

# MINUTES OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL

April 2, 1996

## MEMBERS PRESENT

C. Lajeunesse	D. Mock
K. Alnwick	C.J. Monro
E. Aspevig	M. Morel
M. Booth	M. Morriss
M. Bornstein	M. Novick
L. Braverman	W. Owen
I. Bryan	A. Peart
C. Cassidy	N. Potts
R. Tomlinson for P. Cheevers (regrets)	C. Ravindran
M. Creery	J. Sandys
W. Cukier	D. Shaw
L. Gunter for A.R. DeLuca	J. Swain
I. Devine	J. Turtle
E. Deutsch	W.E. Vine
M. Dewson	C. Webb
J. Easton	W. White
P. Flynn	P. C. Wong
P. Gharghuri	
K. Goheen	
L. Grayson	
B. Hartley	
J. Hicks	
P. Jensen	
S. Karim	
L. Kelly	
S. Kelman	
A. Kittler	
I. Levine	
L. Lewis	

## MEMBERS ABSENT

A. Bonifacio
J. Campbell
N. Dzelevotich
A. Heisey
M. Kosny (regrets)
J. Meslin
A. Pokas
S. Port
C. Sam Foh (regrets)

J. Pollard for D. McKay

R. Malinski

M. Maskow

D. Mason

M.C. Mayo

M. Miller

## 1. President's Report

The President began with a budget update. There will be a meeting of the Finance Committee on April 9, 1996 at which a balanced budget will be submitted for consideration. Another meeting is scheduled for April 23, 1996, if needed, to approve the final budget for submission to the Board on April 29, 1996. The proposed budget takes into consideration the PPAC report, the series of consultations throughout Ryerson, feedback from the President's presentations, and the Board's directive to administration to continue towards the FMP2 targets

The issue of the \$4 million pay equity decision is still being pursued. It was raised at the recent breakfast with A. Castrelli, who may raise it in the House, but the outcome still does not look good.

External evaluations for "major research proposals" to be funded under the new money have been received. There are some good proposals, and the decisions will be announced soon.

It is hoped that breakfast meetings like the recent one with A. Castrelli will be held about every three weeks beginning in September. Council members can advise the Secretary of Academic Council or the President's Office of ideas for other speakers, or for invitees.

The President referred members to Ryerson Community Achievements for March 1996 as printed in the agenda. He thanked and congratulated Kenise Kilbride for her leadership in successfully proposing to SSHRC and Citizenship and Immigration Canada, in conjunction with York University and the University of Toronto, the establishment of a Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Settlement.

## 2. The Good of the University

Carla Cassidy recognized Ricardo Tomlinson, a Business student, representing Paul Cheevers.

Mr. Tomlinson read a letter he had prepared in support of the proposed minor in Caribbean Studies. He presented to members a petition with 230 names in support of the program. He thanked Council for an opportunity to speak and urged consideration for the implementation of this program which has been in the works for 3 years, concluding that value must be measured by social significance as well as financial considerations.

D. Mock responded that the proposal would go through E. Aspevig's office first, before going to ASC. To date he has not seen documentation on this minor. He explained that all Liberal Studies are associated with program specific minors.

The President assured R. Tomlinson that the proposed minor would be given proper consideration.

E. Aspevig said that the minor is to be supported under Track 3 funding, and that a Caribbean Studies Committee has been established to look at curriculum development. He received the final committee report on the minor within the last two weeks. As there is currently no minor within Liberal Studies, the proposal needs vetting by the Liberal Studies Council, then ASC and Academic Council. As well there may be opportunity for a co-op program with the U. of T. He assured members that the proposal will be given proper consideration.

I. Bryan asked D. Mock if there is any accounting of which projects were funded under Track 2 and Track 3 last year and to what amount. D. Mock answered affirmatively, saying the allocation for 1996-97 will be outlined in the May Budget Bulletin; the Bulletin also will specify how the money was used in 1995-96.

Referring to the recent publication of salaries over \$100,000, Ms. Bryan asked how faculty can earn \$40,000 above the top of the RFA salary scale. M. Dewson explained that overloads, Continuing Education courses, administrative stipends and research contracts paid through Ryerson could account for this.

D. Shaw made the suggestion, on behalf of others, that students be allowed to use only their student number on examination papers to avoid subjectivity in marking. D. Mock felt this assumes unfairness in marking. He will meet with D. Shaw to discuss this; R. Ravindran also asked to attend the meeting. K. Alnwick feels this solution has limited potential to resolve the problem it is intended to address.

L. Kelly requested that RYESAC and administration look at the administration and timing for the Faculty Course Evaluation for one year courses as she feels it would be better given in the middle of the winter term.

### 3. Minutes of the March 11, 1996 Meeting

It was duly moved and duly seconded that:

The Minutes of the March 11, 1996 meeting of Academic Council be adopted as printed in the agenda.

MOVED: J. Easton

SECONDED: D. Mason

L. Braverman noted two points in the minutes for correction: "Bill 26" on minutes page 2, paragraph 2, should be "Public Sector Salary Disclosure Act". In the 5th paragraph on page 2, the first sentence should include students as well as faculty and staff.

The minutes, as printed in the agenda, were CARRIED with the corrections as noted.

It was also noted that on page 2 of "Ryerson Community Achievements" Jules Glover should

Page 5

Minutes of Academic Council

April 2, 1996 Meeting

be Julia Glover.

**4. Business Arising Out of the Minutes**

Further to an item in the February 6, 1996 minutes, D. Shaw requested that administration and faculty be advised that RYESAC, not RSU, is one of the two official elected student governing bodies at Ryerson. M. Dewson will follow up.

**5. Correspondence**

**Retroactive Accreditation of the Applied Chemistry and Biology Program**

J. Easton reported to members that national accreditation of the Applied Chemistry and Biology Program has been received from the Canadian Society of Chemistry (Chemical Institute of Canada) for five years retroactive to May 1993.

**6. Reports of Actions and Recommendations of Departmental and Faculty Councils**

**(a) Respecting Changes to Certificate Programs**

D. Mock presented these changes for information only.

L. Braverman asked why the time lag exists between changes made to the degree program and these same changes being made in the certificate programs. She suggested a policy be developed to identify the impact on certificate programs of changes made to degree programs.

D. Mock explained that changes are not always the same in both the certificate and degree programs, and that certificate changes must also go through the Continuing Education Council.

J. Hicks said an attempt is made to monitor changes from Council minutes and that certificate

courses are systematically checked prior to calendar production, but he would like to see something automatic.

D. Mock agrees with Ms. Braverman in principle; he feels the implementation of planned RISIS revisions should improve the process.

L. Lewis said she did not know about the changes to Facility Management, as shown on page 20 of the agenda. D. Mock will recheck these changes with the department.

E. Aspevig noted that the ESL courses on pages 18 and 19 have his authority, if necessary.

M. Booth feels there is a need to modify the "Course Change Form" to include the Academic Dean as well as the Continuing Education Dean.

## 7. Reports of the Committees

### Report No. 122 of the Academic Standards Committee, March 25, 1996

#### (a) Proposed Changes to the Certificates in Mechanical Engineering Technology, Advanced Mechanical Engineering Technology and Industrial Engineering Technology

MOTION: That Academic Council approve the proposed changes to the Certificates in Mechanical Engineering Technology, Advanced Mechanical Engineering Technology and Industrial Engineering Technology as reflected in the documentation appended to this report.

Moved: D. Mock

Seconded: D. Shaw

D. Shaw expressed appreciation for the amount of work done in preparing the report on these certificates and for the quality and clarity of detail

L. Braverman also expressed appreciation and pointed to number 1 on page 45 as extremely impressive. She asked what kind of advanced standing students can get, and if this can be shown on the certificate. She noted that on page 46, "OAC" is left out before the second word "credits" and on Page 47 that there are two courses shown as CMEC 411. She asked if CMEC 322 on page 48, is reflective of Industrial Engineering?

D. Mock replied that completion of common year certificate courses does not give access to day programs automatically. J. Hicks said CMEC 322 does not reflect Industrial Engineering but is a valid elective.

S. Karim asked what percentage is required for "OAC"s. D. Mock felt 60% is probably



correct to bring certificates in line with day programs. K. Alnwick pointed out that CE look after their own admissions.

The motion was CARRIED.

**(b) Revisions to Certificate Admission Requirements**

D. Mock presented the revisions for information.

L. Braverman posed the following questions about consistency:

- Can terminology relating to professional experience be made consistent; eg. “relevant professional experience”, “acceptable professional experience”, “related professional experience” etc.
- What is the significance of the “or equivalent” phrase in the admission requirement?
- Re introductory and advanced level certificates, what is the meaning of “successful completion in” versus “completion in”?

She also noted several corrections:

- Pg. 51 - Certificate in Economic Analysis should read “OSSD with 6 “OAC’s” for consistency.
- Pg. 59 - “Certificate in Architectural Certificate” should read “Certificate in Architectural Technology”
- Pg. 62 - Should be CKMT for Mathematics not CMKT, the code for Marketing.

E. Aspevig noted that the on Pg. 51, the text at the bottom of the page replaces proposed admission requirements for the Certificate in Economic Analysis shown in the box.

D. Mock expressed his appreciation for the exemplary detail presented by Ms. Braverman. Since this type of detailed information does not have to be passed by Council, he suggested that in future it would be useful to have it documented for correction of the calendar, rather than presented at Council.

W. Owen asked about the ratio of students entering certificate courses under the "mature student" designation versus those with OSSD.

M. Booth explained that students make the choice as to whether their qualifications are adequate to take a particular course, and that this is not handled in a formal way. She said the changes made in the certificates was to bring their language into some kind of consistency and to make it appropriate for 1996.

S. Karim asked if Engineering applicants are evaluated as he finds some students are not prepared. D. Mock explained that CE Program Directors are available for consultation if students wish to obtain advice about course and program levels..

**(c) Professionally-Related Studies in Ryerson's Tripartite Curriculum, A Framework for Discussion, Revision 6, 25-3-96**

D. Mock introduced the discussion paper printed in the agenda which was developed by ASC to provide a context for the Committee of the Whole to discuss the tripartite curriculum policy.

Reports 23 and 41, on which the discussion paper is based, are guidelines only, allowing curriculum to be developed beyond these guidelines if there is suitable justification. Dr. Mock then directed members to the three general questions printed on page 65.

MOTION: That Academic Council resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for a discussion of Ryerson's tripartite curriculum policy.

Moved: D. Mock

Seconded: C. Thomas

The motion was CARRIED.

Because the Vice-Chair wished to participate in the discussion, the President continued as Chair in Committee of the Whole. The Chair recognized C. Cassidy who expressed her concern with the volume of curriculum changes in the past that appear to have given insufficient consideration to the principles or rationale underlying the curriculum structure. She feels some proposals may be developed without awareness of the tripartite policy or by simply ignoring the policy altogether. The purpose of her suggestion at the January Council meeting was to refocus on the academic principles and rationale underlying the policy and to hear from the Vice President, Academic, the deans, and others, of Ryerson's commitment to the tripartite policy and its principles. The central issue, she emphasized, is what curriculum structure can best prepare students for their life as professionals, as citizens and as human beings. To date liberal studies courses and professionally-related courses have been based in another discipline. This interdisciplinary potential is one of Ryerson's strengths, and Ryerson needs to find ways to maximize this potential.

L. Lewis supports C. Cassidy's view; she feels the whole area of related studies needs to be opened up to the whole institute.

W. Cukier expressed her view that the commitment to interdisciplinary studies and the tripartite curriculum is not the same thing and creates some paradoxes, in that pushing some kinds of interdisciplinary studies violates the principles of tripartite structure.

J. Swain, Technical Theatre Production student, expressed that taking a variety of courses has been a tremendous help to her in her studies.

S. Karim asked how this structure relates to professional accreditation. D. Mock responded that the tripartite structure can accommodate and has accommodated professional accreditation requirements..

S. Kelman said she was not aware of tripartite policy until the issue arose. She feels it is necessary as some programs are too narrowly focused. She would like a clearer definition of the term professionally-related.

D. Shaw feels liberal arts and professional courses are clearly defined. As some professional courses can quickly become obsolete, professionally-related courses can give students skills for adapting knowledge from their core curriculum to a new or specific skill. Professionally-related should not be de-emphasized.

K. Alnwick feels the liberal studies policy remains relevant to its objectives, the tripartite structure is a positive and distinctive feature of Ryerson, and the policy is sound. However, the definitions, starting with professionally-related, should be revisited, as well as the way shared curriculum,

implied by tripartite, is implemented and managed.

J. Sandys feels the structure makes sense but the definition of liberal studies needs to be broadened.

W. Owen said professionally-related courses are often developed by the departments with a view to internalization.

M. Bornstein feels programs becomes restrictive when departments restrict courses to those that can be given by the department's faculty; it is up to the departments to open up the curriculum.

L. Braverman expressed her enthusiasm for the tripartite curriculum and thanked Academic Standards and Carla Cassidy for the opportunity to discuss the policy. She noted that on page 65 "standard" was used, whereas in the minutes when this policy was developed, the percentages were shown as "guidelines". On page 64, the liberal studies definition should read "...understand and appraise the social..." rather than just "...understand the social...".

She then proceeded to answer the 3 questions on page 65.

Is this policy still relevant?

Yes, it relates to Ryerson's mission and objectives, and it makes Ryerson unique and is part of "Ryersonness". Tripartite gives a structure to programs and makes them easier to understand and evaluate.

What changes, if any, should be made to the policy or its implementation to fulfill Ryerson's mandate better, and support our mission?

Take the three definitions of liberal studies, professional and professionally-related and develop practical working definitions, and revise and combine all policies into a current comprehensive policy relevant for 1996. Ms. Braverman asked if we should have a fourth category to broaden the scope. Other ideas were to have different guidelines for different programs, educate the Ryerson community about the policy, make it more user-friendly, and label all courses in the different categories for each program to eliminate confusion.

What alternative policy, if any, would better ensure delivery of curriculum consistent with Ryerson's new mandate and mission?

Ms. Braverman felt it best to make the current tripartite policy do-able rather than reinvent it.

D. Shaw feels shared curriculum is not being utilized as fully as possible. She reminded Council that there is a curriculum substitution form, although not widely used, for students who want to take courses not directly related to their program. They need only prove the course is related to their plan of study.

D. Mason supports breadth of curriculum but feels, with more course selection, that timetabling presents problems. He suggests that ASC reinvigorate the policy.

E. Aspevig felt the discussion extraordinary in that tripartite has gained approval over the years and is showing strength in the new economy. He was surprised but gratified at the support but expressed concern about redefining terms, as he took part in the original definition struggles.

MOTION: That the Committee of the Whole be dissolved.

Moved: E. Aspevig

Seconded: D. Shaw

The motion was CARRIED.

D. Mock and C. Lajeunesse thanked ASC members for their work in putting together the discussion paper.

## 8. New Business

There was no new business.

## 9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.