

MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING
TUESDAY, May 5, 2009

Members Present:			
<u>Ex-Officio:</u>	<u>Faculty:</u>	<u>Students:</u>	
K. Alnwick	A. Bal	A. Lindgren	M. Abadir
S. Boctor	P. Corson	J. Macalik	K. Chadha
P. Coppack	Y. Derbal	D. Mason	T. Hassan
D. Doz	J. Dianda	A. Mitchell	M. Malik
U. George	D. Elder	M. Panitch	S. Martin
J. Hanigsberg	P. Goldman	R. Ravindran	M. Piacente
K. Jones	M. Haider	J. Saber	L. Salvador
A. Kahan	R. Hudyma	A. Singh	A. Sharif
M. Lefebvre	G. Kapelos	C. Stuart	C. Sule
S. Levy	R. Keeble	N. Thomlinson	N. Williams
A. Shepard	J. Lassaline	D. Tucker	P. Yoon
P. Stenton	D. Lee	J. Turtle	
A. Venetsanopoulos	Y. T. Leong	K. Webb	
M. Yeates	A. Levin	A. Wellington	
<u>Regrets:</u>	<u>Absent:</u>		<u>Alumni:</u>
M. Anthony	S. Dhebar		
G. R. Chang	S. Espin		
M. Dewson	C. Gouldson		
A. El-Rabbany			
L. Grayson			
H. Lane Vetere			
J. McIntosh			
H. D. Mwendwa			
Z. Murphy			
D. Rose			
D. Sookram			
A. Walker			

1. President's Report

The President thanked the Senate for agreeing to an early meeting time as he is attending a dinner where Jack Cockwell is being inducted into the Business Hall of Fame. He thanked all of the members who are in attendance and who are not returning. He also noted that it is the last meeting before the new Bylaws come into effect.

He informed Senate that construction of the Gallery will begin soon and the architects will be hired soon for the Student Learning Centre. There is still no announcement from the Federal or Provincial government on the infrastructure projects in Ontario. He informed Senate that the new structure of Senate will give more formality to the budget presentation, but he wished to make a few comments on this year's budget process. The 2008-09 budget year ended on balance with no deficit. The 2009-10 budget is balanced as well, and natural inflation needed to be accommodated, as well as the lost endowment income. There was a wish to increase the bursaries and provide 1% to reallocation of new priorities. Compared to the income from tuition fees and grants, ultimately budgets were not reduced. Fees were split for students, and they can pay them in separate semesters with a \$70 deferral fee which would be covered by OSAP for qualified students. Compared to other universities, it is a good budget without pushing problems to later years. It was unanimously approved by the Board.

2. Report of the Secretary of Senate

There was no report.

3. Good of the University

A. Mitchell chaired. She stated that this is the last Good of the University session, as there is no such session in the new Senate Bylaw.

M. Yeates reported on the granting council's results of the Vanier competition which provides 55 three-year doctoral awards of \$50,000 per year. Universities were given a certain number of nominations they were allowed to submit. Larger universities with relatively small research funds entered in the inter-university competition. Two Ryerson students received awards. Geta Hailu (PhD Mechanical Engineering) received the 2008-2009 NSERC Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarship of \$50,000 per year for two years. Valerie Vorstenbosch, who is currently finishing her MA in Psychology at Ryerson and will be pursuing a doctorate program in Psychology this fall, received a three-year SSHRC Canada Graduate Scholarship of \$35,000 per year. A fair number of universities did not get any awards. The President suggested that there be a congratulatory letter from Senate.

M. Piacente reported that a team from the Ted Rogers School of Management will be hosting the first JDC Central event here, from January 22 to 25, 2010. JDC is a well-rounded competition among Business Schools across Canada, involving challenges in Academics, Parliamentary Debate, Sporting Events and Social/Team Spirit events. It is expected that approximately 400 students will be in attendance.

M. Abadir reported that the first full-time Criminal Justice studies students are graduating this year. She stated that it is an excellent program.

M. Yeates reported that the Canada Scholarship \$35,000 award has been in existence for six to seven years and Ryerson has had five students receive three-year scholarships. Three of the five who had the degree have graduated and the other two will graduate next year in four years or less. He will compare this to the results at other universities.

4. Minutes of the March 31 Meeting

Motion: *That Senate approve the minutes of the March 31 meeting of Senate.*

Moved by R. Ravindran and seconded by D. Mason

Motion approved.

5. Business Arising from the Minutes

5.1.1 **Motion #1:** *That Senate approve the proposed policy on Accommodation of Student Religious, Aboriginal and Spiritual Observance.*

K. Alnwick moved, P. Goldman seconded.

K. Alnwick stated that it was a privilege to work with the committee to review the Accommodation of Student Religious Observance Policy. Feedback received on the policy was about the awareness and understanding of the policy and the sensitivity to the issues. Changes were noted. The President stated that the CAUC noted that Ryerson's current policy is exemplary.

Amendment #1:

L. Salvador passed out an amendment for consideration. She asked what would happen since Ramadan starts in August this year. K. Alnwick reported that per the current policy, students should inform their instructor in the first two weeks. If they have an issue they need to report to the instructor as soon as possible at the beginning of the semester. She stated that the proposed policy is more inclusive. She believes that what is lacking is that while students bear responsibility, instructors have some responsibility to review the calendar before setting the outline. The University has no responsibility to schedule core courses or labs that are offered during times when there is a required observance. The amendment asked to add the statement: "All reasonable efforts should be made by the University to prevent any conflicts between religious and academic obligations for compulsory....."

K. Alnwick stated that the committee believed that a central response was not possible.

D. Mason seconded this amendment.

D. Mason stated that the faculty are required to respond to these requests on their own, and that a reasonable effort on the part of the university would be helpful. This would address the issue of exams on Friday afternoon, etc.

T. Hassan spoke for the amendment.

C. Stuart spoke against the amendment. The notion of reasonable efforts had a lot of discussion. The word "reasonable" is not in the policy so that they should be comfortable to

ask and accommodation given. The notion of reasonable in the amendment means that it may not happen, and then the policy would need to be used. The focus needs to be on education.

M. Haider spoke against the amendment. He stated that if one would try to operate a university of this size with all of the required obligations it would not be possible.

N. Thomlinson opposed the amendment as worded because it is almost impossible given the requirements for loading. It is an additional onus for the Registrar which it may not be able to deliver on, and that would be unfair to the Registrar.

L. Salvador clarified that this was to address core courses.

A. Shepard agreed that it was an untenable position for the Registrar to be put into this position to construct a timetable that recognizes all religions.

D. Mason stated that the duty to accommodate comes down on the faculty member, not the university. If that is the case, then the University has to make a reasonable effort. The duties to accommodate have increased the faculty's workload. He agrees that all efforts would be impossible but that reasonable effort to schedule two sections with one in a time with no issues would be possible.

K. Alnwick stated that degree program courses are scheduled at all hours. Retraining from 1:00-6:00 p.m. on Friday would be 10% of courses. Putting into policy something like this is not meaningful. No other university has such a central practice. Locally rooted response is the only response that will work. There was good reason to not include it in the policy.

T. Hassan stated that she attended a focus group on the policy. There is a lack of options when there is a conflict. So students are forced to choose.

C. Stuart responded that the crux of the issue is that students are forced to choose between observance and class, and that students are not aware of the types of accommodation they can make. She noted that the next two issues were to address examples, education, and a one-year review to see if it is working. The committee was aware of the issues.

M. Malik opposed the amendment. He is concerned that there is a legal duty to accommodate and we are doing that. Including the word "reasonable" makes it ambiguous. He also stated that the spirit of the amendment is already in the policy to take any measures possible.

M. McKay, Co-ordinator, Aboriginal Student Services, addressed Senate and stated that it also addresses spirituality, and it accommodates these issues as well.

Motion to amend defeated.

Returned to a discussion of the Motion #1 (5.1.1).

J. Hanigsberg commented that the policy is very good, but that there is a potential conflict of interest in the section allowing a formal request to the DHPO. There is a strong potential for

that office to find itself in a conflict as if there was not a proper accommodation, the student would likely go to that office. Instead she suggested the student make it to the Chair/Director, and the student can work with the student and the instructor to assist in the policy.

K. Alnwick stated that he accepted this as a friendly amendment. He understands that the mandate of the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Office (DHPO) is to hear complaints and this is awkward in relation to that office.

Amendment #2:

On page 31, second last paragraph, it is suggested that the “DHPO” be replaced with “Chair/Director”.

J. Hanigsberg moved, D. Mason seconded.

M. Malik spoke against the motion to maintain a level of comfort. J. Hanigsberg responded that she had consulted with A. Whiteside on this matter, and that the DHPO would remain involved. The conflict of interest is not with respect to the confidentiality, it is with respect to receiving a formal request. It is not to prevent them from assisting.

P. Goldman commented on how hard it is for students to go to their Chair/Director to request an accommodation. He spoke against the amendment.

Amendment approved.

J. Dianda asked if the word “Aboriginal” Spiritual Observance should be removed from the title. K. Alnwick replied that this had been discussed, and it was decided that inclusion of Aboriginal was important and marginalized.

Amendment #3:

J. Dianda moved an amendment, D. Mason seconded.

D. Mason stated that he did not wish to minimize Aboriginal recognition, but perhaps Wiccans would find this troubling.

M. McKay stated that the community struggle with the words to describe themselves. The ability to identify themselves is a big problem. Aboriginal is the most inclusive term. The policy attempted to recognize the difference in Aboriginal observance.

T. Hassan asked about the spiritual observance on someone who is not part of a religious or Aboriginal group. It should also include other spiritual groups.

G. Kapelos suggested that the wording be “religious, aboriginal, and spiritual observance”.

M. Malik stated that the title was designed to be more inclusive and the language does not leave anyone out.

A. Stuart said that she could not vote for the amendment if aboriginal was removed, but she would agree to include the commas.

Motion to amend defeated.

Amendment #4:

Motion to amend wording to: “Student Religious, Aboriginal, and Spiritual Observance”

G. Kapelos moved, C. Stuart seconded

Motion to amend approved.

J. Turtle referred to the second paragraph of the policy, that he cannot determine that someone “accept the sincerely held beliefs of students at face value” and asked if the calendar posted is an exhaustive list. What is the list that he should go by? K. Alnwick commented that before the current policy, students were required to get a note from their religious leader, and that was removed. There was concern about removing this at the time. The committee believes that diversity should be accommodated. The wording is not very different from that in the current policy. Human Rights legislation supports this. He would also say that there is no exhaustive list.

C. Sule stated that as a secular, non-religious person, he might consider that taking his own birthday off or taking a family vacation would count. It was replied that this would not count.

D. Mason commented that the impact on faculty workload could be huge. Some faculty cannot avoid a particular event and they have to create a second exam or test. The University has the duty to accommodate, not the faculty. Therefore, the university has to supply the resources to accommodate.

The President had to leave and A. Mitchell assumed the chair.

A. Levin asked about the way in which faculty are expected to weigh the sincerity of the belief. He assumed it was something that would be listed in the calendar, or else why have such an elaborate policy. K. Alnwick responded that it is not designed to support capricious requests. He noted that this is not different from the existing policy. He also noted that there is a motion for a review.

C. Stuart commented that the discussion mirrors what the discussion was in the committee on how to reasonably assist the faculty in being agents to support the policy, and that is why there is an educational component.

J. Dianda asked about the statement regarding an academic disadvantage or penalty. But if a student misses class, there may be a disadvantage to the student, and there cannot be a requirement that a new lecture be held. He suggested that the word “mitigate” be substituted.

M. Malik stated that all of the barriers need to be removed. He supports the current wording.

T. Hassan asked about the sentence on academic disadvantage or penalty. If this is about student status, there are different levels of disadvantage as a whole, not about the specific class. K. Alnwick agreed that there needs to be lots of education and means to facilitate. He gave an example that in some observances there are a series of daily prayers, and some a particular day of the week. Students could leave the lecture and return. Electronic notes might mitigate the circumstance.

D. Mason said that he reviewed the creed policy and the phrase “undue hardship” is there. This document does not help getting us to what is undue hardship for the faculty. The language is too broad. If making up an exam is declared undue hardship, the university would support them. Being unfairly disadvantaged is too broad.

A. Shepard thanked the committee as it is a complex concept. The policy supersedes an existing one, and the changes are only that the request in the first two weeks to two weeks before the event is all that is being requested. The current policy will not expire if this one is not passed.

M. Malik commented on the undue hardship in the creed policy that was referred to. The Ontario Human Rights Policy only relates this to cost or health issues.

C. Stuart stated that you cannot isolate a sentence and that it all has to be read together.

Motion #1 (with amendments 2 and 4) is approved.

Motion #2: *That Senate request that the University take all possible steps to promote community awareness and understanding of the policy and related observance issues.*

A. Shepard moved, K. Alnwick seconded.

M. Malik asked who would be responsible for this. K. Alnwick stated that the Provost is the responsible party and he would consult with the Provost. The Learning and Teaching Committee would be a good place, and formal responsibility would be with the Registrar.

Motion #2 is approved.

Motion #3: *That a review of experience with policy timelines be carried out after one year with a report to Senate in Fall 2010*

K. Alnwick moved, C. Stuart seconded

N. Thomlinson moved an amendment: “timelines and accommodations”. D. Mason seconded.

Amendment approved

Motion #3 (with amendment) is approved.

6. Correspondence

There was none.

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

(for information only)

*7.2.1.1 **Motion:** That Senate approve the submission of the proposal for a new field in **Film Preservation and Collections Management** within the existing MA in Photographic Preservation and Collections Management to the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies for Standard Appraisal.*

M. Yeates moved, M. Lefebvre seconded.

An executive summary is included.

R. Hudyma asked what the notion is of film. Is it celluloid only or is it digital? D. Snyder replied that it is chemical film only.

Motion approved.

8. Reports of Committees

8.1 Report #W2009-1 of the Nominating Committee

8.1.1 Motion: That Senate approve the nominations to the Senate Standing Committees for 2009-10.

M. Panitch moved, C. Sule seconded.

Motion approved.

8.2. Report #W2009-1 of the SRC Committee

8.2.1 Motion #1: That Senate approve the amendment of Policy 56: Publication of Research Results.

D. Mason moved, N. Thomlinson seconded.

Motion approved.

8.2.2 Motion #2: That Senate approve Policy 118: SRC Integrity, as presented.

T. Venetsanopoulos moved, J. Hanigsberg seconded.

T. Venetsanopoulos commented that every university with research has a policy such as the one proposed that is consistent with the Tri-Council policies and with the policies of the University. This is the first time Ryerson has attempted such a policy and is consistent with other universities. It is important to have this policy as soon as possible. It covers all involved in research.

If there are questions then there could be a request for written submissions.

D. Mason stated that he has a few problems with the policy and he did not have time to consult or respond to the policy as he has been busy for the last few weeks. Section 6 is broadly problematic. There is also no reference to honest mistakes. There is no question about the principle, but there are broader issues.

A.M. Singh stated that on page 48, section 4.14, there is individual and collective responsibility, but that there is an issue with requiring someone to report on the misconduct of others. P. Goldman agreed that someone would not know that they were committing misconduct. He also has an issue with 4.16.

T. Venetsanopoulos responded to the comment on “honest mistakes”. He said that the committee determined that ignorance of the law is not acceptable, but that this would be considered in the individual case. He agreed that 4.14 and 4. 16 could be removed.

He asked that the motion be tabled until the next meeting so that there could be broader consultation. D. Mason commented on why 4.14 and 4.16 are inappropriate. It will be broadly circulated for comment.

8.3 Report #W2009-2 of the Academic Standards Committee

A. Shepard moved all motions.

8.3.1 Motion #1: *That Senate approve the periodic program review of the Hospitality and Tourism Management program with the recommendations listed in the ASC Evaluation section.*

K. Alnwick seconded.

Motion approved.

8.3.2. Motion #2: *That Senate approve the periodic program review of the Midwifery Program.*

K. Alnwick seconded.

Motion approved.

8.3.3 Motion #3: *That Senate approve the review of the Certificate in Applied Digital Geography and GIS, and the Advanced Certificate in Applied Digital Geography and GIS programs.*

K. Alnwick seconded.

Motion approved.

8.3.4 Motion #4: *That Senate approve the review of the certificate program in Economics.*

K. Alnwick seconded.

Motion approved.

8.3.5 Motion #5: *That Senate approve the review of the certificate program in Publishing.*

M. Malik seconded.

Motion approved.

8.3.6 Motion #6: *That Senate approve the revisions in the Applied Digital Geography and GIS certificate programs.*

M. Lefebvre seconded.

Motion approved.

8.3.7 Motion #7: *That Senate approve the Certificate in Dietetics Practice in Canada for Internationally Educated Dietetics Professionals.*

D. Tucker seconded.

Motion approved.

8.3.8 Motion #8: *That Senate approve the Certificate in Financial Management in Canada.*

J. Hanigsberg seconded.

Motion approved.

8.3.9 Motion #9: *That Senate approve the Inter-professional Certificate in Advanced Neuroscience-Stroke Care.*

J. Hanigsberg seconded.

N. Thomlinson asked about the governance of the certificate and what it means. A. Shepard stated that policy 76 states that the home of a certificate is designated as a logistical home with a curriculum committee properly constituted. N. Thomlinson asked if this is breaking ground for the Chang School. Most CE certificates assign courses to the academic unit, and not the Chang School. J. Hanigsberg stated that it is not new ground. M. Zeytinoglu stated that there is a similar certificate in Project Management.

D. Mason stated that the Chang School is not an academic unit.

Motion approved.

9. New Business

9.1 Shaping our Future: An Academic Plan for 2008-2013

A. Shepard commented that this year was a year to move forward with planning at the Department/School and Faculty levels, and there will be more informal conversations on plans moving forward. He also commented that last year's plan required a report to Senate on the academic structure. A commission has been established to look at the structure, chaired by M. Yeates. A list of members is available to the Senate, and this will be more broadly announced. Tentatively, a report will come to the January Senate meeting.

9.2 Report of the Vice President, Research and Innovation

T. Venetsanopoulos briefly stated that there is a reasonably complete report. He also noted that, in the table of contents, his title should be corrected to read: "Vice President" not "Vice Provost".

10. Meeting adjourned 6:22 pm.