

**MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING**

**TUESDAY, JANUARY 29, 2008**

<b>Members Present:</b>			
<b><u>Ex-Officio:</u></b>	<b><u>Faculty:</u></b>		<b><u>Students:</u></b>
K. Alnwick	P. Albanese	Y. T. Leong	G. Alivio
S. Boctor	D. Androutsos	D. Mason	S. Abdelgadir
M. Dewson	M. Antony	A. Matthews David	A. Bahadur
D. Doz	I. Baitz	M. McAllister	T. Hassan
Z. Fawaz	J. P. Boudreau	A. Mitchell	H. Kere
U. George	V. Chan	Z. Murphy	M. Levine
L. Grayson	D. Checkland	J. Norrie	E. Moss
K. Jones	P. Corson	M. Panitch	R. Sadjadi
A. Kahan	D. Elder	R. Ravindran	
M. Lefebvre	C. Farrell	D. Rose	
S. Levy	P. Goldman	S. Rosen	<b><u>Alumni:</u></b>
A. Shepard	M. Greig	A. Singh	A. Walker
A. Shilton	R. Hudyma	C. Stuart	
P. Stenton	R. Keeble	D. Tucker	
A. Venetsanopoulos	D. Lee	K. Webb	
<b><u>Regrets:</u></b>	<b><u>Absent:</u></b>		
C. Cassidy	S. Dhebar		
G. R. Chang	S. Ghebresslassie		
T. Dewan	S. Omer		
O. Falou	H. Otieno		
J. Lassaline	R. Rose		
T. Schwerdtfeger	M. Stanton		
D. Sydor	T. Whitfield		
M. Yeates			

**1. President's Report –**

Applications from the Guelph Application Centre indicate that the system was up 4.8. Ryerson is up 12.5 % and first-year choices are up as well. We are second only to U of T in applications. Given the relative size, this is incredible. This is due to the academic reputation of the university.

Ryerson received a \$500,000 grant from Sunnybrook hospital in Inter-professional health care competition for the Stroke Network. The Chang School won \$2.8M for the Internationally-educated professionals program. K. Jones reported on the MBA Games which involve academics, spirit and athletics. Last year, we came third, and this year we came first in academics and spirit, and third in athletics. Josh Raskin, the Director of “I Met the Walrus”, and a New Media 2004 Ryerson graduate, was nominated for an academy award in the animated short film category.

The President reported that the Sam the Record Man's and Future Shop sites, the property on Bond and on Church Streets were purchased. The Premier gave Ryerson \$45M to assist with building a library on Yonge Street. Today, Ryerson received \$6.8M in funding.

**2. Report of the Secretary of Senate**

The Secretary reported on Elections.

**3. The Good of the University – A. Mitchell chaired.**

D. Checkland gave a handout on sabbaticals, which he reviewed. He asked if there is a role for Senate in the articulation of the reason for sabbaticals. These are, in part, for SRC, and result in such things as publications. He is concerned about the apparent loss of some of the other rationales for sabbaticals, which are to provide opportunity for reflection, re-orientation and re-organization of SRC agendas in other directions. Another rationale is a re-orientation that is not as specific, but just to allow a time for something different. In practice, sabbaticals are in danger of becoming unimportant. He has no particular agenda in raising the issue, but if there is a shift solely for SRC, that should be a decision and not the result of drift.

D. Elder reported that the contract for CUPE I included a provision for reimbursement for professional development, and members have still not gotten a procedure for reimbursement. There is still an issue about paying TAs and GAs in a timely fashion. The President said that he did not know about this in advance and could not respond, but the matter would be looked into.

D. Mason stated that this is not the first time that the pay issue has been raised. The President stated that he did not know if it is the same issue as before or just the same symptom. M. Dewson stated that there was communication about the critical requirement to get information to HR in a timely way, but there are still some delays in submission of information. There is no disagreement that the issues need to be resolved.

**4. Minutes of the December 4, 2007 meeting.**

**Motion to approve the Minutes of the December 4, 2007 meeting:**

D. Mason, M. Levine seconded

**Motion approved.**

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

**5.1 Report on the Special Senate Meeting –**

Notes were distributed. The Provost thanked Senators for attending, and found it a most stimulating and engaged meeting. The comments are a summary of the notes from each facilitator. These will have influence on the Academic Plan. He summarized some of the categories that were addressed. There was a student Town Hall just before Senate meeting, which was attended by about 40 students. There will be additional cluster groups in the next few weeks. Further input is requested. A. Mitchell commented that the facility that we are in may be one reason that there is not a lot of interaction based on the physical setup of the room.

**5.2 Motion on Examination Scheduling -**

D. Mason asked that this item be moved to New Business, until after discussion of item 8.1.1.

**6. Correspondence -**

There was no correspondence.

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

There were no reports.

**8. Reports of Committees -**

**8.1 Report of the *Ad hoc* GPA Review Committee:**

Z. Fawaz presented. D. Schulman was commended for leading the committee and keeping them on time and on task. He thanked the *ad hoc* committee, the Learning and Teaching Committee, and the APG. The office of the Vice Provost Students was established to support the Report on Student Engagement and Experience. It was clear to him that a revision of the Grading, Promotion and Standing policy would support this effort. The Provost agreed, and changes are proposed to be put in place for the Fall 2008 term.

The changes bring Ryerson in line with other Canadian universities, with standing based on GPA alone. The changes will compel us to pay additional attention to students who encounter difficulties; there is a clear desire to do this. There will be students who, despite interventions, will have difficulties, and the proposed changes help students get “de-invested” from a program in which they cannot succeed. He related the story of a very successful student who benefited from not being suspended after an unsuccessful first semester.

**8.1.1 Motion: *That Senate approve the revisions to Policy 46, The Grading Promotion and Academic Standing Policy as presented for implementation for Fall 2008.***

A. Fawaz moved and S. Abdelgadir seconded.

V. Chan asked about probationary contracts. It was clarified that changes are not being made to individual program practices on probationary contracts. The spirit is for additional support. V. Chan asked about 2.5.c.i. It was clarified that the policy does not override existing policy in Engineering.

D. Mason stated that it is unclear why someone would be “Required to Withdraw” after the Fall term. He asked that, in paragraph F2.4.3, the word “normally” should be replaced with “otherwise”. The friendly amendment was accepted. It was clarified that a student can be “Required to Withdraw” for failure to meet a probationary contract. It was also clarified that it is up to the department to electronically log probationary contracts.

J. Norrie stated that, there should not be a minimum policy that is disabled by subsequent policies at the local level, as these are unfair to students. C. Stuart asked if it is possible for a part-time student to have a limit on the number of terms they can be on Probation. It was clarified that there is not. She further asked about the application of CE courses to a program. K. Alnwick stated that CE courses can apply to a degree. Currently, suspended students can enroll in up to two courses per term, and have them credited to their program. This is changed. Z. Fawaz stated that the policy is geared to giving all the support necessary to allow students to succeed. But once they have failed in this effort, they need time to de-invest in the program. In the current policy, this was the “second chance” of sorts. Now they need to serve a time out, and then approach the program for reinstatement if they still wish to continue. The statement of understanding, while on suspension, is no longer part of the policy. Reinstatement will be at the discretion of the program admission committee, and there will be a variety of follow-up on the details.

J. Norrie stated that courses taken while on suspension allowed students to show their ability as part of the requirement for reinstatement. It was asked how schools would decide about reinstatement. K. Alnwick stated that it is clear that some schools will want to see performance before reinstatement. There have been extensive discussions on this to look at strategies to enable Faculty-based approaches.

It was agreed to remove Institute on Page 10. The title of the policy should include “Undergraduate”.

S. Abdelgadir stated that students appreciate the changes proposed to support students. These changes are beneficial to students.

**Motion approved.**

## **8.2 Report of the Senate Academic Standards Committee –**

### **8.2.1 Motion: *That Senate approve the Periodic Program Review of the Computer Engineering program with the recommendations listed in the ASC Evaluation section.***

A. Shepard moved and A. Mitchell seconded.

M. Zeytinoglu stated that the report is the assessment of the Computer Engineering Program. The results of the accreditation visit and their assessment report is used as part of the program review, along with supplemental material to meet the PPR policy requirements. The report includes a recommendation to approve the review.

J. P. Boudreau asked about the developmental plan and the category of curriculum. It was clarified that some of the curricular changes have already been implemented at the undergraduate level. J. P. Boudreau asked if a review requests changes, what the timeline

is for implementation of the changes?. The President asked if this question could be passed on to the Dean of Graduate Studies. This program review is on the undergraduate program.

**Motion approved.**

**9. New Business –**

**Motion on Examination Scheduling:**

D. Mason asked A. Shepard about his notion of the progress toward a more rational period of grading. The Provost responded that the new GPA policy will change what happens at the end of the Fall semester. There will be no need to review student standings. Given this, for most years there will be extra time for grading. For two out of seven years, it is still difficult. It was agreed that there would be a discussion of ways to deal with the scenarios for those years.

Based on this, D. Mason asked to leave the motion on the table until the next meeting, so that there could be further discussion before the next meeting.

**10. Meeting adjourned 7:15 pm.**

Respectfully submitted,

Diane R. Schulman, Ph.D.  
Secretary of Senate