

RYERSON UNIVERSITY

SENATE MEETING AGENDA

Tuesday, June 3, 2014

SENATE MEETING AGENDA

Tuesday, June 3, 2014

THE COMMONS - POD 250

4:30 p.m. Light dinner is available
5:00 p.m. Senate Meeting starts

1. Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum
2. Approval of Agenda
Motion: *That Senate approve the June 3, 2014 agenda*
3. Announcements
- Pages 1-8 4. Minutes of Previous Meetings
Motion: *That Senate approve the minutes of the May 6, 2014 meeting*
5. Matters Arising from the Minutes
6. Correspondence
- Pages 9-12 7. Reports
 - 7.1 Report of the President
 - 7.1.1 President's Update
 - 7.2 Report of the Secretary
- Pages 13-46 7.3 Draft of the 2014-2019 Academic Plan: M. Lachemi
Motion: *That Senate approve Ryerson University's Academic Plan for 2014-2019*
- 7.4 Committee Reports
 - 7.4.1 Report from the Policy 60 (*Student Code of Academic Conduct*) Review Committee: C. Evans and D. Checkland, Co-Chairs
 - Pages 47-66 7.4.1.1 For information, a report on the activities of the Policy 60 review committee, including the Supplementary Data Report from the Academic Integrity Office (AIO) for activity in 2012-2013 (see Appendix B)
 - Pages 67-101 7.4.1.2 Amendment to include new sections in Policy 60 regarding graduate supervised research activities
Motion #1: *That Senate approve an amendment to Policy 60 (Student Code of Academic Conduct) to include a new section (Section E) entitled "Graduate Supervised Research Activities," as well as a corresponding new section (Section II.C) in the Procedures, both as described in the draft revision, which would come into effect on September 1, 2014*

7.4.1.3 Amendment to include a new range of minimum penalties for findings of academic misconduct

Motion #2: *That Senate approve an amendment to Policy 60 such that the minimum penalty for academic misconduct on any assignment or other form of evaluation within a course is a grade reduction on the work, including the possibility of a grade of zero, as described in the draft revision, which would come into effect on September 1, 2014*

7.4.1.4 Request to extend the mandate of the Policy 60 Review Committee

Motion #3: *That Senate approve to extend the mandate of the Policy 60 Review Committee to the end of the 2014-2015 Senate session, with a report due by the December 2, 2014 Senate meeting*

Pages 102-103

7.4.2 Report #W2014-4 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC)

7.4.2.1 Report #W2014-1 of the Nominating Committee: J. Turtle

Motion #1: *That Senate approve the nominees for the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC), the Senate Priorities Committee (SPC), the position of Vice-Chair of Senate, and to fill vacancies as Faculty Senators from the Faculty of Community Services, as presented in this report*

7.4.2.2 Recommendation to add another Chang School representative to the Academic Standards Committee: C. Evans

Motion #2: *That Senate approve the addition of one more Chang School representative on the Academic Standards Committee (ASC), for a total of two representatives*

7.4.2.3 Update on the October 2013 Senate meeting request for AGPC to develop policy clarifying the definition of an “Academic Director” by the June 2014 Senate meeting: J. Turtle

Motion #3: *That Senate defer discussion of the definition of an “Academic Director” until the October 2014 Senate meeting*

7.4.2.4 Update on the January 2013 Senate meeting request for AGPC to develop policy guidelines regarding the creation of new Schools/Departments by the June 2014 Senate meeting: J. Turtle

Motion #4: *That Senate defer discussion of guidelines regarding the creation of new Schools/Departments until the October 2014 Senate meeting*

Pages 104-145

7.4.3 Report #W2014-5 of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC):
C. Evans

Pages 104-109	7.4.3.1	Four-year overview of ASC activities as an information item for Senate
Pages 110-134	7.4.3.2	Periodic Program Review – Bachelor of Health Administration in Health Information Management <i>Motion #1:</i> <i>That Senate approve the Periodic Program Review – Bachelor of Health Administration in Health Information Management</i>
Pages 134-138	7.4.3.3	Changes to Course Sequencing, Titles, Descriptions, and Requisites for the Bachelor of Social Work Program <i>Motion #2:</i> <i>That Senate approve changes to the Social Work program as described in the attached document</i>
Pages 138-145	7.4.3.4	Ted Rogers School of Management Co-Operative Education Proposal <i>Motion #3:</i> <i>That Senate approve TRSM’s Co-Operative Education Proposal as described in the attached document</i>
Pages 146-157	7.4.4	Report #W2014-1 of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee, For information: C. Evans

8. Old Business

9. New Business as Circulated

10. Members’ Business

11. Consent Agenda

11.1 2008-2013 “Shaping Our Future” Academic Plan Update

(See: http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2014/Academic_Plan_Update_June_2014_final.pdf)

11.2 Council of Ontario Universities (COU) Update

(See http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2014/COU_Update_as_of_May_23_2014.pdf)

12. Adjournment

SENATE MINUTES OF MEETING TUESDAY, May 6, 2014			
MEMBERS PRESENT:			
EX-OFFICIO:	FACULTY:		STUDENTS:
J. P. Boudreau	D. Checkland	A. McWilliams	A. Adeli
M. Bountrogianni	M. Dionne	J. P. Pascal	D. Anderson
U. George	S. Dolgoy	A. Pejovic-Milic	A. Hassan
C. Hack	C. Falzon	K. Raahemifar	A. Lam
S. Krishnan	A. Ferworn	S. Rahkmayil	P. Noorzad
M. Lachemi	D. Greatrix	A. Saloojee	J. Rodriguez
M. Lefebvre	F. Gunn	N. Thomlinson	U. Siddiqui
S. Levy	A. Hunter	K. Tucker-Scott	M. Tabatabaei Anaraki
J. Mactavish	E. Kam	P. Walsh	S. Torabi
D. O'Neil Green	V. Magness	N. Walton	
P. Stenton	J. Martin	J. Wolofsky	
SENATE ASSOCIATES:			
M. Lee Blickstead			
A.M. Brinsmead			
REGRETS:	ABSENT:		ALUMNI:
L. Bloomberg	S. Campbell		G. Farok
D. Chant	L. Di Cintio		M. Sarkis
I. Coe	P. Diverlus		
W. Cukier	G. Goldar		
C. Evans	R. Hoilett		
J. Hanigsberg	Md. Sirajul Islam		
G. Hauck	M. Ismail		
J. Isbister	D. Mason		
A. Kahan	D. Rose		
H. Lane Vetere	F. Stewart		
L. Lavallée	D. Valliere		
S. Murphy			
R. Ravindran			
C. Zamaria			

The meeting started at 5:00 p.m. with the Committee of the Whole roundtable discussions regarding the Presidential Search. The following questions were discussed.

1. What are the strengths upon which Ryerson should build over the next five to ten years?
 2. What are the challenges the institution will face during this period?
 3. Given these strengths and challenges, what should be the next President's key priorities?
 4. What are the implications of these priorities as it relates to the required experience and leadership attributes we must seek in the next President?
-

1. Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum

2. Approval of Agenda

Motion: *That Senate approve the May 6, 2014 agenda*

M. Lefebvre moved; M. Sarkis seconded

Motion Approved.

3. Announcements - None

4. Minutes of Previous Meetings

Motion: *That Senate approve the minutes of the April 1, 2014 meeting*

A. McWilliams moved; K. Raahemifar seconded

Motion Approved.

5. Matters Arising from the Minutes

D. Checkland, Co-Chair of the Policy 60 Review Committee, announced that a full revision of Policy 60 will likely not be ready for the June Senate meeting, as originally planned when the Committee was struck in October 2013. However, a full report on the progress of the Committee's work will be ready for the June meeting, as well as a motion to have the Committee continue to exist into the next session of Senate.

6. Correspondence - None

7. Reports

7.1 Report of the President

7.1.1 President's Update

President Levy stated that the outcome of the current provincial election is not expected to suspend or reverse any of the University's existing plans. This includes the Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA) process, the details of which the government has asked Ryerson and other universities to keep confidential for the time being. President Levy then read out the names of the honorary doctorate recipients for Spring convocation, which are also listed in the agenda on p. 6. He invited Senators to attend convocation if possible, noting that their attendance is greatly appreciated, especially by the students' partners, families, friends, etc. The President then explained that since the previous Senate meeting the University's budget was passed, with a 2% reduction instead of 3%, due to details in the SMA that are confidential for the time

being. He went on to say that student applications to Ryerson are good this year, although there is an overall softening of applications to universities across Ontario, as expected due to changing demographics, especially in the northern areas of the province. The President then noted the passing of Jim Flaherty, and mentioned that Ryerson sent a letter of condolence to his family, as well as a photograph of Mr. Flaherty opening the Mattamy Athletic Centre. He concluded by noting that he was recently in the Bahamas with Professor Jean Golden and a colleague from Social Work, where about 40 Ryerson students are involved with a school called Every Child Counts, which is the only school there for young children with disabilities. He congratulated Professor Golden and the other Ryerson participants for their work there.

7.2 Report of the Secretary

J. Turtle announced on behalf of the Senate Priorities Committee (SPC) that there will be a Special Meeting of Senate on May 27 to discuss the most recent draft of the Academic Plan before it comes to Senate at the June meeting for approval.

7.2.1 Invitation for expressions of interest to fill vacancies on the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC), to be received by the Secretary on behalf of the Nominating Committee

- one (1) TRSM Faculty Senator*
- one (1) Community Services Faculty Senator*
- one (1) FEAS Faculty Senator*
- one (1) graduate student Senator
- two (2) undergraduate student Senators

*Note: According to the Senate bylaw, only one of these positions can be filled by a Chair/Director.

7.2.2 Notice of Election for the Senate Priorities Committee (SPC) and Vice Chair of Senate (attached)

7.3 Committee Reports

7.3.1 Report #W2014-4 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC)

7.3.1.1 Policy 45 (*Governance Councils*) revision (attached, as well as a summary sheet of the changes)

Motion #1: *That Senate approve the revised version of Policy 45*

A. McWilliams moved; D. Checkland seconded

Amendment to Motion #1: *That sections 2.3.a.iii, 2.3.b.iii, 4.3.a.iii, and 4.3.b.iii in Policy 45 be amended to include that, “Where a bylaw proposes a UPC or GPC membership that is any subset of the faculty participating actively in the program, the bylaw shall provide justification for the chosen structure, and shall ensure that the subset is elected by all faculty participating actively in the program” (full version attached)*

N. Thomlinson moved and S. Dolgoy seconded

Amendment Approved.**Motion Approved.**

The Chair noted that the bylaws coming up at this point in the agenda are divided into categories – those for which the just-approved Motion #1 is relevant (Motions #6 through #11), and the rest for which it is not. Later in the meeting, J. Turtle noted that the information now required for Councils that consist of only a subset of eligible members is available to Senate, because those Councils were informed in advance, and that representatives from those Councils are available at the meeting to provide that information if requested.

7.3.1.2 Bylaws for the Department Council in Physics

Motion #2: *That Senate approve the bylaws for the Department Council in Physics*

J. P. Boudreau moved; A. Adeli seconded

Motion Approved.

7.3.1.3 Bylaws for the Department Council in Economics

Motion #3: *That Senate approve the bylaws for the Department Council in Economics*

J. P. Boudreau moved; S. Krishnan seconded

Motion Approved.

7.3.1.4 Bylaws for the Department Council in Architectural Science

Motion #4: *That Senate approve the bylaws for the Department Council in Architectural Science*

J. P. Boudreau moved; D. O’Neil Green seconded.

M. Dionne raised the point that the phrase “present at meetings,” including by electronic means, deserves more consideration, both for bylaws and other situations, such as dissertation exams. The Chair recommended that such consideration be given in the future.

Motion Approved.

7.3.1.5 Bylaws for the Faculty Council in the Ted Rogers School of Management (TRSM)

Motion #5: *That Senate approve the bylaws for the Faculty Council in the Ted Rogers School of Management (TRSM)*

J. P. Boudreau moved; F. Gunn seconded

K. Raahemifar noted that some bylaw drafts include details regarding approval dates and procedures, but others do not. J. Turtle acknowledged that is the case, but noted that where those details are not included in the actual bylaws, there is correspondence on file with that information, including substantial detail in a cover letter for the TRSM Faculty Council bylaws. He also agreed that this information should be included in subsequent bylaw drafts.

Motion Approved.

7.3.1.6 Bylaws for the Graduate Program Council in Communication and Culture

Motion #6: *That Senate approve the bylaws for the Graduate Program Council in Communication and Culture*

J. Mactavish moved; J. P. Boudreau seconded

K. Raahemifar asked if these, and other Graduate Program Council (GPC) bylaws, had been discussed and voted on by the relevant Graduate Council. J. Turtle responded that Policy 45 specifies an approval process, which was followed for the bylaws under consideration, including dates of approval on the bylaw covers. J. Mactavish noted that in addition to the Policy 45 requirements, almost all of the GPC bylaws had been approved by other relevant bodies (e.g., Departmental Councils), and added that in general a lot of consultation had been done.

Motion Approved.

7.3.1.7 Bylaws for the Graduate Program Council in Digital Media

Motion #7: *That Senate approve the bylaws for the Graduate Program Council in Digital Media*

J. Mactavish moved; M. Bountrogianni seconded

M. Dionne raised questions about the specific number of members on the Council, due to potential confusion regarding the phrase “a minimum of...” D. Checkland agreed that this is an important issue, because it is not possible to establish quorum when the total number of members is not specified, and recommended that the bylaws be amended accordingly. M. Dionne recommended that the bylaws be **tabled to a later meeting**. J. Mactavish agreed.

7.3.1.8 Bylaws for the Graduate Program Council in Documentary Media

Motion #8: *That Senate approve the bylaws for the Graduate Program Council in Documentary Media*

J. Mactavish moved; G. Farok seconded

Motion Approved.

7.3.1.9 Bylaws for the Graduate Program Council in Immigration and Settlement

Motion #9: *That Senate approve the bylaws for the Graduate Program Council in Immigration and Settlement*

J. Mactavish moved; A. McWilliams seconded

Motion Approved.

7.3.1.10 Bylaws for the Graduate Program Council in Nursing

Motion #10: *That Senate approve the bylaws for the Graduate Program Council in Nursing*

J. Mactavish moved; A. Lam seconded

Motion Approved.

7.3.1.11 Bylaws for the Graduate Program Council in Urban Development

Motion #11: *That Senate approve the bylaws for the Graduate Program Council in Urban Development*

J. Mactavish moved; U. George seconded

Motion Approved.

7.3.1.12 Bylaws for 17 Graduate Program Councils that have full membership of eligible YSGS members

Motion #12: *That Senate approve the bylaws for the Graduate Program Councils in Aerospace Engineering, Applied Mathematics, Biomedical Physics, Building Science, Chemical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Computer Networks, Computer Science, Early Childhood Studies, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Environmental Applied Science and Management, International Economics and Finance, Literatures of Modernity, Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, Media Production, Molecular Science, and Professional Communication*

J. Mactavish moved; J. P. Boudreau seconded

Motion Approved.

7.3.2 Report #W2014-4 of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC): C. Evans absent, J. Turtle presented

7.3.2.1 Periodic Program Review of the Ted Rogers School of Business Management, Bachelor of Commerce degree

Motion #1: *That Senate approve the Periodic Program Review of the Ted Rogers School of Business Management, Bachelor of Commerce degree*

U. Siddiqui moved; M. Bountrogianni seconded

Motion Approved.

7.3.2.2 Revisions to the Chang School Certificate in Public Relations

Motion #2: *That Senate approve the revisions to the Chang School Certificate in Public Relations*

M. Bountrogianni moved; K. Raahemifar seconded

Motion Approved.

7.3.2.3 Discontinuation of the Chang School Certificate in Financial Management in Canada

Motion #3: *That Senate approve the Discontinuation of the Chang School Certificate in Financial Management in Canada*

U. Siddiqui moved; A. Ferworn seconded

Motion Approved.

7.3.2.4 Revisions to the Chang School's Project Management Bridging Certificate for Internationally Educated Professionals (PMBCIEP)

Motion #4: *That Senate approve the revisions to the Chang School's Project Management Bridging Certificate for Internationally Educated Professionals (PMBCIEP)*

M. Bountrogianni moved; J. Mactavish seconded

Motion Approved.

7.3.2.5 Addition of a Required Course to the Chang School Certificate in Physical Activity: Assessment and Promotion

Motion #5: *That Senate approve the addition of a required course to the Chang School Certificate in Physical Activity: Assessment and Promotion*

K. Raahemifar moved; E. Kam seconded

Motion Approved.

7.3.2.6 Addition and Deletion of Elective Courses in the Chang School Certificate in Architecture

Motion #6: *That Senate approve the Addition and Deletion of Elective Courses in the Chang School Certificate in Architecture, as described in the ASC report*

K. Raahemifar moved; A. McWilliams seconded

Motion Approved.

7.4 Report of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies (YSGS)

7.4.1 Program Review for the MBA and MMSc in the Management of Technology and Innovation (MTI)

- MBA-MTI Self Study
(http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2014/MBA_MTI_Report.pdf)
- MMSc-MTI Self Study Report
(http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2014/MMSc_MTI_Report.pdf)
- MBA-MTI and MMSc-MTI Peer Review Report
(http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2014/Peer_Review_MBA_MTI_MMSc_MTI.pdf)
- TRSM Response to Peer Review Report (MBA-MTI and MMSc-MTI)
(http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2014/TRSM_Response.pdf)
- YSGS Response to PRT Reports (MBA-MTI and MMSc-MTI)
(http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2014/YSGS_PRT_Response.pdf)

Motion #1: *That Senate approve the MBA-MTI and MMSc-MTI Degree Program Review and*

Responses as recommended by YSGS Council on April 17, 2014.

J. Mactavish moved; C. Falzon seconded

Motion Approved.

7.4.2 New Program Proposal: Professional Masters Diploma (PMDip) in Energy and Innovation (attached)

Motion #2: *That Senate approve the Proposal of the Energy and Innovation Professional Master's Diploma program as approved by YSGS Council on April 17, 2014 so that it can move on for approval from the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance ("the Quality Council").*

J. Mactavish moved; S. Rakhmayil seconded

Motion Approved.

8. Old Business

- J.P. Boudreau asked if many more bylaws are expected for the June Senate meeting. J. Turtle responded that not many, if any, are expected.

9. New Business as Circulated - None

10. Members' Business

- D. Checkland offered a correction to information he provided at the last Senate meeting regarding Facilitated Discussions for suspicions of academic misconduct. He noted that approximately two-thirds of FDs lead to findings of misconduct, not one-third.
- D. Checkland also raised the issue of stress on faculty caused by the scheduling of essay-style exams too close to the end of the exam period. C. Hack explained how the exam schedule is created, and noted that every effort is made to accommodate factors such as essay-style exams requiring more time for grading.
- S. Rakhmayil suggested that exams for large classes be held in spaces to fit all the students, as opposed to multiple rooms, and that the exam schedule be available earlier than it is now.
- N. Thomlinson suggested that these exam issues be examined more formally by Senate. S. Levy suggested that this topic be moved to SPC for discussion.

11. Consent Agenda - None

12. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Ryerson University
President's Update to Senate
June 3, 2014



Everyone Makes a Mark

Thank you – As 2013-14 draws to a close, sincere thanks are extended to all members of Senate for another great year advancing academic distinction, support for student success, and progress in building the reputation of Ryerson for leadership in programs, research and innovation.

Daphne Cockwell School of Nursing (DCSN) Anniversary – Congratulations are extended to everyone in the DCSN community on celebrating 50 years of leadership. The first postsecondary program in Ontario to offer diploma nursing education outside a hospital nursing school, the Ryerson program started in 1964 with 19 students, and has grown to more than 2,700 students today, including degree completion programs for registered nurses, the collaborative nursing degree program with George Brown and Centennial Colleges, the graduate program in nursing, and a breadth of roles including management, community and public health, nurse practitioner, clinical nurse specialist and nurse researcher. In 2009, the Daphne Cockwell School of Nursing was the first school of nursing in Canada to be named after a nurse, honouring the mother of benefactor Jack Cockwell with the deep respect of fellowship. In addition to events marking the milestone, a new entrance scholarship has been established for nursing students.

Colm Wilkinson Musical Tribute – On Sunday, May 11th an evening in support of students and honouring the outstanding career of Colm Wilkinson (Doctor of Laws *honoris causa* '12) was a superb success, with proceeds benefiting the Colm Wilkinson Scholarship for Ryerson Theatre School students. I would like to extend special thanks and congratulations for this great initiative to Peggy Shannon, Rena Mendelson and the many students who participated in making it happen. It was inspiring to see Koerner Hall filled, with the audience loving the music and paying huge respect to both Colm Wilkinson and the student careers this scholarship will launch.

Long Service Event – On May 7th forty-seven faculty and staff were honoured at the first annual President's Breakfast for 30, 35 and 40+ years of service. The event was exceptional for the historic memories, pride at helping build the university, and the loyal blue-and-gold spirit among those whose efforts are the foundation of what we continue to be able to achieve together. The event recognizing 30, 35 and 40+ years of service joins the 25 Year Club taking place on May 29th this year, the Retiree Celebration this coming November 14th, and the array of special occasions celebrating Ryerson achievements and contributions as part of the university's Recognition & Awards program.

Congratulations –

- The Canadian Museum for Human Rights (CMHR) will include the award-winning Ryerson exhibit "*Out from Under: Disability, History and Things to Remember*" as part of the first display at the grand opening of Canada's new national museum in Winnipeg this September.
- The Association of Ontario Midwives announced on May 1st that midwifery Professor Vicki Van Wagner is the recipient of a Lifetime Achievement Award for her influential role in facilitating midwifery regulation, the formation of the professional association and continued involvement in Ontario's Midwifery Education Program.

- Alex Ferworn is the recipient of the 2014 Technology Ambassador Award, presented at the 2nd Annual Partners In Research National Awards (PIRNA) event on May 23rd in Ottawa, honouring leading Canadian researchers and their public outreach efforts.
- Vrenia Ivonoffski, founding artistic director of Act II Studio (now the Estelle Craig Act II Studio) at The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education, received the 2014 Maggie Bassett Award presented on May 5th by Theatre Ontario for significant, sustained and unselfish contributions in the development of theatre in the province. Since 1991, the Studio has offered older adults the opportunity to create and experience a unique kind of theatre informed by a long-life perspective, including acting, directing and playwriting led by cutting-edge theatre professionals, performing in classical, musical and fringe theatre, and collaborating with medical and social science researchers in hospitals, universities and agencies to write and perform plays on health and social issues such as cancer and dementia.
- Jason Nolan, School of Early Childhood Studies, is taking up an invited residency at the Rockefeller Foundation Bellagio Center this Fall to work on *Tuning Spaces for Autistic Engagement through User-initiated Design*. The Rockefeller Foundation Bellagio Center's mission is to identify innovation and impact-oriented solutions to critical global problems.
- David E. Smith, Distinguished Visiting Professor in the Department of Politics and Public Administration, has won the 2014 Canada Prize in the Social Sciences for his book, *Across the Aisle: Opposition in Canadian Politics*. Awarded by the Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, the 2014 Canada Prizes were presented on May 7th in Toronto.
- Gregory Taylor, a postdoctoral fellow in the Ted Rogers School of Information Technology Management, was one of five finalists for the 2014 Donner Book Prize honouring excellence in public policy thinking, research and writing for his book *Shut Off: The Canadian Digital Television Transition*, analyzing technological and economic change in Canadian media.
- Sean Wise, Ted Rogers School of Business Management, won Entrepreneur Mentor of the Year, and Ryerson won Most Entrepreneurial Postsecondary Institution, in the Ontario regional semi-finals of the inaugural Startup Canada Awards. The final national awards presentation will take place on June 12th in Toronto.
- Team Urban Harvest is one of two Grand Winners at the 2014 U.S. Department of Energy Challenge Home Student Design Competition, with category wins in Best Design Solution Integration, Best Technical Integration, and Best Presentation. The team of architectural science and building science students competed with 28 North American teams including Ryerson's Team Threshold House, which also made the podium in Best Presentation.
- Ali Naqvi, PhD Molecular Science, won the Three-Minute-Thesis (3MT) competition at Ryerson, and went on to win 3rd place in the Ontario competition on April 24th as well as the People's Choice Award for his presentation "Milk. It does a body good...but how?" studying the structure and function of casein peptides in milk. The next step is the inaugural National 3MT Competition which takes place in late May.
- Master of Professional Communication students Nicola Brown, Laura Baker, Victoria Larson, Natasha Mendonca, Stefan Milosevic, and Cayley Montmarquette won the Sharon Berzok Student Award as the best overall in the student categories at the 2014 Gold Quill Awards sponsored worldwide by the International Association of Business Communicators.

- Architectural science students were winners in the 2014 Extreme Redesign 3D printing challenge, an international contest where students redesign an existing product or create a new one that improves completing a task. Eddy Kwok and Lily Huang won 2nd Place for Up-Right, a posture and back support system for knapsacks. Tiffany Tse and Kate Gonashvili won 3rd Place for Cane[a]ction, a crutch-and-cane combination to address walking and balance disabilities. Both teams won in the college engineering category.

Every Child Counts – In 2012 Jean Golden, Sociology, developed an institutional relationship between Ryerson University and the Every Child Counts School for children with special needs in Abaco, the Northern Bahamas. In April we attended the world premiere of a documentary film produced by director Wendy Loten in conjunction with Ryerson that tells the story of a typical island school that became a beacon of hope for disabled children faced with limited education options. The film, screened at the National Art Gallery of The Bahamas, was launched to help the school's founder Lyn Major continue her efforts in providing alternative education for children with learning, developmental and physical disabilities. The leadership of Jean Golden in this important initiative is making a difference not only for the school, but for the practicum students participating in a vital learning experience. It was clear the Ryerson impetus in helping build the school and promoting its support by telling its story are deeply appreciated.

Tanenbaum Gift – On May 1st Ryerson announced a gift by Carole Tanenbaum to the Ryerson Image Centre (RIC) in honour of Howard Tanenbaum, Founding Chair of the RIC Advisory Board and a driving force behind the acquisition of the Black Star Collection. Ryerson's acclaimed and longstanding lecture series in photography and image arts, featuring talks on campus to Toronto audiences by more than 235 photographers, filmmakers, photo-historians, media artists and curators over the years, will now be known as the Howard and Carole Tanenbaum Lecture Series. The donation also supports the development of an archive devoted to the series on the RIC website, to be undertaken by a collaboration including the RIC, the School of Image Arts, and Ryerson Library Special Collections, as well as students from the Film and Photographic Preservation and Collections Management (FPPCM) Program. In recognition of Mr. Tanenbaum's long-standing support and his role as Founding Chair of the RIC Advisory Board, the galleries' reception area has been named the Howard Tanenbaum Welcome Centre.

Ryerson Science Rendezvous – On Saturday, May 10th Yonge-Dundas Square was dedicated to Canada's annual nationwide celebration of science. Ryerson activities for 2014 included a fire show, liquid nitrogen show, and water-science show; activities and experiments for children such as making 'silly putty' from things found around the house; physics pun building a 'tricorder' and moving a laser beam through a maze, demonstrations of 3D printing; programming a robot and gesture-control technologies; memory testing and visual illusions; the botany of community gardening and the 'Bio-Logic' of the world under a microscope; innovations in energy research from solar cells and heat pumps to batteries and flywheels; and much more. Special thanks to Darrick Heyd, Associate Dean Undergraduate, Faculty of Science, and all the many participants and volunteers contributing to a highly-anticipated event in the community calendar.

Feats of Engineering program – A new initiative this summer is offering young women from high schools in the GTA the opportunity to experience real world engineering. Participants will go behind the scenes at leading companies such as Bombardier, EllisDon and Google, meet the engineers, tour the facilities and be part of projects making our world a safer, better place. The program is an unprecedented collaboration among university engineering faculties at Ryerson, Western University, University of Waterloo and UOIT, and is supported by a four-year grant of

\$1.4 million from Hydro One, and a grant of \$65,000 from the Motorola Solutions Foundation. A companion initiative, the 'WEMADEIT' Youth Think Tank, will involve the students in making suggestions for more effective outreach to encourage young women to consider engineering.

Ryerson Budget – At its meeting of April 28th the Board of Governors approved a balanced operating budget for 2014-15 that promotes the university's strategic priorities and covers enrolment growth, inflationary and salary costs. Overall average tuition fees will increase by three per cent in 2014-15, with a ten per cent increase in student financial assistance. The budget was developed in the context of a one per cent base operating grant reduction from government for 2014-15 and a provincial policy decision to cap overall tuition fee increases at three per cent, and benefited from extensive budget consultations held across the university.

from the President's Calendar

April 14, 2014: Ryerson hosted a table at the 27th Annual Public Policy Forum Testimonial Dinner and Awards held at the Metro Toronto Convention Centre.

April 21, 2014: At the Ryerson Faculty Conference I was honoured to be asked to speak about the progress of the university over the last decade.

April 24, 2014: Ryerson hosted a table at the 2014 Couchiching Gala chaired by Sabi Marwah, (Doctor of Laws *honoris causa* '12) at which an award was presented to Phil Fontaine (Doctor of Laws *honoris causa* '11).

April 24, 2014: The Ryerson Digital Media Zone (DMZ) celebrated its 4th anniversary, with Chancellor Lawrence Bloomberg cutting the ceremonial cake.

April 29, 2014: The annual Scotiabank Photography Award now makes its home at the Ryerson Image Centre, increasingly noted as a distinctive exhibit and research facility taking its place among international leaders in photography.

May 1, 2014: Attending the Centre for Labour Management Relations (CLMR) Symposium with the Radiation Safety Institute, it was clear that Ryerson is becoming a centre for government and public/private sector agencies to come together to discuss major issues.

May 5, 2014: As a follow-up to the Ryerson mission to South Africa, we are now hosting visits from South African universities, and welcomed the University of Witwatersrand to campus.

May 5, 2014: The Hon. Frank McKenna was at Ryerson speaking to the Capital Markets Student Group, and I was pleased to be asked to offer the introduction.

May 7, 2014: At a forum entitled "Innovation in the Public Sector" hosted by Metrolinx, I gave an invited presentation on Ryerson progress being seen as *the* innovative university in Ontario.

May 13, 2014: The annual Ontario Centres of Excellence Discovery event demonstrated once again the leadership and distinctive innovative strength of Ryerson projects.

May 13, 2014: The 2014 "MAC at the MAC" conference for Management and Confidential employees was an excellent event featuring a very well-received keynote address from Board of Governors Chair Phyllis Yaffe, and I was very pleased to offer welcoming remarks.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Ryerson University
ACADEMIC PLAN
2014 – 2019

Office of the Provost and Vice President Academic
June 2014

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Advancing the vision to be Canada's leading comprehensive innovation university

Located in the heart of one of the world's most culturally and linguistically diverse urban centres, Ryerson University's high quality programs and scholarly, research and creative activities extend beyond the walls of the university.

Ryerson is deeply connected to the city and the world beyond, attracting talent, opportunities and global connections to the Greater Toronto Area. Programs and curriculum are not static; they are relevant to changing careers, professions and scholarly disciplines. Students, faculty and staff challenge the status quo with new solutions and new ways of thinking. Longstanding partnerships with community, industry, government, and professional practice drive research and innovation that responds to real-world problems.

Ryerson recognizes that creativity and innovation should not be contained. Its diverse learning community collaborates across disciplines and with external partners, taking smart, calculated risks to turn promising ideas into tangible solutions, products, processes or services that make a positive and meaningful impact upon society. Students are trusted to learn. In their programs and through experiential learning opportunities students solve complex problems, think critically and communicate clearly, gaining the confidence and knowledge to build careers, enter diverse professions or to launch their own ventures and create jobs.

Ryerson also challenges conventional ideas of a university by blurring the boundaries between its campus and downtown Toronto. The Mattamy Athletic Centre at Maple Leaf Gardens has brought an iconic building back to life, the Ryerson Image Centre has helped make Toronto an international photography destination, and the Student Learning Centre is transforming Yonge Street.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Contents

Ryerson’s Momentum	1
Taking Ryerson Forward	5
Guided by Values	7
Priorities	9
Strategies	14
Measuring Success	25
Integrated Planning in Action	26
A Passionate and Engaged Community	27
Strategies Matrix	29

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Ryerson's Momentum

In two decades, Ryerson University has transformed into a comprehensive university with an array of undergraduate, master's and doctoral programs and diverse scholarly, research and creative (SRC) activities. *Shaping Our Future*, the university's 2008-13 academic plan, identified priorities that contributed to Ryerson's remarkable success and development. The dedicated efforts of countless talented people moved Ryerson far beyond the expectations set by that plan.

This academic plan builds upon Ryerson's proud traditions and its position as a leading post-secondary institution. It expands the university's strengths for relevant programs and SRC activities, its engaging learning and teaching environment that integrates theory with practice and strong relationships with external communities.

Reputation for Excellence

Ryerson has earned a reputation for high-quality, professional and career-related education and responsive SRC activity, and its programs are in high demand. As of the 2013-14 academic year it had grown to 40,000 students with 140,000 alumni worldwide. More than 100 undergraduate, master's and PhD programs are offered across a wide range of disciplines from arts and humanities to science and engineering. Ryerson has become the first choice for more undergraduate applicants than any other Ontario university relative to available spaces. In a relatively short 10-year span, graduate education has become firmly established; last year, six applications were received for every available graduate space. Nearly all of its undergraduate programs, and many of its graduate programs, provide experiential learning – a hallmark of Ryerson's educational experience. Ryerson has pursued professional accreditation where it is available; today two-thirds of its undergraduate students are enrolled in accredited programs. Ryerson is a leader in online university education in Ontario, and home to The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education, Canada's largest continuing education provider with over 1,500 courses, seminars and workshops, and 90 certificate programs to promote lifelong learning.

Ryerson's SRC activity, local and international partnerships, and external funding are growing steadily and contributing to its rising reputation. Total research funding doubled between 2008 and 2013, and in 2012-13, Ryerson ranked fifth in sponsored research among Ontario non-medical/doctoral universities. In addition, Ryerson has established academic and research partnerships with over 132 institutions in 34 countries.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Social, Cultural and Economic Impact

Ryerson's approach to responding to the complex and rapidly evolving needs of society is distinct from that of other post-secondary institutions. The university's urban context is an advantage and influences how students and faculty learn and teach, engage in creative practice, and pursue research and innovation; the local urban focus also makes the university globally relevant. The Ryerson experience is multifaceted. It emphasizes basic and applied research, creative endeavours and scholarly activities that respond to real-world problems in community, government, and the private and not-for-profit sectors. It is built on programs designed to be relevant to changing careers, professions and scholarly disciplines, with significant opportunities for research and experiential learning. Graduates go on to make significant contributions in their fields of practice and in broader society. Deep connections and partnerships with leading institutions, community agencies, industry, government and professional practices drive program and research relevancy.

The City Builder

Ryerson is – and always has been – very much a part of its community and city. The university takes pride in being situated in the heart of downtown Toronto and the GTA. Declaring its intention to be a city builder, Ryerson has enriched and contributed to public life in broad ways.

Ryerson purposefully aims to make post-secondary education more inclusive. Its student population reflects the increasing diversity of the city, and it provides access and support to under-represented groups, in particular first generation students, Aboriginal people, persons with disabilities and internationally educated professionals. Its *Spanning the Gaps* program is geared toward young people and adults who might not otherwise experience post-secondary education. Ryerson has more than 500 Aboriginal students on campus and recognizes that Aboriginal people have a distinct history in Canada and unique contemporary experiences. In 2012, the university was presented with an Eagle Staff to recognize 20 years of leadership in Aboriginal support, programming and partnerships.

Ryerson's academic and research partnerships with leading institutions such as St. Michael's Hospital, TIFF (Toronto International Film Festival), Bombardier Aerospace and Hydro One are having a positive and transformative effect upon society. Ryerson continues to attract new talent, opportunities and global connections to its campus and contributes to the city's economic development and civic, cultural and social vitality.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Launched in 2008, Ryerson's award-winning Master Plan has been a catalyst for change and renewal both on campus and in the university's downtown neighbourhood. The Mattamy Athletic Centre at Maple Leaf Gardens brought the country's most historic sports arena back into the international spotlight, allowing the university to deepen the student life experience, attract talented student athletes and offer unique opportunities to children, families, community groups and organizations. The Ryerson Image Centre, home to the famous Black Star Collection, is strengthening research and graduate education in a niche discipline and helping to make Toronto an international photography destination. The Student Learning Centre is transforming Yonge Street and will provide a new collaborative learning and research space for developing synergies between students and faculty from all disciplines.

Fostering Innovation

Ryerson's innovation agenda is strengthened by its strong connections to community and city. For Ryerson, innovation means encouraging its academic community to challenge the status quo with new solutions and to apply new ways of thinking that transform the world. As one of the world's most diverse and urban universities, it also recognizes that innovation depends on diversity of experience and thought.

Innovation at Ryerson is fed by robust programs, SRC activity and experiential learning. Students, faculty and staff discover, create and explore new ideas in more than 100 labs, institutes and research centres. They collaborate with a growing number of Canadian and international partners, and undertake responsive research which meets the needs of society. The result is a community that tackles pressing issues, develops new solutions, technologies and products, and launches social, cultural, civic and commercial ventures. Ryerson's leadership and commitment to social innovation and entrepreneurship was recognized when it was named the Ashoka Foundation's first Canadian "Changemaker Campus."

Through its programs and zone learning – a pioneering approach to experiential learning that is transforming entrepreneurial education in Canada – Ryerson is shaping the next generation of change-makers and advocacy leaders, innovators and entrepreneurs. Zone learning builds on the success of the Digital Media Zone (DMZ), one of Canada's largest communities of startups, and the Innovation Centre for Urban Energy (i-CUE) which is the country's first business incubator and accelerator devoted solely to urban energy. Since its inception in 2010, the DMZ has helped young entrepreneurs create over 100 companies and 900 jobs.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

This enterprising spirit is also evident inside the university. The Ryerson community is encouraged to test ideas, think creatively and work across units to ensure that structures, systems, processes and policies remain flexible, nimble and responsive as the needs of the university change.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Taking Ryerson Forward

With Mind and Skill

Ryerson University motto: “Mente et Artificio”

Ryerson’s Mission

Ryerson’s distinctive core mission – to serve societal need by providing career-related and professional education, and scholarly, creative and research activities – responds to the demand for highly skilled, creative and critical thinkers who can frame increasingly interconnected, complex problems and determine effective solutions. It conveys the responsibility to serve as well as anticipate and respond to societal need by seeking and defining new opportunities to make the world better.

Ryerson’s diverse learning community drives new lines of inquiry to foster responsive and robust research, innovation, scholarly and creative endeavours. The university brings to life its motto, “With Mind and Skill.” The foundational knowledge of a discipline is combined with real-world experiential learning experiences and life skills such as critical thinking, creativity and the self-confidence to take calculated risks. Cross-cultural competence and a deep appreciation of the linguistic and cultural diversity of the campus and the city help students to become responsible and engaged global citizens. Students are not only prepared for future careers and professions but are empowered to drive change in existing organizations, launch new companies, social or civic ventures, and create jobs.

Ryerson’s mission statement has guided the university’s development for the past 20 years:

“The special mission of Ryerson University is the advancement of applied knowledge and research to address societal need, and the provision of programs of study that provide a balance between theory and application and that prepare students for careers in professional and quasi-professional fields. As a leading centre for applied education, Ryerson is recognized for the excellence of its teaching, the relevance of its curriculum, the success of its students in achieving their academic and career objectives, the quality of its scholarship, research and creative activity and its commitment to accessibility, lifelong learning, and involvement in the broader community.” (Ryerson University Mission Statement, 1994)¹

¹ The mission statement is derived from the Objects of the University as outlined in the Ryerson University Act: 1) The advancement of learning, and the intellectual, social, moral, cultural, spiritual, and physical development of the University’s students and employees, and the betterment of society. 2) The advancement of applied knowledge and research in response to existing and emerging societal need and in support of the cultural, economic, social, and technological development of Ontario. 3) The provision of programs of study that provide a balance between theory and application and that prepare students for careers in professional and quasi-professional fields.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Ryerson's Vision

Ryerson will be Canada's leading comprehensive innovation university, recognized for its high-quality career-related and professional bachelor, master's and doctoral programs and relevant scholarly, research and creative activities. It will be a global leader in interdisciplinary, entrepreneurial zone learning. Ryerson's students, graduates and faculty will contribute significantly to Ontario's and Canada's social, cultural and economic well-being.

Ryerson will provide students with the best learning experience, leading to great careers and engaged graduates who enable change. The university, through the sustained work of faculty and staff, is continuing on a transformative path to meet the changing needs of students and helping to shape Canada's future generation of change-makers and advocacy leaders, innovators and entrepreneurs. As the next step in its evolution, Ryerson will enhance and expand its strong foundation of distinctive programs and SRC activities. It will continue to cultivate leadership in new approaches to teaching and learning. The university will continue to foster innovation and entrepreneurship through zone learning and partnerships with public, private and not-for-profit organizations, attracting the brightest and most ambitious innovators from around the world.

As a city builder, Ryerson will extend its community engagement. The university will draw new opportunities and global connections to the Greater Toronto Area that encourage social and cultural innovation and economic development. Ryerson will promote inclusion through clear pathways for transfer students, access and outreach initiatives and support for members of under-represented groups, and grow continuing education offerings on-campus and online.

Throughout its history, Ryerson has challenged conventional approaches to post-secondary education. Innovative thinking – rooted in Ryerson's culture and infused in the community's values – is central to this vision.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Guided by Values

In the pursuit of knowledge, therein you will find life.

Simoogit Ax̱diiwilluugooda, Nisga'a Nation
Translation Dr. Bert McKay

The values that follow illustrate Ryerson's commitment to creating an open and accessible environment that is vibrant, inclusive and representative of an institution of excellence. Each of these values is important in its own right and together they serve as the foundation of the academic plan's aspirations and priorities.

Commitment to Excellence

Excellence: The university strives for the highest standards in its programs, teaching and learning, SRC activity, administration and governance.

Academic Freedom: The university embraces unequivocally freedom of thought and expression in support of teaching, learning and SRC activity within a culture of mutual respect.

Integrity: The university expects students, faculty and staff to act in accord with the highest standards of conduct. The university strives to always manifest transparency, fairness and accountability in its processes of decision-making, administration and governance.

Enterprising: The university champions innovation and entrepreneurship, and empowers its students, faculty and staff to think creatively, take initiative and demonstrate resourcefulness.

Sustainability: The university takes responsibility for a shared future with the broader community, and aims to pursue environmental, social and economic sustainability through its programs, SRC activity, policies, built environment, and fiscally sound operations.

Commitment to the Whole Person

People First: The university is committed to the success of its students, faculty and staff by creating a safe, secure and healthy environment that puts people first, is supportive of the whole person and enhances the development of physical, mental and spiritual well-being.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Collegiality: The university fosters a collegial environment and collegial institutions where students, faculty and staff work in collaborative ways to support the university's shared mission.

Lifelong Learning: The university encourages learning as a lifelong activity through accessible, responsive and comprehensive continuing education, and professional development and learning opportunities for students, faculty and staff.

Commitment to Community and Inclusion

Community: The university sustains its commitment to ensuring a strong sense of belonging and engagement for students, alumni, faculty and staff, and values mutual and reciprocal relationships with the broader community.

Inclusion: The university values the equitable, intentional and ongoing engagement of diversity within every facet of university life. It is the shared responsibility of all community members to foster a welcoming, supportive and respectful learning, teaching, research and work environment.

Equity: The university values the fair and just treatment of all community members through the creation of opportunities and the removal of barriers to address historic and current disadvantages for under-represented and marginalized groups.

Diversity: The university values and respects diversity of knowledge, worldviews and experiences that come from membership in different groups, and the contribution that diversity makes to the learning, teaching, research and work environment.

Respect for Aboriginal Perspectives: The university will continue to cultivate and develop relationships with Aboriginal communities, both within and outside the university. The campus environment will embrace and support Aboriginal learners, faculty and staff, and ensure Aboriginal people take a leading role in the advancement of Aboriginal education at Ryerson.

Access: The university is committed to providing access to education and employment opportunities at Ryerson for students, faculty and staff of all backgrounds, in particular those from marginalized and under-represented groups.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Priorities

Over the next five years, Ryerson will pursue its vision to be Canada's leading comprehensive innovation university by focusing on four interconnected priorities:

PRIORITY ONE

Enable Greater Student Engagement and Success through Exceptional Experiences

Students are Ryerson's top priority, and are attracted by high-quality programs and learning opportunities that extend beyond the classroom. Ryerson will provide students with exceptional experiences and opportunities – inside and outside their programs and classes, locally and globally – to prepare them with the necessary skills to build thriving careers in today's knowledge economy.

This priority envisions a rich learning environment – intellectual, cultural, social, technological and physical – where students are inspired and fully engaged, supported and encouraged to take advantage of diverse curricular and co-curricular opportunities. Faculty and staff work collaboratively to provide graduates with strong intellectual foundations, as well as transferable skills needed to succeed in careers, become responsible global citizens and enable positive change. They recognize that learning occurs through interactions with diverse faculty, industry practitioners, peers and organizations in the community, and through experiential learning and research opportunities. Active participation in a vibrant and inclusive campus life also builds a stronger sense of community for all students.

This priority stems from a shared responsibility for excellence in every aspect of Ryerson's learning environment so that all students – including undergraduate and graduate, Aboriginal, first generation, international, adult learners and students with disabilities – can experience broad intellectual and personal growth during their academic careers, have access to the supports and services they need to succeed, and participate in an equitable and inclusive environment.

Ryerson will continue fostering program and teaching excellence and offer greater interdisciplinary opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students. The university will continue enhancing education by expanding experiential learning opportunities. Recognizing that many instructors already use technology in the classroom, the university will strategically develop opportunities to increase the use of best practices in e-learning in a greater number of programs and courses.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

By offering exceptional experiences and opportunities, Ryerson will make its unique approach to education a distinct advantage for undergraduate, graduate and continuing education students.

PRIORITY TWO

Increase SRC Excellence, Intensity and Impact

Excellence in scholarly, research and creative activity has been fundamental to Ryerson's evolution as a comprehensive innovation university. Its SRC agenda is gaining momentum and is broadly recognized for its value and contributions to community, industry and society. Ryerson will continue to build a culture that fosters inquiry, discovery, knowledge and creative works. This commitment will support Ryerson's strong forward trajectory in research growth, further raise its reputation for high-quality research and creative endeavours, and drive innovation across sectors – all the while recognizing and celebrating the distinctive SRC strengths of its programs and faculties across disciplines.

Ryerson aspires to become one of Canada's top 10 non-medical research universities in terms of research funding, and a leader in applied SRC in collaboration with community, industry and government partners. It has led the province in research funding growth in recent years. To continue moving its SRC enterprise forward, the university aims to engage a greater number of undergraduate and graduate students and faculty members in collaborative and interdisciplinary pursuits. Attention will be placed on attracting strong researchers, external funding and partners that will support increased activity and quality. Integral to the long-term success and sustainability of a robust SRC culture are graduate programs. Ryerson will foster excellence in graduate studies in order to effectively attract and retain high-quality students and realize continued progress in its scholarly, research and creative endeavours.

Ryerson has a compelling and unique research and innovation story to share within the university and externally that speaks to its unique capabilities. This includes SRC activity targeted at tangible impacts on prosperity, culture and social development through relationships with community and industry. It includes a pronounced emphasis on creative activity. Ryerson will celebrate and communicate its SRC strengths and achievements in order to attract additional research opportunities and talent, and build recognition of the link between significant SRC pursuits and Ryerson's rising prominence as a distinguished institution.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

PRIORITY THREE

Foster an Innovation Ecosystem

Ryerson's vision is to be recognized as Canada's leading comprehensive innovation university. Ryerson will foster an environment conducive to innovation: where it can flourish on a larger scale across the university while involving more people and partners.

Inspired by its mission, Ryerson defines innovation broadly – encouraging its academic community to challenge the status quo with new solutions and to apply new ways of thinking to transform the world.

Ryerson recognizes that there are many kinds of innovators. Some people innovate for commercial reasons; others advocate new thinking and approaches designed to create positive social change; some do both. The definition above encompasses creative, cultural and social innovations that can enrich the fabric of society and improve quality of life, as well as innovations that create new companies, products and jobs, produce novel social and civic ventures, and drive change in existing organizations.

Ryerson will nurture an environment that instils creative and entrepreneurial thinking across disciplines, and supports more students, faculty and staff to become innovators who can make a positive difference. It will strive to stimulate innovation through the education, research and learning opportunities offered to students; through strengthened interdisciplinary connections; through increased partnerships with like-minded organizations; and through the university's strong commitment to continue building a robust SRC culture.

Ryerson trusts students to learn, and is adding a self-motivated entrepreneurial dimension to post-secondary education through zone learning. Ryerson has already expanded its multidisciplinary zone learning to include urban energy, fashion, design fabrication and transmedia, and will look for more opportunities to engage students in pursuing entrepreneurial pathways for their ideas in close collaboration with their peers, faculty mentors, and industry and community partners. Ryerson will also look for opportunities to expand zones on campus, regionally and in select locations outside Canada.

By fostering a stimulating environment, Ryerson will become a leading institution for innovation whose students, graduates and faculty have a positive and meaningful

DRAFT_May.22.2014

impact on the social, environmental and economic vitality of Toronto, Ontario and beyond.

PRIORITY FOUR

Expand Community Engagement and City Building

Community engagement is a hallmark of Ryerson's approach to its programs, experiential learning and SRC activities. It allows Ryerson to work with and benefit those around it, opens avenues for creating positive change in the community, and contributes to Ryerson's reputation as a city-building university. It also underpins the university's internal culture. Ryerson's diverse community is its most important asset and new ways to foster collaboration, inclusion and positive interactions across the university will be pursued.

This priority focuses on strengthening engagement in ways that move the university and the city forward together. It will expand connections to community, government, and industry organizations to create greater opportunities for academic and SRC interaction and collaboration, student engagement and international reach and influence. Ryerson will be a leader in the university sector with city-building efforts that have a positive local and regional impact.

Community engagement also impacts upon philanthropy. A strong sense of community and shared belonging among students, faculty, staff, alumni and the broader public is key in the impetus to give back. Through collaborative efforts, Ryerson will endeavour to build a stronger culture of philanthropy to help realize the vision of the academic plan. The university community will reach out to alumni, individuals and external organizations with meaningful opportunities for involvement that can contribute to building a common sense of purpose and commitment to the university's future.

Ryerson has many opportunities to augment both the level of local engagement and its influence as a city builder. Expanding external engagement will bring new opportunities to the university, increase the reciprocal benefits in the community, and strengthen connections with distinct groups, such as Aboriginal communities. Ryerson is revitalizing its campus and surrounding neighbourhood and is recognized as a leading institution that takes pride and ownership in its city's advancement. While continuing to realize the vision of its Master Plan, Ryerson is explicitly expanding the notion of city building to include its community of scholars, innovators, and creative practitioners who participate in civic issues and contribute their intellectual capital to the cultural and social well-being, and economic vitality of the city, province and country.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

While the mutual benefits of local engagement are many, Ryerson is also aware of its responsibilities as a global citizen. Ryerson has a highly diverse community of students, faculty, staff and alumni with meaningful connections to countries around the world. Combining the strength of its diversity with its strong history of external engagement, Ryerson can establish greater international reach and influence by partnering with like-minded organizations and establishing joint programs with international institutions. Increasing global connections will expand Ryerson's international focus, create new opportunities for students and faculty, and allow Ryerson to bring new talent to its programs and the GTA.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Strategies

The following strategies provide a framework to pursue the plan's four priorities. They are deliberately expressed at a macro level to give ample opportunity for the university's faculties, schools, departments and other units to interpret and activate the strategies locally. Implementing individual strategies can achieve more than one priority; a matrix is provided, starting on page 29, to illustrate this.

At both the local and macro levels, it is assumed that the strategies will be pursued by linking academic goals and priorities to resource allocations that are fiscally sustainable and aligned to the university's priorities. Over the five-year life of the plan there will be opportunities to modify directions and expectations. The capacity to pursue these strategies will depend on available budgets.

WORKING TOGETHER

Ryerson's talented faculty and staff will continue to work together to achieve the priorities of the academic plan and the university. All academic and functional units across the university play important roles in moving the university forward. Diverse teams of students, faculty and staff strengthen the academic environment and contribute to a more inclusive community. Diversity also helps students, faculty and staff develop cross-cultural competencies that enable professional success and responsible citizenship. Ryerson encourages a common purpose, bringing together disparate ideas and capabilities that invigorate the university as a whole.

Ryerson's vision of being a leading innovation university extends to how its faculty and staff think, act and get things done. The university will continue cultivating a collegial environment that takes advantage of the enterprising ideas of experienced faculty and staff to increase teaching, learning, SRC and operational excellence. Experimentation and collaboration among diverse teams will be encouraged to ensure that structures, systems, processes and services remain flexible, nimble and responsive as the needs of the university change. Potential enhancements and modernizations to the university's IT assets, digital communication channels and enterprise platforms will be evaluated, taking into account Ryerson's reputation for strong digital, design and technology capabilities.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

The university will also consider how existing space might be better used and shared. When future opportunities are presented to build or update facilities, consideration should be given to developing spaces that reflect the principles of the Master Plan, encourage collaboration and foster cross-disciplinary interactions to spark creativity and innovation.

STRATEGIES

- 1. Attract and retain high-quality faculty and staff with diverse backgrounds.**
 - 2. Assess administrative structures, processes and services to ensure ongoing effectiveness of university assets, support for academic programming and SRC activity, and enhanced space utilization.**
-

EXCEPTIONAL EXPERIENCES

Ryerson will foster even greater student engagement and success by offering exceptional experiences inside and outside the classroom.

Ryerson is committed to helping students succeed and invests significant resources in building a supportive learning environment.

The university will continue to strengthen and nurture existing programs, ensuring above all else, that they remain high quality and current. Program revisions will be made more flexible to respond to external developments in professions, industries and scholarly fields. It will also explore new program possibilities including professional master's degrees which respond to student and societal demand in such areas as health and law.

Student recruitment and retention, flexible course scheduling, and access and transfer pathways remain important considerations in creating exceptional learning experiences. Through the ongoing Curriculum Renewal Initiative, Ryerson will give students greater choice to suit their career goals. The university will also emphasize curriculum innovation and will do more to support the delivery of interdisciplinary programs and SRC activity, minimizing the structural barriers that inhibit them.

Students will continue to acquire strong foundational knowledge and practical skills within their disciplines and through experiential learning opportunities. The university will provide undergraduate and graduate students with increased opportunities to develop

DRAFT_May.22.2014

broad transferrable knowledge and competencies, including hard and soft skills, which enable successful career building and transitioning. Ryerson's zone learning – a key driver in the university's innovation ecosystem – will give students dedicated support and spaces for taking their ideas to the next level, and encourage entrepreneurial thinking. All students regardless of career ambitions stand to benefit from zone learning. It teaches critical life skills such as the ability to take smart, calculated risks and the resiliency to learn from mistakes.

Active student engagement and a welcoming, vibrant university life can make a tremendous difference to students' learning. The university will offer expanded co-curricular activities, intramural and recreation programs; encourage involvement in and collaboration between student organizations and clubs, competitions at the national and international levels, and other activities led by students and staff; create shared spaces where students will want to spend time with their peers; and offer a nationally recognized program of varsity athletics.

Ryerson is experiencing increasing demand for services that aid students to complete their studies, including support for mental well-being. Ryerson will make strong efforts to offer the right level and type of support for all students.

STRATEGIES

- 3. Continue the ongoing evolution of Ryerson's high-quality curriculum, so that programming and its delivery remain innovative and responsive to students. Courses will be made more accessible, students will be given more choice and transferability will be enhanced.**
- 4. Foster greater interdisciplinary SRC activity, curriculum and programs – including the continued evolution of the curriculum model – giving consideration to development, delivery, administration, support and related policies.**
- 5. Evolve and expand experiential learning opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students.**
- 6. Offer services, supports, spaces and improved engagement opportunities that enable student success at all levels, encourage high retention, and facilitate the timely completion of students' academic goals.**

DRAFT_May.22.2014

ACCESS

Ryerson will continue to provide access to post-secondary education and support for adult learners and under-represented groups.

Supporting access to education and lifelong learning is part of Ryerson's mission and reflects its commitment to serve society. The university will continue to make opportunities available to those desiring to change careers, pursue advanced training, and build brighter futures through education. Access to education is delivered through The G. Raymond Chang School for Continuing Education, which offers many of its courses through distance education, and through programs and initiatives that bridge gaps to university education for members of under-represented groups. Initiatives to ease transitions for students transferring to or from Ryerson will also be supported.

STRATEGIES

- 7. Develop access and program initiatives to support under-represented groups, including Aboriginal students, first generation students, students with disabilities and internationally educated professionals.**
 - 8. Encourage partnership between academic departments and The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education to support growth in continuing education through on-campus and distance offerings.**
 - 9. Enhance pathways and transition support for students transferring from other post-secondary institutions, and provide appropriate transfer credit for students' prior learning.**
-

TEACHING AND LEARNING

Ryerson will continue to distinguish itself through teaching and learning excellence.

The university already offers a robust learning and teaching program and popular teaching workshops to help faculty members, instructors and teaching assistants develop their teaching skills and better achieve learning outcomes. The university will support faculty in the use of new technologies, and develop best practices for high-quality distance education and hybrid learning as part of a blended learning strategy.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Consideration will also be given, in learning and teaching programs, of how best to support faculty members' development to meet students' changing needs and expectations, to provide an inclusive learning environment and to contribute to students' experiences inside and outside the classroom. Interactions with faculty translate into valuable learning experiences and build relationships that establish a solid foundation for success in upper-years, create engaged alumni and support retention.

The university recognizes that research and external connections to community and industry are drivers in teaching and learning excellence. Stronger linkages between the teaching and research enterprises will engage undergraduate and graduate students and support greater SRC intensity, benefitting the university as a whole. Faculty members will also be encouraged to continue to cultivate and expand external connections in support of Ryerson's educational and SRC mandate.

Ryerson's library plays a foundational role in connecting students, faculty and staff from across disciplines, and has long been a partner in student success and engagement, knowledge creation and dissemination, and technology-enhanced learning. The Student Learning Centre will provide the library with new spaces and modalities for collaboration with academic partners to deliver innovative services that encourage productive multidisciplinary interactions, and intensify students' out-of-class learning experiences.

STRATEGIES

- 10. Recognize high-quality teaching and provide opportunities for faculty, instructors, and teaching and graduate assistants to continually develop their teaching practices and skills, and encourage the use of new and diverse learning and teaching methods.**
 - 11. Develop a university-wide blended e-learning strategy, which incorporates the principles of inclusive design and accessibility, in order to expand technology-enhanced and high-quality online offerings.**
 - 12. Encourage faculty to increasingly incorporate SRC activity into classroom learning, and to provide greater opportunities for undergraduate and graduate student involvement with research.**
 - 13. Enhance the Library's role as a provider of exceptional learning spaces, quality digital and physical collections, and innovative services for teaching, learning, research and collaboration.**
-

DRAFT_May.22.2014

GRADUATE EDUCATION

Ryerson will continue to strengthen graduate education. In addition to the student-oriented strategies discussed above, which apply to graduate students as well as undergraduates, the strategies described in this section are specifically designed to support the continued development, administration and delivery of graduate education, and enable the strategic expansion of master's and PhD programs to meet demand for highly qualified personnel in the private, public and not-for-profit sectors. There is recognition that graduate education needs coordinated structures and a funding model that better support its delivery.

Graduate students are enriched by their programs. They develop essential research and professional skills, play an integral and vital role in faculty SRC activities and, in turn, receive mentoring, supervision, training and support. As such, stronger linkages between graduate education and research are central to the long-term success and sustainability of a robust SRC culture at Ryerson.

STRATEGIES

- 14. Attract top graduate students by developing a strategic approach to domestic and international recruitment, and fostering excellence in graduate student supervision.**
 - 15. Strengthen graduate education by introducing a new funding allocation mechanism, identifying ways to improve the administration and delivery of graduate education, and implementing policies that support program quality and timely program completion.**
 - 16. Continue master's and doctoral program development subject to appropriate government funding.**
-

SRC ACTIVITIES

Ryerson will increase the excellence, intensity and impact of its SRC activities. Ryerson's SRC activity continues to gain momentum. External funding doubled between 2008 and 2013 and Ryerson's share of increasingly competitive Tri-Council funding continues to grow. Meanwhile, the research landscape is changing.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

With increased attention being paid to Canada's "innovation gap," the focus on demonstrating the impact and relevance of university-based research is intensifying. External funding is shifting toward collaborative projects and moving away from traditional Tri-Council sources. As a result, the internal administrative structures needed to support SRC activity are changing.

Sustaining the university's research trajectory will require increased research intensity across all disciplines. To increase intensity and advance excellence, the university will offer support to researchers at every stage of the process that takes into account the changing funding landscape.

Strengthening institutional supports for SRC activity and ingraining its importance in Ryerson's culture at all levels is essential to the next stage of the university's evolution. As such, the university will endeavour to streamline administrative structures, processes and resources. Recruiting efforts will focus on the strategic hiring of research-intensive faculty and, as noted in the section on graduate education, efforts will be made to attract additional high-quality graduate students who will broadly contribute to and support Ryerson's growing SRC activity.

To achieve excellence, intensity and impact, the university will strengthen collaboration across the university and with partners on cross-disciplinary themes, including:

- > Digital Media and Technology
- > Energy and Sustainability
- > Health and Well-being
- > Technological and Industrial Innovation
- > City Building and Social Justice
- > Design, Culture, and Creative Industries
- > Management, Entrepreneurship and Competitiveness
- > Teaching and Learning for the New Economy

Ryerson also aims to become a leader in applied SRC activities in collaboration with private- and public-sector partners. To this end, the university will pursue increased external funding and the continued development of collaborations with leading institutions domestically and internationally.

The success of Ryerson's SRC agenda will improve its performance against standard research metrics such as publication and citation measures, strengthen its reputation, attract additional research opportunities and talent, and perpetuate a culture of

DRAFT_May.22.2014

rigorous SRC activity. The university will work to better disseminate its research and creative successes and promote its contributions to society.

STRATEGIES

- 17. Increase SRC quality, participation and funding by providing a range of supports suited to researchers at every stage of the research process and throughout their careers.**
- 18. Streamline administrative structures, processes and resources to strengthen Ryerson's research culture.**
- 19. Expand SRC partnerships and sponsored research with industry, government and community organizations as well as other academic institutions, locally, nationally and internationally to drive innovation and to increase socio-economic impacts.**
- 20. Strengthen collaboration across the university and with partners on cross-disciplinary themes by leveraging expertise across disciplines to expand commercialization, knowledge translation and mobilization capacity of researchers and the university.**
- 21. Support increased research dissemination through traditional and non-traditional channels, and publicize the SRC achievements of Ryerson faculty and students to further build reputation and attract high quality students, faculty and partners.**

INNOVATION INITIATIVES

Ryerson will build an innovation ecosystem where students, faculty and staff can connect with each other and with external partners to learn how to transform their ideas into practical innovations. This includes civic, cultural or social innovations that enrich the fabric of society and improve quality of life, as well as innovations that create new jobs and drive change.

Innovation at Ryerson is fed by academic programs and SRC activity, more than 100 labs, institutes and research centres, and its pioneering zone learning model, which is

DRAFT_May.22.2014

helping students to become innovators, entrepreneurs and creative problem solvers. The university will look for opportunities to increase the synergy among these elements in ways that accelerate change, involve more stakeholders, and attract leading community, industry and government partners.

Multidisciplinary zones will continue to be developed, with opportunities for students and faculty to work with entrepreneurs in residence, visiting fellows, industry partners and practitioners (including alumni). Zone learning's ongoing integration into programs through the optional specialization will allow students from a wide range of disciplines to participate. The university will also seek to expand zone learning opportunities, and other innovative and entrepreneurial activities locally, nationally and internationally.

STRATEGIES

- 22. Implement financially-sustainable mechanisms and initiatives to leverage and coordinate entrepreneurship and innovation-building activities across the university, and provide structures, frameworks and collaborative spaces to permit and support multidisciplinary participation.**
- 23. Support and encourage entrepreneurship and innovation across a greater number of disciplines through new initiatives that will complement the curriculum.**
- 24. Develop and expand Ryerson's experiential zone learning concept in a manner that encourages the participation of students and faculty from a greater number of disciplines.**

PARTNERSHIPS, COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CITY BUILDING

Ryerson will seek expanded connections with external organizations and communities, enriching the university and enhancing the cultural and social well-being, and economic vitality of Toronto and beyond. The strategies below are intentionally broad to account for the wide-ranging benefits of community engagement.

Culture of Philanthropy

Increased philanthropy is essential to the university's ability to realize its ambitions. Donor support enhances the teaching and learning agenda and faculty research, builds and improves campus infrastructure, provides financial assistance to students, and

DRAFT_May.22.2014

helps to build a strong varsity athletics program. Ryerson will work to foster a culture of philanthropy by expanding connections with alumni, individuals and external organizations, and involving them in the life of the university.

Alumni are the university's greatest accomplishment and act as ambassadors, mentors, and representatives in the community. The process of building loyal and engaged alumni begins with exceptional student experiences and connections with programs, faculty and campus life. Ryerson's students become graduates and alumni who are committed to the university and its success, and contribute to the university's reputation.

Local engagement and city building

Ryerson will expand its external engagement, including with Aboriginal communities, and develop a university-wide strategic community engagement and communications plan that values equity, diversity and inclusion; is based on collaborative and mutually beneficial interactions; leverages current engagement activity; and builds a more visible presence for Ryerson in particular communities. This will allow the university community to better contribute its knowledge, advocate for positive social change and help to develop new opportunities for the city.

The university will reach out to the community in the GTA and beyond to develop more extensive relationships with schools, community organizations, industry and employers resulting in enhanced opportunities for interaction, collaboration and mentoring in programs and SRC activities. Ryerson's downtown location is within easy reach of major institutions, industries, government, and community agencies. This will allow the university to build more extensive academic and SRC relationships, and to bring Toronto's leaders into its classrooms and forums.

Students, faculty and staff will be encouraged to participate in community, civic and volunteer activities to expand Ryerson's positive influence and impact on civic issues.

International outreach and engagement

By serving as an academic partner to diverse organizations around the world, Ryerson can build its reputation as an organization that attracts new talent, connections and opportunities the GTA through its academic programs, SRC activity and innovation initiatives. International partnerships with academic institutions and organizations also enable students and faculty to study and work abroad, deepening cross-cultural awareness and fostering global perspectives.

Through distance education and other innovative initiatives, Ryerson will reach out strategically to emerging markets and developing societies where students and faculty

DRAFT_May.22.2014

collaborate with their peers in devising solutions for global challenges. The transition to a more global perspective can be assisted by technologies that bring international experts and issues into classrooms and labs, and through partnerships with like-minded institutions around the world.

STRATEGIES

- 25. Foster a culture of philanthropy through all of the university's constituent communities, and seek increased engagement with donors to support and realize the university's priorities.**
 - 26. Create transitional pathways leading current students to become engaged alumni who can remain involved in the university after graduation.**
 - 27. Cultivate relationships with Aboriginal communities and students to create an educational environment that embraces and supports Aboriginal perspectives and experiences, and builds community for Aboriginal people.**
 - 28. Develop a university-wide community engagement and communications strategy that values equity, diversity and inclusion; leverages current engagement activity; and builds a more visible Ryerson presence in particular communities.**
 - 29. Expand engagement with local, national and international external organizations to enrich student experiences and inclusion, increase civic engagement, and create valuable academic, research and innovation opportunities that contribute to Ryerson's profile and impact as a city-building university.**
-

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Measuring Success

To support the launch and ongoing implementation of the academic plan, the University Planning Office will develop metrics and performance indicators to help the university and individual units measure their progress in meeting the plan's strategic priorities.

The indicators and metrics chosen will provide the flexibility to evolve over the life of the plan. They will be shared with the community in a companion document. There will be an annual update on the progress of the plan, including high-level reports to the Senate and Board of Governors, which will require each unit to assess how successful they have been in meeting the university's and their own strategic priorities. The University Planning Office will support faculties, departments and schools, and other units in the development of their individual plans and will develop the tools and timelines for reporting on individual unit plans.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Integrated Planning in Action

The university leadership commits itself to an environment of integrated planning that coordinates advancement efforts, strategic research priorities, space allocation and building programs, human resources, and financial and other services in support of Ryerson's academic mission. The strategies in the plan establish a general framework from which individual academic and administrative units build their own strategic or academic plans. It establishes parameters for the many complementary planning exercises as well as those decision-making and priority-setting exercises that are essential in successful contemporary universities such as Ryerson.

Next steps

All academic and administrative units will prepare or renew individual plans that support the university's future direction set out in the academic plan. Units set goals and objectives for their respective areas and act on strategies contained in the academic plan that are relevant to them. Faculty and unit plans view the academic plan through the lens of local norms, culture and aspirations, take into account developmental plans that are part of the periodic program review process, and include strategic investment requests needed to implement new initiatives. The University Planning Office will develop tools and timelines for developing individual academic plans.

DRAFT_May.22.2014

A Passionate and Engaged Community

This is a true community plan. The extensive consultation process undertaken in developing the plan and the high level of engagement are a testament to the passion and dedication of Ryerson's academic community and the university's forward trajectory.

Consultation participants included students, faculty, staff, alumni, and members of Senate and the Board of Governors, as well as external industry and community partners. A community consultation blog was launched to facilitate online discussions and, for each phase of consultation, a discussion paper was developed and shared widely.

Phase One: Consultations on Future Directions

- > October – December 2013
- > 40 meetings
- > 3 community-wide town halls
- > 20 written submissions received
- > 870 participants

Phase Two: Consultations on Proposed Priorities and Strategies

- > February – March 2014
- > 20 meetings
- > 3 community-wide town halls
- > 30 written submissions received
- > 800 participants

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Provost's Academic Plan Advisory Group

At the outset of the consultation process, the provost formed an advisory group of select faculty members and staff to provide additional forward-thinking insight. Members are recognized below for their outstanding contributions to the plan's development.

Martin Antony

Chair, Department of Psychology

Andrew Hunter

Chair, Department of Philosophy

John Austin

Executive Director, Student Affairs

Michael Kolios

Associate Dean, Faculty of Science

Lisa Barnoff

Director, School of Social Work

Lynn Lavallée

Associate Director, School of Social Work

Randy Boyagoda

Director, Zone Learning

Ali Lohi

Professor, Department of Chemical Engineering

David Checkland

Professor, Department of Philosophy

Jennifer MacInnis

Legal Counsel and Senior Director, Applied Research and Commercialization

Christopher De Sousa

Director, School of Urban and Regional Planning

Kelly MacKay

Professor, School of Hospitality and Tourism Management

Chris Evans

Vice-Provost, Academic

Ana Pejović-Milić

Chair, Department of Physics

John Enright

Interim Associate Dean, Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science

Neil Thomlinson

Professor, Department of Politics and Public Administration

Charles Falzon

Chair, The RTA School of Media

David Valliere

Chair, Department of Entrepreneurship and Strategy

Cecile Farnum

Librarian

Paul Walsh

Professor, Department of Aerospace Engineering

Desmond Glynn

Senior Program Director, The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education

Murtaza Haider

Associate Dean, Ted Rogers School of Management

Nancy Walton

Director, E-Learning

Darrick Heyd

Associate Dean, Faculty of Science

Lois Weinthal

Chair, School of Interior Design

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Strategies Matrix

P1 > Enable Greater Student Engagement and Success through Exceptional Experiences

P2 > Increase SRC Excellence, Intensity and Impact

P3 > Foster an Innovation Ecosystem

P4 > Expand Community Engagement and City Building

Strategies	P1	P2	P3	P4
1. Attract and retain high-quality faculty and staff with diverse backgrounds.	X	X	X	X
2. Assess administrative structures, processes and services to ensure ongoing effectiveness of university assets, support for academic programming and SRC activity, and enhanced space utilization.	X	X	X	
3. Continue the ongoing evolution of Ryerson's high-quality curriculum, so that programming and its delivery remain innovative and responsive to students. Courses will be made more accessible, students will be given more choice, and transferability will be enhanced.	X		X	X
4. Foster greater interdisciplinary SRC activity, curriculum, programs – including the continued evolution of the curriculum model – giving consideration to development, delivery, administration, support and related policies.	X	X	X	
5. Evolve and expand experiential learning opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students.	X		X	X
6. Offer services, supports, spaces and improved engagement opportunities that enable student success at all levels, encourage high retention and facilitate the timely completion of students' academic goals.	X			
7. Develop access and program initiatives to support under-represented groups, including Aboriginal students, first generation students, students with disabilities and internationally educated professionals.	X			X
8. Encourage partnership between academic departments and The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education to support growth in continuing education through on-campus and distance offerings.	X			X
9. Enhance pathways and transition support for students transferring from other post-secondary institutions, and provide appropriate transfer credit for students' prior learning.	X			X
10. Recognize high-quality teaching and provide opportunities for faculty, instructors, and teaching and graduate assistants to continually develop their teaching practices and skills, and encourage the use of new and diverse learning and teaching methods.	X			
11. Develop a university-wide blended e-learning strategy, which incorporates the principles of inclusive design and accessibility, in order to expand technology-enhanced and high-quality online offerings.	X			X
12. Encourage faculty to increasingly incorporate SRC activity into classroom learning, and to provide greater opportunities for undergraduate and graduate student involvement with research.	X	X	X	

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Strategies	P1	P2	P3	P4
13. Enhance the Library's role as a provider of exceptional learning spaces, quality digital and print collections, and innovative services for teaching, learning, research and collaboration.	X	X	X	X
14. Attract top graduate students by developing a strategic approach to domestic and international recruitment, and fostering excellence in graduate student supervision.	X	X	X	
15. Strengthen graduate education by introducing a new funding allocation mechanism, identifying ways to improve the administration and delivery of graduate education, and implementing policies that support program quality and timely program completion.	X	X		
16. Continue master's and doctoral program development subject to appropriate government funding.	X	X		
17. Increase SRC quality, participation and funding by providing a range of supports suited to researchers at every stage of the research process and throughout their careers.	X	X	X	X
18. Streamline administrative structures, processes and resources to strengthen Ryerson's research culture.		X	X	X
19. Expand SRC partnerships and sponsored research with industry, government, and community organizations as well as other academic institutions, locally, nationally and internationally to drive innovation and increase socio-economic impacts.	X	X	X	X
20. Strengthen collaboration across the university and with partners on cross-disciplinary themes by leveraging expertise across disciplines to expand commercialization, knowledge translation and mobilization capacity of researchers and the university.		X	X	
21. Support increased research dissemination through traditional and non-traditional channels, and publicize the SRC achievements of Ryerson faculty and students to further build reputation and attract high quality students, faculty and partners.		X	X	X
22. Implement financially-sustainable mechanisms and initiatives to leverage and coordinate entrepreneurship and innovation building activities across the university, and provide structures, frameworks and collaborative spaces to permit and support multidisciplinary participation	X	X	X	
23. Support and encourage entrepreneurship and innovation across a greater number of disciplines through new initiatives that will complement the curriculum.	X		X	
24. Develop and expand Ryerson's experiential zone learning concept in a manner that encourages the participation of students and faculty from a greater number of disciplines.	X	X	X	
25. Foster a culture of philanthropy through all of the university's constituent communities, and seek increased engagement with donors to support and realize the university's priorities.	X	X	X	X
26. Create transitional pathways leading current students to become engaged alumni who can remain involved in the university after graduation.	X	X	X	X
27. Cultivate relationships with Aboriginal communities and students to create an educational environment that embraces and supports Aboriginal perspectives and experiences, and builds community for Aboriginal people.	X	X		X

DRAFT_May.22.2014

Strategies	P1	P2	P3	P4
28. Develop a university-wide community engagement and communications strategy that values equity, diversity and inclusion and leverages current engagement activity; and builds a more visible Ryerson presence in particular communities	X			X
29. Expand engagement with local, national and international external organizations to enrich student experiences and inclusion, increase civic engagement, and create valuable academic, research and innovation opportunities that contribute to Ryerson's profile and impact as a city-building university.	X	X	X	X



OFFICE OF THE VICE PROVOST ACADEMIC

From: Dr. David Checkland and Dr. Chris Evans, Co-chairs, Policy 60 Review Committee

To: Dr. John Turtle, Secretary of Senate

Re: Report on the activities of the Policy 60 review committee

Date: May 22, 2014

Dear Dr. Turtle,

At its October, 2013 meeting, Senate created a special committee to review and revise Policy 60, the *Student Code of Academic Conduct*.

The mandate of the Policy 60 Review Committee (the committee) is:

“To fully review Policy 60 in a process involving extensive consultation with the Ryerson community and during which the committee will be guided but not bound by ideas considered by the previous Provostial committee and included in the Framework approved in June 2012.”

The committee initiated its work in the fall of 2013. As of today's date, a total of 14 meetings have been held.

The committee submitted two interim reports to Senate, the first at the February, 2014 meeting and the second at the April, 2014 meeting.

The following documents are submitted as an update for Senate of the current status of the review and the committee's work to date.

Membership:

Co-chairs: David Checkland and Chris Evans.

Faculty Representatives: One faculty representative from each of the six Faculties, as well as one each from the Yeates School of Graduate Studies and the Chang School of Continuing Education as follows: Tara Burke (Arts), Linda Cooper (FCS), Suanne Kelman (FCAD), Jeffrey Yokota (FEAS), Noel George (Science), Chris MacDonald (TRSM), Anthony Bonato (YSGS), and Anne Marie Brinsmead

(Chang School).

Student Representatives: Two students from the RSU, one student from CESAR, and one graduate student as follows: Roshelle Lawrence¹ (RSU rep on Senate), an additional student rep nominated by the RSU (Melissa Palermo²), Shinae Kim³ (CESAR representative on Senate), and Pardis Noorzad⁴ (graduate student representative on Senate).

Resource Persons: Senate also approved the following resource persons to support the work of the committee: the Director of e-Learning (Nancy Walton); the Ombudsperson (Nora Farrell); the Secretary of Senate (John Turtle); the Director of the Academic Integrity Office (Giselle Basanta); the Academic Integrity Officer (Donna Bell); the Assistant Vice President/Vice Provost, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (Denise O’Neil Green); the CESAR Student Advocate; the RSU Student Issues and Advocacy Coordinator; an RFA representative (Peter Danziger).

Methodology:

The core methodology used has been to “compare and consult”. The overall policy was sub-divided into conceptual “blocks” upon which consensus had to be attained among committee members.

To inform and facilitate the consensus reaching process, resource persons prepared comparison charts for each conceptual block. These comparison documents summarized for the committee the ways in which other Ontario universities, as well as McGill University, address issues relevant to each conceptual block.

The conceptual blocks are:

- Introduction and purpose of the Policy
- Defining academic misconduct
- Penalties and consequences – in particular expanding the range of penalties at the lower end of severity

¹ Roshelle Lawrence was replaced by Jesse Root in May 2014, after new RSU executive took office.

² Melissa Palermo was replaced by Rajean Hoilett in May 2014, after new RSU executive took office.

³ Shinae Kim resigned from the Committee but CESAR did not propose a replacement.

⁴ Pardis Noorzad resigned from the Committee. Charles Sule was nominated as a replacement and approved by Senate at its January, 2014 meeting.

- Decision making and tracking – especially determining who should be the first decision maker
- Appeals*
- Graduate students – in particular issues around supervised research activities
- Revocation of a degree – as no process for this currently exists in the Policy
- Procedures under Policy 60*

The items flagged with an asterisk were not discussed during the meetings to date, except for procedures in the context of the two amendments before Senate on June 3, 2014.

In addition to this comparison approach, ideas were presented to the community and ideas were received from the community through a series of consultations.

Consultations:⁵

Two community town halls were held in November, 2013.

A consultation with Chairs/Deans/Directors was held on November 28, 2013.

A consultation was held with Academic Integrity Committee/Senate Appeals Committee panel chairs on December 3, 2013. Another was held with AIC/SAC members on December 4, 2013.

Two separate consultations were held with graduate program directors about academic misconduct in the context of supervised research activities.

In addition, an open invitation for email input was made at each session and a dedicated, confidential email address was created for this purpose.

Senate was invited to provide input at both the February and April 2014 Senate meetings.

The Report Document:

The working document attached as Appendix A presents to Senate, for its information, the current status of the concept blocks.

⁵ Throughout the entire lifespan of the committee confidential and dedicated email address for feedback and input has been in place. The address is policy60@ryerson.ca.

There is consensus at the committee level on each of these concepts as described in the document.

Please note that this document is not draft policy language – it presents conceptual structures for each block of the policy and blends policy principles/elements with procedural details. It also does not address appeals at all, nor does it provide procedures for all policy elements.

Some important changes in policy the Committee is likely to recommend (digested from the Report Document, below):

- 1) A wider range of penalties less severe than "zero" on an assignment in order to: a) allow for subtler "fit" between violation and penalty; b) encourage faculty to use the formal system more to allow for better tracking of multiple violators;
- 2) Creating an option for faculty now disinclined to pursue possible cases of academic misconduct to refer such cases to an academic Designated Decision Maker (DDM);
- 3) Modelling the recruitment and training of DDM's on the Research Ethics Board approach to share issues of workload and to increase institutional expertise;
- 4) Establishing the principle that there is always an educative role to be kept in mind in addressing both suspected violations and actual violations, as well as committing Ryerson to taking this role seriously;
- 5) Further clarifying and addressing issues specific to both graduate and undergraduate supervised research.

The Supplementary Data Report:

The supplementary data report, attached as Appendix B, summarizes academic misconduct cases filed with the Academic Integrity Office (AIO) and the Senate Office between September 1, 2012 and August 31, 2013.

The AIO and the Senate Office, at the request of the Policy 60 Review Committee, compiled the data. This report is being presented to Senate for its information as supplemental material to the report from the Policy 60 committee.

A Note of Gratitude:

At this point, we would like to express our deep appreciation of our fellow committee members – both voting members and resource persons – for their strong engagement with, and commitment to, the review of Policy 60. Policy 60 is a complex structure with profound ramifications for students and faculty alike, as well as for the reputation of Ryerson University and its programs. We still have a ways to go, but the progress to date has been due to the efforts of our outstanding committee colleagues. We would also like to thank those community members who took the time to attend our consultation sessions and/or write to us with their concerns, advice and supportive words.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Chris Evans', written in a cursive style.

Chris Evans

David Checkland

Co-chairs for the Policy 60 Review Committee

The Report Document

A Working Document re: Policy on Student Academic Conduct

This document is not a draft policy – it presents conceptual structures for each block of the policy and blends policy principles/elements with procedural details. It reflects the status of discussion at the committee level as of mid-May, 2014. There are topics in this document which are still “works in progress” and it should be read with these caveats in mind.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

1. Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity

This Policy is premised on the commitment of Ryerson University (the “University”) to foster and uphold the highest standards of *academic integrity*, the fundamental values of which are *honesty, fairness, respect, responsibility, trust, and trustworthiness*⁶. These values are central to the development and sharing of knowledge, and as such, all members of the Ryerson community, including faculty, students, graduate assistants, and staff, have a responsibility to adhere to and uphold them in their teaching, learning, evaluation, scholarly research and creative activity. This includes a responsibility to take action if they have reasonable grounds for thinking that academic misconduct has occurred.

2. The Purpose of the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy

The purpose of this Policy is to guide the Ryerson community in understanding: i) what academic integrity and misconduct are for students; ii) the processes the University will follow when there is a suspicion of student academic misconduct; and iii) the academic penalties and other consequences that may be imposed if students are found to have engaged in academic misconduct. This policy applies to all current and former Ryerson students (undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education), and applies to any academic activities whether on or off campus.

3. Educational Emphasis

One of the central values motivating this policy is that of education, and Ryerson recognizes it has a role in fostering academic integrity through providing students and faculty with information and learning opportunities about academic integrity and its nature and importance. Those involved in applying this policy are encouraged to keep this emphasis in mind at all stages of the process.

4. Fair Process

The University recognizes that it is a serious matter for students to be involved in an academic misconduct investigation, and is therefore committed to handling these matters in a respectful, timely and thoughtful manner. The University will apply the Policy in a non-adversarial,

⁶ *International Centre for Academic Integrity* (1999)

investigative manner that is consistent with the principles of natural justice, including the right to be heard, and the right to a timely and fair decision on the merits of each individual case. Within the decision-making processes associated with the implementation of this Policy, as well as any related Procedures (the *Procedures*), all decision-makers will make reasonable efforts to acquire all information needed to make a fair decision. The standard of proof that findings of misconduct are to be weighed against is the balance of probabilities.

5. Awareness of Academic Integrity

All members of the Ryerson community have a responsibility to inform themselves about academic integrity and misconduct, including the contents of this policy. Anyone with concerns or questions about academic integrity should feel free to consult with the Academic Integrity Office (AIO) or, in the case of students unsure about a particular matter, the appropriate instructor or academic supervisor. The Academic Integrity Office provides educational material and information about this policy for the use of faculty, staff and students.

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

1. Academic Misconduct and Professional Codes of Ethics/Practice

In some programs students may be required to abide by the standards of a professional code of ethics or practice as a condition of successful completion of a practicum or field placement. Students must be informed of any such requirement in advance. Where such codes substantively differ from or impose requirements at variance with this Policy, violations of such codes are not to be pursued under this policy. It is neither prudent nor possible for Ryerson to attempt to enforce the codes of external bodies.

2. Academic Misconduct

Behaviour that undermines the University's ability to evaluate fairly students' academic achievements, or any behaviour that a student knew, or ought to have known could gain them or others unearned academic advantage or benefit, counts as academic misconduct. While the following list of examples characterizes the most common instances of academic misconduct, it should not be seen as exhaustive.

a. Plagiarism – includes but is not limited to:

- i. claiming, submitting or presenting the words, ideas, artistry, drawings, images or data of another person, including information found on the Internet and unpublished materials, as if they are one's own, without appropriate referencing;
- ii. claiming, submitting or presenting someone else's work, ideas, concepts, opinions or theories as if they are one's own, without proper referencing;
- iii. claiming, submitting or presenting another's substantial compositional contributions, assistance, edits or changes to an assignment as one's own;
- iv. claiming, submitting or presenting collaborative work as if it were created solely by oneself or one's group;
- 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;
- vi. minimally paraphrasing someone else's work by changing only a few words and not citing

the original source.

b. Cheating - includes but is not limited to:

- i. Having ready access to aids or devices not expressly allowed by the instructor during an examination, test, quiz, or other evaluation.
- ii. copying another person's answer(s) on a test, exam, quiz, lab report, or other work to be evaluated;
- iii. copying another person's answers, with or without their permission, to individually assigned projects;
- iv. 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);
- v. improperly submitting an answer to a test or examination question completed, in whole or part, outside the examination room unless expressly permitted by the instructor;
- vi. resubmitting altered test or examination work after it has already been evaluated;
- vii. presenting falsified or fabricated material, including research results;
- viii. improperly obtaining, through deceit, theft, bribery, collusion or otherwise, access to examination paper(s) or set of questions, or other confidential information;
- ix. working collaboratively on work to be evaluated where such collaboration has been expressly forbidden by the instructor.

c. Misrepresentation of personal identity or performance - includes but is not limited to:

- 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, may be 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, transcripts or documents);
- iv. withholding or altering academic information, portfolios, essays, transcripts or documents, including in the admissions process;

d. Submission of false information - includes but is not limited to:

- i. submitting altered, forged or falsified medical or other certificate or document for academic consideration, or making false claims for such consideration, including in or as part of an academic appeal, or the academic misconduct process;
- ii. submitting false academic credentials to the University;
- iii. altering, in any way, official documents issued by the University;
- iv. submitting falsified letters of reference

e. Contributing to Academic Misconduct - includes but is not limited to:

- i. offering, giving or selling essays, tests, quizzes or other assignments where it is reasonable to expect that these will likely be subsequently used or submitted for credit;
- ii. allowing work to be copied during an examination, test or for other assignments;
- iii. offering, giving or selling questions and/answers to tests or exams;
- iv. unauthorized sharing of examination questions and/or answers.

f. Damaging, Tampering or Interfering with the Scholarly Environment - includes but is not limited to:[Note: Some types of damaging or tampering fall under the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct (Policy 61)].

- i. obstructing and/or disturbing the academic activities of others;
- ii. altering the academic work of others in order to gain academic advantage.
- iii. tampering with experiments or laboratory assignments;
- iv. altering or destroying artistic or creative works such as drawings or films;
- v. removing, altering, misusing or destroying University property to obstruct the work of others;
- vi. unauthorized access to, stealing, or tampering with, any course-related material;
- vii. unauthorized access to, or tampering with, library materials, including hiding them in a place where they will not readily be found by other members of the Ryerson community.

g. Copyright – Language is being developed in consultation with the Library.

h. Violations of Specific Departmental or Course Requirements

Instructors may, to ensure academic integrity, include additional specific requirements in their course outlines provided these are consistent with this policy. Departments may do the same in student handbooks, provided the additional requirements are consistent with this policy.

i. Academic Misconduct in Supervised Research Activities

- i) Graduate Research - Under development
- ii) Undergraduate Research – Under development

PENALTIES AND OTHER CONSEQUENCES

1. Assignment of Penalties

Once a decision maker has made a finding that academic misconduct has occurred, the decision maker will assign a penalty that is appropriate and reasonable, taking into consideration all of the particular and relevant circumstances of the individual case in accordance with the accompanying *Procedures* for this Policy. In conjunction with any penalty that may be imposed by the decision maker, students may also be assigned an educational remedy.

a) Penalties that may be *assigned* by a decision maker

- i. A decision maker may impose a grade reduction on any academic work as appropriate,
- ii. A decision maker may assign a mark of zero for any academic work as appropriate.
- iii. A decision maker may assign a grade of “F” in the course as appropriate.
- iv. A decision maker may remove a student from a co-op program option, placement, internship or practicum, either permanently or temporarily.

b) Penalties that may be *recommended* by a decision maker to a Panel

Decision makers may recommend the following penalties to a panel. A panel may assign the following penalties:

- i. **Disciplinary Suspension (DS)**
A decision may recommend to a panel a disciplinary suspension for a term not less than one semester, but not more than 2 academic years. A disciplinary suspension will be noted on the student's official transcript and will be purged from all student records in accordance with the *Procedures* made under this policy.
- ii. **Disciplinary Withdrawal (DW)**
A decision maker may recommend to a panel that the student be permanently withdrawn from his or her program. A disciplinary withdrawal will be permanently noted on the student's official transcript.
- iii. **Expulsion**
A decision maker may recommend to a panel of the Senate Appeals Committee that the student be expelled from the University. Expulsion from the University will be permanently noted on the student's official transcript.
- iv. **Revocation of a Degree, Diploma, or Certificate**
The Dean or Designate may recommend to a panel of the Senate Appeals Committee that a Degree, Diploma, or Certificate be revoked permanently.

2. Tracking Academic Misconduct

- i) All findings of academic misconduct under this policy will be tracked by placing a Disciplinary Notation (DN) on the student's academic record, not on the official transcript. A DN may be cited as relevant the purpose of *progressive discipline*, the principle that penalty ought generally to increase for repeat offences. (See "Assigning of Penalty/Consequences, below.)
- ii) A DN will be purged from a student's academic record in accordance with the *Procedures* made under this Policy.

3. Other Consequences

- i) A decision maker or a panel may require a student who has engaged in academic misconduct to replace any damaged or destroyed materials.
- ii) Whether or not there is a finding of academic misconduct, a decision maker and/or panel may assign an educational remedy to the student, e.g. Academic Integrity Tutorial, online quiz, etc. to prevent similar circumstances from arising in the future. The Academic Integrity Office will monitor the attendance/completion of an assigned educational remedy. Assignment of an educational remedy will not, on its own, be assigned a DN. However, if a student is assigned to an educational workshop more than two times (not within the same academic term), the student will have a DN placed on his/her academic record.

iii) Should a decision maker or panel require or recommend that a student fulfill any conditions, e.g. counseling, the replacement of damages or destroyed materials, the Academic Integrity Office will monitor the implementation and completion of such conditions.

iv) In the event that a penalty assigned under this policy affects student funding such as, but not limited to research grants, stipends, scholarships, bursaries or OSAP, the appropriate Ryerson faculty/staff will be notified via a copy of the decision letter and further action may be taken as a result.

v) Previously assigned grades may be adjusted.

vi) Students' graduation may be delayed until all academic misconduct appeals have concluded.

INVESTIGATING AND MAKING A FINDING OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

1. Who Can Investigate Suspected Misconduct?

a) The formal processes to investigate suspicions of academic misconduct may be initiated by the following:

- i) Ryerson employees holding an academic position at Ryerson University;
- ii) course instructors employed by Ryerson University;
- iii) Associate Members of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies;
- iv) the Registrar (or designate).

All others, including students, graduate assistants, other staff, external examiners, etc. who become aware of possible misconduct should report the basis for their concern to an appropriate person as listed above.

(N.B. The term "faculty member" is used to cover all those listed above in the remainder of this section.)

2. Investigating a suspected offence

a) A faculty member may investigate if she/he suspects misconduct by a student or students, unless informing another faculty member of the suspicion is more appropriate (i.e. the suspected misconduct took place in relation to a course where another faculty member is the instructor or supervisor, etc.). Normally, "investigating" will involve collecting information regarding the suspected offence such as examining work submitted, checking work for originality by various means (e.g. Internet searches, text comparison, Turnitin, web sites, comparison with prior work by the student, etc). In unusual cases, or where the faculty member has concerns regarding how to proceed, the faculty member should consult with the Academic Integrity Office regarding appropriate investigative activity.

b) Once a faculty member has collected enough information likely to support a finding of misconduct she/he has two options or routes regarding how to proceed:

i) The faculty member may continue with the matter her/himself;

ii) The faculty member may (See "Procedures, xxx) the basis for a suspicion of misconduct to a Designated Decision Maker.

c) Route 1: The choice to pursue the matter him/herself *will* involve the initiating faculty member in the following roles:

i) continuing as investigator of a suspicion of academic misconduct, including formally notifying the student(s) involved of concerns through the Academic Integrity Office website;

ii) decision-maker with respect to whether or not misconduct has occurred;

iii) person assigning penalty subsequent to a finding of misconduct.

Further, it also *may* involve the faculty member as,

iv) respondent in the case of any subsequent appeals by the student(s).

d) Facilitated and Non-Facilitated Discussion: Once the faculty member has decided the evidence warrants discussion with the student, he/she will choose to have either a Facilitated Discussion, or a Non-Facilitated Discussion with the student. The purpose of this meeting is to inquire into the basis of the suspicion(s) and to give the student an opportunity to answer questions and articulate his/her perspective. The meeting is not intended to be accusatory in nature, but investigative. The student is allowed to bring a support person with them, but the student must generally speak for him/herself. (See accompanying "Procedures".)

e) Route 2: A faculty member may choose to follow the second route and refer the matter to a Designated Decision Maker.

i) The designated decision maker will first review any evidence provided by the faculty member (see below), and determine if further investigation is warranted. If not, the case will end here, and the faculty member cannot later choose to pursue the case themselves.

ii). If the designated decision maker decides there is enough evidence to proceed, then the designated decision maker will invite the student (through the Academic Integrity Office notification process) to attend either the non-facilitated discussion or facilitated discussion. (see "Procedures" for timelines). The choice to refer to a designated decision maker *may* involve the faculty member in:

1. supplying any relevant further information regarding the suspicion if reasonably requested to supply such by a designated decision maker. The faculty member may, if he/she desires, make a recommendation regarding penalty to the designated decision maker;

2. forwarding that information to a designated decision maker, who may contact the faculty member with inquiries for clarification or for further relevant information.

The faculty member *may also* later:

3. be asked to appear as a witness at any subsequent appeal panel.

In choosing to refer to a designated decision maker, the faculty member defers to the designated decision maker the roles of:

- i) deciding whether academic misconduct has occurred and;
- ii) deciding what the appropriate penalties/consequence shall be.

A faculty member may *not* appeal the designated decision maker's decision, either with respect to whether misconduct occurred, or with respect to penalty.

f) On either route, after the facilitated discussion /non-facilitated discussion, the faculty member or designated decision maker will decide, based on the information available, whether academic misconduct has occurred, and will do so using a "balance of probabilities" standard of proof.

3. Assigning of Penalty/Consequences

a) After a decision has been made that misconduct has occurred, the faculty member or designated decision maker will assign a penalty and/or consequences (as per section xxx). He/she will also notify the Academic Integrity Office of both any finding of academic misconduct and the penalty/consequences. (as per "Procedures" xxx). Prior to assigning penalty/consequences the faculty member or designated decision maker should consult with the Academic Integrity Office regarding;

1) the general practice regarding penalty for similar violations

(N.B. Such information, while potentially relevant to penalty/consequences, is not relevant to whether misconduct occurred, hence *can only* be requested and received *after* a finding regarding misconduct has been made. It is imperative that a faculty member or designated decision maker maintain the strictest confidentiality at all times during and after this process regarding this and all other information that might identify an individual student).

b) On either route, once a decision has been made that misconduct has occurred, the faculty member will notify the Academic Integrity Office (as per "Procedures") of the finding, any penalties assigned, and any further consequences assigned.

c) The Academic Integrity Office will formally notify the student regarding:

- 1) the finding of the faculty member or designated decision maker;
- 2) any penalty or consequences assigned;
- 3) the students' rights regarding appeal and the procedures related to appeal.

d) In order to implement the Principle of Progressive Discipline, the Academic Integrity Office, on receiving a finding of misconduct from a decision maker, will:

- 1) inform the Registrar's Office that a DN is to be placed on the student's Academic Record;
- 2) review the past record of the student to determine if there has been a prior DN on the student's record;
- 3) in cases where there has been a prior finding of misconduct, the Academic Integrity Office will send the student's record to a designated decision maker (other than the one making the current decision) for review and a recommendation as to whether a hearing regarding Disciplinary Suspension (DS) is warranted.
- 4) if the designated decision maker decides that the pattern of offences does not merit a Disciplinary Suspension hearing, he/she will inform the student (see "Procedures") that any further findings of misconduct will result in such a hearing;
- 5) Where warning has been given under 4) immediately above, should another finding of misconduct occur, the Academic Integrity Office will convey to the designated decision maker that there may be an Automatic Hearing re Disciplinary Suspension;
- 6) Where the designated decision maker recommends proceeding with such a hearing, the Academic Integrity Office will convene a panel of the Academic Integrity Council to conduct a Disciplinary Suspension hearing.

4. Designated Decision Makers – Under development

- a) The Academic Integrity Council

All Designated Decision Makers are to be drawn from the Academic Integrity Council.

APPEALS – Under development

GRADUATE SUPERVISED RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

1. General

a. Within a graduate program, it is essential that an environment exists in which faculty and students have the utmost regard for the principles of academic integrity. Honesty and mutual trust constitute the very basis of all scientific and scholarly exchange. It is the responsibility of the entire University community to contribute to creating a community that demands vigorous research and academic production at the graduate level based on the highest principles of academic integrity.

b. Graduate students must:

- i. Pursue their research activities in a manner that is consistent with the highest standards and policies of ethical and scientific practice;
- ii. Adhere to Ryerson University's Research Ethics Board (REB) guidelines and policies;

- iii. Carry out research in honest search for knowledge and base findings upon a critical appraisal and interpretation according to scientific, scholarly and/or creative principles appropriate to the specific discipline.

c. The purpose of this section of the Policy is to provide the Ryerson Community with guidance for dealing with issues relating to academic integrity in supervised research activities by Graduate Students.

2. Application of this Section

a. This section applies to all academic work produced not in a course, which usually includes Comprehensive Examinations, Major Research Papers, Proposals, Theses and Dissertations at the Graduate Level.

b. The application of this section does not include academic work produced in a course. For guidance relating to academic misconduct within a course, please refer to section B2.a. for the applicable penalties and the relevant Student Code of Academic Conduct Procedures (the Procedures).

3. Jurisdiction

a. Graduate supervised research activities includes the comprehensive examinations, which may involve a research component, and the research conducted for Major Research Papers, Proposals, Theses and/or Dissertations, and the resulting document. Together, these “milestones” comprise the most significant part of the graduate degree requirements. Confirmation of the knowledge base in a particular discipline, research and the resulting document must meet the highest standards of research and academic integrity. Consequently, the Graduate Program Director and/or the Dean or Dean’s Designate of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies will have the jurisdiction to identify the decision maker to make decisions about, and assign penalties for breaches of this policy described in A. Academic Misconduct, in the following circumstances and in accordance with the Procedures:

- i. Supervised research activities in accordance with graduate degree requirements, i.e. the comprehensive examination (or equivalent); and/or
- ii. Research carried out for Major Research Papers, Theses or Dissertations, and/or the final document itself.

4. Penalties and Consequences for Academic Misconduct in Graduate Supervised Research Activity

a. In addition to Section B. Penalties and Consequences for Academic Misconduct, specifically Section B2.b. “Outside a Course”, the decision maker may assign a “Fail” where appropriate. In cases where a penalty of “Fail” is assigned, a Disciplinary Notation will also be placed on the student’s academic record.

b. In addition to Section B4.b. “Other Consequences”, specifically B4.b.i., any issues regarding funding, e.g. scholarships that have been awarded to Graduate Students, may be impacted by the

application of this Policy and will be referred to the Graduate Program Director and/or the Dean or Dean's Designate of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies.

5. Higher expectations for Graduate Students

a. Graduate students who have gone through several years of post-secondary education prior to their graduate level studies have an obligation to be familiar with the general principles and expectations of academic integrity in coursework, non-coursework requirements, and research in their discipline, Department, Program and/or School. It is expected that Graduate Students will familiarize themselves with the actions that are defined as academic misconduct by the University. Graduate students will be expected to demonstrate that knowledge when engaging in all university-related activities. Graduate students who are unclear about what might be considered academic misconduct should consult with their Supervisor, Graduate Program Director, or the Academic Integrity Officer.

b. The University expects that Graduate Students understand the importance of academic integrity principles, and are aware of consequences of departures from these principles.

6. Information for Graduate Students relating to Academic Integrity

a. Graduate students will be directed to information about academic integrity by the Graduate Program Director, the Yeates School of Graduate Studies, the Academic Integrity Office, and/or other faculty members as appropriate.

b. Graduate students will receive general information about academic integrity at Ryerson University, and any specific or special standards of research and academic integrity in their discipline, during orientation to their Graduate Program.

c. For assistance in responding to issues relating to academic misconduct, graduate students are encouraged to contact the Student Issues and Advocacy Office at the Ryerson Student Union (RSU) for advice and advocacy services for Graduate Students.

7. Procedures

a. For the procedures relevant to this section of the Policy, please refer to Part II, C of the Procedures.

b. Part II, C of the Procedures will be reviewed annually in consultation with representatives from the Academic Integrity Council, the Senate Appeals Committee, Graduate Program Directors, the Yeates School of Graduate Studies and a student representative from the RSU.

8. All other provisions of Policy 60 remain in force and effect

All other provisions of this Policy, i.e. Section A – D, and the Procedures, remain in force and effect for Graduate Students where applicable. For example, suspicions of academic misconduct for work submitted “within a course”, are governed by those applicable provisions in the Policy and Procedures.

- Part II of the Procedures -

C. Procedures for Dealing with Suspicions of Academic Misconduct in Graduate Supervised Research Activities.

Consultation

Members of the Ryerson community may consult with the Academic Integrity Office, the Graduate Program Directors, the Yeates School of Graduate Studies, and the Ombudsperson about any issue or concern relating to these Procedures.

Academic Integrity Office

The Academic Integrity Office is responsible for implementing the Procedures and is impartial as between the parties in matters related to academic integrity.

Decision Maker

Having received a suspicion of academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities, the Graduate Program Director, Dean or Dean's Designate will identify the appropriate decision maker who will make a request for a Facilitated Discussion, determine whether academic misconduct has occurred, and assign any penalties in accordance with the Policy and Procedures.

Potential decision makers may include, but are not limited to, the student's graduate supervisor, graduate program director, Comprehensive reader, Dean or Dean's Designate of Yeates School of Graduate Studies.

Investigation

Prior to requesting a facilitated discussion, the decision maker, who has assumed jurisdiction of the matter, having received a suspicion of academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities, may request one or more faculty member(s) with subject matter expertise conduct an investigation into the facts and provide a report to the decision maker. The student will not be contacted during this investigation phase unless or until the designated decision maker decides there is sufficient evidence to proceed with a facilitated discussion.

Representation at Facilitated Discussions

a. In recognition of the severity of the potential impact on students at the Graduate level, there is no option for a Non-Facilitated Discussion in dealing with suspicions of academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities.

b. Graduate students responding to a suspicion of academic misconduct relating to supervised research activities may be accompanied by an advocate and/or support person to the Facilitated Discussion. Students are, however, expected to speak on their own behalf whenever reasonably possible.

Notice of Facilitated Discussion

a. In the event of a suspicion of academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities, the decision maker, who has assumed jurisdiction of the matter, will be required to send an electronic request through the Academic Integrity Office's automated system for a Facilitated Discussion with the Graduate student via the Graduate student's Ryerson email only.

b. The Academic Integrity Office will issue the Notice of Facilitated Discussion as soon as possible after an electronic request is received and the Facilitated Discussion scheduled in consultation with the parties.

Contents of the Notice of Facilitated Discussion

a. The contents of the Notice of Facilitated Discussion must include:

- i. The date and time of the Facilitated Discussion;
- ii. The location of the Facilitated Discussion;
- iii. The name of the Facilitator;
- iv. A summary of the substance of the suspicion of academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities;
- v. The contact name and number of the Student Issues and Advocacy Officer at the Ryerson Students Union and the Ombudsperson; and
- vi. Contact information for the appropriate personnel in the Academic Integrity Office.

Timelines for the Facilitated Discussion

The Facilitated Discussion will normally be held within 5 business days of the Notice of Facilitated Discussion being issued to the parties. If the Graduate student fails to attend the Facilitated Discussion, the decision maker may proceed in their absence.

Requests for Accommodation

All requests for accommodation will be considered.

Facilitated Discussion

a. At the Facilitated Discussion, the Academic Integrity Officer/Designate will introduce the parties, including any advocates or support persons in attendance, identify the decision maker, and outline the process. Decisions will not be made at the Facilitated Discussion.

b. Normally, the decision maker will provide a chronology of events leading up to the Facilitated Discussion and review the results of the investigation into the facts. .

- c. The Graduate Student, if applicable, should bring rough notes, drafts, relevant documents or other supporting materials to the discussion
- d. The decision maker has the discretion to schedule any subsequent Facilitated Discussions to bring forth any other information required prior to making a decision.
- e. The facilitator from the Academic Integrity Office will review the relevant sections of Policy 60, including the applicable timelines and possible consequences and the right to appeal.
- f. A summary of the Facilitated Discussion must be completed by the facilitator from the Academic Integrity Office and signed by the student and decision maker. If either disagrees with the content of the summary, s/he should note the disagreement on the form before signing.

Decision and Impartiality

- a. The Academic Integrity Office will issue the decision of the decision maker, who has assumed jurisdiction of the matter, including the assignment of any penalties and/or consequences usually within 5 business days. If the decision is to be issued later than 5 business days of the Facilitated Discussion, the parties will be notified and a new timeline established.
- b. The decision maker, who has assumed jurisdiction of the matter, should not have information regarding any previous acts of academic misconduct before the Facilitated Discussion is held or before the decision is issued. If there is previous knowledge, the decision maker should disregard this information in determining whether academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities has occurred.
- c. Any person involved in dealing with a particular matter relating to a suspicion of academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities, may not serve on a panel of the Academic Integrity Council or the Senate Appeals Committee convened for hearing the same matter.

Penalties and Consequences

- a. The penalties and consequences under for academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities are set out in Section E of the Policy.
- b. In the event that there is a finding of academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities, a Disciplinary Notation will be placed on the student's academic record.

Educational Remedies

The decision maker may require the Graduate Student to attend the mandatory component of the Academic Integrity Tutorial in accordance with Part I, Section F of the Procedures: *Academic Integrity Tutorial (AIT)*.

In the event that an educational remedy is assigned and there is a finding of academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities, a Disciplinary Notation will be placed on the student's academic record.

APPENDIX B

Supplementary Data Report

The total number of suspicions of academic misconduct reported to the Academic Integrity Office (Academic Integrity Office) between September 1, 2012 and August 31, 2013 was 493.

For the total number of reported suspicions of academic misconduct (493), 389 (78.9%) fell into the category of plagiarism.

Of the total number of reported suspicions of academic misconduct (493), 423 (86%) involved undergraduate students, 54 (11%) involved Continuing Education students registered either in a Certificate or non-Certificate program in The Raymond G. Chang School, and 16 (3%) involved Graduate Students.

Pursuant to Policy 60: *Student Code of Academic Conduct*, instructors or Chair/Directors requested a “Facilitated Discussion” with a representative from the Academic Integrity Office (AIO) in 85% of total cases to provide the student(s) with an opportunity to respond. Instructors or Chair/Directors opted for a “Non-Facilitated” discussion with the student(s) in the remaining 15%.

Of the total number of suspicions of academic misconduct (493), 321 (65%) resulted in a finding or “charge” of academic misconduct. In 172 (35%) of total cases, there was no finding or charge. Of the total number of charges of academic misconduct (321), in 283 (88%) cases the student received a “zero” mark for the academic work at issue, the minimum penalty that must be assigned for a charge of academic misconduct within a course.

The Academic Integrity Council (AIC) heard a total of 52 appeals and conducted 5 automatic hearings⁷ during this period. As of August 31, 2013, 35 (62%) matters heard by the AIC were denied, and 12 (21%) were granted. Of the remainder of AIC appeals, 7 were rescinded (12%) by the appellant, and 3 are in progress (5%) at the time this report was prepared.

The Senate Appeals Committee (SAC)⁸, whose decisions are final, heard 6 matters in accordance with Policy 60 during this period. Of those 6 appeals to SAC, 5 (83%) were denied, and 1 (17%) was granted. In addition, one appeal was not accepted because it was submitted late and was not complete, and one appeal was withdrawn.

⁷ Automatic hearings are required where an instructor or Chair/Director has recommended a disciplinary suspension, disciplinary withdrawal or expulsion.

⁸ The SAC also hears matters pursuant to Policies 61, 134, and 152.

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

STUDENT CODE OF ACADEMIC CONDUCT

Policy Number: 60

Approval Date: March 3, 2009

Original Approval Dates: March 4, 2003
(Amended October 2003, January 2004, April 2006, April 1, 2008,
June 4, 2013)

Presented By: Senate Appeals Committee

Responsible Office: Provost and Vice President Academic

Implementation Date: Fall 2013

Procedural Review: Annually (Fall 2014)

POLICY INDEX		Page
A. ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT		1
A1. Academic Dishonesty		1
a. Plagiarism		1
b. Cheating		2
c. Misrepresentation of personal identity or performance		2
d. Submission of false information		2
A2. Contributing to Academic Misconduct		2
A3. Damaging, Tampering or Interfering with the Scholarly Environment		2
A4. Unauthorized Copying or Use of Copyrighted Materials		3
A5. Violations of Departmental Policies on Professional Behaviour		3
A6. Violations of Specific Departmental or Course Requirements		3
B. PENALTIES AND CONSEQUENCES FOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT		3
B1. Definitions		3
a. Disciplinary Notice (DN)		3
b. Disciplinary Suspension (DS)		3
c. Disciplinary Withdrawal (DW)		3
d. Expulsion		3
B2. Assignment of Penalties		3
a. Within a course		4
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)		5
iii. Disciplinary Withdrawn (DW)		5
iv. Expulsion		6
b. Other Consequences		6
C. APPEALS PROCESS		6
C1. Filing an Appeal		6
C2. Student Enrollment During Appeal Process		7
C3. Timeliness		7
C4. Conflict of Interest		7
C5. Appeals Committees		7
a. Academic Integrity Council		7
b. Registrar's Appeals Committee		7
c. Senate Appeals Committee		7
d. Hearing Panels		7
i. Academic Integrity Council		7
ii. Senate		7
e. Training		7
C6. Hearing of Academic Integrity Council or Senate Appeals Committee		8
C7. Decision		9
D. GENERAL REGULATIONS		9
D1. Notification		9
D2. Dropping a Course		9
D3. Deferred Grade (DEF)		9
D4. Meetings to Discuss Suspicion of Academic Misconduct		9
D5. Reduction of Potential for Bias		9
D6. Evidence of Misconduct		9
D7. Re-assessment of Work by Someone Other than the Original Instructor		10
D8. Verification		10
D9. Audio and Video Recording		10
D10. Procedures		11
E. GRADUATE SUPERVISED RESEARCH ACTIVITIES		
E1. General		
E2. Application of this Section		
E3. Jurisdiction		
E4. Penalties and Consequences for Academic Misconduct in Graduate Supervised Research Activities		
E5. Higher Expectations for Graduate Students		
E6. Information for Graduate Students relating to Academic Integrity		
E7. Procedures		
E8. All Other Provisions of Policy 60 Remain in Force and Effect		

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0"

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

**RYERSON UNIVERSITY
STUDENT CODE OF ACADEMIC CONDUCT**

Intellectual freedom and honesty are essential to the sharing and development of knowledge. In order to demonstrate Ryerson's adherence to these fundamental values, all members of the community must exhibit integrity in their teaching, learning, research, evaluation, and personal behaviour.

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

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

It is imperative that all members of the community abide by the Code in order to maintain an environment that is consistent with the values and behaviour we espouse. Instructors¹, 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.

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

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

- 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. 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)²** - 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

² Disciplinary Suspension (DS) cannot be assigned to graduate students.

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 grade reduction, including a mark of zero "0", on any academic work assigned by the instructor, as appropriate. A mark of zero "0" on the work falls within the category of grade reduction. As a consequence of any determination of academic misconduct, a DN will be placed on the student's academic record (see above);
- ~~i.~~ 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 (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 Integrity Council; and
 - b. may only be assigned by Senate Appeals Committee.
- v. Expulsion
 - a. may only be recommended by the instructor, Chair/Director, or Academic Integrity Council; and
 - b. may only be assigned by Senate Appeals Committee.
- vi. Rescinding of a degree, diploma or certificate
 - a. may only be recommended by the instructor, Chair/Director, or Academic Integrity Council; and
 - b. may only be assigned by Senate Appeals Committee
- vii. Requirement to replace damaged or destroyed materials
 - a. may be recommended by the instructor or Chair/Director; and
 - b. may be assigned by Academic Integrity Council;
- viii. Removal from a co-op program option, placement, internship or practicum, either permanently or temporarily may be assigned.
- ix. A requirement to participate in the mandatory component of the Academic Integrity Tutorial in conjunction with another penalty³ may be assigned.

b. Outside of a course: All of the above penalties except a reduction of the grade on a piece of work and an "F" in a course may be assigned. A mark of zero "0" on the work falls within the category of grade reduction. The minimum penalty is the assignment of the mandatory component of the Academic Integrity Tutorial, and the DN will be placed on the student's academic record.

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)

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

- 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 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 ~~reduction of the grade, which includes a mark of zero "0", grade of "0"~~ is assigned for the work, the student may drop the course in accordance with the published deadline. A mark of zero "0" on the work falls within the category of grade reduction.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, Not Bold, No underline

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.

E. GRADUATE SUPERVISED RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Formatted: Font: Bold

E1. General

a. Within a graduate program, it is essential that an environment exists in which faculty and students have the utmost regard for the principles of academic integrity. Honesty and mutual trust constitute the very basis of all scientific and scholarly exchange. It is the responsibility of the entire University community to contribute to creating a community that demands vigorous research and academic production at the graduate level based on the highest principles of academic integrity.

b. Graduate students must:

- i. Pursue their research activities in a manner that is consistent with the highest standards and policies of ethical and scientific practice;
- ii. Adhere to Ryerson University's Research Ethics Board (REB) guidelines and policies;
- iii. Carry out research in honest search for knowledge and base findings upon a critical appraisal and interpretation according to scientific, scholarly and/or creative principles appropriate to the specific discipline.

c. The purpose of Section E is to provide the Ryerson Community with guidance for dealing with issues relating to academic integrity in supervised research activities by Graduate Students.

E2. Application of this Section

a. Section E applies to all academic work produced not in a course, which usually includes Comprehensive Examinations, MRP, Proposals, Theses and Dissertations at the Graduate level.

b. The application of Section E does not include academic work produced in a course. For guidance relating to academic misconduct within a course, please refer to section B2.a. for the applicable penalties and the relevant Student Code of Academic Conduct Procedures (the Procedures).

E3. Jurisdiction

a. Graduate supervised research activities includes the comprehensive examinations, which may involve a research component, and the research conducted for MRPs, Proposals, Theses and/or Dissertations, and the resulting document. Together, these "milestones" comprise the most significant part of the graduate degree requirements. Confirmation of the knowledge base in a particular discipline, research and the resulting document must meet the highest standards of research and academic integrity.

b. Suspicions of academic misconduct should be brought to the attention of the Graduate Program Director who will identify the appropriate decision maker. Potential decision makers may include but is not limited to, the student's graduate supervisor, Graduate Program Director, Dean or Dean's Designate

of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies. The decision maker will have the jurisdiction to make decisions about, and assign penalties for breaches of this Policy in the following circumstances and in accordance with the Procedures:

- i. Supervised research activities in accordance with graduate degree requirements, i.e. the comprehensive examination (or equivalent); and/or
- ii. Research carried out for MRPs, Theses or Dissertations, and/or the final document itself.

E4. Penalties and Consequences for Academic Misconduct in Graduate Supervised Research Activity

a. In addition to Section B. Penalties and Consequences for Academic Misconduct, specifically Section B2.b. “Outside a Course”, the decision maker may assign a “Fail” where appropriate. In cases where a penalty of “Fail” is assigned, a Disciplinary Notation will also be placed on the student’s academic record.

b. In addition to Section B4.b. “Other Consequences”, specifically B4.b.i., any issues regarding funding, e.g. scholarships that have been awarded to Graduate Students, may be impacted by the application of this Policy and will be referred to the Graduate Program Director and/or the Dean or Dean’s Designate of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies.

E5. Higher expectations for Graduate Students

a. Graduate students who have gone through several years of post-secondary education prior to their graduate level studies have an obligation to be familiar with the general principles and expectations of academic integrity in coursework, non-coursework requirements, and research in their discipline, Department, Program and/or School. It is expected that Graduate Students will familiarize themselves with the actions that are defined as academic misconduct by the University. Graduate students will be expected to demonstrate that knowledge when engaging in all university-related activities. Graduate students who are unclear about what might be considered academic misconduct should consult with their Supervisor, Graduate Program Director, or the Academic Integrity Office.

b. The University expects that Graduate Students understand the importance of academic integrity principles, and are aware of consequences of departures from these principles.

E6. Information for Graduate Students relating to Academic Integrity

a. Graduate students will be directed to information about academic integrity by the Graduate Program Director, the Yeates School of Graduate Studies, the Academic Integrity Office, and/or other faculty members as appropriate.

b. Graduate students will receive general information about academic integrity at Ryerson University, and any specific or special standards of research and academic integrity in their discipline, during orientation to their Graduate Program.

c. For assistance in responding to issues relating to academic misconduct, graduate students are encouraged to contact the Student Issues and Advocacy Office at the Ryerson Student Union (RSU) for advice and advocacy services for Graduate Students.

E7. Procedures

a. For the procedures relevant to Section E of the Policy, please refer to Part II, C of the Procedures.

b. Part II, C of the Procedures will be reviewed annually in consultation with representatives from the Academic Integrity Council, the Senate Appeals Committee, Graduate Program Directors, the Yeates School of Graduate Studies and a student representative from the RSU.

Formatted: Space Before: Auto, After: Auto

Formatted: Font: Times, Font color: Black

E8. All other provisions of Policy 60 remain in force and effect

All other provisions of this Policy, i.e. Section A – D, and the Procedures, remain in force and effect for Graduate Students where applicable. For example, suspicions of academic misconduct for work submitted “within a course”, are governed by those applicable provisions in the Policy and Procedures.

STUDENT CODE OF ACADEMIC CONDUCT PROCEDURES

Glossary of Abbreviations

AIC	Academic Integrity Council	DS	Disciplinary Suspension
AIO	Academic Integrity Office	DW	Disciplinary Withdrawal
AIT	Academic Integrity Tutorial	FAI	Fundamentals of Academic Integrity
ARUCC	Association of Registrars of Universities and Colleges of Canada	FD	Facilitated Discussion
CE	Continuing Education	GA	Graduate Assistant
CESAR	Continuing Education Students' Association of Ryerson	non-FD	non-Facilitated Discussion
DHPO	Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Office	RSU	Ryerson Students' Union
DN	Disciplinary Notice	TA	Teaching Assistant

I. SUSPICION OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

A. Consultation and Representation

- Members of the Ryerson community may consult with the Academic Integrity Officer or their Chair/Director on any academic misconduct procedure or concern. The Academic Integrity Officer is responsible for ensuring that all matters related to the implementation of the Student Code of Academic Conduct are handled fairly and is neither an advocate for students or faculty nor a decision-maker in the process. Students may also consult with an advocate from RSU or CESAR. The Ombudsperson may be consulted at any time during the process. Faculty may also seek assistance from the Faculty Advisor appointed by the Vice Provost Academic whose role is to provide support and guidance to faculty on issues related to academic integrity. Contact the Academic Integrity Office (AIO) for contact information or consult www.ryerson.ca/ai.
- If there are concerns or allegations of prejudice, discrimination or harassment related to a suspicion or determination that a student has engaged in academic misconduct, the student must consult with the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Office (DHPO). Normally, any allegations should be dealt with before the Facilitated Discussion (FD) actually occurs, but if this has not happened, an appeal should be submitted to meet any deadlines. In this case, the appeal will not be heard until an investigation has been done by the DHPO and a decision made as per the Discrimination and Harassment Policy.
- Neither advocates nor lawyers are permitted to attend the initial facilitated/non-facilitated discussion regarding the suspicion of academic misconduct. Upon appeal, students may be represented by an advocate who is not a lawyer at the Academic Integrity Council (AIC). Legal counsel is not permitted at the AIC level. Either an advocate or legal representation is permitted at the Senate appeal level.

B. Notification

- If an instructor, lead teacher, or Chair/Director suspects academic misconduct, s/he will use the AIO automated system (<https://runner.ryerson.ca/studentWorkshops/instructor>), to send the student notification of the date and time of a non-Facilitated Discussion (non-FD), or to request an FD through the AIO.

2. Notification of the nature of the suspicion will be sent to the student via his or her Ryerson email account, which is the University's official means of communication with students. The automated system will send notification to the student, the instructor, the AIO, and the Registrar so that the student is prevented from dropping the course while under investigation.
3. The FD/non-FD should normally be held within five (5) working days of the notice. If the student cannot attend at that time, it is his or her obligation to contact the instructor, or AIO if appropriate, in a timely manner and on reasonable grounds, to make arrangements for a mutually agreed upon time. If the student fails to contact the instructor or AIO and/or fails to attend the FD/non-FD, the instructor may make a decision without the benefit of input from the student.

C. Impartiality

1. The instructor should not have information regarding any previous acts of misconduct before a FD/non-FD is held or a recommendation is made. If there is such previous knowledge, the instructor should disregard this information in determining if academic misconduct has occurred.
2. Any third party who has been involved in the discussion or determination of academic misconduct has occurred may not serve on an AIC panel or Senate Appeals Committee panel for any hearing on the case.
3. The Academic Integrity Officer is a neutral party and not a decision maker. S/he provides guidance and support to both the student and the instructor and ensures that both parties are aware of their rights and responsibilities.

D. Discussion and Decision

1. Types of Discussion: The discussion between the instructor and the student may be held in one of two ways.
 - a. Facilitated Discussion (FD) (with AIO)
 1. The AIO will arrange for the facilitation of the discussion to assist with a fair and focused discussion about what occurred from each perspective. Instructors must be prepared to present the evidence in support of their suspicion either prior to or at the discussion in support of their suspicion at the FD with the student(s). If applicable, students should bring rough notes, drafts or other supporting materials to the discussion. The instructor may request additional information.
 2. Group academic misconduct or academic misconduct involving more than one student
 - a. If two or more students involved in a group project are suspected of academic misconduct, the instructor must contact the AIO to assist in determining a fair process. Students may be called in for a discussion of the suspicion as a group or individually. Students may request an individual meeting but also may be required to attend a group meeting. The instructor will determine an appropriate means of evaluating the work of students deemed not to be involved in the academic misconduct.
 - b. If two or more students are suspected of academic misconduct, in circumstances other than in a group project, e.g., suspicion of widespread cheating in an exam, the AIO must be contacted to discuss the process.
 - iii. The FD should be an open dialogue to discuss the instructor's concerns and the student's response. The instructor or AIO may schedule subsequent FDs to bring forth other information. The student may also request additional FDs if new information is provided by the instructor.

- iv. The instructor, lead teacher or Chair/Director who raised the suspicion, a TA, GA or exam invigilator who brought the complaint to the instructor, the student(s) suspected to have violated the policy and the Facilitator are the only individuals who may be present in an FD.
- v. Requests for accommodations for disabilities should be communicated to the AIO upon receipt of the notification.
- vi. Submission of False Documents in a discussion: If it is suspected that a false document has been submitted as part of an academic misconduct discussion, the following should be considered:
 - a. If the instructor determines that the suspected document is not essential to the decision, s/he may make a decision on the original suspicion of academic misconduct.
 - b. If the suspected document is essential to the matter being discussed, the instructor should not make a decision until the authenticity of the document has been determined.
 - c. If the suspected document is found to be authentic, the discussion should be rescheduled.
 - d. If the document is found to be falsified, the instructor should charge the student with academic misconduct for the falsified document. Note: the original suspicion will be subsequently considered.
- vii. A Summary of Facilitated Discussion Form must be completed by the Facilitator and signed by the student and the instructor. If either the instructor or the student disagrees with the content of the summary, he or she should note the disagreement on the form before signing. Both parties will be provided with a copy of this form. In extenuating circumstances, the Facilitator may determine an alternate means for confirming that the summary reflects the discussion.
- viii. Decision:
 - a. Decisions are not to be made in the FD. Instructors have up to three (3) working days from the completion of all discussions on the matter to make a decision and inform the AIO.
 - b. If the instructor determines that there has been no academic misconduct, the Summary of Discussion form will be destroyed unless the student requests that it be confidentially retained for one year by the AIO. The instructor may assign any component of the Academic Integrity Tutorial as a course requirement for educative purposes even if it is concluded that the student has not engaged in academic misconduct (see Procedures Section I.F.).
 - c. If academic misconduct has been determined, the Registrar will automatically assign a DN (Disciplinary Notice) as required by the University.
 - d. The AIO will send the instructor's decision letter out within two (2) working days of the instructor providing their decision via Ryerson email to the student, the instructor, the Associate Registrar, the Chair of the student's program department/school (or CE Program Director for Continuing Education students not enrolled in a program), and the Chair/Director of the teaching department/school (if different from the program department/school).
 - e. The student has ten (10) working days from the date of the emailed decision letter to submit an appeal if they disagree with the decision. If an appeal is not filed by the deadline, the decision will stand.
 - f. Once a decision is made by the instructor, that decision stands until any appeal process is complete.

For penalties see Section E.

- b. Non Facilitated Discussion (without AIO)**
- i. The student must be notified via Ryerson email of the date, time and reason for the non-FD, using the AIO automated system (<https://runner.ryerson.ca/studentWorkshops/instructor>).
 - ii. Group academic misconduct or academic misconduct involving more than one student
 - a. If two or more students involved in a group project are suspected of academic misconduct, the instructor must contact the AIO to assist in determining a fair process. Students may be called in for a discussion of the suspicion as a group or individually. Students may request an individual non-FD but also may be required to attend a group non-FD. The instructor will determine an appropriate means of evaluating the work on the assignment of those students deemed not to be involved in the academic misconduct.
 - b. If two or more students are suspected of academic misconduct, other than in a group project, e.g., suspicion of widespread cheating in an exam, the AIO must be contacted to discuss the process.
 - c. The student has the right to request an FD with the AIO rather than meeting with the instructor alone. Students wishing to do so can contact the AIO directly at aio@ryerson.ca before the discussion is scheduled. The instructor may schedule subsequent non-FDs to bring forth other information. The student may also request additional non-FDs if new information is provided by the instructor.
 - iii. The instructor must provide the student with any relevant evidence concerning the suspicion either prior to or at the discussion.
 - iv. A mutually agreed-upon third party, such as a Departmental Assistant or other staff member may be present as a note taker. The Chair/Director or another instructor may not be the third party or be present at the discussion.
 - v. The Summary of Discussion Form (<http://www.ryerson.ca/content/dam/senate/forms/non-facilitated-code-summaryform.pdf>) must be completed by an uninvolved third party or if there is not one, by the instructor. If either the instructor or the student disagrees with the content of the summary, s/he should note the disagreement on the form before signing. In extenuating circumstances, the instructor may determine an alternate means of confirming that the summary accurately reflects what was discussed.
 - vi. Submission of False Documents in a discussion: If it is suspected that a false document has been submitted as part of an academic misconduct discussion, the following should be considered:
 - a. If the instructor determines that the suspected document is not essential to the decision, s/he may make a decision on the original suspicion of academic misconduct.
 - b. If the suspected document is essential to the matter being discussed, the instructor should not make a decision until the authenticity of the document has been determined.
 - c. If the suspected document is found to be authentic, the discussion should be rescheduled.
 - d. If the suspected document is found to be falsified, the instructor should charge the student for the falsified document. Note: the original suspicion can then be dealt with separately.
 - vii. Decision:
 - a. Instructors have three (3) working days from the date of the FD/non-FD to make a decision and inform the student.

- b. If the instructor determines that there has been no academic misconduct, the Summary of Discussion form will be destroyed unless the student requests that it be confidentially retained for one year by the AIO. The instructor may assign the Academic Integrity Tutorial (AIT) as a course requirement for educative purposes even if it is concluded that the student has not engaged in academic misconduct (see Procedures Section I.F.).
- c. If it has been determined that there has been academic misconduct, the Registrar will automatically assign a DN as required by the University. This is not a penalty issued by the instructor but rather a consequence.
- d. Once a decision is made, the instructor must use the AIO automated system to issue the decision letter using the decision option.
(<https://runner.ryerson.ca/studentWorkshops/instructor>).

E. Penalties: Before assigning one or more of the penalties listed below, instructors must review the “Suggested Guidelines for Instructors and Appeal Panels on Issuing Penalties,” which are posted on the AIO website (www.ryerson.ca/ai).

- a. The minimum penalty which can be assigned if academic misconduct is determined is a zero (0) on the work if the misconduct is in a course.
- b. The instructor may also assign an “F” in the course.
- c. The Academic Integrity Tutorial (see Procedures Section I.F.) may be assigned.
- d. After reviewing the “Suggested Guidelines for Instructors and Appeal Panels on Issuing Penalties” and consulting with the AIO, the instructor may recommend Disciplinary Suspension (DS), Disciplinary Withdrawal (DW), or Expulsion for undergraduates or CE students and DW or Expulsion for graduate students (see Policy Section B2).
- e. If a DS, DW, or Expulsion is recommended by the instructor, there will be an automatic hearing of the AIC (see Procedures Section IV.B.1). To allow the required period for a student appeal the AIO will schedule an AIC hearing after ten (10) working days from receipt of the decision letter.
- f. Outside a course: All of the above penalties except a zero (0) on a piece of work and an “F” in a course may be assigned. The minimum penalty is the assignment of the mandatory component of the Academic Integrity Tutorial, and the DN will be placed on the student’s academic record.

F. Academic Integrity Tutorial (AIT): The AIT has two components: an online workshop entitled “Fundamentals of Academic Integrity” (FAI); and a series of educational workshops on a variety of topics. Educational workshops are open to all students and are normally done in scheduled sessions on campus. Some sessions are available online. Please contact the Academic Integrity Officer for information.

- 1. Assignment of the Academic Integrity Tutorial: Assignment of both components of the AIT is done online using the AIO automated system.
- 2. If an instructor has opted for a non-FD, assignment of both components of the AIT is done within the Final Decision tab. A maximum of three (3) workshops can be assigned from the selection.
- 3. If an instructor has opted for an FD, the AIO will be responsible for submitting the instructor’s decision and workshop information and supplying this information to all relevant parties.
- 4. If an Appeal Panel assigns the AIT, the decision letter will direct the student to contact the Academic Integrity Officer at aio@ryerson.ca.

G. General Guidelines for the AIT

- a. If it is determined that the student engaged in academic misconduct and the AIT is assigned, the FAI is mandatory and must be completed within the time frame specified by the instructor. If the AIT is required for graduation, the AIO should be contacted in a timely manner.

- b. The Academic Integrity Officer can adjust deadlines at the student's request, if appropriate. Students who do not have a deadline extended and have not completed the AIT by the specified time, will be prevented from registering for courses in the following semester.
- c. If only the FAI is assigned, generally 1-2 weeks should be allowed for completion. All other educational workshops should provide a 4-6 week completion date not including University closures. The majority of these workshops are not available in April or December due to final exams, and availability in the summer may be limited.
- d. If the student files an appeal of the determination of academic misconduct, the completion date will be adjusted accordingly.
- e. Even if academic misconduct has not been found, instructors may assign up to three (3) workshops. This then becomes a course requirement and an INC will be assigned if the workshop(s) are not completed by the end of the semester. Once completed, the instructor must submit a grade revision form to update the student's grade for the course. If not completed within the required 3 month period, the INC will become and an "F" in the course.
- f. The AIO may confirm if a student has previously taken a specific workshop.

II. SUSPICION OF NON-COURSE RELATED ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

A. Documents (Including portfolios and presentations)

- 1. The submission of any false documents (e.g. transcripts, essays, portfolios, and letters of recommendation or information considered in the admissions process) or omission/withholding of pertinent information/documents which would be considered in the admissions process will result in the following:
 - a. If determined before the start of classes through an administrative review conducted by the Undergraduate Admissions Office, that Office will revoke all Undergraduate Offer of Admissions and cancel any related registration. Revocation of the offer of admission may not be appealed.
 - b. If determined before the start of classes through an administrative review conducted by the Graduate Admissions Office, that Office will revoke the Graduate Offer of Admission and cancel any related registration. Revocation of admission is final and may not be appealed.
 - c. If it is determined in the first semester of classes through an administrative review or by the Undergraduate department/school/program, the Undergraduate Admissions Office will revoke all Undergraduate Offer of Admissions. Students may appeal to the Registrar's Appeals Committee whose decision is final and may not be appealed.
 - d. If it is determined in the first semester of classes through a Graduate administrative review or by the Graduate program, a determination of misconduct will be brought forward by the Graduate Admissions Office who would revoke all Graduate offers of Admissions. Students may appeal to the Dean of Graduate Studies Appeals Committee whose decision is final and may not be appealed.
 - e. If it is determined when grades and or a standing has been assigned to an Undergraduate student, the Undergraduate Admissions Office will assign a DW to the student. Students may appeal to the Registrar's Appeals Committee whose decision is final and may not be appealed. Students may remain in classes until the appeals process is completed.
 - f. If it is determined when grades and or a standing has been assigned to a Graduate student, the Graduate Admissions Office will assign a DW to the student. Students may appeal to the Dean of Graduate Studies Appeals Committee whose decision is final and may not be appealed. Students may remain in classes until the appeals process is completed.
 - g. If it is determined after the granting of an Undergraduate degree, the Undergraduate department/school/program or Undergraduate Admissions Office will recommend rescinding the degree. There will be an automatic hearing by the Registrar's Appeals

- Committee whose decision is final and may not be appealed.
- h. If it is determined after the granting of a Graduate degree, the Graduate program or Graduate Admissions Office will recommend rescinding the degree. There will be an automatic hearing by the Dean of Graduate Studies Appeal Committee whose decision is final and may not be appealed.
2. In all of the above cases, the Association of Registrars of Universities and Colleges of Canada (ARUCC) will be notified if it is determined that academic misconduct has occurred.
 3. Submission of False Documents or Written Statements in an Appeal or Hearing: If it is suspected that a document or written statement submitted in an appeal or hearing is false the Panel should consider the following in its deliberations:
 - a. If it is suspected that the document or written statement is false before the hearing occurs, the AIO should establish a fair process.
 - b. If during the hearing it is suspected that the document or written statement is false:
 - i. If it is determined not to be essential to the decision, and if all members of the Panel believe they can render their decision without consideration of the document or written statement in question, the Panel can render its decision.
 - ii. If it is found to be authentic, the Panel can reconvene and render its decision.
 - iii. If it is found to be false, the Chair of the Panel may determine that the student engaged in academic misconduct with respect to the document or statement. If the student appeals this decision, a separate hearing will be held specific to the false document or written statement.
 - iv. Upon resolution of the issues related to the submission of a false document or written statement, a new panel will be formed to hear the original determination of academic misconduct.
 - v. The Chair of an Appeal Panel at any level may put forward a suspicion of academic misconduct for a false document or written statement submitted as part of any appeal or hearing.
 4. Other Documents or Information:
 - a. All verification of documents should be conducted by the office of the student's Chair/Director, or where appropriate the Chang School, not by individual instructors.
 - b. If it is supplied within an appeal, the document may be verified by the offices of Academic Integrity or Secretary of Senate, depending on the level of the appeal submission.
 - c. A suspicion of academic misconduct for submitting a false document may be brought forward by the Chair/Director, Dean or Chair of an Appeals Committee.

B. B.—Contributing to Academic Misconduct and/or Unauthorized Copying or Use of Copyrighted

Materials: Any member of the Ryerson community who suspects any of these types of academic misconduct (see Policy Sections A2, A3 and A4) should inform the Academic Integrity Officer, who will determine the appropriate person to be consulted.

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: A, B, C, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: -0.06" + Tab after: 0.19" + Indent at: 0.19"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.19", First line: 0"

C. Procedures for Dealing with Suspicions of Academic Misconduct in Graduate Supervised Research Activities.

1. Consultation

a. Members of the Ryerson community may consult with the Academic Integrity Office, the Graduate Program Directors, the Yeates School of Graduate Studies, and the Ombudsperson about any issue or concern relating to these Procedures.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

2. Academic Integrity Office

a. The Academic Integrity Office is responsible for implementing the Procedures and is impartial as between the parties in matters related to academic integrity.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

3. Decision Maker

a. Having received a suspicion of academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities, the Graduate Program Director will identify the appropriate decision maker who will make a request for a Facilitated Discussion, determine whether academic misconduct has occurred, and assign any penalties in accordance with the Policy and Procedures.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

b. Potential decision makers may include, but are not limited to, the student's graduate supervisor, Graduate Program Director, Dean or Dean's Designate of Yeates School of Graduate Studies.

4. Investigation

a. Prior to requesting a Facilitated Discussion, the decision maker, who has assumed jurisdiction of the matter, having received a suspicion of academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities, may request one or more faculty member(s) with subject matter expertise conduct an investigation into the facts and provide a report to the decision maker.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Pattern: Clear (White)

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

5. Representation at Facilitated Discussions

a. In recognition of the severity of the potential impact on students at the Graduate level, there is no option for a Non-Facilitated Discussion in dealing with suspicions of academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

b. Graduate students responding to a suspicion of academic misconduct relating to supervised research activities may be accompanied by an advocate from the Ryerson Student Union and/or support person to the Facilitated Discussion. Students are, however, expected to speak on their own behalf whenever reasonably possible.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Pattern: Clear

6. Notice of Facilitated Discussion

a. In the event of a suspicion of academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities, the decision maker, who has assumed jurisdiction of the matter, will be required to send an electronic request through the Academic Integrity Office's automated system for a Facilitated Discussion with the Graduate student via the Graduate student's Ryerson email only.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

b. The Academic Integrity Office will issue the Notice of Facilitated Discussion as soon as possible after an electronic request is received and the Facilitated Discussion scheduled in consultation with the parties.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

7. Contents of the Notice of Facilitated Discussion

a. The contents of the Notice of Facilitated Discussion must include:

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25"

i. The date and time of the Facilitated Discussion;

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

ii. The location of the Facilitated Discussion;

iii. The name of the Facilitator;

iv. A summary of the substance of the suspicion of academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities;

v. The contact name and number of the Student Issues and Advocacy Officer at the Ryerson Students Union and the Ombudsperson; and

vi. Contact information for the appropriate personnel in the Academic Integrity Office.

8. Timelines for the Facilitated Discussion

a. The Facilitated Discussion will normally be held within 5 business days of the Notice of Facilitated Discussion being issued to the parties.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

b. If the Graduate student fails to attend the Facilitated Discussion, the decision maker may proceed in their absence.

9. Requests for Accommodation

a. All requests for accommodation will be considered in accordance with University policy.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.5"

10. Facilitated Discussion

a. At the Facilitated Discussion, the Academic Integrity Officer/Designate will introduce the parties, including any advocates or support persons in attendance, identify the decision maker, and outline the process. Decisions will not be made at the Facilitated Discussion.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

b. Normally, the decision maker will provide a chronology of events leading up to the Facilitated Discussion and a review of the results of any investigation into the facts.

c. The Graduate Student, if applicable, should bring rough notes, drafts, relevant documents or other supporting materials to the discussion.

d. The decision maker has the discretion to schedule any subsequent Facilitated Discussions to bring forth any other information required prior to making a decision.

e. The facilitator from the Academic Integrity Office will review the relevant sections of the Policy, including the applicable timelines and possible consequences and the right to appeal.

f. A summary of the Facilitated Discussion must be completed by the facilitator from the Academic Integrity Office and signed by the student and decision maker. If either disagrees with the content of the summary, s/he should note the disagreement on the form before signing.

11. Decision and Impartiality

a. The Academic Integrity Office will issue the decision of the decision maker, who has assumed jurisdiction of the matter, including the assignment of any penalties and/or consequences usually within 5 business days. If the decision is to be issued later than 5 business days of the Facilitated Discussion, the parties will be notified and a new timeline established.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

b. The decision maker, who has assumed jurisdiction of the matter, should not have information regarding any previous acts of academic misconduct before the Facilitated Discussion is held or before the decision is issued. If there is previous knowledge, the decision maker should disregard this information in determining whether academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities has occurred.

c. Any person involved in dealing with a particular matter relating to a suspicion of academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities, may not serve on a panel of the Academic Integrity Council or the Senate Appeals Committee convened for hearing the same matter.

12. Penalties and Consequences

a. The penalties and consequences under for academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities are set out in Section E of the Policy.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

b. In the event that there is a finding of academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities, a Disciplinary Notation will be placed on the student’s academic record.

13. Educational Remedies

a. The decision maker may require the Graduate Student to attend the mandatory component of the Academic Integrity Tutorial in accordance with Part I, Section F of the Procedures: Academic Integrity Tutorial (AIT).

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

b. In the event that an educational remedy is assigned and there is a finding of academic misconduct in Graduate supervised research activities, a Disciplinary Notation will be placed on the student’s academic record.

Formatted: Justified, Indent: Left: 0.5", First line: 0", Pattern: Clear

III. STUDENT ENROLLMENT DURING APPEAL/HEARING PROCESS

Students may remain in class and may enrol in courses while their case is under appeal, or pending an automatic hearing. If students are found to have engaged in academic misconduct at the end of a semester and a hearing cannot be scheduled until the next semester, students may enrol in courses and continue in their program until a final decision is rendered. If the decision results in a DS, a DW or Expulsion, the student will normally be dropped from all courses and fees refunded. However, the Panel has the discretion to determine whether the penalty is effective at the end of the previous term or at the end of the term in which the student is currently enrolled.

IV. APPEALS AND AUTOMATIC HEARINGS: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COUNCIL (AIC)

A. Appeals

1. The student may ~~only~~ appeal the determination of engaging in academic misconduct.

2. Only if the penalty is an assigned grade of F on the course, or if there is a recommendation for a penalty of DS, DW or expulsion, may the student appeal the penalty.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.63", No bullets or numbering

3. If a grade reduction is assigned as a penalty, it is not subject to appeal. A mark of zero “0” on the work falls within the category of grade reduction.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 11 pt

4. There may be no appeal of the assignment of a DN, or the minimum penalty of a grade reduction, which includes a zero “0” zero (0) on the work. Such appeals will not be accepted at any level.

Formatted: Font color: Auto, Pattern: Clear

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

1. There has been a recommended penalty of DS, DW or Expulsion.
2. A penalty hearing is required because a student has more than one DN.

C. Consultation/Representation: Students are encouraged to seek assistance from an advocate. RSU or CESAR may be contacted for advocacy services. The Ombudsperson may be consulted at any time during the process. Students may be represented by an advocate who is not a lawyer at the AIC. Students may also bring a support person, who is not their legal representative and who may not participate in the hearing. Faculty may also seek assistance from the Faculty Advisor whose role is to provide support and guidance to faculty on issues related to academic integrity and appeal package/hearing preparation. Contact the AIO for information regarding this role. If there are

concerns or allegations of prejudice, discrimination or harassment on a prohibited ground as outlined by the Human Rights Code related to a suspicion or determination of academic misconduct, students must consult with the DHPO (see Procedures Section IA.2). Appeals will not be heard until that office has completed its investigation.

D. Submissions and Documentation

1. Appeals

- a. Student Responsibility in submitting an appeal: An AIC Appeal Form must be filed by the student in the AIO within ten (10) working days from receipt of the decision letter. The student must submit all documentation on the checklist provided on the form. Incomplete submissions will not be accepted. This includes all Summary of Discussion forms. If the student does not receive these in time for his or her appeal submission, s/he must contact the AIO. If, after the student has submitted his/her appeal, new evidence becomes available to him/her that s/he wishes to include, the student must contact the AIO as soon as possible. If the student does not have the opportunity to submit it in advance, s/he may bring it to the hearing, along with 5 copies. The Panel Chair will allow the respondent to see the document(s) and will be asked if s/he is willing to have it considered. If it is not acceptable to the respondent then the Panel Chair, in consultation with the Panel, shall determine if the evidence is to be accepted at that time and if so, whether or not additional time is required to review.
- b. Academic Integrity Officer Responsibility in receipt of an appeal:
 - i. If a student believes that there has been prejudice, discrimination or harassment, s/he must consult with the DHPO. However, if the AIO believes that there is a claim of prejudice, discrimination or harassment that the student has not discussed with that office, the AIO must inform the student that s/he must consult with the DHPO and that his or her appeal will not be heard until that office has completed its investigation.
 - ii. The AIO will forward a student's appeal to the instructor (or the person who brought forward the charge) for his/her response.
 - iii. The AIO will schedule the hearing and send a complete appeals package to all relevant parties.
- c. Instructor Responsibility in responding to an appeal: The instructor must respond to the student's appeal in writing to the AIO and submit all relevant documentation and evidence which will be given to the student and the AIC panel. If, after the instructor has submitted his/her response, new evidence becomes available to him/her that s/he wishes to include, the instructor must contact the AIO as soon as possible. If the instructor does not have the opportunity to submit it in advance, s/he may bring it to the hearing, along with 5 copies. The Panel Chair will allow the appellant to see the document(s) and will be asked if s/he is willing to have it considered. If it is not acceptable to the appellant then the Panel Chair, in consultation with the Panel, shall determine if the evidence is to be accepted at that time and if so, whether or not additional time is required to review.

E. Automatic Hearings

1. Academic Integrity Officer Responsibility: The student will be notified by the AIO of the intent to schedule an automatic hearing for one of the reasons noted in Procedures Section IVB. If the hearing is for a second (or more) determination of academic misconduct, this notice will not be sent until after the ten (10) working days allowed for a student appeal. If the student appeals the determination of academic misconduct and/or the penalty, the automatic hearing will not occur until after that appeal has been heard.
2. Student Responsibility: A Response to Notice of Automatic Hearing Form, including all of the items on the checklist provided on the form, should be filed by the student with the AIO within ten (10) working days of receipt of the Notice. Even if the form is not submitted, the hearing

will proceed. If the student does not appear for the hearing, the Panel will make its decision without input from the student.

3. Instructor and Chair/Director Responsibility:
 - a. If the hearing is held because of a recommendation of a penalty greater than an "F" in a course, the person who has determined that the student engaged in academic misconduct must state, in writing, the reason for the recommended penalty and provide all of the relevant evidence to the AIO in advance. He or she should also be present at the hearing.
 - b. If the hearing is to determine the penalty related to a second (or more) academic misconduct, the Chair/Director of the student's program will be given the opportunity to review the student's submission and provide, in writing to the AIC prior to the hearing, a recommendation for a penalty, including a recommended length of DS or a recommendation for DW or Expulsion. The Chair/Director, or designate, should also be present at the hearing to respond to questions.

F. Request for a Waiver of Hearing:

If an appellant signs the request for a waiver of hearing, the panel will make a decision without the appellant or respondent in attendance. A decision will be issued within five (5) working days of the panel meeting.

G. Pre-Hearing Procedures

1. The AIC must schedule a hearing as soon as possible based upon the availability of the student and the instructor or Chair/Director. Reasonable effort will be made to accommodate the availability of the student's advocate. Students 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 the student and the instructor, chair or director. Students who have any concerns about the timing of their hearings may contact the Academic Integrity Office.
2. A panel will be established consisting of two (2) faculty and one (1) student member of the AIC who have no conflict of interest with the student or instructor (see Policy Section C4 for regulations on Conflict of Interest). For graduate student hearings, the student panel member must be a graduate student unless permission is waived by the student. It will be determined in advance which of the faculty members will chair the Panel. Where possible for DS, DW and Expulsion hearings, panel members will not have been part of any previous hearings for this student.
3. The AIO will obtain an updated copy of the student's official academic record and workshops completed for verification and clarification in the hearing if relevant.
4. The AIO shall distribute a Notice of Hearing indicating the date, time and place of the hearing and the names of the panel members, copies of the student's appeal, and the instructor's/Chair's/Director's response, to: the members of the Panel, the instructor and/or Chair/Director, the student, and the student's advocate, if any (see Policy Section C1c for regulations on student receipt of appeals information).
5. The AIO and/or Panel Chair (see below) may determine that a resource person from the Department/School or Faculty should be present at the hearing to answer questions with regard to Department/School or Faculty matters (e.g. professional conduct standards, curriculum requirements, etc.). A resource person may stay for the entire hearing.

6. Investigation by the DHPO: If there has been a claim of prejudice, discrimination or harassment related to the appeal, the AIO (or Senate) will forward the appeal with the student's approval to the DHPO for investigation. Once the DHPO has completed the investigation, this information will then be forwarded to the Dean (administrator) for a decision. This decision will then be forwarded to the AIO (or Senate) in order for the appeal to proceed. Results of that investigation will be handled as follows:
 - a. If it has been determined that there is no prejudice, discrimination or harassment on a prohibited ground, then a memo from the DHPO stating that there has been an investigation and that it has been determined that no grounds were found will be included in the appeal package. The report of the DHPO and the Office of the Dean Decision letter will be included in the package.
 - b. If it has been determined that there has been prejudice, discrimination or harassment on a prohibited ground, the report of the DHPO and the decision letter from the Office of the Dean who is the decision maker is to be included in the appeal package. The process outlined in the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Policy will be followed.

H. Hearing Regulations

1. Representation/Support
 - a. Students may be represented by an advocate who is not a lawyer. RSU or CESAR may be contacted for advocacy services. The student's advocate may speak for the student and confer with the student as necessary. Should the advocate fail to attend, the Panel Chair has the discretion to postpone, delay, or proceed with the hearing.
 - b. Students and instructors may each have a support person in the hearing, but this person may not participate in any way. If either party wishes to speak with their support person during the hearing, they may request to do so to the Panel Chair. The Panel Chair will grant this request at his/her discretion. The conversation must occur outside of the room.
 - c. Students and instructors may also bring witnesses, but these must be declared in advance. If a witness is not declared in advance, the Panel will decide if the witness is to be heard. Witnesses called by either side shall be present at the hearing only while giving testimony. Should the witness fail to attend, the Panel Chair has the discretion to postpone, delay, or proceed with the hearing.
 - d. Instructors may indicate that they wish to bring a resource person, such as a lead instructor to the appeal. The AIO will determine if this is appropriate. A resource person may be present for the entire hearing.
2. If either the student or the instructor (Chair/Director) fails to attend the hearing, and there are no unforeseen circumstances, the AIC may proceed in his or her absence.
3. The Panel Chair may adjourn the hearing when it is required for a fair process.
4. The Appellant and Respondent will both be given the opportunity to present a brief opening and closing summary of his/her case to the Panel. These summaries are to be made verbally; video, audio, or multimedia materials used as presentation aids are not permitted. The appeal hearing package may be used as a reference.
5. Normally, the Academic Integrity Officer or designate may be present at the hearing for the purpose of providing advice on policy or procedural issues and to verify official records.
6. When required, the Panel Chair or AIO may ask for a resource person to attend, and may adjourn the hearing if necessary until that can be arranged. The resource person may stay for the entire hearing.

7. Prejudice: If there is a claim of prejudice based on a ground prohibited by the Human Rights Code in the documentation, the appeal will not proceed until there has been a decision letter. If a claim is made during the hearing, the Chair should stop the hearing and ask that the Secretary of Senate, Academic Integrity Officer, or student's advocate, meet briefly with the appellant to determine if he/she are in fact claiming prejudice on a prohibited ground. If so, the hearing is adjourned until a formal investigation is complete. If there is not a neutral party in attendance, the Panel Chair may call the AIO, Secretary of Senate or DHPO or adjourn the hearing until arrangements can be made to discuss the claim of prejudice.
 8. If new evidence is to be presented at the hearing, it must be done so at the beginning of the hearing after introductions. The other side will be given an opportunity to view the evidence and respond. The Chair in consultation with the Panel shall determine if the evidence is to be accepted and, if so, if the hearing should be adjourned to allow time for a response. New evidence must be in written form and sufficient copies should be provided by whoever is bringing forth new evidence.
 9. A hearing is open to the public except when the Panel is of the opinion that matters involving public security may be disclosed or the person disclosing intimate financial or personal matters may be negatively affected by doing so if the public is present. The appellant, respondent or a panel member may request that the hearing be closed. If the hearing is closed, the support person can remain in the hearing. 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. The Chair of the Panel shall make the final decision on these matters.
 10. The hearing may not be audio or video recorded, and no minutes of the proceedings are taken. Support people and witnesses may not take notes. The decision letter is the official record of the proceedings.
 11. Once a decision has been reached, panel members are responsible for the confidential shredding of all documents and deletion of all emails in their possession related to the appeal. The complete original copy of the appeal shall be retained and held in confidence by the AIO and the Registrar shall confidentially retain copies.
- I. Decision** (see Policy Section B for specifics on penalties and Policy Section C7a for Burden and Standard of Proof):
1. Decisions are made by majority vote of the Panel, in private. The result of this vote is not disclosed in the decision letter.
 2. The Panel Chair votes only in the case of a tie.
 3. ~~If the Panel may assign a grade reduction on the work, the course instructor will determine the numerical value of the grade reduction as appropriate. A mark of zero "0" on the work falls within the category of grade reduction, which includes a mark of zero "0". The Panel may not award any numerical/letter grade except the minimum penalty of a zero (0) on the work, or an "F" in the course.~~
 4. The Panel may:
 - i. deny the appeal;
 - ii. grant the appeal;

- iii. grant the appeal and attach any reasonable conditions it deems warranted. If conditions are not met, the original decision will stand;
 - iv. maintain ~~or reduce~~ the penalty of an "F" in the course ~~to~~ or, assign a grade reduction on the work. A mark of zero "0" on the work falls within the category of grade reduction, which includes a mark of zero "(0)" on the work to be determined by the instructor, as appropriate. (Note: If academic misconduct is found, the minimum penalty is a grade reduction, which includes a mark of zero "0" zero (0) on the work to be determined by the instructor, as appropriate, and a DN on the academic record is automatic and may not be removed by the Panel.) (See Policy Section B4ai for information on when DN can be removed);
 - v. assign or remove the requirement for the Academic Integrity Tutorial;
 - vi. in exceptional circumstances, if new evidence related to the charge is presented in an appeal or automatic hearing, or if the assigned or recommended penalty differs dramatically from the published penalty guidelines, the Panel may assign a higher penalty;
 - vii. for a recommendation of DS or for an automatic DS:
 - a. determine no disciplinary suspension is warranted(deny the recommendation for DS).
 - b. determine that DS is warranted and set the penalty from 1 term to 2 years. (Note: The Spring/Summer term is not considered a term of suspension for full-time program students, and these students may not take courses in this term while on DS. Spring/Summer term is considered an academic term for part-time programs. A DS cannot be assigned for graduate students.
 - viii. for a recommendation of DW:
 - a. determine no DW is warranted (deny DW). The Panel may assign a lesser penalty. A DS cannot be assigned to graduate students.
 - b. determine that DW is warranted and set a period of at least two years during which the student may not apply to any Ryerson program or certificate or take any CE courses at Ryerson. The case is referred to the Senate Appeals Committee by the Academic Integrity Office.
 - ix. for a recommendation of Expulsion from the University:
 - a. determine Expulsion is not warranted. The Panel may assign a lesser penalty. If the lesser penalty is DW, the case will be referred to the Senate Appeals Committee.
 - b. determine that Expulsion from the University is warranted. The case will be referred to the Senate Appeals Committee by the Academic Integrity Office.
5. The student will be notified of the decision within five (5) working days via their Ryerson e-mail. If the student does not receive the decision within this time, he or she should contact the Academic Integrity Officer.
 6. If there is a recommendation of DW or Expulsion, the AIO will inform the Secretary of Senate of the need to schedule an automatic hearing by the Senate Appeals Committee.
 7. Based upon matters arising at the hearing, the Panel may make recommendations to the Academic Integrity Officer on procedural or policy matters for forwarding to the appropriate office.
 8. Once a decision has been reached, panel members are responsible for the confidential shredding of all documents and deletion of all emails in their possession related to the appeal. The panel chair should retain their information until s/he are sure an appeal to Senate has not been submitted by the student. The complete original copy of the appeal shall be retained and held in

confidence by the AIO and the Secretary of Senate and the Registrar's Office shall confidentially retain copies of the decision.

V. APPEALS AND AUTOMATIC HEARINGS: SENATE APPEALS COMMITTEE

- A. Appeals:** A student may appeal the decision made by the AIC, based on one of the following grounds:
1. there is new evidence that was not available at the time of the first hearing which has a reasonable possibility of affecting the decision;
 2. there was a substantial procedural error which could have affected the outcome;
 3. inadequate weight was given to the evidence provided; or
 4. if a higher penalty has been assigned by the AIC.
- B. Automatic Hearings:** An automatic hearing of the Senate Appeals Committee will be scheduled when the AIC recommends DW or Expulsion.
- C. Consultation/Representation:** Students are encouraged to seek assistance from an advocate. RSU or CESAR may be contacted for advocacy services. The Ombudsperson may be consulted at any time during the process. Students may also seek assistance from legal counsel at the Senate level students may also bring a support person who may not participate in the hearing. Faculty may also seek assistance from the Faculty Advisor whose role is to provide support and guidance to faculty on issues related to academic integrity and appeal package/hearing preparation. Contact the AIO or Senate Office for information regarding this role. If there are concerns or allegations of prejudice, discrimination or harassment on a prohibited ground as outlined by the Human Rights Code related to a suspicion or determination of academic misconduct, students must consult with the (DHPO) (see Procedures Section IA.2). No appeals will be heard until that office has done its investigation.

D. Submissions and Documentation of Appeals

1. **Student Responsibility in submitting an appeal:** Students must submit a Senate Academic Misconduct Appeals Form to the Secretary of Senate within ten (10) working days from the date of the AIC decision. The student must provide, in writing, a detailed explanation as to why the Senate Appeals Committee should consider the case. Forms and instructions for the filing of appeals can be found at the Senate website (<http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/>), and are available from the Office of the Secretary of Senate.
2. **Office of the Senate Responsibility in Receipt of an Appeal:**
 - a. If a student believes that there has been prejudice, discrimination or harassment, s/he must have consulted with the DHPO. However, if the Office of the Senate believes that there is a claim of prejudice, discrimination or harassment that the student has not discussed with that office, the Secretary of Senate must inform the student that s/he must consult with the DHPO and that his or her appeal will not be heard until that office has done its investigation and a determination has been made.
 - b. The Office of the Senate will forward a student's appeal to the AIC Panel Chair and instructor (or person who brought the original charge) for their response.
 - c. The Office of the Senate will schedule a hearing and send a complete appeals package to all relevant parties.
3. **AIC Panel Chair and Instructor Responsibility in Response to an Appeal:** The Chair of the AIC Panel and the instructor (or the person who assigned the original penalty) shall be co-respondents to the appeal and may submit a combined or separate response and supporting documents.

E. Automatic Hearings

1. **Office of the Senate Responsibility:** The student will be notified by the Office of the Senate of the intent to schedule an automatic hearing. If appropriate, this notice will not be sent until after the ten (10) working days allowed for a student to submit an appeal. If the student submits an appeal, the automatic hearing will not occur until after that appeal has been heard.
2. **Student Responsibility:** A Response to the Notice of Automatic Hearing Form should be filed by the student with the Office of the Senate within ten (10) working days of receipt of the notice. Even if the form is not submitted, the hearing will proceed. If the student does not appear for the hearing, the Panel will make its decision without input from the student.
3. **Chair of the AIC Panel Responsibility:** The Chair of the AIC Panel is the respondent and must respond to the student's submission and be present at the hearing. The Chair may call the instructor or the Chair of the student's Department/School to be a witness in the hearing.

F. Pre-Hearing Procedures: The Secretary of Senate Responsibility:

1. Review all appeals to determine if the appeal meets one of the required grounds. The Secretary of Senate may dismiss an appeal and strike a panel as per policy.
2. If the appeal is not dismissed, the Office of the Senate will forward the appeal to the Chair of the AIC and the original instructor(s) who charged the student who shall be the respondent(s), and determine if other resource people should be required to attend the hearing. The respondent(s) (see Procedures Section V.D.3.) should reply to the appeal within five (5) working days of receipt of the appeal. Enrollment Services and Student Records must also receive a copy of the Notice of Appeal.

3. Establish a Panel of the Senate Appeals Committee and appoint a Panel Chair (see Policy Section C4 for regulations on Conflict of Interest).
4. Schedule a hearing as soon as possible based upon the availability of the student and the respondent(s). Reasonable effort should be made to accommodate the availability of the student's advocate. Students 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 the student and instructor, chair or director.
5. Forward all of the submissions for the appeal to: all members of the Panel of the Senate Appeals Committee; the respondent(s); involved faculty members and/or Chairs/Directors; the Registrar; the student (see Policy Section C1c for regulations on student receipt of appeals information); the Academic Integrity Officer and the student's advocate or legal counsel, if any.
6. The Secretary of Senate or AIO will obtain a copy of the student's official academic record and workshops completed for verification and clarification in the hearing if relevant.

G. Hearing Regulations

1. Representation/Support
 - a. Students may be represented by an advocate or by legal counsel. RSU or CESAR may be contacted for advocacy services. Students may also consult with the Ombudsperson. The student's advocate or legal counsel may speak for the student and confer with the student as necessary. Should the advocate or legal counsel fail to attend, the Panel Chair has the discretion to postpone, delay or proceed with the hearing. Faculty may also seek assistance from the Faculty Advisor whose role is to provide support and guidance to faculty on issues related to academic integrity and appeal package/hearing preparation. The Faculty Advisor should not attend the hearing. Contact the AIO or Office of the Senate should information be needed regarding this role.
 - b. Students and instructors may each have a support person in the hearing, but this person may not participate in any way.
 - c. Students and instructors may also bring witnesses, but these must be declared in advance. If a witness is not declared in advance, the Panel will decide if the witness is to be heard. Witnesses called by either side shall be present at the hearing only while giving testimony. Should the witness fail to attend, the Panel Chair has the discretion to postpone, delay or proceed with the hearing.
 - d. Instructors may indicate that they wish to bring a resource person such as a lead instructor to the appeal. The Secretary of Senate will determine if this is appropriate. The resource person may be present for the entire hearing.
2. If either the student or the instructor (Chair/Director) fails to attend the hearing, and there are no unforeseen circumstances, the Panel may proceed in his or her absence.
3. The Panel Chair may adjourn the hearing when it is required for a fair process.
4. Normally, the Academic Integrity Officer, Secretary of Senate or designate may be present at the hearing for the purpose of providing advice on policy or procedural issues and to verify official records.
5. When required, the Panel Chair may ask for a resource person to attend, and may adjourn the hearing if necessary until that can be arranged. The resource person may stay for the entire hearing.

6. Prejudice: see Procedures Section IV. G. 6.
 7. If new evidence is presented at the hearing, it must be done so at the beginning of the hearing after introductions. The other side will be given an opportunity to view the evidence and respond. The Chair in consultation with the Panel shall determine if the evidence is to be accepted and, if necessary if the hearing should be adjourned to allow time for a response.
 8. A hearing is open to the public except when the Panel is of the opinion that matters involving public security may be disclosed or the person disclosing intimate financial or personal matters may be negatively affected by doing so if the public is present. The appellant, respondent or a panel member may request that the hearing be closed. If the hearing is closed, the support person can remain in the hearing. 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. The Chair of the Panel shall make the final decision on these matters.
 9. The hearing may not be audio or video recorded, and no minutes of the proceedings are taken. The decision letter is the official record of the proceedings.
- H. Decision (See Policy Section B for specifics on penalties and Policy Section C7a for Burden and Standard of Proof.)**
1. Decisions are made by majority vote of the Panel in private. The result of this vote is not disclosed in the decision letter.
 2. The Panel Chair votes only in the case of a tie.
 3. If the Panel assigns a grade reduction on the work, the course instructor will determine the numerical value of the grade reduction as appropriate. A mark of zero "0" on the work falls within the category of grade reduction. The Panel may not award any numerical/letter grade except an "F" in the course.
 4. 3. The Panel may:
 - a. deny the appeal;
 - b. grant the appeal;
 - c. grant the appeal and attach any reasonable conditions it deems warranted. If conditions are not met, the original decision will stand;
 - d. maintain the penalty of an "F" in the course or, assign a grade reduction on the work. A mark of zero "0" on the work falls within the category of grade reduction. Note: If academic misconduct is found, a DN on the academic record is automatic and may not be removed by the Panel. See Policy Section B4ai for information on when DN can be removed;
 - e. assign or remove the requirement for the Academic Integrity Tutorial;
 - f. for a recommendation of DS or for an automatic DS:
 - i. determine no disciplinary suspension is warranted (deny the recommendation for DS).
 - ii. determine that DS is warranted and set the penalty from 1 term to 2 years. (Note: The Spring/Summer term is not considered a term of suspension for full-time program students, and these students may not take courses in this term while on DS. Spring/Summer term is considered an academic term for part-time programs. A DS cannot be assigned for graduate students.
 - g. for a recommendation of DW:

- i. determine no DW is warranted (deny DW). The Panel may assign a lesser penalty. A DS cannot be assigned to graduate students.
- ii. determine that DW is warranted and set a period of at least two years during which the student may not apply to any Ryerson program or certificate or take any CE courses at Ryerson.
- h. for a recommendation of Expulsion from the University:
 - i. determine Expulsion is not warranted. The Panel may assign a lesser penalty.
 - determine that Expulsion from the University is warranted.

~~5.4.~~ The student will be notified of the decision within five (5) working days via their Ryerson e-mail. If the student does not receive the decision within this time, he or she should contact the Office of the Senate.

~~6.5.~~ Based upon matters arising at the hearing, the Panel may make recommendations to the Secretary of Senate on procedural or policy matters for forwarding to the appropriate office.

~~7.6.~~ Once a decision has been reached, panel members are responsible for the confidential shredding of all documents and deletion of all emails in their possession related to the appeal. The complete original copy of the appeal shall be retained and held in confidence by the Office of the Secretary of Senate; and the AIO and the Registrar's Office shall confidentially retain copies of the decision.

~~8.7.~~ Decisions of the Senate Appeals Committee are final and not appealable.

("Procedures" revised August 2011 – effective Fall 2011)

Report #W2014-4 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC)**June 3, 2014**

1. Nominating Committee Report #W2014-1

AGPC nominees: Vanessa Magness, TRSM; Kileen Tucker Scott, FCS;
Jurij Leshchyshyn, FEAS

SPC nominees: Michelle Dionne, Arts; Alex Ferworn, FEAS; Urooj Siddiqui, FEAS
undergraduate student

Vice Chair of Senate nominee: Nima Naghibi, Arts

Faculty of Community Services nominees to fill vacancies as Faculty Senators: Henry
Parada, Social Work; Richard Meldrum, Occupational and Public Health

Respectfully submitted,

J. Turtle
(for the Nominating Committee):

Gerd Hauck, Debbie Chant, Eric Kam, Vanessa Magness, Kaamran Raahemifar,
Urooj Siddiqui

Motion #1: *That Senate approve the nominees for the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC), the Senate Priorities Committee (SPC), and for the position of Vice Chair of Senate as presented in this report*

2. Recommendation to add another Chang School representative to the Academic Standards Committee: C. Evans

Motion #2: *That Senate approve the addition of one more Chang School representative to the Academic Standards Committee*

3. Update on the October 2013 Senate request for AGPC to develop policy clarifying the definition of an “Academic Director” by the June 2014 Senate meeting: J. Turtle

Motion #3: *That Senate defer discussion of the definition of an “Academic Director” until the October 2014 Senate meeting*

4. Update on the January 2013 Senate request for AGPC to develop policy guidelines regarding the creation of new Schools/Departments by the June 2014 Senate meeting: J. Turtle

Motion #4: *That Senate defer discussion of guidelines regarding the creation of new Schools/Departments until the October 2014 Senate meeting*

Respectfully submitted

M. Lachemi
Chair (for the AGPC):

A. M. Brinsmead, S. Dolgoy, C. Evans, C. Falzon, C. Hack, G. Hauck, E. Kam,
H. Lane Vetere, L. Lavallée, R. Lawrence, V. Magness, A. McWilliams,
K. Raahemifar, U. Siddiqui, J. Turtle



OFFICE OF THE VICE PROVOST ACADEMIC

From: Dr. Chris Evans, Vice Provost Academic

To: Dr. John Turtle, Secretary of Senate

Re: Summary report of the Academic Standards Committee activities, 2010 – 2014.

May 20, 2014

Dear Dr. Turtle,

The following report presents data summarizing the activities of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) of Senate from September, 2010 to May, 2014. The report presents a categorized enumeration of all proposals received and reviewed by the ASC as well as the tally of the number subsequently approved by Senate. I am providing this information to Senate for its information.

Mandate of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC): The Senate bylaw states that the ASC “Provides advice to Senate with respect to the quality of both operating and proposed undergraduate programs (degree, diploma, certificate, and special-purpose programs), including undertaking periodic program reviews, assessment of new undergraduate program proposals, review and formulation of policies governing undergraduate curriculum structure, and regarding such other matters as referred to it by Senate or the Provost and Vice President Academic.”

The ASC Approach: The ASC is vital to the sound academic operation of the University. It is the ultimate internal arbiter of quality for undergraduate programs and Chang School certificates, and it plays a key role in the review and formulation of policies governing undergraduate curriculum structure. The approach taken to these activities for the past four years has been to work closely with academic units to ensure their proposals are strong, coherent, well justified and consistent with Ryerson’s academic policies. A typical scenario is as follows:

The proposal is submitted to the Office of the Vice Provost Academic for preliminary review. Advice is given on structure and content and direction is provided on seeking other relevant input (e.g., statements of learning outcomes, curriculum mapping, University Planning Office input, additional consultations etc.). The proposers have an opportunity to revise in light of this advice. Ultimately they submit their revised proposal to the Vice Provost Academic as Chair of ASC. The Vice Provost Academic presents the proposal to an *in camera* session of ASC. The committee members discuss the proposal and

generate a set of queries. The queries form the basis of a memo from the Vice Provost Academic to the proposers. The proposers are asked to respond in writing to the queries. Once that is done, the Vice Provost Academic invites the proposers to meet with the members of ASC for a face-to-face discussion of the proposal. This is an opportunity to clarify any items that remain vague, for ASC to provide additional advice, and for the proposers to emphasize the significance of the proposal to their home academic unit, to their Faculty, and to Ryerson. After this face-to-face session, additional revisions may be requested. Once these, if any, are complete, the ASC deliberates and votes on whether to recommend the proposal to Senate.

I would also like to take this opportunity to recognize the hard work and commitment of all the ASC members who have devoted their time to supporting the quality of Ryerson's programs.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Chris Evans', written in a cursive style.

Chris Evans, Vice Provost Academic and Chair for the Committee

2010 / 2011 Senate Year

Category of Proposal	Number Submitted to ASC	Number Approved by Senate
New Programs	3	3
Discontinuation of Programs	0	0
Program Reviews	3	3
Curriculum Modification to Programs	5	3 ^{a,b)}
New Minors	3	3
Modifications to Minors	0	0
New Certificates	8	8
Modification of Certificates	5	5
Certificate Reviews	1	1
Discontinuation of Certificate	0	0
Other	3	3 ^{c)}

Total Proposals Processed = 31

Proposals Approved = 29 (94%)

a) One proposal was reviewed by ASC and returned to the proposers as the proposal did not conform to Ryerson's curriculum policy about number of liberal studies courses.

b) One proposal was reviewed by ASC and returned to the program as the proposal did not well justify the proposed changes. The ASC offered advice to the program on revising, but the program did not present a revised document in this Senate year.

c) Revised Minors policy, Ryerson's IQAP policies, a framework for curriculum renewal.

2011 / 2012 Senate Year

Category of Proposal	Number Submitted to ASC	Number Approved by Senate
New Programs	6	6
Discontinuation of Programs	0	0
Program Reviews	2	2
Curriculum Modification to Programs	14	14
New Minors	4	4
Modifications to Minors	2	2
New Certificates	11	11
Modification of Certificates	0	0
Certificate Reviews	0	0
Discontinuation of Certificate	0	0
Other	2	2 ^{a)}

Total Proposals Processed = 42

Proposals Approved = 42 (100%)

a) Discontinuation of a mandatory laptop program, Optional Specialization in Digital Entrepreneurship and Innovation

2012 / 2013 Senate Year

Category of Proposal	Number Submitted to ASC	Number Approved by Senate
New Programs	1	1
Discontinuation of Programs	0	0
Program Reviews	2	2
Curriculum Modification to Programs	5	5
New Minors	10	10
Modifications to Minors	1	1
New Certificates	2	2
Modification of Certificates	2	2
Certificate Reviews	4	4
Discontinuation of Certificate	0	0
Other	1	1 ^{a)}

Total Proposals Processed = 26

Proposals Approved = 26 (100%)

a) Optional Specialization in Zone Education

2013 / 2014 Senate Year¹

Category of Proposal	Number Submitted to ASC	Number Approved by Senate
New Programs	0	0
Discontinuation of Programs	1	1
Program Reviews	2	2
Curriculum Modification to Programs	9	8 ^{a)}
New Minors	5	5
Modifications to Minors	1	1
New Certificates	2	2
Modification of Certificates	7	7
Certificate Reviews	1	1
Discontinuation of Certificate	5	5
Other	3	2 ^{b)}

Total Proposals Processed = 36

Proposals Approved = 35 (97%)

a) The proposal was reviewed by ASC and felt to be in need of revisions. It did not make a strong case for the proposed changes and there were major areas where the plans and impacts were unclear. The proposers were provided with written advice to revise and are working on this. But they did not come back to ASC in this Senate year.

b) Program name changes. One proposal did not well justify the proposed change. The proposers were provided with written advice to revise and are working on this. But they did not come back to ASC in this Senate year.

¹ This total includes the two proposals in front of Senate at the June 2014 meeting.

REPORT OF ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Report #W2014-5; June 2014

In this report the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) brings to Senate its evaluation and recommendation on the following items:

- Periodic Program Review of the Bachelor of Health Administration in Health Information Management, School of Health Services Management
- Changes to course sequencing, titles, descriptions, and requisites for the Bachelor of Social Work program
- Ted Rogers School of Management Co-operative Education Proposal

A. PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW – Bachelor of Health Administration in Health Information Management

1. BASIC INFORMATION AND HISTORY

Health Information Management (HIM) is a *part-time degree completion* program comprised of 24 one-semester courses, the equivalent of approximately two years of full-time study, for those with either of the following: a minimum of a two-year CAAT diploma from a CHIMA accredited or recognized health record/health information program with related experience; or a three year CAAT diploma in an applied health science with related experience. Students are admitted directly to the Health Information Management stream of the School of Health Services Management, Bachelor of Health Administration program. The HIM program is designed to further develop a student's knowledge in the theory and management of health information. The HIM program's initial entering class was in 2003 and consisted of 39 students.

Health information management is concerned with health-related information and the management of systems to collect, store, process, retrieve, analyze, disseminate and communicate information related to the planning, provision, research and evaluation of health care services and more specifically includes the application of information to enable evidence based decision making in health care at the individual, department, organizational and system level.

In the early 1990's, the Canadian Health Record Association (CHRA)¹ recognized that, with the evolution taking place in the health services industry, there would be a need to prepare individuals at the baccalaureate level especially in the area of preparing health information to support the decisions-making process. Four Canadian universities, including Ryerson University and the University of Western Ontario, were named as suitable sites to address the identified needs. In contrast to the University of Western's direct entry four year undergraduate program, Ryerson proposed a part-time, degree-completion option with the intent to work in partnership with George Brown College which offers a 2-year Diploma program in Health Information Management.

2. SOCIETAL NEED

Healthcare is among the largest industries in Canada. Second only to trade in the services economy, it employs over 10% of the Canadian workforce². Out of fourteen NAICS³ aggregate services-producing economic sectors, healthcare produces the 4th largest gross domestic product in Canada, after the real estate, trade and financial industries⁴. Healthcare is also one of the fastest growing industries in Canada. The rapid growth in the healthcare sector is driven by several factors, including ageing population,

¹ The Canadian Health Records Association subsequently changed its name to Canadian Health Information Management Association (CHIMA) in 2003.

² Statistics Canada, 2007

³ North American Industry Classification System, 2009

⁴ Statistics Canada, 2007

increase in life expectancy, mutating diseases, changing policies, a more educated public and increased demand for a better quality of care.

While all students enrolled in the Health Information Management part-time degree completion program are currently employed in the field, health industry experts and stakeholders confirm that there is an increasing need for HIM graduates. Canada Health Infoway reported that, as far as health executives are concerned, healthcare business comes down to information management business. In this respect, a Health Region executive stated the following: *“We’re not [just in] the healthcare business; we’re in the information management business. We should start thinking as information managers dealing with healthcare information, and think about the tools we need to do it properly”*⁵.

3. EXISTING AND ANTICIPATED STUDENT DEMAND

Since inception in 2003 there has been a steady increase in applications and in the last three years it has held steady at 46 applications per academic year. However, from that applicant pool only 15 students per academic year met the requirements for acceptance into the program. Most recently, in the Fall of 2011 there were 27 applications; however, only 5 of these applications were deemed to be qualified and were confirmed. Of note is that of the 5 that were confirmed, all 5 enrolled. While no formal track of records regarding the profile of applicants to the program is available, the primary reasons for turning down applications have dealt with inappropriate academic preparation for the HIM degree completion program (e.g. less than 2 years community college preparation), no work experience and lack of professional certification.

The 2012 Student Survey Results indicated that 13% of the student body was 24 years of age or younger and 40% were over the age of 40 (in 2009 almost 75% were over the age of 40 and none were under the age of 25). This reflects the beginning of a new growth in the younger cohort and would suggest a possible expansion, targeting a younger profile student and perhaps consideration of a full-time direct entry program. As a result, discussions have been underway for a collaborative full-time direct entry program in partnership with the Ted Rogers School of Information Technology Management. As a result of these discussions, and to test interest in the concept, a Certificate in Health Informatics has recently been developed and offered through the Chang School. The results of this collaborative program will be monitored and will inform further discussion going forward.

A joint study on the Human Resource needs for Health Informatics and Health Information Management was released on November 2, 2009 by the Canadian Health Information Management Association (CHIMA), Canada Health Infoway, COACH, the Information and Communications Technology Council (ICTC), and Information Technology Association of Canada – Health (ITAC-Health). The purpose of the report was to estimate the current supply of and five-year requirements for Health Informatics and Health Information Management professionals. The findings indicate serious risks of skills shortages and several initiatives are proposed to avert these shortages. They recommend “HIM professionals will require additional theoretical knowledge and practical insight into information technology systems and applications. The skill broadening that is required exceeds the learning that is associated with normal working experience. Formalized professional development will be required”⁶.

By 2014 the number of HI and HIM professional who will require broader skills will increase from 8,880 in 2009 to between 13,690 and 32,170. These figures are particularly important for a degree completion program like Ryerson’s Bachelor of Health Administration in Health Information Management. Among the report’s recommendations is a clear call to “[expand] the role of skill certification by building on certification programs that are already in place”. HIM may consider a full time direct entry HIM management program; however, this should not be initiated at the expense of the current programming structure.

⁵ Canada Health Infoway - http://www2.infoway-inforoute.ca/Documents/Vision_Summary_EN.pdf

⁶ Canada Health Infoway, CHIMA, COACH, ICTC, ITAC. Health Informatics and Health Information Management Human Resources Report. November 2009

4. PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

By the end of this program HIM graduates will be able to ...

1. Apply a deep and broad knowledge of the key concepts, methodologies, current advances and strategies in health information management to a variety of settings which may intersect with and include the wider healthcare and health management fields.
2. Collect, interpret, assess, and debate multiple sources of information informing critical selection of methods, approaches, and strategies for facilitating planning and decision-making in a health care setting.
3. Complete a capstone research project integrating a broad range of skills and knowledge from the health care field by identifying a specialized area of inquiry, by implementing effective research methods (qualitative or quantitative), by critically evaluating resulting data and by formally preparing and presenting findings of publishable quality.
4. Communicate health information, appraisal of literature, arguments, data analysis and interpretation effectively to a variety of audiences first through oral presentations and by responding to questions and secondly through essays, formal research reports and other written assignments.
5. Monitor and appraise the changing field of health care and identify gaps in current understanding, challenging assumptions and re-evaluating current practices in light of new developments and understandings in the field.
6. Apply specialized health information management knowledge, strategies and critical thinking skills to complex multidisciplinary problems involving multiple stakeholders in the health care system demonstrating principles consistent with academic and social responsibility.

Following development of the program learning outcomes, a curriculum mapping exercise was initiated. Learning Outcome 1 is first introduced at an introductory level in the 300 level courses (HSM 301, HIM 300, HIM 301, HIM 302 and HSM 326) then reinforced in later courses at an intermediate level (HIM 403, HIM 404, HIM 405, HSM 437, HSM 417 and HSM 408) and lastly students demonstrate proficiency in Learning Outcome 1 by the time they reach the practicum project (HIM 406 and HIM 407). This pattern is repeated through all the learning outcomes except perhaps Learning Outcome 3 which is particularly applicable to the Practicum experience. Further progression in meeting Goal 3 is demonstrated at an introductory level through Research Methodology (HSM 417) and is reinforced through Program Planning and Evaluation (HSM 408) and culminates in the actual completion of a formal Practicum Research Project of publishable quality (Proficiency).

5. PROGRAM CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER ACADEMIC PLANS

The above learning outcomes are consistent with the University mission and academic plan, the Faculty academic plan and the school's academic plan. Ryerson's degree-completion HIM program is uniquely structured to capitalize on students currently working in the healthcare field who can then apply the skills they are learning immediately to their workplace which draws on Ryerson's history of applied knowledge to address societal needs. Further woven through many of the program goals is a focus on the acquisition of critical thinking, interpretation and assessment of multiple sources of information related to a specialized health information management field as well as the broader health care field and in turn societal needs in general (e.g. public health; Pan Canadian Health record). Lastly program Learning Outcome 3 which applies to the required capstone research project integrates both theoretical and applied knowledge at a high level integrating the learning from the entire program including the application of a broad range of knowledge, critical thinking and research skills to a specific health care management problem within a healthcare organization and measures its success through the demonstration of effective communication skills through a formal presentation to both an academic and business audience and through a formal research document of publishable quality. The rigour required for the Capstone course is deliberately designed to prepare for graduate level work.

School of Health Services Management Vision, Mission and Goals

Mission

- To be the leading and preferred national provider of innovative, part-time undergraduate education in Health Information Management and AUPHA certified degree-completion education in Health Services Management for working professional students

Vision

- To be the national leader in flexible and innovating management education and applied research for career health professionals

Overarching Program Goals

- To educate a health practitioner to assume entry or middle-level management responsibilities in the provision of appropriate, cost effective client-centred health services in institutional and community settings
- To facilitate the personal and professional development of a manager who will contribute to the evolution of multi-disciplinary, holistic health communities
- To build a broad understanding of political, social, economic, ethical, cultural and technological factors which shape health and the health system
- To provide a basis for entry into advanced or graduate studies

6. PROGRAM CURRICULUM AND STRUCTURE

The 24 course degree-completion program in Health Information Management is offered as a part-time program.

- 13 Professional courses
- 7 Professionally related courses (3 required; 4 electives)
- 4 Liberal Studies

The program is designed around the needs of the working professional in health information management and offers courses in various formats such as lecture, intensive on-site and distance course delivery via the internet. The program offerings have gained wide acceptance from students pursuing the Bachelor of Health Administration degree. This structure satisfies the needs of individuals who reside at considerable distances outside the Greater Toronto Area.

Students must take HSM 301 as the first course. This provides the foundation for an understanding of the Canadian health care system. There is no prerequisite to HSM 301 but this course forms the prerequisite for many of the management courses which follow. Of particular note is that many HIM courses are utilized by other certificates and programs, including Health Services Management (HSM 301 and others), Health Informatics (HSM 301 and others), Environmental Public Health Leadership (HSM 408), and Project Management (HSM 301).

Health Information Management Curriculum	
<p>LEVEL I, SEMESTER I</p> <p>Professionally Required Courses HSM 301: The Healthcare System HIM 300: Managing Health Information Services HIM 301: Healthcare Information Analysis</p> <p>Professionally Related and Required (one of) ACC 100: Financial Accounting ECN 104: Introductory Microeconomics ECN 204: Introductory Macroeconomics</p> <p>Professionally Related Elective (One)</p> <p>Liberal Studies_(One)</p>	<p>LEVEL I, SEMESTER II</p> <p>Professionally Required Courses HIM 302: Health Information Systems HSM 326: Law for Health Managers</p> <p>Professionally Related and Required (two of) ACC 100: Financial Accounting ECN 104: Introductory Microeconomics ECN 204: Introductory Macroeconomics</p> <p>Professionally Related Elective (One)</p> <p>Liberal Studies_(One)</p>

<p>LEVEL II, SEMESTER I Professionally Required Courses HIM 403: Managerial Accounting and Finance HSM 417: Research Methodology HSM 437: Human Resources Management HIM 404: Health Economics</p> <p>Professionally Related Elective (One)</p> <p>Liberal Studies (One)</p>	<p>LEVEL II, SEMESTER II Professionally Required Courses HIM 405: Issues in Health Information Mgmt. HSM 408: Program Planning and Evaluation HIM 406: Practicum Seminar HIM 407: Practicum</p> <p>Professionally Related Elective (One)</p> <p>Liberal Studies (One)</p>
---	--

Professionally Related Electives	
<p>EID 100 Digital Skills and Innovation for the Global Economy GMS 422 Quality Management HSM 307 Principles of Long Term Care Service Delivery HSM 308 Project Management-Long Term Care HSM 309 Trends in Long Term Care Service Delivery HSM 310 Institutional Structure INT 901 Gerontology: Critical Issues and Future Trends INT 902 Disability Issues INT 904 Health Promotion and Community Development INT 905 Conflict Resolution in Community Services INT 906 Sexuality: Power and Pleasure INT 907 Team Work for Community Services INT 908 Homelessness in Canadian Society INT 910 First Nations Issues INT 911 International Community Development INT 912 Community Development: International Field Experience</p>	<p>INT 913 Issues of Migration INT 914 Settlement Experiences INT 915 Responses to Migration INT 916 Introduction to Fundraising INT 917 Community Development INT 920 Community Collaborations ITM 100 Foundations of Information Systems ITM 102 Business Information Systems I ITM 305 Systems Analysis and Design ITM 500 Data and Information Management ITM 505 Managing Information Systems ITM 595 Auditing of Information Systems ITM 610 Database Administration MHR 522 Industrial Relations MKT 100 Principles of Marketing</p>

Table 1 provides details of the rationale for the inclusion of Professional and Professionally-Related Required courses in the Health Information Management program curriculum. The courses offered in Level I address Learning Outcomes 1, 2, 4 and 5, which reveal a foundational level of learning. In Level II, the students integrate and apply previous learning to complex problems that consider multiple stakeholder issues, including corporate social responsibility (Learning Outcomes 3 and 6).

Table 1

Rationale		
Professionally Related Required		
Introductory Financial Accounting	ACC 100	Establishes the basis for Financial Management
Introductory Microeconomics	ECN 104	Establishes the basics of microeconomic theory and the concepts of demand and supply required for health economics
Introductory Macroeconomics	ECN 204	Establishes the basics of macroeconomic theory and the concepts of monetary and fiscal policy required for health economics
Professionally Required		
Managing Health Information Services	HIM 300	Explores the manager’s role as it relates to planning, organizing, leading and control. Is a general management course which establishes the basis for further studies. Students develop skills in problem-solving, decision making, leadership and motivation.
Healthcare Information Analysis	HIM 301	This course focuses on analysis methodologies and the use of current data analysis software such as query and reporting tools, on-line analytical processing (OLAP), executive information systems and data mining tools
Health Information Systems Management	HIM 302	This course is an extension of HIM 301 and takes a systems perspective in terms of database management, quality management and utilization management.

The Healthcare System	HSM 301	Focus is on the health system as a whole and the possibility of an integrated client-centered continuum. Comprised of three main foci: the client, the system, and the manager. Students must be aware of all three facets in the current environment in order to understand changing managerial functions and relationships. Build on previous knowledge of health, illness, client relationships and the health system
Law for Health Managers	HSM326	The effective manager must have an understanding of relevant legal issues in order to ensure client and staff rights and security. It is the manager's role to supervise and instruct others at the unit level
Managerial Accounting and Finance	HIM 403	This course focuses on the unique financial management features, reporting policies and analytic tools in health services organizations. Builds on basic accounting principles, a basic understanding of funding, and the role of the manager.
Health Economics	HIM 404	This course takes the student beyond using the fundamental tools necessary to apply basic economic principles to the health care field. Exposure is provided on a balance of population –based health economics and consumer driven, managed health care economics.
Issues in Health Information Management	HIM 405	This course focuses on current issues in the healthcare field affecting health information management and asks students to consider issues from different stakeholder perspectives. Students are asked to frame the issues through alternate stakeholder perspectives in order to understand and appreciate the complexity of some the health care issues currently being debated.
Program Planning and Evaluation	HSM 408	A central responsibility of the departmental-level manager is to initiate and oversee the development of programs that will meet the needs of the client. The responsible manager will evaluate program outcomes in relation to stated objectives for client well-being. This course builds on the function within the management cycle and on the ability to understand the research process and provides the groundwork for the practicum experience.
Research Methodology	HSM 417	This course builds basic skills in statistics and research methodology in the health field. To ensure the quality, appropriateness and cost-effectiveness of the services they provide, managers must make decisions based on the best available evidence. This course lays the groundwork for the final practicum project.
Human Resource Management	HSM 437	This course increases the understanding of the processes involved in merging human talents, needs and aspirations with the requirement of the client –centered health services organization. It builds on the theory and practice of leadership and communication skills, to develop skills and knowledge in human resources planning, recruitment, selection and evaluation.
Practicum Seminar	HIM 406	The practicum is the “capstone” course of the degree program. It provides the opportunity to apply and integrate theory and skills from all previous courses in a practice setting other than the student's current setting in the production of a significant research project, thus further developing skills and broadening perspectives on management, the organization and the system.
Practicum	HIM 407	

7. DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

Diversity and inclusion in the health information management program is reflective of the broader healthcare field and several courses address this topic specifically. For example, HIM405 Current Trends in Health Information Management uses both teaching and assessment methods to encourage reflective practice on alternative and diverse stakeholder viewpoints. The capstone course (HIM 406 and HIM 407) requires students to engage with health service organizations and providers in the field reflective of a very diverse healthcare system. Students are required to work on a research project collecting data and interacting with staff in a collaborative way to produce a high quality presentation to both an academic and business community and a paper which is of sufficient quality to consider

submission to an academic journal. This requires students to be aware of and sensitive to a diverse audience who may have different expectations and priorities.

8. CURRICULUM AND STRUCTURE - UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS

The following is a brief summary of the UDLE's mapping matrix:

Depth and Breadth of Knowledge: This is well represented through all courses and reflects all program learning outcomes to some degree. The 300 level courses particularly address Depth and Breadth of Knowledge at an introductory level. This is reinforced through the 400 level courses and by the final courses (the Practicum HIM 406 and HIM 407) student's depth and breadth of knowledge are demonstrated in both written and verbal form and assessed at the proficiency level through their practicum research project.

Knowledge of Methodologies: HIM is structured to culminate in a high level research project. The 300 level courses are designed to introduce students to the collection, interpretation, assessment and the debate around multiple sources of information in order to inform critical selection methods, approaches and strategies for facilitating planning and decision-making in a health care setting. These concepts are then reinforced in the Research Methods course (HSM 417) and Program Planning and Evaluation course (HSM 408). They are later applied at a proficiency level in the capstone practicum (HIM 406 and HIM 407) where students are required to engage in and produce a formal research project.

Application of Knowledge: The 300 level courses provide the basic introduction (ex. CHIM 300) into how to critically assess, and weigh and assign power to alternative viewpoints on health information management issues. The 400 level courses both reinforce and formalize the application of their knowledge (ex. CHIM 408) leading to and culminating in a formal research project at a health care institution and including a formal presentation and research paper (CHIM 406 and CHIM 407).

Communication Skills: Many courses use both essays and presentations to assess communication skills. For example, CHIM300 uses both a reflection paper and a research paper to assess written communication skill at an introductory level. Similarly the very first course students are required to take - CHSM 301 - requires both presentations and written assignments for assessment at an introductory level. At the reinforcement level, HSM 408, HSM 417 and HSM 437 integrate both presentations and written assignments into both teaching and assessment. The capstone courses (HIM 406 and HIM 407) require proficiency to present their research findings by means of a formal presentation to the entire School of Health Services Management faculty and students, and often include representatives of the host institution and practicum preceptor. The final research project must be written up as a formal research project suitable for publication.

Awareness of Limits of Knowledge: Awareness of limits of knowledge is associated with courses which require some degree of literature review and critical analysis. Specifically, CHSM 301 and CHIM 300 require research papers and some degree of awareness that there is a wide range of opinion in these areas for which they have only an introductory understanding at this point. This is particularly relevant as many of these students come from a healthcare background and often make the assumption that they already have a good understanding of the system. These first few courses lay the foundation of an awareness of the limits of their understanding. This is then formalized and reinforced in the 400 level courses such as HSM 417 (research methodology) and HSM 408 (program planning and evaluation. In the capstone courses (HIM 406 and HIM 407), students have a greater understanding and appreciation of the limits of their knowledge and how this impacts the strength of their interpretations of that knowledge and the conclusions they can draw from their own research project.

Autonomy and Professional Capacity: Many courses from the 300 level through the 400 level and culminating in the capstone course, the practicum, require students to develop transferable skills such as a broad understanding of the health care field and management field beyond simply the health

information management sector. Further they have developed their critical thinking and analytical skills which can be applied to a wide context. Through courses such as CHIM 301 (Health Information Analysis) at an introductory level, CHSM 408 (Program Planning and Evaluation) at an reinforcement level and HIM 406 and HIM 407 (Practicum) students have developed a proficiency in initiative, personal responsibility and accountability as demonstrated by their ability to manage their own learning under changing circumstance particularly through the independent projects required in these courses to access information provided by host healthcare institutions. Further, group work and the ability to manage and work effectively in groups are required by many courses including HSM437; HSM301; HIM404. For those courses which require students to gather data from either their own workplace (ex. HIM 301; HIM302 and HSM408) or in the case of the practicum another workplace setting, students are required to pay significant attention to business ethics and act and behave in a professional manner consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.

Each course was assessed and the variety of teaching methods and assessment methods used. HIM learned how diverse the teaching and assessment methods were in the program and how well the course structure mapped to program learning outcomes, culminating in the final practicum project which requires the integration of all of program learning outcomes and affirms and clearly resonates with the undergraduate degree level expectations (UDLES).

9. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Both the Health Information Management Program and the Health Services Management Program undergo curriculum reviews on an annual basis through the curriculum committee. In addition to the curriculum committee, the School Council is involved in all matters related to academic planning, administration, operation and procedural policies. Program retreats are planned for the School of Health Services Management to provide strategic planning opportunities for continued program improvements for both the HSM and HIM program streams.

10. ENROLMENT IN PROGRAM COURSES

Enrolment in program courses by HIM students do not represent the total enrolment of these courses as both HSM program student and CE students also enroll in these courses. In addition, the School of Health Services Management is consistently seeking to provide online offerings to meet the needs of out-of-province students. Further, while the majority of students in each course are from the HSM stream or CE students, it is anticipated that as the HIM program continues to build due to the projected increasing societal demands for HIM trained graduates, additional sections will be required to meet this demand.

11. RELATIONSHIP TO CURRENT DISCIPLINE AND PROFESSION

The Health Information Management program is rather unique. In Canada, the provision of academic preparation for health information professionals at the university level is a relatively new initiative. The programs are predominately offered as diploma programs by community colleges and the Canadian Healthcare Association. In the Toronto region, there are a number of options for professional education in Health Information Management; however, the only viable degree option currently available for comparison purposes besides Ryerson's BHA in Health Information Management is the Bachelor of Health Science in Health Information Management offered by the University of Ontario Institute of Technology (OUIT). However, the program at UOIT is no longer offered, as of the 2013-2014 Undergraduate Calendar.

The HIM program is unique in that most students are already working full time in the health information management field while completing their degree. Students are exposed to both academic integrity and social responsibility in several courses and learning outcomes 6 specifically addresses principles consistent with academic and social responsibility. At a more advanced and experiential level, the Practicum as the capstone course in the program emphasizes both academic and professional integrity through a learning contract. In order to proceed, students enter into a contractual agreement with a healthcare organization around a particular research proposal which addresses the FINER criteria (Feasible, Interesting, Novel, Ethical and Relevant).

Certification

The School of Health Services Management received full re-certification status by AUPHA (Association for University Programs in Health Administration) in 2006 and has been re-certified until 2018. Although the AUPHA focus is on the Health Services Management program, they viewed the HIM stream positively and have recognized the complementary value of the HIM program to the School of Health Services Management. In addition, since students entering the HIM stream are already certified by the Canadian Health Information Management Association (CHIMA) and since CHIMA (formerly CHRA) was involved in the development of this program, the HIM program has been granted full recognition status by CHIMA (Canadian Health Information Management Association). CHIMA's program recognition process is the means by which CHIMA evaluates formal educational programs for their suitability to prepare students to meet national standards and become eligible to enter health information management practice as certified professionals. Graduates of CHIMA-recognized programs are eligible to challenge the Canadian College of Health Information Management (CCHIM) national certification examination. Programs that achieve CHIMA-recognition are required to undergo a periodic re-recognition process for compliance with all standards to maintain their recognition status with CHIMA.

12. INNOVATIVE OR CREATIVE CONTENT AND/OR DELIVERY

Teaching methods vary from course to course but a variety of methods, including interviews with managers in the field, simulations, group work, and in particular practical research field experience as part of the capstone course, make for a diverse and creative learning experience. Peer feedback and peer teaching (or student teaching) is widely utilized in the program. In addition, case studies are often employed as a teaching method as are guest speakers, films and videos. Computer simulations, games, and role playing exercises are utilized by at least two courses.

13. PARTNERSHIPS OR COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENTS

Informal collaborative agreements are in place with CHIMA certified college diploma programs which provide the foundation for the HIM degree completion model (e.g. George Brown College; Fleming College and St. Lawrence College). Other partnerships particularly relevant to the health information management part-time degree option at Ryerson's School of Health Services Management are the formalized relationships required for the final practicum research project. As a result of the practicum requirement for a major field-research project, the School of Health Services Management has developed ongoing relationships with several health services and health information management partners. Such relationships are important for the future placement of HIM students and are nurtured by the program's Director. The placements include hospital service and information management departments, Community Care Access Centres, long-term care facilities and health information management organizations such as CHIMA and COACH.

14. EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

The HIM Program provides experiential learning opportunities at the beginning of the program at the 300 level and at the end of the program and specifically the capstone course in the program. For example:

CHIM 300 Lakeview Simulation via experiencepoint.com: This course is taught over the internet in an asynchronous environment. The simulation is run by experiencepoint.com and is designed to engage students in applying change management theory through a simulation involving a fictitious hospital, Lakeview hospital, which needs to improve its customer satisfaction while operating under extensive resource constraints. Upon completion of the simulation, students are required to write a reflection paper.

CHIM 406 Practicum Seminar: The first pre-field work seminar orients students to the process of experiential learning. Students and faculty supervisors establish learning contracts detailing the terms and conditions of fieldwork placements.

CHIM 407 Practicum: In this course, the Practicum project/exercise must be directly related to health information management. The practicum is the "capstone" course of the Health Information Management program, and provides the opportunity to apply management theory and concepts in a

working environment which is specific to health information services delivery. Students evaluate and analyze on-site management issues within the context of their understanding of organizational systems.

15. STUDENT ASSESSMENT

Assessment methods vary from course to course but a variety of methods are employed including assignments, quizzes, presentations and critical analysis papers such as literature reviews and research reports. Of particular note is the increasing emphasis placed on the acquisition of skills directly related to communicating their knowledge in both written and oral formats as the student progresses through the curriculum, culminating in a formal presentation open to the site preceptor and the entire school of health services management and a written research report of publishable quality.

16. STUDENT SUCCESS AND ACHIEVEMENT

The greatest marker of student success and achievement for the HIM program is the successful completion of the capstone course, CHIM 407 Practicum. All students are required to complete the capstone course as a requirement for graduation and, while challenging, students in general feel the process to be extremely rewarding and recognize it as proof of the knowledge and skills acquired throughout the program.

17. LIBRARY

A subject librarian oversees primary collection development in the core areas of health information management. However, it should be noted that the program is heavily supported by collection development efforts in the following programs and/or courses: Health Services Management, Information and Technology Management, Nursing, Public Health, Business Management, Accounting, Law, Computer Science and others. The report prepared for the PPR entitled *An Evaluation of Library Resources and Services Supporting the Program in Health Information Management*⁷ demonstrates that Ryerson University Library resources and services adequately support the program in Health Information Management.

18. SURVEYS

Student Survey 2012: Currently there are about 70 active students enrolled in the HIM stream and 24 HIM students (34%) responded to the student survey.

- virtually all students were employed either part-time or full-time prior to enrolment in the HIM program
- 12.6% had attended community college
- the majority of respondents were female (83.3%) which is representative of HIM's enrolment as well the age ranges were relatively evenly distributed between 12% and 15% with the highest percentage represented in the 45-49 age bracket and the lowest in the 50 or older bracket.
- the majority of students felt the program was academically challenging (22/24 or 92%), well organized (20/24 or 83%) and of high quality (24/24 or 100%)
- the majority (87.5%) felt the program workload was manageable although 3 of the 24 respondents felt the workload was excessively high

Program *strengths* identified in the student survey:

- problem-solving, written communication
- research skills
- understanding professional/ethical responsibilities
- understanding people from different cultures
- developing a broad knowledge of career field
- mastering specific employment related skills/knowledge
- working in teams

⁷ Appendix A1-N Library Resources

Program *weaknesses* identified in student survey:

- understanding the international context of the career field
- entrepreneurship
- leadership skills
- responding to technological innovations

Other information from student survey:

- there appears to be a reasonable interpretation and consensus that tests, examinations, written assignments, learning materials, classroom instruction, group work and print and computer-based library resources were effective or very effective
- some work or improvements could be directed toward experiences with computer-based technology, which likely are related to students who are solely dependent on online/distance education resources
- the consensus seemed to support that professors are current and knowledgeable, well-organized, available outside of class, intellectually challenging and provide useful feedback
- 16.6% of students felt that professors needed to work on their availability and feedback
- 78% felt that academic advising was either effective or very effective; 22% indicated that the question was not applicable as it would appear they have not used the program department for this purpose
- 90.9% indicated that they would recommend this program to others and 95.8% of students indicated that they would also recommend Ryerson University to other students

The biggest concerns identified by students appear to be the final practicum requirements including travel (distance education students having to fly to drive to Toronto three times for seminars) and the time required to be at the practicum site away from their employment. Another concern was the time required to participate in blackboard discussions (which is typical for distance education).

Alumni Survey 2012:

There was a response rate of seven students of a total possible 25 (28%).

- all were employed when they entered the program and HIM graduates identified their jobs prior to entering the program as HIM Professional (4) and Managers (3). None identified securing a more senior job position as a result of their degree, but this could simply be more reflective of a tighter job market and less room for advancement.
- all seven graduates indicated the level of satisfaction with the core courses as very satisfactory or satisfactory
- with the elective courses two-thirds indicated very satisfactory or satisfactory
- 5 of 7 respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the practicum
- five respondents indicated courses they felt should be added to the HIM stream including statistics (SPSS training, epidemiology, healthcare research), Informatics courses (Electronic health records, Data Analysis and reporting, computer technologies), and project management
- five respondents commented that there was too much overlap in the economics courses
- other recommendations for the program included improving online learning so all exams can be done online and to revisit the requirement to travel to Toronto for the practicum seminars

Practicum Preceptor Evaluations:

While all HIM students are currently employed in the health information field during their studies, the capstone of the HIM program, the Practicum (HIM 406 and HIM 407), provides students with a unique opportunity to apply what they have learned about management theory and concepts at an alternate work setting through the production of a major research project. Four practicum supervisors completed the evaluation forms. Overall the responses were favourable with all four indicating that their expectations were more than satisfactory or exceeded their expectations.

More recently, a practicum student completed a research paper on the preceptors' perception of the practicum experience based on preceptor responses from January 2007 through to and including January 2011 academic terms. The value in the experience was deemed both pleasurable and

enjoyable by the preceptors involved in Ryerson's practicum program. The majority of preceptors were highly impressed by the student's attitude, professionalism, work ethic and final deliverables (written report and/or presentations). The students' projects were deemed both valuable and useful to the host organizations and in several cases had an impact on steering health care management decisions.

Recommendations for improvement included increasing the number of face-to-face visits by faculty, hosting an annual preceptor appreciation breakfast, hiring a full-time faculty member to work exclusively with the practicum program in an effort to fill the existing gap in communication and support identified by the preceptors.

19. FACULTY

Since its inception the HIM program has operated with one tenured faculty member (who is also the Director of the program) and one Limited Term Faculty position. Both positions split their responsibilities equally between the HIM program and HSM program. The remaining faculty are CUPE contracts. (Note that as of 2012 there are now 3 full-time RFA positions)

Faculty members are encouraged to incorporate student participation, as appropriate to their SRC programs and the skills and interests of students. There are very few available resources for supporting faculty research; however a research assistant was hired on a contractual part-time basis from 2009 to 2011 to help manage some of the research activities associated with the practicum and any publications and poster's which resulted from practicum related activities.

20. ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Health Information Management is intended for two separate, distinct applicant streams:

Stream A:

For individuals who are graduates of health record/health information accredited or recognized programs, having at least two years related experience in the field of health information and a grade average of 'B' or higher. Documentation of professional registration/certification with CHIMA is also required. Potential candidates with other post-secondary academic backgrounds and extensive work experience in the field will be considered on an individual basis.

Stream B:

Individuals who are graduates from a three-year diploma program with a grade average of 'B' or higher in applied health sciences (e.g. nursing, medical laboratory technology, chiropody, radiology, respiratory therapy) from an Ontario College of Applied Arts and Technology (CAAT), or the equivalent. The diploma must include a one-year introductory, university-level humanities course or equivalent. Candidates must have at least two years of professional experience in the health services field as well as documentation of professional registration/certification where applicable.

Potential students with other post-secondary academic backgrounds and extensive work experience in the field will be considered on an individual basis. Applicants with no specific experience/training in the health information field will be expected to achieve proficiency in the core health information subject areas that are currently taught in the CAATs or equivalent educational systems.

21. STUDENT QUALIFICATIONS

While the admission data indicated a large number of applications with only a few enrollments, a large number of these are due to applications which do not meet the eligibility requirements. Since HIM is a degree-completion program recognized by CHIMA, it is important for the program to maintain standards that are appropriate to maintain CHIMA recognition status. As part of the development plan, there have been some discussions going forward for the design and implementation of a certificate in Health Information Management.

22. ENROLMENTS, RETENTION AND GRADUATION DATA

Students are admitted three times a year in the Fall, Winter and Spring semesters (Table 2). Once admitted, part-time students are given up to eight years to complete their program (and in theory extensions beyond this period are available for special circumstances). It is expected that students will maintain an average registration of one, one-semester course per term for each of the three academic terms per year (i.e. a total of 3 courses/credits per year), but this is not always possible due to a variety of reasons. Since the degree-completion requires twenty four (24) credits, in theory the student should complete the program in the 8-year time-frame.

Table 2 Applications and Acceptances

Academic Year	Total Applications	Accepted
Fall 2008-Spring 2009	46	15
Fall 2009- Spring 2010	46	13
Fall 2010 – Spring 2011	46	11

The retention rate of the HIM program has varied over the years but essentially ranged from 70-90% after 1 year in the program (Table 3). Similarly the 2 year retention rate for the HIM program (Table 4) for the last three academic years was a steady 75%. In the most recent academic year of 2010-2011 the 3 year retention rate was also 75% (Table 5). Of note are the variations and this is often reflective of the part-time nature of the program where students are sometimes unable to complete a course during an academic year due to a variety of reasons including work related issues or the availability of a particular course in the term of their choice.

Table 3 Percentage of students retained in any year level at Ryerson after one year of study

Reported for part-time programs Retained in:	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
Ryerson	79.1%	75.0%	77.0%	76.6%
Health Information Mgt (PT)	68.8%	75.0%	66.7%	90.9%
Health Services Mgt (PT)	69.2%	77.8%	94.4%	84.0%

Table 4 Percentage of students retained in any year level at Ryerson after two years of study

Reported for part-time programs Retained in:	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
Ryerson	63.6%	68.0%	62.7%	66.9%
Health Information Mgt (PT)	41.7%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%
Health Services Mgt (PT)	77.8%	61.5%	66.7%	77.8%

Table 5 Percentage of students retained in any year level at Ryerson after three years of study

Reported for part-time programs Retained in:	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
Ryerson	47.7%	52.7%	54.3%	51.4%
Health Information Mgt (PT)	47.1%	25.0%	43.8%	75.0%
Health Services Mgt (PT)	56.0%	50.0%	41.7%	37.5%

The HIM program's initial entering class in 2003 of 39 students graduated their first students in 2007 and currently a total of 25 students have now graduated from the program.

23. RESOURCES

HIM consists of one Director (also the only Tenured faculty), one Limited Term appointed Faculty and one Administrative Assistant (note – as of 2012 there are 3 full-time faculty). The support staff splits responsibilities between the HSM stream and HIM stream. There was a 2 year contract Program Manager position from 2008-2010 and a contract Research Assistant position from 2009-2011. Due to resource constraints neither contract was renewed. There are currently six CUPE instructors involved with the Health Information Management Program. Due to the relatively small class sizes (less than 50), the program does not typically employ Teaching Assistants or Graduate Assistants. Office space includes 3 office spaces for the Director, the LTF and the Administrative Assistant and a shared office space for CUPE instructors.

24. STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES AND OPPORTUNITIES

As part of the periodic program review, a SWOT analysis was undertaken and input was collected from instructors as well as students and the administrative staff. It should be noted this analysis is ongoing.

Some of the *strengths* of the program include:

- the variety of delivery options (traditional, modular, and online)
- HIM instructors are current and most continue to work in the healthcare management field
- the flexibility and structure of the degree-completion model which builds on previous education and provides students an opportunity to receive credit for their college level work and apply that education towards a baccalaureate degree
- when the full-time University of Ontario Institute of Technology program closes, there will be an increased interest in the HIM part-time degree completion model – HIM has already received some communication for students concerned about the closure of that program and looking to complete their studies at Ryerson

Challenges include:

- lower than expected student enrolment numbers
- a much higher application rate than enrolment, however, many students who apply do not meet the academic requirements for entry into the program
- awareness of the program still appears to be lagging and this may also be affecting the quality and quantity of eligible applicants
- some concern from some students that the demands of the practicum are too high

Opportunities for improvement:

- students have opportunities to study in traditional format and also modular weekend and web-based formats; however, there is a need increase the number of sections and to continue to develop both modular content and web-based content to meet the increasing needs of student from outside the greater Toronto Region
- students are integrated into classes which include the Health Services Management program, Certificate students and other Continuing Education students; an increase in demand as expected by recent industry reports will result in courses needing to be restructured to guarantee access to HIM program students
- for continued success there must be ongoing efforts to ensure the relevancy and timelessness of the curriculum as well as continued efforts at student recruitment and retention
- continued and imaginative methods of program awareness and presentation are necessary to ensure the program's future viability
- due to resource constraints student engagement initiatives such as a Speaker Series and Symposium were unsustainable at the time, however should be considered again in the future should more resources become available.

The vitality, relevance and success of the program are highly integrated into the strong practitioner orientation of the curriculum and the experience of the instructors. The value of an instructing faculty with current health services and health information experience cannot be understated. However, the

dependency on CUPE instructors also poses a challenge when it comes to curricular and strategic planning given CUPE instructors typically have full time jobs elsewhere and their loyalties and time constraints do not allow them the flexibility required for these program activities.

25. DEVELOPMENTAL PLAN

Recent changes have impacted the HIM program. Of particular note to this program review is the recent move to the Ted Rogers School of Management from the Faculty of Community Services in 2011. The School of Health Services Management and the Health Information Management program have some plans considered to be imperative to short term and long term development.

Short Term:

- School retreat for strategic planning
- Secure funding for faculty
- Secure funding for staff
- Provide a School “presence” in the Ted Rogers School of Management
- Formalize a budget

Long Term:

- Increase awareness of program
- Increase student performance, retention and graduation rates
- Develop a Master’s option
- Develop a HIM Minor and a HIM Major for Bachelor of Commerce students
- Establish pathways to the School of Business Management MBA program
- Develop a 4-year, direct entry, BHA Degree in Health Informatics
- Develop new courses / new potential areas of focus. Based on the alumni survey and informal conversations with experts in the field further consideration should be given to the development of new courses particularly in (a) International Healthcare Systems, (b) Project Management in Healthcare, (c) Quality Improvement in Healthcare, and (d) Managing Complex Chronic Disease.
- Develop a Research Institute with a focus on Chronic Disease Management and Prevention

26. PEER REVIEW TEAM REPORT

i. Outline of the Visit

The Peer Review Team (PRT)⁸ made its on-site visit to the School of Health Services Management occurred on January 15 and 16, 2014.

ii. General Assessment of the HIM Program

The PRT unanimously concluded that the HIM program is of high quality. The HIM program is viewed very positively among faculty, students, professional associations, and prospective employers. The key strengths of the HIM program include:

- the relevancy of the curriculum
- flexibility of on-site and distance options
- quality of the on-site facilities (e.g., classroom and meeting space)
- passion that the students, faculty and Director show towards the program

Despite numerous positive aspects, the PRT indicated a number of concerns with the HIM program including:

- the low program enrollment
- the lack of role clarity for various aspects of the program
- the need for additional administrative and operational support
- possible excessive expectations of the practicum
- lack of broad program awareness in the health care community
- low health services management research capacity

In terms of course content, key steps that the School of Health Services Management should undertake to improve program quality include:

- (1) reducing the number of economics courses in the program
- (2) removing an introductory information technology course from the program
- (3) adding courses in health care statistics, process view of information systems, IT privacy and ethics, project management, data analytics/big data, and change management
- (4) moving a number of professionally related electives to liberal studies electives

Other steps that the School of Health Services Management can take to improve the quality of the HIM program include:

- (1) initiating a health care research seminar series to help increase research capacity
- (2) working with CHIMA to best operationalize the latest HIM program entry option
- (3) working with the Association of University Programs in Health Administration (AUPHA) and CHIMA to identify and assess alternatives to the HIM practicum

The most pressing issues with the HIM program require working closely with the Dean of the Ted Rogers School of Management and focus on increasing HIM program enrollment and enhancing research capacity. Key steps include:

- (1) striking a committee to examine the workload and expectations of the HIM practicum
- (2) reinstating the position of HIM Program Manager, but with increased responsibilities
- (3) adding a tenure-track position with the goal of enhancing health services management research capacity
- (4) reinstating the part-time undergraduate research coordinator position
- (5) developing a five-year plan to significantly increase HIM program enrollment
- (6) initiating extensive HIM program marketing activities

⁸ Dr. Norman Archer, Professor Emeritus, DeGroote School of Business McMaster University, Dr. Todd Boyle, Associate Professor and Chair of Information Systems, Canada Research Chair in Quality Assurance in Community Pharmacy, Gerald Schwartz School of Business, St. Francis Xavier University and Karen Spalding Associate Professor and Program Director, Master of Nursing, Daphne Cockwell School of Nursing, Ryerson University.

iii. Assessment of Program Objectives

The mission of Ryerson University is the advancement of applied knowledge and research to address societal need, and the provision of programs of study that provide a balance between theory and application and that prepare students for careers in professional and quasi- professional fields. The HIM program is unique as it is a degree completion program where the vast majority of students have previous community college education and currently works in the health care field while they are enrolled in the program. Students have the unique opportunity through this program to complete a Bachelor's degree while also taking courses that enhance their knowledge and skills in their specialized professional field – health informatics. Currently, this is the only degree program of its kind in Canada, thus meeting a crucial need for not only Ontario but all provinces, since the courses are offered on-line. Students are enrolled in the HIM program from Newfoundland to British Columbia.

The courses are taught by faculty with expertise in health services management and by instructors who are currently working in the field. The curriculum mapping demonstrates that the courses offer sufficient breadth and depth of knowledge expected at an undergraduate level. The courses are sequenced to ensure that students have an opportunity to learn about the health care system at an introductory level (i.e., 300 level courses). These concepts are then reinforced in specialized courses occurring during the second year (i.e., 400 level courses). Lastly, students demonstrate proficiency in program goals through completion of a capstone research project. This project requires the application of a broad range of knowledge, critical thinking, and research skills to a specific health care management problem within an external organization. Students are required to submit a written report, as well as formally present key findings to an audience that includes faculty, students, and health care organizations.

iv. Admission Requirements

The PRT believes that the admission requirements are appropriate and enable students to be successful in the program. However, since the two year undergraduate entry option (effective January 2014) allows for students to enter the HIM program without first completing courses from an accredited CHIMA institution, CHIMA provided some concerns regarding this newest program entry option.

Historically, the CCHIM (Canadian College of Health Information Management) has supported the Ryerson degree completion program due to the requirement that the students only gain entry after successfully completing an Accredited HIM diploma level program AND successfully challenging the national certification exam. Under the two year undergraduate entry option (effective January 2014) the Ryerson program graduates would not have CCHIM certification, would not have covered core HIM content, and may not be deemed suitable for many of the jobs that require this credential and core content.

This may have implications for Ryerson; offering a speciality degree in an area where employers may require certification and yet this is not the ultimate outcome of the program. Additionally, many job postings also require the applicant to be a CHIMA member in good standing and this too is not an option with this criteria. CCHIM is open to discussing new models Ryerson might be looking at undertaking and potential pilot Accreditation options. CCHIM would like to strengthen their affiliation as the Accrediting body with any and all options Ryerson considers for the HIM stream moving forward.

While the PRT views that such justification and expectations may be excessive and limit the flexibility of the School of Health Services Management to enhance the HIM program, it is important that there is some agreement between the two parties on this particular admission criterion. The need to maintain a positive relationship with CHIMA is critical given their importance in HIM program marketing and growth and the impact of CHIMA accreditation on student employment success.

Recommendation 1: The current Director of the School of Health Services Management should meet with appropriate members of the Canadian Health Information Management Association to discuss how to best operationalize the new HIM program entry option which is effective January 2014.

v. Curriculum and Teaching Assessment

The PRT concluded that, for the most part, the degree requirements (e.g., required and elective courses), level expectations and learning outcomes are appropriate for an undergraduate degree in health information management. The online courses appear to be well developed, at an appropriate level, and have clearly communicated expectations. Students liked the option of completing courses either in-class or online, felt that the courses were well designed, and believed that the instructors did an excellent job of delivering the courses.

A review of the professionally required courses indicates that they are appropriate and of sufficient depth and breadth for HIM professionals. The PRT also reviewed the list of professionally related required courses. Among this list, the PRT believes that there is currently too great an emphasis on economics. The PRT believes that three economic courses should be streamlined to free up space in this group for new courses.

Recommendation 2: The School of Health Services Management should remove ECN 104 and ECN 204 from the list of professionally related required courses in the HIM program and replace them with a single introductory course in economics. This new course would be the prerequisite for HIM 404 Health Economics.

The removal of an economics course would allow space in the HIM program for a new course in health care statistics. Discussions with HIM students and alumni indicated that there is demand for such a course, which is currently absent from the HIM program curriculum.

Recommendation 3: The School of Health Services Management should introduce a new course in health care statistics and include it in the list of professionally related required courses.

A total of four professionally related electives provide an opportunity for students to build a broad background in health care management. However, among the courses listed in this category, it is the view of the PRT that INT 901 (Gerontology: Critical Issues and Future Trends), 904 (Health Promotion and Community Development), 907 (Team Work for Community Services), 908 (Homelessness in Canadian Society), and 910 (First Nations Issues) belong in the Liberal Studies Electives category.

Recommendation 4: The School of Health Services Management should move INT 901, 904, 907, 908, and 910 to the Liberal Studies Electives category to free up options for new professionally related electives.

It is recommended that one of the introductory courses in information systems, specifically ITM 102 (Business Information Systems I) be removed from the list of professionally related electives. It is expected that the majority of students have already received the equivalent content as part of their previous college education or based on their industry experience. As a result, this course reintroduced as part of the Ryerson University HIM program may be offered at too low a level to be of much value to students.

Recommendation 5: The School of Health Services Management should remove ITM 102 from the list of HIM professionally related electives courses.

A review of the current ITM course listing highlights a number of ITM courses that should be made available for students in the HIM program. The current ITM courses in the HIM program are very functionality oriented and do not adequately convey the process view of modern information systems. In addition, courses in information ethics and privacy are also missing, both of which are critical issues in an age of e-health.

Recommendation 6: The School of Health Services Management should add to the list of HIM professionally related electives courses focused on the process view of information systems and IT privacy and ethics. Such courses may include ITM 407 (Info Tech, Ethics, and Society), ITM 410 (Business Process Design), and ITM 602 (Configuring and Implementing ERP Apps) among others.

Based on interviews with CHIMA and Program Advisory Council members, there are a number of courses that are relevant and desirable for HIM professionals but seem to be missing or not extensively addressed in the current curriculum.

Recommendation 7: The School of Health Services Management should add courses in project management, data analytics/big data, and change management to the list of professionally related electives in the HIM program.

The practicum, delivered through HIM 406 (Practicum Seminar) and HIM 407 (Practicum), allows students to apply key concepts and skills obtained in the HIM program to a real health care setting. Student input on the practicum indicates that it is a very heavy load, well over the 6 hours allocated to these courses and particularly the 3 hours allocated to HIM 407. Based on the student interviews and discussions of the nature and scope of their practicum projects, the PRT has concerns that the current workload and expectations may be too high for a Bachelor's degree. The PRT also notes, however, that students may not be in the best position to assess issues surrounding program workload and expectations.

Recommendation 8: The Ted Rogers School of Management should strike a committee to examine the workload and expectations of the practicum in the Health Information Management program. The committee will contain members from Ryerson University undergraduate programs that have a similar requirement (e.g., practicum, major project, undergraduate thesis). This committee will: (1) assess if the practicum workload and expectations match similar requirements in other Ryerson University undergraduate degree programs; and (2) provide metrics to enable HIM faculty and students to assess when the practicum requirements may be beyond normal expectations.

Discussions with HIM faculty indicate that a significant amount of work is required to prepare (e.g. ethics review) and supervise students involved in the practicum. The preparation and supervision activities appear to be spread out over a number of HIM faculty members. Based on discussions with HIM faculty, it appears that various activities related to the practicum are taking them away from more critical activities (e.g., research, broader university service) needed for tenure and promotion through the ranks. The PRT concludes that many of the operational aspects of the practicum are being completed by faculty on a volunteer basis and the PRT believes that relying on such goodwill is a short-term and unstable approach for practicum delivery. In addition, the PRT believes that this approach may have negative long-term consequences on the careers of junior faculty.

Recommendation 9: The Ted Rogers School of Management should reinstate the position of Program Manager in the School of Health Services Management, but with a higher level of expectations. Among other things, this individual will be the primary point of contact for students while undertaking the practicum exercise. It is further recommended that: (1) the ad-hoc or goodwill activities related to the operation and management of the practicum be transferred to the Program Manager, with the goal of freeing up time for HIM faculty to focus on their broader university commitments (e.g., research, recognized university service); and (2) the Director activities related to the operational aspects of the practicum (e.g., assessing host work environment, dealing with host-student issues, practicum grading) be delegated to the Program Manager, in order to enable the Director to focus more time on HIM program growth.

It is also the view of the PRT that the practicum may be a significant bottleneck in student progress through the HIM program and overall program growth. Given the type of students served by the program (e.g., working professionals from across Canada), the PRT believes that students should be provided with alternatives to the practicum to help increase program flexibility. Such options may include, for example, a combination of a smaller project, detailed case study, and job shadowing of a HIM professional.

Recommendation 10: The School of Health Services Management should undertake discussions with the Ted Rogers School of Management, Association of University Programs in Health Administration (AUPHA), and the Canadian Health Information Management Association (CHIMA) to identify and assess alternatives to the HIM practicum, with the goal of providing students with more flexible options to completing the HIM program.

vi. Quality Indicators and Required Resources

Students that were interviewed commented that academic services were adequate on-site but did suggest that for students commuting and/or from other provinces improvements in on-line support would be helpful. Faculty also commented that when delivering on-line courses, there are times when electronic interfaces were not working and they often had to troubleshoot any related technology or software issues on their own.

Recommendation 11: The Ted Rogers School of Management should appoint a resource person to serve as the key point of contact for addressing, on the faculty's behalf, technology issues related to online course development, online course delivery, and student use of the course technology.

Applications to the HIM program have remained relatively flat since program introduction in 2003. Over the past ten years, a total of 31 students have graduated from the HIM program. Given that students are only completing the equivalent of two years of full-time study (versus the more traditional four years) the graduation time is noted, but understandable as the program is targeted to working professionals employed full-time in the health care field. However, the low enrollment is of concern to the PRT, given that the program has been in existence for 10 years, the ideal physical location of the program (i.e., large number of health care providers in the local area), and the lack of direct competition (i.e., similar university programs) within the local area and across Canada. In addition, the overall interest and enrollment in the HIM program is low when compared to the other Bachelor of Health Administration program (i.e., Health Services Management) in the School of Health Services Management (i.e. 241 current students or approximately 72% of the students in this School

Recommendation 12: The School of Health Services Management should work with the Dean of the Ted Rogers School of Management to develop a five-year plan to grow and sustain the HIM program to a similar size as that of the Health Services Management program.

There is a lack of HIM program awareness in the health care area, with the program described as a “best kept secret” by one of the interviewees. It was noted in the interviews with stakeholders that this program is not well known outside of Ryerson University and its partner organizations utilized for student placements. While the HIM self-study document highlights the need for increased program awareness, the steps outlined appear to be more of a piecemeal approach, versus a formal, thorough, and well-developed communication/marketing strategy and plan.

Recommendation 13: The School of Health Services Management should partner with an external marketing agency, Canadian Health Information Management Association, HIM Program Council, and HIM alumni to develop an aggressive marketing campaign to increase awareness of the HIM program, both within the Greater Toronto Area and across Canada.

The vast majority of the courses in this program are taught by sessional faculty who are hired through the Chang School of Continuing Education on a course by course basis. The one positive outcome of this approach is that the sessional instructors, for the most part, have recent experience in the health care field that they can bring to the classroom. However, as per their hiring contracts, sessional instructors are not expected to publish or conduct research. As a result, the research-related activities of the faculty involved in the HIM program are very limited.

Recommendation 14: The School of Health Services Management should hire a tenure-stream RFA position with a HIM specialty and a strong HIM or health services management research capability.

It is important for HIM students to be involved in strengthening research capacity and in the dual roles of the receiver and disseminator of research results. Ongoing engagement in research is one of the key differentiators between community college and university education. To help solidify that the HIM degree is indeed a university program, versus a two-year continuation of a college program, it is important that students are exposed to health care research throughout the HIM program and beyond their own practicum or that of their classmates.

Recommendation 15: The School of Health Services Management should initiate a health care research seminar series. Students would be required to attend in person or view online a number of these sessions throughout the HIM program.

To help build research capacity it is also important that students be provided with the support needed to disseminate their work to the broader research community. From 2009 to 2011, a research assistant was hired on a part-time basis in the School of Health Services Management to help students disseminate through posters and publications the key outcomes from practicum-related activities. It is recommended that such a position be reinstated. However, given the low enrollment in the HIM program, a dedicated HIM resource for this task is not appropriate at this time. Instead, it is recommended that a formal part-time position (i.e., 0.5 FTE) be created at the Ted Rogers School of Management to help undergraduate students in the entire business school disseminate their work to the broader research community. This resource would: (1) actively encourage undergraduate students to publish their work (e.g., extensive marketing of the service); (2) serve as the key point of contact for students with questions regarding presenting or publishing their work; (3) assist students with selecting appropriate publication outlets or conferences; and (4) arrange for an internal (i.e. within Ryerson University) peer-review of the work prior to formal (i.e., external) conference or journal submission.

Recommendation 16: The Ted Rogers School of Management should create a part-time undergraduate Research Coordinator position to facilitate the dissemination of undergraduate research.

27. Program Response to the Peer Review Team Report

The 2014 HIM Peer Review Team Report concluded that the program is “high quality”, enabling health care information management workers to complete their degrees part time. The most significant concerns expressed were: (1) the lack of a RFA tenure track member in the School of Health Services Management (SHSM) with research and teaching expertise in HIM, (2) the relatively small size of the program, (3) the program’s sustainability in terms of faculty load, (4) the limited research output of the SHSM faculty, and (5) various curriculum course redundancies and opportunities.

These assessments gave rise to 16 recommendations, not necessarily ranked in terms of substantive importance. Not all of these are in the SHSM’s, or in some cases, Ted Rogers School of Management’s (TRSM) mandate to initiate. The SHSM agrees with most of the recommendations made, and is ready, if feasible to take on the ambitious change agenda proposed.

It is the view of the SHSM that the most important recommendations are to: (1) hire an RFA with HIM research and teaching expertise, and (2) reinstate the “Program Manager” position. Both hires would contribute to distributing faculty work load, releasing time for more research activity. This would also supply capacity for more active program promotion and to help handle the administrative and academic demands of the larger cohort thus produced. The hires would also be used to sustain and build relations with key stakeholders, including alumni and the Canadian Health Information Management Association (CHIMA).

The workload concern was linked to the high demands the final practicum seminar/project/paper requirement places on faculty and students. While the SHSM hopes to preserve this important program element, and retain our capability to deliver it, it is understood that it may have to be streamlined if enrollment grows.

The most important curriculum suggestions were: (1) to reduce the Introductory Economics requirement by one course, and (2) add a required applied “statistics for healthcare management” course. With two or three exceptions, the other curriculum proposals were agreed to by the SHSM.

In sum, the HIM Peer Review Team Report supplies a useful map for the SHSM HIM program. In its present state, the program is sustainable, though finding time to commit to research is challenging. The SHSM welcomes the prospect of a larger and more vital HIM program; however the School would have difficulty sustaining quality without the commitment of Ryerson University investments in a HIM RFA faculty member and a Project Manager.

Recommendations and responses:

The Peer Review Team's Report is thorough and thoughtful, offering 16 specific, and therefore useful, recommendations that can contribute to the program's improvement. In general the SHSM agrees with the Review Team's assessments and suggested directions. While some suggestions cannot be implemented by SHSM, most can be initiated by the School, then TRSM and University support will be required to see them through.

Response to Recommendation 1:

i. SHSM will meet with CHIMA officials to work towards creating admission standards, and/or in-program requirements that meet CHIMA expectations, while providing non-Accredited yet HIM-skilled candidates fair access to the program. CHIMA has supported the HIM program as complementary to its own. However, it is clear that qualified graduates of information systems and/or computer science programs, who do IT work in healthcare should be eligible to apply for the program. CHIMA conducts assessments of experienced practitioners holding degrees to determine eligibility to sit for the Association's National Certification Exam⁹. It may be possible to create a comparable approach for HIM students.

Response to Recommendation 2:

HIM will request the Department of Economics to create a single introductory micro/macro course. In the interim, ECN 204 will be removed as a Professionally Related required course. Two economics courses in a short program are more than necessary. Introductory microeconomics principles are the most relevant for healthcare economics.

Response to Recommendation 3:

HIM intends to design and introduce an applied course, "Introduction to Healthcare Statistics", that introduces sampling and probability principles and applies fundamental statistical analyses in healthcare contexts. It should develop skills in Excel and a statistical package (e.g. R or SPSS). This course will be added as a Professionally Related required course.

Response to Recommendation 4:

The SHSM cannot deem courses from other programs as Liberal Studies electives; it is the responsibility of the courses' home Department/Faculty of Record to do this. Further, this recommendation detracts from the spirit of the intent of Liberal Studies electives. The Ryerson BHA is a university degree so intellectual breadth is necessary. The courses, with the possible exceptions of First Nations Issues and Homelessness in Canada, are more appropriately placed as Professionally Related Electives. Most HIM students are graduates of applied college programs so it is necessary to ensure that they also undertake Liberal Studies as part of their education. Finally, the Professionally Related elective list is not finite, so there is no need to "open up" options on this table.

Response to Recommendation 5:

The SHSM will remove ITM 102 from the Professionally Related electives list. It is a sensible idea. The students are expected to have IT background and experience. The CHIMA accreditation, one held by many students, includes familiarity with Information Management as a core competency. It would be redundant for students to take this course.

Response to Recommendations 6 & 7:

The SHSM will consult with ITM curriculum experts to identify whether the ITM courses identified and/or others, are appropriate HIM Professionally Related electives for the Program. The SHSM will also consult with other Schools in TRSM and Ryerson Faculties to identify appropriate candidate courses for the Professionally Related elective list. Beyond Big Data, it may be appropriate to explore the

⁹ CHIMA (n.d.) Advanced standing Candidates, External Graduate Program. Avail <https://www.echima.ca/advanced-standing-candidates/external-graduate-program>.

possibility of adding a GIS course (e.g. Spatial Databases and Digital Cartography, CODG 101) to this list.

Response to Recommendations 8 and 10:

The SHSM will strike a committee, comprising faculty and students, to examine the expectations of the practicum. The committee will look at practices in other Schools that have comparable requirements. However, the intent is to preserve the core elements of the practicum because of the value-added noted by graduates. In order to reduce faculty load, SHSM will endeavour to engage sessional faculty to support practicum activities.

The Practicum and associated research project produce work comparable to that of professional Masters Degrees. Notably all students conduct applied studies involving data collection and analyses; vital skills as evidence-based management is promoted in the healthcare system. Since the projects are individually done, SHSM can be confident that students have demonstrated capabilities. (This is not feasible in the larger TRSM programs where numbers preclude individual assessments of this quality).

The Practicum is labour-intensive for students and faculty, but not easily scalable in its current format. Nonetheless the SHSM has developed processes, networks, etc. that are worth preserving. Should the SHSM be successful in developing a Master's program, this capability could be migrated to that level, and the current Practicum requirements may adjusted to "normal" undergraduate expectations.

Response to Recommendation 9:

The SHSM will request the reinstatement of a Program Manager to support Faculty Department Assistant activities, including program promotion and stakeholder relation management (including practicum logistics, alumni relations, program development, etc.) SHSM has three full time faculty, including a Director, and one DA for about 300 part time students in the HIM and a sister Bachelor of Health Administration program in Health Services Management. More than half of the curriculum is delivered by sessional instructors through CE. Substantial expansion of the program and its activities is not feasible without more administrative support. It should be noted that this Program manager would contribute half of their time to the HIM program and the other half to HSM.

Response to Recommendation 11:

The SHSM will discuss the appointment of a resource person to support student use of online course delivery with Ryerson's Chang School of Continuing Education, which is responsible for the School's online offerings.

Response to Recommendations 12 and 13:

The SHSM will develop and execute a program promotion plan, with the assistance of the proposed Program Manager, mentioned in relation to Recommendation 9. The plan should incorporate closer cooperation with CHIMA as suggested.

Response to Recommendation 14:

The SHSM will reconfirm the need for an RFA hire with HIM expertise and research capacity. It is remarkable that SHSM has been offering a HIM program since 2003 without a permanent HIM faculty member; relying mostly on sessional instructors (Professionally and/or academically qualified) for the core HIM courses. Such in-house expertise would contribute to the legitimacy of the program and its offerings. Two years ago an LTF was appointed to build the HIM certificate and contribute to the program; however this position was not renewed in 2013-14.

Response to Recommendation 15:

The SHSM will, with the assistance of the proposed Program Manager, introduce a research seminar series. This is a good way to develop research capacity and understanding through broadly engaging faculty and students.

Response to Recommendation 16:

Creating a part-time undergraduate Research coordinator to facilitate the dissemination of undergraduate research is an interesting idea that the SHSM supports. The SHSM will confer with other Schools that have similar capstone projects that may be candidates for publication, and work towards building a case for such a position in TRSM.

28. Dean's Response

The Dean wrote that the School of Health Information Management (HIM) had received and reflected upon the collegial suggestions provided in the Program Review Team (PRT) Report and stated that the recommendations were thoughtful and generally quite helpful for bolstering the program.

The Dean focussed his response on resourcing and the plans for the future of Health Information Management, as those areas provided a convenient frame to analyze the core issues. On the issue of resourcing, the program response to the PRT report was to reconfirm the need for an RFA hire, with HIM expertise and research capacity. The Dean allocated a tenure-track position to HIM early-on in his tenure as Dean. The Dean sees the potential of the program and the high quality of the industry partnerships and student practicums as features to be proud of and build upon. The addition of the faculty member in 2014-2015 will enable more intensive research and ease the pressure on CUPE teaching.

The Dean stated that TRSM must assess whether the Chang School is best suited to delivering this program or if this should be handled within TRSM. The Dean's assessment is that having a strong Health Information Management program strategically positions TRSM, and would be strongly in favour of moving to a self-administered and taught program. TRSM, however, is operating in a time of fiscal constraint, so while reinstating a program manager would also be a legitimate aspiration, both the amount of work of said individual, and the fiscal environment would need to change in order to action this recommendation and response. On the up-side, TRSM is exploring a Master's degree in HIM, and if this came to fruition, a project manager would be an inevitable requirement of growth.

The Dean stated that the potential for a differentiated Master's program in HIM has the potential to reshape the School and the prominence of HIM within TRSM. As the reviewers and response indicate, the practicum in the current undergraduate program is on par with professional Masters requirements. This is likely due to strong leadership in building intensive partnerships and a willingness of key faculty to take on an intensive workload in supervising undergraduate students. While these characteristics that differentiate the program in the marketplace are laudable, they are likely not sustainable. Enrollment numbers must be openly questioned and ways sought out to streamline the practicum to make the degree program more attractive to prospective candidates. More targeted marketing of the program would likely yield increased enrollments and help build the case for a Master's program. A Master's program with the current practicum requirements would not only better align with Master's level expectations, it would also likely be well received in the market. The development of a Master's program would allow HIM to streamline the practicum requirements at the undergraduate level to a far more manageable (and sustainable) level.

The Dean wholeheartedly endorsed the notion of becoming closer partners with the Canadian Health Information Management Association (CHIMA). The area of health informatics is a niche that Ryerson (and HIM) could exploit and it has strong institutional (university) capacity and commitment. Further, by aligning the HIM program with the Association's National Certification Exam, Ryerson may become even more well-known to an important industry body (and thereby have highly capable students channeled towards the University's programs).

In summary, the Dean was supportive of the response to the PPR subject to fiscal constraints, increased student enrollments, offering the program through TRSM, graduate level aspirations and a deepened relationship with CHIMA.

29. ASC EVALUATION

The Academic Standards Committee's assessment of the Periodic Program Review of the Bachelor of Health Administration in Health Information Management indicated that, overall, the review was well-done and provided an informative evaluation of the program. The ASC indicated the following recommendations to be addressed in a follow-up report:

1. Provide a more in-depth analysis of the curriculum mapping of courses to program learning outcomes to include all learning outcomes. Consider gaps, overlaps and redundancies and how they will be addressed.
2. Provide an update on discussions with with Canadian Health Information Management Association (CHIMA) officials to work towards creating admission standards, and/or in-program requirements that meet CHIMA expectations, while providing non-Accredited yet HIM-skilled candidates fair access to the program.
3. Provide an update on advances made in developing/implementing the recommendations made by the Dean and the Peer Review Team as well as initiatives contained in the HIM developmental plan.

30. FOLLOW-UP REPORT

In keeping with usual practice, the follow-up report which addresses the recommendations stated in the ASC Evaluation Section is to be submitted to the Dean of the Ted Rogers School of Management and the Provost and Vice President Academic by the end of June, 2015.

Recommendation

Having satisfied itself of the merit of this proposal, ASC recommends:

That Senate approve the Periodic Program Review of the Bachelor of Health Administration in Health Information Management, School of Health Services Management

B. CHANGES TO COURSE SEQUENCING, TITLES, DESCRIPTIONS, AND REQUISITES FOR THE BACHELOR OF SOCIAL WORK PROGRAM

1. INTRODUCTION AND CURRICULUM

The intent of the School of Social Work is to revise the way social work practice (knowledge through classroom-based learning) and field education (knowledge through practicum-based experiential learning) is offered. In doing so, the School proposes to:

- separate some co-requisites
- reposition some courses
- retire two courses and develop two new courses to replace them

The impetus for this change is three-fold: (1) it can better meet student learning needs as part of the sequencing of courses, (2) it can create more variety of opportunities for faculty workload, and (3) it aims to cut costs of curriculum delivery because it would allow some courses (SWP 31A/B) to grow in size.

CURRENT CURRICULUM		PROPOSED CURRICULUM	
Year 2	Year 3	Year 2	Year 3
SWP 302	SWP 31A*	SWP 302	SWP 402 *
SWP 402*	SWP 31B*	SWP 001* (new mandatory practice course)	SWP 002* (new mandatory practice course)
SWP 335	SWP 36A	SWP 335	SWP 36A
SWP 435	SWP 36B	SWP 435	SWP 36B
SWP 341	SWP 538	SWP 341	SWP 538
Liberal studies elective, 1	SWP 638	Liberal studies elective, 1	SWP 638
Liberal studies elective, 2	Professional elective, 1 (SWP or INT)	Liberal studies elective, 2	Professional elective, 1 (SWP or INT)
Professionally related elective, 1	Professional elective, 2 (SWP or INT)	Professionally related elective, 1	Professional elective, 2 (SWP or INT)
Professionally related elective, 2	Liberal studies elective, 1	Professionally related elective, 2	Liberal studies elective, 1
CMN 100	Liberal studies elective, 2	CMN 100	Liberal studies elective, 2

The courses* where there would be significant changes to sequencing are SWP31A, SWP31B, and SWP402 and to course titles and descriptions SWP31A, and SWP31B in the current curriculum and SWP001, SWP002, SWP402 and to course titles and descriptions SWP001 and SWP002 in the proposed curriculum.

2. CURRENT CURRICULUM

- In the current curriculum, SWP 31A and SWP31B are tied as a two-semester course; the course is focused on knowledge specific to social work practice knowledge, skills and values, in the context of current practice issues and settings.
- It is offered as a co-requisite with SWP36A and SWP36B, also tied as a two semester course; this course is an experiential learning course whereby students are in a field placement setting in the community, with a Field Instructor (supervisor in the placement setting) and a Faculty Consultant (faculty person who oversees the placement learning).
- These four courses are all "tied" together in one package, and cannot be separated. This means that one faculty member must agree to teach all 4 courses, with one constant group of students.
- The original intent of these courses being offered as co-requisites (what has been described as a linked model) was that students doing both at same time would reinforce theory and practice as integrated learning.

The issues and concerns with the current curriculum are related to student learning, to faculty workload, and to financial considerations.

- Feedback from Field Instructors and Faculty Consultants revealed that many students need to be better prepared to enter the field placement setting in 3rd year; this suggests that there needs to be further preparation in the 2nd year of the curriculum.
- Students have indicated that they need a course to better prepare them for direct practice, and in particular, to better prepare them to be able to engage in SWP 341 where the curriculum revolves around a series of "simulations" where students engage in "practice" situations with actors.
- Students need more opportunities to develop communication skills from a social work perspective.
- The proposal of creating a new 2nd year course to better prepare students for practice and to address the issues above was not possible given resource issues. The Dean suggested that it would be better to find a way within the current allotment of social work courses to create space for this new curriculum.
- Currently, only a small number of students are given permission to pursue Spring/Summer field placements because courses are not technically offered in the Spring/Summer. For those students who complete their field placement in the Spring/Summer term (i.e., for students with Advanced

Standing status, who work full-time and require block placements. or for students going on international or out-of-province placements), they do not have access to the linked model of learning (i.e., SWP 31 and SWP 36 together). This then results in a different learning model for students, whereby the learning processes are significantly different, based solely on timing of courses. This raises concerns about consistency for students across the program.

- It is increasingly difficult to secure enough field placements for students in the Fall/Winter semesters. The ever-increasing enrolment in the School of Social Work and in other social work programs in the GTA, combined with funding cuts in the social service sector, has resulted in an increase demand for field placements while agencies have less capacity to meet those demands. There is less demand from other social work programs for students pursuing Spring/Summer placements.
- With recent curriculum revisions to the part-time program for students with Advanced Standing status (entry to third-year of program) and the new direct entry to second-year program, these cohorts of students will receive transfer credits for SWP 36A/B upon admission; thus, whole cohorts of students will no longer be doing 3rd year field placements. For these cohorts of students we now must offer SWP 31A/B without it being linked to SWP 36A/B. This again raises issues of consistency across the curriculum's learning process for students. Students who enter the program with Advanced Standing status in Year 3 do not have access to either of the social policy courses (SWP302 and SWP402).
- Students have limited access to full-time RFA faculty in this linked model.
- With SWP31A and SWP31B tied to SWP36A and SWP36B faculty who wish to teach practice or field education only can do so if they teach all four courses as part of their workload. As a result, those faculty have limited opportunities to teach in the graduate program or in other areas of the undergraduate program where they have expertise or to teach one course or another.
- The above-noted limitations regarding faculty teaching options sometimes results in the 3rd year practice and field courses being taught primarily by part-time instructors.
- SWP 36, because it involves field supervision, has to be kept small (approximately 24 students). Because it is currently tied to SWP 31, that means SWP 31 must be kept at the same size because this package of courses is taught by one faculty member to one group of students.
- The Dean has indicated that the School must find ways to deliver the curriculum at lower financial costs.

3. PROPOSED CURRICULUM

In the proposed curriculum, the changes include the following:

- The practice (SWP 31) and field (SWP 36) courses are no longer offered as co-requisites, nor are these courses tied as a package of four courses; SWP36A and SWP36B becomes a stand-alone two semester course, as the field placement course in 3rd year.
- The original practice course (SWP31A/B) is now separated into two distinct one-semester courses. Thus, both SWP31A and SWP31B are retired, and SWP001 and SWP002 are created as new courses.
- One of these new one-semester courses (SWP001) is shifted from 3rd year of the curriculum to the 2nd year of the curriculum.
- To make room in 2nd year for the new one-semester practice course, a current policy course (SWP402) is shifted to the 3rd year of the curriculum.

The proposed new model addresses the issues and concerns with the current curriculum in several ways:

- There would be consistency for students across the curriculum, whether they complete their field placement credit (SWP36A and SWP36B) in the Fall/Winter or the Spring/Summer semesters.
- The new practice course in 2nd year (SWP001) would focus on areas of practice learning, in order to better prepare students for the Winter course in 2nd year (SWP 341), and for the first field placement setting in 3rd year (SWP36A/B).
- With the practice and field courses no longer tied/linked, the Spring/Summer field placement option could be offered to more students, which creates more opportunities for field placements for students overall; there is decreased competition with other schools for placements in Spring/Summer, and

decreased demand (due to lower numbers of students) for placements in Fall/Winter. Students can have a reduced course load in Fall/Winter (by doing Spring/Summer placement), which is important for some students with family and employment commitments, as well as a form of accommodation for students registered with the Access Centre. Additionally, more students may pursue out of province or out of country placements, which are only offered in Spring/Summer, knowing that this experience will not 'deprive' them of the linked learning in our current model which ties SWP31AB to the placement experience. These Spring/Summer placements, as SWP36AB, would be done between Year 3 and Year 4.

- Students who enter the program with Advanced Standing status in Year 3, will have access to one of the social policy courses (SWP402).
- Faculty would have more options in terms of teaching practice and/or field course, which allows them flexibility and availability to teach other courses in the graduate and undergraduate program.
- With the increased flexibility for teaching, more RFA faculty may be teaching in the practice and/or field courses, which can benefit students in terms of learning experience and access to faculty.
- The practice courses will be able to grow in size because they are no longer tied to the field courses.

4. PROPOSED CHANGES IN COURSE TITLES, DESCRIPTIONS AND REQUISITES

SWP 001: Preparing for Social Work Practice (replaces SWP31A)

(A new mandatory practice course for the 2nd year curriculum. Like all other SWP courses in 2nd year, this course would become a pre-requisite for all 3rd year courses in the curriculum.)

This course is designed to enhance students' understanding of the interface between theory and practice, to promote the transferability of knowledge and skills. The primary focus of the course is the development of skills essential for a beginning social worker working within a decolonizing and anti-oppression framework. Skill areas include developing self-knowledge, communication, and engaging with supervisors, service users, families, and communities. In addition, the course provides preparation for, and orientation to, the field placement experience. It is a classroom-based course.

SWP 002: Decolonizing and Anti-Oppression Practices (replaces SWP31B)

(A new mandatory practice course for the 3rd year curriculum. This course would become a co-requisite for SWP36A and SWP36B. It is a co-requisite simply to regulate sequencing to ensure that students take the course prior to or during placement.)

This course is designed to increase the capacity of students to understand and apply decolonizing anti-oppressive principles and approaches to a range of different social work settings. Students will develop analytical and conceptual skills and will deepen their knowledge and understanding of power, colonization, and transformation, as these relate to working within marginalized populations. The integration and application of social work theory and knowledge to practice situations are emphasized. It is a classroom-based course.

The current SWP36A and SWP36B do not change in terms of sequencing, but there will be a slight modification in the course description. As this course would no longer be tied/linked to the practice course, the course would change slightly by adding integrative seminars to be held on a pre-scheduled occasional basis during each semester, whereby students can gather with other students and their Faculty Consultant to discuss field placement learning and issues.

SWP 36A/B: Field Practicum

(The only change is the addition of integrated seminars.)

This first field practicum provides opportunities for students to have direct contact with service-users. Emphasis in this beginning level experience is on understanding social work skills, values and ethics within the community, organizational and policy contexts of practice. Students attend placement two days a week for two semesters as well as scheduled integrative seminars. Alternate methods of completing this credit may be available to those with extensive prior experience or those undertaking an international placement.

SWP402: Social Policy and Social Inclusion

(The only change is that this course is no longer a pre-requisite for all 3rd year courses in the curriculum, as it would be offered in the 3rd year rather than the 2nd year of the curriculum.)

Building on SWP 302, this course focuses on approaches and tools for social action and social change, moving students from a theoretical knowledge of social policies to a practical, action-oriented focus on making social claims visible and building program capacity. It examines issues of governance, funding structures, voices, exclusionary processes, and experiences with the social welfare system. The course explores strategies of collaboration and citizen engagement for social inclusion and social change.

Recommendation

Having satisfied itself of the merit of this proposal, ASC recommends:

That Senate approve the changes to course sequencing, titles, descriptions, and requisites for the Bachelor of Social Work program

C. TED ROGERS SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT CO-OPERATIVE EDUCATION PROPOSAL

1. OVERVIEW

TRSM is proposing to develop Co-op options for all full-time Bachelor of Commerce degree programs/majors offered by the School of Business Management, the School of Retail Management, the School of Accounting and Finance, and the School of Hospitality and Tourism Management.

- This proposal presents an opportunity to strategically position the within the greater Toronto area as a leader in Co-op business education that will significantly impact students' educational experience, and further prepare them for their respective careers.
- The proposal aligns with the proposed Academic Plan 2014-2019 Priority 1: Create student engagement and success through exceptional experiences.
- It builds on the success of the Co-op option in the Business Technology Management (BTM) program and takes into account students' desire for more career relevant work experience as well as employers' demand for students with this type of work experience. The BTM co-op program has been offered for more than 15 years – it directly benefits TRSM by attracting more, higher quality students, enhancing the brand and reputation, and by supporting Ryerson's priority for experiential learning.

2. STARTING DATES – A PHASED-IN APPROACH

Pending university approvals the TRSM Co-op program will be announced in September 2014 to prospective students applying to university for fall 2015 acceptance. TRSM will continue to admit all students into the regular degree programs and to make admittance into the Co-op option an application process in second year. Due to the large numbers of programs/majors in TRSM, it is proposed that the various Co-op options would be phased in over three periods (Table 6).

Table 6: Proposed Schedule of Starting Dates for Students to Enter Work Placements

Phase I (Winter/Summer 2015)	Phase II (2016/2017)	Phase III (2017/2018)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School of Accounting and Finance • School of Hospitality and Tourism Management • Real Estate Management Major* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School of Retail Management • Law and Business Major* • Global Management Studies Major* • Economics and Management Science Major* • Human Resources Management Major* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marketing Management Major* • Entrepreneurship Major*

* Major in the Ted Rogers School of Business Management (TRSBM)

Phase I programs/majors have indicated an interest in launching the Co-op program immediately. For the School of Accounting and Finance this would capture the first cohort of the new school and establish an important competitive position. A similar situation exists with the new Real Estate major. Both programs have received strong support from their Advisory Councils. The School of Hospitality and Tourism Management (HTM) would offer students who will be in second year in fall 2014 the choice to apply for the Co-op option; in effect grandfathering the program to students who entered TRSM as the fall 2013 cohort. HTM's strong industry partnerships demonstrate the ability to move forward in the first phase.

Phase II will be programs/majors that will begin cultivating an awareness of the Co-op option to the first year students of 2014/15 in preparation for application starting in their second year. At the same time the Office of Co-operative Education will work with existing and new industry partners to develop work placements for 2016.

Phase III programs/majors may require additional lead time to develop the Co-op option. In the case of Entrepreneurship this relates to developing a funding model to provide paid placements where students would be working with start-up companies that on their own would not likely be able to fund the placement.

In all programs/majors the determination of when to start the program will depend upon both quality work placements and qualified students being in place. It is possible that a program may start earlier or later dependent upon either of these variables.

3. STUDENT INTAKE

It is the intention to accept up to 10 students into each program as a first cohort to ensure for quality of work placements and student success. As industry interest is built, and each program becomes established, the student intake is expected to increase, provided there are the necessary resources to support the students.

The projections for student intake are based on a modest first cohort of 5 to 10 students, growing in the range of 10% to 16% of each program/major's annual student cohort. The 16% projection is based on the current BTM experience.

At steady state the second year Co-op cohort would be in the range of 205 students (10%) to 327 students (16%). With between 2 to 3 cohorts out in any year the total Co-op placements would be a minimum of 410 students (2 cohorts at 10%) to a maximum of 981 students (3 cohorts of 16%). Currently, the BTM Co-op program has approximately 150 students across 3 cohorts.

4. STUDENT BENEFITS

Students who are successful in meeting the admission requirements and are admitted into their Co-op program can expect ongoing support from TRSM's Careers and Employer Partnerships (CEP) centre and Ryerson's Office of Co-operative Education as they progress through the alternating work and academic terms that knit together the foundation of their Co-op experience. As part of the requirements of completing their Bachelor of Commerce (Co-op option) degree program, students will have to successfully pass a minimum of three work terms. By completing these work terms students will:

- Apply ideas and skills learned in the classroom to real world situations
- Obtain a minimum of one year's work experience relevant to each individual program
- Develop soft skills (e.g. time management, interpersonal) and workplace etiquette necessary to succeed in their careers
- Gain confidence in their chosen field of study and better understand their career interests
- Acquire new skills and knowledge from industry that will enhance their academic studies
- Earn a salary to alleviate cost of living and tuition fees, potentially lowering their debt load
- Build professional relationships and develop a network of job search contacts
- Work towards professional designations specific to their careers
- Return to the classroom energized and invigorated by their work placements; enthusiastic to re-

engage with their professors and peers and share the insights and knowledge imparted by their experiences

- Have a Co-op designation on their degree and academic transcript

The richness of the student experience has most recently been evidenced through the creation of the Ryerson University Co-operative Student Association (RUCSA). Formed under the initiative of a group of BTM co-op students, this association is dedicated to supporting co-op students and providing opportunities for further engagement with industry partners and alumni of the Co-op programs.

5. PROGRAM BENEFITS

Co-op education will strengthen and add value to the programs/majors offered at the Ted Rogers School of Management. A review of the current co-operative education options offered across Ontario demonstrated the potential for TRSM to own a unique position in the GTA as evidenced from the limited offerings particularly across the full range of business specializations available at Ryerson.

- TRSM will attract high caliber students who are seeking a quality institution where they can pursue Co-op education in the GTA, bolstering TRSM's academic standing within Ontario's post-secondary landscape.
- Due to the limited number of students accepted into each Co-op program, it is expected that students will be motivated to compete for these offers, thus raising the level of engagement from students as well as inspiring academic excellence.
- Students will begin to make important connections between what they have learned in the classroom and how it relates to the business environment. As evidenced by the BTM Co-op experience, this synthesis will lead to a richer learning experience, one that will inspire students to become more engaged with their peers and professors, as well as take an active role in shaping their career paths.
- From a curriculum perspective, the addition of Co-op options will build upon the foundational learning outcomes expected of all TRSM students.

6. EMPLOYER BENEFITS

In general, employers who recruit TRSM Co-op students will accrue the following benefits:

- Access to highly motivated, enthusiastic, skilled employees who have a passion to accelerate their learning and apply themselves in a professional work environment
- Ability to recruit full-time students throughout the academic year
- Strengthened industry relations with the Ted Rogers School of Management
- Ability to claim the Ontario Co-operative Education Tax Credit (CETC)
- Opportunity to hire graduates from TRSM who have gained work experience and training from their own organization
- Opportunity to give back to the community by positively impacting the career trajectories of TRSM Co-op students

7. LEARNING OUTCOMES

Presently, all of the Schools within TRSM are developing learning outcomes in relation to the University Degree-Level Expectations (UDLEs). This process is being informed by the learning goals that have been created in compliance with the standards set by TRSM's accrediting body, the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). For the purpose of establishing the co-op option, the learning goals, as outlined below, are taken from the AACSB quality control process¹⁰. While these learning goals provide the framework for establishing learning expectations and reporting guidelines for students and employers, it is not expected that all work placements will deliver on all seven goals. The learning goals are:

1. Communication: Graduates will be able to express ideas and information effectively and accurately using a range of media commonly used in business environments.

¹⁰ As an important part of accreditation with AACSB, it is a requirement to maintain a quality control process called Assurance of Learning (AoL). This process involves tracking and measuring several general and management specific learning goals that every TRSM student should be able to demonstrate with proficiency upon graduation.

2. *Ethical Understanding & Reasoning*: Graduates will be able to recognize and analyze ethical problems in order to choose and defend appropriate resolutions.
3. *Critical Thinking*: Graduates will be able to synthesize, analyze and interpret a range of information using qualitative and quantitative techniques, for the purposes of making sound and ethical business decisions.
4. *Group & Individual Dynamics*: Graduates will be able to effectively self-manage and perform effectively within heterogeneous teams.
5. *Integration of Business Functions*: Graduates will be able to integrate all business functions, practices and related theories in order to address business problems and advance strategic business decisions.
6. *Role of IT in Business*: Graduates will understand the role of communications and information technology (CIT) in business applications and decision making related to the advancement of strategic business goals.
7. *Financial Theories & Analysis*: Graduates will be able to apply basic accounting and financial concepts and forms of analysis to analyze and interpret business situations and decisions.

8. ROLES AND RESOURCES

Building on the experience of existing Ryerson Co-operative programs, the success of Co-op programs at TRSM will depend upon the collaboration with Ryerson's Office of Co-operative Education, TRSM's CEP, Faculty Advisors for each program/major, and Ryerson's extensive network of industry partnerships. It is expected, given the scale of the number of programs being proposed that additional administrative support will be required in order to assist Faculty Advisors with the oversight of co-op students.

a) The Office of Co-operative Education

The Office of Co-operative Education will provide support services and assistance to TRSM Co-op students by:

- Seeking and forming relationships with potential employers (job development)
- Advising students as they prepare for the job search and career planning process (resume and interview advising)
- Managing the Co-op employment process to help as many students find work as possible (posting jobs, sending applications to employers, arranging interviews, presenting job offers etc.)
- Monitoring students and employers during work terms (work site visits)
- Providing career advice
- Assisting in the development of Co-op programs at Ryerson
- Engaging in other activities in support of Co-op students, as required

b) Careers and Employer Partnership Centre (CEP)

Where the Office of Co-operative Education will support Co-op students for each academic program/major and will be linked to each via the Co-op Faculty Advisor, a unique feature of TRSM is the faculty-specific Careers and Employer Partnership Centre (CEP). CEP provides a distinct advantage in bringing additional industry connections to the Co-op program. The Office of Co-operative Education will be the primary provider of support services to TRSM co-op students; however, CEP will assist the Office of Co-operative Education in maximizing industry relationships to the best advantage of the program and the students.

c) Faculty Advisors and Faculty Administrators

The Co-op Faculty Advisors, with the assistance of a Co-op Faculty Administrator, will provide an integral link between the Office of Co-operative Education and the Ted Rogers School of Management. The typical duties of the Co-op Faculty Advisor include:

- Assisting in the recruitment of potential Co-op students
- Handling academic matters related to student work terms
- Reviewing and grading work term reports and employer evaluations for work term credit
- Assisting in referrals and the recruitment of potential Co-op employers/employment
- Acting as a resource to Co-op staff regarding the academic program
- Assist staff from the Office of Co-operative Education in resolving student issues

- Approving Co-op positions that have not been developed by the Office of Co-operative Education (student generated jobs)
- Maintaining and revising guidelines for work term reports and employer evaluations where necessary
- Where necessary, approving any student requests to alter work and academic term sequences
- In conjunction with the staff of the Office of Co-operative Education , addressing concerns about student work performance noted in any unsatisfactory employer evaluations and/or resolving issues that may arise during work terms

The typical duties of the Co-op Faculty Administrator would include:

- Coordinating information sessions to recruit potential Co-op students
- Assisting in reviewing and assessing applicants for admissibility to the Co-op option based on program guidelines
- Maintaining and updating records of student enrollment on work terms and reviewing the academic standing of Co-op students to maintain their participation in the Co-op option/program
- In conjunction with the staff of the Office of Co-operative Education , addressing concerns about student work performance noted in any unsatisfactory employer evaluations and/or resolving issues that may arise during work terms

9. ANTICIPATED RESOURCE COMMITMENTS WITHIN TRSM

The experience of BTM has demonstrated that the model of a Faculty Advisor with partial administrative support and the partnership with the Office of Co-operative Education can successfully oversee a program's Co-op program. It is anticipated that as the program is rolled out across other TRSM programs/majors the need for further administrative support and coordination across programs dealing with shared corporate partners will require additional structure. It is proposed that the following resource commitments will be required:

- A Faculty Advisor for each Co-op program/major
- Co-op Faculty Administrator for the Faculty Advisors (proposed hire 2015)
- Provision for additional TRSM administrative support as required, likely situated in CEP, to act as the primary connector for the programs and industry, allowing Faculty Advisors to focus on the academic requirements (proposed hire 2015/2016)

These commitments are proposed for the start-up and will be reviewed as the programs grow.

10. CO-OPERATIVE EDUCATION FEES

Ryerson students admitted to the Co-op option of their academic program pay an ancillary Co-op fee. Students currently pay a total of \$1875.00 in fees. The fees are paid in installments depending on the program of study. Co-op fees are assessed based on participation in the Co-op program not on a per work term basis. For consistency, it is proposed that all TRSM Co-op options follow the installment plan used by the Business Technology Management Co-op program.

11. ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Students are considered for the Co-op option on the basis of academic achievement and non-academic requirements. Admission is selective, with the assessment of applicants taking the form of a competition based on academic performance, their suitability to represent the program, and potential to succeed in co-op work terms.

Students are required to have a minimum cumulative grade point average (CGPA), which will be determined by each School within TRSM. The proposed minimum CGPAs are:

- School of Business Management: 3.0
- School of Retail Management, School of Hospitality and Tourism Management: 2.8
- School of Accounting and Finance: 3.33

Students must successfully complete all required courses from the core curriculum of their respective programs at the time of applying to the Co-op option. As spaces in the Co-op option are limited, students are expected to present grades above the minimum requirement. It should be noted that over time, the

minimum CGPA may be adjusted appropriately to reflect the academic qualifications of TRSM's expanding student body.

In addition to meeting the academic requirements above, students will be required to provide or complete non-academic criteria as part of the admissions process. Prospective Co-op students from all programs/majors will need to submit a resume as well as undergo an interview in order to be considered for admission to the Co-op option. Supplementary documents, such as a letter of intent or short essay, may also be required at the discretion of each individual program/major.

12. TYPES OF WORK OPPORTUNITIES

Work opportunities for Co-op students at TRSM will vary by program specialization. Each program/major has developed (i) a list of job positions that prospective Co-op students could apply for in their respective fields of work, and (ii) a list of organizations that have expressed an interest in hiring students for Co-op work placements.

13. STUDENT ARRANGEMENTS OF WORK TERM EMPLOYMENT

As the Co-op programs expand, it is possible that there may be work terms when the number of students exceeds the number of job placements that are available through the Office of Co-operative Education. Alternatively, students may already have in mind a potential employer that aligns with their career interests. In either situation, the student may take the initiative and find a position that will be suitable for their work placement. In these instances, the position must be approved by the Office of Co-operative Education and the Faculty Advisor in order to qualify as one of the student's Co-op terms. The position must be relevant to the student's field of study and provide the student an opportunity to apply skills and knowledge, specific to their program, in the workplace. Students must also complete and submit a Job Eligibility Form before commencing their work term. If a student must complete a work term that does not follow the recommended sequence for their program, they accept full responsibility that they may not be able to take the next logical group of courses due to unavailability of these courses in their next academic term.

14. STUDENT COMPENSATION

It is expected that students will be provided remuneration in the form of an equitable wage. Students can expect to be paid in accordance to several factors, including but not limited to: previous work experience, relevant skills and abilities, credentials earned, nature of job position, and economic climate. Regardless of initial starting wage, the Co-op work experience is in itself a valuable asset, and is likely to favourably increase earning potential once students have graduated from their program.

15. WORK TERMS DURATION AND DEFINITION

In accordance with the Canadian Association for Co-operative Education (CAFCE), students are required to complete the number of work terms equivalent to 30% of their academic study. Typically, the Bachelor of Commerce degree program can be completed in four years or eight academic terms; therefore, students are expected to complete a minimum of three work terms. All programs/majors have scheduled 4 or 5 work terms in order to ensure that students meet this minimum requirement, as well as to provide opportunities for additional work terms.

Each work term must consist of at least 12 consecutive 35-40 hour weeks. The typical work term is 16 weeks. Under certain circumstances, students may complete consecutive work terms provided they have approval from the Office of Co-operative Education and their Faculty Advisor. Depending on each individual Co-op student's program, it may be more beneficial for some students to complete an eight or twelve month work placement, particularly if the placement is more likely to secure future employment. For other students, having the opportunity to complete a minimum of three different work placements will provide a variety of experiences and assist the student in narrowing their career interests while further developing their professional skill set.

16. SCHEDULING OF CO-OP WORK TERMS

Scheduling the first work term will depend on the work term sequence decided on by each program/major to meet the unique needs of their sector or functionality. Since students will not apply for the Co-op program until the beginning of second year, the earliest a work term can be scheduled is the spring/summer semester following second year.

There are several factors that may influence a student's schedule and timeline to degree completion, including: number of required and/or optional work terms, successfully passing required work terms, availability of work placements, and course availability. Students must also maintain the minimum CGPA that was required of them at the time of their admission to the Co-op option.

17. EXITING THE CO-OP PROGRAM

The co-op program is optional; therefore, a student may choose for personal reasons to exit co-op and return to the regular (non-co-op) program. However, in the unlikely event that a student's academic or work term performance is not meeting the minimum co-op program requirements (e.g. fails more than one co-op work term; CGPA falls below the minimum requirement for admission to the Co-op option), they may also be required to return to the regular program. In accordance with Ryerson University policy, the student will transition back into the regular program with minimum disruption; however, course availability will depend on the semester that the student chooses to re-enter the regular program.

A student who withdraws, or is required to withdraw from the Co-op Option may not be eligible for re-entry to the Co-op program at a later date. Students returning to the regular program may also be required to pay all or a portion of the co-op fee as deemed appropriate by the Office of Co-operative Education and the Registrar's Office.

18. INTERIM UPDATES: WORKSITE VISITS

Students are monitored at the workplace by regular visits from the staff at the Office of Co-operative Education. Typically these visits are conducted in-person around the midpoint of the work placement and include a discussion with the co-op student and his/her supervisor/manager and/or person who work most directly with the student on a day-to-day basis. In the event that an in-person visit cannot be arranged, a phone or video conference may be conducted. A Site Visit Report is written after each worksite visit.

19. WORK TERM CO-OP REPORTS

Students are required to complete work term reports as part of their evaluation. The purpose of the work term report is to provide students with the opportunity to reflect on their experience and to describe how knowledge learned in the classroom can be applied to the work environment. Students also describe how the experience impacted them and prepared them for their next academic term. Work term reports are submitted at regular intervals during or following a student's work term. In general, the guidelines are:

- For a four-month work term, students must submit 1 report within a month of completing the work term
- For an eight-month work term, students must submit 1 report within a month of completing the end of the work term
- For a twelve-month work term, students must submit 2 reports - 1 report submitted after completing four months of employment, and the 2nd report submitted after completing the twelfth month of employment
- For a sixteen-month work term, students must submit 2 reports - 1 report submitted after completing eight months of employment, and the 2nd report submitted after completing the sixteenth month of employment

Work term reports are graded on a pass/fail basis, and students must pass this assignment in order to progress in the program. The intention is to use the Business Technology Management Co-op Work Term Report as a template for other Co-op programs, although this may vary for each program/major.

20. EMPLOYER'S EVALUATION

At the end of the work term, the employer evaluates the student's performance for initiative, communication skills, quality and timeliness of work and working relationships with others. The employer discusses the evaluation with the student, providing clarification and answering any questions. The student includes reflections from the employer's evaluation in the co-op report.

Recommendation

Having satisfied itself of the merit of this proposal, ASC recommends:

That Senate approve the Ted Rogers School of Management Co-operative Education Proposal

Respectfully Submitted,



Chris Evans, Chair for the Committee

ASC Members:

Charmaine Hack, Registrar

John Turtle, Secretary of Senate

Chris Evans, Vice-Chair and Vice Provost Academic

Denise O'Neil Green, Assistant Vice President/Vice Provost, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

Andrew Hunter, Faculty of Arts, Philosophy

Neil Tomlinson, Faculty of Arts, Politics

Ian Baitz, Faculty of Communication and Design, Graphic Communications Management

Jean Bruce, Faculty of Communication & Design, Image Arts

Mary Sharpe, Faculty of Community Services, Midwifery

Nick Bellissimo, Faculty of Community Services, Nutrition

Medhat Shehata, Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science, Civil Engineering

Colin Ripley, Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science, Architecture

Vadim Bostan, Faculty of Science, Chemistry & Biology

Kelly McKay, Ted Rogers School of Management, Hospitality & Tourism

Naomi Eichenlaub, Library

Des Glynn, Chang School of Continuing Education



OFFICE OF THE VICE PROVOST ACADEMIC

From: Dr. Chris Evans, Vice Provost Academic

To: Dr. John Turtle, Secretary of Senate

Re: Report of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee, 2013 – 2014.

May 20, 2014

Dear Dr. Turtle,

The following report summarizes the deliberations and recommendations of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee,

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Chris Evans", written in a cursive style.

Chris Evans, Vice Provost Academic and Chair for the Committee

Ryerson University

Report of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

May 20, 2014

Report of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
1.0 Senate Learning and Teaching Advisory Reports	4
Preamble.....	4
E-Learning at Ryerson	4
The Academic Plan	5
Universal Design for Learning.....	7
Teaching Chair Program.....	10

Introduction

The goal of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLT) is the promotion of an effective educational environment by identifying, prioritizing, and acting upon issues from across the university. In Spring 2012, the SLT was re-purposed as a standing committee specific responsibility that is called together to address issues related to the promotion of an effective and comprehensive educational environment. Specific issues may identified by any or all of the Senate, the Provost, the Vice Provost Academic, and the Director of the Learning and Teaching Office (LTO).

This document provides a report of the issues identified and discussed during the academic year 2013-2014.

Members of the Senate Learning and Teaching committee 2013 – 2014:

Chris Evans, Vice Provost, Academic (Chair)

Heather Lane Vetere - Vice Provost, Students
Maureen Reed –Director, Learning & Teaching Office (non-voting)
John Turtle - Secretary of Senate (non-voting)

Appointees of the Vice Provost, Academic

Donna Bell – Academic Integrity Officer
Katherine Penny – Director, Curriculum Quality Assurance
Rona Abramovitch – Special Advisor to the Provost
Anne Johnson – Faculty, Chemistry and Biology
Beth Swart– Faculty, Nursing

Appointees of the Vice Provost, Students

Christina Halliday - Director, Student Learning Support
John Austin - Executive Director, Student Affairs
Marc Emond - Manager, Access Centre
Nancy Walton - Director, e-Learning

Learning & Teaching Office

Restiani Andriati, Digital Media Projects Office
Paola Borin, Curriculum Development Consultant
John Paul Foxe, TA/GA Coordinator
Dalia Hanna, Manager, Teaching & Learning
Michelle Schwartz, Research Associate
Gosha Zywno, Faculty Associate, UTDP
Amira Rezkalla, Administrative Assistant

Faculty Representation

Eric Kam - Arts, Economics (Teaching Chair)
Marsha Barber - Communication & Design, Journalism (Teaching Chair)
Linda Cooper – Community Services, Nursing (Teaching Chair)
Medhat Shehata - Engineering & Architectural Science, Civil Engineering (Teaching Chair)
Tetyana Antimirova - Science, Physics (Teaching Chair)
Mary Foster - Ted Rogers School of Management, Marketing (Teaching Chair)
Don Kinder - Library (Teaching Chair)
Linda Koechli, The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education (Teaching Chair)

Students

Monica de Vries - Arts, Public Administration
Eli Vandersluis – Engineering & Architectural Science, Mechanical Engineering
Rachel Velsher - Ted Rogers School of Management, Business Management

1.0 Senate Learning and Teaching Advisory Reports

Preamble

During the 2013 – 2014 academic year the SLT was called together to discuss four teaching related issues and make recommendations. The four identified issues were E-learning at Ryerson, the New Academic Plan, Universal Design for Learning, and the Teaching Chair Program. The following summarizes the meeting discussions and recommendations.

E-Learning at Ryerson

Background

Prior to the meeting, the committee was provided with background documentation around e-learning as well as three questions to consider. The LTO gave a presentation to the committee on e-learning and converting courses to a hybrid format. The committee then discussed the three questions and made recommendations.

Questions

1. *Moving to an online format: the challenges of teaching pedagogy*

Question: What do you see as the teaching challenges in face-to-face vs. online learning? Are they the same or are they different? How can some of the online challenges be overcome? Would these challenges differ for hybrid courses?

2. *Engaging students online*

Question: How can faculty-student interactions be created online? How can we make students feel like they are part of Ryerson in this format?

3. *Academic Integrity*

Question: Are online academic integrity issues different from those in face-to-face formats? If so, what practices would assist in creating integrity online?

Discussion Summary and Recommendations

1. *Moving to an online format: the challenges of teaching pedagogy*

Some members were concerned about moving courses to an e-learning format because they believe that some disciplines would not be well served by online courses. In particular the FCAD teaching committee believes that e-learning requires motivated students, has challenges around group work, takes considerable facilitation on the part of faculty, and could result in losses around student engagement and interaction with faculty. Other members of SLT stated that converting courses to hybrid formats is a time consuming process and requires resources. In addition, if courses are to be presented in a hybrid format, the professor needs to be present in the course and this type of facilitation takes training. On the other hand, hybrid courses allow students to best apply what they've learned during in-class time and this leads to an increase in enthusiasm for course material. In addition, some members identified current resources available to all faculty on campus that can assist with e-learning design

2. *Engaging students online*

Some members were concerned that online courses would fail to promote student-faculty interaction. However, other members suggested that this might be an opportunity for faculty to engage in different ways with their students. Some members agreed but suggested that faculty would need training to engage in this way. Some members wondered if online education could

lead to lower student-to-student engagement but others suggested that students already communicate with friends online. Some members felt students should be involved in the conversation about online engagement to help identify the best ways to reach students. In addition, some members suggested that students might also have difficulties adapting to online formats and that they too need additional resources. Finally, members suggested that Ryerson should encourage universal design for all new courses so that students with different learning needs are accommodated. Many members believed that face-to-face interactions hold great value for students and that Ryerson should encourage hybrid formats so as not to lose this potential. Finally, some members were concerned that if too much academic material is provided online, students will have difficulty focusing on the most important materials.

3. *Academic Integrity*

Members were concerned that the use of test bank materials for online quizzes could easily be compromised. Members felt that faculty would need to be trained in online assessments that promote integrity. One issue mentioned by members was the amount of time necessary to create unique assessments for different students in an online course, as suggested by best practices. Members felt faculty should model integrity by following copyright laws in their slides and materials. Members pointed out that cheating happens in both online and face-to-face classes and in many instances the type of cheating is similar. One concern voiced about online testing was that instructors can never be sure that the student registered in their course is answering test questions.

Recommendations

1. E-learning should not be considered for every course. Departments should identify which courses they believe are suitable.
2. Ryerson should consider promoting e-learning to students who are already highly motivated and more mature who understand how to learn. E-learning may not be the best form of learning for first year students arriving from high school.
3. Faculty need to be trained in this format of teaching, and resources and advisors should be provided.
4. Students need to be provided with tutorials on how to navigate their e-learning courses.
5. Resources currently available for creating online courses should be communicated to faculty
6. Faculty should be trained in applying the principles of universal design for learning to these courses and given a list of best practices/resources on how to encourage student engagement in online courses and how to determine the correct amount of course content.
7. Workshops and online tutorials on how to make online assessments should be made available to faculty.

The Academic Plan

Background

Prior to the meeting, the Provost provided the committee with a discussion document about the new academic plan along with questions around five areas of teaching that were being considered in the development of the new academic plan. The Provost, Mohamed Lachemi, discussed his efforts to get feedback from the community about the new academic plan. The committee then discussed the five areas in small groups and made recommendations. The five areas of discussion and questions associated with those areas are provided below.

Questions

1. **Quality:**
How do we continue to ensure ongoing quality and improvement of academic programming in terms of curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning?
2. **Experiential learning:**
How do we advance experiential learning, particularly new modes, such as zone learning? How do we ensure that experiential learning is interdisciplinary and collaborative, involving all faculties, the Library, Student Services and other partners on campus whose expertise and engagement with students can enhance the experiential learning experience?
3. **E-learning:**
How can Ryerson maintain and increase its position as Ontario's leading provider of online learning? How can Ryerson play a meaningful role at the global level? What additional or enhanced support services and resources are required to ensure a quality learning experience and a high-level of student engagement in a digital environment?
4. **Learning and teaching excellence:**
What steps should we take to ensure that our students continue to enjoy the best possible learning experience? How do we ensure that faculty at all stages of their careers have appropriate opportunities to evolve their teaching practices to meet the changing landscape of post-secondary education?
5. **Student engagement and experience:**
What else can be done to support undergraduate, graduate and continuing education students, enhance their engagement and experience, and improve their academic and career aspirations and outcomes? How do we prepare from an academic and service perspective for a growing on-campus student residence population?

Discussion Summary and Recommendations

1. **Quality:**
Members felt that the academic backgrounds and professional experience of faculty members will impact the quality of teaching at Ryerson. The ability of faculty members to provide relevant experiences will play a role in faculty hiring. In addition, members felt that students need a voice outside of course surveys to provide their professors with teaching feedback. Further, the plan should consider all teaching faculty including the many part-timers. In addition, interdisciplinary teaching should be addressed, with the university finding ways to promote team teaching. Finally, members believed that although the resources available to assist students and faculty impact the quality of teaching, these resources are not always well communicated to students or faculty.
2. **Experiential learning**
Members were enthusiastic about providing experiential opportunities to students. While this represents challenges, it is one area that members felt should be investigated.
3. **E-learning**
Members believed that one of the challenges of e-learning is that it is not for all disciplines or courses. E-learning seems best suited for graduate students or highly motivated upper level students. Members believed that faculty need training, and that a mentorship program to assist with e-learning might be valuable. Some members worried that students might lose the opportunity to spontaneously engage with their professor when in an online environment. Finally, some members were concerned about the faculty-to-student ratio, and that it might be tempting to increase class numbers in an online format.

4. **Learning and teaching excellence**

Members believed there should be a greater focus placed on the delivery of course content. To improve teaching pedagogy, faculty need opportunities to meet other professors to share their teaching experiences. One concern for members is that mid-career professors are provided with fewer opportunities to develop than newer professors. One way to assist both groups is to have mid-career professors mentor newer professors. Further resource support for faculty teaching development should be considered.

5. **Student engagement and experience**

Members suggested that there should be more places for students to get advice about the transition to university, or assistance when they are having difficulties. Members were also concerned that zone learning would leave out some disciplines.

Recommendations

1. The academic plan should consider the quality of teaching and the impact that hiring practices, professional development, resources, and the teaching environment have on teaching quality.
2. The academic plan should highlight Ryerson's strengths in providing students with career relevant experiences and all faculties should be encouraged to think about how this might be done more effectively.
3. The academic plan should promote e-learning as one type of learning but note that all forms of learning (hybrid, face-to-face, and online) are important aspects of teaching today's students.
4. The academic plan should note that professional development for faculty teaching in online formats will be considered.
5. The academic plan should consider faculty-to-faculty engagement as a form of improving course delivery. Facilitating mentorship between faculty members could increase the quality of teaching.
6. The academic plan should highlight that the university will promote ease of access to information for student assistance in learning.

Universal Design for Learning

Background

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is defined as “the design of instructional materials and activities that allow learning goals to be achieved by individuals with wide differences in their abilities to see, hear, speak, move, read, write, understand English, attend, organize, engage, and remember.” The UDL committee was formed to meet AODA requirements and provide accessibility, training, and good teaching practices to faculty. This includes the fulfillment of institutional commitments, the pedagogical presentation of best practice, the provision of fully accessible services, and reflects commitment to teaching excellence. Prior to the meeting, the SLT membership was provided with materials about universal design.¹ During the meeting, the UDL committee made a presentation about universal design for learning. The presentation focused on the work the committee had completed around best practices, a review of universal design, recommendations the committee made to include universal design in the classroom, and actions the committee had taken to educate faculty about universal design. The committee divided the needs for universal design into the six teaching areas listed below:

1. Syllabus/Outline
2. Course Delivery
3. Student Resources
4. Student Assessment

¹ The full UDL Committee report can be accessed at <http://ryerson.ca/content/dam/lt/resources/instructionaldesign/UDLRecommendations.pdf>

5. Course Web Pages/Blackboard
6. Online Delivery

The SLT membership was then split into six groups to consider each of these areas. Each group was asked to:

- a. Review best practice documents created by the UDL Committee;
- b. Suggest areas of training and input on the best practices.

Discussion Summary and Recommendations

1. Syllabus/Outline

Members suggested that faculty list as much information as possible about accessibility (e.g. whether slides are posted, whether videos are captioned) on the course outline to guide students in making choices. In addition, members suggested that the outline be made available online and to the accessibility coordinator at the library. Members suggested creating a template for faculty members to use when creating course outlines. This template would provide consistency for all users and highlight Senate policies around course outlines. Suggestions for faculty included posting an audio file on the course website wherein the faculty member would discuss the syllabus in more detail, posting FAQs about the syllabus, and providing support and guidance around the syllabus to prevent future grievances. Members suggested that Senate create faculty/student friendly tip sheets that will explain Senate policies for course outlines. As an example, FEAS has introduced syllabus templates but their template does not yet address UDL.

2. Course Delivery

Members noted that in order to create a community that uses best practices, the UDL committee should prepare documents that list teaching practices in categories (e.g. practices intended to engage, practices that should be used with slides, etc.). These materials could be used as part of faculty development in New Faculty Orientation or highlighted in teaching related workshops. In addition, members felt that faculty could highlight their use of UDL best practices in their CV or teaching dossier. Currently, faculty are informed about UDL through newsletters sent by the LTO, email, the LTO website, the annual Faculty Conference, and LTO workshops. Some members suggested promoting these best practices by advertising at the dean's councils and new faculty orientations, connecting UDL with teaching awards, and by considering UDL practices as teaching competencies or standards.

3. Student Resources

Some members suggested that aspects of a course that meet UDL best practice should be advertised in the Blackboard shell. In addition, a tab should be created within every Blackboard course shell describing accommodation and student services/resources. Some members believed the Teaching Chairs should promote UDL in each faculty, or that the Access Centre could include information packages in their accommodation notices.

4. Student Assessment

Members described learning support as a web that catches students at various points in their education, providing them with an array of different services in order to assist them with learning and how to study. By offering online literacy self-assessments, students could be provided with a

useful guide to assist them in knowing where they need support. Members did note that providing self-assessments can be limiting in that the student comes to believe there is only one way to learn, thus caution should be taken to promote one type of learning.

5. Course Web Pages/Blackboard

Some members recommended a checklist for UDL content included in a course shell. Members also believed that Ryerson could develop a review system for course webpages to promote a consistent use of UDL. A message about UDL and accessibility could be sent when someone requests a course shell. Members also suggested that workshops on creating course shells should include information about making the course shell accessible through UDL. Training guides for use with the new LMS would also need to be developed by this coming September.

6. Online Delivery

Members wanted to introduce an online UDL/accessibility checklist for faculty to use as a planning tool when creating their course. Once faculty have run through the checklist, the course shell would be labelled and advertised as accessible. Mentorship programs where faculty support each other in creating accessible courses would offer continued assistance when they have questions around UDL.

Recommendations

1. UDL is best promoted in course outlines and course web pages through a template structure and checklist provided to faculty.
2. Tip sheets for course outlines and best practices in course delivery could assist faculty in changing current practices where needed.
3. UDL should be promoted at New Faculty Orientation, the Faculty Conference, and all events that bring faculty together.
4. Information on accessibility services should be made available from course webpages.
5. The accessibility of a course should be made clear to students thinking of taking that course regardless of it being face-to-face or online.

The Teaching Chair Program

Background

The Director of the LTO provided a description of the Teaching Chair Program that outlined the activity and mentorship basis for this program. The Teaching Chairs from each faculty presented information about the faculty development support they had offered during the year. They also discussed challenges they were having in implementing the program. Afterwards, SLT members discussed potential solutions to the difficulties that had been presented. The discussion, by Faculty, is outlined below.

Questions

Discussion Summary and Recommendations

1. Arts

The Teaching Chair outlined that the main mandate for the Teaching Chair was to raise the profile of teaching in the Faculty. To do this he had a number of teaching seminars, created new teaching awards, met with program directors and chairs, and increased communication around teaching issues. Several

challenges were indicated, including the faculty preference to focus on research and getting enough faculty members to join the Faculty Teaching Committee.

2. Faculty of Community Services

The Teaching Chair outlined that the faculty has a long history of providing a lunch-and-learn teaching series and this continued. In addition, the Teaching Chair offered individual assistance to faculty, met with the dean and chairs around teaching related issues, and offered several workshops on teaching related topics. The teaching chair was challenged by low attendance at FCS workshops, ineffective email communication (faculty not reading communications), and getting faculty to serve on the Faculty Teaching Committee.

3. The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education

The Teaching Chair noted that this is the first year for the Chang School to have a teaching chair. Programming included a new instructor orientation, reviews for online courses, a dossier workshop, several joint workshops with the LTO, and providing directors with UDL information. The Teaching Chair's main challenge involved reaching all of the Chang School's part-time faculty members and figuring out how to best meet their professional development needs.

4. Faculty of Communication & Design

The Teaching Chair noted that she had provided workshops, a large workshop event, and individual assistance to faculty, chairs, and the dean. She also noted that she is supporting teaching through promotion of the scholarship of teaching conferences and materials. Her main challenges are with funding for events and promotion to people that most need assistance.

5. Library

The Teaching Chair provided workshops to faculty and TAs around teaching issues that involved information gathering. In addition, assistance was provided to instructors, programs, and faculties. The challenges included getting buy-in from librarians to accept professional development around teaching and creating assessment methods to assist librarians in evaluating their teaching.

6. Ted Rogers School of Management

The Teaching Chair focused on creating better teaching assessments and assisting faculty with teaching dossiers. In addition, the Teaching Chair assisted faculty with e-learning issues. The largest challenge was getting buy-in from faculty to engage with the teaching chair program.

7. Faculty of Engineering & Architectural Sciences

The Teaching Chair reported that three initiatives were promoted: teaching with technology, understanding copyright, and relating research to teaching. This was done through workshops and resources that were provided to FEAS faculty. As with other teaching chairs, the largest challenge was uptake of programs by faculty, however, the Teaching Chair noted that with the Dean's assistance, events had good turnouts.

8. Faculty of Science

The Teaching Chair reported the focus during the academic year was on pedagogies that promote better learning in Science. She conducted workshops and Faculty-wide events with the Dean of Science. She held a well-attended community event on the teaching of science with a guest speaker. In addition, she compiled resources for use by faculty. The long-term goal of the teaching chair program is to create a Science Education Research and Outreach Center (or Institute). The institute will advance the knowledge of teaching pedagogy for success in science education.

Recommendations

Members made several recommendations to assist Faculty Teaching Chairs:

1. Teaching chairs share their knowledge and assist one another in their agendas
2. Teaching chairs pair with student learning support to better promote to faculty the services that are available for students
3. Teaching chairs present their planned activities at New Faculty Orientation
4. Teaching chairs assist with the development of supports for Teaching and Graduate Assistants
5. Teaching chairs develop a joint theme each year and focus on that for individual and university-wide events
6. Teaching chairs assist in the development of a mentorship resource for faculty
7. Teaching chairs promote their agenda at faculty meetings

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Chris Evans', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Chris Evans, Vice Provost Academic
Chair of the Committee