

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**Department of Political Science**

**POL 467H / 2167H**  
**The Politics of Immigration and Multiculturalism in Canada**  
**Fall 2017, Tuesdays, 12 p.m. – 2 p.m. (SS 581)**

Dr. Erin Tolley  
 Assistant Professor  
 Department of Political Science  
 University of Toronto

Office: SS 3122  
 Office Hours: Tuesdays, 2:15-3:45 p.m.,  
 or by appointment  
 Email: [erin.tolley@utoronto.ca](mailto:erin.tolley@utoronto.ca)

**1. COURSE SYNOPSIS AND OBJECTIVES**

Immigration and multiculturalism are more than just policies: they are also inherently political. In this class, we will discuss the normative foundations of immigration and multiculturalism, the current policy frameworks, and a number of key debates. Who should get in? What is the basis of Canadian citizenship? How are those decisions made? And are Canadians as accepting of immigrants and minorities as we believe ourselves to be? We will assess these questions using theoretical, empirical and applied evidence, paying particular attention to contemporary case studies. By the end of this class, you will be able to:

- Describe Canada’s immigration and multiculturalism policy framework and the normative foundations underpinning it
- Understand how institutions have responded to immigration and multiculturalism
- Apply an intersectional lens to issues related to immigration and multiculturalism
- Discuss the effects of immigration and ethnocultural diversity on policy and politics
- Analyse the political implications of Canada’s approach to immigration and multiculturalism

**2. COURSE REQUIREMENTS**

	<b>DUE DATE</b>	<b>WEIGHT</b>	<b>SUBMISSION</b>
<b>Class participation</b>	Cumulative	15%	In class
<b>Seminar presentation &amp; handout</b>	As assigned	15%	In class
<b>Weekly discussion outlines</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>6 outlines in total</b></p> <p>* Due @ noon on the day of class</p> <p>* You must submit 3 outlines by October 31, or you will incur a 3% penalty on your final grade</p> <p>* You may not submit a discussion outline on the day you present</p>	5% each x 6 = 30%	Blackboard
<b>Research proposal</b>	Tuesday, October 24, 2017 @ 4:30 p.m.	10%	Blackboard
<b>Research essay</b>	Friday, December 8, 2017 @ 4:30 p.m.	30%	Turnitin

**Late penalties:** The weekly discussion outlines must be submitted by the beginning of class, or they will not be graded. If you do not submit at least 3 weekly discussion outlines by October 31, you will receive a 5% deduction on your final course grade. Unless there is a medical situation or emergency, the seminar presentation must be delivered on your assigned date, or you will receive a grade of zero. For all other assignments submitted after the deadline, I will assess a late penalty of 5% per day or part thereof, including weekends. Late assignments will not be accepted after 7 days. If you submit an assignment late, you must email me, and I will confirm receipt.

### 3. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF COURSE

Week	Date	Topic	Notes
1	September 12	Introduction & Expectations	
2	September 19	Key Debates & Perspectives	<i>Send seminar presentation preferences by September 20</i>
3	September 26	Immigration and Refugee Policy	
4	October 3	Race, Gender and Intersectionality	
5	October 10	Policy Decisions and Discretion	
6	October 17	Multiculturalism and Immigrant Integration	
7	October 24	Research proposal work week – class cancelled	<i>Research proposal due October 24 @ 4:30 p.m.</i>
8	October 31	Equity and Economic Integration	<i>Must have submitted 3 weekly discussion outlines by this day</i>
9	November 7	Fall break – no class	
10	November 14	The Media	
11	November 21	Policing and Security	
12	November 28	Electoral Politics	
13	December 5	Evaluating Success, Addressing Failure	<i>Research essay due December 8 @ 4:30 p.m.</i>

### 4. TOPICS AND READINGS

**Text** = Augie Fleras, 2015, *Immigration Canada* (Vancouver: UBC Press)

**Blackboard** = resource available through the Course Reserves module on Blackboard

**Journal** = Journal article available through the U of T Library catalogue

**eBook** = Electronic book available through the U of T Library catalogue

**Online** = Link to a document on the internet

#### Week 1: Introduction and Expectations

1. Canadian Council for Refugees. 2010. [Refugees and immigrants: a glossary](#). (online)
2. Michael Dewing. 2013. [Canadian Multiculturalism](#). Ottawa: Library of Parliament. (online)

## Week 2: Key Debates and Perspectives

1. Augie Fleras. 2015. *Immigration Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press. pp. 1-70. **(text)**
2. Phil Ryan. 2010. *Multicultiphobia*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Ch. 1 “Classics of Multicultiphobia,” pp. 29-64. **(Blackboard)**
3. Neil Bissoondath. 1994. *Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada*. Toronto: Penguin. Ch. 5 “The Simplification of Culture” and Ch. 9 “Endings,” pp. 78-97 and 186-224. **(Blackboard)**
4. James Bissett. 2009. The current state of Canadian immigration policy. *The Effects of Mass Immigration on Canadian Living Standards and Society*. Herbert Grubel, ed. Vancouver: Fraser Institute. pp. 3-28. **(e-book)**

## Week 3: Immigration and Refugee Policy

1. Augie Fleras. 2015. *Immigration Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press. pp. 71-199. **(text)**

## Week 4: Race, Gender and Intersectionality

1. Nisha Nath. 2011. Defining Narratives of Identity in Canadian Political Science: Accounting for the Absence of Race. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 44(1): 161-194. **(journal)**
2. Rita Dhamoon. 2009. *Identity / Difference Politics*. Vancouver: UBC Press. Ch. 3 “Rethinking Accounts of the Immigrant,” pp. 67-92. **(Blackboard)**
3. Ange-Marie Hancock. 2007. Intersectionality as a Normative and Empirical Paradigm. *Politics & Gender* 3(2): 248-254. **(journal)**
4. Robin DiAngelo. 2011. White Fragility. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy* 3(3): 54-70.

## Week 5: Policy Decisions and Discretion

1. Vic Satzewich. 2015. *Points of Entry: How Canada’s Immigration Officers Decide Who Gets In*. Vancouver: UBC Press. Ch. 6 “Spousal and Partner Sponsorships” and Ch. 7 “Federal Skilled Workers,” pp. 139-186. **(Blackboard)**
2. Sean Rehaag. 2012. *The Luck of the Draw? Judicial Review of Refugee Determinations in the Federal Court of Canada (2005-2010)*. Research Paper No.9/2012. Toronto: Osgoode Hall Law School. **(e-book)**
3. National Film Board. 1989. [Who Gets In](#). Film. **(online)**

### **Week 6: Multiculturalism and Immigrant Integration**

1. Randall Hansen. 2014. Assimilation by stealth: Why Canada's multicultural policy is really a repackaged integration policy. *The Multiculturalism Question: Debating Identity in 21<sup>st</sup> Century Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press. pp. 73-88 **(Blackboard)**
2. Neil Bissoondath. 1994. *Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada*. Toronto: Penguin. Ch. 4 "Losing the Centre," pp. 45-77. **(Blackboard)**
3. Gérard Bouchard. 2015. *Interculturalism: A View From Quebec*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Chapters 1 and 3, pp. 10-27 and 59-70. **(Blackboard)**
4. Kristin Good. 2009. *Municipalities and Multiculturalism: The Politics of Immigration in Toronto and Vancouver*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Chapters 1 "The Municipal Role in Managing Multiculturalism" and 3 "A Comparative Overview of Municipal Multiculturalism Policies," pp. 3-15 and 47-91. **(Blackboard)**

### **Week 7: Research Proposal Due – Class Cancelled**

### **Week 8: Equity and Economic Integration**

1. Sonia K. Kang, Katherine A. DeCelles, András Tilcsik and Sora Jun. 2016. Whiteness and Self-Presentation in the Labor Market. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 61(3): 469-502. **(journal)**
2. Rupa Banerjee, Jeffrey G. Reitz and Phil Oreopoulos. 2017. [Do Large Employers Treat Racial Minorities More Fairly? A New Analysis of Canadian Field Experiment Data](#). Research Report. **(online)**
3. Jeffrey G. Reitz, Josh Curtis and Jennifer Elrick. 2014. Immigrant Skill Utilization: Trends and Policy Issues. *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 15(1): 1-26. **(journal)**
4. Wendy D. Roth, Marc-David L. Seidel, Dennis Ma and Eiston Lo. Immigrant Category, Social Networks and Ethnic Workplaces Over Time: A Longitudinal Analysis of Immigrants' Economic Integration in Canada. Working Paper 11-10. Vancouver: Metropolis British Columbia. **(Blackboard)**

### **Week 9: Fall Break – No Class**

### **Week 10: The Media**

1. Augie Fleras. 2011. *The Media Gaze: Representations of Diversities in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press. Ch.8 "Racializing Immigrants and Refugees," pp. 140-155. **(Blackboard)**

2. Victoria Esses, Stelian Medianu, and Andrea S. Lawson. 2013. Uncertainty, Threat, and the Role of the Media in Promoting the Dehumanization of Immigrants and Refugees. *Journal of Social Issues* 69(3): 518-535. **(journal)**
3. Sean P. Hier and Daniel Lett. 2013. Racism, media, and analytical balance. *Communication in Question: Competing Perspectives on Controversial Issues in Communication Studies*. Joshua Greenberg and Charlene Elliot, eds. Toronto: Nelson. pp. 123-130. **(Blackboard)**
4. Erin Tolley. 2016. *Framed: Media and the Coverage of Race in Canadian Politics*. Vancouver: UBC Press. Chapter 5, "Journalists and the Framing of Race," pp. 164-185. **(Blackboard)**

<b>Week 11: Policing and Security</b>
---------------------------------------

1. Scot Wortley and Akwasi Owusu-Bempah. 2011. The usual suspects: police stop and search practices in Canada. *Policing and Society* 21(4): 395-407. **(journal)**
2. Yasmeen Abu-Laban and Nisha Nath. 2007. From Deportation to Apology: The Case of Maher Arar and the Canadian State. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* (39)3: 71-98. **(journal)**
3. James Bissett. 2008. Security Threats in Immigration and Refugee Policies. *Immigration Policy and the Terrorist Threat in Canada and the United States*. Alexander Moens and Martin Collacott, eds. Vancouver: Fraser Institute. pp. 75-91. **(eBook)**
4. Desmond Cole. 2015. [The skin I'm in: I've been interrogated by police more than 50 times—all because I'm Black](#). *Toronto Life* (April). **(online)**

<b>Week 12: Electoral Politics</b>
------------------------------------

1. Antoine Bilodeau. 2014. Is Democracy the Only Game in Town? Tension Between Immigrants' Democratic Desires and Authoritarian Imprints. *Democratization* 21 (2): 359-381. **(journal)**
2. Karen Bird. 2015. 'We are not an ethnic vote!' Representational perspectives of minorities in the Greater Toronto Area. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 48(2):249-279. **(Blackboard)**
3. Myer Siemiatycki. 2008. Reputation and representation: Reaching for political inclusion in Toronto. *Electing a Diverse Canada: The Representation of Immigrants, Minorities and Women*. Caroline Andrew, John Biles, Myer Siemiatycki and Erin Tolley, eds. Vancouver: UBC Press. pp. 23-45. **(Blackboard)**
4. Erin Tolley. 2017. Political Players or Partisan Pawns? Immigrants, Minorities and Conservatives In Canada. *The Blueprint: Conservative Parties and their Impact on Canadian Politics* Toronto: University of Toronto Press. pp. 101-128. **(Blackboard)**

## Week 13: Evaluating Success, Addressing Failure

1. Michael Adams. 2008. *Unlikely Utopia: The Surprising Triumph of Canadian Multiculturalism*. Toronto: Penguin. Chapter 2, "The Facts on the Ground," pp. 110-151. \*Note that this page reference refers to the 2008 edition. **(Blackboard)**
2. Randy Besco and Erin Tolley. 2017. Does Everyone Cheer? The Politics of Immigration and Multiculturalism in Canada. Working paper. **(Blackboard)**
3. Keith G. Banting. 2010. Is There a Progressive's Dilemma in Canada? Immigration, Multiculturalism and the Welfare State. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 43(4): 797-820.
4. Jan Wong. 2014. [Canada's birthright citizenship policy makes us a nation of suckers](#). *Toronto Life* (May). **(online)**

## 5. ASSIGNMENTS AND ASSESSMENT

### (a) Seminar participation

Engagement, critical reflection, and discussion are not only integral parts of the political process, they are essential to your success in a seminar course. Participation can be thought of as a combination of **presence** + **purpose**. You need to attend to receive any participation mark at all, but mere presence is insufficient. You must also make a purposeful contribution to the seminar. This might mean any or all of the following:

- Initiating discussion
- Providing information, defining a concept or clarifying a fact
- Giving an informed opinion or reaction
- Providing an example for illustration
- Asking a question or seeking clarification
- Raising potential weaknesses or inaccuracies in an argument
- Drawing a connection with other course concepts or discussions
- Seeking out the opinion of another student or encouraging others to participate
- Synthesizing or summarizing part of the discussion

While active listening is an important part of effective participation, you cannot remain silent for the entire seminar and expect to receive a grade for your contribution. In short: **you must speak**. Your participation grade in this class will be an aggregation of your weekly participation marks over the course of the term. Each week, I will assign you a participation grade using the following 3-point scale.

Grade	Description
0	Not present
1	Present but did not participate
2	Present and made some contribution
3	Present and made purposeful, high quality contribution

## **(b) Seminar presentation and handout**

You will be required to complete **one seminar presentation and handout**. Your presentation will critically assess **one** reading from that week's assigned readings. Presentations will take place between Weeks 4 and 13. You will email me with the top 3 weeks you would like to present in (in order of preference), and the reading on which you would like to focus. I will then assign each student to a week and a reading. I will respect your preferences as much as possible, but you may not get your first choice of week and/or reading. Your presentation should:

1. Identify and critique the reading's main argument in a clear and concise manner. I cannot emphasize enough that this is **not a summary of the reading**. Don't describe the reading's contents; critical analysis is the point here. This component should be the shortest part of your presentation.
2. Evaluate the persuasiveness of author's approach, offering concrete and well-justified critiques. Some questions to consider: What methods are used? What are the data? Do the conclusions follow from the data? Are the arguments convincing? Does the author consider alternative explanations? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the author's theoretical and empirical approach?
3. Discuss the implications of the results presented in the reading. How does this reading relate to other things that we have read or discussed? How does it relate to the other readings assigned for that week?
4. Identify 1-3 questions that stem from the reading and which would provide a good basis for class discussion.

Presentations should be no more than **10 minutes in length** and should be accompanied by a **one-page handout** that provides an outline of your presentation and the 1-3 questions that you would like to put on the table for discussion. If you email me a copy of your handout prior to noon on the Monday before your presentation, I will bring copies for everyone. Otherwise, **please bring paper copies of your hand-out for your classmates**.

Your peers will complete an anonymous peer feedback form that will be taken into consideration, although the professor ultimately has the final authority to issue the grade. Your grade will be based on the content of your presentation (how effectively you analyze the reading), your organization (how coherent and logical your presentation is), your delivery and audience interaction (which includes your presentation style, your response to your peers questions and your ability to generate discussion), and your handout.

## **(c) Weekly discussion outlines**

You are required to submit 6 weekly discussion outlines over the course of the semester. You cannot submit an outline on the week that you present. These outlines accomplish a few things. First, they incentivize you to complete and think about the readings and reward you for doing so. Second, they develop your ability to distil arguments and concisely summarize key points. Third, they set the foundation for a high quality and informed seminar discussion.

You will submit a 1-2 page outline; the exact length might vary depending on the number of readings and their length, but in no case should your outline exceed 2 pages. If you are going to submit a discussion outline for a particular week, you must do so before the beginning of the class on the day it is due. Late discussion outlines will not be accepted. Discussion outlines are to be submitted via Blackboard.

Your outline has two parts: in the first part, you will analyze the readings, one by one; in the second part, you will pose a question or make a reflection that ties the readings together into a synthetic whole.

### *Part 1: Readings*

You will organize this section according to the week's readings (i.e., the outline will include a heading/section for each of the readings in that week. Under each reading, you will:

1. Identify the **main argument** for that reading: what main point is the author trying to get across in this reading?
2. Indicate one **concrete weakness** in the argument, method, data or conclusion of the reading
3. Provide a **suggestion** for how that weakness could be addressed

Be concise! As a rule of thumb, an entry for a journal article or single chapter should not exceed a half-page, single-spaced.

### *Part 2: Question or Reflection*

In this section, you will pose a synthetic question or make a reflection that brings in themes from all of the readings for that week. Here, you are trying to think broadly: what are the implications of this set of readings? How do they dialogue with each other or diverge? What are the main points of contention?

## **(d) Research proposal and essay**

A research essay provides you with the opportunity to engage deeply with a topic, formulate a logical argument, refute competing perspectives, support it with evidence from a number of sources, and convince your audience of your thesis in a compelling and engaging manner.

### Topics:

The research essay should be a significant piece of scholarly writing that engages with an issue related to the course content. Your research essay must have a Canadian focus, although you may bring in research and comparisons from other countries.

### Research proposal requirements:

Good research doesn't happen overnight; it takes planning. Early on in the term, you must submit a 4-5 page proposal (typed, 12-point font, double spaced) that provides an overview of your research essay. This must include the following sections:

- A title for your project
- A research question on a topic related to the course content
- A tentative thesis statement (i.e., your position or answer to this research question)
- A description of the premises that you will use to advance your argument (i.e., an outline)
- An overview of the evidence upon which you will rely
- An annotated bibliography that includes, for each source: its title, full bibliographic information in an established scholarly citation style, the main argument that the source makes, **how it will be used to support the arguments in your paper** (i.e., its relevance), and a critical reflection on that source (i.e., its strengths or weaknesses)
  - Undergraduate students must include at least 6 scholarly sources beyond course readings
  - Graduate students must include at least 10 scholarly sources beyond course readings

The proposal not only encourages you to start thinking about your essay, but it also gives me a chance to provide feedback on the direction you are taking and help direct you to other useful resources. I would strongly encourage you to visit me during my office hours to discuss. You must submit an electronic copy of your research proposal on Blackboard.

Research essay requirements:

A grading rubric will be posted on Blackboard, but in the general, the requirements include:

**Write the essay in your own words.** Do not rely on lengthy quotations, closely paraphrased passages, or a series of pasted-together quotes from several sources. Instead, synthesize the arguments that others make into a single central thesis of your own creation. See below for tips on avoiding plagiarism.

**State the thesis clearly** at the outset of your essay, and use the remainder of your essay to present evidence that supports this thesis. Your thesis and the evidence that you provide should be logical, persuasive, and well reasoned.

Abide by the **word limits**. Undergraduate students are required to submit an essay that is approximately 4000 words in length, while graduate students are required to submit an essay that is approximately 6000 words in length. These word limits do not include the bibliography.

**Cite sources** using the author-date system (parenthetical in-text citations, not footnotes or endnotes. I prefer the author-date system in the [Chicago Manual of Style](#) (see section 15, “Author-Date References). Note that if you quote directly from a source, you must include the page number from which you drew your quotation.

Include a **bibliography** that lists all of the sources you have used in your essay. Although you may cite the course texts, you should not cite lecture notes or non-academic sources such as dictionaries, Wikipedia or blog posts. Your bibliography must include the appropriate number of scholarly sources to which you refer substantively and directly in the text of your essay. Undergraduate students must use at least 6 scholarly sources beyond course readings; graduate students must use at least 10 scholarly sources beyond course readings.

**Proofread your essay.** It should be free of grammatical and typographical errors. Your writing should be clear and fun to read (yes, fun!) Do not obscure your meaning by using jargon or being overly wordy. Use punctuation properly and introduce quotations with preceding text (e.g., “As Martin (2008, 23) argues”).

**Format** your essay appropriate using a 12-point font, double-spaced with 2.5 cm margins.

**Include** a title, your name and your student number at the top of your essay. You do not need to create a separate cover page.

**Submit** an electronic copy of your essay to Turnitin. Submission details will be provided closer to the due date.

## 6. OTHER POLICIES

### Course Communications

You are required to have a valid UTOR email address and to ensure it is properly entered in ROSI. Email will sometimes be used to communicate with students. Forwarding your utoronto.ca email to Gmail, Hotmail or some other account is not advisable, as the message may be filed as “junk” and you will not receive it.

I am available before and after class as well as during my office hours and by appointment. Students may also email me, although I should emphasize that not all issues can be dealt with effectively through this medium; some may require an in-person meeting. Please read the syllabus before you send me an email with a question about due dates or course policies. I check my email regularly during working hours (weekdays from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.) and you can generally expect a reply within 24 hours during this time period. If contacting me by email, please put the course code (e.g., POL 467) in the **subject line** and use your UTOR email address.

Please remember that the university is a professional environment. Email correspondence should include an appropriate salutation (“Hello Dr. Tolley” or “Dear Professor Tolley” not “Hey” or “Hiya” or “Mrs. Tolley”). Please sign off using your full name (there are lots of Michaels, Yasmeeens, Omars and Sarahs). Be polite (“please” and “thank you” still go a long way), proofread what you’ve written, and OMG use real words and sentences.

### Statement on the Use of *turnitin.com*

Normally, students will be required to submit their course essays to Turnitin.com for a review of textual similarity and detection of possible plagiarism. In doing so, students will allow their essays to be included as source documents in the Turnitin.com reference database, where they will be used solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism. The terms that apply to the University's use of the Turnitin.com service are described on the Turnitin.com web site.

### Extensions

Extensions for written work will only be granted in exceptional circumstances; in general, medically documented reasons or severe family or personal crises are the only grounds for extensions. If you require an extension, please contact me as soon as possible. Extensions are at the discretion of the instructor; they are not a right. A medical certificate or other written documentation is required. Medical certificates should establish that the physician examined and diagnosed you at the time of your illness, not after the fact. You cannot be excused for medical reasons after the assignment is due, and you have already missed the due date. Falsified or altered medical notes are considered forgery. Note that computer problems, theft, Internet failure or conflicting course obligations are not legitimate excuses requesting an extension.

### Grade Appeals

You are entitled to the mark that your work merits. Marks cannot be raised because you think you “deserve” a higher mark, you “tried hard,” want to remain on scholarship or are trying to get into law school. These are not valid reasons to appeal. There is a “cooling off” period of 72 hours (3 days) after the assignment has been returned to you; you may not lodge a grade appeal in that time. **Grade appeals must be accompanied by a half-page explanation of the basis of your appeal.** Note that a re-read of written work may result in a raising OR lowering of a mark. There are no provisions for re-writing or “making up” assignments.

### Statement on Academic Integrity

I am committed to the principles of academic integrity and reward those who uphold them. In other words, a student who works hard and plays by the rules will not receive a lower grade than someone who cheats. As is noted in the Course Calendar:

“Honesty and fairness are considered fundamental to the university’s mission, and, as a result, all those who violate those principles are dealt with as if they were damaging the integrity of the university itself. When students are

suspected of cheating or a similar academic offence, they are typically surprised at how formally and seriously the matter is dealt with – and how severe the consequences can be if it is determined that cheating did occur. The University of Toronto treats cases of cheating and plagiarism very seriously. Examples of offences for which you will be penalized include (but are not limited to):

- Using any unauthorized aids on an exam or test (e.g., "cheat sheets," cell phones, electronic devices, etc.)
- Representing someone else's work or words as your own – plagiarism
- Falsifying documents or grades
- Purchasing an essay
- Submitting someone else's work as your own
- Submitting the same essay or report in more than one course (without permission)
- Looking at someone else's answers during an exam or test
- Impersonating another person at an exam or test or having someone else impersonate you
- Making up sources or facts for an essay or report.

As a student it is your responsibility to ensure the integrity of your work and to understand what constitutes an academic offence. If you have any concerns that you may be crossing the line, always ask your instructor. Your instructor can explain, for example, the nuances of plagiarism and how to use secondary sources appropriately; he or she will also tell you what kinds of aids – calculators, dictionaries, etc. – are permitted in a test or exam. Ignorance of the rules does not excuse cheating or plagiarism.

This information is taken from the brochure, *Academic Honesty*, part of a series of University of Toronto publications to help students understand the university's rules and decision-making structures. To view this publication online, please go to [www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies.htm](http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies.htm). All of the policies and procedures surrounding academic offences are dealt with in one policy: 'The Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters.' The full text is located in the back of this calendar" (UTM Course Calendar 2013-2014, 28).

### **Plagiarism**

Plagiarism is a serious academic offence, and perpetrators will be dealt with accordingly. Laziness, careless note-taking, and close paraphrases (i.e., changing a few words or rearranging a quote) are the principle sources of plagiarized material. The University of Toronto's Writing Centre has published a useful document, entitled [How Not to Plagiarize](#). If you are not sure if you are plagiarizing, please ask me.

### **Accessibility and Accommodation**

The University of Toronto is committed to accessibility. If you require accommodation or have any accessibility concerns, please contact [Accessibility Services](#) as soon as possible so that arrangements can be made. Accessibility Services can be reached at [accessibility.services@utoronto.ca](mailto:accessibility.services@utoronto.ca) or 416-978-8060.

### **Privacy and the Protection of Personal Information**

The University of Toronto respects your privacy. The information on medical certificates is collected pursuant to section 2(14) of the *University of Toronto Act, 1971*. It is collected for the purpose of administering accommodations for academic purposes based on medical grounds. The Department will maintain a record of all medical certificates received. At all times it will be protected in accordance with the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*. If you have questions, please refer to [www.utoronto.ca/privacy](http://www.utoronto.ca/privacy) or contact the University's Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Office at 416-946-5835. The address is Room 201, McMurrich Bldg., 12 Queen's Park Crescent, Toronto ON, M5S 1A1.