# SENATE MEETING
# AGENDA

## Tuesday, April 1, 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.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>**1.**</td><td colspan="2">**President's Report**</td></tr>
<tr><td>Pages 1-5</td><td></td><td>1.1</td><td>President's Update</td></tr>
<tr><td>Pages 6-8</td><td></td><td>1.2</td><td>Ryerson Achievement Report</td></tr>
</table>

**2.**     **Report of the Secretary of Senate**
　　　　2.1     Special Senate Meeting

**3.**     **The Good of the University**

**4.**     **Minutes:**
Pages 9-15　　4.1     Minutes of the March 4, 2008 Meeting

**5.**     **Business arising from the Minutes**
Pages 16-17　　5.1     Amendment to Policy #157 – "Establishment of Student Email Accounts for Official University Communication" (the Email Policy)
　　　　　　5.1.1     **Motion:** *That Senate approve the amendments to Policy 157 – Establishment of Student Email Accounts for Official University Communication*

Pages 18-31　　5.2     Report of the Senate Appeals Committee to review the Student Code of Academic Conduct (Policy #60)
　　　　　　5.2.1     **Motion:** *That Senate approve the revised Student Code of Academic Conduct (Policy #60)*

　　　　5.3     Status Report of the *Ad hoc* Committee to Review the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct, (Policy #61)

**6.**     **Correspondence**

**7.**     **Reports of Actions and Recommendations of Departmental and Divisional Councils**
Pages 32-48　　7.1     Report #W2008-1 of the Composition and By-Laws Committee
　　　　　　7.1.1     **Motion #1:** *That Senate approve the Graphic Communications Management School Council By-Laws*
　　　　　　7.1.2     **Motion #2***: That Senate approve the amendments to the Physics Department Council By-Laws*

**8.      Reports of Committees**

**9.      New Business**

**10.     Adjournment**

**Ryerson University**
**Senate**

**President's Update**
**for the meeting of:  April 1st, 2008**

**International Anti-Racism Day** – Ryerson will mark the UN International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination with a rally and panel discussion on Friday, March 28th . Please participate to demonstrate our community's collective strength in challenging racism on and off campus and in ensuring Ryerson is an inclusive and safe learning and working environment.

**Vice Provost Students** – The appointment of Dr. Heather Lane Vetere as Vice Provost Students effective June 1, 2008 was made on March 20th by Provost and Vice-President Academic Dr. Alan Shepard. Dr. Lane Vetere is currently Executive Director, Student Housing Services at the University of Guelph, and was formerly Dean of Students for Victoria University at the University of Toronto. Dr. Lane Vetere is a nationally-recognized leader in student services, with a wide range of experience in all aspects of student life. She has a PhD in Higher Education Administration from Bowling Green State University in Ohio, and a M.Sc. in Consumer Studies and a Bachelor of Applied Science in Consumer Studies from the University of Guelph. Sincere thanks are extended to Dr. Zouheir Fawaz for developing the position and serving on an interim basis, as well as to the  members of the Search Committee. We look forward to welcoming Dr. Lane Vetere to campus.

**Architecture Accreditation Visit** – Congratulations to the Department of Architectural Science for the quality of preparation and an impressive event when the reviewers were on campus for the site visit on February 25th. We have every confidence in a positive result.

**Admissions: the next step** – Demand for admission to Ryerson programs continues very strong, and we are now considering ways to attract and encourage more of the very best students with 90%+ high school averages to come to Ryerson. As the cycle begins to wind down for Fall 2008, we are already looking ahead to putting effective recruitment strategies in place for the next round.

**Sunnybrook/Ryerson Partnership** – On February 22nd, Ryerson met with Dr. Barry McLellan, President & CEO of the Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, and senior Sunnybrook colleagues, to advance the partnership with the G. Raymond Chang School in moving forward the collaborative project funded by the Health Force Ontario 2007-08 Interprofessional Care/Education Fund of the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. Dean Anita Shilton and Provost and Vice-President Academic Dr. Alan Shepard led the Ryerson discussion.

**St. Michael's Hospital and Sick Kids** – Talks are continuing between the university, hospitals, the Ministry of Health & Long-term Care, and the Ministry of Training, Colleges & Universities about developing an increasingly strategic and integral role for Ryerson, in the area of health human resources in particular. I had the occasion to address the St. Mike's Board on March 11th and the response to the Ryerson connection is very positive.

**Master Plan and Related Items** –

- *Gallery Design Unveiling* – The presentation of the design concept for the Ryerson Photography Gallery and Research Centre on March 5th was phenomenally successful, with a wonderful article by Christopher Hume in *The Toronto Star* and extensive coverage by the media, thanks to Diane Kenyon and colleagues in Ryerson Public Affairs, Marketing and Communications.

- *TTC UPass* – We are consulting with the TTC to support the student-led initiative for a student transit pass. Not only is it 'the better way' it champions the Master Plan 'people first' principle.

- *Gould Street Closure* – We continue to discuss the possibilities of closing Gould Street to traffic (subject to Board of Governors approval), including a meeting most recently on March 17th involving the Master Planners and colleagues from the City of Toronto at which the focus was on the technical aspects and the implications for transportation.

- *AUCC Roundtable on Energizing Cities and Neighbourhoods* – I have agreed to co-lead this session at the AUCC membership meeting in Windsor on April 3rd, and will be sharing some aspects of our Master Plan experience. There is significant interest from other institutions, and it is expected the meeting will be well attended.

**Government Relations** –

***Lt. Governor David Onley*** – It was an honour to welcome the Honourable Lieutenant Governor of Ontario David Onley to campus to give a lecture as part of Accessibility Awareness Week. The event was organized by students and staff from The Access Centre and RyeACCESS.

***COU*** – As Chair of the COU Government and Community Relations Committee, I have been meeting government Ministers with COU President & CEO Dr. Paul Genest. This month we met with the Hon. Michael Bryant, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, and the Hon. John Wilkinson, Minister of Research and Innovation. The general purpose of our meetings is to promote universities as contributors to the priorities of government. In both of these meetings I was able to use Ryerson programs as an example where the connection with the Ministry mandate is strong.

***Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities*** – In early March, we had a productive discussion with Parliamentary Assistant Dr. Reza Moridi, who met with us on campus. Dr. Moridi has served as a member of the Ryerson Medical Physics program Advisory Council, and was hosted by the Department of Physics for a post-meeting tour.

***The Hon. Bob Rae, MP Toronto Centre*** – Following the March 17th by-election, I was pleased to send congratulations and best wishes on behalf of our community to our new federal representative, and extended an invitation to campus for a conversation about plans and priorities.

***Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Canada*** – A few years ago, I served as Chair of the federal Education Marketing Advisory Board. This month I was invited to meet with Drew Fagan, Assistant Deputy Minister, Strategic Policy and Planning, about two issues: the interest of the federal government in facilitating opportunities for international students to come to Canada, and for Canadians to study abroad; and enhancing the international role of Canadian universities.

### *President's Congratulations*

- ❖ *January 2008 – Quinton Gordon (Image Arts 1990) made the cut in the prestigious 2008 Hasselblad Masters Awards, an international photography competition where 100 semi-finalists are chosen from an initial group of 1,700 competitors.*

- ❖ *January 10-13, 2008 – A team of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering students (Adeel Ahmad, Richard Fong, Aileen Lim, Wajeh Rehman) won 2nd place in the Engineering Design competition at the 28th Annual Institute of Industrial Engineers (IIE) National Student Conference.*

- ❖ *January 30-February 2, 2008 – The Ryerson team of Civil Engineering students won 2nd place in the 2008 Great Northern Concrete Toboggan Race competition, the second year Ryerson entered the contest and the second year finishing 'in the medals.'*

- ❖ *February 2008 – The Ryerson Information Technology virtualization project was featured in the February 2008 issue of* Dell Power Solutions *magazine, circulated worldwide.*

- ❖ *February 6-9, 2008 – A team of 4th year undergraduate students (Jonathan Cheng, Ryan Matthews and Wayne Yao) from the Ted Rogers School of Information Technology Management placed 4th at the international CaseIT competition against universities from around the world.*

- ❖ *February 21, 2008 – A team of Ted Rogers School of Management graduate students (Kent Chin, Stephen Kershaw, Maggie Yang and Gavin Yeung) won the 2008 RBC Next Great Innovator Challenge, prevailing over more than 100 proposals nationwide.*

- ❖ *February 22-23, 2008 – A team of Ted Rogers School of Management MBA/MMSc students (Miranda Fong, Sarah Fuller, Lance Martel, and Stephen McAteer) placed 2nd in the Leeds-Net Impact Case Competition hosted by the University of Colorado at Boulder. The final 20 teams (down from 52) included the University of Chicago, and the University of California, Berkeley.*

- ❖ *February 22-24, 2008 – Team Ryerson placed 3rd at the 2008 Nursing Games at the University of Montreal, competing against a dozen teams from institutions across eastern Canada.*

- ❖ *February 27, 2008 – The Ryerson Engineering Student Society (RESS) raised $3,470 for SickKids in the annual 24-hour Bug Push around the Quad, persevering in the face of challenging weather conditions.*

- ❖ *March 2008 – Dr. Glen Hoffmann, Department of Philosophy, has been awarded the American Philosophical Association (APA) 2008 Rockefeller Prize for his paper* Truth, Superassertability, and Conceivability*, to be published in an upcoming issue of The Journal of Value Inquiry.*

- ❖ *March 2008 – In the* Financial Post Business Magazine *summary of MBA programs offered in Toronto (by Ryerson, the University of Toronto, York, Wilfrid Laurier, UWO, Queen's, Concordia) the 'selling point' for the Ted Rogers School of Management is '*Ryerson focuses on "real world" applications and a program that provides immediate job value.*'*

- *March 2008 – At the invitation of Chris Gallipeau (RTA 2007), Coordinator of Media Assets for the Canadian Football League, Mike Arsalides and classmates in 4th year RTA wrote and produced a 12-part series called* Inside the Grey Cup *now playing on www.cfl.ca.*

- *March 2008 – Ryerson 2005 honorary doctorate recipient Janet Storch has been selected by the Canadian Nurses Association to receive a '100 in 100 Award' celebrating the accomplishments of 100 exceptional registered nurses in the CNA centennial year.*

- *March 3-9, 2008 – The Ontario Association of Social Workers has recognized Patricia O'Connor, Helen Wong and June Ying Yee, of the Internationally Educated Social Work Professionals (IESW) Bridging Program offered through the G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education, as 'leaders in the social work community' – consistent with the 2008 National Social Work Week theme of 'social workers advocating for human rights in a diverse community.'*

- *March 8/April 6, 2008 - Marblemedia partners Mark Bishop and Matt Hornburg (RTA '98), received a Juno nomination for Children's Album of the Year, and an Independent Music Awards nomination for Favorite Children's Artist of the Year (both for Daniel Cook).*

- *March 12-16, 2008 – Ryerson participated in the annual* Canada Blooms *festival in Toronto, with  students and faculty from the G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education Landscape Design certificate program, and the Architectural Science program, working with youth at the Yonge Street Mission to create bird houses to be installed at the Scotts Wild Bird Trail in Mississauga Riverwood Nature Park; and the School of Interior Design working on the installation of the Heart & Stroke Foundation of Ontario 'Pulse Garden.'*

- *March 14, 2008 – Dr. Martin Antony has been elected President of the Canadian Psychological Association, serving as President-Elect beginning June 2008, and President beginning June 2009.*

- *March 27-30, 2008 – Dr. Mark Gorgolewski and Dr. Ian MacBurnie, Department of Architectural Science, will receive the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture/American Institute of Architects (ACSA/AIA) Housing Design Education Award, with Ryerson as the only Canadian university among the 2007-08 award winners.*

- *March 31, 2008 – Celebrating the 100th anniversary of the publication of* Anne of Green Gables*, Dr. Irene Gemmel, CRC in Modern Literature and Culture, will launch* Looking for Anne: How Lucy Maud Montgomery Dreamed Up a Literary Classic*, and curate a national exhibit.*

- *April 2008 – The upcoming book release of* Shut Up, I'm Talking: And Other Diplomacy Lessons I Learned in The Israeli Government *by Prof. Gregory Levey, Department of Professional Communication, is based on his experiences writing for the UN Israeli delegation and as speechwriter for Prime Minister Ariel Sharon.*

- *Research:*

- o *February 19, 2008 – The Canada Council announced that the exhibition* 41° to 66°: Architecture in Canada - Region, Culture, Tectonics*, co-curated by architecture professors Marco Polo, Ryerson University, and John McMinn, University of Waterloo, and organized by Cambridge Galleries, will represent Canada at the 2008 Venice Biennale in Architecture, the world's most prestigious architectural exhibition, from September 14th to November 23rd, 2008.*

  - o *March 12, 2008 – Dr. Galina Okouneva, (Principal Investigator), Dr. Don McTavish, Dr. John Enright and Dr. Guangjun Liu, Department of Aerospace Engineering, have received an NSERC/CRD grant for "Automated Laser Tracking Evaluation and Scan Constraint Analysis for Pose Estimation," a collaborative 3-year $400,000 project with NSERC, the Canadian Space Agency, and Neptec Design Group (Ottawa, ON).*

  - o *March 18, 2008 – Eli Lechtman (MSc student, Biomedical Physics) has been awarded the NSERC Alexander Graham Bell Canada Graduate Scholarship (CGS) for his PhD studies.*

- ▪ *Varsity Achievements [Ontario University Athletics (OUA)]*
  - o *Boris Bakovic, Men's Basketball, 2007-08 Second Team All-Stars*
  - o *Horia Puscas, Men's Fencing, Silver Medal, OUA championship individual sabre event, and 2007-08 OUA All-Star*
  - o *Michelle Zenger, Figure Skating, Bronze, senior silver solo dance, OUA championship*
  - o *Nic Beaver, Men's Volleyball, OUA Second Team All-Stars*
  - o *Greg McDonald, Men's Volleyball, All-Star Rookie Team*

# RYERSON ACHIEVEMENT REPORT

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

## *Events*

**President Sheldon Levy** unveiled the design concept for the new **Ryerson Photography Gallery and Research Centre**. This bold new venture, designed by internationally-acclaimed, Toronto-based Diamond and Schmitt Architects, places the University amongst the top international centres for photography and related disciplines. It also heralds the transformation of Gould Street. *Toronto Star, Maclean's.ca, Hamilton Spectator* and *The Torontoist* were among the media outlets that reported on the new expanded facility to house the **School of Image Arts** and Ryerson's Black Star Historical Black & White Photography Collection.

**The Accessibility Awareness Committee,** a group composed of students and staff from the Access Centre and RyeACCESS organized activities every day throughout Accessibility Awareness Week. A highlight was the lecture given by Lieutenant-Governor, David Onley.

The **Cara Demonstration Kitchen and Common Room in** the Ted Rogers School of Management was formally opened. The space will be used as a lab, restaurant, and classroom and provide students in the **Ted Rogers School of Hospitality and Tourism Management** with a hands-on opportunity to hone their management skills.

The **Ted Rogers School of Management graduate student team** won the 2008 RBC Next Great Innovator Challenge, which included a $20,000 award for their winning idea entitled VIBE, a personal banking workstation that combines the best of personal banking, ATM services and online banking in an "anytime, anywhere" fashion.  More than 100 proposals submitted from schools across Canada were evaluated by the RBC Applied Innovation team.

The Ryerson University **team of 22 Civil Engineering students** won second place in the Great Northern Toboggan Race and first place in the Best Steering category. The competition challenges engineering students to be innovative and original in building a five-person toboggan made of concrete. They competed against 24 teams representing 17 Canadian universities.

## *MEDIA APPEARANCES*

The Faculty of Appeals hearing regarding the student charged with academic misconduct and its subsequent decision attracted tremendous media attention**. James Norrie**, **Director of the Ted Rogers School of Information Technology Management**, spokesperson for the University, **Nora Loreto**, **President of the Ryerson Students' Union** and numbers of Ryerson students were interviewed.

A *Toronto Star* article by Christopher Hume profiled Ryerson's Master Plan and quoted **President Sheldon Levy**. The article stated that the University's plan to "transform the campus with architectural excellence will revive the downtown area, accommodate more students and put people first."

**President Levy** participated in a panel discussion on *Goldhawk* (Rogers Television) about the challenges facing Toronto in the creation and preservation of public spaces.

The *Toronto Star*, CP24, Global News at Noon, CityTV's Breakfast Television and CFTO reported on the **24-Hour VW Beetle Push by Ryerson Engineering students** to raise funds for Sick Kids Hospital. The *Breakfast Television* segment encouraged viewers to come to Ryerson and watch the event.

*Toronto Star* writer Jim Coyle dedicated a column to the government's $45-million investment to help Ryerson develop its new student learning centre.

The *Toronto Star* singled out a Ryerson initiative as a highlight of the Canada Blooms show, whose unofficial theme this year was ecologically-responsible gardening. **Ryerson Architecture students**, working with youth from the Yonge Street Mission, created 25 unique birdfeeders made from recycled materials which were displayed at the show. **Margery Winkler**, Architectural Science and coordinator of the Certificate in Landscape Design, was quoted in the *Gardening* Life piece.

**Maurice Yeates**, Dean of Graduate Studies, spoke to *Metro News* about the process of writing a thesis.

The *Toronto Town Crier* reported on Ryerson's acquisition of Sam's and three other properties in the vicinity.

**Daniel Doz**, Dean of the Faculty of Communication & Design, appeared on CBON-FM's *Les Arts et les Autres* regarding the disappearance of Polaroid film.
The *Toronto Star* reported on a lecture at Ryerson by **Gerard Kennedy,** Distinguished Visiting Professor at Ryerson University.
**Grace-Edward Galabuzi**, Politics and Public Administration, was interviewed by CBC Radio's *Ontario Today* about multiculturalism and race relations in Canada. The *Daily Observer* quoted Dr. Galabuzi in an editorial criticizing Premier Dalton McGuinty's stand on Afrocentric schools.

**Myer Siemiatycki**, Politics and Public Administration, participated in a Radio-Canada panel discussion about the lack of ethnic or cultural diversity on Toronto city council.

**Sandeep Agrawal**, Urban Planning, spoke to CBC Radio's *Here and Now* and Radio-Canada about social cohesion in Toronto. A letter to the editor by former Toronto city councillor Gordon J. Chong published in the *National Post* stated that the notion of "interculturalism" espoused by Dr. Agrawal should be embraced.

**June Yee**, Social Work, spoke to OMNI News about the Building Bridges program.

The *Windsor Star* and *Calgary Herald* reported on research by **Tony Hernandez**, Centre for the Study of Commercial Activity that uncovered why Internet users pick certain websites.

*Financial Post Business* magazine profiled Ryerson's MBA program offerings and the Ted Rogers School of Management in a feature about the various MBA programs offered by Toronto area universities.

CityTV News reported on Jason Reitman's lecture at Ryerson. Mr. Reitman is the director of the Oscar-nominated film *Juno*. The lecture was one in the **Faculty of Communications & Design** Dean's Lecture Series.

**Rob Wilson,** Ted Rogers School of Management, was quoted in a *National Post* article on copycat ad campaigns.

**Murtaza Haider**, Ted Rogers School of Management, appeared on TVO's *The Agenda*.

**Paul Knox**, Chair, School of Journalism, spoke to the *Globe and Mail* in reaction to a reporter fighting a subpoena to hand over his research for an article on the fatal shooting of a teenager. He also spoke to the *National Post* about the closing of the *Halifax Daily News*.

The *National Post* and *Niagara Falls Review* reported that Image Arts alumnus **Josh Raskin** was nominated for an Oscar for his short animated film.

The *Toronto Star* reported on the International Professionals program offered by the G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education.

**Isabel Pedersen**, Professional Communication, was quoted in an Ottawa Citizen on the longevity of the peace symbol.

**Tariq Amin-Khan**, Politics and Public Administration, commented on the results of the Pakistan election on CBC Newsworld and Sirius Satellite Radio's *The Link*. Dr. Amin-Khan also published an article in the *Toronto Star* in reaction to putting blame on Pakistan in the war on terror.

**Chris Drew**, a member of the Ryerson Student Union, was quoted in a *Toronto Star* article on a proposed universal TTC pass for university students.

**Patrice Dutil**, Politics and Public Administration, participated in a CJBC-AM panel discussion on the topic of whether Toronto has the necessary infrastructure to become one of the world's great cities.

**Greg Elmer**, Infoscape Research Lab, commented in the *Vancouver Sun* on the influence of popular websites like YouTube and Facebook on Canadian politics, and spoke to CBC Radio's *The World at Six* regarding a boycott of online commerce site eBay.

**Andrew Laursen**, Chemistry and Biology, publishes a regular column in *Metro News*.


*Prepared by the Office of Public Affairs.*

# MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING

## TUESDAY, March 4, 2008

**Members Present:**

| Ex-Officio: | Faculty: | | Students: |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| K. Alnwick | P. Albanese | A. Matthews David | G. Alivio |
| S. Boctor | D. Androutsos | M. McAllister | S. Abdelgadir |
| C. Cassidy | M. Antony | A. Mitchell | O. Falou |
| G. R. Chang | I. Baitz | J. Norrie | S. Ghebressllassie |
| M. Dewson | J. P. Boudreau | M. Panitch | T. Hassan |
| D. Doz | V. Chan | R. Ravindran | H. Kere |
| Z. Fawaz | D. Checkland | D. Rose | M. Levine |
| U. George | P. Corson | S. Rosen | E. Moss |
| L. Grayson | D. Elder | A. Singh | S. Omer |
| K. Jones | P. Goldman | D. Sydor | R. Rose |
| A. Kahan | M. Greig | D. Tucker | R. Sadjadi |
| M. Lefebvre | R. Hudyma | K. Webb | T. Schwerdtfeger |
| S. Levy | R. Keeble | | M. Stanton |
| A. Shepard | J. Lassaline | | T. Whitfield |
| A. Shilton | D. Lee | | |
| P. Stenton | Y. T. Leong | | **Alumni:** |
| A. Venetsanopoulos | D. Mason | | S.Dhebar |
| | | | A. Walker |
| | | | |
| **Regrets:** | **Absent:** | | |
| A. Bahadur | T. Dewan | | |
| C. Farrell | | | |
| Z. Murphy | | | |
| H. Otieno | | | |
| C. Stuart | | | |
| M. Yeates | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

**1.      President's Report**
**1.2      Presentation of the Governor General's Silver Medal**
The President announced the recipient of a Governor General's Silver Medal to Julia Bazylevych, and Provost Alan Shepard presented it. Ryerson now qualifies for two of these medals.

The President listed the Honorary Doctorates as mentioned in his report, adding the name of Norman Jewison for the FCAD convocation.

There will be an announcement of the gallery on Gould Street this week. There will be an article in the Toronto Star.

**2.      Report of the Secretary of Senate**
**2.1      Senate Election Results -** The Secretary confirmed the names of the two elected faculty representatives in the Faculty of Communication and Design (Alexandra Bal – Image Arts; and Jana Macalik, Interior Design).

**3.      The Good of the University** - A. Mitchell chaired.

M. Panitch commended RyeAccess for hosting the Lieutenant Governor today.

S. Dhebar commended the university on the good job it is doing to turn the university around and acquiring the money for a new library building.

D. Checkland reported that the first open Town Hall meeting of the Senate Review Committee will take place on Monday, March 31, 11:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m.

T. Whitfield announced that students were successful in closing Gould Street for an event last month.

**4.      Minutes of the January 29, 2008 Meeting**
**4.1      Motion to approve the minutes of the January 29, 2008 meeting**
D. Mason moved,   I. Baitz  seconded

D. Checkland will send amendments to the Secretary.

**Motion approved.**

**6.       Business Arising from the Minutes**
**5.1      Motion on Examination Scheduling**
A. Shepard announced that a good solution has been found to providing sufficient time for grading after final exams. The last Friday of the Fall semester will be a Monday. This will allow for more days for grading and for students to have more study time. There will also be an equal number of Fridays and Mondays in the semester. The GPA policy revision will also allow for an extra day before grades need to be submitted in the Fall term.

D. Mason noted that the handout on key dates of 2008/2009 Academic year indicated two study days and five grading days. With the assumption that there will regularly be two or three days for study and four or five days for grading in each semester, he withdrew his motion.

D. Mason asked about the question on in-camera meetings he had posed some time ago. D. Checkland said that the reason for such meetings would be reviewed in the context of the Senate Review committee.

**7.     Correspondence**
There was no correspondence.

**8.     Reports of Actions and Recommendations of Departmental and Divisional Councils**
There were no reports.

**8.     Reports of Committees**
**8.1     Report of the Senate Appeals Committee on Review of the Student Code of Academic Conduct, Policy #60 (for consideration)**

The following suggestions were made:
Section A4. "Failing to Abide by the Copyright Act" should be modified with an adjective like intentional or egregious.

Regarding the 4$^{th}$ paragraph, page 22, O. Falou stated that as teaching assistants are not considered as "instructors" or "staff" they should be added to this list.

**8.2     Report of the *Ad hoc* Committee to Review the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct, Policy #61 (for consideration)**

The President stated that this meeting is a chance to discuss the Code but there is no resolution.  The Code will come back to Senate with a resolution at the April meeting. Between now and then, the draft Code will be on the Senate website and the Committee is eager to receive comments.  The next meeting of the Committee is Friday, March 14, 1:00-2:30 p.m. JOR-1410.  Anyone who is interested is welcome to attend or speak to any of the members (their names are in the report).  Anyone who wishes to make comments in writing should send them to Vice Provost Students, Zouheir Fawaz, and they will be considered by the Committee.

Z. Fawaz reminded Senate that there was a promise to review this policy. The first meeting of the Committee was on June 15, 2007, and there have been 12 meetings. The committee members were listed in the report, and there was to be a strong student representation. There were nine students who attended the meetings, not all at the same time or to the same degree, but they have been part of the co-authorship of the policy. He thanked them for their valuable participation. In the agenda is the draft version which was decided upon as a result of those meetings. In addition, there has been an undertaking to consult and review policies at other

universities. There was a collection of information by the office the General Counsel in connection with this, and J. Hanigsberg was thanked. The language in the Code is similar to what is in other codes. Other stakeholders were consulted, including the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee and Senate Appeals Committee. This policy is being presented for consultation, and anyone is invited to attend the meeting on March 14, or to give written feedback. The procedures are being worked on in parallel to the policy, and there is a subcommittee for that. New members are welcomed.

The Code is designed to ensure that students have a respectful and safe learning environment. The policy is complaint driven. The Code has been modernized, and more appropriate than the existing 20-year-old Code.

Discussion:
A. Mitchell commented that in the Code of Academic Conduct it is stated that students who are on Disciplinary Suspension are automatically back in their program after their suspension is served. That is not clearly stated in the Non-Academic Code and should be added.

J. Norrie noted the word usage moves between violations, offences and infractions. This should be considered.

JP Boudreau asked about the application part B item 2, Off-campus in Certain Circumstances, questioning the word "certain". Z. Fawaz stated this is applied when students claim to be official representatives of the University.

T. Whitfield asked about section G, and the ability for the Procedures to be changed each year. He asked that the Procedures be voted on along with the Policy. S. Levy commented that he (Whitfield) could join the committee.

P. Albanese referred to some of the items in item 14, which are already against the law. Z. Fawaz noted that the Code states that it does not supercede the law or other policies. D. Mason stated that the police may not be prepared to act on an issue, but that Ryerson might want to act upon it.

D. Checkland asked about the authority of the Student Conduct Officer. It is asked what happens if a student does not do what s/he is told to do. D. Schulman commented that this should be written into the Code.

R. Rose asked that the word "satisfactory" be reconsidered in the context of an apology. She further commented that the biggest concern of students is around the use of the internet in the Code. She noted that most students have a Facebook account. She thinks that there might be a misunderstanding of the use of Facebook. Placing things on the wall in Facebook, she stated, is not the same as posting it on a wall on Yonge Street. It is an invasion of privacy, for example, to bring a charge based on the posting of a picture of an underage person drinking. She has a concern that the University is monitoring Facebook. S. Levy asked her what she would say about a student who came to the University about

harassment that is going on in Facebook, and if the University should take action. She replied that she herself has been singled out, but there are means for this to be handled under Discrimination and Harassment policy. She does not have all the answers.

H. Kere echoed R. Rose's comments, and added a suggestion that there be public consultations on this as she believes that this is changing the climate of the campus. She asked if the Friday meeting could be an open consultation.

Z. Fawaz clarified that there is no monitoring of what is going on in on-line venues.. The statement in the policy is based on input from the students. The wording states that offences under the Code done online may be addressed.

J. Norrie commented that a number of people around the table are experts on the field, despite their age. There is a misconception that the postings are not public. The conduct online is covered the same way as any other forums are covered. This is about student conduct, not where it occurs.

R. Sadjadi asked if it is possible to make a fake account, and it was responded that this is the case.

O. Falou commented on page 39, 1$^{st}$ point, to add Program Director for graduate students.

E. Moss stated concern with the item on page 36, item 8, concerning compliance with "instructor course management" directives. She believes this may infringe on students' rights to discuss issues about an instructor.

JP Boudreau stated that on page 40, Appendix A, the composition and purpose of the ABR team is commendable. He asked that the team look to the departments, particularly Psychology, for assistance.

A.M. Singh asked if the statement on page 36, 12a, "students shall not be drunk and disorderly in public" applies to areas other than university spaces.

D. Checkland commented on the making of fake accounts. If the person did something on a fake account that was against the Code, how would it be known that the account was fake? D. Mason stated that this is a well-known problem and there are effective ways to trace this.

S. Rosen commented that this is about the very nature of accusation, and what would be a legitimate charge or verifiable accusation.

N. Loreto spoke from the floor. She stated that the deadline for the agenda gives only 2.5 weeks and that is not enough time for consultation. She thinks that there are areas that need work, and that there is concern about the content. She thinks the Code is very paternalistic/maternalistic. She asks that the consultation time be longer and the policy brought for the May meeting.

S. Levy stated that this is a Senate policy, not an administrative policy.

D. Mason stated that the meeting to address the policy is in two weeks, and the deadline is too short for adequate student consultation. He moved that the Code be brought to the floor for May.

S. Levy asked that the issue be returned to the committee for its consideration. He believes that the motion is preemptive. D. Mason still maintained that the timeline was too short and the process should not be rushed.

Z. Fawaz stated that the committee will take as much time as is needed to get it right. The Code is not to be rushed, so it will be brought back when it is ready. That may mean bringing it back in May. The committee will not rush the work.

**Motion: that the Code of Non-Academic Conduct not be voted on before the May Senate meeting.**
D. Mason moved, R. Rose seconded.

S. Dhebar commented that the students who were on the committee should have consulted with other students.

O. Falou asked that the document be posted on the web. It will be posted on the Senate website in the morning.

J. Norrie asked that the motion be amended at the committee not be forced to bring the policy to the April meeting. D. Mason commented that there was still not enough time. He would agree that there needs to be a consultation before the document is brought back to Senate. R. Rose did not accept the friendly amendment.

R. Hudyma asked if the committee could set its own agenda for bringing the policy forward, and therefore it is inappropriate to tell the committee what to do.

Z. Fawaz clarified that the committee will formulate the final version of the policy, and it is up to the Senate to approve or not approve the policy. There have been eight months of meetings with a strong student presence. When the committee meets again, it will take the feedback and bring a final version to Senate. If there is enough time to come back in April, he would prefer that option. D. Mason stated that he believes Senate has the right to provide its subcommittees with direction.

**Motion defeated (27 against - 25 for)**

A. Mackay spoke from the floor about the core offences on page 35, stating that she would hope that the medium of a threat not affect the outcome.

**11. New Business**

**9.1 Revision of Policy #157 – "Establishment of Student Email Accounts for Official University Communication" (the Email Policy)**

Wording has been updated to reflect the current technology – the online identity.
K. Alnwick moved, S. Dhebar seconded

It was clarified that the list includes everything that is part of the online identity.

JP Boudreau asked if this should be cross-referenced with the Course Management policy.
J. Norrie asked if the policy should state "send and receive". There was a discussion around the need for an address for students to receive official email. S. Levy asked that the committee look at this issue, and asked that this motion be considered and there be follow-up on the additional concern.

**9.1.1** <u>**Motion:**</u> **That Senate approve revisions to Policy #157 - the Email Policy**

**Motion approved.**

**Motion: that there be an amendment of this policy concerning the sending of email from a Ryerson email account.**
J. Norrie moved, D. Mason seconded

**Motion approved.**

**10. Adjournment**
Meeting adjourned 7:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,


Diane R. Schulman, PhD
Secretary of Senate

**RYERSON UNIVERSITY**
**POLICY OF SENATE**

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

Policy Number:                           157

Approval Date:                          February 2003

Revised Date:             March 2008

Responsible Offices:                    Provost and Vice President Academic; Vice President, Administration & Finance; Vice Provost Students

Review Date:                            Fall, 2012

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.

**Students are expected to monitor and retrieve messages and information issued to them by the University via Ryerson online systems on a frequent and consistent basis. Students have the responsibility to recognize that certain communications may be time-critical. Students have the right to forward their Ryerson E-mail account to another electronic mail service provider address but remain responsible for ensuring that all University electronic message communication sent to their official Ryerson E-mail account is received and read.**

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.

**Students may communicate with Ryerson and Ryerson faculty, instructors, teaching and graduate assistants and staff in a variety of ways :  in-person; telephone; letters (either hand-delivered, by regular Canada Post , courier or registered mail)  or electronically.  Ryerson requires that any official or formal electronic communications from students be sent from their official Ryerson E-mail account .**

Report of the Senate Appeals Committee
W2008-1
April 1, 2008

The following report was submitted to Senate at the March 4, 2008 meeting, and further comments were solicited. The additional changes made to the Student Code of Academic Conduct based upon input from the community follow this report.

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. 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.

+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++
Additional changes to the Code based upon input from the Community:
1. Paragraph 4 of the introduction: The responsibility of teaching and graduate assistants to take action when the Code is violated has been added.

2. Section A4: **Unauthorized Copying or Use of Copyrighted Materials** – **intentionally**(added) failing to abide by the Copyright Act and/or the University's license agreement….

3. Section C7.c: The role of the Faculty Appeals Committee in assigning a penalty has been clarified.

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:              April 1, 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

**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. Instructors[1], graduate and teaching assistants, 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.

---

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

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.

**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** – intentionally 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 <u>minimum</u> 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 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

---

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..

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

---

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.

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 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. *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.*

a. *If a student drops the course, the Registrar's office will re-register the student in that course until a decision is reached.*

b. *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): I****f 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 student representatives of the Student Unions, 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.

# Ryerson University
# School of Graphic Communications Management
# School Council

*By-Laws and Procedures*
*March, 2008*

## 1. Authority

The School Council ("Council") of the School of Graphic Communications Management (GCM) derives its authority from Policy No. 45 of the Senate of Ryerson University (Policy 45).

## 2. Mandate

The Council has the following Mandate:

 a. To develop, review, recommend and enact School policies, consistent with those of Ryerson University and the Faculty of Communication & Design;

 b. To foster understanding and co-operation among faculty, staff and students.

## 3. Membership

Membership in the Council, constituted annually, shall be announced by the Chair of GCM each September in a notice to all faculty members, staff and students, and shall consist of the following members of GCM:

 a. the Chair of GCM;

 b. all full-time faculty members except those on leave;

 c. one member elected by and from the part-time and sessional instructors under contract to teach in the Fall and Winter terms;

 d. four student members, one elected by and from students in each year of the program, subject to the requirements of 3.1.b., below;

 e. two members, non-voting, elected by and from the technical support staff; and

 f. the senior GCM administrative assistant, non-voting, who shall serve as Secretary of Council.

### 3.1 Selection of Student, Part-time/Sessional Instructor and Staff Members

a. The Chair of GCM, in consultation with Council, will annually coordinate the process of election of Council members referred to in paragraphs 3c, d and e, above subject to the following:

   i. Three of the four student members referred to in 3.d. shall be elected each year, by and from the current first, second, and third year classes, no later than the last day of classes of Winter term, and shall take office on September 1 hence.

   ii. The two technical support staff members referred to in 3.e. shall be elected each year, no later than the last day of classes of Winter term, and shall take office on September 1 hence.

   iii. The part-time and/or sessional instructor member referred to in 3.c. shall be elected each academic year during the first 15 days of class and shall take office immediately upon election.

   iv. The fourth student member referred to in 3.d. shall be elected by and from the current first year class during the first 15 days of class in the academic year and shall take office immediately upon election.

   v. Nothing in this section shall limit the ability of Council to meet or pass decisions at any time of the year, although, when practical, the first meeting of the academic year will take place after the members referred to in 3.1.a.iii. and 3.1.a.iv. have been elected.

b. The student membership is subject to the requirement that the number of student members be not less than one-third, and not more than one-half, of the total number of faculty members on the Council. Council shall amend the number of student members as appropriate to ensure that this requirement is met.

### 4. Designation and Duties of the Chair of the Council

a. The Chair of Council shall be a full-time faculty member who shall be elected by and from the voting membership at the first meeting of each academic year. The Chair of GCM may serve as Chair of Council.

b. The Chair of the Council is responsible for scheduling meetings, setting and distributing an agenda, maintaining order and decorum, and forwarding decisions to the Dean, Faculty of Communication & Design.

c. For the period of time each academic year prior to the first meeting of the academic year, the duties described in 4.b. shall be carried out by the existing Chair of Council, or in his/her absence, by the Chair of GCM.

### 5. Obligations of Members

Council members are expected to attend all meetings unless they are unable, in which case they shall notify the Chair of the Council in advance.

### 6. Quorum

The quorum for meetings shall be two-thirds (2/3) of the voting members.

### 7. Voting

a. Each voting member of Council may cast one vote. Members must be present to vote. The support of a simple majority (50% plus one) of those casting either a yes or a no vote is required to carry a motion, except as provided in Article 12 b.

b. The Chair of Council shall not vote except to break a tie.

### 8. Committees

The Council shall establish a curriculum committee as mandated in Section (d) of Policy 45. It may at any time establish other committees to advise the Chair of GCM or assist in dealing with matters concerning the operation of the School. Committees shall normally include faculty and student representatives in the same general proportion as they are represented on the Council.

### 9. Frequency and Notice of Meetings

a. The Council shall meet at least twice each academic year.

b. The Chair of the Council shall forward to each Council member by e-mail a notice of meetings at least five (5) working days in advance of each meeting. An agenda, including all relevant documents, will be forwarded to each Council member by email at least two (2) working days in advance of each meeting.

c. A Council member who wishes to propose an agenda item must submit it by e-mail to the Chair of the Council at least four (4) working days in advance of the meeting at which the member wishes it to be considered.

d. Any two members may request a special meeting of Council. Such request must be by e-mail to the Chair of the Council, and the Chair of the Council shall call a special meeting, which shall be held within twenty (20) working days.

### 10. Openness of Meetings

The following members of the School of GCM may attend Council meetings as observers:

a. Faculty members on leave or reduced workload, part-time and sessional instructors;

b. Full-time and part-time staff;

c. Students enrolled full-time in the GCM program who are registered in a Ryerson course or courses.

Other observers may be admitted by majority vote of the Council as defined in Article 7a. Any observer may be invited to address the meeting by majority vote as defined in Article 7a.

## 11. Minutes

All proceedings of Council, including attendance, will be recorded and a report distributed to all members no later than ten (10) working days after each meeting. Minutes are public documents and may be viewed at the School administrative office by any faculty member, student or staff member of the School. The Chair of the Council will forward a copy of all minutes to the Dean, Faculty of Communication & Design.

## 12. Amendments to By-laws and Procedures

a. Any two members may propose an amendment to by-laws and procedures. The members must circulate the proposed wording to all other members at least four (4) working days in advance of the meeting at which the member wishes it considered.

b. The support of at least two-thirds of members who are present is required to carry a motion for amendment of the by-laws or procedures.

**DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS**

**Ryerson University**

# BY-LAWS OF DEPARTMENTAL COUNCIL

*Amended and Approved by Departmental Council on March 10, 2008*

**DEFINITIONS**

*Administrative Support Staff **– all full-time administrative assistants, departmental assistants & secretaries of the Department of Physics***

**Council** – the Departmental Council of the Department of Physics.

**Council Members** – all individuals who are members of the Departmental Council of the Department of Physics.

**Course Union** – the student association mandated by RSU to represent the undergraduate students.

**Department** – the Department of Physics; Departmental has the corresponding meaning.

**Department Members** – all faculty, administrative and technical support staff, sessional/part-time instructors, Postdoctoral Fellows, undergraduate and graduate students registered in a program offered by the Department of Physics.

**Faculty** – all RFA members of the Department of Physics.

**Graduate Students** –  all students registered in a graduate program offered by the Department of Physics.

**Program** – a graduate or undergraduate degree, diploma, or certificate program offered by the Department of Physics.

**Postdoctoral Fellows**  –  all Postdoctoral Fellows hired to work with faculty members of the Department of Physics.

**Sessional/Part-Time Instructors** – all non-RFA instructors hired by the Department of Physics.

**Technical Support Staff** – all full-time technologists, technicians, and lab supervisors in the Department of Physics.

**Undergraduate Students** –  all students registered in an undergraduate program offered by the Department of Physics.

**ARTICLE I. DEPARTMENTAL COUNCIL**

## *1.1 Objectives*

The purpose and objectives of the Council are:

a) To develop and recommend academic policies relevant to the Department;

b) To promote an effective teaching, learning and research environment within the Department;

c) To represent, maintain and advance the interests of Council members within the Department;

d) To work with the Administration and other groups within the University on areas of common concern.

## *1.2 Membership*

The membership of the Council shall comprise:

a) All faculty, including the Chair and the Program Directors(s) of the Department;

b) One sessional or part-time instructor, where applicable, elected by and from the sessional and part-time instructors of the Department;

c) Representatives of undergraduate and graduate students registered in the programs offered by the Department. The student representatives shall be elected by their respective constituencies, and the total number of student members (undergraduate and graduate) shall be determined by the policies of the Senate. When the Department has both graduate and undergraduate programs, there shall be equal representation of both constituencies;

d) One member of the technical support staff, elected by and from the technical support staff.

**ARTICLE II. STANDING COMMITTEES**

The Council shall establish the following standing committees whose members shall be selected by the Council:

## *2.1. Undergraduate Affairs Committee*

**Mandate:**
a) To make recommendations to Council on all academic issues regarding undergraduate programs, including course revision and delivery, as well as co-op and internship;

b) To liaise with other departments whose students receive service courses from the Department, and to make recommendations to Council regarding those courses;

c) To determine the resources required to support any proposed new undergraduate course or program, and seek Council's approval of the proposed undergraduate program or course;

d) To liaise with the Financial and Infrastructure Resources (Advisory) Committee on issues of concern to both committees;

e) To provide the Web Design Committee with any information deemed important to be posted on the Departmental Website.

f) Report of this committee will be part of the report of the Undergraduate Program Director (or equivalent) at each Council meeting.

**Membership:**
a) Undergraduate Program Director (or equivalent);
b) Three other faculty members;
c) Two undergraduate students, not necessarily Council members;
d) One member of the technical support staff, not necessarily a Council member.


## 2.2. Financial and Infrastructure Resources (Advisory) Committee

The Financial and Infrastructure Resources Committee is advisory to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will consult with the committee on a regular basis on budgetary issues.


**Mandate:**
a) To identify the immediate needs for physical resources necessary to support the research activity, academic programs and courses delivered by the Department, and to make long-term plans for the allocation, maintenance, and replacement of those resources;

b) To maintain up-to-date information on the physical and computational resources (e.g., offices, teaching and research laboratories, workshops, and equipment) available to the Department;

c) To liaise with the other committees of the Council when matters of physical and computational and/or budget resources arise;

d) Report of this committee will be part of the Department Chair's report at each Council meeting.


**Membership:**
a) The Chair of the Department, ex-officio (with voting rights);
b) Two other faculty members;
c) One undergraduate or graduate student, not necessarily a Council member;
d) Two members of the technical support staff, not necessarily Council members.


## 2.3. Research and Graduate Affairs Committee

**Mandate:**
a) To foster the growth of research and graduate studies within the Department through promotion of these activities both within and outside the Department;

b) To promote research initiatives;

c) To be an advocate of researchers' needs and to liaise with other committees of the Council when needed, including liaison with the Financial and Infrastructure (Advisory) Committee on issues of common concern;

d) To determine the resources required to support any proposed new graduate course or program, and to seek Council's approval of the proposed new graduate course or program;

e) To provide the Web Design Committee with any information deemed important to be posted on the Departmental Website.

f) Report of this committee will be part of the Graduate Program Director's report at each Council meeting.

**Membership:**
a) Director of the Graduate Program;
b) Two other faculty members who are appointed to the School of Graduate Studies;
c) One graduate student from a program offered by the Department, not necessarily a Council member.

## *2.4*  **Scholarships/ Awards and Fundraising Committee**

**Mandate*:***
a) To liaise with the University Advancement Office;
   i ) To canvass donations/endowments for undergraduate and graduate scholarships/awards and didactic purposes;
   ii) To identify donors for the purpose of updating lab and teaching materials as well as equipment;

b) To review and rank any relevant undergraduate and graduate scholarship and award applications;

c) To report at each Council meeting.

**Membership:**
Three faculty members.

## *2.5*  **Advertisement and Outreach Committee**

**Mandate:**
a) To organize outreach activities including open houses, presentations in fairs, and graduate and undergraduate conferences;

b) To liaise with University Advancement Office regarding the design and ordering of advertising materials including brochures, banners and other promotional materials;

c) To liaise with the Graduate Program Director and the Undergraduate Program Director (or equivalent) regarding brochures and other promotional materials related to graduate and undergraduate programs;

d) To report at each Council meeting.

**Membership:**
a) Two faculty members;
b) One undergraduate student and one graduate student, not necessarily Council members;
c) One member of the administrative support staff.

### *2.6*    **Web Design Committee**

**Mandate:**
    a)    To enhance and update the appearance of the Departmental Website;
.
    b)    To ensure the Website is up-to-date, to reflect the Department's activities;

    c)    To solicit materials to be posted on the Website;

    d)    To liaise with all other committees for an update of relevant information to be posted;

    e)    To report at each Council meeting.

**Membership:**
    a)    One member of the technical support staff, not necessarily a Council member;
    b)    Two faculty members;
    c)    One undergraduate student, not necessarily a Council member;
    d)    One graduate student, not necessarily a Council member.

## ARTICLE III. AD HOC COMMITTEES

**Mandate:**
Ad hoc committees may be established by the Council from time to time to investigate, report and/or make recommendations on specific issues, such as revision of the By-laws.

**Membership**:
When possible, membership composition of committees should reflect the membership proportions of the Council as a whole.

## ARTICLE IV. TERMS OF OFFICE

## *4.1. Council Officers*

The Chair and Vice Chair of the Council shall be drawn from faculty Council members.

The Secretary of the Council shall be drawn from faculty and technical support staff Council members

Council Officers (Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary) shall be elected at the last regular meeting of the Winter semester to take office at the beginning of the following academic year. The term of office is two years.

An Officer is eligible for re-election.

## *4.2. Sessional / Part-Time Instructor Council Member*

The sessional/part-time instructor Council member shall be elected by his/her constituency for a renewable one-semester term, preferably before the first Council meetings in the Fall and Winter semesters.

### *4.3. Student Council Members*

Undergraduate and graduate student Council members shall be elected by their constituencies for a renewable one-year term, preferably before the first Council meeting in the Fall semester.

### *4.4. Technical Support Staff Council Member*

The technical support staff Council member shall be elected by his/her constituency for a renewable two-year term, preferably before the first Council meeting in the Fall semester.

### *4.5. Members of Standing Committees*

Faculty and technical support staff Council members shall serve for a renewable two-year term. Undergraduate and graduate student Council members shall serve for a renewable one-year term.

### *4.6. Members of Ad Hoc Committees*

Members of an ad hoc committee shall serve until the report of the committee has been accepted by the Council, or until the committee has been dissolved by the Council, whichever comes first.

## ARTICLE V. DUTIES OF COUNCIL OFFICERS

A thorough knowledge of the By-laws and Robert's Rules of Order is a requisite for all Council Officers.

### *5.1. Chair*

The Chair shall:

a) Call the meetings of the Council;

b) Be responsible for provision of written notice of Council meetings and distribution of the agenda one week prior to meetings;

c) Preside at all meetings of the Council, enforce the By-laws and rules of order, and monitor the activities of the committees;

d) Be an ex-officio, non-voting member of all standing committees and of any committees established by the Council;

e) Communicate actions of the Council to the Administration of the University when requested by the Council.

### *5.2. Vice-Chair*

The Vice-Chair shall:

a) Perform the duties of the Chair, in the absence of the Chair;

b) Perform the duties of the Chair and arrange for the timely election of a new Chair, in the event that the office of the Chair is vacated;

c) Call for nominations and preside over Council elections; ensure that elections are carried out in a timely manner;

d) Liaise with the constituencies representing undergraduate students, graduate students, sessional/part-time instructors, and technical support staff of the Department regarding the election of their Council members;

e) Assist the Chair in any Council matter, as requested by the Chair.

## *5.3. Secretary*

The Secretary shall:

a) Maintain soft and hard master copies of the By-laws, policies and procedures, revise them as the Council approves changes, and ensure that the master copies are passed on to the succeeding Secretary in a timely manner;

b) Attend all meetings of the Council and record all facts and Minutes of all proceedings of the meetings  (if necessary, the Secretary may request the assistance of a recording secretary);

c) Compile and distribute the Minutes of the meetings, together with the Agenda, before the next meeting.

**ARTICLE VI. DUTIES OF COMMITTEE OFFICERS**

The Chairs of the Committees shall:

a) Call, and preside over, all meetings of their respective committees;

b) Ensure all positions in their committees are filled, and report the membership to the Secretary of the Council as soon as membership composition is known.

The Secretaries of the Committees shall:

a) Perform the duties of the Committee Chair, in the absence of the Committee Chair;

b) Assist the Committee Chair in any committee matter, as requested by the Committee Chair.

**ARTICLE VII. MEETINGS**

## *7.1. Meetings of Departmental Council*

Departmental Council shall meet at least once per academic term.  The meetings will normally be scheduled for a Thursday, 12:10-2:00 p.m.

Under normal circumstances, <u>written notice</u> of the Council meeting shall be given at least one week prior to the meeting and agenda shall be distributed at least two business days prior to the meeting.  All reports to

be presented at the Council should be submitted to the Council Chair at least five (5) business days in advance for inclusion in the Agenda**.**

The Agenda will include:

a) Approval of the Minutes of the previous meeting of the Council
b) Business arising out of the Minutes
c) Urgent business
d) Report of the Department Chair
e) Report of the Undergraduate Program Director (or equivalent)
f) Report of the Director of Graduate Studies
g) Standing Committees' reports
h) Other reports (e.g., RFA Representative, Graduate Student Representative, Undergraduate Student Representative)
i) Notices and announcements
j) New business

## 7.1.1. Special and/or Urgent Meeting

A special and/or urgent meeting of the Council shall be held following a written request to the Council Chair, made by either the Department Chair, or a standing committee, or at least 20% of the full Council membership. The meeting shall occur no fewer than three business days and no more than 14 days after the Council Chair receives the request.

## 7.1.2. Quorum

Council members are expected to attend all Council meetings, and to inform the Council Chair of their regrets in case of a scheduling conflict.

At meetings of the Council, a quorum shall be 50% of the full membership, with faculty members constituting the majority.

The following adjustments in counting the full membership will be taken into account:

a) A faculty member on leave will not be counted unless present at the meeting;

b) A Council member who has informed the Council Chair that he/she cannot attend due to a conflict with his/her Ryerson schedule or because he/she is engaged in other University business at the time of the meeting will not be counted.

## 7.2. Meetings of Committees

### 7.2.1. Standing Committees

Standing committees shall meet as required. A standing committee may request that the Council Chair call a special meeting of the Council to report on the work and recommendations of the committee.

### 7.2.2. Attendance at Committee Meetings

Committee members are expected to attend all committee meetings, and to inform the committee Chair of their regrets in case of a scheduling conflict. Any Council member may attend a meeting of any committee (students may not attend the Scholarships/Awards and Fundraising Committee when rankings are in progress), of which he/she is not a formal member, as a non-voting participant.

## ARTICLE VIII. ELECTIONS

## 8.1. Election of Council Officers

The Vice-Chair of the Council shall call for nominations and preside over the election, at the last Council meeting of the Winter semester.

## 8.2. Elections of Council Members

RFA faculty of the Department are permanent members of the Council.

Election for the members representing students and technical support staff will take place annually in September. Election for the member representing sessional/part-time instructors will take place twice a year, in September and January. The Vice-Chair of the Council will inform the appropriate constituencies of the need to conduct their elections in a timely manner.

## 8.3. Elections of Committee Officers

Each committee will elect a Chair and a Secretary from its membership. The Chair must be a  faculty member.

## ARTICLE IX. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

## *9.1. Authority*

Authority for policy recommendations of the Council is explained in the Academic Policies and Procedures of the Senate of Ryerson University.

## *9.2. Decisions of the Council*

Decisions of the Council will be made by a simple majority of the Council members present and voting, unless the Council decides, by a simple majority, to increase the threshold.

## *9.3. Recommendations of Committees*

Recommendations of any committee shall be approved by the Council before being transmitted or implemented.

**ARTICLE X. AMENDMENTS TO THE BY-LAWS**

Amendments to these By-laws require a two-thirds majority of the Council. Written notice of proposed amendments must be sent to all Council members at least one week prior to the meeting. Amendments must be ratified by the Senate.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**<u>SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES</u>**

*REPORT TO SENATE, APRIL 1, 2008*

1. Review of Status of New Graduate Programs

   - New Programs Planned for 2008 or 2009
   - Continuing Programs in Review Process

2. ***Master of Arts in Fashion***

   <u>Motion</u>

   That the Senate approve the submission of the proposal for a ***Master of Arts in Fashion*** to the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies for Standard Appraisal.

Submitted by:

_____
Maurice Yeates, Dean
Chair, School of Graduate Studies Council

| Approval or Action by | Responsibility | MSc Applied Mathematics | PhD Pol Studies | MBSc/MASc Building Sc. | MA Lit of Mod | MPl Urban Devpt | MA Fashion | MA ProfCom | MA Phil. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ministry | The Program is presented to the Ministry for approval | | | | | | | | |
| Provost | Provost decides about **Status of New Programs in Graduate Review Process (programs planned for September, 2008 or 2009) - 1** | | | | | | | | |
| **Ryerson Review** | | | | | | | | | |
| Dean - SGS | Letter of Intent (LoI) – including initial analysis of financial viability | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| SGS Program & Planning Comm | Reviews LOI to determine if program appears feasible. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Provost | Decides to proceed based on responses to LoI. Instructs sponsors to prepare OCGS program proposal. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Internal/External Consultant | An expert in the field from another university reviews the proposal. Sponsors re-draft if necessary. | Seco U of T | Carroll McMaster | Straube, Waterloo | Srerbnik, Calgary | Qadeer Queen's | Rouse U Arts London | Fletcher York | Brown UofT |
| Provost | Discusses proposal with Dean, sponsor. | X | X | X | X | X | X | | |
| P&P of SGS | Reviews draft OCGS brief in light of I/E report – recommends to Council SGS based on academic quality | X | X | X | X | X | X | | |
| Council, SGS | Reviews proposal | X | X | X | X | X | X | | |
| Senate | Reviews program proposal for academic quality and moves to proceed to OCGS | X | X | X | X | X | Apr 1 | | |
| **Ontario Council on Graduate Studies Review** | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal Committee | 7 senior faculty from across Ontario + Exec. Dir read brief and comment to Ryerson. Univ can advertise program. | X Bona, Illinois Bland, Toronto | McMullin-- UWO Prince—Vict April 15/16 | Zmeureanu-Concordia Lam– C-Mel Jan 31/1 | Wallace–Alb Stone--Dal March 6/7 | Vos – Fla Atl Burayidi – Wisc (Oshk) March 3/4 | | | |
| External Consultants | 2 or 3 selected, visit Ryerson for a two day period. Prepare reports for submission to OCGS, which sends reports to Ryerson. | X | | X | | X | | | |
| Ryerson | Responds to report(s) | X | | X | | X | | | |
| Appraisal Committee | Reviews report and response and presents recommendation to OCGS (All graduate Deans in Ontario) | | | | | | | | |
| OCGS Executive Director | Informs Ryerson of decision, provides letter required by Ministry for funding claim. **OCGS meeting.** | | | | | | | | |
| **Further Procedures** | | | | | | | | | |
| Board of Governors | Program is presented to Board of Governors for approval of financial viability. | | | | | | | | |

| Approval or Action by | Responsibility | MA Humanities | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Status of New Programs in Graduate Review Process (programs planned for September, 2008 or 2009) -2** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ryerson Review** | | | | | | | | | |
| Dean - SGS | Letter of Intent (LoI) – including initial analysis of financial viability | X | | | | | | | |
| SGS Program & Planning Comm | Reviews LOI to determine if program appears feasible. | X | | | | | | | |
| Provost | Decides to proceed based on responses to LoI. Instructs sponsors to prepare OCGS program proposal. | | | | | | | | |
| Internal/External Consultant | An expert in the field from another university reviews the proposal. Sponsors re-draft if necessary. | | | | | | | | |
| Provost | Discusses proposal with Dean, sponsor. | | | | | | | | |
| P&P of SGS | Reviews draft OCGS brief in light of I/E report – recommends to Council SGS based on academic quality | | | | | | | | |
| Council, SGS | Reviews proposal | | | | | | | | |
| Senate | Reviews program proposal for academic quality and moves to proceed to OCGS | | | | | | | | |
| **Ontario Council on Graduate Studies Review** | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal Committee | 7 senior faculty from across Ontario + Exec. Dir read brief and comment to Ryerson. Univ can advertise program. | | | | | | | | |
| External Consultants | 2 or 3 selected, visit Ryerson for a two day period. Prepare reports for submission to OCGS, which sends reports to Ryerson. | | | | | | | | |
| Ryerson | Responds to report(s) | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal Committee | Reviews report and response and presents recommendation to OCGS (All graduate Deans in Ontario) | | | | | | | | |
| OCGS Executive Director | Informs Ryerson of decision, provides letter required by Ministry for funding claim. **OCGS meeting.** | | | | | | | | |
| **Further Procedures** | | | | | | | | | |
| Board of Governors | Program is presented to Board of Governors for approval of financial viability. | | | | | | | | |
| Ministry | The Program is presented to the Ministry for approval | | | | | | | | |
| Provost | Provost decides about implementation | | | | | | | | |

| Approval or Action by | Responsibility | MASc/PhD EnSciMan | MASc/MEng Phd Civil Eng | MASc/ MEng /Phd Mech Eng | MA Pub Admin | MSA Spatial Analysis | MASc/MEng Phd Chem Eng, 08/09 | MA Economics 08/09 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Status of Continuing Programs in Graduate Review Process (February, 2008)** | | | | | | |
| **Ryerson Review** | | | | | | | | |
| Dean - SGS | Letter of Intent (LoI) – including initial analysis of financial viability | | | | | | | |
| SGS Program & Planning Comm | Reviews LOI to determine if program appears feasible. | | | | | | | |
| Provost | Decides to proceed based on responses to LoI. Instructs sponsors to prepare OCGS program proposal. | | | | | | | |
| Internal/External Consultant | An expert in the field from another university reviews the proposal. Sponsors re-draft if necessary. | | | | | | | |
| Provost | Discusses proposal with Dean, sponsor. | | | | | | | |
| P&P of SGS | Reviews draft OCGS brief in light of I/E report – recommends to Council SGS based on academic quality | | | | | | | |
| Council, SGS | Reviews proposal | | | | | | | |
| Senate | Reviews program proposal for academic quality and moves to proceed to OCGS | | | | | | | |
| **Ontario Council on Graduate Studies Review** | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal Committee | 7 senior faculty from across Ontario + Exec. Dir read brief and comment to Ryerson. Univ can advertise program. | Duenker-Dal Smardon-SUNY Syrac Jan 31/1 | Habib -- Calgary Li – Ohio St April 21/22 | Abbrev Brief | Abbrev Brief | Thrall -Fla WongGMU June 2/3 | | |
| External Consultants | 2 or 3 selected, visit Ryerson for a two day period. Prepare reports for submission to OCGS, which sends reports to Ryerson. | X | | | | | | |
| Ryerson | Responds to report(s) | X | | | | | | |
| Appraisal Committee | Reviews report and response and presents recommendation to OCGS (All graduate Deans in Ontario) | | | | | | | |
| OCGS Executive Director | Informs Ryerson of decision, provides letter required by Ministry for funding claim. **OCGS meeting.** | | | | | | | |
| **Further Procedures** | | | | | | | | |
| Board of Governors | Program is presented to Board of Governors for approval of financial viability. | | | | | | | |
| Ministry | The Program is presented to the Ministry for approval | | | | | | | |
| Provost | Provost decides about implementation | | | | | | | |

2. School of Graduate Studies has reviewed the proposal for a ***Master of Arts in Fashion*** listed below, and submits it to Senate for its approval for it to be sent to the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies for external review ('standard appraisal'). Vol. I of the brief ('The Program') is available for review in the office of the Secretary of Senate, and Volumes I & II ('The Program', and 'Curricula Vitae') are available for review in the office of the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies (YDI-1109). Vol. I of the brief ('The Program') is also available for review at www.ryerson.ca/graduate/temp. Username: gradstudies  Password: 4ryerson

## Motion

That the Senate approve the submission of the proposal for a ***Master of Arts in Fashion*** to the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies for Standard Appraisal.

> **Note**: *Once a program is approved by OCGS, it is presented to the Board of Governors for approval.*

The Provost has final authority to determine whether a program may proceed.

**Ryerson University**
*Master of Arts in Fashion*

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Ryerson University proposes to establish a Master of Arts in Fashion, which will be a high-quality program to prepare students for advanced design and communication work and careers in the professions related to fashion in a variety of media. The program is presented in recognition of several factors: the lack of post graduate program in Canada dealing with fashion; the rapid expansion of the global fashion market in all its forms; and, the growing intellectual and critical debate around fashion culture. This is a single-field program which is open to applicants with interests or production experience in any of the traditional fields associated with fashion and communication design (garment and costume design, photography, fashion television and editorial, curation, web-based archives, blogs and information resources, education, as well as fashion theory, history and culture).

Fashion lies at the cross-roads of culture and commerce. There is a wealth of cultural resources available in downtown Toronto at: Royal Ontario Museum, Bata Shoe Museum, Textile Museum, Design Exchange, Fashion Television, L'Oréal Fashion Week, MaRS, the City of Toronto Archives, national publishers, and Ryerson itself. In terms of commerce, Toronto is home to 550 apparel manufacturers (some located in the 'design and fashion district') estimated to employ 50,000 people, and a number of store company headquarters.

The program curriculum is designed for full-time participants, and anticipates accepting its first cohort of students in September 2009. The intake is targeted at twenty students per year. While the program has a core sequence of required courses, it incorporates a number of options in terms of the array of elective courses available, and the focus of each student's chosen Master's Project during the second year.

The requirement for the MA degree is 14 course units over a period of five semesters, and completion of the Master's. Student academic performance will be monitored each term, through grade evaluations, a Progress Report, and meetings with faculty advisors. Each student will be assigned a faculty advisor in the first year of the program; in the second year, faculty advisors may be selected on the basis of the student's final project discipline.

There will be 16 (11 current, five hires) core faculty associated with the program. Ten faculty in Categories 1 and 3 currently hold the PhD degree. The core faculty all have recognized experience in their respective disciplines; and all Category 3 faculty have research, graduate supervision and exhibition/publication records of note. Category 3 faculty represent related disciplines in the Faculty of Communication & Design (Journalism, Graphic Arts Management, architecture/photography, interior design), in the Faculty of Arts (English,) as well as engineering (design theory and gaming) and computer science (wearable computing). Two category 3 faculty hold Research Chairs. We are currently hiring two more faculty who will be expected to participate in the graduate program, and a new Chair is being recruited. The proposal envisages two additional tenure stream faculty with terminal degrees to serve the graduate program.

The curriculum is represented in table form, below. A core sequence of two required workshop/studio courses is supported by two required Theory/History seminar courses, two Project Development courses including a Master's Project, to be completed by the end of a student's fifth term. A course in Research Methods, and a group of special topics electives, round out the curricular structure.

### Table I: Program of Study for Master of Arts - Fashion

|  | Term I | Credit | Term II | Credit |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Year 1** | Research Methods I | 1 |  |  |
|  | Theory/History Seminar | 1 | Theory/History Seminar | 1 |
|  | Studio/Workshop | 1 | Studio/Workshop | 1 |
|  |  |  | Special Topics Elective | 1 |
| *Sub Total* |  | **3** |  | **3** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Spring/ Summer** | **Term III** |  |  |  |
|  | Internship Seminar | 0.5 |  |  |
|  | Internship | 1.5 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *Sub Total* |  | **2** |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Year 2** | **Term IV** | **Credit** | **Term V** | **Credit** |
|  | Creative /Research Final Project Preparation and Development | 1 | Creative /Research Final Project Excution & Presentation | 3 |
|  | Special Topics Electives | 1 |  |  |
|  | Special Topics Electives | 1 |  |  |
| *Sub Total* |  | **3** |  | **3** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |  | **14** |

**REPORT OF ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

## Report #W2008–2; March 2008

In this report Academic Standards Committee (ASC) brings to Senate its recommendations on several items:

- *Section A* presents the periodic program reviews of the *Urban and Regional Planning* and *Journalism* programs.
- *Section B* presents the committee's evaluation and recommendations to revise Senate Policy #112 *Approval Process for New Undergraduate Programs* and Senate Policy #126 *Periodic Program Review of Undergraduate Programs.*

Further documentation on the items addressed in this and all other ASC reports is available for review through the Secretary of Senate.

**SECTION A:** PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEWS

The following review has been completed in accordance with Senate Policy #126.

# 1. Urban and Regional Planning

**Program Description**

The genesis of the *Urban and Regional Planning* (URP) program at Ryerson can be traced back to 1969 when the Architectural Technology Department introduced a new planning program and admitted its first class of 18 students. The present academic home of the program is the School of Urban and Regional Planning in the Faculty of Community Services. The School currently offers a 4-year program (PLAN), a 2-year post baccalaureate program (PLAB) and a 2-year post diploma program4 (PLAD). Upon successful completion of any of the three programs graduates receive the Bachelor of Urban and Regional Planning degree. The program received its first accreditation by the Canadian Institute of Planners (CIP) in 1973, the year when the original planning program generated its first graduates. The program has since successfully maintained its accreditation.

The urban and regional planning profession is concerned with the development and improvement of human settlements. The profession focuses on how sectors such as housing, transportation, parks, and industrial uses interconnect, and studies the effects of these activities on the natural environment, social well-being, and local economy. The URP program aims to prepare students with substantive knowledge about cities and regions, and with thinking and problem-solving skills for career flexibility and lifelong learning. The mission of the School is *to provide excellence in planning education at the undergraduate level that prepares graduates to contribute as leaders in the community and the profession.* In its mission statement the School also expresses its commitment *to advancing applied*

---

4 The PLAD program is based on articulation agreements with the Mohawk and Fanshawe colleges.

*knowledge and research about cities and regions, and to the enhancement of the practice of planning.*

With approximately 100 new students5 admitted every year and a total enrollment of more than 400 students, the School of URP at Ryerson is one of the largest undergraduate planning programs in North America.

**The Curriculum:**

The program features a strong foundation in the planning process as applied in cities and regions. Students learn about other closely related professions and disciplines such as architecture, landscape architecture, politics, economics, sociology, community development, geography, civil engineering and business. They also learn how planning is done in other cities and regions through field trips built into the program and opportunities for study abroad at six universities in Europe and Australia. Students gain planning experience through project-based studios and through field placements in planning organizations and community agencies.

The PLAN curriculum consists of 41 courses (Ryerson calendar, 2007/2008, pp. 428–438) with a total of 152 hours of instruction. Of these, 23 are required professional and 4 are required professionally-related courses. Program students also take 4 professional electives, 4 professionally-related electives and 6 liberal studies courses. Professional courses include 110 hours of instruction corresponding to 72 percent of the total program hours and professionally-related courses represent 24 instruction hours corresponding to 16 percent of the total program hours.

The 2-year post baccalaureate program PLAB is based on a course mix that reflects courses students have already taken. Liberal studies courses required in the third and fourth years of the PLAN program are replaced by professional and professionally-related electives., PLAB students complete a total of 21 one-semester courses (13 required professional, 2 required professionally-related courses and 6 professional electives). Students in the post diploma PLAD program complete a total of 24 one-semester courses (14 required professional, 2 required professionally-related, 5 liberal studies courses and 3 professional electives). The PLAB, PLAD and the final two years of the PLAN program share a largely common professional curriculum.

**Admission Requirements:**

- **PLAN:** Applicants require an Ontario Secondary School Diploma with six Grade 12 U/M course credits, including Grade 12 U English (minimum grade of 60 percent or higher). Students are encouraged to select Grade 12 U or M courses in the Social Sciences and Humanities and/or Economics and U courses in Canadian and World Studies, Science and/or Mathematics. Applicants may be required to participate in an on-

---

5 For Fall 2006, the School admitted 97 students into the 4-year program (PLAN) and 21 students into the post baccalaureate program (PLAB). Annually, the School also admits 5–10 students into the post diploma program (PLAD).

campus session as part of the admissions selection process. Applicants residing more than 250 km from Ryerson, are invited to submit an essay outlining individual and planning related experiences.

- **PLAB:** Admissions requirements include completion of a bachelor's degree from an accredited English language university including a minimum of six liberal studies (liberal arts and sciences) courses. Applicants are advised to consider courses in microeconomics, ecology, sociology and politics in their first degree program.

- **PLAD:** Admissions requirement include completion of a diploma program in Urban and Regional Planning Technology from Mohawk or Fanshawe colleges with a minimum "B" average overall.

Qualified applicants to the PLAB and PLAD programs must successfully complete a 75 hour, three week Spring/Summer intensive block course offered through the G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education.

## The Program Review

The review provides comprehensive information about the program and the School, including student data, student and graduate surveys, observations gathered from focus groups and a comparator review. The CIP Visiting Team[6] report and the School's response to the accreditation report provide further insight into the program.

### Assessment of Strengths and Weaknesses

The assessment of program strengths and weaknesses, based on the Self-Study Report and the observations and comments made by the CIP Visiting Team are as follows:

Strengths:

- **Curriculum:** The URP program is based on a strong planning curriculum with a clear progression from foundation courses to advanced subjects, all delivered at a high level of academic rigor. Studio courses are an integral part of the curriculum and provide an important learning platform by linking theory with practice. The program has been successful in establishing an urban focus by capitalizing on the School's location at the heart of downtown Toronto.

- **Facilities:** In Fall 2007, the School moved to its new home in the former Doubleday Building located at 105 Bond Street where the School is the prime academic user. With two student lounges, state-of-the-art studio spaces, dedicated computer, presentation and marking rooms and faculty offices, the new facility allows the School to deliver a technologically advanced and modern curriculum.

---

6 D. Anderson (Ontario Professional Planners Institute), G. Carruthers (York University) and G. Hoffman (Canadian Institute of Planners).

- **Alumni:** The School has a distinguished group of alumni who are in senior executive professional positions in the private, not-for-profit and public sectors at both the municipal and provincial levels across Canada. Ryerson planning graduates have also taken leadership roles within the planning profession with two alumni serving as President of the CIP and one serving as president of the Ontario Professional Planners Institute. Ryerson planning graduates also sit as members of the governing councils of four provincial planning institutes. The Ryerson Planning Alumni Association is one of the most dynamic, successful alumni groups at Ryerson. The alumni association produces an annual newsletter and runs a highly successful annual Spring Reception, which has become one of the major social events of the planning profession in southern Ontario.

- **Accreditation:** In 2006 the 4-year PLAN program was re-accredited for a period of 5 years. The PLAN program (and its precursors) has been continuously accredited since the inception of the original planning program. In 2006, the 2-year PLAB and PLAD programs also received full accreditation. In their report program visitors observed that all three programs have been " … *carefully developed and modified to accommodate the students in each program and to provide a challenging learning environment … The course content also requires a high level of independent and collective group work which reflects the requirements of the planner in the working world.*"

Weaknesses:

- **Curriculum:** In its analysis of survey results, the School has identified the need to strengthen certain elements of the curriculum. In particular, the School has stated that graduates of the program can benefit from enhanced communication skills and from a better understanding of the Planning Act and regulations governing the planning processes. The visiting team while acknowledging the strong urban focus of the program also raised questions regarding "… *the balance between urban and regional study and the need to consider additional 'regional' courses to justify a balanced degree program.*"

- **Student Recruitment and Retention:** The Self-Study Report provides data on applications to the program, student retention and graduation. The number of applications to the PLAN program is low; this affects the quality of students admitted to the program. While the School continues to receive a healthy number of highly qualified applicants to its 2-year PLAB and PLAD programs, recruitment of qualified students to the PLAN program is critical for the long term viability of the program. The School has also reported that student retention particularly in the first two years of the program can be further improvement.

Developmental Plan:

As part of the periodic program review process the School considered program strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges, as well as the program's context, mission and goals. The School then responded to observed strengths and weaknesses and has a

developmental plan in place to address others. The plan addresses specific issues faced by the School in the near future, and sets specific goals and objectives to help strengthen the program in several areas. The development plan identifies Students/Alumni, Program Delivery, Faculty and Physical Facilities as the four main development areas and delineates the following objectives:

- **Student/Alumni:** The School has identified as key priorities the expansion of the pool of qualified applicants and the improvement of student engagement, satisfaction and success. Towards these objectives the School intends to develop a recruitment strategy that focuses on secondary school students in the Greater Toronto Area. The School also intends to raise the profile of the program by offering general education/liberal studies courses, by strengthening academic advising for program students and by providing employment and career development assistance.

- **Program Delivery:** As an outcome of the accreditation and the periodic program review processes, the School has identified elements of the program and the curriculum which should be further developed to meet new professional competency and accreditation standards. The School will investigate options necessary to increase student access to courses and to identify potential areas of specializations through the combination of professional, professionally-related and possibly liberal studies courses. These initiatives aim to enhance student engagement by providing students with opportunities to pursue their interests within the program. The School has also identified the implementation of the new *Masters in Urban Development* graduate program as a high priority initiative. The new graduate program will start in Fall 2008 pending final approval of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies and Board of Governors. As the new graduate program will replace the 2-year post baccalaureate PLAB program, its implementation will affect the undergraduate programs administered by the School.

- **Faculty:** In its development plan, the School has identified the enhancement of SRC activities as one of its top priorities, continuing its goal to increase peer-reviewed SRC outcomes and external research grants. The School plans to support faculty in the creation of materials which document professional accomplishments for peer review and in developing grant applications by utilizing existing School, Faculty and University supports. As part of its faculty development plan, the School will address the issue of the decreasing number of practicing professional planners teaching in the program. This initiative aims to retain the crucial program characteristic of integrating professional practice into teaching.

- **Physical Facilities:** At the time of the preparation of the Self-Study report the School identified the maintenance and replacement of the studio equipment as a high priority development initiative. Since that time the School has moved to its new home at 105 Bond Street. The new facility, particularly study and studio areas with new equipment and furniture, have provided a much needed upgrade to the physical environment in which the School operates. As a direct consequence of this infrastructure improvement, the School is confident that it can deliver technologically advanced programs both at undergraduate and graduate levels.

## ASC Evaluation

The School of Urban and Regional Planning offers an undergraduate program with three distinct entry points. This structure allows students with varying academic backgrounds to earn a professional degree in planning. The School is renowned for its urban focus which draws its strength from its downtown Toronto location. The School and its faculty have established close links with the profession and professional organizations. Faculty members from the School serve in prominent positions both in provincial, and most recently in national, professional planning organizations. Many faculty practice locally and sit on various local government committees. These links directly benefit the students as they bring a unique perspective into the classroom.

ASC's assessment and recommendations are as follows:

- **Recruitment:** The School of Urban and Regional Planning has identified student recruitment as a key initiative. The motivation for this initiative is the low ratio of applicants to registrants in comparison to Faculty and University-wide benchmarks. While the School has an excellent reputation within the profession, the planning profession may not necessarily be a well known career choice for potential applicants. *ASC recommends that the School continue in its efforts to formulate a viable student recruitment strategy and collaborate with professional organizations in developing initiatives to introduce planning as a viable career choice to secondary school communities.*

- **Student Engagement, Retention and Academic Advising:** The self-analysis section of the program review documentation identifies student retention, particularly in the first two years of the program as an area of concern. In response, the School is implementing a number of initiatives aimed to enhance student engagement and retention. In particular, the School is developing additional curricular content to engage students during the transition phase from secondary and other post-secondary educational environments into the URP program. The School also intends to institute regularly scheduled meetings with each program cohort to reinforce messages regarding student success and available resources. ASC observed that individual faculty members are the primary source of academic advising and counseling and that such information is delivered in an informal way. ASC commends the School for all these initiatives and the individual faculty members for providing academic advising to program students. *ASC recommends that the School monitor the success of these initiatives in increasing student engagement and retention, and introduce a structured mechanism for academic advising.*

- **Communication Skills:** Data gathered from employer/graduate/student surveys and focus groups indicate that students' oral and written communications skills can be further improved. The significance of communication skills for graduates of the program who as planners will frequently present projects and inform diverse audiences of complex concepts cannot be overestimated. In Fall 2008 the School, as part of a Faculty wide

initiative, will introduce a pilot project aimed to improve writing skills of first-year program students. The outcome of this project can potentially provide valuable insight into how such an initiative can be expanded to the entire program. *ASC acknowledges this initiative and recommends that the School continue in its initiatives to improve not only the written but also the oral and other non-verbal communication skills of its students.*

## Follow-up Report

In keeping with usual procedure, a follow-up report which addresses the recommendations stated in the ASC Evaluation Section is to be submitted to the Dean of Faculty of Community Services and the Provost and Vice President Academic by the end of June 2009.

## Recommendation

Having determined that the program review of the *Urban and Regional Planning* program administered by the School of Urban and Regional Planning satisfies the relevant policy and procedural requirements, Academic Standards Committee recommends:

> *That Senate approve the periodic program review of the Urban and Regional Planning program with the recommendations listed in the ASC Evaluation section.*

# 2. Journalism

## Program Description

Ryerson's journalism program had its origins nearly 50 years ago when students enrolled in the printing management program received a few lectures in "practical journalism". Those lectures later evolved into a full-fledged journalism program. At that time Ryerson offered the only journalism program that trained students to run small-town newspapers where editors and reporters often had to become plate-makers and printers at press time. Since its foundation the School has undergone many changes. In the 1970s Ryerson began granting Bachelor of Applied Arts degrees in Journalism to students in both a 4-year program and a streamlined 2-year post baccalaureate program. The School currently delivers a 4-year degree program leading to a Bachelor of Journalism degree. With the launch of the Master of Journalism program in Fall 2007, the School decided to discontinue the post baccalaureate program such that the 2007/2008 academic year will be its final year.

One of the central tenets of the program is the recognition of journalism as both an intellectual practice and a skill. The program aims to deliver foundation skills in combined media, in which students can bring critical thinking to all their work and connect their journalism courses to other studies. These values are reflected in the mission statement of the School: "*to provide our students with the highest quality teaching and training in Journalism, instilling both a full set of skills and the capacity for critical and creative*

*thinking. We will also strive to become the leading institution in teaching and research in all the various aspects of the craft and the industry*."

The School admits on average 140 new students every year and has a total enrollment of approximately 600 students. Currently, the School has 18 full-time faculty members; in addition, it relies on the services of about 20 rotating sessional instructors with current industry experience. In 2005, the School filled its first research chair position, the Velma Rogers Graham Chair of Research in News Media and Technology.

**The Curriculum:** The curriculum of the Journalism program is in a state of transition. The curriculum that is being phased out was the result of a major revision introduced in 2004. It was designed to meet three objectives: (i) to bring greater coherence to the program, (ii) to introduce an *Online* stream, and (iii) to reduce program hours while preserving the program's traditional emphasis "on craft, on context, and on the critical". The 2004 curriculum, however, did not alter the program's fundamental structure which channeled each student into one specific media-focused stream.

In response to perceived shortcomings of the 2004 curriculum, the School conducted an extensive curriculum review and proposed a new curriculum which was approved for implementation in Fall 2007. The 2007 curriculum (Ryerson calendar, 2007/2008, pp. 311–324) eliminates the requirement that each student must select one of the four media-focused streams in *Newspaper*, *Magazine*, *Broadcast* and *Online*. Students may continue to specialize in a given stream as before, but do so on a self-selecting basis. Most importantly, students will be able to 'mix' their courses to acquire cross-media skills, an option that was not easily available to them in the 2004 curriculum.

The 2007 curriculum consists of 32 one-semester courses with a total of 123 program hours. Of these, 8 are required professional, and 2 are required professionally-related courses. Program students also take 11 professional and 4 professionally-related electives and 6 liberal studies courses. The curriculum balance expressed in hours is as follows. Professional courses are 87 hours corresponding to 71 percent of the total program hours and professionally-related courses constitute 18 hours corresponding to 15 percent of the total program hours. The balance of the program is 18 hours of liberal studies corresponding to 15 percent of the total program hours.

**Internship:** The School has developed a rigorous model for internships which are open only to students in the final year of their programs. The 2007 curriculum makes the internship and masthead courses optional. The School expects that most students will continue to choose internship and/or masthead as their capstone courses. However, students who are more interested in pursuing graduate studies or a non-journalism career, will have the option to complete a series of 'destination' courses.

**International Exchange Programs:** The School currently has eight international exchange agreements in place. The School also encourages internationalism in other ways. Over the years, the School has been successful in forging relationships with Agence France Presse and

Radio France to allow bilingual program students to experience internships in a francophone environment.

**Admission Requirements:** Applicants require an Ontario Secondary School Diploma with six Grade 12 U/M course credits, including Grade 12 U English (ENG4U)/Anglais (EAE4U) with a minimum grade of 70 percent or higher. Applicants are required to submit an essay about a specific journalism-related topic, and additional information about those experiences and interests that would make them good candidates for the program. Applicants are also encouraged to submit portfolios of journalistic work, which would allow the School to assess their potential.

## The Program Review

The review provides comprehensive information about the program and the School, including student data, student and graduate surveys, observations gathered from focus groups and a comparator review. The Peer Review Team[7] (PRT) report and the School's response to the PRT report provide further insight into the program.

### Assessment of Strengths and Weaknesses

The assessment of program strengths and weaknesses, based on the Self-Study Report and the observations and comments made by the PRT are as follows:

Strengths:

- **Faculty:** The School of Journalism is served by dedicated faculty who bring both industry and academic expertise to the classroom. In addition to its 18 full-time faculty complement the School also employs about 20 sessional instructors with current industry experience. In recent years, the School has also been successful in recruiting faculty with advanced degrees. More faculty members have become involved in SRC activities that allow student participation which in turn enriches the program environment.

- **Students:** The School attracts a large number of applicants, resulting in a gifted and committed student body. In 2006, more than 73 percent of newly-admitted students were from Ontario secondary schools. The mean entering average of this cohort was 88 percent with 98 percent of them having an entering average of 80 percent or higher. For the Fall 2006 admission cycle, these figures[8] represented the highest mean entering average and the highest percentage of students with an entering average of 80 percent or higher for any program at Ryerson. Students' competence and dedication add immeasurably to the success of the program.

---

7 Prof. J. Dubois (Faculte de Communication, Universite du Quebec a Montreal) and Prof. K. Kierans (School of Journalism, University of King's College, Halifax).

8 While the figures are given only for the Fall 2006 admission cycle, they are representative of the School's success in attracting highly qualified applicants.

- **Reputation:** The Ryerson School of Journalism is known as the leader in journalism education in Canada. The program is much sought after by high school students. The School attracts some of the country's best journalists to teach both as full-time faculty and on a sessional basis. The School's reputation is further strengthened by its alumni, many of whom have gone onto successful careers in journalism, public relations, politics and law enforcement

Weaknesses:

- **Knowledge and Skills:** The School's objective is to deliver a curriculum which not only provides strong journalistic skills but also a broad-based liberal education. Yet, it has been a continuous challenge to get students to see the relevance, let alone the indispensability, of their academic classes outside of journalism. Major curricular restructuring introduced in 2004 and most recently in 2007 aim to strike a balance between knowledge and skill. The new curriculum includes courses in critical thinking that helps program students develop their analytical abilities and understand the context in which they practise journalism.

- **Language and Reading Skills:** The School has observed that the language abilities of high school graduates have deteriorated over recent years. As a result, program students have increasing problems with basic grammar and composition skills. In response, the School has reshaped the first-year reporting course to address these skills, and added a compulsory grammar examination. Yet, for a program where writing is a core skill, deteriorating language abilities represent a major challenge.

- **Diversity:** As part of the self-critical analysis of the program, the School observed that the composition of faculty and students do not reflect the ethnic make-up of the city and expressed the concern that relatively few minority students are applying to the program. Participants in the employer focus group also commented on the need for a diverse pool of graduates who are able to speak other languages and gain access to stories in different communities.

- **Equipment:** The School of Journalism is located within the Rogers Communication Centre and shares many communications facilities and computing laboratories with other schools in the Faculty. The condition of equipment and facilities used by the School varies greatly. For example, the Toronto Star Newspaper Centre for Journalism Production is a fully-endowed, first rate facility which supports text-based program options. The *Online* newsroom is a relatively new space; yet it is in need of structural changes to create an effective teaching area. There is also intense demand on the limited and aging video equipment. The PRT also recommended that "... [the School] *develop a strategic plan for equipment renewal and renovations paying particular attention to the needs of broadcast and online."*

Developmental Plan:

As part of the periodic program review process the School considered program strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges, as well as the program's context, mission and goals. The School responded to observed strengths and weaknesses and has a developmental plan in place with the following objectives.

- **Curriculum:** While program graduates are universally praised for their knowledge and strong grounding in journalism skills, survey and focus group results point to an increasing demand for graduates who will be able to critique and analyze coverage from a professional viewpoint. Towards this goal, the School has introduced the 2004 and the 2007 curricular revisions which represent a significant attempt for intellectual and analytical development in *all* program courses. The School will monitor and make changes as needed to its curriculum to ensure that as the premier journalism school in Canada it will continue to produce graduates whose skills are based on knowledge, constant reflective practice and the use of analytical tools.

- **Diversity:** The Critical Issues course helps to educate new journalists about how to cover diversity and multiculturalism. Employers participating in the focus group said that as a result of this course, Ryerson graduates are more culturally sensitive in their reporting. Although the curriculum highlights diversity for students already in the program, it cannot solve the problem of attracting a more representative student body. The School, under the leadership of its Chair, is developing an outreach program both to attract a more diverse faculty and a more diverse student body. In addition, the School is in partnership with the Young People's Press program under which high school students from different backgrounds will spend a day at Ryerson learning about writing. The experience exposes high school students of diverse cultures to journalism as a possible course of study and a profession. Individual faculty members also are developing projects to link the Ryerson School of Journalism with culturally diverse high schools.

- **Equipment Renewal:** The School has completed a study for fundraising and identified possible donors and fundraisers. It is establishing an active committee to secure funds for its ongoing need to maintain and replace equipment, to keep facilities at a state-of-the-art level.

## ASC Evaluation

The School of Journalism has a well-deserved reputation as the premier journalism school and as such attracts a large number of highly qualified applicants. Experienced journalists serve the School as full-time and sessional instructors. Graduates of the program work in large numbers at every major media outlet in Canada and abroad. The School can list many of this country's prominent journalists among its alumni. Such an environment allows the School to maintain close relations with various media organizations, which in turn brings real world experience into the classroom and benefits the students.

ASC's assessment and recommendations are as follows:

- **Curriculum:** In the committee's judgment the 2007 Journalism curriculum has several positive aspects. The elimination of streaming requirements without eliminating the option of streaming enables the School to offer students increased flexibility and choice. As part of the 2007 curriculum, program students take 4 professionally-related electives which allow students to sample subject areas external to journalism. While the list of professionally-related courses is extensive (Professionally-Related Table III, Ryerson calendar, 2007/2008, pp. 313–315), inevitably there will be cases when individual students' interests will lead them to courses that are not part of this list. *ASC recommends that subject to the approval of the School, students should be allowed to substitute any course offered by the University outside of the School of Journalism in place of the professionally-related electives published in the calendar.*

- **Equipment:** The self-analysis section of the program review documentation identifies the state of equipment as a concern. In its report the PRT presents its observations on student use of equipment and technology. The PRT report then proceeds with a number of recommendations for their improvement, maintenance and renewal. In its response to the PRT report the School states that "*the School decided to create a fund-raising committee immediately, to address the problem of aging and out-of-date equipment, especially in the areas of broadcast and online.*" ASC concurs with the School's self-assessment and the PRT report, and believes that the School has initiated the process for equipment and facilities renewal. *ASC recommends that the School continue with its equipment renewal plan and develop a strategic approach for the long-term viability of its plan.*

- Student survey: **In the School presented summary survey results and commented on observed trends. However, due to unusually long lead time for the preparation and submission of the program review documentation, survey results presented in the Self-Study report are not representative of the current program, curriculum and students. Therefore, the student and graduate surveys were inconclusive and did not allow the School and ASC to extract the required information.** *ASC recommends that the School conduct new student and graduate surveys in 2008/2009 and present an analysis of these new surveys as part of its Follow-Up Report.*

## Follow-up Report

In keeping with usual procedure, a follow-up report which addresses the recommendations stated in the ASC Evaluation Section is to be submitted to the Dean of Faculty of Communication and Design and the Provost and Vice President Academic by the end of June 2009.

## Recommendation

Having determined that the program review of the *Journalism* program administered by the School of Journalism satisfies the relevant policy and procedural requirements, Academic Standards Committee recommends:

*That Senate approve the periodic program review of the Journalism program with the recommendations listed in the ASC Evaluation section.*

**SECTION B:** REVISED SENATE POLICIES #112 and #126

As part of their commitment to offering undergraduate programs of high quality and standards, all publicly assisted universities in Ontario have policies and procedures that govern the processes for the approval of new undergraduate programs and for the periodic review of existing undergraduate programs. These processes are endorsed by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) and are monitored by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) through the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC).

In December 2005, the COU endorsed OCAV's *Guidelines for University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations* (UUDLES)[9] which lay out the intellectual and creative development of students and the acquisition of relevant skills expected for undergraduate programs. As a consequence of this endorsement, Ontario universities have agreed to modify their existing policies on program review and new program approval no later than June 2008. Once the revised policies are approved, programs will be expected to develop and state intended outcomes at both the program and course level, as well as articulate the relationship of those outcomes to the undergraduate degree-level expectations.

At Ryerson, Senate Policies #112 and #126 govern the approval process for new undergraduate programs and the periodic program review of undergraduate programs, respectively. The proposed revisions to these policies aim to integrate UUDLES into new program approval and periodic program review practices. The proposed changes also update the language used in the text, delineate the procedures for the periodic review of accredited programs (Policy 126, Article IV.A.5) and enhance the mechanism for the program review follow-up (Policy 126, Article VIII). The revised policies are provided in the Appendix.

## Recommendation

Having satisfied itself of the merits of these proposals, ASC recommends:

*That Senate approve the proposed revisions to Policy #112 Approval Process for New Undergraduate Programs and to Policy #126 Periodic Program Review of Undergraduate Programs.*

Respectfully submitted,

---

9  These degree-level expectations are provided in the Appendix. They will also be integrated into the Periodic Program Review Manual and will be available from the Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic.

Alan Shepard,
for the 2007/2008 Academic Standards Committee

K. Alnwick (Registrar)
D. Androutsos (Electrical & Computer Engg.)
J. Dianda (Philosophy)
E. Evans (Retail Management)
D. Glynn (Continuing Education)
D. Granfield (Library)
P. Hadian (Student, Sociology)
G. Hunt (Business Management)
R. Keeble (Urban & Regional Planning)

L. McCarthy (Chemistry and Biology)
A. Mitchell (Interior Design)
G. Murray (Student, Retail Management)
D. Schulman (Secretary of Senate; ex-officio)
J. Smith (Journalism)
R. Stagg (History)
J. Waddell (Nursing)
M. Zeytinoglu (Electrical & Computer Engg.)

**Appendix**

# 1. Guidelines for University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations

The following degree level expectations adopted from OCAV's Guidelines define a threshold framework for the expression of the intellectual and creative development of students. Under these Guidelines all undergraduate degree programs at Ryerson will be expected to demonstrate that at the completion of the program students would have acquired the following set of skills.

**1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge**
a)  a developed knowledge and critical understanding of the key concepts, methodologies, current advances, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline overall, as well as in a specialized area of a discipline
b)  a developed understanding of many of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines
c)  a developed ability to: i) gather, review, evaluate and interpret information; and ii) compare the merits of alternate hypotheses or creative options, relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline
d)  a developed, detailed knowledge of and experience in research in an area of the discipline
e)  developed critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline
f)  the ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline

**2. Knowledge of Methodologies**
… an understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to:
- evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques;
- devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods; and describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship.

**3. Application of Knowledge**
a)  the ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to:
      i)      develop lines of argument;
      ii)     make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study;
      iii)   apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the discipline;
      iv)   where appropriate use this knowledge in the creative process; and
b)  the ability to use a range of established techniques to:
      i)      initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and information;
      ii)     propose solutions;
      iii)   frame appropriate questions for the purpose of solving a problem;
      iv)   solve a problem or create a new work; and
c)  the ability to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.

**4. Communication Skills**
… the ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences

**5. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge**
… an understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and ability, and an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits to knowledge and how this might influence analyses and interpretations.

**6. Autonomy and Professional Capacity**
a) qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:
- the exercise of initiative, personal responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts;
- working effectively with others;
- decision-making in complex contexts;

b) the ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline and to select an appropriate program of further study; and
c) behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.

# 2. Policy #112

Revisions to the text of current policy are highlighted.

**APPROVAL PROCESS FOR NEW UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**Policy Number:**          112

**Original Approval Date:**      March 1, 2005
May 9, 2002
February 7, 1995 (original policy)

**Current Policy Approval Date:**    April 1, 2008

**Policy Review Date:**       May 2013 *(or sooner at the request of the Provost and Vice President Academic or Senate)*

**Responsible Committee or Office:** Provost and Vice President Academic

---

**POLICY STATEMENT**

Before a proposal for a new undergraduate degree program is forwarded to Senate for approval, it will have passed through a rigorous development and review process that includes an assessment as set out in the associated procedures.

**ASSOCIATED PROCEDURES**

The stages of the developmental and approval process are:

**1.**      **GENERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL**

**1.1**      **Initiation of the Process**

Preliminary proposals for new degree programs will be developed by faculty groups ("originating units") that are comprised of faculty from a single school or department, from several schools and/or departments within a Faculty, from schools and departments from different Faculties, or from collaborative structures involving other post-secondary institutions.

**1.2**      **Authorization to Proceed**

The authorization of the Provost and Vice President Academic1 is required before a full program proposal is developed. The first step in obtaining this authorization is a *Letter of Intent (LOI)* to be prepared by the originating unit. When the unit has received approval from the relevant Dean(s), the LOI will be transmitted to the Provost. This letter will include:

a)    a brief statement of the consistency of the program with Ryerson's mission and academic

---

1 Hereinafter referred to as Provost.

plan, the Faculty plan and the Department/School plan;

b) a brief description of the proposed program including its purpose, anticipated student clientele, and curriculum;

c) a preliminary statement of existing and/or emerging societal need and the basis on which this has been determined;

d) a preliminary projection of faculty and other resource requirements;

e) the proposed schedule for program implementation; and

f) an executive summary.

The executive summary will be circulated by the Provost and, along with the complete LOI, will be available for inspection by any interested member of the Ryerson community. A period of one month is set aside for comment on the proposal.

The Provost will respond to the letter of intent as soon as possible after the expiry of the one-month community response period, either authorizing or not authorizing the development of a formal proposal. If the development of a proposal is authorized, an academic unit will be formally designated to assume responsibility for it and a Dean will be designated to provide primary administrative support and leadership. The designated academic unit may correspond to an existing school/department or be newly created for the purpose of developing a formal proposal. In the case of inter-Faculty proposals the Provost shall decide which Dean shall be given primary responsibility.

Authorization to proceed signifies that the University supports the development of a formal program proposal, but it does not commit the University or the Faculty to final endorsement.

## 2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE FORMAL PROPOSAL

### 2.1 The New Program Advisory Committee

Once authorization to proceed has been given, a New Program Advisory Committee2 will be constituted. This Committee will consist of at least 5 members. The designated academic unit will provide the relevant Dean(s) with a list of suggested members and brief biographical sketches. The suggested members may be drawn, as appropriate, from business, industry, labour, agencies, government, and other universities.

As the proposal is developed, the role of the committee is to provide advice on:
a) program objectives;

b) proposed courses and curriculum structure;

c) equipment and other required support (where relevant);

d) likely employment patterns for graduates; and

---

2 If the program is ultimately approved, the initial membership of the Program Advisory Council (See Senate Policy 158: *Program Advisory Councils*) will include members from the New Program Advisory Committee.

e) any other aspects of the proposed program related to its objectives, structure, and societal relevance.

In general, the committee's advice will be sought periodically during the development of the proposal. Its working relationship with the designated academic unit should be iterative.

**2.2**. **Proposal Content**

A proposal must include:

**2.2.1** *Basic information*

a) Name of the program and the proposed degree designation, identification of the designated academic unit, and the names of the principal faculty members involved in its development.

b) Statement of the program goals, clearly identifying the rationale for offering this new program as it relates to societal need, Ryerson's mission and academic plan and the academic plans of the Faculty and the Department/School.

c) Overview of the curriculum, major disciplines/options of the program, and mode of delivery.

d) Discussion of the overlap between, and/or integration of, the program with other existing or planned programs at Ryerson.

e) Copy of the Provost's authorization to proceed and a summary of major departures from the Letter of Intent.

f) List of names, positions, and affiliations of the members of the New Program Advisory Committee.

**2.2.2** *Program details*

a) Clearly defined program learning objectives as they relate to program goals and the University's degree level expectations3.

b) An explanation of the appropriateness of the mode of delivery to meeting the program learning objectives.

c) A presentation of the curriculum of the program**,** in both a clear tabular format and as it would be entered in the calendar, specifying the courses, their modes of delivery and scheduled hours per week, for each term of the program.

d) Discussion of the appropriateness of the program's structure and curriculum for its learning objectives.

e) An analysis of how the program structure and curriculum provide students with the stated learning objectives.

---

3 The Ontario Council of Academic Vice-President's (OCAV) Guidelines for degree level expectations can be found in the Periodic Program Review Manual, and are also available from the Office of Senate.

f) An analysis of the program's curriculum content in terms of professional licensing/ accreditation requirements, if relevant.

g) Report by the University Library on existing and proposed collections and services to support the program goals and learning objectives.

h) A statement of the methods, and appropriateness of these methods, for evaluation of student progress.

i) Statement of admission requirements and how these prepare students to meet the learning objectives of the program.

j) Comparison of admission requirements with those of comparable programs at other universities.

k) Promotion and graduation requirements, if variant from Ryerson's Policy on Grading, Promotion, and Academic Standing.

*2.2.3* *Appendices* **-** The following information, relevant to the above, should be included as appendices to the proposal.

a) Calendar-type course descriptions of each of the proposed courses including course level outcomes and articulating the relationship of these outcomes to program expectations.

b) A synopsis of each professional and required professionally-related course, identifying the major topics of study, potential text(s), methods of evaluation and related computer, laboratory, or studio experience.

c) Curriculum Vitae of the faculty members who will be involved in the development/delivery of the proposed program. These should be in standard format for the discipline and demonstrate the faculty members' expertise in the area of the proposed program.

*2.2.4* *Institutional appropriateness, societal need, and student demand*

a) Assessment of institutional appropriateness. This assessment should refer to the university's mission and to relevant areas of strength within the university and the designated academic unit. These would include teaching, SRC activity, and others as appropriate.

b) Description of the existing and/or emerging societal need(s) that will be met by the program's graduates, and any relevant trends in the anticipated societal need.

c) Indication of any innovative and distinctive aspects of the proposed program, and a comparison with the most similar programs in Ontario. If there are significant similarities between the proposed program and existing programs, a case for duplication should be made.

d) Evidence of student demand for the program, through application statistics for related programs in Ontario or elsewhere and other research as may be appropriate.

e) Evidence that the graduates of the program are and will be needed in the public, voluntary, and/or private sector. The evidence required would include:

i.      letters from potential employers of graduates who have seen the curriculum and commented upon the existing and emerging need for graduates within their organization and more broadly in their field of endeavour,

ii. where applicable, professional society and/or association comments about the need for graduates based on a review of the curriculum.

It may also include:

iii. a formal survey of potential employers, statistics related to the number of Ontario students leaving the province to study in the same field elsewhere in Canada or abroad, and the comments of relevant student groups.

f) Examination of potential collaboration/cooperation with other Institutions offering similar or complementary programs, and the rationale for whether such joint arrangements may or may not be beneficial. The outcome of any consultations with other institutions offering similar programs regarding the possibility of cooperation, sharing of resources, facilities and faculty should be indicated.

**2.2.5** *Data developed in consultation with the University Planning Office (UPO).*

a) Projected enrolment levels for at least the first five years of the operation of the new program, leading to the intended steady-state enrolment levels and the year in which such steady-state will be reached.

b) The facilities, specialized equipment, and other physical resources that will be required to offer the proposed program.

c) Estimated number of faculty members (total and additional, in FTEs) and support staff that will be required to deliver the program at the steady-state conditions.

d) Estimated annual operating and capital funds required to deliver the proposed program.

e) Space, computing and library support that will be required.

A preliminary assessment of financial viability will be carried out as soon as possible after the required information is gathered. The proposal will not be submitted for Decanal approval prior to this preliminary assessment.

**3. DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL COUNCIL(S), NEW PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AND DECANAL REVIEWS**

**3.1 Departmental/School Council(s)**

The formal program proposal will be presented to the relevant Departmental/School Council(s) for review and approval. Where such a Council does not exist the Dean shall establish an appropriate committee consisting of members of related department/school councils.

A record will be kept of the date(s) of the relevant Council meeting(s), along with any qualifications or limitations placed on approval by the Council(s). This information must be forwarded to the Dean.

**3.2** **New Program Advisory Committee**

After the proposal has been approved by the School/Departmental Council(s) it will be forwarded to the New Program Advisory Committee for its review, and recommendations. A record will be kept of meeting dates, and members attending. This information will be forwarded to the Dean.

**3.3** **Dean(s) of Faculty**

After the proposal has been approved by the Department/School(s) and reviewed by the New Program Advisory Committee it will be forwarded to the Dean(s) for approval. If approved, the Dean will submit the proposal to a peer review team and to the Provost. Inter-Faculty programs will require the approval of the Deans of all involved Faculties.

**4.** **PEER REVIEW AND RESPONSE**
As soon as possible after a proposal has been approved by the Dean(s), it will undergo review by a peer review team as described below.

**4.1** **The Mandate of the Peer Review Team**

The general mandate of the Peer Review Team (PRT) is to evaluate and report in writing on the academic quality of the proposed program and the capacity of the designated academic unit to deliver it in an appropriate manner. The report of the PRT will address:

a) the currency, rigour, and coherence of the proposed curriculum;

b) the appropriateness of the program's goals and learning objectives;

c) the ability of the proposed curriculum to meet the program's goals and learning objectives;

d) the adequacy of the proposed number of faculty;

e) the academic expertise of the faculty in relation to the program's goals and objectives;

f) the adequacy of proposed levels of support staff and infrastructure (e.g. space, facilities, technology, library) for the proposed program, within the unit and (to the extent relevant) the university; and

g) any recommendations for improvement and/or modification to the program.

**4.2** **Composition and Selection of the Peer Review Team**

**4.2.1** The PRT will consist of a minimum of three members as follows:

a) two or more faculty from the discipline, field, or profession who are external to the University and at arm's length from the program school/department;

b) one or more faculty from a closely related field or discipline within Ryerson;

c) one additional representative of industry or the profession if requested, and upon approval of the Provost.

The number of external members will exceed the number of internal members.

**4.2.2** The peer review team will be appointed by the Dean in consultation with the Provost, based on written information provided by the originating unit. This information will include the names and brief biographies of six or more faculty external to Ryerson and of three or more faculty internal to Ryerson. No current or former member of the New Program Advisory Committee may be appointed to the PRT.

**4.2.3** The Dean will invite one of the external faculty members to Chair the team.

**4.3 Peer Review Procedures**

**4.3.1** A PRT site visit is required.

**4.3.2** The team will be provided with:

a) the formal proposal and all documentation pertinent to its approval to this point;

b) access to departmental administrators, staff, and faculty, administrators of service departments and librarians as appropriate; and

c) any additional information that may be needed to support a thorough review.

**4.3.3** Immediately upon completion of the site visit, the PRT will hold a debriefing involving the Dean and/or the Provost and any others who may be invited.

**4.3.4** Within four weeks of the completion of the site visit, the PRT will submit its written report to the Dean and the Provost. The Dean will circulate this report to the designated academic unit.

**4.4 Response to the PRT Report**

Within four weeks of receipt of the PRT report, the designated academic unit will submit its response to the Dean. The response will take the form of a statement that identifies any corrections or clarifications, indicates how the PRT recommendations are being accommodated or, if they are not to be accommodated, reasons for this. Alternatively, if the PRT report is strongly favourable, the designated academic unit may respond by resubmitting its proposal incorporating any modifications. The designated academic unit may also withdraw its proposal at this stage.

If the formal proposal is revised following, or as a result of, the PRT review, the formal proposal originally approved by the department/school(s) must be attached as an appendix and the formal proposal must be resubmitted to the Dean(s).

If the Dean(s) believes that this revised proposal differs substantially from the appended formal proposal s/he is required to return it to the Department/School Council(s) for further endorsement before providing decanal endorsement.

The entire proposal, with revisions, including the PRT review and response and the Dean's approval, is submitted to the Provost.

**5.     PROVOST AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE REVIEW**
The Provost will review the proposal and either refer it back to the Dean for further consideration or submit it to the Academic Standards Committee of Senate (ASC) for review.  The ASC will review the proposal for academic quality and societal need and make one of the following recommendations:
   a.   That the program be approved, with or without qualification;
   b.   That the program proposal be returned to the originating unit for further revision;
   c.   That the program not be approved.

**6**.     **SENATE APPROVAL**
The Provost, as Chair of the Academic Standards Committee, will submit a report to Senate. Senate approval is the culmination of the internal academic approval process.4

---

4 The Provost is responsible for presentation of the program to the Board for approval of financial viability.  Final implementation of the program is the responsibility of the Provost.

**3. Policy #126**

Revisions to the text of current policy are highlighted.

**PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**Policy Number:**          126

**Original Approval Date:**          April 5, 2005
                                     May 9, 2002 (Revised from original policy May 7, 1996)

**Current Policy Approval Date:** April 1, 2008

**Policy Review Date:**          May 2013 *(or sooner at the request of the Provost and Vice President Academic or Senate)*

**Responsible Committee or Office:**  Provost and Vice President Academic

---

**I.    PREAMBLE**

Periodic reviews of undergraduate programs serve primarily to help ensure that programs achieve and maintain the highest possible standards of academic quality and continue to satisfy societal need. They also serve to satisfy public accountability expectations through a review process that is transparent and consequential. The process is endorsed by the Council of Ontario Universties (COU) and monitored by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice- Presidents (OCAV) through the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC). Academic programs at Ryerson are also aligned with the statement of undergraduate degree-level expectations adopted by the COU in December 2005. These degree-level expectations can be found in the Periodic Program Review Manual associated with this policy.

Program reviews are carried out under the authority of Senate as set out in the *Ryerson University Act, 1977 (amended),* and apply to all undergraduate degree programs, including second-entry, those offered in full or in part by federated or affiliated institutions and those offered in partnership with other higher education institutions (colleges and universities) through collaborative or other affiliation agreements.

The approval of the relevant Department/School Councils, review by the relevant Program Advisory Council(s), approval of the relevant Dean(s) and the approval of the Provost and Vice President Academic14 are integral to the process. Ultimately Senate approval is required.

---

14 Hereafter referred to as Provost.

Multidisciplinary and Interdisciplinary Programs shall be reviewed as distinct programs and must establish an administrative entity that will be responsible for curriculum and program review.

The process is to be applied to all programs on a cycle of approximately seven years and will be coordinated with any professional accreditation review required for a program. The accreditation review can be used to satisfy the program review requirement to the extent that it meets that requirement. The program must submit a supplementary report containing additional information required by the program review process, if any.

## II.    THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

The self-study has descriptive, explanatory, evaluative and formative functions. It provides an opportunity for program schools or departments, in conjunction with service departments and support units, to assess all dimensions of the program's academic quality and societal need. It is essential that the self-study is reflective, self-critical and analytical, and that it actively involve both faculty and students in the process. The self-study consists of two parts: a narrative that addresses key areas, and appendices that include the data and information that form the basis for the narrative.15

A.  Narrative – The narrative must provide a reflective, self-critical and analytical review of the program based on data and surveys, and must be the result of active involvement of faculty and students. The narrative must include, but is not limited to:

1. Basic Information
   a.   a brief history of the program's development;
   b.   statement of the goals, learning objectives and program expectations and their consistency with the University's mission and academic plan, the Faculty academic plan, the school/department academic plan, and the OCAV degree-level expectation guidelines.

2. Development Since Previous Program Review – a report on how the program has met the goals and objectives of the developmental plan submitted in the previous Program Review and how it has addressed the Senate recommendations on that Program Review.

3. Societal Need16
   a.   a description of current and anticipated societal need;
   b.   an assessment of existing and anticipated student demand.

4. Academic Quality

---

15     The Vice-Chair of the ASC will advise program departments/schools throughout the review process on matters of content and format and to ensure that policy requirements are met.
16     Elements of employer surveys/focus groups may be relevant in this section.

a. description of the program curriculum and structure, including the relationship of the curriculum and individual courses to the program goals and learning objectives;

b. a list of comparator programs, the rationale for the selection of these programs and a discussion of how the Ryerson program compares and contrasts with the structure, focus, learning objectives and overall curriculum of the comparators;

c. a summary and analysis of the results of student surveys/focus groups and graduate surveys, including the quality of support to students and general student satisfaction with the program;

d. a summary and analysis of the results of employer surveys/focus groups;

e. an analysis and evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the mode of delivery (including, where applicable, distance or on-line delivery) to meet the program's learning objectives;

f. an analysis and evaluation of the appropriateness of the methods used for the evaluation of student progress and, where possible, consideration of the effectiveness of the methods used;

g. a statement of admission requirements and an analysis and evaluation of the appropriateness of these requirements;

h. a statement of any variations from Ryerson's GPA policy  and an analysis and evaluation of the appropriateness of these variations;

i. a summary and evaluation of library resources;

j. a summary of faculty qualification, teaching and SRC activity relative to program goals and learning objectives;

k. an analysis and evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the use of existing human and physical resources  to support the program;

l. a summary and evaluation of any partnership or collaborative agreements with other institutions.

m. a summary and evaluation of any experiential learning opportunities.

5. Strengths and Weaknesses - a self-critical analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the program, addressing:
   a. academic quality based on the elements in part (4) above;
   b. the ability of the program to meet its goals and learning objectives.

6. Developmental Plan - a 3-5 year developmental plan.

B. Appendices
   1. Appendix I: All data and survey information on which the narrative is based[17], including but not limited to:
   a. Admissions data and information on student demand;
   b. Retention and graduation data;
   c. Data on enrolment in all program courses (required and elective);
   d. Student satisfaction survey (and focus group comments where appropriate);;
   e. Recent graduate survey;
   f. Employer survey (or focus group comments where appropriate);

---

17 Relevant statistical information is available from the University Planning Office.

g.  Comments from service departments.

2. Appendix II: Curriculum Vitae of all faculty members in the program school or department, and of all other faculty who have recently taught required courses to program students.

3. Appendix III: Course outlines for all courses offered by the program.

4. Appendix IV: Documentation of Advisory Council comments, Department/School Council Approvals, and approval by the Dean (see section III).

Detailed guidelines for the above are contained in a Program Review Manual available from the Office of the Provost.

## III.  REVIEWS AND APPROVALS AT THE PROGRAM DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL AND DECANAL LEVELS

### A.  Department/School Council
The Chair/Director of the program department/school will forward the full self-study report to the Dean who will review it and either refer it back to the department/school for further development or for presentation to the Department/ School Council (or other appropriate administrative entity in the case of multi-disciplinary or inter-disciplinary programs) for its review and approval. A record will be kept of the date(s) of the relevant Council meeting(s), along with any qualifications or limitations placed by the Council on the approval.

### B.  Program Advisory Council
Following approval by the Department/School Council, the self-study report, along with any Department/School Council qualifications or limitations, will be sent to the Dean for presentation to the Program Advisory Council (PAC) for its review and comments.  A record will be kept of the date(s) of the meeting(s) and members attending the meeting(s).

### C.  Dean of the Faculty
After the Program Advisory Council has completed its review, the self-study report, along with any Department/School Council qualifications or limitations and PAC comments, will be returned to the Dean. The Dean will approve its appropriateness for submission to an external peer review team.

## IV.  PEER REVIEW AND RESPONSE

The program must undergo an external evaluation by a Peer Review Team (PRT). Members of the PRT will be given information on the University and its mission, a complete copy of the self-study report, including Department/School Council qualifications or limitations and PAC comments, and a copy of this policy.

**A. Composition and Procedure[18]**
1. The PRT will consist of two or more faculty from the relevant discipline(s), field(s) or profession from another university, including universities outside Ontario, who are at arms length from the program school/department.
2. The membership of the PRT will be determined and appointed by the Dean, in consultation with the Provost. The school/department will provide, for the Dean's consideration, names and brief biographies of at least six potential reviewers.
3. The Dean will invite one of the reviewers to act as Chair of the PRT.
4. There will be a site visit, structured to include the opportunity for PRT discussion with students, faculty and staff.
5. In the case of accredited programs,at his or her discretion, the Provost may require a separate Peer Review when the accrediting body's assessment does not fully cover all of the areas required by the University's program review process or may require an Addendum to the materials presented to an accreditation board associated with the academic discipline under review.

**B. The Peer Review Team Mandate**
The general mandate of the PRT is to evaluate the academic quality of the program and the capacity of the School or Department to deliver it in an appropriate manner. More specifically, the Peer Review will address:
1. the appropriateness of the program's goals and learning objectives and the consistency of the program's curriculum with these goals and objectives;
2. the currency, rigour, and coherence of the program's curriculum;
3. the appropriateness of the mode of delivery and methods used for the evaluation of student progress;
4. the appropriateness of the program's admissions requirements to the program goals and learning objectives;
5. the adequacy and effectiveness of existing human and physical resources, including library resources, to support the program;
6. the quality of support to students and general student satisfaction with the program; and
7. the degree to which the scholarly, research and creative activity in the offering unit provides support for the program goals and learning objectives.

The PRT should, at the end of its report, specifically comment on:
1. the program's strengths and weaknesses;
2. the program's developmental plan; and
3. recommendations for actions to improve the quality of the program, if any.

**C. Peer Review Team Report**

---

18 The Peer Review procedures are outlined in the *Peer Review Team Guide* found in the Program Review Manual.

1. Upon completion of the site visit, the PRT will conduct a debriefing involving the Dean and/or the Provost, the Chair/Director of the program school or department, Assistant/Associate Chairs and Program Directors, if any, and any other individuals who may be invited by the PRT Chair. During the debriefing, the PRT will present its preliminary observations on the program. This is meant to be informational only.
2. The PRT shall submit a written report to the Dean and Provost within four weeks of its site visit.
3. A copy of the PRT report will be forwarded to the Chair/Director.

### D. Response to the Peer Review Team Report

1. Within four weeks, the program will prepare a written response to the PRT report. The written response may include any of the following: corrections or clarifications of items raised in the PRT report; a revised developmental plan with an explanation of how the revisions reflect the recommendations or respond to the weaknesses or deficiencies identified in the report; and/or an explanation of why recommendations of the PRT will not be acted upon.
2. The Dean may accept the response as submitted or refer it back to the program for further action. Once accepted, the Dean will provide a copy of the response to each PRT member as a courtesy.
3. The Chair/Director will forward the revised developmental plan, if any and the final response to the PRT report to the Department/School Council for its information.

## V. SUBMISSION TO PROVOST

The Dean will submit a final report to the Provost, which will include the following:

1. The original self-study report, including all appendices (Appendix IV must be updated.);
2. The PRT report, including the names, positions, and credentials of the reviewers;
3. The program's final response to the PRT report;
4. A developmental plan, if different from the original, reflecting input from the Department/School Council, PAC, PRT and Dean; and
5. Any comments the Dean may wish to make concerning the program and/or any aspect of the review.

## VI. SENATE REVIEW AND APPROVAL

The Provost will review the submission and either refer it back to the Dean for further action or present it to the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) for academic review and recommendations. The ASC may recommend:

1. Approval of the review as submitted, with or without recommendations for further action.
2. Conditional approval of the review, with conditions specified.

3. Referral of the review to the Dean for further action in response to specified weaknesses and/or deficiencies.
4. Rejection of the review as submitted.

The Provost, as Chair of the ASC, will submit a report to Senate that summarizes the findings and conclusions of the ASC review of the program, including the program's strengths and weaknesses, and outlines the actions to be taken on the recommendations arising from the review. If the report includes a recommendation for approval of the program review, it will include a date for a required follow-up report to be submitted to the Dean and Provost on the progress of the developmental plan and any recommendations or conditions attached to the approval. The initial follow-up report is normally due by June 30 of the academic year following Senate's resolution.

If the report is referred to the Dean, a date will be specified for the completion of a revised report. If the revised report is not filed by that date, the program review will be rejected.

Senate is charged with final academic approval of the Program Review.

## VII. REPORT TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Following presentation to Senate, the Provost will present a report that summarizes the outcomes of the Program Review to the Board of Governors for its information.

## VIII. PROGRAM REVIEW FOLLOW-UP

The Chair/Director is responsible for the presentation of the required follow-up report to the Dean and Provost by the specified date. The Provost shall forward the report to the ASC for its information, review, and report to Senate. If it is believed that there has not been sufficient progress in addressing any issues raised by the Program Review, an additional update and course of action may be required by a specified date.

## Senate Representation on the Ryerson University Alumni Association

The Alumni Relations Office is in the process of creating a new Ryerson University Alumni Association (RUAA), the purpose of which shall be to connect and reconnect the graduates of Ryerson University to the institution through communication and personal experiences in order to generate ever increasing, multi-faceted support for Ryerson University.

The Association will serve as a channel of mutual communication between the alumni and the University, and will share with the University responsibility for the direction of all alumni organizations and programs on behalf of the University.

In the interest of good communication and awareness, the RUAA Board will include an *ex officio* member to serve as the Liaison to the Senate, who shall be selected by the Senate, from one of the two elected Alumni representative positions.

That individual shall attend all meetings of the RUAA Board and Council, and shall report to the Senate on the issues and activities of the RUAA, as appropriate, and to the RUAA Board and Council on the activities and issues of the Senate, as appropriate.

Whereas, the Senate supports the creation of the RUAA, Alumni Relations Office is requesting that the Senate will appoint one of its alumni representatives to serve on the RUAA Board, *ex officio*, in the role of Liaison to the Senate for a term of two years.