MINUTES OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2000

Members Present:

C. Lajeunesse
E. Aspevig
M. Dewson
I. Levine
J. Sandys
K. Alnwick
T. Knowlton
M. McCrae
K. Duplisea
C. Zamaria
G. Inwood
K. Penny
A. Kaplan
Y. Yuan
M. Miller
K. Behdinan
D. Glynn
K. Marciniec
D. Herder
J. Davenport
D. Hornik
E. Doolaar
G. Cressy
L. Grayson
R. Mendelson
M. Truelove
D.Northwood
C. Matthews
B. Jackson
S.Tullio-Pow
G. Mothersill
D. Day
L. Michelis
D. Martin
J. Pearce
T. Sly
J. Carvalho
S. Quigley
J. Hicks
N. Zaver
C. McCracken
M. Siemiatycki
B. Lozano
C. Wright

Regrets:

M. Booth
P. Pille
F. Hare
J. Yee

Absent:

M. Creery
J. Chavy
M. Finn
P. Morrison
R. Ravindran
J. Tersigni
J. Okten
A. Aziz
M. Butko
S. Singh

1. President's Report

The President, on behalf of Academic Council, welcomed Dr. Errol Aspevig, Vice President, Academic to his first meeting of Academic Council as the new Vice President.

The President noted that the University had passed the $1 million mark in terms of receiving funding from CFI. This was as a result of two applications in Electrical Engineering which had been recently supported. R. Mendelson explained the initiatives presently underway and noted that they expected further funding to be coming in future months.

The President also noted that $1/2 million had been received from the Counselling Foundation of Canada to establish a tri-mentoring program. This would allow us to meet our student needs, particularly for those students in transition. A note of thanks was expressed to Liz Devine for her efforts.

The President commented on the recent visit of the new Deputy Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, Kevin Costante, which represented an opportunity to show the Deputy Minister various aspects of Ryerson.

The President highlighted the recent initiative (announced by the Government) of the Student Task Force, which would begin undertaking critical consultation. This Task Force will be looking at how efficient universities are, and for ways to improve the workings of the university. L. Grayson commented that there were nine working groups that have been set up for the anticipated areas of review. Ryerson will have its own committee chaired by C. Matthews, which will be trying to be proactive in dealing with the Task Force. The review is to be completed by the end of December.

1. The Good of the University

The election of the Vice Chair was first undertaken. J. Davenport nominated C. Wright for the position. This was seconded by D. Hornik. The motion was passed.

C. Wright assumed the Chair for this portion of the Agenda. A presentation was undertaken by the Registrar, K. Alnwick. A hard copy of the presentation is attached to the minutes.

A Council member inquired regarding the unfunded BIUs and the high intake that was represented on the charts presented. The response was that this was a complex issue. It was noted that improved retention was the present goal overall. In addition, it was the University's intention to pressure the Government for funding for the presently unfunded BIUs.

Another Council member inquired as to the ratio of male to female students. The Registrar responded that, approximately, there was a higher number of female students across programs.

At this point in the Agenda, the Brian Segal Award was presented by the President. C. Lajeunesse highlighted the basis for the award, noting it considered both academic and non-academic components. M. McCrae, Director of the School of Fashion, congratulated Adrianna Nanne on both her accomplishments and the impact she had had on the School. C. Lajeunesse presented the award to Ms Nanne, who thanked the Application Committee and indicated that the course union that she had helped create was especially useful.

A Council member requested the opportunity for a member of the audience, R. Haines, to address Academic Council. He invited the Ryerson Community to attend the November 4 presentation of "Requiem in Remembrance of the Genocides of the Twentieth Century". The aim of this program is to educate the community as well as to create an award in Social Justice. The choir that is featured represents a coalition of staff, students, faculty and alumni.

A Council member indicated he wished to raise an issue that was brought to him by the Jewish Students Association. The Association was concerned with Saturday examinations, and the student questioned whether it was appropriate to have students submitting letters to faculty to have their exam dates changed as a result of religious conflicts. He requested that this practice be eliminated. The Registrar gave a review of the issue and the present Policy, and indicated that he will respond to the community's wishes. Various issues were highlighted, including the need to have a practical compromise achieved in order to undertake University activities. While there is presently no committee struck to review this issue, the matter will be considered by the Vice President, Academic who will report back at the next meeting of Council.

At the closing of the President's report, C. Lajeunesse also welcomed C. Matthews as the new Chief Librarian. He reminded Council that Honorary Doctorate nominations close October 13, 2000.

1. **Minutes of the May 9, 2000 Meeting**

A motion was put forward by K. Alnwick and seconded by K. Penny to approve the minutes as presented. J. Pearce is to be added as being present at the meeting. With this amendment, the motion was passed.

1. **Business Arising out of the Minutes**

i) Course Management Review Committee - Supplementary Report

R. Rosen, Chair of the Course Management Review Committee, presented the report. She gave a review of the amendments suggested as well as the two recommendations highlighted. All programs and schools are to report back to the Secretary of Academic Council no later than January 31, 2000 regarding their status on this issue.

5. Correspondence

No correspondence was received for Academic Council.

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

E. Aspevig presented the information from the School of Justice Studies as well as Hospitality and Tourism Management. For the School of Justice Studies, E. Aspevig noted that the number of courses had increased which provided more opportunities for Minors to be acquired. In addition, there was an amalgamation of three tables to one, and an increased opportunity for flexibility in selecting courses. At the May meeting of Academic Council, the degree designation for Hospitality and Tourism Management had been changed and that there had been a discussion of the application of retroactivity. The information presented at this Council meeting was a follow-up to these discussions, with the Registrar having identified the appropriate period for retroactivity.

7. Reports of Committees

7.1 Report #F2000-1 of the Nominating Committee

K. Penny, Chair of the Nominating Committee, thanked the former Chair, E. Aspevig, for his many years of work on behalf of the Committee. With the consent of Council, K. Penny presented a motion to approve all the nominations as presented in the report for the Committees of Academic Council. This was seconded by C. Wright. The motion was approved.

7.2 Report #F2001-2005 of the Academic Standards Committee

E. Aspevig, Chair of the Academic Standards Committee, presented the report. He commenced his comments by reviewing the process for program reviews, noting that an external review of the quality of the process was to be undertaken in the coming months.

a) Program Review of Urban and Regional Planning

E. Aspevig commented on the history and goals as presented in the report. He noted the School was recognized by the Canadian Institute of Planners and its Provincial counterpart, the Ontario Planners Institute. Admission requirements were also considered by Council; as well, the program's strengths and weaknesses were highlighted. It was noted that a peer review was in substantial agreement with the School's own assessment. One correction to the report was made - Dr. Jill Grant is from the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design and not the University of Toronto. The responses to the identified weaknesses were reviewed as were the various comments from the Academic Standards Committee. E. Aspevig moved the motion that Academic Council endorse the Urban and Regional Planning Program Review as submitted. The motion was seconded by J. Sandys and was duly approved.

b) Program Review of Occupational and Public Health

E. Aspevig commented on the program description elements, as well as highlighting the strengths and weaknesses identified in the review. In the peer review, program options were identified as being of national significance. After highlighting the various portions of the report and noting that a follow-up report was due in June, 2002, E. Aspevig moved the motion that Academic Council endorse the Occupational and Public Health Program Review as submitted. This motion was seconded by J. Sandys. The motion was approved.

c) There were two proposed degree designation changes being brought forward to Council at this time.

ii E. Aspevig explained the proposal to adopt the Bachelor of Journalism as the new degree designation in the School of Journalism. It was noted that the degree presently used is anomalous. Various options were reviewed, with E. Aspevig noting that the most appropriate was the Bachelor of Journalism as recommended by the School and supported by the faculty, students and alumni. The motion was put forward by E. Aspevig and seconded by I. Levine that Academic Council approve the Bachelor of Journalism as the degree designation for the Journalism program. The motion was approved.

ii) A second motion was put forward by E. Aspevig and seconded by C. Wright that Academic Council extend the right of degree replacement to all graduates of the four-year Journalism program

who entered first-year September, 1992 or later and all graduates of the two-year

program who entered the program in September, 1993 or later. The motion was approved.

iii) The School of Image Arts proposed to adopt the Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA) as its degree designation. E. Aspevig noted there were two common designations among university programs in this field, with the BFA degree more commonly occurring in programs with a blend of theory and practice which was characteristic of Ryerson's Image Arts program. The bracketed portion of the program would allow for various specializations to be recognized. A motion was put forward by E. Aspevig and seconded by G. Mothersill that Academic Council approve the Bachelor of Fine Arts (Film Studies) and Bachelor of Fine Arts (New Media) and Bachelor of Fine Arts (Photography Studies) as degree designations for Image Arts. A member of Academic Council inquired how the students who graduated from the program would know of these changes. Academic Council was informed that letters would be sent out from the Registrar's office. Another member of Council inquired why there were parentheses for the degree designations, to which the response was provided that in Fine Arts, it was common to have designations noted in such a manner. The motion was approved.

iv) A second motion was put forward by E. Aspevig and seconded by B. Lozano that Academic Council extend the right of degree replacement to all graduates of the Image Arts program who entered the first year in September, 1995 or later. The motion was approved.

7.3 Report #F2000-1 of the School of Graduate Studies

b) Course Management Policy (Graduate Studies)

R. Mendelson presented the report on behalf of the School of Graduate Studies. She indicated that Council had been working on various policies over the course of the past year. For certain policies, particularly, the Appeals Policy and Course Management Policy, undergraduate policies needed to be approved prior to finalization of the corresponding graduate policies.
In regard to the Course Management Policy, this would be for graduate courses.

Graduate students taking undergraduate courses would use the undergraduate Course Management Policy. She identified the principles which were similar to the undergraduate policy principles, noting that courses were not semesterized and that

status was calculated differently. R. Mendelson put forward the motion that Academic Council approve the Course Management Policy (Graduate Courses). This motion was seconded by M. Truelove.

A discussion ensued at Academic Council regarding the participation of graduate students in the formation of this policy. It was noted that the policy was consistent with the practices for undergraduate students, but the question was raised whether the material could be tabled for the next meeting of Academic Council. The motion was put forward by J. Davenport and seconded by C. Wright to table the policy for the next meeting of Academic Council. This motion was defeated. Council was informed that graduate students are present on the Graduate Council and all committees of the School of Graduate Studies. It was also noted that policies can be reviewed once they are in place in order to evaluate their effectiveness.

Council engaged in detailed discussions regarding the timing of this policy, with it being noted that the formation of this policy predated the arrival of the present graduate students at Ryerson. A question was also raised during the discussion as to whether graduate students would be joining Academic Council as members.

Further in the meeting, it was noted that this issue is going forward for consideration by the Composition Committee. A friendly amendment was put forward by C. Wright to have a review date (in one-year's time), added to the original motion. The amendment and the motion were duly approved.

b) <u>Graduate Students' Academic Appeals Policy</u>

In relation to the Graduate Students Academic Appeals Policy, R. Mendelson noted that there is no corresponding Dean of Graduate Studies for the Dean of the Faculty present in the undergraduate Appeals Policy. As a result, there was one tier removed as compared to the undergraduate Appeals Policy. It was suggested that the removal of this tier improved the efficiency and speed of the appeal being processed. It was noted that graduate students would be handled through this process regardless of whether the course was an undergraduate or graduate course. One member of Council inquired about York University courses since there are joint programs for graduate students. R. Mendelson replied that the jurisdiction of the faculty member would be relevant, and this was provided for in

the Memorandum of Agreement (between the universities). Students would be made aware of the respective appeals policy to follow.

A number of Council members expressed concern about the reduction in the number of levels of appeal, and a question was raised as to whether the infrastructure could be increased for graduate students. R. Mendelson responded by pointing out that the faculty advisor would be able to meet with graduate students and could be of assistance to them through the appeals process. The Secretary of Academic Council also provided the comment that the number of levels of appeals would not necessarily have any impact on the due process the student receives while proceeding through the appeals process. A motion was put forward by J. Davenport and seconded by C. Wright to refer the Appeals Policy back to the Committee. In the ensuing discussion, it was discerned that graduate students who wish to appeal presently would be left without a policy on which they could base their appeal, if this was deferred. Both the pros and cons of proceeding to Committee were discussed by Council, with a vote subsequently being taken. This motion to defer was defeated.

As a result of a friendly amendment by the original mover of the motion, R. Mendelson, an additional component was added to the original motion, namely to add that a review process would take place during the coming year. The original motion and amendment were duly approved.

b) Guidelines for the Preparation and Submission of Graduate Programs

The purpose of these guidelines was reviewed, noting it was to provide programs the opportunity to review and modify their program content. A motion was put forward by R. Mendelson and seconded by D. Northwood for Academic Council to approve the Guidelines for the Preparation and Submission of Graduate Program Modification. This motion was approved.

b) Policies and Procedures for Admissions and Studies - Requirements for Doctoral Programs

A similar set of policies and procedures for the master's program was approved by Academic Council in March of this year. Those policies were used as the basis for the requirements for doctoral programs, with modifications in the areas of doctoral thesis requirement and examinations.

One Council member inquired about the ability of a master's candidate to apply to to transfer to a Ph.D. program and vice-versa. R. Mendelson responded that in exceptional circumstances, such transfers could occur dependent upon the individual's capacity. It was noted that admission requirements are program specific.

A further question was raised regarding the time limits for a degree program. R. Mendelson indicated these limits were in the interests of both the student and the university.

A friendly amendment was proposed by C. Zamaria to change the word "occupation" to "studies" on Page 69 of the Agenda.

In addition, the use of terms "years", "semesters" and "terms" would be clarified.

E. Doolaar proposed a friendly amendment to have "two" consecutive terms changed to "three" on page 71 of the Agenda, under the heading "Program Withdrawal".

The issue of residency for graduate students was raised. R. Mendelson indicated there would be program differences. Faculty advisors were referred to in the policy, however, any workload considerations were considered to be beyond the mandate of the Committee. This issue will be considered by other sectors of the community.

A Council member inquired as to what constituted a clear standing for a graduate student. R. Mendelson responded that "B" has been chosen since it is consistent with graduate programs elsewhere. She noted that each graduate course could have its own practice. The timing for the start date for graduate studies was also being considered, with it presently being September 1. Another issue currently under consideration is how many times a student may attempt a comprehensive exam.

J. Davenport put forward a friendly amendment to the original motion which was that a review be undertaken in a timely fashion. It was accepted by both mover and seconder. It was noted that it would not be practical to review this policy until there were graduate students at the Ph.D. level present in the University.

Following conclusion of the discussion, the motion was duly approved.

7.4 Report #F2000-1 of the Research Ethics Board

This report was presented by R. Rinkoff, Chair of the Research Ethics Board. This report was presented for information to update Academic Council as to the

operation of the Committee. He gave a review of the content of the report, noting that this was the first year for the Committee to operate under the recently approved policy. Additional meetings, and a more formal review process had resulted; as well, the pace for review had accelerated. There were two ways to make submissions to the Committee - either hard copy or electronic copy could be provided. Materials could be addressed to R. Rinkoff, and R. Rosen who was working on behalf of the Office of Research Studies. R. Rinkoff gave a review of the issues presently under

discussion for the Committee, including the definition of research and the use of students as subjects. It was noted that this Committee discusses issues applicable to both graduate and undergraduate students.

8. **New Business**

It was noted that only Council members should be attending at the Council table, in order to provide for cohesion of the Council.

As there was no new business, the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.