

MINUTES OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
Tuesday, March 1, 2005

Members Present:

Ex-Officio:

K. Alnwick
E. Aspevig
S. Boctor
C. Cassidy
A. Kahan
T. Knowlton
C. Lajeunesse
I. Levine
C. Matthews
Z. Murphy
J. Sandys
P. Stenton
S. Williams
M. Yeates

Faculty:

H. Alighanbari
J. P. Boudreau
D. Checkland
J. Dianda
M. Dionne
F. Duerden
D. Elder
C. Evans
C. Farrell
M. Greig
R. Hudyma
N. Lister

Students:

R. Akhavan
D. Ayub
A. Bridges
F. Gorospe
I. Guindo
A. Ladhani
K. Medri
T. Nguyen
S. Norrie
R. Rose
T. Spencer
V. Tighe

Regrets:

M. Booth
S. Cody
M. Dewson
M. Dowler
L. Grayson
A. Johnson
A. Jurczak
S. Mirowski
L. Merali
P. Schneiderman
D. Shipley
K. Tucker Scott

Absent:

M. Anecchini
L. Islam
M. J. Nicholson

Alumni:

J. Gryn

1. President's Report

The President reviewed some of the highlights of the Rae Report. The report notes that Ontario funding of postsecondary education is well below that of other provinces. It remains to be seen how the Ontario government responds to the recommendations in the budget process.

The federal budget did not address issues of student assistance, but did include post-secondary scholarships for aboriginal students. Funding for federal granting councils has been increased, as has funding of indirect costs.

Ryerson Research Chairs were announced. They are Marta Braun, Dennis Denisoff, Derick Rousseau and Fei Yuan. Rebecca Rose was congratulated for being elected as president of RyeSAC.

There was an article in the Globe and Mail specifically related to the Business Building.

2. Report of the Secretary of Academic Council

The Secretary reported on the outcome of Academic Council elections. The results of faculty elections were distributed with the agenda and the results of student elections were distributed at the meeting.

3. Good of the University – J. Dianda, Vice Chair, presided.

S. O'Neill reported that Friday, May 4, is the deadline for the nomination for GREET teaching awards. She also reported on the call for the J.W. McConnell Curriculum Award.

4. Minutes

Motion to approve the minutes of January 25, 2005.

R. Hudyma moved J. P. Boudreau seconded.

Amendments to minutes: C. Matthews was in attendance and on page 5 of the agenda, under *Good of the University* "Ontario Council of University Librarians" should read "Ontario College and University Library Association".

Minutes approved as amended.

5. Business Arising from the Minutes

Interim Report on Timetabling: K. Alnwick reported that there have been efforts to accelerate submission of information to University Scheduling and the work done by University Scheduling after submissions are made. Faculty teaching assignments would need to be confirmed earlier. There has been discussion of doing Fall and Winter scheduling at the same time. Tutorials which are part of scheduled courses are already scheduled as part of the process for scheduling lecture hours. Tutorial hours which are not part of regular course hours are left to resolve after formal scheduling is complete. The final report to Academic Council in May will include: allowable timetabling

constraints by faculty and departments; issues related to the scheduling of part-time faculty; issues of clinical placements and their effect on scheduling; issues related to the scheduling of elective courses; implications of using automated system to schedule courses earlier; and session sequencing issues within courses.

Discussion: J. Gryn asked if there are any intrinsic problems in some departments having a different length of term. It was responded that this would be discussed as part of the Provost's report.

Interim Report on Reconfiguration of Examination Period and Grade Deadlines: E.

Aspevig reported that exam schedules will be released at least two weeks earlier beginning in Fall 2005, and that the scheduling of exams by type (multiple choice, essay or a combination of these) is under review. Calendar dates for 2005-06 have been finalized and a minimum of 72 hours has been provided for grading (an increase of 24 hours over Fall 2004). The exam period has been expanded from 11 to 13 days. Discussions are continuing regarding the role of departmental promotion meetings. In order to provide additional days for exams or grading beyond what has been done would require a shortening of the current 13-week term, which Ryerson has declined to do as recently as January 2004, when the report of the Term Committee was considered.

He expressed the view that the integrity of the marking depends on having sufficient time. He said that, although his opinion is not shared by all, he would need to see justification for continuing promotion meetings, and believes that the 13 week term needs to be seriously reviewed. He has requested a survey of current practice at other universities.

Discussion: It was noted that the exam period is lengthened by adding a Sunday exam day. The Provost responded that it is not likely that departments could have different length terms, but this will be investigated.

6. Correspondence

There was no correspondence.

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

E. Aspevig presented the report from Midwifery.

8. Reports of Committees

8.1 Report of the Composition and By Laws Committee

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

C. Evans moved, M. Mazerolle seconded.

Motion approved.

Motion: That Academic Council approve the Department of Aerospace Engineering Department Council By Laws.

A. Lohi moved, C. Evans seconded

Motion approved.

8.2 Report of the Academic Standards Committee

E. Aspevig moved all motions and Vice Chair M. Zeytinoglu reported.

Motion (amended from motion presented in agenda): That Academic Council approve the revised transfer credit allowance for Occupational and Public Health two-year degree options for university graduates with retroactivity all students currently registered in these programs.

F. Gorospe seconded.

M. Zeytinoglu presented the report as distributed.

It was asked if this change to transfer credit allowance had any impact on other programs coming forward. It was responded that this program is unique as entering students already have undergraduate degrees.

Motion approved

Motion: That Academic Council approve the revisions to the Certificate in Information Systems Management.

R. Hudyma seconded.

M. Zeytinoglu presented the report as distributed.

Motion approved.

Motion: That Academic Council approve the Certificate in Residential Care for Children and Youth.

S. Williams seconded.

M. Zeytinoglu presented the report as distributed.

J.P. Boudreau commented that one of the courses in the certificate is already available through two courses existing in the Psychology department. C. Stuart, Chair of CYC commented that they are hoping to collaborate with the Psychology department in the development of the course.

Motion approved.

Motion: That Academic Council approve the Certificate in Physical Activity: Assessment and Promotion.

S. Williams seconded.

M. Zeytinoglu presented the report as distributed.

Motion approved.

Motion: That Academic Council approve the Certificate in Database Technology

F. Gorospe seconded.

M. Zeytinoglu presented the report as distributed.

Motion approved.

Motion: That Academic Council approve the Certificate in Information Systems Development.

R. Hudyma seconded.

M. Zeytinoglu presented the report as distributed.

It was clarified that those who complete the certificate will not get professional certification but will be prepared to get it.

Motion approved.

Motion: That Academic Council approve the Certificate in Database and Knowledge Management.

R. Hudyma seconded.

M. Zeytinoglu presented the report as distributed.

Motion approved.

9. New Business

9.1 Revision of Policy 112 Approval Process for New Undergraduate Programs

Motion: That AC approve the revised policy 112, *Approval Process for New Undergraduate Programs*

E. Aspevig moved, S. Williams seconded

E. Aspevig reported that there are processes that ensure program quality, for both new programs and through periodic review of existing programs. The policy regarding periodic program review will be brought forward at the next Academic Council meeting. UPRAC, which is a committee of the Ontario Council of Academic Vice Presidents (OCAV), audits how programs are reviewed by the University. It does not review the programs, but ensures that the University's approved process is being followed and applied consistently. The program audit report goes to the Vice Presidents Academic. Best practices have been developed as a result of these audits. Last year, UPRAC

recommended that all universities review their policies to incorporate these best practices, and this revision of Policy 112 is a result of that process.

He summarized the main changes to the policy:

- Some restructuring of the presentation of the proposal;
- More reference to the University, Faculty and department academic plans, as the academic planning process has become institutionalized since the last policy and is now integral to academic planning and curriculum development;
- Inclusion throughout of program goals and learning objectives to meet the requirements of newly revised UPRAC guidelines;
- Inclusion of more information on mode of delivery, including on-line delivery;
- Inclusion of a methods and appropriateness of student evaluation;
- Inclusion of mechanisms for interdisciplinary (inter-Faculty) program development;
- Clarification of the role and composition of a New Program Advisory Committee and its relationship to a Program Advisory Council for an existing program;
- Clarification of the role of the Department/School Council and Dean in the submission and approval of a new program and the return of substantially changed proposals to Department/School councils at the discretion of the Dean;
- A clearly defined mandate for the Peer Review Team;
- Clarification of the role of the ASC and the Provost as Chair of ASC in the presentation of the proposal to AC. List of the recommendations by ASC which are possible and the requirement for the Provost to report to AC (not ASC directly.); and
- A footnote on the presentation of the Program to the Board and final implementation by the Provost.

The policy elements are: generation of a preliminary program proposal, a letter of intent, publication of the LOI and approval by the Provost to proceed; development of a formal proposal; establishment of a New Program Advisory Committee; review by the Department/School Council, Program Advisory Committee and the Dean; review by a Peer Review Team; report of the PRT; response of the Department/ School to the PRT report; review of the Dean, and if satisfied, move to the Provost, who takes to the Academic Standards Committee for review; and submission to AC for approval.

D. McKesock asked what constitutes a program and it was clarified that the policy applies to undergraduate programs which give a Bachelor's degree.

T. Nguyen and R. Rose asked about the comparison of programs to programs external to Ryerson. It was responded that the most comparable programs may be found in Ontario, but these may be international programs.

M. Dionne asked why the membership of the New Program Advisory Committee no longer included at least two academic authorities external to Ryerson. E. Aspevig responded that this requirement was developed at a time when Ryerson perceived the

need for external assistance, and that this no longer applied. The policy does not preclude including such academic authorities.

It was suggested that, on page one of the policy the phrase “Provost and Vice President Academic (Provost)” be clarified, as it is confusing. It was agreed that it would be clarified.

J.P. Boudreau commented that the PRT reviewing the Psychology program commented on the quality of our policy.

The amount of detail on emerging societal need was questioned and it was clarified that that societal need is addressed in the Letter of Intent to determine if there is a need for a program before it is further developed.

Financial resources, enrollment numbers, etc. are iteratively identified throughout the process in consultation with the University Planning Office. Development of the program is not done in isolation from the Provost and there is a feedback loop. If a program is not financially viable, changes are made. The process does not go too far before the viability is assessed.

Motion approved.

9.2 Benefactor Naming

Motion: *Be it resolved that Academic Council hereby assert its legitimate academic policy interest in the matter of “Benefactor Naming” of academic units (Faculties, Schools, Departments, and Library).*

D. Checkland moved, J.P. Boudreau seconded.

D. Checkland amended the motion distributed to Council, adding the Library to the list of academic units. He stated that the current Board Policy on Benefactor naming does not give faculty any input into the naming of academic units. Issues have arisen in this regard in other universities. The motion is an attempt to set in motion a process to develop policy, taking into account the fundraising issues as well as the academic issues. Academic units have been specifically addressed as these are specifically identified with faculty. The motion states that Academic Council has an interest in this issue.

A. Kahan stated that he appreciates the motion. Discussions with donors are very sensitive, and it takes time to cultivate these relationships. When a naming proposal is made to the Board there is a great deal of detail presented which represents collaboration and consultation with the faculty. He cited the Chang School and the Rogers Centre as examples. He is concerned about the inclusion of Council as a whole in such discussions. Donors should not be scrutinized in this detail. The current policy works very well, and he fears what will happen to that policy. D. Checkland responded that he is not suggesting that Council approve a name, but rather that a joint committee be established

to set a policy to avoid what has happened at other universities. He agrees that it should not come to Council to be bandied around, but that Council has an interest in the process.

F. Duerden asked what the faculty involvement is currently. E. Aspevig responded that there is confidential consultation with departments, depending on where the idea comes from in the first place. If it is coming from the department, there is consultation from the start. If it comes from another area, it will be discussed with the administration and the provost consults with the Dean and with others at the local level to ensure that there is nothing problematic with the name or donor. If there is difficulty at that level, then those issues need to be reviewed. The Provost needs to understand what the concerns are. F. Duerden commented that the current administration would certainly consult, but that the term “consultation” is very vague. E. Aspevig responded that this is a complex issue. There needs to be a balance of the “property view” of the academic unit and the need to prevent “donor chill”. Given the current confidence in the administration and the process by which administrators are appointed, there should be no worries about the future.

I. Levine asked for clarification of the first motion, as he interprets the first motion to state that AC has the right to intervene in the process. D. Checkland clarified that it states that Academic Council has a legitimate policy interest.

J. Morgan was recognized from the observer seats, and addressed the issue of confidentiality and suggested that the naming of academic chairs be included.

Motion: that the naming of academic chairs be added to the motion.

D. Mason moved, R. Rose seconded.

Discussion: I. Levine stated that he had supported the motion before the amendment but did not now support it. This would severely constrain the flexibility of individual units to institute endowed chairs. The main issue initially was the imposition of something on a unit.

Motion to amend defeated.

M. Yeates asked if the motion implied that Council would set the policy. D. Checkland envisioned that both bodies would approve the policy. The committee would come back with policy recommendations to both bodies.

T. Knowlton stated that there has been no decoupling of the two motions. He believes that no one can dispute the first motion, but there is a leap to the second motion. There seems to be an assumption that if the first is approved then the second is as well.

Motion approved.

Motion: *Be it further resolved that Academic Council communicate its assertion of interest to the Board of Governors by inviting the Board of Governors to participate*

in the formation of a joint Ad Hoc Committee (in accord with Council By-Law 3.8) to make policy recommendations to both the Board of Governors and Academic Council no later than its first meeting in Fall 2005, regarding the naming of academic units.

The Committee shall consist of three members named by each body, with at least two of those named by Academic Council being teaching faculty, plus the Vice-President Advancement (or his delegate) as a non-voting, ex officio member.

D. Checkland moved, F. Duerden seconded.

D. Checkland commented that although E. Aspevig states that a problem is not likely to occur, it has happened at other universities despite the best intentions. UBC policy has appropriate guidelines, and others may as well. The UBC policy spells out the responsibility very specifically. He thinks that a joint committee is the best way to accomplish this. J. Gryn commented that there are cases where naming should be discussed at a department level. He asked if there is a policy in place about what a donor can request. A. Kahan stated that there are policies about how curriculum is set, etc, and it is made clear to donors that they cannot contravene policies of Academic Council. V. Tighe stated that he is sensitive to the issues of raising funds, and also to the concerns of naming of units. No one has commented on the impact on the students, who identify with a particular name.

Motion: That the motion be amended to include one faculty and one student representative.

V. Tighe moved, R. Rose seconded.

D. Checkland argued against the amendment arguing that the faculty are most impacted by a name. R. Rose argued that the name is associated with a student's degree for the rest of their lives and spoke in favor of the amendment. D. Mason argued that restricting the committee to one faculty member is not acceptable.

Motion to amend defeated.

Motion: That the motion be amended to have a committee of four Academic Council members including two faculty and one student, and increasing the Board membership to four.

V. Tighe moved, R. Rose seconded.

I. Levine argued against the motion but it was commented that the motion does not exclude chairs or Deans.

Motion to amend passed.

T. Knowlton asked if there is another way to address the concern without moving to a joint committee, as this may have unintended consequences. It takes much time to secure

a major donor, and there are already existing checks and balances along the way. He suggested that there be alternate ways of addressing the issue without the formation of a committee. The President clarified that the Board does not have to agree to set up the committee.

S. Williams commented that she is not sure that the establishment of a committee addresses the problem. If the Board did not accept the invitation, then Academic Council would not have any recourse. It might make more sense to establish a committee of Academic Council to bring back ideas before asking for a joint committee. D. Checkland stated that if the Board declines the initiation, that would be very telling. The President commented that by not accepting the invitation the Board would not be stating there was no academic interest. F. Duerden spoke in favor of the resolution, as did T. Nuygen.

M. Yeates stated that he has been involved in previous bicameral institutions. He thinks that the strong statement made in the first motion should be relayed by the Chair of Academic Council to the Board for their discussion. They can then recognize the right of Council in the issue and either ask for a joint committee or ask for further input. The second motion may be presenting a “take it or leave it” choice to the Board. Taking the idea to the Board would lead to a more harmonious solution. There was discussion of the merit of the motion as it stands v. consulting with the Board more informally. It was suggested that an amendment be added to the motion allowing the Board to change the motion. It was suggested that this can be proposed more informally and no amendment was made.

E. Aspevig, following up on M. Yeates’ suggestion, stated that he prefers the idea of working with the Board informally and collaboratively to begin with. A policy could be developed which everyone would be quite happy with without having four people on both sides discuss. In bicameral situations in which areas of conflicting jurisdiction sometimes arise, there should be a more informal collaborative approach. D. Checkland commented that the policy would be developed that might have no input from the faculty. The Board could develop one collaborative policy when the Council wants another.

Motion approved.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

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