

MINUTES OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
Tuesday, January 25, 2005

Members Present:			
<u>Ex-Officio:</u>	<u>Faculty:</u>		<u>Students:</u>
K. Alnwick	J. P. Boudreau	A. Lohi	R. Akhavan
E. Aspevig	D. Checkland	D. Mahoney	M. Anecchini
S. Boctor	S. Cody	M. Malone	D. Ayub
M. Booth	J. Dianda	M. Mazerolle	A. Bridges
C. Cassidy	M. Dionne	D. McKessock	F. Gorospe
M. Dewson	M. Dowler	G. Mothersill	I. Guindo
L. Grayson	F. Duerden	B. Murray	A. Jurczak
A. Kahan	C. Evans	S. O'Neill	K. Medri
C. Lajeunesse	C. Farrell	S. Rosen	S. Mirowski
C. Matthews	M. Greig	F. Salustri	T. Nguyen
Z. Murphy	R. Hudyma	P. Schneiderman	S. Norrie
P. Stenton	A. Johnson	D. Shipley	R. Rose
S. Williams	N. Lister	K. Tucker Scott	T. Spencer
M. Yeates			V. Tighe
<u>Regrets:</u>	<u>Absent:</u>		<u>Alumni:</u>
D. Elder	H. Alighanbari		
J. Gryn	L. Islam		
T. Knowlton	D. Mason		
A. Ladhani	M. J. Nicholson		
L. Merali			
C. O'Brien			
K. Penny			

1. **President's Report** – The president acknowledged that additional motions circulated by a member of Council would be discussed under New Business.

The Rae Review report is expected in early February and the response from the Ontario government is extremely important. A budget is expected in early April and there will be a better understanding of the financial outcomes of the report. Ryerson hopes that there will be a significant move forward in funding the unfunded BIUs. University Planning will analyze and distribute information when it is available.

Ryerson has had 14,700 first-choice applicants for Fall 2005. While applications are down across the system, Ryerson applications are up, and the percent increase is the highest in the system. K. Alnwick, G. Logel, and the Admissions team are commended for a job well done. Everyone at Ryerson should be commended for the good reputation of the University.

2. **Report of the Secretary of Academic Council** – The Secretary reported that the process for election to Academic Council has begun, and that nominations were open as of January 24. The guidelines were distributed, and she would answer any questions on the process.
3. **Good of the University** – J. Dianda, Vice Chair, chaired the session. J. Britnell announced that she had attended a session at the Access Alliance Multicultural Health Centre on bridging projects for training foreign professionals. Ryerson has received over \$2 M of the \$9.3 M funding from the Ministry of Training Colleges and Universities for this initiative.

C. Matthews informed Council that Don Kinder has been selected Academic Librarian of the Year by the Ontario College and University Library Association and that he will be receiving his award later this month at their conference. There was applause, which she said she would pass on to him.

D. McKessock reported that the Ryerson Business forum would be held on January 27. All are invited.

R. Rose reported that RyeSAC, along with other student groups, raised \$6,000 in three days for Tsunami relief efforts. RyeSAC matched this amount and \$12,000 was donated to Oxfam Canada. V. Tighe reported that CESAR has donated \$1,000 to Oxfam.

The President congratulated those who have received MTCU grants for the training of foreign professionals.

4. **Minutes**
Motion: That Academic Council approve the minutes of the December 7, 2004 meeting. Moved by K. Alnwick, seconded by S. Williams.
Minutes approved.
5. **Business Arising from the Minutes**

5.1 Correction: Course Changes in School of Fashion – It was clarified that there was to be a choice in required courses between FFC32A/FFC32B, and FFC33A/FFC33B.

5.2 Correction: Academic Standards Report #F2004-3 (Academic Variations in the School of Nursing). The rewording of the variation was distributed. K. Tucker Scott corrected the statement in the memo to read: “In addition to fulfilling the graduation requirements listed above, students in all nursing programs are required to have attained a minimum grade of C in all nursing theory courses”.

A memo regarding the withdrawal of INT913, 914, 915 and 916, pending School approvals, was circulated.

6. Correspondence

There was no correspondence.

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

No reports.

8. Reports of Committees

8.1 Report of the Composition and By-Laws Committee –

F. Salustri reported and moved all motions.

Motion #1: That Academic Council approve the change to its By-Laws with respect to the order of the agenda (section 5.1).

A. Lohi seconded.

Motion approved.

Motion #2: That Academic Council approve the change to its By-Laws with respect to the dismissal of members for non-attendance (Section 2.6.4)

M. Dowler seconded.

Discussion – It was clarified that dismissal could not be applied to ex-officio members. It was also clarified that dismissal would be required after two consecutive absences without notice or three absences in total for the year. It was commented that, in fact, the proposed attendance requirements were less stringent than in the current By-Laws, as the current absences were recorded for the two-year term, not per year. The Secretary stated that, in practice, attendance was recorded by the year and not for the two-year term.

Motion approved.

The Secretary clarified that the By-Law changes are in effect for the next academic year.

Motion #3: That Academic Council approve changes to the Terms of Reference and Composition of the Learning and Teaching Committee (Section 3.6.11.)

Second by M. Dionne

Motion approved.

Motion #4: That the implementation of the change in composition and mandate of the Learning & Teaching Committee be phased in as outlined in the report.

S. O'Neill seconded.

The Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs, would begin chairing the committee immediately while the composition would not change until Fall 2005.

Motion approved.

Motion #5: That Academic Council approve the change in the composition of the Research Ethics Board (Section 3.6.14.)

Seconded by S. Cody.

Motion approved.

8.2 Report of the Learning & Teaching Committee -

J. Britnell presented the Academic Integrity Model. In Fall 2002, an academic integrity survey was conducted. The model outlines the various ways that academic integrity will be integrated throughout the university. A website will be developed for Fall 2005.

Polices will be reviewed and will support efforts to promote honesty across the University.

Discussion – S. Cody asked what was meant by a “brand”. It was clarified that there will be a graphic or a recognizable logo associated with academic integrity initiatives. She asked about invigilation and difficulty in this area in terms of supplying enough invigilators for large exams. It is a problem in relation to the overall thrust of the model. She asked if there is any plan to address this. E. Aspevig commented that the matter of invigilation has been brought to the APG and will be addressed. It was further clarified that the Academic Integrity Seminar is part of the penalty process designed for students who need to be educated on integrity and that the tutorial being developed for the website will be available for all students as an educational tool.

M. Dionne applauded the move to education on academic integrity. She commented that one of the biggest barriers to academic integrity is the workload, as many hours are spent on papers of “cheaters” and far less on those of honest students.

The committee was thanked for its work.

8.3 Report of the Committee to review the Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy – J. Dianda presented the report and noted that there was a friendly amendment to a statement on page 30 of the agenda. The first two sentences of section IB2 were struck and the phrase “or an appeal” in the third sentence changed to “otherwise an appeal”.

Motion: That Academic Council approve the amendments to the Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy as presented.

J. Dianda moved, G. Mothersill seconded.

After further discussion, section IB2 was amended to read as follows:

IB2. Accommodation for Disability

Students who wish to utilize Access Centre accommodations must present Access Centre documentation to the instructor prior to a graded assignment, test or exam, according to Access Centre Policies and Procedures, otherwise an appeal based on not receiving an accommodation may be dismissed. (See section III.)

Motion approved.

9. New Business

F. Duerden moved and T. Nguyen seconded the following motion:

Resolution re: Timetabling

PREAMBLE

Winter 2005 timetables at Ryerson University were released on December 23, 2004. The Registrar has acknowledged that “circumstances beyond anyone’s control” resulted in the exceptionally late delivery of timetables for the Winter 2005 term. However, Ryerson timetables have never been available as early as are timetables at most Canadian universities.

WHEREAS: Current timetabling practices at Ryerson make it impossible for faculty to plan academic and other activity before the commencement of the semester in which the activity is scheduled to occur; and

WHEREAS: Current timetabling practices at Ryerson make it impossible for sessional and part-time faculty – many of whom depend for their livelihood upon employment at more than one university – to accept employment before the commencement of the semester in which the employment will occur; and

WHEREAS: Current timetabling practices at Ryerson make it unnecessarily difficult for families to organise child-care and other arrangements since the spouses of Ryerson faculty must often arrange their employment commitments before the Ryerson timetable is available; and

WHEREAS: Current timetabling practices at Ryerson make it impossible for students to plan their employment and other commitments prior to the commencement of each semester; and

WHEREAS: Tutorials, an increasingly common feature of undergraduate education at Ryerson, cannot be properly scheduled using current timetabling practices; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: the Registrar be asked to provide, to the March 2005 meeting of Academic Council, a report in which:

- a) any barriers preventing timetables for the Fall and Winter terms from

- being made available in March of the previous academic year are identified; and
- b) any barriers preventing tutorials from being routinely scheduled are identified; and
- c) any policy and administrative changes necessary to eliminate those barriers are identified.

Passed unanimously.

Department of Politics and Public Administration – 13 January 2005

Endorsed:

Dept. of Sociology – 18 January 2005

Dept. of English – 24 January 2005

Dept. of Philosophy – 20 January 2005

Dept. of French & Spanish – 24 January 2005

Dept. of Psychology – 24 January 2005

Dept. of Geography – 24 January 2005

Dept. of History – 24 January 2005

Dept. of Economics – 24 January 2005

Discussion: N. Thomlinson was asked to speak to the motion.

K. Alnwick asked that the report be given at the May meeting rather than in March to ensure that the issues are given proper consideration. He stated that he appreciated the spirit in which the motion was made and that he was eager to work with the community to look at alternatives. The Registrar's office is in the midst of the implementation of the new Student Administration System, and a report date of May would be more feasible. There have already been preliminary discussions on the matter. He acknowledged that there were inordinate delays this year, but that even the historical timetable release date presented challenges. This year, staffing issues made the process more difficult but additional staffing is not necessarily the solution. He recognized the challenges presented by the timetabling issues. It was agreed that there would be an update at the March meeting on how the process is progressing, and that a final report would be presented in May.

J.P Boudreau asked that Council endorse the motion, as it is important to SRC activities and planning. D. Checkland asked if the report could result in changes for 2005-06. K. Alnwick responded that the extent and repercussions of the changes need to be considered. Producing timetables before resource allocations are determined might be difficult. There may be a variety of compromises that can be made which can be introduced as early as Fall 2005.

E. Aspevig stated that this is a complicated issue. Some departments delay input into the system, which in turn delays the system. All of these issues need to be looked at in this analysis. The President stated that anything that can be done to address this must be done in a timely way.

Motion approved as amended to require an interim report at the March meeting and a final report at the May meeting of Academic Council.

F. Duerden moved and J.P. Boudreau seconded the following motion:

Resolution re: Reconfiguration of Examination Period and Grade Deadlines

PREAMBLE

The Fall semester at Ryerson consists of 13 weeks of classes followed by an examination period that, in Fall 2004, was scheduled for December 8 through 18 including Saturdays. Each examination day commenced at 8:00 a.m. Some Continuing Education students wrote their final exams in the evening of December 20. Grades were due on December 20 (December 21 for Continuing Education). Promotion meetings took place on December 21 and 22. The University closed at the end of the day on December 23.

The examination schedule was posted on November 5.

WHEREAS: The late release of the examination schedule at Ryerson imposes hardship on students attempting to finalise plans for travel during the year-end break; and

WHEREAS: Increased enrolment has placed significant pressure on the examination period and made it difficult to accommodate all necessary exams within an 11-day period; and

WHEREAS: Current exam scheduling practices do not schedule the exams based on the type of examination given, with the predictable result that faculty giving machine-scored examinations may be scheduled at the beginning of the examination period and faculty giving examinations that require manual evaluation may be scheduled at the end of the examination period; and

WHEREAS: Current exam scheduling and grade deadlines have created considerable stress and made the deadlines difficult to meet; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: the Provost and Vice-President Academic be asked to report to Academic Council as to what changes in policy and practice would be required to make the examination period and grade submission process more efficient and the end of each academic term less stressful; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: without restricting the generality of the foregoing, the Provost and Vice-President Academic be asked to specifically assess the following options as part of his report to Academic Council:

- a) the publication of the examination schedule during the first month of each term; and
- b) the scheduling of examinations by type (i.e., examinations that require all manual evaluation scheduled first, examinations that can be machine-scored scheduled last, and combined examinations scheduled in between); and
- c) the imposition of a minimum 72-hour “evaluation period” between the last scheduled exam (whether regular or Continuing Education) and the grade deadline; and

- d) the expansion of the examination period and concomitant realignment or reduction of the academic term.

Passed unanimously: Dept. of Politics and Public Administration – 13 January 2005

Endorsed:

Dept. of Sociology – 18 January 2005

Dept. of Philosophy – 20 January 2005

Dept. of Psychology – 24 January 2005

Dept. of History – 24 January 2005

Dept. of English – 24 January 2005

Dept. of French & Spanish – 24 January 2005

Dept. of Geography – 24 January 2005

Dept. of Economics – 24 January 2005

Discussion: The compression around the exam period creates tension for faculty and students. The present examination set-up may not be the most appropriate. It is asked that the Provost and Vice President Academic report on what can be done to make the process more efficient and less stressful. N. Thomlinson stated that the resolution is asking for information, and the points to be addressed should include, but not be limited to, those stated. E. Aspevig accepted the motion as friendly and thanked the presenters for advanced notice of the motions. He supports the motion and will deal with the stated and other relevant issues. There has already been some discussion on the matter, and he agreed to produce a report in May in conjunction with the report on the first motion in May. He noted that the report would include an analysis of promotion meetings, which was the subject of the third motion to be presented.

J.P. Boudreau stated that the integrity of grading papers is compromised by the quick turn around time for grades.

T. Nguyen asked about Sunday exam dates. K. Alnwick responded that there would be Sunday exams next year. K. Medri asked why the weekend days are being brought into the academic week and K. Alnwick explained that this uses the facilities more effectively and avoids students having many exams on the same day.

S. Cody asked if it is possible to look at some student exam schedules to see if they are too demanding. S. O'Neill commented on the difference between machine and manual marking, and asked if exam schedules could take this into consideration. K. Alnwick said this would be considered, but the last time faculty were asked about the type of exam they would be given, 80% of faculty said they were giving an essay exam.

A. Johnson asked about the need for a 13-week semester. E. Aspevig stated that there had been a review committee on this, and that there was a difference of opinion between Faculties. This is an ongoing discussion. There are strongly held beliefs among the different Faculties based on real reasons, and the length of the term is not a simple issue to resolve.

Motion approved.

F. Duerden moved and J.P. Boudreau seconded the following motion:

Resolution re: Promotion Meetings

PREAMBLE

The Fall semester at Ryerson consists of 13 weeks of classes followed by an examination period that, in Fall 2004, was scheduled for December 8 through 18 including Saturdays. Some Continuing Education students wrote their final exams in the evening of December 20. Grades were due on December 20 (December 21 for Continuing Education). Promotion meetings took place on December 21 and 22. The University closed at the end of the day on December 23.

WHEREAS: The Ryerson tradition of promotion meetings originated at a time when classes were small and faculty could thus be expected to know the circumstances of individual students; and

WHEREAS: it is no longer common for classes to be of a size that permits faculty to know the circumstances of individual students; and

WHEREAS: the need for promotion meetings to be scheduled pushes back the grade deadline by at least two full days; and

WHEREAS: the tight timelines of examination completion and grade deadlines resulted in promotion meetings reviewing grade documents that contained many unreported grades; and

WHEREAS: the utility of program promotion meetings – as a result of the factors outlined above – is highly questionable; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Promotion Meetings be made non-mandatory, University-wide, effective with the Fall 2005 term, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: alternative promotion practices be implemented by Departments and Schools that wish to continue to review first semester performance.

Passed unanimously

Department of Politics and Public Administration – 13 January 2005

Endorsed:

Dept. of Sociology – 18 January 2005

Dept. of English – 24 January 2005

Dept. of Philosophy – 20 January 2005

Dept. of French & Spanish – 24 January 2005

Dept. of Psychology – 24 January 2005

Dept. of Geography – 24 January 2005

Dept. of History – 24 January 2005

Dept. of Economics – 24 January 2005

F. Duerden stated that this motion on promotion meetings arose from the previous two issues. A different approach to promotion meetings would give more time for grading. N. Thomlinson stated that the days used for meetings allow for less time for grading and there is concern about the efficacy of the meetings themselves. Meetings have different effects in different departments. In his experience, they are poorly attended, and program coordinators are making decisions without the intended input.

K. Alnwick stated that this motion is inextricably related to the motion on exams, and asked that it be considered as part of the previous motion. If half of the departments opt for promotion meetings, this will not help the timing problem. The issue has been addressed by the APG. R. Rose asked for an explanation of promotion meetings. K. Alnwick responded that after grades are distributed, the promotion data for students in a program are submitted to departments, which are given the opportunity to override academic standings on some grounds.

S. Cody stated that having attended many promotion meetings, she is taken with the amount of the material shared in a concentrated way. She would say that the meetings are vital. M. Dowler agreed, and commented that it is the only way she gets to see a whole student in terms of his or her mark and that she finds the information reassuring as it validates her assessment of the student.

F. Salustri stated that the motion is appropriate, as he gets nothing out of promotion meetings. The proposal suggests a way out, as a department would not have to have a meeting. K. Tucker Scott stated that she reads the motion as a call to look at alternate ways of doing promotions. J.P. Boudreau stated that being asked to discuss students he does not remember is not useful, and that there is pressure brought to bear on faculty.

The Chair commented that there appeared to be no consensus and that the issue is important. He suggested that this be reported on in May with an interim report in March, with consultation with APG. S. O'Neill commented that the process is already not the same in all departments.

The motion was withdrawn with the understanding that promotion meetings would be part of the Provost's report to Academic Council.

K. Medri asked if there was data to support the comment that grading dishonest work takes more effort than honest work. It was replied that there was no data that could be reported on.

J.P. Boudreau thanked the Chair and Academic Council for consideration of the motions.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane R. Schulman, Ph.D.
Secretary of Academic Council