

MINUTES OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
Tuesday, November 6, 2001

Members Present:

E. Aspevig	
L. Grayson	G. Cressy
M. Dewson	R. Mendelson
R. Mendelson	G. Inwood
M. Booth	G. Mothersill
D. Northwood	J. Cook
K. Alnwick	M. Barber
C. Matthews	F. Hare
T. Knowlton	Y. Yuan
S. Williams	J. Yee
M. Creery	A. Cross
B. Jackson	D. Glynn
J. Hicks	K. Marciniac
O. Bay	A. Furman
N. Zaver	M. McCrae
M. Dowler	K. Hampson
M. Mazerolle	R. Malinski
J. Monro	A. Pevec
N. Lister	S. Quigley
F. Salustri	G. Turcotte
D. Elder	S. Wicary
K. Lee Law	R. Kup
D. Tsanos	F. Frkovic
N. Parmar	M. Rashid
R. Virji	D. Amernic

Members Absent:

D. Martin
D. Henriques
S. Sabih

Regrets:

C. Lajeunesse	R. Ravindran
T. Barbiero	J. Sandys
S. Wasti	I. Levine
J. Ellimoottil	D. Heyd
K. Penny	

1. President's Report

The meeting was chaired by Vice-Chair Odelia Bay.

Errol Aspevig presented the President's Report, extending apologies from the President for his absence.

Dr. Steven Liss has been appointed Ryerson NSERC representative and will be providing important two-way communication between the University and NSERC.

Ken Jones has been renewed as the NSERC Chair. This Chair carries with it \$500,000 over the next several years.

Budget follow-up from last meeting: Academic Council was assured that no decisions have been made on the process which will be used to determine budget cuts, but that the Deans, Vice-Presidents and other support persons were working to analyze processes used at other institutions in order to present options to the Ryerson community. An early draft of this discussion paper will be available shortly. The process will be open, consultative and transparent. There will then be consultation with the community.

The President and members of the macro-planning group will be meeting with representative of the unions in the next few weeks to discuss the budget. Further meetings with the community are being planned.

Discussion:

Academic Council was assured that there would be full public accounting of the budget forecast, and that fundraising, not just the cutting of funds, would be included in any budget plan. The day's economic statement from the government on dealing with the monetary crisis did not apparently include any mention of University funding.

A question concerning the cost to the University of the cancellation of the architect for the Engineering building was raised and L. Grayson pointed out that the SuperBuild funds were separate from the University budget and that, in any case, the assumption should not be made that there was any severance payable.

Update on University Name: Gordon Cressy presented an update on the history of the name change from Ryerson Polytechnic University to Ryerson University. A handout was distributed and outlined. There is an opportunity for Ryerson to have the name officially changed without opening up the Ryerson Act. In light of the fact that Community Colleges will now be able to use the term Polytechnic in their name, it was felt that this would be an ideal time to do an official change. Three Toronto area Community Colleges have already applied for the name change. This might create confusion.

The vast majority of the members of the Board of University Governors are in favor of the name change, but they asked for community input. Institutional Advancement will work with RyeSAC and CESAR, and place an ad in the student press to elicit student response. There were 60 responses received to the Infoline message included in the handout, which was sent

to Faculty, Staff and retirees. Fifty-three of the respondents approved of the name change. The Press already seems to be using the name Ryerson University.

Discussion:

A question was asked regarding the research, which was done prior to the name change proposal. G. Cressy answered that there were three studies done. In 1998, a Strategic Council interviewed opinion leaders outside the University. In 1999, there were focus groups involving students, alumni, employers and business leaders, and in 2000 there were a variety of discussions with representatives of RFA, OPSEU and students. This led to last November's decision by the Board of Governors.

Several people expressed their support of the name change in order to eliminate ambiguity. Students attending Ryerson University may be surprised or disappointed to receive a degree and a transcript from Ryerson Polytechnic University. Agreements with other institutions need to be formally made using the legal name. It was reiterated that there would be confusion with the new Polytechnics, and that degree designations were already being changed to eliminate the confusion. These new institutions would not be providing programs, which lead to graduate education.

The question was raised as to what would happen if there were a negative vote on the official name change. G. Cressy stated that things would simply remain the same, with references to Ryerson University, but with the formal name remaining unchanged.

Students were assured that University Advancement would be glad to make presentations to student groups on the issue.

Questions concerning the mandate of the University were raised. Some members asked if the change in name might lead to a change in mandate. It was observed that the mandate of the University was unchanged and that dialogue about that mandate could occur at any point. Some felt the mandate of applied education was, in fact, growing, and that it was quite successful.

In response to a question concerning the changing of the official name of the Act, which is the Ryerson Polytechnical University Act of 1977, G. Cressy replied that he did not know what would happen to the name of the Act itself.

Dissatisfaction with the name change process was expressed. It was felt that fund raising efforts were driving the name change rather than all of the issues currently under discussion. Errol Aspevig replied that, whatever the context that initiated the name change proposal, it was a valid proposal with a justifiable conclusion.

Students spoke in support of the name change and the reduction in the ambiguity of their degrees.

Report of the Secretary of Academic Council

The Secretary reported that nominations were being sought for Honorary Doctorate Degrees. Information was available from the Office of the Secretary of Academic Council. The deadline is November 16.

The revised Appeals Forms and instructions for all levels, the revised medical certificate and the form for Religious Observance are available on the Registration and Records web site. They will be available on the Academic Council website when it is finished.

The memo concerning the reformatting of Policies was presented. Two lists, one of those policies which were archived because they had been superceded by other policies, and another of those documents which were proposed to be removed as policies because they were actually not policy, was presented. It was noted that #69, which appears on both lists, should be on the Removed list only. Academic Council was asked to look at the listed policies to determine if they agreed with the designation. Any disputed designations would be referred to the committees or office responsible for review of that policy. Policies not on the list had already been referred to committees for review and reformatting. Some policies would be combined into overriding policies. In the future, amendments to any policy would generate a new version of that entire policy.

The rationale for this consolidation and removal is to generate a usable and useful set of current policies. All policies will be separated into Policy, and Procedures and Guidelines. Each would specify a designated overseer. Changes in procedure could then be presented to Academic Council without the need to amend the policy itself. Narrative reports should not appear in the Policy.

The reformatted version of the policy on Accommodation of Student Religious Observance Obligations was presented for information.

There was no discussion.

2. Good of the University

University Campaign Update

A written report was provided to members and presented by Rob Peacock of University Advancement. It was felt that the impact of the terrorist events of September 11 might have some impact on the campaign, but that often philanthropy increases after such events. Some contributors were holding out until the first quarter of the year, and while the campaign was on target, there needed to be some flexibility in target dates. The next phase of the campaign would begin when 50% of the goal of \$100 million had been achieved. Spring/Fall 2002 is still the target date. In answer to questions, it was explained that the target amount was determined by feasibility studies.

Other: It was pointed out that, in light of the Student Code of Academic Conduct and the concern for plagiarism, it seemed inappropriate for the *Eyeopener* to publish ads for the purchase of term papers. It was noted that this is a student publication and that its editorial policy is not controlled by the University. There was an announcement of an upcoming Ryerson Theatre School Chamber Choir event for Remembrance Day.

3. Minutes of the October 2, 2001 Meeting

The following changes were made to the minutes.

Page 15, paragraph 3: \$2 million should read \$12 million

Page 16, first (A): \$2.8 million should read \$2.4 million

Page 25 third (A): principals should read principles

Page 26 under discussion: member of Continuing Education should read member for Continuing Education.

Page 17: D. Glynn again clarified his statement: D. Glynn inquired about the effect of the Laptop policy on students taking ITM courses who were not in the program.

Motion: C. Matthews moved and J. Monro seconded that the minutes be approved as amended.

Passed unanimously.

4. Business arising out of the minutes

Report on the Distributed Learning Environment in the School of ITM

E. Aspevig reported that when Academic Council endorsed a proposal to establish the School of Information Technology Management as a Distributed Learning Environment in March, 2001, the VP, Academic was charged with pursuing several outstanding items and reporting back on his findings. This was to be done before the program's implementation was formally approved. While the endorsement was based upon the assessment of the academic merit of the proposal, there were issues related to costs, faculty workload and computer infrastructure.

- Technical Infrastructure – It was reported that the technical infrastructure to support the program does exist.
- Workload – The Office of the Associate VP of Faculty Affairs has received the proposal, and has confirmed that it is consistent with negotiated agreements.
- Nature of the Fee – The Ministry has confirmed that the cost of the lease to students would be treated as a non-tuition-related compulsory ancillary fee, with Ryerson acting as broker between the students and the selected laptop vender. As such, Ryerson would realize no profit from the leases. The fee would be tax deductible to the student or, depending on circumstances, their parents or guardians. The fee would require the approval of the Board of Governors.
- Cost to Students – Cost would be \$1500-1600 per year which includes the lease of the laptop, licensed software (worth about \$1000), computer support and replacement, upgrading software and insurance against loss (probably \$500 deductible). This eliminates the student's need to purchase a computer.
- Financial support for students- There are the following supports available: entrance scholarships; bursaries (40 additional \$500 bursaries for entering students); University wide portion of the tuition set-aside bursary program. In addition fundraising is a School priority.
- Consultation with students – In two meetings with the RyeSAC executive, concerns were expressed about the cost/benefit of the program. The conclusion of their report was that the benefits did not match the costs. It was also unclear to them that the employment benefit of the program was not demonstrated. In the second meeting, attended by the

Director of the School of ITM, students were told that the School agreed with many of their points, but that thinking had progressed past the point of the original report. The main issues of concern to RyeSAC were the downloading of costs to students, concerns about student access, implementation issues and the future of such programs in other areas.

Meetings with representatives of the Course Union, including a representative of part-time students, were held. The part-time program students support the DLE, and hope the School would find ways to make it accessible to them. The Course Union representatives said they were also in favor of the program, but wanted to be sure about the implementation and their role in it.

In response to the concerns, three committees have been established to deal with: curriculum issues; implementation issues; bursaries and fundraising issues. Issues not settled in these committees will be referred to the Director of the School and/or School Council as appropriate. This development bears witness to the students' and the School's desire to make the program as good as it can be.

In conclusion, it was pointed out that the DLE, as endorsed by the Standards Committee and Academic Council, meets the terms of the Lap-top Policy, and is supported by both the Course Union students and the School. The proposal will therefore be taken to the next stage.

Discussion:

The issue was raised about the provision of the DLE to part-time students. K. Grant, Director of the School of ITM, responded that this has already been addressed. The hardware and software will be available in the labs, and part-time students will be able to access them. Full-time students require more intense use of the technology.

It was pointed out that at the March 2001 meeting it was stated that if there were a fee involved, a student referendum would be held. E. Aspevig responded that due to the type of fee it is, only a Board of Governor's approval is required. L. Grayson concurred, saying that only fees that apply to all students require a referendum.

The deferring of costs to students was again questioned, assuming that if students are absorbing the costs of the hardware and software, the University will not have to pay for the technology. K. Grant responded that there will be no decrease in lab space, and that the cost of converting three to five classrooms to the DLE technology, in lieu of the two labs, which would otherwise be required, is the same. Therefore, the capital costs are not actually lower.

The issue of accessibility was raised. ITM is a deregulated program in which students already pay \$300 a year more tuition. It was asked if a tuition increase would be added to the program on top of the laptop cost. E. Aspevig responded that other than the already approved cross-the-board increases, there would be no increase in tuition for ITM. L. Grayson clarified the tuition issue.

It appeared to one member that two student organizations had opposing views of the DLE implementation. Academic Council was assured by the students that the views of the student groups were actually the same and that there has been ongoing discussion.

5. Correspondence

None.

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

Course changes in Justice Studies, Public Administration/Psychology/Liberal Studies, Business Management, Interdisciplinary Studies, Nursing/Midwifery/ECE, Nutrition, Applied Chemistry & Biology, and Civil Engineering were presented for information. There was no discussion.

7. Reports of Committees

Report #F2001-2 of the Nominating Committee

D. Northwood presented the report for K. Penny

Motion: D. Northwood moved and J. Monro seconded that the nominees of the Nominating Committee be approved.

Approved unanimously.

Supplementary Report of the GPA Committee

E. Aspevig reported that the committee was submitting the recommendations as outlined in their report of October 2, with commentary on input received both at that meeting and subsequently by email.

Motion: E. Aspevig moved and D. Northwood seconded the motion that Academic Council approve the amendments to Ryerson's "Promotion Policy" as set out in the report of the GPA Review Committee, modified in respect to Recommendation 7 by this supplement.

Discussion:

A friendly amendment was proposed and accepted that, in Recommendation 7, the word "letter" be replaced with "communication."

J. Monro informed Academic Council that electronic signatures are now acceptable in law.

A friendly amendment was proposed and accepted that, in Recommendation 3, the words "That control of" be eliminated.

A question arose as to the residency policy for co-op students. The questioner was informed that this item was not at issue in this report.

There was a question regarding the grade of “inc”, with concern about its use for students unable to complete laboratory courses. E. Aspevig stated that the report had been in development for three years, and that no such concern was expressed, even in the month since the presentation of the report. R. Goldsmith reported that the recommendations were simply clarifying existing policy, and that the use of this grade had not been changed.

S. Quigley moved and M. Dowler seconded a motion to table.

The motion was defeated with 30 opposed, 3 in favor and 3 abstentions.

The original motion was called and passed with 29 in favor, 3 opposed and 4 abstentions.

Report#F2001-2 of Academic Standards Committee

Motion: Moved by E Aspevig and seconded by S. Williams, that Academic Council approve the designation of *Bachelor of Arts (Child and Youth Care)* for students graduating from the School of Child and Youth Care.

Passed unanimously.

Motion: Moved by E Aspevig and seconded by C. Cassidy, that Academic Council approve the designation of *Bachelor of Arts (Applied Geography)* for students graduating from the School of Applied Geography.

Passed unanimously.

Motion: Moved by E Aspevig and seconded by M. Barber, that Academic Council approve the designation of *Bachelor of Architectural Science (B.Arch.Sc.)* for students graduating from the Department of Architectural Science and Landscape Architecture.

Passed unanimously.

8. New Business

None.

9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.