

DRAFT

MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING TUESDAY, May 6, 2008

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

DRAFT

1. President's Report -

1.1 President's Update - In addition to his written comments, the President complimented the School of Disability Studies for the wonderful event at the ROM. It was announced that there was unexpected funds from the Ontario Trust for Students to support students. A. Kahan explained that the reason for the excess in funds was that universities did not meet their quotas, and the money was put back into the fund. Ryerson received an additional \$7.2M, which is 20% of the total funding.

The appointment of the new Athletic Director, Ivan Joseph, was announced.

As this is the last regular meeting of Senate, members who are not returning were asked to rise, and they were applauded.

1.2 Ryerson Achievement Report – for information only.

1.3 First-year Student Survey 2007 Highlights - for information only. Members were advised to email any questions on the first-year student survey to P. Stenton.

2. Report of the Secretary of Senate

The Secretary informed Senate that the report on Religious Observance had been received and was posted on the Senate website. The Special Meeting of Senate is scheduled for June 3, and the Senate calendar for 2008-2009 is included in the agenda.

3. Good of the University

A. Mitchell chaired.

R. Rose reported that 14 students were arrested at the University of Toronto for a sit-in concerning tuition fees. The RSU is in support of the students and their cause. D. Elder spoke in support of the students as well.

4. Minutes:

4.1 Motion that Senate approve the minutes of the April 1, 2008 meeting -

D. Mason moved and K. Alnwick seconded.

D. Checkland asked for a correction to his comments on page 13, item 7.2.2. The correction was made. M. Yeates answered that there was no commitment to additional faculty positions.

Minutes approved.

5. Business arising from the Minutes

5.1 Report – *Shaping Our Future: An Academic Plan for 2008-2013*

A Shepard presented an overview of the Plan and invited members to attend the two Town Hall meetings scheduled during the week, and to submit email comments.

Discussion:

J.P. Boudreau asked about the timing of the review of the Office of Research Services. A. Shepard responded that the report is expected soon, and that there may be time to make changes in the Plan based on the report.

J. Norrie asked about coordination of the Academic Plan to include in its totality the report of the VPRI, as he is concerned about the close coordination of the two plans. The President stated that the plans will be brought together. The Provost stated that the VPRI wrote that section of the Plan in consultation with the SRC Committee, and he is anticipating some change before June based on further Committee meetings on the Plan. There will be an expanded version of the VPRI plan.

5.2 Report of the *Ad hoc* Senate Review Committee

D. Checkland reported on the Senate Review Committee. The Senate seating was readjusted for this meeting to try a new seating arrangement. There will be further issues to be reported on at the June meeting. There will be a town hall meeting on the report (11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in SHE660) next Wednesday. Emails can be sent to senatereview@ryerson.ca. He outlined the report and the major recommendations regarding conduct of Senate meetings: seating; consent agenda; an announcement section separate from the Good of the University; a discussion of the Good of the University section; *in camera* meetings; new rules clarifying the Ryerson rules, and shifting the rules of order to Bourinot's Rules of Order. There will be an implementation committee established. There are recommendations on the allocation of the 51 elected members, taking into account the potential creation of additional Faculties. This would require the reduction of allocated members and having at-large members. Fully participating non-voting members would also be created to represent the G. Raymond Chang School of Continued Education and part-time faculty. Senate should not get any bigger. Formal ratios for constituent groups might be stipulated.

It was clarified that the faculty would be RFA faculty. JP Boudreau asked about the motivation for creating at-large members. D. Checkland responded that this is not only because of the possibility for new Faculties, but also for a more representation by population. S. Dhebar asked if it could be a smaller Senate, and if there could be more student representatives. D. Checkland replied that the size is fixed by the Act, but that seats could be taken from faculty and given to students, but faculty have a greater experience and stake in the University. The current ratio can be defended.

J. Norrie asked about representation from the Chang School, but noted that the terms of part-time faculty do not coincide with the session of Senate. Having two program directors would be more than other departments have, and he suggests that there should be a certificate director instead.

R. Rose asked about the proportional student representation. It was clarified that there could be no more than two from each Faculty.

D. Elder thanked the committee for keeping CUPE in mind, and stated that more than 60% of the teaching is done by CUPE members.

S. Dhebar asked if there would be a reason to recommend a reduction in the size of Senate. D. Checkland responded that there was no particular reason to reduce the size, as there are already a relatively small number of representatives for each group.

There are also recommendations on Committee structure, eliminating some and folding some into others. A Senate Priorities Committee and an Academic Governance and Policy Committee would be created, establishing both a vertical and a horizontal structure. The SRC Committee would become responsible for all areas of SRC. The recommended functions of these committees are outlined in the report. There are some committees that remain unchanged.

J.P. Boudreau stated that the Senate Priorities Committee is an excellent idea, and the notion of general discussion is a good one. He notes that there are no changes made to the Academic Standards Committee, stating that there is a need for a connection to SRC. D. Checkland stated that some people like the ASC and others do not. There could be a call for a review of that committee at a later date. Mostly good things were heard about that committee.

V. Chan asked about the SRC Committee and pointed out an error in the chart on page 31 of the agenda. The Steering and Financial Review Committee is the Senate Priorities Committee and the SPC Committee should be the SRC Committee.

M. Yeates asked why there was not a separate budget committee, as the proposed committee has a great deal to do. D. Checkland commented that the agenda setting would not take more than a meeting or two, and the number of committees that require all Senate members would be kept to a minimum. A lot of what that committee will do is not that onerous.

S. Levy commented that the committee did a good job of respecting the bicameral nature of governance and there is no academic committee of the Board. This is a good way to achieve interaction and balance.

D. Checkland stated that there will be a Section 6 in the final report on the evolutionary perspective if the Ryerson Act is opened. It will include a recommendation that there be an appropriate room built to house Senate and other larger groups. He noted that the detailed work would have to occur over the next year to be in place for Fall 2009.

R. Hudyma asked about implementation of the various pieces. D. Checkland stated that there will be a report in June that will allow for voting on specific sections.

A. Mitchell mentioned that it will be recommended that meetings be changed to be from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.

5.3 Report of the *Ad hoc* Committee to Review the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct (Policy # 61)

5.3.1 Motion: *That Senate approve the revised Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct (Policy # 61)*

Z. Fawaz, T. Whitfield seconded.

T. Whitfield asked to give an overview. He joined after the March meeting and since then there has been feedback from RSU and CESAR. There were open meetings held by the students. There was a petition circulated. It was asked if there could have been earlier consultation.

Z. Fawaz reported that there were important changes as a result of the further consultations: no specific reference to online conduct, but rather a principle that misconduct is determined regardless of the medium. There is a further principle about jurisdiction in the students' private lives.

D. Mason commented that section B of the Code related to the earlier mention of the situation of students at U of T. He and D. Elder spoke concerning the repression of students' rights to free speech, and the need to ensure that this does not happen at Ryerson. S. Levy commented that because the police were called, the sanctions were out of the hands of the University of Toronto, and were the Crown prosecutor's ruling.

R. Rose stated the process has been a long but often rewarding one. She appreciates the responsiveness to the students' concerns. Procedural meetings have been in progress. She is concerned about the interim measures part of the policy as a result of those meetings. She has spoken to J. Hanigsberg about bringing an amendment. Page 43, Section F2a, "*damage to University property is likely to occur, or the continued presence of the student would be disruptive to the legitimate operations of the University*" is problematic. She believes that this is procedural and should not be in the policy. She asked that this language be used properly, and not to silence students. It is suggested that the Procedures Committee establish guidelines under which the interim measures would be implemented.

T. Whitfield asked for an amendment to page 44, line 3 in section G. It should be stated that students should be included from RSU and CESAR. This amendment is accepted.

R. Rose further asked that there be a direction to draft the language or guidelines in the procedures. The President stated that he wished to express the concern and an expectation that the committee address this issue. There is an agreement that the Procedures Committee will address the concern.

Motion approved. (4 student objections noted as requested.)

6. Correspondence

There was no correspondence.

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

Course changes from the G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education were for information only.

8. Reports of Committees

8.1 Report #W2008-2 of the Composition and By-Laws Committee

8.1.1 Motion: *That Senate approve an increase of four (4) members-at-large and one (1) graduate student member on the Research Ethics Board, effective immediately.*

D. Checkland moved, D. Mason seconded.

J.P Boudreau spoke in support of the motion, although he was at first opposed because of his concern that it would take more time to get protocols approved. In fact, the response time would be decreased as approvals are done electronically, and more people will speed the process. He commends the work of the committee as it is so important for the recruitment of faculty, and they are commended for their hard work. He thinks there should be more support for the committee, A. Karabanow and N. Walton.

Motion approved.

The President also thanked the Research Ethics Board.

8.2 Report #W2008-1 of the Nominating Committee

8.2.1 Motion: *That Senate approve the list of representatives of the Senate Standing Committees as presented in this report*

I. Baitz moved and Z. Fawaz seconded.

Motion approved.

8.3 Report #W2008-3 of the Academic Standards Committee:

A. Shepard moved all motions (1 to 8), U. George seconded.

8.3.1 Motion #1: *That Senate approve the Periodic Program Review of the Collaborative Nursing and Post Diploma Degree Completion Nursing Programs.*

D. Checkland commented that one of the potential weaknesses is reliance on sessional instructors. In the response, that issue is not addressed. It is an issue that Senate should think about. He gave statistics on the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty and to students. He argued against too large a reliance on part-time faculty. S. Levy commented that this issue can be highlighted in the discussion of the finances of the University, bringing to Senate's attention the difficult choices that need to be made.

J.P. Boudreau commented that the collaborative nursing program reaches out into many areas of the University including his Psychology department. There are some challenges presented by this program for his department.

J. Tucker Scott commented that there are 4800 students in the School of Nursing and the class sizes need to be small. Their infrastructure is complex and is a strength, but requires a great deal of energy. It is a benchmark for other schools. The program is looking for other ways to help staff and other kinds of career opportunities not currently in the RFA contract.

With respect to the issue raised by J.P. Boudreau, she is aware of that and they are working on the matter.

8.3.2 **Motion #2:** *That Senate approve the proposed revisions to Policy #112 – Approval Process for New Undergraduate Programs, and to Policy #126 - Periodic Program Review of Undergraduate Programs.*

K. Alnwick seconded.

D. Mason requested a change in Section 2.2.3 - “including” to read “accompanied by”.

Motion approved.

8.3.3 **Motion #3:** *That Senate approve the revisions in Architecture and Landscape Design Certificate Programs.*

H. Otiero seconded

Motion approved.

8.3.4 **Motion #4:** *That Senate approve the new Certificate Programs in Introductory International Economics, Microeconomic Theory and Policy, Macroeconomic Theory and Policy, Industrial Organization and Policy, and Quantitative Economics.*

A. Shilton seconded.

Motion approved.

8.3.5 **Motion #5:** *That Senate approve the discontinuation of the Advanced Certificate in International Economics.*

J.P. Boudreau seconded.

Motion approved.

8.3.6 **Motion #6:** *That Senate approve the revised Certificate in English as a Second Additional Language.*

A. Shilton seconded.

Motion approved.

8.3.7 **Motion #7:** *That Senate approve the revised Certificate in Financial Planning.*

A. Shilton seconded.

Motion approved.

8.3.8 **Motion #8:** *That Senate approve the revised Certificate in Image Arts, Certificate in Media Writing Fundamentals and Certificate in Public Relations.*

D. Tucker seconded.

Motion approved.

9. New Business

9.1 Report to the Senate on Ryerson's Scholarly, Research and Creative Activities, April 2007 – March 2008

It was asked that questions be directed to the VPRI who was not present. D. Mason asked about the issue of SRC particularly in FEAS under NSERC. Success in NSERC has not increased, and there is concern that enough support has not been put into NSERC submissions. The university needs to provide more support to allow people to be successful in NSERC grants, as well as supports for School of Graduate Studies students, research assistants, etc. S. Boctor responded that the feedback from the selection committees on unsuccessful applicants are reviewed by the chair, the associate dean and the faculty, and appeals are filed if there is substance to the appeals. The number of grants is decreasing. The VPRI has instituted an external review process before applications are submitted but some did not use the service. Ryerson does not have much representation on the NSERC grant selection committees. D. Mason mentioned that there are 70,000 faculty across the country and there are 700 in Ryerson (1%). There are 10,500 NSERC researchers and there should be about 100 at Ryerson, but there are 24. S. Boctor stated that this is the number successful in the year, and that there are about 110 NSERC grant holders. The President noted that the VPRI is away on business of the University. A. Shepard echoed concerns and there have been discussion on how to boost these numbers.

V. Chan asked about the six strategic areas, and these do not include the areas of Engineering research and CFI areas. President Levy stated that this was addressed in the plan, that there are a limited number of areas that can be stressed. The Provost will look into this.

J. P. Boudreau asked if there could be further discussion of this report. He is concerned about the planned growth on graduate head counts and the relationship to projected growth in grants. Also, the 50/50 split for the post-doctoral program should be discussed further. S. Levy commented that this would be a good topic brought forward for Senate discussion.

9.2 Final Report - *Learning Together: An Academic Plan for Ryerson, 2003-2008*

K. Alnwick commented that the Registrar's areas played a key role in the growth of Ryerson, introducing a change to the legacy student information system. A. Shepard thanked the Ryerson community, and D. Schulman and P. Stenton.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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