

**MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2007**

Members Present:			
<u>Ex-Officio:</u>	<u>Faculty:</u>		<u>Students:</u>
K. Alnwick	P. Albanese	M. McAllister	S. Abdelgadir
S. Boctor	D. Androustos	A. Mitchell	G. Alivio
C. Cassidy	M. Antony	Z. Murphy	A. Bahadur
M. Dewson	I. Baitz	J. Norrie	O. Falou
D. Doz	J. P. Boudreau	M. Panitch	S. Ghebresslassie
Z. Fawaz	V. Chan	R. Ravindran	T. Hassan
U. George	D. Checkland	S. Rosen	H. Kere
L. Grayson	T. Dewan	A. Singh	M. Levine
K. Jones	D. Elder	C. Stuart	S. Omer
A. Kahan	C. Farrell	D. Sydor	H. Otieno
M. Lefebvre	P. Goldman	D. Tucker	R. Rose
S. Levy	M. Greig		R. Sadjadi
A. Shepard	R. Hudyma		M. Stanton
A. Shilton	J. Lassaline		T. Whitfield
P. Stenton	D. Lee		
A. Venetsanopoulos	D. Mason		<u>Alumni:</u>
M. Yeates	A. Matthews David		A. Walker
			S. Dhebar
<u>Regrets:</u>	<u>Absent:</u>		
A. Aseltine			
G. R. Chang			
P. Corson			
R. Keeble			
D. Rose			
T. Schwerdtfeger			
F. Song			

1. President's Report: The President welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the Ryerson Senate, and welcomed the first elected member from the Library. Given that this is an historic event, he announced that there would be a group photo at the end of the meeting. The Vice Chair election was moved to the head of the agenda and Rebecca Rose and Annick Mitchell each gave a brief speech in support of their candidacies.

The President provided a copy of his remarks in the agenda. He commented that an update on the Master Planning process and the Multi Year Agreement (MYA) with the province were available at the door. Applications to Ryerson increased significantly for this year. This is good, but it is unfortunate that so many students who wanted to attend Ryerson could not do so. The growth of the University was intended to be flat, and the enrollment targets were met. Graduate enrollment is at 1500, which is an amazing number. The quality of the applicants showed Ryerson to be a tremendous success and this success will serve the University well in the next round of discussions on graduate programming. Ryerson had the second largest increase in total number of masters students in the province (U of T was first). He announced that Ryerson's Engineering programs were given six years of accreditation, with one program given three years. This is a remarkable achievement.

President Levy reported that there has been discussion with St Michael's Hospital on plans to deliver health services. The Hospital for Sick Children has also shown an interest in working with Ryerson. He also commented that Ryerson's participation at The Ontario University fair is extraordinary and gave statistics on the large number of faculty, recruitment staff and volunteers who turned out for Ryerson.

The President welcomed the new Provost, Alan Shepard and the new Chief Librarian, Madeleine Lefebvre.

The President noted that Senate does not have some of the structures in place that other Senates have, such as an agenda committee or executive committee. The process of developing these structures should be done slowly and he has asked the Provost to work on this development. This would be the beginning of the process and there would be consultation.

D. Checkland asked what the role of the Senate will be in making the decision on the expansion of Ryerson to meet demand in the GTA. The President replied that the Board has an upcoming retreat on this issue, and the government is currently working on the profile for the expansion. It is possible that a new university or polytechnics could be established, another university could establish a campus in the GTA, or that there could be new roles for colleges or junior colleges. It is best for Ryerson to be proactive in this. It is hard to wait for every normal piece of information to be in place before making a decision as the timing is important.

Peter Lukasiewicz, Chair of the Board, was welcomed and the President noted that the development of a Senate executive committee would allow for more interaction between Senate and the Board.

D. Mason commented that Senate should be more proactive in establishing the academic priorities of the university so that the Board has a basis for its decision on expansion. The President commented that there would be opportunity for the Senate to see the same information the Board sees.

J.P. Boudreau endorsed the previous comments, noting that timeliness is critical. He further asked about the scope of the collaboration with St. Michael's, and it was responded that there is an opportunity for a broad definition.

T. Venetsanopoulos gave a brief introduction of the Sarwon Sahota Award, and presented it to Dr. Wendy Cukier for her SRC activities.

P. Stenton presented the progress indicators, distributed at the door. This is an annual report presented on academic indicators established by Senate in 1998-99. He welcomed questions at the next meeting, or by email, after members had a chance to review. He gave a brief overview. There is one new indicator – retention rate indicators based on required government methodology. The rest are updates of previous information.

2. Report of the Secretary of Senate

D. Schulman reported that A. Mitchell was elected as Vice Chair of Senate. She reviewed the attendance rules for Senate, and the package of information which was distributed with the agenda.

The Secretary reminded Senate that the By-laws allowed for members to speak twice on any issue. This also applies to the Good of the University section. Overall the Good of the University should be about 20 minutes, and in the interest of allowing people to properly respond to questions, it is asked that members email their questions in advance to the appropriate person.

3. Good of the University – A. Mitchell chaired

R. Ravindran noted that it is Ryerson's 15th year as a university and 60th year since establishment. He noted the accomplishments of the university and commented that there should be a celebration of Ryerson. He suggested such things as a stamp, or banners celebrating its accomplishments. A. Kahan commented that planning for a 60th anniversary year will be in 2008-09 and that there are banners all across the borders of the campus with more to be added in coming weeks. Celebrating accomplishments of individuals is an interesting idea and will be considered.

A. Kahan reported that alumni will now be able to retain their Ryerson student email address for up to five years, and there will be an automatic forwarding system so that alumni can receive alumni information.

D. Mason asked about the calendar and the definition of an academic week. He noted that as the semester begins on a Tuesday, there are some four-day weeks, and asked if something is to start in the 11th week, if the week starts on a Tuesday or a Monday. The President commented that this was a good example of something that could be asked in advance. This question will be taken under advisement.

D. Mason asked about grade submission deadlines. Some faculty have an exam on Saturday and must have grades in by Tuesday. He believes this is inappropriate and if there are 150 students and an essay exam, this is not possible. He asked if something significant could be done about grade deadlines. K. Alnwick commented that for the last two years all faculty have 72 hours minimum to submit grades. The preliminary final exam schedule is sent to departments so that issues can be raised. There are a certain number of days between Labour Day and Christmas for instruction, exams and grading.

D. Doz thanked the 50+ volunteers who made Nuit Blanche a success. There were 9000 visitors to the Ryerson sites.

K. Alnwick told members about the new Admissions Handbook which was distributed at the door and to 40,000 people at the Universities Fair. He also distributed the Student Guide to policy and procedures.

In reference to the previous request that members submit their questions in advance, S. Rosen asked how members would know about the questions. The President stated that an individual could raise it as an issue at Senate if they wished.

H. Kere noted that there is a provincial election and a referendum next week, CESAR and RSU have been working to raise awareness on this.

4. Minutes

Motion: That Senate approve the minutes of the May 1, 2007 meeting.

D. Mason moved, R. Rose seconded

Motion approved

5. Business Arising

None

6. Correspondence

Letters were included in the agenda for information.

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

7.1 From Arts:

7.1.1 Discontinuation of Part-time B.A. Program in Justice Studies

Motion: That Senate discontinue the part-time B.A. Program in Justice Studies

C. Cassidy moved, S. Omer seconded.

C. Cassidy stated that the part-time evening program was no longer needed, and the enrollments have been declining. Given the size of the department, they wish to concentrate on the full-time program. It was clarified that there will be no intake into the program beginning fall 2008, and there is no plan to create a direct entry program.

Motion approved

7.2 From the Ted Rogers School of Management (TRSM):

7.2.1 Restructuring of the Management, Entrepreneurship and Strategy Department.

Motion: That Senate approve the restructuring of the Management, Entrepreneurship and Strategy Department into three separate departments: Entrepreneurship/Strategy (E&S), Law and Business (L&B), and Global Management Studies (GMS).

K. Jones moved, D. Checkland seconded.

K. Jones presented the history of the model creating five current departments, noting that it became apparent that one of the departments should be restructured into three separate departments. This proposal is to better serve students and to inform curriculum development. He presented a slide showing the four separate programs in the TRSM: TRS Information Management, Retail Management and Hospitality and Tourism Management. In TRSBM, the Director position was abolished and five Chairs created. An Associate Dean was put in place. It

was a nomenclature change, not a curriculum change. There are no new programs or budget requests, simply a reallocation of existing funds. There is more student representation. The proposal has been approved by all faculty in the School.

D. Mason stated that he is in favour of creating three departments from the one, but asked if this is a recommendation to the Board as per the Ryerson Act, or if the departments would be created directly by Senate. The President thanked him for bringing forward his questions prior to the meeting. A. Shepard commented that E. Aspevig had determined that this was a restructuring, and there would be no need to bring it to the Board as, unlike, for example, creating a medical school, there are no financial implications. There is previous precedence for such restructuring. His understanding is that delaying the creation of the departments would be difficult for those who have been working on establishing an appropriate structure. He explained that Ryerson is bicameral with the Senate having jurisdiction over academic matters, and this is a matter appropriate for Senate. The President commented that looking at the Act, authority is given to Senate and there is no fiduciary issue. D. Mason noted that the Act states that Senate makes recommendations to the Board, reading from Section 9 part c of the Act. The President commented that the Board does approve the University's budget, and read the prelude in Section 9 indicating that they are involved in changes with respect to the expenditure of funds. He maintained that this is not a new budget allocation but reorganization. D. Mason maintained that in other areas, it is clear that there is fiduciary responsibility tied to the decisions of the Board, but not in this one.

M. Levine asked about the effect of the change on students in the program. K. Jones commented that there will be more student voice in the affected areas.

Motion approved

(Noted: 41 votes for the motion, one opposed, the rest were abstentions.)

7.3 From the School of Graduate Studies

7.3.2 MA in Literatures of Modernity:

Motion: That Senate approve the submission of the proposal for an MA in Literatures of Modernity to the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies for Standard Appraisal.

M. Yeates moved, J.P. Boudreau seconded.

Motion approved

7.3.3 MBSc/MASc in Building Science :

Motion: That Senate approve the submission of the proposal for an MBSc/MASc in Building Science to the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies for Standard Appraisal

M. Yeates moved, A. Shilton seconded.

Motion approved

7.3.4 Policy and Procedures for Admissions and Studies (Masters and PhD Programs (Policy #142):

Motion: That Senate approve the revised Policy and Procedures for Admissions and Studies (Masters and PhD Programs) (Policy #142)

M. Yeates moved, A. Shilton seconded

M. Yeates outlined the three main revisions: addition of a category of special student to the roster to allow someone to take one course on a space-available basis; introduction of the Canadian visiting student program allowing a graduate student to take a course at another university; and elimination of the requirement for the Dean to appoint graduate committees.

D. Checkland asked for the rationale for not giving students credit for a course taken as a special student if they are later admitted to the program. M. Yeates stated that they did not wish to get back-door admissions. They do not want students trying out a program and then deciding to apply to graduate school. Student could ask for advanced standing.

P. Goldman asked what the fees would be for foreign students to these programs. C. Faye stated that it would be roughly the same as for a part-time student.

Motion approved.

7.3.5 Graduate Student Academic Appeals Policy (Policy #152):

Motion #4: That Senate approve the revised Graduate Student Academic Appeals Policy (Policy #152).

M. Yeates moved, S. Sadjadi seconded

Motion approved

M. Yeates thanked L. Janzen and I. Gammel for their work on the Literature of Modernity program and , M. Gorgolewski and V. Straka, and K. Schank Smith, new chair of Architecture for their work on the Building Science program.

R. Ravindran thanked M. Yeates for all he has done for graduate programs at Ryerson.

8. Reports of Committees

8.1 Report of the Composition and By-laws Committee

Motion: That Senate approve the Council by-laws of the Departments of Marketing; Management of Human Resources; Accounting; Finance; Entrepreneurship & Strategy; Law & Business; and Global Management Studies; and the Ted Rogers School of Management.

D, Checkland moved on behalf of the Composition and By-laws Committee, A. Mitchell seconded.

K. Jones commented that the By-laws have been in development for over a year and that there has been no governance structure from the time the departments were created until now. All of the departments have unanimously (with one abstention) approved the By-laws. There is a single program with a common first year and the TRSBM Council oversees that common first year or courses that impact that structure. This Council has appropriate representation of students and faculty. The President commented that the Committee had asked for a change to ensure the proper proportion of students and this change was made.

D. Mason stated that he is happy that the departments created a year and a half ago are going to get By-laws, but he is more concerned about the TRSBM Council. The program structure seems to be the same as the first-year Engineering and to embed its existence into a council seems strange to him. He asked why the Engineering model is not followed. K. Jones responded that

there are separate programs in Engineering. In Business, first-year students enter into TR School of Business Management, and select majors later on. There needs to be an oversight of that common first-year program curriculum. All departments have the ability to discuss the effect of that curriculum on their particular major. The model works.

J.P. Boudreau asked about policy 45 and the composition of Councils and about the review date of the Policy. He is concerned with the 1/3 students requirement. His department would require eight students, and he believes this is too many students. The President asked the Secretary to report back.

D. Mason stated that there is an issue of how the governance structure fits into the university structure and the collective agreement. He states that the chairs are “second-class” chairs, with inappropriate levels of funding and that there might be a grievance associated with this. He stated that academic freedom is an issue, as the members of the departments do not have control over their own program’s destiny. The President thanked D. Mason for sharing his questions in advance and asked M. Dewson to comment. He stated that there were changes made during the process of the development of the departments to adhere to the collective agreement. The word “school” is not used in the way that the CA intends. In creating this structure, we have brought the former SBM in line with the CA, as previously there were no appointment committees, etc. K. Jones commented that they do not have the same budgetary range of other chairs, but changes to this are in process. It is intended responsibilities will be established within the next year. K. Jones stated that the Chairs were present at the meeting and could speak for themselves. He noted that there is one Business Management program review and that there was unanimous agreement of the faculty on the By-laws structure.

D. Sydor stated that she is the Chair of Accounting, and finds the structure very helpful. They are moving quickly to full budgetary control. The TRSBM Council is important because of the integrated curriculum. The structure is essential to moving the curriculum forward and all of the faculty approve. D. Checkland asked if the Chairs would be appointed as per the AAA policy, and K. Jones assured him that they would. J. Norrie commented that the structure is important to the other schools, and the other three Directors do not think of the Chairs as “second class”. C. Farrell commented that the departments have been established in a collegial way, and there is buy-in from the faculty. He encouraged Senate to vote in favour of the motion.

D. Mason was planning to make a motion to separate the motion, but decided not to.

Motion approved.

8.2 Report of the Nominating Committee

Motion: That Senate approve the representatives of the Standing Committees of Senate as listed in the report.

I. Baitz presented and moved with amendments, O. Falou seconded.

Motion approved.

8.3 Report of the Academic Standards Committee

Motion: That Senate approve the periodic program review with the recommendations listed in the ASC Evaluation section as conducted by the School of Information Technology Management.

A. Shepard moved and J. Norrie seconded.

A.M. Singh asked about the gender imbalance in the ITM program and if there was any discussion of racial imbalance. J. Norrie commented that there is no issue of racial imbalance, which reflects Canadian society.

Motion approved.

Motion: That Senate approve the IEEQB/Certificate program

A. Shepard moved, A. Mitchell seconded.

J. Norrie commended FEAS and the Chang School for an outstanding and innovative proposal. The President agreed. R. Ravindran stated that this is unique in Canada.

V. Chan asked about the statement on page 123 that students who do not achieve a grade of “C” are required to take a supplementary exam, and asked who would give that exam. S. Boctor stated that the “C” is a PEO requirement. If there are students who require a supplementary exam, there will be appropriate compensation for instructors.

It was asked if students would be under the undergraduate or graduate appeals policy and it was clarified that the undergraduate policy would be applied

Motion approved.

9. New Business

9.1 Motion to Senate – Juma Prayer (found on page 127 of the agenda)

S. Omer moved, T. Whitfield Seconded.

The Secretary reported that Senate Policy 150, Accommodation of Student Religious Obligations, speaks to the issue of students requiring accommodation for any religious obligation. She clarified that, despite what was reported in the student press, the University of Toronto has a policy similar to that of Ryerson.

S. Abdelgadir stated that as a Muslim member of Senate, he is worried about the motion which he did not know about until he read it in the agenda. He is a member of the Muslim Student Association (MSA), and neither he nor the president of the MSA was consulted. He believes that there is good cooperation between the MSA and administration.

S. Omer explained the meaning of Juma prayer, and that students are affected negatively by missing this prayer. He has to choose between missing a lab and going to prayer. He is asking for the creation of a committee to look into Juma prayer accommodation at Ryerson. When S. Levy asked S. Omer what happened when he asked his instructor for accommodation, S. Omer replied that he tried to get into a Monday section, but it was full.

T. Whitfield commented that is an important step in being inclusive of all students. The CFS formed a task force in support of Muslim students and the report suggested that assignment due dates and exam schedules should be adjusted to accommodate Muslim prayer. He reminded Senate that the motion asks for a committee to be formed to study the issue. The President commented that the current policy does what he is asking. T. Whitfield stated that there was an issue with a student that has a problem with every Friday. The Secretary explained that there are ways to address a student’s need by making alternate arrangements.

J. Norrie asked S. Omer if he approached the instructor, and he said that he did not as he assumed that nothing would be done. R. Rose maintained that getting the material from a professor, or getting the exam rescheduled, or getting the notes is not an appropriate accommodation as the student still needs to miss the class. The accommodation of Muslim students has been ongoing, and they now have a place for them to pray. They should not have to choose between their faith and their studies. The policy should be revisited.

The President stated that her comments imply that the policy is flawed, and she replied that the issue is specifically related to a need every Friday.

O. Falou, stated that he is a Muslim student who attends Juma prayer and he has never had to miss a class. He made the point that Muslim students were not consulted on the motion and that the MSA is not aware of the issue. He does not think this is the right approach. He suggested that S. Omer speak to the MSA president. Prayer has to be after 1:30 p.m. in summer and lasts no more than 40 minutes. There are nearby mosques that hold prayer after 2:00 p.m. There was a student he knows of who was properly accommodated. He asked that students speak to the Vice Provost Students.

D. Checkland spoke against the motion as he is opposed to the details of the motion. If there is a lab it may not work to tell the student to do the lab over. He thinks it is the institution's responsibility to accommodate. The President stated that the policy requires us to find an appropriate accommodation.

D. Mason stated that there will be ramifications on other times in the timetable if there are no classes between 1:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m. on Fridays. He is opposed to the motion.

Z. Fawaz stated that it would have been helpful to discuss the motion in advance. The responsibility does not stop with the faculty member. If the first person to look at it does not respond, the situation is looked at progressive levels. As Director and Associate Dean in FEAS, he had to handle many such requests. There was no time when this was not accommodated. This included putting students in new lab sections to accommodate students in this situation. Five or six months ago he was contacted by the French CBC on the report on accommodation. It has been confirmed that Ryerson accommodates students quite well.

The President asked if the mover wished to withdraw the motion, given the information, and as there appeared to be unease about voting on the motion. S. Omer agreed to withdraw the motion, and T. Whitfield also agreed. The President agreed that the motion could be brought back.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane R. Schulman, Ph.D.
Secretary of Senate