

**MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING
TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 2008
AMENDED**

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

1. President's Report

President Levy was at AUCC and A. Mitchell chaired. He sent his regrets. Members were informed that if they had questions about the President's report, they could send them to the President.

2. Report of the Secretary of Senate

2.1 Special Senate Meeting – The Secretary informed Senate of the Special Senate meeting, which is scheduled for June 3, 2008 at 3:00 p.m. in LIB-72. The meeting will be to discuss approval of the Academic Plan, approval of the Report of the *ad hoc* Committee to Review the Senate, and possibly to approve graduate programs.

3. Good of the University

M. Lefebvre announced the Writers' Series, which takes place this Thursday, April 10. The first speaker will be Trish Cohen.

T. Whitfield announced that Gould Street was closed last week by the student unions, and that there is a petition at the table if people care to sign.

S. Abdelgadir announced that the National Society of Black Engineering's (NSBE) conference was held recently. He thanked President Levy, the Provost and the Dean of Engineering for their support. The convention will be at Ryerson in 2010. There will be a planning meeting scheduled shortly.

I. Baitz reported that there was a team from GCM, who traveled to a competition in San Francisco and took first prize for their submission.

4. Minutes of the March 4, 2008 Meeting

4.1 Motion that Senate approve the minutes of the March 4, 2008 meeting

D. Mason moved, T. Schwerdtfeger seconded.

Motion approved.

5. Business Arising from the Minutes

5.1 Amendments to Policy #157 – "Establishment of Student Email Accounts for Official University Communication" (the Email Policy).

5.1.1 Motion: That Senate approve the amendments to Policy 157 – Establishment of Student Email Accounts for Official University Communication

K. Alnwick moved, D. Mason seconded

K. Alnwick reported that the committee discussed the issues in terms of electronic communication from students. D. Checkland asked about "official" vs. "formal" communication. K. Alnwick stated that there is a spam filter that might remove messages from non-Ryerson accounts and that when they come from other email accounts, there may be a question as to who it is from. J.P. Boudreau asked if there should be a cross reference in

the Course Management Policy. The Secretary said this would be reviewed and brought back to the next meeting.

Motion approved.

5.2 Report of the Senate Appeals Committee to review the Student Code of Academic Conduct (Policy #60)

5.2.1 Motion: That Senate approve the revised Student Code of Academic Conduct (Policy #60)

D. Sydor moved, K. Alnwick seconded

D. Mason asked about the onerous process for faculty to discuss misconduct issues with students and stated that this can be difficult for large groups. He also believes there is a perception that the minimum penalty is too high, and that is why some faculty do not charge students. D. Heyd, Chair of the Senate Appeals Committee, spoke from the floor. He stated that there is no requirement to assign a penalty, and if there are large numbers of students involved, the policy is flexible, and there can be an equitable way to deal with the situation in consultation with the Academic Integrity officer. On the issue of penalties, there is no onus on the professor to give even a minimum penalty if there is no finding of misconduct, and there is an Academic Integrity seminar that is a possible educational intervention.

D. Checkland asked, under section D6, how it is known if there is a decision not to charge. D. Heyd stated that there needs to be a written decision. If the instructor does not make a decision, then it is *de facto* not made.

T. Whitfield asked about the change to Section C7 stating that the Faculty Appeals Committee may assign a penalty higher. He asked that if there can be a second appeal to a Faculty Appeals Committee. D. Heyd commented that firstly, “exceptional” circumstances, as stated in the previous policy, could not be defined, and secondly, the Faculty Appeals Committee is a deliberative committee that has knowledge of community standards and their decision has more weight than that of an individual instructor. This maintains a common standard. D. Schulman, stated that there is always an appeal to the Senate where there is no ability to increase the penalty.

T. Whitfield also asked about notification via Ryerson email addresses. He asked if a student facing suspension or expulsion could be contacted by phone or in writing. D. Schulman clarified that students need to check their email as per the previous e-mail policy discussion, and that it is also not optimal for students to be contacted by letter or phone as it is not confidential. S. Abdelgadir stated that students should know that they need to check their email. A. Shepard stated that suspension or expulsion is serious, and that there are breaches of privacy in leaving voice mail or writing a letter, and that this is not disrespectful.

D. Mason commented on the penalty section, stating that faculty can be very detail oriented and the fact that the minimum penalty is a “0” on the work. D. Heyd clarified that if the

professor does not know if there has been misconduct, or if there are doubts, then the student should not be assigned a penalty. If the instructor is sure, the minimum penalty is assigned. Then there is a two-tiered appeals process. D. Heyd clarified that there is an Academic Integrity tutorial. D. Schulman stated that there were over 400 students who went through the process and only half of those were charged with misconduct. Of those, the vast majority received the minimum penalty.

R. Rose asked about notification and whether an electronic receipt could be requested. She also asked if there is a telephone number for someone to contact to ask questions. K. Alnwick stated that there is no capacity to get a receipt that an email has been received. It is the student's obligation to monitor their email. This is how the university communicates important matters. The Academic Integrity Office can be called for questions.

T. Whitfield proposed an amendment to section D10 to include students from RSU and CESAR in the formulation of procedures. D. Schulman stated that it would be difficult to determine who was an RSU or CESAR member. A. Shepard spoke for the amendment.

There was a discussion of whether there should be an acceptance of the amendment without a vote. A. Mitchell accepted the motion as amended.

Motion approved as amended.

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

Z. Fawaz reported that the draft Code has been reviewed at four very productive meetings, one of which was held just after Senate and attended by the public. Subsequent meetings were held, and the Code may be ready to come forward to the next meeting of Senate. Members of the committee are at the table.

6. Correspondence – There was no correspondence.

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

7.1 Report #W2008-1 of the Composition and By-Laws Committee

7.1.1 Motion #1: That Senate approve the Graphic Communications Management School Council By-Laws

D. Checkland moved, D. Doz seconded.

Motion approved.

7.1.2 Motion #2: That Senate approve the amendments to the Physics Department Council By-Laws

D. Checkland moved, P. Goldman seconded.

Motion approved.

7.2 Report #W2008-1 of the School of Graduate Studies:

7.2.1 Review of Status of New Graduate Programs

M. Yeates reviewed the status table, adding that Wallace and Stone have submitted their report and the Literature of Modernities report is being prepared. There were no questions.

7.2.2 Motion: That Senate approve the submission of the proposal for a Master of Arts in Fashion to the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies for Standard Appraisal.

M. Yeates moved, R. Rose seconded.

The full details of the brief are on the web. The CVs are in the Senate office and the School of Graduate Studies office. The program was outlined. There was an internal/external review of the program with suggestions added to the proposal. D. Checkland asked if there is a statement of 16 faculty associated with this program, and if that is a commitment on the part of the University. M. Yeates stated that it was not, and clarified that this included retirements, etc. D. Checkland noted that if there were fewer hires, this would be reflected in increased undergrad teaching loads. L. Lewis, chair of Fashion, commented from the floor that there will be replacements for retirements and a number of new positions, and she is quite confident that there will be sufficient faculty for the program.

J. P Boudreau noted that there is a member of the School of Fashion on Senate. He asked if there is an ongoing search for a director, and this was confirmed. This will not affect the timing of the hiring.

Motion approved.

M. Yeates thanked and congratulated L. Lewis and the School of Fashion. A. Matthews David commented that this would be a first for a graduate program in Canada.

8. Reports of Committees

8.1 Report #W2008-2 of the Academic Standards Committee:

8.1.1 Motion #1: That Senate approve the periodic program review of the Urban and Regional Planning program with the recommendations listed in the ASC Evaluation section.

A. Shepard moved, D. Mason seconded.

M. Zeytinoglu commented on the program review process, and that there are three parts to the report: a calendar-type review; a documentation review including a peer review and the response to the peer review; and the ASC assessment of the review. He briefly reviewed the three recommendations. A. Kahan asked what “non-verbal communication” means. J.P. Boudreau stated that there was an appreciation of the recognition of individual efforts, and

asked about the structured advising system. M. Zeytinoglu stated that this means that faculty provide individual advice, but that as faculty go on leave, etc, there should be a more formal method of providing advising. The Program Advisory Committee will be asked to give a report in a year, and they will be asked to state what they have done.

Motion approved.

8.1.2 **Motion #2: That Senate approve the periodic program review of the Journalism program with the recommendations listed in the ASC Evaluation section.**

A. Shepard moved, U. George seconded.

R. Rose commented that the critical issues course should be earlier in the four years. She asked whether equipment included labs and computers. P. Knox, Chair of the School of Journalism, said that it does. There are 600 students at the graduate and undergraduate programs and that there is a constant need for the programs to be upgraded.

D. Checkland asked about the comment regarding weaknesses in critical thinking skills and abilities. He is interested in knowing what gets taught, and how to identify the particular skills in specific disciplines. There are also broad considerations in terms of contradictions in different ways of thinking. He is frustrated about the generic nature of the comments on critical thinking skills. There is not an obvious answer as to what students really should know. There also seems to be a generic issue around writing skills. He did not mean this to be a discussion about turf wars. P. Knox commented that curriculum changes had been approved several years ago and there was a great deal of discussion of this issue at that time. These are good questions that cannot be addressed in the context of one program's review. Journalism is constrained in the curriculum. There were compulsory courses in an earlier iteration of the program, and there was a need to reduce the number of courses. The Critical Issues in Journalism course is not meant to replace anything offered by Philosophy which are open to journalism students. The same is true for the ethics course, and this is in keeping with what happens in other journalism schools. A. Mitchell commented that this kind of discussion happens regularly at Academic Standards Committee meetings.

Z. Murphy commented that she commends the inclusion of the item on language and reading skills as a weakness area, and that there may be ways to respond to deteriorating language skills across the board. She asked where the issue might be addressed in the report going forward. She asked if there could be an improvement in these skills in student retention, particularly English Language support.

Motion approved.

P. Knox stated that the person who deserves the credit for the report is S. Kelman, who was in attendance. He thanked M. Zeytinoglu and the Academic Standards Committee.

8.1.3 Motion #3: That Senate approve the proposed revisions to Policy #112 Approval Process for New Undergraduate Programs and to Policy #126 Periodic Program Review of Undergraduate Programs.

This motion was withdrawn as the undergraduate degree level expectations were not included. This will be brought back to Senate at the next meeting.

9. New Business

9.1 Senate Representation on the Ryerson University Alumni Association

A. Kahan recognized T. Forkes, and then briefly outlined the engagement of alumni through the newly formed Ryerson University Alumni Association (RUAA). R. Besse has agreed to be the chair of RUAA. There is an alumni member of the Board sitting on RUAA. And S. Dhebar will sit on the RUAA as the Senate representative.

10. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned 7:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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