

Minutes of Academic Council

February 1, 2000

Members Present:

C. Lajeunesse
Marilyn Booth
Edward Slopek
Dennis Mock
Keith Alnwick
Katherine Penny
Kamran Behdinan
Charles Zamaria
Donald Elder
Robert Haines
Mary McCrae
Sandra Tullio-Pow
Mike Bardecki
David Day
M. Juliana Carvalho
Lynn Harrison
Peter Pille
Judith Pearce
Juri Silmberg
Judith Sandys
Nazmin Zaver
Eva Friesen
Linda Grayson
Michael Dewson
Rena Mendelson
Errol Aspevig
Peter Tretter
Naushad Jamani
Rahim Virji
Derek Northwood
Ira Levine
Susan Silver
Michael Miller
David Mason
Desmond Glynn
Leo Michelis
Alan Kaplan
Jack Radford
Perry Chen See
Timothy Sly
John Hicks
Diane Granfield
Monique Richard

Regret:
Rosaria Amato

Absent:
J.C. Eaton
Gordon Cressy
Jean Paul Chavy
Kishore Pillai
Ethan Zon
Amirmakin Aziz
Marion Creery
Sharon Frenkel
Linda Sculac
Mark Gunaratnam
Erin George
Karen Duplisea
Michael Finn
Pat Morrison
Beth Moore-Milroy

1. President's Report

C. Lajeunesse indicated that R. Mendelson wished to introduce a new member of the community. R. Mendelson introduced Mr. Bill Radford, the new Director of International Affairs. Mr. Radford had previously been with the Nova Scotia Agricultural College. She indicated he was meeting with a wide variety of constituencies.

C. Lajeunesse indicated that with the permission of Council, there was a request to amend the Agenda under item 7. The amendment would involve adding a brief report from the Research Ethics Board, #2000-01, which was distributed at the meeting. Seeing no objection, the agenda was amended.

2. The Good of the University

R. Haines assumed the Chair for this portion of the agenda.

P. Tretter asked for follow up to his enquiry regarding the overcrowding in L-72. L. Grayson indicated that a review had been done by the Assistant to the Occupational Health and Safety Office and while some changes had been made with furniture, there was nothing unusual seen in terms of entry or exit although it was recognized there was a significant number of students in the area. No significant danger was indicated.

T. Sly sought Academic Council's position on the ethics of receiving money from tobacco groups, particularly through advertisements on campus. He asked what the justification was

for this, having been told by John Carvalho that the contract for these advertisements ended October 29, although the advertisements were still seen on campus. He enquired whether Academic Council endorsed this practice and, if it did, why it did so, and if it did not, what could be done about this. C. Lajeunesse referred the matter to L. Grayson.

L. Grayson indicated that consideration had been given to this issue. There is a contract with an outside company who provides advertising which by and large, is carefully vetted. Advertisers have indicated that Ryerson is very stringent in its standards. The present advertisements involving tobacco are present due to the difficulty in finding sponsors for non-profit organizations and events. She noted that the ban imposed by the government was effective as of October 2000. The University had not accepted any additional advertisements as of October 1999. She also indicated that almost every week student newspapers promote cigarettes, and as well, Oakham House which is run by the students sells cigarettes. L. Grayson indicated she had objected to this practice at a meeting held previously at Oakham House.

N. Zaver indicated he wished to commend L. Grayson and her team in seeing Ryerson through Y2K "bug free".

3. Minutes of the December 7, 1999 Meeting

Approval of minutes was moved by D. Mason and seconded by J. Sandys. E. Aspevig indicated he was listed as present but in fact, he was absent. With this notation made, the minutes were passed.

4. Business Arising Out of the Minutes

4.1 Courseware Policy Update

M. Dewson was asked to provide an update on the status of the Draft Courseware Policy. He indicated the RFA had indicated to him that they would prefer not to respond directly but through the Joint Committee established by the RFA Agreement. A meeting had been set for the near future and the policy would be reviewed shortly.

4.2 Policy on Information Technology Access and Acceptable Use Update

C. Lajeunesse indicated he had discussed the situation with the Chair of the I.T. Committee, and that there was a review underway, regarding the Policy's applicability to non-academic staff. This policy would then be submitted to the Board at the end of March.

5. Correspondence

There was no correspondence received for Academic Council.

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

D. Mock introduced the course changes proposed for Retail Management. For the course changes from Community Services, he noted that the signatures on the course change forms inadvertently involved the Program Chair and Dean and not the respective Teaching Department Chair and Dean. It was noted, however, that both G. Swede and E. Aspevig, the appropriate Chair and Dean to sign for the course change, agreed with the submission.

D. Day noted a typographical error for PSY806 which should be listed as "Behaviour Modification".

7. Reports of Committees

i. Report #2000/1 of the Nominating Committee

E. Aspevig, Chair of the Nominating Committee, indicated there was one addition to the report presented in the agenda of Academic Council. The Nominating Committee would like to add the name of Olivia Feather, a nursing student, for the Research Ethics Board.

A motion was moved by E. Aspevig, and seconded by J. Sandys to accept the nominations as presented by the Nominating Committee.

The motion was passed.

ii. Report #2000/1 of the Academic Standards Committee

D. Mock presented the report on behalf of the Committee. He indicated that at the last meeting of Academic Council, he tabled the proposed Minor in eBusiness which had now been approved by Business Council. The documentation for eBusiness had been detailed in the last Committee report and was also distributed at the current meeting. D. Mock

reviewed the curriculum, and put forward a motion, seconded by D. Mason that Academic Council approve the Minor in eBusiness.

M. Finn enquired whether ITM had any specialties. D. Mock responded there were two streams in the ITM program, one for telecommunications and one for systems development. He noted that the eBusiness program was not produced solely by ITM but involved instructors from across the Faculty.

The motion was passed.

C. Lajeunesse expressed thanks to K. Grant, the Chair of the ITM program for his efforts in keeping abreast of technology.

Proposed Certificate in Lighting Design

D. Mock reviewed the proposal noting that no other post secondary program existed in Canada in the field of Lighting Design. He undertook a brief review of the material presented, including the curriculum as well as the admission requirements. The motion put forward by D. Mock and seconded by I. Levine was that Academic Council approve the Certificate in Lighting Design.

D. Mason requested that the names of the current program committee members be noted.

The motion was passed.

Proposed Certificate in Geotechnology for Teachers

D. Mock reviewed the elements of the certificate, including the curriculum, the basis for providing the program, as well as the admission standards. A motion was put forward by D. Mock and seconded by E. Aspevig that Academic Council approve the Certificate in Geotechnology for Teachers.

The motion was passed.

Adoption of Psychology Minor by the School of Social Work D. Mock reviewed the proposal to adopt the Psychology Minor by the School of Social Work. He noted that in December of 1999, Academic Council had approved the Psychology Minor which had then been adopted by Early Childhood Education. He noted the curriculum of the Minor was identical to that approved by Council in December. D. Mock put forward a motion seconded by S. Silver that Academic Council approve the inclusion of the Psychology Minor in the Social Work Program.

The motion was passed.

Program Review - Chemical Engineering

D. Mock noted this was the last of the Engineering Programs to complete the cycle of engineering reviews. The program had undergone the professional accreditation process through CEAB, which had been completed in 1997. D. Mock reviewed the curriculum, the admission references, and the review process. He also

noted the strengths and weaknesses, noting the various responses as presented. A motion was moved by D. Mock and seconded by D. Northwood that Academic Council endorse the Chemical Engineering review as submitted.

The motion was passed.

Program Review - Nursing: Post Diploma Degree Program

D. Mock noted that this review involved the post diploma program and not the regular four-year program for Nursing. He reviewed the curriculum, noting the program was offered part and full time. He also noted that all incoming graduates were from the CAATS who had diplomas. He noted the demand for the program was strong. D. Mock reviewed the strengths and weaknesses of the program as well as the responses to identified limitations. A motion was put forward by D. Mock, and seconded by J. Sandys that Academic Council endorse the Nursing Post Diploma Program review as submitted.

M. Finn noted a typographical error on page 34 of the report where there appeared to be a floating "s" in the last paragraph. He also enquired whether there were plans to give Nursing faculty individual offices. D. Mock responded that plans were in the works although it was somewhat dependent on the Superbuild Fund initiative. M. Finn also enquired whether the Ph.D initiative was a realistic goal for the Nursing Faculty. D. Mock indicated he had spoken with University of Calgary and University of Victoria faculty regarding this approach and suitable steps will be taken. E. Aspevig commented that the report was commendable and reflected a good process.

The motion was passed.

iii Report #2000/1 of the SRC Committee

R. Mendelson presented the report on behalf of the SRC committee. She noted that the process of updating various SRC policies was well under way. She reviewed the principles of the Animal Care Policy, as well as various modifications to the present policy in place. She noted that this document ensured that animals would be cared for properly, and would only be used when essential. In addition, another modification was that the procedure to review animal care matters would be changed with a separate committee from the Research Ethics Board. A motion was put forward by R. Mendelson and seconded by E. Aspevig that Academic Council approve the revised Policy on Ethics Review of Research

Involving Animals replacing Academic Council policy of February 2, 1988.

J. Hicks enquired whether research which occurred in departments such as Chemistry and Biology were in compliance with this policy. R. Mendelson responded that there were no present studies underway that did not measure up to the standards indicated in the policy. She noted that while fish were not yet fully documented, the documentation process for fish was under way.

N. Zaver enquired regarding page 39 of the document and the involvement of students. It was noted that students would be involved on the committee at Ryerson.

M. Bardecki made an enquiry regarding policy language. R. Mendelson indicated that animals used in both research and experimentation would be covered under this policy. M. Doucet noted a number of typographical errors particularly page 40 where the term "Board" was used twice. R. Mendelson acknowledged a number of typographical errors and indicated that the term should be "Animal Care Committee". M. Doucet also enquired regarding section 3.2 of the policy and whether there were any veterinarians on campus and what the level of imposition would be to serve on the committee. R. Mendelson indicated that they will need to identify someone who could act as a veterinarian on the committee; they would look into future expansion of the committee if it becomes an imposition on the external member.

The motion was passed.

iv. Report #2000-2001 of the Research Ethics Board

R. Mendelson put forward the motion that the quorum be changed for the Research Ethics Board, specifically the motion made was "that Academic Council amend the policy for ethical conduct and research involving human subjects to modify the quorum for the Research Ethics Board from 7 voting members to 6 voting members in keeping with the standard practice of Academic Council's standing committees." The motion was seconded by R. Haines.

The motion was passed.

8. New Business

Course Management Review Committee - Interim Update

Academic Council entered into a Committee of the Whole discussion with S. Silver as the Chair. (No minutes were taken during Committee of the Whole.) A subsequent motion was made by K. Alnwick, and seconded by D. Mock that the Committee rise and report. S. Silver reported that feedback would be provided to the Course Management Review Committee as soon as possible, and that the final report would be due from the Committee at the April Academic Council meeting.

Academic Appeals Policy

A motion was put forward by N. Zaver and seconded by D. Mason that Academic Council approve the Academic Appeals Policy and thus replace all previous student academic appeals policies of Academic Council.

K. Kwan, Secretary of Academic Council, presented the draft policy to Academic Council. She noted that there were two amendments to the policy, specifically, page 4 of the policy, part B3.2, paragraph 1, in which an additional sentence should be added to paragraph 1 which should read "Access to final exams cannot be extended past the end of the next term (for semester courses) or year (for two semester courses)". She indicated this amendment had been suggested by D. Little from the Registrar's Office. This amendment was considered a friendly amendment.

The second amendment proposed was on page 12 of the policy for part D1, paragraph 5 in which the last sentence would read "the Chair/Director's decision is final and there are no further avenues of appeal during the semester". This amendment was also considered a friendly amendment.

K. Kwan thanked the various constituencies for their input provided throughout the drafting process, and invited the Committee to provide feedback on the draft. P. Tretter moved a motion seconded by N. Jamani for an amendment to page 7 of the policy, part B3.6 paragraph 3 such that two business days would be replaced by five business days.

J. Sandys expressed concern that the time for appeals would be extended to the disadvantage of students. She suggested that two days could be extended to three. M. Bardecki supported the recommendation of three days. D. Mason suggested that if our students received mail outside of Toronto, a longer extension of time was appropriate. K. Alnwick raised a point of order, enquiring whether the delivery time would be logged against the response time. K. Kwan responded that these time periods were independent of each other.

The Committee voted on the amendment to the motion and it was passed.

P. Tretter enquired regarding page 13 of the policy and the Calculation Error or Omission. He enquired whether Merit of Work should proceed beyond the Dean. D. Mock responded that this type of appeal is based on the expertise of the department, and hence at the level of an Academic Council Committee that expertise would be lost. He noted that Merit of Work appeals did not go beyond the level of the department at other universities.

J. Sandys raised the issue of replacing the word "should" with "will normally". After subsequent discussion by the Committee, it was decided that this replacement should occur appropriately throughout the document although there will be exceptions to be noted.

J. Sandys put forward a friendly amendment which was to have the words "Dean/Designate" added throughout the policy wherever the term "Dean" appeared.

K. Alnwick put forward the recommendation that an amendment was needed for clarification for page 3 of the policy, part B paragraph 4. "Continuing Education courses in which the student may be enrolled will not be affected by the standing determination." This was a friendly amendment.

J. Hicks enquired how C.E. appeals would be dealt with and whether there was any differentiation. D. Glynn indicated that a number of areas had been reviewed by the C.E. Division, and that there would be improved consultation between the Academic Directors and the Coordinators in order to expedite the appeals process.

At the request of K. Kwan, D. Loney raised the issue of students providing copies of their appeals as referred to in the By-laws for the Academic Appeals Committee. He indicated he was concerned regarding the cost and noted that past practice of the Committee and the policy, was that the student did not provide copies.

R. Haines put forward the motion seconded by P. Tretter to amend the By-laws, page 3, paragraph 2 to remove the sentence "11 copies of all appeal materials must be submitted."

This motion to amend was passed.

J. Carvalho raised the issue of appeal fees. C. Lajeunesse responded that a decision had been made at a prior meeting of Academic Council that appeal fees should not be implemented at this time although the issue could be revisited in a few years.

M. Finn put forward a friendly amendment to the main motion, which was to amend the title in part D1, page 11. The new title would read "Request Made During A Semester on Medical or

Compassionate Grounds (Inability to Complete Term Work)".

A motion to table the policy to the next meeting of Academic Council was put forward by D. Mason and seconded by E. Aspevig.

The motion was passed.

9. Adjournment

Seeing as there was no other new business, Academic Council adjourned at 7:40 pm.