

RYERSON UNIVERSITY

AGENDA

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday, May 6, 2003

5:30 p.m. A light dinner will be served in The Commons, Jorgenson Hall, Room A-250.

6:00 p.m. Meeting in The Commons.

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| Pages 1-2 | 1. President's Report
1.1 Achievement Report
1.2 Presentation – Student Survey (Paul Stenton & Stephen Onyskay) |
| Pages 3-5 | 2. Report of the Secretary of Academic Council (#W2003-5)

3. The Good of the University |
| Pages 6-14 | 4. Minutes of the April 1, 2003 Meeting

5. Business arising out of the Minutes
5.1 Discussion of Academic Plan – Revised Draft

6. Correspondence

7. Reports of Actions and Recommendations of Departmental and Divisional Councils |
| Pages 15-17 | 7.1 From Engineering:
- Course additions/deletions in Electrical & Computer Engineering

- Course additions/deletions in Civil Engineering (<i>Addendum</i>)

- Report - <i>Organizational Restructuring in the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science</i>

Motion #1: <i>That Academic Council approve the restructuring of the Mechanical, Aerospace and Industrial Engineering Department to form two separate departments: (1) “The Department of Mechanical & Industrial Engineering”; and (2) “The Department of Aerospace Engineering”.</i>

Motion #2: <i>That Academic Council approve the restructuring of the Department of Chemistry, Biology and Chemical Engineering to form two separate departments: (1) “The Department of Chemistry & Biology”; and (2) “The Department of Chemical Engineering”.</i> |
| Pages 18-19 | 7.2 School of Graduate Studies (<i>Addendum</i>):
- Correction to course code in Chemical Engineering (from EN8912 to EN8910) |

- Pages 20-22 **8. Reports of Committees**
8.1 Composition & By-Laws Committee (Report #W2003-3):

 Motion #1: *That Academic Council approve the By-Laws of the Hospitality and Tourism Management School Council.*
- Pages 23-24 8.2 Nominating Committee (Report #W2003-4):

 Motion #1: *That Academic Council approve the nominations for standing committee membership as presented in this report.*
- Pages 25-35 8.3 Learning & Teaching Committee (Report #W2003-1)

 Motion #1: *That Academic Council approve the revised Policy 135, Examination Policy, as attached.*
- Pages 36-40 8.4 Academic Standards Committee (Report #W2003-3):

 Motion #1: *That Academic Council approve the periodic program review as conducted by the School of Business Management.*
- Page 41 **9. New Business**
9.1 Name change from “Learning Resource Centre” to “Library”
- 10. Adjournment**

RYERSON UNIVERSITY ACHIEVEMENT REPORT

For the May, 2003 meeting of Academic Council

Covering Diversity, a course developed in 1997 to teach Journalism students about covering racial and ethnic groups and issues, won the Canadian Race Relations Foundation Award of Excellence First Prize, in a field of 20 nominees from across the country. The prize included \$10,000, which will be used to update the course website.

Events

Fifty-seven graduating students received Dennis Mock Leadership Awards at a ceremony April 4. Student Services held a ceremony in March to distribute its Student Services Leadership Certificates and Awards. About 140 students earned Certificates and 12 were named Award-winners in the program that develops leadership and management skills.

The 55th annual athletic awards banquet was held April 2. Kathy Ann Grizzle, basketball, was named female athlete of the year; John Reid, also from basketball, was named male athlete of the year. A reception was held April 3 for intramural athletes, and President Lajeunesse hosted a luncheon April 7 for graduating athletes and award winners.

The Heidelberg Centre – School of Graphic Communications Management was officially opened April 7 at a ceremony and reception to recognize those who have supported the construction of the new home for GCM.

The annual School of Fashion show featuring design student collections, *Mass Exodus*, was held at the Ryerson Theatre April 9.

President **Claude Lajeunesse** welcomed participants at a training event for trade commissioners and public officials assisting the arts and cultural sector, held at Oakham House April 2. He also delivered welcoming remarks at the Association of Business Communicators conference held in Toronto April 4 at the Westin Harbour Castle. Ryerson faculty were involved in organizing the conference and a number of faculty presented papers or moderated panel discussions.

Special events were held for Ryerson alumni living in and around London, Ontario (April 11) and Ottawa (April 14). The Ottawa event was held at the National Gallery, which currently is displaying the works of Ryerson grad and photographer Edward Burtynsky. Mr. Burtynsky attended the event.

Jack Layton delivered the annual Phyllis Clarke Memorial Lecture March 24 at Ryerson, on "Making Politics Matter."

Author Pierre Berton was at Ryerson March 21 to read from his latest book, *The Joy of Writing*.

Media Coverage

A number of Ryerson faculty experts appeared in local and national media commenting on various aspects of the war in Iraq. They included:

Vince Carlin, chair of Journalism, appeared on 680 News and CBC radio stations in Ottawa, St. John's, Regina, Whitehorse, and Charlottetown discussing media coverage of the war.

Suanne Kelman of Journalism was quoted in the *Ottawa Citizen* and other CanWest papers on media coverage of the conflict. She commented in the *Globe and Mail* April 9 about the use of amateur photographs and video, and again in the *Globe* April 10 about how panelists on news shows are treated differently depending on their political perspective. She appeared on ROB TV's *Bottom Line* March 24 and April 14 discussing coverage of the war, as well as CP24's *Opening Bell* and Citypulse News.

Joe Zboralski of Politics was interviewed in CP24 about the causes of the conflict. He was a featured guest commentator on *InvestorCanada.com*, discussing the ramifications of the war and what is to follow.

Mustafa Koc of Sociology appeared on CBC television's national program *Counterspin*, discussing the aftermath of the war. He was also on CP24's *Talk TV* March 20.

Greg Inwood of Politics appeared on TVO's *Studio 2* program to talk about the provincial NDP's recently released campaign platform.

Vice President Academic **Errol Aspevig** appeared on CBC, Global, and CFTO discussing Ryerson's response to the SARS situation.

Tim Sly, director of Occupational and Public Health, commented in the April 6 *Toronto Star* on how Toronto public health officials are responding to SARS. He also appeared on CBC radio's national program, *The Current*, to talk about why Toronto has been so severely hit by SARS compared to the rest of the country.

Mitchell Kosny, Urban and Regional Planning, was quoted in the *Toronto Star* April 15 on the proliferation of outdoor cafes and restaurant patios in Toronto.

The official Ryerson chair, designed by Interior Design graduate **Agata Jaworski**, was featured in a story that appeared in the April 7 *Globe and Mail*.

Myer Siemiatycki of Politics commented on CBC's *Canada Now* March 4 on the annual city budget, particularly the increase in funding for the police. He was also quoted in the *National Post* on March 11 on the salaries of political leaders.

The launch of a website for aspiring screenwriters, rcc.ryerson.ca/drama, by RTA Chair **Robert Gardner**, was covered in *Playback* magazine's March issue.

Tammy Landau of Justice Studies appeared on CBC television's *Canada Now* April 3 to discuss the leadership of the Toronto Police Association.

Comments by **Peter Duck** of Fashion to Canadian Press about Avril Lavigne were carried in newspapers across the country. Prof. Duck gave his opinion on the fashions of the pop superstar and the trends she might be establishing.

Marsha Barber of Journalism was a panelist on the CBC show *Inside Media* in March to discuss the role of women in the media.

Report of the Secretary of Academic Council
W2003-5
May 6, 2003

1. Academic Council Calendar – attached
 - a. Academic Council Meetings
 - b. Faculty Course Surveys
 - c. Academic Council Elections
2. The following changes were made to the Policy on *Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals* based on the instructions from Academic Council at the April 1 meeting to consider the length of time required for an appeal response and the ability of students to have options for the receipt of appeals decisions. This impacted two sections of the policy (IID1.n and IID2.d): It also includes the friendly amendment to clarify who the respondent is at the Academic Council level of appeal (Section IID3.d.2).

Section IID1.n

From April 1 document: Students must receive a written response within ten (10) working days of the receipt of the appeal by the department/school. The result of the appeal will be deemed to have been received by the fifth working day following the postmark date on the envelope. Students are responsible for contacting the department/school if they have not received a response in the specified time period.

Revised version: The department/school must respond to the student, in writing, within ten (10) working days of the receipt of the appeal. The letter must clearly state the basis on which the decision was reached. Students should indicate if they wish to pick up the decision in person or have the decision e-mailed, faxed or sent by mail. If the appeal decision is mailed, it will be deemed to have been received by the fifth working day following the postmark date on the envelope. Students are responsible for contacting the department/school if they have not received a response in the specified time period.

Section IID2.d

From April 1 document: Students must receive a written response within ten (10) working days of the receipt of the appeal by the Dean. The letter must clearly state the basis on which the decision was reached. The result of the appeal will be deemed to have been received by the fifth working day following the postmark date on the envelope. Students are responsible for contacting the Dean's office if they have not received a response in the specified time period. The Dean's office must send copies of the decision to the instructor, the Chair/Director, the Registrar and the Secretary of Academic Council.

Revised version: The Faculty must respond to the student, in writing, within ten (10) working days of the receipt of the appeal. The letter must clearly state the basis on which the decision was reached. Students should indicate if they wish to pick up the decision in person or have the decision e-mailed, faxed or sent by mail. If the appeal decision is mailed, it will be deemed to have been received by the fifth working day following the postmark date on the envelope. Students are responsible for contacting the Dean's office if they have not received a response in

the specified time period. The Dean's office must send copies of the decision to the instructor, the Chair/Director, the Registrar and the Secretary of Academic Council.

Section IID3.d.2

From April 1 document: immediately forward the appeal to the Chair/Director who shall be the respondent, and who shall reply to the appeal within five (5) working days of receipt, including any documents to be submitted as evidence. The Registrar must also receive a copy of the appeal.

Revised version: immediately forward the appeal to the Chair/Director and, if applicable, the Department/School Appeals Officer or the Chair of the Department/School Appeals Committee. The Chair/Director shall, upon receipt, inform the Secretary of Academic Council who shall be the respondent. The respondent shall reply to the appeal, in writing, to the Secretary of Academic Council within five (5) working days of receipt, including any documents to be submitted as evidence. The Registrar must also receive a copy of the appeal.

3. Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct - After consideration of the discussion at the April 1 meeting concerning the change (in section F2) of the phrase "frivolous, vexatious or trivial" allegations to "false" allegations, it was decided to leave the phrase as it is. The entire policy will be reviewed at a later date.
4. Special Meeting of Academic Council – A special meeting of Academic Council will be held on Tuesday, May 27, from 12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. in A-250, to consider approval of the final draft of the Academic Plan. Lunch will be served.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL CALENDAR 2003-2004

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETINGS

MEETING DATE	AGENDA DEADLINE
Tuesday, October 7	Tuesday, September 16
Tuesday, November 4	Tuesday, October 21
Tuesday, December 2	Tuesday, November 18
Tuesday, January 13	Friday, December 19
Tuesday, February 3	Tuesday, January 20
Tuesday, March 2	Tuesday, February 17
Tuesday, April 6	Tuesday, March 23
Tuesday, May 4	Tuesday, April 20

FACULTY COURSE SURVEYS

FALL 2003	
FCS Detail lists to Departments	Tuesday, September 16
FCS Detail lists returned to Secretary of Academic Council by	Tuesday, September 23
FCS Forms delivered to departments	Wednesday, October 22
FCS Administered	November 3-21
FCS Forms returned to Secretary of Academic Council by	Monday, December 1
Reports to departments	Friday, January 23
WINTER 2004	
FCS Detail lists to Departments	Monday, January 19
FCS Detail lists returned to Secretary of Academic Council by	Friday, February 13
FCS Forms delivered to departments	Friday, March 5
FCS Administered	March 15- April 2
FCS Forms returned to Secretary of Academic Council by	Friday, April 19
Reports to departments	Friday, May 28

ACADEMIC COUNCIL ELECTIONS

Nominations open	Monday, January 26
Student candidate orientation	Monday, February 2
Nominations close	Wednesday, February 4
Names of nominees forwarded to Dean	Thursday, February 5
Ballots distributed to departments	Wednesday, February 11
Absentee ballots available	Thursday- Friday, February 12-13
Election Day	Monday February 16
Tallied votes to Dean	Wednesday, February 18
Results to Secretary of Academic Council	Friday, February 20

MINUTES OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
Tuesday, April 1, 2003

Members Present:

C. Lajeunesse	S. Boctor	F. Salustri
K. Alnwick	M. Booth	R. Kup
E. Aspevig	C. Cassidy	S. Marshall
M. Dewson	L. Grayson	R. Walshaw
T. Knowlton	I. Levine	J. Cook
C. Matthews	L. Merali	M. Yeates
A. Tam	S. Cody	D. McKessock
M. Barber	R. Rodrigues	A. Cross
V. Berkeley	D. Snyder	K. Marciniac
M. Dowler	M. Potter	E. Trott
M. Mazerolle	G. Meti	J. Monro
A. Pevec	D. Smith	L. Lum
A. Lohi	J. Welsh	D. Heyd
K. Raahemifar	J. Dianda	D. Elder
M. Koc	D. Martin	S. Kumar
G. Roberts-Fiati		

Regrets:

J. Sandys
S. Williams (S. Wilson attended)
B. Jackson (S. Giles attended)
G. Turcotte
K. Tucker Scott
C. DeSouza
R. Ravindran

Members Absent:

M. Creery	R. Dutt
A. Furman	S. Sutherland
M. McCrae	
G. Inwood	
S. Kumar	
P. George	
M. Verticchio	
B. Yoon	

1. President's Report

President Lajeunesse reported that the following Honorary Doctorates had been approved by the Awards & Ceremonials Committee for Spring 2003:

Business - Isadore Sharp, Joey & Toby Tanenbaum

Engineering - Fraser Mustard, Linda Hasenfratz

Arts & Community Services - Roberta Jamieson, Bonnie Sherr Klein

Communication & Design – Glenn Pushelberg & George Yabu, Richard Wright.

The President reported on highlights from the Ontario budget, including the establishment of a \$75M Quality Assurance Fund. This fund will grow to \$200M by 2006-07. This will help Ryerson meet inflationary costs. The government also committed to full student funding. There is an allocation of \$400M for phase 2 of the Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Fund for bursary assistance. There is \$40M for facilities renewal, which includes \$1.2 M for Ryerson, and a commitment to consider a multi-year budget, which will allow for better planning. This year Ryerson received almost \$0.5 M from the Graduate Accessibility Fund.

All of the unions at Ryerson have signed a joint letter to the Minister of Colleges and Universities outlining Ryerson's priorities to the government, which include funding of unfunded students and new buildings. The community leaders who signed the letter were thanked.

The Board of Governors has elected Michael Guerriere to serve as its new Chair. The Board has also passed new By-Laws which have been modernized to recognize new needs.

The President met with Howard Hampton, the leader of the NDP party, concerning Ryerson's funding priorities.

Vice President Errol Aspevig was asked to give an update on SARS (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome). He reported that there are Ryerson students in Hong Kong attending universities which were closed. These students were assured that if they wished to return to Canada, Ryerson would deal with academic issues and they would not be penalized. Nursing and CE students have been affected in that some instruction takes place in hospitals. No students are currently diagnosed with SARS and there will be no academic penalties for the voluntary quarantine.

The Vice President also gave an update on the academic planning process. There were a number of consultations with Planning and Priorities Advisory Committee, and the Academic Planning Group (APG), six with the community and one with the Academic Administrators Group. As a result of these, the thinking on the plan has evolved. A number of people wanted to see a more concrete plan. A supplement was finalized yesterday and is on the VP, Academic website. There will be further consultations on that supplement. The RFA executive group will meet with the VP, Academic on April 14; there is a meeting with the Council of the School of Graduate Studies on April 2, and the APG briefly discussed the document. There will be other consultations in the next few weeks, and a discussion paper will be brought to the May Academic Council meeting. There will probably be a special meeting of Academic Council late in May or early in June to consider approval of the plan. Members are invited to respond to the current supplement.

A member expressed concern that the SARS situation might result in a wide-reaching quarantine during final exams. The Vice President responded that the SARS situation has been unfolding

quickly and Ryerson responses were in keeping with recommendations from authorities. Contingency plans will be developed concerning final exams, although there is no anticipation of a problem.

2. Report of the Secretary of Academic Council

2.1 The Secretary reported that the *Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct* would be renumbered Policy 61, as it was separated from the Policy 60, the *Student Code of Academic Conduct*, which was revised at the March meeting. The Non-Academic Code has not been reviewed, but has been updated to change the titles of positions and offices and to make the appeals to Academic Council consistent with the Academic Code. It was noted that section G5a, in the version of the policy included in the agenda, should have been deleted.

Discussion: Corrections were made to paragraph E7. Paragraph “3” should read paragraph “5”. It was also noted that the statement in section F2 had been changed from: “The Director will consider frivolous, vexatious and trivial claims” to “The Director will consider false claims”. There was discussion about the changing of the language and the possible difference in meaning between the different terminologies. There were no motions to amend the proposed language.

The Secretary reported that section 2.2.2 of Policy 46 – *Policy on Grading Promotions and Academic Standing (GPA Policy)* was to be updated to include the DEF (Deferred) grade which was approved as part of the Student Code of Academic Conduct.

Policy 75 – *Recommendations of the Special Committee on Student Complaints* was removed as policy as, after consultation with the Learning & Teaching Committee, the Director of Student Services, the Deans and The Vice Presidents, it was determined that all of the recommendations had been completed.

2.2 A statement of Students’ Rights and Responsibilities was presented, which was a compilation of: the preamble of the Student Code of Academic Conduct that had been replaced at the March meeting, the existing rights and responsibilities found in the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct, and a few new items, are listed. It was noted that the responsibility for the maintenance of a Ryerson e-mail account should read:

- Obtain and maintain a Ryerson University e-mail account *if you are a full or part-time undergraduate or graduate student.*

The statement will be published in the *Student Guide*.

Motion: That Academic Council approve the *Statement of Students’ Rights and Responsibilities* Moved by J. Monro, seconded by D. Martin.

Discussion:

A faculty member commented that the rights listed are about claims students can make against the university, but the responsibilities do not include student academic responsibilities. Another faculty member commented that there is an imbalance in the rights and responsibilities and that there should be an obligation to read and know the content of a course outline as a contract. The Registrar explained that when the rights and responsibilities were originally written they were done in the context of the Code of Conduct.

The VP, Academic commented that what is presented is a collection of things which have already been accepted with some small changes. The list is not an exhaustive list. He proposed a friendly amendment to add the wording “*Among* the rights and *among* the responsibilities are the following.” This was accepted by the mover and seconder.

A member suggested that a one paragraph introduction be given to items submitted for consideration. The Secretary indicated that an overview of the Rights & Responsibilities was included in her report.

There was discussion about “the right to complain without fear of reprisal”. It was believed that this should include respect for confidentiality. One member argued that there is a right to know who is making a complaint.

A member of the audience asked for clarification about the payment of fees as related to the use of facilities. It was clarified that fees for particular activities must be paid.

A student member asked for clarification of the right to “a learning environment that, while safeguarding dissent, is free from interference and disruption”. It was clarified that this referred to illegal activities.

Motion approved.

3. The Good of the University

A member observed that a motion was passed at the May, 2002 meeting asking that Composition & By-Laws Committee consider ways to include librarians and CE program directors as members of Academic Council. He believed there had been considerable support for inclusion of librarians and CE program directors at that time. The President responded that this would require amendment of the Ryerson Act and that the committee had not yet revisited the issue. The Secretary will schedule a meeting of the Committee as soon as possible. It was requested by the Chief Librarian that there at least be a continuance of the non-voting member status of a librarian.

A Social Work student from the audience commented that students in his program have four final exams in a row, all at 8:00 a.m. He suggested that multiple-choice exams could be scheduled later in the exam period.

It was requested that all reformatted policies show the changes which have been made. The Secretary commented that documents with mark-up are extremely confusing to read.

A student commented that *The Toronto Star* had reported that *The Ryerson Review of Journalism* may be eliminated. This publication is considered a vital publication for the School. The Dean of Communication and Design agreed and noted that when the *Review* lost its external sponsor, he had provided it with support. The issue is the overall finances of the School of Journalism.

It was announced that the fashion show is going to be in A250 this weekend, and Mass Exodus will be next week.

There was a question concerning the lack of street lights on Gould Street as well as unsafe lighting conditions at Victoria and Dundas. The VP, Administration responded that the lighting on Dundas has been brought to the attention of PenEquity and they have responded that they will address the issue. She will bring the lighting on Gould to the attention of the city.

4. Minutes of the March 4, 2003 Meeting

Motion to approve by M. Dowler, seconded by L. Merali.

Motion approved.

5. Business arising out of the Minutes

5.1 Motion: That Academic Council approve the policy on *Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals* as amended (Policy 134).

Moved by E. Aspevig, seconded by D. Martin.

The VP, Academic commented that at the March meeting there was a request for a review of the revised appeals policy and he concluded that, given the concerns about the two-level process by one Faculty, the three-level process should be retained with changes. The proposal for a two-level process may be returned to Council in two years. In that time matters which give rise to the large number of appeals in one area will be addressed. He had requested that the Secretary have the committee review the policy. The contributions of the committee are appreciated and not lost. The version of the policy which is presented reflects many improvements.

The Secretary reported on the changes.

- There had been a friendly amendment requested that the respondent at the Academic Council level be whoever had responded to the appeal at the department/school level, who might not necessarily be the Chair or Director.
- Departments/Schools and Faculties could establish Appeals Committees or utilize Appeals Officers, and could hold hearings.
- Grounds for appeals had been clarified.
- Appeals to Academic Council would be on the original grounds of the appeal, as there might not be a hearing at a lower level.
- Training would be required for anyone involved in the decision-making process.
- The necessity for students and faculty to deal with issues as soon as they arise is retained.

There was a discussion of IID.2.d and the ten-day receipt of a response from the Dean. The wording will be changed to: "Deans must respond within 10 working days...."

Friendly amendment – Students may choose to receive their response by e-mail or they could pick up the response in person. There is language in the section on responses from Academic Council which could be utilized.

Discussion:

- Not all students might be aware that e-mail is not confidential.
- There could be a box to check on the form indicating whether an e-mail response or personal receipt is preferred to a mailed response.

The President referred the policy to the committee to consider language about receipt of appeals responses.

There was a question about the placement of the appeals policy in the calendar. The Registrar responded that it will be published in the Student Guide. There was some concern that students be made aware to pick up their Student Guides.

Motion approved with the condition that wording be changed to reflect the above friendly amendment concerning student receipt of decisions.

5.2 Motion: That Academic Council amend the composition of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, established to review the feasibility of a Fall semester study period, to include a Dean and a representative from Continuing Education.

Moved by J. Cook seconded K. Marciniak.

There was a subsequent friendly amendment to include a librarian, which was accepted by the movers.

Motion approved.

6. Correspondence

The Secretary reported that the President had received a note of thanks from the Strathcona Tweedsmuir School for his expression of sympathy on the loss of their students in an avalanche.

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

The VP, Academic reported on the changes from Continuing Education. In addition, there was a distribution of a course change form from Interior Design.

There was a request for clarification of the name of the “Certificate in Marketing Management”. It was clarified that the name is in general usage in the discipline.

8. Reports of Committees

8.1 Report of the Composition & By-Laws Committee

D. Heyd reported and moved.

Motion 1: That Academic Council amend its By-Laws with respect to the Composition and Terms of Reference of the Academic Council Appeals Committee, formed to combine the current Academic Appeals Committee and the Student Discipline Committee.

Seconded by D. Martin

The Academic Appeals Committee and the Discipline Committee are being merged because the Discipline committee meets infrequently and, therefore, has little experience with appeals and hearings.

There is a friendly amendment that the Director of Student Services or Designate, who is a member of the current Academic Appeals Committee, be included as a member of the Academic Council Appeals Committee. This was accepted by the mover and the seconder.

Motion approved.

Motion 2: That Academic Council amend its By-Laws with respect to the composition of the Research Ethics Board as outlined in the report.
Seconded by D. Martin

Membership was tightened up to specifically allow the inclusion of a member with legal expertise.

Motion approved.

Motion 3: That Academic Council amend its By-Laws with respect to the composition of the Awards and Ceremonials Committee as outlined in the report.
Seconded by D. Martin

The motion corrects an oversight in the original composition to include the Registrar as an ex-officio non-voting member of the Awards & Ceremonials Committee

Motion approved.

Motion 4: That Academic Council approve the School of Retail Management School Council By-Laws.
Seconded by D. Martin

The voting in these By-Laws is unusual in that each faculty gets two votes and each student gets one. This is necessary because of the small number of faculty members and retains the proper ratio of voting rights to conform to Policy 45.

Motion approved.

8.2 Report of the Nominating Committee

A. Cross reported and moved.

Motion: That Academic Council approve the candidates elected as representatives for 2003-04.
Seconded by C. Cassidy.

Motion approved.

Motion: That Academic Council approve the nomination, as stated in the report, to complete an unfilled term on the Academic Standards Committee.

Ron Stagg is being nominated for this position.
J. Monro seconded.

Motion approved.

8.3 Academic Standards Committee Report

E. Aspevig moved and called on R. Goldsmith to present the report.
Seconded by K. Alnwick

Motion: That Academic Council approve the proposed degree completion program in Early Childhood Education, subject to the requirements proposed in the report.

A degree completion program is proposed for ECE graduates from George Brown College (GB). Students from colleges usually need extra courses prior to admission to a Ryerson program and must have a B- average. This presents a problem for students as they are not guaranteed admission even if they satisfy these requirements. The proposal deals with the issue of “seamless” progression into studies at Ryerson.

- Students admitted to the George Brown cohort must meet Ryerson admission standards
- Student will have to take three courses in addition to their diploma program.
- There will be Ryerson approved general education course requirements.

George Brown requires a 1.7 GPA to graduate. Therefore, students in the cohort who graduate with a 1.7 will be Ryerson students, but they are entering at a level where they would normally be considered “Conditional” students. This does not put them in a position to receive proper guidance. Therefore, students with a GPA below 2.0 will enter Ryerson on “Probation”.

Discussion:

- There was concern that other schools have higher requirements from George Brown. It was explained that this is the first collaboration of this particular sort. This is not just an agreement with an existing George Brown program. The program is adjusting its curriculum to fit Ryerson requirements.
- ECE has substantial experience with graduates of GB already upon which this agreement is based.
- At time when some programs will have a cut-off of 85% from high school, it was questioned why the Standards Committee would endorse students with a “Conditional” standing. It was explained that the committee is endorsing a program which is augmented by approved Ryerson courses and based on current success of GB students. The committee discussed the 1.7 GPA level at length, and while it would prefer that the GPA be 2.0, GB actually uses the more common model. The committee concluded that there is good academic reason to pursue the proposal.
- The advantage to Ryerson to accept students with a lower GPA was questioned. It was answered that a Ryerson student in third year with a 1.7 GPA would proceed.
- In the School of Business Management, as a general rule, students coming out of a community college are not successful without a 3.0 average. It was asked what the averages were of students from ECE who were successful at Ryerson. Dale Shipley, Director of the ECE program replied that the program replicates programs done at other universities and it meets guidelines set by CUCC. The program accepts GB students into the first year with the same requirements as the first year at Ryerson. The “seamless” movement is honoring the commitment to allow students to proceed in the same way as entering Ryerson students. There is competition with other collaborative ECE programs and Ryerson needs to remain on the cutting edge.
- It is important to remember that students with a 1.7 GPA represent a small number of students, and GB students at this level will be on probation.

Motion approved. (21 for, 10 opposed)

9. New Business

There is a problem in hearing the discussion in the gallery. It was suggested that people who fail to speak into the microphone be charged a loonie, increasing exponentially each time they fail to use the microphone.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Initiating School/Department: **Electrical & Computer Engineering**

Date of Submission: April 2003

Is this the Teaching School/Department, Program School/Department, or both? both

Please add extra rows as needed if multiple courses are involved.

Implementation Date: **Fall 2004**

(Signature on file)

April 22, 2003

Vice President, Academic

Date

Course Code/ Number	Course Title	Nature of Change (Use letters to indicate where provided)				Program(s) Affected	Purpose of Change	Minors Affected
		Hours and Mode	New Course (Y/N)	Re-position (R) Addition (A) Deletion (D)	Required (R) Elective (E)			
ELE718	Hardware Software Codesign Of Embedded System	3 Lect 2 Lab	Y	A	E	Electrical Engineering & Computer Engineering	Program Enhancement	None
ELE514	Advanced Electronics & I.C. Applications	3 Lect 3 Lab	Y	A	R	Computer Engineering	Program Enhancement	None
ELE504	Electronic Circuits II	3 Lect 3 Lab	N	D	R	Computer Engineering	Program Enhancement	None

Addendum: Civil Engineering

Initiating School/Department: Civil Engineering/Continuing Education Division

Date of Submission: May 02, 2003

Is this the Teaching School/Department, Program School/Department, or both? Program School
Please add extra rows as needed if multiple courses are involved.

Vice President, Academic

Date [illegible]

RYERSON UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCE
OFFICE OF THE DEAN

April 24, 2003

Dr. Errol Aspevig
VP, Academic

**Re: Restructuring of the Department of Chemistry, Biology and Chemical Engineering, and;
Restructuring of the Department of Mechanical, Aerospace and Industrial Engineering**

Dear Errol,

It is with great pleasure I endorse the restructuring of the department of Chemistry, Biology and Chemical Engineering to:

The Department of Chemical Engineering, and
The Department of Chemistry and Biology

An overwhelming majority approved this motion at the Departmental Council on February 7, 2003.

and;

The department of Mechanical, Aerospace and Industrial Engineering to:

The Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, and
The Department of Aerospace Engineering

An overwhelming majority approved this motion at the Departmental Council on February 20, 2003.

I strongly support and agree with the creation of these 'new' departments that will result in a win-win situation. I believe that the restructuring of the departments will lead to stronger and better quality undergraduate and graduate program offerings, thus supporting and enhancing Ryerson's and the Faculty's mandate and reputation as the premier university in providing career-oriented and professional programs' education.

Thank you for your continued support.

Sincerely,



Dr. Stal Boctor, P.Eng.
Dean

Addendum: School of Graduate Studies

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
CHEMICAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

TO: Dr. Diane Schulman
Secretary of the Academic Council

FROM: Dr. Ali Lohi
Director – Chemical Engineering Graduate Program

DATE: May 6th, 2003

RE: **CORRECTION TO COURSE CODE REFERENCE**

A course code was incorrectly referred to on the last Council submission, for course changes to the Chemical Engineering Graduate program. This table is shown on page 62 of the Academic Council Agenda for March 4, 2003 meeting. The reference of EN8912 was incorrect – the correct course code for Probability Statistics and Stochastic Processes is EN8910. Please find attached an amended Course Change Form.

Please contact me at ext. 7028 or e-mail alohi@ryerson.ca if there are any questions or concerns.

COURSE CHANGE FORM - 2**School of Graduate Studies****Graduate Program:** Chemical Engineering**Initiating School/Department:** Chemistry, Biology and Chemical Engineering, Dept. of**Approval of VP Academic:** _____
Dr. Errol Aspevig

Course Number	Course Title	Mark with "X"			Y/N	Credits	Programs Affected	Implement Date	Purpose of Change
		Amended	Deleted	Added	Required Elective?				
CE8213	Advanced Numerical Methods	X			Y	1	GHEP GHEN GHSC	Sept. 2003	To meet Chem Eng Grad program needs for program core course; the content of this core course is the same as EN8913
CE8139	Probability, Statistics & Stochastic Processes	X			Y	1	GHEP GHEN GHSC	Sept. 2003	To meet Chem Eng Grad program needs for program core course; the content of this core course is the same as EN8910 and is presently called ME8139

Report of the Composition & By-Laws Committee

#W2003-3

May 6, 2003

- A.** The Composition & By-Laws Committee met with Professor John Cook regarding the reconsideration of the creation of a position for a library representative on Academic Council. In its original report to Academic Council regarding the composition (Report #W2002-3, April 2, 2002) the committee stated the following:

While the Committee is sympathetic to the request to include a Librarian as an elected representative, it feels that there is no way this can be done under the current wording of the Ryerson Act. The Chief Librarian is specified as an ex-officio member of Academic Council. The increasingly important role of the Librarians in the University is being recognized in their inclusion on the standing committees of Academic Council where they are able to have input into areas vital to their role. In January, the Academic Council approved new terms of reference for the Academic Standards Committee and the SRC Committee, and these now include Library members. The Learning and Teaching committee also includes a Librarian.

The Committee has again determined that since librarians are not specified as members of Academic Council in the Ryerson Act, and since, as defined in the act, librarians are not “teaching faculty”, it is not possible to create a voting position for a librarian.

The Committee again recognizes that librarians have voting representation on Academic Council through the Chief Librarian, and that they have voting members on the Academic Standards Committee, the SRC Committee and the Learning & Teaching Committee.

The Committee strongly recommends that the library seek to establish an Academic Council Library Committee, which would report to, and make recommendations to, Academic Council. This is already the procedure for essentially all of the committees of Academic Council except the Nominating Committee and the Composition & By-Laws Committee, which are composed of members of Academic Council. The Learning & Teaching Committee, for example, is not specifically chaired by an Academic Council representative, nor do its members need to be Academic Council representatives. Yet this committee reports to Academic Council, has brought many issues to the floor of Academic Council for discussion and has developed policies which have been discussed and voted upon by Council.

Should the library wish to recommend the establishment of a standing committee of Academic Council for the library, as well as the constituency of that committee, the Composition & By-Laws Committee would be pleased to bring that recommendation to Academic Council for approval.

- B.** The committee reviewed the proposed By-Laws of the Hospitality and Tourism Management School Council (attached) and makes the following recommendation:

Motion: That Academic Council approve the By-Laws of the *Hospitality and Tourism Management School Council*.

Respectfully Submitted,

(signature on file)

Claude Lajeunesse, Chair, for the Committee

Greg Inwood, David Martin, Andrew Furman, Darrick Heyd, Ali Lohi, Diane Schulman

SCHOOL OF HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM MANAGEMENT
SCHOOL COUNCIL BY-LAWS

Passed and Approved by HTM School Council November 14, 2002

The function of the School Council of the School of Hospitality and Tourism Management shall be to approve curriculum changes as well as develop, recommend and approve policy relevant to the School in a manner which is consistent with the general policy of the University. Its function is also to establish two-way communication between Faculty and students, not just with student representatives.

1. a) Composition

The Council shall be composed of the Director of the School, all full-time members of the teaching faculty and one representative chosen by and from the sessional and part-time instructors of the School. There will be four student representatives elected from each year as determined by a mandatory course in each year. The school will inform all students at least one week in advance of the time and location of the representative votes for each year. To be elected or to serve on the Council, all student representatives must have, and maintain, a clear academic standing for the duration of their term.

If a student is unable to fulfill his/her Council obligations as determined by him/herself or by a majority vote of the Council, a new election to fill that position will be held.

b) Term of Office - Elections of Student Representatives

The term of office of student representatives will be for one academic year. Elections will be held within the first 30 days of the academic year. The School Council Elections Committee will announce the election procedures to students and conduct the election, during scheduled classes.

c) Voting

With the exception of student members, every Council member has one vote with the exception of the Chair of the Council who will only break ties. Voting cannot occur by proxy. The four student representatives elected from each year will have one block vote.

d) Responsibilities and Ethical Behaviour

A standard explanation of the responsibilities and ethical behaviours required of Council members is to be given to each member of the Council in September of each year to be signed and returned to the Chair signifying understanding of such responsibilities and behaviour.

2. Chair and Secretary of the Council

A member of the full-time faculty, or full-time faculty designate in the case of the Chair's absence, with or without a student as a co-chair and elected by the Council at its first meeting, shall act as Chairperson of the Council for one year. The Council may choose to elect one student as co-chair. The Chairperson shall be responsible for the conduct of all Council meetings. The Secretary of the Council shall be elected by and from the student members of the Council for one year.

3. Meetings of the Council

The Council shall meet at least once a semester at such times and places as the Chair determines. Additional meetings may be held upon recommendation of the Council, at the call of the Chair or by a request supported by a minimum of 1/4 of Council members. Such requests should be presented to the Chair.

4. Notices of Council Meetings

Notice in writing of a meeting of the Council with accompanying agenda and standing committee reports shall be distributed by the School to each Council member at least seven days before the date of the meeting. This information will be delivered electronically.

5. Quorum of Council Meetings

A quorum for a meeting of the Council shall be not less than 50% of its voting membership (excluding CUPE) and must maintain the membership proportions of Council.

6. Committees

The Council shall establish a subcommittee to consider curriculum and course development as it relates to the School and may establish such other subcommittees as may be thought necessary. Each subcommittee will elect its own Chair. Voting on each subcommittee shall reflect the provisions in 1.c) except in cases where there may be a conflict of interest. In such cases the excluded group must be provided with an opportunity to provide input.

7. Amendments

With prior notice the Council may revoke, amend or re-enact these by-laws by a two-thirds vote of the Council.

8. Enactment

All recommendations of standing and special committees shall be approved by the Council before being transmitted (except to Council members) or implemented. All recommendations by the Council which have significance and effect only within the School shall be submitted to the Director and Dean for approval and will then be reported by the Dean to Academic Council for its information. All recommendations which have extra-departmental ramifications shall be submitted to the Director and Dean for approval and then, where appropriate, brought by the Director to the Academic Standards Committee or Academic Council for discussion and approval.

In the event of a disagreement between the School Council and the Dean, or between the School Council and its Chair and Dean, the disagreement will be referred by the disputants to the Vice President, Academic. In the event of continuing disagreements, the matter shall be reported to the President for action. Should such a dispute have bearing on the academic policy of the University as a whole, the matter shall be reported to Academic Council upon its resolution.

Report of the Nominating Committee
W2003-4
May 6, 2003

Motion: That Academic Council approve the nominations for standing committee membership as presented in this report: (* indicates a re-nomination for an additional term)

Academic Standards Committee

Katherine Penny, Business (Hospitality & Tourism Management)
Ron Keeble, Community Services (Urban & Regional Planning)*
Ronald Stagg, Arts (History)
Bob Murray, Arts (Philosophy)
Lynda McCarthy, Engineering & Applied Science (Chemistry, Biology & Chemical Engineering Dept.)
Zouheir Fawaz, Engineering & Applied Science (Associate Dean, Student Affairs and Special Projects)
Kathy Gates, Community Services (Nursing)*
Mehmet Zeytinoglu, Engineering & Applied Science (Electrical Engineering)

Students:

Audrey Brozovic, Retail Management*
Leonard Kim, International Economics

Admissions Committee

Arthur Ross, Arts (Politics)*
Donald Dickinson, Communication & Design (Image Arts)*

Students:

Preet Singh, Retail Management*
Tasha Williams, International Economics*
Issa Guindo, Business Management*

Alumna:

Moirra Potter

Appeals Committee

Lillie Lum, Community Service (Nursing)*
Jo Kornegay, Arts, (Philosophy)*
Susan Laskin, Arts (Geography)
George Gekas, Business (Business Management)
Roy Morley, Business (Business Management)

Students:

Sean Marshall, Arts (Geography)*
Latif Merali, Business (ITM)*
Truc Nguyen, Communication & Design (Fashion)*
Vashti Campbell, Community Services (Social Work)
Austin Tam, Engineering & Applied Science (Computer Science)*
Ryan Rodrigues, Continuing Education*
Issa Guindo, Additional Student, (Business Management)*
Neda Felorzabihi, Graduate Student (Chemical Engineering)

Awards & Ceremonials

Maurice Mazerolle, Business (Business Management)
Tim Sly, Community Services (Occupational & Public Health)
Peter Luk, Business, (Director, Business Management)
Perry Schneiderman, Communication & Design (Chair, Theatre)
Ivor Shapiro, Communication & Design (Journalism)
Marilynn Booth, Dean, Continuing Education*
Desmond Glynn, Continuing Education (Arts Program Director)

Composition & By-Laws Committee

Michelle Dionne, Arts (Psychology)

Kaamran Raahemifar, Engineering & Applied Science (Electrical & Computer Engineering)

Students:

Benjamin Lewis, Image Arts

Moyeed Uddin Ahmed, Electrical & Computer Engineering

Learning & Teaching Committee

Alexandra Bal, Communication & Design (Image Arts)*

Lynda Cooper, Community Services (Nursing)

Students:

Zaker Khan, Business (Business Management)

Rebecca Nazareth, Community Services (Nutrition)

Moyeed Uddin Ahmed, Engineering & Applied Science (Electrical & Computer Engineering)

Stacey Mirowski, Continuing Education

Christopher Livett, Arts (Geography)

Truc Nguyen, Communication & Design (Fashion)

Nominating Committee

Michelle Dionne, Arts (Psychology)

Marsha Barber, Communication & Design (Journalism)

Carla Cassidy, Dean, Arts*

Gloria Roberts-Fiati, Community Services, (Early Childhood Education)

Students:

Benjamin Lewis, Image Arts

Christopher Livett, Geography

Alumni:

Jacob Gryn

Research Ethics Board

Susanne Williams, Community Services (Dean)*

Doug Clarke, Business Management

Alex Wellington, Arts (Philosophy)

Students:

David Golen, Business Management*

Community Member:

Geoff Arnold*

SRC Committee**Students:**

Vashti Campbell, Undergraduate Student (Social Work)

Mahdi Sabri, Graduate Student (Electrical and Computer Engineering)

Respectfully Submitted,

(signature on file)

Ava Cross, for the Committee:

Alex Pevec, Donna Smith, Gloria Roberts-Fiati, Kaamran Raahemifar,

Stalin Boctor, Carla Cassidy, Ken Marciniak, Christine DeSouza

Report of the Learning & Teaching Committee
W2003-1
May 6, 2003

The Learning & Teaching Committee has reviewed Policy 135, *Examination Policies & Procedures*. It has consulted with the Vice President, Academic, Registrar, the Academic Planning Group, and Computing & Communication Services.

The result of these discussions is the attached revised Policy 135, *Examination Policy*. It incorporates the following changes:

- Elements of the policy concerning appropriate conditions are now applied to all testing situations.
- The policy is divided into University, Department/School, Invigilator (and Gymnasium Invigilator) and student responsibilities.
- There are sections which contain Final Exam specific responsibilities.
- There are sections specifically on electronic examinations.
- There is a section outlining student accommodations
- Procedures for the cancellation and disruption of exams are outlined for both day and Continuing Education courses.

The sections of the revised policy which are new or somewhat revised are highlighted. (See the Student Guide or <http://www.ryerson.ca/~acadpol/current/pol135.pdf> for the current policy).

Motion: That Academic Council approve the revised Policy 135, *Examination Policy* as attached.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signature on file)

Sheila O'Neill, for the Committee:

Marion Creery
Rosemary Volpe
Wendy Freeman
Carolyn Johns
Diane Schulman
Donald McKay
Austin Tam

Don Kinder
Peter Walsh
David Martin
Kileen Tucker-Scott
Alexandra Bal
Kaamran Raahemifar
Vaughn Berkeley

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL

EXAMINATION POLICY

Policy Number: 135

Original Approval Date: December 7, 1999

Reviewed By: Learning & Teaching Committee

Approval Date: May 6, 2003

Responsible Office: Registrar

Preamble

This Policy deals with the infrastructure, invigilation responsibilities, student behaviour, and other aspects of the examination process for examinations held on campus. For purposes of this policy, “examination” is defined as a comprehensive form of testing for the purpose of assessing a student’s level of proficiency in some combination of the following domains: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. While the focus of this policy is final examinations, which are administered (or, in the case of take-home exams, due) outside the normal teaching term, the following basic principles should apply to all tests and examinations.

The framework of the Policy rests to a considerable extent on four principles.

1. The examination process, which is inherently stressful, should be managed in such a way as to minimize extraneous sources of confusion and uncertainty.
2. The examination environment in which examinations are conducted should be one in which students are able to concentrate, reflect, and generally demonstrate what they have learned, with a minimum of disruption and distraction.
3. The integrity of the examination process depends upon the willingness of everyone involved to respect some basic rules of conduct and to accept certain responsibilities, and to do so in a consistent manner.
4. Every effort must be made to ensure that the responsibilities, rules of conduct, and regulations governing the administration of examinations are well publicized so that the responsibilities of students, invigilators, schools and departments, and the University as a whole are clearly understood before the examination period begins.

This document is divided into distinct sections that outline responsibilities and roles of various stakeholders. Each section is divided into two subsets, the first entitled *General Policy*, outlines responsibilities and roles pertaining to all types of examinations, and the second, entitled *Final Exam Specific Responsibilities*, identifies additional responsibilities specific to the final exam process.

1. University Responsibilities

A. General Policy

The University has ultimate responsibility for the successful completion of the examination session, the maintenance of exam integrity, and for assisting students, departments, and invigilators to carry out their respective roles.

The University will:

1. develop and communicate clear policies and procedures to deal with examinations;
2. take action under the Student Code of Conduct in cases where examination policy is breached, whether by cheating, disruptive behaviour, or in any other way;
3. make every effort to ensure that examination rooms are supportive environments that:
 - a. are quiet and free from unnecessary and unreasonable disruption; and
 - b. are suitable in terms of temperature, work spaces, cleanliness, and configuration.
4. enforce the following policy as stated in the *Course Management Policy*: In the Fall and Winter semesters, the last week of classes and the subsequent Saturday and Sunday before the examination period are to be free of all tests and examinations. The same principle applies to Continuing Education courses and to courses taught in the spring/ summer term; that is to say, there are to be no tests or exams during the week preceding a final examination⁴.

B. Final Exam Specific Responsibilities

In addition to the responsibilities outlined in section IA, the University will:

1. where possible, provide space that ensures respect for the academic integrity of the exam by avoiding overcrowding;
2. provide students well before the examination period with clear knowledge of exam locations, times, and length;
3. make every effort to:
 - a. schedule exams as fairly as possible for each student across the available time frame;
 - b. ensure that students will not be required to write more than two exams in one calendar day (subject to exceptional circumstances);
4. take all practical measures to prevent the disruption of examinations;
5. post “quiet zone” posters near exam rooms and make every effort to ensure that no construction or disruptive routine maintenance takes place in the vicinity of examination rooms during the examination period;
6. maintain, as much as possible, security of fire alarm pull stations during final examination weeks for both day program and continuing education.

II. Department/School Responsibilities

A. General Policy

The teaching department/school has direct authority for the integrity and proper conduct of examinations held under its auspices. It is specifically responsible for:

1. establishing examination guidelines specific to subject areas and communicating them to all faculty and students(e.g., by including this information in faculty orientation and in handbooks);

2. with the assistance of the Dean, if necessary, designating “rovers” to provide backup and emergency assistance to invigilators. Rovers will be assigned to specific rooms or clusters of rooms across the campus, and will provide assistance to invigilators as required;
3. developing criteria and procedures for responding to petitions by students for makeup examination or other alternatives to the scheduled examination. The criteria and procedures are to be filed with the Dean of the Faculty. In general, when the student misses all or part of an examination through circumstances clearly beyond his/her control (e.g., verifiable health problems or personal emergencies), the department will arrange for an appropriate alternative. All alternatives must abide by this policy’s guiding four principles, and ensure that a designated Invigilator supervises students and that the makeup test or examination is conducted in an appropriate location. When an examination is missed for other reasons (e.g., inattention to exam schedule), the response is at the discretion of the teaching department. In the latter circumstance, supplemental privileges are not guaranteed;
4. disseminating and implementing best practice strategies for maintaining examination integrity in overcrowded situations;
5. insuring that, in accordance with the current course management policy, no examinations or tests are scheduled during the last week of classes.

B. Final Exam Specific Responsibilities

In addition to the responsibilities outlined in section IB, departments will:

1. provide at least one invigilator per 50 students and, wherever possible, at least two invigilators for each exam room. It is inappropriate to designate OPSEU staff except under extraordinary (i.e., emergency) circumstances, and then only with their express approval. Where an academic unit cannot provide sufficient invigilators, this to be drawn to the attention of the Dean well before the examination period commences;
2. ensure that all invigilators are familiar with the University’s Examination Policy and Procedures, all relevant departmental policies, and the Student Code of Conduct;
3. be responsible for all matters pertaining to examination papers: their accuracy; conformity with stated course management policies; ensuring that students know well before the exam its format, length, and permitted aids/resources; the printing of sufficient numbers; the security of exam papers until the exam time; and ensuring that exam papers are available and accessible on the day of exam;
4. ensure that a faculty or staff member is available to respond to emergencies at all times during which the department’s exams are being held.

C. Electronic Examination Department/School Responsibilities:

The Department or School must:

1. determine that an electronic exam has a very high probability of success before proceeding and must ensure that the examination is designed within the constraints of the electronic examination system;
2. make every effort, where electronic systems are used for examinations, to ensure that all aspects of the system will work correctly during the examination. Appropriate support staff (e.g., CCS or departmental technical staff) must be consulted to confirm and test that the systems resources required for the examination are available;

3. have support staff ensure, upon adequate notification from the Department or School regarding a scheduled electronic examination, that any regularly available computer resources to be used in the examination are in good working order and available during the exam;
4. provide a plan in case a system failure should occur (e.g., a second online exam that can be scheduled for a later date or a paper-based alternative). A plan for individual computer failure must also be in place (e.g., an extra computer or a paper-based alternative);
5. ensure that invigilators are properly prepared to invigilate an electronic exam. This includes:
 - a confirming that they are trained in the basic technical skills and have the account information required to be able to assist students to login and use the examination system;
 - b providing them with a procedure for timely communication with technical support staff should system problems arise;
 - c providing instructions regarding what applications and resources students are permitted to use on the workstations.
6. ensure that adequate technical support is available prior to and during any tests or examinations using computing resources, CCS or other technical support staff must be advised of any requirements with sufficient notice. For final exams, faculty must indicate the electronic requirement on the Ryerson final examination scheduling form;
7. ensure that course outlines contain necessary information concerning the computing resources which students must have in order to take an electronic exam;
8. ensure that faculty notify students a minimum of two weeks prior to the examination date of any computing resources (e.g., individual accounts on system, specific applications, file space, etc.) that will be required during the exam. Students should be provided with appropriate procedures for ensuring their access to the required resources;
9. where possible, enforce system restrictions on the computing resources available to students by an online examination, and not rely upon students' willingness to comply with written or verbal instructions (e.g., using a firewall to restrict website access or removing software not required for the examination);
10. where possible, physically separate workstations in such a way as to make it difficult for students to see what other students are doing.;
11. ensure that faculty notify the library when licensed data will be used for examination purposes.

III. Invigilator Responsibilities

Invigilators are normally faculty members designated by the teaching Department/School or Faculty. In some circumstances, other qualified individuals may be designated by departments/schools or Faculties to assist with invigilation duties.

A. General Policy

The role of an invigilator is to supervise students at an examination. To this end, an invigilator's general responsibilities are to:

1. see that an examination commences, is conducted, and concludes in an orderly and timely manner in accordance with the University's Examination Policy and Procedures, the Student Code of Conduct, and relevant departmental policies;
2. make every effort to safeguard that the integrity of the examination is respected;
3. maintain vigilance at all times. (e.g., not attending to other tasks during the exam).
4. ensure that students sign a section list during the examination;
5. create an environment that is, to the greatest extent possible, supportive of students undertaking the examination;
6. provide students with clarification of ambiguous aspects of the examination as appropriate and to help students in any way that does not impinge on the integrity of the examination;
7. respond to personal student emergencies according to the general procedural guidelines identified below.

B. Final Exam Specific Responsibilities

In addition to the responsibilities outlined in section IC, Final Exam Specific Responsibilities are to:

1. be familiar with the exam policy and procedures;
2. start and end the exam on time and in an orderly manner;
3. not allow students to enter the exam after 30 minute, or leave the exam within the first 30 minutes or the last 15 minutes. Students who arrive after 30 minutes should be referred to the department for alternate arrangements;
4. ensure that exams scheduled for the same time in a given room commence at the same time;
5. ensure that students identify themselves through presentation of a relevant photo-identification card which is to be displayed on the desk at all time.. (In the case of Continuing Education students, a driver's license or other verifiable institutional form of identification may be substituted.).
6. monitor student conduct during examination, and to act upon all observed instances of cheating, contravention of the student responsibilities for exam conduct as set out above, and/or the Student Code of Conduct. (This includes, but is not restricted to, talking during the exam, the consumption of food, rummaging, noise, use of unauthorized aids, etc.).
7. summon a "rover" for assistance in case of personal emergencies (student illness, bathroom needs, etc.) or in cases where a student and/or exam paper must be removed from the exam room. Only one student is permitted to use the washroom at a time;
8. assume primary responsibility for response to an external emergency, such as fire alarms, according to the guidelines outlined in this policy or, in the case of Continuing Education courses, as outlined in Continuing Education's final exam procedures. (In such circumstances, safety and security **always** take priority over other considerations. When an alarm is sounded, the area is to be evacuated immediately.)
9. clarify aspects of the examination which are unclear, but not answer any question that is deemed to infringe on exam integrity;

10. take immediate steps, as appropriate, to prevent further cheating when cheating on a test or exam is suspected. In general, students should be allowed to complete the exam.
 - i. If a student is seen to have unauthorized materials, such materials should be quietly removed, the details noted in writing, and the names of nearby students recorded. The matter should be reported to the Chair/Director.
 - ii. If it is suspected that students are copying material from other students, the names of those students should be noted, and the incident reported to the person grading the test or exam, as well as the Chair/Director.
 - iii. If it is suspected that someone is impersonating a student, the photo identification of that person should be checked, and the person should be asked to sign the exam paper for further verification. If it is suspected that the identification is not valid, students may be asked to provide alternate photo identification. Security may be called, if circumstances warrant.
 - iv. Allowing work to be copied during an examination or test shall constitute cheating.
 - v. Utilizing unauthorized material or consultation outside of the exam room during the period of the exam shall constitute cheating.
11. ensure that all students submit all required exam materials before leaving the exam room.

C. Gymnasium Invigilator

Invigilators assigned to the gymnasium in a particular time slot will decide which one of them shall be the primary invigilator for that time slot. This person will have overall responsibility for:

1. all routine exam announcements to students (when to begin, 15-minute warning, end of examination, etc.);
2. announcements and decisions related to fire alarms or other emergency situations;
3. enforcing policies regarding late arrivals and the prohibition against leaving in the last 15 minutes;
4. summoning “rovers” if required.

D. Electronic Examination Invigilator Responsibilities:

Invigilators must have the skills and information required to ensure that examinations are delivered in a secure manner and consistent with any requirements established by the course instructor, including:

1. explicit instructions on the use of the examination system;
2. accurate account information for each student taking the exam;
3. procedures specifying how to save student work and ensure examination security in the case that a student or students must leave the examination room;
4. instructions regarding alternative plans in the case of system or individual computer failure;
5. a list of approved software applications and resources to be used during the exam;
6. contact information and procedures for timely communication with pre-arranged technical support during the examination.

IV. Student Responsibilities

A. General Policy

Students must consider and respect other students' sensibilities such as stress caused by noise, intense scents, etc. Students are also expected to familiarize themselves with all pertinent information regarding examinations and to adhere to the following rules of examination conduct. Students are expected to:

1. arrive at the examination site on time;
2. refrain from any form of communication with other students upon commencement of the examination, unless communication skills are being evaluated;
3. bring into the examination location only those aids/resources that have been specified by the course instructor;
4. refrain from bringing cellular phones, personal audio equipment, and other electronic devices into the examination room unless specifically permitted by the course instructor;
5. refrain from bringing food into the examination room, unless it is medically necessary. Consumption of food and beverage must be done in a non-disruptive manner;
6. abide by the Student Code of Conduct and not cheat.

B. Final Exam Specific Responsibilities

In addition to the responsibilities outlined in section IVA, students are to respect the following guidelines:

1. No student will be admitted more than 30 minutes after the exam has commenced. No student may leave within the first thirty minutes after the exam has commenced.
2. Those arriving later will be directed to the teaching department to petition for alternative arrangements. Petitions are to be filed with the department no later than the following business day except when medical/emergency circumstances do not permit this deadline to be met. In such cases, the student is responsible to provide appropriate documentation. Such petitions will arise in cases where through emergency, illness, error, or oversight, students have arrived more than 30 minutes late for an examination or have missed the examination entirely.
3. No student is to leave the exam room during the last 15 minutes of an examination
4. Each student must submit all required exam materials before leaving the exam room
5. Students may bring into the exam room only those aids/resources that have been specified by the course instructor(s). (To be specified on course outline or by announcement in class at least two weeks before the end of classes.)
6. All coats and bags must be placed in such a manner as to be inaccessible to the student while the examination is in progress. Students should be cautioned in advance against bringing anything of value to the examination room, noting that the university accepts no liability for lost and stolen items. Students should also be reminded that in an emergency situation (e.g., fire alarm) they may not be able to pick up coats, bags, and other personal belongings and they are strongly advised against bringing items of personal or academic value to the exam room.
7. All students must display a valid and relevant student photo-identification card during the course of an examination. In the case of CE students, a driver's license or other verifiable form of photo-identification must be provided.
8. In case of a personal emergency of any sort (e.g., illness) students are to inform an invigilator of their circumstance and request assistance or permission to leave the exam

room, as circumstances warrant. Only one student will be allowed to use the washroom at a time.

9. Students have a right to ask an invigilator for clarification if aspects of the examination are unclear, but should be aware that invigilators will not answer any question that is deemed to infringe on exam integrity.
10. In the case of externally generated emergencies such as fire alarms, students will, in an orderly manner, follow the directions of the invigilator and evacuate the exam room, and return to the exam room when the emergency has been cleared. All exam materials must be left in the exam room during such emergency. In Continuing Education, examination papers will be collected by the instructor /invigilator. If the exam is to be continued in an alternate exam location, students will go immediately to the assigned alternate exam location.

C. Electronic Examination Student Responsibilities:

Upon notification from instructor, at least two-weeks prior to examination date, students must immediately ensure that any required resources (e.g., individual accounts on system, specific applications, file space, etc.) are valid and that they can be accessed.

Students will abide by any restrictions established by their School or Department regarding the use of applications or resources normally available on networked computers such as e-mail, Internet access or data files.

Unless explicitly required by the examination instructions, electronic communication is not permitted during the examination or while in the examination room.

If a student is required to leave the examination room the student must ensure that any work completed or in progress is saved before leaving the room in all but emergency situations.

V. Student Accommodations

1. The University acknowledges that some students may require alternative examination times/dates on religious grounds. A student who requires an alternative time/date on religious grounds must consult the policy on *Accommodation of Student Religious Observance Obligations* and submit the appropriate form by the deadline described.
2. Students with disabilities who are registered with the Access Centre must be accommodated in accordance to the arrangements provided by the Access Centre guidelines.
3. Requests for alternative examination times/dates on grounds other than religion will be granted in exceptional circumstances involving pre-existing health problems and/or other mitigating circumstances beyond the student's control. (Work schedules and discretionary arrangements such as travel plans are not normally considered to be acceptable grounds.) Such a request must be made to the course instructor within one week of the announcement of the examination schedule. If the request is granted, it is for the instructor to determine an alternative time and date.
4. In the case of emergency situations beyond the student's control, requests for alternative examination times/dates may be granted on compassionate grounds, if the request is made in a timely fashion. If the request is granted, the student should consult with the instructor to determine an alternative time and date.

VI. Cancellation of an Exam Session or Exam Date

A. Disruption of an Exam that has commenced

(Examination session refers to a single time slot, such as Tuesday 8-11; exam date refers to an entire day of exams.) The University shall establish procedures and guidelines for the rescheduling of exams, which are cancelled, and for exams that are disrupted once they have begun. The Registrar shall establish these guidelines for all Undergraduate and Graduate courses and the Dean of Continuing Education shall establish them for Continuing Education courses.

B. Undergraduate and Graduate Classes

1. In the case of cancellation of a single exam session, the exam will be rescheduled for the following evening (or two evenings, if required) in the gymnasium. If new exam papers are required, the printing of these will be expedited by Multiprint and the exam coordinator.
2. In the case of cancellation of a Fall term exam date, the exam will be rescheduled for registration week in January. In the case of cancellation of a Winter term exam date, the exam will be rescheduled for the week immediately following the normal exam period.
3. The University will provide students with the means to obtain timely information concerning rescheduled examinations. Students may confirm the revised time and date at www.Ryerson.ca/rows.
4. A fire alarm results in immediate evacuation of the building. The invigilator is responsible to determine whether the exam can be re-started, or whether a makeup must be scheduled. Make-ups will be written in the evening of the following day or, if necessary, the evening of the second following day, in the gym. A special telephone number **and website** will be available for students to confirm the revised time and date. If new exam papers are required, their printing will be expedited by Multiprint and the exam coordinator.

C. Continuing Education Classes

1. Alternate Locations and Dates

In the event of a disruption of a final exam, Continuing Education will have assigned each class either:

- a) An alternate exam **location** where students will complete the interrupted exam. However, if the instructor determines that a new exam must be written, students must be advised to return to the same classroom on the alternate exam date.

OR

- b) An alternate exam **date** when students will return to the same classroom to write a new exam. This alternate exam date is necessary because, in the event of a disruption, it is not possible to relocate all exams being written on that night.

2. Procedure for Disruption of an Exam that has commenced

Exams may be disrupted by one of the following events. Instructors/invigilators should refer to the appropriate evacuation procedures.

- a) **Fire Alarm:** A fire alarm results in immediate evacuation of the building. If Security determines that the alarm is false, students and instructors/invigilators may re-enter the building and complete the exam. This disruption may take approximately 10-15 minutes.

If Security advises that the building cannot be re-entered after a fire alarm, students will be advised to either go immediately to the assigned alternate exam location to complete the exam or return on the assigned alternate exam date to write a new exam.

- b) **Building Evacuation:** In the event it becomes necessary to evacuate a building, Security will go from room to room advising instructors/invigilators to evacuate. The instructor/invigilator will either advise students to go immediately to the assigned alternate exam location to complete the exam or to return on the assigned alternate exam date to write a new exam. This relocation may take approximately 30-45 minutes.

3. Cancellation of Examination(s)

In the case of cancellation of exam(s) for any reason (such as extreme weather conditions or building closure), students will write their final exam on the alternate exam date, according to the alternate exam schedule. Where possible, Continuing Education will make every effort to advise students and instructors of the cancellation.

REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Report #W2003-3

May 5, 2003

In this report we bring to Council our recommendations on one item, the Business Management periodic program review.

Further documentation on the items addressed in this and all other ASC reports is available for review from the Secretary of Academic Council.

Periodic Program Review for *Business Management*

This review has been completed in accordance with Academic Council Policy #126, *The Periodic Review and Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs at Ryerson*. By this policy and its associated procedures, all programs are reviewed on a cyclical basis with respect to academic quality, societal need, and financial sustainability.

The review for *Business Management* was undertaken and largely completed under the guidelines effective in May, 2001. Policy and procedural amendments approved by Academic Council in May, 2002, will pertain to all reviews undertaken in 2002/03 and thereafter.

Program Description

The current program in Business Management is a fourth-generation descendant of a two-year business certificate program launched in 1948 with the founding of *Ryerson Institute of Technology*. The original certificate was replaced by a three year business administration diploma in 1953. As of 1972, incoming students were enabled to pursue a degree (initially a Bachelor of Technology) through the “3+1+1 model”. According to this model, diploma graduates were required to take a year away from their studies to gain work experience prior to admission to year 4 of the program. The diploma exit was dropped and a fully integrated, four year degree program introduced in 1990/91, with the Bachelor of Commerce designation being adopted in 1999/2000.

With nearly 2,500 full-time and 500 part-time students, Business Management is Ryerson’s largest program and the largest undergraduate business school in Ontario. It is also a very complex school, offering seven Majors (Accounting, Economics and Management Science, Entrepreneurship, Finance, Human Resources Management, Management and Enterprise Development, and Marketing) and nine Minors (one corresponding to each major, plus International Business and Law.) In addition to its in-program teaching functions, SBM provides service courses to students from a wide array of programs across the University.

The mission of the School of Business Management (SBM) is:

“to deliver innovative education programs that integrate business theories with practical applications, and to conduct scholarly explorations that enhance the understanding of business principles and practice, in order to:

- (a) prepare graduates to pursue their career goals in a wide variety of sectors and industries within Canada or elsewhere in the world, and
- (b) support business organizations and serve society by being a source of educated management talent and useful management knowledge.

The mission statement is augmented by a set of guiding principles (e.g., depth, currency, and alliances) and a series of more specific objectives that address continuous quality improvement, student support, and the nurturing of a school research culture, among others.

The size and complexity of the school and its program is mirrored in the curriculum, with more than 130 courses being taught by SBM. In order to graduate, students take a 41 course curriculum plus *BUS 100*, a required, non-credit introduction to university/school life. (See 2002/03 calendar, pp. 175-193, and web-site <http://www.ryerson.ca/business/education.htm>) The first two semesters are common to all Majors, and third semester is common save for one professional elective course drawn from the student's intended Major. The courses in semesters 1-3 include 11 courses from SBM plus liberal studies, economics, communications, and information technology management. In semesters 4-8, students select from a wide range of professional, professionally-related, and liberal studies electives. Depending on the Major selected, students take approximately 13-16 professional courses, 4 additional liberal studies, and 5-8 professionally-related electives. All SBM students take a capstone course, *BUS 800: Strategic Management*, in fourth year.

The school operates international exchange programs with partner universities in England, Scotland, France, Holland, Germany, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, Austria, Mexico, and Australia.

Admission requirements are the OSSD or equivalent, with a minimum of six OAC and/or Grade 12 U/M credits including OAC English/Anglais and Mathematics (OAC Algebra & Geometry or Calculus or one of Grade 12 U Advanced Functions and Introductory Calculus, Geometry and Discrete Mathematics, or Mathematics of Data Management). Approximately 400-450 students are admitted to first year, with the ratio of applicants to registrants in the range of 7.3 - 9.6 over the past four years, consistently above the Ryerson average. Mean entering averages increased from 73.9% to 78.6% between 1996/97 and 2001/02. The averages are slightly below the Ryerson mean, but the rate of increase has exceeded that for the University as a whole. (The increase in SBM is second highest among all Ryerson programs for the time period.) About 250 college graduates are admitted annually into third year of the program.

SBM is currently preparing to seek accreditation from the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). Membership in the AACSB entails rigorous academic standards and the demonstration of continuous quality improvement processes. Canadian business schools currently accredited include Queen's University and the Universities of Alberta, Calgary, Laval, and Toronto, among others. Accreditation will necessitate certain changes in curriculum balance, particularly an increase in professionally-related courses (to use Ryerson's terminology).

The Program Review: Introduction

The program review was challenging for SBM because of the school's size and structure. A considerable amount of time was required to organize and conduct student surveys and to generate and integrate analysis from the different academic areas within the school.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The analysis of strengths and weaknesses was conducted on an area-by-area basis. For the most part, assessment by faculty members and student survey results were the primary inputs. In some areas, little evaluation was provided and results were presented mainly as compilations of survey data. The following list is illustrative only, presenting only a small portion of the strengths and weaknesses identified in the self-study.

<i>Area</i>	<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Weaknesses</i>
Accounting	level and currency of faculty knowledge; depth of course content, and applicability of content across courses	computer skills; faculty availability; confidence in dealing with uncertainty
Economics and Management Science	positive student ratings; currency of curriculum	communication skills; lack of internships; low enrolment
Finance	“Real world” applicability; depth of course content; relevance across courses	computer skills; effectiveness of faculty-student interaction; the need for more real business situations in the curriculum
Human Resources Management	positive student survey results; strong upper level curriculum	computer and numerical skills; lack of integration across courses
Management and Enterprise Development	problem-solving and the process of researching and presenting a compelling argument	computer skills and numerical analysis
Marketing	faculty currency and practical experience; currency and depth of curriculum; applicability of content across courses	overall curricular review needed; currency of course content; computer skills

The peer review team¹ (PRT) report was wide-ranging. Team members expressed some concern that the program is too focussed on business courses, that there should be greater integration among the four schools in the Faculty of Business, and that new and creative faculty hiring strategies are needed. The PRT emphasized the importance of Ryerson’s location for SBM and urged that the School retain its traditional core strengths while developing new niches. It questioned how new courses are developed and introduced to the curriculum and how areas of focus such as International Business would be developed.

Responses to Identified Weaknesses

The developmental plan initially provided by SBM set addressed several areas of weakness and set out broad directions for the school. At the request of the ASC, additional information was provided on several aspects of the plan, in particular its relationship to the accreditation process and approximate time lines for implementation. Taken as a whole, the developmental plan sets out a mixture of mechanisms, actions, and targets that respond effectively to most issues arising from the self-study. More broadly, it should lead to positive impacts on almost every facet of the program and the School as a whole.

Some of the central elements of the plan are:

¹ Dr. David Rutenberg, Queen’s; Dr. Donald Thompson, York; Dr. Brian Metcalfe, Brock

- X a complete review of curriculum (under way)
- X creation of a fully-constituted Program Advisory Committee (completed)
- X orientation program for third year direct entry students
- X intensified faculty hiring initiatives (as many as 11 positions will be available to the school in the coming year).
- X feasibility study for potential graduate programming.

ASC Evaluation

The program review is informative and offers many insightful comments on the School of Business Management, its individual academic areas, and the Bachelor of Commerce program. The self-study reveals a school that is positioning itself for significant change in directions that are extremely promising. The academic program has been under constant review for the past two years with a view towards introducing new and innovative curriculum structures that will provide a more integrated learning experience for students. The self-study provides a worthwhile glimpse into the nature of the review and the motivations for it, both for the program as a whole and for most of the individual Majors.

This being said, certain aspects of the program review are worrisome. The ASC finds it particularly striking that some of the most important analytical portions are addressed only at the level of individual areas (accounting, finance, etc.). There is no comprehensive assessment of strengths and weaknesses of the school/program as a whole, and much of the detailed analysis of student survey results is left to individual areas. Further, there is a very wide range of analytical rigour in the analysis and action plans provided by individual areas. While most have taken pains to synthesize the thoughtful views of faculty and the highly informative results of student surveys, a minority have provided little self-evaluation beyond a descriptive summary of the survey results. This detracts from the overall effectiveness of the program review and can surely not be helpful in planning future directions for SBM.

The ASC has some concern about portions of the documentation submitted as part of the self-study. One is faculty *curriculum vitae*. While many of the CVs are current, informative, and professionally presented, several are not. Some are out of date (seriously so, in a few instances), uninformative, and/or clearly designed for other purposes. The ASC's mandate is not to evaluate faculty CV's, but we cannot help but be concerned given that they form part of the public record of SBM's program review and that in some cases they provide little information for the school to work with in planning the best use of its faculty resources.

The course outlines also give us concern. While a large majority range from satisfactory to exemplary, some fall well short of basic standards of course documentation. Obviously, a course outline is not synonymous with the course that it describes. However, outlines that fail to meet course management guidelines, provide very little information, are ungrammatical, or are unencouraging in tone, raise inevitable questions about the underlying philosophy of teaching and learning.

The self-study leaves the ASC unclear about the relationship between the school as a whole and its individual units. Our mandate does not include an assessment of organizational structure, *per se*, but it does extend into the matter of how the school achieves integration and coherence in the program's curriculum. The committee leading SBM's curriculum review has identified greater integration as one of its focal points, and we endorse that decision wholeheartedly.

Summary Comments and Suggestions

- X The ASC endorses in the strongest terms the school's intention to pursue AACSB accreditation, not primarily for its image-enhancing effects (it will have such effects) but rather because of its stringent standards for ongoing quality enhancement. (Council members who wish to know more about the AACSB may want to visit

<http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation>) In the committee's view this should be a priority for the school, the Faculty, and the University.

- X The school should engage in some collective discussion about course documentation and broader matters of teaching philosophy. (The committee is not challenging in any sense the academic rights of individual faculty members. However, we think it can only be helpful to share ideas, review course management policy, and develop a sense of what best practices look like.) The school should comment on this matter in its follow-up report (see below).
- X If it has not done so already, the school should ask individual areas to review one another's strengths and weaknesses analyses and action plans. Those that fall significantly short should be asked to upgrade their portions of the self-study for inclusion with the follow-up report. (Several of the area self-studies exhibit strong points, but we would recommend accounting and marketing as useful models for others to examine.)
- X SBM should track student success and retention by Major as well as for the school as a whole. There appears to be considerable variation in respect to attrition and academic standings.

Follow-up Report

In keeping with usual procedure, a follow-up report is to be submitted to the Dean and Vice President, Academic by the end of June, 2004.

Recommendation:

Having determined that the Business Management program review satisfies the relevant policy and procedural requirements, the Academic Standards Committee recommends:

That Academic Council approve the periodic program review as conducted by the School of Business Management.

Respectfully submitted by

(Signature on file)

Errol Aspevig,
for the committee

K. Alnwick (Registrar)
C. De Souza (student, Food and Nutrition)
I. Engel (Psychology)
K. Gates (Nursing)
D. Glynn (Continuing Education)
R. Goldsmith (Geography)
D. Snyder (Image Arts)
D. Sydor (Business Management)

A. Mitchell (Interior Design)
J. Logan (Information Technology Management)
Z. Fawaz (Aerospace)
A. Gillis (Mathematics, Physics, and Computer Science)
R. Keeble (Urban and Regional Planning)
R. Stagg (History)

Memo

TO: Dr. Diane Schulman, Secretary of Academic Council
FROM: Cathy Matthews, Chief Librarian
DATE: 25 April 2003
RE: Request for Consistent Naming

Consistent with the University's "branding" and the new signage being installed across campus, the Chief Librarian wishes to draw to your attention that new Library signs are being installed.

It is requested that, where possible, all academic and administrative departments move to adopt the name Library, instead of the older and less "university like" Learning Resources Centre (LRC) commonly used during Ryerson's early days.

Hence, when producing brochures, maps, handouts, web sites, course outlines and other documents which make reference to the Library or other services and offices located within that same space, please bring consistency to these and refer to the Library, not the LRC.

Thank you.