

**MINUTES OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING**  
**Tuesday, January 15, 2002**

**Members Present:**

C. Lajeunesse	E. Aspevig
L. Grayson	G. Cressy
M. Dewson	R. Mendelson
J. Sandys	I. Levine
M. Booth	C. Cassidy
D. Northwood	J. Cook
K. Alnwick	M. Barber
C. Matthews	F. Hare
T. Knowlton	Y. Yuan
S. Williams	M. Creery
A. Cross	D. Glynn
J. Hicks	K. Marciniec
O. Bay	N. Zaver
M. McCrae	M. Dowler
T. Barbiero	K. Penny
K. Hampson	D. Martin
M. Mazerolle	R. Malinski
J. Monro	A. Pevec
N. Lister	S. Quigley
R. Ravindran	G. Turcotte
D. Heyd	D. Elder
S. Wicary	K. Lee Law
R. Kup	D. Tsanos
N. Parmar	R. Virji
M. Ward	R. Fleming
R. Rodrigues	

**Members Absent:**

J. Yee	S. Sabih
F. Frkovic	S. Wasti
M. Rashid	D. Amernic

**Regrets:**

B. Jackson	J. Ellimootttil
F. Salustri	L. Lum
G. Inwood	G. Mothersill
A. Furman	D. Henriques

## **1. President's Report**

The School of Health Services Management has received full undergraduate certification by the Association of University Programs in Health Administration. It is the first time this organization has recognized an undergraduate program outside of the United States.

Drs. Susan Silver, Sue Wilson and Rachel Berman have received an HRDC research grant of over \$626,359. Drs. Mehru Ali, Kenise Kilbride and Judith Berhard, all members of the School of Early Childhood Education, have received HRDC grants totaling \$800,000.

The President will give the State of the University Address on Monday, January 28, 2002 at 3:00 p.m. in The Commons, Room A-250. The Board of Governors meeting will follow.

The President discussed the issue of inappropriate graffiti found in Kerr Hall. It was confirmed that all of the necessary information has been sent to the police for investigation. The graffiti was photographed and then covered as per University policy. The President spent time on Saturday inspecting the graffiti and was satisfied that it had been properly removed. This is considered a very serious matter, and any of the vandals will be prosecuted to the full extent of Ryerson policy and the law. As of now, there is no proof that these vandals were members of the Ryerson community, and since this is an area often visited by others, they may well not be. This is not usual Ryerson behaviour. This is the Ryerson community's problem and everyone is asked to report such incidents as soon as possible.

## **2. Report of the Secretary of Academic Council**

Two reformatted polices: Missions and Aims of Ryerson University, and Course Management were distributed in the agenda. They will be available on the website and distributed to the departments and schools.

The revised timeline for Academic Council elections was distributed with the agenda.

## **3. The Good of the University**

Odelia Bay thanked the organizing committee for the December 6, 2001 Memorial.

## **4. Minutes of the December 4, 2001 Meeting**

**Motion: To approve the minutes**

**R. Pevec moved and C. Matthews seconded**

Correction: R. Malinski was in attendance.

**Passed unanimously.**

## **5. Business Arising out of the Minutes**

### **5.1 Discussion Paper on Academic Planning, Budget Adjustments and Long-Term Restructuring**

The Vice-President Academic asked if there was any discussion of the Discussion Paper. In December, an invitation had been sent to the community for email responses to the Paper, and two were received. There will be an informal consultation with the community on Thursday, January 17 in Room A-250 from 1:00-3:00 so that the Vice-President and others can get advice on how to proceed. The time is stretched over two hours so people can come when

they can. The Vice-President is also meeting with the Faculty of Business. There will be more consultations if needed.

There was no further discussion.

## **6. Correspondence**

None

## **7. Reports of Actions and Recommendations of Departments and Divisional Councils**

E. Aspevig presented the curricular changes in Business, Community Services and Engineering, and Applied Science. Two additional forms were distributed for changes in Nursing and Midwifery.

There was a question as to whether any of the changes were the result of budgetary reductions. The Vice-President assured Academic Council that all reductions in program hours were brought to the Academic Standards Committee and they would be judged on their academic merit. It is realized that the question stems from concerns that budget issues are driving academic change, but the Academic Standards Committee will not bring forth a recommendation for any proposal which is not academically sound.

There is an error in the form on Page 25 from Social Work. SWP 927 should be added to the Professionally-Related Elective group, not Liberal Studies.

**Motion: That Academic Council approve the name change of the *Department of Civil Engineering - School of Civil Engineering* to “*Department of Civil Engineering*”.**

D. Northwood felt this motion was not necessary as that was already the name of the department.

**D. Northwood seconded.**

**Passed unanimously.**

## **8. Reports of Committees**

### **8.1 Report of the Nominating Committee**

Katherine Penny presented the report nominating Richard Fleming and Melanie Ward as alumni representatives to Academic Council, and Lucy Gallo as student representative to the Learning & Teaching Committee.

**Motion: That Academic Council approve the nominees as presented in the report of the Nominating Committee.**

**Seconded by J. Sandys.**

**Passed unanimously.**

### **8.2 Report of the Composition and By-Laws Committee**

An amended page 31 was distributed.

The President, who is Chair of the Committee, presented the report. All language in the By-Laws has been updated. This is the first of two parts of the By-Laws which will be brought to Academic Council. The first part of this report is concerned with the composition of Academic Council. The proposed changes were outlined.

**Faculty:** There is no change in composition in the proposal. There is still one Chair and four faculty from each Faculty, five faculty from Continuing Education and one CUPE representative. Continuing Education faculty will now be elected from full-time faculty who also teach one course in Continuing Education, or who are involved with Continuing Education through service on its committees. There will be one representative per Division. The CUPE representative will now be elected by and from full-time CUPE faculty. CUPE remains included due to grandfathering of a previous allowance for this representation.

**Alumni:** There is no change in alumni representation. There are still three representatives, but they will be elected in a more efficient process through the Alumni Office.

**Students:** There is no change in the total number of students on Academic Council. Representatives have been redistributed to better reflect current demographics. Instead of three representatives from Engineering, Business, and Communication and Design, and three from Arts and Community Service combined, there will now be two students from each Faculty. Instead of one graduate student, there will be two. Instead of one Continuing Education student, there will be two. Both RyeSAC and CESAR will have representatives elected specifically to the position of Academic Council Representative. The President of CESAR and the VP for Education of RyeSAC will be specified as being the representative both in his/her job description and on the ballot.

The second part of the report involves the membership and Terms of Reference of the Standing Committees. The Secretary of Academic Council will serve as an ex-officio, non-voting member of all of the standing committees of Academic Council. This will ensure continuity. The term of office on committees will be specified as two years, renewable once, with the possibility for a third term in special cases. (The practice has been two terms; it was never specified)

It is proposed that the following committees be deleted from the By-Laws because they have not been functioning or formulated as committees for a number of years: Agenda Committee; Procedures Committee; Open College Committee. The following committees are currently on hold because they deal with items currently under negotiation: Faculty Course Survey Committee; Information Technology Committee; Intellectual Property Committee. The Planning & Priorities Committee has not yet met to define its composition or Terms of Reference.

All of the new Terms of Reference were discussed and agreed upon by the committees themselves. The Committee, which had excellent representation, modified the report many times after lengthy discussion. The report is unanimously endorsed by the Committee.

**Motion: That Academic Council approve the amendments to the composition of Academic Council as proposed in this report.**

**Moved by R. Malinski, seconded by R. Ravindran.**

Discussion: J. Cook asked why the committee could find no way within the Act to include Ryerson Faculty Association representation on Academic Council. It was noted that CUPE, RyeSAC and CESAR all had representation. He claimed that many Ontario Universities have direct representation. The President responded that RFA is not excluded because all of the faculty members on Academic Council are RFA members. The problem which the committee faced is the specification of 50 members by the Act. The appointment of an RFA representative would mean that one of the other positions, faculty, student or alumni, would have to be eliminated. The CUPE representation on Council, which was allowed many years ago, was not in accordance with the Act, but given that the representation was long-standing, and that CUPE was willing to meet the definition of "faculty" as stated in the Act, the Committee felt that we should continue with a CUPE representative as such.

J. Cook noted that there was a contradiction with the representation of RyeSAC and CESAR. He also felt that librarians should be included. It was again noted that the suggestion that the number of representatives be increased is impossible under the Act. There was disagreement about whether librarians can be considered as "teaching faculty" under the definition of the Act. Although the Deans are listed at the end of the list, defining Faculty, they are specifically listed as ex-officio members of Council. This is confusing.

J. Morgan spoke from the audience on several issues of interest to him:

Librarians: One of the graduate student positions could be eliminated until the graduate student body is larger.

Deans: He reiterated that Deans are listed in two separate places in the Act, and could theoretically be elected as faculty and serve ex-officio.

Chairs: He felt that the Chairs should not be established as a sub-group.

Continuing Education Representatives: The definition proposed was felt to be unworkable. The phrase 'per year' has a sense of continuation. This needs to be clarified. Does one have to teach each year or would one lose one's seat?

Distribution: It is stated that Faculties will decide the distribution of the seats within the Faculty. It was questioned as to whether the Act gives Academic Council the authority to say this. The sub-division is then a question. The decision may end up in the hands of the Chairs and Deans.

Rationale: The status of the rationale was questioned. Some of the rationale may be prescriptive. There is an equation of full-time faculty with those who teach full-time loads. Does this exclude those who have release time or are seconded or who are on sabbatical?

S. Quigley suggested that faculty representation be assigned proportionally to the size of the Faculty. I. Levine disagreed, stating that he felt that the equal representation was better.

C. Matthews appreciated the support for librarian representation and suggested that, if the limited number of seats is ever changed due to the opening of the Act, the representation of librarians be considered. It is recognized that the Chief Librarian serves ex-officio.

N. Zaver suggested that the number of graduate student representatives was higher than warranted by the population, and that the part-time instructors should somehow be represented.

J. Cook noted that there is a disproportionate number of ex-officio members of administration, which can grow without bounds, while the other constituents are limited by the specification of 50 members.

**The motion was tabled, and returned to committee.**

**Motion: That Academic Council approve the amendments to the composition and Terms of Reference of the Standing Committees of Academic Council as proposed in this report.**

**Moved by F. Hare, seconded by C. Matthews.**

No discussion

**Passed unanimously.**

### **8.3 Report of the Academic Standards Committee**

**Motion: That Academic Council approve the proposed variations to the GPA Policy for the *School of Midwifery*.**

**Moved by E. Aspevig, seconded by R. Mendelson.**

The report was presented by C. Stuart, Vice-Chair of the Standards Committee.

**Discussion:** The raising of the minimum standard would have no effect on retention since students generally succeed at a high level, or do not succeed at all. Grades in courses that students take at another university in the consortium do not import to Ryerson. Students generally do not take courses at other universities.

Eliminating the Conditional Standing in this program will not present a problem for this program, as students are given a great deal of individual attention and advisement and the faculty-student ratio is very low.

**Passed unanimously.**

**Motion: That Academic Council approve the proposed modifications to the *Fashion* curriculum.**

**Moved by E. Aspevig, seconded by M. McCrae.**

C. Stuart presented the report.

**Discussion:** The question of whether the changes were made for budgetary reasons was again raised. Council was assured that the majority of the changes were fine-tuning of the updating of the program. A few changes resulted in cost savings, but they allowed for expansion of electives in the program.

The President reiterated that Council had been assured that all proposals endorsed by Academic Standards Committee were sound academically.

**Passed unanimously.**

**Motion: That Academic Council approve the proposed modifications to the admission criteria for the *School of Interior Design*.**

**Moved by E. Aspevig, seconded by K. Alnwick.**

The report was given by C. Stuart.

**Passed unanimously.**

**Motion: That Academic Council approve the proposed modifications to the curriculum for the *School of Interior Design*.**

**Moved by E. Aspevig, seconded by I. Levine.**

C. Stuart reported, and commended the School for its hard work on the proposal. Errors in the phase-in of the program in the 4<sup>th</sup> year were noted. The phase-in begins in 2002-2003.

**Discussion:** Council was again assured that, while some budget savings did occur as the result of program changes, the entire curriculum was sound, and nothing had been lost. The program is accredited and so it must meet accreditation criteria.

There was confusion about the number of Liberal Studies electives, as the proposal states at one point that they are being increased and that in another place they are being decreased. It was explained that they were being decreased from eight to six as defined by Ryerson, but that the accreditation body had a different definition of Liberal Studies courses.

The reduction from 177 to 163 hours for students in the program would result in no saving of tuition as there were still 18-21 hours in each semester.

**Passed unanimously.**

## **9. New Business**

**Motion: That the Ryerson Academic Council, in its continued commitment to students, support Ryerson students in their objective to raise awareness about the funding crisis in Canada's post-secondary education system through their participation in the national day of action of February 6, 2002.**

**Moved by O. Bay, Seconded by F. Hare**

E. Aspevig read the memo circulated to faculty asking that they not penalize students for classes and assignments missed on this day. O. Bay circulated materials related to the issue, and noted that the concern was for the entire post-secondary system and its lack of funding, as well as for tuition hikes.

It was further noted that increased tuition was a hardship for many students and prevented access for some. All are in favor of more funding, but it was noted that this is a highly political issue to be ultimately determined by the voters.

**Passed unanimously.**

**10. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.