

SENATE MEETING AGENDA

Tuesday, December 4, 2018



SENATE MEETING AGENDA

Tuesday, December 4, 2018

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 the Agenda
Motion: *That Senate approve the agenda for the December 4, 2018 meeting*
3. Announcements
- Pages 1-6 4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
Motion: *That Senate approve the minutes of the November 6, 2018 meeting*
5. Matters Arising from the Minutes
6. Correspondence
- Pages 7-13 7. Reports
 - 7.1 Report of the President
 - 7.1.1 President's Update
- Pages 14-15 7.2 Communications Report
- 7.3 Report of the Secretary
 - 7.3.1 Annual Nominating Committee Constituted
 - 7.3.2 Update on student Senator position - TRSM
- Pages 16-27 7.4 Committee Reports
 - 7.4.1 Report #F2018-2 of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC): M. Benarroch

- Pages 16-17 7.4.1.1 TRSBM Law and Business Co-op Resequencing Proposal
- Motion:** *That Senate approve the TRSBM Law and Business Co-op Resequencing Proposal as described in the agenda package.*
- Pages 17-20 7.4.1.2 School of Nursing Course Grade Variations
- Motion:** *That Senate approve the School of Nursing Course Grade Variations as described in the agenda package.*
- Pages 28-35 7.4.2 Report #F2018-2 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC): M. Benarroch
- 7.4.2.1 Academic Policy Review Committee (APRC) update: D. Bell (see attached report)
- 7.4.2.2 Senate Bylaws Update – D. Checkland
- Pages 36-61 7.4.3 Report #F2018-1 of the Curriculum Implementation Committee (CIC): C. Hack (see attached report)
- 7.4.3.1 Policy #2 Undergraduate Curriculum Structure – C. Hack
- Motion:** *That Senate approve the minor revisions to Policy #2 Undergraduate Curriculum Structure as described in the agenda package.*
- Pages 62-81 7.4.4 Report #F2018-1 of the Scholarly Research and Creative Activity Committee (see attached report)
- 7.4.4.1 Policy #144 Research Centres
- Motion:** *That Senate approve Policy #144 Research Centres as described in the agenda package.*

8. Old Business

9. New Business as Circulated

10. Members' Business

11. Consent Agenda

11.1 Course Changes

https://www.rverson.ca/senate/agenda/2018/Course_Change_Forms_December_2018.pdf

Faculty of Arts: Arts (Common Platform); Arts & Contemporary Studies; Economics; Languages, Literatures & Cultures; Philosophy; Politics & Public Administration; Sociology

Faculty of Communication & Design: Creative Industries; Fashion; Graphic Communications Management; Image Arts; Interior Design; Journalism; Professional Communications; RTA New Media; RTA Media Production; RTA School of Media; RTA School of Performance (Acting/Dance); RTA School of Performance (Production); RTA Sports Media

Faculty of Community Services: Child & Youth Care; Disability Studies; Nutrition; Social Work; Urban & Regional Planning

Faculty of Science: Chemistry & Biology; Computer Science; Mathematics; Medical Physics

Faculty of Engineering & Architectural Science: Electrical & Computer Engineering

Ted Rogers School of Management: Accounting (Co-op Option); Business Management; Entrepreneurship & Strategy; Finance; Hospitality & Tourism Management; Information Technology Management; Real Estate Management

12. Adjournment

SENATE MINUTES OF MEETING			
Tuesday, November 6, 2018			
MEMBERS PRESENT:			
EX-OFFICIO:	FACULTY:		STUDENTS:
L. Barnoff	D. Androutsos	R. Ravindran	N. Chen
M. Benarroch	R. Babin	P. Shannon	J. Circo
M. Bountrogianni	A. Bailey	S. Sabatinos	A. Jagayat
D. Brown	T. Burke	N. Thomlinson	F. Khan
D. Cramb	D. Checkland	M. Tiessen	J. Marriott
G. Craney	Y. Derbal	M. Vahabi	S. Mehmood
I. Crookshank	K. Dermody	N. Walton	A. Rahunathan
T. Duever	M. Dionne		S. Rattan
C. Falzon	S. Dolgoy		
C. Hack	R. Hudyma		
M. Lachemi	C. Kular		EX-OFFICIO STUDENTS:
S. Liss	K. Kumar		
M. Moshé	V. Magness		
D. O'Neil Green	D. Mason		
A. Saloojee	A. McWilliams		
C. Shepstone	R. Meldrum		
P. Sugiman	A. Miransky		
D. Taras	P. Moore		
S. Zolfaghari	S. Rakhmayil		
SENATE ASSOCIATES:			ALUMNI:
A. M. Brinsmead			J. Makuch
M. Zouri			C. Tam
REGRETS:		ABSENT:	
C. Antonescu		F. Abdulrahman	
A. El-Rabbany		N. Allou	
R. Kucheran		S. Benda	
J. Mactavish		S. Faruqi	
I. Mishkel		E. Ignagni	
J. Tiessen		A. Nguyen	
A. Yazdani		A. Sharma	
		J. Zboralski	

1. Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum

2. Approval of the Agenda

Motion: *That Senate approve the agenda for the November 6, 2018 meeting*

R. Ravindran moved; A. McWilliams seconded

Motion Approved.

3. Announcements – None

4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Motion: *That Senate approve the minutes of the October 2, 2018 meeting*

A. McWilliams moved; R. Babin seconded

Motion Approved.

5. Matters Arising from the Minutes - None

6. Correspondence - None

7. Reports

7.1 Report of the President

7.1.1 President's Update

Highlights:

President Lachemi discussed the four convocations held on October 10th and 11th that awarded two honorary doctorates. One went to Maria Campbell from FCAD and the other to Hassan Yussuff from TRSM. He then thanked faculty and staff for their volunteering.

He commented that it is too early to decide next steps in relation to the Provincial Government's decision on the Brampton campus project. He announced the establishment of a National Centre for Cyber Security in Brampton. The Chang School is also planning to offer programming in Brampton.

President Lachemi discussed the Future Skills Centre proposal. Ryerson submitted a proposal to the federal government to establish this centre. It is a national competition. He thanked S. Liss and the VPRI team for their dedicated and hard work on this proposal. The budget that was allocated for this initiative is estimated at \$370M for 5-6 years. The government will announce the winner by the end of November, 2018.

The Board approved the naming of the Student Learning Centre (SLC). It will be The Sheldon and Tracy Levy Student Learning Centre. The naming ceremony will take place on November 27, 2018 at the SLC.

A video was shown about the Ryerson rooftop gardening project which was initiated by students.

7.2 Communications Report – As presented in the agenda.

7.3 Report of the Secretary

7.3.1 Update on Student Senator Elections

The Secretary presented an update on the by-elections to fill two student Senator vacancies. The results were finalized on October 18, 2018, and are as follows:

Faculty of Communication & Design representative - Naomi Chen

At-Large representative - Simran Rattan

7.4 Committee Reports

7.4.1 Report #F2018-1 of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council

7.4.1.1 Urban Health PhD Program – New Program proposal

Motion: *That Senate approve the new program proposal for the Urban Health PhD Program as described in the Senate Agenda.*

N. Walton moved; V. Magness seconded

Cory Searcy, Associate Dean, Programs, YSGS, spoke to this agenda item. Regarding the PhD report in Urban Health, it would be the first degree to explicitly focus on urban health in Canada. It is a 4-year program that will be housed in the Daphne Cockwell School of Learning. Initially the plan will accept five students per year and up to 20 students after four years. The program would require the addition of five courses. Four of those would be new core courses, and one would be an elective selected from existing courses. The program would commence in September, 2019. The feedback from the proposal has been positive with a total of 23 recommendations. He thanked those who were involved in developing the proposal.

Motion approved.

7.4.1.2 Building Science PhD Program - New Program proposal

Motion: *That Senate approve the new program proposal for the Building Science PhD Program as described in the Senate Agenda*

T. Duever moved; V. Magness seconded

Cory Searcy provided a brief overview of this proposal. He stated that it would be the first PhD program in Canada focused explicitly on Building Science. It's targeted as a four-year program housed under the Department of Architectural Science. The program can initially accept two students and eventually a maximum of eight. In addition to the dissertation, the program contains four required courses. One of those would be a new core course created for PhD students and the other three would be drawn from existing MSc electives. No new resources are required for this program and it is intended to commence in September 2019. Both a desire for this program and the need for graduates of this program in the working field have been identified. Overall, the program was thoroughly reviewed and the feedback was positive. There were a total of six recommendations and all of them have been addressed by the program. He thanked everyone involved in the process.

Motion approved.

7.4.1.3 Literatures of Modernity Graduate Program – Periodic Program Review

Motion: *That Senate approve the Periodic Program Review for the Literatures of Modernity Graduate Program as described in the Senate Agenda*

V. Magness moved; M. Vahabi seconded

Motion approved.

7.4.1.4 Mechanical and Industrial Engineering Graduate Programs – Periodic Program Review

Motion: *That Senate approve the Periodic Program Review for the Mechanical and Industrial Engineering Graduate Programs as described.*

R. Ravindran moved; T. Duever seconded

Motion approved.

7.4.2 Report #F2018-1 of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC): M. Moshé

7.4.2.1 Ted Rogers School of Business Management Foundational Quantitative Curriculum Modification

Motion: *That Senate approve the TRSM Foundational Quantitative Curriculum Modification*

M. Moshé moved; V. Magness seconded

Motion approved.

7.4.2.2 SOPHe Major Curriculum Modification

Motion: *That Senate approve the SOPHe Major Curriculum Modification*

M. Moshé moved; N. Walton seconded

Motion approved.

7.4.2.3 School of Accounting & Finance Co-op Resequencing Proposal

Motion: *That Senate approve the School of Accounting & Finance Co-op Resequencing Proposal*

M. Moshé moved; S. Rakhmayil seconded

Motion approved.

7.4.2.4 RTA School of Media's Discontinuation of Concentrations in the New Media Program

Motion: *That Senate approve the RTA School of Media's Discontinuation of Concentrations in the New Media Program*

M. Moshé moved; P. Shannon seconded

Motion approved.

7.4.2.5 School of Fashion's Major Curriculum Modifications

Motion: *That Senate approve the School of Fashion's Major Curriculum Modifications*

M. Moshé moved; C. Falzon seconded

Motion approved.

7.4.2.6 16 Course Proposals for Addition to the Liberal Studies Elective Table

Motion: *That Senate approve the 16 Course Proposals for Addition to the Liberal Studies Elective Tables.*

M. Moshé moved; A. McWilliams seconded

Motion approved.

7.4.3 Report #F2018-2 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC):
M. Benarroch

7.4.3.1 Chemistry and Biology Bylaws

Motion: *That Senate approve the Chemistry and Biology Bylaws as described in the agenda package*

A. McWilliams moved; K. Dermody seconded

Motion approved

7.4.3.2 Senate Bylaws Discussion and Q&A

D. Checkland provided an update on the committee's revisions so far and referred to the Summary of proposed changes. He asked members to review the summary of changes and send feedback to the committee.

D. Mason raised concerns about the position of Vice Chair of Senate being only available to a faculty Senate member and not a student Senate member. He seemed to recall that there has been a student Vice Chair in the past. D. Checkland commented that he does not remember a student serving in this role. D. Checkland replied that the main reasoning behind this change is that there is a high degree of fluctuation regarding student attendance to Senate Priorities Committee meetings. Overall, both the demand of time and preparedness for these meetings are typically too much for students. For this reason, students have rarely held this role and, upon consultation, most people seemed unanimous with the decision to simply decree this role to faculty Senate members only.

D. Checkland stated that he was hoping to meet with the Aboriginal Education Council to discuss indigenous representation on Senate and that he would then reach out to the other members of the committee to discuss the different ways to approach this. He then encouraged people to review the bylaws and give any feedback they may have.

7.4.3.3 Ryerson's Freedom of Expression Statement

Motion: *That Senate approve the Freedom of Expression Statement as described in the agenda Package.*

A. McWilliams moved; T. Burke seconded

A. McWilliams provided an introduction to this statement and began speaking about the timeline of the review of this statement.

A disruption impacted A. McWilliams from completing his report.

Motion to move the question.

N. Thomlinson moved; M. Dionne seconded.

Note: Due to an interruption before the end of the meeting, Senate was unable to complete the agenda as planned.

The meeting adjourned at 7:02 p.m.

8. Old Business - None

9. New Business as Circulated - None

10. Members' Business - None

11. Consent Agenda (For information)

11.1 Progress Indicators – November, 2018

https://www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2018/Progress_indicators_November_2018.pdf

11.2 Course Changes from:

https://www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2018/Course_Change_Forms_November_2018.pdf

- Faculty of Arts: Department of English; Department of History; Department of Politics and Public Administration
- Faculty of Communication & Design: School of Image Arts

12. Adjournment

Ryerson University President's Update to Senate December 4, 2018



APPOINTMENTS

Kelly MacKay has been appointed vice-provost, academic effective December 1. She joined Ryerson in 2011 and is currently professor of tourism in the School of Hospitality and Tourism Management. Kelly has held a variety of leadership roles, including interim associate vice-president, research and innovation, and associate dean, research and graduate programs at the Ted Rogers School of Management; previously, at the University of Manitoba, she was associate dean, academic and faculty senator. In her new role, Kelly will chair the academic standards committee and oversee the Office of Academic Integrity, the Experiential Learning Office, the Learning and Teaching Office, and Curriculum Quality Assurance.

Jen McMillen has been appointed vice-provost, students effective January 1, 2019. Jen joins us from Humber College, where she is dean of students. Previously, at Humber College, she was director of student access, wellness and development; at New College, University of Toronto, she was director of residence and student life; and at Brock University, she was the human rights and equity officer as well as the associate director, residence and food services. Jen holds a bachelor of kinesiology from McMaster University and an MEd in higher education from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto. In her new role at Ryerson, Jen will oversee the Students Affairs Office, the Office of the Registrar and Undergraduate Admissions and Recruitment, and Athletics and Recreation.

CONGRATULATIONS

Rivi Frankle, assistant vice-president, development, received the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP), Greater Toronto Chapter. The citation noted her remarkable career so far spanning over four decades, during which she has been a steadfast champion of diversity and inclusion, having raised \$200 million at Ryerson for projects including the Lifeline Syria Challenge.

Sarah Henstra, associate professor in the Department of English, has won the 2018 Governor General's Literary Award for Fiction in English—one of Canada's most prestigious literary prizes—for her novel *The Red Word*, about sexual politics on a fictional university's campus. The jury cited it as "groundbreaking and provocative." In the Drama category, **Jordan Tannahill** (IMA '11) won his second "GG" for his two-play volume, *Botticelli in the Fire & Sunday in Sodom*. He was praised by the jury for his "powerful artistic voice" and "masterful literary ability." Both writers were awarded their prizes and \$25,000 each by Governor General Julie Payette on November 28 at Rideau Hall in Ottawa.

DISCOVERY GRANTS – On October 9, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) announced that 20 Ryerson researchers are being awarded grants totaling over \$2.2 million. All told, Ryerson has received \$10.1 million in NSERC's latest funding cycle, making the most of the

Government of Canada's decision to invest substantially in discovery science, which enables researchers to undertake projects of a greater scope.

GRADUATE STUDENT LEADERSHIP AWARDS – On October 17, the Yeates School of Graduate Studies honoured the recipients of the inaugural Graduate Student Leadership Awards. The awards recognize students who are having a meaningful, positive impact—whether by building bridges between students, producing excellent scholarly research and creative activity that challenges the status quo, or by finding ways the university and the city can achieve progressive change together. The winners in each category were:

-- Innovation and Impact: Jaclyn Nofech-Mozes (PhD student, Psychology)

-- Student Engagement and Experience: Angélique Bernabé (PhD student, Economics), Eno Hysi (PhD student, Biomedical Physics)

-- Community Engagement and City Building: Riley Kucheran (PhD student, Communication and Culture), Erin Meger (PhD student, Mathematical Modelling and Methods), and the MPI students in the School of Urban and Regional Planning's My Inclusive Campus Studio Group

ENROLMENT – Ryerson's admissions for fall 2018 are within 1% of their targets—a remarkable achievement, for which university registrar Charmaine Hack deserves significant praise. The domestic target was 8179, and there were 8154 confirmations, while the international target was 850, and there were 868 confirmations. Overall, the figures stand at 9022 admissions, compared to a targeted 9029—within 0.1%. International enrolments were up by 26% from last year, with China, India, Vietnam, South Korea, and the United States being the top five countries represented.

EVENTS

INDIGENOUS SUPPORT SERVICES COURSE – In June, three Indigenous students in the Faculty of Community Services, along with instructor and Anishinaabe scholar Nicole Ineese-Nash, spent four weeks in Temiskaming, Northern Ontario, completing a fieldwork course based at the Temiskaming Native Women's Support Group. Ramona Shawana (early childhood studies), Jessica Sherk (social work) and Shazeal Taylor (midwifery) used their varied backgrounds and skills to assist Indigenous clients and staff with childcare, education and training, and mental health. The students were given the opportunity to interact with and learn from community elders, some of whom acted as advisors for the course.

CYBERSECURITY COMPETITION – From September 28 to October 12, high school students throughout Canada vied for over \$7000 worth of prizes in CanHack, the inaugural cybersecurity competition organized by the DMZ in partnership with RBC. As the Canadian offshoot of picoCTF, a global hacking competition run by Carnegie Mellon University, CanHack tested students' critical-thinking and programming skills across five categories: web exploitation and security, binary exploitation, reverse engineering, forensics, and cryptography. The competition was designed to develop students' skills through experiential learning, encourage students' interest in studying and working in the field, and promote cybersecurity education in general—the prizes were restricted to high school students, but anyone could participate.

NEWCOMERS CONFERENCE – From October 1 to 2, the Newcomer Students' Association of Ryerson held its second annual conference, *Integrating Our Voices: Centering Stories of Migration*. Honorary guest speakers included distinguished visitor and Senator Ratna Omidvar and Parkdale—High Park MPP Bhutila Karpoche. Panels and talks focused on migrant integration, refugee and newcomer empowerment and inclusion in policy and settlement services, increasing newcomer civic engagement, stories of migration and belonging, and building solidarity between migrants and Indigenous peoples.

STUDENT LEADER CHICAGO VISIT – From October 9 to 14, 20 Ryerson students visited Chicago to experience political life in the United States, just weeks before the midterm elections. Under the auspices of the CanStudyUs initiative, organized by the Ryerson Leadership Lab (via distinguished visitor Karim Bardeesy) and the Democratic Engagement Exchange (via Faculty of Arts senior advisor, Democratic Engagement John Beebe), the students met with a range of people involved with campaigning on many levels, from top strategists to grassroots community activists. The students then worked directly with organizations on voter-outreach strategies, translating what they had learned about civic engagement into action.

INUIT ART AND THE GROUP OF SEVEN – On October 19, The Modern Literature and Culture Gallery launched *Re-Locating the Canadian North: Contemporary Inuit Art and the Group of Seven*, an exhibition that questions and subverts stereotypes of Inuit culture in popular Canadian art and historical narratives. Co-curated by MLC director Dr. Irene Gammel, William Huffman of Dorset Fine Arts, and Communication and Culture MA student Emily Pleasance, the exhibition showcases original prints by Inuit artists from Cape Dorset, Nunavut, as well as art by Pleasance herself. The latter includes cubes made out of soil sourced from Nunavut, which are on sale, with proceeds going to the Nunavut Kamatsiaqtut Help Line, a 24/7 counselling service for northerners experiencing stress and crisis.

SOCIAL JUSTICE WEEK – “The Power We Have” was the theme of Ryerson’s eighth annual Social Justice Week, which focused on what “ordinary” citizens can do to effect change. Held from October 22 to 26, the event highlighted truth and reconciliation, and featured the Annual Truth and Reconciliation Commission Check-In; Indigenous Walking Tours of campus spaces; a presentation by Brian Charles of the Chippewas of Georgina Island about the interconnected histories Indigenous peoples and settlers; and the official launch event of the Yellowhead Institute, “Indigenous Strategies for Transformative Change.” Other presentations and discussions focused on textbook affordability, organizing to prevent sexual violence, improving policing, ending racial and shadeist discrimination, fostering harm reduction, and strategies for citizens to impact decision making in the City of Toronto. Distinguished visitor Olivia Chow presented *Building Skills for Change: From Passion to Action*, during which she and facilitators from the Institute for Change inspired students to channel their ideas into activism.

TED ROGERS SALES LEADERSHIP PROGRAM – On October 22, the Ted Rogers Leadership Centre launched the Ted Rogers Sales Leadership Program, aimed at developing, in TRLC founder and chair Dr. Brian Segal’s words, “exceptional ethical sales leaders.” It will offer experiential learning for undergraduate and graduate students, including international sales case competitions, role-playing and simulations, live sales projects, and social selling opportunities. It will also allow students to connect with industry sales leaders and acquire co-op and job placements. The program will be led by an advisory committee of marketing and sales faculty, alumni, and corporate sales leaders, with a view to

being accepted as an Associate Member of the University Sales Center Alliance and assisting TRSM's growth as a leading business school in Canada.

FEMINISMS AND TRANSFORMATIVE CHANGE – On October 29, three newly elected women MPPs, all of whom are New Democrats and members of the Ryerson community, shared their stories with the Ryerson community for the kick-off event of the speaker series Feminisms and Transformative Change, co-sponsored by the faculties of Arts and Community Services. Jill Andrew (Toronto—St. Paul's), Bhutila Karpoche (Parkdale—High Park), and Sara Singh (Brampton Centre) spoke about their decisions to enter politics, their winning campaign strategies, and their experiences thus far at Queen's Park. The discussion was moderated by Sara Mojtehdzadeh, Work and Wealth reporter at the Toronto Star, and hosted by Peggy Nash, distinguished visitor in both faculties, and herself a former MP for Parkdale—High Park.

RU-PASS REFERENDUM – In a referendum held from October 29 to November 1, Ryerson students voted in favour of the RU-Pass, which will allow unlimited access to all transportation on the TTC system for full-time students. Voter turnout was 42.8%, out of which 62.2% voted "yes." The pass will come into effect September 2019 and will cost students \$70 per month, as opposed to the current fee of \$116.75 for a monthly post-secondary pass. In future years, the fee will not be able to be adjusted by more than 5% annually. Students are able to opt out if their use of transit is restricted due to grounds protected under the Ontario Human Rights Code.

CAMPUS VIGIL – Ryerson students and faculty gathered on October 31 for a vigil in the Sears Atrium to honour the 11 victims of the Pittsburgh synagogue massacre. Staff and faculty, together with the Jewish student group Hillel Ryerson, sought to unite the community in condemnation of anti-Semitism and discrimination of all kinds. Students from Hillel Ryerson read out family reminiscences of the victims and lit candles in their memory.

TRANS AWARENESS MONTH – November 2018 was Ryerson's third annual Trans Awareness Month, and the university community participated in a host of advocacy and educational events organized by Ryerson Positive Space. On November 1, after a trans pride banner was installed between Jorgenson Hall and Kerr Hall, the \$1000 Sumaya Dalmar scholarship was launched to support racialized trans students. Other events included the screening of the documentary *Sex Spirit Strength*, one of whose subjects is a young Indigenous man in Saskatchewan who was bullied for being two-spirit; the panel discussion *Transdressing*, on trans inclusion in clothing Design and fashion; Ryerson Athletics initiatives to make their spaces more welcoming to trans students; and Trans 101 workshops encouraging participants to help make Ryerson a safer, more supportive campus for trans students, with more inclusive learning environments.

UNITED WAY CAMPAIGN – On November 1, Ryerson kicked off its 2018 United Way Greater Toronto Campaign to help fight poverty and bolster mental and physical health and wellbeing in the downtown community and across the GTA. Co-Chairs provost and vice-president academic Michael Benarroch and vice-president, administration and operations Deborah Brown are encouraging Ryerson community members to volunteer their time as ambassadors (frontline volunteers who raise awareness), make

donations to the United Way Greater Toronto agency of their choice, and participate in the various campaign events Ryerson is hosting until the end of December.

INNOVATION CONFERENCE – From November 1 to 3, Ryerson hosted the second annual George Vari Innovation conference, aimed at encouraging youth entrepreneurship and innovation. In addition to a Startup Expo, panels, workshops, a case competition, and a closing gala, the conference featured *Beyond the Horizon: The Hadfield Experience*, an exclusive presentation by former astronaut Chris Hadfield. Commander Hadfield gave an inspiring talk that touched on the value of failure to drive success. He was interviewed onstage by distinguished visiting professor Karim Bardeesy, and he concluded with a rousing version of “Space Oddity,” the David Bowie hit Hadfield famously performed on the International Space Station. Hadfield’s presentation was co-produced by the Ryerson Leadership Lab, the Ryerson Engineering Students Society, and the Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science.

REMEMBRANCE DAY – On November 9th, the Ryerson community joined in reflection for the annual Remembrance Day ceremony in the Kerr Hall Quad. We honoured those who have given their lives for our freedom with the laying of a wreath, a reading of John McCrae’s poem *In Flanders Fields*, a moment of silence, and the traditional Last Post bugle call. Participants pinned their poppies to decorative wreaths in respect and tribute.

At sunset on Sunday, November 11, the bell sounds of Ryerson’s carillon rang out 100 times from the clock tower and across the quad—once for every year since the armistice that ended the Great War. As played by longtime Ryerson carillonneur Wayne Detcher, the carillon joined others on Parliament Hill and in universities, city halls, places of worship, military bases, and elsewhere throughout Canada to evoke the ringing of church bells in 1918 that spread the news that the war was over. Ryerson was honoured to take part in the Bells of Peace initiative, organized by the Royal Canadian Legion in collaboration with the Canadian government.

FCAD’s CATALYST – On November 22, the Faculty of Communication & Design officially launched The Catalyst, Ryerson’s first large-scale facility dedicated to Scholarly Research and Creative (SRC) activity in communication and design. Under the direction of Greg Elmer, Bell Globemedia Research Chair and professor in the School of Professional Communication, the Catalyst aims to spark interdisciplinary research both within FCAD’s schools and in collaboration with external research partners. It occupies 5000 square feet on the second floor of the Rogers Communications Centre and offers offices for centres and labs, meeting rooms, and configurable workspaces, all designed to support potential and ongoing SRC projects for FCAD students, faculty members, and collaborators. The Catalyst’s Co-Lab resource centre, part of Ryerson’s Creative Technology Network, is helping SRC projects develop digital technologies.

from the President’s Calendar

October 15, 2018: Along with The Honourable Ratna Omidvar, senator and Ryerson distinguished visitor, I hosted a breakfast meeting with Indo-Canadian leaders and delegates from Indiaspora, a non-profit organization working to advance the Indo-American community. We spoke about building bridges and philanthropic engagement.

October 15, 2018: Over lunch, I met with the Ryerson Arts Student Society manager and executive. The students presented their plans for the school year, and we discussed their topics of interest.

October 15, 2018: I met with Paul Davidson, president of Universities Canada. We spoke about Universities Canada's priorities, including reaching out to governments and communicating the role of universities in society.

October 16, 2018: I met with the Lalani Group, which owns land next to Ryerson, to discuss partnership and being good neighbours.

October 17, 2018: I was pleased to give welcoming remarks to the 2018 annual OPSEU conference, which had as its theme creating and maintaining work-life balance.

October 17, 2018: As a member, I attended a meeting of the advisory council for Sidewalk Labs, where we discussed their vision for Toronto.

October 17, 2018: At a networking reception for distinguished visitors, I delivered opening remarks.

October 17, 2018: I spoke with Andrew Petter, president and vice-chancellor of Simon Fraser University, about lobbying the government to expand the Incubate Innovate Network of Canada (I-INC), which we founded in collaboration with SFU and the University of Ontario Institute for Technology.

October 18, 2018: I attended a meeting with the executive heads of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), followed by a COU council meeting.

October 18, 2018: Assistant vice-president, University Relations Jennifer Grass and I had an introductory meeting with George Zegarac, deputy minister of Training, Colleges and Universities.

October 18, 2018: I attended the reception for the Centre for Free Expression, which featured a discussion with Nadine Strossen, professor of Constitutional Law, New York Law School and former president, American Civil Liberties Union, about the potential roles of tougher laws and university regulations in combating "hate speech."

October 18, 2018: I was happy to deliver welcoming remarks to Leaders in Learning, The Chang School's annual awards evening. We celebrated the academic achievements, contributions to social and cultural innovation, and community engagement of continuing education students.

October 19, 2018: I spoke with the Honourable Patty Hajdu, minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, about our application for the Future Skills Centre.

October 19, 2018: Vice-president, University Relations Jennifer Grass and I met with Jan Mollenhauer, chair of the Yonge/Dundas board, to discuss city building and partnership, and to provide the board our input about their strategic plan.

October 19, 2018: I was honoured to sit at the head table of the Canadian Disability Hall of Fame luncheon.

October 22, 2018: I was proud to meet with Ryerson's recipients of 2018 Undergraduate Awards, the largest international awards program for undergraduate university students in the world.

October 22, 2018: Over lunch, I met with the Ryerson Engineering Student Society manager and executive. The students presented their plans for the school year, and we discussed their topics of interest.

October 22, 2018: I attended a board meeting of the non-profit organization Hackergal, focusing on coding and initiatives that will encourage high school girls to study and pursue STEM subjects.

October 22, 2018: As a board member, I attended the reception for a DMZ Advisory Council meeting.

October 23, 2018: Vice-president, administration and operations Deborah Brown and I had an introductory meeting with city builder George Spezza, director of Business Growth Services at the City of Toronto.

October 23, 2018: Over lunch, I met with the Ted Rogers Student Society manager and executive. The students presented their plans for the school year, and we discussed their topics of interest.

October 23, 2018: I was happy to give welcoming remarks at Ryerson's School of Urban and Regional Planning Awards.

October 23, 2018: I attended the Social Justice Week event Indigenous Strategies For Transformative Change, which officially launched the Yellowhead institute.

October 24, 2018: I had a lunch meeting with Ambarish Datta, managing director and CEO of the Bombay Stock Exchange Institute (BSEI) about partnering with Zone StartUp India.

October 24, 2018: I was delighted to attend the presentation of rings to last year's national champion women's volleyball team at MAC, where we raised Ryerson's first-ever USports national championship banner—a very proud moment for our university community.

October 25–26, 2018: I attended the Ontario Economic Summit in Niagara-on-the-Lake, a gathering of thought leaders from the public and private sectors to discuss confronting disruption and navigating Ontario's transition to a learning-based economy.

October 26, 2018: I was pleased to deliver remarks welcoming student athletes and their families to the reception for the Ryerson Athletics Hall of Fame Induction Ceremony.

October 30, 2018: I met with the grassroots group Canadian Students for Sensible Drug Policy (CSSDP) Ryerson to discuss the students' goals of promoting harm reduction and education about drug policy reform.

October 31, 2018: Vice-president, equity and community inclusion Denise O'Neil Green, general counsel and secretary of the board of governors Julia Shin Doi and I met with John P. Brown, senior partner in the Toronto Litigation Group of McCarthy Tetrault, who is responsible for the law firm's response to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's final report. We discussed Ryerson's experience in responding to the report.

November 1, 2018: In Ottawa, I met with five members of parliament from Brampton to discuss Cybersecure Catalyst – A National Centre for Cybersecurity.

November 2, 2018: As a member, I attended a meeting of the National Research Council in Ottawa.

November 5, 2018: I hosted the President's Leadership Lunch for Ryerson's United Way campaign, where I gave remarks welcoming Max Beaumont, who represents the United Way-funded agency Big Brothers Big Sisters of Toronto.

November 5, 2018: Vice-president, administration and operations Deborah Brown and I spoke with Dr. Eileen Devilla, Toronto Public Health, about the safe injection site close to campus.

November 6, 2018: I participated in a United Way Campaign Cabinet conference call.

November 6, 2018: I attended an Executive Group Retreat about positioning Ryerson for success for 2030 and beyond.

November 7, 2018: I met with Mark Newburgh of Hillel Ontario, as well as the student organization Ryerson Hillel, to discuss their plans for the school year.

November 7, 2018: I attended a lunch hosted by the Canadian Club of Toronto, at which the Honourable Patty Hajdu, minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour spoke about the federal government's investment in skills and quality jobs.

November 8, 2018: Vice-president, administration and operations Deborah Brown and I met with WZMH Architects to discuss smart buildings.

University Relations

Monthly Metrics & Reach



UR Highlights: October

- Developed full-page Globe and Mail announcement ad highlighting new Chancellor and Board of Governors appointments.
- Led the development of new recruitment materials for Ryerson Open House including a viewbook for the Faculty of Arts and a poster-zine for the Faculty of Community Services.
- Created marketing and communications materials to support Ryerson's 2018 United Way campaign.

Media Relations

- The announcement of Janice Fukakusa's appointment as Chancellor was picked by over 60 outlets across the country including The Toronto Star, The Globe and Mail, National Post and University Affairs.
- The School of Nursing's EMBODY - a multimedia exhibit on the experiences of those suffering from dementia - was covered by The Toronto Star and CTV News.
- Ryerson experts were quoted widely on the 2018 municipal elections - comment on topics including platforms, voter turnout and voter demographics was covered in more than 80 media stories.
- Supported media relations outreach on Ryerson's 8th annual Social Justice Week.

Marketing

- Produced more than 40 print projects during October including Law School brochure and Transmedia Zone book.
- Created Brampton initiatives handout and website.

- Worked with the Faculty of Arts to develop brand appendix and guidelines.
- Sourced new photographs from the Yellowhead Institute launch event for the DAM.
- Over 530 images were downloaded from the DAM.

Publications

- Produced 13 editions of Ryerson Today (RT)
- Highest open rate was for President's message on Brampton campus (40.5%). Second-highest open rate for October stories was "What you need to know about cannabis on campus" (39 %).

Website

- Comparing October 2018 to October 2017, we saw a 7.14% increase in pages viewed on ryerson.ca, while the bounce rate improved by 1.3%.
 - October 2018: 3.7 million pages viewed
 - October 2017: 3.4 million pages viewed
- This means more people came to the website and it was higher quality traffic.

Digital Marketing

- Planning digital campaigns for FCAD, YSGS and several collaborative projects (e.g., World Access to Higher Education campaign).



Social Media

- **Instagram:** Over 85% of posts had engagement above 1K and reach surpassing 8K; overall engagement was 24K. Our follower count increased by 860, continuing the strong trend from September.
- **Facebook:** Our Facebook page reached 70K followers and increased engagement by +868 engagement month over month. We continue to maintain a perfect 100% response rate to messages and inquiries.
- **Twitter:** Our Twitter account reached 50K followers on the back of an increase of 344 month over month.
- **LinkedIn:** Followers up by 1.9K; 1.1K social engagements (likes, comments, shares); our content had 317K impressions
- **Giphy:** 751K views; this is a huge spike in impressions in October (200% growth month-over-month), thanks to the launch of our first set of stickers on this channel

REPORT OF ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE**Report #F2018–2; December 2018**

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

- **TRSBM LAW AND BUSINESS – Co-op Resequencing Proposal**
- **SCHOOL OF NURSING – Grading Variations**
- **For Information: Periodic Program Review Follow-up Reports**
 - **Business Technology Management**
 - **Criminology**
 - **Medical Physics**
 - **Health Services Management**

A. TRSBM LAW AND BUSINESS – Co-op Resequencing Proposal**1. Introduction and Rationale**

The Law and Business major in the School of Business Management proposes to amend the sequence of its Co-operative Education program by moving entry into co-op from the end of first year to the end of second year. The proposed change would commence in the 2019-2020 academic year and would defer the student intake from summer after first year to the Winter term in students' second year of study. The rationale for this change is as follows.

- It aligns the law and business department's co-op schedule with the other departments in TRSM, the majority of which accept entry at the end of second year.
- It permits law majors to take at least one law course prior to entry into co-op, as the first available law course is only offered to students in year 2 of their studies. This benefits not only students, but also to industry partners who are offering such work placements
- It will provide law and business students with a greater focus in their co-op experience and provide them with a sense of direction for their career aspirations.
- It will improve students' competitiveness in obtaining co-op placements. As a result of the intake change, the revised co-op sequence is proposed to start in the Winter term. With their first work placement in the Winter term, students will have more opportunities given that most other programs start their work placement in Spring/Summer.

Currently, Law and Business has 670 full time declared majors, representing about 10% of all Business Management students. Current enrolment in the Law and Business Co-op option is 31 students. With the proposed sequencing change, the number of students in the Law and Business major interested in participating in the co-op program is expected to grow.

2. Comparison between the Current (2017/2018 Academic Year) and the Proposed Curricula

Summary of current co-op work term sequence: <i>For students admitted Fall 2018 and prior. The Law and Business department will continue to offer this sequencing to this cohort of students.</i>			
	Fall	Winter	Spring/Summer
Year 1	1 st Semester	2 nd Semester	*Apply to co-op*
Year 2	3 rd Semester	4 th Semester	WKT131
Year 3	5 th Semester	WKT231	WKT331
Year 4	6 th Semester	7 th Semester	WKT431
Year 5	8 th Semester		

Summary of proposed co-op work term sequence: For students admitted Fall 2019 and after.			
	Fall	Winter	Spring/Summer
Year 1	1 st Semester	2 nd Semester	
Year 2	3 rd Semester	4 th Semester	*Apply to co-op*
Year 3	5 th Semester	WKT131	WKT231
Year 4	6 th Semester	7 th Semester	WKT331
Year 5	WKT431	8 th Semester	

3. Summary of the Proposed Curriculum Changes*

Year 1 – 2019-2020:

- No change to curriculum
- Co-op application deadline removed

Year 2 – 2020-2021:

- No Change to curriculum
- Co-op application deadline of June 1, 2021
- Spring/Summer term - WKT131 Removed

Year 3 – 2021-2022:

- Fall term – 5th semester remains unchanged
- Winter term – WKT231 is replaced by WKT131
- Spring/Summer term – WKT331 is replaced by WKT231

Year 4 – 2022-2023:

- Fall term – 6th semester remains unchanged
- Winter term – 7th semester remains unchanged
- Spring/Summer term – WKT431 is replaced by WKT331

Year 5 – 2023-2024

- Fall term – 6th semester is replaced by WKT431
- Winter term – added 8th semester courses

*Note: The operationalization of new or revised curriculum may require that implementation timelines be adjusted.

Recommendation

Having satisfied itself of the merit of this proposal, the Academic Standards Committee recommends: *That Senate approve the School of Business Management's Law and Business Co-op resequencing proposal.*

B. SCHOOL OF NURSING – Grading Variations

1. Introduction and Rationale

In addition to the current standing variation of a 'C' grade or above in all nursing courses, it is proposed that the following **five 'clinical practice' courses** in the Ryerson, Centennial, George Brown Collaborative Degree Program include course grade variations related specifically to students' ability to demonstrate 'satisfactory' performance in the evaluation of clinically related skills:

NSE 12 A/B - Nursing Practice I

NSE 22 A/B - Nursing Practice II
NSE 32 A/B - Nursing Practice III
NSE 417 - Nursing Practice IV
NSE 418 - Nursing Practice V

The foci of these courses include the knowledge acquisition and application of a variety of hands-on nursing skills, beginning at an introductory level and progressing throughout the program to the level expected of a novice, newly graduated nurse (upon completion of the program), in compliance with the Standards of Practice of the College of Nurses of Ontario. In order to be eligible to write the profession registration exam and to enter practice in the province of Ontario, students must successfully graduate from an accredited nursing baccalaureate program. Accreditation of baccalaureate programs requires that students demonstrate their ability to implement the Standards of Practice throughout their baccalaureate nursing education.

Senate previously approved an academic standing variation for all courses in the Collaborative Nursing Degree Program whereby a course 'pass' grade is considered a 'C' or above. In the five practice courses, evaluation methods include a combination of written and oral assignments/exams (which are numerically graded) as well as a clinical practice performance evaluation (which is graded on a 'satisfactory'/'unsatisfactory' basis). All evaluations are based on pre-determined criteria, which appear in each course syllabus. Specifically:

NSE 12A/B Nursing Practice I: Introduction to Nursing Practice (Year 1)

To achieve the minimum required final grade of 'C' in order to pass the course, students are required to:

1. achieve a satisfactory evaluation in the Clinical Case Study Workshop (CCSW) (winter term week 5) in order to be admitted to the clinical setting and the student's clinical experience in weeks 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11. Students who fail to demonstrate competency and receive an unsatisfactory evaluation on their performance are given a one-time repeat CCSW opportunity to achieve a satisfactory grade. Students who fail to achieve a satisfactory on this second testing opportunity will not be admitted to the clinical setting. As a result, students will receive an unsatisfactory grade for the clinical component of the course.

In the Clinical Case Study Workshop students demonstrate their readiness for clinical practice. Students are expected to demonstrate a beginning understanding of safety and infection control principles relevant to the ADL care provided while utilizing communication strategies that will promote a therapeutic relationship with the client. These expectations are consistent with the College of Nurses of Ontario (CNO) Professional Standards for nursing practice.

2. achieve a satisfactory clinical placement evaluation; failure to achieve a satisfactory evaluation in the clinical component of this course will automatically result in a course failure (i.e., a final course grade of "F").

As this is a clinical course, students must be able to demonstrate their knowledge, skill and judgement, appropriate to their abilities as novice learners, in the clinical setting before moving on to the clinical course in year 2. Students are evaluated according the CNO Standards, within their scope of practice as year 1 students. The requirement for successful completion of the clinical practice component of a nursing practice course is typical in nursing programs throughout the province.

=====

NSE 22A/B Nursing Practice II: Acute and Chronic Care (Year 2)

To achieve the minimum required final grade of 'C' in order to pass the course, students are required to achieve:

- i. a mark of no less than 'C' or above on all three course exams, combined*; and

ii. a 'satisfactory' winter semester, final clinical performance appraisal.

Students who do not meet any one of the above two requirements will receive an 'F' final course grade, regardless of their accumulative numerical course grade.

* This requirement is integrally linked to students' ability to demonstrate satisfactory performance of the professional Standards of Practice - specifically the standards related to knowledge and knowledge application. Due to the number of students who require clinical placements, the difficulty in accessing adequate numbers of placement sites, and the variance in patient acuity in the hospital settings, clinical placements are varied and not all provide students with the opportunities to deliver the nursing care associated with the required content covered in the course. To counterbalance this, simulation and case study methodology is heavily incorporated throughout the course.

NSE 32A/B Nursing Practice III: Community Nursing (Year 3)

To achieve the minimum required final grade of 'C' in order to pass the course, students are required to:

- demonstrate satisfactory, safe and ethical community-focused nursing practice performance that integrates community nursing theory and the College of Nurses of Ontario Standards of Professional Practice (2002) at the level required of a year 3 student;
- *develop and successfully implement a learning plan that reflects community nursing concepts; and
- *attend all required practice-related hours including, but not limited to orientation activities, practice days, facilitation meetings and the maternal-child simulation.

*These requirements are directly linked to the students' ability to demonstrate satisfactory performance in the clinical setting.

NSE 417 Nursing: Practice IV (Year four, semester one)

To achieve the minimum required final grade of 'C' in order to pass the course, students are required to:

- *complete mandatory practice hours including: school and placement orientation, 179 hours of direct clinical practice and clinical conferences;
- *achieve a passing grade of minimum 80% in the drug calculation quiz. If a passing grade of 80% is not achieved after 3 attempts, the student may be deemed unsafe in clinical practice and removed from the course;
- *achieve a passing grade of minimum 80% in the infection control / PPE quiz. If a passing grade of 80% is not achieved after 3 attempts, the student may be deemed unsafe in clinical practice and removed from the course;
- *attend one (1) clinical simulation session, and
- *attend one (1) clinical skills workshop, and
- complete the HESI Exit Exam 1[®], and
- achieve a *satisfactory* score for the professional portfolio.

*These requirements are directly linked to the student's ability to demonstrate satisfactory performance in the clinical setting.

The rationale for the mandatory completion of the **non-graded components** are as follows:

Drug calculation and infection control tests: The knowledge tested provides evidence that the students have reviewed key material prior to beginning a new clinical placement. This testing supports student safety and success in the clinical setting and also meets the knowledge requirements determined by clinical placement agencies.

Attendance at one (1) clinical simulation session and one (1) clinical skills workshop: The knowledge and skills reviewed in these experiential learning opportunities also support student safety and confidence

in the clinical setting. Due to the current program structure, students have been away from an acute care setting for one year and the skills necessary for these settings require review so that the students are able to practice safely and then build on their skill set in terms of complexity and volume as they take care of an increasing number of patients/clients.

NSE 418 Nursing: Practice V (Year four, semester two)

To achieve the minimum required final grade of 'C' in order to pass the course, students are required to:

- *complete 350 hours of direct clinical practice including: school (online) and placement orientation, and clinical conferences;
- achieve a satisfactory standing **in all standards** in clinical practice;
- *complete the online orientation;
- complete the HESI CAT Exam[®], and
- achieve a satisfactory score for the professional portfolio.

*These requirements are directly linked to the student's ability to demonstrate satisfactory performance in the clinical setting. Satisfactory performance in practice as a course pass requirement is the norm in the professional baccalaureate education of nurses.

Completion of the HESI Exit Exam 1 and 2[®]: The series of exams are used as diagnostic tools to assess the student's current practice knowledge base. Research has shown that scores obtained on the HESI exams are highly predictive of success on the NCLEX licensing exam. This computerized testing opportunity allows students to: engage in a simulated testing setting; experience the computerized testing methodology; and receive a computer generated individualized report. This report is discussed and clarified with the Faculty Advisor so the student can create a study plan to prepare for the graded HESI exam in the winter term, the final NSE 418 practice exam, and the NCLEX licensing exam (after graduation). The goal is to enhance student success rates in this licensing exam.

Completion of the CAT Exam 1[®]: The computer adaptive testing (CAT) most closely mimics the experience of the NCLEX exam that students will write after graduation to become registered to practice in Ontario. This is their first opportunity to write an adaptive test. This is the final strategy used within the program to support student preparation and success on the licensing exam.

Recommendation

Having satisfied itself of the merit of this proposal, the Academic Standards Committee recommends: *That Senate approve the School of Nursing course grading variations.*

C. For Information: PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW FOLLOW-UP REPORTS

The Business Technology Management undergraduate program was required to submit a one-year follow-up report following Senate approval of its periodic program review in 2017. Three additional undergraduate programs (Criminology, Medical Physics, and Health Services Management) submitted a two-year follow-up report following Senate approval of their periodic program reviews in 2016.

i. BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT One-Year PPR Follow-up Report

This follow-up report addresses the recommendation stated in the Academic Standard Committee's assessment of the Periodic Program Review of the Bachelor of Commerce, Business Technology

Management, approved by Senate in April 2017.

Recommendation

The Academic Standards Committee (April 2017) recommends that the program provide a follow-up report which will include:

1. Progress on the developmental plan, as outlined in the supplemental report.
2. The most recent course outlines for all required courses in the program that are taught by Teaching Departments outside the School of Information Technology Management (e.g., CMN 124, GMS 200, SSH 105, ACC 100, etc.).
3. The mapping of the required courses taught outside of the School to the program learning outcomes. Include an analysis of the mapping of all required courses—taught both within and outside of the School—to the program learning outcomes and a plan to address any gaps that may be identified through the revised curriculum mapping. It is recommended that Ryerson's Curriculum Development Consultant be consulted for assistance with the mapping and analysis.
4. Progress on integrating equity, diversity and inclusion into the BTM curriculum.

Response

1. Progress on the Developmental Plan as outlined in the Supplemental Report

Priority 1: Full-time Faculty Complement

In the summer of 2017, BTM lost 4 LTF, hired 5 new LTF for a 3 year term, and renewed 1 LTF for a 1 year term that is about to expire. As a result, the School will have the same number of LTF in Fall 2018 as it did when this report was written. In addition, a new tenure stream faculty was hired in the summer of 2017 and another in 2018 respectively, while one tenured faculty member retired. BTM is in the process of transferring in another tenured faculty from another school within TRSM. In the meantime, the student body keeps growing; therefore, there is still much need for new full time faculty to bring the faculty to student ratio to Ryerson standards. Although not as fast as desired, the trend in the faculty complement is in the right direction.

Priority 2: Student Quality

The Math requirement TRSM wanted to implement as an admission standard was rejected by the university, and this was a big setback for BTM. In the meantime, at least as far as GPAs are concerned, we had a higher quality of incoming cohort in 2017 than that in any other academic year. The mean and median GPA for the 2017 cohort was 81.46% and 81.16% respectively, where these numbers were 80.40% and 80.33% in 2016 and below 80% before 2016. While less than half of BTM students had a GPA of 80% or above prior to 2016, that ratio was 55% in 2016, and jumped to 63.1% in 2017. We continue to advocate for higher admission standards in the hopes of increasing especially the math proficiency of the incoming cohort.

As for first year performance and retention, first year students take 3 ITM courses that are tracked. In ITM100, the averages were 2.39 in Fall 2016 and 2.49 in Fall 2017; in ITM107, the averages were 2.37 both in Fall 2016 and Fall 2017; in ITM207, the averages were 1.74 in Winter 2017 and 2.08 in Winter 2018. The average first year performance for BTM students is in the C- to C+ range with signs of upward trending. As well, the retention rates for the 3 courses are trending in a favorable direction, as follows:

ITM100: 89.74% in Fall 2016 and 94.4% in Fall 2017

ITM107: 80.43% in Fall 2016 and 85.66% in Fall 2017

ITM207: 72.37% in Winter 2017 and 84.33% in Winter 2018.

Priority 3: Curriculum Enhancement

In order to fill the gap in the learning outcomes related to the core courses, we included two important courses into our existing program. After updating the content of these courses (i.e., ITM 820 Information Systems security and Privacy and ITM 618 Business Intelligence and Analytics), they were added to the

list of BTM core courses effective Fall 2017 and Fall 2018. These courses are added as 3rd year core courses. These courses have improved all aspects of the learning outcomes (LO1 through LO14), with a focus on reinforcement and proficiency.

In addition, the following elective courses have been developed/updated in response our PPR review in order to improve core knowledge areas.

ITM 704 Mobile Application Development

ITM 711 Cloud Computing

ITM 735 ICT and Diversity Management

ITM 780 Web Design and Management

ITM 805 Big Data Analytics (Python & R)

As a final note, we are in the process of developing an advanced business process design course to complement the enterprise architecture offering, and we plan to launch a FinTech course in Winter 2019.

Priority 4: Experiential Learning Opportunities

The BTM Co-op program remains strong and growing. For the 2017-2018 academic year, we had 80 applicants to this program, all of whom were admitted. The number of applications grew to 142 for the 2018-2019 academic year; therefore, we are on target for accepting over 100 students into co-op this year. We have also made progress in increasing the diversity of capstone projects our students take on. As well, we are encouraging our students to increase participation in case studies for which we are running a preparatory workshop and have designed a new elective course.

Priority 5: Student Engagement for Learning and Career Success

The School continues to support, through financial means and through a faculty liaison, BTM student groups in their career and networking-focused activities and the alumni night events. We also continuously encourage these groups to reach out to the BTM student body and be as representative as possible. Through the same means, we also support students going to case competitions for their preparation and travel. As mentioned above, we are in the process of launching an IT case study course.

Priority 6: Diversity in the Community

BTM is one of the fastest growing programs in TRSM. The number of female students enrolled in the BTM program has increased from 20% in 2013 to 25.3% in 2017. To address the importance of diversity, we have introduced a unique course called ICT and Diversity Management to address issues of diversity in business and education. The School undertook new initiatives to support women in the program. The School's website and related social media pages highlight many success stories about our female students related to the Co-op program, scholarships and awards, and activities related to the ITM women student association (WITM).

As a final note, although our program does not control admissions, our efforts continue to make BTM an attractive program for a diverse group of potential students and to support female students.

Priority 7: Industry Ties

BTM continues to build its Program Advisory Council with new recruits who are strong industry leaders, three of whom joined the council since this report was submitted. The program goals have been communicated to each PAC member, and they seemed receptive to helping the program achieve all of them. BTM will keep strengthening its PAC as a firsthand connection to the Toronto business world.

Priority 8: Addressing the Competition

The School has achieved its goal of BTM accreditation and has sufficient applications to the co-op program (142) to meet the goal of a co-op cohort of 100. It has hired two tenure stream faculty experts in

artificial intelligence, analytics and machine learning with strong research records and future potential to be competitive in this critical area, and is in the process of transferring another faculty member with a proven record in analytics with the hopes of complementing our existing faculty in becoming a center of excellence in applied analytics and artificial intelligence.

2. Course outlines for required courses taught by Teaching Departments outside the School of Business Technology Management.

The required course outlines have been submitted.

3. Mapping and analysis of all required courses to learning outcomes.

All required courses, both those taught within and outside of the School of Business Technology Management, have been mapped and analyzed to program learning outcomes (see Priority 3).

4. Integration of equity, diversity and inclusion in the program.

Integration of EDI into the program has been addressed through the Priority 7 progress reported to date.

ii. CRIMINOLOGY Two-Year PPR Follow-up Report

This follow-up report addresses the recommendations stated in the Academic Standard Committee's assessment of the Periodic Program Review of the Bachelor of Arts, Criminology, approved by Senate in May, 2016.

Recommendation

The Academic Standards Committee (May 2016) also recommends that the program provide a two-year follow-up report, as follows:

1. The results of a graduate survey and a survey of employers.

Response

1. Results of Graduate Survey

The survey was sent out on February 13, 2018 to all 698 alumni up to Fall 2017, and a reminder email was sent on February 28, 2018. As of March 15, 2018, 23 responses were received. Due to the large number of alumni for whom we did not have valid email addresses (617 alumni), it must be noted that the responses are not representative of the entire population of Criminology alumni. The survey results should be interpreted accordingly. More than half of the respondents graduated in the last 4 years, and more than 80% of respondents are employed, as follows:

- 4 (17.4%) are employed in the criminal justice system
- 2 (8.7%) are in other government organizations
- 3 (13%) are practicing law
- 2 (8.7%) are at NGOs/community agencies
- 1 (4.3%) is employed in the private sector
- 7 (30.4%) are employed in other organizations
- 3 (13%) are currently completing other forms of schooling
- 1 (4.3%) is neither employed nor in school

More than half are employed in criminology or in a related field, and are in mid-level positions and above. About half of the respondents thought the Criminology program prepared them well/very well for employment, while more than 75% of respondents stated the Criminology program prepared them well/very well for further education. Over 80% of respondents indicated they either were, or were planning to pursue further education.

60.9% of respondents indicated that they finished the degree in 4 years. More than 80% of the respondents thought they made considerable or outstanding progress in knowledge of the discipline; about 70% of the respondents thought they made considerable or outstanding progress in research methods; more than 95% of the respondents thought they made considerable or outstanding progress in critical thinking; more than 60% of the respondents thought they made considerable or outstanding progress in policies; more than 85% of the respondents thought they made considerable or outstanding progress in communication; and more than 70% of the respondents thought they made considerable or outstanding progress in autonomy and professional capacity.

At least half of the respondents felt there should be more emphasis placed on knowledge of the discipline, on research methods, policies, communication, autonomy and professional capacity, while more than 40% thought there should be more emphasis placed on critical thinking.

Overall, 14 out of 23 respondents would recommend the Criminology program at Ryerson to others.

2. Results of Employer Survey

The employer survey was initially sent out in July 2017 to 24 employers and yielded no responses. The survey was sent out a second time on February 13, 2018, and a third and final time on March 22, 2018. We received a total of 3 responses. However, one of the respondents only answered the first five questions, so we are essentially looking at responses from 2 organizations.

The employers were generally positive about the likelihood that they would hire a graduate from the Criminology program at Ryerson University. They also generally agreed that the positive reputation of the criminology program would influence their decision to hire. The employers were generally positive in rating the quality of Ryerson graduates from the criminology program compared to those from comparable universities and in comparing the recent graduates of the criminology program with those of 5 to 10 years ago.

The employers generally agreed with the criminology program being current, academically rigorous, and practical. They also generally agreed with the criminology program preparing its students to apply principles of their discipline to solve key problems; develop new ideas; and plan and organize activities. The employers noted that the program could provide more in terms of culturally sensitive approaches for our graduates.

iii. HEALTH SERVICES MANAGEMENT Two-Year PPR Follow-up Report

This follow-up report addresses the recommendation stated in the Academic Standard Committee's assessment of the Periodic Program Review of the Bachelor of Health Administration in Health Services Management, approved by Senate in May 2016.

Recommendation

The Academic Standards Committee (May 2016) also recommends a **two-year follow-up report** for Health Services Management as follows:

1. Mapping and analysis of the required courses to the revised program outcomes.

Response

1. Mapping and analysis of required courses to revised program outcomes

The School of Health Services Management (SHSM) met in Fall 2017 to discuss and revise the Health Services Management program Learning Outcomes (LOs). They were approved by the School, and in June-July 2018 discussed with Curriculum Consultants in the Office of the Vice Provost, Academic. This

led to further revisions, and the LOs listed in Table 1. The LOs were then mapped to the HSM required courses.

Table 1: Health Services Management LOs and UDLEs

Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations	Health Services Management Learning Outcomes (LOs)
1. Depth & breadth of knowledge	LO1a. Define, describe, and apply relevant policy concepts and theories to support decision making in the Canadian healthcare services environment.
	LO1b. Identify and describe management skills associated with core functions (human resources, governance and strategy) within organizations across the health services sector.
2. Knowledge of methodologies	LO2a. Assemble, interpret, and evaluate extant research to support evidence-based management in healthcare.
	LO2b. Read and interpret financial reports.
3. Application of knowledge	LO3. Collect, analyze and interpret quantitative and qualitative data to develop and effectively communicate evidence informed solutions to health service delivery problems
4. Communication skills	LO4a. Communicate in written form clearly effectively for health service management audiences.
	LO4b. Communicate in verbal form (presentations) effectively for health services management audiences.
5. Awareness of limits of knowledge	LO5a. Discuss and acknowledge knowledge gaps with respect to decision-making in healthcare services.
	LO5b. Recognize, describe and analyze the roles of ethics, diversity and equity in health services management.
6. Autonomy and professional capacity	LO6. Exercise initiative and demonstrate personal responsibility and accountability.

Mapping HSM required courses to Learning Outcomes

The mapping revealed that the program's Learning Outcomes are introduced and reinforced in the required core courses. Many LOs, particularly those related to communication in written and verbal formats, are addressed in a number of core courses. The program relies on the capstone Practicum and Practicum seminar, in which students complete a study in a host organization (not their own), to help students develop proficiency in all LOs, except for financial and management skills, ethics, and diversity and equity.

The mapping also shows that the program focuses primarily on evaluation, policy and public health related knowledge and skills. Coverage of financial and management skills is adequate, including at least two courses that introduce and analyze financial reporting, for example. However, the management and financial courses lead only to the reinforcement levels of proficiency. The situation is similar for ethics, diversity and equity, which reinforce outcomes in two courses.

In contrast, the program's final courses, Research Methodology and Program Planning and Evaluation are sequenced to lead to the conducting of a program, or in some cases product, evaluation. This is not at all a criticism; rather it reflects the Program's earlier home in the Faculty of Community Services. Students and industry value evaluation skills. As importantly, the techniques employed reflect an evidence-based approach to organizational problems, whether they are clinical, operational or managerial in nature.

Since the capstone course projects vary by student, they do not all necessarily address management-focused or ethics/diversity/equity issues explicitly. The School in future curriculum discussions will consider including a Practicum project element asking students to reflect on management, financial and ethical/diversity/equity implications of recommendations that arise from their studies.

Conclusions

The School has redrafted and adopted appropriate learning outcomes that reflect industry, and related student needs. Mapping these learning outcomes onto the program's required courses reveals they are being met. This exercise will inform our deliberations as we consider offering a single BHA program. This rationalization will enable the School to more efficiently deliver its BHA, together with three Certificates and the new MHA (CC).

As a follow up to the Academic Standards Committee's review (November 2018), the program is required to provide to ASC, by no later than June 30, 2019, a further follow-up report on the progress made to (a) address the gaps identified in the course mapping and to (b) more fully integrate equity, diversity and inclusion into the curriculum.

iv. MEDICAL PHYSICS Two-Year PPR Follow-up Report

This follow-up report addresses the recommendation stated in the Academic Standard Committee's assessment of the Periodic Program Review of the Bachelor of Science, Medical Physics, approved by Senate in May 2016.

Recommendation: The Academic Standards Committee (May 2016) also recommends a Two-Year Follow-up Report on the results of a student, alumni, and employer survey. The employer survey could include co-op employers.

Response

The Department of Physics conducted a student survey in selected courses in the Winter 2018 semester. The courses were PCS 228 - Electricity and Magnetism (a 2nd-year course), PCS 40A/B - Medical Physics Thesis (a 4th-year course). A survey of alumni of the Medical Physics BSc (Honors) Program was also conducted. A total of 33 students participated in the survey, as divided into the following groups: PCS 228 = 17 students, PCS 40A/B = 12 students, and Alumni = 4 students.

The survey included a total number of 18 questions that were categorized into four main groups:

- Program-related questions
- Teaching-related questions
- Instructor-related questions
- Concluding questions

The survey results revealed that students in various stages of the Medical Physics BSc (Honors) Program, including 2nd-year, 4th-year, and alumni, evaluated their degree of satisfaction with the program and its academic objectives as "Good" to "Very Good". Considering the very low response rate experienced in past surveys, the program is very pleased with both the participation rate and the received evaluations of the program. Moreover, it expects to further improve students' satisfaction with the full implementation of the new curriculum that will be in place starting Fall 2018.

As a follow up to the Academic Standards Committee's review (November 2018), the program is required to provide to the ASC, by no later than June 30, 2019, a summary of the results of an employer survey.

Respectfully Submitted,



Marcia Moshé, Chair for the Committee

ASC Members:

Charmaine Hack, Registrar

Donna Bell, Secretary of Senate

Marcia Moshé, Chair and Interim Vice Provost Academic

Anita Jack-Davies, Vice President/Vice Provost, Equity and Community Inclusion

Bettina West, Director, Curriculum Quality Assurance

Anne Marie Singh, Faculty of Arts, Criminology

Stephanie Walsh-Matthews, Faculty of Arts, Arts & Contemporary Studies

Gillian Mothersill, Faculty of Communication & Design, Graphic Communications Management

Wendy Freeman, Faculty of Communication & Design, Professional Communication

Thomas Tenkate, Faculty of Community Services, Occupational and Public Health

Annette Bailey, Faculty of Community Services, Nursing

Andy Gean Ye, Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science, Electrical & Computer Engineering

Donatus Oguamanam, Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science, Mechanical & Industrial Engineering

Noel George, Faculty of Science, Chemistry & Biology

Jeffrey Fillingham, Faculty of Science, Chemistry & Biology

Christopher Gibbs, Ted Rogers School of Management, Hospitality and Tourism Management

Donna Smith, Ted Rogers School of Management, Retail Management

Val Lem, Library

Linda Koechli, Chang School of Continuing Education

Dalia Hanna, Chang School of Continuing Education

Yelda Nura, Student

Huda Hajjaj, Student

**Report #F2018-3 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC):
M. Benarroch**

December 4, 2018

1. Academic Policy Review Committee (APRC) update: D Bell (see attached report)
2. Senate Bylaws Update – D. Checkland

Respectfully submitted,

M. Benarroch, Chair,
Provost & Vice President Academic

On behalf of the Committee:

M. Moshé, Interim Vice Provost Academic
I. Crookshank, Interim Vice Provost Students
C. Hack, Registrar
D. Bell, Secretary of Senate
T. Duever, Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Architectural Science
D. Checkland, Faculty of Arts
S. Dolgoy, Faculty, Faculty of Communication and Design
R. Meldrum, Faculty of Community Services
S. Sabatinos, Faculty, Science
K. Kumar, Faculty, Faculty of Engineering & Architectural Science
R. Hudyma, Faculty, Ted Rogers School of Management
A.M. Brinsmead, Chang School Program Director
F. Khan, Undergraduate Student Senator
J. Circo, Undergraduate Student Senator,
R. Kucheran, Yeates School of Graduate Studies Student Senator

ACADEMIC POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

FALL 2018

The Academic Policy Review Committee (APRC), an ad hoc committee of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC), has a mandate to review five academic policies and make its recommendations to AGPC, which then makes recommendations for policy revisions to Senate. The academic policies under review by the APRC are:

- 134: Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals;
- 135: Examinations;
- 145: Course Management - Undergraduate;
- 151: Course Management – Yeates School of Graduate Studies; and
- 152: Graduate Student Academic Consideration and Appeals.

To date, Senate has approved Policy 162: Grade Reassessment and Grade Recalculation (formerly part of Policy 134 and Policy 152) as well as a revised Policy 135: Final Examinations.

This report summarizes the findings of two pilots that the APRC initiated during the 2017-2018 academic year: a pilot of an online system for requesting academic consideration on health grounds, and a pilot of student self-declaration of extenuating circumstances to request academic consideration. The report also outlines the APRC's recommendations based on the results of each pilot.

Pilot of Academic Consideration Request (ACR) Online System

Background Information: In its [report to Senate \(January 2017\)](#), the APRC summarized its findings from stakeholder consultations regarding the policy and procedures for requesting academic consideration for missed work based on medical grounds. One of the issues raised in the consultations was the need for clear and consistent procedures for processing requests for academic consideration. At the time, one Faculty was using an online system designed in-house to process students' academic consideration requests, and another Faculty was planning to develop its own online system for processing such requests.

Given the growing interest in an online system and the advantages of a single, central system that could be used by all Ryerson students, the APRC worked with Ryerson's Computing and Communications Services (CCS) to develop a customized online system for students to submit their requests for academic consideration.¹ In October 2017, the Ted Rogers School of Management (TRSM) volunteered to pilot the academic consideration request online system with all undergraduate students in their Faculty. The Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science joined the pilot in Winter 2018.

Description of the Online System: Students log into the system using their Ryerson student number and select the term for which they are requesting academic consideration. Because the system is integrated with RAMSS (Ryerson's Administrative Management Self Service), all of a student's courses that term appear, along with the instructors' names, allowing the student to select the courses in which an academic obligation will be missed. Students are also able to

¹ The APRC acknowledges and thanks the CCS team of Ayu Er, Paul Harding, Yaghoub Soltanpour, and Mithura Jeyarajan for the development and ongoing refinement of the academic consideration online system and for training faculty and staff to use the system.

select the evaluation they are missing in each affected course and are given the option of uploading documentation (e.g., a Ryerson Health Certificate) to support their request. When students submit their online request, a notification email is automatically sent to their program department and to the instructors of courses for which they are requesting academic consideration. After the program department receives and reviews students' health certificates or other relevant documentation, the department sends an automated email notification to the students and their instructors, informing them as to whether the documentation has been verified.

Advantages of the ACR Online System. The online system has a number of advantages.

1. Administrative Efficiency

The system eliminates errors, illegibility, and missing information that often occur when students complete the hard copy academic consideration request form. It saves students time because they do not need to notify individual instructors and their program department that they will be missing an academic obligation. The system also allows program departments to process student requests in an efficient and timely manner.

2. Getting Needed Help for Students

The system allows program departments to readily identify students who may be experiencing challenges that are affecting their academic studies. It automatically records, per term and over a student's academic career, the total number of requests a student submits for academic consideration. When students submit a second request for academic consideration in a term, an automated email is sent to inform them of on-campus support services (centrally and at the Faculty level) to help them overcome any academic and/or personal challenges that may be affecting their studies. The automated email message also informs students that, if they have repeated requests for academic consideration, they may be required to meet with the Chair/Director of their program department to ensure that they are aware of available supports appropriate for their needs.

3. Tracking Correlations

Because the system integrates with RAMSS, it is possible to assess whether requests for academic consideration are correlated with other variables (e.g., difficulty of course, grade in a course, GPA, etc.).

Results of Pilot: A survey was sent to TRSM students at the end of the Fall 2017 term to assess their experience with the online system. Feedback was also solicited from TRSM staff and faculty. The student survey results revealed that the majority strongly agreed that the new automated system was easier to use and allowed for academic consideration requests to be processed faster than the previous process used in TRSM. They also rated the new online system as more secure because it required them to log into RAMMS. The most frequent suggestion for change was to allow students to submit their health documentation online rather than being required to submit a hard copy to their program office. The overwhelming majority of student respondents (91%) recommended that the online system be available to all students at Ryerson. The feedback from TRSM staff and faculty was equally positive. TRSM staff were particularly pleased with the administrative efficiency of the online system.

The TRSM study had implications beyond the question of whether to implement an online system across the University. Because of the system's amenability to tracking correlations, it provided interesting evidence on how requests for academic consideration are correlated with other variables such as the difficulty of a course, a student's grade in a course, the student's

GPA, etc. The TRSM data analysis revealed that health certificates were used more frequently in academically challenging courses and that students with CGPAs at or near the minimum requirement for a Clear academic standing were more likely to submit requests for academic consideration, regardless of the difficulty of the course in question. Even after providing academic consideration, 35% of those students either failed or dropped the course.² We will return to these issues at the end of this document.

Recommendations

Based in part on the results from the TRSM pilot, APRC recommends the following changes to the procedures for requesting academic consideration:

1. **That undergraduate students in all programs be required to submit their requests for academic consideration based on health grounds via the online system.** As of Fall 2018, undergraduate students in TRSM and FEAS are joined by those in the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Science in being able to access the online system. The plan is to implement the online system for undergraduate students in the remaining Faculties and the Chang School by the end of Spring/Summer 2019. Consultations with programs will determine whether the service should also be available for graduate students.
2. **That students' uploaded documentation be accepted without the requirement of submitting the original hard copy document to the program office.** If this procedure is adopted, students would be required to retain the hard copy document, in the event that the program department and/or instructor ask to see it or for random audits (which program departments could conduct periodically). In addition, students would be warned that misrepresentation of facts may constitute academic misconduct and would be subject to the processes, penalties and consequences, as outlined in Ryerson's Policy 60: Academic Integrity. Such a procedure would provide advantages of both efficiency and consistency. With a single, campus-wide system, processing times for academic consideration requests will be much faster, valuable staff time spent handling hard copy documents will be saved, and it will be far easier to retrieve documentation and to ensure that it is being universally managed in ways that comply with Ryerson regulations governing the protection and retention of private student records.

The APRC will work with Faculties that are interested in piloting this procedure in Winter 2019.
3. **That the online system be expanded to allow students to request academic consideration based on compassionate grounds as well as to request academic accommodation for student religious, Aboriginal and spiritual observance.** Currently, the online system allows students to request academic consideration for health reasons only. However, the system was designed, and can be readily adapted, to include requests based on other grounds.

² The APRC acknowledges and thanks Dr. Allen Goss, TRSM Associate Dean, Students, for the analysis and summary of the TRSM academic consideration request data from October 2017-June 2018.

Pilot of Self-Declarations

In its [report to Senate \(January 2017\)](#), the APRC highlighted the numerous concerns raised during the consultation process about the policy of requiring a health certificate to document health grounds for academic consideration. For example, Ryerson's current policy on academic consideration allows students to submit the health certificate three days after the missed evaluation. By the time students make their medical appointment, they often show no signs of illness, so health care professionals must base their assessment on students' self-report of illness. In this respect, the current system is a self-declaration system, but with a health care professional as intermediary. More generally, doctors aren't always able to 'verify' certain illnesses. Many illnesses have few or no objective signs, and thus many medical certificates have no real value as the doctor can only repeat what the patient says.

An additional concern is that the use of health certificates places significant burdens on the public health care system, which is paying for an office visit for each health certificate completed; on the student who is usually paying an additional fee to the health professional; and on the faculty and staff who must process them. Medical associations in some provinces (e.g., Ontario, Alberta, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and Labrador) have criticized employers' and universities' requirement of 'sick notes'. They claim that the practice clogs medical offices with people who aren't sick or who are sick but don't need treatment, and they suggest that it represents a wasteful use of resources in the medical system. There are health-related concerns expressed by these medical associations as well. Requiring students to visit a physician's office when they are sick but don't require treatment, unnecessarily exposes vulnerable populations (the elderly, the immune-compromised, and the young) to illnesses.

Given these concerns, some Canadian universities allow students, under certain conditions, to self-declare illness or other extenuating circumstances rather than obtain a health certificate. The APRC saw the usefulness of a pilot of self-declarations, and the Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering (MIE) volunteered to undertake such an initiative. During the 2017-2018 academic year, undergraduate MIE students who were seeking academic consideration were allowed – under defined circumstances – to use a self-declaration form rather than a Ryerson Health Certificate or other documentation if health or personal circumstances significantly impaired their ability to meet their academic obligations.

MIE students could use a self-declaration form if: (1) it was their first self-declaration that term; (2) the extenuating circumstances were acute, lasting for three days or less; (3) academic consideration was being requested for no more than two academic obligations; and (4) the missed academic obligation was not a final exam or group work. If additional requests for academic consideration needed to be made in a term, students were required to meet with their program director and submit standard documentation (i.e., a Ryerson Health Certificate in the case of health-related circumstances).

The results showed that, during the 2017-2018 academic year, 104 self-declarations were used, in addition to 490 health certificates.³ Of the students who submitted self-declarations, 27% submitted only self-declarations with no subsequent health certificate(s). The remainder of these students who submitted self-declarations (73%) also submitted health certificates.

³ The APRC acknowledges and thanks Dr. Jacob Friedman for the analysis and summary of the 2017-2018 self-declaration data in the Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering.

The total number of requests for academic consideration in the department during the pilot period represented a 20% increase over the previous academic year. This seems like a very substantial increase, considering enrolments only increased by approximately 3%. But when breaking down the data based on the way consideration requests were submitted, it was revealed that the number of health certificates submitted was the same number as the previous year, suggesting that self-declarations did not displace health certificates, but added to them.

A close analysis of the data revealed more as well. There was no change in the number of students who submitted one or two academic consideration requests prior to and after the introduction of self-declarations. However, the number of students who submitted three or more requests increased substantially in 2017-2018. Since students could have submitted a maximum of two self-declarations, the majority of academic consideration requests submitted by students who made multiple requests were health certificates. Specifically, students who submitted more than three requests for academic consideration in a year were the ones most likely to use self-declarations and were the ones most responsible for the 20% increase in consideration requests over the year. The department suggested that the availability of self-declarations had limited impact on these students as they would likely have submitted health certificates if self-declaration had not been an option.

The department met with students after two academic consideration requests were submitted in a term to express their concern for the students' well-being and to suggest on-campus resources. However, the department acknowledged the need for guidance on how to conduct these meetings and how to respond to students who continue to submit multiple requests for academic consideration.

The department noted some limitations with the data. The self-declaration pilot began mid-way through the Fall 2017 term, and the online academic consideration request system began mid-way through the Winter 2018 term. Department staff noted a submission spike when the online system went live, which may have affected the results. It was also noted that the department was working with only half of a semester of online data, which limited the range of possible analysis. For these reasons, the department is continuing the self-declaration pilot for the Fall 2018 term, which will result in a full set of data that can be assessed in detail.

Summary

Both the TRSM pilot of the ACR online system and MIE's self-declaration pilot have yielded valuable results as the APRC considers recommended policy revisions. The data from both pilots indicate a high number of academic consideration requests. In TRSM, 20% of undergraduate students submitted at least one request for academic consideration during an eight-month period, with over 6,000 academic obligations requiring alternate arrangements (e.g., make-up tests). The majority of requests for academic consideration were for health issues lasting between two to four days. In MIE during Fall 2017/Winter 2018, 24% of undergraduate students submitted at least one request for academic consideration, with 837 academic obligations requiring alternate arrangements.

In the APRC's view, such numbers have two main implications. First, there are significant benefits to be gained in ensuring the effective management of academic consideration requests of all sorts. Second, there is room for further study of how best to deal with students who, for whatever reason, submit multiple requests during a single semester.

Recommendations

Based on these observations, the APRC makes the following two additional recommendations related to the management of academic consideration requests. The APRC recommends that:

1. **in defined circumstances, verification documentation not be required for students seeking academic consideration due to extenuating circumstances.** Instead, students experiencing extenuating circumstances would, in defined circumstances, self-declare by notifying their Program Department and instructors. Adopting self-declarations would support students who have legitimate extenuating circumstances that affect negatively their ability to meet their academic obligations.

The APRC will produce, for community consultation and feedback, a discussion paper that outlines various models for self-declarations, and the advantages and disadvantages of each.

2. **the use of health certificates – and, if adopted, self-declarations – be monitored over the next two years as more Faculties join the ACR online system.** This monitoring will allow us to assess whether there are cross-Faculty differences in the percentage of students submitting requests for academic consideration during an academic term/year. More importantly, it will facilitate the rational assessment of the extent to which students benefit from the combination of academic consideration and related advising (see #3 below).
3. **Schools/Departments/Faculties be encouraged to develop strategies to address the inappropriate use of requests for academic consideration—either health certificates or (if adopted) self-declarations.** Such strategies could take a range of forms. For example, departments and schools with a high number of requests for academic consideration related to courses seen as challenging should explore ways to support students in those courses. Where the number of requests for academic consideration reveals students who are struggling academically, strategies should be developed to ensure that those students are aware of relevant campus services. Such initiatives will benefit from the added student-specific information that will be provided by the ACR online system as it is extended across campus.

Departments and schools may also consider training for chairs/directors and program staff to ensure that requests for academic consideration are addressed consistently and fairly. This is especially important in the cases where different personnel meet with students who have submitted more than two academic consideration requests in a term, to ensure consistency of the advice being provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcia Moshé, Co-chair
Interim Vice Provost, Academic

Neil Thomlinson, Co-chair, Chair, Politics & Public Administration
Kathleen Kellett, Interim Associate Dean, Arts
Marcus dos Santos, Associate Dean, Faculty of Science
Liping Fang, Associate Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Architectural Science
Jennifer Martin, Associate Dean, Faculty of Community Services
Ivor Shapiro, Associate Dean, Faculty of Communication & Design
Allen Goss, Associate Dean, Student Affairs, TRSM
Samantha Wehbi, Associate Dean, Students, Yeates School of Graduate Studies (YSGS)
Muthana Zouri, Program Director, Communication & Design (Chang School)
Ron Babin, President, Ryerson Faculty Association (RFA)
Salman Faruqi, Vice President Education, Ryerson Student Union (RSU)
José Gonzalez, Student Issues & Advocacy Coordinator (RSU)
Lyndall Musselman, Student Rights Coordinator, Continuing Education Students Association of
Ryerson (CESAR)
Fatma.Abdulrahman, Vice President Education (CESAR)
Donna Bell, Secretary of Senate (non-voting)
Victoria Madsen, Senate Policy & Appeals Administrator (non-voting)

Curriculum Renewal Initiative

Curriculum Implementation Committee's

Update Report to Senate on Implementation of Open Electives

November 2018

Background

Policy #2: Undergraduate Curriculum Structure and the proposed implementation plan of the policy were approved by Senate in December 2017. The implementation plan consists of two phases:

- *Phase 1* requires each undergraduate Faculty to critically and thoroughly review the requisite structure on all of its active courses (over 3000 in the University). A suggested order for the Faculty reviews in this phase was outlined in the implementation plan based on forecasted time commitments for each Faculty to complete their review.
- *Phase 2* requires that programs transition to open electives in their curriculum and that the new curricular mapping for each program be built in the university's Student Administration System (SAS).

The Roll-Out

The implementation plan's roll-out is being led by the Vice Provost Academic, with primary support from the Curriculum Management Office (Office of the Registrar). As a first step, the VP Academic held information meetings with each Faculty to review the revised undergraduate curriculum structure that had been approved by Senate and to introduce the process requirements and schedule for full implementation of open electives in program curriculums across the University. The following timeline shows main milestones, both past and forthcoming.

- **January–February 2018.** Curriculum Management developed and prepared resources and workshop materials to help illustrate and guide the requisite course review for faculty members. TRSM offered to be the first to engage in a review, which changed the planned Faculty order in the review process.
- **February–June 2018.** Curriculum Management introduced the process to TRSM faculty members at workshops in February and March—an iterative process for both TRSM and Curriculum Management. TRSM's initial summary of the review of all its courses was completed in late June. In that same month, a workshop was given to faculty members in the Faculty of Arts—the second Faculty to initiate the review.
- **July–September 2018.** Curriculum Management assessed faculty decisions and the impacts of those decisions on students' access to courses. In the spirit of providing more access, as well as to ensure a consistent application of the criteria being used to make decisions, numerous in-person consultations were held with TRSM faculty and staff. This allowed for a detailed exchange of information while also highlighting issues for further consideration, not just within programs and TRSM, but also with colleagues in other Faculties. The revised compiled TRSM package was forwarded to Curriculum Management in September. In that same month, a workshop was held for faculty members in Community Services, the third Faculty to initiate the review.

- **November 2018–February 2019.** The Faculty of Arts' initial summary of the Faculty review of all courses is scheduled to be provided to Curriculum Management in November 2018. In-person consultations with Curriculum Management staff and with colleagues in other Faculties will then proceed.
- **February 2019–September 2022.** Initially Phase 1 for all Faculties was scheduled to be completed in time for the publication of the undergraduate calendar in March 2021 and Phase 2 in time for the 2022-2023 academic year in September 2022. Based on the experience to date and the resources allotted,¹ the completion of Phase 1 is now scheduled for March 2022. Depending on adequate resourcing, overall completion of Phase 2 may still be in September 2022.

Results to Date

Course requisites are intended to be placed on courses for sound pedagogical reasons: to ensure the student is academically prepared to have a fair chance of success in the course. The requisite review has offered faculty members with a consolidated view of courses to easily identify when the requisites placed on a course are not achieving the desired outcome. Faculty members and program departments have also been able to think through and see the requisites of all of their courses as a cohesive package and to make meaningful revisions. In addition, cross-department and cross-Faculty discussions have been prompted to ensure that course requisites are properly aligned across the University.

The review process has had several results. First, some course requisites have been found to be redundant and/or their intended outcome is unclear. Second, consideration is being given to the many 'flavours' of courses offered at Ryerson in some subject areas. This is often signalled by a course having a string of requisites. For example, some courses have lists of 10 or more anti-requisites. Courses with significant overlap need to be viewed in the same way across departments so that students, regardless of program, can't enroll in more than one of these courses for credit. The requisite review process has identified some of these cases, but there is room for further examination of how Ryerson creates and supports the offerings of significantly overlapping courses. This examination will be especially needed once the implementation of open electives allows students to access courses from across the University.

Changes have also been occurring in how students are able to access information on the course choices available to them. In particular, the approval of open electives by the University has provided Curriculum Management with the opportunity to re-design the degree-progression mapping tool, the Academic Advisement Report (AAR). This redesign has involved a new layout and structure and was made operational for newly admitted students in most programs in Fall 2018, while students who were in progress prior to Fall 2018 remain with the 'old' view to eliminate confusion in their AAR experience.

When originally developed, degree progress reports were laid out to reflect, as much as possible, the presentation of curriculum information in the Ryerson calendar. Requirements were grouped primarily by year and semester taken, with the requirement category (i.e. required, professional, professionally-related, liberal studies) as the secondary grouping. The

¹ The presumed resources were the assignment of two full-time term Curriculum Advising Officer positions to support the project from its inception. Curriculum Advising was able to hire one Open Electives Support Officer to deal with the project's workload in September 2018.

redesigned AAR adopts the 'bucket approach' which uses the course category as the main grouping. This significantly shortens the report and provides the student with a more holistic view of all program requirements. Once open electives are fully operational, this new layout will be able to correctly credit them as open electives. In the past, such courses would appear as 'non-applicable in satisfying program graduation requirements.' When programs finally transition to open electives, there will be a reduced need for the student and program to administer course exceptions.

As the roll-out progresses, the expectation is that more sharing and conversation will occur, and more potential improvements will be identified.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcia Moshé, PhD
Interim Vice Provost Academic
Chair, Curriculum Implementation Committee

Committee Members:

Charmaine Hack, University Registrar
Sarena Knapik, Assistant Registrar – Curriculum Management Office
Linda Koechli, G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education
Marcia Moshé (Chair)
Catherine Schryer, Faculty of Community and Design
Neil Thomlinson, Faculty of Arts
Donna Bell, Secretary of Senate
Janice Waddell, Faculty of Community Services
Bettina West, Ted Rogers School of Management
Stephen Wylie, Faculty of Science

**Curriculum Implementation Committee
Proposed Changes to the Policy 2: Undergraduate Curriculum Structure Glossary
Report to the Academic Governance and Policy Committee**

November 2018

At its meeting on November 5, 2018, the Curriculum Implementation Committee (CIC) voted in favour of recommending to the Academic Governance and Policy Committee minor changes to the Policy 2 (Undergraduate Curriculum Structure) Glossary.

The CIC recommends a revised definition of “Degree Completion Program” as well as the addition of two terms: “Direct Entry Program” and “Reach-back Course”. Degree completion programs are distinct from direct entry programs, and “reach-back course” is a standard term used in Offers of Admission. The proposed changes were brought forward by the Registrar’s Office,

Proposed Change to the Definition of Degree Completion Program

Current Definition: An undergraduate program in which students are admitted to either an advanced level of a program or to a specifically designed, discrete program based on the completion of a public (often Ontario) college diploma program. Other admission criteria may be required.

(Replaces "direct entry" or "post diploma degree completion" program)

Proposed Definition: An undergraduate program in which students are admitted to a specially designed, discrete program, based on the completion of a public (often Ontario) college diploma program. Other admission criteria may be required.

(Replaces "post diploma degree completion" program).

See related terms: Bachelor’s Degree, Collaborative Program, Program, Joint Program, Undergraduate Degree Program

PROPOSED ADDITIONS TO THE GLOSSARY

Direct Entry Program:

A post-secondary degree pathway based on the completion of a public (often Ontario) college diploma program. Other admissions criteria may be required. Entry is into Year 3 of a four-year program. In some cases, reach-back courses may be assigned.

See related terms: Reach-back Course

Reach-back Course:

A course(s) from Year 1 or Year 2 of a four-year program that may be assigned to a direct entry student.

See related terms: Direct Entry Program

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Curriculum Implementation Committee by:

Marcia Moshé, PhD
Chair, CIC
Interim Vice Provost Academic

RYERSON UNIVERSITY POLICY OF SENATE

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM STRUCTURE

Policy Number: 2

Policy Approval Date: December 5, 2017

Next Policy Review Date: Fall 2022 (or earlier if required)

Implementation Date: December 6, 2017

Responsible Committee or Office: Provost and Vice President Academic

1. PURPOSE OF POLICY

This policy describes the curriculum structure of all Ryerson undergraduate degree programs.

2. APPLICATION AND SCOPE

This policy applies to existing and – together with Policy [#112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs](#) – to proposed Ryerson undergraduate degree programs. For certificate programs, refer to Senate Policy [#76: Development and Review of Certificate Programs](#).

3. DEFINITIONS

See Appendix I: Glossary.

Definitions contained in this glossary may be amended upon the recommendation of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC) as part of the consent agenda of Senate. Such amendments do not require or imply a review of the rest of the policy.

4. GOALS AND PRINCIPLES

The overarching goals of Ryerson's undergraduate degree programs and their curriculum structure are built into its legislated objects, its mission and aims, and its Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs). The curriculum policy of the University will reflect those overarching goals, while taking account of how this framework has been evolving in keeping with broader trends in post-secondary education and Canadian society.

4.1 Ryerson's Objectives

The University's objectives are set out in the [Ryerson University Act \(1977\)](#), Article 3, as follows:

The objects of the University are:

1. *the advancement of learning, and the intellectual, social, moral, cultural, spiritual, and physical development of the University's students and employees, and the betterment of society;*
2. *the advancement of applied knowledge and research in response to existing and emerging societal needs and in support of the cultural, economic, social, and technological development of Ontario; and*
3. *the provision of programs of study that provide a balance between theory and application and that prepare students for careers in professional and quasi-professional fields.*

4.2 Ryerson's Mission

Ryerson is known for its mission to provide career-relevant education and must ensure sufficient rigour and depth to serve this mission. The "Mission and Aims" of the University are formally set out in Senate Policy #[103: Mission and Aims of Ryerson University](#), which has also been approved by the Board of Governors. The "mission" is defined thus:

The special mission of Ryerson University is the advancement of applied knowledge and research to address societal need, and the provision of programs of study that provide a balance between theory and application and that prepare students for careers in professional and quasi-professional fields. As a leading centre for applied education, Ryerson is recognized for the excellence of its teaching, the relevance of its curriculum, the success of its students in achieving their academic and career objectives, the quality of its scholarship, research and creative activity and its commitment to accessibility, lifelong learning, and involvement in the broader community.

For the detailed "aims," refer to Senate Policy #[103: Mission and Aims of Ryerson University](#).

4.3 Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs)

The Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs), established by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) and endorsed by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), are part of Ryerson's [Institutional Quality Assurance Process](#) (IQAP, Senate [Policy #110](#)) and establish a framework for defining the attributes of a Ryerson graduate both generally and on an individual program basis. (See also Appendix 2)

4.4 Principles

Based on the overarching goals described above, the following are the basic principles that underlie Ryerson's curriculum policy.

4.4.1 Alignment with UDLEs

The curriculum should ensure that students meet the educational objectives laid out in the Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations, included here as Appendix 2.

4.4.2 Breadth and Depth of Knowledge

Ryerson's goal is to produce graduates who are well-rounded, both intellectually and in other ways, with a breadth as well as a depth of knowledge, and who have learned to think critically and communicate clearly, both orally and in writing. Graduates will gain transferable skills and

the ability to work effectively with others to solve complex problems and contribute to the betterment of the community.¹

4.4.3 Program Quality and Currency

The University is committed to ensuring that all programs achieve and maintain the highest possible standards of academic quality. The strengthening and nurturing of existing programs includes, but is not restricted to, reviews and revisions conducted under the auspices of Senate Policy #126 or #127² that respond to external developments in professions, scholarly fields, and society at large, as well as taking account of interdisciplinary links with other subjects and relevant international perspectives.

4.4.4 Provision of Multiple Curricular Opportunities

While it is recognized that there are sometimes constraints on curriculum (such as external accreditation requirements), students should be provided with, and encouraged and supported to take advantage of, multiple curricular opportunities in order to meet their own educational goals.

4.4.5 Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

Ryerson will continue to make post-secondary education more inclusive. The curriculum in programs should take account of the diversity of Canadian society, not only to ensure the inclusion of all students in the educational process but as a means to enrich the curriculum.

4.4.6 Indigenous Peoples

In the development and implementation of curriculum at Ryerson, consideration will be given to the recommendations of the *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada* (2015) to increase student knowledge and capacity on the histories and experiences; cultures and languages; residential school legacies and current realities of Indigenous peoples in Canada.

4.4.7 Dealing with Emerging Trends

Ryerson students should be encouraged to play an active role in their learning – including, but not restricted to experiential learning – to give them the skills required to deal with emerging trends as they build careers, enter various professions or launch their own ventures.³

¹ As noted in [Policy #103](#), Ryerson aims to “provide its students an educational experience of high quality, fostering in them knowledge and skills, critical enquiry, ethical standards, creativity, commitment to lifelong learning, a capacity to make an early and sustained contribution to their chosen field and to be effective problem solvers.”

² [Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs](#)
[Policy 127: Curriculum Modifications: Graduate and Undergraduate Programs](#)

³ As noted in [Policy #103](#), “Ryerson’s programs should reflect excellence and commitment to teaching that encourages students to play an active part in their learning; a curriculum of core courses and electives which offers the breadth and depth required to appreciate society’s broader issues and problems, and the understanding and knowledge necessary for professional leadership; academic programs which combine theory and practice, directly connected to their professional fields, that anticipate and respond to emerging trends and future societal need; interdisciplinary studies and international perspectives; and activities and support systems that enhance success and well-being of the whole student.”

5. PROGRAM STRUCTURE

An undergraduate degree program normally consists of 40 one-term degree level courses, or the equivalent.⁴

Upon completion of an undergraduate degree program, the student's primary area(s) of study (their "major" or, where applicable, their double major) is noted on the academic transcript and on the graduation award document.

To achieve its goals, the curriculum structure of all Ryerson undergraduate degree programs is based on three broad categories of study, which are defined by their objectives and supported by their regulations.

5.1 Core Studies

5.1.1 Objectives

Core studies provide students with both depth and breadth of knowledge of either a single area of study, or of two disciplinary or interdisciplinary areas of study, establishing an essential knowledge base for a career or further study in the area(s). Core studies comprise the primary area(s) of study which includes the student's "major" (or, where applicable, "double major").

5.1.2 Regulations

- 5.1.2.1 Core studies are defined by the Program Department/School and are approved by Senate.
- 5.1.2.2 Core studies include required courses considered foundational and integral to the program area(s).
- 5.1.2.3 Core studies include courses provided by any Teaching Department with expertise in the subject matter being delivered, which the Program Department has identified as integral to the program area(s).
- 5.1.2.4 There may be choices offered within the core studies of a program. The courses that comprise such choices are referred to as core electives.

5.2 Open Electives

5.2.1 Objectives

The open electives category provides students with the opportunity, based on their career path or their personal interests, to choose degree-level courses outside their core or to gain greater depth and breadth within their core. Open electives also allow students to earn a Minor.

5.2.2 Regulations

- 5.2.2.1 Open electives include all degree-level courses **except those identified as liberal studies courses**⁵ and those courses specifically excluded by Program or Teaching Departments/Schools as follows:

⁴ An undergraduate degree program will normally comprise a minimum of 120 "course hours" (see glossary for definition).

⁵ **Upper Level** liberal studies courses may be directed, by the student's Program Department, to satisfy open elective requirements.

- 5.2.2.1.1 Program Department(s)/School(s) may prevent⁶ their students from using courses that are too closely related to the content of core courses in their program;
- 5.2.2.1.2 Program Department(s)/School(s) may prevent⁶ their students from using introductory level core elective courses; and/or
- 5.2.2.1.3 Teaching Department(s)/School(s) may prevent⁶ enrolment in a specific course by permitting enrolment only of those students for whom it is a core required course (which may include students in their own program).
- 5.2.2.2 Students must meet all pre-requisite requirements.
- 5.2.2.3 Program Departments/Schools and Teaching Departments/Schools must negotiate, and agree upon, any restrictions that are applied. If the Program and Teaching Departments/Schools cannot agree, the matter will be referred to the Vice Provost Academic, who will decide operational matters and may refer academic matters to the Academic Standards Committee of Senate.
- 5.2.2.4 Restrictions on any other basis than those listed in 5.2.2.1 above require the approval of Senate on the recommendation of its Academic Standards Committee.
- 5.2.2.5 All restrictions should be based on sound and verifiable grounds including resource availability (including available teaching faculty), class size limitations (e.g. for studio and lab-based courses), and the presence of non-academic criteria (e.g. the submission of portfolios) within the program's admission requirements.
- 5.2.2.6 In order to maximize student choice of open electives among a wide range of subject areas, Teaching Departments/Schools in all Faculties have a responsibility to offer their courses as open electives to non-program students, within the limits posed by academic and fiscal responsibility and other constraints. Teaching Departments / Schools also have a responsibility to ensure an appropriate number of seats in their open electives courses.

5.3 Liberal Studies

5.3.1 Objectives

Liberal studies are intended, as a category, to develop students' capacity to understand and critically appraise the social, cultural, natural, and physical context in which they will work as a professional and live as an educated citizen. Liberal studies are also intended to develop skills in critical thinking, analysis, and written communication. Liberal studies courses, to the maximum degree feasible, provide a means by which students from a variety of programs may meet to share perspectives on the subject area being studied.

5.3.2 Regulations

- 5.3.2.1 Liberal studies are degree-level courses in disciplines outside students' core area(s) of study.

⁶ "Prevent" includes, but is not restricted to, the application of restrictions, exclusions, or antirequisites.

- 5.3.2.2 Students in all Ryerson programs, except those in the Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science,⁷ are required to complete at least six (6) liberal studies courses to fulfil the requirements of the liberal studies category.
- 5.3.2.3 Courses used to satisfy the requirements of the liberal studies category cannot simultaneously satisfy the requirements of any other category.
- 5.3.2.4 Liberal studies courses are offered at two levels, lower and upper.
 - 5.3.2.4.1 Lower level liberal studies courses are intended for first- and second-year students. Normally, they will be introductory or survey courses.
 - 5.3.2.4.2 Upper level liberal studies courses are more focussed and intellectually demanding, with the standards of evaluation reflecting those that should prevail at the advanced undergraduate degree level.
- 5.3.2.5 The number of liberal studies courses required at each level varies by program, but normally conforms to one of two patterns: three lower level and three upper level courses, or two lower level and four upper level courses. The choice of pattern, and the placement of the liberal studies course requirements within the program structure, are the responsibility of the Program Department/School. Students in any given program must complete the minimum number of upper level liberal studies courses prescribed by their program.
- 5.3.2.6 All liberal studies courses must include a substantial writing component designed to foster critical thinking that:
 - 5.3.2.6.1 requires the student to carry out an analysis of the assignment's subject, and make and justify an evaluative, comparative or explicatory judgment;
 - 5.3.2.6.2 comprises one or more individually-written assignment(s) that is/are completed out of class;
 - 5.3.2.6.3 totals at least 1200-1500 words at the lower level and at least 1500-2000 words at the upper level; and
 - 5.3.2.6.4 has a combined weight of at least 25-35% of the student's final grade in the course.
- 5.3.2.7 The quality of student work expected in the liberal studies writing component must reflect the level of the course.
- 5.3.2.8 The instructor is expected to provide commentary on the clarity of organization, logic, syntax, and grammar of student writing, and explicitly indicate that such attributes will form part of the basis upon which the assignment will be evaluated.
- 5.3.2.9 In addition to the mandatory writing component, liberal studies courses may include a variety of other methods of assessment (e.g., in-class, essay-type and multiple-choice testing, final examinations, field work, class

⁷ The Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science obtained the approval of the Academic Standards Committee and Senate for a variation from the minimum requirement. FEAS programs require two lower level liberal studies and two upper level liberal studies, one of which must be chosen from a select list of liberal studies courses.

- presentation and debates, and assessments of student contributions to class discussion).
- 5.3.2.10 Upper level liberal studies courses may be substituted for lower level liberal studies requirements, but lower level liberal studies courses may not be substituted for upper level requirements.
 - 5.3.2.11 Normally, there will be no restriction on the number of liberal studies courses a student may select from any one discipline.
 - 5.3.2.12 Specific liberal studies courses, due their close relation to a program's core studies, cannot be taken for liberal studies credit by students in that program.
 - 5.3.2.13 Restrictions will normally be determined by the Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee (LSCC), but may be recommended by either Program or Teaching Departments/Schools. Between meetings of the LSCC, the Chair of the Committee may impose exclusions made necessary by curriculum modifications.
 - 5.3.2.14 Program Departments/Schools may not prescribe, either directly or by prerequisite structure, specific liberal studies courses for credit in the liberal studies category.
 - 5.3.2.15 The liberal studies curriculum, within the limits imposed by academic and fiscal responsibility, will maximize choice among a wide range of subject areas.

5.3.3 *Guidelines for the Development of Liberal Studies Courses*

The Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee (LSCC) will develop and maintain guidelines for the development of new liberal studies course proposals, and procedures for the submission and consideration of such proposals, and will publish the guidelines and procedures on an appropriate Ryerson website.

6. PROGRAM BALANCE

There must be an appropriate program balance among the three categories of studies. For program design and evaluation, the following program balance ranges are standard and the calculation is **based on the total number of one-term degree level courses**, or the equivalent, in the program.

Core Studies	60%-75%
Open Electives	10%-25%
Liberal Studies	15%-20%

The Academic Standards Committee of Senate may, in exceptional circumstances and without prejudice, recommend to Senate the approval of deviations from the above.⁸

7. CURRICULAR ELEMENTS

The following outlines the definitions and policies for curricular elements that may be part of a student's program of study and where their achievement is noted on the student's Official

⁸ Some programs, to meet the standards of professional accreditation, have obtained the approval of the Academic Standards Committee and Senate for a variation from the specified program balance. Such existing variations are not affected by this policy.

Transcript. The curricular elements listed below must be approved by Senate, as per the requirements outlined in the Procedures section of Senate Policy [127: Curriculum Modifications: Graduate and Undergraduate Programs](#).

7.1 Concentration

7.1.1 Description

A Concentration is a Senate-approved curricular element that provides students the opportunity to develop in-depth knowledge representing a sub-specialization or emphasis within the core of a degree program or major. Courses for a Concentration are selected from the core elective courses offered to students within their degree program or major. Concentrations are optional.

7.1.2 Regulations:

- 7.1.2.1 A Concentration curriculum consists of at least six, specified/prescribed one-term degree-level core elective courses offered to students within their degree program or major.
- 7.1.2.2 Core required courses of the degree program or major may not be included in the course count/defined structure of a Concentration.
- 7.1.2.3 The completion of a Concentration cannot be made mandatory.
- 7.1.2.4 Earning one Concentration will not increase the number of courses required to graduate.
- 7.1.2.5 Where it is possible, a student may complete more than one Concentration; however, no individual course can be applied to satisfy the requirements of more than one Concentration.
- 7.1.2.6 Course substitutions are not permitted.
- 7.1.2.7 Completion of a Concentration is subject to availability of courses.
- 7.1.2.8 Completion of the degree, with the addition of more than one Concentration, may require the completion of extra courses. Additional fees may also be incurred.
- 7.1.2.9 Students must complete all courses in a Concentration prior to graduation from their program of studies.
- 7.1.2.10 Restrictions [e.g., grade variations on individual courses; a minimum Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA) requirement for completion of the Concentration] are not permitted.
- 7.1.2.11 Any course used to satisfy a requirement of a Concentration cannot also be used to satisfy a requirement of a Minor.
- 7.1.2.12 Students must declare a Concentration(s) at a time specified by their program.
- 7.1.2.13 Completion of a Concentration is noted on the academic transcript, but not on the award document.

7.2 Co-operative Education

7.2.1 Description

Co-operative education is a Senate-approved program that allows students to gain work experience in business, industry, government, social services, and professions, before they

graduate. Work terms normally occur between the students' second and fourth academic years.

7.2.2 Regulations

- 7.2.2.1 One co-op work term consists of a 16 week (4 month), full-time (35 - 40 hours per week), paid work experience related to a student's area of study, and a co-operative program shall consist of 3-5 such work terms.
- 7.2.2.2 Normally, students must successfully complete the minimum number of work terms prescribed by their program to fulfil their co-op requirements.
- 7.2.2.3 As part of the work term requirements, students must complete a work term report and be given an evaluation of their performance by the employer.
- 7.2.2.3 Normally, admission to a co-op program is competitive. Students are selected for co-op based on their CGPAs and other non-academic criteria, such as interviews and/or a written statement.
- 7.2.2.4 Students must have a Clear Academic Standing and meet the stated minimum CGPA at the end of second/third year. To remain in a co-op program, students must maintain a Clear Academic Standing and a minimum CGPA as required by their department/school, or receive Departmental/School approval.

7.3 Double Major

7.3.1 Description

A Double Major is a Senate-approved program with a curricular focus in two areas, offering both breadth and depth within the areas of study.

7.3.2 Regulations

- 7.3.2.1 A Double Major curriculum comprises core studies in two disciplinary or interdisciplinary areas of study.
- 7.3.2.2 The core studies in each discipline or interdisciplinary area in a double major are defined discretely by the appropriate Program Departments/Schools.
- 7.3.3.3 Students may be admitted directly into a double major program in Year 1 or may apply to transfer to a double major program for Year 2.
- 7.3.3.4 To be accepted into a double major program, students must meet the academic requirements specified by both Program Departments/Schools. The requirements may include the completion of specified courses with a minimum final grade and/or a minimum CGPA.
- 7.3.3.5 Additional regulations for a double-major program may be Faculty specific.

7.4 Minor

7.4.1 Description

A Minor is a Senate-approved curricular element that provides an opportunity for students from multiple programs to explore a secondary area of undergraduate study, either for personal interest beyond their degree program, or as an area of specific expertise related to their degree program that will serve their career choice(s).

7.4.2 Regulations:

- 7.4.2.1 Courses in a Minor have a coherence based on discipline, theme and/or methodology, as determined by the program offering the Minor.
- 7.4.2.2 A Minor curriculum consists of six one-term, degree-level courses which may be core, open elective, and/or liberal studies.
- 7.4.2.3 Course substitutions are not permitted.
- 7.4.2.4 All students are eligible to pursue any Minor except those that are specifically excluded by their program department or by the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) of Senate. Exclusions may be applied when the subject area of the Minor is too closely related to the core studies of a program.
- 7.4.2.5 Where it is possible, a student may take more than one Minor. However, an individual course may only be used to satisfy the requirements of one Minor.
- 7.4.2.6 It is acknowledged that scheduling issues such as course availability may prevent individual students from being able to access all the courses in a specific minor in the same time frame as they are completing the requirements for their degree.
- 7.4.2.7 Any course used to satisfy a requirement of a Minor cannot also be used to satisfy a requirement of a Concentration.
- 7.4.2.8 The completion of a Minor may require the completion of courses additional to those in a student's program. Additional fees may also be incurred.
- 7.4.2.9 Students must complete all courses in a Minor prior to graduation from their program of studies.
- 7.4.2.10 No Minor may be claimed twice.
- 7.4.2.11 Completion of a Minor is noted on the academic transcript, but not on the award document.

7.5 Optional Specialization⁹

7.5.1 Description

An Optional Specialization is a Senate-approved program that provides an opportunity for students to enrich and augment their studies by focusing on a specific area of interest in addition to their degree program requirements.

7.5.2 Regulations

- 7.5.2.1 An Optional Specialization curriculum comprises a defined set of distinct degree level courses.
- 7.5.2.2 At least some of the courses in an Optional Specialization must be completed in addition to degree program requirements.
- 7.5.2.3 No course substitutions will be permitted in the completion of an Optional Specialization nor can courses unique to the Optional Specialization be used to fulfil the requirements of a degree program.
- 7.5.2.4 Students must be officially registered in an Optional Specialization.

⁹ Unlike the Optional Specialization described here, *Optional Specializations in Zone Learning* are external to the student's degree program, and require the successful completion of a single non-credit course (CEDZ-100) over a specified number of terms.

- 7.5.2.5 Students may be required to achieve a minimum CGPA for all courses in the Optional Specialization to earn this special designation
- 7.5.2.6 Students must have a Clear Academic Standing in their program of studies to register and continue in an Optional Specialization. Additional academic criteria may be required.
- 7.5.2.7 Non-academic criteria may be required to register in an Optional Specialization.
- 7.5.2.8 Students must complete all courses in an Optional Specialization prior to graduation from their program of studies.
- 7.5.2.9 Completion of an Optional Specialization is noted on the academic transcript, but not on the award document.

7.6 Other

Any curricular element not covered by this policy will conform to the framework established by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance.

8. AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

8.1 Senate

The highest academic authority of the University, Senate has the authority over all curriculum matters as outlined in the [Ryerson University Act](#), the [Senate Bylaw](#), and Ryerson policies, including Senate's [Institutional Quality Assurance Process \(IQAP\) policies](#).

8.2 Provost and Vice President Academic

Has overall responsibility for this policy and any operating procedures that may be adopted from time to time.

8.3 Vice Provost Academic (VPA)

Has administrative responsibility (together with the Registrar) for actions taken under the authority of this policy. Without restricting the generality of the foregoing, the VPA will lead the development of any operating procedures that may be required, will resolve disputes between Program Departments/Schools and Teaching Department/Schools as per Section 5.2.2.3 of this policy; and will chair the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) and the Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee (LSCC).

8.4 Registrar

The operational units of the Office of the Registrar have primary responsibility for the day-to-day interpreting and application of the policy. The Registrar will consult with the VPA and the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) as required to ensure that the intent of the policy is met in its implementation.

8.5 Academic Standards Committee of Senate (ASC)

Has the authority to interpret this policy and make recommendations to Senate about program curricula, including justifiable exceptions, based on the general principles as outlined above.

8.6 Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee (LSCC)

Provides recommendations to the ASC on proposals for new liberal studies courses and other matters concerning the liberal studies curriculum.

The LSCC reports directly to the ASC, is chaired by the Vice Provost Academic (or designate), and consists of the following members:

- 8.6.1 Two representatives from each Faculty (Arts, Communication and Design, Community Services, Engineering and Architectural Science, Science, Ted Rogers School of Management) appointed by their respective Dean.
- 8.6.2 Two student representatives appointed by the Vice Provost Academic following a transparent process that is publicly announced.
- 8.6.3 One Chang School representative appointed by the Dean of the Chang School.

Between meetings of the Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee, the Chair of the Committee may impose exclusions made necessary by curriculum modifications.

8.7 Department/Program/Faculty Councils

The responsibilities of Department/Program/Faculty Councils are as specified by Senate Policy [#45: Governance Councils](#) and by their individual bylaws.

8.8 Dean of Arts

The Dean of Arts has primary responsibility for the administration of Liberal Studies course offerings.

9. RESCINDS

The following Senate Policies are rescinded with the adoption of this policy, but are grand-parented for use by programs until they have completely transitioned to the revised model:

- Policy #7: Procedures for the Preparation, Submission and Approval of Academic Proposals (1975)
- Policy #14: Liberal Studies: Development of a Tripartite Curriculum (1977)
- Policy #33: Program Balance (1977)
- Policy #35: Degree Programs Policy (1982)
- Policy #44: Liberal Studies in the Ryerson Curriculum (1986)
- Policy #64: Change to the Composition of the Liberal Studies Committee (1989)
- Policy #74: New Structure for Administration of Liberal Studies at Ryerson (1991)
- Policy #107: Revision of Liberal Studies Policy (1994)
- Policy #109: Implementation of Liberal Studies Policy (1995)
- Policy #124: Professionally-Related Studies in Tripartite Curriculum (1996)
- Policy #148: Minors Policy (2015)
- Policy #149: Concentrations Policy (2016)

10. POLICY #2 – APPENDIX 1: GLOSSARY

The following nomenclature related to curriculum appears in various University documents and other Senate policies. Other documents and policies may elaborate on these definitions but may not contradict them. If/when IQAP policies change, the change must be reflected in both places.

Definitions contained in this glossary may be amended upon the recommendation of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC) as part of the consent agenda of Senate. Such amendments do not require or imply a review of the rest of the policy.

Academic Year	For the purpose of this policy, the academic year is normally comprised of a Fall term and a Winter term.
Accreditation	see <i>Professional Accreditation</i>
Antirequisite	Courses that contain similar content and therefore cannot both be used toward fulfilling degree requirements. See related terms: <i>Co-requisite, Course, Prerequisite</i>
Bachelor's Degree	An academic credential awarded upon successful completion of an undergraduate degree program.
Billing Units	The measure used to calculate undergraduate tuition fees.
Certificate Level Course	A graded course that may be used to fulfil only Certificate requirements (i.e., is not part of an Undergraduate Degree Program). See related term: <i>Degree Level Course</i> .
Collaborative Program	An academic program offered by Ryerson in collaboration with another accredited post-secondary institution. See related terms: <i>Degree Completion Program, Joint Program, Program, Undergraduate Degree Program</i> . See also Policy #155: Approval of Collaborative Academic Program Agreements .
Concentration	A Senate-approved set of degree level courses within the core of a degree program or major, which is completed on an optional basis. See related terms: <i>Double-Major, Major, Minor, Optional Specialization</i>
Co-operative Education Program	A program that alternates periods of academic study with periods of paid work experience in business, industry, government, social services and the professions.
Core Elective Course	A degree level course that provides choice in the core studies of a program.
Core Required Course	A degree level course that must be completed by all students in a program.

Core Studies	<p>Core studies provide both depth and breadth of knowledge of either a single, or of two disciplinary or interdisciplinary areas of study. They establish an essential knowledge base for a career or further study in the area. Core studies include core required courses and may include core elective courses.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Core Required Course, Core Elective Course, Elective Course, Liberal Studies, Open Elective, Major</i></p>
Co-requisite	<p>A course that must be successfully completed before, or concurrently with, another course.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Antirequisite, Course, Prerequisite</i></p>
Course	<p>The smallest formally recognized academic unit of study approved for inclusion in one or more programs, which has a unique course code, title and description recorded in the annual Ryerson calendar.</p> <p>See specific variants: <i>Degree Level Course, Certificate-Level Course, Non-credit Course</i></p> <p>See also related terms: <i>Course Contact Hours, Course Count, Course Hours, Credit Course ,</i></p>
Course Code	<p>A unique alpha-numeric identifier. The letters identify the academic area in which the course is resident, while the digits indicate whether the course is a one- or two-term course. The digits do not necessarily indicate course level.</p>
Course Contact Hours	<p>The hours associated with a given course which may include lecture, seminar, studio, tutorial, and laboratory hours and such activities as internship, online learning, and independent study.</p> <p>A one-term degree level course is normally a minimum of 36 course contact hours (3 hours per week for 12 weeks).</p>
Course Count	<p>A numeric value assigned to each individual course, based on its course hours, and reflecting its value relative to the 40 courses normally making up a program. For example, a one-term degree level course will normally have a course count of one.</p> <p>Exceptions to the standard course counts are noted in the Ryerson undergraduate calendar.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Course, Course Contact Hours, Course Hours</i></p>
Course Hours	<p>An undergraduate degree program will normally comprise a minimum of 120 course hours. This number is based on the number of courses in the degree program (normally 40) multiplied by the number of weekly course contact hours associated with each course (normally 3) or, expressed another way, it multiplies the weekly course contact hours at full course load (5 courses X 3 hours) by the number of semesters (8).</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Course, Course Contact Hours, Course Count</i></p>

Course Weight	<p>Course academic value is a combination of the GPA weight assigned to a course, the course count assigned to the course and the number of academic terms (course length) assigned to the course. Normally, for example, the GPA weight assigned to a course of 1.0 and the course count of 1.0 will also align with the terms (course length) of 1 academic term.</p> <p><i>Note: there are exceptions to this relationship.</i></p> <p>See also Policy #46: Undergraduate Grading, Promotion, and Academic Standing Policy (“the GPA policy”).</p>
Credit Course	<p>A graded course that constitutes partial fulfilment of certificate, diploma or degree requirements.</p> <p>See related term: <i>Non-credit Course</i></p>
Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA)	<p>A cumulative average calculated as an indicator of overall academic performance. Calculated as the sum of the cumulative products of GPA weights and earned grade points, divided by the sum of the cumulative GPA weights, and rounded up to the next higher second decimal place.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>GPA Weight, Term Grade Point Average (GPA)</i></p> <p>See also Policy #46: Undergraduate Grading, Promotion, and Academic Standing Policy (“the GPA policy”).</p>
Curriculum	<p>The prescribed plan of study, approved by Ryerson Senate.</p> <p>See related term: <i>Undergraduate Degree Program</i></p>
Degree Completion Program	<p>An undergraduate program in which students are admitted to either an advanced level of a program or to a specially designed, discrete program, based on the completion of a public (often Ontario) college diploma program. Other admission criteria may be required.</p> <p>(Replaces “direct entry” or “post diploma degree completion” program).</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Bachelor’s Degree, Collaborative Program, Program, Direct Entry Program, Joint Program, Undergraduate Degree Program</i></p>
Degree Level Course	<p>A graded course that constitutes partial fulfilment of the requirements of an undergraduate degree. Such course may also constitute partial fulfilment of the requirements of a certificate and/or diploma.</p> <p>A one-term degree level course is normally a minimum of 36 course contact hours (3 hours per week for 12 weeks).</p> <p>See related term: <i>Certificate Level Course</i></p>
Degree Level Expectations	<p>The knowledge and skill outcome competencies that reflect progressive levels of intellectual and creative development. Degree level expectations are established by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-President (OCAV’s) and are expressed in Ryerson’s Institutional Quality Assurance Process policies.</p>

Degree Program	See “Undergraduate Degree Program” See also Policy # 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs
<u>Direct Entry Program</u>	<u>A post-secondary degree pathway based on the completion of a public (often Ontario) college diploma program. Other admissions criteria may be required. Entry is into Year 3 of a four year program. In some cases reach-back courses may be assigned.</u> <u>See related terms: Reach-back Course</u>
Double Major	A Senate-approved program with a curricular focus in two areas offering both breadth and depth within the areas of study. See related terms: <i>Concentration, Major, Minor, Optional Specialization</i>
Elective course	A degree level course that is not specifically required within a program of study, providing the student with some choice within the category. Elective courses may be core, open, or liberal studies. See related terms: <i>Core Course, Course, Liberal Studies, Open Elective</i>
Faculty / faculty	When capitalized, an academic unit consisting of teaching departments/schools and established by Senate and the Board of Governors. The head of a Faculty is the Dean. Non-capitalized, the term ‘faculty,’ for the purpose of this policy, refers to the academic teaching staff of the University. See also Senate Bylaw .
GPA Weight	See Policy # 46: Undergraduate Grading, Promotion, and Academic Standing Policy (“the GPA policy”).
Honours	A Senate-approved undergraduate degree designation.
Joint Program	A program of study offered by two or more universities or by a university and a college or institute, in which successful completion of the requirements is confirmed by a single degree document. See also Policy # 110: Institutional Quality Assurance Process ; Policy # 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs ; Policy # 155: Approval of Collaborative Academic Program Agreements .
Liberal Studies	Degree-level courses that are in disciplines outside students’ core area(s) of study that develop students’ capacity to understand and critically appraise the social, cultural, natural, and physical context in which they will work as a professional and live as an educated citizen. See related terms: <i>Core Course, Core Studies, Course, Elective Course, Open Elective</i>

Major	<p>The primary focus of study within a degree program, offering both breadth and depth within a discipline, area of study, or interdisciplinary subject area.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Concentration, Core Studies, Minor, Optional Specialization</i></p>
Minor	<p>A Senate-approved set of degree-level courses with coherence based on discipline, theme and/or methodology. A Minor is distinct from the student's major and is completed on an optional basis in partial fulfilment of the requirements of a degree.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Concentration, Core Studies, Major, Optional Specialization</i></p>
Non-credit Course	<p>A course which cannot be used to fulfil any certificate, diploma or degree program requirements.</p> <p>See related term: <i>Credit Course</i></p>
Open Elective	<p>Degree level courses students may choose related either to their career paths or their personal interests. Open electives allow students to experience subject matter outside their core area(s) of study(ies), to earn a Minor, and/or to gain greater depth or breadth within their core studies.</p> <p>Students may satisfy open elective program requirements with any degree-level course for which they meet enrolment eligibility – with some exceptions.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Core Course, Core Studies, Course, Elective Course, Liberal Studies</i></p>
Optional Specialization	<p>An optional Senate-approved set of distinct degree-level courses that students must successfully complete, where at least some courses in the optional specialization are completed in addition to the student's degree program requirements.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Concentration, Double Major, Major, Minor</i></p>
Optional Specialization in Zone Learning	<p>An optional specialization, external to the student's degree program, that requires the successful completion of a single non-credit course (CEDZ-100) over a specified number of terms.</p>
Post-baccalaureate Program	<p>Requires the completion of a bachelor's degree program for admission. Post-baccalaureate programs normally lead to a second bachelor's degree, a certificate, or a professional credential.</p>
Prerequisite	<p>A requirement, usually a course, that must be successfully completed prior to be eligible to enrol in another course.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Antirequisite, Co-requisite</i></p>
Professional Accreditation	<p>Review at the provincial, Canadian or international levels by professional bodies of some university programs.</p>
Program	<p>See "Undergraduate Degree Program"</p>

Program balance	<p>The percentage of a program drawn from each of the three categories of degree level courses—core, open elective, and liberal studies—in a program.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Core Course, Core Studies, Liberal Studies, Open Elective</i></p>
Program Department	<p>The academic unit (department/school) responsible for the development, delivery and administration of one or more programs.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Faculty, Teaching Department</i></p>
<u>Reach-back Course</u>	<p><u>A course(s) from Year 1 or Year 2 of a four year program that may be assigned to a student in a direct entry program.</u></p> <p><u>See related terms: <i>Direct Entry Program</i></u></p>
Semester	See <i>Term</i>
Senate	<p>Subject to the approval of the Board of Governors with respect to the expenditure of funds, Senate has the power to regulate the educational policy of the University including, but not restricted to, making recommendations to the Board with respect to the establishment, change or termination of programs and courses of study, schools, divisions and departments; and determining the curricula of all programs and courses of study, the standards of admission to the University and continued registration therein, and the qualifications for degrees, diplomas and certificates of the University.</p> <p>See also Ryerson University Act, Article 10.</p>
Specialization	See <i>Optional Specialization</i>
Teaching Department	<p>The academic unit (department/school) responsible for the development, delivery and administration of a course.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Program Department, Faculty</i></p>
Term	<p>A teaching term is 12 weeks, except for Bachelor of Engineering programs, which have a 13-week term. Students are evaluated and awarded credits for successful completion of enrolled courses at the end of each term.</p>
Term Grade Point Average (GPA)	<p>A term average calculated as an indicator of overall academic performance. Calculated as the sum of the term products of GPA weights and earned grade points, divided by the sum of the term GPA weights, and rounded up to the next higher second decimal place.</p> <p>See also <i>Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA), GPA Weight</i>.</p> <p>See also Policy #46: Undergraduate Grading, Promotion, and Academic Standing Policy (“the GPA policy”).</p>
Undergraduate Degree Program	<p>The complete set and sequence of courses, combination of courses, or other units of study, research and practice prescribed by the University for the fulfilment of a baccalaureate degree. Degrees are granted for meeting the established requirements at the specified</p>

	<p>standard of performance consistent with the University's Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs).</p> <p>See also Institutional Quality Assurance Policies (#110, #112, #126, #127) for a baccalaureate/bachelor's degree: honours.</p> <p>See also <i>Collaborative Program, Degree Completion Program, Joint Program, Program</i></p>
--	--

11. POLICY #2 –APPENDIX 2: UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS (UDLES)

The Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs), established by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) and endorsed by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), are part of Ryerson’s [Institutional Quality Assurance Process](#) (IQAP, Senate [Policy #110](#)) and establish a framework for defining the attributes of a Ryerson graduate both generally and on an individual program basis.

EXPECTATIONS	BACCALAUREATE/BACHELOR’S DEGREE: HONOURS <i>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:</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
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 creative process; and b. The ability to use a range of established techniques to: <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 c. The ability to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources
4. Communication Skills	<p>The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.</p>
5. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge	<p>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.</p>
6. Autonomy and Professional Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring: <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; 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 c. Behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.

REPORT OF THE SCHOLARLY, RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY COMMITTEE

Report #F2018-1; October, 2018

In this report the Scholarly, Research and Creative Activity Committee brings to Senate its recommendation on revisions to Policy 144 – Research Centres with a request for approval of the revised policy.

For Senate's information this report also includes a copy of the Policy 144 Working Group Report to the Senate SRC Activity Committee and the proposal for the process to develop a new Strategic Research Plan that the Senate SRC Activity Committee approved at its meeting.

Recommendation

- The SRCAC unanimously recommends that Senate approve the revisions to Policy 144 – Research Centres.

Respectfully Submitted,

Steven N. Liss, Chair for the Committee

SRCAC Members:

- Naomi Adelson, Associate Vice-President, Research and Innovation
- Kelly MacKay, Policy 144 Working Group Chair
- Patrizia Albanese, Chair, Research Ethics Board
- Cory Searcy, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies
- Alexandra Orlova, Associate Dean, Research and Graduate Studies, Arts
- Hong Yu, Associate Dean, Research and Graduate Programs, Ted Rogers School of Management
- Charles Davis, Associate Dean, SRC Activities, Communications and Design
- Jennifer Martin, Associate Dean, Faculty Development, Undergraduate Students and SRC, Community Services
- Michael Kolios, Associate Dean, Research and Graduate Studies, Science
- Sri Krishnan, Associate Dean, Research, Engineering and Architectural Science
- Jane Schmidt, Associate Chief Librarian (Acting)
- Donna Bell, Secretary of Senate
- Andriy Miransky, Faculty, Science
- Idil Atak, Faculty, Arts
- Yuanshun Li, Faculty, Ted Rogers School of Management
- Catherine Schryer, Faculty, Communication and Design
- Cecilia Rocha, Faculty, Community Services
- Guangjun Liu, Faculty, Engineering and Architectural Science
- Brian Cameron, Librarian
- Thomas Duever, Dean, Engineering and Architectural Science
- Eno Hysi, Graduate Student
- Fahim Khan, Undergraduate Student Senator

SCHOLARLY, RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY COMMITTEE REPORT

Report #F2018-1 - October, 2018

At its meeting on October 29, 2018, the Scholarly, Research and Creative Activity Committee (SRCAC) considered revisions to Policy 144 – Research Centres.

This report provides a rationale for the policy revisions as well as an explanatory note for the changes made. The updated policy is included in Appendix A and the Working Group report is included in Appendix B. The SRCAC approved the proposed revisions to Policy 144, shared them with the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC) and recommends that Senate adopt the updated policy.

At its meeting, the SRCAC also approved the proposed process for the Strategic Research Plan development. A copy of the Strategic Research Plan process is enclosed in Appendix C for Senate's information.

Policy 144 – Research Centres

The Research Centres policy was first approved on May 9, 2000. It has not been revised since that time.

As heard during a series of consultations, updates to the policy were required to:

- address a lack of awareness of and adherence to the current policy,
- increase transparency and accountability across creation, operation, and review of centres, and
- improve communication of Policy 144

Summary of changes

- Followed the new Senate policy template and added sections to clarify:
 - Purpose of Policy
 - Application and Scope
 - Definitions
 - Values and Principles
 - Roles and Responsibilities
- Expanded the Research Centre creation process to follow a similar process to Policy 112 - Development of New Programs (e.g. posting of proposals for community consultation)
- Enhanced the role of the Senate SRC Activity Committee
- Introduced a requirement for, at a minimum, a Research Centre to post an Executive Summary of its Annual Report on its website by September 1 each year
- Extended the time between Research Centre reviews, making it so that all Research Centres are subject to a five year review
- Outlined criteria for Research Centre renewal decisions
- Articulated reasons for discontinuation of a Research Centre
- Provided additional detail about elements to be included in the Research Centre terms of reference

**RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE****APPENDIX A****RESEARCH CENTRES****Policy Number:** 144**Policy Approval Date:** XXX, 2018**Next Policy Review Date:** 2023**Responsible Committee or Office:** Vice-President Research and Innovation**1. Purpose**

Ryerson University is known for its interdisciplinary scholarly, research and creative (SRC) activities that cross department and Faculty boundaries. The University sees value in encouraging such strategic collaborations, the potential impact in bringing together a critical mass of researchers around a common theme, and facilitating the mutual benefits and visibility that researchers and the University may find in establishing Research Centres to support such work.

Scholarly, research and creative fields and the academic capacity of the institution evolve over time; therefore, Research Centres cannot be considered permanent fixtures and their continuation is dependent on performance and relevance, which must be reviewed on a regular basis.

The purpose of this policy is to set out the processes for the establishment, operation, review, renewal and discontinuation of Research Centres at Ryerson, including a framework for determining their governance, reporting and review obligations, with the goals of facilitating Research Centres' attainment of excellence and realization of their missions, ensuring transparency, accountability and coordination of effort within the University, and minimizing the liabilities of the Research Centres and the University.

2. Application and Scope

This policy applies to all Research Centres at the University and those groups seeking to establish a Research Centre. While certain Research Centres may use cognate titles such as "institute" or "hub", such titles alone do not imply differences in structure or function and thus do not bring the entity outside the scope of this policy.

This policy does not apply to (i) centres whose function is primarily physical, administrative, or academic; (ii) zones or other incubator/accelerator programs; or (iii) sole faculty member labs or research groups.

3. Definitions

- 3.1 **Research Centre** is typically an interdisciplinary group of Ryerson researchers who have been formally brought together under a common theme or area to create and disseminate knowledge associated with the theme or area. A Research Centre may undertake activities that are not specifically research focused including knowledge dissemination, policy, capacity building or education, but its primary purpose should be SRC activity. The specific title of the Research Centre is not determinative in any regard as to its inclusion in this definition.
- 3.2 **Faculty Research Centre** is a research entity established at the faculty level that advances the specific strategic SRC priorities of the Faculty and reports to a Dean(s) through its governance framework.
- 3.3 **University Research Centre** is an institutional-level entity that advances the specific strategic SRC priorities of the University and reports directly to the Vice-President, Research and Innovation through its governance framework.

4. Values and Principles

- 4.1 Research Centres should build upon and reflect the existing and potential SRC strengths and priority areas within a Faculty or the University.
- 4.2 Research Centres are created and operated on the principles of mutual benefit and mutual obligation between the Research Centre and the Faculty/University.
- 4.3 Each Research Centre will have a clearly defined mission that supports the major strategic SRC objectives of the Faculty and/or University, and adds value to the Faculty and/or the University and/or the communities they serve.

- 4.4 The mission and activities of the Research Centre should not duplicate those accomplished by an existing department / school or Research Centre within the Faculty / University, and proposed new Research Centres should be reviewed in the context of other activities that are ongoing within the University to ensure that the University's overall effort in a given field of inquiry is strengthened.
- 4.5 Research Centres often, though not always, are inter-departmental or inter-Faculty in character, providing opportunities for new relationships within the Faculty, the University, or broader intellectual and other communities.
- 4.6 Each Research Centre should typically be directed by a tenured faculty member, except when justified in extraordinary circumstances.
- 4.7 A Research Centre's focus should be defined broadly enough to attract the intellectual and professional participation of a critical mass of faculty members, post-doctoral researchers, and graduate students and undergraduate students should be involved in a Research Centre's work and activities in significant and systematic ways.
- 4.8 A Research Centre should not be formed except in circumstances in which several faculty members, at least, plan to be seriously involved in the work of the Research Centre, and the Research Centre's viability does not depend on the work of a single faculty member.
- 4.9 Research Centres bring value to the University and while they typically receive University funding and support, they should have a plan that ensures their fiscal viability.
- 4.10 Upon creation or renewal, the University (Dean(s) for Faculty and Vice-President Research and Innovation for University) will document, in a transparent manner, the commitment for sustainable infrastructure and support that will be provided by the University to the Research Centre for a five year term.
- 4.11 Research Centres must demonstrate the University's commitment to equity, diversity and inclusion.
- 4.12 Research Centres operate with academic independence, transparency and accountability, and are subject to all applicable University policies, procedures and guidelines.

- 4.13 Research Centres are created, supported, reviewed, and renewed or discontinued in a transparent manner.

5. Policy

5.1 Research Centre Creation

- 5.1.1 Research Centres are normally established for a five-year renewable term.
- 5.1.2 Participating researchers seeking to establish a Research Centre must prepare a proposal that outlines:
- 5.1.2.1 The proposed Research Centre name
 - 5.1.2.2 The Research Centre's proposed Terms of Reference, containing elements itemized in Appendix A
 - 5.1.2.3 The potential importance of the SRC activities and a statement of how the Research Centre aligns with the Academic Plan, Strategic Research Plan and, in the case of a Faculty Research Centre, Faculty research priorities
 - 5.1.2.4 Any unique and distinguishing features of the Research Centre, and any intersection of the proposed Research Centre with other Research Centres, programs or endeavors of the University
 - 5.1.2.5 The anticipated impacts on the Faculty or the University including associated Administrative Units, Academic Departments and Schools and Academic Programs and the Library
 - 5.1.2.6 The proposed scope of activities, outputs and evaluation metrics
 - 5.1.2.7 How the Research Centre will uphold the values and principles of equity, diversity, and inclusion
 - 5.1.2.8 A proposed budget including expenditures and sources of income, both internal and external
 - 5.1.2.9 Any physical requirements, including any specialized equipment, office and/or research space.
 - 5.1.2.10 Proposed members and membership categories with CVs of the associated faculty and staff.

- 5.1.3 Proposals for Faculty Research Centres must first be submitted to and approved by the appropriate Dean(s) to move forward for consultation. Proposals for University Research Centres must first be submitted to and approved by the Vice-President Research and Innovation to move forward for consultation.
- 5.1.4 To avoid duplication and overlap with existing University activities the new Research Centre's proponents should consult widely across the Faculty / University community on their proposal.
- 5.1.5 At a minimum, all proposals for new Research Centres must be posted on the Office of the Vice-President Research and Innovation website for a minimum of 14 days to allow for review and comments by any interested member of the Ryerson community. The proponents should consider all such comments and feedback received as a result of the consultation process and make any necessary adjustments to their proposal as a result.
- 5.1.6 The relevant Dean(s), for Faculty Research Centres, or the Vice-President Research and Innovation, for University Research Centres, submits the revised proposal and response to feedback to the Senate SRC Activity Committee.
- 5.1.7 Faculty Research Centres will go to Senate for information as part of the Senate SRC Committee report. University Research Centres that are recommended by the Senate SRC Committee will go to Senate as part of the regular agenda.
- 5.1.8 New Research Centres will have a probationary period for their first year of operation. At the end of the first year of operation, each new Research Centre will be reviewed with respect to the attainment of the milestones described in its plan for creation. The annual report will form the basis for the review. At that time, the Research Centre will be:
 - 5.1.8.1 removed from probation, with review and renewal due in four years; or
 - 5.1.8.2 given a year's extension with the expectation of meeting a set of well-defined deliverables; or
 - 5.1.8.3 reclassified; or
 - 5.1.8.4 discontinued.

5.2 Research Centre Operation

- 5.2.1 Once approved a Research Centre must operate in accordance with its approved terms of reference, budget, administrative structure and approved activity plan.
- 5.2.2 All Research Centres must provide to the Dean(s), in the case of a Faculty Research Centre, or the Vice-President Research and Innovation, in the case of a University Research Centre, an annual report by June 30th of each year. The annual report will report on
 - 5.2.2.1 the SRC activities (current and anticipated)
 - 5.2.2.2 the degree to which the Research Centre has met the stated annual objectives and milestones
 - 5.2.2.3 how the Research Centre is contributing to the SRC objectives established for the Faculty / University
 - 5.2.2.4 its financial statement for the previous year and its proposed budget for the following year
 - 5.2.2.5 the next year's activity plan with milestones.
- 5.2.3 The Research Centre must post at a minimum, an Executive Summary of the Annual Report to the Research Centre's website by September 1st of each year.
- 5.2.4 All Research Centres and Research Centre staff and affiliated researchers are subject to the existing policies and procedures of the University and are expected to work with the relevant units of the University including University Advancement, the Office of the Vice-President Research and Innovation, Campus Facilities and the Research Ethics Board with respect to any activities they may undertake.
- 5.2.5 Any modifications to a Research Centre terms of reference must be approved by the Vice-President Research and Innovation or Dean(s) as appropriate and documented in the Research Centre's next annual report.

5.3 Review and Renewal or Discontinuation

- 5.3.1 All Research Centres that pass the probationary period will be subject to a five year review.
- 5.3.2 The five-year review will be initiated by the Dean(s) for Faculty Research Centres and by the Vice-President Research and Innovation for University Research Centres 12 months in advance of the expiry of the current term.
- 5.3.3 The process of review begins with a self-assessment report on the Research Centre provided by the Director to the Dean(s) or Vice-President Research and Innovation as appropriate. On the basis of this report as well as a review of annual reports, the Dean(s) for Faculty Research Centres and the Vice-President Research and Innovation for University Research Centres shall determine whether an independent review should be conducted by an appropriate peer group established by the Dean(s)/Vice-President Research and Innovation.
- 5.3.4 Renewal decisions should be based on an assessment of:
 - 5.3.4.1 past performance as outlined in annual reports and feedback letters
 - 5.3.4.2 financial sustainability and continuing purpose
 - 5.3.4.3 impact/outcomes measured against the Research Centre's stated goals and plans. Specifically, the impact of a Research Centre must be demonstrated to enhance research over and above what would have been accomplished by individual faculty members
 - 5.3.4.4 how well the Research Centre's current activities and future plans align with the strategic priorities of the Faculty and/or University.
- 5.3.5 Upon the completion of the review the Dean(s) / Vice-President Research and Innovation will communicate a written determination to renew or discontinue the Research Centre. The Research Centre has 14 days to provide a written response to be considered by the Dean(s) / Vice-President Research and Innovation.
- 5.3.6 The Dean(s)/Vice-President Research and Innovation may place any conditions on the renewal including a probationary period which would necessitate a subsequent annual review as set out above. Renewal and discontinuation decisions will be communicated to Senate via the Senate SRC Activity Committee report.

- 5.3.7 At any point outside the review process a Research Centre may be discontinued in the event:
- 5.3.7.1 A majority of members of the Research Centre vote for discontinuation.
 - 5.3.7.2 A qualified Director has not been found within 18 months.
 - 5.3.7.3 The Research Centre has fulfilled its stated goals and has no plans for future activities.
 - 5.3.7.4 Lack of submission of annual reports for a period of two years.
 - 5.3.7.5 The Research Centre no longer meets the mandate articulated in its terms of reference or fulfills the requirements described in this policy.
- 5.3.8 In any case the University has the right to discontinue a Research Centre at any point due to financial exigency.
- 5.3.9 In the case where it has been determined that a Research Centre should be discontinued, the Dean(s) or Vice-President Research and Innovation, in close consultation with the Research Centre Director, should initiate a discontinuation process. In any such process care should be taken regarding human resources, financial and contractual issues.

5.4 Identification

No research lab, group or other entity of the University that undertakes research activities should use the designation of Centre, Institute or other wording that implies recognition as a Research Centre by a Faculty of the University without having first fulfilled the approval process set out in this policy.

6. Roles and Responsibilities

- 6.1 The Dean(s) for Faculty Research Centres and the Vice-President Research and Innovation for University Research Centres has the responsibility to:
 - 6.1.1 oversee the governance and budgets of Research Centres
 - 6.1.2 receive the annual report of each Research Centre and review its activities including its financial management and compliance with university policies, and respond to the annual report with feedback to the Research Centre's Director by August 31 of each year
 - 6.1.3 establish a schedule and conduct a review of each Research Centre according to the terms set out in this policy
 - 6.1.4 support the promotion of Research Centres, their activities, and accomplishments
- 6.2 The Vice-President Research and Innovation and Deans of Faculties may participate as members of Research Centres but should not act as Director of a Research Centre.
- 6.3 In circumstances where the Vice-President Research and Innovation or Dean is a member of a University or Faculty-based Research Centre, a declaration of a conflict of interest will be made and the Provost will assign a delegate to act in the role of the Vice-President Research and Innovation for University Research Centres and the Vice-President Research and Innovation will assign a delegate for Faculty Research Centres.
- 6.4 It is the responsibility of the Vice-President Research and Innovation or designate to ensure compliance with and implementation of this policy.

7. Related Documents

Policy 143: Policy on the Indirect Costs Associated with Scholarly, Research and Creative (SRC) Funding

Appendix A: Terms of Reference Elements

A Research Centre will operate based on an approved terms of reference that articulates:

1. Centre mandate, mission and objectives
2. Membership
 - 2.1 categories such as member, ex-officio member, associate member, corporate member, student member
 - 2.2 eligibility for membership
 - 2.3 membership rights and responsibilities (e.g. voting, statement of affiliation)
 - 2.4 term of membership
 - 2.5 procedures for the election and/or appointment of members.
3. Administrative structure
 - 3.1 A description of the proposed powers, duties, responsibilities, and term of the Director(s)
 - 3.2 A description of the proposed powers, duties, responsibilities, term, and general composition of the Management and/or Advisory Board
 - 3.2.1 Whatever entity is proposed must include, for University-based Research Centres, one designate of the Vice-President, Research and Innovation or, for Faculty-based Research Centres, one designate of the relevant Dean(s).
 - 3.3 A description of the proposed governance structure, including the relationship between the Director(s), the Management and/or Advisory Board, and the Vice-President Research and Innovation or Dean(s) as appropriate
 - 3.4 Specification of term limits, if desired, for the Director(s) and for Members of the Management and/or Advisory Board
 - 3.5 A process for the selection of the Director(s) initially and for renewal or replacement at the end of the specified term
 - 3.6 A process for filling vacancies
 - 3.6.1 if a Director takes an approved leave or steps down before the end of the specified term
 - 3.6.2 on the Management and/or Advisory Board
 - 3.7 A process for the Research Centre general operation (e.g. preparation, submission and implementation of an annual budget and work plan)

4. Closure

4.1 Notice of discontinuation

4.2 disposition of assets upon closure

4.3 allowance for costs related to closure to be included in the budget for the final year of operation.

Appendix B

REPORT OF THE POLICY 144 REVIEW WORKING GROUP

October 2018

In this report to the Senate Scholarly, Research and Creative Activity Committee, the Working Group presents the feedback received through the consultation process undertaken from April to June 2018 and from September to October 2018 as well as its recommendations for revisions to Policy 144 - Research Centres.

Recommendation

- The Policy 144 Review Working Group recommends that the Senate SRC Activity Committee approve the revisions to Policy 144

Respectfully Submitted,

Kelly MacKay, Working Group Chair

Working Group Members:

- **Charles Davis**, Faculty of Communication & Design
- **Tom Duever**, Dean, Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science
- **Naomi Eichenlaub**, Library
- **Tony Hernandez**, Director, Centre for the Study of Commercial Activity
- **Mustafa Koç**, Faculty of Arts
- **Michael Kolios**, Co-Director, iBEST
- **Lorraine Janzen Kooistra**, Director, Centre for Digital Humanities
- **Maurice Mazerolle**, Ted Rogers School of Management
- **Nicholas Reid**, Faculty of Science
- **Cecilia Rocha/Fiona Yeudall**, Faculty of Community Services
- **Cory Searcy**, Yeates School of Graduate Studies
- **Bala Venkatesh**, Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science
- **Mohammadreza Vatani**, Graduate Student

POLICY 144 REVIEW WORKING GROUP REPORT

The Working Group is pleased to provide the attached draft revision of Senate Policy 144 for consideration of the Senate SRC Activity Committee and this report of its activities and findings. The revised policy is based on a consultation process that is documented in Appendix A, which included eleven Town Halls, online feedback, and meetings with stakeholders (e.g. Chairs, Directors and Deans). The policy review has been undertaken guided by the principles of inclusion, transparency, and excellence:

- **Inclusion:** the review involved a wide-array of stakeholders and provided the opportunity for diverse perspectives to be included in the conversation
- **Transparency:** reports will be provided to the Senate Scholarly Research and Creative Activity Committee and the SRC Leaders Group
- **Excellence:** the research centres present an opportunity to showcase areas of strength through their impact, funding, contribution to training (graduate studies), collaborations and partnerships, innovation, national /international reputation, depth and excellence of research.

The growth in SRC activity at Ryerson precipitated the creation of Senate Policy 144 on Research Centres (2000) to guide their establishment and contribution expectations. Since that time, and in particular during the period of 2011-2015, there was significant growth in the number of research centres established. The vast majority of centres operate as a Faculty-based centre irrespective of where researchers originate. The review of Policy 144 is being conducted to identify areas of strength, to clarify terms, roles and responsibilities, and to reflect best practices.

As part of the review process, the Working Group undertook a series of consultations in Spring 2018 including Town Halls and online feedback to gain an understanding of what was working well with the existing policy and areas for improvement. Furthermore, because of the scope of recommended revisions to the policy, community members recommended a second round of consultations to review the draft of proposed updates to Policy 144. The Working Group agreed and scheduled additional town halls and online feedback opportunities in September and October 2018.

Common themes heard during the consultations included the lack of awareness of and adherence to the current policy, the need for increased transparency and accountability across creation, operation, and review of centres, and better communication of Policy 144. This review process has provided a spotlight on the existence of Policy 144, the changing research landscape at Ryerson, and the proposed necessary revisions to existing Policy 144, which are summarized below.

Summary of Proposed Changes to Policy 144

- Followed the new Senate policy template and added sections to clarify:
 - Purpose of Policy
 - Application and Scope
 - Definitions
 - Values and Principles
 - Roles and Responsibilities
- Expanded the Research Centre creation process to follow a similar process to Policy 112 - Development of New Programs (e.g. posting of proposals for community consultation)

- Enhanced the role of the Senate SRC Activity Committee
- Introduced a requirement for, at a minimum, a Research Centre to post an Executive Summary of its Annual Report on its website by September 1 each year
- Extended the time between Research Centre reviews, making it so that all Research Centres are subject to a five year review
- Outlined criteria for Research Centre renewal decisions
- Articulated reasons for discontinuation of a Research Centre
- Provided additional detail about elements to be included in the Research Centre terms of reference

Other Implementation Considerations

The updated policy, once approved would apply on a “go forward” basis, and therefore allow existing centres time to implement any changes required to adhere to the revised policy.

The information in this report should provide support for the execution of Senate Policy 144 on Research Centres, and for the identification of potential opportunities, strategic planning, and future directions related to research centres for the Office of the VP Research and Innovation and Faculties.

Additional Feedback Received

In conducting the consultations, the Working Group received information and feedback that did not necessarily fit within the scope of a policy for research centres but nonetheless was important to document and communicate to the Senate SRC Activity Committee for consideration.

There are common challenges faced by centres that might be addressed by dedicated structures and supports at the Faculty and University levels, and a stronger adherence to senate policy. These operational challenges in some cases led to issues with attracting leadership, students, HQP, and broader faculty and interdisciplinary participation in the centres. A majority of Town Hall participants expressed desire for modest ongoing support to sustain current operations. Comments proved to be primarily operational and centred upon a need for:

- Sustainable funding
- Administrative support
- Communication/collaboration among centres
- Recognition of contributions of centres and directors.

During the consultations, the Working Group members heard specific suggestions to improve centre operations related to those needs, which included:

- creating a Network of Directors
- providing shared admin and services support
 - websites
 - media, marketing, and communications
 - events
 - finance and administration
 - space
- conducting an orientation for directors
- providing EDI training to centre directors and to director search committee members including any external committee members
- recognizing centre leadership/directorship (e.g. add a section in the RFA Annual Report to document “centre” membership/contributions/activities)
- sharing best practices in a dedicated D2L or Google Drive
- building common templates to simplify approvals and set a consistent standard for the documentation required for Research Centre proposals, terms of reference, annual reports, review reports, letters of support and membership letters
- using research centres as an asset to recruit and hire new faculty and promoting research centres during new Faculty orientation as a way to enhance research trajectory and community participation, and
- stabilizing operational funding
 - through institutional (e.g., OVPRI, Faculty) grants and matching programs for Centres
 - using the Policy 143 overhead framework to provide incentive for centre participation
 - making it easier for multi-Faculty funding support for centres

In addition, during the consultation process, there was some discussion about the lack of policy and consistency regarding Research Chairs (non-CRC), Zones, and other related entities (e.g. centres and institutes that do not have research at the core of their mandate). There was a perception that people could avoid the requirements of Policy 144 through use of creative naming. There was also a perception that without a relevant policy for these initiatives, there is a lack of clarity and transparency about what the entities do, to whom they report, how they are funded (and by whom), how (and by whom) they are evaluated, and (in the case of Chairs) how the position is filled and for how long.

Appendix A: Policy 144 Review Process

Phase 1

- **Planning & Initial Approval (Completed By May 1, 2018)**
- Presentation and discussion at the January 18, 2018 Chairs, Directors and Dean Meeting
- Initial discussions with SRC Leader's Group at the February 28 meeting to consult on the approach and policy revisions
- Presentation of review plan to Senate SRC-AC at the March 26 meeting to obtain approval of the review plan and formation of a working group
- Recruit working group
- Update to Senate at the May 1 Senate Meeting on formation of Policy 144 Working Group

Phase 2

- **Consultation Phase (Completed By June 31, 2018)**
- Convened Policy 144 Working Group (meeting held April 16) to review policy review plan and approve consultation questions and schedule
- Consultation plan included:
 - town halls (held April 26, May 1, May 7, May 15, May 24 and June 4)
 - Online survey (open from April 26 to June 15)
 - Dedicated web page to explain the policy review process
- Working group met on June 26 and July 10 to review feedback from consultations and provide direction for policy revisions

Phase 3

- **Policy Revision Process (Complete By September 30, 2018)**
- Chair revised Policy 144 based on direction from Working Group and circulated a revised draft to the Working Group for their feedback
- Working Group provided feedback via email by August 27
- Chair revises the draft based on feedback and circulated a second draft to the Working Group
- Working Group meets on September 5 to approve revised policy and fall consultation process

Phase 4

- **Consultation on Revised Policy (Complete By October 31, 2018)**
- Draft revised policy is shared with Deans for feedback
- Draft revised policy is posted for Community Feedback
- Consultation plan included:
 - town halls (to be held on September 24, October 1, October 3, October 4 and October 9)
 - Dedicated website and Online survey (open from September 20 to October 17)

Phase 5

- **Final Policy Review Meetings with SRC-AC and Senate (Complete By December 15, 2018)**
- Working Group presents Policy 144 revisions to the SRC Leader's Group for their input and discussion (October 15 meeting)
- Working Group presents report and revised Policy 144 for recommendation for approval at the October 29 Senate SRC-AC meeting
- If approved, revised Policy 144 goes to November 4 APGC meeting
- If approved, revised Policy 144 on the agenda at the December 4 Senate meeting

PROPOSAL FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW STRATEGIC RESEARCH PLAN

October 25, 2018

OVERVIEW

APPENDIX C

Background

The Strategic Research Plan articulates the University's [key research themes](#) that represent Ryerson's strategic strengths and reflect the diverse scholarly, research and creative activity that is taking place across the institution. The existing [Strategic Research Plan \(2014 – 2017\)](#) was extended for one year and a new one needs to be submitted for Fall 2019 to comply with Tri-Agency requirements. The University is now undertaking the development of a new Strategic Research Plan. The University is also now undertaking a review of its Academic Plan. The development of the two plans will be aligned as together they provide an opportunity to highlight areas of strength and reaffirm the University's commitment to key scholarly, research and creative activity.

Principles to Guide the Strategic Research Plan Development

In line with Ryerson's mission, vision and values, the development of a new Strategic Research Plan will be guided by the following principles:

- **Inclusion:** the review will involve a wide-array of stakeholders and provide the opportunity for diverse perspectives to be included in the conversation
- **Transparency:** regular reports will be provided to the Senate Scholarly Research and Creative Activity Committee and the SRC Leaders Group and communication best practices will be employed throughout the review
- **Excellence:** Areas of strength will be identified based on impact, funding, contribution to training (for example, graduate training), collaborations and partnerships, innovation, national / international reputation, depth and excellence of research

Steering Committee Composition

To support the Strategic Research Plan development, a Steering Committee will be formed that consists of active researchers with diverse experiences, including at minimum one Indigenous researcher and representation from each of the Faculties:

- Associate Vice-President, Research and Innovation (Chair)
- Dean
- Five Experienced Researchers, for example:
 - Canada Research Chair
 - Royal Society Fellow
 - Emeritus Researcher
 - Named Research Chair
- Three Emerging Researchers, for example:
 - Early Research Award winner
 - Royal Society New Scholar
 - Emerging Researcher
- Two students (selected from Senators):
 - Undergraduate
 - Graduate
- Post-doctoral fellow
- Library representative

The Steering Committee will consult widely and will be advised by other members of the University community (such as the OVPRI team, Executive Group, the Chairs, Directors and Deans Group, Equity and Community Inclusion, the Library, University Advancement, The Chang School). As much as possible, consultations will take place using existing scheduled meetings and accessibility accommodations will be made to ensure inclusion in the consultations.

High-Level Timeline/Schedule

Phase 1 - Planning & Initial Approval (Complete By December 5, 2018)

- Initial discussions with SRC Leaders Group (October 15 meeting) to consult on the proposed approach
- Presentation of development proposal to SRC-AC (October 29 meeting) to obtain approval of the plan and Steering Committee composition
- Steering Committee formed
- Meeting with the University Academic Plan Group
- Update Senate on development process (December 4 Senate meeting)

Phase 2 - Initial Consultations (Complete By February 11, 2019)

- Steering Committee reviews and approves consultation questions and schedule
- Proposed consultation plan to include:

Town halls for each Faculty (minimum of 6 meetings) to occur between December 5 and February 6 (target one a week)
Online survey

Dedicated web page to explain the Strategic Research Plan development process

- Steering Committee meets (target February 8 meeting) to review and analyze feedback from consultations and to develop draft themes
- Update to the SRC Leaders Group (target February 11 meeting)

Phase 3 - Consultation on Themes (Complete By April 8, 2019)

- Steering Committee consults on the draft proposed key research themes:

Town halls (minimum of 4 meetings) to occur between February 18 and April 1

Online survey

Update to dedicated web page

- Meeting with the University Academic Plan Group
- Steering Committee meets (target April 4 meeting) to review and analyze feedback from consultations and provide direction for development of draft Strategic Research Plan
- Update to the SRC Leaders Group (target April 11 meeting)

Phase 4 - Strategic Research Plan Drafting (Complete By May 17, 2019)

- Chair develops a new Strategic Research Plan based on direction from Steering Committee and circulates a first revised draft to the Committee for their feedback by April 30
- Steering Committee meets to discuss the draft (target May 2 meeting)
- Update to the SRC Leaders Group (target May 6 meeting)
- Chair revises the draft based on feedback and circulates a second draft to the Committee by May 10

Phase 5 - Consultation on Draft Strategic Research Plan (Complete By June 28, 2019)

- Steering Committee consults on the draft Strategic Research Plan:

Town halls for each Faculty (minimum of 6 meetings) to occur between May 21 and June 19

Online survey

Update to dedicated web page

- Meeting with the University Academic Plan Group
- Steering Committee meets (target June 21 meeting) to review and analyze feedback from consultations and provide direction for revisions to the draft Strategic Research Plan
- Update to the SRC Leaders Group (target June 24 meeting)

Phase 6 - Draft Strategic Research Plan Revision (Complete By August 15, 2019)

- Chair revises draft Strategic Research Plan based on direction from Steering Committee and circulates a first revised draft to the Committee for their feedback by July 15
- Steering Committee provides feedback electronically by August 9
- Chair revises the draft based on feedback and circulates a second draft to the Steering Committee by August 15

Phase 7 - Final Policy Review Meetings with SRC-AC (Complete By September 30, 2019)

- Steering Committee meets to approve draft Strategic Research Plan (target September 5 meeting)
- Update to the SRC Leaders Group (target September 9 meeting)
- Hold SRC-AC meeting (target September 23) to have the Steering Committee report back and obtain approval for the new Strategic Research Plan