

MINUTES OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
Tuesday, April 1, 2003

Members Present:

C. Lajeunesse	S. Boctor	F. Salustri
K. Alnwick	M. Booth	R. Kup
E. Aspevig	C. Cassidy	S. Marshall
M. Dewson	L. Grayson	R. Walshaw
T. Knowlton	I. Levine	J. Cook
C. Matthews	L. Merali	M. Yeates
A. Tam	S. Cody	D. McKessock
M. Barber	R. Rodrigues	A. Cross
V. Berkeley	D. Snyder	K. Marciniec
M. Dowler	M. Potter	E. Trott
M. Mazerolle	G. Meti	J. Monro
A. Pevec	D. Smith	L. Lum
A. Lohi	J. Welsh	D. Heyd
K. Raahemifar	J. Dianda	D. Elder
M. Koc	D. Martin	S. Kumar
G. Roberts-Fiati	T. Nguyen	

Regrets:

J. Sandys
S. Williams (S. Wilson attended)
B. Jackson (S. Giles attended)
G. Turcotte
K. Tucker Scott
C. DeSouza
R. Ravindran

Members Absent:

M. Creery	R. Dutt
A. Furman	S. Sutherland
M. McCrae	
G. Inwood	
S. Kumar	
P. George	
M. Verticchio	
B. Yoon	

1. President's Report

President Lajeunesse reported that the following Honorary Doctorates had been approved by the Awards & Ceremonials Committee for Spring 2003:

Business - Isadore Sharp, Joey & Toby Tanenbaum

Engineering - Fraser Mustard, Linda Hasenfratz

Arts & Community Services - Roberta Jamieson, Bonnie Sherr Klein

Communication & Design – Glenn Pushelberg & George Yabu, Richard Wright.

The President reported on highlights from the Ontario budget, including the establishment of a \$75M Quality Assurance Fund. This fund will grow to \$200M by 2006-07. This will help Ryerson meet inflationary costs. The government also committed to full student funding. There is an allocation of \$400M for phase 2 of the Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Fund for bursary assistance. There is \$40M for facilities renewal, which includes \$1.2 M for Ryerson, and a commitment to consider a multi-year budget, which will allow for better planning. This year Ryerson received almost \$0.5 M from the Graduate Accessibility Fund.

All of the unions at Ryerson have signed a joint letter to the Minister of Colleges and Universities outlining Ryerson's priorities to the government, which include funding of unfunded students and new buildings. The community leaders who signed the letter were thanked.

The Board of Governors has elected Michael Guerriere to serve as its new Chair. The Board has also passed new By-Laws which have been modernized to recognize new needs.

The President met with Howard Hampton, the leader of the NDP party, concerning Ryerson's funding priorities.

Vice President Errol Aspevig was asked to give an update on SARS (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome). He reported that there are Ryerson students in Hong Kong attending universities which were closed. These students were assured that if they wished to return to Canada, Ryerson would deal with academic issues and they would not be penalized. Nursing and CE students have been affected in that some instruction takes place in hospitals. No students are currently diagnosed with SARS and there will be no academic penalties for the voluntary quarantine.

The Vice President also gave an update on the academic planning process. There were a number of consultations with Planning and Priorities Advisory Committee, and the Academic Planning Group (APG), six with the community and one with the Academic Administrators Group. As a result of these, the thinking on the plan has evolved. A number of people wanted to see a more concrete plan. A supplement was finalized yesterday and is on the VP, Academic website. There will be further consultations on that supplement. The RFA executive group will meet with the VP, Academic on April 14; there is a meeting with the Council of the School of Graduate Studies on April 2, and the APG briefly discussed the document. There will be other consultations in the next few weeks, and a discussion paper will be brought to the May Academic Council meeting. There will probably be a special

meeting of Academic Council late in May or early in June to consider approval of the plan. Members are invited to respond to the current supplement.

A member expressed concern that the SARS situation might result in a wide-reaching quarantine during final exams. The Vice President responded that the SARS situation has been unfolding quickly and Ryerson responses were in keeping with recommendations from authorities. Contingency plans will be developed concerning final exams, although there is no anticipation of a problem.

2. Report of the Secretary of Academic Council

2.1 The Secretary reported that the *Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct* would be renumbered Policy 61, as it was separated from the Policy 60, the *Student Code of Academic Conduct*, which was revised at the March meeting. The Non-Academic Code has not been reviewed, but has been updated to change the titles of positions and offices and to make the appeals to Academic Council consistent with the Academic Code. It was noted that section G5a, in the version of the policy included in the agenda, should have been deleted.

Discussion: Corrections were made to paragraph E7. Paragraph “3” should read paragraph “5”. It was also noted that the statement in section F2 had been changed from: “The Director will consider frivolous, vexatious and trivial claims” to “The Director will consider false claims”. There was discussion about the changing of the language and the possible difference in meaning between the different terminologies. There were no motions to amend the proposed language.

The Secretary reported that section 2.2.2 of Policy 46 – *Policy on Grading Promotions and Academic Standing (GPA Policy)* was to be updated to include the DEF (Deferred) grade which was approved as part of the Student Code of Academic Conduct.

Policy 75 – Recommendations of the Special Committee on Student Complaints was removed as policy as, after consultation with the Learning & Teaching Committee, the Director of Student Services, the Deans and The Vice Presidents, it was determined that all of the recommendations had been completed.

2.2 A statement of Students’ Rights and Responsibilities was presented, which was a compilation of: the preamble of the Student Code of Academic Conduct that had been replaced at the March meeting, the existing rights and responsibilities found in the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct, and a few new items, are listed. It was noted that the responsibility for the maintenance of a Ryerson e-mail account should read:

- Obtain and maintain a Ryerson University e-mail account *if you are a full or part-time undergraduate or graduate student.*

The statement will be published in the *Student Guide*.

Motion: That Academic Council approve the *Statement of Students’ Rights and Responsibilities*

Moved by J. Monro, seconded by D. Martin.

Discussion:

A faculty member commented that the rights listed are about claims students can make against the university, but the responsibilities do not include student academic responsibilities. Another faculty member commented that there is an imbalance in the rights and responsibilities and that there should be an obligation to read and know the content of a course outline as a contract. The Registrar explained that when the rights and responsibilities were originally written they were done in the context of the Code of Conduct.

The VP, Academic commented that what is presented is a collection of things which have already been accepted with some small changes. The list is not an exhaustive list. He proposed a friendly amendment to add the wording “*Among* the rights and *among* the responsibilities are the following.” This was accepted by the mover and seconder.

A member suggested that a one paragraph introduction be given to items submitted for consideration. The Secretary indicated that an overview of the Rights & Responsibilities was included in her report.

There was discussion about “the right to complain without fear of reprisal”. It was believed that this should include respect for confidentiality. One member argued that there is a right to know who is making a complaint.

A member of the audience asked for clarification about the payment of fees as related to the use of facilities. It was clarified that fees for particular activities must be paid.

A student member asked for clarification of the right to “a learning environment that, while safeguarding dissent, is free from interference and disruption”. It was clarified that this referred to illegal activities.

Motion approved.

3. The Good of the University

A member observed that a motion was passed at the May, 2002 meeting asking that Composition & By-Laws Committee consider ways to include librarians and CE program directors as members of Academic Council. He believed there had been considerable support for inclusion of librarians and CE program directors at that time. The President responded that this would require amendment of the Ryerson Act and that the committee had not yet revisited the issue. The Secretary will schedule a meeting of the Committee as soon as possible. It was requested by the Chief Librarian that there at least be a continuance of the non-voting member status of a librarian.

A Social Work student from the audience commented that students in his program have four final exams in a row, all at 8:00 a.m. He suggested that multiple-choice exams could be scheduled later in the exam period.

It was requested that all reformatted policies show the changes which have been made. The Secretary commented that documents with mark-up are extremely confusing to read.

A student commented that *The Toronto Star* had reported that *The Ryerson Review of Journalism* may be eliminated. This publication is considered a vital publication for the School. The Dean of Communication and Design agreed and noted that when the *Review* lost its external sponsor, he had provided it with support. The issue is the overall finances of the School of Journalism.

It was announced that the fashion show is going to be in A250 this weekend, and Mass Exodus will be next week.

There was a question concerning the lack of street lights on Gould Street as well as unsafe lighting conditions at Victoria and Dundas. The VP, Administration responded that the lighting on Dundas has been brought to the attention of PenEquity and they have responded that they will address the issue. She will bring the lighting on Gould to the attention of the city.

4. Minutes of the March 4, 2003 Meeting

Motion to approve by M. Dowler, seconded by L. Merali.

Motion approved.

5. Business arising out of the Minutes

5.1 Motion: That Academic Council approve the policy on *Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals* as amended (Policy 134).

Moved by E. Aspevig, seconded by D. Martin.

The VP, Academic commented that at the March meeting there was a request for a review of the revised appeals policy and he concluded that, given the concerns about the two-level process by one Faculty, the three-level process should be retained with changes. The proposal for a two-level process may be returned to Council in two years. In that time matters which give rise to the large number of appeals in one area will be addressed. He had requested that the Secretary have the committee review the policy. The contributions of the committee are appreciated and not lost. The version of the policy which is presented reflects many improvements.

The Secretary reported on the changes.

- There had been a friendly amendment requested that the respondent at the Academic Council level be whoever had responded to the appeal at the department/school level, who might not necessarily be the Chair or Director.
- Departments/Schools and Faculties could establish Appeals Committees or utilize Appeals Officers, and could hold hearings.
- Grounds for appeals had been clarified.

- Appeals to Academic Council would be on the original grounds of the appeal, as there might not be a hearing at a lower level.
- Training would be required for anyone involved in the decision-making process.
- The necessity for students and faculty to deal with issues as soon as they arise is retained.

There was a discussion of IID.2.d and the ten-day receipt of a response from the Dean. The wording will be changed to: “Deans must respond within 10 working days....”

Friendly amendment – Students may choose to receive their response by e-mail or they could pick up the response in person. There is language in the section on responses from Academic Council which could be utilized.

Discussion:

- Not all students might be aware that e-mail is not confidential.
- There could be a box to check on the form indicating whether an e-mail response or personal receipt is preferred to a mailed response.

The President referred the policy to the committee to consider language about receipt of appeals responses.

There was a question about the placement of the appeals policy in the calendar. The Registrar responded that it will be published in the Student Guide. There was some concern that students be made aware to pick up their Student Guides.

Motion approved with the condition that wording be changed to reflect the above friendly amendment concerning student receipt of decisions.

5.2 Motion: That Academic Council amend the composition of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, established to review the feasibility of a Fall semester study period, to include a Dean and a representative from Continuing Education.

Moved by J. Cook seconded K. Marciniec.

There was a subsequent friendly amendment to include a librarian, which was accepted by the movers.

Motion approved.

6. Correspondence

The Secretary reported that the President had received a note of thanks from the Strathcona Tweedsmuir School for his expression of sympathy on the loss of their students in an avalanche.

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

The VP, Academic reported on the changes from Continuing Education. In addition, there was a distribution of a course change form from Interior Design.

There was a request for clarification of the name of the “Certificate in Marketing Management”. It was clarified that the name is in general usage in the discipline.

8. Reports of Committees

8.1 Report of the Composition & By-Laws Committee

D. Heyd reported and moved.

Motion 1: That Academic Council amend its By-Laws with respect to the Composition and Terms of Reference of the Academic Council Appeals Committee, formed to combine the current Academic Appeals Committee and the Student Discipline Committee.

Seconded by D. Martin

The Academic Appeals Committee and the Discipline Committee are being merged because the Discipline committee meets infrequently and, therefore, has little experience with appeals and hearings.

There is a friendly amendment that the Director of Student Services or Designate, who is a member of the current Academic Appeals Committee, be included as a member of the Academic Council Appeals Committee. This was accepted by the mover and the seconder.

Motion approved.

Motion 2: That Academic Council amend its By-Laws with respect to the composition of the Research Ethics Board as outlined in the report.

Seconded by D. Martin

Membership was tightened up to specifically allow the inclusion of a member with legal expertise.

Motion approved.

Motion 3: That Academic Council amend its By-Laws with respect to the composition of the Awards and Ceremonials Committee as outlined in the report.

Seconded by D. Martin

The motion corrects an oversight in the original composition to include the Registrar as an ex-officio non-voting member of the Awards & Ceremonials Committee

Motion approved.

Motion 4: That Academic Council approve the School of Retail Management School Council By-Laws.

Seconded by D. Martin

The voting in these By-Laws is unusual in that each faculty gets two votes and each student gets one. This is necessary because of the small number of faculty members and retains the proper ratio of voting rights to conform to Policy 45.

Motion approved.

8.2 Report of the Nominating Committee

A. Cross reported and moved.

Motion: That Academic Council approve the candidates elected as representatives for 2003-04.

Seconded by C. Cassidy.

Motion approved.

Motion: That Academic Council approve the nomination, as stated in the report, to complete an unfilled term on the Academic Standards Committee.

Ron Stagg is being nominated for this position.

J. Monro seconded.

Motion approved.

8.3 Academic Standards Committee Report

E. Aspevig moved and called on R. Goldsmith to present the report.

Seconded by K. Alnwick

Motion: That Academic Council approve the proposed degree completion program in Early Childhood Education, subject to the requirements proposed in the report.

A degree completion program is proposed for ECE graduates from George Brown College (GB). Students from colleges usually need extra courses prior to admission to a Ryerson program and must have a B- average. This presents a problem for students as they are not guaranteed admission even if they satisfy these requirements. The proposal deals with the issue of “seamless” progression into studies at Ryerson.

- Students admitted to the George Brown cohort must meet Ryerson admission standards
- Student will have to take three courses in addition to their diploma program.
- There will be Ryerson approved general education course requirements.

George Brown requires a 1.7 GPA to graduate. Therefore, students in the cohort who graduate with a 1.7 will be Ryerson students, but they are entering at a level where they would normally be considered “Conditional” students. This does not put them in a position to receive proper guidance. Therefore, students with a GPA below 2.0 will enter Ryerson on “Probation”.

Discussion:

- There was concern that other schools have higher requirements from George Brown. It was explained that this is the first collaboration of this particular sort. This is not just an agreement with an existing George Brown program. The program is adjusting its curriculum to fit Ryerson requirements.
- ECE has substantial experience with graduates of GB already upon which this agreement is based.
- At time when some programs will have a cut-off of 85% from high school, it was questioned why the Standards Committee would endorse students with a “Conditional” standing. It was explained that the committee is endorsing a program which is augmented by approved Ryerson courses and based on current success of GB students. The committee discussed the 1.7 GPA level at length, and while it would prefer that the GPA be 2.0, GB actually uses the more common model. The committee concluded that there is good academic reason to pursue the proposal.
- The advantage to Ryerson to accept students with a lower GPA was questioned. It was answered that a Ryerson student in third year with a 1.7 GPA would proceed.
- In the School of Business Management, as a general rule, students coming out of a community college are not successful without a 3.0 average. It was asked what the averages were of students from ECE who were successful at Ryerson. Dale Shipley, Director of the ECE program replied that the program replicates programs done at other universities and it meets guidelines set by CUCC. The program accepts GB students into the first year with the same requirements as the first year at Ryerson. The “seamless” movement is honoring the commitment to allow students to proceed in the same way as entering Ryerson students. There is competition with other collaborative ECE programs and Ryerson needs to remain on the cutting edge.
- It is important to remember that students with a 1.7 GPA represent a small number of students, and GB students at this level will be on probation.

Motion approved. (21 for, 10 opposed)

9. New Business

There is a problem in hearing the discussion in the gallery. It was suggested that people who fail to speak into the microphone be charged a loonie, increasing exponentially each time they fail to use the microphone.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.