a faculty, staff or other Student.
6. Misuse of Facilities, Equipment, Materials or Services - Students shall not:
 - a. use any facility, equipment, material or service in a manner which might put another person at risk or without proper authority;
 - b. obtain any University equipment, material or service by fraudulent means or by providing false information.
7. Misuse of Library or Computer Resources - Students shall not:
 - a. remove books, equipment or other library material from the university libraries without proper authorization;
 - b. mutilate, deface, intentionally misplace library books or material or in any way deprive others of access to library resources;
 - c. abuse any University computer or computer related facility or software, alter or remove computer files or software without proper authorization, purposefully misplace, or deprive others of access to such computer resources;
 - d. use computer equipment on campus to download, distribute or send offensive, discriminatory, and/or harassing material.

8. Compliance with Directions from University Employees - Students are required to comply with directions of University employees (including faculty and staff) acting in the legitimate performance of their duties (e.g. regarding exam rules, instructor course management directions, smoking, evacuation, pets).
9. Identification on Request - Students are required to identify themselves to representatives of University Security & Emergency Services, exam invigilators, or other University employees where such information is relevant to the legitimate pursuit of their duties.
10. Harassment - Students shall not:
 - a. engage in activity that violates the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Policy based on the grounds specified by the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Policy (race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, age, record of offences, marital status, family status, disability);
 - b. engage in conduct which, although not based on the grounds specified by the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Policy, is abusive, demeaning, threatening, or intimidating, or involves the misuse of authority or power that exceeds the bounds of freedom of expression or academic freedom.
11. Possession, Use or Distribution of False Identification - Students shall not possess, distribute or use false or altered identification.
12. Misconduct Related to the Use of Alcohol/Drugs - Students shall not:
 - a. be drunk and disorderly in public;
 - b. possess, provide, or consume illegal drugs;
 - c. possess or consume alcoholic beverages, except when properly in attendance at a licensed campus pub or event, or as permitted under the Residence Contract;
 - d. possess or consume alcohol anywhere on University premises if under the age of nineteen (19) years;
 - e. provide alcoholic beverages to any person under the age of nineteen (19) years.
13. Hazing - Students shall not engage in any act which endangers, or could reasonably be seen to endanger the mental or physical health or safety of a student, for the purpose of initiation, admission into, affiliation with, or as a condition for continued membership in, a group or organization.
14. Firearms, Explosives, Weapons – Students shall not use, possess, or distribute firearms, explosives, or other weapons.
15. Unauthorized Use of Dangerous Chemicals – Students shall not use dangerous chemicals unless they have proper authority from the University.
16. False, Frivolous or Malicious Charges - Students shall not knowingly bring a false, frivolous or malicious charge under this Code or any other policy of the University.
17. Abuse of the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct - Students shall not falsify, distort or misrepresent information, or interfere with the application of this Code.

D. REMEDIES AND PENALTIES

The following penalties may be imposed for a breach of the Code. More than one penalty may be imposed concurrently for a single breach. When imposing a penalty the full context will be

considered including elements such as the severity of the offence, the harm caused, and whether the student has been found guilty of prior breaches of the Code. The Assessment of Behavioural Risk Team may be consulted in determining appropriate penalties or the need for supports (e.g. those provided by the Access Centre or the Centre for Student Development and Counselling).

1. Penalties imposed by the Conduct Officer

The following penalties may be imposed by the Conduct Officer:

- a. Written reprimand—a notice in writing to the Student that the Student has committed or is committing an offence
- b. Apology—an expression of regret for the offence in a form satisfactory to the Conduct Officer
- c. Letter of Behavioural Expectations—an undertaking (i) not to engage in certain behaviour, and (ii) setting out the consequences if the letter is not followed, and in some cases (iii) that prescribes a range of actions to be taken (e.g. seeking counselling, a psychiatric assessment, registration with the Access Centre, attending services off campus that should help the student).
- d. Community or University service or other activity that allows students to reflect on and learn from their behaviour of its impact
- e. Restitution—compensation for loss, damage or injury in the form of monetary or material replacement
- f. Loss of privileges—prohibition or limitation on entering University premises or specific parts thereof or restriction on contact with specific person(s).

2. Penalties imposed by the Vice Provost, Students

The following penalties may be imposed by the Vice Provost, Students, on the recommendation of the Conduct Officer:

- a. Deregistration from a single course
- b. Non-Academic Disciplinary Suspension (NDS) for a period up to two (2) years. For continuing education students, suspension will result in the student being prohibited from enrolling in any courses at Ryerson during the period specified by the Appeals Committee.
 - i. The length of the suspension is determined by the Vice Provost, Students and may be recommended by the Conduct Officer.
 - ii. The NDS notation shall remain until students graduate, or for eight (8) years, whichever comes first. Students who subsequently graduate from another post-secondary institution may petition the Registrar's Office to have the notation removed. Continuing education students and part-time degree students may petition the Registrar to remove the NDS two years after the period of suspension has been served.
 - iii. No courses may be taken at Ryerson, including at The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education during the period of NDS. Course work taken elsewhere during the period of suspension will not be credited towards GPA calculations, Academic Standing or graduation requirements within the student's program.

- iv. If the NDS is assigned during the semester, students may be permitted to complete some or all of the other courses in which they are enrolled, and the suspension will become effective at the end of the semester.
- v. A student who is assigned an NDS may not be admitted to any program or certificate until the specified period of suspension has been served and any specified conditions have been met.

3. Penalties imposed by the Senate Appeals Committee

The following penalties may only be imposed by the Senate Appeals Committee, on the recommendation of the Vice Provost, Students:

- a. Non-Academic Disciplinary Withdrawal (NDW)—Students who are assigned a NDW for non-academic misconduct shall be withdrawn from the University for a period of at least two (2) years. A NDW shall be permanently noted on a student’s academic record and official transcript.
 - i. A student who is assigned a NDW may not apply to the same program but may apply to any other program after serving the specified period of withdrawal and after meeting specific conditions established by the Senate Appeals Committee;
 - ii. No courses may be taken at Ryerson, including at The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education, during the period of NDW. Course work taken elsewhere during this period will not be credited towards GPA calculations, Academic Standing or graduation requirements within any Ryerson program;
 - iii. For continuing education students, NDW will result in the student being prohibited from enrolling in any courses at Ryerson during the specified period, and from enrolling in certificate programs or courses as determined by the Senate Appeals Committee.
- b. Expulsion-- Students who are expelled from the University shall not be allowed to register or enroll in any course or program of the University. Expulsion shall be permanently noted on a student’s academic record and official transcript.

E. APPEALS AND HEARINGS

- 1. Appeals of the charges brought by, or penalties imposed by, the Conduct Officer under section D1, are to the Vice Provost, Students. If the Conduct Officer recommends a penalty under section D2, the Vice Provost shall be the decision maker.
- 2. Appeals of charges brought by, or penalties imposed by the Vice Provost, Students under section D2 are to the Senate Appeals Committee.
- 3. If the Vice Provost, Students recommends a NDW or Expulsion, the Senate Appeals Committee shall hold a hearing.
- 4. Decisions of the Senate Appeals Committee are final.

F. INTERIM MEASURES

1. Disruption of Instructional Activities

Disruption of instructional activities, including examinations, may be dealt with by the appropriate instructor as a matter of classroom discipline. The instructor may require the student to leave the area for the remainder of the particular class or examination. Any disruption that results in the removal of a student shall be reported to the Chair or Course Director.

2. Urgent Situations and Risk to On-going Personal Safety

- a. In some circumstances, such as those involving serious threats or violent behaviour, it may be necessary to remove a student from the University. In such cases, the Conduct Officer may recommend to the Provost and Vice President Academic (or delegate), that the student be suspended for up to five (5) working days if there is a reasonable apprehension that the safety of others is endangered, damage to University property is likely to occur, or the continued presence of the student would be disruptive to the legitimate operations of the University. A temporary suspension must be reviewed by the Provost and Vice President Academic (or delegate) within the five (5) working day suspension period, and either revoked or continued.
- b. The Conduct Officer may also convene a meeting of the Assessment of Behavioural Risk Team in order to assess risk of harm to self or others and determine the best course of action to enhance safety.
- c. In extreme circumstances indicating risk to self or others, Security and Emergency Services may immediately and temporarily remove (“bar”) a student from campus or a specified part of campus pending application of these Interim Measures and other parts of this Code.
- d. If the suspension under (a) is continued, the student may request a hearing by the Senate Appeals Committee, who shall hear and decide on the matter within ten (10) working days. Grounds for appeal are limited to the following:
 - (i) That the Provost and Vice President Academic (or delegate) had no power under this Code to reach the decision taken
 - (ii) That there was a fundamental procedural error seriously prejudicial to the appellant; or
 - (iii) That the appellant has new evidence to present that could not reasonably have been presented earlier.

G. POWER TO CREATE PROCEDURES UNDER THIS CODE

Procedures under this Code shall be established by the Vice Provost, Students in keeping with fair process and the principles of natural justice and in consultation with the Conduct Officer. Procedures shall be published annually at the start of each academic year. Published procedures shall be in effect for that academic year.

APPENDIX A: DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSESSMENT OF BEHAVIOURAL RISK TEAM

Purpose of Team

To provide the university with a working group to provide behavioural risk recognition, information gathering, initial risk assessment, critical interventions, and finally, recommendations and referral to the appropriate person or group with long term responsibility for risk mitigation and case management. The team itself is not responsible for long term case management but will refer to the appropriate resource on or off campus.

Team Composition

Manager, Centre for Student Development and Counselling (Psychologist)
General Counsel and Secretary of the Board of Governors
Supervisor, Safety and Security
Manager, Access Centre for Students with Disabilities
Manager, Safety and Security
Director, Office of the Provost and Vice President Academic
Coordinator, Ryerson Health Centre (Physician)
Psychologist, Centre for Student Development and Counselling
Consulting Psychiatrist, St. Michael's Hospital
Officer, Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Services
Student Conduct Officer

Team Activation

The team is activated by any member of the team when someone from the Ryerson Community either:

- threatens harm against another person or intentionally causes harm to another person;
- threatens harm to themselves, or intentionally causes harm to themselves;
- causes Ryerson community members to believe that the person poses a danger to themselves or any other person.

Activation Timeframe

The team makes every effort to respond to a crisis as soon as possible – usually within one business day or less.

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

**ESTABLISHMENT OF STUDENT E-MAIL ACCOUNTS FOR OFFICIAL
UNIVERSITY COMMUNICATION**

Policy Number:	157
Approval Date:	February, 2003
Review Date:	March, 2008
Responsible Offices:	Provost and Vice President Academic; Vice President, Administration & Finance; Vice Provost Students
Review Date:	September, 2009
Previous Implementation dates:	Academic Year beginning September 2003 Academic Year beginning September 2007 for Continuing Education Students
Effective Date:	Fall, 2008

All students in full and part-time graduate and undergraduate degree programs and all continuing education students are required to activate and maintain their Ryerson online identity in order to regularly access Ryerson's E-mail (Rmail), RAMSS, my.ryerson.ca portal and learning system, and other systems by which they will receive official University communications.

Only the Provost and Vice President Academic, the Vice President, Administration and Finance, and the Vice Provost Students may authorize use of the system for the simultaneous sending of e-mails to all students.

Procedures for student activation and use, as well as the Ryerson Student Computing Guidelines, shall be available on the Ryerson University website.