

Minutes of Academic Council
December 1, 1998

Members Present

Members Absent

Alnwick, K.	Creery, M. (Regrets)
Aspevig, E.	Cukier, W. (Regrets)
Balzan, C.	Dewson, M. (Regrets)
Bardecki, M.	Jakotic, M.
Black, M.	MacQuarrie, D.
Booth, M.	(Regrets)
Cao, M.	Mason, D. (Regrets)
Elder, D.	Mendelson, R.
Ellimootttil, J.	(Regrets)
Finn, M.	Morriss, M.
Flores, I.	Pille, P.
Gelmon, J.	Rodriguez, W.
Glynn, D.	Silmberg, J.
Granfield, D.	(Regrets)
Grayson, L.	Slopek, E.
Haines, R.	Valade, C.
Harrison, L.	Virji, R. (Regrets)
Heath, S.	
Hicks, J.	
Kapp, R.	
Kennedy, D.	
Koc, M.	
Lajeunesse, C.	
Levine, I.	
Malinski, R.	
Maskow, M.	
Miller, M.	
Mock, D.	
Moore Milroy, B.	
Northwood, D.	
Pearce, J.	
Penny, K.	
Richard, M.	
Salmons, E.	
Sandys, J.	
Sharifi, F.	
Silver, C.	
Haubrich, D. for S. Silver	
Sly, T.	
Steele, D.	
Trubic, J.	
Woodley, M.	
Zamaria, C.	
Zaver, N.	

Prior to the commencement of the meeting, D. McIntyre, Vice Chair of the Board of Governors, reported to Academic Council on the work of the PARC (Presidential Advisory Review Committee). He reported on both the process and the undertaking, and thanked the various members, advisors and support (Ed Valin) for their work.

C. Lajeunesse responded to D. McIntyre's remarks, and expressed his gratitude to all members of the review committee for their work, both in terms of the amount and the quality. He indicated he was making a commitment to meeting and hopefully exceeding the priority issue. C. Lajeunesse reiterated his belief in Ryerson, and noted he had received a letter from the RFA. He stated that he welcomed suggestions that would come forward in terms of assisting the President to work with the community.

President indicated that with the permission of Council agenda items #6 and #7 would be inverted. There were no objections raised by Council members.

1. President's Report

The President reported on the 1998-99 budget. He indicated that 29 million dollars had been made available by the government for fair funding grants for those institutions where the BIU was less than 5,700. As a result Ryerson was not eligible for this. He did indicate that other opportunities were being pursued such as ATOP.

The President indicated that the government had announced a survey of graduates would be undertaken in regard to where jobs were most available. The graduates from 1996 would be surveyed from Ryerson, and one of the issues to be addressed was whether they were employed six months or a year and a half after graduation. The government was expecting a fifty percent response rate.

The President stated that the Maclean's overall ranking did not, in his opinion, reflect the value of Ryerson. In looking at the other twenty institutions, he noted that Ryerson has more graduates than students at the other universities so comparisons were not surprising. He noted that Ryerson had moved ahead in some areas, particularly the reputational survey which reflected well on students and teachers. If Council wished, D. Mock would do a presentation for Council at the next meeting as he had previously done for the Board of Governors.

The President reminded Council that the President's Annual Holiday Celebration would be held on Wednesday, December 9th from 3:00 - 5:30 in the Commons in Jorgenson Hall.

2. The Good of the University

D. Steele assumed the chair for this portion of the agenda. He indicated that there would be a presentation by the external auditors regarding Ryerson's financial statements. The presentation was introduced by L. Grayson, who indicated that P. Arthur, H. Mitchell, M. Torey of Ernst & Young and J. Winton would be reviewing with Council the changes to Ryerson's Financial Statements and the implications of these changes for the University.

P. Arthur indicated that a number of changes from the Canadian

Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA) had resulted in significant improvements in financial accounting. Over time, a clearer picture of the University's affairs will emerge. In terms of the objectives of the new reporting, there will be an increase in the communication of useful information which will help decision-makers. P. Arthur reviewed a number of areas including the following: usefulness of financial information; role of the auditor; the new accounting standards; and the changes to the financial statements (see attached copies of the slides). In general, he noted that the recommendations for not-for-profit entities which had emerged from CICA had resulted in changes being made to the way that revenue was recognized and capital assets amortized. P. Arthur explained fund accounting to Council, noting that the new presentation format would alter the timing of revenue recognition, and amortization of capital assets. These changes will result in more detailed balance sheets and a full picture of the financial situation on one sheet of paper. In addition, it would allow for better matching of revenues and expenses.

J. Winton indicated she had a number of copies of Ryerson's audited 1998 financial statements which could be picked up subsequent to the meeting, and would be available from the Secretary of Academic Council. J. Winton reviewed the financial statements for reporting purposes, highlighting a number of areas that had been impacted by the new reporting requirement, including externally funded grants and contracts, and donations. On the expense side, materials and supplies, and amortization of capital assets were also impacted by the changes in reporting format.

In response to a question from Council member C. Zamaria regarding amortization of fixed assets, J. Winton indicated that the values represented on the slides were not market value but, original cost, depreciated over time. In addition, J. Winton indicated in response to the question whether the University was doing better than previously, that the operating

budget was right on target. She also pointed out that the deficit indicated on the balance sheet included all the University's funds - operating, capital, trust, and research.

D. Steele indicated to Council that the Good of the University was now entering the open session. J. Ellimoottil made an inquiry on behalf of a Business student. After relaying the circumstances for the Business student he inquired whether a transfer of marks was dependent on enrolment status. D. Mock replied that the University did not count the credits brought into the program for the GPA, however once into the program any courses taken would be included in the GPA calculation. As a result, upon graduation, one would see all the courses that had been taken and the GPA would reflect the program courses. K. Alnwick indicated that the basis for this policy was to allow students who were experimenting with courses prior to entering a program to not have their GPA suffer. Once into a program, all courses taken would then be reflected in the GPA calculation. Both D. Mock and K. Alnwick indicated that they

would be happy to meet with the student to discuss the policy if the student wished.

3. Minutes of November 3, 1998 Meeting

C. Lajeunesse resumed the chair's role. Motion put forward to approve the minutes was by E. Aspevig and K. Alnwick. Two amendments were to be made in the minutes. On page 10 of the minutes a correction was to be made to the fifth paragraph with "M. Cao" replaced by M. Koc. In addition, C. Zamaria had inquired whether D. Mock confirmed that the thesis supervision will be equivalent to .05, and project supervision will be equivalent to .02. D. Mock confirmed that over time there would be a review with R. Mendelson's assistance. However, for the first three programs these figures would be correct.

Minutes were approved.

4. Business arising out of the minutes

There was no business arising out of the minutes.

5. Correspondence

There was no correspondence received in the Office of Academic Council.

6. i. Report #137 of the Academic Standards Committee

D. Mock, Chair of the Academic Standards Committee, reported on the various issues in the report.

Proposed degree designation change in Business Management

D. Mock noted that the Business Management graduates were presently receiving the degree of "Bachelor of Business Management" (BBM). This degree is considered to be disadvantageous to our graduates because of its lack of familiarity among employers, and as a result, the School of Business Management has requested the redesignation of its degree as "Bachelor of Commerce" (B.Com.). As of the Spring 1999, those students currently enrolled in the program would receive the B.Com degree, with the opportunity available for students who are currently enrolled to obtain the BBM subsequent to graduation. Motion put forward by D. Mock seconded by K. Alnwick that Academic Council endorse the degree designation Bachelor of Commerce in the Business Management Program.

The motion was passed.

Proposed Finance Option in Business Management

D. Mock noted there are currently six options in the School of Business Management, with a finance minor available. He referred Council to the top of page 73 noting that the proposed finance option would have the same structure as the other

business options (see pages 81-82). In addition, the proposed promotion policy variation would be like that presently in use by the accounting option.

The motion was put forward by D. Mock and seconded by J. Trubic that Academic Council affirm the academic quality of the proposed finance option in the Business Management Program.

E. Aspevig inquired how large an option was to be expected. D. Mock replied that the total number in first year would be the same as in previous years, and some students were expected to switch from the accounting option. L. Maguire indicated that they expected 70-100 students from Business and Accounting to be enrolled in this option.

The motion was passed.

Proposed Changes to First Year Engineering Curriculum

D. Mock noted that this change had been initiated a number of years ago. The entire first semester contained a common curriculum, with the second semester nearly common with some program specificity. He noted this curriculum change would meet the requirements of CEAB, and represented a restructuring of the program. The objectives are clearly laid out in the Standards Report, and include the review of the courses that are involved in the restructuring.

The motion was put forward by D. Mock and seconded by F. Sharifi that Academic Council approve the proposed first year engineering curriculum.

I. Flores inquired regarding the goal of the curriculum restructuring. If the goal was to facilitate transferring students between the programs he asked whether there were certain criteria or minimums involved.

D. Northwood responded that the targets for enrolment were the same, and that the curriculum was noted to be not entirely common for the first year, however, it was more common than the curriculum presently in use. This proposed curriculum would assist those students who were interested in switching programs in second year without having to restart the program completely, therefore it should increase mobility. D. Northwood noted there are different cut-offs which will be a consideration, and some planning will still be necessary in order to have successful transfers.

I. Flores also inquired whether it was possible for all students to leave a program into another and what the impact would be on admissions. K. Alnwick responded that they would continue to admit students into the various programs, and with the admission would be certain rights in terms of transfers. The curriculum change would facilitate a student to transfer from one program to another but did not have an impact on the fact that student had entered into a program formally when they were first admitted. Therefore, the impact on admissions would

not be significant.

M. Koc inquired regarding efficiencies and timetabling. He asked whether there had been any consideration given, or any plans to adopt a similar model in other faculties. D. Mock responded this was something at least considered in Engineering for a number of the groups, and there had been some discussion in other parts of the University, for example, Business. He didn't know of anything similar in this scope elsewhere.

M. Bardecki inquired what the impact of the first year engineering curriculum changes would be on the second, third and fourth years? D. Mock responded that subsequently in the agenda for Academic Council there were a number of the changes to upper year semester curricular. Additional changes would be forthcoming to the January Council meeting as well.

R. Kapp inquired whether there were plans to change the mode of teaching and if so, what the impact would be on students. D. Northwood responded, indicating there were no plans to change the mode of teaching. He noted that some of the courses already overlapped to some degree, and that the engineering curriculum changes were being proposed in order to overcome insularity which previously occurred in the first year due to the nature of the courses taken. D. Mock also noted that other universities have a common first year engineering curriculum.

The motion was passed.

Proposed Changes in Admission Requirements and Curriculum in Environmental Health

D. Mock noted that the changes reflected in the Standards Report contained both admission and curriculum issues. D. Mock reviewed the admission change which was proposed. He also reviewed the curriculum changes, noting the detail of these changes were found on pages 83-91 of Council's agenda.

The motion was put forward by D. Mock and seconded by J. Sandys that Academic Council endorse the proposal to amend the admission requirements and curriculum in Environmental Health.

M. Richard inquired why a math course had been added but a computer course was deleted. B. Clarence responded that the changes had occurred after discussion with students and faculty. The computer course had been deleted, however, they would be introducing computer applications to as many courses as possible. As for the math course this was added since the students in the programme did not tend to have had much prior experience in that subject area. M. Richard inquired that there had been a change in the OAC math credit requirement to which D. Mock responded that there was no change.

The motion was passed.

Proposed Minor in Sociology

D. Mock noted that this proposed Minor in Sociology was for both Social Work and Early Childhood Education students. He noted that there were some specific differences in the content areas, however generally, content and sequential progression was very similar.

The motion was put forward by D. Mock and seconded by M. Koc that Academic Council approve the proposed Minor in Sociology.

J. Gelmon inquired how the ECE electives were in fact options. D. Mock reviewed the courses in the various semesters. L. Harrison inquired whether SOC502 and SOC504 would be equivalent to one credit. D. Mock responded that the student would end up with an extra half credit in terms of the requirements for the minor. M. Pomerance noted that the way that the courses were run, since they were against each other, the students would need to choose which course they wish to take. In the future, the timing of the courses might change, and as a result, they thought it most appropriate to lay out all the options in the proposed minor. J. Pearce inquired whether students could take three-year-long courses and also end up with an extra credit. D. Mock responded in the affirmative.

The motion was passed.

Proposed Amendments to the Minor in Business Communication

D. Mock reviewed the materials presented and noted that the proposal involved a series of revisions of course numberings, a restructuring of the current minor as offered to the School of Business Management, and the extension of the minor to the School of Hospitality and Tourism Management.

Motion was put forward by D. Mock and seconded by K. Penny that Academic Council approve the restructuring of the Minor in Business Communication and its extension to Hospitality and Tourism Management.

E. Salmons inquired whether the minor would be available to other programs. D. Mock noted that this minor does appear in other programs, and since it is program specific, a program would have to initiate a proposal in order to have the minor applicable for that program.

L. Harrison noted a correction on page 77, last sentence which should refer to SHTM students rather than HTMG students.

The motion was passed.

Proposed Amendment to Admission and Curricular requirements for Advanced Standing Applicants to the Program in Social Work

D. Mock reviewed the two proposals for applicants with baccalaureate degrees and those who were graduates of college

diploma programs respectively.

Motion was put forward by D. Mock and seconded by D. Haubrich that Academic Council approved the proposed changes to admission and curricular requirements for direct entry into Social Work.

J. Sandys requested clarification as to why there was a reference to upper level liberal studies courses. E. Aspevig noted that in Social Work, liberal studies are loaded early on and so there would be a need to take upper level courses subsequently.

L. Harrison requested an explanation of the type of employment or level of responsibility in the various positions that people would be coming from to enter this program. J. Sandys noted that they expected people with social services background who did not necessarily have managerial level experience.

D. Loney inquired what the status would be for the students while they were taking SWP105. D. Haubrich responded that students would be classified as "special students" until their admittance into the program. R. Haines inquired whether students would have their GPA calculated at that point. D. Mock replied that the GPA would not be calculated until the students were registered in the program. M. Finn inquired whether students entering the program had a 2- or 3-year diploma. D. Haubrich responded that generally it was a two-year diploma. J. Sandys noted that these students would be taking liberal studies courses and transition course prior to their admittance into the program.

The motion was passed.

Proposed Course Weighting Changes in Architecture

D. Mock noted that the proposal from Architecture involved course weightings being doubled from 2.0 to 4.0 for various studio and thesis courses in Architecture. He noted that the rationale followed the pattern of other universities. He also noted that this was identical to the Interior Design pattern which had already been approve by Council at a previous meeting.

The motion was put forward by D. Mock and seconded by M. Miller that Academic Council approve the requested amendments in Architecture studio and thesis course weighting.

The motion was passed.

Proposed Reorganization of Design Courses in Electrical Engineering

D. Mock noted that these were also course weighting issues. In terms of the thesis course the total number of hours would

remain the same, however, the components had been separated into two one-semester courses. He also reviewed the allocation of the weights in the various courses.

The motion was put forward by D. Mock and seconded by D. Kennedy that Academic Council approve the reorganization of Electrical Engineering courses as proposed.

The motion was passed.

ii. Report #84 of the Nominating Committee

E. Aspevig, chair of the Nominating Committee presented report #84. The report contained three names being put forward, one of which was a replacement.

The motion was put forward by E. Aspevig and seconded by J. Sandys that Academic Council approved the recommendations of the Nominating Committee.

The motion was approved.

iii. Report #5 of the Standing Committee on Academic Council on Open College

M. Maskow presented the report to Council, noting that the courses referred to in the report had previously been approved by the History Department.

The motion was put forward by D. Mock and seconded by E. Aspevig that Academic Council accept the report of the Standing Committee on Academic Council on Open College.

The motion was approved.

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

D. Steele assumed the chair's position at this time. D. Mock was asked to review the reports. D. Mock encouraged departments to bring forward their course changes to Academic Council earlier in the year, noting that there was now a significant number presented in the one report. He referred to page 71 which had been missed by the printing process and which was included as a separate attachment. He also referred to the additional memorandum from the School of Fashion, which provided clarification on a memorandum already included in the materials. D. Mock reviewed with Council each of the course change forms presented in the Academic Council materials. This material is presented to Council for information.

A motion was put forward by D. Mock and seconded by J. Sandys regarding a name change for the School of Environmental Health:

Whereas the School of Environmental Health wishes to change the school name to more accurately reflect the nature of the

material it offers, it is hereby resolved that the name of the school be changed to School of Occupational and Public Health.

The motion was passed.

M. Bardecki inquired whether there were other changes to be forthcoming in January from the other departments. D. Mock noted that there were Engineering departmental changes still to come forward in January due to the exceptional nature of the course curriculum changes.

8. New Business

D. Steele indicated the only item under new business at this time was the University's response to the Ombudsperson's Annual Report 1997-'98. This report had been sent out under separate cover. L. Grayson was asked to present the University's response.

L. Grayson noted that it had been almost four years since the first discussions, and she was pleased to now be presenting the University's response to the first Ombudsperson's Annual Report. She noted that L. Hoffman would like to make some comments to Council.

L. Hoffman indicated she would like to thank the people in the room who had helped her learn about Ryerson. She appreciated the environment at the University, and the assistance in establishing her Ombudsperson's Office. She was very appreciative of the way the University had responded noting that there was room for improvements to be made. L. Hoffman noted that ten concerns had been raised in her report and in all of these, the University had either acknowledged there were problems and indicated they were working towards solutions, or the University had already corrected or was in direction of correcting the issue identified. As a result, she indicated she felt the Ombudsperson's Office and the University had created a healthy synergy.

J. Gelmon raised a question regarding the issue of make up exams. He asked if he didn't write an exam for a medical reason, he could get an Aegrotat standing, and asked about the lack of reference to a make-up date for an exam. L. Hoffman indicated that the issue identified in that case was a family crisis and the student had been told they could do a make-up exam. At the third level appeal there appeared to be some confusions around a make-up exam. She noted that thus far an informal process but that the ramifications could be severe for students. She indicated she needed to monitor this area closely in case there is a need to develop a formal policy.

D. Steele indicated that from the RyeSAC perspective he was pleased with the work of the University's ombudsperson and the University's response which acknowledged concerns.

M. Koc referred to page 4 of the Ombudsperson's Report, which addressed communications as one of the problems. He asked

whether faculty, in particular RFA, were represented on the Ombudsperson's Committee. He also made the suggestion that they needed to have more information about policies, and that possibly if a pamphlet could be developed for new faculty this could be of assistance. L. Hoffman responded that faculty members were on the Ombudsperson's Committee and they represented the concerns of academic staff but were not present as RFA appointees. She did indicate that she had met with the RFA and thought a positive relationship had been developed. In terms of the policies, she indicated that most policies are fairly condensed already, although training seminars could be held for new faculty.

C. Zamaria inquired where the Ombudsperson Report would go from here, particularly in regards to issues such as the availability of academic staff. He indicated he felt these issues were the beginning for further interpretations. L. Hoffman indicated that this was now a public report and it would be published. She indicated her work involved systemic reviews and would continue throughout the year. Her practice in the past had been that in the next report she would return to the recommendations and comment on what had taken place since then.

L. Grayson noted that attached to the Ombuds Report is the University's response which includes the steps that have already been taken or will be taken during the course of the year. She noted that the accountability time line was tight.

L. Hoffman indicated that she would also like to note that congratulations had been extended to the University on areas that had demonstrated progress.

C. Zamaria indicated that he was concerned that unless the dialogue commenced shortly, that there would be an impact on faculty and morale as a result of this report. He inquired whether perhaps dialogue could be further entertained. D. Mock responded that the University encouraged faculty to do research and scholarship during the summer but he noted that some departments appeared to have no one present in the summertime to deal with student issues. He stated it may not be faculty members who were present but there did need to be some discussions in areas such as appeals. He indicated that the University had the responsibility to respond to requests and it would be inappropriate to have an entire department close down for a time period. C. Zamaria referred to specifically the phrase "connect to faculty members" and indicated he was concerned about the impact the release of this document would have.

D. Glynn inquired on behalf of the Appeals Committee whether the Ombudsperson has access to appeals materials. K. Kwan responded that the appeals material are only available to the Appeals Committee members attending a hearing, and the Secretary of Academic Council's Office.

R. Haines indicated that no where in the Ombudsperson's Report

did it say that a faculty member needed to be on call, and he noted that if a student needed access that it was important that a faculty member be available to be contacted. He indicated he had taken offence to C. Zamaria's questionning and the attitude that appeared to be expressed. C. Zamaria responded that his issue was in regard to administrative support for faculty. D. Mock indicated that this issue would be further discussed.

As there were no further questions or comments raised, the Vice Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.