

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)

Procedural Review Annual

Presented By: Senate Appeals Committee

Responsible Office: Provost and Vice President Academic

Implementation Date: Fall 2009

Procedural Review: Fall 2011

POLICY INDEX	Page
A. ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT	1
A1. Academic Dishonesty	1
a. Plagiarism	1
b. Cheating	2
c. Misrepresentation of personal identity or performance	2
d. Submission of false information	2
A2. Contributing to Academic Misconduct	2
A3. Damaging, 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 Disciplinary Withdrawn (DW)	5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

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- iv.** Disciplinary Withdrawn (DW)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

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

B4. Consequences

a. Academic Record

i. Disciplinary Notice (DN)

- a.** The DN notation shall remain until a student graduates, or for eight (8) years for full-time undergraduate students, for four (4) years for graduate students, and for fourteen (14) years for part-time undergraduate program students, whichever comes first. Students

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.

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 grade of "0" is assigned for the work, the student may drop the course in accordance with the published deadline.

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

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

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

D6. Evidence of Misconduct:

- a. Instructors must be prepared to present the evidence for their suspicion at their scheduled meeting with the student(s). Students may bring, or be asked to bring, rough notes, drafts or other documents.
- b. If an instructor suspects academic misconduct and raises that suspicion with a student and decides not to charge a student, he or she may not subsequently change his or her mind and charge the student with academic misconduct.
- c. If evidence is discovered more than four (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.

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

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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

1. 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 and official transcript.

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

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 or a penalty greater than a zero (0) on the work. There may be no appeal of the assignment of a DN or the minimum penalty of a zero (0) on the work. Such appeals will not be accepted at any level.

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

1. There has been a recommended penalty 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. 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 a zero (0) on the work (Note: If academic misconduct is found, the minimum penalty is a zero (0) on the work 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. 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:
 - 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 or reduce the penalty of an “F” in the course to a zero (0) on the work (Note: If academic misconduct is found, the minimum penalty is a zero (0) on the work 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;
 - 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.
 - ii. determine that Expulsion from the University is warranted.
- 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 Office of the Senate.
- 6. 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. 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. Decisions of the Senate Appeals Committee are final and not appealable.

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