

# Lakehead

UNIVERSITY

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Karen Roche, Secretary of Senate  
**FROM:** David Tranter, Chair  
Senate Academic Committee  
**RE:** Report of the Senate Academic Committee (SAC)  
**DATE:** September 25, 2008

---

Please accept my report as Chair in respect of the regular meeting held on Wednesday, September 24, 2008.

### 1) Terms of Reference

The committee moved to recommend for review by the Senate Organization Committee, that the Senate Academic Committee Terms of Reference be amended as follows:

- a. The addition of the Associate Vice-President (Academic), ex officio
- b. The addition of the Director, Institutional Analysis and Government Relations, ex officio
- c. The committee organization to include a Vice-Chair, to be elected by the Committee from among those members holding academic appointment.

### 2) Development of Regulation, Peer Evaluation

The committee passed a motion to accept the following regulation related to peer evaluation. The regulation should be added to the university regulations, section V, Standing.

**University regulation on the maximum weight of peer evaluation as a component of the final grade:** "For courses that include a peer evaluation component, the maximum weight of the peer evaluation component will not exceed 15% of the final grade unless otherwise approved by the head of the academic unit and the Dean."

### 3) Proposed Graduate Calendar Change – Supervisory Responsibilities Regulation.

This item was referred back to the Faculty of Graduate Studies Council. It was the opinion of the committee that the proposed calendar change should be included in a graduate student handbook and was more of a guideline for committees, supervisors and students, than a graduate regulation.

4) Proposed Calendar Change – Business Minor mark

This item was referred back to the Faculty of Business Administration. It was the opinion of committee members that the calendar change should relate to all Business Minors, not just those in the HB Commerce.

5) Amendments to Senate Policy Regarding Academic Appeals

The Director of Risk Management and Access to information forwarded two amendment requests to the committee, relating to contradicting timelines cited in the policy to appeal to the Senate Academic Committee and an omission in the grounds section of Form B. (see attached)

The committee accepted those minor amendments to the policy.

Respectfully submitted,  
D. Tranter, Chair

For courses that require the course or work in dispute as a pre-requisite, the student shall be permitted to attend such courses until the decision of the Reappraisal Committee is communicated to him/her by the Office of the Registrar. Except in the case of further appeal, the student will be instructed by the Registrar to register in or withdraw from (and no longer attend) the courses concerned.

**Step 5: If the matter is not resolved at Step 4, the student may apply for a hearing of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee (SAAC).<sup>3</sup>**

An application for a hearing by the SAAC must be made on Form B to the Director of Risk Management and Access to Information within 20 Working Days of the release of the decision issued under Step 4.

Deleted: 10

An appeal to the SAAC will not be processed unless a decision has been rendered at Step 4.

A decision of the SAAC is final and binding upon all parties.

**(2) Appealing an Academic Decision Other than a Final Course Mark**

A student who wishes to appeal an Academic Decision other than a Final Course Mark must take the following steps within 20 working days of the release of the decision being appealed.

**Step 1: Discuss the matter with the original decision-maker.**

The student and the decision-maker may each be accompanied by another individual who may act only as an observer.

The decision-maker shall advise the student of his/her decision within five (5) working days.

**Step 2: If the matter is not resolved at Step 1, discuss the matter with the decision-maker's immediate supervisor.**

The student and the immediate supervisor may each be accompanied by another individual who may act only as an observer.

The decision-maker's immediate supervisor shall participate in discussion with the student and the decision-maker for the purposes of mediation and resolution prior to Review of the Academic Decision at Step 3. Within 5 Working Days following the meeting, the supervisor shall provide the student (cc: to the decision-maker) a written communication documenting the fact that discussion as required by Step 2 has occurred. Upon receipt

<sup>3</sup> A detailed explanation of the SAAC and its procedures begins with Article VI of this policy.

signature of the Faculty Dean. Such cases may not be appealed to the Vice President (Academic) and Provost.

A Review by the Vice President (Academic) and Provost shall follow the same procedures and timelines laid out in Step 3(a) above.

**Step 4: If the matter is not resolved at Step 3, the student may apply for a hearing of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee (SAAC).<sup>4</sup>**

An application for a hearing by the SAAC must be made on Form B to the Director of Risk Management and Access to Information within 20 Working Days of the release of the written communication at Step 3.

Deleted: 10

A decision of the SAAC is final and binding upon all parties.

#### **IV. TIME LIMITS**

Students who wish to initiate the Reappraisal of a Final Course Mark must request a Reappraisal no later than March 1 (or the next Working Day) for courses completed in the Fall and no later than October 1 (or the next Working Day) for courses completed in any other term as outlined under Article III (1), Step 4.

Students who wish to challenge an Academic Decision Other than Final Course Mark must initiate the appeal process by meeting with the original decision-maker within 20 Working Days of the release of the decision.

If at any stage in the appeal process, a course Evaluator(s) or other Academic Decision-maker is unwilling to meet with the student, or refuses to participate in the process, he/she waives the right to be represented.

An application that is outside the established time limits must include written reasons for the delay.

---

<sup>4</sup> A detailed explanation of the SAAC and its procedures begins with Article VI of this Policy.

(4) Please identify the Person or Committee whose decision or ruling is being appealed:

---

(5) Please state briefly the form of redress that you are seeking through your appeal:

(6) Please check below the appropriate grounds for your appeal (may be one or more):

- evidence of a factual error or procedural irregularity in the consideration of the appeal at a previous level of appeal;
- evidence that one or more of the rules of Natural Justice (see Schedule A to the Senate Policy Regarding Academic Appeals) has been violated at a previous level of appeal;
- new evidence which may be, on a reasonable interpretation, material to resolution of the appeal (see Article IX of the Senate Policy Regarding Academic Appeals);
- evidence that a decision reached at a previous level of appeal is unreasonable.

(7) Please provide a brief, reasoned argument in support of each of the grounds that you are claiming for your appeal.

(8) Please summarize the evidence which you are prepared to offer in support of your grounds for appeal. You may attach any documents that you feel would support your appeal.

(Note: You have the right to be accompanied at the hearing by a person of your choosing who may act only as an observer.)

**In the case of a Formal Hearing only:**

Do you intend to call witnesses? Yes / No

If yes, please provide below the names of these witnesses.