

## SENATE MINUTES OF MEETING

Tuesday, May 29, 2018

| <b>MEMBERS PRESENT:</b>   |                 |                |                   |
|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| <b>EX-OFFICIO:</b>        | <b>FACULTY:</b> |                | <b>STUDENTS:</b>  |
| J. Austin                 | I. Baitz        | J. Friedman    | B. Arkinson       |
| L. Barnoff                | R. Babin        | E. Harley      | L. Emberson       |
| M. Benarroch              | S. Benda        | R. Hudyma      | T. Nowshin        |
| I. Coe                    | T. Burke        | K. Kumar       | R. Rezaee         |
| T. Duever                 | B. Ceh          | V. Magness     |                   |
| C. Falzon                 | K. Church       | D. Mason       |                   |
| C. Hack                   | Y. Derbal       | A. McWilliams  |                   |
| M. Lachemi                | M. Dionne       | S. Rakhmayil   |                   |
| A. Levin                  | H. Doshi        | N. Thomlinson  |                   |
| J. Mactavish              | C. Dowling      |                | <b>EX-OFFICIO</b> |
| I. Mishkel                | N. Eichenlaub   |                |                   |
| M. Moshé                  | A. Ferworn      |                |                   |
| D. O'Neil Green           |                 |                |                   |
|                           |                 |                |                   |
| <b>SENATE ASSOCIATES:</b> |                 |                | <b>ALUMNI:</b>    |
|                           |                 |                |                   |
|                           |                 |                |                   |
|                           |                 |                |                   |
| <b>REGRETS:</b>           |                 | <b>ABSENT:</b> |                   |
| B. Baum                   | P. Sugiman      | C. Antonescu   | L. Pine           |
| M. Bountrogianni          | C. Tam          | S. Asalya      | R. Ravindran      |
| A. M. Brinsmead           | J. Tiessen      | R. Botelho     | N. Ul Saqib       |
| D. Brown                  | K. Underwood    | R. Chumak-     | K. Venkatakrishna |
| G. Craney                 | S. Zolfaghari   | C. Davenport   | J. Zboralski      |
| S. Dolgoy                 |                 | S. Faruqi      | M. Zouri          |
| S. Liss                   |                 | E. Hysi        |                   |
| J. Makuch                 |                 | D. Lis         |                   |
| C. Shepstone              |                 | F. Muto        |                   |

1. Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum
2. Approval of the Agenda

**Motion:** *That Senate approve the agenda for the May 29, 2018 meeting*

D. Mason moved; A. McWilliams seconded

**Motion Approved.**

3. Announcements – None
4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

**Motion:** *That Senate approved the minutes of the May 1, 2018 meeting Correction: SRCAC Motion approved after each item 7.4.3.1 and 7.4.3.3 were missed. All 3 were approved just not recorded.*

**Motion to amend minutes**

T. Nowshin moved; E Harley seconded

**Motion to amend minutes Approved.**

R. Rezaee commented that there were some key points excluded from the minutes, which she made during the Committee of the Whole discussions. She stated that there was nothing included regarding the Human Rights issue she raised; comparisons of students' disabilities – should be fair for every student; and that some issues were changed and minutes are not correct. There was also nothing included regarding the outcome of Policy 159. Every policy should refer to Policy 159.

J. Turtle responded that as per Senate Bylaws, we do not provide a verbatim record, and he does not agree that there are major shortcomings in the minutes. He explained further that this was the first step of the review of Policy 159 so there will be more time to revisit the policy.

L. Emberson called the question and made a motion to move the meeting minutes and that R. Rezaee could contact J. Turtle about the other issues she wanted to raise. D. Mason seconded this motion.

In response to J. Turtle's comments, D. Mason stated that the minutes are the official record of the meeting, and context of issues raised during Committee of the Whole discussions should be included. The intent and context is critically important. It is advisable for Secretary of Senate and interested Senators to discuss how to capture that in the minutes.

R. Rezaee confirmed that she would like to talk to J. Turtle about these issues. M. Lachemi pointed out to R. Rezaee that we are asking that she speak to the Secretary of Senate outside of this meeting. It was agreed to table the minutes.

**Original Motion Approved.**

M. Lachemi noted that we will make sure we go back and correct any mistakes within the minutes.

## 5. Matters Arising from the Minutes

Under Item 7.4.3.3 from the minutes of the May 1, 2018 Senate meeting: “K. Underwood asked two questions about the distribution of indirect costs, specifically the 15% that is allocated to faculty members: What happens to those funds if they are not accessed by faculty members? And, in general, can there be more clarity regarding the procedures around how faculty access those funds? S. Liss promised to follow up and report back to Senate at the May 29 meeting.”

A response from S. Liss, Vice-President Research and Innovation, was read out by the Secretary of Senate at the May 29, 2018 Senate Meeting: “The faculty member’s share of the overhead is distributed into the central overhead account and is segregated into a sub account for the faculty member at the end of the project when all the funds have been received. Once the funding is distributed to the account it sits there until it is used. The only time it is defaulted back to the University is if the faculty member leaves the University. Currently a faculty member can access their overhead on a cost reimbursement basis by charging the expense against the account or transferring the expense to the overhead account. We are in the process of working with finance to change the system so the Faculty share of overhead will be transferred to an account administered at the Faculty level and accessed much like the faculty SRC funds.”

No additional questions.

## 6. Correspondence - None

### 7. Reports

#### 7.1 Report of the President

##### 7.1.1 President’s Update

#### **Highlights:**

President Lachemi commented that this is the last Senate meeting; and thanked Senators for their support and encouragement, dedication and hard work throughout the academic year. He also recognized those Senators who will be leaving Senate due to the end of their term. He thanked Interim Vice Provost, Students, John Austin for serving in this capacity for the past year in his huge portfolio. President Lachemi also recognized Imogen Coe, as the founding Dean of Science, who has made her mark in her role as founding Dean and has made history. This will be her last Senate meeting. He also recognized and thanked John Turtle, Secretary of Senate, for his dedicated five-year service in that role. This will also be John Turtle’s last Senate meeting as Secretary of Senate.

The Search Committee for Chancellor will be finalized soon at the Board’s meeting at the end of June. President Lachemi felt confident we will have a recommendation from the Board on the next Chancellor.

President Lachemi encouraged members to attend the Spring Convocation which will be held June 6 to 13 at the new venue - MAC for the first time.

President Lachemi announced that Ryerson will be celebrating its Double Anniversary (70 years old and 25 years young) starting June 1 with a celebration on Gould Street.

President Greer was given special recognition at the Awards & Ceremonials Gala, as the first President when Ryerson received designation as a University.

The Learning and Teaching Office hosted the successful May Faculty Conference. He thanked Eric Kam and the LTO team for doing a wonderful job. There were 740 attendees.

The Ryerson Library will be hosting an exhibition from June 1-21, depicting Ryerson's rich history. President Lachemi encouraged members to visit this exhibit. President Lachemi thanked Chief Librarian Carol Shepstone for her role in coordinating this valuable history of Ryerson. A video depicting Ryerson's history was shown. He thanked the committee that worked so hard to produce this video in time for the celebration.

## 7.2 Communications Report - as presented in the agenda

### 7.3 Report of the Secretary

The Secretary of Senate gave a brief update of the membership of Senate 2018-2019, stating that the Senate membership is complete with the exception of the two Chang student representatives which we typically try to fill in Fall.

The Standing Committee membership of AGPC and SPC are also almost complete. He mentioned that he would have liked to have had a full complement of the Senate Priorities Committee, including the Vice Chair of Senate. A. Ferworn served in this role for the past two years and is finishing this term. The Chair of Senate has kindly agreed that we will extend this period before looking for a new Vice Chair of Senate rather than rush. The appointment of Vice Chair will be extended until later when SPC will meet to confirm this role in the Fall.

### 7.4 Committee Reports

#### 7.4.1 Report #W2018-5 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC): M. Benarroch

7.4.1.1 New draft policy for Grade Reassessment and Grade Recalculation, and deletion of corresponding sections from Policy 134 (Undergraduate Academic consideration and Appeals) and Policy 152 (Graduate Academic consideration and Appeals)

**Motion:** *That Senate approve the draft Grade Reassessment and Grade Recalculation Policy, as well as the deletion of the reassessment and recalculation sections currently in Policy 134 (Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals) and Policy 152 (Graduate Academic Consideration and Appeals)*

M. Moshé presented the policy on behalf of the Academic Policy and Review Committee (APRC) and also took the opportunity to thank the APRC members for their hard work in the past year. In particular, she thanked J. Freidman, Chair of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering and Co-Chair of this committee for over two years, as he will be taking a sabbatical. Currently the policy on grade recalculation and reassessment reside in Policies 134 and 152. She noted that there are a number of advantages to having a policy separate from academic consideration and academic appeals. As well, there are advantages to combining Graduate and Undergraduate policies in this area. These advantages are outlined in detail in the APRC report to Senate and they are also based on extensive consultations that were conducted with faculty, staff, and students. Because we still

have the sections of Policy 134 and 152 that deal with academic consideration and academic appeals are still in the process of being reviewed, the committee proposed that the sections on grade reassessment and grade recalculation in Policies 134 and 152 be deleted. There will be a note in the policies that indicates that people would be referred to the new policy.

M. Moshé moved; A. McWilliams seconded

R. Rezaee indicated that mixing Graduate and Undergraduate policies is not a good idea due to differences between courses: passing grade for graduate and undergraduate is different, re-assessment is different, course is different. Undergraduate courses are much easier to access/locate concerns than Graduate programs which are largely rooted in research. Because of this, you cannot find the information based on the things here such as recalculation, textbook, course outline, course notes, assessment, and grade rubric. General Recalculation is a disadvantage for Graduate students. As well, Undergraduate students are not very involved with their Program Director, whereas Graduate students are directly involved with their Graduate Program Director. Another issue is that ten days is not enough time for the problem to be brought to the attention of the instructor. There is nothing in the policy that states the student can ask for an extension based on the case they present.

M. Moshé responded that the current policy is very similar to the existing policy. There have been extensive consultations with Undergraduate and YSGS faculty and students. There were two members from YSGS who were on the APRC that consulted as well and they supported the policy. Policy improves on timelines rather than decrease, making timelines clearer. In terms of flexibility of timelines for students, it is reflected both in the policy and in the principal section that indicates the policy supports or is consistent with the Senate policy framework which highlights the overarching principle of flexibility by design.

M. Lachemi asked that the Dean of YSGS (J. Mactavish) comment on the consultation. J. Mactavish said she is in support of the content of the policy. Believes it is clear and that there has been appropriate consultation with both the YSGS and with Undergraduates. There were two YSGS students on the committee and it was reviewed by YSGS Advisory Council and other *Ad Hoc* groups.

Lauren Emberson moved a Motion to call the question

**Motion Approved. S. Rakhmayil abstained.**

7.4.1.2 New Graduate Admissions Policy; New Graduate Status, Enrolment, and Evaluation Policy (plus a Procedures section); retirement of current Policy 142 (*Graduate Admissions and Studies*)

**Motion:** *That Senate approve a new Graduate Admissions Policy; a new Graduate Status, Enrolment, and Evaluation Policy and related Procedures; as well as the retirement of the current Policy 142 (Graduate Admissions and Studies)*

J. Mactavish moved; T. Duever seconded

J. Mactavish stated that this motion is from the YSGS Council. This policy has been in need of a revision and she wanted to thank the numerous people who helped in the process. Dealing with

the major academic policy pertaining to Graduate education at Ryerson. Much of the work that was done involved detangling the policy elements from the procedural elements. The result of this work is two new policies; the Graduate Admissions Policy and the Graduate Status, Enrollment, and Evaluation Policy with its related procedures.

R. Rezaee stated that she was concerned there are no students on this committee, as students' views are necessary since the policy pertains to them. She also stated that there is no mention of processes regarding students with disability, or of international students. She asked how many Town Halls were kept and whether they were announced to the community.

J. Mactavish responded that there are Graduate students in the Advisory group, Program and Planning Committee, and the YSGS Council. There are many mechanisms for soliciting broad-based input across the university that doesn't always arrive from a Town Hall or survey. As for the student status, definition of students in this policy is specific to their status as students, not as a particular descriptor of a student who happens to be a Graduate student with a disability. The items that pertain to Academic Support and Accommodations with respect to students with accommodation and support needs are covered under Policy 159.

L. Emberson mentioned that she believes the committee members are acting in the best interest of the students and that she does not believe the revisions in policy are being made too hastily. She thanked those who put time in to work on the policies.

**Motion Approved (majority). R. Rezaee voted against motion.**

7.4.1.3 Update on the review of Ryerson's Freedom of Expression statement. A. McWilliams reported that the committee met twice since the last Senate meeting. A draft statement is being finalized. They will be reconvening in August. He encouraged members to send feedback to the committee at [freedomofexpression@ryerson.ca](mailto:freedomofexpression@ryerson.ca) address.

7.4.2 Report #W2018-2 from the Yeates School of Graduate Studies (YSGS): J. Mactavish

7.4.2.1 Periodic Program Review (PPR) Final Assessment Report (FAR) – Communication and Culture (MA and PhD)

**Motion:** *That Senate approve the joint Periodic Program Review between Ryerson University and York University for the Communication and Culture MA and PhD programs*

J. Mactavish moved; D. O'Neil Green seconded

J. Mactavish outlined that this PPR was a complicated and lengthy process because it is a joint program between Ryerson and York University and that it is Ryerson's oldest program. It was complicated because it was required to satisfy two institutional quality assurance processes. The program resulted in twelve recommendations, many of which revolved around the complexities of mounting a program around two institutions.

**Motion Approved.**

#### 7.4.2.2 Periodic Program Review (PPR) Final Assessment Report (FAR) – Film & Photography Preservation and Collection Management (MA) in FCAD

**Motion:** *That Senate approve the Periodic Program Review for the Film and Photography Preservation and Collection Management MA program*

J. Mactavish moved; C. Falzon seconded

**Motion Approved.**

J. Mactavish stated that FPPCM is one of Ryerson's flagship programs. Their peer review happened in December, 2017. There were six recommendations, four of which were academic and the other two were administrative in nature.

#### 7.4.2.3 Curriculum Modifications – Master of Journalism Program

J. Mactavish explained that this modification has resulted in a reduction of the program length, bridging silos between the various forms of media, enhancement of digital skills and innovation, and streamlining the process. She noted that the remaining particulars are outlined in the agenda and stated that this is the end of the PPRs and Assessment Reports. She thanked everyone for their contributions.

**Motion:** *That Senate approve the curriculum modifications for the Master of Journalism program as described in the agenda*

J. Mactavish moved; A. McWilliams seconded

**Motioned Approved.**

#### 7.4.3 Report #W2018-3 from the Academic Standards Committee

M. Moshé thanked the committee members for their dedication. She then acknowledged that this year the committee reviewed 27 proposals, including PPRs, Curriculum Reviews, and proposals for minors. She recognized the invaluable support of Katherine Penny on this committee.

##### 7.4.3.1 Periodic Program Review – Sociology, Faculty of Arts

**Motion:** *That Senate approve the Periodic Program Review for Sociology*

M. Moshé moved; V. Magness seconded

M. Moshé stated that this is the first program review for the Bachelor of Arts in Sociology which was launched in 2005. Program has distinguishing features such as its consistent emphasis on social equity, community engagement, and inclusion throughout. It offers core skills in qualitative and quantitative research methods. It specifically focuses on Toronto's urban environment. The two external peer reviewers praised the experiential learning aspect of core courses and the inclusion of courses that address indigenous issues. They also thought that the program is exemplary at reflecting Ryerson's academic plan as it enables exceptional experiences, and expands community engagement and city building. However, the reviewers did identify weaknesses surrounding resource issues. The Dean of Arts has committed to consider these issues.

**Motion Approved.**

7.4.3.2 Chang School Certificate in Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Management – Review

**Motion:** *That Senate approve the review of the Chang School Certificate in Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Management*

M. Moshé moved; A. Levin seconded

M. Moshé stated that this is a six-course certificate that is offered through Ted Rogers School of Information Management. The review included feedback from students and an environmental scan. A number of curriculum issues were identified. Students found this certificate and the Chang School in Information Management to be very similar. Students also mistakenly thought this certificate was entry level as it included a number of lower level courses. The certificate also included courses that aren't directly related to enterprise architecture and information management. The recommendation is to discontinue this certificate and to launch a new certificate that addresses these issues.

**Motion Approved**

7.4.3.3 Chang School Certificate in Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Management – Discontinuation (effective Fall 2018)

**Motion:** *That Senate approve the discontinuation of the Chang School Certificate in Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Management*

M. Moshé stated that if senate approves the motion, the eighteen students who were enrolled will be notified and they will be worked with individually to come up with a plan to complete their studies.

M. Moshé moved; Y Derbal seconded

**Motion Approved.**

7.4.3.4 Chang School Certificate in Advanced Enterprise Architecture & Infrastructure Management – Proposal (new)

**Motion:** *That Senate approve the proposal for a new Chang School Certificate in Advanced Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Management*

M. Moshé moved; A. Levin seconded

M. Moshé stated that this new certificate addresses all of the issues mentioned in the review of the now discontinued certificate in Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Management. The proposed certificate is shorter and includes courses that are specific to the area. Students are required to complete four courses in total. Three of these are required and one is an elective. To be admitted, applicants must have successfully completed three CITM courses that are prerequisites for the required and elective courses. Certificate would plan to launch in Fall 2018.



D. Mason asked if there was any chance that students from the previous program can be migrated to this one. An ITM representative responded that they are in the process of transitioning and it will be based on what is in the best interest of the students. Only two students were identified so far.

**Motion Approved.**

7.4.3.5 Chang School Certificate in Information Systems Management – Course Additions, Deletions, Repositioning

**Motion:** *That Senate approve the course additions, deletions, and repositioning for the Chang School Certificate in Information Systems Management*

M. Moshé moved; Y. Derbal seconded

M. Moshé stated that these changes intend to keep the certificate current and to provide the prerequisites for the advanced certificate.

**Motion Approved.**

7.4.3.6 Chang School Certificate in Occupational Health and Safety Leadership – Proposal (new)

**Motion:** *That Senate approve the proposal for a new Chang School Certificate in Occupational Health and Safety Leadership*

M. Moshé moved; Y. Derbal seconded

M. Moshé stated that the proposal has been developed to address the new educational requirements of the Board of Canadian Registered Safety Professionals. As of July 2018, this board will be changing their minimum requirement to take their professional designation exam from a certificate to a two-year diploma in Occupational Health and Safety or the equivalent of a two-year diploma. The series of certificates would be considered equivalent to a two-year diploma. The completion of this proposed certificate in addition to the current Chang School certificate in Occupational Health and Safety and the certificate in Advanced Safety Management would satisfy the board's academic requirements. It is a core course certificate preparing students for leadership roles and responsibilities in the area of Occupational Health and Safety.

K. Church commented on the courses content regarding students with disability. She stated that Disability Studies can be helpful to this program, but realizes that it is difficult to get cross-feed among programs.

**Motion Approved.**

7.4.3.7 For Information: Chang School Certificates – March and April, 2018.

NOTE: J. Turtle explained that this item was also included in the May 3, 2018 Standards Report to Senate, but was mistakenly omitted from the Senate agenda. It is therefore included again for the May 29, 2018 Senate meeting.

8. Old Business

9. New Business as Circulated

10. Members' Business

R. Babin provided the following Notice of Motion: "At the next senate meeting, on behalf of faculty members, I will bring forward a motion regarding Policy 134 (Undergraduate Academic Appeals) and regarding the current online trial currently underway in the Faculty of Science. Our concern regarding this trial is that the electronic form encourages frivolous and unfounded accusations by students against faculty members regarding prejudice. The form lacks sufficient caution."

11. Consent Agenda

11.1 [Academic Plan Update](#)

Includes the Annual Report to Senate from the Vice-President, Research and Innovation

12. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.