

MINUTES OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
Tuesday, December 2, 2003

Members Present:

Ex officio:

K. Alnwick
E. Aspevig
S. Boctor
C. Cassidy
M. Dewson
L. Grayson
A. Kahan
T. Knowlton
I. Levine
S. Williams
M. Yeates

Faculty:

D. Checkland
S. Cody
J. Cook
J. Dianda
M. Dionne
M. Dowler
D. Elder
C. Evans
P. George
A. Lohi
D. Martin
D. Mason

Students:

V. Campbell
A. Cherrie
N. Felorzabih
B. Lewis
C. Livett
S. Marshall
S. Mirowski
E. Sullivan

Alumni:

J. Gryn
V. O'Brien

Regrets:

M. Ahmed
M. Barber
M. Booth
G. Diamantakos
C. Lajeunesse
N. Lister
L. Lum
C. Matthews
J. Monro
R. Rodrigues
J. Sandys
D. Snyder
P. Stenton
K. Tucker Scott

Members Absent:

R. Dutt
G. Inwood
C. Flores
Z. Khan
R. Nazareth
R. Ravindran
M. Sabri

1. President's Report – Katherine Penny, Vice Chair, chaired the meeting. Errol Aspevig reported that the President sent his regrets as he was meeting, along with other Ontario University presidents, with the Provincial Liberal Caucus. The new government is in the process of setting its priorities, and is moving ahead on a tuition freeze. Universities are discussing compensating revenue to make up for the freeze, and the Minister is aware of the unfunded BIUs, referring to them as “stranded students”.

He was also pleased to announce that G. Raymond Chang has donated \$5M to Ryerson for Continuing Education. Continuing Education will now be known as the G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education.

The President's holiday celebration is on December 10, and all are invited.

Dr. Aspevig also announced that the Ryerson Institute for Aerospace Design and Innovation was launched last week. The Institute is a partnership between the Aerospace Engineering Department and several aerospace companies. The design facility will be used for graduate and undergraduate student research. Projects will be generated by industry partners and will be jointly supervised by faculty and industry engineers. Stipends will be paid to students by the industry. RIADI will help to establish Ryerson's position in Aerospace Engineering. Current partners are Pratt and Whitney, Messler-Dowty, Bombardier and Honeywell, and other major partners will be confirmed shortly. Each partner contributes \$50-75,000 in project funding, for a total of \$1-1.5M in support over five years. There is seed funding for equipment. This will be of great benefit to the Aerospace Engineering department and for the University. University Advancement was commended for its role in obtaining this partnership.

Paula Curtis, the new Executive Director, Development was introduced.

2. Report of the Secretary of Academic Council

D. Schulman reported that the schedule for election to Academic Council was in the agenda and that student elections would be held online for the first time. Members were reminded that faculty serve two-year terms and students serve one-year terms and that both could be nominated for a second term.

3. Good of the University

Ombudsperson's Report 2002-2003 - The Ombudsperson, Nora Farrell reported. A separate document containing the report, the University response and an update on University actions on recommendations from the previous year was distributed with the agenda.

The role of the Ombudsperson Office was reviewed as outlined in her report.

Ms. Farrell made note of her statistics on the number of complaints and stated that the numbers are similar to those at other universities. She summarized her recommendations concerning attention to key aspects of application of the Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy as outlined in her report, and summarized her recommendations. The high level of support of the Ombudsperson's committee was acknowledged, and all those with whom she worked to resolve issues and all who brought forward complaints were thanked.

Discussion: V. Campbell asked if students were informed about their right to not sign a summary of discussion form when being interviewed about suspected academic misconduct, and their ability to note that they have been treated disrespectfully. D. Schulman responded that this was conveyed to faculty who asked, and that the policy would be made more specific when it was updated. Specific notation would be put on the form.

E. Trott noted that the new ECE playground is a significant improvement, and it is a creative “return to nature” design. D. Shipley and the School were commended.

E. Trott also read two pieces of work from the same student (with permission), one written outside of class and one written in class. She noted that the discrepancy between the writing in the two pieces of work were obvious. There was discussion in the class in question centered on what types of rewriting are considered acceptable. It was observed that in one program, a professor will not read work that is not clearly written and edited, while in her class they are instructed to submit unedited papers. Students in the class thought it was acceptable to have a family member edit a paper. One student said it was not fair for someone who cannot write to get the same degree as she.

4. Minutes

D. Schulman noted the following corrections to the minutes:

On page 6, IRH010 should read ISH010.

In the members present, it should be noted that K. Penny was present and D. Elder was not.

J. Gryn requested that alumni not be listed as students.

Motion to approve the minutes as amended.

Moved by D. Mason, seconded D. Martin

Motion approved

5. Business Arising out of the Minutes

Motion: That Academic Council add the following fourth clause to the Student Code of Conduct Section 1, A1, a: Plagiarism: “iv) paying someone to edit or proofread your work, without the knowledge and written permission of your instructor or supervisor.”

Moved by M. Dowler, seconded by S. O'Neill.

M. Dowler read a flyer taken off a university bulletin board, advertising an editing service. She stated that unless students contribute significantly to the editing of their work, they have learned nothing.

S. Williams related a discussion held by the Community Services Directors about whether it was acceptable to have someone voluntarily edit something, as the motion stressed that the editing was paid. She noted that some journals require paid editing for submissions. She sees the difference, but wishes to have that situation clarified.

K. Alnwick commented that he supports the motion, but finds the wording necessary but insufficient. The existing code already includes statements on what is considered plagiarism. There needs to be a statement on editing, but the act of payment is not the issue. The issue is that the work is not the work of the individual. There needs to be a clear definition of where the line exists. The motion does not go far enough. As mentioned in the “Good of the University”, voluntary proofreading and editing need to be addressed.

G. Roberts-Fiat commented that she recognizes the intent, but disagreed with the focus on paid editing. It is primarily ESL students who need help proofreading and editing. These students may not have access to friends or relatives who can help them, as their friends may likely be ESL students as well. The clause should be expanded to include students who need to use editing services, and require that students also submit an original draft so that it can be determined that the work has not been substantially changed.

E. Trott asked if there should be a uniform policy which applies to all faculty as the policy is inconsistently applied, with some requiring edited papers and some not.

D. MeKessock commented on the need to be very careful about the wording of the policy.

D. Mason commented that proofreading or editing is not necessarily plagiarism. Coaching may be desirable, and there may be many sources of help for students. Proofreading might be ok, but editing may not. He argued that the premature motion should not be passed.

J. Gryn suggested that it should be ensured that the work is the student's own, and proofreading should be distinguished from substantial editing.

V. Campbell stated that students in the Access Center and others have tutors making recommendations on how to improve a paper. She agreed that editing and proofreading are not the same.

E. Aspevig spoke against the motion, not because he was opposed to it, but because the discussion raised a variety of complex questions. It would be useful to establish a working group to explore the issue further.

K. Penny asked if M. Dowler wished to withdraw the motion in favor of the establishment of a committee to address the issue. M. Dowler declined to withdraw the motion as she was concerned that the committee would take too long to get a policy in place. Although the motion is imperfect, she believed the motion would be useful in the meantime.

B. Lewis commented that, if the motion were passed, students might be placed in a position where they are unaware that the policy was changed. D. Schulman replied that because of the new policy requiring students to have Ryerson e-mail accounts, the information could be disseminated very easily.

T. Lewis, Director of the Access Centre, stated that there is a bursary system through the Access Centre to provide students with assistance. She was concerned about students needing to get permission for editing of papers. She reported that A. Whiteside, Discrimination and

Harassment Prevention Office, has also expressed concern with the wording, and had asked that the wording be examined.

E. Trott expressed concern about the inaction and that she would report to her students that Academic Council had taken no action.

Motion to table the motion.

Moved by D. Mason, seconded by K. Alnwick.

Motion approved

Motion to form an *ad hoc* work group to discuss the wording of the above amendment.

Moved by K. Alnwick, seconded by D. Mason.

Discussion:

The committee should include student representation. It was suggested that ESL and students from the Access Centre be included. Since establishing such a broad reaching committee would be very time consuming, it was suggested that Academic Council students represent these concerns. D. Schulman will establish an ad hoc committee to discuss the motion and will report back in January.

J. Cook commented that such small steps undermine the overall concept of what constitutes learning in the process of writing essays. The system puts extraordinary demands on students. There needs to be a better way of dealing with student's learning and writing.

D. Mason echoed the comments but disagreed with the conclusion to vote against the motion. He agreed there is a problem, and is not sure of the solution.

Motion approved.

D. Schulman asked that those interested in serving on the *ad hoc* committee email her on Wednesday to be included. She noted that the Learning and Teaching Committee will be addressing Academic Integrity as a key issue beginning in January.

6. Correspondence

D. Schulman reported that M. Sabri, Graduate Student representative, had submitted his resignation from Academic Council and that Dean Yeates had been asked to appoint a replacement. She also reported that, as per the By Laws, C. Flores, RyeSAC student representative had been informed that, since he had missed three meetings of Council he was removed from his seat. He reported that he had a class conflict. RyeSAC has been asked to appoint a replacement.

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

E. Aspevig outlined course changes as presented in the agenda.

From Arts:

Course changes in Liberal Studies

Course Additions in Public Administration

Course changes in Sociology – It was asserted that the course code was incorrect. A. MacKay clarified that the code is correct for part-time programs. Information on SOC 021, 605, and 606 will be checked and will be reported back at the next meeting.

From Business:

Course Changes in Hospitality and Tourism

CAAT Advanced standings in ITM – changes are consistent with other advanced standing admissions in Business

From Communication & Design

Course Changes in Fashion

From Community Services

Course Changes in Midwifery

From Engineering & Applied Science

Course Changes in Aerospace Engineering - It was confirmed that changes in AER 420 and AER 520 were correct.

Course Changes in Architectural Science

Course Changes in Chemistry and Biology – It was noted that CHY200 is moving from NCFS 03 instead of NCSF 03.

Course changes in Lower Level Liberal Studies in Chemistry and Biology

Revisions in Electrical and Computer Engineering were withdrawn.

Course changes in Graduate studies were distributed separately and outlined by M. Yeates.

8. Reports of Committees

Report of the Composition and By Laws Committee – presented and moved by A. Lohi

Motion 1: That Academic Council approve the By-Laws of the School Council of the School of Child and Youth Care.

Seconded by D. Martin

Motion approved.

Motion 2: That Academic Council approve the By-Laws of the Departmental Council of the Department of Chemistry and Biology.

Seconded by D. Martin

D. Schulman confirmed that the number of student representatives met the policy.

Motion approved.

Motion 3: That Academic Council approve the By-Laws of the Departmental Council of the Department of Chemical Engineering

Seconded D. Martin

Motion approved.

Report of the Academic Standards Committee – E. Aspevig moved and turned the discussion over to M. Zeytinoglu, Vice Chair of the Committee.

Motion 1: That Academic Council approve the designation of *Bachelor of Design (Fashion Design)* and *Bachelor of Design (Fashion Communication)* for students graduating respectively from the Fashion Design and Fashion Communication program options offered by the School of Fashion.

Seconded by I. Levine.

M. Zeytinoglu outlined the report as presented in the agenda.

Motion approved.

Motion 2: That Academic Council approve the designation of *Bachelor of Arts (Radio and Television)* for students graduating from the School Radio and Television Arts.

Seconded I. Levine

M. Zeytinoglu outlined the report as presented in the agenda.

Motion approved

Motion 3: That Academic Council approve the proposed curriculum restructuring in Radio and Television Arts.

Seconded by I. Levine.

M. Zeytinoglu outlined the report as presented in the agenda.

J. Cook commented that he supported the changes in the program, but that he was concerned about the move to semesterizing all programs at Ryerson. He sees a connection between this semesterization and the problems of plagiarism and purchased essays.

Motion approved.

9. New Business

Motion: That Academic Council approve the amendment of section 2.4.3 of the *Policy on Grading Promotion and Academic Standing* as outlined in the report.

K. Alnwick moved, S. Williams seconded

The proposal is an attempt to update Policy 46 with respect to suspension.

B. Lewis commented that he had distributed an amendment to Academic Council, but realized that the amendment needed to be properly worded. The issue addressed by his amendment to the proposed change to the policy concerned the transfer of students under suspension. The concern was that students who are suspended after the winter term who find that they have selected the wrong program, should be given an option to enter a different program in the Fall should the department agree to admit them. This would allow students to

switch programs. Otherwise they may have to wait more than a year to get into a new program.

In the first sentence in the last paragraph on page 87, it will be clarified that two courses be specified rather than suggested.

K. Alnwick withdrew the motion and will bring the motion back to Academic Council in January.

J. Dianda suggested that the change did not go far enough and that the courses students take while under suspension should be counted in the student's GPA. K. Alnwick responded that not incorporating such grades in the GPA is consistent with other university's policies. Students would receive credit which would replace the F originally received. J. Dianda argued that counting the grade might make it possible for a student to get off probation sooner, but that he would defer to the decision of the Registrar. He agrees that the change in policy is commendable. He further asked if there is still a suggestion of a minimum period of suspension. K. Alnwick commented that the departments would be given some autonomy on the issue. It was clarified that the policy signals that suspension is a serious matter and that "time-out" is a good idea.

J. Gryn asked that in paragraph one on page 88, it be clarified that the courses referred to are the same courses mentioned in the previous paragraph, and that credits are pending achieving the marks stipulated by the department.

Motion: That Academic Council approve Policy 158: *Program Advisory Councils*
E. Apevig moved and S. Williams seconded.

Ryerson has had Advisory Councils (sometimes called committees or boards) for many years to ensure currency and relevance in programs. These have operated in a variety of ways. They have existed implicitly as part of other policies such as the old PREP process. There is no issue about the existence and desirability of these entities. However, a review of the current practice was undertaken and it was found that the practice was inconsistent. Some councils are active, some not. After reviewing the literature, a policy was developed to reinvigorate Advisory Councils.

The Policy outlines the role of Advisory Councils, establishing that they are advisory and do not have the authority of Academic Council or the Board and do not have decision making powers. All schools which offer programs are required to have one. The Deans are responsible to report on the dates the Councils met in order to insure that they are meeting regularly. Membership of the Councils is outlined, including the constituencies, who chairs, how they are identified and appointed, the length of term, the number of meetings and procedures of minutes and agenda.

D. Mason enquired whether the guidelines should specify that the chair of the department should not be the chair of the Council. He moved that the Policy be amended to say that the Chair could not be the Chair of the Council. V. Campbell seconded.

Discussion:

I. Levine spoke against the amendment. He thought there should be more flexibility as some council's would be relieved to have the department chair be the Council chair.

V. Campbell spoke for the amendment, citing potential conflict of interest.

It was clarified that the proposed amendment was that the Council Chair should be elected by the members of the Council, but would normally not be the Department/ School Chair/Director.

S. Boctor spoke for flexibility in the policy.

P. Schneiderman spoke as a department chair stating that the amendment was very restrictive

C. Cassidy spoke against the motion. The Advisory Council should not be turned over to an outside group. Symbolically the university should be clear that the university has control over its own program.

T. Knowlton spoke against the amendment. He stated that in the first year or two, no one would be comfortable being the chair of a Council, and the amendment is too restrictive,

D. Mason asked if the inclusion of the word “normally” addressed this issue. T. Knowlton responded that that was the intent all along and that the discussion was simply “splitting hairs”.

V. Campbell commented that if the intention is that the department chair be precluded from chairing the Council, it should be made clear.

The Motion to amend the policy was defeated.

The Motion to approve Policy 158 was passed.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane R. Schulman, Ph.D.
Secretary of Academic Council