

The logo for Ryerson University, featuring the text "RYERSON UNIVERSITY" in white, uppercase letters on a blue rectangular background. A vertical yellow bar is positioned to the right of the blue rectangle.

RYERSON UNIVERSITY

SENATE MEETING AGENDA

Tuesday, December 3, 2013

SENATE MEETING AGENDA

Tuesday, December 3, 2013

THE COMMONS - POD 250

4:30 p.m. Light dinner is available

5:00 p.m. Senate Meeting starts

1. Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum
2. Approval of Agenda
Motion: *That Senate approve the December 3, 2013 agenda*
3. Announcements
4. Minutes of Previous Meetings
Pages 1-7 **Motion #1:** *That Senate approve the minutes of the October 1, 2013 meeting*
Pages 8-13 **Motion #2:** *That Senate approve the minutes of the November 5, 2013 meeting*
5. Matters Arising from the Minutes
6. Correspondence
7. Reports:
 - 7.1 Report of the President
 - 7.1.1 President's Update
 - 7.1.2 Achievement Report
 - 7.2 Report of the Secretary
 - 7.3 Committee Reports
 - 7.3.1 Report #F2013-3 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC)
 - 7.3.1.1 In response to the June 2013 motion that Senate request AGPC to formulate a draft policy, based on the September 18 2012 YSGS document "Proposal for a Framework for Professional Master's Diplomas," for consideration by Senate: C. Evans

Motion: *That Senate approve the proposed modifications to Policy 112 (Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs) as described in the attached revision.*

Pages 42-55

7.3.3 Report #F2013-3 of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC): C. Evans

Pages 42-50

7.3.3.1 Bachelor of Science, Contemporary Science Program

Motion #1: *That Senate approve the phase out of the Bachelor of Science, Contemporary Science Program (with Co-Operative Program Option and Optional Specialization in Management Sciences)*

Page 50

7.3.3.2 Minor in Criminal Justice

Motion #2: *That Senate approve the change of name of the Minor in Criminal Justice to Minor in Criminology*

Pages 50-52

7.3.3.3 Acting/Dance Studies Module for Creative Industries BA Program

Motion #3: *That Senate approve the new Module in Acting/Dance Studies for the Creative Industries BA Program*

Pages 52-54

7.3.3.4 Acting/Dance Studies Minor

Motion #4: *That Senate approve the New Minor in Acting/Dance Studies in the Ryerson Theatre School*

Pages 56-152

7.3.2 Report #F2013-2 of the Senate Priorities Committee (SPC)

7.3.2.1 In response to the January 2013 motion that Senate establish a Task Force on Interdisciplinary Programs:
N. Thomlinson

Motion #1: *That Senate receive the attached Final Report from the Task Force on Interdisciplinary Programs*

Motion #2: *That Senate request the Provost to consider the Report in the preparation of the 2014-2019 Academic Plan*

Motion #3: *That Senate request the Provost to respond to the Report by October 2014*

8. Old Business
9. New Business as Circulated
10. Members' Business
11. Consent Agenda – Various course changes from:
(see: http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2013/course_change_forms_Dec_3_2013.pdf)
 - Arts** – Arts and Contemporary Studies; Arts Common Platform; History; Language, Literatures and Cultures; Philosophy; Psychology; Sociology;
 - Communication and Design** – Fashion; Graphic Communications Management; Image Arts; Image Arts/Creative Industries; Journalism; Professional Communication; RTA School of Media; Theatre School;
 - Community Services** – Early Childhood Studies;
 - Ted Rogers School of Management** - Accounting; Finance; Business Technology Management; Entrepreneurship/Strategy; Global Management Studies; Hospitality and Tourism Management; Marketing; Retail Management;
 - Engineering & Architectural Science** - Chemical Engineering; Electrical and Computer Engineering
 - Science** – Chemistry and Biology
12. Adjournment

**SENATE
MINUTES OF MEETING**

TUESDAY, October 1, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT:			
EX-OFFICIO:	FACULTY:		STUDENTS:
L. Bloomberg	D. Chant	A. Saloojee	A. Adeli
J. P. Boudreau	D. Checkland	F. Stewart	S. Campbell
M. Bountrogianni	L. Di Cintio	N. Thomlinson	P. Diverlus
I. Coe	S. Dolgoy	K. Tucker-Scott	G. Goldar
W. Cukier	M. Dionne	P. Walsh	A. Hassan
C. Evans	D. Elder	N. Walton	R. Hoilett
U. George	C. Falzon	J. Wolofsky	Md. Sirajul Islam
C. Hack	A. Ferworn	C. Zamaria	M. Ismail
J. Hanigsberg	D. Greatrix		S. Kim
G. Hauck	F. Gunn		A. Lam
J. Isbister	A. Hunter		R. Lawrence
A. Kahan	E. Kam		P. Noorzad
S. Krishnan	L. Lavallee		J. Rodriguez
M. Lachemi	D. Mason		U. Siddiqui
H. Lane Vetere	J. Martin		M. Tabatabaei Anaraki
M. Lefebvre	A. McWilliams		
S. Levy	J. P. Pascal		
J. Mactavish	A. Pejovic-Milic		
D. O'Neil Green	K. Raahemifar		
P. Stenton	R. Ravindran		
SENATE ASSOCIATES:			ALUMNI:
M. Lee Blickstead			G. Farok
A.M. Brinsmead			M. Sarkis
REGRETS:	ABSENT:		
J. Girardo	S. Rahkmayil		
V. Magness	D. Rose		
S. Murphy	D. Valliere		
S. Torabi			

1. Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum
2. Approval of Agenda
Motion: *That Senate approve the October 1, 2013 agenda*

D. Mason moved; K. Raahemifar seconded
Motion Approved
3. Announcements
J. Hanigsberg introduced two newly-appointed employees: Kristina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice President, Human Resources; and Joshna Maharaj, Executive Chef, Food Services
4. Minutes of Previous Meeting
Motion: *That Senate approve the minutes of the June 4, 2013 meeting*

K. Raahemifar moved; D. Mason seconded
Motion Approved.
5. Matters Arising from the Minutes
Regarding Motion 7.3.2.1 to approve the Nominating Committee report, N. Thomlinson stated that as M. Lovewell was a non-voting member of Senate, he should not have moved or seconded motions of Senate.
6. Correspondence - None
7. Reports:
 - 7.1 Report of the President
 - 7.1.1 President's Update
 - 7.1.2 Achievement Report
 - 7.2 Report of the Secretary
 - 7.2.1 Response to Notice of Motion from June 4, 2013 Senate meeting regarding the number of regular Senate meetings.

Motion: *That Senate include June as a regular meeting of Senate, and that the Senate Bylaw 9.3.2 be revised to read: "At least seven (7) regular meetings of Senate shall be held between 01 October and 15 June..."*

This was tabled to the Senate meeting of November 5, 2013.
 - 7.2.2 Response to question from the floor under Item 7.3.2.1 of the June 4, 2013 Senate meeting suggesting that there have been increases in the membership of some Standing Committees that contravene Senate bylaws

Senate was invited to submit inquiries and/or information about specific committees so that the Secretary can follow up.

7.3 Committee Reports

7.3.1 Report #F2013-1 of the AGPC

7.3.1.1 Updated Senate and Committee Membership from the Nominating Committee

Motion: *That Senate approve the committee memberships from the Nominating Committee as presented in this report*

A. McWilliams moved; U. Siddiqui seconded

Motion Approved.

7.3.1.2 Amendment of Policy 150 (*Accommodation of Student Religious, Aboriginal, and Spiritual Observance*) to make it consistent with Policy 134 (*Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals*) regarding the submission of documents

Motion: *That Senate approve to amend Policy 150 (Accommodation of Student Religious, Aboriginal, and Spiritual Observance) as described in the excerpt attached*

K. Raahemifar moved; U. Siddiqui seconded

N. Thomlinson advised that the original motion be amended to read “*That Senate approve to amend...*” instead of “*That AGPC recommends that Senate approve to amend...*,” which is reflected in these minutes.

Motion Approved.

7.3.2 Report #F2013-1 of the SPC

7.3.2.1 Response to motion passed under Item 7.3.1.1. of the June 4, 2013 Senate meeting to create a new Policy 60 (*Student Code of Academic Conduct*) Review Committee, to be named at the October 2013 meeting

Motion (D. Mason moved; M. Dionne seconded): That Senate express its gratitude to the members of the previous Provostial committee for their work on Policy 60, and that Senate now strike an *ad hoc* committee, under the provisions of Article 7 of the Senate Bylaws, to fully review Policy 60 in a process involving extensive consultation with the Ryerson community and during which the committee will be guided but not bound by ideas considered by the previous Provostial committee and included in the Framework approved in June 2012. The new committee would consist of:

- two co-chairs (David Checkland and Chris Evans);
- one faculty representative from each of the six Faculties, as well as one each from the Yeates School of Graduate Studies and the Chang School of Continuing Education as follows:
 - Tara Burke (Arts),
 - Linda Cooper (FCS),

- Suanne Kelman (FCAD),
- Jeffrey Yokota (FEAS),
- Noel George (Science),
- Chris MacDonald (TRSM),
- Anthony Bonato (YSGS), and
- Anne Marie Brinsmead (Chang School)
- two students from the RSU, one student from CESAR, and one graduate student as follows:
 - Roshelle Lawrence (RSU rep on Senate),
 - an additional student rep nominated by the RSU;
 - Shinae Kim (CESAR rep on Senate), and
 - Pardis Noorzad (graduate student rep on Senate)
- five non-voting resource persons:
 - the Director of e-Learning (Nancy Walton),
 - the Ombudsperson (Nora Farrell),
 - the Secretary of Senate (John Turtle),
 - the Academic Integrity Director (Giselle Basanta), and
 - the Academic Integrity Officer (Donna Bell)
 - the Student Issues and Advocacy Coordinator

Friendly Amendment #1: D. Checkland suggested that an additional resource person be added: Vice President/Vice Provost Equity, Diversity and Inclusion as a non-voting member

Friendly Amendment #2: M. Dionne suggested that a Ryerson Faculty Association resource person be added.

Friendly Amendment #3: K. Tucker Scott suggested that the Academic Integrity Director be removed as resource person. This amendment was later withdrawn.

Friendly Amendment #4: S. Kim suggested that the CESAR Student Rights Coordinator be added as a resource person.

Motion (moved by C. Zamaria / seconded by D. Mason) That the motion be amended to replace the “five non-voting resource persons” section with the following wording:

The committee shall consult broadly including, but not limited to, the following resource persons:

- the Director of e-Learning (Nancy Walton),
- the Ombudsperson (Nora Farrell),
- the Vice President/Vice Provost Equity, Diversity and Inclusion,
- a resource person from the Ryerson Faculty Association,
- the Secretary of Senate (John Turtle),
- the Academic Integrity Director (Giselle Basanta), and
- the Academic Integrity Officer (Donna Bell)
- the RSU Student Issues and Advocacy Coordinator
- the CESAR Student Rights Coordinator

K. Tucker then **withdrew** Friendly Amendment #3 and deferred to C. Zamaria’s amendment.

Amendment Carried.

Friendly Amendment #5: M. Dionne suggested that an interim report be submitted no later than February 2014.

MOTION AS AMENDED

That Senate express its gratitude to the members of the previous Provostial committee for their work on Policy 60, and that Senate now strike an *ad hoc* committee, under the provisions of Article 7 of the Senate Bylaws, to fully review Policy 60 in a process involving extensive consultation with the Ryerson community and during which the committee will be guided but not bound by ideas considered by the previous Provostial committee and included in the Framework approved in June 2012. The new committee would consist of:

- two co-chairs (David Checkland and Chris Evans);
- one faculty representative from each of the six Faculties, as well as one each from the Yeates School of Graduate Studies and the Chang School of Continuing Education as follows:
 - Tara Burke (Arts),
 - Linda Cooper (FCS),
 - Suanne Kelman (FCAD),
 - Jeffrey Yokota (FEAS),
 - Noel George (Science),
 - Chris MacDonald (TRSM),
 - Anthony Bonato (YSGS), and
 - Anne Marie Brinsmead (Chang School)
- two students from the RSU, one student from CESAR, and one graduate student as follows:
 - Roshelle Lawrence (RSU rep on Senate),
 - an additional student rep nominated by the RSU;
 - Shinae Kim (CESAR rep on Senate), and
 - Pardis Noorzad (graduate student rep on Senate)

The committee shall consult broadly including, but not limited to, the following resource persons:

- the Director of e-Learning (Nancy Walton),
- the Ombudsperson (Nora Farrell),
- the Vice President/Vice Provost Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (Denise O'Neil Green)
- a resource person from the Ryerson Faculty Association,
- the Secretary of Senate (John Turtle),
- the Academic Integrity Director (Giselle Basanta), and
- the Academic Integrity Officer (Donna Bell)
- the RSU Student Issues and Advocacy Coordinator (Lyndall Musselman)
- the CESAR Student Rights Coordinator

The committee will report to the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC), which shall consider the committee report and bring forward proposed revisions to Policy 60 not later than the June 2014 meeting of Senate. An interim report of the committee will be delivered to Senate no later than February, 2014.

Motion as Amended was Approved.

7.3.3 Report #F2013-1 of the Academic Standards Committee:

7.3.3.1 Optional Internship in the BA Professional Communication

Motion: *That Senate approve the Inclusion of an Internship in the Bachelor of Arts Degree Program in Professional Communication*

C. Evans moved; N. Walton seconded

Motion Approved.

7.3.3.2 Architectural Science Optional Co-operative Education Internship

Motion: *That Senate approve the Inclusion of the Co-operative Education Internship Option in the Bachelor of Architectural Science Degree Program*

C. Evans moved; S. Krishnan seconded

Motion Approved.

8. Old Business

- 8.1 Response to motion passed at the June 4, 2013 Senate meeting that Senate request AGPC to formulate a draft policy regarding Professional Master's Diplomas (PMDs), based on the September 18, 2012 YSGS document "Proposal for a Framework for Professional Master's Diplomas", for consideration by Senate; and that Senate approval of further proposals for PMDs be delayed until such time as Senate has put a policy in place.

C. Evans, Vice Provost Academic, reported that there may be more urgency on this matter than previously reported as some Diplomas are in the proposal stage, and that the AGPC will be working on draft policy for Senate consideration.

- 8.2 Response to suggestion under Item 7.3.3.1 at the June 4, 2013 Senate meeting that questions regarding the Optional specialization in Zone Education (OSZE) be appended to the minutes of the June 4 meeting .

C. Evans, Vice Provost Academic, noted that the questions were included in the October agenda package (pp. 37-41), that they will be retroactively attached to the minutes of the June 4, 2013 meeting of Senate, and that a future report from the Provost would respond to the questions.

9. New Business as Circulated

- 9.1 Discussion of draft version of Ryerson's 2014-2019 Academic Plan: M. Lachemi, Provost and Vice President Academic

M. Sarkis suggested engaging alumni in this process. M. Lachemi advised that an announcement be made to alumni through the appropriate channels.

10. Members' Business

- 10.1 Motions from D. Checkland regarding N. Walton to finish her term on Senate and as Vice Chair of Senate

N. Thomlinson acted as Vice chair during the discussion and voting process on this issue.

Motion #1: *In the absence of clear policy or guidance from either the Ryerson Act or the Senate By-law, Senate hereby affirms that it is its sole and exclusive right to determine whether or not an “Academic Director: who is not Director of a School is eligible to serve as a faculty Member-at-Large or as Vice-Chair; and Senate hereby directs the Academic Governance and Policy Committee to bring to Senate by May 2014 draft policy clarifying this matter.*

D. Checkland moved; D. Mason seconded

Motion Approved.

Motion #2: *That Senate hereby affirms that Dr. Nancy Walton may serve out her second year of a two-year term as a faculty member-at-large.*

D. Checkland moved; M. Dionne seconded

(Vote count: 44 For; 9 Against; 2 Abstentions)

Motion Approved.

Motion #3: *That Senate hereby affirms that Dr. Nancy Walton may serve out the second year of her term as Vice-Chair of Senate.*

(Vote: 45 For; 3 Against; 4 spoiled ballots)

Motion Approved.

- 10.2 Clarification of class start time: D. Mason
M. Lachemi advised he will report on this at the next Senate meeting
- 10.3 D. Mason asked why bottles of water were still being offered in vending machines on campus despite Ryerson’s no bottled water policy

J. Hanigsberg asked D. Mason to provide more information on this and advised she will address this at the next Senate meeting
11. Consent Agenda - None
12. Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

**SENATE MINUTES OF MEETING
TUESDAY, November 5, 2013**

MEMBERS PRESENT:			
EX-OFFICIO:	FACULTY:		STUDENTS:
J. P. Boudreau	D. Checkland	R. Ravindran	A. Adeli
I. Coe	L. Di Cintio	F. Stewart	G. Goldar
W. Cukier	S. Dolgoy	N. Thomlinson	A. Hassan
C. Evans	M. Dionne	K. Tucker-Scott	R. Hoilett
U. George	C. Falzon	P. Walsh	M. Ismail
C. Hack	A. Ferworn	N. Walton	S. Kim
G. Hauck	D. Greatrix	J. Wolofsky	A. Lam
J. Isbister	F. Gunn		R. Lawrence
A. Kahan	A. Hunter		P. Noorzad
S. Krishnan	E. Kam		J. Rodriguez
M. Lachemi	V. Magness		U. Siddiqui
H. Lane Vetere	D. Mason		M. Tabatabaei Anaraki
S. Levy	A. McWilliams		S. Torabi
S. Murphy	J. P. Pascal		
D. O'Neil Green	A. Pejovic-Milic		
P. Stenton	S. Rahkmayil		
SENATE ASSOCIATES:			
M. Lee Blickstead			
A.M. Brinsmead			
REGRETS:	ABSENT:		ALUMNI:
L. Bloomberg	P. Diverlus		
M. Bountrogianni	G. Farok		
S. Campbell	Md. Sirajul Islam		
D. Chant	D. Valliere		
D. Elder			
J. Hanigsberg			
L. Lavallée			
M. Lefebvre			
J. Mactavish			
J. Martin			
K. Raahemifar			
D. Rose			
A. Saloojee			
M. Sarkis			
C. Zamaria			

The Committee of the Whole Discussion on Development of the 2014-2019 Academic Plan was held prior to the meeting

(See: http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2013/Committee_of_the_Whole_Questions_F2013.pdf)

1. Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum
 2. Approval of Agenda
Motion: *That Senate approve the November 5, 2013 agenda*
 U. George moved; R. Ravindran seconded
Motion Approved
 3. Announcements
 4. Minutes of Previous Meeting
Motion: *That Senate approve the minutes of the October 1, 2013 meeting*
 D. Mason moved; N. Thomlinson seconded
Motion Approved

Motion to table minutes of October 1, 2013 to next Senate meeting, in order to amend minutes.
 D. Checkland moved; D. Mason seconded
Motion Approved
 5. Matters Arising from the Minutes - None
 6. Correspondence
 7. Reports:
 - 7.1 Report of the President
 - 7.1.1 President's Update
 - 7.2 Progress Indicators – 2013 – Presented by P. Stenton
 (See: http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2013/FINAL_Progress_Indicators_for_Senate_Nov_5_2013.pdf)
 - 7.3 Report of the Secretary
 - 7.4 Committee Reports
 - 7.4.1 Report #F2013-2 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC)
 - 7.4.1.1 Membership of Nominating Committee and One Nomination to Fill a Chang School Senate Representative Vacancy

Motion #1: *That Senate approve the membership list for the 2013-2014 Nominating Committee*
 A. McWilliams moved; N. Walton seconded
Motion Approved
- Motion #2:** *That Senate approve M. Reed as the Chang School representative to Senate to*

replace W. Isaac

The Secretary of Senate announced the withdrawal of this motion.

7.4.1.2 Amendment to the Bylaws to make June a regular meeting of Senate.

Motion #3: *That Senate include June as a regular meeting, and that Articles 9.3.2 and 9.3.5 in the Senate Bylaw be amended accordingly*

G. Hauck moved; D. Mason seconded

Motion Approved

7.4.1.3 Creative Industries Bylaws

Motion #4: *That Senate approve the Bylaws submitted by the School of Creative Industries*

U. Siddiqui moved; S. Dolgoy seconded

Motion to Defer

G. Hauck requested that Senate defer this motion until I. Levine arrived as he was slated to speak to this motion.

G. Hauck moved; R. Hoilett seconded

Motion to Defer Approved

Friendly Amendment #1

R. Hoilett suggested that FCAD Student Union members should be included.

I. Levine referred to the inclusion of students in Section 3e and indicated he did not consider it a friendly amendment.

Friendly Amendment #2

D. Checkland identified a potential inconsistency among Articles 3.b, 8, and 12.a. With help from D. Mason, it was suggested that:

(1) Article 3.b be changed to just "All full-time faculty"

(2) Article 8 be changed such that the second sentence is now "Faculty on leave who are absent from the meeting shall not be included for the quorum calculation."

(3) Article 12 be changed such that sub-article 12.a is deleted.

The mover and seconder accepted these changes as a friendly amendment.

Motion Approved as Amended.

7.4.2 Report #F2013-2 of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC)

7.4.2.1 Minor in Geography

Motion #1: *That Senate approve the Minor in Geography from the Department of Geography*

C. Evans moved; J. P. Boudreau seconded

Motion Approved

7.4.2.2 Minor in Geographic Analysis

Motion #2: *That Senate approve the Minor in Geographic Analysis from the Department of Geography*

C. Evans moved; U. George seconded

Motion Approved

7.4.2.3 Minor in Environment and Urban Sustainability

Motion #3: *That Senate approve the Minor in Environment and Urban Sustainability from the Department of Geography*

C. Evans moved; J. P. Boudreau seconded

Motion Approved

7.4.2.4 Admission Requirement Modifications for the Bachelor of Social Work Degree Program

Motion #4: *That Senate approve the admission requirement modifications for the Bachelor of Social Work degree program*

C. Evans moved; U. George seconded

Motion Approved

7.4.2.5 Curriculum Modifications to the Bachelor of Fine Arts (Film Studies) – School of Image Arts

Motion #5: *That Senate approve the curriculum modifications to the Bachelor of Fine Arts (Film Studies) degree program in the School of Image Arts*

C. Evans moved; C. Falzon seconded

Motion Approved

7.4.2.6 Curriculum Modifications to the Bachelor of Fine Arts (Photography Studies) – School of Image Arts

Motion #6: *That Senate approve the curriculum modifications to the Bachelor of Fine Arts (Photography Studies) degree program in the School of Image Arts*

C. Evans moved; C. Falzon seconded

Motion Approved

7.4.2.7 Optional Specialization in Engineering

Motion #7: *That Senate approve the Optional Specialization in Engineering Innovation and Entrepreneurship*

C. Evans moved; P. Walsh seconded

Motion Approved

7.4.2.8 Admission Changes in Health Services Management

Motion #8: *That Senate approve the admissions changes in Health Services Management and Health Information Management*

C. Evans moved; A. Adeli seconded

Motion Approved

7.4.2.9 Change of Degree Name – Bachelor of Arts (Criminal Justice) – and Department Name

Motion #9: *That Senate approve the change of the degree program name of the Bachelor of Arts (Criminal Justice) to the Bachelor of Arts (Criminology) and the change of the department name from the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology to the Department of Criminology.*

C. Evans moved; J. P. Boudreau seconded

Motion Approved

7.4.2.10 Curriculum Modifications to the Bachelor of Engineering – Civil Engineering

Motion #10: *That Senate approve the curriculum modifications to the Bachelor of Engineering (Civil Engineering) degree program in the Department of Civil Engineering*

C. Evans moved; U. Siddiqui seconded

Motion Approved

7.4.2.11 [Addendum] – Integrated Digital Option in Bachelor of Film Arts (Film Studies) and (Photography Studies)

Motion #11: *That Senate approve the Integrated Digital Option in the Bachelor of Fine Arts (Film Studies) and the Bachelor of Fine Arts (Photography Studies) degree programs from the School of Image Arts*

C. Evans moved; G. Hauck seconded

Motion Approved

8. Old Business:

8.1 Update regarding bottled water on campus: J. Hanigsberg

A letter from the Vice President Administration and Finance, Julia Hanigsberg, was circulated. It was stated that some machines on campus appear to still have bottled water for sale. Further follow up will be conducted.

8.2 Statement on class start and end times: M. Lachemi

M. Lachemi announced that a statement was posted in the November 4, 2013 issue of *Ryerson Today*. D. Mason asked for this statement to be included in the minutes. M. Lachemi agreed:

“At Ryerson, undergraduate and graduate day classes begin at 10 minutes past the hour, and end on the hour. The 10-minute interval provides travel time for students and faculty coming from various locations across a large, downtown campus. It is important that instructors complete their class by the scheduled end time, to provide the next instructor time to set up and to ensure that students have time to make their next class. Evening classes at The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education begin at the scheduled start time – 6:00 pm, 6:30 pm, etc. Instructors are encouraged to provide a reasonable break during any class that is two hours or longer.”

A. Ferworn asked about the current status of the Professional Masters Diplomas (PMDs).

C. Evans responded that information on this will be brought to the next Senate meeting.

8.3 A motion on the creation of Schools and Departments was tabled at the January 2013 Senate meeting for the November 2013 meeting

Motion: *That Senate request the Academic Governance and Policy Committee to develop policy guidelines for Senate concerning the creation of Schools and Departments, and present these to Senate by the end of the 2013-2014 academic year*

D. Checkland moved; D. Mason seconded

Motion Approved

9. New Business as Circulated - None

10. Members' Business

D. Checkland announced that the first Town Hall consultation on Policy 60 will be held on November 19 (12:00-1:00). Advertisements were placed in the school newspapers and emails were sent out to the community. The community is also encouraged to send comments to policy60@ryerson.ca.

11. Consent Agenda (for information only)

11.1 Calendar changes from:

Arts & Contemporary Studies; Economics; English; History; Geography; Philosophy; Psychology; Image Arts; Professional Communication and Sociology

(See: http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2013/Course_change_forms_Nov_5_13.pdf)

12. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Ryerson University President's Update to Senate December 3, 2013



Everyone Makes a Mark

Star Blanket – On October 25th the university gave pride of place to the traditional star blanket given as a gift to Ryerson from the Aboriginal Education Council in 2010. The elegant blanket, hand-made in Ryerson blue and gold, is on permanent display in the main hallway of Jorgenson Hall, celebrating the history and culture of our community.

Remembrance Day – On November 11th Ryerson joined Canadians from coast to coast in remembering the sacrifices of veterans of past wars, and the many who serve in modern-day operations around the world. This year we were pleased to welcome the Hon. Glen Murray as our lead speaker at the event. The occasion to pause and reflect is engaging more people every year as a significant date in our community calendar. Ryerson is also honoured to host the Black Veterans Remembrance Ceremony recognizing the contributions of Canadian Forces who served overseas and participated on the home front as fundraisers, factory workers, and volunteers.

Two city-building awards –

- Heritage Toronto has recognized the partnership of Ryerson University and Loblaw Companies Limited, and project architects and contractors, with the 2013 William Greer Architectural Conservation and Craftsmanship Award of Merit for exceptional preservation and craftsmanship in the restoration of Maple Leaf Gardens. On November 14th a historic plaque was installed by Heritage Toronto at the site.
- Tourism Toronto and the Greater Toronto Hotel Association (GTHA) have presented Ryerson with the 2013 Presidents' Award for "preserving Toronto's past and shaping its future" in the revitalization of the university's downtown precinct, the pedestrianization of Gould Street and the creation of multiple award-winning buildings contributing to the vibrancy of Toronto's downtown core.

RBC project – On November 13th Ryerson welcomed Board of Governors Vice-Chair Janice Fukakusa and colleagues for the announcement of \$1.75 million in support of the RBC Immigrant Diversity and Inclusion Project. The project will involve Ryerson faculty and students in developing multidisciplinary approaches to advance understanding and increase opportunity in four areas: immigrant employment and entrepreneurship, social engagement, mental health, and consumer behaviors. The project builds on a record of RBC leadership partnering with Ryerson in areas of academic strength contributing to social progress at local and global levels.

Partnership with St. Michael's Hospital – On November 6th, Ryerson and St. Michael's Hospital announced a 20-year partnership on a new Institute for Biomedical Engineering and Science Technology (iBest). A key part of the initiative is the creation of a 22,000-square-foot home in St. Michael's Keenan Research Centre for approximately 15 Ryerson faculty members and 40 Ryerson students involved in ongoing health care research. The space will also include a 2,000-square-foot "incubator" that will specialize in the development and commercialization of innovative biomechanical products for the care and treatment of patients, similar to the Digital Media Zone. A new physical connection to the hospital via a bridge over our common street will

also allow researchers to apply their discoveries to patient needs in “bench-to-bedside” research. Construction is expected to start next spring, with move-in spring 2015.

Movember Foundation grant – A Ryerson project exploring new ways to reduce the stigma of mental illness among men and boys in Asian communities has been awarded \$3 million over three years by the Movember Foundation. The project will study the effectiveness of two pilot anti-stigma interventions with 2,160 men living in Vancouver, Calgary and Toronto Led by principal investigator Dr. Sepali Guruge and co-principal investigators Dr. Josephine Wong and Dr. Souraya Sidani, Daphne Cockwell School of Nursing the project will partner with colleagues from the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, the University Health Network, Simon Fraser University and the University of Calgary, as well as community-based agencies providing culturally and linguistically inclusive social care across Canada.

Aerospace research and training – Ryerson is part of an innovation and research working group of industry leaders and academic partners taking shape over the next 12-18 months. On October 29th the Ontario government announced an investment of up to \$26 million to relocate Centennial College aviation programs to the former de Havilland aircraft manufacturing centre at Downsview Park, providing new classrooms, workshops and hangar space. The building will also house the Downsview Aerospace Innovation and Research (DAIR) working group, which includes Ryerson University, the University of Toronto, York University, Centennial College, Bombardier, Pratt & Whitney Canada, Honeywell, UTC Aerospace Systems, MDA Corporation and Sumitomo Precision Products Canada Aircraft, Inc.

Reputation Rankings – In both the *Canadian Business* and *Macleans* magazine ranking issues, Ryerson gets a very strong rating among professionals surveyed for the reputation category and asked which school impressed them most highly. In *Canadian Business*, Ryerson joined leaders including Western, the University of Toronto, McGill and UBC on the Top 10 list at #10; in *Macleans*, out of 49 universities included in the ranking issue, opinion-makers chose Ryerson as #11 in the country for “Most Innovative” and #7 nationwide in “Leaders of Tomorrow.”

Congratulations –

- Dr. Reena Tandon, Community Engaged Learning and Teaching (CELT) co-ordinator for the Faculty of Arts, was among 27 rising leaders from GTA public, private and non-profit organizations to receive a 2013 DiverseCity Fellowship supported by CivicAction.
- Dr. Kathryn Woodcock, Occupational and Public Health, received the I. King Jordan Award from the Association of Late-Deafened Adults (ALDA) for her distinguished career, contributions to her community and serving as a role model for late-deafened adults. The award is the highest honour presented by the ALDA board of directors.

Retiree Event – On November 14th we paid tribute to the valuable service and contributions of 2013 Ryerson staff and faculty retirees. It was great to share stories and welcome so many who joined us on this occasion. It is a wonderful reminder of our strong and continuing connection with members of the Ryerson family, and an opportunity to extend appreciation and thanks.

Student Awards Events – Our annual cycle of events reflects our tradition of celebration and pride in the achievements of our students, and the support that inspires and encourages them. Ryerson leadership in engaging partners and recognizing their impact on student success is a signature characteristic advancing economic, social and cultural well-being together, and I believe we can ask a lot of our students with such strong mentors and models for them to follow.

Varsity Athletics – Ryerson is making its presence felt on the national intercollegiate scene:

- The Ryerson Rams Men's Soccer team made history this season:
 - achieving a CIS ranking of #2 nationwide, finishing first in the OUA East with a 12-0-2 record, the only undefeated team in the country at the end of league play;
 - qualifying for the CIS championship for the first time in team history;
 - celebrating Alex Braletic as the first Ryerson student-athlete to win CIS MVP honours in any sport winning the Joe Johnson Memorial Trophy for CIS Soccer Player of the Year.

The team went all the way, defeated at the very end in hard-fought OUA/CIS playoff games in a season where they took the field with outstanding blue-and-gold talent and pride.
- Men's Basketball and Men's Volleyball teams made the national CIS Top Ten rankings in the opening weeks of the varsity season.

Alumni Achievement Awards – On November 18th we announced the annual awards recognizing outstanding Ryerson graduates who have excelled in their careers and made significant contributions to their profession, community and country. The awards will be presented at a special event on Thursday, February 13th, 2014. The winners are:

- Marci Ien (RTA '91), CTV Canada AM co-host, CTV News Channel occasional anchor, broadcast journalist.
- Patrick O'Hanlon (Urban and Regional Planning '83), president, Angus Glen Development Ltd., one of the GTA's most influential home builders.
- John Saunders (Psychology '77), anchorman and sports journalist, ESPN and ABC Sports, Toronto Raptors play-by-play announcer (1995-2001), 2013 inductee into the Ryerson Rams Hall of Fame (Hockey 1976-78).
- Nicole Winstanley (Publishing '00), president and publisher, Penguin Group Canada, and first female president of a Canadian branch of a major global publishing house.

Isadore Sharp Outstanding Recent Graduate Award –

- Lekan Olawoya (Social Work '07), Chair, Premier's Council on Youth Opportunities, and recipient of the 2011 United Way Toronto Innovation and Creativity Award.

Outstanding Volunteer Award –

- Maurizio Rogato (Urban and Regional Planning '02), former Chair of the Ryerson Alumni Planning Committee.

Outstanding International Alumni Award –

- Teriano Lesancha (Social Work '12), the first Maasai woman from her village in Kenya to earn a university degree, whose charitable foundation SupaMaasai empowers girls and women through education and entrepreneurship.

Next Big Idea – Winners of 'The Next Big Idea' competition for India's most innovative entrepreneurs were announced on November 11th. The two companies, *Citrus Payment Solutions*, an online system for merchants and consumers, and *Ingenuity Ventures*, a marketing service using interactive media and social networking, have won the opportunity to experience three weeks incubating their businesses in the DMZ. Supported by the Ontario government, the Next Big Idea was announced at the launch of the partnership between Ryerson University, Ryerson Futures Inc. (RFI) and Bombay Stock Exchange Institute Ltd. (BSEI) in July 2013.

Installations: Every year there are new presidents and chancellors installed at universities across Canada, and it is a privilege to recognize our national fellowship offering congratulations on behalf of the Ryerson community. There were nine such special events this Fall, including the installation of President Meric Gertler at the University of Toronto, an occasion I was pleased to attend bringing greetings on behalf of us all. Farther afield I am proud to report that we continue to be represented on occasion by members of our alumni, proudly wearing a Ryerson hood as members of the platform party.

from the President's Calendar

October 24, 2013: At the Queen's Park cabinet office annual policy conference, I delivered the keynote address on Ryerson's success advancing an agenda of city-building and innovation.

October 24, 2013 – CRTC Chair Jean-Pierre Blais was on campus announcing the launch of “a conversation with Canadians” on the future of television in an evolving digital world.

October 24, 2010 – The #BringItHome Sochi 2014 Olympic Winter Games campaign was launched at the Mattamy Athletic Centre, designed to build the spirit of home field advantage and national pride.

October 30, 2013: At the annual COU David Smith dinner, the Hon. Dalton McGuinty, former premier of Ontario, was honoured for his contributions to postsecondary education.

November 6-8, 2013: With Kevin Lynch, I served as co-chair of the Ontario Economic Summit with agenda focused on the province's ‘Emerging Stronger’ strategy.

November 9, 2013: At the Council of Chairs of Ontario Universities (CCOU) conference, I participated on a member of a panel entitled “Listening to Managers of University Education” discussing projected changes in the postsecondary sector.

RYERSON ACHIEVEMENT REPORT

A sampling of appearances in the media by members of the Ryerson community for the December 2013 meeting of the Ryerson University Senate.

The Globe and Mail reported on a new Ryerson-St. Michael's Hospital 20-year collaboration to create new health technologies, quoting **President Sheldon Levy**, and mentioning **Michael Kolios** and the Digital Media Zone <http://bit.ly/1bejGEm>. The item, pitched by Public Affairs, was also picked up by Global News <http://bit.ly/1eIDxGB> and Academica.ca.

President Levy spoke to CBC Radio's Metro Morning about the DMZ's new partnership in India. Listen: <http://bit.ly/18a9Uze>. He also spoke to the Toronto Star about the DMZ <http://bit.ly/18wfAE1>

Yahoo! Finance reported on the launch of Women's History Month, with Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women Kellie Leitch joined by Ryerson students and **Julia Hanigsberg**, vice president, administration and finance. The article quoted **President Levy** <http://yhoo.it/1aKEExix>. Similar items appeared in the Digital Journal, Nebraska TV, AZ TV, and the Sacramento Bee.

ABC News reported on an exhibit of **Robert Burley's** photographic work at the National Gallery of Canada, produced by the Ryerson Image Centre and curated by **Gaelle Morel** <http://bit.ly/H32rwP>. Similar items appeared on Fox 19 <http://bit.ly/GSfhNH>, CBS <http://bit.ly/1aQOZoe>, Photo Life and Digital Journal. Prof. Burley spoke to CBC Radio about his book on Kodak, "The Disappearance of Darkness".

680 News reported that Ryerson moved from 12 to 10 in Maclean's annual university rankings' comprehensive category <http://bit.ly/1genxa4>. Related stories appeared on CBC News <http://bit.ly/1aLdsxo> and the Weekly Voice <http://bit.ly/1bIQANt>.

Bloomberg Businessweek reported that Ryerson was recognized with the 2013 Presidents' Award by the Tourism Toronto and the Greater Toronto Hotel Association in recognition of the revitalization of the University's downtown precinct, the pedestrianization of Gould Street and the creation of multiple award winning buildings contributing to the vibrancy of Toronto's downtown core <http://buswk.co/16LuK97>.

Yonge St. Media reported on a multi-million dollar Ryerson Faculty of Community Services study on reducing mental illness stigma among men in Asian communities, quoting **Sepali Guruge**, one of the principal investigators, an item pitched by Public Affairs <http://bit.ly/1dpQgVU>.

The National Post published a major feature story on Ryerson's Fashion Research Centre, quoting collection co-ordinator **Ingrid Mida**, an item pitched by Public Affairs <http://bit.ly/16XWKd6>.

Chancellor Lawrence Bloomberg appeared on BNN's Headline program following his induction into the Investment Industry Hall of Fame.

BioPhotonics featured cancer and blood cell research by **Michael Kolios** <http://bit.ly/17RFV3x>. Reuters profiled WaveCheck chemotherapy monitoring for women with breast cancer, co-developed by Kolios <http://reut.rs/1qsTEkU>. Similar items appeared in 9&10 News and Yahoo Finance, while Healthcare Technology reported on crowdfunding for WaveCheck <http://bit.ly/1fHUPy3>. Virtual Strategy Magazine reported on WaveCheck being named to the Globe and Mail's top 10 crowdfunding list.

Canadian Business ranked Ryerson fourth out of 10 Canadian MBAs <http://bit.ly/1aluzaT>.

The New Yorker profiled film alumni **Walter Woodman** and **Patrick Cederberg's** short film *Noah* <http://nyr.kr/163ADge>. They were also featured in The Hollywood Reporter <http://bit.ly/1cXK8DS>, CTV News and the Huffington Post.

Marie Bountrogianni, interim dean, The Chang School, spoke to the National Post about an enterprising remedy for youth underemployment <http://bit.ly/15hiqQj>.

The Council of Ontario Universities featured **Wendy Cukier**, vice president research and innovation, and Founder and Director, Diversity Institute, among Top 25 Women of Influence. <http://bit.ly/18bCQHg>. The item, pitched by Public Affairs, also appeared in Advisor.ca <http://bit.ly/19OiXtd>, Yahoo! and OSIX News. **Dr. Cukier** spoke to the National Post about an incubator program for women entrepreneurs <http://bit.ly/1fu4GpG>. The item, pitched by Public Affairs, was also picked up by The Saskatoon Star Phoenix, Montreal Gazette, Regina Leader-Post, Calgary Herald, Edmonton Journal, Vancouver Sun and Ottawa Citizen.

Canadian Architect reported that the Ryerson Image Centre/School of Image Arts building was recognized by the 2013 Toronto Urban Design Awards <http://bit.ly/14LYvea>. A similar item appeared in Daily Commercial News.

Ivor Shapiro, Journalism, spoke to the Canadian Press in reaction to the Toronto Star purchasing a video of Mayor Rob Ford. The item was also picked up by the Montreal Gazette <http://bit.ly/1ac0IED>, Maclean's <http://bit.ly/1d0betE>, City News Toronto <http://bit.ly/1cldRnV>, CP24, Metro News, Mississauga News, and News Talk 650.

A number of Ryerson faculty members were quoted in the media regarding the Mayor Ford issue:

Oren Amitay, Psychology, spoke to Global News about pressure being put on the Mayor to consider rehab <http://bit.ly/1aaLxWT>. He also spoke to 680 News <http://bit.ly/17EAnfe>.

Myer Siemiatycki, Politics, was quoted in a Huffington Post Politics article about Mayor Ford's regrets and denials <http://huff.to/17im53g>. He also spoke to eCanada Now about the Mayor's admission to smoking crack-cocaine <http://bit.ly/1arl0RN> and to the Toronto Star about the mayor's allies calling on him to take leave and get help. He was also quoted in a Canadian Press piece on Mayor Ford sparking interest in Toronto politics. The item was picked up by CityNews <http://bit.ly/18kvPEg>, Yahoo! News Winnipeg Free Press, 660 News, Maclean's <http://bit.ly/1d7ByTk>, CBC.ca, Huffington Post, Toronto Star <http://bit.ly/1g5a3gG> World Journal and Yahoo! News.

Gabor Forgacs, Hospitality and Tourism Management, spoke to CBC News <http://bit.ly/HzvJD0> and Radio Canada <http://bit.ly/1bdFEax> about the impact of Mayor Ford's troubles on the city.

Chris Macdonald, TRSM, published an op-ed in the Ottawa Citizen on the topic of the Mayor's downfall <http://bit.ly/17Mcq3l>.

Patrice Dutil, Politics, spoke to Radio Canada about Mayor Ford <http://bit.ly/1aGWZfD>. He also spoke to MSN News <http://on-msn.com/1bdiRdr>.

The Guardian reported on a study on sizes and the fashion industry by **Ben Barry**, Fashion <http://bit.ly/1cR61UY>.

Robert Ott, Chair, School of Fashion, spoke to the Toronto Star about challenges ahead for the Canadian garment industry <http://bit.ly/1qMEOsb>.

The Canadian Press reported that **Alex Braletic** was named CIS men's soccer player of the year. The item was picked up by Metro News <http://bit.ly/1b9fkQl>, the Winnipeg Free Press, Nanaimo Daily News and Times Colonist.

Fairchild TV interviewed exchange student **Haiyang Li (Jane)** on her experience at Ryerson's DMZ. Video: <http://bit.ly/1fmcAAh>. The item was pitched by Public Affairs.

CTV News interviewed **Andrew Cherwenka**, founder of Authentic, a DMZ-based startup, on the topic of Twitter's IPO, an item pitched by Public Affairs.

A CBC News segment on Take Our Kids to Work Day featured a tweet by **Julia Hanigsberg**, vice president, administration and finance, on Ryerson's event <http://bit.ly/1as9p4X>.

Canadian Art featured an exhibition of emerging indigenous artists at the Ryerson Image Centre <http://bit.ly/1eY4uK>. A similar item appeared on APTN National News.

Yonge Street Media featured DMZ-based entrepreneur **Zacharie Weingarten** and his company FoodStory, which has turned a TTC bus into a mobile food market <http://bit.ly/1bbgxFs>. The item, pitched by Public Affairs, also appeared in Star Business Club.

The Toronto Star profiled Green Screenz, a new movie industry product conceived by Ryerson MBA student and entrepreneur **Kevin Moroney** <http://bit.ly/18WbZ2B>

Economia Mexico reported on the DMZ, quoting **Dean Gerd Hauck** <http://bit.ly/17aMQa7>.

OMNI News: Mandarin Edition interviewed **Michelle Beaton**, international student recruitment manager, on higher education in Canada.

Global News interviewed **Colleen Carney**, Psychology, on the impact of Daylight Savings Time <http://bit.ly/16sThmq>. Similar items appeared on CityNews Toronto <http://bit.ly/1bJ3DhG>, 680 News <http://bit.ly/1ayIRG9>, 660 News and Radio Canada.

Trinidad and Tobago Newsday reported on a video produced by eight RTA students <http://bit.ly/HBNB0N>. A similar item appeared in Trinidad Express <http://bit.ly/1aXuNDk>.

FLARE profiled Fashion alumna **Joyce Gunhouse** of the Comrags label <http://bit.ly/16sz5Ry>.

The Globe and Mail featured alumnus **J. E. Skeets** and his show on NBA TV <http://bit.ly/1fdCMNC>.

Engineering.com profiled research by **Fengfeng Xi**, Aerospace Engineering, on wing design and aerodynamics, an item pitched by Public Affairs <http://bit.ly/1dXdR2Q>. A similar item appeared on Phys.org.

TechVibes profiled DMZ-incubated startup Greengage. <http://bit.ly/1bCWEXy>. A similar item appeared in Betakit <http://bit.ly/16MZd6D>

April Lindgren, Journalism, appeared on TVO's The Agenda discussing ethnic media.

A Canadian Press article on transit expansion mentioned that the 13-member panel convened by the Ontario Premier would be chaired by Ryerson's **Anne Golden**. Pick-ups included the Toronto Star <http://bit.ly/1qzqxR1>, CTV News <http://bit.ly/1dpk8RK>, Metro News, Global News, Winnipeg Free Press, Inside Halton, Hamilton Spectator and Ottawa Citizen.

CBC Radio's Here and Now interviewed **Steve Tissenbaum**, TRSM, on Christmas retail displays before Halloween. Listen: <http://jasonosler.com/>

CBC National spoke with **Elizabeth Evans**, TRSM, regarding retailer Sears closing stores including its flagship at the Toronto Eaton Centre. Video: <http://bit.ly/1dISC8e>.

Canadian Business profiled Ryerson's specialized MBA in commercial real estate management and mining specialization, quoting MBA director **Kimberly Bates** <http://bit.ly/1dFHWUv>

Jessa Chupik, manager of recruitment, retention and employment equity, spoke to the Globe and Mail about being happy at work <http://bit.ly/Hmeq8a>

Chris MacDonald, TRSM, spoke to CTV News about Loblaw's decision to compensate victims in Bangladesh, as a faculty expert pitched by Public Affairs. Video: <http://bit.ly/1eWziig>.

Kernaghan Webb, TRSM, addressed the topic on CBC Radio's Metro Morning. The segment was picked up in Windsor, Thunder Bay and Ottawa.

South Asian Focus quoted Provost **Mohamed Lachemi** and **Usha George**, dean, Faculty of Community Services in an article about a Ryerson conference on economic integration <http://bit.ly/18eRY78>.

Julia Shin Doi, general counsel and secretary of the Board of Governors, was quoted by the Canadian Bar Association about community among Korean-Canadian lawyers <http://bit.ly/1hc8xbH>

The Globe and Mail reported on Ryerson initiatives in sustainable architecture

The Canadian Press reported on Parkinson's research by Ryerson graduate student **Rachel Bar**. The item was picked up by Canada.com <http://bit.ly/1a9jJAP>, AOL, Sing Tao Daily, Calgary Herald, Metro, Huffington Post, CBC News and CTV News <http://bit.ly/H48ctM>

The Globe and Mail profiled DMZ-based student finance app Spenz. <http://bit.ly/HdfcoH>

Global's The Morning Show reported on student **Kyle Forgeard's** surprise lecture serenades, which have gone viral on YouTube. Similar items appeared in the Daily Mail Online <http://dailym.ai/1eEXnKu>, Toronto Star <http://bit.ly/19G5vuD>, Global News <http://bit.ly/170tTXY>, Waterloo Region Record and Guelph Mercury.

The Globe and Mail quoted **Chad Nuttall**, student housing services, on posh dorm rooms.

Asian Pacific Post reported that alumnus **Gagandeep Ghuman** was recognized by the School of Journalism as a "Headliner" <http://bit.ly/1bSr6xF>

Martin Antony, Psychology, spoke to eFm: This Morning (South Korea) about phobias. Listen: <http://bit.ly/1601Ogu>

Daily Commercial News reported on a Ryerson-Schneider Electric partnership to build a smart grid, quoting **Bala Venkatesh**, Electrical Engineering <http://bit.ly/17E3h9z>. A Yonge Street Media article on the topic quoted **Sri Krishnan**, interim dean of engineering <http://bit.ly/18ODyNh>. Other pick-ups include WRLWND.com, quoting **Adam Kahan**, vice-president of university advancement and **Bala Venkatesh** <http://bit.ly/15u1yIq>, Clean Energy, Electrical Line Magazine and PEM Magazine.

Dana Lee, RTA, spoke to CBC Radio's Metro Morning about pick-and-pay television and the TV industry. Listen: <http://bit.ly/174ZKXr>. **Gregory Taylor**, address the topic on BNN's The Close. Video: <http://bit.ly/16hYwSl>.

CBC News quoted **Pamela Palmater**, Politics, on the topic of protests in New Brunswick.

Digital Community Facilitator **Hamza Khan** spoke to CBC's The National about Twitter's IPO.

China News profiled DMZ entrepreneur **Cathy Han** <http://bit.ly/18oHYMO>. A similar item appeared in Sina News <http://bit.ly/H34cu0>.

Law Times quoted vice-provost **Avner Levin** on diversity in law firms <http://bit.ly/1c9xtkk>. He also spoke to CTV News about Facebook removing its search privacy controls and to Global about privacy issues surrounding the iPhone.

Heather-Lane Vetere, vice-provost, students, spoke to the Toronto Star about a mid-term fall break for Ontario university students <http://bit.ly/1fwT9Yf>. The item was also picked up by Metro News.

CBC News reported on the Machinima art series at the Ryerson Image Centre, quoting curator **Steven Loft** <http://bit.ly/1gxAuuf>. The Toronto Star profiled the Ghost Dance exhibit at the RIC <http://bit.ly/GW2NV5>.

Canadian Architect reported that the Department of Architectural Science would launch a new co-op program, an item pitched by Public Affairs <http://bit.ly/1amNdKa>.

Mexical Xpress featured research by **Nick Bellissimo** <http://bit.ly/GUHu72>, on the topic of factors affecting children's appetite and food intake, an item pitched by Public Affairs.

The Toronto Star profiled the DMZ, and startups SensorSuite and Rayku, an item pitched by Public Affairs.

Randy Boyagoda, English, spoke to CityNews in reaction to Alice Munro's Nobel Prize for literature, as a faculty expert identified by Public Affairs.

The Canadian Press reported that **Kamal Al-Solaylee**, Journalism, won the \$10,000 Toronto Book Award. The item was picked up by Metro News, CBC News <http://bit.ly/16yhhVt>, City News Toronto <http://bit.ly/1bJ9nN6>, News Talk 980, News 1130, Brandon Sun, Rocky View Weekly and Global Toronto <http://bit.ly/1belpZp>.

Lucia Dell'Agnes, Fashion, spoke to the Toronto Star about the design of Team Canada's hockey jerseys for the Sochi Olympics. <http://bit.ly/1bV0MUr>. The item was also picked up by the Hamilton Spectator. The design was unveiled at the Mattamy Athletic Centre, and covered by the Toronto Star, CBC News Now and CityTV's Breakfast Television.

Entrepreneurs get head starts on campus (Maclean's) "...Ryerson's DMZ nurture startups"; quotes **Brennan McEachran** of HitSend <http://bit.ly/199kdX1>

A Canadian Press article on a possible Enbridge pipeline through Ontario and Quebec quoted **Phil Walsh**, Centre for Urban Energy, and was picked up by the National Post <http://bit.ly/1bUhNOu>, CBC.ca <http://bit.ly/1ad7sLu>, City News Toronto <http://bit.ly/1fUtNV9>, MSN News, CTV News <http://bit.ly/1bAP4Bx>, Canadian Manufacturing, Hamilton Spectator, Yahoo News and Huff Post Business.

New Canadian Media quoted **Harald Bauder**, academic director of the Centre for Immigration and Settlement, in an article on migrants as much more than agents of growth.

Murtaza Haider spoke to Global Toronto about deferred maintenance in the City of Toronto, as a faculty expert pitched by Public Affairs <http://bit.ly/1bFB99T>.

The Australian Society of Entrepreneurs featured **Ivan Joseph's** TEDxRyerson talk on self-confidence <http://bit.ly/15P0TvS>. A similar item appeared in Australian Anthill. Global News profiled DMZ-based entrepreneur **Christine Fitzgerald** of Innohub/Aha Moment.

In an article on universities, student unions and free speech, the Prince Arthur Herald reported that "of Ontario's 23 universities, the best was Ryerson University in Toronto, ranked as one of Canada's top universities..." The item was also picked up by Huffington Post.

Hossein Rahnama, director of research and innovation at the DMZ, spoke to CBC Radio's Spark about context-aware computing Listen: <http://bit.ly/1bN7iyZ>

The Globe and Mail profiled the DMZ <http://bit.ly/1at1AOS>.

The Toronto Star reported that Ryerson will launch a youth activism program honouring Jack Layton, quoting distinguished visiting practitioner **Cathy Crowe** and Jack Layton Chair **Myer Siemiatycki** <http://bit.ly/18XAHVZ>. The item was also picked up by Sing Tao Daily <http://bit.ly/19Q1Y7P>.

Star Business Club profiled Ryerson DMZ-based startup Kira Talent; expert advice features **Brynn Winegard** <http://bit.ly/14E0yPh>

Fangmin Wang of Library & Archives was quoted in a Post City article on tablet devices.

The Gleaner quoted **Julia Hanigsberg**, vice president, administration and finance, <http://bit.ly/18kEElw> on the topic of water-bottle-free campuses. A similar item appeared in the Water Environment Federation <http://bit.ly/19t0iCs>.

Daily Commercial News profiled the construction of the Student Learning Centre <http://bit.ly/18OL26v>

CTV Toronto and CP24 Interview with Dr. **Su-Ting Teo**, director of Ryerson's Health Centre, on mental health issues among students. Video: <http://bit.ly/1dxdlpo>

Journalism student **Christina Dun** contributed a piece to the Huffington Post on fashion and culture at Ryerson <http://huff.to/1bvgTtU>.

Metro News profiled Theatre School student **Venessa Koch** and her thesis <http://bit.ly/16fehbF>.

Sportswear International reported on "Canada's leading fashion school, Ryerson University" <http://bit.ly/1gCJuyp>

Sandra Kerr, director of the 50+ program at the Chang School, appeared on AM 740. Listen: <http://bit.ly/18BRj5l>

Sign Builder Illustrated quoted **Abhay Sharma**, GCM, in an article about a new partnership between Roland and Ryerson <http://bit.ly/1dmla0V>. The item was also picked up by My Print Resource, Label & Narrow Web and What They Think.

CBC Radio's Here and Now spoke with **Klaas Kray** about his research on whether God matters, an item pitched by Public Affairs.

Lisa Taylor, Journalism, was quoted in the Toronto Star on the topic of reviewing access to criminal court records <http://bit.ly/18stp6u>

Sean Sedlezky, Retail Management, spoke to the National Post and Regina Leader-Post about the retail landscape.

The Financial Post profiled DMZ startup set scouter <http://bit.ly/180iKUp>.

The Globe and Mail <http://bit.ly/1eYqiB3>, CP24 Breakfast, Global, CTV News and CFTR 680 News reported on Liberal Leader Justin Trudeau's visit to Ryerson.

HR Reporter profiled research on women facing identity conflicts in the workplace by **Fei Song**, TRSM, <http://bit.ly/15xexak>. Similar items also appeared in Physorg and Guelph Mercury. The item was pitched by Public Affairs.

CBC Radio's Here and Now interviewed EDGE Lab researcher **Sherene Ng** about the entrepreneurial support she's received from Ryerson. The item was pitched by Public Affairs.

Report #F2013-3 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC)

1. Draft policy requested at the June 2013 meeting, based on the September 18 2012 YSGS document “Proposal for a Framework for Professional Master’s Diplomas.”

Motion: *That Senate approve the proposed modifications to Policy 112 (Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs) as described in the attached revision.*

RYERSON UNIVERSITY POLICY OF SENATE**DEVELOPMENT OF NEW GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

Policy Number¹:	112
Previous Approval Dates for Policy 112	May 6, 2008, March 1, 2005, May 9, 2002 February 7, 1995 (original policy)
Previous Approval Dates for Policy 127	January 2002 (Reformatted), October 2000, October 1996
Current Policy Approval Date	May 3, 2011
Policy Review Date	May 2013 <i>(or sooner at the request of the Provost and Vice President Academic or Senate)</i>
Policy Reviewed	November 4, 2013
Responsible Committee or Office	Provost and Vice President Academic

POLICY STATEMENT**I. SCOPE**

This policy governs the creation of new degrees, degree programs or programs of specialization² that require Quality Council approval at the undergraduate and graduate level, including those offered jointly with other post-secondary institutions. It does not include change of program name only, nor the inclusion of a new stream(s) or option(s) within an existing program.

Definitions:

- A. New program:** A new program has substantially different program requirements and substantially different learning outcomes from those of any existing approved programs offered by the institution.
- B. Degree program:** The complete set and sequence of courses, combination of courses and/or other units of study, research and practice prescribed by the University for the fulfillment of a degree. Degrees are granted for meeting the established requirements at a specified standard of performance consistent with the university's Degree Level Expectations (DLEs). (See APPENDIX I and II).

II. AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

- A. Senate:** Final internal authority for the academic approval of all Ryerson University programs rests with the Senate.

¹ This policy combines Policies on new undergraduate programs (Policy 112) and graduate programs (previously Policy 127) in keeping with COU guidelines developed in 2010.

² This includes Graduate Diplomas at the Masters and Doctoral level

- B. Academic Standards Committee (ASC), Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council (YSGS Council):** As committees of Senate, these committees will review final proposals for new undergraduate and graduate programs as defined by the Quality Council, respectively, and will bring recommendations to Senate with respect to their approval.
- C. Provost and Vice President Academic**
1. approval of the development of program proposals, based on Letters of Intent (LOI); and
 2. final approval of implementation and budget of new programs.
- D. Vice Provost, Academic**
1. accepting undergraduate LOIs and full program proposals for submission to the Provost;
 2. submitting full undergraduate program proposals to the Academic Standards Committee for review and approval: and
 3. monitoring of new programs, once initiated, in conjunction with the Vice Provost, University Planning.
- E. Vice Provost, University Planning**
1. development of budget and evaluation of student demand.
- F. Deans**
1. Faculty Deans, or Deans of Record for Interdisciplinary Programs, have the authority for the submission of:
 - a. new undergraduate program LOIs to the Vice Provost Academic for submission to the Provost;
 - b. new undergraduate program proposals to the Vice Provost Academic for submission to the Provost;
 - c. new graduate program LOIs to the Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies for submission to the Provost; and
 - d. new graduate program proposals to the Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies for submission to the Provost.
 2. Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies has the authority for the submission to the Provost of:
 - a. new graduate program LOIs; and
 - b. new graduate program proposals.
- G. YSGS Programs and Planning Committee:** Reviews and makes recommendations on graduate program proposals to YSGS Council.
- H. Department/School and Faculty Councils (where applicable):** The approval of Councils is required for an LOI or new program proposal to proceed to the Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record for submission to the Vice Provost Academic for undergraduate proposals or the Provost for graduate proposals.
- I. Ontario University Council on Quality Assurance:**
1. The Quality Council has the authority to approve or decline new program proposals.
 2. The Provost, through the Vice Provost Academic, has the responsibility to report to the Quality Council about the approval process for all new programs.
- J. Board of Governors:** Authority for the financial approval of all new programs rests with the Board of Governors.
- K. Disputes:** If there is a disagreement within a Department/School, or between Departments/Schools with respect to the development of a new program, the relevant Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record shall decide how to proceed. Should there be a disagreement between Deans or Dean(s) of Record or between a Dean and a Department/School or Faculty Council, the Provost

shall decide how to proceed.

III. IMPLEMENTATION: If a new program does not begin within thirty-six months of its approval by the Quality Council and Ryerson University's Board of Governors to commence, its approval will lapse.

IV. PROCEDURES: The Provost shall establish the procedures related to this policy, and review those procedures as necessary. The procedures associated with this policy shall include all of the steps necessary for the approval of undergraduate and graduate programs.

APPENDIX I: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

	UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE
EXPECTATIONS	<i>All undergraduate degree programs at Ryerson will be expected to demonstrate that at the completion of the program students would have acquired the following set of skills.</i>
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A developed knowledge and critical understanding of the key concepts, methodologies, current advances, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline overall, as well as in a specialized area of a discipline; b. A developed understanding of many of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines; c. A developed ability to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Gather, review, evaluate and interpret information; and ii. Compare the merits of alternate hypotheses or creative options, relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline; d. A developed, detailed knowledge of and experience in research in an area of the discipline; e. Developed critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline; f. The ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline.
2. Knowledge of Methodologies	<p>An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; b. Devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods; and describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship.
3. Application of Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Develop lines of argument; ii. Make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; iii. Apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the discipline; iv. Where appropriate use this knowledge in the

	<p>creative process; and</p> <p>b. The ability to use a range of established techniques to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and information; ii. Propose solutions; iii. Frame appropriate questions for the purpose of solving a problem; iv. Solve a problem or create a new work; and <p>c. The ability to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.</p>
4. Communication Skills	The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.
5. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge	An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and ability, and an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits to knowledge and how this might influence analyses and interpretations.
6. Autonomy and Professional Capacity	<p>a. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The exercise of initiative, personal responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts; ii. Working effectively with others; iii. Decision-making in complex contexts; <p>b. The ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline and to select an appropriate program of further study; and</p> <p>c. Behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.</p>

APPENDIX II: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS

MASTER'S DEGREE	
EXPECTATIONS	<i>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:</i>
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	A systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.
2. Research and Scholarship	<p>A conceptual understanding and methodological competence that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Enables a working comprehension of how established techniques of research and inquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline; b. Enables a critical evaluation of current research and advanced research and scholarship in the discipline or area of professional competence; and c. Enables a treatment of complex issues and judgments based on established principles and techniques; and, <p>On the basis of that competence, has shown at least one of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The development and support of a sustained argument in written form; or b. Originality in the application of knowledge.
3. Level of Application of Knowledge	Competence in the research process by applying an existing body of knowledge in the critical analysis of a new question or of a specific problem or issue in a new setting.
4. Professional Capacity/Autonomy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The exercise of initiative and of personal responsibility and accountability; and ii. Decision-making in complex situations; and b. The intellectual independence required for continuing professional development; c. The ethical behaviour consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and d. The ability to appreciate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.
5. Level of Communications Skills	The ability to communicate ideas, issues and conclusions clearly.
6. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge	Cognizance of the complexity of knowledge and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.

DOCTORAL DEGREE	
EXPECTATIONS	<i>This degree extends the skills associated with the Master's degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrated:</i>
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	A thorough understanding of a substantial body of knowledge that is at the forefront of their academic discipline or area of professional practice.
2. Research and Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The ability to conceptualize, design, and implement research for the generation of new knowledge, applications, or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the research design or methodology in the light of unforeseen problems; b. The ability to make informed judgments on complex issues in specialist fields, sometimes requiring new methods; and c. The ability to produce original research, or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, and to merit publication.
3. Level of Application of Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The capacity to undertake pure and/or applied research at an advanced level; and b. Contribute to the development of academic or professional skills, techniques, tools, practices, ideas, theories, approaches, and/or materials.
4. Professional Capacity/Autonomy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex situations; b. The intellectual independence to be academically and professionally engaged and current; c. The ethical behaviour consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and d. The ability to evaluate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.
5. Level of Communication Skills	The ability to communicate complex and/or ambiguous ideas, issues and conclusions clearly and effectively.
6. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge	An appreciation of the limitations of one's own work and discipline, of the complexity of knowledge, and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.

**POLICY 112: DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL OF
NEW GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

PROCEDURES

The stages of the developmental and approval process are:

1. GENERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL

1.1 Initiation of the Process

Preliminary proposals for new degree programs will be developed by faculty groups ("originating units") that are comprised of faculty from a single school or department, from several schools and/or departments within a Faculty, from schools and departments from different Faculties, from other internal Ryerson units, or from collaborative structures involving other post-secondary institutions.

1.2 Authorization to Proceed

The authorization of the Provost and Vice President Academic³ is required before a full program proposal is developed.

The first step in obtaining this authorization is a *Letter of Intent (LOI)* to be prepared by the originating unit. When the unit has received approval from the relevant Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record, the LOI will be transmitted to the Vice Provost Academic for undergraduate proposals and the Provost for graduate proposals.

This letter will include:

- a. a brief statement of the consistency of the program with Ryerson's mission and academic plan, the Faculty plan and, if applicable, the Department/School plan;
- b. a brief description of the proposed program including its purpose, anticipated student clientele, and curriculum;
- c. a preliminary statement of existing and/or emerging societal need and the basis on which this has been determined;
- d. a preliminary projection of faculty and other resource requirements, developed in consultation with the University Planning Office;
- e. a schedule for the development of the program, noting that the program proposal must be presented to the ASC or YSGS Council within one year of the approval of the LOI;
- f. the proposed schedule for program implementation;
- g. an executive summary; and
- h. for graduate programs, a statement of whether the program is a professional program and/or a full cost recovery program;

³ Hereafter referred to as Provost.

- i. for graduate programs, letters of support and commitment from the relevant Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record.

The executive summary will be posted by the Provost and, along with the complete LOI, will be available for inspection by any interested member of the Ryerson community. A period of one month⁴ is set aside for comment on the proposal.

The Provost will respond to the letter of intent after the expiry of the one-month community response period. If the development of a proposal is authorized, an academic unit will be formally designated to assume responsibility for it and a Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record will be given primary responsibility. The designated academic unit(s) may correspond to an existing school/department or be newly created for the purpose of developing a formal proposal. In the case of undergraduate inter-Faculty proposals the Provost shall decide which Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record shall be given primary responsibility.

Authorization to proceed signifies that the University supports the development of a formal program proposal, but it does not commit the University or the Faculty to final endorsement.

2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE FORMAL PROPOSAL

2.1 Proposal Content

A proposal must include:

2.1.1 *Basic information*

- a. Name of the program and the proposed degree designation(s), identification of the designated academic unit, the program governance structure and the names of the principal faculty members involved in its development.
- b. Statement of the program's learning outcomes, clearly identifying the rationale for offering this new program as it relates to societal need, Ryerson's mission and academic plan and the academic plans of the Faculty and the Department/School. Anticipated student demand for the program, supported with the strongest evidence possible, and evidence that graduates of the program are and will be needed in appropriate sectors.
- c. Overview of the curriculum and major disciplines/options of the program.
- d. A presentation of the program curriculum in a clear tabular format.
- e. Discussion of the overlap between, and/or integration of, the program with other existing or planned programs at Ryerson.
- f. Copy of the Provost's authorization to proceed and a summary of major departures from the Letter of Intent
- g. **New Program Advisory Committee (for undergraduate programs only):** Once authorization to proceed has been given, a New Program Advisory Committee will be constituted. This Committee will consist of at least 5 members. The designated academic unit will provide the relevant Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record with a list of suggested members and brief biographical sketches. The suggested members may be drawn, as appropriate, from

⁴ At the discretion of the Provost the posting requirement may vary for programs of specialization.

business, industry, labour, agencies, government, and other universities. As the proposal is developed, the role of the committee is to provide advice on:

- i. program learning outcomes;
- ii. proposed courses and curriculum structure;
- iii. equipment and other required support (where relevant);
- iv. likely employment patterns for graduates; and
- v. any other aspects of the proposed program related to its learning outcomes, structure, and societal relevance.

In general, the committee's advice will be sought periodically during the development of the proposal. Its working relationship with the designated academic unit should be iterative.

2.1.2 *Program details*

a. **Alignment with institution's plans**

- i. Consistency of the program with the institution's mission and academic plans.
- ii. Clarity and appropriateness of the program's requirements and associated learning outcomes in addressing the institution's own undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations.
- iii. Appropriateness of degree nomenclature.

b. **Admission requirements**

- i. A statement of the admission requirements and the appropriateness of the program's admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program.⁵
- ii. Sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, for admission into a graduate, second-entry or undergraduate program, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience.

c. **Structure**

- i. Appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and degree level expectations.
- ii. For graduate programs, a clear rationale for program length that ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period.

d. **Program content**

- i. Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study.
- ii. An analysis of the program's curriculum content in terms of professional licensing/accreditation requirements, if any.
- iii. Identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components.
- iv. For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion.
- v. Evidence that each graduate program requires students to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses.

e. **Mode of delivery**

- i. Appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.

⁵ Admission requirements should be established at an early stage in the program development. They should be established in consultation with the appropriate admissions unit (e.g., the Office of Undergraduate Admissions and Recruitment for undergraduate programs).

- f. **Assessment of teaching and learning**
 - i. Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.
 - ii. Completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution's statement of its Degree Level Expectations.
 - iii. Promotion and graduation requirements, if variant from Ryerson's graduate or undergraduate policies on grading, promotion and academic standing.

- g. **Resources (Developed in consultation with the University Planning Office)**
 - i. **For all programs**
 - a. Adequacy of the administrative unit's planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any current institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the program.
 - b. Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program.
 - c. Report by the university library on existing and proposed collections and services to support the program's learning outcomes and learning objectives.
 - d. Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain quality graduate and undergraduate research activities, including information technology and laboratory access.

 - ii. **Resources for graduate programs only**
 - a. Evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate.
 - b. Where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students.
 - c. Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision.
 - d. Estimated number of faculty members (total and additional, in FTEs) and support staff required to deliver the program at steady-state conditions
 - e. Projected enrolment levels for at least the first five years of the operation of the new program, leading to the intended steady-state enrolment levels and the year in which such steady-state will be reached
 - f. Tuition proposal for graduate programs
 - g. For PhD programs based on an already existing related Master's program, flow-through cohort data on publication, employment and student funding

 - iii. **Resources for undergraduate programs only:** Evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of:
 - a. faculty and staff to achieve the learning outcomes of the program or of plans and the commitment to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program, including estimated number of faculty members (total and additional, in FTEs) and support staff that will be required to deliver the program at steady-state conditions
 - b. planned/anticipated class sizes;

- c. projected enrolment levels for at least the first five years of the operation of the new program, leading to the intended steady-state enrolment levels and the year in which such steady-state will be reached;
- d. provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and
- e. the role of adjunct and part-time faculty.

A preliminary assessment of financial viability will be carried out as soon as possible after the required information is gathered. The proposal will not be submitted for Decanal approval prior to this preliminary assessment.

h. Quality and other indicators

- i. Definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program).
- ii. Evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

2.1.3 Preliminary External Review for Graduate Programs – If a graduate program so desires, it may engage an external consultant to review the written documents, normally prior to department/school council approval. The consultant will be selected in consultation with the Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record and the Dean of YSGS, and may not be a member of the subsequent Peer Review Team.

2.1.4 Appendices - The following information, relevant to the above, should be included as appendices to the proposal.

- a. Calendar-type course descriptions of each of the proposed courses, accompanied by course level outcomes, and articulating the relationship of these outcomes to program expectations.
- b. A synopsis of each undergraduate professional and required professionally-related course, identifying the major topics of study, potential text(s), methods of evaluation and related computer, laboratory, or studio experience.
- c. A comparison of the proposed program with the most similar programs in Ontario or beyond. If there are significant similarities between the proposed program and existing programs, a case for duplication should be made.
- d. Curriculum Vitae of the faculty members, who will be involved in the development/delivery of the proposed program, formatted as per the RFA Collective Agreement in a single volume.

3. PROCESS FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

3.1 Departmental/School Approval

The formal proposal for an undergraduate or graduate program will be presented to the relevant Departmental/School Council(s) for review and approval. The appropriate Council(s) will be determined in accordance with Senate policies. Where such a Council does not exist the designated Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record shall establish an appropriate committee consisting of members of related department/school councils.

A record will be kept of the date(s) of the relevant Council meeting(s), along with any qualifications or limitations placed on approval by the Council(s). This information must be forwarded to the designated Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record.

3.2 Decanal Endorsement

After the undergraduate program proposal has been approved by the Department/School(s) it will be forwarded to the Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record for his/her endorsement. Once the undergraduate program proposal is approved, the Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record will submit the proposal to the Vice Provost Academic. The Vice Provost Academic will submit the proposal to the ASC for review and approval. Inter-Faculty programs will require the endorsement of the Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record of all involved Faculties.

After the graduate program proposal has been approved by all participating School/Department Council(s), it will be forwarded to the Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record. Once the graduate program is endorsed, the Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record will provide a letter of support and the program proposal to the Yeates School of Graduate Studies for review by the Program and Planning Committee of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council.

3.3 University Planning Office

The University Planning Office (UPO) should be consulted early in the process and throughout the development of the proposal.

4. PEER REVIEW AND SITE VISIT

As soon as possible after a proposal has been endorsed by Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record, it will undergo review by a peer review team as described below.⁶

4.1 Composition and Selection of the Peer Review Team (PRT)

- a. The PRT will consist of two faculty from the relevant discipline(s), field(s) or profession from another university, including universities outside Ontario where appropriate, who are at arm's length from the program school/department
- b. The membership of the undergraduate PRT will be determined and appointed by the Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record based on written information provided by the program. The membership of the graduate PRT will be determined by the Dean of YSGS in consultation with the faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record. Information from the program will include names and brief biographies of four or more faculty external to Ryerson.
- c. The Faculty Dean(s), or Dean(s) of Record for undergraduate programs and the Dean of YSGS, in consultation with the Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record for graduate programs, will ask one of the external reviewers to serve as Chair.
- d. There will be a site visit, structured to include the opportunity for the PRT to meet with appropriate faculty, staff and students.

⁶ Curriculum that falls under an Expedited Approval process as defined by the Quality Council does not require the use of external reviewers.

4.2 The Mandate of the Peer Review Team

The general mandate of the Peer Review Team is to evaluate and report in writing on the academic quality of the proposed program and the capacity of the designated academic unit to deliver it in an appropriate manner. The report of the PRT will address:

- a. the consistency and alignment of the program's learning outcomes with the institution's mission, academic plans and degree level expectations, and appropriateness of the degree nomenclature;
- b. the alignment of the program's learning outcomes with the admission requirements and sufficient explanation of any alternative admission requirements;
- c. the appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and degree level expectations, and for graduate programs a rationale for program length;
- d. the effectiveness of the curriculum in reflecting the current state of the discipline, and in innovative or creative components. For graduate programs an indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements and evidence of the requirement to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses;
- e. the appropriateness of the mode(s) of delivery to meet the program's learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
- f. the appropriateness of methods used to assess, document and demonstrate student achievement of the program's defined learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
- g. the appropriateness and effectiveness of the use of human, physical and financial resources, evidence of a sufficient number and quality of faculty, and evidence of resources to sustain quality scholarship and research activities;
- h. the qualifications, appointment status and recent research or professional/clinical expertise of faculty, and evidence of sufficient student financial assistance to ensure quality and numbers of students;
- i. the evidence of adequate numbers and quality of faculty and staff to achieve the learning outcomes of the program, of planned/anticipated class sizes, of supervision for experiential learning opportunities (if required) and of adjunct and part-time faculty; and
- j. indicators of quality including faculty, program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience

4.3 Provided to the Peer Review Team Before the Site Visit

The Peer Review Team will be provided with a Letter of Invitation, a site visit agenda and their mandate, along with the formal proposal and all documentation pertinent to its approval to this point. This communication will remind the PRT of the confidentiality of the documents presented.

4.4 Provided to the Peer Review Team During the Site Visit

- a. The PRT will be provided with:
 1. access to program administrators, staff, and faculty, administrators of related departments and librarians and students as appropriate; and
 2. any additional information that may be needed to support a thorough review.
- b. At the close of the site visit for an undergraduate program, the PRT will hold a debriefing involving the designated Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record, Vice Provost Academic, and/or the Provost and any others who may be invited. For a graduate program, the Dean of YSGS will also attend.

4.5 After the Site Visit

Within four weeks of the completion of the site visit, the undergraduate PRT will submit its written report to the designated Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record and the Provost. The graduate PRT will submit its written report to the Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record and the Dean of YSGS, also within four weeks of the visit. For undergraduate programs, the designated Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record will circulate this report to the designated academic unit. For graduate programs, the Dean of YSGS will circulate this report to the designated academic unit and the designated Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record.

4.6 Response to the PRT Report

Within four weeks of receipt of the PRT report, the designated academic unit will submit its response for undergraduate program proposals to the designated Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record and for graduate program proposals to the Dean of YSGS. The response will take the form of a statement that identifies any corrections or clarifications, indicates how the PRT recommendations are being accommodated or, if they are not to be accommodated, reasons for this.

A written response to the PRT report must be provided by the designated Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record for undergraduate program proposals and the Dean of YSGS for graduate program proposals.

If the proposal is revised following, or as a result of, the PRT review, the original proposal and the revised proposal must be resubmitted to the designated Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record /Dean of YSGS.

If the designated Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record or the Dean of YSGS believes that this revised proposal differs substantially from the appended formal proposal s/he is required to return it to the Department/School Council(s) for re-approval before providing final decanal endorsement.

Undergraduate Programs

The entire proposal, with revisions, including the PRT review and response and the Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record endorsement, is submitted to the Vice Provost Academic. The Vice Provost Academic, will submit the proposal to ASC.

Graduate Programs

The entire proposal, with revisions, including the PRT review and response and the

designated Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record endorsement, is submitted to the Yeates School of Graduate Studies, for submission to the PPC. PPC will make one the following recommendations:

- a. That the program be sent to the YSGS Council with or without qualification; or
- b. That the program proposal be returned to the designated academic unit for further revision.

Upon approval by the PPC, the Dean of YSGS will submit the entire proposal, with revisions, including the PRT review and response, along with the designated Faculty Dean(s) or Dean(s) of Record endorsement, to the Provost prior to submission to the YSGS Council.

5. ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE (ASC) AND YEATES SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES COUNCIL (YSGS) REVIEW

The ASC or the YSGS Council will review the proposal for academic quality and societal need and make one of the following recommendations:

- a. That the program be recommended for approval by Senate, with or without qualification;
- b. That the program proposal be returned to the originating unit for further revision; or
- c. That the program not be recommended for approval by Senate.

6. SENATE APPROVAL - The Chair of the Academic Standards Committee or the Dean of YSGS (as Chair of the YSGS Council) will submit a report to Senate. Senate approval is the culmination of the internal academic approval process.

7. QUALITY COUNCIL APPROVAL - Once approved by Senate, the Proposal Brief, together with all required reports and documents, as outlined in the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance Framework, will be submitted to the Quality Council for approval as per the required process. Following submission to the Quality Council, the university may announce its intention to offer the program if it is clearly indicated that QC approval is pending and no offers of admission will be made until that approval is received.

8. REPORT TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS - The Provost is responsible for presentation of the program to the Board for approval of financial viability.

9. PROVOST - Final implementation of the program is the responsibility of the Provost.

10. PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW - All new programs will be reviewed no more than eight years after implementation and in accordance with Senate Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs.

REPORT OF ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Report #F2013–3; December 2013

In this report the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) brings to Senate its evaluation and recommendation on the following items:

- Phase out of the Bachelor of Science, Contemporary Science Program
- Change of name of the Minor in Criminal Justice to Minor in Criminology
- New Module in Acting/Dance Studies for the Creative Industries BA Program
- New Minor in Acting/Dance Studies, Ryerson Theatre School

A. PHASE OUT OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE, CONTEMPORARY SCIENCE PROGRAM (WITH CO-OPERATIVE PROGRAM OPTION AND OPTIONAL SPECIALIZATION IN MANAGEMENT SCIENCES¹)

The process of Periodic Program Review (Senate Policy 126) has been undertaken by the Contemporary Science program over the past year. This review has assisted in formulating the recommendation that the Bachelor of Science (Contemporary Science) program be phased out – the last cohort of new students would enter the program in the Fall of 2014. The recommendation to phase out the program comes from the Faculty of Science, and has wide support among the academic units responsible for running the program.² The following report summarizes the main features of the Periodic Program Review self-study.

1. PROGRAM INFORMATION

- The Contemporary Science Program was developed in parallel with the new science programs in Biology, Chemistry, Medical Physics, and Mathematics and its Applications. Contemporary Sciences, Biology, and Chemistry were first to launch in Fall 2005.
- The program shares a point of entry with the B.Sc. programs in Biology, Chemistry, and Medical Physics with common curriculum in the first year, covering Chemistry, Biology, Physics, Mathematics, and Computer Science.
- Beginning in the second year, students focus on three different areas of science selected from seven different streams of focus: Biology, Chemistry, Computational Sciences, Environmental Sciences, Informatics, Physics, and Psychology. Students choose the three best suited to their interests and goals, selecting a minimum of one the following: Computational Sciences, Informatics, and Physics.
- To date, no student has completed the Co-operative program option and one student (only) is currently enrolled.
- All students enrolled in Contemporary Science may enroll in the Optional Specialization in Management Sciences.

¹ The Optional Specialization in Management Science remains available for all other programs to which it is currently available in the Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science and in the Faculty of Science.

² All of the courses offered within this program are delivered in lecture format and 80% (12 of 15 courses) include laboratories or tutorials.

2. CURRICULUM

- Of the core courses in the program (i.e. courses that are required for all Contemporary Science students, regardless of stream) 80% (12 of 15) include laboratories or tutorials
- Students must complete six liberal studies courses, and a communications course,
- Students must complete six courses in each of three science streams:
 - Biology Stream - three required courses and three electives
 - Environmental Science Stream - three required courses and three electives
 - Chemistry Stream - three required courses and three electives
 - Physics Stream - two required courses and four electives
 - Informatics Stream - four required courses and two electives
 - Computational Stream - two required courses and four electives
 - Psychology Stream - two required courses and four electives

The best subscribed stream is Psychology, with 23 students having satisfied the required courses to date (although not all 23 have completed the additional electives). The next most popular stream is Biology, followed by Chemistry and Physics with 19, 9, and 9 students having completed the required courses for those streams over the eight-year history of the program. The Environmental Science, Computational Science, and Informatics streams, in contrast, are relatively less popular, with only 5, 5, and 4 students having completed the required courses in these streams to date. It is important to note that student must complete at least one stream in Physics, Computational Science, or Informatics. Thus **a maximum total of 18 students, over the eight-year history of the program, have satisfied the basic requirements to graduate from this program. There were just two graduates of the Contemporary Science Program in June, 2013.** The Contemporary Science program will continue to graduate a very small number of students each year. The data also demonstrate that many courses offered as electives have never been completed by Contemporary Science program students.

3. RATIONALE FOR PHASING OUT THE CONTEMPORARY SCIENCE PROGRAM

This program has been offered since 2005 and has not yet found traction. It was launched under the mistaken premise that it would have broad appeal to future high school science teachers. To date, the current program director has had a conversation with only one Contemporary Science student who identified this as a career goal. The current job market for teachers and recent proposed changes to Teachers' Colleges in Ontario make it unlikely that the demand for this program by aspiring teachers will increase in the near future.

As elaborated in the following paragraphs, the levels of student satisfaction and achievement, and the fact that the program cannot deliver on most of its expected Program Learning Outcomes or University Degree-Level Expectations, suggest that the program is unable to meet societal need. The Faculty of Science believes that cancellation of this program is in the best interest of the Faculty and the University as a whole. Continuation of the program gains little but jeopardizes the academic reputation of the new Faculty of Science.

Learning Outcomes and Degree Level Expectations: An analysis of the correspondence between curriculum and expected program learning outcomes indicates that the program, as structured, can only deliver 2 of the 7 expected outcomes. Further, the program curriculum does a poor job in support of 3 of 6 University Degree Level Expectations. The programs from which Contemporary Science draws do not, themselves, share these same deficiencies. These are rigorous, layered programs where lower-level courses build scaffolding, a basic level of proficiency and understanding within a discipline. Advanced

courses then build upon this scaffolding and a development of higher level proficiencies and professional skills. The deficiency in the Contemporary Science program is that students never ascend to these higher level courses (or ascend to a limited number) and opportunities to develop the skills for critical analysis, synthesis, and professional practice are limited.

Lack of Depth: The Contemporary Science program effectively has students 'minor' in three different science disciplines. However, in principle students get the general content equivalent of a 'minor' in each stream, attaining the equivalent of a 'major' in none. When the Contemporary Science program was launched, this was the best opportunity for students wishing to maintain breadth in science, as there were no opportunities for a student to 'major' in one field of science and 'minor' in another. With the development of the new Minors policy, this advantage of Contemporary Science is eroded. The advantage now only remains for the subset of students who explicitly wish to pursue three streams of science. Experience in the Contemporary Science program office suggests that most students have genuine interest in two streams, and are compelled to complete a third in which they have limited interest. This may contribute to academic difficulties in the third stream.

Student Success and Student Perception of the Program: Student academic success is poor for the Contemporary Science program relative to other programs across the University, and is lower than success in other science programs. Correspondingly, student engagement, and perceptions of the program suggest that Contemporary Science is not effectively meeting the needs and wants of its students.

Contemporary Science program students appear to view their program differently than students in other science programs, including during the first year when all are immersed in the same curriculum and share the same in-class experience. Contemporary Science students more commonly perceive an emphasis on superficial learning, with less emphasis on application and problem solving. This perception of lower academic expectations may contribute to the lower retention observed in the program, or it may be related to academically weaker students enrolling in the program.

It appears that Contemporary Science students view their educational program and the value derived in a less positive way than students in other science programs, in FEAS, or across the University. First year Contemporary Science students generally perceived less institutional contribution to the development of important skills such as critical and analytical thinking, problem solving, and working effectively (with others or independently). There is nothing in the educational experience during the first year of study to distinguish Contemporary Science students from students in Biology or Medical Physics.

4. CONTEMPORARY SCIENCE LEARNING OUTCOMES

Upon completing this program, students will be able to ...

1. demonstrate an understanding of fundamental concept in core scientific disciplines.
2. demonstrate an understanding of advanced concepts and theories in multiple scientific disciplines.
3. demonstrate an ability to apply concepts from multiple scientific disciplines to understand and solve complex, cross-disciplinary problems.
4. select and apply appropriate techniques to design experiments and test hypotheses within multiple scientific disciplines.
5. demonstrate the ability to effectively communicate concepts within multiple scientific disciplines.
6. demonstrate an ability to critically assess experimental data and synthesize results in multiple

scientific disciplines.

7. demonstrate professional skills in multiple scientific disciplines that are in demand by employers of recent B.Sc. graduates.

5. DATA FROM THE UNIVERSITY PLANNING OFFICE

The entering high school averages for Contemporary Science students have been comparable to those of other science programs over the history of the program (Table 1), but lower than those of the faculty (FEAS) and of Ryerson overall. Perhaps more revealing, however, has been the percentage of students entering the program with high school marks above 80% (Table 2). Between 2005 and 2011, this percentage has fallen between 13% and 32%, with a seven-year average of 22%. This is the lowest percentage among the science programs. Moreover, it is far below those of FEAS (41% seven-year average) and Ryerson overall (55%). The Contemporary Science program appears to be attracting a weaker cohort of students than other programs across the university. This creates a significant challenge for retention because these students are in a rigorous program with many demands (i.e. total lecture, laboratory and tutorial hours exceeding the norm across campus), and a far smaller percentage of the students enter with scholarships.

Table 1. Entrance Averages

YEAR	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Program							
Ryerson	78.8	79.8	80.2	80.6	81.5	81.4	81.9
Engineering Architecture & Science	77.7	78.5	78.4	79.3	79.8	80.1	-
Science	-	-	-	-	-	-	77.9
Biology	75.1	76	76.1	77.5	79.7	79.2	79.2
Chemistry	74.8	79.9	76.5	76.2	79.7	76.6	77.7
Contemporary Sci. - Undeclared	74.5	75.4	75.9	75.8	77.3	76.2	78.2
Mathematics	-	-	-	74.9	75.9	77.2	78
Medical Physics	-	75.7	78.0	79.1	77.6	77.5	77.4

Table 2. Percentage of students with entrance averages above 80%

YEAR	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Program							
Ryerson	41.3	48.4	52.2	55.1	61.7	61.6	66.0
Engineering Architecture & Science	32.3	38.5	36.6	42.8	48.0	48.8	-
Science	-	-	-	-	-	-	30.9
Biology	18.7	27.8	23.3	32.1	48.5	40.9	40.3
Chemistry	4.0	40.0	22.6	14.3	48.4	24.4	27.0
Contemporary Sci. - Undeclared	12.8	21.1	32.3	27.8	20.9	15.0	26.7
Mathematics	-	-	0.0	25.0	20.0	21.4	31.6
Medical Physics	-	22.7	30.0	44.0	26.7	27.6	23.3

Contemporary Science is a small program. The target enrollment for first year has been ~ 40 students for the past several years. The target was reduced to 28 for Fall, 2013. The program has generally met this target. Data presented in Table 3 reflects a pooling of enrollments (after November 1) for Contemporary Science. However, it should be noted this data is misleading as it aggregates Contemporary Science students with Undeclared Science students. Assuming the actual number in first year that are Contemporary Science students totals about 35 after November 1, there is a significant loss between years 1 and 2. The program appears to have reached a steady-state in which approximately 15 students

enter second year and 10-12 students enter the third and fourth years of the program. The total enrollments for Year 4 are also misleading as they aggregate students in years 4+. Contemporary Science Program students commonly take more than 4 years to graduate. As a result, the anticipated convocation of ~ 10 Contemporary Science students per year anticipated from Table 3 does not reflect experience.

Table 3. Undergraduate fall headcount enrolled by year level.

<u>Program</u>	<u>Year Level</u>	<u>F2005</u>	<u>F2006</u>	<u>F2007</u>	<u>F2008</u>	<u>F2009</u>	<u>F2010</u>	<u>F2011</u>
Engineering and Architectural Science	Total	3174	3115	3156	3280	3404	3516	3763
	Year I	900	906	921	1020	1050	1058	1105
	Year II	704	634	748	704	779	810	836
	Year III	753	602	565	671	628	672	721
	Year IV	817	973	922	885	947	976	1101
Science	Total	1074	1070	1185	1313	1354	1483	1641
	Year I	371	390	452	488	447	534	626
	Year II	182	238	277	337	338	336	367
	Year III	187	156	182	215	252	271	264
	Year IV	334	286	274	273	317	342	384
Contemporary Sci. - Undeclared	Total	66	74	78	107	107	108	106
	Year I	66	61	54	72	68	71	72
	Year II	-	13	16	21	15	15	15
	Year III	-	-	8	9	14	11	8
	Year IV	-	-	-	5	10	11	11

The proportion of students carrying a part-time load is greater in Contemporary Science than in the other Science programs (aggregate) or in the Faculty (FEAS). This cannot be attributed to Contemporary Science being a more rigorous program. It may be related to either the program attracting a weaker applicant pool than other science programs, or to challenges in accessing stream electives. Initiatives have been taken to make it easier for students to access these elective by including pre-requisites on the electives table, and by including courses that run more reliably. However, scheduling of courses is based on the needs of the home programs. A student trying to access elective courses from multiple different programs commonly experiences scheduling conflicts.

6. STUDENT SUCCESS AND ACHIEVEMENT

Contemporary Science program students have most often, over the history of the program, had lower academic success than students in other science programs, the broader Faculty of Engineering, Architecture, and Science, and the broadest group of Ryerson undergraduate students (across all programs). This is evident from the percent of students with Clear academic standing after first year, with a six year average below 50% (Table 4). This is approximately 20% lower than the percent clear for Ryerson students across all programs. The lower success rate relative to other science programs is surprising, as Contemporary Science students share a common first year curriculum with Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics and its Applications, and Medical Physics program students. It is suggestive that students opting for this program may be academically weaker, on average, than students choosing other science programs. This may be reflected in the lower entrance scores (Tables 1 & 2). It may also be that the program is attracting students it did not anticipate. Instead of appealing to students who are strong in many disciplines and who want to maintain currency in many disciplines, perhaps the program is appealing to students with a general interest in science but who are relatively weak in all areas.

Table 4. Percent with Clear academic standing after 1 year.

<u>Program</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>
Ryerson	64.2	66.9	66.8	74.7	76.1	74.2

Engineering Architecture & Science	53	59.7	56.5	63.9	67.2	-
Science	-	-	-	-	-	53
Biology	46.3	54.3	50	52.1	64.8	54.7
Chemistry	47.4	60.5	52.2	61.1	61.1	37.3
Contemporary Sci. - Undeclared	49.1	48.1	35.6	55	47.1	52.7
Mathematics	-	-	-	66.7	76.9	55.2
Medical Physics	-	58.1	55.2	70.3	76	56.8

This lower success among Contemporary Science students has translated to a lower retention rate within the program, relative to other programs across the University, the Faculty, and the other science programs. By the end of three years, retention in the program is less than 50%, lags other science programs by 4 to 25%, and lags the University by 20-25% (Table 5).

When retention within any Ryerson program is considered, Contemporary Science students fall substantially behind the broader Ryerson community. However, retention rates are comparable to those of other science programs. It has been common for Contemporary Science students to transfer to other science programs through completion of Plan Change forms. For the past two years, the number of students moving out of Contemporary Science and into a different science program has outnumbered those transferring in by ~ 3:1.

Table 5. Percent retained within the same program after 3 years.

<u>Program</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Ryerson	71.28	70.27	70.36	-	-
Engineering Architecture & Science	64.82	59.46	-	-	-
Science	-	-	56.60	-	-
Biology	54.63	54.62	58.33	-	-
Chemistry	58.82	52.38	69.70	-	-
Contemporary Sci. - Undeclared	50.00	47.06	44.44	-	-
Mathematics	-	-	55.56	-	-
Medical Physics	63.33	55.17	61.11	-	-

The majority of students entering the Contemporary Science program enter Ryerson directly from high school. These students, in general, appear to fare better than students who are not new high school graduates. Among the former students, retention after 3 years is substantially better than retention overall (Table 6 versus Table 5). Retention among this group of students is comparable to other science programs, but again lags retention among other programs across the University.

Table 6. Percent retained of newly admitted secondary school students after 3 years.

<u>Program</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Ryerson	75.49	78.25	78.57	77.01	-	-
Engineering Architecture & Science	71.17	74.69	-	-	-	-
Science	-	-	64.04	67.68	-	-
Biology	60.24	56.94	63.10	67.95	-	-
Chemistry	65.52	85.19	60.00	66.67	-	-
Contemporary Sci. – Undeclared	66.67	65.71	53.85	58.82	-	-
Mathematics	-	-	-	33.33	-	-

Medical Physics - 59.09 68.42 72.00 - -

Similarly, the percent of recent high school graduates admitted to the program in 2005, and who successfully graduated within 6 years, is comparable to Chemistry and Biology. However, students admitted to other Ryerson programs generally had greater success in graduation within this time.

7. HIGHLIGHTS OF THE NATIONAL SURVEYS ON STUDENT ENGAGEMENT (NSSE), 2007 AND 2011

In 2008, the first year students surveyed were members of the second cohort (admitted in Fall, 2007). There were no fourth year students in the program. The Contemporary Sciences program has a small enrollment, and therefore the number of first-year respondents was small for each survey (n=20 in 2008, n=14 in 2011). There were no significant differences in the first year curriculum for Contemporary Science students admitted in 2007 and 2010. Admissions requirements were the same for these cohorts. Therefore, these cohorts were considered to be equivalent, and results from 2008 and 2011 were pooled to permit more meaningful comparisons between Contemporary Science respondents and those of the general Ryerson population, FEAS students, and two other science programs (Biology and Medical Physics). Seven fourth year Contemporary Science students responded to the 2011 survey. The responses of these students were compared with Ryerson and FEAS fourth year students. These comparisons were made with caution, given the small number of science program respondents.

- In general, students in Contemporary Sciences appear less engaged academically than their general Ryerson cohort. As first year students, Contemporary Science program students are far less likely to ask questions in class or contribute to class discussions. This gap appears to persist over their academic career, although it narrows by fourth year. Over their career, Contemporary Science students are more likely to come to class unprepared and less likely to engage faculty in discussions about careers.
- Contemporary Science students are less likely than general Ryerson students to prepare papers or assignments that integrate ideas from multiple sources. They are far less likely, in both first and fourth year, to make an in-class presentation.
- Contemporary Science students in both first year and fourth year are far less likely to prepare multiple drafts of assignments than are their colleagues in other Science programs. The disparity in the first year is interesting since Biology, Medical Physics, and Contemporary Science share a common curriculum, with the same assignments, and presumably the same time constraints.
- Only 4 of 7 students in fourth year responded that they “probably” or “definitely” would choose Ryerson again suggests a concerning level of dissatisfaction with the program curriculum or specific skills training.
- Contemporary Science program students perceive much less program emphasis on analyzing basic elements of a theory, synthesizing ideas, assessing the value of data, and applying concepts than did students in other Science programs. These perceptions of program expectations continued through the fourth year of study, with Contemporary Science students seeing far less emphasis on applying theories to solving practical problems. These patterns are concerning. A Science education should develop skills in critical analysis and problem solving. The program emphasis on development of these skills is reflected in program learning outcomes. However, the perception of students that program expectations are on superficial learning (i.e. memorization) rather than deeper understanding suggests that students failed to recognize expectations, that the program failed to deliver on its goals, or both.

8. RESOURCES

One virtue of the Contemporary Science Program is that it requires minimal resources beyond those needed for the other Faculty of Science undergraduate programming. Operating the Contemporary Science program requires no additional faculty or staff, requires no administrative resources (as the program director and academic assistant double as the director and academic assistant for the first year science program), and no dedicated physical resources. Operating the program adds approximately two laboratory sections to each first year science course, necessitating sufficient laboratory space, provision of laboratory supplies, and hiring of an additional teaching assistant per course. It is arguable, however, that in the absence of the Contemporary Science program, intake to other science programs would expand and the same resource needs would be internalized to those programs.

9. CONCLUSION

Continuing to offer a program that fails to meet a societal need, fails to meet its own expected program learning outcomes and University Degree Level Expectations, which has a low success rate in terms of academic achievement and retention, and in which students feel disengaged threatens the academic reputation of Science at Ryerson and of the University more broadly.

10. PHASING OUT PLAN

1. The last admission cohort will be F2014.
2. In F2015, the Calendar Program Information, which is promotional, will either be removed or accompanied by a note to the effect that the program has been discontinued.
3. In F2015, the first-year curriculum will be deleted or noted as no longer offered because there will be no new students admitted. However, the first-year curriculum of Contemporary Science is common to Biology, Chemistry and Med Physics, therefore any student who is missing courses from first year will be able to enroll in them in 2015-16.
4. The curriculum for the remaining years of the program will be removed (or noted as discontinued) in their turn in subsequent years according to the schedule below. All courses in Contemporary Science are also offered to other programs in the Faculty, so there should be no issue for students who wish to enroll in those courses in subsequent years. The First Year Office (which manages the program) will facilitate enrolments of students who are in need of credits to graduate.
5. By F2020 there will be no further reference to Contemporary Science in the Calendar.
6. Students who started in the regular program in 2014 may continue towards their degree until academic year 2021-22 and those in Co-op may continue until 2023-24.

Regular Program	Co-Op Program	Last Offered
Year 1	Year 1	2014-2015
Year 2	Year 2	2015-2016
Year 3	Year 3	2016-2017
Year 4	Year 4	2017-2018
	Year 5	2018-2019

11. A SUGGESTION FROM ASC

The ASC is fully supportive of the phase out of this program. At the same time, Committee members recognize that there is an appetite among students on campus to explore general science concepts. The ASC suggests that the Faculty of Science consider the possibility of developing a Minor in Science which would address this interest among the broader Ryerson student body.

Recommendation

- Having satisfied itself of the merit of this proposal, ASC recommends: *That Senate approve the phase out of the Bachelor of Science, Contemporary Science Program (with Co-Operative Program Option and Optional Specialization in Management Sciences)*

B. CHANGE OF NAME OF THE MINOR IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE TO MINOR IN CRIMINOLOGY

On November 5, 2013, Ryerson Senate voted to change the name of the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology to Department of Criminology and the program name from Bachelor of Arts (Criminal Justice) to Bachelor of Arts (Criminology).

The Department Council voted on November 12, 2013 to change the name of the Minor in Criminal Justice to the Minor in Criminology. A approval for this change was also received from the Dean of Arts, Dr. Jean-Paul Boudreau.

Therefore, the Department of Criminology is requesting, for consistency, that the Minor in Criminal Justice be changed to Minor in Criminology.

Recommendation

- Having satisfied itself of the merit of this proposal, ASC recommends: *That Senate approve the change of name of the Minor in Criminal Justice to Minor in Criminology*

C. NEW MODULE IN ACTING/DANCE STUDIES FOR THE CREATIVE INDUSTRIES BA PROGRAM

This is a proposal to add a new “creative-content module” to the list of modules offered in the interdisciplinary Bachelor of Arts (Creative Industries) offered within the Faculty of Communication and Design. This will bring the number of modules to thirteen.

1. BACKGROUND

All eight FCAD schools participate in the delivery of the creative-content modules for the Creative Industries program. Previously approved modules are:

- School of Fashion: *The Fashion Industry: Markets, Aesthetics & Creativity*
- School of Professional Communication: *Communication Studies*
- School of Image Arts: *The Art & Business of Film*
- School of Image Arts: *Visual Culture*
- School of Image Arts: *Curatorial Practices*
- School of Journalism: *The Business and Practice of News*
- School of Graphic Communications Management and the School of Creative Industries: *Concept to Reality: Publishing and Printing*

- RTA School of Media: *Storytelling in Media*
- RTA School of Media: *Media Business*
- RTA School of Media: *The Music Industry*
- Theatre School and Department of English: *Performance Studies*
- School of Interior Design: *Interior Design: Humanscale for Creative Thinkers*

The Creative Industries program requires all students to complete two creative-content modules. Each module consists of a menu of required and elective courses from which the student must complete six. Students will select one module at the start of their first year and another to commence in their second year, and will complete two courses per year in each module until the module is completed in year 3 or year 4. Delivered either exclusively by a professional school within FCAD or in tandem with a partnering school or department, each module is intended to introduce students to the historical and aesthetic aspects of a creative discipline while also examining how that discipline functions as a business. Certain modules also contain a studio or production component.

2. CURRICULUM FOR THE MODULE IN ACTING/DANCE

The module in Acting/Dance Studies introduces students both theoretically and experientially to Theatre and Dance as performance and production disciplines. Students will study the historical, artistic and business aspects of these art forms while enhancing their personal qualities of vocal and/or physical expression. Studio work will expose students to the rigorous technical preparation that performing artists must maintain throughout their careers.

Structure of the module: Two required and four elective courses

Required: (2)

THF 101	Elements of Production I
THF 200	Timelines of Performance History I

Elective: (4)

(at least 2 will be selected from THA 340, THD 220, THD 320 and THF 325)

THF 201	Timelines of Performance History II
THF 316	The Global Stage
THF 325	Musical Theatre
THF 405	Human Development in the Arts
THA 340	Improvisation
THD 220	Latin American Dance Forms
THD 320	Western Dance Styles
THF 403	Landmarks in Canadian Theatre

3. COMPARISON TO PROPOSED ACTING/DANCE MINOR

The Acting/Dance Studies module should be viewed as a “companion” to the Theatre School’s proposed Minor with the same title. While the course content is virtually the same as the Minor, the module differs in the following respects:

1. The module is offered exclusively to Creative Industries students who, upon completion, will receive credit toward their degree requirements.

2. THL 100, a liberal studies course, is not offered as an elective in the module, as students cannot apply liberal studies courses toward their module requirements (unlike students endeavouring to complete a Minor).
3. The module requires that students complete a minimum of 2 studio courses from the 4 studio courses offered. This is among the features that differentiate the Acting/Dance Studies module from the Performance Studies module offered currently by the Theatre School in partnership with the Department of English. While the latter module focuses on the historical, narrative and literary aspects of performance disciplines, the former incorporates an introduction to production and technique training through mandatory studio courses and the required production course, THF 201.

4. EXCLUSIONS AND COMMON FEATURES

Certain exclusions will apply. Because there is some course overlap between the Performance Studies module and the Acting/Dance Studies module, Creative Industries students can attribute only one of these modules to their degree requirements. Also, because Creative Industries students can undertake a Minor, it should be noted that students who have completed either the Performance Studies or Acting/Dance Studies module will not be eligible for the proposed Acting/Dance Studies Minor. However, Creative Industries students who have taken neither module would be eligible for the proposed Acting/Dance Studies Minor.

A common feature of the creative-content modules is that Creative Industries students take classes together with students enrolled in the teaching program. This is expected to be the case with most of the courses in the Acting/Dance Studies module with the exception of the four studio courses. Consistent with the Acting/Dance Studies Minor, these courses are intended for non-majors only, and cannot be taken by students enrolled in the Acting Performance or Dance Performance BFA programs.

5. LEARNING OUTCOMES

Upon completing this module, students will be able to:

1. Analyze theatrical and dance forms on the basis of both theoretical criteria and the application of historically derived staging conventions and performance techniques.
2. Contribute to the sustainability of performing arts companies through knowledge acquired in the practical realities of production, promotion, and funding structures.
3. Facilitate the work of theatre and dance artists through the provision of appropriate rehearsal, production and performance facilities.
4. Support the delivery of theatre and dance performances to diverse audiences on the basis of cross-cultural studies of these art forms.

Recommendation

- Having satisfied itself of the merit of this proposal, ASC recommends: *That Senate approve the new Module in Acting/Dance Studies for the Creative Industries BA Program*

D. NEW MINOR IN ACTING/DANCE STUDIES, RYERSON THEATRE SCHOOL

Toronto is one of the major centres of performing arts activity in North America and Ryerson, located in the heart of Toronto, offers students unsurpassed access to shows, performers, and the theatre environment. With more than 125 professional dance and theatre companies, commercial and non-profit, the city produces over 10,000 live dance and theatre performances per year.

A Minor is an opportunity for a student to explore a secondary area of undergraduate study outside their degree program. It may facilitate an exploration of personal interest or may be related to the student's degree program and serve to support a career choice. Having the option of Minors at Ryerson University is a powerful tool for attracting students to a more varied and balanced learning experience and will enhance the scope of their education. The Minor can provide a "teachable" for those students wanting to undertake B.Ed. degrees and a teaching career.

Ryerson is one of the most innovative universities in one of the most progressive urban centres of the country. Part of building this reputation is working together to celebrate the primary ingredient that makes us so dynamic – our diverse community. A commitment to inclusiveness and diversity is imbedded within the teaching and learning offered in the Acting/Dance Studies Minor and indeed throughout the Theatre School. Courses offered in the Acting/Dance Studies Minor that address issues of diversity such as African Canadian drama, queer theatre/dance and aboriginal theatre include THF 201 Timelines of Performance History II, THF 316 The Global Stage, THF 405 Human Development in the Arts, THF 403 Landmarks in Canadian Theatre, and THL 100 Theatre in the Canadian Identity.

An Acting/Dance Studies Minor will foster cultural sensitivity and awareness of the way that art informs, reflects and contributes to both our culture and our economy. The inter-disciplinary aspect of sharing of courses with students in other Programs at Ryerson will not only enrich the student experience, it will promote accessibility between the various schools within the greater University.

By combining lecture courses already offered by the School of Theatre with four new studio- based acting and dance classes, the Theatre School believes this combination of lecture and studio-based courses has the capacity to stimulate self-motivation and discipline, instill confidence and open doors to creative solutions necessary and highly sought-after skills in today's marketplace.

CURRICULUM

To receive the Acting/Dance Studies Minor, a student must complete six courses from the following course of study:

REQUIRED

THF 101 Elements of Production I

THF 200 Time Lines of Performance History I

FOUR OF THE FOLLOWING

THD 320 Western Dance Styles

THF 325 Musical Theatre

THF 403 Landmarks in Canadian Theatre

THA 340 Improvisation

THF 201 Timelines of Performance History II (pre-requisite THF200)

THF 405 Human Development in the Arts

THD 220 Intermediary Tech I: Dance

THF 316 The Global Stage

THL 100 Theatre and the Canadian Identity

The two required courses include foundational Performance Industries concepts and history presented in a lecture format. Together these courses survey the seminal theories of theatre and dance, trace the

evolution of performance and staging practices, and study the interrelationship between the creative, practical and business aspects of performing arts production. The elective courses prepare students for a more in-depth knowledge about different aspects of the Acting and Dance disciplines. The Acting/Dance Studies Minor will offer focused aspects of both theoretical and practical knowledge as it applies to acting and/or dance methods and techniques. The combination of lecture and studio-based courses will benefit students by providing skills to increase the development of vocal and physical expression and enhance their understanding of the creative process.

The Acting/Dance Studies Minor is designed for those students who are interested in areas of performance – acting and/or dance – and who desire the opportunity to explore these areas through the prescribed course work of a minor.

Courses are appropriate for students who have little or no performance experience as well as those with a significant background in either acting or dance. Students may choose from a variety of possible combinations including courses in dance, acting and academic subjects. It is quite common for acting and dance students to enter into the B.F.A. programs in Acting and/or Dance with varying degrees of skills and experience and the Theatre School faculty is accustomed to developing learning and teaching strategies to effectively train students with less performance experience in a particular area of study. It is for this reason that the Acting/Dance Studies Minor can accommodate students with varying skills. Acting and dance classes are often a staple of many undergraduate programs at universities throughout North America and it is always the case that students enter these classes with a wide range of previous training and experience.

Studio space is an issue for the Theatre School as resources are very limited. Enrollment in some of the studio courses may be restricted by virtue of the size of the School's studios. If demand is great, the School will try to accommodate as many students as possible by seeking out additional studio space for a few hours a week, such as the Lower Gym.

The Acting/Dance Studies Minor is not available to RTS Acting and Dance students.

Recommendation

- Having satisfied itself of the merit of this proposal, ASC recommends: *That Senate approve the New Minor in Acting/Dance Studies in the Ryerson Theatre School*

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Chris Evans', written in a cursive style.

Chris Evans, Chair for the Committee

ASC Members:

Charmaine Hack, Registrar

John Turtle, Secretary of Senate

Chris Evans, Vice-Chair and Vice Provost Academic

Denise O'Neil Green, Assistant Vice President/Vice Provost, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

Andrew Hunter, Faculty of Arts, Philosophy

Neil Tomlinson, Faculty of Arts, Politics

Ian Baitz, Faculty of Communication and Design, Graphic Communications Management

Jean Bruce, Faculty of Communication & Design, Image Arts

Mary Sharpe, Faculty of Community Services, Midwifery

Nick Bellissimo, Faculty of Community Services, Nutrition

Medhat Shehata, Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science, Civil Engineering

Colin Ripley, Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science, Architecture

Vadim Bostan, Faculty of Science, Chemistry & Biology

Kelly McKay, Ted Rogers School of Management, Hospitality & Tourism

Naomi Eichenlaub, Library

Des Glynn, Chang School of Continuing Education

Eszteella Vezer, Faculty of Arts, Psychology

Report #F2013-2 of the Senate Priorities Committee (SPC)

1. Report from the Task Force on Interdisciplinary Programs

Motion #1: *That Senate receive the attached Final Report from the Task Force on Interdisciplinary Programs.*

Motion #2: *That Senate request the Provost to consider the Report in the preparation of the 2014-2019 Academic Plan.*

Motion #3: *That Senate request the Provost to respond to the Report by October 2014.*



Task Force on Interdisciplinary Programs

FINAL REPORT

to

SENATE

03 December 2013

Table of Contents

A. Executive Summary	1
B. Background and Mandate	3
C. Methodology	5
D. Goals / Principles	6
E. Definitions	6
F. Issues / Challenges / Problems	7
1. Development	7
2. Inter- versus multi-disciplinary teaching/learning	8
3. Budget	8
4. Faculty Resources	9
5. Faculty Assignment	10
6. Governance	11
7. Course Capacity	12
8. Sense of Community	12
9. Specialization in Zone Education	13
10. Chang School of Continuing Education Certificates	13
11. Minors	14
12. Graduate Studies	14
G. Improvements	16
H. Recommendations	16
I. Acknowledgements	19
J. Appendices (Supporting Documents)	20
1. Creation and Mandate of Senate <i>Task Force on Interdisciplinary Programs</i>	21
2. Definitions	22
3. Inter- and Multi-Disciplinary Programs	
a) Graduate	24
b) Undergraduate	24
c) Minors	24
d) Chang School of Continuing Education Certificates	25
4. Qualitative Interviews	26
5. Summary of ACS Student Responses	40
6. Grad Student Focus Group Report	43

K. Appendices (Background Information)	47
1. <i>Report of the Task Force on Interdisciplinarity</i> (University of Ottawa, 27 June 2006)	48
2. <i>Summary of Recommendations</i> Report of the Task Force on Interdisciplinarity (University of Ottawa, 27 June 2006)	66
3. <i>Making Interdisciplinarity Work</i> Presentation by Dr. Adele Reinhartz (University of Ottawa) Senate Information Session, Ryerson University, 04 November 2010	79
4. <i>Interdisciplinarity – Questions</i> Senate Discussion, Ryerson University, 07 December 2010	87
5. <i>Interdisciplinarity: Senate Discussion 2010-11</i> Presented to Senate 24 March 2011 by Provost Alan Shepard	89

A. Executive Summary

Since achieving University status, Ryerson University has approved inter-and multi-disciplinary programs. Academic Plans (2008-2013), updates to Senate, and Senate discussions in 2010 and 2011 indicate that the expansion of inter-and cross-disciplinary offerings remained a University goal. The 2010-2011 Senate discussions resulted in a presentation identifying the challenges facing interdisciplinary programs, however, no recommendations were made. In the Senate meeting of 24 January 2012 interest in the issue of interdisciplinary was renewed with a proposal to accept Creative Industries as a stand-alone School. Senate narrowly approved the proposal but directed that the issue of interdisciplinarity be revisited. Accordingly a Task Force was established in January 2013 to: (1) identify issues which are problematic to the operations of such programs; (2) consult widely with the Ryerson community; and (3) make recommendations to Senate by the Fall of 2013. The Task Force was constituted with membership from each Faculty.

The Task Force began by establishing definitions related to interdisciplinarity, identifying such programs at Ryerson, and developing a methodology. Using its own expertise, the committee began by compiling a list of known issues. Based on this preliminary information, the committee developed a protocol to interview stakeholders ranging from faculty in interdisciplinary programs to Deans, Chairs, Program Directors, University Planning and the Ryerson Faculty Association. Data from relevant student surveys were reviewed, and focus groups were conducted with graduate students in interdisciplinary programs. The Task Force was guided by its Senate mandate to make recommendations that would improve the operations of interdisciplinary programs with the underlying principle of protecting probationary faculty involved in these programs.

Confusion exists around definitions related to interdisciplinarity, and the terms are often used interchangeably and erroneously. The Task Force divided cross-disciplinary, interdisciplinary, multi-disciplinary, pluri-disciplinary and trans-disciplinary approaches into two groups: (1) inter- and trans-disciplinary approaches consolidate different disciplinary perspectives into one approach; and (2) cross-, multi-, and pluri- approaches apply distinct disciplinary perspectives to the same problem. For the purpose of this report, we have referred to the former as interdisciplinary and the latter as multi-disciplinary.

Through its consultation process, the Task Force identified the following issues:

1. Development: No policy exists stating that multi- and interdisciplinary programs should be treated as equal to disciplinary programs in terms of resources.
2. Teaching and Learning: Interdisciplinary approaches require faculty versed in interdisciplinary methods; multi-disciplinary approaches work best in team teaching situations. Both approaches require greater intentionality than is currently evident.
3. Budget: Inter- and multi-disciplinary programs must be resourced appropriately. However, such programs are often “in the dark” about available financial resources.
4. Faculty Resources: The following factors exacerbate the delivery of inter- and multi-disciplinary programs.
 - a) Team teaching is often required but difficult to accomplish.
 - b) No provision is made for the calculation of team teaching in teaching assignments.
 - c) Faculty are appointed to a single academic unit. Cross appointments are rare, and where they exist, procedures for making appointments, seeking tenure, and responsibilities are not defined or standardized across the university.
 - d) The process of determining faculty complements is unclear, and a tendency exists to “double count” faculty associated with interdisciplinary programs.
5. Faculty Assignment: Considerable tensions exist between disciplinary academic units and interdisciplinary programs as the Directors of such programs have to request the “release” of faculty to teach in their programs.
6. Governance: Concerns exist that faculty service for interdisciplinary programs will not be recognized.
7. Class capacity: Students from multi- and interdisciplinary programs often experience difficulty getting into elective courses.
8. Sense of Community: Students and faculty note difficulties – including but not restricted to a shortage of physical space – in establishing a sense of community.
9. Specialization in Zone Education: This new specialization is inherently interdisciplinary and will experience the issues identified above.
10. Chang School of Continuing Education: The Chang School is experiencing similar difficulties as related to its Interdisciplinary certificates.
11. Minors: Many minors contain courses from different Departments. These minors often lack governance especially in terms of ensuring their availability to interdisciplinary students.
12. Graduate Studies: Graduate programs have experienced the difficulties identified above as well as other challenges. Several interdisciplinary graduate programs were established when no other graduate programs existed. Now many areas have established their own disciplinary graduate programs, and tensions over resources exist especially in terms of faculty complements and access to graduate student teaching and research assistantships.

The Task Force noted that some improvements have occurred such as the recently-passed Senate Policy 45 that creates a governance structure that applies to all programs – whether disciplinary or inter- or multi-disciplinary. The Senate debate regarding Creative Industry also signals the need for an appropriate model for the delivery of interdisciplinary programs.

The Task Force developed twelve recommendations to address the issues identified above (see pages 17-18) and recommends that Senate accept the Report of the Task Force. It requests that the Provost consider its report in the development of the next Strategic Academic Plan and that the Provost respond to the report in a Fall 2014 meeting of Senate.

B. Background and Mandate

Background

Shortly after achieving University status, Ryerson University began to approve inter- and multi-disciplinary programs. While the multi-disciplinary goals and purposes of each new program were clear, the development of multi-disciplinary programs was not a pillar of the university's academic plan. With the benefit of hindsight, the University probably should have first defined the terms "interdisciplinary" and "multi-disciplinary;" established a clear sense of the goals and purpose of such programs; and addressed many administrative matters vital to the success of such programs (e.g., putting in place an agreed-upon structure, policy regarding approval and operation of the programs, establishing a transparent and understandable process to ensure that the approved programs had an adequate faculty complement). Even in the absence of clear, University-wide, and user-friendly structure and policy, many of the approved inter- and multi-disciplinary programs created their own administrative procedures, and have succeeded and even thrived, but not without experiencing significant challenges, particularly with regard to faculty appointments, resources and student support.

The 2008-13 Academic Plan, *Shaping Our Future* established, as a "principal priority," the need "...to balance discipline-based programs with cross-disciplinary programs ..." (p. 7), noting:

While universities sometimes continue to define canons of knowledge and practice along traditional lines, the world for which we are preparing students is seldom as engaged as we are by our disciplinary categories of knowledge and practice. Generally speaking, the world beyond is intrinsically more cross-disciplinary in its approach. In many arenas it seems that the boundary crossing, within the knowledge economy especially, is speeding up ever more. (p. 8)

and

New and innovative curricula and program structures, including both discipline-based and cross-disciplinary programs, double majors, and increased access to minors within a program of study, will be encouraged. (p. 11)

Increasing interdisciplinarity is lauded in each annual "Academic Plan Update" to Senate. The 04 May 2010 update contains, perhaps, the most clear statement of intent as it describes the interdisciplinary

developments of the 2009-10 year and says “We should encourage these initiatives, and help remove roadblocks” (p. 4). Overall, the Plan and Senate updates make it clear that the expansion of inter- and cross-disciplinary offerings is a University goal. What is missing is an implementation plan.

The issue of governance of interdisciplinary programs was flagged, in Fall 2009, by the “green paper” produced by the Provost’s *Commission on Academic Structures*, which included a proposal to create a separate Faculty for inter- and multi-disciplinary programs. As a result of its deliberations, and submissions to the Commission, the Final Report of the Commission (02 February 2010) did not include any recommendation addressing inter- or multi-disciplinary programs at Ryerson.

By Fall 2010, the issue of inter- and multi-disciplinarity had seized the Senate Priorities Committee, which made the subject one of the “major topics” to which significant Senate meeting-time would be devoted. As a first step, Senate sponsored an information event titled “Making Interdisciplinarity Work” on 04 November 2010, and brought as a guest speaker Dr. Adele Reinhartz, who had headed a University of Ottawa Task Force charged with addressing the subject. A copy of the University of Ottawa *Report Of The Task Force on Interdisciplinarity* (27 June 2006) is attached as Appendix K-1; the *Summary of Recommendations* of the Task Force (27 June 2006) is attached as Appendix K-2; and the presentation by Dr. Reinhartz at Ryerson (04 November 2010) is attached as Appendix K-3.

The next step was a discussion of the subject by Senate, which took place 07 December 2010. Senate was divided into groups, with each group charged with addressing a set of questions. The questions that were considered are attached here as Appendix K-4. The discussion from that meeting was organised into themes, and the questions and responses were presented to Senate by the Provost on 05 April 2011. A copy of that presentation is attached here as Appendix K-5. While the 2010-11 process identified some issues and provided some answers, it did not end with any conclusive recommendations in terms of policy, procedure, or administrative change. Many of the identified challenges continued to exist, yet new programs continued to be proposed and approved.

The catalyst for renewed Senate interest in the issue of inter- and multi-disciplinarity was the approval, on 24 January 2012 (with Board approval following on 25 June 2012), of a program in Creative Industries, and the subsequent proposal, considered by the 04 December 2012 meeting of Senate, to create a stand-alone School as the Academic Unit responsible for the new program. Senate approved the proposal (after a motion to defer was defeated with the President having to break a tied vote), but it directed that the issue of interdisciplinary programs be revisited.

Mandate

Accordingly, the Senate Priorities Committee recommended to the 29 January 2013 meeting of Senate that a *Task Force on Interdisciplinary Programs* be established:

1. To examine current practices at Ryerson in order to identify issues which are problematic to the operation of inter- and multi-disciplinary programs;
2. To consult widely with the Ryerson community, including with all current inter/multi-disciplinary programs, with University Planning, and with the Ryerson Faculty Association in the process of identifying such issues;
3. To make recommendations to Senate by the November 2013 meeting of Senate regarding improvements that could be made to improve the operation of such programs, and their relationships with discipline-based schools/departments and programs.

The Task Force was duly constituted, with membership from each Faculty as follows:

- Jennifer Mactavish, Dean, Yeates School of Graduate Studies (Chair);
- Chris Evans, Vice-Provost Academic (Science);
- Elizabeth Evans, Associate Dean (TRSM);
- Sri Krishnan, Interim Dean (FEAS);
- Ron Pushchak, School of Occupational and Public Health (FCS);
- Catherine Schreyer, Chair, School of Professional Communications (FCAD);
- Neil Thomlinson, Politics and Public Administration (Arts); and
- Stéphanie Walsh Matthews, Director, Arts and Contemporary Studies (Arts).

The authority, mandate, and composition of the Task Force are consolidated in Appendix J-1.

C. Methodology

The Task Force has met physically six times (26 March, 25 April, 19 June, 19 September, 09 October, and 31 October) and exchanged documents by e-mail throughout. Recognising that the Task Force members were named to the Task Force because of their involvement and expertise in various aspects of inter- and multi-disciplinary education at Ryerson, the Task Force first undertook to establish the goals of the exercise, and to bring some coherence to the discussion by examining definitions for the terms that are frequently used but rarely explained. The Task Force also identified the inter- and multi-disciplinary programs at Ryerson, agreed to a process to secure as much input as possible within the time constraints of its mandate; and compiled a preliminary identification of issues known to be problematic to the operation of inter- and multi-disciplinary program. The first phase of consultation aimed to solidify the identification of issues and challenges by conducting qualitative interviews of participants drawn from many segments of the Ryerson community including disciplinary and interdisciplinary faculty members, current inter/multidisciplinary Program Directors (both undergraduate and graduate); Chairs of Departments that have faculty participating in inter-

and multi-disciplinary programs; Deans; the Chang School of Continuing Education; University Planning; the Registrariat; and the Ryerson Faculty Association (see Appendix J-4). Data from the student surveys conducted as part of the Periodic Program Review of the Arts and Contemporary Studies BA program were also utilised (see Appendix J-5). Focus groups were conducted with interdisciplinary graduate students in several interdisciplinary graduate programs (see Appendix J-6). The Task Force then attempted to refine and consolidate the results of the consultation in order to identify improvements that could be made to improve the operation of inter- and multi-disciplinary programs, and their relationships with discipline-based schools, departments and programs, and to make recommendations as to how those improvements might best be effected. If Senate views the Report favourably, it will then decide upon implementation measures.

D. Goals/Principles

The recommendation of the Senate Priorities Committee regarding the creation of the Task Force established an over-arching principle as it charged the Task Force “To make recommendations to Senate by the November 2013 meeting of Senate regarding *improvements that could be made to improve the operation of such programs, and their relationships with discipline-based schools/departments and programs*” (emphasis added). This direction to the Task Force, taken with the direction of the University’s academic plan, *Shaping Our Future*, establishes the overarching policy goals: that interdisciplinary programs are desirable; that their development should be encouraged; and that their operation should be improved and better integrated with the academic offerings of the University. The advent of Graduate Diplomas and Zone Education constitutes further evidence of the need to act on these general goals. It is generally recognised that another goal is the protection of probationary faculty involved with interdisciplinary programs in light of their traditional academic appointment to a Department/School.

E. Definitions

There is a tendency to think of the classification of academic programs as a binary. On the one hand, there are programs that are administered and taught by an academic unit consisting of faculty, the majority of whom share a common disciplinary training (***Disciplinary***). “Subfields” or “sub-disciplines” may or may not be involved in such programs (***Intradisciplinary***).

On the other hand are those programs that are administered and taught by faculty with a variety of disciplinary backgrounds. It is commonplace to refer to such programs as interdisciplinary,

but the application of a single label to the range of combinations and permutations possible within the “non-disciplinary” category can be both unhelpful and misleading. Accordingly, the Task Force distinguishes between ***cross-disciplinary***, ***interdisciplinary***, ***multi-disciplinary***, ***pluri-disciplinary***, and ***trans-disciplinary*** (the definitions are explored in Appendix J-2). Although all of these categories have disciplinary foundations, the role of disciplines is quite different. In the case of ***inter-*** and ***trans-*** disciplinary study, disciplinary approaches are integrated or consolidated, so that the student is presented with a problem as understood through the analysis and contextualisation of a variety of disciplines. The emphasis is not, in other words, on a variety of disciplinary approaches, but rather upon the development of an interdisciplinary approach appropriate to a problem. In the case of ***cross-***, ***multi-***, and ***pluri-*** disciplinary approaches, distinct disciplinary approaches are applied to the problem. This report generally refers to the former as interdisciplinary and to the latter as multi-disciplinary.

When identifying issues, challenges, and problems, many are found across most non-disciplinary programs – whether graduate, undergraduate, or continuing education – and also with respect to the administration of Minors. It is fruitful, therefore, to structure the discussion around the issues, rather than around the program types, and to simply identify, within that discussion, the unique situations, if any, that are encountered by individual program types (i.e., those cases where problems or challenges are encountered differently by inter- versus multi-disciplinary programs).

F. Issues / Challenges / Problems

The Task Force, through its consultation with the Ryerson community, has identified some issues/challenges/problems associated with the development and delivery of inter- and multi-disciplinary programs, and with their relationship to disciplinary programs.

1. Development

The capacity of inter- and multi-disciplinary offerings can be increased in two ways: increasing the capacity of existing programs, and developing new programs, minors, and double-majors. While it is generally assumed that programs (whether disciplinary, interdisciplinary, or multi-disciplinary) should be treated equally and equitably in terms of resource allocation, administrative support, and governance requirements, this is nowhere stated as policy. It is an open question whether it should be. A related question is the degree to which standardisation can – or should – be expected *between* inter- and multi-disciplinary programs.

At the very least, those involved in the development of new initiatives should be aware of the issues that they will face with the operation of the program, and should be as proactive as possible so that the issues do not become major problems. It is hoped that the identification of issues here will be helpful in that respect.

2. Interdisciplinary teaching and learning versus multi-disciplinary teaching and learning

Interdisciplinary teaching really involves presenting material from an interdisciplinary perspective, a feat best accomplished by faculty who, themselves, have been trained in interdisciplinary methods and approaches. In some circumstances, students may be presented with the disciplinary bases of the methods and approaches used, but this would not necessarily be the case.

Multi-disciplinary teaching and learning involves the presentation and examination of problems from a variety of disciplinary perspectives. On the teaching side, this can be best accomplished by team-teaching, but other methods can also be used to cover deliberately the approaches and methods of more than one discipline. On the learning side, students recognise and synthesize discrete and identifiable approaches and methods.

In addition to the need for clarity around goals and objectives, logistical challenges are different between the two approaches. As the curriculum structure of Ryerson is amended to facilitate greater student choice, students will be able (assuming that seats are made available in courses across the University) to formulate their own multi-disciplinary program, perhaps including some interdisciplinary offerings. The provision of those offerings, however, requires a greater degree of intentionality than is currently in evidence.

3. Budget

Interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary programs must be resourced appropriately relative to other programs offered by the University. This involves such matters as staffing, physical space, library resources, course capacity, and especially faculty complement (see #4 below). Ryerson currently devolves central funding to Faculties, and funding for programs is devolved from Faculties to Departments or, in the case of inter- and multi-disciplinary programs, directly to the programs. The existing practice is not transparent and often leaves those developing programs – as well as those operating approved programs – “in the dark” as to the financial resources that *are* available, as well as with respect to the financial resources that they should *expect* to be available. The situation is particularly acute in programs that cross Faculty boundaries.

4. Faculty resources (teaching assignment, service, administration)

The successful delivery of any program – undergraduate or graduate degree, diploma, certificate, or minor – is obviously very much a function of the quality of instruction available. For inter- and multi-disciplinary programs, the problems routinely experienced are similar to those experienced within Department-based programs, but exacerbated by several factors:

a. possibility of team-teaching

While team-teaching is sometime desirable within Department-based programs – particularly for those courses with an intra- or interdisciplinary focus – it is essential in many multi-disciplinary programs, to bring the perspective of two or more disciplines to bear on the analysis of a problem, issue, or theme. Organising team-teaching at Ryerson is not easy for a variety of reasons, including the way in which faculty members' teaching assignments are calculated.

b. calculation of faculty teaching assignments

At Ryerson, in most Faculties, teaching is assumed to consist of undergraduate courses that are the responsibility of the academic unit to which the faculty member is appointed. The faculty member is then "released" from such courses in order to pursue other activities such as graduate teaching, teaching in other programs (including inter- and multi-disciplinary ones), research, service, etc. It is expected that the faculty "teaching load" will add up to whatever is the "Departmental Teaching Standard" for his/her Department. No explicit provision is made for the calculation of non-standard course delivery, including team-teaching.

One result of this method of calculating faculty teaching load is that team teaching is often possible only if a faculty member is willing to engage in it on an "overload" basis (i.e., in addition to the normal teaching assignment).

A second result of this method of calculating faculty teaching assignments is a degree of possessiveness, on the part of Departments/Schools, with respect to scarce faculty FTEs (see also "c" below).

c. nature of faculty appointments

At Ryerson, faculty are usually appointed to a single academic unit (usually a Department or School) and are usually expected to fulfil their teaching obligations with respect to the courses for which that academic unit is responsible, and their service obligations with respect to the Department or School to which they are appointed. This is problematic for inter- or multi-disciplinary programs, the Directors of which must secure teaching capacity by negotiating the "release" of desired faculty with the Chairs or Directors of the Departments or Schools to which the desired faculty members are appointed. Since the hiring of the faculty member was usually justified initially on the basis of the needs of the programs or courses for which the Department/School is *directly* responsible, requests from the Directors of inter/multi-disciplinary programs are not always received warmly.

Even where the teaching in inter/multi-disciplinary programs is covered adequately by negotiated teaching release, there remains a need for faculty to be involved in the governance and the administration of the inter/multi-disciplinary program, and to have that service recognised as equal to other forms of service within the Department/School

to which the faculty member is appointed. This is a serious issue for all faculty, but is of critical importance to probationary faculty.

Memorandum of Understanding #3 in the RFA collective agreement¹ provides for cross-appointments, but it refers to “concomitant appointments in two Departments/Schools” (p. 223). Only in very rare cases have faculty been appointed, or cross-appointed, to a *program* as opposed to an *academic unit*. This restriction is intended to protect faculty – particularly probationary faculty facing the rigours of tenure and promotion – by ensuring that academic appointments can be made only by academic units possessed of a Department Hiring Committee (DHC)² and a Departmental Evaluation Committee (DEC).³

d. calculation of faculty complement

The process of determining the faculty complement necessary to deliver a program is unnecessarily opaque at Ryerson, and it often works to the disadvantage of inter- and multi-disciplinary programs. As noted above, faculty are usually appointed to Departments or Schools, even when their letter of appointment specifies involvement in inter- or multi-disciplinary programs. This can create two serious problems. First, involvements specified in Letters of Appointment are difficult to enforce over time. Second, there is a tendency to “double count” those faculty members such that they are FULLY counted in *both* the disciplinary program administered by the academic unit to which they are formally appointed *and* by the inter- or multi-disciplinary program in which they teach. It is not particularly problematic to have faculty considered to be part of the complement of the Department/School and of the complement of a separate inter- or multi-disciplinary program, but their teaching *capacity* cannot be counted (in full) in both places. Their Department Teaching Standard will specify the maximum number of courses members of the faculty can teach. If some or all of that teaching is in inter- and multi-disciplinary programs, there must be “backfill” in the Department/School-based program, the needs of which probably justified the faculty hire in the first place.

5. Faculty assignment

Given that faculty hires are usually justified on the basis of the needs of the programs and/or courses for which an academic unit (Department or School) is responsible; and given the preferences of many faculty to teach in inter- and multi-disciplinary programs, diplomas, and certificates, serious questions arise about the best way to resolve a series of competing imperatives.

Faculty allocation is a zero-sum game, so if faculty members are totally or partially allocated to a disciplinary program based in the Department or School, they are not available for allocation to the inter/multi-disciplinary program. The reverse is also true. Given that the number of faculty is insufficient to teach all of the courses that are on offer in any given semester, the competing imperatives of the various programs creates considerable tension between faculty members (who

¹ Collective Agreement between the Board of Governors, Ryerson University and the Ryerson Faculty Association. In force until 30 June 2015.

² Article 4.1

³ Article 5.1

want to follow their teaching and/or research interests), their Chairs/Directors (who are responsible for the optimal delivery of the programs for which their Department/School is directly responsible); and the Program Directors of inter-multi-disciplinary programs (who are responsible for the optimal delivery of the inter/multi-disciplinary program). As noted above (4b, 4c, and 4d), Directors of inter- and multi-disciplinary programs must approach the Chairs and Directors of Departments and Schools and negotiate the “release” of faculty members from teaching obligations within the programs for which the academic unit is wholly responsible. Moreover, in any given semester or academic year, the Chairs/Directors of Departments/Schools are likely to be faced with several such requests, possibly from several different programs. Chairs and Directors are evaluated according to the success of the program(s) for which their academic unit is responsible; the inter/multi-disciplinary Program Directors are evaluated according to the success of the program for which they are responsible; and faculty would generally like the ability to choose the programs in which they teach. In addition, the negotiations surrounding these competing imperatives normally also involve Faculty Deans. Given that there are too few faculty to satisfy the needs of all programs, tension is inevitable.

6. Governance

Governance issues are of two types. Internal issues relate to the operation of the program, and are often related to the question of faculty resources (see #4 above) and faculty assignment (see #5 above). External issues relate to governance, communication, and decision-making across Faculties.

Currently, the governance structure for inter/multi-disciplinary programs, certificates, or minors involves a “Dean of Record,” a Program Director, and a Program Council (Senate Policy 45). The position “Dean of Record” has not been defined by Senate policy. The Provost’s *Commission on Academic Structures* (02 February 2010) explicitly rejected the creation of a separate Faculty to house interdisciplinary studies. One major reason for that decision was a desire to integrate inter- and multi-disciplinary programs within Faculty structures (even when more than one Faculty is involved) and to ensure close collaboration between inter/multi-disciplinary programs, and disciplinary programs based in Departments. The reality, however, is that the weight of all these goals falls very heavily on the Program Director of the inter/multi-disciplinary program. While Policy 45 spells out the requirements of Program Councils for inter- and multi-disciplinary programs, concern remains that faculty service on such bodies will not be adequately recognised in consideration of tenure and promotion by DEC members normally drawn from the ranks of the discipline-based program(s) housed in a Department/School.

7. *Course Capacity (seats in disciplinary courses for students of inter/multi-disciplinary programs)*

Ryerson's curriculum policies (both existing and proposed) require undergraduate students to take courses outside the program in which they are enrolled. Different programs require the completion of different numbers of such courses. Currently, these are in the Professionally-Related and Liberal Studies categories. In the curriculum model currently under consideration by a committee of Senate, these would become "Open" and "Breadth" electives. What is a "professional" or "program" course for the students of most academic undergraduate programs (whether required or elective) may also be an elective for the students of other programs. The availability of space (seats) in such courses is an issue for the students of many programs, but the concern is heightened for the students of inter- and multi-disciplinary programs at both the undergraduate and graduate level. Where Departments and Schools have allowed their program courses to be included in the curriculum of multi-disciplinary programs (in order to provide exposure to that particular discipline), there must be some mechanism to ensure that an adequate number of seats is available. This space must be provided in any course available as an elective to students from *any* other programs (whether disciplinary, inter-, or multi-disciplinary).

8. *Sense of community (students and faculty)*

One of the persistent problems reported by students in inter- and multi-disciplinary programs is that, absent a Department/School that takes responsibility for the administration of the program, it is very hard to build and sustain any sense of community. This general claim has several constituent parts:

- lack of a "champion" for the program (either an individual or a cohesive small group of faculty), both within the university and externally (e.g., to industry, potential employers)
- faculty not concentrated in a single physical location;
- administrative offices that are housed in Departments/Schools (and sometimes move when the Program Director or Program Administrator changes);
- lack of physical space for building relationships with colleagues and faculty in the program and for collaborations involving course work and/or research (a problem shared by many discipline-based programs); and
- governance questions.

Successful programs engender a sense of community among students and faculty. This makes faculty feel like they belong, it improves the student experience while enrolled, and it is likely to pay dividends when students graduate and begin to consider alumni contributions. Inter- and multi-

disciplinary programs face unique challenges in developing a sustained sense of community. They also face increased challenges to ensure adequate communication between program and students – and among students – to ensure that students are aware of resources across campus and beyond campus. Data derived from surveys of ACS students and alumni confirm these challenges with respect to development of a sense of community. There is a need to examine the successes and failures of such programs in other institutions and to attempt to identify some “best practices” that could be utilised at Ryerson.

9. Specialization in Zone Education

The recently announced Specialization in Zone Education is inherently interdisciplinary, in addition to being a vehicle to provide experiential learning for students in a variety of disciplinary, multi- and interdisciplinary programs. It is projected to provide six one-semester course credits, so it is, in terms of academic credit, similar to a Minor or a Chang School Continuing Education Certificate. It is likely to experience most of the issues identified above. Given the heavy emphasis on practitioner participation, it is likely that there will be additional challenges around governance, particularly the preservation of academic control.

10. Chang School of Continuing Education Certificates

In keeping with the “collaborative model” espoused by the Chang School, there is normally an academic unit with assigned responsibility for courses and Certificates offered by the School. The Chang School, however, is also involved in the delivery of interdisciplinary courses, as well as many multi-disciplinary Certificates, including a successful collaboration with the Faculty of Community Services through which a series of interdisciplinary courses (CINT) are delivered. Such courses form a part of several Certificates and Minors offered by the Faculty of Community Services. The governance and administrative model utilised in the Faculty of Community Services may offer some guidance for other similar collaborations.

Since 1998, the Chang School has also administered the Interdisciplinary Certificate in Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Management, which draws from Departments/Schools in three Faculties: Arts (Politics and Public Administration); Community Services (Social Work); and the Ted Rogers School of Management (Human Resources and Organizational Behaviour, Marketing, and Entrepreneurship and Strategy). Despite its success, the operation of this Certificate highlights many of the problems with inter- and multi-disciplinary programming at Ryerson. It also highlights many of the ingredients necessary for success, not least of which is the presence of a research Centre (The Centre for

Voluntary Sector Studies). The program was also grounded in an unusual degree of cooperation between three Faculties and the School of Continuing Education (as it then was). In terms of problems, the “root” is, quite simply, a lack of faculty whose primary (or even secondary) responsibility is to the courses, the Certificate, or the Minor. As a result the Coordinator, employed by the Chang School, has a difficult time administering the Certificate, and there really is nobody tasked with administering the “day” offerings that make up the Minor, a situation that causes a lot of problems including, but not restricted to, hiring and assessing of CUPE instructors, monitoring of course outlines, and responding to students enrolled in the course. Expansion of the day offerings, long a goal of all involved, is impossible in this environment. Thus the problems of the Certificate are mainly in the areas of faculty resources and governance, and unfold along lines very similar to the problems experiences by other multi- and interdisciplinary programs.

11. Minors

Academic responsibility for minors normally rests with a Department or School. There are many minors, however, that contain courses that are the responsibility of different Departments or Schools. In such cases, there is rarely any kind of effective governance arrangement. Some kind of governance structure is required to:

- ensure availability of courses making up the minor;
- review regularly the syllabi of the courses making up the minor to ensure continued coherence or relevance;
- conduct negotiations with Teaching Departments/Schools to ensure that there are sufficient seats made available in courses that form part of the minor to allow the students of other programs to enrol in them.

Since the courses that make up minors are typically “Professional” courses within the program of the Teaching Department (and “Professionally-Related” courses for the students completing the minor), this can be a major issue.

12. Graduate Studies

Many of the problems identified with inter- and multi-disciplinary graduate programs can be reduced to some common denominators: availability of faculty to teach and supervise, availability of faculty to engage the administration of the program, and availability of support for students (particularly in the absence of a Department/School to act as advocate).

At Ryerson, several inter- or multi-disciplinary graduate programs were approved at a time when there were no graduate programs based in the Departments of the contributing disciplines.

Naturally, faculty who were keen to engage in graduate education leapt at the opportunity to participate in the programs proposed and eventually launched. As time went on, many of the contributing Departments/Schools launched their own discipline-based graduate program and, at that point, faculty found themselves pulled in two opposing directions. Pressure was, quite logically, applied to ensure that faculty were engaged in the graduate programs that are the responsibility of the academic unit to which they were appointed. Concurrently, concern was expressed in many quarters that undergraduate education would be “cannibalised” by the needs of graduate education, since it is generally supposed that graduate courses should be taught by tenure-stream faculty, while undergraduate courses can be (and often are) taught by part-time and sessional instructors. Also, since graduate courses generally have lower enrolment and are more intellectually challenging, many faculty would prefer teaching graduate courses to teaching undergraduate courses, particularly high-enrolment undergraduate courses. But, at a time when Departments/Schools are under pressure to increase the student/faculty ratio, having faculty members teach more than one low-enrolment graduate course per year is enormously problematic for both the Department’s performance indicators and for the undergraduate programs that are the responsibility of that Academic Unit. While it is tempting to conclude that the problem of inadequate “faculty complement” in inter- and multi-disciplinary graduate programs would be relieved, if not totally solved, by letting faculty teach as many graduate courses as they liked, the implications of such action, particularly for *undergraduate* education, have not been well studied and are poorly understood.

At the level of graduate students, ongoing problems have been identified with respect to student support. The problems exist in discipline-based programs as well, particularly in cases where funding is not provided beyond the third year of a doctoral program. The situation is particularly acute, however, in inter- and multi-disciplinary graduate programs because the allocation of employment as a Graduate (teaching) Assistant (GA) – tied as it is to undergraduate program offerings – is controlled by the Academic Unit responsible for the undergraduate program requiring the assistance. If the Academic Unit also has a department-based graduate program, its students are likely to receive the majority of the limited number of Graduate Assistantships available, partly because the Department will desire to support its “own” students, and partly because the graduate students are more likely to be known to the faculty needing assistance. This has resulted in a situation where many graduate students enrolled in interdisciplinary programs are employed by departments that do not have a department-based graduate program. As more department-based

graduate programs are launched, the potential sites of employment for interdisciplinary graduate students are reduced further. The situation is exacerbated by the fact that funding for graduate assistantships is usually provided by Faculty Deans who, in the face of their own budget pressures, seek to constrain the amount of GA funding made available. Inter- and multi-disciplinary graduate programs that cross Faculty boundaries are thus doubly disadvantaged.

G. Improvements

Ryerson has made some progress with the project of institutionalizing inter- and multi-disciplinary programs at all levels. Senate recently passed an amended Policy 45 that sets out structure for Program Councils and treats inter- and multi-disciplinary programs similarly to programs that are based in Departments/Schools. Senate approved some Graduate Diplomas, but then passed a resolution directing that policy concerning Graduate Diplomas be in place before any more are approved. Though no formal direction has (yet) been given, it seems likely that policy defining the scope, function, and responsibilities of a “Dean of Record” will be shortly forthcoming. At its 04 December 2012 meeting, Senate narrowly approved the establishment of a School of Creative Industries as the academic home of the new interdisciplinary program in Creative Industries. The vote on that motion made it quite obvious that there are serious differences of opinion, within the Ryerson community, as to the most appropriate model for the delivery of interdisciplinary programs. Senate responded to that difference of opinion by establishing this Task Force.

H. Recommendations

Before enumerating recommendations for Provostial consideration, it is important to note that the Task Force did not examine how interdisciplinary programs (and graduates therefrom) are viewed *outside* Ryerson, although this matter was certainly flagged in student responses to the Task Force. The mandate of the Task Force involved making recommendations to ensure that programs approved by the Ryerson Senate are delivered well. The Task Force was not asked to engage in any kind of assessment of individual programs, nor was it asked to examine or discuss the employability of the graduates of inter- or multi-disciplinary programs. These questions, while serious and important, should be addressed through the program review processes that are mandated for all Ryerson undergraduate, graduate, and CE programs.

It should also be noted, at this juncture, that the Task Force is explicitly **not** recommending two policy options that were suggested as part of the consultation process. Some members of the

Ryerson community continue to support the creation of a Faculty or other administrative unit to take charge of all inter- and multi-disciplinary activity. This idea was rejected by the Task Force, at least partly because, as recently as February 2010, a University-wide Commission examining the broader question of University structure (The Provost's *Commission on Academic Structures*) studied the question and declined to recommend a separate Faculty. The Task Force concluded that there are other policy options that could produce the same benefits without that alteration of structure.

The second option that seems attractive to some members of the Ryerson community is to permit academic appointments to programs, including cross appointments. The goal embedded in that option is to have faculty with direct responsibility for inter- and multi-disciplinary programs. The Task Force concluded that this goal can be addressed in other ways that do not require major changes to the collective agreement between the Ryerson Faculty Association (RFA) and the Ryerson Board of Governors. Moreover, these other options would retain more flexibility for faculty than would result from a direct appointment model. However, where cross-appointments to multi-disciplinary programs exist, and remain the only option to appropriately staff multi-disciplinary programs, revisions to the RFA collective agreement should be considered.

The Task Force makes the following specific recommendations, and includes, at the end of the list, a procedural recommendation that would ensure that these recommendations are investigated, and a report is made to Senate.

- 1) State, as a matter of general principle, that the University will treat all programs equally and equitably in terms of resource allocation, administrative support, and governance requirements.
- 2) Hire interdisciplinary scholars to teach in interdisciplinary programs, with faculty acquisition plans for multi-disciplinary programs equitably recognized in the university's hiring process.
- 3) In the calculation of the faculty complement necessary to deliver approved programs, refrain from "double-counting" faculty as being fully available to a Department/School and its programs and, at the same time, to inter- or multi-disciplinary programs.
- 4) Ensure – irrespective of the place of primary appointment – that calculations of FTE faculty requirements for inter- or multi-disciplinary programs are done in exactly the same way as for programs based in a Department/School; and that this calculation is part of the formal approval process undertaken by Senate on the recommendation of its Academic Standards Committee, or of the YSGS Council if the program in question is at the graduate level.
- 5) Work with the Ryerson Faculty Association to develop clear and transparent mechanisms to:
 - a. guide the hiring process when faculty will be appointed to a Department/School but expected to teach in, and contribute to, an inter- or multi-disciplinary program. This guidance should address such things as the creation of the job ad and the formation of an appropriate hiring committee (DHC).

- b. ensure that faculty – particularly probationary faculty – are not disadvantaged when some or all of their service responsibilities are rendered to inter- and multi-disciplinary programs and/or when their research is interdisciplinary in nature.
 - c. monitor, and negotiate changes to, teaching assignments specified in letters of appointment. This could include assignments for fixed periods of time.
 - d. balance faculty wishes with respect to graduate and interdisciplinary teaching with needs of approved undergraduate programs based in the Department/School to which the faculty member is appointed.
 - e. facilitate team-teaching, where that is seen as necessary to the success of the program. This could include establishing policy for team-teaching assignments as a common unit of faculty teaching load.
- 6) Define “Dean of Record” in Senate policy, and codify the responsibilities and powers of the position.
 - 7) Identify specific policies that should be revised in order to improve the operation of inter-/multi-disciplinary programs, and their relationships with discipline-based schools/departments and programs.
 - 8) Develop mechanisms to ensure that the courses offered by disciplinary programs provide a sufficient number of seats for the students of inter- and multi-disciplinary programs who require the course.
 - 9) Develop consistent policy pertaining to space and support staff allocation for interdisciplinary programs (both graduate and undergraduate). Space and/or staff could be shared with Departments / Schools, but this shouldn’t be dependent upon the academic appointment of the Graduate Program Director (GPD), and should require consultation between the Program Council and the Department/School Council. Recognise formally that space and support staff are prerequisites for engaging students and developing a sense of community. Common student space for graduate programs, in particular, needs to be a high priority.
 - 10) Promote linkages between multi- and interdisciplinary programs and appropriate research centres or institutes.
 - 11) Develop policy regarding the support of graduate students through GA/RA allocation, and to ensure that the funds follow the students. Consider policy that allocates GA funding to multidisciplinary programs to enable offers of admission supported by appropriate funding, consistent with norms across universities.
 - 12) It may be necessary to create an academic leadership position at a relatively high level, and to assign to that position specific responsibility for inter- and multi-disciplinary programs (Certificate, Undergraduate, Graduate) and research.

The Task Force on Interdisciplinary Programs recommends that Senate accept the Report of the Task Force, and request the Provost to consider the Report in the preparation of the Academic Plan, and to respond explicitly to the Report of the Task Force – including the recommendations enumerated above – setting out specific actions to be undertaken by the university. The Provost’s response should be considered by Senate by October 2014.

I. Acknowledgements

The Task Force on Interdisciplinary Programs takes this opportunity to thank members of the Ryerson community for their support and participation in the consultations that are the basis for our report. Faculty, program and Department/School administrators, students, and RFA officials were extremely gracious in responding to surveys, participating in interviews and/or focus groups, and otherwise providing comment to the Task Force. All members of the Task Force appreciate very much this willingness to work for improvements in the delivery of inter- and multi-disciplinary programs.

For their efforts in supporting the timely completion of this report, the Task Force extends a special thanks to Research Assistant (and Ryerson grad student!) Margaret Bancercz, as well as to staff members Rachel Trozzolo and Patrick O'Donoghue.



Task Force on Interdisciplinary Programs

FINAL REPORT

to

SENATE

03 December 2013

J: APPENDICES: Supporting Documents

The Bylaw of Senate provides:

7. AD HOC COMMITTEES

7.1. General:

7.1.1. Formation and Life: An ad hoc committee may be formed for a limited term by a Senate resolution. Members need not be members of Senate. Unless reconstituted by Senate, the committee is dissolved upon presentation of its report. The motion to establish an ad hoc committee must include the Terms of Reference of the committee, and may include:

- 7.1.1.1. the proposed number of members on the committee;
- 7.1.1.2. details of proposed distribution of members, if any;
- 7.1.1.3. names of proposed members of the committee, if any; and
- 7.1.1.4. the committee report date.

Composition of Task Force:

Motion passed by Senate 29 January 2013:

That Senate hereby establish a Task Force on Interdisciplinary Programs, consisting of the following members: Dr. Jennifer Mactavish, Dean of Graduate Studies (Chair); Dr. Chris Evans, Vice-Provost Academic; Dr. Stephanie Walsh-Matthews, Director, Arts and Contemporary Studies; Dr. Ron Pushchak, School of Occupational and Public Health; Dr. Neil Thomlinson, Politics and Public Administration; Dr. Sri Krishnan, Associate Dean, FEAS; and Elizabeth Evans, Associate Dean, Ted Rogers School of Management.

Amendment

“ ... to add at least one member from each Faculty...”

Dr. Catherine Schreyer, Chair, School of Professional Communications (FCAD) was added and this was reported to the 05 March 2013 meeting of Senate.

Mandate of Task Force

Although the Bylaw of Senate requires that the Terms of Reference of the committee be part of the motion establishing it, the 29 January 2013 motion approved by Senate did not include that information. However, the Report of the Senate Priorities Committee to the 29 January 2013 meeting of Senate (included in the agenda package) included the following:

The Task Force shall have the following mandate:

1. To examine current practices at Ryerson in order to identify issues which are problematic to the operation of inter- and multi-disciplinary programs;
2. To consult widely with the Ryerson community, including with all current inter/multidisciplinary programs, with University Planning, and with the Ryerson Faculty Association in the process of identifying such issues;
3. To make recommendations to Senate by the November 2013 meeting of Senate regarding improvements that could be made to improve the operation of such programs, and their relationships with discipline-based schools/departments and programs.

Definitions

prepared by Stéphanie Walsh Matthews, PhD¹
for Ryerson University Task Force on Interdisciplinary Programs
09 May 2013

cross-disciplinary	Introduces students to a wide variety of learning from divergent disciplines (much like multi-disciplinarity). “Cross-disciplinary” is often reserved to define the grouping of disparate learning environments. At Ryerson, this would be from different Faculties, thus allowing for a congruence of “applied” learning, “theoretical” learning, as well as innovation.
inter-disciplinary <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">v. 1</div>	When researchers exchange their knowledge, analysis, and methods between two or more disciplines. Interdisciplinarity occurs when there is interaction between specialists and their fields and where a mutual enriching dialogue occurs. The disciplines involved will eventually have to transform , even if slightly, to accommodate the functions of the other disciplines. A good example of this would be Human Ethology, where the study of animal behaviourism and childhood psychology and cancer studies are all studied under the multiple lenses of biologists, doctors, psychologists, and philosophers. Interdisciplinarity is a founding principal of cognitive sciences.
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">v. 2</div>	To focus on a particular issue or a series of interrelated issues through a multitude of lenses, thus opening the scope of enquiry. Interdisciplinary refers to the variety of disciplines used to analyse, contextualise, understand a problem. The multi-discipline approach will happen within the context of a course.
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">v. 3</div>	Reinforces the value of broadening skills and experience beyond the boundaries of a single concentration. Interdisciplinary studies involves students in a range of thought, from scientific to humanistic. Courses are designed to illuminate principles, methods, and skills that cross disciplinary boundaries. These programs are intended for students whose interests do not conform to standard academic programs. (Concordia University)
intra-disciplinary	As opposed to cross-disciplinary (that proposes a very large arch of study), “intra-disciplinary” reserves the disparate learning to specific fields from within a larger discipline. In many respects our difficulty in separating and understanding the variants within these terms can be a taxonomical problem, simply put.

¹ using material from Concordia University (noted in text), and

- «Interdisciplinarité», sur *Wikipédia*, en collaboration avec: Darbellay, F. (éd.) (2012). *La circulation des savoirs. Interdisciplinarité, concepts nomades, analogies, métaphores*. Bern, Berlin, Bruxelles, Frankfurt am Main, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang.
- [Edgar Morin](#) – 1994. «Sur l'interdisciplinarité», Bulletin Interactif du Centre International de Recherches et Études transdisciplinaires, n° 2, 1994.

multi-disciplinary	When a student has access to a multitude of disciplines and where there is a common thread through each of the disciplines (i.e., humanities, social sciences, a historical period). Usually, “multidisciplinary” has been used in defining multiple discipline stakeholders within one “Faculty “ (or larger context of study). In this case it is the program that shares the many-disciplinary approach.
pluri-disciplinary	When researchers from different disciplines meet and discuss around a given theme. Pluri-disciplinarity is the result of the researchers, although converging around a common theme, retaining/keeping their particular discipline’s focus. In other words, parallel approaches all contributing (by addition) specifically.
transdisciplinary	When a particular thought system is applied across diverse sciences without concern for boundaries. A good example of this is André Leroi-Gourhan’s Prehistoric Anthropology where the notion of systems is evaluated across physics, biology, economy, and sociology.

Inter/Multi Disciplinary Programs

a. GRADUATE

- Environmental Applied Science and Management
- Communication and Culture
- Immigration and Settlement Studies
- Policy Studies (housed in Arts, but 2 other faculty are also involved so the program is billed as an IDP)
- Masters in Digital Media (New program for Winter 2013, includes Arts, FCAD, FEAS, FOS and TRSM)
- Proposed programs (currently in LOI phase) all are multi-departmental with additional TRSM courses:
 - Biomedical Engineering
 - Energy and Innovation
 - Facilities and Infrastructure Management

b. UNDERGRADUATE

- Arts and Contemporary Studies
- Arts Undeclared
- Biomedical Engineering
- Contemporary Science (has no department of its own – it is run from the Dean's office; there are no contemporary science courses *per se*)
- Creative industries (modular system involves schools in FCAD plus a business requirement offered by TRSM). This now has its own school so its structure will differ from other IDP.
- Economics (BComm Economics and Management Science is housed in Arts, but most of the curriculum comes from TRSM)
- Environment and Urban Sustainability (Arts and FOS)
- Financial Math (ne course that is structurally an IDP: FOS and TRSM)
- Medical physics (has no interfaculty courses)
- Specialization in Management Sciences
- New business minors developed solely for non-business students
- Chang School Certificates for example the Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Management Course. The change in structure of this program has created problems; it may serve as a “poster child” for what is good and about IDPs.

c. MINORS

Minors where it is not clear that a single Academic Unit is responsible for the Minor (i.e., where consultation might reasonably be required to change the requirements of the Minor)

- Business Essentials (BSM, ENT, FIN, GMS, ITM, MKT)
- Curatorial Studies (FPN, HST, MPC, NPF)
- eBusiness (ENT, GMS, HTI, ITM, LAW, MKT, RMG)
- Family Supports and Community Practice (CLD, DST, FNA, FNF, FNP, INT, SWP)
- Global Management (FIN, GMS, HIS, LAW, MHR)
- Labour and Employment Relations (ECN, LAW, MHR, OHS, POG/PPA, SOC)
- Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Management (INP but courses the responsibility of Politics, Social Work, HROB, MKT, ENT)
- Sales Management and Service Quality (CMN, HTH, MHR, MKT, RMG)

d. CHANG SCHOOL CERTIFICATES

Courses with **Required** courses drawn from more than one Academic Unit, and with Interdisciplinary Governance structure?

- Accounting – Finance
 - Required: ACC, FIN
 - Electives: ACC, FIN, ITM, LAW, QMS
- Advancing the AODA: Principles and Practices of Accessibility
 - Required: DST, INT, SWP
 - Electives (3 from 6 streams): CLD, DST, GER, INP, INT, MHR, OHS, PHL, SOC, SWP (and no PPA course in a stream called “Public Policy and Law”)
- Business Analysis
 - Required: GMS, ITM, QMS
 - Electives: CMN, GMS, HTH, ITM, MKT, QMS
- Business Management
 - Required: ACC, ECN, GMS, ITM, LAW, MHR, MKT, QMS
- Community Engagement, Leadership, and Development
 - Required: INP, CVSW (Social Work)
 - Electives: CMN, CRM, DST, FNY, INT, CKPM (Project Mgmt), CODG (Geo), PHL, PSY, SOC, SWP, CVFS (Family Supports)
- Economics and Finance
 - Required: ECN, FIN
 - Electives: ECN, FIN
- Ethics
 - Required: all PHL (but certificate has interdisciplinary governance structure)
 - Electives: CODG (Geo), CRM, ECN, ENG, HST, INT, PHL, POG, PPA, PSY, SOC
- Financial Management
 - Required, ACC, FIN, GMS, ITM, LAW, MHR, QMS
- Financial Planning
 - Required: ACC, ECN, FIN, LAW, QMS
- Fundraising Management
 - Required: INP912 (TRSM), INT916 (FCS), CVFM
- Health Informatics
 - Required: CHIT (ITM??), HSM
 - Electives: CHIM, ITM, MHR, CZLW (Law)
- Health Services Management
 - Required: CMN, HSM, CVNU (Nursing)
- Health Studies
 - Required: HSM, CDCE (Workplace communication: CMN??)
- Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Management
 - Required: INP courses [Politics, Social Work, Bus Mgmt (HROB, Mkt, Ent/Strat)]
- Nursing Leadership and Management, Advanced
 - Required: CVNU (Nursing),
 - Electives: CKPM (Project Mgmt), CVSW (SOWK), HIM, HSM, INP, INT, MHR, PPA
- Project Management
 - Required: ITM, CKPM
 - Electives: CMN, CKPM, HSM, ITM, MHR,
- Social Sciences and Humanities Foundations
 - Required: Interdisciplinary SSH courses (FoA)
 - Electives: all “platform” intro courses in FoA

Qualitative Interviews Report Interdisciplinary Task Force

Prepared by Margaret Bancercz

Introduction

Interviews were conducted over the course of two months with 13 interviewees from the Ryerson University community. Interviewees ranged from junior and senior administrators (3) to disciplinary (4) and interdisciplinary (6) faculty members. Interdisciplinary faculty members were identified as interdisciplinary if they had a current leadership role in interdisciplinary programs at Ryerson or were heavily engaged in teaching in an interdisciplinary program. Interdisciplinary programs were identified using the “Inter/Multi Disciplinary Programs”¹ list as created by the Interdisciplinary Task Force.

This report will begin with the identification of a purpose, followed by a brief discussion on methodology and a results section. The results section is separated by headings that identify with a particular question in the interview guide: successes, challenges, key opportunities, steps/ recommendations, and miscellaneous. The “Inter/Multi Disciplinary Programs” list created by the Interdisciplinary Task Force is Appendix J-3 of the Task Force Report. Schedule 1 attached to this report is the interview guide including potential probes that were used in some cases, and Schedule 2 of this Report is a more detailed summary of interviewee responses.

The information under each heading is stratified using the three groups interviewed: administration, disciplinary faculty, and interdisciplinary faculty. The data is sub-headed based on the amount of interviewees giving the same response.

Under headings “successes” and “challenges”, responses are sub headed with “top”, “most important”, and “less important” (if applicable) based on the amount of times a particular response was given in the interview process. Under the “key opportunities” and “steps and recommendations” headings, “top” and “most important” sub headings will be used as well. However, responses given by only one interviewee will be stratified into a chart identifying administration, disciplinary and interdisciplinary faculty. Finally, the miscellaneous section offers data that may be useful to the Task Force but is not able to be grouped under a particular interview question. Modes were identified if they existed. More details were provided under each data point that received more than one response. Single responses were also noted.

Purpose

The purpose of these interviews is two-fold. First, the information collected is intended to inform the final report of the Interdisciplinary Task Force that will be written for the Ryerson University Senate. Second, the information collected will also serve to inform a series of surveys that will be distributed to other stakeholders in the Ryerson University community.

¹ See Appendix J-3 of the Report

Methodology

Interviewees were preselected by the Task Force using nested purposeful sampling methods.² Intensity sampling was used to identify “information rich cases”,³ or interviewees viewed as those that would be able to provide more information than the average Ryerson community member based on their past and present experiences. Interviewees were then stratified to identify common threads in the three groups interviewed: administration, disciplinary faculty, interdisciplinary faculty.

A common interview guide⁴ was used for all interviewees with general and open-ended questions in order to identify participants’ perspectives on interdisciplinarity at Ryerson University. Probes were used to gain more insight into an interviewee’s response, or touch on more specific topics related to interdisciplinarity.

Interview responses were coded in two cycles. The first cycle included structural coding,⁵ or the organization of data based its relation to a particular research question found as headings in the results section. The second cycle was based on pattern coding,⁶ which identified common themes or responses between participants which were then grouped together.

Results

Successes

Top Successes:

- Current interdisciplinary programs already in place – Arts and Contemporary Studies, current graduate programs, liberal studies, Creative Industries as a good model because faculty from different disciplines have a common goal [3/13] [2 disciplinary, 1 interdisciplinary]
- Team teaching as found in Arts and Contemporary Studies, as richer for both faculty and students [3/13] [2 disciplinary, 1 interdisciplinary]

Important Successes:

- Ryerson fairly supportive of interdisciplinary research funding wise [2/13] [1 disciplinary, 1 interdisciplinary]
- Ryerson faculty open to collaboration and cooperation [2/13] [2 interdisciplinary]

² Michael Quinn Patton, *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods 3rd ed.* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc., 2002).

³ Patton.

⁴ See Schedule 1 for full list of questions used in interviews

⁵ Johnny Saldaña, *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers.* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc., 2009).

⁶ Saldaña.

Some interesting successes:

- Dean of Graduate Studies assumption of role of Dean of Record for interdisciplinary programs [1/13] [interdisciplinary]
- Interdisciplinary courses offered jointly by the Chang School and the Faculty of Community Services [1/13] [administration]
- Research effective because of a research centre - the Centre for Immigration and Settlement Studies
- Benefit from a chair's perspective: Beneficial to release a faculty member to the Environmental Science and Management (ENSCIMAN) program to teach because ENSCIMAN provides generous compensation, more than enough to hire a CUPE instructor

Challenges**Top Challenges:**

- Enough stable and continuous teaching support in interdisciplinary programs (interdisciplinary courses treated as overload, no one reports to the program director of interdisciplinary courses, casual relationships and "begging" of disciplinary chairs to release faculty members to teach) [6/13] [1 administrator⁷, 2 disciplinary, 3 interdisciplinary]
- Graduate interdisciplinary students have a hard time getting TAs/GAs/RAs – process is not stable, very casual, ambiguous; disciplinary graduate students end up with jobs and even some undergraduates [6/13] [2 disciplinary, 4 interdisciplinary]

Important Challenges:

- Not being able to have joint/cross appointments [3/13] [1 administrator, 1 disciplinary, 1 interdisciplinary]
- Hiring is done only for specializations in a particular areas of research or for disciplines [3/13] [1 administrator, 1 disciplinary, 1 interdisciplinary]
- Interdisciplinary programs not properly funded [3/13] [1 administrator, 1 disciplinary, 1 interdisciplinary]
- No physical space for interdisciplinary students/programs – nowhere for an interdisciplinary program to exist, no signage for program, nowhere for students to lounge and interact [3/13] [3 interdisciplinary]
- Structure of undergraduate teaching responsibilities hinders opportunities to teach at graduate level, where undergraduate teaching takes precedence and faculty

⁷ Administrative interviewee mentioning challenge from conversation with faculty members, though not personally experienced.

members can only then be “bought out” from their undergraduate responsibilities [3/13] [3 interdisciplinary]

Less important Challenges:

- PhD students graduating from interdisciplinary programs will have a hard time finding academic jobs [2/13] [1 disciplinary, 1 interdisciplinary]
- Interdisciplinary research may pose risks to a faculty member's hiring/promotion/tenure because of a low number of publications, or publications in certain types of journals that are not disciplinary journals [2/13] [1 disciplinary, 1 interdisciplinary]

Key opportunities

Top opportunities:

- Joint hires/cross appointments [3/13] [2 disciplinary⁸, 1 interdisciplinary]
- Look at other universities for best practices or experiences [3/13] [2 disciplinary, 1 administrator⁹]
- Protocols for acquiring teaching personnel for interdisciplinary programs [3/13] [1 administrator, 1 disciplinary, 1 interdisciplinary¹⁰]

Important Opportunities

- Interdisciplinary graduate students to be properly funded (i.e. TAs) [2/13] [1 disciplinary, 1 interdisciplinary]
- Interdisciplinary programs should be treated equally with disciplinary programs [2/13] [1 administrator, 1 interdisciplinary]

⁸ One of which suggested a 60/40 commitment split between two departments, alternating with every new faculty member hired between the two departments (rather than the traditional 50/50)

⁹ Suggested that the Task Force focus on professional universities, or polytechnics, since Ryerson is a polytechnic

¹⁰ Interdisciplinary teaching support as requirements for departments

Responses from single interviewees:

Ways to increase interdisciplinarity at Ryerson University		
Administration	Disciplinary	Interdisciplinary
Expand the current interdisciplinary courses between the Chang School and the Faculty of Community Services to more faculties	Create more interdisciplinary programs, both undergraduate and graduate	Having an associate VP with responsibilities in terms of administration and resources for interdisciplinary programs could be tried out
Altering professional programs (i.e. engineering) to a combined BA/MA 5 year program in order to include interdisciplinary courses	Increase capacity of programs so that students of different disciplines could take courses across campus	
	Have a communal shared space between departments or faculties to encourage organic discussions on collaboration	

Improve Current Interdisciplinary Research		
Administration	Disciplinary	Interdisciplinary
	Protocols for research – funding RAs for both faculty and students	Ryerson could create more grants that require the engagement of colleagues across the university, as they did one year in the past
		Acknowledgement for research grants for non-principal investigators involved in a project

Steps/recommendations for the Task Force to put into ReportTop recommendations:

- Take baby steps, approach interdisciplinarity cautiously [3/13] [2 disciplinary, 1 interdisciplinary]
- Fund interdisciplinary graduate students properly with systematic, transparent and equal access to TAs/As/RAs [3/13] [1 disciplinary, 2 interdisciplinary]

Important recommendations:

- Back up any ideas with resources (funding and space) [2/13] [1 disciplinary, 1 interdisciplinary]
- Foster communication between departments/faculties (i.e. communal space)[2/ 13] [2 disciplinary]
- Create a systemic way of ensuring stable teaching support for interdisciplinary programs (i.e. by requiring departments to release faculty members) [2/13] [2 disciplinary]

Responses from single interviewees:

In General		
Administration	Disciplinary	Interdisciplinary
Look at polytechnic universities to see what they are doing with multidisciplinary or interdisciplinarity		Lack of a common understanding of interdisciplinarity, leading to a poorly structured interdisciplinary framework could create further power inequalities between programs/departments at Ryerson
		Define the problem clearly in the report, discussing existing issues/practices and current multidisciplinary services offered
		Understand view of all stakeholders, especially students
		Think about maintaining the quality of interdisciplinary programs
		Space for the Centre for Immigration and Settlement Studies in new building on Yonge St.

On faculty members: hiring/teaching/research		
Administration	Disciplinary	Interdisciplinary
	LTO workshops on teaching interdisciplinary courses	Understand current environment of tenure in departments
	Creation of cross-appointments	Think about identity issues for faculty
	Do not let the university push interdisciplinarity onto faculty, interdisciplinary research should be allowed to flourish organically	
	Fund research centres to encourage interdisciplinary research	
	Make sure hiring/promotion/tenure committees are able to give adequate credit to interdisciplinary research	

On structures		
Administration	Disciplinary	Interdisciplinary
Do not create new structures to house interdisciplinary studies, use existing departments to create a flexible atmosphere	No interdisciplinary faculty, expertise housed in departments and programs combined between departments	Structures and administration devoted to interdisciplinary programs so that interdisciplinary programs do not have to keep using disciplinary resources for collaboration
Make sure that interdisciplinary programs are treated on equal footing with disciplinary ones		Fix the structural impediments to teaching graduate courses (i.e. undergraduate teaching should not undermine graduate teaching)
		Multidisciplinary programs should become departments with core faculty

Students		
Administration	Disciplinary	Interdisciplinary
Require students to take interdisciplinary course for their Ryerson degree		Identity issues for students in interdisciplinary programs

Miscellaneous

- Confusion of terms, meaning of interdisciplinary [6/13] [2 administration, 2 disciplinary, 3 interdisciplinary]
 - Multidisciplinary versus interdisciplinarity (x2)
 - Interdisciplinarity not just a classroom filled with students from different backgrounds
 - Multidisciplinarity versus interdisciplinarity versus transdisciplinarity (x2)
 - Some might argue that the tripartite structure at Ryerson provides interdisciplinarity if the term “interdisciplinary” is not properly defined
 - Current discipline departments offer interdisciplinarity through their service courses
 - Very little common understanding
 - No single definition
- The creation of a Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies is not a good idea [4/13] [1 administration, 2 disciplinary, 2 interdisciplinary]
 - May become a second tier form of hiring for disciplinary faculty that did not get hired in a disciplinary department
 - Interdisciplinary studies frequently cut, would not a secure place for faculty
 - Would rather see programs rather than rigid structures that are not flexible and fluid and do not mirror interdisciplinary knowledge
 - Would be detrimental to Creative Industries

Response given by single interviewees:

- Look at Bologna Process in the European Union which has standardized a variety of undergraduate and graduate level training across the European Union Zone, perhaps there is more interdisciplinarity found in that process
- Look at the University of Waterloo, since they are more of a hands-on institution
- Best faculty teach core courses in disciplinary departments, “worse” faculty go to teaching service courses and others, so we must understand this practice first
- Breaking down hierarchies and barriers between the university is unrealistic and inefficient
- Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies is a good idea
- Too much interdisciplinarity may sacrifice knowledge depth for students

Analysis

Though all thirteen interviewees offered unique responses and perspectives on viewing interdisciplinarity at Ryerson University, some overarching patterns could be developed.

Generally participants were in favour of interdisciplinarity at Ryerson and supported its expansion, however a few were concerned about how this would impact students' future, in terms of knowledge depth and academic careers.

Current interdisciplinary successes at Ryerson were very few, where interviewees from administration had the hardest time identifying them. A few faculty members, both disciplinary and interdisciplinary, cited the availability of current interdisciplinary programs and team teaching as successes. Interdisciplinary research was considered successful as well.

The challenges found at Ryerson were the most discussed topic across each interview. The top challenges were primarily identified by those of the interdisciplinary faculty and are arising due to administrative reasons. The difficulty of acquiring stable teaching support for an interdisciplinary program was identified by 6 out of 13 participants, with the overwhelming majority coming from faculty, with 3 interdisciplinary faculty members voicing this concern over 2 disciplinary ones. Another major challenge identified was the difficulty of interdisciplinary graduate students obtaining TAs, GAs and RAs on campus, where one interdisciplinary faculty member described the situation as "...the largest most important thing impacting interdisciplinary graduate students". This challenge was voiced by 6 faculty members with a majority of them interdisciplinary. It was curious to note that both science faculty members interviewed mentioned no issues with their interdisciplinary graduate students' opportunity to obtain work at Ryerson. In fact, one interviewee mentioned that many Environmental Science and Management students go to the Faculty of Science for TA/GA/RA opportunities.

Key opportunities, much like the challenges, centred for the most part on administrative opportunities, having to do with teaching, graduate student funding through TA/GA/RA opportunities, as well as the equal treatment of interdisciplinary programs. This was where most of the discussion about structural elements at Ryerson occurred. Many interviewees at the same time argued against the creation of a Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies (see miscellaneous section above), but also supported the creation of formal structures to ensure the sustainability and survival of current interdisciplinary programs, both for the faculty and students.

The top steps and recommendations were again based on administrative issues. One recommendation addressed the financial support of students through access to TA/GA/RA and the creation of a "formalized" and "equal" process for interdisciplinary graduate students in the acquisition of TA/GA/RA positions. Faculty teaching support in interdisciplinary programs was also mentioned as an important step, which should have "stable, and continuous teaching personnel". A couple of faculty members also would like to see the fostering communication between faculties and departments through the creation of some common space as elicited earlier in their interviews.

Both disciplinary and interdisciplinary faculty voiced concerns about caution in the Task Force's approach to interdisciplinarity, as well as concern about resources behind the ideas that may be implemented at Ryerson. However, administration did not suggest any concrete recommendations. More generally, over half the participants voiced a concern over the confusion of the term "interdisciplinary" which could cause problems for any further steps taken towards interdisciplinarity at Ryerson. As mentioned earlier, there was a group of interviewees that voiced disfavour for a Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies, of which 2 were interdisciplinary, 1 disciplinary and 1 administrative. A single interdisciplinary participant was in favour of such a structure. It is important to note however, that the question of having an interdisciplinary faculty was mostly brought up by the participants themselves and not by the interviewer.

On the whole interviewees were able to identify concrete challenges they have been experiencing, or have seen at Ryerson with regards to interdisciplinarity, though solutions to them were very scarce. The theme of the lack of teaching supporting in interdisciplinary programs was prevalent throughout the interviews, exhibited in both disciplinary and interdisciplinary faculty members, though mostly in the latter. Access to TA/GA/RA opportunities for interdisciplinary graduate students was also a theme throughout interviews, though not as frequent as the former theme of teaching support. Drawing from the discussions in the interviews, interdisciplinary programs at Ryerson are being treated as "second class programs" in the words of a participant administrator. Disciplinary departments and programs have permanent and larger amounts of resources, while interdisciplinary programs do not. They are forced to either use some of disciplinary departments' resources, or use informal relationships, specifically to garner teaching support. Moreover, based on the structural impediments of graduate teaching discussed by some participants, we can conclude that graduate interdisciplinary programs are at a larger disadvantage than undergraduate ones because faculty members must be "bought out" of their undergraduate teaching responsibilities, making it harder for graduate interdisciplinary programs to source teaching personnel. This could stem from the fact brought up by the administration group that Ryerson remains a polytechnic university and the majority of its programs are professional undergraduate programs.

An interesting observation to note from the interview process is the lack of awareness on the part of administration of many faculty issues, and *all* student issues. In addition, senior administration was the only group that found no other changes needed at Ryerson to increase interdisciplinarity other than equal treatment of programs. Both of these observations suggest a disconnection between faculty, students and administration and a need for a feedback mechanism from students and faculty to Ryerson administration.

It is also important to note that most discussions focused on the current interdisciplinary issues and programs at Ryerson University, rather than new initiatives for programs. We can infer that the majority of interviewees would support the restructuring of current programs and their relationships with departments, rather than creating completely new structures such as a faculty. Thus, key recommendations and steps should focus on current interdisciplinary issues occurring at Ryerson with which both faculty and students are dealing. Further consultation with a larger group of faculty and interdisciplinary students is recommended.

Schedule 1: Interview Guide

Interview Guide for Interdisciplinarity at Ryerson Interviews

This past January, the Senate created an Interdisciplinary Task Force assigned to examine current interdisciplinary practices at Ryerson through consultation with the Ryerson community. This was done in order to suggest recommendations to Senate on how to improve interdisciplinarity at Ryerson.

Based on your experience, you have been selected by the Task Force as an ideal candidate to participate in this study.

This will be a short interview meant to get your perspective on interdisciplinarity at Ryerson. It will be used to inform the final report created for the Senate as well as a survey distributed to a larger number of faculty in September. No attribution will be made to you or your name through your responses; confidentiality will be respected. The raw data will only be seen by the Task Force and all data will be deleted upon the completion of the study.

As mentioned in the contact email, this interview will be recorded. Is that okay? (i.e. Do I have your consent to do so?)

Do you have any questions or concerns regarding this process before we begin?

1. What has been your experience with interdisciplinarity at Ryerson? Please tell me about it.
 - Research
 - Taught, developed courses, programs, curriculums, syllabi?
 - Different departments?
 - Supervised students (undergrad/grad)
 - Student life
2. Thinking about IDP at Ryerson from your perspective, what do you think has been working well?
 - Courses
 - Faculty
 - Research opportunities
 - Type of university that Ryerson is (new, more hands-on)
3. What do you see as challenges?
 - Grants
 - Hiring, tenure, promotion
 - Administration
 - Institutional culture
 - Leadership
 - Lack of interdisciplinary faculty
 - Lack of funds
4. What do you think could be done differently? (key opportunities)

- How to make it work better/ how to improve
 - Some options from challenges section
 - More support for some of the things that have been working well
5. As far as the Task Force report to Senate is concerned, what would you like to see with regards to recommendations/steps that should be taken?
6. Did I miss anything important, do you have anything further to add?

Schedule 2: Thematic Analysis of In-Depth Interviews

Point Form Summary

Themes	Issues identified
Limited Resources/Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Properly fund interdisciplinary programs so both faculty and students want to be there ○ Some programs receive more resources than others, interdisciplinary programs suffer --- fund them equally so they are not the “poor cousins” ○ Back up interdisciplinarity with resources and physical space ○ Make sure that there are resources behind whatever the Task Force proposes ○ When engaging in interdisciplinary research under an interdisciplinary program with no home department and working between faculties, research grants become ambiguous with more than one dean ○ Increased enrolment of students, but number of instructors and administrative structures are not growing with it ○ Interdisciplinary graduate students need to be funded properly and consistently with TAships
Hiring, Tenure, Promotion of Faculty & Rewards System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Untenured faculty unable to participate in new interdisciplinary program innovations because seen as risky ○ Unable to hire interdisciplinary instructors for interdisciplinary programs ○ Hiring process does not understand multidisciplinary programs or departments ○ Create an interdisciplinary hiring committee sourced from across the university capable of assessing interdisciplinary teaching and research ○ The committees created for the hiring of CRCs have been very successful ○ Joint hires are not allowed under collective agreement and are never 50/50 between departments ○ Creation of cross-appointments needed ○ Currently, no rewards for faculty supervising interdisciplinary students, unless they are in the Faculty of Arts who have a point system ○ Faculty members should be rewarded for trying different innovative interdisciplinary initiatives, rather than penalized if the idea does not work for the first time

Institutional Culture

- **Lack of a common understanding of interdisciplinarity, leading to a poorly structured interdisciplinary framework could create further power inequalities between programs/departments at Ryerson**
- **Lack of faculty/department flexibility when trying to create new interdisciplinary programs**
- **Disciplinary culture continues to exist**
- **Friction between faculties**
- **Siloes in university preventing interdisciplinary collaboration**
- **Territoriality, departments wanting their own courses and not sharing with any other departments**
- **Cultural barriers in institution hampering creativity**
- **Graduate interdisciplinary programs are treated like second class programs, no one is willing to be responsible for them**
- **Faculty very willing to collaborate on interdisciplinary research**

Governance

- No faculty report to interdisciplinary program directors
- Lack of authority/ownership in interdisciplinary programs, no one is in charge, no one can force change or improvement
- No permanent faculty teaching in interdisciplinary programs relying on casual relationships and encounters to survive
- Engaging in graduate teaching is not systematized across campus, not in RFA Collective Agreement
- No formal structures to hire instructors or faculty in interdisciplinary programs
- Need for good formal governance structures for interdisciplinary studies which should be created in consultation with the community and stem from our current structure
- Need interdisciplinary programs to be more like departments
- Need for equity in resource distribution in particular for graduate interdisciplinary programs
- No standard, transparent or structured ways to deal with TA work. Who is in charge of hiring or giving money to TAs?
- When two deans involved in a program, there is no equal sharing of costs (i.e. ISS program)

ACS – SUMMARY OF STUDENT RESPONSES
(Survey conducted as part of the Periodic Program Review, 2013)

The Arts and Contemporary Studies (ACS) program aims to prepare graduates to think, work and participate actively in the changing social, political and cultural environments of the 21st century. It combines the intellectual agility and other benefits of a liberal arts education with hands-on, applied skills and competencies. In terms of student numbers, it is the largest interdisciplinary undergraduate program at Ryerson.

Program Structure

The program comprises a range of required interdisciplinary courses that allow students to focus on “Ideas that Shaped the World” from ancient times to the present day. In these courses, students also develop key skills and competencies, including the ability to read precisely and critically, communicate effectively, develop strategies for life-long learning, mediate conflict, work in teams and conduct research and analysis. Students also have the option of pursuing a complementary minor in a professionally-related area.

Program Enrolment

ACS is a high-demand program at Ryerson. On average, it receives 1800 applications per annum and admits only 175 new students each September. The most recent data show that the applicants-to-registrants ratio for ACS (11.5:1) is higher than the Ryerson average (9.2:1). Over the last 5 years, the mean entrance-grade average for ACS was 82% – higher, again, than the Ryerson average (80%).

As part of the Periodic Program Review process mandated by the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario and Ryerson Policy, an extensive survey was conducted of current students enrolled in the ACS program and of alumni. The full results of those surveys may be seen in the Periodic Program Review documents. What follows is an explanation of the survey responses particularly germane to the Task Force on Interdisciplinary Programs.

Current Students

Surveys of ACS students have demonstrated that skills acquired through the program are valuable and sought-after assets in the work place. These skills include, but are not restricted to research, analysis, and critical thinking. Although some students have found it difficult to determine how, exactly, the program has led them to their career choice, most of

them emphasize the importance of a broad liberal arts degree, combined with the essential skills in research and applied methodologies (such as qualitative research methods and statistics). These skills make the graduates adaptable to different work areas and research disciplines. The availability of minors in fields such as human resources, professional communications, business, accounting and law is an additional asset that contributes to the success of ACS graduates in the workplace.

According to the survey data¹, nearly 90% of the current student body surveyed agrees that most of their professors and instructors are current and knowledgeable in their fields, that they are available outside of class time to help students, and generally speaking, that the teaching in the ACS program is of high quality. Because of ACS's interdisciplinary nature, this kind of feedback strengthens the program's resolve to continue to work with excellent faculty members, and demonstrates the nature of those faculty members' commitment, and the overall collaborative character of the Faculty of Arts under the guidance and direction of the Dean of Arts and operating with the full support of the chairs of the partner Departments. In addition, over 90% of the surveyed students agreed that ACS is an academically-challenging program, and over 80% said that they are given useful feedback on their academic performance.

Of the current student body surveyed, over 65% said that the program was good preparation for a career. Students also noted that ACS helped them to develop their creativity and leadership, and to improve their problem-solving, research, critical-thinking, and oral and written communication skills. In addition, students reported that the various assessment methods used by their professors and instructors were effective ways of measuring their understanding of the material. Overall, ACS students had overwhelmingly positive comments to make about the program, adding that they would strongly recommend it to other prospective students. In this regard, they commented primarily on the program's flexibility and the wide range of faculty expertise.

Alumni

ACS alumni were very much in agreement with current students. Among ACS graduates, 92.8% indicated they would highly recommend the program – a score that is significantly higher

¹ In the Periodic Program Review, see "Student Satisfaction Survey Form & Data"

than the Ryerson average. Among ACS graduates, 35% felt “very satisfied” and 58% were “satisfied” with where their education had led them thus far. Only 7% were dissatisfied, which is significantly lower than the Ryerson average as well as the Faculty of Arts average.

From Interdisciplinary Curriculum to Professional Life

ACS students who go on to be successful OGS and SSHRC applicants attribute their achievements to the academic strengths of the program and to the support they received from faculty and staff. ACS students who go on to a career in education state that ACS was instrumental to the development of qualities they consider to be unique and indispensable in finding a job teaching in Toronto. Those qualities are directly linked to the broad and flexible curriculum offered by ACS, which allows students to complete necessary courses in many teachable areas. ACS graduates also do very well in the editing and publishing world. Some of our graduates hold senior editing, managing, and publishing positions, and achieved those positions soon after graduation. ACS alumni are presidents, journalists, curators, entrepreneurs, professors, teachers, researchers, marketers, and more.

On Interdisciplinary Studies: Student Comments

Student comments highlight several features of the interdisciplinary ACS program as being highly valuable. The ability to gain valuable knowledge in several areas was cited as a strength not typically found in university programs. Several respondents noted that the program meets the needs of those who know what they want to study, but it is also very well-suited to those who are not so sure. The program was credited with developing the interests of each person with maximum flexibility. One student summarised nicely:

I would recommend ACS to others. It draws from a broad base of traditions and disciplines that help to ensure that it appeals to students’ diverse interests. More than most programs, I feel it offers a meaningful learning experience in personal, social, and cultural terms, as opposed to being geared simply towards developing skills for the workplace. The degree of freedom with which I’ve been able to navigate the program’s various offerings is also something of which I’ve been particularly appreciative. The flexibility with which I’ve been able to chart my academic course has helped to alleviate the stress that is inherent in trying to schedule and organize my academics, make the most of my university experience, and get into graduate school.

Interdisciplinary Task Force: Interdisciplinary Graduate Student Focus Group Report

Introduction

To develop a clear understanding of the current state of interdisciplinary programs at Ryerson University, the Interdisciplinary Task Force engaged in conversations with those who are involved in the programs, seeking their feedback and ideas. Included in these conversations were two focus groups of current graduate students in interdisciplinary programs.

Throughout the focus groups students discussed their experiences and views about the strengths and challenges associated with interdisciplinary graduate education at Ryerson. Collectively, the students self-identified, with pride, their status as the “first-generation” of interdisciplinary students. Students were drawn to interdisciplinary graduate programs because they perceived them to have greater practical application in their fields of interest and allowed for greater flexibility to work with supervisors from multiple disciplines. They were thrilled with the support their program directors provide and it is evident for them that faculty members really want to be a part of their programs. Despite the assets of interdisciplinary programs there are many challenges inside and outside Ryerson University that require attention as both academia and industry adjust to a world of changing knowledge. Discussions in the focus groups centred on four main themes: the lack of a champion for interdisciplinary programs, program curricula, graduate assistantships (GA) and teaching assistantships (TA), and physical space. This brief report will begin with an overview of the methodology used, followed by a thematic analysis of the focus group results and recommendations.

Method

Focus groups were used for two purposes: first, to engage graduate students in Ryerson’s interdisciplinary discussion through learning about their experiences, and second, as a method of data triangulation, complimenting earlier in-depth interviews with faculty members and administration involved in interdisciplinary education at Ryerson University. Two focus groups were conducted with a total of 6 students representing the Communication and Culture program and the Environmental Science and Management Program.

Both sessions¹ proved to be very informative and supported insights on student challenges discussed in the faculty and administration interview report. Interview responses were coded in two cycles. The first cycle involved structural codingⁱ, or the grouping of data based on a particular question asked during the focus group session. The second cycle centred on pattern codingⁱⁱ, identifying common themes from participants, which were then grouped together and presented thematically.

Analysis

Lack of a Champion

Many of the challenges discussed during the focus group sessions flowed from the perceived lack of a “champion” at the decanal level for interdisciplinary programs. There was a feeling that without someone advocating for students at a higher administrative level with a deep understanding of and interest in the program, many opportunities such as involvement in campus initiatives (i.e. learning/research centres) were missed. In addition, students need someone to ensure there are reserved seats in classes that are often at capacity with disciplinary students. Without a champion, students felt that they lacked an identity. This affects

¹ Appendix A shows the questions and potential probes used during the focus group sessions.

current students as well as graduates who encounter difficulties defining their degree when applying for jobs. There is a lack of familiarity both within Ryerson and outside of it with regards to what a given interdisciplinary program encompasses and the meaning of such a degree. As such, students feel that there is a fundamental need for either one person or a collective group of faculty members to facilitate the integration of their program with both the university and the industry. The lack of clarity concerning the degree itself and the lack of identity are ongoing embedded concerns across the major themes discussed.

In lieu of a champion at the decanal level, there could be opportunities for collective support. Despite the large number of faculty members who participate in interdisciplinary programs, these faculty are not easily accessible and the onus is on the student to locate faculty members for support. If the faculty collaborated to host open houses and networking events bringing people together from around campus and from relevant industries, this could help the program and students to create a more distinguished presence on campus and solidify an identity.

Program Curricula

An interdisciplinary program's flexibility is desirable in both the admissions process, where students of different background are eligible to apply, as well as throughout their degree in terms of course variety and research topics. A number of students mentioned that they felt better prepared for employment because they were able to build their course work and research in a unique direction. It however, should be noted that some students felt that because it was not a disciplinary program it made it difficult for employers to understand students' competencies and presented a challenge when job searching.

The flexibility of course selection is seen as an asset to the program, however this flexibility also hinders the number of courses that are offered and available to students. Though the course calendar shows all approved courses, this did not necessarily translate into courses offered. While this is true in all programs throughout the university, interdisciplinary students may only have a select few courses that apply to their area of interest. If they entered a program intent on taking courses that are never offered, it prevents them from steering their studies in a desired direction.

Bringing together students of different backgrounds and research areas adds breadth to class discussions, collegial relationships, and collaborative work. One student indicated that because everyone's research area is so different, there is a more cooperative research environment. Students are more willing to share resources, conference information, and sources rather than hoarding information, which may occur in disciplinary programs where competition is much higher. While students noted that there was a benefit to having a class with colleagues from different backgrounds, they also believed that this could cause difficulty when some students are underprepared for the complexity of a core course because they have not completed relevant courses in the past.

There were mixed feelings about how to support some curriculum concerns because of the inconsistency in how interdisciplinary programs are set up. Students in programs without streams felt that these could be beneficial as guides in course selection. However, at the same time students in programs with streams felt that these guides stifled their opportunity to develop their own plan of study. Nonetheless, there was an overarching sense that students could benefit from more guidance in course selection and the securing of seats in different departments when attempting to take courses outside of the program.

Graduate Assistantships/Teaching Assistantships

Graduate students turn to GAs and TAs to supplement their funding and to gain valuable skills that are necessary for some industry positions and vital for a future in academia. There were vast differences in students' experiences around applying for and obtaining or not obtaining GA/TA positions, though there was agreement that interdisciplinary students need additional support in this respect.

Students in interdisciplinary programs face unique difficulties in attaining GA/TA positions because the job postings are most widely circulated and recruited for within departments and often granted to a supervisor's own students. Interdisciplinary students are likely to have a background that would make them qualified applicants for positions in programs where they have no faculty connections and go unnoticed in the hiring process. Interdisciplinary Students need help networking with faculty members that are hiring.

Graduate programs do not keep consistent records on the success rate of students in attaining GA/TA positions and thus it is difficult to assess the extent of the issue. Regardless, more commitment needs to be made to help students ensure they have access to enough funding opportunities to be successful in their programs. If there was more support in fostering the informal relationships between students and faculty members of different departments, this could potentially aid in the opening up of contract opportunities for interdisciplinary students. A formal mechanism around GA/TA positions and ensuring that all students have an opportunity to work at Ryerson would ensure equity and create a better educational experience. It is important to monitor which positions are being filled and in what departments to ensure a protected number of spots for interdisciplinary students. It was mentioned that a lot of interdisciplinary students hold positions in departments where there is no graduate program. While this is currently a benefit for interdisciplinary graduate students, there is fear that with the growth of new graduate programs, new disciplinary students will be given priority access to their departmental positions leaving interdisciplinary students with even less GA/TA opportunities.

Physical Space

The most visibly apparent challenge for interdisciplinary students is the lack of physical space for them on campus. There is no collective area for interdisciplinary students to congregate where they would have easy access to their program director, program administrator, faculty members and a location to share information and postings of opportunities. Students feel that they have no place to call their own and interact with fellow classmates.

With an ever changing and growing campus, students felt that there needs to be someone fighting on their behalf (such as the above mentioned "champion") where there are opportunities for space to be acquired. This space is a necessity for interdisciplinary students in order to complete course and research work, fulfill GA/TA responsibilities, and to collaborate with other students and form collegial relationships. In addition, such a space designated for interdisciplinary students could be an area where academic support, conference, employment and research opportunities would be posted which would be easier to navigate than the onslaught of inapplicable emails they are receiving. Lastly, students understood that it is not possible to have all faculty members from the program in one space, but felt that their Program Administrator and Program Director should be easily accessible in one location to facilitate discussions and administrative procedures without trekking from one building to another.

Recommendations

- 1) Champion – Facilitate involvement with research centres, network with faculty and industry to promote program, and advocate for physical space and presence on campus
- 2) Curricula – Improve access to existing academic resources and evaluate potential of offering streams/concentrations to help students focus their coursework and research to better define their academic competencies and skills (i.e. the three existing policy fields in the Policy Studies PhD Program)
- 3) GA/TA – Explicate the CUPE 3904 Unit 3 Collective Agreement and institute formal mechanisms that increase transparency of hiring process to ensure opportunities for interdisciplinary students
- 4) Space – Establish a single, central location for all interdisciplinary graduate programs to use with each program having an individual communication board for program specific-information and a separate board where interdisciplinary information such as academic resources and conferences can be displayed. This lounge can double as a workspace and collaborative area.

ⁱ Johnny Saldaña, *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc., 2009).

ⁱⁱ Ibid.



Task Force on Interdisciplinary Programs

FINAL REPORT

to

SENATE

03 December 2013

K: APPENDICES: Background Information

Report of the Task Force on Interdisciplinarity

Prepared by

Adele Reinhartz,
Vice-recteure associée à la recherche/
Associate Vice-President Research
Université d'Ottawa / University of Ottawa

On behalf of the Task Force on Interdisciplinarity

June 27, 2006.

Context of Working Group

Interdisciplinarity, that is, intellectual work that entails collaboration or integration between and among the disciplines, has been a feature of the University of Ottawa for many years, as it has of other universities. Interdisciplinarity takes place in many and diverse ways and places, within the traditional departments, in labs, informal and formal research groups, and in many cases within the work of individual scholars who bring a range of methodologies to bear on their research questions. At the same time, the University also has fostered specific endeavours, in the form of university-based, formally-structured Interdisciplinary Units (“IUs”) that exist explicitly to undertake interdisciplinary research and/or teaching in particular areas. Many, indeed, most of these IUs, have functioned smoothly. But in some cases, particularly with those that have experienced rapid growth in size and complexity, IUs have found themselves constrained by structural features. The University has been engaged in a lengthy and gradual process with the hope of addressing these constraints, so that these particular IUs can continue to flourish but also to lay the groundwork for the future.

The current discussion had its origins at a Deans’ retreat in December 2001. A working group, chaired by Susan Mann, was established, and delivered its report in September 2002.

Dr. Mann’s working group undertook a broad process of consultation, with deans, department chairs, and directors of programs, centres and institutes, members of administration, faculty, staff, students as well as representatives from other universities in Canada, the United States, and overseas. Its mandate was to:

- assess the current situation at the University of Ottawa in the area of interdisciplinary programs, centres and institutes;
- examine what other institutions are doing in the area, to determine best practices;
- recommend the best way for both existing and potential interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary programs to reach their full potential and especially their teaching objectives, all on the strength of a coherent disciplinary core;
- recommend measures that will allow centres and institutes to operate in the most favourable conditions possible;
- state the structural or administrative impact of the academic recommendations, and propose governance models for programs, centres and institutes.

The report was intended to “serve as both a guide and template as we set our institution’s future course in the management of interdisciplinary programs and research.” The report recommended a framework for interdisciplinarity, made a number of suggestions for expanding interdisciplinary activities, underscored the importance of investing financially in such activities, and provided some guidelines for resolving practical issues.

The recommendations were adopted by Senate in April 2003. A number of its recommendations were acted upon.¹ For example, the Strategic Areas of Development (now called Strategic Areas of Development in Research) have become a vehicle for the promotion of interdisciplinary research (Recommendation 4); interdisciplinary programs have been attached to and governed by one or more faculties (Recommendation 7); a new award – the Interdisciplinary Research Prize – has been created (Recommendation 21); interdisciplinarity has been incorporated into many new undergraduate programs (Recommendation 26), and in some cases faculty members have been hired specifically for interdisciplinary programs or for the “express purpose of being partly in an interdisciplinary program and partly in a disciplinary program” (Recommendation 17).

Other recommendations, however, have not been acted upon. For example, the Mann report recommended “that the University community be kept informed of progress in interdisciplinarity through an annual report to Senate from the vice-presidents (Academic and Research), and reporting by Associate Deans at the Faculty level” (Recommendation 2). This has not been the practice. Similarly, recommendation 3 specified that the vice-deans and chief librarian, “individually and in concert across faculties, be the facilitators and problem-solvers for interdisciplinarity” yet it does not seem that this mandate has been taken on by this group of people (not surprising, given that each of them already has a large and complex portfolio). The recommendation “that the promotion of interdisciplinary teaching or research be included as a criteria [sic] for the allocation of University research chairs” (Recommendation 16) has also not been implemented. While some progress has been made, it seems that there has not been widespread and consistent “recognition at the individual, unit, and grants administration levels of out-of-faculty thesis supervision and research collaboration” (Recommendation 24), nor have there been “revisions to the collective agreement” to “allow for / ensure: a) joint chairs and joint appointments for those professors who wish to be formally attached to two different faculties; b) sensitivity to the nature and demands of interdisciplinarity in hiring, evaluation, tenure and promotion procedures and decisions” (Recommendation 27).

Despite the fact that many of its recommendations were not implemented, the Mann Report has had a positive impact at the University. The report, as well as the process of consultation and discussion of which it was a part, raised the profile of interdisciplinarity, encouraged discourse and dialogue, led to faculty support for a number of interdisciplinary enterprises, and stimulated the formation of new interdisciplinary units. Yet the very movement towards greater interdisciplinarity itself accentuated the ongoing structural barriers to activities that took place between two or more units, particularly when two or more faculties were involved.

In 2004-2005, interim associate vice-president research, Nicole Bégin-Heick, was asked to revisit the question of interdisciplinarity at the University of Ottawa. Her mandate was to examine current best practices related to the nurturing of interdisciplinarity in

¹ For a detailed analysis of the implementation of the Mann Report, see “A Framework for Managing Interdisciplinarity at the University of Ottawa,” a report prepared by Nicole Bégin-Heick, March 2005 (attached).

academic institutions and to suggest possible mechanisms to attain a greater degree of interdisciplinarity in research and teaching at the University of Ottawa. Her report (attached) points to a number of barriers to interdisciplinarity that exist at the University of Ottawa, as they do at most universities. Among them are institutional structures, policies and procedures; the academic reward system; decentralized budget strategies, and limited resources. Her report also evaluates the Mann recommendations, and, most important, calls for the University “to establish a visible strategy that will engage all the players. This strategy must demonstrate what the goals are, what elements are in place and a time line to ensure that the goals will be reached.” She points to the fact that when Senate adopted the Mann recommendations, it “unfortunately... did not, at the same time, provide a path to ensure that the recommendations would be enacted, or a mechanism to validate the results.” Her report concludes that “As a matter of course, the Senate should never be asked to adopt a report’s recommendations without an accompanying strategy for implementation.”

In the winter 2005-2006, a small working group of three (associate vice-president academic, Sylvie Lauzon, associate dean of FGPS, Ruby Heap, and associate vice-president research, Adele Reinhartz [chair]) began a third phase in the discussion. Initially this group focussed on the governance of interdisciplinarity, but it soon became clear that governance was only one aspect of the issue. Governance could not have a major impact without a close look at other aspects, principally, budget, and the possibility of some central funding particularly of faculty positions.

The present task force was established in April 2006. Its mandate is to look principally at the institutional or structural barriers to interdisciplinarity and to develop a set of recommendations that in the short term would soften them if not eliminate them altogether, and in the long term would help to foster all manner of interdisciplinary initiatives both within the IUs and elsewhere throughout the University.

This report will outline the recommendations, and present an action plan that, it is hoped, will result in full implementation within one year, i.e. by July 1, 2007.

Definitions

“Interdisciplinarity” is a buzz word that appears in the strategic plans, websites and press releases of virtually every Canadian university, and a good number of American and overseas universities as well. Yet the term itself means different things to different people. The Mann report defines interdisciplinarity as a generic term denoting any intellectual activity that embraces more than one discipline. The report goes further than this, however, by distinguishing among three related terms: Multidisciplinarity, which is the gathering of specialists in more than one discipline around a topic of teaching or research; Interdisciplinarity, which entails the integration of separate streams of specialist knowledge in aid of a specific topic or problem; and Transdisciplinarity, which refers to new ways of thinking about problems that lie outside the purview of any discipline. While these three forms of intellectual activity may be seen as sequential and hierarchical (multi being the lowest and trans the highest), this need not be the case.

As the Mann report notes, however, the question of how universities might best facilitate interdisciplinarity does not require, nor is it addressed by, these sorts of definitions. Thus the report adopts a more pragmatic definition: “interdisciplinarity had to involve two or more disciplines, it had to be centred around a topic, problem or theme, it had to be developing ‘a new intellectual space’ and, at the program level, it was likely beginning to create courses specific to the theme with new course codes.”

The term “interdisciplinarity” implies the existence of a well-defined set of “disciplines” upon which “interdisciplinarity” can draw. At the current juncture, when methodologies developed in one field of inquiry are readily and frequently adopted by other fields of study, the definitions of “disciplines” are by no means absolute. Indeed, the definition of a “discipline” may even be arbitrary, given that areas that at some universities may be interdisciplinary (such as women’s studies) may in fact be full-fledged departments (and hence “disciplines” at other universities), and discrete departments, such as human kinetics or religious studies, may in fact involve faculty trained in a variety of disciplines such as history, sociology, and anthropology. While we agree completely with the Mann Report in acknowledging that interdisciplinarity can flourish only in the context of strong disciplines, we must also accept that “discipline,” like “interdisciplinary” can be defined and interpreted in many different ways.

Finally, whereas the Bégin-Heick report pointed to centres and institutes as the ideal locale for interdisciplinarity, interdisciplinarity is by no means confined to these formally-structured entities. Even in the absence of task forces, working groups, detailed recommendations, implementation strategies, and special initiatives, interdisciplinarity will continue to inform much, though by no means all, of the research and teaching that takes place within the traditional departments, in labs, informal and formal research groups, and in some cases within the work of individual scholars who bring a range of methodologies to bear on their research questions.

For present purposes, we have used the term “interdisciplinarity” to refer to any activity that takes place between two or more, formally constituted, entities (e.g. departments, schools, faculties). The recommendations in this report pertain primarily to the university-based, formally-structured Interdisciplinary Units (“IUs”) that exist explicitly to foster interdisciplinary research and/or teaching in particular areas or focussed on specific problems or topics.

Mandate

The present task force aims to do two things: address (and, we hope, to eliminate or at least to soften) the barriers experienced in the context of these latter entities and to continue to provide an environment in which interdisciplinarity, in its myriad forms, locations, and levels of formalization, can continue to flourish.

In doing so, we must keep in mind three important points: First, interdisciplinarity is only one aspect of the teaching and research at the University and is not meant to replace the

current structures, disciplines, programs, etc., or to create a new competing enterprise (“University of Interdisciplinarity”). Indeed, as we have noted, interdisciplinarity depends upon the disciplines, however they are defined, as a foundation for intellectual and professional activity and training. Second, we must take care not to “throw the baby out with the bath water.” In making new recommendations we should not be introducing new problems or undermining current successes. Finally, we must acknowledge that interdisciplinarity activities will and should continue to take place in the full variety of informal and formal ways that we currently see, and perhaps others that we cannot yet predict. It is neither possible nor desirable to regulate or to subsume all interdisciplinarity under the governance and other frameworks being proposed here.

The recommendations of this task force will therefore pertain to the following Interdisciplinary Units (IUs) (see appendices for the full listing):

- U of O institutes (currently 4)
- U of O research centres (currently 16)
- Interdisciplinary graduate programs (currently 13)
- Interdisciplinary undergraduate programs (currently 17). This category includes programs
 - That have core courses taught by professors coming from at least two departments/faculties
 - And/or that have courses developed and coded to reflect the interdisciplinary nature of the program (e.g., EAS in Aboriginal studies; BPS in Biopharmaceutical Science; DVM in International Development and Globalization; FEM in Women’s studies, etc.)

Recommendations

The Task Force looked closely at five interrelated areas:

- I. Governance
- II. Budget
- III. Faculty
- IV. Students
- V. Promoting and Valuing Interdisciplinary Research

In addition, the Task Force considered two additional areas: VI. Benchmarking and Performance Indicators, and VII. Implementation Process

I. Governance

The Mann Report spoke out strongly against creating new structures for the governance of interdisciplinarity, on the grounds that interdisciplinarity should be integrated completely and seamlessly into the very fabric of the university.

As the report stresses:

None of this requires major structural change at the University of Ottawa. Should new structures eventually be required they will follow the path scholars will have traced and the culture the institution will have developed with the increasing

practice of interdisciplinarity. That path and that culture will be one of flexibility and ought not to need structural anchoring. Indeed, the University should avoid encumbering interdisciplinary activities with governance structures peculiar to them. That can only add to the burden of scholars interested in working in this way and risks casting in stone something that is, by definition, nimble and changing. On the contrary, the University is in a very good position to take the unusual step of integrating rather than isolating interdisciplinarity. Both the practice and the theory elsewhere suggests that interdisciplinarity requires new administrative structures, its own permanence, its own budget, outside traditional university patterns. The conventional thinking appears to be based on the presumed impossibility of fitting horizontally arranged study, knowledge, research and teaching into vertically arranged structures of power, status and prestige. I think the University of Ottawa can do just that. Better to link than to separate. Better to co-operate than compete. Better to share than hoard. A commitment to that approach, with a mandate and resources to go with it could go a long way to having interdisciplinarity flourish at the University of Ottawa.

In keeping with this principle, the Mann Report charged the entire senior administration with the responsibility for interdisciplinarity, by recommending “That the University’s interest in promoting and facilitating interdisciplinarity be clearly indicated by a formal mandate of responsibility to the following people : Vice-Rectors (Academic and Research); Assistant Vice-Rectors (Academic and Research); Deans of faculties; Vice-Deans (Programs and Research)” (Recommendation 1), and “That all University administrators with responsibility for promoting and facilitating interdisciplinary activity be required to meet together at least twice a year for purposes of co-ordination and collaboration” (included in the Report as Recommendation 4 but not in the final recommendations as adopted by Senate).

In theory and in principle, the Mann Report is of course correct. It is indeed the case that interdisciplinarity is an important enterprise for the entire university, and that it involves those responsible for the administration of academic programs and research at the faculty level as well as centrally. Yet in practice, the fact that interdisciplinary units, their directors, and at least some of the faculty who participate in them continue to confront structural barriers suggests that specific structures and leadership may indeed be necessary, as other universities have found.

A number of different models exist in North American universities.

College or Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies, headed by a Dean (e.g. New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences at Arizona State University at the West Campus)

Associate Dean for Interdisciplinary Studies (Dartmouth College; covers primarily undergraduate academic programs)

Vice Provost for Interdisciplinary Research (University of Missouri-Kansas City)

Vice-Provost for Interdisciplinarity (Duke University, since 1998; reports to the Provost)

The view of the Task Force is that it is counterproductive to create a new faculty or college. While doing so might simplify the processes for addressing the difficult financial and human resource facets of interdisciplinarity, it also violates the very spirit of this enterprise, for instead of making the walls around the faculties more permeable to allow more fluid movement of resources across faculty boundaries, it simply encapsulates interdisciplinarity in a potentially impermeable structure of its own.

What is needed, however, is an individual at each level of governance (university-wide, faculty, IU) who will act as leader and champion and take responsibility for trouble-shooting as well as for insuring that there are mechanisms and processes in place for the many negotiations that are necessarily integral to the smooth functioning and indeed the flourishing of endeavours that involve the participation and cooperation of two or more “disciplinary” units such as departments, faculties and schools. Second, at each level, there needs to be a forum for the discussion and management of interdisciplinary units. In addition, there is need for a forum for the IUs and others involved in interdisciplinary activities. This would help to overcome the isolation in which many IUs currently function. Finally, there need to be mechanisms for including representatives of IUs in the decision-making processes of the university that pertain to interdisciplinarity, and, conversely, for ensuring that those most closely involved with the administration of interdisciplinarity are in direct communication with those whom the University has charged with steering its major interdisciplinary ventures.

To this end, the Task Force recommends the following:

Recommendation 1: University-wide:

- a. For the Interdisciplinary enterprise as a whole: a leader and champion at the Associate Vice-President level, with the title Associate Vice-President for Interdisciplinarity. In keeping with the dual focus of interdisciplinarity at the University of Ottawa, the AVPI reports to both the Vice-President Academic and the Vice-President Research. The experience at Duke, which, though with far fewer students than the University of Ottawa, is a research-intensive university considered one of the top ten in the country, suggests that ideally the AVPI would be a full-time position. Initially, however, it may be preferable to combine it with a current AVP position such as that of the associate vice-president research (AVPR). Doing so would prevent delay in the implementation period, and also allow for further consideration as to the need for and budgetary implications of creating a brand-new administrative position at the associate vice-president level. This recommendation, therefore, is that the AVP Research become the AVP Research and Interdisciplinarity (AVPRI) for the period of a year.
- b. Interdisciplinary Council: The council is a sub-committee of the Academic Planning Committee and will report regularly to the Academic Planning Committee through the Chair. Its initial mandate will be to implement recommendations of Interdisciplinarity Task Force, to participate, in partnership with the Interdisciplinary Forum, in the review and development

of policies as needed, to discuss new IUs, and to oversee the review of current IUs.

Composition:

AVPRI (Chair)

Will call meetings of the Council as needed

Will report monthly to the Academic Planning Committee

Executive Committee (AVPRI, AVPA, Associate Dean FGPS);

Mandate is to constitute a single address for interdisciplinary units;

be a clearinghouse for issues to be referred to the Council;

supervise the implementation process, and trouble-shoot as

needed).

Executive committee of Interdisciplinary Forum

Deans

AVP HR

AVP Resources

AVP Institutional Research and Planning

Director of Research Grants and Ethical Services

- c. Interdisciplinary Forum: The Forum is parallel to and independent of Interdisciplinary Council. It will develop its own terms of reference but, as its name suggests, it will provide a forum for the discussion of issues, both broad and specific, pertaining to interdisciplinarity as it is practiced at the University. In addition, it will be involved with the review and development of policies, in partnership with the Council, and in the promotion and evaluation of interdisciplinarity.

Composition:

Director or delegate of each IU

Student representatives (to be selected by GSAED and SFUO)

Executive of Interdisciplinary Council

Chair and Executive to be selected by the Forum itself

Other faculty/students involved in interdisciplinary activities outside the framework of the IUs

Recommendation 2: Within the Faculties: a designated decanal-level individual with responsibility for interdisciplinarity. The Faculties are essential partners in interdisciplinarity, including the interdisciplinary research and teaching taking place within and between their departments or schools, and those that take place between faculties as well as in the formal IUs. At this level too there needs to be a leader. Each faculty will need to decide whether it will be necessary to create a new position, whether the Dean can take on the role of leader, or whether this mandate should be added to a current vice-decanal position. Furthermore, each faculty will need to ensure that there is a place or forum for the discussion of interdisciplinarity and of the IUs in which its faculty members and/or departments/schools are involved.

Recommendation 3: Within the IUs:

- a. A leader, in the person of the formally-appointed director. The variety and diversity of IUs precludes a neat template for the governance of these units.
- b. Each IU needs to determine the governance structures that are best suited to its size and mission and that will execute the necessary leadership and administrative functions, including financial responsibility, research/academic programming, and external relations.
- c. Students should be included in those IUs that involve academic programs at the undergraduate and/or graduate level, and/or in which students are involved in the research activities.
- d. Each IU should ensure that its governance provides for the following functions or activities as applicable:

Scientific and/or academic direction
 Financial Management
 Strategic Planning
 Liaison with external partners
 Program management (e.g. courses, research seminars)
 Hiring/Tenure/Promotion
 Day to Day management
 Role of members (faculty, students) in decision-making processes
 Others as needed

NB: In some IUs, a single committee can deal with all of these functions, in others a more elaborate committee structure may be appropriate. Not all of these functions are necessary for all types of units. The list is likely to be fully applicable to the Institutes; Centres normally would not have to deal, for example, with program management or with hiring/tenure/promotion processes. Undergraduate and Graduate programs, on the other hand, may not need scientific direction or liaison with external partners, but they will have to address the full range of “student life” matters that are outlined below.

II. Budget

Without appropriate financial measures in place, interdisciplinarity will remain a modest and underdeveloped project for the University. The Mann report recommended the creation of incentives, such as prizes and research grants (19, 20, 21), envisioned some resources towards positions allocated to the Faculties that would specifically span an IU and a department or school (17), and suggested a review of the distribution of BIU funding in order to facilitate collaboration among participating units in an interdisciplinary program (23).

These measures have been implemented to a greater or lesser extent, yet it is fair to say that the financial arrangements for some (though by no means all) of the IUs continue to be a source of difficulty for the IUs and the Faculties alike. The IUs are in the position of constantly requesting resources from the Faculties, and often feel that they lack the

autonomy to and resources to fulfill their mandate properly. In allocating resources, the Faculties may be in the difficult position of choosing between the needs of a core department that is struggling to staff large undergraduate courses, and those of an IU that may have few students of its own yet whose mandate is core to the University.

A way to address this problem would be to increase the resources available centrally for the operation of IUs. For example, if IUs had their own positions to offer, on a shared (joint or cross-appointment) basis with the Faculties, and if these positions do not come at the expense of the Faculty's "own" allocations, then a gain for the IU will also mean a gain for the Faculty. Similarly, if appropriate compensation could be provided to faculties or departments whose faculty members participate in IUs, a secondment to an IU would pose less of a hardship for the "home" department.

Currently there is some central funding that supports the operations of some of the Research Centres and Institutes, and a small number of faculty positions have been allocated to several IUs either from Faculty budgets or centrally. The key questions that will need to be addressed are: 1) how much funding should be available centrally for the IUs, and for which sorts of activities? and 2) where will the necessary funds be found?

In principle, the funding of IUs involves partnership between the University (Central Administration) and the Faculty (Department). In some cases, there are also external funding partners, such as the granting councils, ministries and agencies, business or industry. The needs and opportunities will vary depending on the nature of the IU (Institute, Research Center, Program), whether professor positions are required, and the expected size of the student pool where applicable.

Recommendations:

1. That each unit develop a business plan that is coherent with its own strategic plan, and that will outline the amount of each contribution, and include a detailed needs analysis, a plan to maximize external revenues, and a timeframe to reach stability.
2. That central administration create a central pool of funding, in time for next fiscal year, to provide:

Some faculty positions to be allocated centrally to the IUs and shared with the Faculties

Appropriate compensation to faculties whose faculty are seconded to IUs.

Currently faculties/departments are compensated on a per-course basis, which in most cases does not truly compensate for the "loss" of a core faculty member.

This last measure is crucial; without significant investment, interdisciplinarity will be unable to flourish at the University of Ottawa.

III. Faculty: Hiring, Tenure and Promotion

Another issue that is absolutely crucial for the interdisciplinary enterprise pertains to the career path of the faculty involved in the IUs. The Mann Report recommended that revisions to the collective agreement be undertaken with regard to joint chairs and

appointments, sensitivity to interdisciplinarity in all processes pertaining to career path, and that the functions of an interdisciplinary program director be akin to those of a departmental chair with regard to participation in hiring, tenure and promotion, and other matters (27, 10). Important steps have been taken with regard to the Institute for Women's Studies, and it is time to move in this direction for the other IUs as well.

The guiding principle is that faculty members need to have their interdisciplinary activities taken into account appropriately throughout the processes of hiring, tenure and promotion, whether they are seconded from other units or hired specifically for IU activities. Normally, IU faculty will have a formal affiliation with at least two units, one or, occasionally, two of which may be IUs. Currently, these are all cross-appointments, meaning that the primary appointment is in a department or school, and the secondary appointment is in the IU or in another department or school. One possibility that should be considered, however, is that of a joint appointment, in which a faculty member has an equal appointment in more than one unit. Furthermore, as the Mann recommendations specified, it is important that the IU, perhaps through its director or a personnel committee, have a formal role in the hiring, tenure and promotion processes of the faculty who are members of the IU. It is crucial that faculty not be penalized for participating in interdisciplinary units, and that in each case that work is taken into full account for the processes of tenure and promotion.

Recommendation 1: That discussions and negotiations take place between the administration and the APUO such that faculty who participate in IUs have those activities taken fully into account in at the time of hiring, tenure and promotion.

IV. Student Life

As the Mann report recognized, it is essential that the University foster a sense of belonging among students in interdisciplinary programs, for example, by providing space, creating a "virtual home" and special courses, encouraging students to form student associations, and providing student advisors (8, 9, 11). Some programs have indeed done so, others are still struggling to achieve this goal. With regard to student advising, for example, students in some interdisciplinary programs fall between the cracks, unsure of where to turn.

The viewpoints of the present task force are consistent with those articulated in the Mann report. The fundamental principle is that students in interdisciplinary programs should have the same level of service as students in department programs. Three main areas must be addressed: funding, a sense of belonging, and access to student services.

Recommendation 1: that each program address the following issues:

- Sense of place, both physical and social
- Student association
- Inclusion of students in program governance
- Professors who are visibly and clearly identified with the program and can speak on its behalf

- Academic advising
- Orientation and transition program for new students
- Early-identification for at-risk students
- Availability of TAs specifically assigned to this program
- Student mentoring
- Library support, e.g. designated librarians
- Financial resources, especially for funding graduate students (TAs, RAs, scholarships)

V. Promoting and Valuing Interdisciplinary Research

This element was not addressed in the Mann Report, but the need for robust and flexible information systems is stressed in the Bégin-Heick report as a matter that should be addressed as soon as possible. As the report indicates,

At present the research database is incapable of ascribing parts of a grant to two or more researchers. As a result, only the principal investigator and his/her academic unit are credited. Similarly, participation in team teaching and co-supervision of theses are not appropriately recognized. These issues should remain at the forefront when designing new systems and capturing data. In a first step, the RE form used by the Research Grants and Ethics Service to record applications for fund and grants received should be modified to include co-PIs and the proportion of each person's involvement. Similarly, the FGPS should devise means to record co-supervisions and ascribe appropriate credit. (BH Report, section 5.1)

The Director of Research Grants and Ethical Services and his team have already done considerable investigation into what would need to be done in order to:

- Identify interdisciplinary research: who, what, where, how much. This requires that we incorporate the concept of multiple PIs into our research databases.
- Identify how and where such research is being catalyzed
- Celebrate interdisciplinary research and its accomplishments
- Obtain information on trends
- Demonstrate how each unit *enables* interdisciplinary research
- Demonstrate how each unit *generates* new projects

Recommendation 1: That RGES take the lead in developing information systems that will generate information at the level of the individual, faculty / department, and IU. Doing so will be of benefit not just for tracking the activity of the IUs, but all interdisciplinary research on campus, including the impact of the SADR on our research activities.

VI. Benchmarking and Performance Indicators

It will be helpful to establish a set of performance indicators that will allow us to see whether the recommendations and their implementation are achieving the desired goal of breaking down barriers to interdisciplinarity, facilitating interdisciplinarity, and contributing to knowledge. In addition, given that other universities are currently in the

process of finding their own solutions to the challenges posed by interdisciplinarity, it will be important to benchmark our own activities against or with the measures being developed at comparable institutions in Canada and elsewhere.

Recommendation 1: That a working group composed of members of the Council and Forum, and others as needed, be formed to develop appropriate performance measures and to propose a plan for benchmarking our performance with regard to interdisciplinarity against comparable universities

VII. Implementation Process

As was pointed out in the Bégin-Heick report, adopting a set of recommendations does not ensure implementation. Nor can these recommendations be implemented overnight. In this case, the complexity of the issues and the large number of units and individuals involved will necessarily require a careful implementation process for which we must allow adequate time for consultation and discussion. We anticipate that while some aspects will be relatively quick and easy to put in place, others, such as budget and Human Resources considerations, may take the better part of a year. It is our hope that full implementation will be in place by June 30, 2007.

Recommendation 1:

- That the implementation process as outlined in the Report of the Task Force on Interdisciplinarity begin in September 2006
- That the Council report monthly to the Academic Planning Committee on progress in all six elements of the plan (governance, budget, faculty, student life, valuing research, and benchmarking/performance indicators)
- That a final report, including recommendations for the next phase of activity be brought to the Academic Planning Committee in June 2007.

What follows is a brief outline of implementation processes, including persons responsible, for the major recommendations. These will be filled in and perhaps modified as the process unfolds.

Governance

Leadership:

University Level:

Goal: To develop a governance structure that brings focus and consistency to the university discussion and decision-making processes specifically pertaining to Interdisciplinary Units. To provide a mechanism for dealing constructively with problems and issues as they arise. To ensure that the IUs as well as the deans and senior administration are involved in governance. To promote interdisciplinarity within the University community as well as outside it.

What: AVP for Interdisciplinarity; addition of this mandate to the AVP Research on a one-year basis

Who: AVPR to develop terms of reference, submitted to necessary committees for consultation and finally to the Administrative Committee for approval.

When: Process to begin immediately; position to be effective September 1.

NB: Position to be reviewed after implementation period, to determine need and scope.

Faculty Level:

What: Vice/Associate Dean level leadership

Who: Deans of the faculties, in consultation with current vice-deans and others as needed

When: Effective September 1

Interdisciplinary Council:

What? Mandate, Terms of reference, modus operandi

Who? Academic Planning Committee to strike the Council; Council itself to develop terms of reference

When? Council to be struck at first meeting of Academic Planning Committee in September. Committee to consider terms of reference and formal mandate by December 2006.

Interdisciplinary Forum

What? Mandate, Terms of reference, modus operandi

Who? Academic Planning Committee to strike the Forum; Forum itself to develop terms of reference

When? Forum to be struck at first meeting of Academic Planning Committee in September. Nomination of executive and chair. Committee to consider terms of reference and formal mandate by December 2006.

Policies:

What? Policies and procedures on:

- Hiring faculty for work in IUs

- Secondment of faculty members for work in IUs

- Establishment of new IUs

- Review of existing IUs

- Research Chairs

- Role of SADR in Interdisciplinarity

- Development of interdisciplinary programs

- Others as needed

Who? Working groups, to include members from Council and Forum, chaired by a member of Council Executive. Working group prepares policies, consults with constituents, presents to both Council and Forum. Must be passed by Academic Planning Committee, then to Senate.

When? Ongoing. To be completed by June 30, 2007.

Governance in the IUs

What? IUs will be asked to prepare three brief documents: an academic plan, a governance plan, and a business plan.

Who and How? Process initiated by the Council executive; the director will organize the process of discussion and consultation within each IU. In some cases, the current structures, budgets and processes already address all relevant issues and thus will simply need to be reported. In others, this will provide an opportunity to rethink and revise current practices.

When? Initial meeting with Council Executive in September. Internal consultations throughout the fall, to be followed by meetings with the relevant deans and the executive committee, and others as needed. Revision of academic, governance and business plans as needed, followed by sign-off by the IU (through the Director), the relevant deans, and the Council Executive. Processes should be complete by June 30, 2007.

Budget

Goal: To ensure that the University is providing adequate and appropriate resources to support interdisciplinarity, including the IUs. University support comes indirectly through the Faculty budgets, and directly through central resources. One important aspect of the implementation of the recommendations pertaining to budget will be to examine the current level of central funding and to consider whether and how it could be possible to increase the amount of central funding available without at the same time compromising faculty budgets or other university initiatives.

Who? Working group of Council and Forum, to include AVP Institutional Research and Planning, AVP Finance, Council Executive, representatives from the IUs.

How? Analyze current level of central funding as well as the need for central funding, based on IU business plans. Make recommendations regarding the appropriate level of compensation to the faculties/departments for faculty members seconded to IUs. Project funding needs to 2010. Look closely at possible sources, including but not limited to BIUs generated by IU programs. Develop guidelines for eligibility. Provide to the IUs a template for their business plans, and guidance in how to create such a plan.

When? Process to begin September 1. Ideally it will be possible to submit a budget request to the Administrative Committee in December, in time for implementation for the coming fiscal year.

Faculty: Hiring, Tenure and Promotion

Goal: To arrive at hiring, tenure and promotion practices that will take interdisciplinarity activities into full account.

Who? AVP Human Resources or delegate, AVPI, others as needed

How? Negotiation with APUO on inclusion of IUs formally in processes of tenure and promotion. Consideration of question of joint vs. cross appointments.

When? Timeline: Begin summer 2006, with aim for implementation for 2007-2008 academic year

Student Life

Goal: To ensure that students are functioning under the same conditions (funding, student services, sense of belonging) as are students in departmental undergraduate and graduate programs.

Who? Dean of FGPS, Associate Vice President Academic, others as needed.

How? Interdisciplinary programs will be asked to work with the checklist provided in the recommendations above. Budgetary needs will be addressed in the business plan, as detailed above.

When? To begin in September, with an aim to have measures in place by June 30, 2007.

Promoting and Valuing Interdisciplinary Research

Goal: To put new information systems in place to allow a more comprehensive and flexible way of gathering and analyzing research data.

Who? Director of Research Grants and Ethical Services, in consultation with the Council, the Forum, others as needed.

How? Build on draft documents; consider integrating this project with other data needs that have been identified (e.g., evaluation of the SADR; benchmarking; scorecard).

Identify processes and budgets required.

When? Consultation to begin September, 2006. Consider phasing in as IT capabilities and budgeting become available.

Benchmarking/Performance Indicators

This area was not covered in detail in the deliberations of the Task Force, yet in discussion all agreed that it would be important to develop these measures early on in the implementation period.

Goal: To be able to measure our own progress and to benchmark our activities against comparable national and international institutions.

Who? Council Executive, in consultation with the Council, Forum, experts in the field of program evaluation, as well as Benchmarking and Balanced scorecard committees at the University

When? A plan to be in place by June 30, 2007.

Implementation Timetable

June 14, 2006 Final recommendations brought to the Task Force

June 27, 2006 Task Force report to Academic Planning Committee

July 2006 Report to Executive of Senate

July 2006-June 2007 Implementation

Spring 2007 Inaugural Event:

-Poster Display and prizes

-Key note address

June 2007 Wrap-up Report, to include:

-Revisions as ascertained by implementation process

-Recommendations for the long-term

Postscript

As will be obvious throughout this report, the recommendations of the 2006 Task Force bear a remarkable resemblance to the recommendations of the Mann Report passed by Senate in April 2003, with three exceptions:

- Identification of a leader who has primarily responsibility for shepherding the implementation of the recommendations
- Creation of two new structures (Interdisciplinary Council and Interdisciplinary Forum)
- Inclusion of a plan for implementation

We will learn from the year-long process of implementation that no doubt will require us to revise and rethink some of these recommendations.

These recommendations do not put an end to the conversation but allow us to begin the real work of creating an environment where interdisciplinarity is valued and facilitated, whether through formalized research and program structures or in all manner of informal ways, alongside and in dialogue with the disciplines.



uOttawa

L'Université canadienne
Canada's university

Task Force on Interdisciplinarity

Summary of Recommendations June 27, 2006

Université d'Ottawa | University of Ottawa



Governance: University-wide Recommendation 1a: Leadership

For the Interdisciplinary enterprise as a whole: a leader and champion at the Associate Vice-President level, with the title Associate Vice-President for Interdisciplinarity.

Reports to both the Vice-President Academic and the Vice-President Research.

One year trial: Add Interdisciplinarity to mandate of AVP Research

Reopen at end of implementation period.

Governance

Recommendation 1b: Interdisciplinary Council

Sub-committee of the Academic Planning Committee

Reports monthly to the Academic Planning Committee

Initial mandate: implement recommendations of Interdisciplinarity Task Force

Composition:

- AVPI (Chair)
- Executive Committee (AVPI, AVPA, Associate Dean FGPS)
- Executive committee of Interdisciplinary Forum
- Deans, AVPs for HR, Resources, Institutional Research and Planning; Director of Research Grants and Ethical Services

Governance

Recommendation 1c: Interdisciplinary Forum

Subcommittee of Academic Planning Committee.

The Forum is parallel to and independent of Interdisciplinary Council.

Will provide a forum for the discussion of issues, both broad and specific, pertaining to interdisciplinarity as it is practiced at the University.

Will be involved with the review and development of policies, in partnership with the Council, and in the promotion and evaluation of interdisciplinarity.

Composition:

- Director or delegate of each IU
- Student representatives (to be selected by GSAED and SFUO)
- AVPA, AVPR, Assoc Dean FGPS (ex officio)
- Chair and Executive to be selected by the Forum itself
- Other faculty/students involved in interdisciplinary activities outside the framework of the IUs

Governance: In the Faculties

Recommendation 2:

A designated decanal-level individual with responsibility for interdisciplinarity: Dean, current associate/vice-dean, or new position.

A forum for discussion and decision-making with regard to interdisciplinarity within the faculty and in partnership with other faculties

Governance: In the IUs Recommendation 3

Leadership: Director, as at present,

Governance structures as needed to address the following areas, as pertinent to the IU:

- Scientific and/or academic direction; strategic planning
- Financial Management
- External activities
- Program management (e.g. courses, research seminars)
- Hiring/Tenure/Promotion
- Day to Day management

Inclusion of students in governance structure(s) where appropriate (e.g. for IUs that are or involve academic programs)

Budget Recommendation 1

That each unit develop a business plan that is coherent with its own strategic plan and includes revenues from all sources

The Plan will include:

A detailed needs analysis

A plan to maximize external revenues

A timeframe to reach stability.

Budget Recommendation 2

That central administration create a central pool of funding to provide:

- Some faculty positions to be allocated centrally to the IUs and shared with the Faculties
- Appropriate compensation to faculties whose faculty are seconded to IUs. Currently faculties/departments are compensated on a per-course basis, which in most cases does not truly compensate for the “loss” of a core faculty member

Faculty Recommendation 1

That discussions and negotiations take place between the administration and the APUO such that faculty who participate in IUs have those activities taken fully into account in at the time of hiring, tenure and promotion.

Discussions will include the question of joint vs. cross-appointments

Student Life Recommendation 1

That each program develop ways to ensure that students have funding, a sense of place, and access to student services to the same level as students in departmentally-based programs.

Promoting & Valuing Interdisciplinary Research

Recommendation 1:

That RGENS take the lead in developing information systems that will generate information at the level of the individual, faculty / department, and IU. Doing so will be of benefit not just for tracking the activity of the IUs, but all interdisciplinary research on campus, including the impact of the SADR's on our research activities.

Benchmarking/Performance indicators Recommendation 1

- That a working group composed of members of the Council and Forum, and others as needed, be formed to development appropriate performance measures and to propose a plan for benchmarking our performance with regard to interdisciplinarity against comparable universities

Implementation Process Recommendation 1

- That the implementation process as outlined in the Report of the Task Force on Interdisciplinarity begin in September 2006
- That the Council report monthly to the Academic Planning Committee on progress in all six elements of the plan (governance, budget, faculty, student life, valuing research, and benchmarking/performance indicators)
- That a final report, including recommendations for the next phase of activity be brought to the Academic Planning Committee in June 2007.

RYERSON UNIVERSITY



Making Interdisciplinarity Work

Adele Reinhartz
University of Ottawa
November 4, 2010

General Definition

- Interdisciplinarity is a generic term denoting any intellectual activity that embraces more than one discipline.

Specific Definitions

- **Multidisciplinarity:** the gathering of specialists in more than one discipline around a topic of teaching or research
- **Interdisciplinarity:** the integration of separate streams of specialist knowledge in aid of a specific topic or problem
- **Transdisciplinarity:** new ways of thinking about problems that lie outside the purview of any discipline.

Issues at the University of Ottawa

- Interfaculty funding for Interdisciplinary Research Centre and Institutes
- Tracking and properly crediting collaborative research funding from external granting agencies
- Faculty Appointments, Workload calculation and Tenure/Promotion criteria
- Staffing Interdisciplinary graduate programs
- Student Experience in Interdisciplinary undergraduate programs

Context at the University of Ottawa

- Mann Report Sept 2002
- Begin-Heick Report March 2005
- Reinhartz Report June 2006

Main Topics

- Governance
- Budget
- Faculty
- Students
- Promoting and Valuing Interdisciplinary Research
- Benchmarks and Indicators

Governance

Models

1. No new structures: Deans and Senior Administration takes responsibility
2. College or Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies, headed by a Dean (e.g. New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences at Arizona State University at the West Campus)
3. Associate Dean for Interdisciplinary Studies (Dartmouth College; covers primarily undergraduate academic programs)
4. Vice-Provost for Interdisciplinarity (Duke University, since 1998; reports to the Provost)

Recommendations

1. University: Leader/champion for interdisciplinarity as part of the senior administrative team
2. Faculty: Senior admin within each faculty (vice-deans)
3. Programs: Determine appropriate governance mechanisms
4. Opportunities for “horizontal” (cross-faculty) governance, communication and decision-making
 1. Interdisciplinary Council (vice-deans)
 2. Interdisciplinary Forum (chairs of the Interdisciplinary Units/programs)

Budget

Interdisciplinary programs must be resourced appropriately: staffing, space, library resources and especially FACULTY

Compensation to Faculties for secondment of professors/instructors to interfaculty endeavours

Who is responsible for funding interdisciplinary programs?

Recommendations

- 1. Agreements between/among Faculties
- 2. Central fund supplements interfaculty agreements especially for faculty compensation and staffing

NB: Appropriate measures will depend on existing budgetary structures

Faculty: Hiring, Tenure and Promotion

- Faculty members need to have their interdisciplinary activities taken into account appropriately throughout the processes of hiring, tenure and promotion, whether they are seconded from other units or hired specifically for interdisciplinary programs

Ryerson Faculty Association

Memorandum of Understanding – 3: INTERNAL CROSS APPOINTMENTS FOR FACULTY MEMBERS

“Where sound academic reasons exist, a faculty member may receive a subsequent appointment in the University such that she/he holds concomitant appointments in two Departments/Schools.”

Students

- Space (physical, psychological)
- Student services: academic counselling; access to staff to help navigate rules and regs
- Sense of place, both physical and social
- Student governance (e.g., student association, student-run activities)
- Inclusion of students in program governance
- Professors who are visibly and clearly identified with the program and can speak on its behalf
- Orientation and transition program for new students
- Early-identification for at-risk students
- Availability of TAs specifically assigned to this program
- Student mentoring
- Library support, e.g. designated librarians
- Financial resources, especially for funding graduate students (TAs, RAs, scholarships)

Recommendation

- Ensure that new (and existing) programs address the issues explicitly
- Ensure adequate resourcing of interdisciplinary programs (see above under Budget)

Promoting and Valuing Interdisciplinary Research

- Identify interdisciplinary research: who, what, where, how much. This requires that we incorporate the concept of multiple PIs into our research databases.
- Identify how and where such research is being catalyzed
- Celebrate interdisciplinary research and its accomplishments
- Obtain information on trends
- Demonstrate how each unit *enables* interdisciplinary research
- Demonstrate how each unit *generates* new projects

Benchmarking and Performance Indicators

- How do we know when we are doing well, and what areas need to be improved?
- Set up clear goals and benchmarks
- Document progress
- Develop performance indicators
- Perhaps can be done by a small group that includes administrators and chairs of interdisciplinary programs

**Interdisciplinarity
Senate Discussion
December 7, 2010**

QUESTIONS

Topic 1: Governance and Organization (Leadership, structure, budget)

1. As a university, do we want to encourage and “grow” our interdisciplinary profile, and if yes, how much bigger?
2. If much larger is the answer, then the structure has to reflect this, which raises the question, who owns the program, who owns the curriculum and who assigns the budget?
3. Should we have a separate faculty? (We could answer this question differently from the Task Force on restructuring.)

Topic 2: Interdisciplinary research (Funding/credit)

1. What can Ryerson do to facilitate “credit” sharing between departments, faculties and even universities?
2. How can the ORS facilitate interdisciplinary research at Ryerson, especially in terms of increasing awareness of expertise amongst the faculty, but also identifying the appropriate funding sources (case work model)?
3. Can we devise a system to share credit internally only? (e.g. Can we have more than one PI?)

Topic 3: Faculty Appointments (Tenure, promotion, “home”)

1. Can the Collective Agreement have a clause that deals with cross-disciplinary hiring?
2. Collectively, should we devise interdisciplinary clusters that we support strategically as a university?
3. Are there structural models of faculty agreements at other universities that we can use?
4. Should cross-disciplinary programs be housed in a disciplinary department or an interdisciplinary cluster?

Topic 4: Graduate Program Staffing (“backfill” for disciplinary departments/schools. TA’s, general cooperation and resources)

1. How do we ensure that undergraduate (usually disciplinary, department-based) programs are not cannibalised to support graduate programs, especially interdisciplinary graduate programs?
2. Can we clarify, to the faculties and departments, the particular funding arrangements for graduate and undergraduate programs, both disciplinary and interdisciplinary?
3. How do we ensure equitable support for graduate students in disciplinary and interdisciplinary graduate programs? (Particularly worrisome is the term of GA appointments, which are mostly controlled by discipline-based program departments.)
4. How can the university balance the FTE requirements of disciplinary programs, disciplinary department-based undergraduate programs, interdisciplinary graduate programs and interdisciplinary undergraduate programs?

Topic 5: Issues in Undergraduate Interdisciplinary Programs (Student experience, preparation for graduate study and careers.)

1. Should we focus on professional differences or commonalities? Service courses are essentially the same with a slightly different slant, e.g. ACS401, so would it be beneficial to combine them?
2. Given the limitations of a high school education, how do we provide a broad, yet deep, knowledge base to give students the confidence to specialize in their chosen field?
3. How can we find structural ways to provide a faculty identity while providing flexibility of choice in courses?

Topic 6: Issues in Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs (Student experience, graduate supervision, careers)

1. How do we ensure students have access to professional accreditation?
2. Who will champion interdisciplinary programs?
3. How do we nurture the development of interdisciplinary collaboration?

Topic 7: Are we true believers? (Role and importance of interdisciplinary programs and interdisciplinarity)

1. Are we already sufficiently interdisciplinary but at different levels (macro/micro)?
2. Are we in danger of short-changing students without a strong disciplinary background?
3. What are we willing to give up to be, or not be, inter/multi-disciplinary?
4. How much inter/multi disciplinary content is necessary to be real added value (more than "dabbling")?



THEME 1: ACADEMIC COMMITMENT

- Is Ryerson already interdisciplinary enough?
- How can students be provided with the broad knowledge base they need to succeed?
- Does interdisciplinarity threaten strong Ryerson discipline based programs?
- How might Ryerson be willing to change to become more interdisciplinary?

ACADEMIC COMMITMENT - RESPONSE

- Curriculum model proposal
 - More interdisciplinary approach
 - Retains strong professional program base
 - Provides students with more choice and opportunity for broader education
 - Encourages interdisciplinary and cross disciplinary program development

THEME 2: ACADEMIC STRUCTURE

- Should there be an Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies?
- Should the university establish interdisciplinary clusters?
- Who will champion interdisciplinary programs and nurture their development?
- How can faculty be hired for interdisciplinary programs or given cross appointments?
- What is the best way to fund interdisciplinary programs?

ACADEMIC STRUCTURE - RESPONSE

- Interdisciplinary Faculty was not recommended
- A “Dean of Record” is established for interdisciplinary programs and initiatives to serve as champion and ensure appropriate funding.
- Ten Cross Disciplinary appointments will be funded for next year.

THEME 3: GRADUATE STUDIES

- How can interdisciplinary graduate programs best be funded?
- How can graduate students in interdisciplinary programs be provided with graduate assistantships?
- How can faculty participate in interdisciplinary graduate programs without disadvantaging undergraduate programs?

GRADUATE STUDIES - RESPONSE

- Existing interdisciplinary graduate program funding is through the Dean of Graduate Studies. This model could be discussed.
- Undergraduate programs should be encouraged to look employ qualified graduate students in interdisciplinary programs as graduate assistants.
- Departments and Schools must manage teaching assignments to the best advantage of both undergraduate and graduate programs.

THEME 4: RESEARCH

- How can interdisciplinary research be facilitated?
- How can faculty be made more aware of the research of others to promote interdisciplinary collaboration?
- Can a process be devised to share the “credit” for research both internally and externally?
- How can interdisciplinary research best be funded?

RESEARCH – RESPONSE

- Vice President Research and Innovation is in process of compiling a database of research interests to facilitate interdisciplinary collaboration.
- A method should be devised to ensure that appropriate credit is given internally for interdisciplinary research.