

**Minutes of Academic Council**  
**December 2, 1997**

**Members Present**

Alnwick, K.  
Altrows, L.  
Aspevig, E.  
Bardecki, M.  
Booth, M.  
Creery, M.  
Cukier, W.  
de Haan, R.  
Dewson, M.  
Elder, D.  
Friesen, E.  
Frost, A.  
Grayson, L.  
Haines, R.  
Harrison, L.  
Heath, S.  
Ho, D.  
Kapp, R.  
Kelley, A.  
Kennedy, D.  
Koc, M.  
Lajeunesse, C.  
Levine, I.  
Malinski, R.  
Maskow, M.  
McIntosh, C.  
Mendelson, R.  
Miller, M.  
Mock, D.  
Morgan, H.  
Morriss, M.  
Richard, M.  
Sam Foh, C.  
Sandys, J.  
Shaw, D.  
Sher, D.  
Silver, S.  
Smith, D.  
Trubic, J.  
Wallace, R.  
Williams, S.  
Wilson, L.  
Wu, J.  
Zamaria, C.  
Zaver, N.

**Members Absent**

Black, M.  
DeLuca, A. (Regrets)  
Easton, J.  
Finn, M.  
Garnette, I.  
Monro, J. (Regrets)  
Nam, S.  
Northwood, D.  
O'Connor, E.  
Pearce, J.  
Pettypiece, A.  
Sharifi, F.  
Shukla, N.  
Tindugan, M.

**1. President's Report**

The President began his report by making a reference to the Ryerson Achievement Report which had been

distributed with the agenda. He drew attention, in particular, to the results of the *Maclean's* Survey. He said that we are quite gratified with certain improvements in Ryerson's rating in the survey, for example, our ranking above Dalhousie and Western in national reputation for quality.

He then referred to an advertisement that had been published in the Toronto *Globe and Mail*. The advertisement was placed on the occasion of a conference on university education in Ontario involving the Premier and other government officials, Chancellors and Board Chairs, and Presidents of Ontario universities.

He then presented to the meeting a series of overheads. Copies of these are appended to the minutes. The data presented showed the relatively larger impact on Ryerson, as compared with other universities, of reductions in government transfers to universities, of the impact of the shift of grant monies from the enrolment envelope to the research envelope, and of the relatively higher support of research universities by private donors.

He went on to say that the advertisement was intended to draw the attention of the conference and the public to some of the serious problems that Ryerson faces as we try to carry out our mandate on behalf of the people of Ontario, in a context of inadequate funding.

He also stressed that the advertisement made a key case against the idea of a two tier system of universities.

With reference to the portion of the article dealing with fees deregulation, he apologized that the wording as it finally appeared in the advertisement did not clearly reflect his and Ryerson's position, namely, that the statement of support for deregulation should have been conditional on the availability of financial aid sufficient to offset fully the impact of increases in fees on those who are unable to afford them.

He also apologized that there had not been enough consultation prior to the appearance of the advertisement in the *Globe and Mail*.

He then turned to Professor Joe Springer, President of the Ryerson Faculty Association, for comment.

Dr. Springer stated that the Ryerson Faculty Association supports the efforts of the President to improve the funding of the university but is concerned that any improvements in funding for Ryerson must be in a context which protects access to Ryerson by all qualified students.

The President then went on to say that he had met recently with Assistant Deputy Minister David Trick to press Ryerson's views. He said that he believes his meeting with the Assistant Deputy Minister was productive.

Regarding his recent Asian trip he noted that details of the trip will be published in the *Forum* but he informed Council of his overall view that the trip was a successful one.

He then noted the recent celebration sponsored by Professor Murray Pomerance, Chair, Sociology Department and other members of faculty, of the award of the first PhD. in Women's Studies in Canada to Dr. Katherine Side. Dr. Side teaches Sociology at Ryerson on a sessional contract. He thanked Professor Pomerance for his initiative.

## **2. The Good of the University**

In the absence of A. DeLuca, Vice Chair of Council, S. Williams agreed to act in the capacity of Vice

Chair for The Good of the University portion of the meeting.

She began by inviting D. Mock and K. Alnwick to do a presentation on timetabling. D. Mock explained the origins of some changes in the type of timetabling software used at Ryerson and then turned over the meeting to K. Alnwick to do the detailed presentation. This is summarized in copies of the information presented in overheads which are appended to these minutes.

K. Alnwick also drew Council's attention to the fact that information packages were available for pick-up at the end of the meeting.

In subsequent discussion L. Altrows asked what is being done to manage more effectively 8:00 a.m. teaching assignments.

K. Alnwick replied that he and the timetabling staff are aware that too many eight o'clock's for one faculty member or for one cohort of students can be a problem and this problem will be addressed as effectively as it can be in the upcoming timetabling.

C. Zamaria expressed concern that certain idiosyncratic local issues may not be addressed effectively because of lack of feedback channels.

K. Alnwick responded that as Registrar he really has to rely upon the academic administrative structure for feedback on timetabling issues. He urged Professor Zamaria to draw whatever specific concerns he has about scheduling in Radio and Television Arts to his attention through the Chair of the Department.

J. Trubic asked whether there would be some opportunity for review of timetables before they are actually published.

K. Alnwick replied that it is his intention that Chairs and Academic Directors will have an opportunity to look at a penultimate form of the timetables and to address a limited number of issues in that stage of the process. He noted that he expects timetables to be ready for review sometime in the week of December 8th.

R. Kapp asked with respect to the fourth objective identified for timetabling at Ryerson, what progress can be made on improving the scheduling as a function of Ryerson's contractual obligation to facilitate the research portion of a faculty members workload.

K. Alnwick replied that the schedulers attempt to act on any requests for this kind of support that are put forward by the Chairs.

M. Koc acknowledged that the Registrar faces serious structural problems in carrying out the scheduling responsibility. He asked whether Ryerson is helping the Registrar to produce better timetables by trying to eliminate any structural impediments to that outcome.

D. Mock replied that first of all he is impressed with the degree to which timetabling has been able to improve its response to student requests to register in particular courses. He stated that he regards the timetabling objective of making sure that students have access to courses they must take for graduation and of having the highest possible level of success in obtaining places in courses which are electives as objectives which should, indeed must, be maintained. He said that the biggest structural problem with the

scheduling relates to the fact that we have between 30 and 40 academic programs with highly defined curricula. There is among these many programs some overlap. We are looking at opportunities to reduce the overlap because this should lead to improved timetabling ability.

D. Elder, who represents CUPE 3904 on Academic Council, asked for clarification of the university's policy on CUPE members involvement in research with university support.

M. Dewson replied that the formal arrangement is that the role of members of CUPE 3904 is defined as being limited to teaching under the Collective Agreement.

R. Haines asked for clarification of a term used by the President in his presentation. That term is "corridor".

At the President's request, D. Mock replied. He said that under government policy for funding university education each university has a defined range of student enrolment which will be considered eligible for funding purposes. The current funding mid-point for Ryerson is 12,180 FTE students but will increase as "New Money" is rolled into our base. The level of funding for this cohort of students will remain constant through enrolment shifts of 3% up and 3% down, a total of 6%. If the enrolment were to rise above the 3% ceiling, no additional grants would be paid, although grants could be reduced if enrolment were to fall more than 3% below the corridor mid-point.

He also noted that some universities have transferred enrolments from the undergraduate to the postgraduate level to take advantage of the significantly higher income generated by graduate level enrolments.

### **3. Minutes of the November 4, 1997 Meeting**

The President resumed the chair.

It was duly moved and seconded that the minutes be adopted as circulated.

With reference to the minutes of the report of the SRC committee, M. Bardecki pointed out that M. Foster, not being a member of Council was not eligible to move the motions on page 8 of the minutes.

The Chair acknowledged that and asked Council if it would agree to the substitution of an eligible mover at this meeting. Council agreed and L. Harrison was designated as the mover of the two motions regarding the SRC report on page 8 of the minutes.

M. Morrisey noted that she should have been shown as having been present at the meeting.

Secretary's Note: The motion that Academic Council approve the proposed policy on Centres at Ryerson as appended to the agenda of this meeting [November 4, 1997] should be shown in the minutes as having been CARRIED.

### **4. Business arising out of the minutes**

There was no business arising out of the minutes.

### **5. Correspondence**

The Chair drew the attention of the meeting to the Report of the Working Group on the Access Centre, which had been circulated for information.

There was no discussion of the report.

The President thanked L. Grayson and other members of the Working Group for their efforts on behalf of students at Ryerson who require the services of the Access Centre.

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

D. Mock took Council through the items in the agenda for this portion of the meeting. All the information in this section of the meeting was received for information. E. Aspevig noted that on page 23, in information respecting a Spanish course, that the mode of teaching should have been shown as laboratory rather than lecture.

**7. Reports of Committees**

A. Report #131 of the Academic Standards Committee

D. Mock presented this report.

1. Proposed Revisions to the Public Administration Curriculum.

It was moved by D. Mock and seconded by M. Morrise that

Academic Council approve the proposed revisions to the B.A.A. program in Public Administration.

In speaking to the motion D. Mock congratulated all those involved in developing this proposal for its excellent quality.

CARRIED.

2. Proposed certificate in Interdisciplinary Studies in Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Management.

It was moved by D. Mock and seconded by C. Sam Foh that

Academic Council endorse the academic quality of the proposed Certificate in Interdisciplinary Studies in Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Management.

C. Sam Foh asked for an explanation of why there is no finance course in the core requirements for the proposed certificate.

C. Cassidy replied that the range of courses in the program came out of the surveys and round table discussions convened to help determine the optimum content. Three of the four core courses are considered basic to the certificate program. The critical issues course, among the core courses, is essential for integration of the material in the basic courses.

Professor Meinhard added that a finance module is included in a key required course.

C. Sam Foh asked for clarification of the optimum sequence by which students should take courses in the certificate. C. Cassidy replied that students, in her experience, are best served by advice but not by directives because of the pattern of offering of courses and the kinds of personal commitments that students in this certificate are likely to have.

The motion CARRIED.

B. Report of the Ad/Hoc Committee which addressed certain questions regarding the policy on Appointments in the Academic Administration (Reedyk).

Committee co-chairs Dan McIntyre of the Board of Governors and Dr. Anne Kittler from Academic Council presented this report.

In the presentation of the report, D. McIntyre spoke initially. He expressed thanks to his colleagues on the committee. Initially it was thought that the committee might be able to wrap up this work in 2 or 3 meetings but the fact is the work took 11 meetings to complete.

He then proceeded through the report systematically.

With respect to the recommendation that the position of Registrar be removed from the purview of the Reedyk report, it was noted that the committee's view is that this position should be treated in the same way as other senior positions in the administration and not like a term appointment in the academic administration.

With respect to the recommendation on guidelines for performance appraisal and development, he reported that the committee discussed this issue at sufficient length to determine that the present system is flawed, and significant effort needs to be made to develop a more appropriate system. Accordingly the committee has made a recommendation that a separate committee be struck to address this issue.

The essential thrust of recommendations regarding search committees for Chairs and Academic Directors and the Chief Librarian is that the membership of search committees based on the Reedyk report be reduced. The idea of reducing the size of the search committee is to make it easier to schedule and hold meetings when all members can be present. There is no intention in the recommendations of the committee that the balance be shifted, that was not the purpose.

C. Zamaria asked whether the committee had done comparisons with other universities on the composition of their search committees.

The reply was that there is no clear pattern in other universities, although it appeared that the numbers in search committees in Ryerson tend to be larger than most.

C. Zamaria replied that insofar as the recommendations called for reduction of the numbers of faculty and or students on search committees, the reductions may not be appropriate.

In subsequent discussion, initiated by E. Aspevig it was confirmed that the proposed size of the Chair and Chief Librarian search committees involves a reduction of one member in each.

With reference to the provision of an appointee from outside the department in the case of the Chair/Director search M. Miller asked whether this position would be filled by a decanal appointment.

This was confirmed.

D. Shaw expressed concern about the proposed composition of the search committee for Chair and for the Chief Librarian. She argued that it would be better to have two students rather than to have one proposed, since students would likely find it easier to discuss options among themselves.

In response to a question from E. Friesen it was confirmed that in the section on the Chief Librarian search, the wording on members from the library was inadvertently changed. The wording in the final proposal will specify that Librarians elect Librarians from among themselves.

L. Altrows commented that by his calculation a Chair could be selected at Ryerson with only one faculty member of a search committee in support of that appointment.

A. Kittler confirmed that was the case.

R. Haines expressed the view that under the proposal the Dean has far too much control.

R. Kapp agreed. He said that the idea that a Chair of a Department could in effect be imposed by a Dean is just inappropriate and this aspect of the proposal is fraught with difficulties.

D. McIntyre replied that the search process, as a matter of principle according to previously approved policy at Ryerson, is to be advisory. Yet in previous forms of the policy what amounts, in effect, to a veto power for the search committee violates that principle. The proposal before Council regarding the Deans final decision making authority is consistent with the principle of the advisory status of search committees.

C. Sam Foh argued that there should be an explicit provision for representation from part-time students in these processes.

R. Kapp raised the issue of the possibility of a conflict between the suggested revisions to the "Reedyk" policy and the RFA contract. Specifically, under the RFA contract tenure appointments can only be made on the basis of recommendations of Departmental Appointment Committees.

W. Cukier expressed concern with the proposal that the Dean has the capacity to override the majority vote of search committee in the case of a search for a Chair or Academic Director.

D. McIntyre suggested that the override situation would be most unlikely to arise. A more likely scenario would be difference in opinion within the search committee, with small differences as the basis for that difference of opinion.

W. Cukier added the comment that it seems to her inappropriate to make policy to deal with exceptional circumstances.

D. Shaw commented that it is obvious that there are a number of problems with proposals before Council

and she suggested that the committee take its proposals back for reconsideration.

C. Zamaria, said that he appreciates the work the committee has put in, but, he does not support the thrust of the committee's proposals, in particular, because they simply make things more convenient for the Dean or the Vice President, Academic, rather than improving the quality of the process.

J. Sandys suggested that the committee consider adding a student member to the Chair/Academic Director and Chief Librarian search committees and that it be specified that the outside chair be elected rather than appointed.

R. Kapp suggested that the legal questions he had raised earlier really need to be addressed before any further consideration of proposals before Council.

M. Dewson commented that as a matter of law, provisions of the Collective Agreement would take precedence over university policy.

D. McIntyre thanked members of Council for the discussion and feedback. He indicated that it would be the intention of the review committee now to take into account the comments of Academic Council and to move forward with recommendations to the Board.

C. Report #4 of the Open College Committee

This was presented by M. Maskow for information.

She stated to Council how pleased she was once again bringing information to Council about new course developments at Open College. The financial difficulties that CJRT-FM Inc. has experienced in the last several years have made such new initiatives impossible until just recently.

#### **8. New Business**

There was no new business.

#### **9. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.