

MINUTES OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
Tuesday, March 5, 2002

Members Present:

C. Lajeunesse	M. Dewson
L. Grayson	J. Sandys
R. Mendelson	D. Northwood
I. Levine	K. Alnwick
J. Cook	C. Matthews
R. Virji	J. Yee
Y. Yuan	M. Creery
S. Williams	D. Glynn
A. Cross	R. Rodrigues
J. Hicks	R. Kup
O. Bay	M. Dowler
M. McCrae	S. Wicary
K. Penny	D. Martin
K. Hampson	D. Heyd
M. Mazerolle	R. Ravindran
A. Pevec	S. Quigley
N. Lister	K. Lee Law
G. Turcotte	R. Fleming
M. Ward	F. Hare
A. Furman	
S. Wasti	

Members Absent:

L. Lum	S. Sabih
F. Frkovic	M. Rashid
D. Amernic	N. Parmar
K. Marciniac	D. Elder
D. Tsanos	D. Henriques
C. Cassidy	G. Cressy

Regrets:

E. Aspevig	J. Ellimoottil
T. Knowlton	F. Salustri
J. Monro	T. Barbiero
M. Barber	N. Zaver
R. Malinski	M. Booth

1. President's Report

The President congratulated Darren Cooney on his election as RyeSAC President. He also congratulated Dr. Ken Jones on the renewal of his Eaton/SSHRC/NSERC Chair in the Management of Technological Change in Retailing. The award is for \$500,000 for five years. The Chair's partnership with the GEOIDE Network has been Ryerson's first formal participation in the Federal Networks of Centres of Excellence Program.

Catherine Matthews reported that she had nominated Business 100 for the Alan Blizzard Award which is given annually by the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education recognizing collaborative programs that facilitate teaching and learning, student success, and recognize endeavors in enhanced technology. The nomination also recognizes the contribution of the Learning Support Service, the School of Business Management and the Ryerson Library.

It was announced that Ryerson would receive a one-time grant of \$607,000 for research infrastructure. This is double what would normally be Ryerson's share, and is the result of a strong lobbying effort. The library will be receiving a share of these funds.

On February 14, Assistant Deputy Minister Jessica Hill spent a few hours touring Ryerson. She was shown not only the best of Ryerson, but also areas in need of improvement. RFA President, Michael Doucet, and RyeSAC President, Odelia Bay, joined the meeting after the tour. She conveyed the message that the Ministry is very supportive of the universities, but that there was a competition for funds with the health care system. The government is on temporary hiatus until the leadership issues are settled.

Council was asked to read the Infoline message concerning the Double Cohort. It is clear that the plans made five years ago were too pessimistic, and the government is now asking Ryerson to take in more students than planned. The Board has already stated that this will not be done unless these students are fully funded.

The President was saddened to report the deaths of two students in separate automobile accidents. Condolences were offered to the friends of Fariba Hashemi-Davani from the School of Social Work, and Julia Louie from the School of Journalism.

2. Report of the Secretary of Academic Council

Policy Update: A list of policies, which have been removed as policies, was presented. It was noted that although Policy 23 entitled "Confidentiality of Student Records" was being incorporated in the amendments to the Course Management Policy, and removed as a policy on its own, there is still a University Policy #1-020 entitled "Student Information: Collection, Dissemination and Confidentiality" in the Policy & Procedures Manual.

A question was raised about the removal of the policy on Military Research. It was explained that this was actually a report on Military Research and not a policy and that other universities in Canada did not have such a policy.

A statement on the format and procedure for submissions to Academic Council was included in the agenda, and members were asked to refer to it when submitting reports and documents. In the future all items should be submitted electronically so that they can be put on the Academic Council website at www.ryerson.ca/acadpol, which is now accessible from the homepage through News and Events and Resources and Services.

3. Good of the University

Paul Stenton and Stephen Onyskay of University Planning presented the Ryerson University Graduating Student Survey 2000. Copies were distributed. The survey is done on a three-year rotation cycle as part of a 30-member consortium of Canadian universities. The 2000 survey was unique in that it included all graduating students. The report highlighted the results of the survey in the areas of: Contribution of various activities to students' growth and development; Ryerson's contribution to the development of skills and personal traits; Students' satisfaction with professors; Students' satisfaction with various aspects of the University; Percentage of respondents identifying reasons for recommending or not recommending Ryerson to others; and the Distribution of respondents by level of debt upon graduation. More detailed analyses, including the department level, are available in the Library and through the Deans. There is a comparison to the aggregate results of other universities but not to individual universities. Ryerson falls within the error bars of the aggregate study. Other universities had a greater error as their samples were smaller. It was noted that there was no relationship between grade point average and satisfaction.

A possible error in the standard deviation on page 9 of the report was noted. This will be checked and reported back to Council.

John Cook raised a variety of issues about what he perceives as a trend toward suppression of debate at the University. He discussed the cancellation of the February Academic Council meeting, saying that the cancellation was "cavalier", "wrong in principle and wrong in spirit". He further commented on the Administration's response to the *Eyeopener* issue, which was of concern to the campus community. While he did not wish to defend what the paper did, he was concerned that administrators were being told not to respond to the *Eyeopener*. He saw this as another example of the suppression of debate, and felt that the issue should not have been silenced. His third concern was about the President's State of the University address, which he felt portrayed a complimentary view of the University, but did not present any of the critical problems, such as prayer space for Muslim students, the high attrition rate and the lack of an RFA contract. He felt that the issues of the students present at the address had not been dealt with, and that there was a morale problem. Lastly, he commented that there seemed to be a lack of debate at Academic Council.

The President responded that Academic Council meetings had been cancelled three times in either January or February in the last few years. Other universities have the ability to cancel meetings for lack of agenda items. President Lajeunesse stated that the allegations about the *Eyeopener* debate were unfounded and that he had not told anyone not to speak to the *Eyeopener*. He wished to have the rumors put to rest. He had made a clear

statement on the issue and since there have been formal complaints filed, he would not comment further. Some members of the community, who worked closely with students and had seen first-hand the impact of child abuse, have declined to speak to the *Eyeopener*. This is their right. He indicated that he had met with the *Eyeopener* that morning. He went on to say that the State of the University address was limited in time. He wished he had addressed the attrition rate, as it has been declining. He could not comment publicly on the RFA contract as this would be seen as bad-faith bargaining, and would be inappropriate. He thanked John Cook for his comments, and said that he welcomed such input.

John Cook thanked the President for his response and clarifications, but stated that there were still larger issues which needed to be addressed. Since there is a committee looking at the By-Laws of Academic Council, members were encouraged to send their comments on the cancellation of meetings to the Secretary of Academic Council.

It was announced that there would be a memorial service for Julia Louie on March 15 at Oakham House.

4. Minutes of the January 15, 2002 meeting

Motion to accept the minutes: Keith Alnwick moved and Ginette Turcotte seconded.
Passed unanimously.

5. Business Arising out of the Minutes

Due to illness, Errol Aspevig was not in attendance. His report would be available on the Vice President, Academic's web page. It was requested that the report be forwarded to members of Academic Council when it was available.

6. Correspondence

There was no further discussion on the correspondence which concerned the cancellation of the February meeting.

7. Reports of Actions and Recommendations of Departmental and Divisional Councils

Reports from Arts, Business, Continuing Education and Engineering were attached. There was no discussion of these reports.

8. Reports of Committees

Report of the Nominating Committee

MOTION: That Academic Council approve the nominee as presented in the report of the Nominating Committee.

Katherine Penny moved, Darrick Heyd seconded.

Stephen Wicary was nominated for membership on the Composition & By-Laws Committee.

Passed unanimously.

Report of the Learning & Teaching Committee

David Martin, Vice Chair of the Committee, presented the report. Based on communication prior to the meeting, he amended the proposed wording of section 2.4 d) to read “That instructors who wish to post grades on exams, tests or assignments may do so by sorted student identification number.”

MOTION: That Academic Council approve the amendments to section 2.4 of the Course Management Policy as presented in this report.

Seconded by Ginette Turcotte.

Discussion: There was concern that even if numbers were sorted randomly, some students could be identified because of their number. It was requested that the language reflect the concern, and that it be made clear that instructors are to inform students that they will be posting grades for that course.

The motion was tabled and returned to committee.

There was further concern expressed about the timeliness of the return of assignments and tests. It was asked that the Committee also address this issue. The returning of assignments in large classes is sometimes a problem as it is time-consuming. There is a policy against putting graded assignments in a box outside an office for return. It was noted that grades are to be kept between a student and the instructor, and that putting assignments in a box does not honor confidentiality.

Report of the Composition & By Laws Committee

Darrick Heyd presented the report on behalf of the President who is Chair of the committee. Part of the proposal for the revision of the Composition of Academic Council at the January meeting included the rewording of the representation from RyeSAC and CESAR to say that these organizations would specifically elect their representatives to Council. RyeSAC had already altered its own By-Laws to state that the VP Education would be specifically designated as the Academic Council representative. Since this motion was tabled, Academic Council’s By-Laws and RyeSAC’s By-Laws were now in conflict. It is thus requested that the portion of the original amendment dealing with this issue be passed.

MOTION: That Academic Council amend its composition as presented in the report. Seconded by Katherine Penny.

Passed unanimously.

Report of the Scholarly Research and Creative Activity Committee

Judith Sandys presented the amendment to the Policy on Publication of Research Results. The amendment changes the length of time that research results can be held back, from two years to one year, which is in keeping with practice.

MOTION: That Academic Council approve the amendment of Policy 56 as outlined in the report of the SRC Committee. Seconded by Ira Levine.

Passed unanimously.

Report of the Academic Standards Committee

Keith Alnwick made the motions for the Standards Committee, and Carol Stuart, Vice Chair, presented the report.

MOTION 1: That Academic Council approve the designation of *Bachelor of Arts (Public Administration and Governance)* for students graduating from the *School of Public Administration*. Seconded by Andrew Furman.

This change reflects the current curriculum of this program.

Passed unanimously.

MOTION 2: That Academic Council approve the designation of *Bachelor of Interior Design* for students graduating from the *School of Interior Design*. Seconded by Ira Levine.

This changes the designation to be more in keeping with standard professional degree names and eliminates the applied designation.

Passed unanimously.

MOTION 3: That Academic Council approve the proposed degree completion program in *Information Technology Management* for graduates of a 3-year Diploma in Business Administration (business majors). Seconded by David Martin.

This program is for years 3 and 4 of the ITM program for graduates of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. It is modeled after the current Business Management program. There will be two streams available. It was clarified that students who enter the program as full-time students will be required to participate in the Distributed Learning Initiative.

There was a question of how such degree completion programs are noted on Ryerson transcripts, as experience shows there seems to be confusion with transcripts from the Child and Youth Care program. It was noted that this is not the same situation, but that this would be considered.

Judith Sandys raised a concern about the number of credits being given for courses at the college level. There needs to be further general discussion about degree completion programs and the number of years credit students get when they transfer. There is more competition in this area than there has been. In some instances, CAAT programs have been asked to build in necessary courses for transfer.

Passed unanimously.

MOTION 4: That Academic Council approve the proposed certificate in *Health Services Management*. Seconded by Andrew Furman.

It was noted that the entrance specification of “6 OAC” courses was problematic as OAC courses were being phased out. It was agreed that the wording would be amended to read “6 OAC courses or Grade 12U or Grade 12M credits or the equivalent”.

Passed unanimously.

MOTION 5: That Academic Council approve the deletion of the certificate in *Economic Analysis* and the addition of the proposed certificate in *Economics*. Seconded by Des Glynn.

A basic certificate is proposed to replace the existing certificate, and an advanced certificate is proposed. Although there is one elective course common to both, students will not be able to use that credit towards both certificates.

Passed unanimously.

MOTION 6: That Academic Council approve the proposed certificate in *International Economics*. Seconded by Judith Sandys.

The first certificate, or the equivalent, is a prerequisite for this certificate.

Passed unanimously.

MOTION 7: That Academic Council approve the proposed certificate in *Financial Planning*. Seconded by Des Glynn.

This is an extremely advanced certificate with very specific prerequisites.

Passed unanimously.

MOTION 8: That Academic Council approve the deletion of three certificates in *New Media* and the addition of the proposed certificate in *New Media Studies*. Seconded by Des Glynn.

The upper levels of these three certificates have become redundant with the Image Arts Program. The proposed certificate replaces the lower level certificate allowing for specialization. A brief description of what New Media is was requested and given.

It was noted that the requirements should be amended to read “6 OAC courses or Grade 12U or Grade 12M credits or the equivalent”.

Passed unanimously.

MOTION 9: That Academic Council approve the deletion of the certificate in *Management and Community Studies*.

MOTION 10: That Academic Council approve the deletion of the advanced certificate in *Management and Community Studies*.

MOTION 11: That Academic Council approve the deletion of the advanced certificate in *Law Procedures*.

Seconded by John Hicks.

Passed unanimously.

MOTION 12: That Academic Council approve the variations to the ranges of conversion to letter grades for courses offered by *Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science* schools and departments to students enrolled in programs offered by the *Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science*.

Seconded by Derek Northwood.

FEAS has been concerned about their students being disadvantaged with respect to graduates of other Engineering schools in terms of the conversion of grades to letters. At other universities the standard is that 60% is a C. The proposal changes the conversion of percentages to letter grades within the Faculty but does not affect students or programs outside the Faculty. Courses taken in FEAS by students in other Faculties would use the standard scale.

A friendly amendment was made as follows: This change would be implemented in Fall 2002.

Discussion: Darrick Heyd raised objections to the motion. He stated that there are many different grading scales across the country. It was felt that when a program is accredited the overall percentage average is what is looked at. He felt that the proposed solution is not a good one, and stated that the proposal, which was passed by the Departmental Council in 1998, said that the Clear standing would be moved to 1.67. It did not state the current proposal. A clear standing at 2.00 is seen to be harmful to students. U of T has a clear standing at 1.50. He is also concerned about sections which may have students from different programs mixed in the same sections. It was explained that, at the moment, there are no classes in which there are Engineering and Applied Science students mixed with other students.

Carol Stuart noted that the proposal did not come from the Standards Committee, but had emanated from FEAS. It was also stated that the mixing of courses would not happen.

Stalin Boctor noted that the matter had been debated for eight years and discussed publicly for the last four years. In 1998, the Department Councils passed a motion to make Clear and graduation standard a 1.67. The current proposal arrives at the solution to the problem in a different way without changing the standards of the University. The

GPA Committee had discussed this issue and did not want anything to appear to be changing the University standards.

Sophie Quigley noted that any solution to the problem of retention was welcome, and that while this was not the solution presented to the Departmental Councils, she would vote for it if necessary. This seemed to be the same as when faculty were asked to raise grades in their classes.

Darrick Heyd proposed an amended motion: That Academic Council approve a reduction in the minimum standard for Clear status from a GPA of 2.00 to 1.67 for students in the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science. Seconded by Sophie Quigley.

There was concern that the proposed amendment was not an amendment but rather a new motion. The Chair allowed some discussion before ruling on the issue.

The motion as originally proposed leaves the other Faculties alone, and only affects Engineering internally. If 1.67 is the GPA for Clear standing, it might be possible for students in FEAS to achieve that GPA by doing well in non-FEAS courses while still doing poorly in their major.

There is no standard practice across universities on GPA. Systems differ and there is a two-tiered system at several universities. McMaster has a system whereby GPA standards are different for many degrees.

After some further discussion of the merits of the amended motion, the Chair ruled that the motion was not an amendment but rather a new motion. Discussion of the original motion resumed.

Rena Mendelson expressed concern about the difference in the B and B+ range in the current and proposed system as related to entrance to graduate programs. Stalin Boctor replied that students come to the graduate programs from many universities with different systems and that the 70% average and not the grade was what needed to be considered. He did not see the change as a problem for graduate admission.

Odelia Bay stated that the GPA Committee was firm on the retention of the Conditional standing and that the Committee felt that the relationship between GPA and letter grades was acceptable. She asked that the entire system be looked at again, but questioned what group would do this. One possibility was the formation of an *ad hoc* committee to study the University-wide GPA conversions. John Cook suggested that the policy be reviewed within a year.

Michael Dewson expressed the opinion that endorsement by the Standards Committee was well considered. He urged Council to accept the proposal.

Darrick Heyd responded that he had no urge to kill the spirit of the proposal but was concerned that there had been a lack of consultation about the final proposal. It had not been brought to the Departmental Council as written. Sophie Quigley concurred.

John Hicks raised the issue of the application of the GPA conversion to Continuing Education courses. Stalin Boctor replied that the motion stated that the conversions would only apply to courses taught by FEAS to students enrolled in programs in FEAS.

The motion was called by Judith Sandys.

Passed: 22 in favor, 5 opposed.

The President agreed with the recommendation to review the policy on grade conversion.

MOTION 13: That Academic Council approve the proposed variations to *Conditional and Probationary Standing for students enrolled in programs offered by the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science*. Seconded by Derek Northwood.

Conditional standing was originally eliminated from the proposal sent to the Standards Committee. It was agreed that it would be reinstated, and would apply to students with a 1.84-1.99 GPA. Probation would be from 1.00-1.84.

Keith Alnwick expressed concern that, due to resource problems in the Registrar's office, this variance from the rest of the University could not be implemented for the Fall 2002 semester. Discussion followed about the need for this change in standing criteria in light of the preceding motion. The President indicated that the changes would be implemented for Fall 2002.

The back-dating of the conversion and standing was discussed. This will not be done. For current students, the CGPA will be based on two different systems. Whichever system works best for current students will be implemented.

Passed unanimously.

9. New Business

There was no new business.

10. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.