

**RYERSON UNIVERSITY**  
**SENATE MEETING AGENDA**  
**Tuesday, March 3, 2009**

---

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

**6:00 p.m.** Meeting in The Commons (POD-250).

---

Pages 1-4 Pages 5-9	<b>1. President's Report</b> 1.1 President's Update 1.2 Ryerson Achievement Report
Pages 10-11	<b>2. Report of the Secretary of Senate</b> 2.1 Report #W2009-1 of the Secretary of Senate: Senate Election Results 2009-2010
	<b>3. The Good of the University</b>
Pages 12-16	<b>4. Minutes:</b> 4.1 Minutes of the January 27, 2009 Meeting
Pages 17-25	<b>5. Business Arising From the Minutes</b> 5.1 Report #W2009-2 of the Ad hoc Committee to Review the Course Management Policy (policy #145) 5.1.1 <b>Motion:</b> <i>That Senate approve the amendment of Policy # 145: The Course Management Policy, effective September 1, 2009.</i>
	<b>6. Correspondence</b>
Pages 26-29	<b>7. Reports of Actions and Recommendations of Departmental and Divisional Councils</b> 7.1 From Communication and Design: Course changes from Interior Design  7.2 From Community Services: Course changes from Daphne Cockwell School of Nursing
Pages 30-31	<b>8. Reports of Committees</b> 8.1 Report #W2009-1 of the Nominating Committee  8.2 Report #W2009-2 of the Composition and Bylaws Committee 8.2.1 <b>Motion #1:</b> <i>That Senate approve the changes to the bylaw of the Department of Physics Council such that one Postdoctoral Fellow is included in its membership.</i>
Page 32	

Pages 33-73

8.2.2 **Motion #2:** *That Senate approve the amendment of Section 5.2 of its bylaw (effective July 1, 2009) to state: “Vice-chair: The Vice-Chair shall be elected by and from elected Senators in conjunction with elections to the Senate Priorities Committee.”*

8.3 Report #W2009-2 of the Senate Appeals Committee

8.3.1 **Motion #1:** *That Senate approve the amendment of Policy 134: Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy, as presented to Senate on January 27, 2009, to be implemented for Fall, 2009.*

8.3.2 **Motion #2:** *That Senate approve the amendment of the Student Code of Academic Conduct to replace Faculty Appeals Committees with an Academic Integrity Council, effective September 1, 2009.*

**9. New Business**

**10. Adjournment**

## Ryerson University Senate

### President's Update for the meeting of: March 3, 2009

---

**RU Ryerson?** – Members of Senate are invited to the ‘RU Ryerson?’ Awards on Thursday, March 19<sup>th</sup> (time and specific location to be announced) at the AMC Theatres in Toronto Life Square. As reported in the last update, Ryerson students have been invited to produce a 3-minute video showing what Ryerson means to them, and I am proud to sponsor the President’s Prizes. The entry deadline is March 1<sup>st</sup>, then the Ryerson community can vote online until March 15<sup>th</sup> for the videos available for viewing at <http://www.ruryerson.ca/>. On March 19<sup>th</sup> the top ten videos will be screened and the prizes awarded. This is a great student initiative, and I hope you can join us for the festivities.

**DiverseCity** – Ryerson was prominent at the DiverseCity launch on January 26<sup>th</sup>. The strategy is focused on recognizing ‘the world reflected in our city’ with a plan to reflect our ethnic and cultural diversity in leadership positions. Over three years, the project will move forward on eight key initiatives that will expand networks, strengthen private and public institutions, and advance knowledge on diversity in leadership. The TRSM Diversity Institute in Management & Technology is responsible for the initiative entitled *DiverseCity Counts*, with a mandate to track GTA progress in diversifying its leadership and report annually on the Toronto region’s success (see <http://www.diversecitytoronto.ca/>).

**Black History Month** – Viola Desmond Day: A Celebration of Strong Black Canadian Women was held on February 12<sup>th</sup>, organized by the Ryerson Tri-Mentoring Program, Discrimination & Harassment Prevention Services, Ryerson Students’ Union and the United Black Students at Ryerson. Desmond was a Halifax beautician and business woman who, 150 years ago, refused to give up her seat in a movie theatre simply because of the colour of her skin. A committee of Ryerson students and staff chose the following four women as the recipients of awards named after prominent black Canadian female figures:

*Mary Ann Shadd Award*: Pauline Bleuh, 3<sup>rd</sup> year Nursing

*Carrie Best Award*: Professor Carole Chauncey, TRSM

*Viola Desmond Award*: Bai Rashid, a high school student participating in the Ryerson First Generation project

*Portia White Award*: Kay Sealy, Enrollment Services and Student Records.

**Budget** – Given our commitment to transparency, openness, and communication on the 2009-10 budget, we are continuing to post updates on the web page as information becomes available, including the federal and provincial government context and statements from the university sector (see

<http://www.ryerson.ca/about/president/economicupdate/index.html>).

**Empire Club** – On March 5<sup>th</sup> at 12 noon I am giving a speech entitled *A New Reality: Building Universities and Cities for the Digital Age*. The speech builds on the ideas articulated in the Installation speech and the Canadian Club speech, in recognizing that the university has a responsibility to be a city-builder, not just in bricks-and-mortar, but in attracting the world's best talent and growing the economy through vigorous partnerships and confident ambition.

**Chancellor's Panel, Canadian Club** – On February 9<sup>th</sup>, Ryerson colleagues joined Chancellor G. Raymond Chang to hear the Chancellors of the University of Toronto, Queen's University, and the University of Western Ontario participate in a 'Chancellor's Panel' about the importance of universities. The event was a very positive addition to advocacy on behalf of all universities.

**Emoti-Chair concert** – News of the "world's first" accessible rock concert for the deaf and hard of hearing, organized by the Ryerson Centre for Learning Technology and the Science of Music, Auditory Research and Technology lab has attracted enormous media attention in Canada and internationally. The March 5<sup>th</sup> concert at Clinton's Tavern in Toronto will feature a number of acts, including Fox Jaws, Hollywood Swank, ill.gates and the Dufraines. But the stars will be the "emoti-chairs" designed to analyze sound frequencies and translate them into vibrations, motions and blasts of air. The experience has been described by a user as follows: *For the first time in my life, I could feel sad or happy because of how the music vibrations felt on my skin. I never felt those kinds of feelings before when music was played. It was how the chair 'played' the music that enabled me to have a shared experience with people who are emotionally moved by listening to music.*, The concert will also have interpreters, open captioning and music visualization.

**'Green' Ryerson** – A February 4<sup>th</sup> article in the *Toronto Star* with the headline *Universities' ivory towers going green* featured a photograph and description of the Ryerson University Bicycle Room as the latest in a series of notable Ryerson achievements that include: a second Gold Award from the Recycling Council of Ontario (RCO) at the 2008 Ontario Waste Minimization Awards (Ryerson was also awarded Gold in 2007) for initiatives that recycled a record 72 per cent of waste accumulated across campus last year; the 2008 Professional Grounds Management Society (PGMS) Green Star Honour Award; and the City of Toronto 2008 Bicycle Friendly Business Awards for Best Bicycle Parking and Best Large Business. Members of the community are to be congratulated for their commitment to sustainability, led by our students and our ingenious and conscientious team in Campus Planning and Facilities.

### **Government Relations:**

**Invest Toronto** – On January 20<sup>th</sup>, I was invited by City Councillor Kyle Rae to attend the Invest Toronto Consultation Session with stakeholders.

**Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities** –

- As reported in November, the Ministry is working with Courtyard Group on capital planning for projected enrollment expansion; we continue to make the case for Ryerson within the GTA.
- February 4<sup>th</sup> – We welcomed Dr. Reza Moridi, Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister, on a campus visit to the Ryerson Computer Science Department.

- February 9<sup>th</sup> – On behalf of the Council of Ontario Universities, President & CEO Dr. Paul Genest and I met with Deputy Minister Deborah Newman to make a strong case for university operating funding.

**Ministry of Culture** – On January 27<sup>th</sup> the Director of the Ryerson Photography Gallery and Research Centre, Doina Popescu, and I had a meeting with Minister of Culture Aileen Carroll to provide an overview on the importance of the Gallery.

**Ministry of International Trade and Investment** – On February 4<sup>th</sup>, we had the opportunity to have a meeting and general discussion with Minister Sandra Pupatello.

**India Consul General** – On January 29<sup>th</sup>, on behalf of Ryerson University we extended a welcome to Ontario to the new India Consul General Preeti Saran.

**President's Congratulations** – I am proud to acknowledge Ryerson achievements sent to me since the last update, and continue to encourage everyone to let me know about accomplishments by members of our community. More details of achievements, research, awards and distinctions, and life at the university are also available at 'News and Events' on the Ryerson web site.

- ❖ January 2009: Tristan Tidswell (4<sup>th</sup> yr RTS) is backstage at the Canadian Opera Company this winter/spring as the recipient of the Wally Russell Foundation lighting internship.
- ❖ January 2009: Dr. Jean-Paul Boudreau has been elected to the Board of Directors of the Canadian Psychological Association.
- ❖ January 6-10, 2009: Competing for the first time in the John Molson MBA International Case Competition, the TRSM team (Catherine Chow, Renice Jones, Nancy Migally, and Beverly Nollert) coached by Dr. Dale Carl placed in the top six among 36 teams from nine countries, the only Canadian team to win their division.
- ❖ January 13, 2009 – Kaitlyn Taylor (Politics & Governance, Women's Varsity Basketball) is the Ryerson outstanding scholar-athlete at the 6th Annual OUA Women of Influence Luncheon.
- ❖ January 15, 2009: Patricia O'Connor, Coordinator of Field Programming, Internationally Educated Social Work Professionals (IESW) Bridging Program, The Chang School, is the recipient of the 2008 Toronto Star Immigrant Champion Award from the Toronto Region Immigrant Employment Council, 'for a local champion who makes a positive difference by assisting skilled immigrants with their entry and development in the workforce.'
- ❖ January 18, 2009: *Son of the Sunshine*, the first feature film by Ryan Ward (RTS 2004) in which he is co-writer, director, and lead actor, screened at Slamdance Film Festival 2009.
- ❖ January 22, 2009: At the Ontario University Athletics (OUA) Winter Invitational, the Ryerson figure skating team won bronze medals in creative dance (Alex Dabkowski & Tara Bartolini) and fours freeskate (Alex Dabkowski, Madeleine Jullian, Stephanie Hodgson, Tabitha Copping), the first time Ryerson has entered a fours freeskate team. For the first time in Rams history, every skater at the competition earned points for the team.
- ❖ January 24-25, 2009: The TRSM DECA Ryerson team competed against 13 universities from Ontario and Quebec and won: Five 1<sup>st</sup> place overall awards in the categories of Restaurant & Food Services Management, Internet Marketing, Marketing Management, and Sports &

Entertainment Marketing; two 3<sup>rd</sup> place overall awards in Fashion Merchandising & Marketing, and Travel & Tourism; seven Top 5 awards in Fashion Merchandising & Marketing (1), Travel & Tourism (2), Restaurant & Food Services Management (3), Financial Services (1); plus the 2008-09 Civic Consciousness Chapter Award.

- ❖ January 26, 2009: *Princess Margaret Blvd* by Kazik Radwanski (Image Arts '08) received the Grand Jury Award for Best Narrative Short at the Slamdance Film Festival 2009.
- ❖ January 26, 2009: Araya Mengesha (4th yr RTS) will play a lead role in "Rice Boy" at the 2009 Stratford Shakespeare Festival.
- ❖ January 29, 2009: Boris Bakovic, Varsity Men's Basketball, made history by becoming the Rams all-time leading scorer with 1,343 career points in just three seasons, breaking the previous record of 1,312 set by Jan-Michael Nation in 1998-02. Bakovic was also named Canadian Interuniversity Sport (CIS) Athlete of the Week, and Ontario University Athletics (OUA) Athlete of the Week for two weeks in a row.
- ❖ January 31, 2009: A Ryerson team from the Ted Rogers School of Management won the Certified Management Accountants of Ontario (CMA Ontario) 4<sup>th</sup> Annual Case competition. Team members Akeelya George, Maung Aung Zaw, Dhruval Patel, and Fatima Seedat won 1<sup>st</sup> place and \$5,000 in a competition entered by 37 teams from 19 Ontario universities.
- ❖ February 2, 2009: Four Seasons Hotels and Resorts, led by Chairman and CEO Isadore Sharp (Arch.Sci. '52, Alumni Achievement Award, Honorary Doctorate, Honorary Chair of the Ryerson Invest in Futures campaign) was named by Fortune Magazine as one of the "100 Best Companies to Work For" and as one of only thirteen "All Star" companies that have been on the list since it was launched in 1998.
- ❖ February 3, 2009: Greg Benedetto (RTA 2007) is part of a team nominated for a 2009 Juno Award in the 'Music DVD of the Year' category for *It All Started With a Red Stripe*.
- ❖ February 7-8, 2009 – Calling themselves 'Ryerson's Pirates of the Carriboggan' a team of Civil Engineering students placed 2<sup>nd</sup> in the 2009 Great Northern Concrete Toboggan Race, finishing in the medals three years in a row. The team built their toboggan complete with mast and sail, wore pirate hats and sprinkled gold coins along the deck, and won \$1,000 in treasure.

# RYERSON ACHIEVEMENT REPORT

*A sampling of achievements and appearances in the media by members of the Ryerson Community for the March 3 2009 meeting of Senate.*

## Events

Advance news of the first ever concert for the deaf, which is being organized by Ryerson's Centre for Learning Technology and the Science of Music, Auditory Research and Technology lab, was covered by the *National Post*, *Toronto Star*, P2P.net, *Music Radar*, *Paste Magazine*, *Prefix Magazine*, *IT Examiner* and *Softpedia*. The Emoti-Chair created by **Deborah Fels**, Ted Rogers School of Management, which makes the concert possible, was featured on CBC's *The Hour*, and in the *Guardian*, *NME News*, *FYI Music News* and *Exclaim*.

Celebrated Canadian stage and screen talent Paul Gross spoke at Ryerson in January as part of the **Faculty of Communication & Design Dean's Lecture Series**. The lecture was covered in blogTO.

*Eye Weekly* reported that Ryerson won two Toronto Bicycle Friendly Business Awards presented by the City of Toronto and the Toronto Cyclists Union for Best Bike Parking and Best Large Business. The Bike Room and awards were also covered in a *Toronto Star* feature story on sustainability initiatives at GTA post secondary institutions.

## MEDIA APPEARANCES

**President Sheldon Levy** spoke to the *Toronto Sun* about the revitalization of the Ryerson campus, including the new Image Arts Building and other projects.

**President Levy** spoke to the *Globe and Mail* about the increase in first-choice applications to Ryerson.

The *Toronto Star* quoted Associate Dean, Administration **James Norrie**, Ted Rogers School of Management, regarding the impact of the economic crisis business studies applications. He also appeared on the *John Oakley Show* discussing Bill Ayer being denied entrance to Canada and rights surrounding cellphone ownership.

The *Ottawa Citizen* reported that 10.5 per cent more students applying to post-secondary studies had chosen Ryerson as their first choice. The *Star.com* and 680 News reported that applications to Ryerson had increased in the wake of the strike at York University.

York University's student newspaper, *Excalibur*, reported on the growth in application numbers for Ryerson and U of T. The *Excalibur* also spoke to **Ann Rauhala**, Journalism, on journalism training and education.

*Maclean's* quoted **Julia Hanigsberg**, General Counsel and Secretary of the Board of Governors on accessibility to legal education.

The *Windsor Star* profiled poet and third-year Radio and Television Arts student **Boonaa Mohammed**.

Thestar.com quoted Associate Dean, Academic **Wendy Cukier**, Ted Rogers School of Management, and **Philip Lim**, Director, Career Development and Employment Centre about the impact of the current economic conditions on the job market.

The Canadian Press reported on Ryerson Engineering students' participation in the concrete toboggan race.

**Bryan Evans**, Politics and Public Administration, spoke to the *National Post* about regulations and free enterprise.

Nationalpost.com quoted **Dave Valliere**, Chair, Entrepreneurship and Strategy Department, Ted Rogers School of Management, on the topic of taking a business national.

A CTV.ca article reported that the work of students from the School of Interior Design would be on exhibit during the Interior Design Show.

**Matt Halliday** published a column in the *Toronto Sun* on the topic of multiculturalism in Toronto and also discussed the issue on CFRB-AM's *John Moore Show*.

**Jacqui Gingras**, Nutrition, took part in a CBC.ca online discussion on eating disorders and healthy body image.

**Sedef Arat-Koc**, Politics and Public Administration, published a post on Wordpress Blog on the topic of human rights.

*Metro* reported that students from the Ted Rogers School of Management won the academic category at the MBA games for the second consecutive year.

MyKawartha.com reported that third-year Radio and Television student **Gwen Elliot** would vie for the title of Miss World Canada.

*Metro News Services* also quoted **Julia Hanigsberg**, Interim Dean, The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education, about continuing education enrolment in tough economic times.

**Janet Hercz**, Director of Strategic Development and Operations, The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education, spoke to the Canadian Press, *Waterloo Region Record* and *Cape Breton Post* about workers returning to school to pursue new careers.

The *Ottawa Citizen* cited Ted Rogers School of Management **Avner Levin**'s study on online privacy and social networking.

The *Gazette* profiled **Ernest Tucker**, the first black person to study Journalism at the then Ryerson Institute of Technology.

Professor Emeritus **James Mars**, Urban and Regional Planning, appeared on CBC's *Here & Now*, discussing Metrolinx and the proposed east-west subway line.

The *Victoria Times-Colonist* profile of actress and Journalism graduate **Liane Balaban**.

The Canadian Press and Metroland reported that Ryerson basketball player Boris Bakovic was named CIS top male athlete of the week.

Metroland reported that Ryerson will conduct a research project on Peel's labour market. Metroland profiled the work of **Professor Emeritus Marvyn Novick** and his Blueprint for Poverty Reduction campaign.

Canada.com quoted **Carolyn Meyer**, Department of Professional Communication, on the impact of technology on grammar and punctuation in electronic messages.

The *Toronto Star* reported that the Ryerson Tamil Students' Association would stage a 30-hour fast to raise awareness about the war between the Tamils and the Sri Lankan government.

Metroland reported that Ryerson Urban and Regional Planning students will help redevelop Bridlewood Mall site, in an article that quoted **Mitchell Kosny**, URP.

**Karen Mulhallen**, English, commented on [nationalpost.com](#) about the ecology of books and publishing.

The *National Post* profiled the Ted Rogers School of Retail Management in a feature story that quoted **Elizabeth Evans**, Director.

**Greg Murray**, a fourth-year student at the Ted Rogers School of Management, published a column in the *National Post* on the topic of bailouts and the retail industry.

The *Calgary Herald* profiled Ryerson Fashion graduate **Adejoke Taiwo**, one of the designers competing on the new season of *Project Runway Canada*. The *Torontoist* profiled fellow Ryerson graduate and competitor **Jessica Biffi**.

**David Martin**, Director of the Ted Rogers School of Hospitality and Tourism Management, spoke to the *Sudbury Star* about the impact of the economic downturn on tipping in the service industry.

CBC.ca reported that Image Arts Film graduate **Kazik Radwanski**'s work had received special mention at the Slamdance Film Festival.

**Alex Ferworn**, Computer Science, spoke to CTV National News about his research on canine augmentation technology for rescue dogs.

**Wendy Cukier**, Ted Rogers School of Management, was quoted in *Metro* on the topic of systemic barriers hurting minorities. Dr. Cukier also appeared on CityTV and Global National discussing gun violence.

The *Sault Star* reported that **Grace Edward-Galabuzi**, Politics and Public Administration, will be keynote speaker at Algoma University during Black History Month. Dr. Edward-Galabuzi was also quoted in *Toronto Sun*, *Toronto Star* and *Metro* article on Africentric schools.

**Gerald Hunt**, Ted Rogers School of Business Management, commented in the *Globe and Mail* on workplace rights for gay workers.

**Carl Benn**, Chair of History, spoke to the *Toronto Star* about the significance of the ox.

**Andrew Laursen**, Chemistry and Biology, publishes a regular column on the environment in *Metro*.

The *Hill Times* quoted **Greg Elmer**, Radio and Television Arts, on the topic of third parties filing expenses and contributions.

The *Hill Times* also quoted Distinguished Visiting Professor Chair in Journalism **Jeffrey Dvorkin**, on the topic of media outlets closing their Parliament Hill bureaus. The *Taipei Times* also quoted him during his recent visit to Taiwan.

The *Globe and Mail* quoted **Alice Chu**, Fashion, on economic indicators.

The *Manitoba Cooperator* and *Ontario Farmer* reported on biofuel research and the Cellulosic Biofuels Network, which includes participants from Ryerson.

**Tariq Amin-Khan**, Politics and Public Administration, appeared on OMNI News: South Asian Edition, discussing the ongoing conflict in Kashmir.

**Joyce Smith**, Journalism, spoke to Canada.com about online journalism and advertising revenue.

**Arne Kislenko**, History, appeared on OMNI News: South Asian Edition discussing Barack Obama's inauguration celebrations.

**Patricia O'Connor**, Academic Coordinator in the Chang School of Continuing Education, spoke to the *Toronto Star*, *Canoe Live* and *CBC News at Six* upon receiving the *Toronto Star Immigrant Champion Award*.

The Canadian Press quoted **Greg Inwood**, Politics and Public Administration, about the by-election in the riding where provincial Conservative leader John Tory is running.

The *Globe and Mail* and *Chatham Daily News* quoted **David Martin** and **Gabor Forgacs**, Ted Rogers School of Hospitality and Tourism Management, on the impact of the economic downturn on the hospitality industry.

**Lucia Dell'Agnese**, Fashion, was quoted in the *London Free Press* and *Toronto Sun* about the significance of the American First Lady's wardrobe choices for Inauguration Day.

**Carolyn Meyer**, Professional Communication, spoke to the *Gazette* about the impact of technology on the way we write and spell.

*Huliq News* reported on the International Shoe Design Competition organized by the Bata Show Museum and Ryerson.

The *National Post* and the *Oakville Beaver* reported that Ryerson student **Lyndon Casey** and his brothers would screen their film, *Captain Coulier (Space Explorer)*, at the 2009 Sundance Film Festival.

**April Lindgren**, Journalism, publishes a regular column in *Metro*.

The *Dunnville Chronicle* reported that graduate **Bret Culp** won a Gemini Award for Best Visual Effects for his work on *The Tudors*.

InsideToronto.com reported that Ryerson graduate **Ryan Ward**'s feature film debut would premiere at Slamdance.

**Jean-Paul Boudreau**, Psychology, appeared on CJBC-AM's *YA Pas 2 Matins* and CBLFT-TV's *Le Telejournal Ontario*, discussing school lockdowns. He also spoke to CJBC-AM's *Audela de la 401* regarding crime in schools.

The *Toronto Star* profiled Ryerson's Midwifery Pre-registration Program.

The *Toronto Star* reported that studies by York and Ryerson Universities found a rise in homelessness.

*Canadian Jewish News* reported that Ryerson was among many Canadian schools to reject CUPE Ontario's boycott of Israeli academics.

**Sheldon Rosen**, Theatre School, spoke to the *Globe and Mail* about playwright Hannah Moscovitch.

The *Epoch Times* spoke to **Nadia Potts**, Theatre School, about Divine Performing Arts.

Greenlivingonline.com quoted **Andrew Laursen**, Chemistry and Biology, on the effects of salt in the environment.

**Patrice Dutil**, Politics and Public Administration, appeared on CJBC-AM's *YA Pas 2 Matins* discussing municipal governance.

**David Day**, Psychology, spoke to CBC *News at Six* about the psychological consequences of lockdowns.

**Elizabeth Evans**, Ted Rogers School of Retail Management, spoke to *Marketing* magazine about the shift in consumer psychology.

**Paul Knox**, Journalism, was quoted in the *Financial Post* about possible layoffs at the *Globe and Mail*.

**Pamela Robinson**, Urban and Regional Planning, spoke to the *National Post* about a design competition for Toronto's PATH.

CAW Saw Gindin Chair **Judy Rebick**, Politics and Public Administration, spoke to BBC News, *Democracy Now!* and Middle East Online about a protest against Israeli actions.

*Toronto Life* magazine profiled Image Arts graduate **Daniel Ehrenworth**.

*Prepared by the Office of Public Affairs.*

**Report #W2009-1 of the Secretary of Senate  
Senate Election Results - 2009-2010**

<b>CHAIRS/DIRECTORS</b>		
Arts	No election	
Business	<b>Avner Levin</b>	Law
Communication and Design	<b>David Tucker</b>	Radio and Television Arts
Community Services	<b>Melanie Panitch</b>	Disability Studies
Engineering, Architecture and Science	<b>Pedro Goldman</b>	Physics

<b>Librarian</b>	
Val Lem	Acclaimed

<b>AT-LARGE FACULTY (8) (134 Ballots submitted, 574 Total votes cast)</b>			
		<b>Term</b>	<b># Votes</b>
Alexandra Anderson	Image Arts		21
Anthony Bonato	Math		8
<b>Vincent Chan</b>	Mechanical & Industrial Engineering	1-year	36
<b>David Checkland</b>	Philosophy	2-year	81
<b>Michelle Dionne</b>	Psychology	2-year	66
Faith Donald	Nursing		18
<b>Nina-Marie Lister</b>	Urban and Regional Planning	1-year	62
<b>Michael Kolios</b>	Physics	2-year	17
Jurij Leshchyshyn	Architecture		33
<b>April Lindgren</b>	Journalism	1-year	50
Fernando Pardo	Marketing – Business Management		23
Kileen Tucker Scott	Nursing		27
<b>Carol Stuart</b>	Child and Youth Care	1-year	45
Charles Zamaria	Radio & Television Arts		23
<b>Mehmet Zeytinoglu</b>	Electrical & Computer Engineering	2-year	63
Declined to Vote			1

<b>FACULTY (81 ballots submitted, 81 votes cast)</b>			
			<b># Votes</b>
<b>Arts (1)</b>	<b>Colin Mooers</b>	Politics	Acclaimed
<b>Business (0)</b>	No election		
<b>Communication &amp; Design (1)</b>	<b>Alexandra Anderson</b>	Image Arts	15
	Charles Zamaria	Radio & Tel. Arts	3
	Declined to Vote		1
<b>Community Services (1)</b>	<b>Faith Donald</b>	Nursing	14
	Kileen Tucker Scott	Nursing	11
	Declined to Vote		0
<b>Eng, Arch &amp; Science (1)</b>	Anthony Bonato	Math	14
	<b>Jurij Leshchyshyn</b>	Architecture	22
	Declined to Vote		1

<b>G. RAYMOND CHANG SCHOOL OF CONTINUING EDUCATION</b>	
Business Management	Frances Gunn
Graphic Communications Management	Gillian Mothersill

<b>STUDENT ELECTIONS (Bold = elected) (3292 Ballots submitted, 5441 total votes cast)</b>			
<b>FACULTY</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>D/S</b>	<b># VOTES</b>
<b>Arts (1)</b>	<b>Andrew West</b>	Public Admin.	Acclaimed
<b>Business (1)</b>	<b>Nisreen Rawdah</b>	Business Mgmt.	226
	Mitchell Silber	Business Mgmt.	81
	Declined to vote		30
<b>Communication &amp; Design (1)</b>	<b>Tanisha Amirah Jhuman</b>	Radio & Tel. Arts	Acclaimed
<b>Community Services (1)</b>	Kateryna Aksenchuk	Nursing	27
	Thomas Granofsky	Social Work	21
	<b>Olufemi Ijiwoye</b>	Nursing	140
	Deep Jaiswal	Nursing	46
	Courtney Miller	Nursing	22
	Declined to vote		23
<b>Eng, Arch &amp; Science (1)</b>	Mohsin Mehboob	Mechanical Eng.	160
	Ryan Snow	Electrical Eng.	79
	<b>Omar Taha</b>	Industrial Eng.	481
	Abraar Vakil	Electrical Eng.	86
	Declined to vote		18
<b>At-Large (5)</b>	Asad Ahmed	FEAS (Electrical)	215
	Mai Habib	FCAD (RTA)	155
	Shauna Fraites	FEAS (Electrical)	167
	<b>Cyndie Kalkhourst</b>	FCAD (RTA)	494
	<b>Joshua McLarnon</b>	Arts (Politics)	480
	<b>Aishah Nofal</b>	TRSM (Bus. Mgmt.)	729
	<b>Sarah Reaburn</b>	FCS (Nursing)	269
	Toby Whitfield	TRSM (Bus. Mgmt.)	240
	<b>Natasha Williams</b>	TRSM (Bus. Mgmt.)	504
	Declined to vote		395
<b>Chang School</b>	<b>Mohammad Ali Aumeer</b>		94
	Jason McIntosh		18
	<b>Craig Alexander Samuelsson</b>		57
	Angela Walcott		15
	Declined to vote		4
<b>Graduate Studies</b>	<b>Khurram Shahzad Baig</b>	Chemical Eng.	54
	Francesco D'Elia	Mechanical Eng.	19
	Michael Dick	Comm. & Culture	24
	M. Ebrahim Poulad	Mechanical Eng.	27
	<b>Asif Sharif</b>	Mechanical Eng.	40
	Declined to vote		1

<b>PARTICIPATING ASSOCIATES</b>		
Claudette Smith	Chang School	2009-11
Peter Monkhouse	Chang School	2009-11
Vihn Quan	CUPE	2009-11
Frank Tang	CUPE	2009-11

**MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING**  
**TUESDAY, January 27, 2009**

<b>Members Present:</b>			
<b>Ex-Officio:</b>	<b>Faculty:</b>	<b>Students:</b>	
K. Alnwick	A. Bal	A. Lindgren	T. Hassan
S. Boctor	P. Corson	J. Macalik	M. Malik
M. Dewson	Y. Derbal	D. Mason	S. Martin
D. Doz	J. Dianda	A. Mitchell	J. McIntosh
U. George	D. Elder	Z. Murphy	H. D. Mwendwa
L. Grayson	A. El-Rabbany	M. Panitch	R. Rose
K. Jones	S. Espin	R. Ravindran	A. Sharif
H. Lane Vetere	P. Goldman	D. Rose	D. Sookram
S. Levy	R. Hudyma	C. Stuart	C. Sule
A. Shepard	G. Kapelos	N. Thomlinson	N. Williams
P. Stenton	J. Lassaline	D. Tucker	
M. Yeates	D. Lee	J. Turtle	
	A. Levin	A. Wellington	
<b>Regrets:</b>	<b>Absent:</b>	<b>Alumni:</b>	
M. Abadir	C. Gouldson	S. Dhebar	
M. Anthony	M. Haider	A. Walker	
C. Cassidy	R. Keeble		
K. Chadha	Y. T. Leong		
J. Hanigsberg	K. Webb		
A. Kahan	P. Yoon		
M. Lefebvre			
M. Piacente			
J. Saber			
A. Singh			
A. Venetsanopoulos			
K. Zeppieri			

**1. President's report** – The President's Update was included in the agenda. K. Alnwick reported that first choice applications across the system were up by 1.1% and Ryerson was up 10.1% (800 applications). This is the largest increase in the province. Ryerson has the second largest first choice applications in the province, after the University of Toronto. Applications from students who are not coming directly from high school are up 9% overall and Ryerson is up 19%. These results are credited to Ryerson's people and programs. There will likely be no new spaces in first year.

A. El-Rabbany commented that his son has applied to Ryerson as his first choice and is receiving lots of information from other universities, but is not receiving information from Ryerson. The Registrar stated that there is lots of electronic information made available to students and there is more information to come. R. Ravindran asked if the admissions trend is consistent, and K. Alnwick responded that the increase may be partially related to the strike situation at York, but Ryerson applications have been consistently increasing. There has been an increase of 63% in first choice since 2004. There is no way to project what the increases will be in future years. President Levy stated that there will be increased demand in the GTA because of the demographics. There is no other university with a higher ratio of first choice/places available. This is likely to increase. The reality is that there will be many disappointed students. Next year will probably see a decrease of about 100 students accepted to Ryerson. There is no intention to meet budget problems by adding more students. The 100 students represent about \$1M with fees and grants.

The President made a presentation on the budget. Information on budget pressures faced by all universities based on market downturns was presented first. Endowments are not generating as much interest as they were predicted to generate, leaving a gap in the funds available. For some universities, the gap has consumed reserve funds. Many universities have to put operating money into their pension funds – Ryerson does not. Ryerson has \$71M in endowments. Despite the loss in interest, the allocations to bursaries and scholarships will not be reduced. The University will strive for a balanced base budget with minimal lay-offs. One of the strategies may be an early retirement program, but there is not one proposed at the moment. Everyone is being asked to reduce budgets by 3-5%. There has been no word from the government on the funding for 2009-10, and no word on graduate programming.

- 2. Report of the Secretary of Senate** – D. Schulman reported that elections for students and for faculty-at-large and CE faculty are in process. R. Rose asked about the use of laptops in elections. The Secretary reported that a message was sent to all student candidates to clarify this. Guidelines will be reviewed to ensure that the principles of democratic elections are upheld.
- 3. Good of the University** – A. Mitchell chaired. N. Farrell, Ombudsperson made a presentation of her annual report to the community, included in the agenda. She presented data on the number of inquiries in specific areas, and made some recommendations with regard to future directions. These recommendations are in the areas of: student fees and their reporting; the handling of the charges of academic misconduct; and the wording of

academic standing variations to ensure that they are more easily understood. She also presented an update of last year's report, noting that there is more information online about who to contact for academic advice and commending the establishment of the Student Information and Advisement Centre. She also reported that Faculties are improving their advising services and students are more able to find out if they are qualified to graduate. The University has indicated that there will be a more timely response to student appeals and the Registrar has responded on the process for retroactive dropping of courses. She appreciates the civility with which people listen to other's issues and their willingness to resolve issues.

R. Rose asked about accessibility issues. N. Farrell responded that the increase in questions in this area is likely due to the increased number of students who use the Access Centre.

K. Alnwick commented on the fees recommendations, stating that fees information has been made more intuitive and understandable. With regard to the accumulation of debt, students need to signal when their academic plans are changed, but there will be a communication about this when timetables are posted.

T. Hassan thanked N. Farrell for her work and the work of her office on behalf of CESAR.

N. Thomlinson asked that Senate convey their congratulations to President Levy on his reappointment for a second 5-year term.

#### **4. Minutes**

**MOTION: That Senate approve the minutes of the December 2, 2009 meeting.**

R. Ravindran moved, D Mason seconded

**Motion approved.**

#### **5. Business Arising from the Minutes**

**MOTION: That Senate approve the amendment of its Bylaw as attached to this report, effective July 1, 2009.**

N. Thomlinson moved, A. Mitchell seconded

The President commended the Committee for its work on the Bylaw.

**Motion approved**

#### **6. Correspondence** – There was no correspondence.

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

7.1 – Report from TRSM – for information only.

Note that change regarding ECN601 on page 97 is deleted.

## **8. Reports of Committees**

**8.1 Report of the Senate Appeals Committee** – Notice of motion on the amendment of the *Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy*. S. Laskin, Chair of the Senate Appeals Committee was present to answer questions. There was no discussion. The motion will be brought to Senate at the next meeting.

### **8.2 Report of the *ad hoc* Committee to Review the GPA Policy**

**MOTION: That Senate approve the amendment of Policy 46, *Policy on Grading Promotion and Academic Standing*, effective Fall, 2009.**

M. Malik moved K. Alnwick seconded.

K Alnwick reported that changes to the GPA policy were made last January. Issues and inconsistencies were identified in implementing the policy. There has been extensive consultation with the Departments and Schools and there is now consensus on what is presented in the revisions.

C. Stuart asked about the impact of RTW is on students in part-time programs. A student taking 1 course who does not get a 2.0 may be RTW for a year. K. Alnwick responded that Departments and Schools can override calculated standings where appropriate.

### **Motion approved.**

**8.3 Report of the *ad hoc* Committee to Review the Course Management Policy** – Notice of motion on the amendment of the policy. D. Mason stated that he was in attendance at one of the committee meetings and that there was an addendum at the door that clarified some issues.

N. Thomlinson asked about the requirement for the posting of grades on all assignments. Sometimes students receive grades on assignments when they pick them up. If the grades are posted, students may not come for their work, and faculty will have to retain it for one year, as per FIPPA requirements. D. Schulman responded that the wording would be changed to reflect that students would be given access to grades on all assignments, tests, etc.

T. Hassan stated that CESAR was not part of the discussion. R. Rose stated that she was eventually part of the committee. She wished to raise the issue of plagiarism detection services. The policy has a requirement for opt-out statement, with the option of listing alternate arrangements or requiring students to consult with the instructor to get those arrangements. She has asked for the statement to state that the opt-out requirements must be in the outline. She also asked that the statement about the allowance of the use of plagiarism detection services when plagiarism is suspected, even when it is not stated in an outline or a student has opted out, be removed. The Secretary reported that the committee did discuss these issues and decided to leave the wording as it is.

A. Levin commented on the issue of intellectual property. The US courts have ruled that there are no intellectual property issues with turnitin.com.

D. Mason commented that he believes the “and/or” statement in section 4.3.1 should be changed to “and”.

C. Stuart asked that the committee look at the use of the words “must and may” in the policy. She asked about the retention of final exams given on BB.

J. Dianda asked about section 2.2.6 regarding missing a make-up exam, and whether the rule applied with or without an excuse. He also asked about the requirement to schedule a make-up exam if there are pedagogical reasons not to do so, e.g. if a midterm exam is reviewed in class before a student takes a make-up, does that student have an advantage?. He further asked about section 2.2.5 and the return of work to students. He asked what the consequences if work is not returned by the deadline.

T. Hassan agreed with concerns expressed on section 4.3.1 from the perspective of CE students.

N. Willaims stated that there are a few issues in the policy that need to be raised. She was asked to send the Secretary an email with her issues.

#### **8.4 Report of the Academic Standards Committee**

**MOTION: That Senate approve the proposed revisions to accounting courses and the Accounting Minor with the recommendations and requests stated in the ASC evaluation section.**

A. Shepard moved, K. Jones seconded

**Motion approved.**

#### **9. New Business**

N. Williams reported on the success of undergraduate students from TRSM in the JDC West – one of Canada’s most prestigious undergraduate commerce competitions, which is quite similar in structure to the MBA games. The team brought home more awards than any other Ontario school.

#### **10. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane R. Schulman, PhD  
Secretary of Senate

**Report of the *ad hoc* Committee to Review  
Policy 145: The Course Management Policy  
#W2009-2  
March 3, 2009**

The *ad hoc* Committee presented a draft version of the Course Management Policy (including an addendum circulated at the meeting) to Senate for discussion on January 27. The Committee met again to review and incorporate Senate's comments. The committee was joined by Senators J. Dianda, T. Hassan, A. Levin, and N. Thomlinson, and CESAR Student Advocate E. Shelton.

The changes to the draft presented on January 27 are as follows:

2.2.1 – The changes proposed in the addendum were incorporated.

2.2.5 – In response to the point raised about there being no consequence when graded work is not returned before the last date to drop a course, “some graded work will be returned” has been changed to “some graded work should be returned”. It is, however, recognized that it is important that students receive timely feedback.

2.2.6 – In response to the point that mid-term make-up exams may be of a different format from the original exam and that, as it will likely be given after more material is presented in class, “ Make-ups should measure the same knowledge..” has been changed to “Make-ups should measure the same material..”.

2.2.8 – It was clarified that students must inform instructors if they do not want their grades posted “in hard copy”.

2.2.9 – The wording was amended for clarification to read: “All grades, on assignments or tests must be posted or made available to students through the return of their work. Grades on final exams must be posted. However, as there may be other consideration in the determination of final grades, students will receive their official final grade in the course only from the Registrar. Final official course grades may not be posted or disclosed anywhere by an instructor.”

2.5.1.7 – Language was clarified.

3.2.6 – Clarified that Departments/Schools may require a statement.

3.2.7 – Clarified that Departments/Schools MUST inform students of the Ryerson email policy.

3.2.8 – Language clarified.

4.3.1 – The wording in the addendum was inserted, with the exception that “and/or a statement indicating the provision in section 4.3.1.2” was changed to read “and a statement.....”.

**MOTION: That Senate approve the amendment of Policy 145: *The Course Management Policy*, effective September 1, 2009.**

Respectfully submitted,

Diane R. Schulman, Secretary of Senate,  
for the Committee:

P. Chan, S. Dolgoy, J. Hercz, K. Mckay, J. Norrie, R. Fraser, R. Halpern, M. Reed, R. Rose,  
J. Waddell

**RYERSON UNIVERSITY**  
**POLICY OF SENATE DRAFT 2-9-09**

**UNDERGRADUATE COURSE MANAGEMENT POLICY**

Policy Number:	145
Approval Date:	March 3, 2009
Previous Approval Date:	March 30, 2004
Policy Review Date	Winter, 2014 or earlier at the request of Senate or the Provost Vice President, Academic
Responsible Committee or Office	Provost and Vice President Academic

**1 PREAMBLE**

In a university setting, learning is a shared enterprise in which faculty and students come together in an environment influenced by their disciplines, academic programs, the University, broader intellectual traditions, and the values and priorities of the community at large. An academic course represents a discrete learning endeavour in which an intensive sharing of knowledge, expertise, experience, and perspective may occur.

The central purpose of this course management policy is to provide a framework of common understanding for students, faculty and staff concerning the structures, processes, objectives, and requirements that pertain to Ryerson undergraduate courses. Course outlines are required by the University and it is the obligation of all faculty members to prepare outlines for their courses that adhere to this policy. It is the responsibility of Chairs and Directors to ensure that course outlines are produced and meet policy requirements.

The Policy recognizes the importance of diversity in learning and teaching styles and modes of course delivery while (a) defining the types of information that both students and faculty need in order to optimize the learning value of any given course, and (b) making clear to students and faculty alike the principles and procedures that have been adopted by the University that bear upon the operation of academic courses. In a more general sense, this policy seeks to reflect the fundamentals of course management.

**2 UNIVERSITY-WIDE POLICY ELEMENTS**

**2.1 Provision of Course Outlines**

2.1.1 Students will be provided with a course outline, either electronically on the University's Course Management System or in hard copy, by or at the first meeting of every course that includes, as a minimum, information on the items specified in Section 4.0. The information in this outline should be discussed at the first class. Outlines may be supplemented by more detailed topical or project information that is provided periodically through a course. In Distance Education courses, the course outline should be available electronically prior to the start of the course.

2.1.2 Course outlines must be submitted to the Department/School in the format requested, and revised course outlines must be submitted when changes are made during the semester.

**2.2 Assessment and Feedback on Student Performance in a Course**

Timely and constructive feedback in response to student work is an essential element in the learning process. Constructive feedback refers to any type of instructor response that serves to inform, guide, encourage, and/or instruct the student in respect to relevant course work or related aspects of her/his learning endeavour. Students should also be able to assess their progress as early as possible.

2.2.1 Each course must have at least two, independent assessments per semester in the evaluation scheme. Where appropriate, these should be of different types. An individual assessment may not be worth more than 70% of a student's final grade.

2.2.2 Students who add a class after there has been an assessment must be given the opportunity to make up that assessment.

2.2.3 It is important that all student term work be graded and returned with reasonable promptness. In the case of tests for which the faculty member will retain the question paper, students should receive feedback on the content of the test, in addition to a numerical grade.

2.2.4 Where an assignment or test requires students to build directly on the proficiencies developed through an earlier assignment/test, they should have the benefit of feedback on the earlier work before the subsequent due date.

2.2.5 To enable students to assess their progress in a course, some graded work should be returned to the student prior to the final deadline for dropping courses without academic penalty. Course outlines will provide an indication of approximately when the first graded project(s) will be returned to students. In cases where a course does not lend itself to early feedback, this should be clearly noted on the course outline.

2.2.6 Should a student miss a mid-term test or equivalent (e.g. studio or presentation), with appropriate documentation, a make-up will be scheduled as soon as possible in the same semester. Make-ups should cover the same material as the original assessment but need not be of an identical format. Only if it is not possible to schedule such a make-up may the weight of the missed work be placed on the final exam, or another single assessment. This may not cause that exam or assessment to be worth more than 70% of the student's final grade.

2.2.7 Final exams are not returned, but are retained for a period of one year after the end of the semester. Departments and Schools must develop procedures to ensure that the disposal of examination papers respects the privacy of the students' work.

2.2.8 While it is preferable to post grades electronically on the Course Management System, grades on assignments, tests and exams, including final exams which are posted in hard copy must be posted by numerically sorted student identification number after at least the first two digits have been removed. Instructors must inform students in all course management documentation of the method to be used in the posting of grades. Students who wish not to have their grades posted in hard copy must inform the instructor in writing prior to the due date of the first assignment.

- 2.2.9 All grades, on assignments or tests must be posted or made available to students through the return of their work. Grades on final exams must be posted. However, as there may be other consideration in the determination of final grades, students will receive their official final grade in the course only from the Registrar. Final official course grades may not be posted or disclosed anywhere by an instructor.
- 2.2.10 It is the responsibility of the Department or School to develop systems or determine procedures for the confidential return of graded course work. It is the instructor's responsibility to ensure that these procedures are followed.

### **2.3 Changes to an Announced Evaluation Scheme**

- 2.3.1 During the semester, it is sometimes necessary or desirable for a faculty member to revise the plan of student evaluation contained in the course outline. When this is the case, the faculty member will:
  - 2.3.1.1 discuss the changes with the class;
  - 2.3.1.2 make such revisions as early as possible in the course;
  - 2.3.1.3 confirm the changes both orally and in writing (i.e., handout or posting to course web site); and
  - 2.3.1.4 forward a copy of the revised outline to the Department/School.
- 2.3.2 When a change involves only the extension of a deadline, a minimum of one week's notice is normally required. In the case of other changes (e.g., in the number, mix, and/or weighting of methods of evaluation) students will be given as much notice as possible in order to reasonably adjust their course work plans.
- 2.3.3 Once students have begun work on a particular component of the evaluation scheme, changes will be made to that component only under extraordinary circumstances. When such changes must be made, students will, if at all possible, be given the opportunity to complete the evaluation(s) as initially set out and with the same course weight, if they so wish.
- 2.3.4 When changes are made to the plan of student evaluation or to the nature of a particular assignment/test to accommodate the needs of an individual student or of a group within the class, the nature of the accommodation will be outlined in writing, normally by email, with a copy retained by the student(s) and the faculty member(s).
- 2.3.5 In the case of emergencies such as faculty illness, the Chair/Director of the teaching department (or a designated course co-ordinator) is responsible for restructuring the evaluation scheme, if required, in such a way as to maintain course integrity while not creating undue disadvantage for students. Normal periods of notification may be waived in such circumstances.

### **2.4 Period of Prohibition from Testing**

- 2.4.1 In the Fall and Winter semesters, the last week of classes and the subsequent Saturday and Sunday before the examination period are to be free of all tests, examinations or major assignments or assessments. The same principle applies to Continuing Education courses and to courses taught in the spring/summer term.
- 2.4.2 Exceptions/Clarifications: If the structure of a course requires a justifiable exception to the above principle, or to the following rules, the Chair/Director must approve that exception (see section 5.0).
  - 2.4.2.1 This provision does not apply to courses taught intensively, at a distance,

or otherwise outside the usual scheduled hours per week mode.

- 2.4.2.2 Take home examinations may be handed out during the last week of class, but cannot be due until the end of the first week of examinations.
- 2.4.2.3 It is recognized that in certain types of courses it may not be possible to avoid tests or other in class assessments in the last week of classes without creating undue problems in other areas of course management. Where absolutely necessary, a single assessment may be exempted from the above restrictions where it meets ALL the following criteria:
  - 2.4.2.3.1 it is a logical continuation of a regular, ongoing series of term assessments (e.g., weekly or bi-weekly field placement, lab or studio assignments);
  - 2.4.2.3.2 it is held in the normal class/lab/field placement time slot
  - 2.4.2.3.3 it is worth no more than 15% of the final course grade.
- 2.4.2.4 A final assignment given in lieu of a final exam, which cannot itself be made due prior to the last week of class, may be due during the final exam period.
- 2.4.2.5 If an assignment involves a presentation component, and it is necessary for this presentation to be made in the last week of the semester, any written component of that assignment must be due the week prior to the last week of class and the presentation cannot itself be worth more than 15% of the final course grade.

## **2.5 Record Keeping**

- 2.5.1 Faculty members are required to:

- 2.5.1.1 submit copies of all course outlines, and any revisions, in the requested format, to their Department/School and/or Continuing Education at the beginning of each term;
- 2.5.1.2 only assess the work of officially registered students (i.e., the work of non-registered students is not to be assessed);
- 2.5.1.3 maintain a grade calculation sheet for each class they teach;
- 2.5.1.4 forward a copy of all grade calculation sheets to the Department/School or Continuing Education at the end of the term, to be retained for at least one year;
- 2.5.1.5 retain all final examinations for a period of one year after the end of the term); and
- 2.5.1.6 forward all final exams to the Department/School or Continuing Education (or make them otherwise accessible) if they are not returning the following term, or if they will be away for an extended period of time.
- 2.5.1.7 Course shells on the Course Management System may be accessed by the Chair/Director in case of emergency and/or the need to reassign the course to another instructor.

## **3 DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL/ CONTINUING EDUCATION POLICIES AND HANDBOOKS**

- 3.1 Department/School Handbooks** - All Departments and Schools, including the Chang School, must develop an online Student Handbook which must contain the policies and items outlined in section 3.2. Departments/Schools with programs must include information specific to the program. The handbook may also be made available in hard copy. In lieu of

repeating general Department/School information in each course outline, instructors may refer to the Student Handbook.

- 3.1.1 Policies and Guidelines established by Departmental/ School Councils must be distributed to faculty
- 3.1.2 For Continuing Education courses, the policies and guidelines of the teaching Department/School apply. For CE courses which do not have a home teaching department, CE is to develop policies and guidelines.
- 3.1.3 Departments/Schools must ensure that the information in course outlines is in keeping with University and Department/School policies.

### **3.2 Department/School Policies and Guidelines**

- 3.2.1 **Group Work**- The Department/School should establish policies regarding:
  - 3.2.1.1 the total amount of group work to be allowed in their courses;
  - 3.2.1.2 procedures to ensure that students are afforded sufficient individual assessment (Group work for which a student does not receive an individual assessment should not constitute more than 30% of a course grade.);
  - 3.2.1.3 Fair, appropriate and timely procedures for students who encounter difficulty with their working group.
- 3.2.2 **Academic Integrity** – It should be determined what information should be included in program/Department/School student handbooks and websites, and what common elements are to be included in course outlines concerning academic integrity and the Student Code of Academic Conduct (Senate Policy 60). In courses taken by students outside the Department/School, it is recommended that pertinent polices be stated on the course outline, or reference made to a Department/School website.
- 3.2.3 **Course Variation** - The amount and types of variation that are appropriate among different sections of the same course should be determined. Course descriptions and overall objectives must be consistent and there should be comparable assignment structures and grading schemes in all sections of the same course.
- 3.2.4 **Attendance** – It should be determined what policies, if any, are appropriate regarding the use of class attendance as a basis for grades. If attendance grades are permitted, criteria must be established and included in the course outline.
- 3.2.5 **Class Participation** – It should be determined what policies, if any, are appropriate regarding the use of class participation as a basis for grades. If participation grades are permitted, criteria must be established and included in the course outline.
- 3.2.6 **Accommodation of Students with Disabilities** - Departments and Schools are required to accommodate students with disabilities. A statement should be made regarding the accommodation of these students, including use of the Access Centre in their handbook and the Department/School may require such a statement on each course outline (Senate Policy 159).
- 3.2.7 **Student Email policy** – Departments/Schools must inform students of the Ryerson policy regarding the requirement that their Ryerson email address be used and maintained as their official communication with the University (Senate Policy 157).

3.2.8 **Non-Academic Conduct** – Departments/Schools should make a reference to the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct with regard to student behaviour (Senate Policy 61).

3.2.9 **Other** – It should be determined what other areas relevant to the school/department should be included in the course outline, ensuring that these are in conformity with overall University policy.

## 4 COURSE OUTLINES – REQUIRED INFORMATION

### 4.1 Basic information

- 4.1.1 Name and number of course; semester and year, prerequisites, and exclusions, if any.
- 4.1.2 Faculty member's name; office location and scheduled student consultation hours; office telephone number; e-mail address; faculty/course web site(s) if available. (If any of these factors are unknown when the course outline is prepared, the information will be provided in writing at the beginning of the course. Student consultation hours may be posted or disseminated by other means.) Continuing Education students must be provided with an appropriate e-mail address for the course.
- 4.1.3 Method of posting grades and, if necessary according to sections 2.2, a statement of the process by which an individual student may request that his/her grades not be posted.
- 4.1.4 Any instructions or limitations on student use of email for faculty contact, as well as any preference for means of student contact.

### 4.2 Course description

- 4.2.1 Calendar Course Description
- 4.2.2 A synopsis that informs students of
  - 4.2.2.1 the course's academic focus and scope;
  - 4.2.2.2 course objectives and/or intended learning outcomes; and
  - 4.2.2.3 topics with their tentative sequence and schedule.
- 4.2.3 Texts, reading lists, and other course materials or equipment;
- 4.2.4 A description of the teaching method(s) that will be used (e.g., lecture, laboratory, studio, cases, problem-based learning, seminar, field work, in-class debates, oral presentations, un-graded journals, or combinations of these)
- 4.2.5 A schedule of any field trips or required activities outside of class time.

**4.3 Other Course Issues** - In addition to any general statement required by Department/School policy, each outline must include a statement on specific academic issues related to the course. These may include, but are not limited to:

- 4.3.1 An indication of any requirement for the submission of work to an electronic plagiarism detection service and a statement indicating the provision in section 4.3.1.2.
  - 4.3.1.1 Instructors who choose to use an electronic plagiarism detection service that retains a copy of the submitted work in its database must include either:
    - 4.3.1.1.1 the following statement: "Students who do not want their work submitted to this plagiarism detection service must, by the end of the second week of class, consult with the instructor to make alternate arrangements." Or

- 4.3.1.1.2 the details of alternate arrangements including the deadlines for consultation with the instructor concerning the use of these arrangements.
- 4.3.1.2 Even when an instructor has not indicated that a plagiarism detection service will be used, or when a student has opted out of the plagiarism detection service, if instructor has reason to suspect that an individual piece of work has been plagiarized, the instructor is permitted to submit that work in a non-identifying way to any plagiarism detection service.
- 4.3.2 Specific details on any Information Technology requirements for courses utilizing IT in course work, assignments or exams.
- 4.3.3 Specific requirements for field placements, if appropriate.
- 4.3.4 Policies on the appropriate use of cellular phones, laptop computers and other electronic devices in the classroom
- 4.3.5 The requirement for medical documentation/notification for missed work, or other issues as set out in the *Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy*.

**4.4 Variations within a Course:** In cases where there are multiple sections of the same course with consequent variations in course delivery methods, grading and/or methods of evaluation, etc., students will be provided with at least a brief section/instructor-specific description in addition to the generic course outline (See section 3.1.3).

#### **4.5 Departmental/University Policies and Course Practices**

- 4.5.1 Information must be given on all Department/School policies which have been identified in section 3.0. Where relevant information is available through departmental handbooks and/or websites, course outlines will provide direction to these.
- 4.5.2 Students should be reminded that they are required to adhere to all relevant University policies, such as the Student Code of Academic Conduct.
- 4.5.3 For courses involving research with human subjects/participants, the guidelines of the Research Ethics Board must be clearly referenced.

#### **4.6 Evaluation**

- 4.6.1 A list and tentative schedule of all assignments, tests, exams, and other work to be graded, and general descriptions of these. (More specific information on each assessment will be provided by the course instructor as early in the course as possible.)
- 4.6.2 The weighting of each assignment, test, and/or other unit of evaluation.
- 4.6.3 The inclusion of snap tests or other unscheduled evaluations as part of the grading scheme, if applicable.
- 4.6.4 An indication of approximately when the first test results/term work will be returned to students.
- 4.6.5 Policies on deadlines for the acceptance of assignments and/or take-home examinations, and on any penalties that will be assessed when such deadlines are not met.

### **5 DEVIATION FROM COURSE MANAGEMENT POLICY**

Academic courses are highly varied in format, delivery, objectives, and structure. No course management policy can anticipate all possible circumstances and configurations.

In cases where a course must vary from approved course management policy, this may be authorized by the relevant Chair/Director. Students will be informed in writing of such variances at the beginning of the course or, if they arise during the course, at the earliest possible opportunity.

Report of the Senate Nominating Committee  
#W2009-1  
March 3, 2009

Elections for student Senators were held online from Friday, January 23- Thursday, January 29, 2009. There were five at-large undergraduate seats, five Faculty seats (one per Faculty), two graduate student seats and two Chang School seats up for election.

By Monday January 26, the Chief Electoral Officer began receiving complaints, both in person and by email, about the way in which some undergraduate candidates were campaigning. There were no complaints about the Graduate Student or The Chang School elections.

The major concern was that students were being approached by candidates with laptop computers who asked the students to log into their my.ryerson.ca site to vote for them. This was occurring in a variety of ways and in a variety of places. There were reports that some students felt intimidated by this approach.

In response to the complaints, the Chief Electoral Officer sent an email to the candidates telling them to cease this practice. This succeeded only in a limited way, and the complaints continued. There were a variety of other campaign issues that arose concerning the use of university listservs for campaigning, the removal of campaign posters and the placement of campaign material in computer labs and next to computers set up by candidates for student voting, all of which is forbidden by the Senate election guidelines.

On Monday, February 2, the Chief Electoral Officer called all of the undergraduate candidates together to ask them to send letters to the Senate Nominating Committee addressing their own campaign practices and their complaints about the practices of others. The Student Conduct Officer and the Director of the Office of the Vice Provost, Students also attended. All of the candidates complied with the request.

A sub-committee of the Senate Nominating Committee met on Thursday, February 5 to discuss the complaints that had been filed and the submissions received from the candidates. The Committee determined that it wished to hear from the candidates involved, and met with each of them on Monday, February 9.

In general, the Committee found the lack of consideration for, and understanding of, the democratic process of voting to be very troubling and it grappled with how to balance the best interests of Ryerson University and its Senate with the need to uphold the election's integrity. The mere existence of a Senate is a testament to the University's commitment to democratic governance. Those elected to represent others as members of that Senate must have integrity, and must conduct themselves with honour and dignity.

After long and careful deliberation, the Committee has decided the following:

1. The election results will stand.

2. All elected undergraduate student Senators will be required to attend a discussion on the meaning of the democratic process. Dr. Neil Thomlinson, Chair, Department of Politics and Public Administration, has agreed to conduct this discussion before the beginning of the Senate term on July 1, 2009.
3. The guidelines for student elections will be revised to be very specific on the use of computers in the voting process, and, in general, election and campaign guidelines will be strengthened significantly to ensure the integrity of the process.
4. Beginning in 2010, all student candidates will be required to attend a mandatory session where the campaign guidelines will be discussed, and they will be asked to sign a statement indicating that they understand the election rules.

Ryerson University is, at its core, an educational institution. The Committee believes that this experience needs to be used as a “teachable moment”, and that the lessons learned will strengthen both the Senate and the student experience.

Respectfully submitted,

Melanie Panitch, Chair, for the Committee  
C. Cassidy, Y. Derbal, R. Ravindran, C. Sule, D. Schulman (non-voting)

**Composition and Bylaws Committee**  
**Report #W2009-2**  
**March 3, 2009**

**MOTION 1: That Senate approve the changes to the Bylaw of the Department of Physics Council such that one Postdoctoral Fellow is included in its membership.**

An inconsistency was noted in the Senate Bylaw that was passed on January 27, 2009 with respect to the election of a Vice Chair of Senate. The Bylaw states that the Vice Chair is elected at the first meeting of Senate, which is not until October. However, the Senate Priorities Committee is elected following the Senate elections in February. The Vice Chair of Senate is the also the VC of this committee, which needs to begin its work shortly after its election, and certainly before October.

Current 5.2: Vice-Chair: The Vice-Chair shall be elected by and from elected Senators at the first meeting of each session.

Therefore the following amendment to the Bylaw is proposed:

**MOTION 2: That Senate approve the amendment of section 5.2 of its Bylaw (effective July 1, 2009) to state: “Vice-Chair: The Vice-Chair shall be elected by and from elected Senators in conjunction with elections to the Senate Priorities Committee.”**

Respectfully submitted,

Sheldon Levy, Chair for the Committee  
David Checkland, Murtaza Haider, George Kapelos, Ronald Keeble, Dana Lee,  
Mohamed Malik, Annick Mitchell, Diane Schulman (non voting), Natasha Williams

**Report of the Senate Appeals Committee**  
**W#2009-02**  
**March 3, 2009**

**1. Proposal to amend Policy 134: Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy**

A proposed amendment to **Policy 134: Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy** was presented to Senate at the January 27, 2009 meeting for discussion (see attached report and policy). There were no amendments suggested to the proposed policy, nor were any sent subsequent to the meeting.

**MOTION #1: That Senate approve the amendment of Policy 134: *Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy*, as presented to Senate on January 27, 2009, to be implemented for Fall, 2009.**

**2. Proposal to Implement an Academic Integrity Council**  
**Amendment of Policy 60: Student Code of Academic Conduct**

The Senate Appeals Committee proposes the establishment of an Academic Integrity Council (AIC) to assume the function of the Faculty Appeals Committees in the current policy. This would include the Chang School Appeals Committee and the School of Graduate Studies Appeals Committee. The AIC would be composed of 4-5 faculty from each of the Faculties and 2-4 students from each of the Faculties, Graduate Studies and the Chang School. The AIC would be administered by the Academic Integrity Office. Membership on the AIC would be for two years, and updated training would be required each year. If the AIC concept is approved, procedures would be put in place to determine how faculty and students would be selected.

AIC Hearing Panels would consist of two faculty and one student from the AIC, with at least one member from the Appellant's Faculty. This would ensure that any Faculty perspective or expertise would be represented.

**Reasons to propose an Academic Integrity Council**

- In the Ombudsperson's report for 2007-08 (presented to Senate on January 27, 2009), she notes that her office has seen an increase over last year in the number of complaints related to academic misconduct charges, and that these complaints largely focus on procedural errors that have occurred.
- The Academic Integrity Officer notes that, at the Faculty Appeals Committee level, there are issues concerning lack of timely scheduling of hearings and the inability to schedule hearings due to a lack of availability of sufficiently trained Faculty Appeals Committee members and Panel Chairs.
- Membership on Faculty Appeals Committees often changes from year to year. Ideally, members of academic misconduct appeals panels should be experienced adjudicators, with a clear knowledge of the policies and procedures. The AIC would improve consistency in the decision-making process.
- The AIC would allow for student engagement in the academic integrity process.

**Data and Information on Academic Misconduct**

Ryerson's academic misconduct process requires that faculty who suspect misconduct call students in for a discussion. This is increasingly done with the assistance of the Academic Integrity Officer

or trained facilitator. A decision is made by the instructor on whether to charge the student with academic misconduct and, if there is a charge, on the penalty or recommended penalty.

- From September 1, 2007- August 31, 2008, there were 650 documented suspicions of academic misconduct.
- Of the 650 documented suspicions, 384 utilized an AIO facilitator.
- Of the 650 documented suspicions, there were 322 charges of academic misconduct.
- Of the 322 students who were charged, 68 appealed to their Faculty Appeals Committee
  - TRSM - 22; FCS - 13; FEAS - 22; Arts - 8; FCAD – 2, Chang School -1. The School of Graduate Studies Appeals Committee had no appeals in 2007-08. Its first appeal was heard in December 2008.
  - Plagiarism of sources - 11; plagiarism from other student's work - 22; cheating - 21; misrepresentation of performance or identity - 9; Automatic hearings – 5.
- Of the 68 Faculty appeals, 50 were denied
- Of the 50 denied appeals, 12 were appealed to Senate.
- Of the 12 appeals to Senate, 7 were denied, 1 was granted, 3 were dismissed, and 1 was not accepted as it was incomplete.

The Senate Appeals Committee is presenting the policy portion of Policy 60: *Student Code of Academic Conduct*, with modifications made to reflect the change from Faculty Appeals Committees to an Academic Integrity Council. The current policy can be found at <http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/policies/pol60.pdf>. Each instance of the insertion of the AIC has been highlighted in the attached revised policy. The only sections with substantive changes are sections C5 and C6, which concern the hearing process. These changes are for clarification of current practice. Also in section C5, in order to facilitate timelier scheduling of Senate Appeals hearings, the membership of a Senate Appeals Panel has been reduced from 4 (3 faculty and 1 student) to 3 members (2 faculty and 1 student).

If the amendment to the policy is approved, the procedures would be developed as outlined in section D10 of the policy,

**MOTION #2: That Senate approve the amendment of the Student Code of Academic Conduct to replace Faculty Appeals Committees with an Academic Integrity Council, effective September 1, 2009.**

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Laskin, Chair, Senate Appeals Committee (for the Committee)

Mitu Sengupta	David Valliere	Darius Sookram	Frank Whitestone
Patrice Dutil	Peter Pille	Natasha Williams	Osman Hamid
Martin Greig	Avner Levin	Katie Zeppieri	Christine Demtriades
Yew-Thong Leong	Andrew Furman	Paul Yoon	Asif Sharif
Daria Sydor	Lucia Dell'Agnese	Shakera Martin	Susan Lamola
Sue Edwards	Darrick Heyd	Ken Chadha	Jessica Thom
Jean Bruce	Sanjeev Bhole	Jason McIntosh	Jeffrey Yokota
Linda Cooper	Margareth Zanchetta	Piero Dodaro	Robert Rinkoff
Kateryna Aksenchuk			

**Report of the Senate Appeals Committee**  
**#W2009-1**  
**January 27, 2009**

**Amendment of Policy 134: Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy**

The Committee reviewed the recommendations of an *ad hoc* Committee established to review the Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy. Members of the *ad hoc* Committee were: D. Bell (Academic Integrity Officer), L. Cooper (Senate Appeals Committee, Community Services), J. Dianda (Chair, Faculty of Arts Appeals Committee), P. Dutil (Senate Appeals Committee, Arts), S. Laskin (Chair, Senate Appeals Committee), J. McIntosh (Senate Appeals Committee, Student, CE), G. Mothersill (Associate Dean, Communication & Design), K. Neale (Student Issues and Advocacy Coordinator, RSU), R. Rose, (VP Education, RSU), D. Schulman (Director, Office of the Provost and Secretary of Senate), E. Shelton (Student Rights Coordinator, CESAR), J. Thom (Senate Appeals Committee, Graduate Student)

The current policy can be found at [www.ryerson.ca/senate/policies/pol134.pdf](http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/policies/pol134.pdf).

The changes made to the policy are as follows:

1. The Policy has been reorganized so that there is a policy with a coordinated procedures section that gives more detail on the policy. The responsibility of each party in the consideration and appeals processes has been clearly indicated. This mirrors the format of the Student Code of Academic Conduct.
2. Similar policy and procedures have been condensed (e.g. recalculation and regrading). In general, the policy has been made more user friendly.
3. The Chair/Director role in the regrading of work has been clarified. The Chair/Director can deny a regrading only if the student does not submit rationale for that regrading that is based in the merit of the work.
4. Grounds for an appeal have been reordered so that the two most common – medical and compassionate - are first. It has also been made clear in the procedures that students must determine if they meet one or more of the grounds to file an appeal.
5. It has been clarified that students who appeal to subsequent levels must provide a letter indicating where the decision at the previous level was in error. Intent to dismiss an appeal may be based on there being no rationale provided.

The draft policy is presented for discussion and the policy will be brought for approval to the March 3, 2009 meeting of Senate. The procedures are presented for discussion, but do not require Senate approval.

Respectfully submitted,

S. Laskin, Chair, for the Committee

Mitu Sengupta	David Valliere	Margareth Zanchetha	Jason McIntosh	Piero Dodaro
Patrice Dutil	Peter Pille	Robert Rinkoff	Kateryna Aksenchuk	
Martin Greig	Avner Levin	Darius Sookram	Frank Whitestone	
Yew-Thong Leong	Andrew Furman	Natasha Williams	Osman Hamid	
Daria Sydor	Lucia Dell'Agnese	Katie Zeppieri	Christine Demtriades	
Jean Bruce	Sanjeev Bhole	Shakera Martin	Asif Sharif	
Linda Cooper	Jeffrey Yokota	Ken Chadha	Susan Lamola	
Sue Edwards	Darrick Heyd	Paul Yoon	Jessica Thom	

**RYERSON UNIVERSITY**  
**POLICY OF SENATE**  
**UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC CONSIDERATION AND APPEALS**  
**DRAFT 1-15-09**

**Policy Number:** 134

**Approval Date:** March 3, 2009

**Previous Approval Dates:** April 1, 2003, January 25, 2005

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

**Implementation Date:** Fall 2009

**Review Date:** Fall 2013, or sooner at the request of the Provost

<b>POLICY INDEX</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>I. ACADEMIC CONSIDERATION</b>	1
IA. General Regulations	1
IB. Alternate Arrangements	2
1. Accommodation for Missed Examination and/or Assignment: Religious Observance	2
2. Accommodation for Disability	2
3. Alternate Arrangements for Missed Examination and/or Assignment: Medical or Compassionate	3
4. Arrangements for Inability to Complete Term Work in More Than One Course	4
5. Advance Consideration of Academic Standing	4
IC. Grade Reassessment	4
1. Regrading of work or Recalculation by instructor	4
2. Formal regrading of Work by Someone Other than the Instructor	5
ID. Course Management Issues	5
<b>II. ACADEMIC APPEALS – GRADE AND STANDING</b>	6
IIA. Grounds for Appeals	6
1. Medical	6
2. Compassionate	6
3. Course management	7
4. Prejudice	7
5. Procedural error	7
IIB. Student Responsibilities	8
1. Burden of Proof	8
2. Filing an appeal	8
IIC. Decision Maker Responsibilities	9
1. Responding to Appeals	9
2. General Regulations	10
3. Dismissal of Appeals	10
4. Conflict of Interest	11
5. Standard of Proof	11
IID. Senate Appeal Hearings	11
1. Senate Appeals Committee and Panels	11
2. Notice of Hearing	11
3. Hearing Regulations	11
4. Decisions	12
5. Record Keeping	12

<b>ACADEMIC CONSIDERATION AND APPEALS PROCEDURES INDEX</b>	
<b>P-I. Academic Consideration</b>	13
P-IA. General Regulations	13
P-IB. Alternate Arrangements	13
1. For a Conflict between a Religious Observance and an Examination, Test, or Assignment Due Date	13
2. For Accommodation of a Disability	13
3. For Missed Assignment, Test and/or Examination for Medical and Compassionate Reasons	14
3a.. Student Responsibility	14
3b. Instructor Responsibility	15
3c. Chair/Director or Designate Responsibility	15
4. For Inability to Complete Term Work in More Than One Course	15
4a. Student Responsibility	15
4b. Instructor Responsibility	16
4c. Chair/Director or Designate Responsibility	16
4d. Registrar Responsibility	16
5. Advance Request for Consideration of Academic Standing	16
P-IC. Grade Reassessment	17
1. Regrading or Recalculation by the Instructor	17
1a.. Student Responsibility	17
1b. Instructor Responsibility	17
1c. Chair/Director Responsibility	17
2. Formal Regarding of Work by Someone Other than the Instructor	17
2a.. Student Responsibility	17
2b. Instructor Responsibility	18
2c. Chair/Director Responsibility	18
3. Course Management Issues	18
<b>P-II. Academic Appeals</b>	19
P-IIA. Grounds for Appeal	19
P-IIB. Department/School Level Appeals	19
1. Student Responsibility	19
2. Chair/Director or Designate Responsibility	20
P-IIC. Faculty Level appeals	21
1. Student Responsibility	21
2. Dean Responsibility	21
P-IID. Appeals to Senate Appeals Committee	22
1. Student Responsibility	22
2. Chair/Director or Designate Responsibility	23
3. Secretary of Senate Responsibility	23
4. Appeal Panel Decisions	24
<b>P-III. DISMISSAL OF APPEALS</b>	24
P-IIIA Circumstances for dismissal	24
P-IIIB Dismissal at the Department/School Level	25
P-IIIC Dismissal at the Faculty Level	25
P-IIID Dismissal at the Senate Level	25

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

This Policy<sup>1</sup> provides the process by which students may seek academic consideration. It is expected that requests for academic consideration will be made as soon as circumstances arise which will impact their academic performance. The policy also describes the grounds and process by which students may appeal when they believe the academic consideration provided is not appropriate or when they have been unable to resolve course-related issues with their instructors.<sup>2</sup> The University is responsible for dealing with student appeals fairly and must adhere to the timelines established in this policy.

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

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

## **I. ACADEMIC CONSIDERATION**

### **IA. GENERAL REGULATIONS**

1. It is the student's responsibility to notify and consult with either the instructor, or the Chair/Director of the teaching or program department/school, depending on the situation, as soon as circumstances arise that are likely to affect academic performance.
2. It is the student's responsibility to attempt to resolve all course-related issues with the instructor as soon as they arise, and then, if necessary, with the Chair/Director of the teaching Department/School. Failure to do so may jeopardize the success of an appeal made at a later date.
3. It is the instructor's responsibility to respond in a timely fashion when students raise grading or course management issues.

---

<sup>1</sup> The "Graduate Student Academic Appeals Policy" applies for the School of Graduate Studies.

<sup>2</sup> For the purposes of this document, "instructor" shall mean any person who is teaching a course at Ryerson.

4. It is the responsibility of the Department/School to ensure that Department/School handbooks have up-to-date contact information published outlining who in the school/department is responsible for academic consideration and appeals.
5. When issues are not resolved with an instructor, or when a student does not receive a timely response from an instructor, the Chair/Director should normally be contacted for an informal resolution, where possible.
6. It is the Chair/Director's responsibility to be accessible to discuss matters that cannot be resolved between the instructor and the student.
7. If academic concerns are not resolved informally with the instructor or the Chair/Director, students may file an appeal with their Department/School.
8. If the Chair/Director is the instructor for a course in which an accommodation or alternate arrangement is being requested and the matter cannot be resolved, he or she should request that the Dean appoint an appropriate replacement to act as Chair/Director in the process.
9. Students who do not receive their final grades because of outstanding debt to the University, risk missing the deadline for filing an appeal. Grades will not be officially released to students with outstanding debt.
10. Students who are appealing their Required to Withdraw or Permanently Withdrawn standing may continue in their program and shall be registered in courses on the basis of a probationary contract until the standing appeal is resolved. Students must pay all appropriate fees. If the appeal is denied and they remain Required to Withdraw or Permanently Withdrawn, they will be given a full refund of the fees charged for the program courses in which they enrolled that semester.
11. Appeals not filed by the published deadlines and incomplete appeals will normally not be accepted. In extenuating circumstances, students or university administrators may request that a Chair/Director, Dean, or the Secretary of Senate, depending upon the level, provide an extension.
12. It is the student's responsibility to maintain updated contact information with the University to ensure that all information related to grades, standings and appeals are properly received. Ryerson program students are required to maintain a Ryerson e-mail address. (See Policy 157: Establishment of Student E-Mail Accounts for Official University Communication).

## IB. ALTERNATE ARRANGEMENTS

**IB1. Accommodation for Missed Examination and/or Assignment: Religious Observance:** Students must have filed the necessary forms for accommodation of religious observance at the beginning of the term, or for final exams, as soon as the exam schedule is posted. (See Policy 150: **Accommodation of Student Religious Observance Obligations** and related form).

**IB2. Accommodation for Disability:** Students who wish to utilize Access Centre accommodations must present Access Centre documentation to the instructor prior to a graded assignment, test or exam, according to Access Centre Policies and Procedures, otherwise an appeal based on not receiving an accommodation may be dismissed. (See Section III and Policy 159: **Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities.**)

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

- a. Students shall inform instructors (via email whenever possible) in advance when they will be missing an exam, test or assignment deadline for medical or compassionate reasons. When circumstances do not permit this, the student must inform the instructor as soon as reasonably possible.
- b. Alternate arrangements are based upon the severity of the circumstances and the amount of work missed. Generally, normal employment commitments will not constitute grounds for academic consideration. However, changes to normal employment commitments as a result of a more complex issue may be part of a request for academic consideration.
- c. Instructors will determine if documentation is required for an alternate arrangement based upon medical or compassionate grounds. In the case of illness, a Ryerson Medical Certificate, or a letter on letterhead from a physician with the student declaration portion of the Ryerson Medical Certificate attached, is required. Documentation is required within three (3) working days of the missed work. In extraordinary circumstances, exceptions to the 3 day requirement to provide documentation can be granted if the medical illness, including documented mental health issues, prevents a student from seeking medical attention or documenting their illness in a timely fashion.
- d. All faculty and staff are required to exercise discretion and adhere to the principles of confidentiality regarding any documentation received.
- e. Once an alternate arrangement is accepted, it is final unless subsequent events interfere with the fulfillment of that alternate arrangement, and the grade in the course may not be appealed based upon an allegation of the original arrangement being unfair.
- f. Students who are either not offered an alternate arrangement or who do not accept the alternate arrangement offered by an instructor, may consult with the Chair/Director. If the test or assignment for which an alternate arrangement has been made becomes a point of contention in the final course grade or violates the Course Management Policy or course outline, the student may appeal the final course grade at the end of the term, on the original medical or compassionate grounds
- g. Normally a student who misses a final exam will be given an incomplete (INC) and given a make-up exam as soon as possible within the three-month completion period.
- h. Unless an incomplete grade (INC) is applicable, the instructor cannot grant extensions beyond the final date for submission of grades as part of an academic consideration.

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

- a. Students who are unable to complete their term work in more than one course, due to circumstances that arise during the semester, should consult with the Chair/Director of their program Department/School as soon as possible. Failure to do so may jeopardize the ability to provide consideration and to launch a future appeal.
- b. When seeking alternate arrangements, students must submit supporting documentation to their program Chair/Director who should advise them as to what to do on a course-by-course basis as soon as possible. A copy of the suggested arrangement will be kept on record in the Department/School, and each instructor should be informed of the suggested arrangement. Students must contact each instructor to verify that the suggested arrangement is acceptable to the instructor
- c. Instructors should not require documentation to support the request for an alternate arrangement, as the Chair/Director has already made an assessment.
- d. While it is advisable for students to discuss dropping a course with the instructor, courses may be dropped at the time of the consultation with the Chair/Director. The Chair/Director must inform the involved faculty member that the student has dropped the course. The Registrar will review documentation and contact the Chair/Director should any clarification be required as to why a student should be granted a INC or course drop after the deadline. The Registrar has final approval of both retroactive course withdrawal without academic penalty and any possible financial arrangements that may result.

**IB5. Advance Consideration of Academic Standing:** If, during the semester, students experience medical or compassionate circumstances that may later affect their academic standing, it is the students' responsibility to bring the situation to the attention of the Chair/Director at the earliest possible time.

## IC. GRADE REASSESSMENT

## IC1. Regrading of Work or Recalculation by Instructor

- a. Students who believe that an assignment, test or exam, either in whole or part, has not been appropriately graded, or that there has been a miscalculation of a grade due to an omission, improper addition, etc., must contact the instructor to resolve the issue within ten (10) working days of the date when the graded work is returned to the class. Grades not questioned within this period will not be recalculated at a later date.
- b. Students may be required to submit a written request for regrading, stating why the work warrants a higher grade. The instructor must respond within five (5) working days. A reassessment may result in the grade remaining the same, being raised or being lowered. Students must receive feedback that addresses their rationale for requesting a re-grading of the work.
- c. If there is a concern about work returned during the final week of classes, or a final paper or exam, there might not be an opportunity to review the grade with the instructor or to have the work remarked prior to the assignment of a final

grade for the course. In that case, a meeting with the instructor should be scheduled as soon as possible.

- d. Students shall be given supervised access to any graded work that has not been returned or to their final exams, and be permitted to use that work for a reasonable length of time in order to prepare the required explanation for the regrading request.
- e. It is recognized that there are assignments that do not lend themselves to independent re-evaluation, such as presentations or performances. Therefore, these may not be reassessed.

**IC2. Formal Regrading of Work by Someone Other than the Instructor**

- a. Students may request a formal regrading of their work if:
  - i. they do not accept an instructor's regrading of the work; or
  - ii. the instructor has not responded to the student; or
  - iii. the instructor has not regraded the work within five (5) working days or
  - iv. they do not feel they can discuss the matter with the instructor.
- b. To request formal regrading, students must submit reasons, in writing to the Chair/Director, as to why the original grade, and if applicable, the instructor's revised grade, was inappropriate, based on evidence from the course outline, course notes, textbooks, etc. Asserting that the work deserves more marks or that the student disagrees with the mark is not sufficient support for the reassessment. The Chair/Director may deny the request for a regrading if the rationale is not based upon the merit of the work.
- c. If the request for regrading is accepted, the Chair/Director will follow the procedures outlined in the Procedures appended to this policy, to have the work formally regraded.
- d. A regrading may result in the grade remaining the same, being raised or being lowered, and the reassessed grade becomes the official grade for that work. The revised grade cannot be subsequently appealed. If reassessment of the work was not done or has not been done in keeping with this policy, the ground of the appeal is Procedural Error

**ID. COURSE MANAGEMENT ISSUES:** Students who have concerns about how a course is taught or managed should first consult with the instructor as soon as the concern arises. However, if they feel that the matter cannot be discussed with the instructor or if the matter cannot be resolved, students should consult with the Chair/Director.

**II. ACADEMIC APPEALS - GRADE AND STANDING:** Academic Appeals are reserved for issues related to grades and academic standings that could not be resolved informally with an instructor or a Chair/Director. Where appropriate, appeals may be filed at any time during the term.

**IIA. GROUNDS FOR APPEALS:** There are four grounds that may be considered for grade and academic standing appeals: Medical; Compassionate; Prejudice; and

Procedural Error. In addition, Course Management may also be considered as grounds for grade (but not academic standing) appeals. With the exception of Procedural Error, no new grounds may be introduced at subsequent levels.

### **IIA1. Medical**

- a.** An appeal may be filed on Medical grounds when an unforeseen medical condition occurs during the term that impacts a student's ability to meet academic obligations. It is expected that students who need an alternative arrangement for meeting academic obligations will submit appropriate documentation for work that is missed, and will make alternate arrangements for either a single course or for all courses in that term (see section IB on **Alternate Arrangements**). Alternate arrangements are based upon the severity of the circumstances and the amount of work missed.
- b.** Students must submit a fully completed **Ryerson Medical Certificate**, or a letter on letterhead containing all of the information required by the medical certificate and signed by an appropriate regulated health professional for the applicable period of time, with the signed affidavit portion of the Ryerson Medical Certificate appended. The documentation should explain the duration of the medical condition and the impact of the medical condition on the student's ability to perform during that period. Where circumstances do not permit this, the student must inform the instructor as soon as reasonably possible. The University may seek further verification of medical claims.
- c.** Students must submit applicable medical documents within three (3) working days of any test, exam or assignment due date to receive consideration for that work. In extraordinary circumstances, exceptions to the 3-day requirement to provide documentation can be granted if the medical illness, including documented mental health issues, prevents a student from seeking medical attention or documenting their illness in a timely fashion.

### **IIA2. Compassionate**

- a.** Appeals may be filed on Compassionate grounds when there are events or circumstances beyond the control of and often unforeseen by the student, which seriously impair that student's ability to meet academic obligations. Instructors should have been informed of these circumstances as soon as they affected a student's ability to complete his/her work so that alternate arrangements could be made. Failure to have done so may jeopardize the appeal. Alternate arrangements are based upon the severity of the circumstances and the amount of work missed. Changes to normal employment commitments as a result of a more complex issue may be appealed on compassionate grounds.
- b.** Students must submit applicable documentation within three (3) working days of a test, exam or assignment deadline to receive consideration for that work. In extraordinary circumstances, exceptions to the 3-day requirement to provide documentation can be granted.

### **IIA3. Course Management**

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

### **IIA4. Prejudice**

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

### **IIA5. Procedural Error**

- a.** Appeals may be filed on the ground of Procedural Error when it is believed that there has been an error in the procedure followed in the application of either this policy or any applicable policy of the University that has impacted a student's grade or standing. Appeals granted on this ground will rectify the procedural error.
- b.** Where students claim that an academic regulation or policy was improperly applied or not followed, they must reference both the policy and the alleged

error, and explain how this procedural error has affected their academic record. This may include such things as a failure to recalculate a grade or remark an exam, or when a response deadline has been missed.

## **IIB. STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **IIB1 Burden of Proof**

- a. Grade Appeals:** In all grade appeals it is the student's responsibility to demonstrate that the final grade they have received in a course should be reviewed. Students will only receive grades which reflect their knowledge of the course material.
- b. Academic Standing Appeals:** In all academic standing appeals the responsibility is on students to demonstrate that their academic standing should be changed. Since Academic Standing is determined by students' academic performance, students must provide substantial reasons why their current standing is not appropriate. Students should normally have consulted with the Chair/Director as soon as the situation that affected their academic performance arose

### **IIB2. Filing an Appeal**

#### **a. Levels of Appeal**

- i. Department/School Level:** Students who wish to file either a grade or standing appeal based on one of the grounds in section IIC, must first appeal to their Department/School (or The Chang School for grade appeals in continuing education (CE) courses) by the deadline outlined in the Ryerson calendars,
  - a.** Grade appeals must be submitted to the Department/School in which the course is taught. Grade appeals for all CE courses are to be submitted to The Chang School, and the appropriate Program Director will coordinate the response with the appropriate Department/School.
  - b.** Standing appeals are submitted to the student's program Department/School.
- ii. Faculty Level:** Students who wish to appeal the decision of the Department/ School must do so to the Dean within ten (10) working days of the date of the decision letter from the Department/School. Students must indicate in their letter where they disagree with the Department/School decision.
- iii. Senate Level:** Students who wish to appeal the decision of the Faculty must do so to the Senate within the (10) working days of the date of the decision letter from the Faculty. Students must indicate in their letter where they disagree with the Faculty decision.

#### **b. General Regulations**

- i.** Students must use the appeals forms available on the Senate website, and must retain a copy for their records for submission at any subsequent appeal.
- ii.** Incomplete or late appeals will normally not be accepted.

- iii. Appeals must be filed in person unless prior arrangements are made to submit it via fax, mail or email. If the appeal is incomplete, it is not accepted. If fax, mail or email submissions are accepted, original documents must be submitted in person by the student by a date to be determined based upon the circumstances..
- iv. INC grades must be appealed within ten (10) working days of the posting of the new grade. Students are responsible for periodically checking for the posting of their grades.
- v. If a student appeals only an academic standing, it will be assumed that the grade(s) upon which the academic standing was based have been accepted.
- vi. The program Department/School is not required to consider an appeal of an academic standing if the grade appeal was denied and it was the sole basis of the standing appeal or if the grade appeal was granted and the standing is automatically changed as a result.

**c. Advocates and Legal Counsel**

- i. Students may consult with an advocate at any time during the appeals process. An advocate may represent a student at any hearing that may occur at the Department/School, Faculty or Senate level. Advocates may speak on behalf of the student.
- ii. Legal Counsel are permitted to represent students or the University Respondent only at the Senate level of appeal.

**d. Ombudsperson:** Students may consult with the Ombudsperson regarding issues of fairness at any time during the appeals process.

**IIC. Decision Maker Responsibility**

**IIC1. Responding to Appeals**

- a. **Department/School:** Each Department/School must determine who shall respond to student appeals. The Chair/Director (or designate or committee) may consider appeals at the Department/School level. For continuing education courses the CE Program Director shall act as Chair/Director in appeals which concern procedural issues, and shall refer all other appeals to the appropriate academic coordinator.
- b. **Faculty:** Each Faculty must determine who shall respond to student appeals. The Dean (or designate or committee) may consider appeals at the Faculty level.
- c. **Continuing Education:** In cases involving continuing education courses that are not housed in a specific Faculty, the Dean of The Chang School of Continuing Education (or designate or committee) shall consider the appeal.
- d. **Senate:** The Senate Appeals Committee shall form panels to hear appeals at the Senate level.

**IIC2. General Regulations**

- a. No academic appeal may result in the granting of a numerical grade.
- b. If a student initiates more than one academic appeal, the decision maker at any

level may determine if the appeals should be heard concurrently or sequentially. Grade appeals are considered before standing appeals.

- c. If an appeal of a charge of academic misconduct is related to a concurrent grade or academic standing appeal, the misconduct appeal will be heard first, and the decision, if relevant, forwarded to the appropriate department/school. As per the Student Code of Academic Conduct, a grade of “DEF” may be assigned while a misconduct charge is under investigation.
- d. The Registrar must approve any recommendation by the Chair/Director or Dean to grant a student a retroactive course withdrawal without academic penalty and any associated financial arrangements.
- e. All correspondence with students (setting of hearing dates, decision letters, etc.) will be done via Ryerson email. The only exception will be the distribution of the appeals package for Senate appeals. Students shall receive their packages either in person or via courier, normally within five (5) working days of the hearing.
- f. Appeals decisions are normally sent to students within five (5) working days of the receipt (or the hearing) of the appeal, unless the student is notified of extenuating circumstances which require an extension of that deadline.
- g. Current information on who is responsible for responding to appeals in each Department, School and Faculty must be provided to students in a Department/School handbook and to the Secretary of Senate. Members of any appeals committee shall have terms from July 1 to June 30 of the following year.
- h. All individuals who have responsibility for deciding appeals, including Chairs/Directors, Deans, or designates, and all Appeals Officers shall be required to attend training session(s) conducted by the Office of the Secretary of Senate prior to making any appeals decision.
- i. Anyone who chairs an appeals committee at any level may not serve on an appeals committee at any other level.

### **IIC3. Dismissal of Appeals:**

- a. **Department/School:** The Department/School may dismiss (not accept) an appeal only when the appeal is submitted past the deadline or is incomplete.
- b. **Faculty:** In some circumstances where the Dean or designate believes that the grounds have not been met, or that the student has not indicated where the error was in the previous decisions, the Dean or designate will give the student notice of intent to dismiss (not accept) the appeal. The student is given the opportunity to respond in writing to the intent to dismiss within five (5) working days of receipt of the notice. A panel of the Senate Appeals Committee will be convened to determine if the appeal should be heard or if the recommendation to dismiss the appeal should be upheld.

- c. **Senate:** In some circumstances where the Secretary of Senate believes that the grounds have not been met, or that the student has not indicated where the error was in the previous decisions, the Secretary will give the student notice of intent to dismiss (not accept) the appeal. The student is given the opportunity to respond in writing to the intent to dismiss within five (5) working days of receipt of the notice. A panel of the Senate Appeals Committee will be convened to determine if the appeal should be heard or if the recommendation to dismiss the appeal should be upheld.

**IIC4. Conflict of Interest:** No member of an Appeals Panel should have had any prior involvement with the case. A member of a Hearing Panel, a student or an instructor (appellant and respondent) must disclose any conflict of interest, if known, as soon as possible before the Hearing. If either party raises a conflict of interest regarding any Panel member(s) once the Hearing has begun, the Hearing Panel will judge the validity of the conflict and will decide on whether the Panel member may sit on the appeal. If the Panel member with the conflict is excused and there is no quorum, the Hearing may continue if agreed upon by all parties or will be adjourned and a new hearing scheduled with a new Panel member.

**IIC5. Standard of Proof:** In an academic appeal it is the student's responsibility to show that the original decision was incorrect. The standard of proof in all decisions shall be "a balance of probabilities". This means that, in order for students to be granted their appeals, they must show the Panel that it is more likely than not that the original decision was incorrect.

#### **IID. Senate Appeal Hearings**

**IID1. Senate Appeals Committee and Panels:** The Senate Appeals Committee is established by the Senate. The Secretary of Senate shall establish hearing panels consisting of at least three members of the Senate Appeals Committee, including at least one student.

**IID2. Notice of Hearing:** Both parties must be given ten (10) working days notice of an appeal hearing date and time. An appeal may be scheduled with less than ten (10) days notice with the written agreement of both parties. Documentation will be distributed to all parties, normally within five (5) working days of the hearing.

#### **IID3. Hearing Regulations**

- a. Representation/Support**
  - i. Students may be represented by an advocate or legal counsel who may speak for the student and confer with the student as necessary.
  - ii. Students may have a support person in the hearing, but this person may not participate in any way. Students may also bring witnesses, but these must be declared in advance on the appeal form.
  - iii. The University may retain legal counsel who may speak for the respondent and confer with the respondent as necessary.
- b. Procedural Decisions by the Panel**
  - i. The Panel Chair may adjourn the Hearing when it is required for a fair process.
  - ii. If either the appellant or the respondent fails to attend the Hearing, and there are no extenuating circumstances, the Hearing may proceed in his or her

absence. Hearings will not be postponed if a witness, advocate or counsel fails to appear.

- iii. A Hearing is open to the public except when the appellant, respondent or a Panel member requests that the hearing be closed. Members of the public may not participate in, or in any way disrupt, the hearing. Any member of the public, or the support person, may be removed from the hearing by the Panel.
- iv. All witnesses called by either side should be present at the start of the Hearing to be introduced, and then, unless the Panel decides otherwise, only while giving testimony. If the hearing remains open, witnesses may return after all witnesses have presented their testimony.
- v. If either party brings witnesses not listed in the appeal form or the Notice of Hearing, the Panel must decide if those witnesses are to be heard.
- vi. If new documentation is presented the panel must determine if that documentation is to be considered. If there is no objection from the other party, the documentation should be accepted. The hearing may be adjourned to allow the other party time to review the new documents. The Panel may determine that the documentation is not relevant and is not to be accepted.

- c. The Hearing may not be audio or video recorded by anyone, and no minutes of the proceedings are taken. The decision letter is considered the official record of the proceedings.
- d. The Secretary of Senate or designate may be present at the Hearing for the purpose of providing advice on procedural issues.
- e. All Senate hearings will be conducted in a manner consistent with the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act (SPPA)*. A copy of the *SPPA* is available for review in the Senate Office.

**IID4. Decisions:** Decisions of the Senate Appeals Committee are final and may not be appealed.

**IID5. Record keeping**

- a. Statistics on the type, grounds and outcome of appeals must be reported to the Secretary of Senate at the end of each term.
- b. The complete original copy of the appeal documents shall be retained and held in confidence by the Senate Office and the Registrar shall confidentially retain a copy of the decision letter. All other copies of the appeals documents are to be shredded.

## **ACADEMIC CONSIDERATION AND APPEALS PROCEDURES**

### **P-I. Academic Consideration**

#### **P-IA. General Regulations**

1. Students should normally notify and consult with their instructor when they require academic consideration for circumstances that arise during the semester that impact their ability to meet academic obligations. If the circumstance affects all of their course work, or if they believe that they cannot discuss the matter with their instructor, they should consult their Chair/Director or designate.
2. Students, instructors, Chairs/Directors or designates should make every effort to resolve issues related to student requests for academic consideration informally whenever possible.
  - a. Requests for academic consideration should be made via email where possible, but can be made in person or over the phone if necessary.
  - b. Instructors will respond to requests for academic consideration via email where possible, and in person or via phone if necessary.
  - c. If an instructor has not responded to a specific request for academic consideration within 5 business days a student should email the Chair/Director to discuss the situation.

### **P-IB. Alternate Arrangements**

#### **P-IB1. For a Conflict between a Religious Observance and an Examination, Test, or Assignment Due Date**

- a. To request an alternate arrangement for work that must be missed because of a conflict with a religious observance, students must fill out and submit the Student Request for Accommodation of Religious Observance form found at [www.ryerson.ca/senate/forms/relobservforminstr.pdf](http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/forms/relobservforminstr.pdf)
  - i. within the first 2 weeks of the beginning of the term for each test and assignment scheduled in a course; or
  - ii. for final exams, within five days of when the final exam schedule is posted.
- b. Students and instructors must negotiate and agree upon appropriate accommodations for religious observance.
- c. If students and instructors cannot agree on an appropriate accommodation for religious observance, then it is the responsibility of the student to contact the Chair/Director or designate to discuss the matter.

#### **P-IB2. For Accommodation of a Disability**

- a. To receive accommodation for a disability students must first register with the Ryerson University Access Centre
- b. The Access Centre will assess the students' request, and where appropriate, provide students the appropriate documentation to present to each instructor outlining the nature of accommodations required for each course.
- c. Students must present Access Centre documentation prior to a graded assignment, test or exam. Documentation submitted after the work, test or exam will not be accepted.
- d. Detailed instructions on appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities and the related procedures are found in Policy 159: Academic Accommodations of Students with Disabilities [www.ryerson.ca/senate/policies/pol150.pdf](http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/policies/pol150.pdf)

**P-IB3. For Missed Assignment, Test and/or Examination for Medical and Compassionate Reasons**

**a. Student Responsibility**

- i. Students must contact their instructor, via email in advance when they will be missing an examination and/or assignment or test for medical or compassionate reasons.
- ii. When circumstances do not permit advance notice, students must contact the instructor via email as soon as reasonably possible.
- iii. Students must submit appropriate documentation within three (3) working days of the missed assignment, test or exam. In extraordinary circumstances, exceptions to the 3 day requirement to provide documentation can be granted if the medical illness, including documented mental health issues, prevents a student from seeking medical attention or documenting their illness in a timely fashion.
  - a. **Medical documentation:** Students must submit a fully completed **Ryerson Medical Certificate**, or a letter on letterhead containing all of the information required by the medical certificate and signed by an appropriate regulated health professional for the applicable period of time. The signed affidavit portion of the Ryerson Medical Certificate must be attached. The documentation should explain the duration of the medical condition and the impact of the medical condition on the student's ability to perform during that period. Where circumstances do not permit this, the student must inform the instructor as soon as reasonably possible. The University may seek further verification of medical claims.
  - b. **Compassionate documentation:** While it is recognized that compassionate grounds may sometimes be hard to document, items such as relevant travel documents, death certificates or notices from a funeral home, letters from counsellors, therapists, or religious or community leaders would be appropriate documentation. It is advisable that students provide as much documentation as possible.
- iv. If students do not receive a response from the instructor with 5 business days concerning alternate arrangements for the missed work, they should consult with the Chair/Director via e-mail.
- v. Students who are not offered or do not accept alternate arrangements offered by the instructor may consult with the Chair/Director.
- vi. If consultation with the Chair/Director does not result in an acceptable alternate arrangement, students must document their concerns via email, stating why they do not accept the alternate arrangements. Students will be asked to abide by alternate arrangements to the extent possible once the Chair/Director has intervened, but can appeal the final course grade if the test or assignment for which the alternate arrangement was given becomes a point of contention for the final course grade. Once the documentation has been approved, if an arrangement cannot be made for a make-up for a missed final exam, the student can request an incomplete (INC) grade. A form must be filed by the instructor indicating the date by which the work must be completed, which must be within three months.
- vii. It is the students' responsibility to follow up with the instructor if they have not received a make-up final exam within the three month time frame after receiving an INC in a course.

viii. If students encounter problems or issues scheduling a make-up final exam after receiving an INC it is their responsibility to contact the Chair/Director to help schedule the exam with the three month time frame.

**b. Instructor Responsibility**

- i. After receiving a request for an alternate arrangement, instructors will assess the merit of the request based on medical and compassionate grounds and respond to the student within five (5) working days.
- ii. If instructors require medical or compassionate documentation, it must be presented within three (3) working days of the missed work. In extraordinary circumstances, exceptions to the 3 day requirement to provide documentation can be granted if the medical illness, including documented mental health issues, prevents a student from seeking medical attention or documenting their illness in a timely fashion. If the instructor wishes to validate the document they must have the Chair/Director or designate call the appropriate office. It may only be confirmed that the documentation is valid. A physician cannot be asked about the nature of the student's medical condition.
- iii. Acceptable alternate arrangements may include setting a make-up test, transferring the weight of the missed work to the final examination (as per Course Management Policy ([www.ryerson.ca/senate/policies/pol145.pdf](http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/policies/pol145.pdf)), or extending a deadline. All considerations must be documented via email.
- iv. If a student requests an INC, once documentation has been validated for missed final examinations the instructor must fill out the appropriate form, retain a copy, submit a copy to the Registrar and provide a copy to the student.
- v. It is the responsibility of the instructor to schedule a make-up final exam for INC grades within three months of giving the INC.

**c. Chair/Director or Designate Responsibility**

- i. A Chair/Director or Designate may need to respond or intervene in cases where the instructor has not responded to the student's request, the student does not feel comfortable with approaching the instructor, or the student disagrees with the alternate arrangement and would like further consultation.
- ii. Once a consultation has been completed the Chair/Director may recommend alternate arrangements to the instructor.
- iii. The Chair/Director may be contacted by students who have difficulty completing incomplete (INC) grades in the three-month period. In these cases it is the responsibility of the Chair/Director to facilitate an appropriate resolution.

**P-IB4. For Inability to Complete Term Work in More Than One Course**

**a. Student Responsibility**

- i. It is students' responsibility to contact the Chair/Director of their program, normally via email, when circumstances arise during the semester that prevent them from completing their work in more than one course.
- ii. All considerations must be documented via email.
- iii. Once the student has consulted with the Chair/Director, the Chair/Director will contact each faculty member via email outlining the proposed alternate arrangements. It is then the responsibility of the student to get the approval of the alternate arrangements from each instructor.

- iv. If an instructor does not agree with the proposed alternate arrangements, it is the responsibility of the student to consult with the instructor and the Chair/Director to discuss alternatives.

**b. Instructor Responsibility**

- i. Instructors who receive suggested alternate arrangements from the Chair/Director regarding a student should contact the Chair/Director if they require further information on the matter or wish to discuss the recommended alternate arrangements.

**c. Chair/Director or Designate Responsibility**

- i. It is the responsibility of the Chair/Directors to request supporting documentation outlining the student's request for alternate arrangements in more than one term course.
- ii. The Chair/Director should advise students as to what to do on a course-by-course basis as soon as possible, and document the recommendations in writing via email.
- iii. Potential alternate arrangements may include offering the student the option of completing the work in some courses, dropping some courses, requesting extensions of deadlines or assigning grades of INC. A Chair/Director may also facilitate leaves of absence from the program if the circumstances prevent the student from continuing in the program.
- iv. It is the responsibility of the Chair/Director to send an email to each instructor outlining the proposed alternate arrangements for the student.
- v. Courses may be dropped by the Chair/Director, but the Chair/Director should inform the student that it is advisable to speak to the instructor before dropping any course.
- vi. The Chair/Director may recommend to the Registrar that a student be permitted to drop one or more courses after the drop deadline depending on the circumstances. It is the responsibility of the Chair/Director to contact the Registrar and provide appropriate documentation as to why this recommendation is being made. The reasons must be that the student was unable, for some documented medical or compassionate reason, to drop the course by the deadline.
- vii. The Chair/Director must ensure that copies of suggested alternate arrangements be kept on record in the Department/School.

**d. Registrar Responsibility**

The Registrar will review documentation and contact the Chair/Director should any clarification be required as to why a student should be granted a INC or course drop after the deadline. The Registrar has final approval of both retroactive course withdrawal without academic penalty and any possible financial arrangements that may result.

**P-IB5. Advance Request for Consideration of Academic Standing:** It is the students' responsibility to contact the Chair/Director or designate when circumstances arise that may later affect their academic standing on medical or compassionate grounds.

**P-IC. Grade Reassessment**

**P-IC1. Regrading or Recalculation by the Instructor**

**a. Student Responsibility**

- i. Students who believe that an assignment, test or exam, either in whole or part, has not been appropriately graded or that there has been a

miscalculation must first review their concerns with their instructor, or Chair/Director if they feel the matter cannot be discussed with the instructor, within ten (10) working days after the graded work is returned to the class.

- ii. Students can request a reassessment of work either verbally or via email. Students are encouraged to follow up on verbal discussions with emails. Failure to properly document such discussions may jeopardize any future appeal.
- iii. If requested, students may be required to submit a written rationale to the instructor outlining where there has been an error in the grading of the work, with documentation from notes, the text, the course outline, etc. Requests that are not based on the merit of the work will not be considered.
- iv. If the instructor does not respond to the request for a regrade or recalculation, or if the student disagrees with the result, the student may file a request for a formal regrade with the Chair/Director. (See Section P-IC2.)

**b. Instructors Responsibility**

- i. It is the responsibility of the instructor to return graded work in a timely manner.
- ii. It is the responsibility of the instructor to respond to requests for regrading or recalculation of work within five (5) days of the student's request, assuming that the student has met the ten (10) day deadline for filing that request.
- iii. Instructors can request that students submit a written rationale for regrading the work including where the grading of the work has been in error, with documentation from notes, the text, the course outline, etc.
- iv. Instructors should inform students that the regrading of work may result in a grade which is higher, lower or the same as the original grade.

**c. Chair/Director or Designate Responsibility**

- i. It is the responsibility of the Chair/Director to assist in resolving disputes over grade reassessments when the student asks for assistance.

**P-IC2. Formal Regrading of Work by Someone Other Than the Instructor**

**a. Student Responsibility**

- i. Students may submit reasons, in writing to the Chair/Director, as to why the original grade, and if applicable, the instructor's revised grade, was inappropriate, based on evidence from the course outline, course notes, textbooks, etc.
- ii. It is the student's responsibility to show why the work deserves more marks. That the student disagrees with the mark, or wishes to have a higher mark, is not sufficient support for the reassessment. The Chair/Director may deny the request for a regrading only if the rationale is not based upon the merit of the work.
- iii. Either the student or the instructor (whoever has the work) must provide the original graded assignment, test, or exam in question, to the Chair/Director.
- iv. A clean copy of the work, with all grading notations and all student identifiers deleted must be provided to the Chair/Director. If it is a paper

or assignment, or a test that has been returned to the student, the student must supply the copy.

- v. If students request a partial regrading the Chair/Director will determine if a partial regrading is appropriate.

**b. Instructor Responsibility**

- i. It is the responsibility of the instructor to provide the Chair/Director the grading scheme utilized in evaluating the work.
- ii. Either the student or the instructor must provide the original graded assignment, test, or exam in question, to the Chair/Director.
- iii. A clean copy of the work, with all grading notations and all student identifiers deleted must be provided to the Chair/Director. If it is an exam that has not been returned to the student, the instructor must supply the copy.

**c. Chair/Director or Designate Responsibility**

- i. It is the responsibility of the Chair/Director to facilitate a process by which the work will be remarked by a qualified person other than the original instructor.
- ii. The Department/School may determine if it is more appropriate to remark the entire assignment or portions in addition to those specified by the student.
- iii. If a partial remarking was requested, the student must be notified in writing by the Chair/Director of the decision to remark other portions prior to the remarking, with an explanation of why the structure of the work warrants such a decision. In this case, the student may decide to rescind his or her request for regrading.
- iv. The regrader must receive the grading scheme and a clean copy of the work to be regraded with all identifiers removed.
- v. If remarking within the university is not possible, another mechanism for reassessment of the material should be arranged. This may include submission to an external assessor.
- vi. A regrading may result in the grade remaining the same, being raised or being lowered, and the reassessed grade becomes the official grade for that work. This grade may not subsequently be appealed, unless the student identifies a procedural error in the regrading process.

**P-ID. Course Management Issues**

**P-ID1.** It is students' responsibility to bring all Course Management issues to the attention of the instructor, or the Chair/Director if they feel the issue can not be discussed with the instructor, as soon as the issue arises.

**P-ID2.** It is the responsibility of the instructor to ensure that the Course Management Policy ([www.ryerson.ca/senate/policies/pol145.pdf](http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/policies/pol145.pdf)) is followed.

**P-II. Academic Appeals:**

**P-IIA. Grounds for appeal:** The grounds for a grade or standing appeal are medical, compassionate, course management, prejudice or procedural error as defined in the Policy section IIC. Before filing an appeal, a student must determine if one or more of the grounds apply.

## **P-II.B. Department/School Level Appeals**

### **P-II.B1. Student Responsibility**

- a.** All appeals at the Department/School level must be filed by the deadline stated in the Ryerson Calendars using the forms (and instructions), available on the Senate ([www.ryerson.ca/senate](http://www.ryerson.ca/senate)) and Enrollment Services and Student Records websites, or from Departments/Schools. Unless other arrangements have been made in advance, appeals must be submitted in person. If fax, mail or email submissions are accepted, original documents must be submitted in person by the student by a date to be determined based upon the circumstances. If the submission is incomplete, it will not be accepted. All documents to be presented as evidence must be attached to the appeal.
- b.** If students are appealing their final course grades, they must appeal to the Department/School in which the course was taught. If they are appealing their academic standing, they must appeal to their program Department/School. If they are appealing a grade in a continuing education class, they must submit their appeal to The Chang School information desk, which will forward the appeal to the appropriate Program Director.
- c.** Students who have attempted to have work reassessed or grades recalculated and have not had the matter resolved prior to the appeal deadline, or who have not yet received a response from an instructor or a Chair/Director, and who wish to appeal, may submit a formal appeal by the deadline. This appeal may be withdrawn at a later date if the issue is resolved.
- d.** Students who wish to appeal a final course grade must first consult with the instructor and/or Chair/Director. Students appealing an academic standing must first consult the Chair/Director. This consultation must occur as soon as possible after their grades and/or notice of academic standing are posted, allowing enough time to meet the deadline for the last date to appeal.
- e.** Students may consult with a student advocate from RSU or CESAR for advice on their appeal.
- f.** Students may consult with the Ombudsperson regarding issues of fairness at any time during the appeals process.
- g.** If there is both a grade appeal and a standing appeal, students must inform their program Department/School of the grade appeal at the time the standing appeal is filed.
- h.** Appeals of final grades submitted as a result of completing an INC grade must be filed within ten (10) working days of the posting of the new grade. Students are responsible for periodically checking for the posting of the grade. Appeals deadlines may be extended for grades not posted in a timely manner.
- i.** Students must retain a copy of all appeals documents as it is not the responsibility of the Department/School to provide these documents should the student wish to file a further appeal.

### **P-II.B2. Chair/Director Responsibility**

- a.** Appeals must be submitted in person. However, if there are extenuating circumstances, the Chair/Director may agree to accept the appeal via fax, mail or email. If fax, mail or email submissions are accepted, original documents must be submitted in person by the student by a date to be determined based upon the circumstances. The Chair/Director may also agree to accept an appeal after the deadline if there are extenuating circumstances. The Chair/Director or designate will ensure that the appeal is complete before it is accepted.

- b. If a student has initiated more than one appeal, the Chair/Director or designate shall determine whether the various appeals should be considered concurrently or sequentially.
- c. If there is a grade appeal for a course not within the student's Department/ School, the program Department/School must receive the decision on the grade appeal before a standing appeal can be heard. If both appeals are to the same Department/School, the appeals may be considered at the same time.
- d. If a grade appeal is delayed because there is an unresolved reassessment or recalculation, the related standing appeal may also be delayed.
- e. If an appeal of a charge of academic misconduct is related to a concurrent grade or academic standing appeal, the misconduct appeal will be heard first, and the decision, if relevant, forwarded to the appropriate Department/School. As per the Student Code of Academic Conduct, a grade of "DEF" may be assigned while a misconduct charge is under investigation.
- f. The program Department/School is not required to consider an appeal of an academic standing if the grade appeal was denied and it was the sole basis of the standing appeal or if the grade appeal was granted and the standing is automatically changed as a result.
- g. The Department/School must respond to the student in writing within five (5) working days of the receipt of the appeal whether the appeal was granted or denied. (See P-IIA3.)
- h. If the Chair/Director is unable to respond to a student within the five (5) working days because s/he is unable to get necessary information, the student must be notified of when they are to expect a decision. This should be as soon as possible.
- i. **Decisions:**
  - i. The Chair/Director or designate may not award a numerical grade, or require any action contrary to a university policy or collective agreement.
  - ii. The Chair/Director or designate may
    - a. deny the appeal
    - b. grant the appeal
    - c. grant or deny the appeal in part subject to conditions. If the student does not accept the conditions attached, the appeal will be considered denied.
  - iii. The Registrar must approve any recommendation by the Chair/Director to either allow a student to take a course that has been failed more than three times (or fewer as per a Department/School standing variation), or to grant a student a retroactive course withdrawal.
  - iv. The Chair/Director must send the decision letter, following the format provided by the Senate Office, to the student via Ryerson email. A copy must be sent to the student's program department (if different), and the Associate Registrar, Enrolment Services. The decision will be deemed received on the date sent.
  - v. Students are responsible for contacting the Department/School if they have not received a response in the specified period of time.

## **P-II.C. Faculty Level Appeals**

### **P-II.C1. Student Responsibility**

- a. Appeals must be filed within ten (10) working days of receipt of the decision at the Department/School level and must be complete. Forms and instructions found on

the Senate and Registration and Records websites, or from the Dean's office, must be utilized.

- b. Students may consult with and be represented by an advocate such as a student advocate from RSU or CESAR.
- c. Students may consult with the Ombudsperson regarding issues of fairness.
- d. Except for Procedural Error, the grounds for an appeal must be the same as those claimed at the Department/School level.
- e. Grade Appeals are filed with the Faculty in which the course is taught and Standing Appeals are filed with the student's program Faculty. Grade appeals for continuing education courses must be filed with the Dean of the Faculty which has responsibility for that course. If the course is not tied to a specific Faculty, it is to be filed with the Dean of The Chang School.
- f. Unless other arrangements have been made in advance, appeals must be submitted in person. If fax, mail or email submissions are accepted, original documents must be submitted in person by the student by a date to be determined based upon the circumstances.
- g. All documents to be presented as evidence must be attached to the appeal. This includes all documentation from the previous level of appeal. It must also include a letter stating where the decision of the Chair/Director is disputed. If it does not, the Dean may dismiss the appeal (See procedures on Dismissal.)
- h. If the Faculty fails to respond to a student's appeal within five (5) working days and there has been no prior agreement between the student and the Dean or delegate to extend the time period, the student is permitted to proceed directly to the Senate Appeals Committee.
- i. If a student does not proceed within the timeline stipulated, the appeal will be considered terminated. Required to Withdraw/Permanently Withdrawn students will be removed from their courses once the time for the appeal has expired without an appeal being launched.
- j. Students must retain a copy of all appeals documents as it is not the responsibility of the Dean to provide these documents should the student wish to file a further appeal.

#### **P-IIC2 Dean Responsibility**

- a. Appeals not submitted within ten (10) working days of the date of the decision letter from the Chair/Director will normally not be accepted. The Dean, designate, or appeals committee will not accept incomplete appeals. Documentation must include all documents submitted to the Department/School and the decision letter. It must also include a letter from the student indicating where the decision of the Chair/Director is in error. If it does not, the Dean may dismiss the appeal.(See procedures on Dismissal)
- b. Unless other arrangements have been made in advance, appeals must be submitted in person. However, if there are extenuating circumstances, the Dean may agree to accept the appeal via fax, mail or email. If fax, mail or email submissions are accepted, original documents must be submitted in person by the student by a date to be determined based upon the circumstances. If the appeal is not complete is not accepted. The Dean may also agree to accept an appeal after the deadline if there are extenuating circumstances.
- c. In some situations appeals may be dismissed (not accepted) at this level (see Dismissal Procedures).

- d. The Dean must respond to the student in writing within five (5) working days of the receipt of the appeal. . If the Dean is unable to respond to a student within the (10) working days because s/he is unable to get necessary information, the student must be notified of when they are to expect a decision. This should be as soon as possible.
- e. **Decisions:**
  - i. The Dean or designate may not award a numerical grade, or require any action contrary to a university policy or collective agreement.
  - ii. The Dean or designate may
    - a. deny the appeal
    - b. grant the appeal
    - c. grant or deny the appeal in part subject to conditions. If the student does not accept the conditions attached, the appeal will be considered denied.
  - iii. The Registrar must approve any recommendation by the Dean to either allow a student to take a course that has been failed more than three times (or fewer as per a Department/School standing variation), or to grant a student a retroactive course withdrawal.
  - iv. The Dean must send the student a copy of the decision letter, following the format provided by the Senate Office, to the student via Ryerson email. A copy must be sent to the student's program department/school and teaching Department/School (if different), and the Associate Registrar, Enrolment Services. The decision will be deemed received on the date sent.
  - v. Students are responsible for contacting the Dean's office if they have not received a response in the specified time period.

## **P-IID. Appeals to the Senate Appeals Committee**

### **P-IID1. Student Responsibility**

- a. Students must submit an appeal to the Secretary of Senate within ten (10) working days of receipt of the Faculty Level response. Forms and instructions for the filing of Appeals can be found at the Registration and Records or Senate websites, or are available from the office of the Secretary of Senate. Unless other arrangements have been made in advance, appeals must be submitted in person. However, if there are extenuating circumstances, the Secretary of Senate may agree to accept the appeal via fax, mail or email. If fax, mail or email submissions are accepted, original documents must be submitted in person by the student by a date to be determined based upon the circumstances. If the appeal is not complete is not accepted. The Secretary of Senate may also agree to accept an appeal after the deadline if there are extenuating circumstances.
- b. The student's appeal must include all of the documents submitted at all previous levels, all decision letters, all evidence, and a letter to the Senate Appeals Committee that clearly outlines where the decision made by the Dean and Chair/Director are in dispute. Failure to provide this letter may result in the appeal being dismissed (see Section P-III.)
- c. The student may consult with an advocate from RSU or CESAR, who may represent them in the hearing. The student may also consult with a lawyer, who may represent them at the Senate level. Any advocate or legal counsel must be indicated on the appeal form.
- d. Students must indicate on the form if they are bringing any witnesses.
- e. Students must retain a copy of all appeals documents.

- f. Students must reply to all email inquiries as to their availability for a hearing, which will be scheduled as soon as possible. Students are normally given (10) working days notice of the hearing date, but the appeal may be heard sooner if both parties agree in writing.
- g. Students must be present at the hearing unless the student requests a paper review. Unless there are extenuating circumstances, the hearing will proceed even in the student's absence.

#### **P-IID2. Chair/Director Responsibility**

- a. The Chair/Director serves as the respondent in the Hearing. In grade appeals, the Chair/Director is encouraged to bring the instructor for the course, and where not possible, all of the relevant materials. Often only the instructor is able to answer the Hearing Panel's questions.
- b. The Chair/Director (or other respondent) shall reply to the appeal in writing to the Secretary of Senate within five (5) working days of receipt, including any documents to be submitted as evidence. A copy of the relevant course outline(s) must be submitted for all grade appeals and where possible, student's grades in each component of the course. The Registrar must also receive a copy of the appeal.

#### **P-IID3. Secretary of Senate Responsibility**

- a. The Secretary will review the appeal to determine if it is complete and is within the deadline.
- b. In some situations, the Secretary will give the student notice of dismissal (non-acceptance) of the appeal (see section III).
- c. The Secretary will immediately forward the appeal to the Chair/Director and determine in consultation with the Chair/Director, who shall be the respondent and, based on the nature of the issue, if others should be called as witness or co-respondents.
- d. The Secretary will establish a Hearing Panel of the Senate Appeals Committee, consisting of at least two (2) faculty and one (1) student, and appoint a Hearing Panel Chair
- e. The Secretary will determine if the student's academic record is pertinent to the appeal, and if so, provide it in the complete appeals package.
- f. The Secretary will schedule a hearing based upon the availability of the student and the instructor or Chair/Director. Both parties must receive at least ten (10) working days notice of the date, time and place of the hearing. An appeal may be scheduled with less than ten (10) working days notice with the written agreement of both parties.
- g. The Secretary will forward all of the appeal submissions, including a Notice of Hearing, to: all members of the Hearing Panel; the Chair/Director and any instructors who will be attending the hearing; the Registrar; the student; and the student's advocate, if any. Students must receive appeals information related to their Hearing from the Secretary of Senate either in person by prior arrangement or by courier, normally five (5) working days in advance of the Hearing. It will be deemed that the information has been received on the date it was picked up or couriered.

#### **P-IIID4. Appeal Panel Decisions**

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

#### **P-III. Dismissal of Appeals**

##### **P-IIIA. Circumstances for dismissal**

1. Submission past the deadline.
2. Incomplete submissions.
3. Failure to provide a letter, or insufficient rationale, outlining the reasons why the decision made at the Department/School level or Faculty was incorrect.
4. Missing an exam and/or assignment for religious observance. (See Policy section IB1.) If a student did not file appropriate forms at the beginning of the semester or as soon as the final exam schedule is posted, cannot appeal at a later date based on religious observance (See Policy 150: Accommodation of Student Religious Obligations [www.ryerson.ca/senate/policies/pol150.pdf](http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/policies/pol150.pdf))
5. Accommodation for Disability (Policy Section IB2)- A student who has been granted an accommodation from the Access Centre, but has not requested that accommodation from his or her instructor, may not claim the accommodation after-the-fact, or base an appeal on the grounds that the accommodation was not given. (See Policy 159: Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities [www.ryerson.ca/senate/policies/pol159.pdf](http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/policies/pol159.pdf))
6. Grade re-assessments are not grounds for an academic appeal. (See Policy section IC.) Students are required to review grade concerns with the instructor within ten (10) working days of when the graded work is returned to the class or by the appeal deadline if it is a final exam or paper. If the instructor does not agree to review the work or does not respond within five (5) working days, a student should consult the Chair/Director. The only appeal permitted regarding quality of work is if the re-assessment of the work was not done or has not been done in keeping with the policy. The ground for this type of appeal is Procedural Error (Section IIB.5). There is no appeal of the new grade received - it may go up or down or remain the same.
7. **Medical (See Policy section IIC2)** – Documentation must be submitted within three days of a missed test or exam, or graded assignment deadline, or as soon as reasonably possible. It is expected that students will consult with a physician at the time of their illness. Appeals can be dismissed if the medical certificate is not submitted in a timely

way, if it does not cover the period of time in question, or if there is no medical documentation submitted with an appeal based on medical grounds.

8. **Prejudice (See Policy section IIC4)** – If the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Office has found that there has been no prejudice on a prohibited ground, continuation on the ground or Prejudice will be dismissed.

#### **P-IIIB. Dismissal at the Department/School level**

1. Only appeals which are not filed by the deadline date found in University calendars, or which are not complete or filed on the appropriate forms may be dismissed (not accepted) at the Department/School level.
2. If there are extenuating circumstances (medical/compassionate) that prevent a student from meeting the deadlines a student may request an extension from the Chair/Director. Supporting documentation may be required.
3. Students should be notified in writing within five (5) working days of the Dismissal of the appeal.
4. There is no further appeal unless it is based on Procedural Error

#### **P-IIIC. Dismissal at the Faculty Level**

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

#### **P-IIID. Dismissal at the Senate Level**

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

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

**STUDENT CODE OF ACADEMIC CONDUCT**  
**DRAFT 3-3-09**

Policy Number: 60

Approval Date: March 3, 2009

Original Approval Dates: March 4, 2003  
(Amended October 2003, January 2004, April 2006, April 1, 2008)

Procedural Review Annual

Presented By: Senate Appeals Committee

Responsible Office: Provost and Vice President Academic

Implementation Date: Fall 2009

Review Date: Fall 2011

<b>POLICY INDEX</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>A. ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT</b>	1
A1. Academic Dishonesty	1
a. Plagiarism	1
b. Cheating	2
c. Misrepresentation of personal identity or performance	2
d. Submission of false information	2
A2. Contributing to Academic Misconduct	2
A3. Damaging, Tampering or Interfering with the Scholarly Environment	2
A4. Unauthorized Copying or Use of Copyrighted Materials	2
A5. Violations of Departmental Policies on Professional Behaviour	2
A6. Violations of Specific Departmental or Course Requirements	3
<b>B. PENALTIES AND CONSEQUENCES FOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT</b>	3
B1. Definitions	3
a. Disciplinary Notice (DN)	3
b. Disciplinary Suspension (DS)	3
c. Disciplinary Withdrawal (DW)	3
d. Expulsion	3
B2. Assignment of Penalties	3
a. Within a course	3
b. Outside of a course	4
B3. Conditions	4
B4. Consequences	4
a. Academic Record	4
i. Disciplinary Notice (DN)	4
ii. Disciplinary Suspension (DS)	4
iii. Disciplinary Withdrawn (DW)	5
iv. Expulsion	5
b. Other Consequences	5
	5
<b>C. APPEALS PROCESS</b>	
C1. Filing an Appeal	6
C2. Student Enrollment During Appeal Process	6
C3. Timeliness	6
C4. Conflict of Interest	6
C5. Appeals Committees	6
a. Academic Integrity Council	6
b. Registrar's Appeals Committee	6
c. Senate Appeals Committee	6
d. Hearing Panels	6
i. Academic Integrity Council	6
ii. Senate	6
e. Training	7
C6. Hearing of Academic Integrity Council or Senate Appeals Committee	7
C7. Decision	7

<b>D. GENERAL REGULATIONS</b>	8
D1. Notification	8
D2. Dropping a Course	8
D3. Deferred Grade (DEF)	8
D4. Meetings to Discuss Suspicion of Academic Misconduct	8
D5. Reduction of Potential for Bias	8
D6. Evidence of Misconduct	8
D7. Re-assessment of Work by Someone Other than the Original Instructor	9
D8. Verification	9
D9. Audio and Video Recording	9
D10. Procedures	9

## **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<sup>3</sup>, 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.

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.

---

<sup>3</sup> For the purposes of this document, "instructor" shall mean any person who is teaching a course at Ryerson.

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

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

- i. copying another person's work (including information found on the Internet and unpublished materials) without appropriate referencing;
- ii. presenting someone else's work, opinions or theories as if they are your own;
- iii. presenting another's substantial compositional changes to an assignment as your own;
- iv. working collaboratively without permission of the instructor on an assignment, and then submitting it as if it were 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)**<sup>4</sup> - 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. 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 Academic Integrity Council or Senate Appeals Committee.

**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.

**B2. Assignment of Penalties:** Although students may commit similar infractions, the circumstances surrounding these infractions may vary. The penalty imposed shall take into account the specific circumstances. Once it has been determined that academic misconduct has occurred, a formal charge must be filed and one or more of the following penalties must be imposed or recommended by the instructor or Chair/Director: (See Procedures for the format of the notification.) In addition to a penalty, students may be assigned the educational component of the Academic Integrity Tutorial (See Procedures section IE.)

**a. Within a course:**

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

---

<sup>4</sup> Disciplinary Suspension (DS) cannot be assigned to graduate students.

**B3. Conditions** – The Academic Integrity Council 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 full-time undergraduate students, for four (4) years for graduate students, and for fourteen (14) years for part-time undergraduate program 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 undergraduate 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

<sup>3</sup> 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.

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 Academic Integrity Council, 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 Academic Integrity Council 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 for full-time undergraduate students and fourteen (14) years for part-time undergraduate students, 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 Academic Integrity Council or Senate Appeals Committee.

**iii. Disciplinary Withdrawal (DW)**

- a. There shall be an automatic hearing of the Academic Integrity Council if there is a recommendation of DW by an Instructor or Chair/Director, an assignment of DW for a graduate student for a second DN, or if there is an assignment of a DW based on a third misconduct.
- b. The length of the Disciplinary Withdrawal may be recommended by the Chair/Director or by the Academic Integrity Council 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 Academic Integrity Council.
- 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 **Academic Integrity Council**.

- 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, the Associate Registrar, and the Assistant Registrar for 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 **Academic Integrity Council** 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 the Academic Integrity Council.*
- 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 Academic Integrity Office or the Secretary of Senate. Documentation is normally received within five (5) working days of the hearing. 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 Academic Integrity Council or Senate level, 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 Enrollment During Appeal Process**

Students may remain in class and may enrol 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 enrol 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 a Hearing 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. Academic Integrity Council:** The Academic Integrity Officer shall establish an Academic Integrity Council, comprised of faculty and student representatives from each of the Faculties,
- b. 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.
- c. Senate Appeals Committee:** The Senate Appeals Committee, as established by the Senate By-Laws, shall hear appeals of the decisions of the Academic Integrity Council.
- d. Hearing Panels:**

- i. **Academic Integrity Council Hearing Panels shall consist of at least two (2) faculty members and one (1) student. One faculty member should, where possible, be from the Faculty in which the charge has been made. For graduate student hearings the student panel member must be a graduate student. It shall be decided in advance which faculty member will chair the hearing and write the decision.**
- ii. Senate Appeals Committee Panels shall consist of at least two (2) faculty members and one student. For graduate student hearings, the student panel member must be a graduate student. It shall be decided in advance which faculty member will chair the hearing and write the decision.
- e. **Training: All members of the above Committees/Council shall be required to attend annual training session(s) conducted by the office of the Secretary of Senate.**
- f. **No member may serve concurrently on the Academic Integrity Council and the Senate Appeals Committee.**

#### C6. Hearings of the Academic Integrity Council or Senate Appeals Committee.

- a. **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.**
- b. **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.)**
- c. **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.**
- d. **Hearing Regulations**
  - i. **All Senate hearings will be conducted in a manner consistent with the Statutory Powers Procedure Act (SPPA). A copy of the SPPA is available for review in the Senate Office.**
  - ii. **Representation/Support**
    - a. **Students may be represented by an advocate at an Academic Integrity Council Hearing who may speak for the student and confer with the student as necessary.**
    - b. **Students may be represented by an advocate or legal counsel at a Senate Appeals Committee Hearing, who may speak for the student and confer with the student as necessary.**
    - c. **Students may have a support person in the hearing, but this person may not participate in any way. Students may also bring witnesses, but these must be declared in advance on the appeal form.**
    - d. **The University may retain legal counsel at the Senate level who may speak for the respondent and confer with the respondent as necessary.**
  - iii. **Procedural Decisions by the Panel**
    - a. **The Panel Chair may adjourn the Hearing when it is required for a fair process.**

- b. *If either the appellant or the respondent fails to attend the Hearing, and there are no extenuating circumstances, the Hearing may proceed in his or her absence. Hearings will not be postponed if a witness, advocate or counsel fails to appear.*
- c. *A Hearing is open to the public except when the appellant, respondent or a Panel member requests that the Hearing be closed. Members of the public may not participate in, or in any way disrupt, the Hearing. Any member of the public, or the support person, may be removed from the Hearing by the Panel.*
- d. *All witnesses called by either side should be present at the start of the Hearing to be introduced, and then, unless the Panel decides otherwise, only while giving testimony. If the Hearing remains open, witnesses may return after all witnesses have presented their testimony.*
- e. *If either party brings witnesses not listed in the appeal form or the Notice of Hearing, the Panel must decide if those witnesses are to be heard.*
- f. *If new documentation is presented the Panel must determine if that documentation is to be considered. If there is no objection from the other party, the documentation should be accepted. The Hearing may be adjourned to allow the other party time to review the new documents. The Panel may determine that the documentation is not relevant and is not to be accepted.*
- iv. *In exceptional circumstances when a member of the Panel cannot attend, the requirement for a quorum can be waived if both parties agree.*
- v. *The Hearing may not be audio or video recorded by anyone, and no minutes of the proceedings are taken. The decision letter is considered the official record of the proceedings.*
- vi. *The Academic Integrity Officer or Secretary of Senate or designate may be present at the Hearing for the purpose of providing advice on procedural issues.*

## C7. Decision

- a. Burden and Standard of Proof: *In a Misconduct appeal the onus is on the University (e.g. instructor, Chair/Director) 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 an Academic Integrity Council Panel must forward a copy of all appeals decisions to the student, instructor, Chair/Director, Dean, Dean of Graduate Studies where appropriate, Academic Integrity Officer, and Registrar. Appeal decisions of the Senate Appeals Committee will be sent, in addition, to the Chair of the Academic Integrity Council Panel.*
- c. *The Academic Integrity Council may assign a penalty higher than the one recommended by the instructor or Chair/Director in exceptional circumstances if new evidence is presented in an appeal or an automatic hearing, or if the assigned or recommended penalty differs dramatically from the published penalty guidelines.*
- d. *The Academic Integrity Officer will:*
  - i. *review all Hearing Panel 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 "O" is assigned for the work, the student may drop the course in accordance with the published deadline.

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

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

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

### **D6. Evidence of Misconduct:**

- a. Instructors must be prepared to present the evidence for their suspicion at their scheduled meeting with the student(s). Students may bring, or be asked to bring, rough notes, drafts or other documents.
- b. If an instructor suspects academic misconduct and raises that suspicion with a student and decides not to charge a student, he or she may not subsequently change his or her mind and charge the student with academic misconduct.
- c. If evidence is discovered more than four (4) weeks after a final grade has been assigned for the course, the instructor may present that evidence, in a non-identifying way, to the Academic Integrity Officer to request permission to notify the student of a suspicion of Academic Misconduct. The Academic Integrity Officer will determine whether notification to the student would be reasonable given the circumstances and the amount of time that has passed and provide that determination 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 Academic Integrity Officer 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 a student representative from RSU and CESAR, and shall be published annually at the start of the academic year. Interpretation of the procedures shall be the responsibility of the Academic Integrity Officer.