# MINUTES OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL

## MAY 9, 2000

Members Present:

| | |
|---|---|
| Claude Lajeunesse (Chair) | Sandra Tullio-Pow |
| Dennis Mock | Karen Duplisea |
| Linda Grayson | Gordon Cressy |
| Rena Mendelson | Edward Slopek |
| Ira Levine | Mary McCrae |
| Marie Truelove | Matthew Butko |
| Judith Sandys | David Day |
| Marilynn Booth | Michael Finn |
| Keith Alnwick | Leo Michelis |
| Eva Friesen | Lynn Harrison |
| Jack Radford | Katherine Penny |
| Marion Creery | Peter Pille |
| Diane Granfield | Susan Silver |
| David Mason | Juliana Carvalho |
| Juri Silmberg | Desmond Glynn |
| John Hicks | Simboonath Singh (for Don Elder) |
| Robert Haines | Peter Tretter |
| Rosario Amato | Judy Okten |
| Naushad Jamani | Rahim Virji |
| Nazmin Zaver | |

Regrets:

| | |
|---|---|
| Michael Dewson | Charles Zamaria |
| Derek Northwood | Jean-Paul Chavy |
| Alan Kaplan | Beth Moore Milroy |
| Tim Sly | Michael Miller |
| Kamran Behdinan | Kishor Pillai |
| Sharon Frenkel | Perry Chen See |

Absent:

| | |
|---|---|
| Michal Bardecki | Pat Morrison |
| Monique Richard | Linda Sculac |
| Ethan Zon | Amirmakin Aziz |
| Mark Gunaratnam | Erin George |

Prior to the meeting, a short reception was held in honour of Vice President, Academic, Dennis Mock who will be completing his term as of June 30, 2000.

1. President's Report

The President indicated that the Board of Governors had approved the buddget and that copies would be available through the office of Secretary of Academic Council.

2. Good of the University

R. Haines assumed the chair for this portion of the Agenda. The Associate Vice President, Academic, R. Mendelson, announced that this year's recipients of the Sarwin Sahota Award will be Image Arts Professor, Bruce Elder, and Applied Geography Professor and Director of the Centre for the Study of Commercial Activity, Ken Jones. These awards will be presented at the annual faculty conference held in May.

N. Jamani expressed his thanks as a student to D. Mock for the opportunity to be part of the Academic Standards Committee.

Prior to completion of this part of the Agenda, C. Lajeunesse expressed thanks, on behalf of Council, to R. Haines for his work as Vice Chair.

3. Minutes of the April 4, 2000 Meeting

A motion was put forward by K. Alnwick and was seconded by N. Jamani to approve the minutes.

The motion was passed.

4. Business Arising out of the Minutes

There was no business to report arising out of the minutes.

5. Correspondence

No correspondence was received for Academic Council.

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

D. Mock presented information from both Business Management and Applied Arts regarding course changes.

7. Reports of Committees

i. Report #2000-4 of the Academic Standards Committee

D. Mock reviewed the proposed integrated degree/diploma program in Applied Chemistry and Biology/Laboratory Science. He reviewed the context for the relationship

to be established with The Michener Institute for Applied Health Sciences, noting that this proposal would allow for both the degree and diploma to be completed in a reduced amount of time (i.e. five years as opposed to six). He reviewed the governance as well as the policy structures and noted that a joint committee would be created that would deal with management of this program. On page 17 of the Agenda, he noted one correction where "46 one-semester course equivalents" should be "47 ..." and "27 to be taught at and by Ryerson" should actually be "28 ...". D. Mock reviewed the Liberal Studies component. He also reviewed the options that students would choose from in selecting whether to opt for the degree, or degree and diploma route.

A motion was put forward by D. Mock and seconded by R. Haines that Academic Council approve the joint B.Sc. degree/diploma in Applied Chemistry and Biology/ Laboratory Science.

J. Carvalho inquired whether there was any Physics in the program and was informed by D. Mock that within the discipline, this is not present. A question was asked by a Council member how a student could complete a degree and not a diploma, whereupon D. Mock responded that if a student failed a Michener course, he/she

could still continue with the Ryerson component of the program in order to complete the degree. K. Alnwick noted that in implementing the program, a review would be undertaken regarding the potential promotion variations that would be required and this item would be returned to Academic Council in the Fall.

Following discussions, the motion was passed.

ii. Program Review of Hospitality and Tourism Management

D. Mock reviewed the program review of Hospitality and Tourism Management. He reviewed the curriculum breakdown as listed, as well as the admission criteria for incoming students. He noted that the report highlighted various strengths and weaknesses as identified in both the program review and in discussions with the Academic Standards Committee. He noted that there was a comprehensive section for comments from the Committee which is the essence of the report.

A motion was put forward by D. Mock and seconded by N. Jamani that Academic Council endorse Hospitality and Tourism Management Program Review as submitted.

J. Okten inquired what the impact was for the placement rates in terms of the industry. D. Mock responded that one of the concerns of the department was that the entry positions attained by students were lower than they had hoped. K. Penny, Chair of the Hospitality and Tourism program, indicated that they intended to discuss this issue with the industry. L. Harrison indicated that this was an issue that was encountered worldwide and not specific to Ryerson students.

Following this discussion, the motion was passed.

iii. Report #2000-3 of the Nominating Committee

E. Aspevig, Chair of the Nominating Committee, indicated that the Committee wished to bring forward both the report attached in the Agenda as well as an Addendum which had been distributed at the start of the meeting. He noted that the report listed the new members of Academic Council for 2000-2001, as well as proposed members for the committees of Appeals, Standards, Discipline (for 1999-2000) and Nominating.

The motion was put forward by E. Aspevig and seconded by J. Sandys that Academic Council accept the report of the Nominating Committee as presented.

The motion was passed.

A subsequent motion was put forward by E. Aspevig and seconded by J. Sandys that would grant the Nominating Committee the authority to fill the remaining vacancies on the Appeals, Standards and Nominating Committees for 2000-2001 on an interim basis, pending ratification by Academic Council at the October 2000 meeting.

The motion was passed.

iv. Report #2000-1 of the Information Technology Committee

M. Pomerance, Chair of the Information Technology Committee reminded Council that a policy had been presented to them in December, at which time, it was indicated that the policy would go forward to the Board of Governors for approval, once approved by Academic Council. For various reasons, as Chair of the Information Technology Committee, he had deemed it unwise to work on the procedural issues until approval was granted by the Board of Governors for the policy itself. He noted that the Information Technology Committee had recognized that there were a number of issues that required resolution and, as a result, it seemed the best practice to take the Policy back to the

Committee for work prior to proceeding to the Board of Governors. As a result, the procedures section of the Policy had not yet been completed.

P. Tretter expressed concern for the re-examination by the Committee since the Policy had been approved by Council. M. Doucet also inquired whether any light could be shed on what new issues had arisen. M. Pomerance indicated that the intent of the Policy rests on the idea that information technology is a valuable and public resource which is subject to harm coming from anywhere. There were a number of jurisdictional issues which needed to have additional analysis and, consequently, it led to the need for further review by the Committee. M. Pomerance invited additional comments from a member of the Committee, L. Grayson. L. Grayson indicated that she thought the issues had been well summarized by the Chair. J. Okten inquired whether adequate protection was available for the University community pending completion of the IT Policy. M. Pomerance responded in the affirmative.

v. Report #2000-3 of the SRC Committee

R. Mendelson reviewed the basis for amending the Centre's policy at Ryerson. R. Mendelson put forward a motion which was seconded by L. Harrison as noted at

the front of the report as well as on the Agenda.

The motion was passed.

vi. The Course Management Review Committee Report

R. Rosen, Chair of the Course Management Review Committee, reviewed the process and noted the considerable feedback that had been received by the Committee regarding the preliminary draft report. R. Rosen reviewed the structure of the Report, as well as the policy elements and further recommendations included for work to be done by the programs. She thanked the Committee, particularly, R. Goldsmith, for their efforts.

A motion was put forward by J. Sandys and seconded by J. Pearce, to approve the Course Management Policy as presented.

During the discussion of the report, J. Okten inquired whether there was a way to measure progress by the departments in following the report and its recommendations. R. Rosen replied that by January 2001, it was recommended that departments report back to both the Dean and the Secretary of Academic Council. It was recommended by a member of Council that the

report should have a date mandated for reporting back and, as a result, January 2001 will become the due date required by Council. K. Alnwick inquired whether the Policy would be applicable for September, 2000, to which D. Mock indicated that once passed, there would be an attempt to implement all aspects of the policy immediately; however, there will be some elements which will take a great period of time to be implemented. It was expected that all elements would be in force as of January, 2001.

During the discussions in Council, it was noted that this policy would be applicable for undergraduate courses. There were substantial discussions involving whether the faculty had the freedom to use different methods of course delivery in different sections of the same course. This issue was referred back to the Committee for continued work.

M. Doucet, an observer of Academic Council, commended members of the Committee for their work and made a number of inquiries. Particularly, he inquired whether it was sufficient to post a course outline on the website. This issue was referred back to Committee members for discussion. He also referred to page 45, part E of the policy, noting that the heading should be, "Departmental/University Policies and Course

Practices". This was noted as a friendly amendment to the Policy. M. Doucet also referred to Policy Element 3, second paragraph, suggesting that the word, "normally" be added to the one week's notice that would be required. Again, this was seen as a friendly amendment. Additionally, "chair/director", on the bottom on page 45, would be inserted, and on page 47, "incomplete grade form" would be inserted in the appropriate paragraph. All these were considered friendly amendments.

Following these discussions, the motion to approve the policy was passed.

8. New Business

D. Mock invited R. Goldsmith to join him at the table. D. Mock noted that a report from a committee, chaired by E. Aspevig in 1995 and 1996, resulted in two policies coming forward. These policies were being brought forward again for amendment, in light of both experience and new requirements. He then proceeded to review the three factors listed at the front of the reports, which had motivated amendments to the policy.

A motion was put forward by D. Mock and seconded by D. Mason to approve the Development, Review and Approval of New Undergraduate Degree Programs policy.

M. Doucet inquired how circulation of proposals would be undertaken so as to notify the community. D. Mock responded that an E-mail could be sent to the community when appropriate. M. Doucet also inquired as to page 56, second paragraph, suggesting that "Community Services" should be added. This was seen as a friendly amendment.

M. Doucet also referred to section B, paragraph 1. (a) and suggested that it would be useful to source the degree designation that would be defined. He also noted the confusion which appears to emanate from use of the terms "originating unit" and "designated academic unit" as found on page 57, for example. He suggested changes by referring to the word "invoke" on page 61.

L. Harrison inquired why on page 55, paragraph B, "target groups" had been deleted. R. Goldsmith responded that this section would be covered under the purpose of the program as "student interests". He indicated that some negative language had been perceived around the use of the word, "target". There followed a discussion as to whether "target" or "market" was the appropriate term for consultation. In the end, it was resolved that this issue was covered elsewhere. It was also noted that this section of the policy referred to the Letter of Intent and not to the program proposal and, hence, should be more of a general sense for the audience.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the motion was passed.

A second motion was put forward by D. Mock and seconded P. Tretter to approve the Periodic Review and Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs at Ryerson policy.

I. Levine inquired whether brief resumes of the reviewers were necessary. He suggested that an amendment be made to indicate that brief resumes would be presented, if available. D. Mock noted that this part of the Policy was carried out in principle. It was noted by another member of Council that such resumes would give Academic Council a basis for understanding why a person had been chosen for the review. Following subsequent discussions, it was decided that the word "normally" would be added to page 68, under paragraph B.

1. As well, under Section V. A., sentence #2, the word "resume" would be replaced by "qualifications/ credentials".

   Following these discussions, the motion was passed.

9. Adjournment

As there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.