

NROD60H3: Current Topics in Neuroscience

Physiology of Learning and Memory

University of Toronto Scarborough, Fall 2022 edition

Tuesday 3:00 – 5:00 PM EST

Academic Resource Centre 332

Instructor: Robert ROZESKE

Office: Science Wing 627A

Office hours: Thursday 3:00 – 5:00 PM EST

Email: robert.rozeske@utoronto.ca

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Our experiences not only determine who we are, but also who we will become. The brain is a repository of past experiences, a driver of behaviour, and a powerful predictor. As a predictor, the brain evolved to maximize our survival by compiling our experiences in an ordered fashion across time, and using this catalogue of events, it guides future behavior. This process is known as learning and memory. A defining feature of an episodic memory is that it occurred in a specific place. Yet, ‘place’ is an abstract concept, so it does not exist in the physical world. We will learn how the brain creates spatial representations, or cognitive maps, that serve as a stage for our memories. We will also explore how the brain encodes a diversity of social, fear, and habit memories. We will focus on research that uses *in vivo* recording methods in animal models during memory tasks, which will provide an understanding of the dynamic relationship between neural activity and behaviour.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

- Understand of how specialized neurons in the hippocampal formation generate spatial representations, or cognitive maps, that are the essential building-blocks of an episodic memory
- Become familiar with widely used *in vivo* recording (electrophysiology and calcium imaging) and manipulation (optogenetics and chemogenetics) techniques in neuroscience
- Understand how *in vivo* neural activity across multiple brain regions interact to support learning, strengthening, and retrieval of a diversity of memory types
- Become adept at searching for primary research articles and critically analyzing the scientific narrative of the authors to determine if the experiments support their conclusions
- Improve scientific communication skills through group presentations, reviewing grant proposals, and writing an original grant on the physiology of learning and memory
- Confidently engage in productive classroom discourse by listening to others, formulating ideas that build upon previous comments, and sharing a perspective that propels the discussion narrative forward
- Hone intellectual self-defense skills so that the endless amount of information confronted daily, both inside and outside the classroom, is interpreted using a critical lens

WORKLOAD AS PERCENTAGE OF FINAL GRADE

1. Presentation:	35%	(5% background; 25% papers; 5% discussion)
2. Participation:	15%	(5% classroom; 10% Perusall)
3. Grant proposal:	35%	(2% rationale; 8% experimental plan; 25% final)
4. Peer review of grant proposal:	15%	

WORKLOAD DETAILS

1. Presentation (total 35%): Various due dates

Each week, a research topic in a subfield of physiology of learning and memory will be presented by a group of students. The class period will consist of three parts: (1) a group presentation of the 'foundational' paper in the subfield, (2) individual student presentations on their research article and (3) a group-led discussion that explores the subfield. Group members will share the same grade for the foundation and discussion portions of the presentation, but each group member will receive an individual grade for the research article they present. Grading rubrics are on Quercus.

Once the presentation group is set, I encourage group members to decide how they will communicate with each other and distribute the responsibilities equally for the foundational paper & class discussion segments. As the group prepares their presentation, be respectful of your group members by giving everyone a voice and including them in the process. It is highly encouraged to discuss your plans with me during office hours 1-2 weeks prior to presentation. If irreconcilable differences arise during presentation preparation, contact me as soon as possible prior the presentation.

Topic selection (0%): On the first day of class I will provide an overview of each topic. PDFs of articles are located on Quercus in the Files section. Review the papers in the folders and visit the interactive document on Quercus in the Pages section called "Sign-up for Presentation Article". Select your article by typing your name in the "student" column. Groups will be generated organically as a function of article sign-up. Articles are selected on a first-come, first-served, basis. If you do not select an article before **08 September at 11:59PM EST**, one will be assigned to you.

Foundation (5%): For each weekly topic, a PowerPoint presentation lasting 10 minutes will be given to introduce the class to your subfield. The presentation should emphasize the findings of the foundation paper, but also provide a general background of the topic. The goal is to explain how the foundation paper paved the way for the subfield. The optional review paper provided for each topic is a helpful source to understand the history, theory, and methods of the subfield. You should begin by establishing how this topic is related to theories of learning and memory. What are the central hypotheses in the subfield? How is the subfield informed by *in vivo* neurophysiology? Then, explain the figures of the foundation paper. Then provide a smooth on-board to the recent research articles. The Foundation section will be assessed on: presentation and organization of content, accurate presentation of facts, adequate subfield background, clarity of explanation of the foundation paper, adherence to time limit, scientific narrative that combines the subfield with the foundation paper.

Article (25%): Articles should be presented in a PowerPoint presentation lasting 25-30 minutes. Remember, the Foundation presentation was just delivered, so an in-depth review of topic is not required. Moreover, your peers read these articles in preparation for class, so you do not need to explain every little detail. Rather, your presentation should address the following:

(i) *Motivation*: What did the scientists view as an interesting and unsolved phenomenon? What is their hypothesis and how does it fit into the theory of this subfield? What knowledge gap will they fill?

(ii) *Results*: For each main figure you should: (a) describe the question that motivated the experiments that were performed. (b) what techniques were used, what analysis methods were applied to address the question? (c) when considering all of the figure's panels, what was the final message of the figure?

(iii) *Limitations*: Every paper has valuable information and limitations. To get you started, consider the following questions: Is there a disconnect between the dependent measures and what the authors claim they are measuring? Were all effects convincing? Are the paper's conclusions truly supported by the data? Did the experiments create a logical scientific narrative? How could the paper be improved?

(iv) *Perspectives*: What was amazing about this paper? How did it change the way you think about the brain? Do the results conflict with existing findings? Did the paper develop new techniques, behaviours, theories, etc.? What follow-up experiments do the findings inspire? You may want to reserve a few minutes for peer questions.

In the Files section of Quercus, I uploaded a PDF "How to read a scientific article" that may be helpful. When preparing your presentation, look at Perusall (details below) to see what your peers are struggling to understand and integrate this information in your slides. You will be assessed on: understanding of the motivation & hypotheses, methods, clear explanation of results, critical analysis of the limitations, perspective on paper's impact, presentation & organization of content, and adherence to time limit.

Discussion (5%): After the Foundation and Article presentations, the group will lead a class discussion lasting 10-15 minutes. The group is granted the liberty to structure the Discussion as they see fit. The task is to engage the class to discuss the topic at a high intellectual level that critically examines the article's findings and interpretations. Do the findings in articles all agree? Can you synthesize a take-home message? What are the implications of that message on the field of neuroscience, health, society? The Discussion section will be assessed on: presentation and organization of content, critical analysis of the article's implications for the subfield and beyond, ability to field questions, adherence to time limit, and engagement of your classmates. To ensure there are no technical delays, please submit your PowerPoint files to me via email prior to the start of class.

2. Participation (total 15%): Every class & each Tuesday by 3:00PM EST on Perusall

Classroom (5%): As a seminar course, the objective is to discuss everyone's questions, needs for clarification, criticisms, and perspectives on research articles. Since research articles are composed of several figures that build upon one another to create a narrative, it is critical to have a clear understanding from the outset, otherwise you will be quickly lost. Even if you believe your question to be obvious or unsophisticated, ask it. To generate a situation where curiosity conspires with theory to create interesting speculations and plausible scientific ideas, it is essential to maintain a professional and courteous demeanor during class. Although we will create a safe space for discussion, it does not mean that we cannot disagree with each other. Remember, what drives an interesting discussion is a common thread that considers and integrates previous comments. Whether or not you agree with your classmates, listen to them, build upon their comments, consider how you can link your idea to your peer's ideas.

To discuss the articles, you must attend class. An excellent participation grade reflects weekly comments and questions that demonstrate critical evaluation of course material and original thinking. The best

strategy to ensure active participation is to read the assigned articles and come to class prepared to discuss. If you are not comfortable speaking in class, please contact me and we can discuss alternatives.

Perusall (10%): To encourage reading of the assigned articles before class, students will be required to annotate articles using Perusall. This software provides an interactive platform for classmates to virtually interact in the context of the assigned readings. Each week the class will be assigned the articles of that week's topic. For each of the articles, you will be required to provide at least four annotations per article. Annotations can take the form of questions that you post or answering a question from an existing conversation thread. Not all annotations are created equal, so I have provided guide in the Files section of Quercus called "General Thoughts on Perusall Annotations" that demonstrates how annotations will be assessed. Perusall is being used because primary research articles are dense, and this platform provides a virtual space for classmates to collectively work through challenging topics, techniques, and experiments. Students will be split into 2 or 3 article annotation groups on Perusall. You are not required to annotate the articles associated with your presentation topic. All annotations are due each week on **Tuesday by 3:00PM EST**.

To access Perusall, use this link: <https://app.perusall.com/home>. Sign up for an account and follow the account confirmation directions. Once confirmed, enter the course code: ROZESKE-L2BEY . Perusall contains several functions that you will not be required to use for class, but might find useful (e.g., private notetaking for articles). This link provides the step-by-step process for account setup and use: <https://support.perusall.com/hc/en-us/articles/360033995074-Getting-started>

3. Grant Proposal (total 35%): Various due dates

Grants are the bread and butter of scientists. Mention the word "grant" to any research professor and they will tell you that they recently submitted one, or are currently writing one. Scientists are perpetually writing grants because research is expensive and securing funding is a competitive process. The ability to write a clear, exciting, and compelling grant is a scientist's most valuable skill. For this assignment you will write a grant that follows the format of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC). This federal agency awards research funds for five-year projects via the Discovery Grant funding mechanism (https://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/ResearchPortal-PortailDeRecherche/Instructions-Instructions/DG-SD_eng.asp). With millions of taxpayer dollars at stake, grant proposals are reviewed by a panel of three researchers in your general field of study. Your goal is to convince them that your exciting new experiments will create a step-change in the field. To convince your reader, you must communicate the following throughout various sections of your grant:

1. What is your research question and why is it significant?
 - a. Explain what you are interested in studying and the hypotheses or predictions that stem from your question. Why spend money to study it?
 - b. To develop a fundable grant, you must walk the line between an over-the-top almost impossible hypothesis that would radically change how we think about the brain and a so-overly-obvious hypothesis that it is practically already in textbooks and there is nothing further that is exciting to explore.
2. What is the theory or prediction in the subfield, and where are the knowledge gaps?
 - a. Connect your research question to theories in your field. Where do existing theories fall short? Will your hypothesis disprove a central prediction from a theory in the field? Will it confirm a theory in the field?

- b. You are solving a puzzle that is either going to confirm a theory's prediction or break a theory and establish a new one. Your job is to provide an adequate background so that your reader clearly understands where there are gaps in scientific knowledge.
3. What is your approach to address the knowledge gaps?
 - a. You will propose three specific aims that contain multiple experiments to address the knowledge gaps. A major aspect of writing a successful grant is to propose an exciting set of experiments that specifically, and perhaps cleverly, address the knowledge gap.
 - b. Explain the methodology you will use to fill the knowledge gap (e.g. record 1000s of hippocampal parvalbumin interneurons in a mouse with *in vivo* calcium imaging during zero-gravity maze task on a SpaceX flight).
 - c. Pre-emptively anticipate questions or criticisms of the reviewers by explaining the data analysis strategy, how experimental results will be interpreted, and additional strategies if technical issues arise.
4. How will the results of your experiments fill the knowledge gaps and push the field forward?
 - a. Describe the impact and the big-picture implications. Research is not an island; link your potential results with existing publications and explain how it will advance knowledge.

Your grant must investigate a question in the field of neurophysiology of learning and memory. Imagine you have access to all the techniques and resources that we discussed during this course. The goal is to synthesize what you have learned about *in vivo* recording and manipulations of neural circuits to write an original grant. Although the grant is reviewed by neuroscientists, it is unlikely they are specialists in your subfield. This means your reader is informed but may not use the same research techniques as you (e.g., neurophysiology of hippocampal somatostatin interneurons during fear compared to the expression of proinflammatory cytokine mRNA in the hippocampus after stress). Your task is to articulate your ideas to an informed population of scientists with a clear and simple narrative. I have provided guide in the Files section of Quercus called "General Thoughts on Grant Writing Structure". This writing project is divided into three stages that will provide you feedback to improve your grant throughout the semester.

Rationale and hypothesis (2%): due 29 September by 11:59PM EST

Provide a summary of your proposed research project. What is the prevailing theory in the field? How does your hypothesis relate to the subfield's theory? What is your rationale for suggesting this hypothesis? Remember, theories are only useful if they generate clear, testable predictions. I will provide feedback on the feasibility of your proposal. Submit your two paragraph Word file on the Quercus assignment "Grant Proposal: Rationale & hypothesis". Late submission will be accepted, but with a 10% reduction penalty for every day late.

Experimental plan (8%): due 13 October by 11:59PM EST

This assignment will help you develop experiment ideas. Experiments in grants are centered around three specific aims; the aims serve to outline three broad goals of the grant. You will provide three specific aims designed to test the grant's overarching hypothesis. Begin by writing a paragraph that provides the reader with sufficient background to understand why you will perform these aims. For each aim, describe in a few sentences the experiments you are planning: experimental and control groups, recording method, neural manipulation method, behavioural task, etc. One aim typically has 2 to 3 experiments associated with it. I will provide feedback on the feasibility of your experiments. Submit your Word file on the Quercus assignment "Grant Proposal: Experimental plan". Late submission will be accepted, but with a 10% reduction penalty for every day late.

Grant proposal for peer review (0%): due 17 November by 11:59PM EST

Your grant proposal must adhere to the following formatting guidelines. The length must be between 7.75 and 8 double-spaced pages, this excludes the reference section. In Word, use Times New Roman font size 11 with 2.54 cm (1") margins. As per the NSERC guidelines website, your submission must have the following sections:

Project title: One short and descriptive sentence that communicates the substance of your proposal.

Overview: Here you provide the background and rationale that is motivating the entire grant. This is like an abstract in a research paper and is the first section your referees will read. It should be clear, exciting, and compelling. In one to two paragraphs summarize your grant in lay terms and broadly describe the methods and deliverables of your specific aims. This section contains five references.

Objectives: Begin by writing a paragraph that provides the reader with an abbreviated, but sufficient background, to understand why you will perform these specific aims. Then list the aims one by one. Each aim should be one sentence long and succinctly capture the goal of that aim. After listing the aims, write a paragraph that describes the valuable information that will come from completion of these aims. Also describe the big-picture implications of these aims and how their completion fits into your long-term goals as a researcher. Finally, describe what completion of these aims will provide to the research community. The "Experimental Plan" assignment will guide you. This section contains five references.

Literature review: As your reader may not be in the same subfield as you, this section should provide them with enough background to understand the theory, brain regions, cell types, techniques, etc. that are directly relevant to your specific aims. This section should highlight how your specific aims relate to the most recent publications in the field. Remember, in a grant you are making the case that funding your proposal will create breakthroughs that push the boundaries of current knowledge. This section should be one to one-and-a-half pages long and include at least 10 references that are not review papers.

Methodology: This section is organized by specific aim and for each aim there are separate sub-sections of rationale, experimental approach, and feasibility. For rationale, explain why you chose these particular experiments and methods. For experimental approach explain your experimental and data analysis approach with enough detail that your reviewer understands the methods and the control/experimental groups. For feasibility, describe potential pitfalls or data interpretation issues, and your strategy to address them if they arise. Please refer to the grant writing guide provided in Quercus for more details.

Impact: In this section you make the final case why your proposal should be funded. Emphasize the novelty of the experimental approach and how the results will change the trajectory of your research field and advance the natural sciences. It is also appropriate to discuss how anticipated results will inform clinical practice(s) and potentially lead to novel therapeutics or medical devices.

References: In text citations must follow the formatting style used by the journals Nature or Science (for an example, refer to an assigned paper published in one of these journals). A reference manager is highly encouraged because it will save you time and make your life easier. Reference managers organize all your citations within your text and insert a formatted and chronological bibliography at the end of the document. There are two free reference managers. One is Mendeley, which seamlessly integrates into Word. The other is Paperpile, which can be used with Google Docs. Paperpile requires one additional step of converting your Google Doc to a Word file before submitting your final grant proposal.

The nearly finalized draft will be submitted on Quercus assignment "Grant proposal: Proposal for peer review". As this is a double-blind anonymous review process, do not write your name or identifying

information on your grant proposal. You will not receive a grade for this version of your grant, but a more polished version of your grant will receive more valuable feedback from your peer. Late submissions will result in a 10% reduction per day applied to your final grant submission.

Final grant proposal (25%): due 01 December by 11:59PM EST

After receiving anonymous feedback from your peer, integrate their comments as you see fit and finalize the grant proposal for submission to me. The final grant proposal will be submitted through Quercus assignment “Grant Proposal: Final Version” and assessed by Ouriginal. The grading rubric is available on Quercus. Late submissions will be accepted, but with a 10% reduction penalty for every day late.

Grants will be assessed by adherence to length & formatting guidelines, depth of background described in the literature review, novelty of hypothesis and specific aims, understanding of the methods proposed, grasp of the theoretical implications of the results, appropriate/accurate references, and clarity of writing. In a grant, the merit of the scientific idea is as important as the clarity in which you describe it. If your writing is poor and incoherent, your reader will not be able to grasp your brilliant idea.

4. Grant Proposal peer review (15%): due 24 November by 11:59PM EST

Before a grant is submitted to a private or federal granting agency it has been pored over by several scientists and is ultimately a product of a team effort. In the same spirit, each student will be assigned a peer’s grant to review, which will advance the clarity and rigor of the proposal. The peer review process will be double-blind and administered on Quercus. By 18 November you will be able to access the grant that was assigned for your review. In the Quercus assignment “Grant Proposal: Proposal for peer review” you will find on the right-hand side a link to the proposal you will review (a tutorial can be viewed at <https://community.canvaslms.com/videos/1133>). Do not annotate the grant proposal on Quercus; the grant review you write will be given to your peer in a separate document (details below). Your review will follow the model used by several granting agencies that requires the referees to include:

Summary: In two to three paragraphs, provide your understanding of the author’s experimental rationale, hypothesis, objectives, methodology, and impact. Here you legitimize that you understood the grant.

Strengths & Weaknesses: In two separate sections, provide feedback on which aspects of the grant were the most compelling and the aspects that could be improved. In the Strengths section, comment on what you found to be the highlights of the grant. It could be the solid theoretical grounding, thorough literature review, clever/interesting experimental methods, and/or data analysis strategy. In the Weaknesses section, provide constructive suggestions for how the proposal can be improved. Ask yourself, “Am I excited about this grant? Do the proposed experiments specifically address a knowledge gap in the field? Are the techniques used appropriately?” Your comments for improvement could range from adding missing control groups, adopting a different behavioural task, recording from a more specific neuronal subtype, using a different neural perturbation method, etc. As you craft your peer review, remember the hours of work that you sunk into your own grant proposal; provide honest criticism, but take care to be constructive in your tone. Your goal is to guide the writer on how they can elevate their grant to perfection, not to crush their spirit.

Submission guidelines: The length of the peer review should be 2.5 to 3 double-spaced pages. In Word, use Times New Roman font size 11 with 2.54 cm (1”) margins. Include the title of the grant proposal in the header section of your peer review. Submit your review on Quercus assignment “Peer Review: Peer review of grant proposal” and Ouriginal. Late submissions will be penalized 10% per day. A grading rubric is on Quercus. By 25 November you will receive your reviewed grant to integrate the peer review

comments into the final grant proposal. Importantly, the anonymous feedback you receive from your peer on your grant will not factor into the overall grade that you receive for your grant proposal.

COURSE SCHEDULE

WEEK	DATE	TOPIC	READINGS
01	06 SEP	Course introduction	Syllabus
	08 SEP	Due	Sign up for presentation article
02	13 SEP	The hippocampus in memory and space I	Milner et al 1998; Colgin et al 2008; Lisman et al 2017.
03	20 SEP	The hippocampus in memory and space II	
04	27 SEP	Hippocampal replay	Wilson et al 1994; de Lavilleon et al 2015; Fernandez-Ruiz et al 2019; Mou et al 2022. Rev: Joo et al 2018.
	29 SEP	Due	Grant Rationale & hypothesis
05	04 OCT	Memory allocation	Guzowski et al 1999; Ramirez et al 2013; Yiu et al 2014. Tanaka et al 2018. Rev: Josselyn et al 2020.
	11 OCT	Reading Week	
	13 OCT	Due	Experimental plan
06	18 OCT	Systems consolidation	Frankland et al 2004; Goshen et al 2011; Weible et al 2012; Kitamura et al 2017. Rev: Takehara 2020.
07	25 OCT	Fear memory	Phillips et al 1992; Herry et al 2008; Diehl et al 2018; Krabbe et al 2019. Rev: Duvarci et al 2014.
08	01 NOV	Social memory	Maaswinkel et al 1996; Hitti et al 2014; Oliva et al 2020. Scribner et al 2020. Rev: Piskorowski et al. 2018.
09	08 NOV	Ventral hippocampus	Nadel 1968; Jimenez et al 2018; Ciochi et al 2015; Padilla et al 2019. Rev: Dong et al. 2010.
10	15 NOV	Hippocampal dopamine	Gasbarri et al 1996; McNamara et al 2014; Takeuchi et al 2016; Kaufman et al 2020. Rev: Duzskiewicz et al. 2019.
	17 NOV	Due	Grant proposal for peer review
11	22 NOV	Habit learning	Packard et al 1996; Barnes et al 2005; Yin et al 2009; Crego et al 2020. Rev: Lipton et al. 2019.
	24 NOV	Due	Peer review of grant proposal
12	29 NOV	Closing remarks	
	01 DEC	Due	Final grant proposal

COURSE MATERIALS

The weekly topic will have one review article, one foundational paper, and three recent research papers. Often, the recent research papers will have a supplementary file in addition to the main article. All materials are available on Quercus in the Files section. Students are expected to read the three recent research articles. The review and foundational papers are optional. Evidence that you read the assigned articles will be determined by in class participation and Perusall activity (see *Participation* for details).

COURSE POLICIES

Email: All correspondence should be sent from a UofT email address to the instructor’s email address listed on the first page of the syllabus. Please use professional email etiquette as outlined in the document “General Thoughts on Email Etiquette” that is available in the Files folder on Quercus.

Video and audio recording: For reasons of privacy as well as protection of copyright, unauthorized video or audio recording in classrooms is prohibited. This is outlined in the Provost’s guidelines on *Appropriate Use of Information and Communication Technology*. Note, however, that these guidelines include the provision that students may obtain consent to record lectures and, “in the case of private use by students with disabilities, the instructor’s consent must not be unreasonably withheld.”

Copyright of lecture material: As protection of copyright, unauthorized copying, use, or uploading onto the internet of any of the lecture slides, handouts, or course materials produced by Professor Rozeske is strictly prohibited.

Contesting a grade: Re-grade requests will only be considered within two weeks of the grade being received. These will only be considered if adequate written justification is provided by the student. If granted, re-grading will consist of re-evaluation of the complete assignment, potentially leading to a grade increase, no change, or decrease. Requests without a solid rationale will not be considered (e.g. I need a higher grade to apply to med or grad school).

Classroom conduct: Students and faculty are responsible for maintaining an appropriate learning environment in all instructional settings, whether in person or online. Professional courtesy, respectful language, and sensitivity will help to create a welcoming and safe learning environment for everyone. Students are expected to participate in class discussions and resist the temptation to use their mobile device or laptop to engage in non-course related activities.

Attendance: Related to participation is your attendance in class. Class attendance and punctuality are required. Understandably, in certain circumstances tardiness cannot be avoided, but please be on time. Habitual tardiness demonstrates a lack of respect for the entire class as it disrupts the flow of the lecture and discussions. As the adage goes, “to be early is to be on time, to be on time is to be late”. Lastly, you are expected to bring the required readings (digital or hard copy) to class. If you are unable to attend class, refer to the Psychology Department Missed Term Work Policy outlined in this syllabus. An unexcused absence will result in a 0% for class participation that day.

Office hours: Students are encouraged to attend office hours if they want to discuss the course content, their grant proposal, their presentation, and their performance in class. Students are also welcomed to attend office hours if they would like guidance on how they can become involved in neuroscience beyond the classroom. Contact me to book an appointment on Thursdays from 3:00 – 5:00PM EST. If this period is fully booked, we can discuss alternative times.

GRADING SCALE & DEFINITIONS

<https://advice.writing.utoronto.ca/general/grading-policy/>

PERCENT	LETTER	GRADE VALUE	GRADE DEFINITION
---------	--------	-------------	------------------

90-100	A+	4.0	<i>Excellent</i> : Strong evidence of original thinking, good organization; capacity to analyze and synthesize; superior grasp of subject matter with sound critical evaluations; evidence of extensive knowledge base.
85-89	A	4.0	<i>Excellent</i>
80-84	A-	3.7	<i>Excellent</i>
77-79	B+	3.3	<i>Good</i> : Evidence of grasp of subject matter; some evidence of critical capacity and analytic ability; reasonable understanding of relevant issues; evidence of familiarity with literature
73-76	B	3.0	<i>Good</i>
70-72	B-	2.7	<i>Good</i>
67-69	C+	2.3	<i>Adequate</i> : Student who is profiting from the university experience; understanding of the subject matter and ability to develop solutions to simple problems in the material.
63-66	C	2.0	<i>Adequate</i>
60-62	C-	1.7	<i>Adequate</i>
57-59	D+	1.3	<i>Marginal</i> : Some evidence of familiarity with the subject matter and some evidence that critical and analytic skills have been developed.
53-56	D	1.0	<i>Marginal</i>
50-52	D-	0.7	<i>Marginal</i>
0-49	F	0.0	<i>Inadequate</i> : Little evidence of even superficial understanding of subject matter; weakness in critical & analytical skills; limited or irrelevant use of literature.

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY MISSED TERM WORK POLICY

For missed term work (assignments and term tests) due to illness, emergency, or other mitigating circumstances, please follow the procedures outlined below.

- The following reasons are not considered sufficient for missed term work: travel for leisure, weddings, personal commitments, work commitments, human error.
- [Missed Final Exams](#) are handled by the Registrar's Office and should be declared on eService.
- Instructors cannot accept term work any later than five business days after the last day of class. Beyond this date, accommodations are only possible via the Registrar's Office [petition process](#).

The email address to submit missed term work accommodations requests is: robert.rozeske@utoronto.ca

ILLNESS OR EMERGENCY accommodations:

For missed work due to ILLNESS OR EMERGENCY, complete the following process:

1. Complete the [Request for Missed Term Work Accommodations Form](#).
2. Declare your absence on [ACORN](#) (Profile & Settings > Absence Declaration)
3. Email **both** of the following items to the course email **WITHIN 2 BUSINESS DAYS** of the missed work:
 - a. the [Request for Missed Term Work Accommodations Form](#)
AND

- b. a screenshot of your Self-Declared Absence on ACORN

Note:

- *If you are unable to submit your request within 2 business days, you must still email your instructor within the 2 business day window to explain the nature of the delay. Exceptions to the 2 business day deadline will only be made under exceptional circumstances.*
- *If your absence is declared on ACORN, we do not require any additional supporting documentation (e.g. medical notes) to support your missed term work accommodation request.*

ACADEMIC CONFLICT accommodations:

For missed term work due to an ACADEMIC CONFLICT (e.g. two midterms at the same time):

1. Complete the [Request for Missed Term Work Accommodations Form](#).
2. Take screenshots of your course Quercus pages that demonstrate the conflict.
3. Email the form and screenshots to the course email **at least two weeks (10 business days) before the date of the activity**, or as soon as possible if it was not possible to identify the conflict earlier. Requests sent after the activity deadline may not be accommodated.

Note:

- *Multiple assignments due on the same day are not considered conflicts. Students are expected to manage their time effectively to meet assignment deadlines.*
- *Back-to-back tests/quizzes are not considered conflicts. Only overlapping activities are conflicts.*
- *Students are responsible for keeping their course timetables conflict-free. Students who register in two courses with overlapping lecture/tutorial/lab schedules will not be accommodated.*

RELIGIOUS CONFLICT accommodations:

For missed term work due to a RELIGIOUS CONFLICT:

1. Complete the [Request for Missed Term Work Accommodations Form](#).
2. Email the form to the course email **at least two weeks (10 business days) before the date of the activity**, or as soon as possible if it was not possible to identify the conflict earlier. Requests sent after the activity deadline may not be accommodated.

ACCESSABILITY SERVICES accommodations:

For missed **TERM TESTS** due to ACCESSABILITY REASONS:

- **Contact your AccessAbility consultant** and have them email the course email detailing accommodations required.

For missed **ASSIGNMENTS** due to ACCESSABILITY REASONS:

- If your desired accommodation is **within the scope** of your Accommodation Letter (e.g. your letter includes “extensions of up to 7 days” and you need 3 days):
 1. Complete the [Request for Missed Term Work Accommodations Form](#).
 2. Email the form ***AND*** your **Accommodation Letter** to the course email specifying how many days extension you are requesting.
- If your desired accommodation is **outside the scope** of your Accommodation Letter (e.g. your letter includes “extensions of up to 7 days” but you need more time than that):
 1. **Contact your AccessAbility consultant** and have them email the course email detailing the accommodations required.

Accommodation Procedure:

After submitting your documentation, you will receive a response from your instructor or TA. This form does not guarantee that you will be accommodated. The course instructor reserves the right to decide what accommodations (if any) will be made. Failure to adhere to any aspect of this policy may result in

a denial of your request. **You are responsible for checking your official U of T email and Quercus course announcements daily**, as accommodations may be time-critical.

For missed assignments, **do not wait for the instructor's response to resume work on your assignment**. Extensions may be as short as one business day, depending on the nature of the illness/emergency. Complete your assignment as soon as you're able, and email it to your instructor.

For an **anticipated absence** (e.g. a scheduled surgery or an illness with a prolonged recovery period), if you would like to request accommodations in advance, submit a [Verification of Illness Form](#) completed by your doctor AND the [Request for Missed Term Work Accommodations Form](#) to the course email. Absences can be declared up to 14 days into the future on ACORN.

Missed Accommodations

If an accommodation is granted but a continued illness/emergency prevents you from meeting its requirements, you must repeat the missed term work procedure to request additional accommodations. **Please make it clear in your subject line that you are requesting a second accommodation.** E.g. If you are given an extension but are still sick and need more time, or if you miss a make-up term test, you must submit *another* [Request for Missed Term Work Accommodations Form](#) and declare your extended absence on ACORN. *Note: In the case of a missed make-up test, an opportunity to write a second make-up test may not necessarily be provided.

DISABILITY-RELATED ACCOMMODATIONS

Students with diverse learning styles and needs are welcome in this course. In particular, if you have a disability/health consideration that may require accommodations, please free to approach me and/or the Accessibility Services Office (<http://www.utsc.utoronto.ca/ability/>) as soon as possible. Accessibility Services staff (located in Rm AA142, Arts & Administration Building) are available by appointment to assess specific needs, provide referrals and arrange appropriate accommodations. Please contact 416-287-7560 (tel/TTY) or email ability@utsc.utoronto.ca for more information. The sooner you let us know your needs the quicker we can assist you in achieving your learning goals in this course.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Academic integrity is essential to the pursuit of learning and scholarship, and to ensure that a degree from the University of Toronto is a strong signal of a student's individual academic achievement. As a result, the University treats cases of cheating and plagiarism very seriously. The University of Toronto's Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/behaveac.htm>) outlines the behaviours that constitute academic dishonesty and the processes for addressing academic offences. Potential offences include, but are not limited to:

In papers and assignments:

- Using someone else's ideas or words without appropriate acknowledgement
- Submitting your own work in more than one course without the permission of the instructor
- Making up sources or facts
- Obtaining or providing unauthorized assistance on any assignment

On tests and exams:

- Using or possessing unauthorized aids
- Looking at someone else's answers during an exam or test

- Misrepresenting your identity; and
- When you knew or ought to have known you were doing it.

In academic work:

- Falsifying institutional documents or grades
- Falsifying or altering any documentation required by the University, including but not limited to, doctor's notes; and
- When you knew or ought to have known you were doing so.

All suspected cases of academic dishonesty will be investigated following procedures outlined in the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters. If students have questions about what constitutes appropriate academic behaviour or appropriate research and citation methods, they are expected to seek out additional information on academic integrity from their instructors or from other institutional resources.

Note: You may see advertisements for services offering grammar help, essay editing and proof-reading. Be very careful. If these services take a draft of your work and significantly change the content and/or language, you may be committing an academic offence (unauthorized assistance) under the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*.

It is safer to take your draft to the Writing Centre whose services can be accessed through the Centre for Teaching and Learning at <http://uoft.me/AcademicLearningSupport>. They will give you guidance that you can trust. Students for whom English is not their first language should go to the English Language Development Centre also available at the Centre for Teaching and Learning. If you decide to use these services in spite of this caution, you **must keep a draft** of your work and any notes you made before you got help and be **prepared to give it to your instructor** on request.

UNIVERSITY'S PLAGIARISM DETECTION TOOL

Normally, students will be required to submit their course essays to the University's plagiarism detection tool 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 tool's reference database, where they will be used solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism. The terms that apply to the University's use of this tool are described on the Centre for Teaching Support & Innovation website (<https://uoft.me/pdt-faq>).

MASKS IN THE CLASSROOM

While the mask mandate has been paused as of 1 July 2022, the use of medical masks continues to be strongly encouraged at U of T Scarborough in indoor settings where physical distancing is not possible. We ask everyone to respect each other's decisions, comfort levels, and health needs. Masks are available at all building entrances at U of T Scarborough and in all classrooms.

EQUITY, DIVERSITY, INCLUSION

The University of Toronto is committed to equity, human rights and respect for diversity. All members of the learning environment in this course should strive to create an atmosphere of mutual respect where all members of our community can express themselves, engage with each other, and respect one another's differences. U of T does not condone discrimination or harassment against any persons or communities.