

**MINUTES OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING**  
**TUESDAY, MAY 1, 2007**

<b>Members Present:</b>			
<b>Ex-Officio:</b>	<b>Faculty:</b>	<b>Students:</b>	
K. Alnwick	P. Albanese	J. Morgan	A. Ashraf
E. Aspevig	D. Androutsos	R. Ravindran	L. Brown
L. Bishop	I. Baitz	S. Rosen	R. Castelino
S. Boctor	J. P. Boudreau	A. Singh	O. Falou
C. Cassidy	V. Chan		R. Gherman
G. R. Chang	D. Elder		H. Kere
M. Dewson	C. Evans		Hilda
D. Doz	E. Evans		S. Omer
Z. Fawaz	C. Farrell		R. Rose
U. George	M. Greig		
S. Giles	R. Hudyma		
L. Grayson	G. Hunt		<b>Alumni:</b>
A. Kahan	D. Johnston		A. Walker
S. Levy	R. Keeble		
A. Shilton	J. Lassaline		
P. Stenton	D. Lee		
A. Venetsanopoulos	D. Mason		
M. Yeates	A. Mitchell		
<b>Regrets:</b>	<b>Absent:</b>		
C. Baskin	T. Dewan		
G. Alivio	A. Ganuelas		
P. Corson	A. Lyn		
M. Dionne	J. Pierce		
S. Edwards	D. Sydor		
T. Haug	A. Warnick		
K. Jones			
C. Katsanis			
T. Kouluk			
B. McIlroy			
M. Panitch			
P. Schneiderman			
C. Stuart			
L. Yung			

1. **President's Report** - President Levy recognized Provost and Vice President Academic Errol Aspevig as follows:

I know we have an agenda this evening, but I am asking Academic Council if I can add an item at the last minute. This kind of item comes along once every 36 years. There is a story that goes along with our request. Thirty-six years ago, Ryerson hired an honours philosophy graduate from the University of Manitoba on a one-year teaching contract. A lot of people use the phrase “and the rest is history”, but in Errol’s case it’s true. Because of course I am speaking about Errol Aspevig. Today is his last Academic Council meeting since he is retiring in June; and it is an understatement to say that everyone at Ryerson is glad that he stayed longer than a year.

As you know, Errol thinks of himself as a teacher first and foremost. And maybe his title changed over the years - to Chair, then Dean, then Provost and Vice- President Academic - but teaching is what he has been doing all along.

He arrived at Ryerson just when permission was granted to give degrees in technology and applied arts, and in countless and continuing ways, he has guided a generation of students, faculty and staff through a remarkable time of growth and change. He is a listener who respects and values the opinions of others - a thinker who is generous with his ideas. And he is a wonderful colleague who provides stability and continuity and finds a way to get things done at the right pace for Ryerson.

Given his love for teaching, and all the hours he has spent on the work of Academic Council, it seemed especially appropriate to pay tribute to Errol and his outstanding career among colleagues where academic decisions are made.

So on behalf of all of us, over the past 36 years, today, and into the future where your strength and wisdom will continue to be in evidence thank you for your enormous contribution in building the university we are today.

It is my pleasure to ask the Chancellor, Dr. Raymond Chang, to join me in bestowing the title of Provost and Vice-President, Academic Emeritus on Dr. Errol Aspevig.

The certificate reads:

In recognition of the great distinction with which he has served  
the University over 36 years, and in honour of his outstanding  
academic leadership,  
Ryerson University confers upon  
Dr. Errol Aspevig  
The title of  
Provost and Vice President Academic Emeritus  
Presented this 1st day of May 2007.

E. Aspevig stated that it has been an honour to serve on Council for the past 15 years. Council is always serious, responsible and collegial. He was especially aware of the

collegiality seven or eight years ago when he was recovering from a serious illness and he received a card signed by everyone at Council.

Chancellor Chang announced that he will be funding a scholarship in Errol's name. The endowment will be for \$125,000.

A photograph was taken and a celebratory cake cut and served.

The President added a few items to his written report. On April 26 there was a visit from the new Indian High Commissioner, Mr. R.L. Narayan. This was his first visit to Toronto in his new capacity. The President was honoured to co-host the event with R. Seethapathy, a member of the Board of Governors. The President left that event to attend the signing of an agreement with the French university, L'Institute Nationale de l'Audiovisual (INA).

Monsieur Daniel Jouanneau, the Ambassador of France to Canada, and Mr. Phillippe Delacroix, Counsel General of France, among others, were in attendance. The signing was for an agreement between INA and Ryerson's School of Radio and Television Arts, and with it Ryerson joins a select few universities with such agreements, including Harvard, UCLA and Beijing University.

The President thanked those members who will not be returning to Council in the fall (Michelle Dionne, John Morgan, Liz Evans, Gerald Hunt, P. Schneiderman, Sue Edwards, Chris Evans, Nora Loreto, Gail Alivio, Tracey Haug, Jason Pierce, Taras Kouluk, Anna Lyn, Andrea Warnick, Laura Brown, Roxana Gherman, Ali Ashraf, Maudad Quazi and Robin Castelino) for their dedicated service to the community. He announced the attendance of Heather Kere as the new RSU representative and Hilda Otieno as the new CESAR representative.

S. Levy announced that this was the last ever meeting of Academic Council, as it will become a Senate in the fall. Documents are in the process of being changed. The change will be approved along with the provincial budget bill.

A Ryerson achievement report, which documents all of the achievements recognized over the year in chronological order, was distributed.

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

The Secretary reported that the Academic Council Schedule for next year was posted as usual, and that the dates of the Faculty Course Survey would be distributed after the RFA meeting regarding ratification of the online survey.

## **3. Good of the University – E. Evans chaired.**

D. Mason asked for an update on the report he had requested on the effect of the US Patriot Act on the University. The President asked J. Hanigsberg, General Counsel and Secretary of the Board, to give a preliminary report. She stated that there is an audit being done across administrative areas of the university with material due at the end of May. There is a standard clause for outsourcing and other requirements with respect to privacy. There was a meeting of the COU to look at what other provinces which have already dealt with this issue are doing. There have been discussions with Turnitin.com about provision of only numbers

to the site and not student names. Only the University would know the names linked to papers.

J.P. Boudreau thanked the University, including the Registrar's Office, Secretary of Academic Council and the Academic Integrity Office, for a smooth exam process. He recognizes that it is a phenomenal amount of work and an organizational challenge. He thanked Dr. Schulman for all of the calls and emails over this period. He believes that the process has gone well, but that there are challenges. First, he believes that there is a sense of disconnect on the part of instructors and students at exams. One professor wanted to make an announcement thanking his students and could not do that, and one wanted to return assignments and could not do so. The second issue he raised was that there is a great divide between what happens in the semester and what happens in finals. For some, the last exam is actually just a last exam, not a final exam, and they have been doing exams in tiered classes all semester. He realizes that departments are probably in violation of policy in not having a 50/1 ratio of students to invigilators, but this is a cost issue. He asked that someone look at the possibility of running the 4<sup>th</sup> test in the same classroom as during the semester, and asked if that might reduce the number of days needed at the Convention Centre. He strongly supports the work of Council and of the Secretary.

In response, the Provost commented that the use of the Convention Centre was developed through discussion with the Deans. Some students were concerned about the integrity of the exam process. Those students concerned about others cheating felt disadvantaged. There is also the issue of announcements being made while other students are taking exams in the same room. This was very disturbing. It was difficult for people to supervise classrooms and hallways, and there was a lot of noise to contend with. With growth, and as tiered classes were created, Ryerson did not have the facilities to ensure that students could not see others' papers. There was a need to generate appropriate space to write. There was a sense that it was not inappropriate for exams to have a more formal tone. The Convention Centre was chosen because it is easy to get to by public transportation; there is less difficulty with fire alarms, better facilities, less disturbance, and more integrity. It is essential that there be no question about the integrity of the Ryerson exam process. He believes that use of the convention center is effective. There are trade offs. There can be some changes made going forward, but all things considered it is a better system than previously.

S. Rosen asked if there is a system of preventative support, in light of the incidents at Virginia Tech. He reported on an incident he experienced several years ago, which he did not believe was properly handled, and asked if Ryerson is examining its procedures. The President replied that the University is doing a review and an external audit. COU will be looking at best practices of all universities. He assured him that a lot of attention is being paid to this, not only by Ryerson, but by all universities. It is hard to balance the problem and individual student rights. Ryerson is taking a leadership role. L. Grayson will give a comprehensive report in the fall, when there are concrete recommendations. There are many initiatives already in place.

R. Gherman asked what professors should do if they receive a paper they are concerned about and if that person has a right to pass that on. It was responded that concern can be raised through the Chair to the Dean, to security, to Counseling Services, the Director of Student Services, the Vice Provost Students, or to the Behaviour Risk Assessment Team

where recommendations can be made on how to proceed. Wherever it is brought, it will be sent to the right place and dealt with. Z. Fawaz commented that safety is of utmost importance and taken very seriously. This issue has been a subject of discussion at three meetings today alone. D. Androutsos commented that there could also be concerns with staff or faculty.

#### **4. Minutes**

**Motion:** *That Academic Council approve the minutes of the April 4, 2007 meeting.*  
D. Mason moved, O. Falou seconded.

**Motion approved.**

#### **5. Business Arising from the Minutes**

R. Rose asked about follow-up on reviewing the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct. Z. Fawaz responded that a committee is being formed and there will be student representation on that committee. It is hoped that this will be done over the next few months and come back to Council in the fall.

5.1 Tripartite Curriculum Review Report - E. Aspevig brought the Tripartite Curriculum Review back to Council for its endorsement. There were two changes made to the recommendations as the result of the discussion at the April meeting. Based on C. Stuart's comments, Recommendation 5 has been changed to state that the subcommittee review and make a recommendation with regard to the size of PR tables. Recommendation 13 has been modified based on D. Mason's question about incorporating a prerequisite structure. E. Aspevig stated that no one has contacted him with further comments.

**Motion:** *That Academic Council endorse the May 1, 2007 Tripartite Curriculum Review Report.*

A. Shilton seconded.

J. Morgan asked about the affect of adopting the report. E. Aspevig stated that it becomes a basis for the recommended reviews and is the authorization for ASC to proceed under the established principles.

J.P. Boudreau asked about item 16 under Associate Matters concerning the recommendation that "Departments ensure that experiential learning be a part of every Ryerson student's education" and the financial ramifications of this. E. Aspevig stated that the word "ensure" does not mean an absolute requirement, but a goal that would be met where it is possible to do so.

**Motion approved.**

#### **6. Correspondence**

There was no correspondence.

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

7.1 From the G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education: There were no questions.

7.2 From the School of Graduate Studies: M. Yeates announced a correction to page 35 which should read “admission requirements to the nutrition program and completion of at least one *of each of the following*. On page 38 Special topics I will be implemented in May, 2007 not September, 2007. A. Chan asked about B. Comm credits for non B. Com students mentioned on page 34, and W. Cukier explained that the course requirement for non B. Comm. Students is greater than that for B. Comm. students.

J.P. Boudreau asked about the minimum of B average for the Nutrition Communication program and if it compares to other programs. M. Yeates stated that a B average is extremely important.

## **8. Reports of Committees**

8.1 Report of the Nominating Committee – I. Baitz presented.

This report fills the vacancies for committees for the fall 2007. He thanked M. Dionne as chair of the committee, and D. Schulman for organizing the nominations.

**Motion: *That Academic Council approve the members of standing committees presented in the report.***

O. Falou seconded.

**Motion approved.**

8.2 Report of the Academic Standards Committee – E. Aspevig presented and moved.

**8.2.1 Motion #1: *That Academic Council approve the Certificate in Enterprise Mainframe Computing for IBM Z Series Computers.***

U. George seconded

It was asked how many people will be served by this certificate and it was responded that the introductory course is expected to enroll 25 students, which is the capacity of the computer lab.

**Motion approved**

**8.2.2 Motion #2: *That Academic Council approve the Certificate in Environmental Public Health Leadership***

A. Shilton seconded.

**Motion approved**

**8.2.3 Motion #3: *That Academic Council approve the revisions in Certificate in Computer Applications***

U. George seconded

**Motion approved**

**8.2.4 Motion #4: That Academic Council approve the discontinuation of the Certificates in Computer Programming (Computer Systems) and Computer Programming (Engineering)**

O. Falou seconded

**Motion approved**

**8.2.5 Motion #5: That Academic Council approve the revisions in Certificate in Family Supports**

A. Shilton seconded

**Motion approved**

**8.2.6 Motion #6: That Academic Council approve the revision in Certificate in Project Management.**

A. Shilton seconded

**Motion approved.**

**8.2.7 Motion #7: That Academic Council approve the program in Mathematics and its Applications leading to the Bachelor of Science (Mathematics) degree**

D. Mason seconded

The name of the program was questioned and S. Ferrando, Chair of the Department of Mathematics, responded that the program is an option in the science program and the name is appropriate to the design of the program. In a response to a question about the access to minors in social science, S. Ferrando stated that because of the constraints on the number of courses on the program, these minors were not built in. In response to a question on the granting of a B.Sc., M. Zeytinoglu stated that this is appropriate because the program is based on the contemporary science platform.

C. Cassidy noted that there is an option in Economics. S. Ferrando explained that students come into the contemporary science program and then select from options. This option was agreed to by the Department of Economics.

**Motion approved.**

**8.2.8 Motion #8: That Academic Council approve a reduction in the Liberal Studies requirement for engineering programs to a minimum of four one-semester courses.**

S. Boctor seconded

R. Ravindran complemented the Provost on his statement in the Tripartite Curriculum Review on writing. In industry he noted that many engineers cannot articulate. While he has been at Ryerson the number of LS courses has gone from eight to six and now to four. He believes this is not a problem, but he asks if the quality of the LS courses has been enhanced. E. Aspevig stated that there was discussion of this matter at ASC and also between the Deans of Arts and of Engineering, Architecture and Science. S. Boctor stated that writing skills are a problem, but that a remedial language program was instituted in cooperation with Faculty of Arts such that students take language courses based on a proficiency exam. Students must pass the language proficiency test before going to third year. Visiting accreditation teams for all programs stated that there is no longer a writing concern. Dean Cassidy stated that all LS courses have a minimum writing component which she personally verifies. C. Cassidy stated that the proposal is for students with writing problems to be channeled into writing-intensive courses. Even though the number of courses is decreased, the intensity of the writing component will be increased.

R. Castelino stated that he had been an undergraduate in Engineering and he realized that his writing skills had diminished over time. He is concerned that four LS might not be sufficient. D. Androutsos stated that a bigger problem is that calculus is not required in high school, and students' Math skills are worse than their English skills. Z. Fawaz commented that, in their defense, he is impressed with the communication skills of engineering students. These skills are evident when they represent Ryerson in competitions, many of which have a presentation component. Students are not generally deficient in this area.

J. Morgan stated that, as someone who has taught first year students for 25 years, he is terrified by the writing skills of first-year students, and notes that there is still a deficiency in the fourth year. He believes, however, that the discussion should not just focus on writing. The reduction in LS courses is not in keeping with the recommendation to increase elective choice. The LS offer students experience in critical thinking of a particular kind and make them better citizens. J.P. Boudreau stated that we should also think about the professionally related component, and look at ways to put some of the pressure on that area to accomplish these goals. Psychology offers several PR courses with written components to other programs. PR courses can play a big role and programs need to look at this component. A.M. Singh asked if this reduction detracts from the good citizen notion. C. Cassidy replied that she is a great advocate of LS and does not disagree at all with what has been said. She believes that what we are dealing with is the external pressures of accreditation. It would be better if students took 8 LS, but there is an imposed accreditation reality. She agrees that it is a sad day, but the load that engineering students need to carry to meet accreditation requirements is beyond that of other students in other universities.

M. Zeytinoglu commented that the issue of writing competencies is universal. At other universities, students must complete writing intensive courses. The TPC review cites the need to enhance writing skills. The ASC noted that the freeing up of resources by reducing the LS courses for engineering students will help to improve the overall LS course quality. There is a writing component in PR courses and P courses as well, and other courses which allow students to become good citizens. E. Aspevig stated that ASC was quite concerned about the student load, and it is hard to expect students to perform as well with too many courses. The engineering student load is high compared to other universities across Canada.

This is not an argument against LS, but rather a means to bring the programs in line with other engineering programs.

S. Rosen stated that Council needs to look at what the essence is of a university graduate, and the development of students that goes beyond the examination of this one program.

O. Falou commented that it is important to look at how seriously students take LS courses. Engineering students need to be shown how important these are for their future.

T. Venetsanopoulos commented, as former Dean of Engineering at U of T, that this is not unlike the situation at other universities. U of T added a writing component to all engineering courses. This was done by experts in communications, and the writing evaluated by experts as well.

**Motion approved.**

**8.2.9 Motion #9: That Academic Council approve the program in Biomedical Engineering leading to the Bachelor of Engineering (Biomedical Engineering) degree**

S. Omer seconded

D. Mason noted that, in his opinion, the already reduced four LS courses in this program are now reduced to three LS courses, as the fourth is to be selected from a small group. M. Zeytinoglu stated that this small group of “impact of technology” courses was considered by the LS council as appropriate, and is already in place for engineering. S. Boctor stated that this agreement has been in place since 1991. D. Mason stated that he is not arguing against the courses, but it bothers him that we are moving in this direction. E. Aspevig commented that the function and content of courses need to be taken into consideration. ASC had comfort with this.

**Motion approved.**

The President commented on the quality of discussion on the last two motions.

**9. New Business**

9.1 Academic Plan Update – E. Aspevig presented the report. Ryerson has exceeded expectations and is way ahead of where we dreamed we would be. This is due to the leadership of the Deans and the work of the whole community. Staff, faculty, students, Academic Council, and the BOG have all been engaged as the University moves ahead. Their originally broad objectives have been gradually consolidated around fewer priorities, bringing together the Academic Plan, the Quality Agenda and the Multi-Year Agreement. Each Dean has provided a few pages that address just these priorities. The report is provided for information.

There were no questions. The President commended E. Aspevig for his work on the plan as it is handed over to his successor.

T. Venetsanopoulos presented his report on SRC. The President commented that members could ask questions via email.

J.P. Boudreau asked about CFI/MRI and CRCs and the tie to precise formulas. He also asked if there is a way to see where all the strengths are in terms of research, so that collaborations can be built, and what can be done to increase advocacy in Queen's Park and in Ottawa. T. Venetsanopoulos replied that CRCs are based on a rolling average formula over three years. If that percentage increases faster than other universities, the number of CRCs will increase. U of T actually lost 12 chairs, because it did not increase faster than inflation. Ryerson increased by 25%. There is no formula for the CFI. Last year three out of five applications were successful. There are not too many CFI opportunities in the future. As to ways to visualize strengths, there are about 700 professors and 150 who have externally funded research. Clusters are already being created. He is trying to collect data to visualize this information through an expertise database. In terms of advocacy, he is working to create opportunities for faculty to serve on granting council committees. He networks and advocates regularly both at the national and provincial levels.

R. Ravindran complemented T. Venetsanopoulos for a comprehensive report, and noted the national trend in NSERC. He also complemented the ORS.

The President wished all members well, commenting that it has been a great year thanks to all.

## **10. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Diane R. Schulman PhD  
Secretary of Academic Council