

**MINUTES OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING**  
**Tuesday, May 7, 2002**

**Members Present:**

E. Aspevig	L. Grayson
M. Dewson	R. Mendelson
L. Lum	I. Levine
J. Cook	K. Alnwick
C. Matthews	Y. Yuan
F. Salustri	S. Williams
M. Creery	G. Mothersill
J. Hicks	R. Rodrigues
M. Dowler	G. Inwood
K. Penny	K. Hampson
D. Martin	M. Mazerolle
D. Heyd	A. Pevec
N. Lister	S. Quigley
D. Elder	M. Ward
A. Furman	F. Hare
C. Cassidy	J. Monro
B. Jackson	V. Berkeley
K. Lee Law	A. Lisman (for K. Marciniac)

**Members Absent:**

M. McCrae	G. Cressy
R. Fleming	J. Yee
S. Sabih	R. Kup
F. Frkovic	M. Rashid
T. Barbiero	N. Parmar
D. Tsanos	D. Henriques

**Regrets:**

C. Lajeunesse	D. Northwood
R. Ravindran	S. Wasti
G. Turcotte	K. Marciniac
R. Virji	T. Knowlton
M. Booth	M. Barber
D. Glynn	R. Malinski
J. Sandys	

**1. President's Report** – The meeting was chaired by Errol Aspevig.

The recipients of the RFA awards were recognized: Kenise Kilbride received the Ryersonian of the Year award, June Yee received the Professor of the Year award and Kit Jones received the RFA Distinguished Service award.

Honorary Doctorates were announced. For the June convocation: Michael de Pencier, Chair of Key Publishing and Ian Rowe, President and CEO of the Centre for Research in Earth and Space Technology. For the Fall convocation: Christopher Plummer.

Judy Rebick has been named the CAW Chair.

The Annual Ryerson May Conference will be held May 15-16, and Judy Britnell was thanked for her efforts in its organization.

Financial update: Funding is still uncertain. Preliminary funding is set at \$1.9 million based on last Fall's enrollment. This may be adjusted. Undergraduate, graduate and continuing education applications are all up.

Strategic planning has slowed in recognition of the demands of the teaching cycle at this time of year, but will start again. The Student Success and Retention Task Force has been meeting, as have the Curriculum task forces. A Chair for the university wide curriculum task force will soon be appointed. The PPAC has met and will continue to meet and contribute to the planning process. There will also be regular consultations with the community over the next few months.

**8.10 Report of the School of Graduate Studies** – The Chair requested that this item be moved ahead in the agenda to accommodate Dr. Anthony Bannon, Director of the George Eastman House in Rochester, NY, who was attending for the presentation, and who needed to leave to return home.

Rena Mendelson reported that this was her twelfth report to Academic Council. The School of Graduate Studies had reviewed a number of policies and procedures over the year. A review of the procedure for the approval of new graduate courses and programs was in process and a recommendation to allow for early engagement of Schools and Departments was being proposed. This would be brought to the June SGS Council meeting for approval.

Modifications to the MA program in Electrical and Computer Engineering were presented for information.

**Motion: That Academic Council approve the submission of the proposal for a *Master of Arts in Photographic Preservation and Collection Management* to the Ontario Council for Graduate Studies for standard appraisal.**

**Rena Mendelson moved, Ira Levine seconded.**

Rena Mendelson explained that the submission to the OCGS was standard practice for graduate programs after Academic Council approval. It would then go to the Board of Governors, and then the VP, Academic for implementation at his discretion.

Brian Damude, Chair of Image Arts, made a few comments on the need for the program and the quality of the partner. Dr. Mendelson welcomed Dr. Bannon, and introduced Robert Burley who gave a short power-point presentation outlining the need for preservation and the resources

available at the George Eastman house and at Ryerson. Dr. Bannon addressed Council, stating that he was pleased to be at the meeting to formalize the agreement.

Council members commented on the quality of the program and an offer was made by the Chief Librarian to work with the program on image acquisitions. Alex Lisman, representing RyeSAC, commented that RyeSAC was concerned about the full cost recovery nature of the program. R. Mendelson replied that it was essential not to take funds from undergraduate programs to fund graduate programs, and under the current funding model, full cost recovery graduate programs were necessary.

Questions concerning the cross-border issues which might arise were addressed by Dr. Bannon who said that the George Eastman House had experience with this and that the local Congresswoman was involved and could expedite visa issues.

The Chemistry department has resources which may be of use in the chemistry course offered in the program. Internships for the program will be offered in both Canada and the US.

**The program was approved unanimously.**

## **2. Report of the Secretary of Academic Council**

Diane Schulman reported that there were additional policies which had been removed as policy, and some which had been reformatted. The reformatted policies were attached to the agenda. Three additional policies would be recommended to be revised by motions in committee reports. The calendar for the 2002-03 Academic Council meetings, Faculty Course Surveys and Academic Council Elections was also attached.

## **3. Good of the University**

Alex Lisman requested information on program costing for 2000-2001 on behalf of RyeSAC. Paul Stenton responded that the costing should be complete in June.

## **4. Minutes of the April 2, 2002 meeting**

Keith Alnwick moved and Jane Monro seconded that minutes be approved. Approved unanimously.

## **5. Business Arising from the Minutes**

A follow-up on the Graduating Student Survey 2000 was presented by Paul Stenton. A comparison was made of Ryerson's response on three questions on personal life, ethical issues and national and global issues with overall university responses. It was shown that there was no statistical difference between the Ryerson responses and those of other universities. John Cook responded that while he had expected that the statistics would show a weakness specific to Ryerson, he was surprised to see that the problems with these areas were not being addressed by the university system. He felt that there is still need for discussion to address the apparent shortcomings. It was agreed that the issues were important.

## **6. Correspondence**

A letter was received, and distributed, from the Librarians with regard to a Library representative on Academic Council. The issues outlined in the letter were to be addressed in a later motion at the meeting.

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

### **7.1 Report from the Vice President, Academic**

**Motion: To approve the amendments to Policy 126 – *Periodic Program Review – Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs at Ryerson***

Moved by K. Alnwick, seconded by S. Quigley

Discussion: The Vice President asked Ron Goldsmith to present the report. The amendments to the policy are based upon a visit from UPRAC, and actually clarify what is already being done. The UPRAC team noted that the Ryerson policy and practice are both sound, but felt the policy should more fully reflect the practice. The amendment on page 26 calls for the inclusion of faculty and staff in the process. This has always been done. The amount of inclusion is not specified as some departments are small and the numbers of faculty and staff are small. The amendment also calls for analysis of the material presented. The schedule for reviews was also included, with dates out to 2011-12. It was noted that the Program Review is to be used as a basis for program improvement.

The Program Review manual will also be updated to reflect the changes in policy.

Discussion: A question about retention data for part-time programs was raised. Since part-time programs have students who opt in and out of classes, retention data may not be meaningful. The response was that data in itself are not the whole story, and there should be some explanation of the data included in the report. The program review process is still in its first cycle and the process is evolving.

The timing of the Computer Science program review was questioned, as it seems to be too soon after the review which was just done. Changes would not yet have been fully implemented for a whole class. It was responded that the schedule was fluid and the Dean should be made aware of the concern.

The issue of developing a plan for a period of 3-5 years when the budget cycle is for one year was raised. A long range plan seems unworkable. The Vice President responded that this was an important issue.

The Vice President noted the remark on page 24, commending Ryerson for its program review process.

**The motion to amend the policy passed unanimously.**

### **7.2 – 7.6 Reports from Arts, Business, Community Services, Continuing Education and Engineering and Applied Science – for information**

The Vice President, Academic presented the changes for information, as outlined. The Registrar applauded those who had made submissions for 2003.

A question about the Marketing Minor was raised, and it was explained that Hospitality and Tourism needed to make some equivalency changes to allow students to access the minor. Changes which had been made to the minor affected its accessibility to students in this program.

### **7.7 Approval of the By-Laws of the Departmental Council of Chemistry, Biology and Chemical Engineering**

**Motion to approve: Darrick Heyd, seconded by David Martin**

The Secretary of Academic Council noted that these were the first By-Laws, to her knowledge, which had been submitted to Academic Council for approval as per the policy. There would be a call for all Departments and Schools to submit By Laws. The By-Laws of the Departmental Council of Chemistry, Biology and Chemical Engineering were a very complete model.

**Motion passed unanimously.**

## **8. Reports of Committees**

### **8.1 Report of the Nominating Committee #W2002-4**

**Katherine Penny, Chair of the Committee, moved and Darrick Heyd seconded** that the report be accepted with the following amendments: Sajjad Wasti removed as a student nominee for the Appeals committee; Melina Spinosa removed as a student nominee for the REB (graduating); Arshad Muhammad (L&T Committee) should read Muhammad Arshad.

**Motion passed unanimously.**

### **8.2 Report of the Learning & Teaching Committee #W 2002-2**

Judy Britnell, Chair of the committee presented the report. The report does not reflect the large amount of work done by the committee. It had reviewed its Terms of Reference, and several policies. There were more policies under review. Further work was done on the issue of advisement and the committee report was submitted to the Task Force on Student Success and Retention.

**Motion: To approve amendments to section 2.4 of the Course Management Policy as outlined in the report. Sophie Quigley moved, Sue Williams seconded.**

Amendment: Amended wording for the proposal was distributed. Section (d) on page 86 should read: "Grades on assignments, tests and exams, including final exams, **may be posted by student identification number sorted after at least the first two digits have been removed.**"

There was a concern that changes to policy such as this would not be known by the community. Diane Schulman responded that her office has been sending all policies to the Chairs and DAs as they are dealt with at Academic Council, and that a message server for faculty and academic staff was being developed for disseminating such information. Keith ALnwick also stated that some new policies would be found in the student handbook.

A question was raised about who would be responsible for the disposal of exams. This is the departments' responsibility.

**Motion passed unanimously.**

### **8.3 Report of the Composition & By-Laws Committee #W2002-3**

**Motion: That the composition of Academic Council be amended beginning in 2003-2004, as proposed in the report of the Composition & By-Laws Committee. Darrick Heyd moved, Katherine Penny seconded.**

Darrick Heyd presented the report. He stated that the report was deceptively brief, considering the length of the discussions. The original revision of the composition which had been presented in March was returned to the committee, with the request by the RFA for an RFA and a Librarian representative. The committee had conferred with the RFA and the Librarians, and had long discussions in committee.

The committee agreed that there should be RFA representation, and the RFA representative as well as the CUPE, RyeSAC and CESAR representatives were to be elected specifically to the position as of 2003-2004. The Associate Vice Presidents were to be included as ex-officio members.

The Committee supported the concept of inclusion of a Librarian representative, but felt that, given the narrow definition of faculty in the Ryerson Act, this was not currently possible. In the past year, Librarians had been given seats on the Standards and SRC Committees, and had representation of Learning & Teaching. There had been discussion of establishing a standing Library Committee of Academic Council. Cathy Matthews, Chief Librarian, responded that the Librarians were disappointed and that while there had been discussion about a Library Advisory Committee, it was not decided whether it would be a Committee of Academic Council or answering directly to the VP Academic. With no elected representative to Council, she does not support the committee as an Academic Council committee.

Members of Council expressed concern about the exclusion of Librarian representation, feeling that it failed to recognize the contribution of Librarians to the teaching function. Some felt it prevented them from voting for the motion. Members of the committee responded that the committee genuinely wished there was a way around the wording in the Act to allow such representation, but that the mandate of the Committee was to bring the composition into accordance with the Act as written. The Collective Agreement was consulted for a description of the duties of a Librarian and what was found did not support their inclusion in Academic Council. It was suggested that the only way representation could be allowed was to amend the collective agreement or the Act. It was pointed out that students support recognition of the work of the Librarians. A question was asked regarding the election of a Librarian to the position of Academic Council RFA representative, as they are members of the RFA. It was responded that since Librarians would not be eligible to sit on Council, they could not run for this position.

Members of the Committee pointed out that failing to vote for the motion on the table would simply eliminate the other changes being made to composition.

John Hicks, CE Program Director, pointed out that he was no longer a representative to Council, as the CE representatives were now being elected. The Secretary of Academic Council responded that they always should have been elected, and that two of the seats from CE had gone unfilled for years. CE Program Directors did not meet the definition of faculty as spelled out in the Act. Some members erroneously believed the CE Program Directors were *ex-officio* members. That is not the case. *Ex-officio* members are clearly listed in the Act.

Elimination of Associate members was discussed. These members are not specified in the Act, and were non-voting in any case. The Chair has had a liberal policy of recognizing speakers from the floor, so this would not change the input of these persons.

It was pointed out that the Council was being asked to vote on the 6 bulleted items as presented. Further discussion of the matter of Librarian representation was not excluded in the proposed amendments.

**The motion passed (24 for, 4 opposed)**

**Motion: That the Composition & By-Laws Committee consider ways in which Librarians and CE Program directors might be included as representatives to Academic Council.**

**Moved by John Cook, seconded by Cathy Matthews**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**8.4 Report of the Admissions Committee #W2002-1**

Keith Alnwick reported that the committee was developing a Policy and procedures on collaborative agreements, which would be presented to Council next year.

**8.5 Report of the Academic Appeals Committee #W2002-1**

Jane Monro reported on the activity of the committee. There had been over 40 Third Level Appeals this past year. The committee was looking at giving feedback to the schools on how to avoid some of the problems with appeals.

There is currently a sub-committee, which has been meeting weekly, working on revising the Appeals Policy. The group consists of Jane Monro, Gillian Mothersill, Judy Pearce, Jim Dianda, Andrew Noble, Dawn Little and Diane Schulman. The proposal would be submitted to the full committee and to Council next year.

Panels this year have dealt with a variety of complex legal issues. Another small work group is developing training sessions for new Appeals Committee members.

**8.6 Report of the Student Discipline Committee W2002-1**

Diane Schulman reported that a small work group is reviewing the Student Code of Conduct and the process of student discipline hearings in an attempt to improve the policy and the process. A report will be submitted to the Student Discipline Committee next year.

**8.7 Report of the Animal Care Committee W2002-1**

Tim Sly presented the report. The committee functions similarly to the Research Ethics Board. It has reviewed three protocols this year.

**8.8 Report of the SRC Committee W-2002-2**

Robert Dirstein presented the report. The committee has reviewed a number of policies on research. There are still some left to review.

**Motion: That Academic Council approve the amendments to Policy 154 – *Signing of Research Applications and Agreements in Support of Research*, as outlined in the report of the SRC Committee.**

**Moved by Keith Alnwick, seconded by Cathy Matthews**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**8.9 Report of the Academic Standards Committee W2002-4**

Carol Stuart presented the report.

**Motion: That Academic Council approve the full-time, 4-year program in *Gerontology* leading to the *Bachelor of Arts (Gerontology)***

**Moved by Sue Williams, seconded by Jane Monro**

**Motion: That Academic Council approve the part-time, degree completion program in *Gerontology* leading to the *Bachelor of Arts (Gerontology)***

**Moved by Sue Williams, seconded by Keith Alnwick.**

There is a need for professionals and paraprofessionals to deal with an aging population. Graduates of the proposed program will not be employed in medical facilities, but rather in other

kinds of agencies dealing with aging. They will have a broad-based understanding of the field. The program was developed by an inter-faculty committee, with collaboration with George Brown College, which was particularly involved in the degree completion program. The Fall 2003 intake will be 40 students. The full time and part time programs will begin at the same time, and the part time program meets with CUCC standards. There are no other comparable programs.

There is no licensing for graduates of this program. Dean Levine pointed out that the course in Environmental Design could be taught by the new Chair of Interior Design, who has expertise in the area of design for the aging. It is not believed that students will be in competition with Master's students, as those with Master's degrees will most likely go on to PhDs and research. It was proposed that there is a need for a course addressing the contribution of literature to the understanding of aging, as well as a course in the arts. If there is such a course developed it could be included in the program.

A correction was made to page 99, where "Fillin" should read "Gillin". "Gerontology" should read "gerontology", and "it's" should read "its" on page 106.

**Both motions passed unanimously.**

**Motion: That Academic Council approve the part-time, degree completion program in *Health Information Management* leading to the *Bachelor of Health Administration (Health Information Management)***

**Moved by Sue Williams, seconded by Keith Alnwick.**

This is a second program for Health Services Management. It will be a part time degree completion program, offered mainly to George Brown College graduates, and students from the CHRA. Ryerson is one of four universities selected by CHRA to offer this program. George Brown is the only college in Ontario to offer the diploma in this area.

Changes have been made to the original proposal. The 2.75 GPA requirement for the practicum course has been dropped, and admissions criteria will be worked out with the Registrar. An appropriate ethics course will be added.

A question concerning the analysis portion of the degree was raised, and it was responded that statistics courses were included in the certificate portion of the degree program. Michael Doucet raised the issue of delivery of the program by part-time sessional instructors. This is an RFA as well as a pedagogical issue. The introductory Humanities course which students will have upon admission to Ryerson is becoming a standard for college programs.

**The motion passed unanimously.**

The following motion was submitted as part of an addendum to the Standards Committee report, distributed at Council:

**Motion: To defer the introduction of a recommendation that a senior level (OAC or Grade 12 in the new Ontario secondary school curriculum) mathematics be included as prior study by applicants to the Bachelor of Arts (Contemporary Studies) program,**

**and that**

**following admission to the program for Fall 2003 and 2004, that data on the prior high school studies of applicants (and registrants) be reviewed with a view to introducing the recommendation or deletion of the recommendation from the program's admission statement as deemed appropriate.**

**Moved by Keith Alnwick, seconded by Carla Cassidy.**

Standards had supported the math entry requirement, but it was feared that it might unduly limit student applications. The requirement is being deferred until it can be further studied.

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Motion: That Academic Council endorse the Early Childhood Education Program Review with the recommendation that an employers survey be done as part of the curriculum revision process.**

**Moved by Sue Williams, seconded by Sophie Quigley**

The program review was presented. The program has high retention and graduation rates. There had been a change in chair during the process. An employer focus group was done, but no representative from the Toronto School Board attended. Students are not employed by the Board directly after graduation as they have to complete a B Ed.

**Motion passed unanimously.**

Errol Aspevig commended Carol Stuart on her able Vice-Chairmanship of the Standards Committee over the past year.

## **9. New Business**

**Motion: moved by Sophie Quigley and seconded by Marie Dowler  
That new graduate programs and/or courses must be approved by the departmental councils of the departments offering these programs and/or courses before they are submitted to Academic Council for approval**

**All academic changes to graduate programs and/or graduate courses must be approved by the departmental councils of the departments offering these programs and/or courses before they are submitted to Academic Council for approval.**

**Changes to a service graduate course should also be approved by the departmental council of the department teaching that course.**

The Chair ruled that after due consideration and consultation with the Secretary of Academic Council, the motion was ruled out of order. The Secretary stated that the motion had policy implications for Policy 45 – Constitutional Provisions for Department/School Councils and Policy 127 – Procedures for Graduate Program Approval. It was not an appropriate stand alone motion. Both of these policies are currently under review, and the intent of the motion would be taken into consideration in those reviews.

It was agreed, however, that the issues raised by the motion were important and that discussion would follow.

Rena Mendelson stated that the Program and Planning Committee of the School of Graduate Studies had already had discussions as a result of the concerns raised at the last Academic

Council meeting. As a result there was discussion of revising the policy to have broader inclusion in the process. Graduate Studies Council and Program Committees are made up of faculty from the departments. It will be assured that relevant Chairs and Department/School Councils are informed of Graduate Studies initiatives. A proposal will be brought to the next meeting of the Council of the School of Graduate Studies.

It was stated that there is a difference between informing and approving. Regulation of graduate courses is the responsibility of the School of Graduate Studies, but there is an effect on undergraduate programs and courses. An example was presented whereby instead of a retiring faculty member in English being replaced with an instructor who could continue to teach that faculty's undergraduate courses, the instructor was replaced with one who teaches a graduate course. It was felt that there should be a sign-off on what is offered by the graduate program, and that this would promote a continuum between the undergraduate and graduate programs. Undergraduate programs could feed graduate programs.

Rena Mendelson responded that these were workload issues, and had nothing to do with program quality, or even the Department/School Councils. Faculty are only permitted to teach one graduate course per year. It is inappropriate for undergraduate students on Department/School Councils to have input on graduate courses. This is better decided by the graduate students involved in the courses and programs.

The committee established by Chemistry, Biology and Chemical Engineering promotes graduate studies and research, but does not have approval rights for graduate courses and programs. There is a curriculum committee for each graduate program, and it was agreed that these committees would be looked at to determine how these concerns can be best addressed.

## **10. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane R. Schulman, PhD, Secretary of Academic Council