

**MINUTES OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING**  
**Tuesday, April 11, 2006**

<b>Members Present:</b>			
<b>Ex-Officio:</b>	<b>Faculty:</b>		<b>Students:</b>
K. Alnwick	H. Alighanbari	G. Hunt	C. Alstrom
E. Aspevig	J. P. Boudreau	A. Johnson	L. Brown
S. Boctor	S. Cody	D. Johnston	M. Carter
D. Doz	T. Dewan	J. Lassaline	A. Chaleff-Freudenthaler
K. Jones	J. Dianda	N. Lister	A. Ganuelas
A. Kahan	M. Dionne	A. Lohi	M. Kamali
S. Levy	S. Edwards	D. Mason	P. Lewkowicz
Z. Murphy	C. Evans	J. Morgan	N. Loreto
J. Sandys	E. Evans	G. Mothersill	S. Persaud
A. Shilton	C. Farrell	S. Rosen	T. Spencer
P. Stenton	M. Greig	D. Shipley	L. Yung
	R. Hudyma		V. Tighe
			<b>Alumni:</b>
			L. Merali
<b>Regrets:</b>	<b>Absent:</b>		
L. Bichler	G. Brown		
C. Cassidy	F. Duerden		
N. Ciffolillo	D. McKessock		
M. Dewson			
D. Elder			
L. Grayson			
J. Gryn			
D. Lee			
D. Mahoney			
C. Matthews			
C. O'Brien			
R. Ravindran			
P. Schneiderman			
K. Tucker Scott			
S. Williams			
M. Yeates			

1. **President's report** – The President congratulated Sri Krishnan for winning the New Pioneer Awards, and will send him a congratulatory letter on behalf of Council. The Board approved the Benefactor Naming policy at its last meeting. The Chancellor Search committee has met and candidate names and suggestions are welcome. The budget as outlined in the infoline message was approved by the Board. Graduate allocations have not been announced but there is money for a large expansion in Ontario and a complex method of distributing these funds. The discussions will be bilateral with the government.

There is an RFP for master planning companies which will begin in the fall. Broad consultation will be a major requirement of that RFP. The President gave a speech at the Canadian Club which was well attended and well received. He went on a walk-about through Cabbagetown and also on Church Street. There is a good feeling about Ryerson in the community. There have been meetings with Minister George Smitherman, who is a long time supporter, who brought forward ideas for partnership opportunities for Ryerson. The President also met with Minister Bentley, who seemed positive on Ryerson's space needs. There are two new Deputy Ministers at the MTCC and he has met with them both. The President attended the AUCC meeting in Ottawa.

The President was asked how much more students will be paying in tuition fees, and it was replied that the average is \$165 for two terms.

P. Stenton presented Progress Indicators and Related Statistics, a copy of which was distributed with the agenda. The report is intended as a resource document for the use of departments and programs over the year. He highlighted a few indicators: There is a double cohort effect, with demand and entering averages at a peak. These are still above the 2003 indicators. The number of students from the GTA has decreased, and this is offset by international and out-of province students. This is unexpected and will be tracked. Clear standings after one year have decreased, but retention has gone up. Expenditures on library and student services have gone up, as has library service, but the proportion of the library budget spent on new acquisitions has gone down. The percentage of faculty with doctoral degrees continues to rise. Research funding per faculty member has gone down this year. The student/faculty ratio has gone up due to a volume issue, and it is hoped that this will be addressed in the next year with new faculty hires.

2. **Report of the Secretary of Academic Council**  
The Secretary reported on the two items in the report.

3. **Good of the University** – J. Dianda chaired.  
J.P. Boudreau congratulated University Advancement on the new website and asked about the mechanism for providing the requested feedback. A. Kahan stated that it will not be changed based on each individual comment. It is a dynamic site and the information will be updated over time. There are technical issues that prevent daily updates. Only the top 2000 of the 100,000 pages have been updated. Patience is appreciated.

N. Loreto announced the post-residency fee campaign of the Graduate Student Caucus, with 10% of graduate students signing a pledge not to financially support Ryerson until a system of post-residency fees is instituted. She expressed concern that throughout the year there is an achievement report included in the agenda, and brought forward several instances in which students, including T. Spencer and her, were featured in the media but their achievements not

reported. The President commented that these should be mentioned and this will be taken under advisement.

L. Yung asked about the \$15M for the naming of the Business Building and the Faculty of Business, commenting that he believed these were normally named separately. A. Kahan stated that this is not his understanding. The President commented that the Rotman School naming applied to both the school and the building and that initially the Schulich School also applied to the school and building. The \$15M is in the same ballpark as these two examples. It was stated that the policy discussed by Council on Benefactor Naming was not in regard to naming buildings.

N. Loreto asked why students who are not Ontario residents are not allowed to be RAs and TAs and asked if this could be changed. Marion Creery volunteered to look into this issue.

N. Loreto reported that the RSU passed a motion to ask the university to absorb the cost of a fee statement error which resulted in some students having a \$7.60 balance. K. Alnwick responded that this was the first he had heard of the issue, and there will be follow-up and a report back to Council.

N. Loreto asked about the follow-up from the last meeting concerning an Occupational and Public Health class. K. Alnwick did follow-up and determined that seating for 10 had been removed from the room and arrangements were made to return the 10 seats. At the start of the semester there is sufficient seating for the enrollment but whether it remained in the room, he could not say. There is a larger issue of how to learn about such problems. N. Loreto agreed that students do take chairs, but she commented that furniture does tend to fall apart. K. Alnwick commented that awareness is important and that these matters need to be reported when a situation arises.

A. Chaleff-Freudenthaler commented that the follow-up on the tax forms was very good. He noted that there are seniors taking CE courses who could not figure out how to access RAMSS, and the cost of getting the form for \$10 may be too much for them. He asked if the fee could be waived for seniors who are computer illiterate and who find the fee a hardship. The President asked that there be follow-up with the Dean of the Chang School.

A. Chaleff-Freudenthaler then asked how Ryerson was doing in allocating the new funds for faculty hiring and the President reported that there are 52 new tenure stream appointments. On average Ryerson did considerably better than average. A. Chaleff-Freudenthaler asked if he could have a copy of the Interim Accountability Agreement, and it was stated that he could.

#### 4. Minutes

##### **Motion to approve the minutes of the March 7, 2006 meeting**

A. Ganuelas moved, C. Farrell seconded.

N. Loreto commented that she wished to have two sentences added to the minutes in regard to her comments on private influence in public institutions. These were read and given to the Secretary for insertion in the minutes.

J. Morgan commented that the minutes misrepresented his statement on the acceptance of private donations and asked that the minutes be corrected to state that donations without privileges are acceptable.

**Motion approved.**

**5. Business arising out of the Minutes**

**5.1 Report of the Ad Hoc Timetabling Committee**

D. Mason stated that the committee met 14 times over the last few months and has come to understand the issues a lot better. The interim report discussed the possible alternatives for timetabling. This report looks at the stages of implementation and, given the challenges of stage 3, the report concentrates on that stage. Currently timetables are built around individual students. The challenges in moving to earlier dates are that there is no way to assess student intention and there need to be ways to maintain student access to courses. This has to do with curriculum issues, loading, and classrooms.

**Motion:**

**WHEREAS Academic Council continues to desire improvements to the timeliness of Timetable production, and**

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT Academic Council accept in principle the goal recommendations as set out in Section F of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Timetabling; and**

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Provost and Vice President Academic shall strike an *ad hoc* committee, with suitable representation of academic and administrative staff to undertake a detailed analysis of the feasibility and implementation requirements to pursue the changes necessary in achieving that goal; and**

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Provost report back to Council at appropriate times on the progress of achieving necessary changes to timetable production and related changes that support that goal.**

D. Mason moved, K. Alnwick seconded.

J. Morgan stated that he believed the motion is out-of order as it does not meet the By Law stipulation on the formation of an *ad hoc* committee. The President responded that this is not intended to be a committee of Council but rather a committee of the Provost. D. Mason agreed. J. Morgan accepted this ruling. He went on to state that, in regard to the motion, he was not clear what it means for Academic Council to accept something in principle. He further commented that the motion calls for a detailed analysis of the feasibility etc. and he assumes that this is to be done by the committee. There is a lack of a mandate to pursue the changes, unless this is included in the notion that Council accepts something in principle. Council's role is not clear. He thinks that the final report is good, and it explains that there is a price for having earlier timetables. The report should be taken back to constituencies for their input. They might find that the earlier timetable is not actually the most important goal. The new system should not create a less favorable situation.

D. Mason stated that he believes that the costs have been laid out, and that the suggested amendment would redo what has already been done, delaying the process by a year. The primary cost is that information would have to be gotten earlier. The other cost is the potential for students not getting the courses they need due to the prescriptive curriculum. He is therefore concerned that the work of the 14 meetings would be undone. The President stated that this is therefore not a friendly amendment, and there would need to be a motion to amend the motion. D. Mason stated that one of the goals of the committee is to have a discussion on the report, and he welcomed comments. J. Morgan suggested that there should have been a widespread distribution of the report. He suggested that the motion be postponed to the May meeting so that faculty have time to reflect on the report. D. Mason agreed that he could table this until the May meeting.

J.P. Boudreau commented that, as loading is due at the end of the month, he is reluctant to table the motion. The dates which are suggested are an improvement over last year. The Registrar commented that the April 21 submission date will be observed and that he will ensure that this deadline is met. The expectation is that there will be more cooperation. J.P. Boudreau stated that he received his intentions data last week, and there was a great deal of paper generated to show that one student had selected a course. He suggested that intentions be dealt with differently.

T. Dewan commented that the report was excellent. He asked about why the previous year's activity cannot be used as student intent and why the requests for courses cannot be submitted without names assigned. Procedurally he suggested that there cannot be a non-friendly amendment and suggested that there need to be time to reflect on it. The President asked that Council not get into the details of the report but rather address the procedural issue.

D. Mason stated that the intention information is not just data, as it is built around what students need to graduate. The President again stated that the discussion is not about the detail of the report, and asked D. Mason if there can be a forum to discuss these details as there seem to be many questions. The committee could make itself available to a community forum.

**Motion to postpone to a definite time (the May 9, 2006 meeting)**

D. Mason moved, K. Alnwick seconded.

K. Alnwick suggested that the interim report also needs to be read, as it answers some of the questions being posed.

**Motion approved.**

**6. Correspondence**

There was no correspondence.

**7. Report of Actions and Recommendations of or Departmental and Divisional Councils**

Course changes from Graduate Studies were presented.

**8. Reports of Committees**

8.1 Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Course Management Policy

S. Cody presented the report.

**Motion: That Academic Council approve the revisions to the Course Management Policy as outlined in the report.**

S. Cody moved, A. Ganuelas seconded

J. Morgan asked if the Chair is bound by the exceptions to the prohibition on testing in the last week and D. Schulman clarified that the Chair did not have to abide by the exceptions as listed. It was further asked why the Dean was eliminated as needing to approve an exception. It was clarified that having a Dean approve individual exceptions was too much micro-management.

There was a discussion of the requirement that a final not be worth more than 70% of the final grade. D. Mason commented that 70% is an arbitrary line. The President stated that there either needs to be a number or there was no policy. S. Cody stated that this is a repositioning of the item and not a new item and asked if this is a reasonable discussion. N. Loreto asked if there should be a mechanism for students who cannot meet the 70%.

J.P. Boudreau asked about the notion of “valid and verifiable reasons”. D. Schulman explained that The Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy addressed this. For consistency, section F should read for “valid and verifiable reason”. This was agreed

J. Dianda commented on the statement that ideally evaluation should be of two or more types, stating that a faculty member might define what they believe is ideal. This should be clarified. He asked about the consequences of work not being returned and whether this opens the door to more appeals. The President commented that this is the intended consequence. D. Mason asked about the phrasing of the statements on return of graded work before the last date to drop, for example, if there is a 4<sup>th</sup> year thesis project.

N.M. Lister commented that the phrasing is such that the policy makes course outlines more and more about exceptions and the policy seems to be more and more absolute.

T. Dewan commented on the requirement that assignments not be due in the first two weeks of class. K. Alnwick replied that university policy allows students to add and drop in the first two weeks. D. Mason commented that in his course he gives an assignment in the first week that is worth 3%. R. Hudyma commented that students should have bought a book by week two and a quiz is an important component for them at the beginning.

A. Johnson commented on the 70% final exam issue and the addition of the value of missed midterms onto the value of the final exam. Depending on the relative weightings of midterms and finals, the final could potentially be worth twice as much as it was originally if the weighting of the midterm and the final are roughly equal. This is a much more drastic change to the grading scheme than if the student missed a midterm which was worth much less than the final.

N. Loreto asked to table the motion and that this continue to be worked on.

**Motion to table.**

N. Loreto moved, D. Mason seconded.

It was commented that there had been consultation on the policy and it is not clear, if the report were returned to the committee, what the committee would do to change it. J. Morgan

commented further that people could make an amendment to the individual things to which they disagree. The President commented that policy should not be written on the floor. T. Dewan suggested that the changes be presented as a sequence of motions.

**Motion to table defeated.**

**Motion to approve the report defeated.**

The existing policy remains in effect.

8.2 Amendment of the Student Code of Academic Conduct

**Motion: That Academic Council Approve the amendment of the Student Code of Academic Conduct as outlined in the report.**

J.Dianda moved, G. Mothersill seconded.

N. Loreto commented that there were no track-changes in the document, and it was suggested that the original report be included. She found it difficult to read. She asked if there was a student on the committee. D. Schulman stated that the document was significantly different from the original and that track-changes would have been inappropriate. The url for the original policy was included for members' reference. She reported who was on the committee, and that, although there was not a student, the Ombudsperson was a consultant to the committee. A. Chaleff-Freudenthaler commented that this is a complex document as he was quite busy, he did not assess the policy as he did not read it.

S. Cody commented that there had been a student on the Course Management Committee.

J.P. Boudreau commented that it is an important and heavy document and it appears that there are new additions. It was asked what drives the changes. J. Dianda stated that he agrees that this is a weighty policy and that until the current Secretary of Academic Council came to Ryerson and decided to do something with policies they had been chaotic. When this policy was rewritten it was evaluated by a law professor and found to be comprehensive and well written. Since then there has been feedback on needed improvements, including the addition of an Academic Integrity Officer and after two years the policy needed to be reviewed. The President commented that there is a case for having a committee of Academic Council representing the group.

D. Shipley was concerned about the ability to remove a DN from students' records in their last year. J. Dianda responded that students who are applying for graduate programs are prevented from applying until one year after graduation as the DN is on their record until they graduate. If they have received a DN in the first half of their program, it is up to the discretion of the chair to be determined if it can be removed.

It was clarified for T. Dewan that contributing to academic misconduct is already in the policy as academic misconduct.

R. Hudyma commented that it is a challenge to digest and understand the policy and that the guidelines need to be laid out in a digested way. The President noted that the committee is being

commended for its work and yet there is a notion of voting the policy down. The committee is doing the work of the whole, and there is no point to a committee if the work is to be redone by Academic Council.

S. Cody called attention to the preface report to the policy where notable changes have been explained, e.g. the recognition of the Academic Integrity Officer. She believes it is by no means an inconsiderate presentation.

N. Loreto stated that she was concerned that students would not understand the word “petition” with respect to having a DN removed. J. Dianda stated that it was hard to accept that the word petition would not be understood by a university student and that it could be looked up.

N. Loreto was further concerned about an advocate not being present at a discussion between faculty and student. G. Mothersill commented that many of the parts of the policy were designed to be beneficial to the students. Having a facilitator present is best for students and would prevent the escalation of the process.

N. Loreto further asked about an appeal of a charge or a penalty of greater than 0. J. Dianda explained that the minimum penalty is a 0, and that cannot be appealed. An F can be appealed as too severe, but if plagiarism is accepted, the minimum penalty is a 0.

It was clarified for A .Chaleff-Freudenthaler that contacting the RSU or CESAR advocate was mentioned on page 46. It was agreed that it would be added to the consultation paragraph of the procedures section.

JP Boudreau commented that there are difficult changes. The Secretary commented that it is important to read the policy in its entirety to see if, as a whole, it was a good policy.

It was clarified that the Chair of the student’s program would be the one to remove the DN.

T. Dewan commented on group misconduct, stating that it is sometimes impossible to tell who in a group has cheated. He stated that at the Rottman School, each person signs an agreement that they will not commit misconduct and that penalties cannot be applied to a group unless this is done.

It was clarified for N. Loreto that the advocate can participate in the hearing.

J. Morgan proposed a friendly amendment to include “cannot be removed by the committee” in section C5.c.

**Motion approved.**

### **8.3 Report of the Academic Standards Committee.**

**Motion: That Academic Council approve the Certificate in Design for Arts and Entertainment.**

E. Aspevig moved, A. Ganuelas seconded.

**Motion approved.**

9. **New Business**

There was no new business.

10. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

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