MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING

TUESDAY, March 4, 2008

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

1. President's Report

1.2 Presentation of the Governor General's Silver Medal

The President announced the recipient of a Governor General's Silver Medal to Julia Bazylevych, and Provost Alan Shepard presented it. Ryerson now qualifies for two of these medals.

The President listed the Honorary Doctorates as mentioned in his report, adding the name of Norman Jewison for the FCAD convocation.

There will be an announcement of the gallery on Gould Street this week. There will be an article in the Toronto Star.

2. Report of the Secretary of Senate

2.1 Senate Election Results - The Secretary confirmed the names of the two elected faculty representatives in the Faculty of Communication and Design (Alexandra Ball – Image Arts; and Jana Macalik, Interior Design).

3. The Good of the University - A. Mitchell chaired.

M. Panitch commended RyeAccess for hosting the Lieutenant Governor today.

S. Dhebar commended the university on the good job it is doing to turn the university around and acquiring the money for a new library building.

D. Checkland reported that the first open Town Hall meeting of the Senate Review Committee will take place on Monday, March 31, 11:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m.

T. Whitfield announced that students were successful in closing Gould Street for an even last month.

4. Minutes of the January 29, 2008 Meeting

4.1 Motion to approve the minutes of the January 29, 2008 meeting

D.Mason approved. I. Baitz. seconded

D. Checkland will send amendments to the Secretary.

Motion approved.

5. Business Arising from the Minutes

5.1 Motion on Examination Scheduling

A. Shepard announced that a good solution has been found to solve the time for grading. The last Friday of the Fall semester will be a Monday. This will allow for more days for grading and for students to have more study time. There will also be an equal number of Fridays and Mondays. The GPA policy revision will also allow for an extra day.

D. Mason noted that the handout on key dates of 2008/2009 Academic year indicated two study days and five grading days; with the assumption that there will be two or three days for study and four or five days for grading. He withdrew the motion.

D. Mason asked about his question on in-camera meetings. D. Checkland said that the reason for such meetings would be reviewed in the context of the Senate Review committee.

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 Senate Appeals Committee on Review of the Student Code of Academic Conduct, Policy #60 (for consideration)

Section A4. "Failing to Abide by the Copyright Act" should state that this should be modified with an adjective like intentional or egregious.

Regarding the 4th paragraph, page 22, O. Falou stated that as teaching assistants are not considered as "instructors" or "staff" they should be added to this list.

8.2 Report of the *Ad hoc* Committee to Review the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct, Policy #61 (for consideration)

The President stated that this meeting is a chance to discuss the Code but there is no resolution. The Code will come back to Senate with a resolution at the April meeting. Between now and then, the draft Code will be on the Senate web site and the Committee is eager to receive comments. The next meeting of the Committee is Friday, March 14, 1:00-2:30 p.m. JOR-1410. Anyone who is interested is welcome to attend or speak to any of the members (their names are in the report). Anyone who wishes to make comments in writing should send them to Vice Provost Students, Zouheir Fawaz, and they will be considered by the Committee.

Z. Fawaz reminded Senate that there was a promise to review this policy. The first meeting was on June 15, 2007, and there have been 12 meetings. The committee members were listed in the report, and there was to be a strong student representation. There were nine students, not all at the same time or to the same degree, but they have been part of the co-authorship of the policy. They are thanked for their valuable participation. In the agenda is the draft version which was decided upon as a result of those meetings. In addition, there has been an undertaking to consult and review other university policies. There was a collection of information in the office the General Counsel in connection with this, and J. Hanigsberg was thanked. The language is similar

to what is in other codes. Other stakeholders were consulted, including the Learning and Teaching, Senate Appeals Committee. This policy is being presented for consultation, and anyone is invited to attend the meeting on March 14, or to give written feedback. The procedures are being worked on in parallel to the policy, and there is a subcommittee for that. New members are welcomed.

The code is designed to ensure that students have a respectful and safe learning environment. The policy is complaint driven. The Code has been modernized, and more appropriate than the existing 20-year-old Code.

Discussion:

A. Mitchell commented that in the Code of Academic Conduct it stated that students who are on Disciplinary Suspension are automatically back in their program, and that is not made clearly. It should be added to the Code.

J. Norrie noted the word usage moves between offences and infractions. This should be considered.

JP Boudreau asked about the application part B item 2, Off-campus in Certain Circumstances – the word "certain" is questioned. Z. Fawaz stated this is applied when students claim to be official representatives of the University.

T. Whitfield asked about section G, and the ability for the Procedures to be changed each year. He asked that the Procedures be voted on along with the Policy. S. Levy commented that he (Whitfield) could join the committee. He asked why they can be changed each year.

P. Albanese referred to some of the items in item14, which are already against the law. Z. Fawaz noted that the policy states that it does not supercede the law or other policies. D. Mason stated that the police may not be prepared to act on an issue, but that Ryerson might want to act upon it.

D. Checkland asked about the authority of the Student Conduct Officer. It is asked what happens if a student does not do what s/he is told to do. D. Schulman commented that this should be written into the Code.

R. Rose asked that the word "satisfactory" be reconsidered in the context of an apology. She further commented that the biggest concern of students is around the use of the internet in the Code. She noted that most students have a Facebook account. She thinks that there might be a misunderstanding of the use of Facebook. Placing things on the wall in Facebook, she stated, is not the same as posting it on a wall on Yonge Street. She asked what would happen with their picture. It is an invasion of privacy, for example, about the posting of a picture of an underage person drinking. She has a concern that the University is monitoring Facebook. S. Levy asked her what she would say about a student who came to the University about harassment that is going on in Facebook, and if the University should take action. She replied that she

herself has been singled out, but there are means for this to be handled under Discrimination and Harassment policy. She does not have all the answers.

H. Kere echoed R. Rose's comments, and added a suggestion that there be public consultations on this as she believes that this is changing the climate of the campus. She asked if the Friday meeting could be an open consultation.

Z. Fawaz clarified that there is no monitoring of what is going on in on-line venues. This is not the case. The statement in the policy is based on input from the students. The wording states that offences under the Code, may be addressed.

J. Norrie commented that a number of people around the table are experts on the field, and that many users are over the age of 34. There is a misconception that the postings are not public. The conduct online is covered the same way as any other forums are covered. This is about student conduct, not where it occurs.

R. Sadjadi asked if it is possible to make a fake account, and it was responded that this is the case.

O. Falou commented on page 39, 1st point, to add Program Director for graduate students.

E. Moss stated that page 36, item 8, complies with directions from "instructor course management" directives.

JP Boudreau stated that on page 40, Appendix A – the composition and purpose of the team is commendable. He asked that the team look to the departments for assistance.

A.M. Singh – page 36, 12a – "students shall not be drunk and disorderly in public" does this apply to areas other than university spaces.

D. Checkland commented on the making of fake accounts. If the person did something on a fake account that was against the Code, how would it be known? D. Mason stated that this is a well-known problem and there are effective ways to trace this.

S. Rosen commented that this is about the very nature of accusation, and what would be a legitimate charge or verifiable accusation.

N. Loreto spoke from the floor. She stated that the deadline for the agenda gives only 2.5 weeks and that is not enough time for consultation. She thinks that there are areas that need work, and that there is concern about the content. She thinks it is very paternalistic/maternalistic. She asks that the consultation be longer and the policy brought for the May meeting.

S. Levy stated that this is a Senate policy, not an administrative policy.

D. Mason stated that the meeting to address the policy is in two weeks, and the deadline is too short for adequate student consultation. He moved that the Code be brought to the floor for May.

S. Levy asked that he return this to the committee for its consideration. He believes that the motion is preemptive. D. Mason still maintained that the timeline was too short and the process should not be rushed.

Z. Fawaz stated that the committee will take as much time as is needed to get it right. The Code is not to be rushed, so it will be brought back when it is ready. That may mean bringing it back in May. The committee will not rush the work.

Motion: that the Code of Non-Academic Conduct not be voted on before the May Senate meeting.
D. Mason moved, R. Rose seconded.

S. Dhebar commented that the students who were on the committee should have consulted with other students.

O. Falou asked that the document be posted on the web. It will be posted on the Senate website in the morning.

J. Norrie asked that the motion be amended at the committee not be forced to bring the policy to the April meeting. D. Mason commented that there was still not enough time. He would agree that there needs to be a consultation before the document is brought back to Senate. R. Rose did not accept the friendly amendment.

R. Hudyma asked if the committee could set its own agenda for bringing the policy forward, and therefore it is inappropriate to tell the committee what to do.

Z. Fawaz clarified that the committee will formulate the final version of the policy, and it is up to the Senate to approve or not approve the policy. There have been eight months of meetings with a strong student presence. When the committee meets again, it will take the feedback and bring a final version to Senate. If there is enough time to come back in April, he would prefer that option. D. Mason stated that he believes Senate has the right to provide its subcommittees with direction.

Motion defeated (27 against - 25 for)

A. Mackay spoke from the floor about the core offences on page 35, and she would hope that the medium of that threat not affect the outcome.

9. New Business

9.1 Revision of Policy #157 – "Establishment of Student Email Accounts for Official University Communication" (the Email Policy)

Wording has been updated to reflect the current technology – the online identity.
K. Alnwick moved, S. Dhebar seconded

It was clarified that the list includes everything that is part of the online identity.

JP Boudreau asked if this should be cross-referenced with the Course Management policy. J. Norrie asked if the policy should state "send and receive". There was a discussion around the need for an address for students to receive official email. S. Levy asked that someone look at this issue, and asked that this motion be considered and then review the additional concern.

9.1.1 Motion: That Senate approve revisions to Policy #157 - the Email Policy

Motion approved.

Motion: that there be an amendment of this policy concerning the sending of email from a Ryerson email account.
J. Norrie moved, D. Mason seconded

Motion approved.

10. Adjournment
Meeting adjourned 7:40 pm.