

The Law and Learning Lab

at Toronto Metropolitan University

A proposal for a Faculty Research Centre pursuant to Policy 144

David Sandomierski

Associate Professor, Lincoln Alexander School of Law

Simon Wallace

Assistant Professor, Lincoln Alexander School of Law

August 2026

Executive Summary.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Background.....	6
Silos	7
Inertia	8
Incentives.....	8
The Law and Learning Lab: Disrupting Stasis in Legal Education	9
Core Activity 1: Create a Research Infrastructure	11
Core Activity 2: Stimulate Innovation in the Law Classroom.....	12
Core Activity 3: Build Institutional Capacity to Improve Dialogue	13
The Law School as an Interdisciplinary Hub.....	13
Integrating Faculty and Staff Missions.....	14
Bringing Academics and Practitioners Together.....	15
Strategic Alignment	15
Lincoln Alexander School of Law	15
TMU	16
Duplication and Intersection	16
Impact on the Library and the School of Law	17
Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion.....	17
Pedagogical Design.....	17
Law Teaching Fellows.....	17
Research	18
Access to Justice.....	18
Indigenous and Racial Justice	18
Physical Space and Equipment Requirements	18
Years 1–2.....	18
Years 3–4.....	18
Year 5 and Beyond.....	18
Terms of Reference.....	19
Mission	19
Mandate	19
Objectives.....	19
Membership.....	20
Categories.....	20
Eligibility	20
Rights	20
Responsibilities	21

Terms	21
Procedures for Election and/or Appointment.....	21
Term of the Law and Learning Lab.....	22
Administrative Structure.....	22
Director	22
Advisory Board	24
Multiple Units	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Governance Structure	25
Membership Council.....	25
Membership Committee.....	25
Grants Committee	25
Director and Advisory Board	25
Vacancies.....	25
Director	25
Advisory Board Members.....	25
General Operations	26
Resources, Sources of Revenue, Distribution of Indirect Costs	26
Annual Budget and Work Plan	26
Closure	26
Notice of Discontinuation.....	26
Disposition of Assets Upon Closure.....	26
Costs Related to Closure in Final Year of Operation.....	27
Probationary Year and First-Year Milestones	27
Governance and Administration	27
Advisory Board	27
Programs.....	27
Research	27
Partnerships and Funding.....	27
Evaluation Metrics	28
Research	28
Pedagogical Innovation	28
Appendix A: Budget.....	29
Expenditure.....	29
Revenue Sources	29
Appendix B: List of Proposed Members.....	30
Members.....	30

Associate Members	30
Appendix C: CVs of Proposed Members	31

Introduction

The Law and Learning Lab at Toronto Metropolitan University aims to intervene strategically in the ecosystem of legal education. It aims to facilitate, inspire, and empower legal educators to integrate the academic and professional missions of legal education. It strives to incubate ideas, formulate methods, and devise institutional structures to realize the capacity of law schools to serve as “knowledge-seeking, critique-generating, [and] change-making”¹ institutions – and to prepare their graduates to contribute expansively to society.

The Law and Learning Lab takes its title from Harry Arthurs’ seminal 1983 report, *Law and Learning*,² which called on Canadian law schools to pursue “humane professionalism.” Employing the laboratory approaches of experimentation and iteration, the Lab takes seriously two convictions about legal education: (1) that the aspiration to bring together the academic and professional missions is shared by most legal educators, but (2) is under-realized due to silos, inertia, and misaligned incentives that drive toward path dependence.

The Lab pursues its mission through three core activities. First, it will establish a research structure to explore how the academic and professional missions of legal education can be understood as mutually reinforcing. As part of its work, it will serve as the intellectual engine for the new Integrated Practice Curriculum. Second, it will stimulate innovation in the law classroom by supporting experimentation and research in law teaching. Third, it will build institutional capacity to break down silos within the university, within the law school, and between the academy and the profession.

International in outlook and with close relationships to all Canadian law schools, the Lab will be located at Toronto Metropolitan University. TMU’s history of hands-on education combined with its contemporary embrace of scholarship makes it an unparalleled place to explore the intersection of theory and practice at a moment when such integrated knowledge is increasingly needed. The Lincoln Alexander School of Law is Ontario’s newest law school with a distinctive mission to teach law “differently”. Its future location on Toronto’s Sankofa Square, whose namesake invokes looking to the past to build the future, makes it an ideal convening space in which to experiment and pilot new approaches to legal education. The Lab aims to support new and established law schools alike, cultivating exchanges of ideas and stimulating innovation and experimentation.

¹ Harry W Arthurs, *Connecting the Dots: The Life of an Academic Lawyer* (McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2019) at 68.

² Consultative Group on Research and Education in Law, *Law and Learning: Report to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada* (Ottawa: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, 1983) (Chair: Harry W Arthurs) [*Law and Learning*].

Background

Christopher Columbus Langdell, Dean of Harvard in the late nineteenth century, pioneered a new model of legal education that encouraged students to discover and articulate the law for themselves by reading primary documents – cases. The law library was to be the law student’s “laboratory” and reading for class, combined with an interactive pedagogy styled “Socratic”, injected a degree of experiential learning into what had previously been a more passive “reading and recitation” method.³ In the same breath, however, Langdell somewhat undercut his experiential, interactive vision by publishing a *Summary of the Law of Contracts*, appended to the second edition of his casebook.⁴ This summary, somewhat paradoxically, conveyed to students a taxonomic and apparently rational organizing structure of the law – one whose very existence obviated the need for students to do the discovery work themselves.

In response to this Summary, Oliver Wendell Holmes, a future US Supreme Court justice, wrote a scathing review, taking issue with this rationalizing work. “The life of the law has not been logic: it has been experience,”⁵ Holmes wrote – and ever since then, modern legal education has been characterized by a dialectical tension between “logic” and “experience”. On the logic side, “thinking like a lawyer” has become the paradigmatic goal of legal education, training students in the art of reasoning by analogy, applying and distinguishing precedents on the basis that law is a more or less stable body of doctrine that, if applied consistently, would make good on the justice system’s promise of equal treatment.⁶ On the experience side came a number of critiques arguing that this “rule of law” ideal was never achievable in reality and that the lived experience of people must come first in evaluating, understanding, applying, practising, and critiquing law. Whereas the commitment to “thinking like a lawyer” would justify the continuation of Langdell’s case method, the realist critique spawned a series of reforms to legal education. These reforms included teaching materials based on “real-life” categories instead of abstract doctrinal categories;⁷ calls to reduce the priority given to judge-made law and to focus equally on contracts and legislation;⁸ and the rise of the “clinical legal education” movement that provided students with experience with real clients.⁹

While these reforms have succeeded to varying degrees, a recent major report in 2007 suggests that none has been successful at displacing the case method as the undisputed core of North American legal education. The 2007 Carnegie Report on Legal Education described three “apprenticeships” provided to law students: a cognitive apprenticeship in thinking like a lawyer, a “practical” apprenticeship in skills training, and an apprenticeship in reflecting on the nature of one’s professional identity, including ethical training but extending to a broader sense of

³ See Daniel R Coquillette and Bruce A Kimball, *On the Battlefield of Merit: Harvard Law School, the First Century* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2015) at 166–67.

⁴ Christopher Columbus Langdell, *A Selection of Cases on the Law of Contracts: With a Summary of the Topics Covered by the Cases: Prepared for Use as a Text-Book in Harvard Law*, 2d ed (Boston: Little, Brown, 1879).

⁵ Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr, Review of CC Langdell, *A Summary of the Law of Contracts* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1880), (1880) 14 Am L Rev 233 at 234.

⁶ See generally David Sandomierski, *Aspiration and Reality in Legal Education* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2020), c 5.

⁷ Harold Canfield Havighurst, *A Selection of Contract Cases and Related Quasi-Contract Cases* (Rochester, NY: Lawyers Co-operative, 1934).

⁸ See Lon L Fuller, “What the Law Schools Can Contribute to the Making of Lawyers” (1948) 1:2 J Leg Educ 189. In Canada, see David Sandomierski, “Catalytic Agents? Lon Fuller, James Milner, and the Lawyer as Social Architect, 1950–69” (2021) 71:1 UTLJ 91.

⁹ See Richard J Wilson, *The Global Evolution of Clinical Legal Education: More than a Method* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018) at 72ff.

professional self. The Carnegie authors found that the cognitive apprenticeship predominated in law schools and argued for the equal, and integrated, pursuit of all three apprenticeships.¹⁰ A major study by the Institute for the Advancement of the American Legal System similarly argued for “a much broader blend of legal skills, professional competencies, and characteristics that comprise the whole lawyer.”¹¹ And indeed, a recent empirical study of Canadian legal education revealed that while many law professors are committed to experiential, realist, or critical theories of law and aspire to “make better lawyers” in their teaching, traditional rationalistic approaches nevertheless predominate in the classroom.¹²

There are some good reasons for the persistence of a method with origins in 1870. Teaching students to discover the law from judicial writings and to reason by analogy empowers them to understand the importance of the non-arbitrary, principle-based role of an independent judiciary. Law, as a check against market power and democratic excesses, protects individual rights and ensures fair processes. This is the rule of law ideal which, however imperfectly realized, is made possible by rules and conventions for what constitutes valid persuasive techniques – precisely those cultivated by “thinking like a lawyer”.

However, there are also less good reasons for the dominance of one method of legal education. These include institutional features that (i) reinforce silos, (ii) generate inertia, and (iii) disincentivize experimentation and drive towards path dependence.

Silos

Law, while a discipline in its own right, is also the pre-eminent *interdisciplinary* meeting ground. Legal realism and its intellectual heirs have emphasized how economics, psychology, and politics – to name only a few – are indispensable considerations for understanding the social phenomenon of law. And yet, the disciplinary structure of the university can make these connections difficult to pursue deeply. Across a university, reflections and studies in law and justice can take place in many ways, but the law school’s independence can mean that these diverse insights only partially make their way into the education of future lawyers.

Secondly, within the law school, faculty and staff roles are understandably distinct, but often in a way that under-realizes the potential of integrating classroom learning with extracurricular and career-facing activities. Many staff roles are explicitly geared to helping students find their vocational path (through, for example, career placement, extracurricular activities, and clinical programs); many faculty incorporate this consideration at a higher order in their classroom (through structured reflective practice, or through instruction touching on public interest litigation, law reform, and corporate governance, among other things). But there is rarely a mechanism for enabling students to directly bring these two sources of learning together.

Finally, the law school at an institutional level can reinforce an apparent dichotomy between the concerns of the academy and the profession. Practitioners who teach often do so in their own separate courses as “adjunct” lecturers, or as one-off guest lecturers. Professional placements occur outside the law school, outside regular hours. While law schools rely heavily on practitioners to

¹⁰ William M Sullivan et al, *Educating Lawyers: Preparation for the Profession of Law* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2007) [Carnegie Report].

¹¹ Alli Gerkman and Logan Cornett, *Foundations for Practice: The Whole Lawyer and the Character Quotient* (Denver: Institute for the Advancement of the American Legal System, 2016).

¹² Sandomierski, *Aspiration and Reality*, supra note 6.

supplement their curricula and provide mentorship, opportunities for cross-pollination between academic faculty and practitioners are rarely available.

Inertia

Law schools have well-developed governance processes for reviewing their program offerings. These processes are generally good at making regular improvements and refinements to existing processes and curricula but are generally not designed to encourage the re-thinking of program structures. In part this may be due to resources – responding to short-term concerns is a big enough job. However, the very structures designed to review curricula may skew reform towards the act of refining, not re-imagining. To be sure, there have been many meaningful, serious moments of curricular reform,¹³ but on the whole large curricular transformations are the exception, not the rule.

Incentives

In the current law school environment, faculty receive multiple messages that research output is the most important metric for professional success, including attaining tenure and promotion to full professor.¹⁴ There is little explicit incentive for investing time in re-thinking teaching methods and materials. Moreover, the research interests of faculty members are much more diverse than the relatively narrow slate of mandatory courses. It can therefore appear rational for faculty to focus their efforts on generating their research, which rarely informs their teaching of the mandatory “core” courses. This dynamic leads to following established teaching methods and course materials, particularly in the crucial formative first year of law school.¹⁵

These three institutional features – silos, inertia, and incentives – contribute to a remarkable stasis in legal education. This stasis comes at a high individual, social, and systemic cost. Students receive the message that one must master a relatively narrow set of skills, which happen to map onto a relatively narrow set of professional outcomes. Capacities essential to many areas of law – problem solving, design thinking, collaboration, alternative dispute resolution, creativity, entrepreneurialism – are de-prioritized, and students can graduate without an appreciation of, or training in, the very things many of them will need. The convergence of preferred methods can exacerbate inequities as well, advantaging those with pre-existing socioeconomic capital, those free of disability or caregiving obligations, and those whose cultural background or upbringing suit the standard mode. The inequities of legal education compound into inequities in access to legal services and in the profession itself, exacerbating market forces to undermine meaningful access to justice.

¹³ See respectively Rosalie Jukier, “Where Law and Pedagogy Meet in the Transsystemic Contracts Classroom” (2005) 50:4 McGill LJ 789; John Borrows, “Heroes, Tricksters, Monsters, and Caretakers: Indigenous Law and Legal Education” (2016) 61:4 McGill LJ 795; on the University of Victoria’s JD/JID program and the Indigenous law methodology underlying it, Val Napoleon and Hadley Friedland, “An Inside Job: Engaging with Indigenous Legal Traditions through Stories” (2016) 61:4 McGill LJ 725 and Hadley Friedland and Val Napoleon, “Gathering the Threads: Developing a Methodology for Researching and Rebuilding Indigenous Legal Traditions” (2015) 1:1 Lakehead LJ 16; and, on Georgetown’s Curriculum B, David A Hyman, Jing Liu and Joshua C Teitelbaum, “Does the 1L Curriculum Make a Difference?” (2024) 21:2 J Empirical Legal Stud 375.

¹⁴ See Edward Rubin, “What’s Wrong with Langdell’s Method, and What to Do about It” (2007) 60:2 Vand L Rev 609 at 614.

¹⁵ See Sandomierski, *Aspiration and Reality*, *supra* note 6, c 6.

The Law and Learning Lab: Disrupting Stasis in Legal Education

The name, “Law and Learning Lab”, takes inspiration from two towering sources in legal education. The first is Christopher Columbus Langdell’s invocation in 1886 that “the library is the proper workshop of [law] professors and students alike; ... it is to us [what] the laboratories of the university are to the chemists and physicists.”¹⁶ Used in this way, the laboratory metaphor signalled, in the words of a 1914 Carnegie Report on legal education, the “application of the universal scientific method of induction to law”¹⁷ – a preoccupation in multiple fields in the late nineteenth century and of particular interest to Harvard’s President Charles Eliot, who had installed Langdell as Dean and championed the case method against a skeptical law faculty.¹⁸

We employ the laboratory metaphor more expansively than Langdell. Where Langdell’s laboratory was a solitary encounter between a student and a closed set of texts, the Law and Learning Lab does three further kinds of work. First, it is a site of experience: like a teaching hospital,¹⁹ the Lab treats live, unselected problems – not curated specimens – as the basic material of legal education, reflecting Holmes’s point that “the life of the law has not been logic: it has been experience.”²⁰ Second, it is a site of making: like an architect’s studio,²¹ the Lab produces things – curricula, teaching tools, pilot courses – and subjects them to critique and revision. Third, and most fundamentally, it is a site of experimentation: following John Dewey’s Laboratory School,²² founded a generation after Langdell’s, the Lab encourages legal educators to consider their classrooms as sites to try new things and to learn from the experience. A Lab in this fuller sense does not simply discover principles already latent in the material, as Langdell’s did; it builds things, tests them, and embraces failure.

Law and Learning is the title of Harry Arthurs’ seminal 1983 report on Canadian legal education. In it, he characterized Canadian law schools as pursuing “humane professionalism” – an integration of scholarly aims with preparation for professional practice. Arthurs identified three elements of this aspiration: learning legal rules, learning legal skills, and developing “a humane perspective on law, and a deeper understanding of law as a social phenomenon and an intellectual discipline.”²³ Arthurs’ critical appraisal of legal education at that time – that “the professional overwhelms the academic”²⁴ and that there was further need for “a safe haven for academic work,”²⁵ was highly influential. Its legacy has been to improve the scholarly capacity and identity of Canadian legal education, although as one commentator has written, “the background story the Report told about legal education has scarcely shifted”: curriculum remains eclectic, legal research and writing

¹⁶ Christopher Columbus Langdell, *Address* (5 November 1886) (1887) 3 LQ Rev 123 at 124.

¹⁷ Josef Redlich, *The Common Law and the Case Method in American University Law Schools: A Report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*, Bulletin No 8 (New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1914) at 16.

¹⁸ Coquillette and Kimball, *supra* note 3 at 284–85, 354–55.

¹⁹ Richard K Neumann Jr, “Osler, Langdell, and the Atelier: Three Tales of Creation in Professional Education” (2013) 10 Legal Comm and Rhetoric: JALWD 150 at 156–57.

²⁰ Holmes, *supra* note 5.

²¹ Neumann, *supra* note 19 at 160–63.

²² Katherine Camp Mayhew and Anna Camp Edwards, *The Dewey School: The Laboratory School of the University of Chicago, 1896–1903* (New York: D Appleton-Century, 1936).

²³ *Law and Learning*, *supra* note 2 at 47.

²⁴ *Ibid* at 55.

²⁵ *Ibid*.

instruction is little more developed, and law schools remain poorly aligned with the profession they train students to enter.²⁶

The Law and Learning Lab takes inspiration from Arthurs' seminal report in at least two respects: it embraces the idea that law schools should aspire to integrate their scholarly and professional missions – for which “humane professionalism” is one among multiple possible epithets²⁷ – and it embraces an empirical approach to interrogating the extent to which they are doing so. The Lab accepts two further premises. First, it accepts that this aspiration to bring together the academic and professional missions is shared by the vast majority of legal educators and is given institutional effect in many ways by modern day law schools. Second, it acknowledges that the capacity to *realize* this common aspiration is also structurally constrained²⁸ by certain institutional features that drive toward path dependence.

Inspired by, and extending beyond, its namesakes, the Law and Learning Lab aims to intervene strategically in the ecosystem of legal education. It aims to facilitate, inspire, and empower legal educators to treat abstract concepts and practical experience as mutually reinforcing vectors for legal learning as one way of bringing together the academic and professional mission of legal education. It aims to incubate ideas, formulate methods, and devise institutional structures to realize the capacity of law schools to serve, in another Arthurian formulation, as “knowledge-seeking, critique-generating, [and] change-making”²⁹ institutions – and to prepare their graduates to contribute expansively to society.

The Lab begins as a convening space for Canadian legal educators, but from its inception welcomes and envisions engagement with legal educators across North America and worldwide. The host school, Lincoln Alexander School of Law, is positioned well as Ontario's newest law school, located in downtown Toronto, with a distinctive mission to teach law “differently”. As a school with few established precedents, it is a place to experiment and pilot new approaches to legal education. But the Lab aims to support new and established law schools alike, by cultivating exchanges of ideas and stimulating innovation and experimentation.

The Lab aims to support experimentation in the pursuit of greater integration between scholarship, teaching, and professional development through three core activities:

1. Establish a research structure to explore at a deep level how the academic and professional missions of legal education can be understood as mutually reinforcing.
2. Serve as a stimulus for teaching innovation.
3. Build institutional capacity to break down silos and generate dialogue.

²⁶Catherine Dauvergne, “New Crossroads and the Opportunity for a Crisis: The State of Canadian Legal Education” (2023) 101:3 Can Bar Rev 708 at 726, 739–40.

²⁷ Consider, for example, the 2007 Carnegie Report's idea of “civic professionalism” (Sullivan et al, *supra* note 10 at 13, 28). Other formulations focus on the student, for example the “lawyer as citizen” (Sandomierski, *Aspiration and Reality*, *supra* note 6, c 1), “social architect” (Lon L Fuller, “The Lawyer as Architect of Social Structures” in Kenneth I Winston, ed, *The Principles of Social Order: Selected Essays of Lon L Fuller*, rev ed (Portland, OR: Hart, 2001) 285 at 287), or “lawyer-statesman” (Anthony T Kronman, *The Lost Lawyer: Failing Ideals of the Legal Profession* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1993) at 14–15, 118–20).

²⁸ Arthurs is the pre-eminent voice for the structural analysis of Canadian legal education. See Harry W Arthurs, “The Political Economy of Canadian Legal Education” (1998) 25:1 J L and Soc'y 14.

²⁹ Arthurs, *supra* note 1 at 68.

Core Activity 1: Create a Research Infrastructure

How is a law school to integrate its diverse missions, which include (at least) generating legal scholarship, cultivating thinking skills, instilling a wide range of professional competencies, helping students discover their professional vocation, and serving the public? How can educators bring to life the insight that law cannot be understood, taught, reformed, or practised without a simultaneous understanding of deeper principles and how these principles manifest in granular, real-life situations? What are the images of the lawyer, legal professional, and citizen that are implicitly and explicitly being communicated to students? How do law schools tip the scales in favour of certain ideas about law, or opportunities for social contribution? To what extent should the cognitive capacities of artificial intelligence require legal educators to fundamentally re-imagine their goals and the ways they achieve them? These are among the questions the Lab will conduct and on which it will commission research.

These questions are of universal concern for legal educators worldwide, and the Lab's pursuit of them will complement research centres in other jurisdictions that focus on pedagogical technique,³⁰ the empirical study of the profession,³¹ professional formation,³² and civil-justice reform³³ in those countries' distinctive contexts.

The Lab's location in Canada provides an opportunity to learn from distinctive innovations in Canada that have proven to be both original and enduring. These include the transsystemic programs at McGill (common law and civil law) and the University of Victoria (common law and Indigenous Legal Orders), programs in French common law (Université de Moncton and the University of Ottawa), and experiential or co-op programs at Calgary, UVic, and Osgoode.³⁴ Canadian legal education has a distinctive history, in part because of its site as encounter of multiple legal traditions: the United Kingdom and the United States; French and English Canada; and Indigenous and settler societies. Canada is also unique in offering a second-degree law program at exclusively public universities, creating a robust intellectual ecosystem for the study of law and legal education.

In addition to research on these more universal questions about legal education, the Lab will explore in-depth one new curricular innovation – the Integrated Practice Curriculum (IPC). The IPC is currently in use at two Ontario law schools, including at the Lincoln Alexander School of Law. By incorporating additional competencies into the curriculum, it enables graduates to obtain their licensing requirements without completing articles.

The Lab will serve as the intellectual engine for the Integrated Practice Curriculum. It will strive to articulate a theoretical foundation for the IPC, exploring how the IPC can respond to the recommendations of the Carnegie Report to integrate the cognitive, practical, and professional identity apprenticeships. The Lab will serve as a site of experimentation for different ways of operationalizing the IPC and its objectives of integrating practical knowledge into the curriculum.

³⁰ [Centre for Legal Education at Nottingham Trent University Law School](#).

³¹ [“After the JD: A National Study of Lawyer Careers” published by the American Bar Foundation](#).

³² [Centre for Professional Legal Education at Bond University; Legal Education Associate Deans \(LEAD\) Network Australia](#).

³³ [“Foundations for Practice 2.0” published by the Institute for the Advancement of the American Legal System](#).

³⁴ See e.g., [McGill University's Unique BCL/JD Program](#); [University of Victoria's Juris Doctor and Juris Indigenarum Doctor \(JD/IJD\)](#); [Université de Moncton's Étudier la common law en français](#); [University of Notre Dame's Law School Mission and History](#); and [Georgetown University Law Center's “Curriculum B \(Section 3\)”](#).

While this research will be of immediate benefit to the schools that adopt the IPC – providing intellectual leadership on the competency pathways for IPC schools and model or illustrative curricula – all law schools will be able to draw on the lessons of this singular innovation.

In time, the leadership provided by the Lab on the IPC will serve as a model to similarly convene and lead on other initiatives in legal education. For example, integrating Indigenous knowledge and perspectives into the law curriculum is a major commitment of Canadian law schools pursuant to their response to Call to Action 28 of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.³⁵ The Lab could serve as a convening space to share resources and explore collaborations, a role fulfilled today primarily in the virtual space.³⁶ Other prospects for such consolidation work include efforts to integrate into the legal curriculum racial justice, climate justice, entrepreneurialism, spirituality and politics,³⁷ and the role of AI and other technological developments in legal education.

While no one organization can contain expertise for all of these fields, the Lab can identify, share, study, and build networks across these distinct initiatives in order to highlight the approaches that might transform legal education. Over time, the Lab will help to reveal the intrinsic commitment to integrating diverse disciplines and visions of legal professional vocation that law schools already inhabit, and will hopefully spur a virtuous circle of inspiration, connection, innovation, and study, with the goal of re-articulating the “core” of legal education.

All the research products of the Lab will be published on the Lab’s website, and the Lab will also pursue other creative opportunities for dissemination of its research. The Lab will pursue partnerships with other organizations, such as Massey College and the Law Commission of Canada, to assist with the broad reach of scholarly and public impact.

Core Activity 2: Stimulate Innovation in the Law Classroom

A great and perhaps puzzling contrast in legal education is the distance between the incredible development of legal thought over the past 150 years (from legal formalism to legal realism, law and economics, critical legal studies, and more), on the one hand, and the apparent stasis in the mandatory curriculum and its dominant method of pedagogy, on the other.

The Lab will make targeted investments to help disrupt this stasis – to incubate new ideas, to stimulate experimentation, to engender a culture of innovation in teaching, to generate scholarship on legal teaching and learning, to facilitate exchanges, and to share results of these experiments.

Foundational to this mission, the Lab will support and champion the scholarship of legal teaching and learning. This initiative aims to address the structural incentive among faculty to prioritize research over teaching:³⁸ by supporting law teachers to ultimately publish their findings of their innovations, the Lab will “hack” this incentive. Moreover, teaching experiments that respond to research findings, and that are studied with the aim of producing research, are more likely to be deliberately planned and well informed, and to generate results that can be studied, repeated, and improved upon. Moreover, the generation of such research enables an enduring record of the innovation from which future educators can learn indefinitely.

³⁵ Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action* (Winnipeg: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015) at 3 (Call to Action 28).

³⁶ See e.g., [Reconciliation Syllabus](#).

³⁷ See e.g., [The Project for Integrating Spirituality, Law, and Politics](#).

³⁸ See Sandomierski, *Aspiration and Reality*, *supra* note 6.

In support of its mission to support innovation in teaching the Lab will:

- Create and administer a fund for teaching experimentation available to Lab members at all Canadian law schools.
- Provide research support to design, study, and publish on the experiments and innovations.
- At TMU, partner with the Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching to create a “Law Teaching Fellowship” based on their existing Teaching Fellowship program³⁹ on a cost-shared basis.
- Provide support to members at other law schools in setting up a similar fellowship program at their university (including by potentially offering matching funds).
- Publish teaching innovations and their research products on the Lab’s website.
- Conduct an annual conference to showcase experiments and innovations supported by the Lab.
- Establish a program of exchanges and visitations among Canadian law teachers to encourage the sharing of ideas and experiences across institutions.
- Provide education and training on law teaching to graduate students in law, new law professors, adjunct instructors, and established law professors.
- Establish a postdoctoral fellowship focused on legal education.
- House a signature experimental teaching space available for teachers at the Lincoln Alexander School of Law, other instructors at TMU, and law teachers from other law schools.

Core Activity 3: Build Institutional Capacity to Improve Dialogue

To help break down the silos within the university and the law school, between law schools, and between the academy and the profession, the Lab will convene a working group of legal educators to devise institutional solutions in consultation with past and present university administrators from institutions across the country. Recommendations from the working group will be shared with members and the Lab will support efforts at all Canadian law schools to improve dialogue amongst the various law school constituencies.

The Lab will also support efforts at Lincoln Alexander School of Law and TMU to experiment with certain strategies and to make the lessons from the experience at TMU available to other law schools. Such strategies may include: (i) law school as interdisciplinary hub; (ii) promoting collaboration between staff and faculty; and (iii) initiatives to bring academics and practitioners together.

The Law School as an Interdisciplinary Hub

At all universities, and particularly at TMU, there are SRC and teaching activities engaging with themes that are essential to any society’s understanding of law and justice. This work is being done

³⁹ [Toronto Metropolitan University. “Teaching Fellows”.](#)

across many departments,⁴⁰ and there are additional important insights to be gained from collaboration with cognate professional fields, such as Architecture⁴¹ and Medicine.⁴² The Law School is the natural home within the university to serve this convening role, but without dedicated curation, collaborations will be episodic and potentially fleeting.

The Lab will work to develop ongoing, sustaining forums to enable these scholars and teachers across the university to find each other and explore possibilities for collaboration. It will also provide support to cultivate these relationships and pursue initiatives. Such initiatives may include the co-hosting of interdisciplinary residencies (e.g., “Designer-in-Residence”; “Artist-in-Residence”). By hosting an experimental classroom available for use across the university, the Lab will naturally invite greater collaborations with colleagues from across the university. At a policy level, the Lab will identify any administrative barriers to these collaborations, considered and studied as case studies, and generate scholarly and research outputs than can generate solutions to increase interdisciplinary approaches to law teaching, in the spirit of Arthurs’ *Law and Learning* report.

Integrating Faculty and Staff Missions

The Carnegie Report’s emphasis on the apprenticeship of “professional identity formation” reveals the wide variety of law school activities that support students in discovering their professional vocation. Some of these activities occur in the classroom, such as when students learn to think like lawyers, or study public interest litigation, law reform, corporate governance, entrepreneurialism, and social movements (to name a few). Many other activities occur outside the classroom, supported by professional staff. These include moot and negotiation competitions, law firm recruitment, public interest jobs fairs, and external speakers (again, to name a few). There is an opportunity to curate more deliberate dialogue among these activities, so that faculty and staff can think collectively about how their different learning interventions might complement one another.

At the Lincoln Alexander School of Law, the Lab will curate and convene opportunities for faculty and staff to explore their shared mission. This can happen at the level of ideas – for example, through readings groups and presentations – but also at the level of operations. The Lab will help faculty and staff discover the opportunities for cross-pollination, develop a shared culture, anticipate and avoid miscommunications, and hopefully make for a more unified student experience. This convening work by the Lab will operationalize an ethos of care in constructing an integrated approach to professional identity formation.

⁴⁰ These include the Department of Criminology, the Department of Politics and Public Administration, the Department of Sociology, the Department of Philosophy, the Department of History, the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, the Department of Economics, the Department of Psychology, the School of Social Work, the School of Urban and Regional Planning, the School of Disability Studies, the School of Occupational and Public Health, the Daphne Cockwell School of Nursing, the Ted Rogers School of Management, the School of Journalism, the RTA School of Media, and the School of Health Services Management.

⁴¹ An illustrative example of the possibilities for interdepartmental collaboration is the Law and Architecture course offered in the Fall of 2025 between the Law School and the Department of Architectural Science. See [Law and Architecture: Reimagining Lincoln Alexander Law](#) (2025), online (video), YouTube.

⁴² A contingent of law faculty has been to visit the new School of Medicine and have already begun brainstorming possibilities for collaboration. On the relationship between pedagogy in law, architecture, and medicine, see Neumann, *supra* note 19.

Bringing Academics and Practitioners Together

The Lab will facilitate the ongoing encounter and dialogue between academics and professionals to ensure the sharing of ideas. Many practitioners teach in the modern law school, typically as adjunct instructors. At the Lincoln Alexander School of Law, practitioners and academics also co-teach certain mandatory courses. There is an opportunity to have more shared discussions about pedagogy that deliberately places academics and practitioners in the same room together (literally and figuratively). The Lab will undertake such coordination at the Lincoln Alexander School of Law, in part by co-hosting external visitors and other residencies (e.g., “practitioner in residence”).

Beyond dialogue and collaboration in teaching, there is an opportunity to re-think spatial arrangements at law schools to encourage more “accidental collisions” among academics, students, and practitioners. Such spontaneous interactions allow not only for ad hoc learning but also for professional socialization, including mentorship, for law students. The Lab will support efforts at the Lincoln Alexander School of Law to envision how the wisdom and experience from practice can be integrated into the life of law schools by deliberate spatial design.

At a larger policy level, the Lab will convene representatives from the profession and its associational and regulatory bodies on its Advisory Board in order to ensure two-way dialogue between legal educators and the profession.

Strategic Alignment

Lincoln Alexander School of Law

At the Faculty level, the Lab is a direct response to the priorities articulated in the Lincoln Alexander School of Law’s *Academic Plan 2025–2030*.⁴³ The Plan’s fifth priority, “Build Agility and Preparedness for a Changing Future,” commits the law school to “Reimagine Learning and Teaching” through pedagogical innovation, interdisciplinary approaches, co-designed learning experiences, technology-driven pedagogy, and community-centred design of physical and digital spaces. The Lab operationalizes each of these commitments: the Law Teaching Fellows program creates the institutional infrastructure for faculty-led pedagogical experimentation; the program of exchanges and visitations and potential Fellow projects embed interdisciplinary collaboration at the core of the Lab’s work. The Lab also advances the Plan’s first priority, “Enhance Student Experience and Success” by studying and strengthening the Integrated Practice Curriculum – and by generating evidence-based improvements to the experiential and clinical learning at the heart of the law school experience.

The Lab further aligns with Priority 2, “Lead Locally and Connect Globally through SRC Excellence,” which expressly calls for the Faculty to “facilitate faculty-led initiatives to create research centres and specialized academic programs that align with key areas of interest and strategic importance” to expand external research funding, and to foster interdisciplinary and community-based collaborations. By transforming pedagogical experiments into publishable scholarship of teaching and learning and convening stakeholder meetings, the Lab contributes to the Faculty’s SRC profile while serving as the national intellectual home for the study of legal education. The Lab’s outward-facing role embodies the Plan’s aspiration to “lead locally and connect globally” and honours the

⁴³ [Lincoln Alexander School of Law, *Academic Plan 2025–2030*](#) (Toronto: Toronto Metropolitan University, 2025), online.

Faculty's founding vision, reaffirmed throughout the Academic Plan, of a law school dedicated to innovation, access, and the reimagination of legal education.

TMU

The Lab aligns with several priorities of the TMU Academic Plan 2025–2030, *Transforming Futures*.⁴⁴ The Plan's first priority, "Enhance the learning journey for greater student success" encapsulates the Lab's core purpose. The Lab's research on the IPC, its Teaching Fellows program, and its interdisciplinary programming respond directly to the Plan's second priority, "Reimagine learning and teaching." The fourth priority, "Make impact through SRC and innovation," affirms TMU's commitment to scholarly excellence across all disciplines: the Lab deploys pedagogical innovation to generate SRC activity, contributing to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and to legal education research.

The Lab further aligns with the TMU Strategic Research Plan 2025–2030.⁴⁵ The "Democracy, Justice and Governance" theme encompasses the justice ecosystem within which legal education operates. The "Future of Work" theme connects to the Lab's research on the integration of the professional and academic missions of legal education.

Through the Law Teaching Fellowship and its partnership with CELT, the Lab helps to align the activities of the Law School with the priorities of the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic. Among the measures by which the University's Senate tracks its own progress is Indicator 13, Teaching-Related Research.⁴⁶ By generating, curating, and disseminating research on legal education, the Lab would produce precisely the teaching-related research that Indicator 13 is meant to capture.

Duplication and Intersection

The Lab does not duplicate any existing unit at Toronto Metropolitan University. The University's recognized research centres and institutes are organized around substantive domains – migration and settlement, urban energy, biomedical engineering, corporate social responsibility, digital humanities, and the like – and none takes legal education, or the integration of the academic and professional missions of professional education, as its object of study.

Within the Lincoln Alexander School of Law, the existing infrastructure consists of teaching clinics, experiential placements, and student-support offices that deliver legal education and services. There is also an infrastructure of administrative support (Associate Dean (Academic) and the JD Director) and faculty governance (e.g., Curriculum Committee) charged with organizing the curricular and other activities of the law school. The Lab studies and reimagines the work of law schools, including at Lincoln Alexander School of Law, making SRC resources available to faculty and administrators across all law schools, empowering these actors to fulfil their roles. The Lab does not aim to perform the coordinating and curricular design work at the Law School – this is reserved for the existing structures. On the other hand, none of these actors has the specific mandate, as the Lab does, of researching legal education.

⁴⁴ [Toronto Metropolitan University, *Transforming Futures: Academic Plan 2025–2030*](#) (Toronto: Toronto Metropolitan University, 2025), online.

⁴⁵ [Toronto Metropolitan University, *Strategic Research Plan 2025–2030*](#) (Toronto: Toronto Metropolitan University, 2025), online.

⁴⁶ Toronto Metropolitan University, [TMU Senate Progress Indicators and Related Statistics](#) (Toronto: Toronto Metropolitan University, January 2026) at 102 (Indicator 13: Teaching-Related Research, calculation deferred), online.

The nearest cognate activity within the university is the work of the Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching, the University's central support for the scholarship of teaching and learning, whose Teaching Fellows program supports pedagogical innovation across all disciplines. The relationship there is one of partnership rather than overlap: the Lab's Law Teaching Fellowship is designed and cost-shared with the Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching, drawing on its general expertise in the scholarship of teaching and learning while the Lab supplies the disciplinary depth, the doctrinal and professional context, and the law-specific research agenda that a university-wide teaching centre is not constituted to provide. Future collaborations may include working together on the experimental teaching space to be housed in the law school but available to the TMU community at large. In these respects, the Lab extends and concentrates an existing institutional strength rather than competing with it.

Impact on the Library and the School of Law

There will be a minimal use of administrative resources from the law school (required to set up the new cost centre, post for Research Assistants, etc). In time the Lab will fund a part-time coordinator to eliminate this extra administrative burden.

Aside from the request for the Law Library to archive the digital and physical assets of the Lab in the case of closure, there is no anticipated impact on TMU Libraries – aside from the normal function of providing research assistance to TMU researchers affiliated with the Lab.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

Pathways to professional success in law school can reinforce existing systemic inequities – advantaging students whose cognitive styles, cultural backgrounds, and material circumstances align with conventional legal pedagogy, and disadvantaging those who do not. A colonial framework of law and education may perpetuate the exclusion and discrimination faced by Indigenous students and other marginalized groups. The very objective of the Lab strives to reduce these inequities, and a lens of equity, diversity, and inclusion will therefore animate the mission and operation of the Lab.

Pedagogical Design

The convergence of legal education on a single pedagogical method advantages students with pre-existing socioeconomic capital, those free of disability or caregiving obligations, and those whose cultural background or upbringing suit the standard mode, while disadvantaging others. The Lab's core activities – the fund for teaching innovation, the Law Teaching Fellowship, and its research on the Integrated Practice Curriculum – exist in part to diversify the methods available to legal educators. The Lab will encourage applicants to its funded programs to consider how their innovations affect students with disabilities or caregiving obligations, or who face barriers due to socioeconomic, cultural, or other systemic factors.

Law Teaching Fellows

The Lab is committed to the equitable distribution of Teaching Fellowship funds across the Lincoln Alexander School of Law faculty over time. In any selection process, which will be undertaken in concert with the CELT, preference will be given, all other factors being equal, to ideas demonstrating a commitment to inclusion and access.

Research

The Lab will encourage, support, and invite all Law Teaching Fellows to reflect on the equity dimensions of their projects – through disaggregating student experience data, considering differential impacts across student populations, or examining how an innovation might serve students historically underserved by conventional legal pedagogy.

Access to Justice

The inequities of legal education compound into inequities in access to legal services and in the profession itself. The Lab's research and dissemination work will attend to how pedagogical innovations affect not only students but the communities those students will go on to serve, particularly communities currently underserved by the legal profession.

Indigenous and Racial Justice

Efforts to integrate Indigenous knowledge and perspectives into legal education – including in response to Call to Action 28 of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada – and to integrate racial justice into the curriculum are underway at law schools across the country. There could be some benefit to an institutional home that actively consolidates these ideas, and in time the Lab may extend its convening role to do so, sharing resources and building networks among schools and educators already engaged in this work, without claiming expertise or ownership it does not have.

Physical Space and Equipment Requirements

Years 1–2

The Lab will operate from the Director's faculty office. Such a space is sufficient for the Director's administrative work, small meetings with Teaching Fellows and RAs, and consultations. Membership meetings and Advisory Board sessions will be held in existing bookable rooms within the law school.

Years 3–4

As the Lab's activities expand, a dedicated space will become increasingly important to cultivate a community and encourage affiliations and joint work. During these interim years a small working area for the Director, RAs, and visitors will be beneficial to the Lab's development.

Year 5 and Beyond

The Lab's space needs will grow to include collaborative workspace, research assistant workstations, and a small seminar room for Teaching Fellow presentations and visiting scholar talks. The Director will engage meaningfully in the design for the new law school facilities at 277 Victoria St to ensure appropriate space for the Lab is planned for in the law school's permanent home, including spatial arrangements in the law school that encourage the kind of accidental encounters between academics, practitioners, and students described in Core Activity 3.

Terms of Reference

The Law and Learning Lab will be created as a Faculty Research Centre pursuant to Policy 144. It will be housed at the Lincoln Alexander School of Law at Toronto Metropolitan University.

Mission

The Law and Learning Lab (the Lab) exists to support legal educators throughout Canada and worldwide to transcend the inhibiting features of path dependency, and to realize the shared aspiration of integrating the academic and professional missions of legal education.

The Lab takes seriously two convictions: that the aspiration to bring together the academic and professional missions is shared by most legal educators; and that the capacity to realize this aspiration is structurally constrained by institutional features that drive toward path dependence.

Mandate

The Lab pursues its mission through three core activities.

1. It will build a research structure to study the integration of the academic and professional missions of legal education and provide research and intellectual support for curricular development, with particular emphasis on the Integrated Practice Curriculum.
2. It will stimulate innovation in the law classroom.
3. It will build institutional capacity to break down silos within the university, within the law school, and between the academy and the profession.

Objectives

In service of this mandate, the Lab's objectives are:

- To conduct and commission research on the relationship between the academic and professional missions of legal education, publishing its findings for legal educators in Canada and abroad.
- To provide model curricula and competency pathways for schools using the Integrated Practice Curriculum, and to share its lessons with all law schools.
- To establish a fund for teaching innovation available to Lab members at all Canadian law schools.
- To establish a Law Teaching Fellowship with TMU's Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching, and to support similar fellowships at other law schools.
- To convene an annual conference and a program of exchanges and visitations among Canadian law teachers.
- To convene a working group of legal educators and current and former administrators to devise institutional solutions that break down silos within the university, within the law school, and between the academy and the profession.

- To pilot certain institutional and pedagogical experiments at the Lincoln Alexander School of Law – including spatial arrangements – and to make studies or reviews of these experiments available to other law faculties.
- To provide research support to design, study, and publish innovations in legal teaching, and to publish completed innovations and their research products on the Lab’s website.
- To provide education and training on law teaching to graduate students in law, new law professors, adjunct instructors, and established law professors, and to establish a postdoctoral fellowship focused on legal pedagogy.

Membership

Categories

- Members
- Associate Members
- Ex Officio Members: The Dean of Law or their Designate plus up to two staff members at the Lincoln Alexander School of Law, mutually agreed upon by the Dean and the Director

Eligibility

Members

Full-time faculty members at the Lincoln Alexander School of Law and the Director of the TMU Law Library.

Associate Members

Full-time faculty members at a law school, or at a university’s legal studies, law and society, or similarly named interdisciplinary legal studies program; Part-time or sessional instructors at a Canadian law school; full-time faculty at Canadian universities and colleges; graduate students in law or a related discipline; law librarians.

Rights

Members

Full voting rights, eligibility for leadership roles including Director (reserved for tenured faculty members pursuant to Policy 144, s. 4.6), eligibility to serve on committees, eligibility to apply for research and teaching support, access to all Lab resources.

Associate Members

Non-voting rights, but access to Lab resources and eligibility to apply for research and teaching support. Eligible to serve on committees.

Ex Officio Members

Full voting rights, eligibility to serve on committees, access to all Lab resources.

Responsibilities

Members

Actively contribute to the work of the Lab, participate in meetings and workshops, supervise and mentor students and early career scholars, fulfil other academic citizenship roles as needed. All members of the Lab are expected to adhere to the highest ethical standards. Members in receipt of Lab funds are required to acknowledge the Lab's support for research or teaching in any public dissemination.

Associate Members

Attend relevant meetings and contribute to the intellectual life of the Lab.

Ex Officio Members

Attend relevant meetings and contribute to the intellectual life of the Lab.

Terms

Terms or renewals for Members and Associate Members may be staggered for continuity purposes, with modified term lengths if needed.

Members

Renewable three-year term with the possibility of re-appointment based on active involvement and contributions.

Associate Members

Renewable three-year term with the possibility of re-appointment based on active involvement and contributions.

Ex Officio Members

Renewable two-year term with re-appointment determined by the Dean and Director on mutual agreement.

Procedures for Election and/or Appointment

Members

The initial Membership consists of those whose CVs were included in the original proposal.

Applications for new membership: Potential Members must apply or be nominated by an existing Member, highlighting their expertise, contributions, and commitment to the Lab's mission. The Director appoints and renews new members on the advice of the Membership Committee.

Review: The Membership Committee reviews applications and evaluates eligibility based on established criteria, which will include ability to contribute to (a) legal education research, (b) innovation in law teaching, or (c) institutional capacity building.

Associate Members

Potential Associate Members apply with a statement of interest and CV.

Review: The Membership Committee reviews applications and evaluates eligibility based on established criteria, which will include ability to contribute to (a) legal education research, (b) innovation in law teaching, or (c) institutional capacity building.

The Director appoints and renews Associate Members on the advice of the Membership Committee.

Renewals

Members and Associate Members seeking renewal of their term shall submit an application indicating their contributions to and engagement with the Lab to date.

The renewal of Ex Officio Members shall be mutually agreed upon by the Dean and Director (with the exception of the Dean or Dean's Designate).

The Membership Committee shall determine renewals based on established criteria.

Term of the Law and Learning Lab

The Law and Learning Lab is established as a Faculty Research Centre for an initial five-year term, subject to renewal under Policy 144.

Administrative Structure

Director

Term

The Director's term is five years, renewable subject to section 3.5 and shall normally run from July 1 to June 30.

The maximum term limit for the Director is three consecutive terms.

Selection

The inaugural Director shall be appointed by the Dean of Law. In accordance with Policy 144, s. 4.6, the inaugural Director will typically hold the rank of at least Associate Professor with tenure at the Lincoln Alexander School of Law.

Renewals of the term of Director shall be determined by the Dean of Law upon consultation with the Membership and the Advisory Board.

Selection and appointment of a new Director shall be made by the Dean of Law. The Dean of Law shall solicit applications from among the Membership and will consult with the Advisory Board and the Membership on the criteria and process to be used for selection.

Members at the rank of Associate Professor (with tenure) or above at the Lincoln Alexander School of Law shall be eligible to serve as Director.

Powers and Duties

Governance and Membership

- Appoint and renew new Members and Associate Members on the advice of the Membership Committee.

- Appoint and renew members of the Advisory Board, after the consultation required under section 3.2.1, other than the Dean's Designate.
- Convene meetings of the Advisory Board.
- Chair the Membership Committee, Grants Committee and the Membership Council.

Staffing

- Recruit, hire, and supervise research associate(s) and student Ras.
- Recruit, hire, and supervise the coordinator.

External Relations and Representation

- Serve as the principal point of contact for the Lab's partners.
- Represent the Lab within and outside the University.
- Manage the Lab's digital presence.

Financial Management and Accountability

- Prepare, submit, and implement the annual budget and work plan.
- Prepare the annual report and report to the Dean (due June 30 per Policy 144, s. 5.2.2).
- Maintain records against the measures set out in Evaluation Metrics, to inform the annual report and the probationary and five-year reviews.
- Secure funding for the Lab from various sources (e.g., contributions from law faculties, philanthropy, strategic partners, grant competitions).
- On the advice of the Grants Committee where applicable, administer funds for teaching and research support.
- Approve all financial expenditures of the Lab.
- Bind the Lab contractually to the extent permitted by TMU policies.
- Post, at minimum, an Executive Summary of the Annual Report on the Lab's website by September 1 of each year, in accordance with Policy 144.

Programs and Operations

- In partnership with CELT and the Grants Committee, participate in the selection of the annual Law Teaching Fellow at TMU.
- Track and support Lab publication and dissemination outputs.
- Develop and pursue special Lab projects.
- Oversee the physical set-up of the Lab's facilities.

Advisory Board

Composition

The Advisory Board will have a minimum of 9 and a maximum of 15 members, excluding the Director, who is an ex-officio non-voting Board member.

The Advisory Board will include one designate of the Dean of Law, appointed by the Dean in accordance with Policy 144.

The Centre for Excellence in Research and Teaching (CELT) will have one ex-officio member of the Advisory Board. The CELT Advisory Board member will be jointly selected by the Director of the Law and Learning Lab and the Executive Director of the CELT, or the designate of the Executive Director of the CELT.

Aside from the Dean's Designate and the CELT ex officio member, Members of the Advisory Board are appointed and renewed by the Director in consultation with the Dean of Law. Advisory Board Members will include representatives from the following areas:

- **Education** (e.g., Representatives from the other IPC law schools, the Legal Practice Program, the Canadian Association of Law Teachers, the Canadian Council of Law Deans, including former deans, legal education scholars from Canadian and international law schools, and faculty from other disciplines.)
- **Regulators, licensing bodies, professional associations and legal service organizations** (e.g., The Law Society of Ontario and the Federation of Law Societies of Canada; the Ontario Bar Association, Canadian Bar Association, and Advocates' Society; Legal Aid Ontario; and the Law Foundation of Ontario.)
- **Industry** (e.g., Lawyers in private practice, government practice, non-profit practice, or non-practising law school graduates; members of the judiciary.)
- **Ex-Officio Board Members** (i.e., So long as a partnership exists between the Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching and the Lab, the Director, Teaching Development and Digital Learning of the CELT (or their designate) will be an ex officio Advisory Board Member.)

Term

Each member of the Advisory Board shall serve a three-year renewable term. Terms or renewals may be staggered for continuity purposes, with modified term lengths if needed.

Powers, Duties, and Responsibilities

- Review annual reports and provide strategic guidance and substantive expertise.
- Support fundraising efforts.
- Assist the Lab in developing networks with academic and professional partners.
- Other duties and responsibilities as may arise from time to time.

Institutional Affiliations

Being a Faculty Research Centre, the Lab is housed primarily in the Lincoln Alexander School of Law. As relationships with other organizations mature, these Terms of Reference may be modified to reflect ongoing developments.

Governance Structure

Membership Council

The voting body of the Lab is chaired by the Director. It meets a minimum of once per year to review and consult on the annual plan. It consists of the Members, Associate Members (who attend as non-voting members), and Ex-Officio members.

Membership Committee

Includes a minimum of three Members, establishes (and may modify) its own Terms of Reference, and recommends candidates for Membership and Associate Membership (and renewals thereof) to the Director based on criteria that it establishes that are compatible with the Lab's Terms of Reference.

Grants Committee

Includes a minimum of three Members, establishes its own Terms of Reference and establishes criteria and process requirements for the allocation of research and teaching support funds, including working in partnership with the CELT at TMU to appoint the annual Law Teaching Fellow.

Director and Advisory Board

The Director reports to the Dean of Law.

The Advisory Board advises the Director who will communicate relevant advice to the Membership Council and to the Dean of Law.

Vacancies

Director

If a Director takes an approved leave or steps down before the end of the specified term, a Director shall be appointed by the Dean of Law to fill the vacancy (temporarily or until the end of the term, as the case may be).

Advisory Board Members

If an Advisory Board position becomes vacant due to resignation or incapacity, a replacement will be selected by the Director, considering the need for expertise in the vacated area.

General Operations

Resources, Sources of Revenue, Distribution of Indirect Costs

The Lab will be a responsible steward of its resources. Its sources of revenue will include:

- Contributions from Canadian law schools, including a startup fund from the Lincoln Alexander School of Law.
- Philanthropic activities, to be coordinated with University Advancement where applicable.
- External grant funding (e.g., Tri-Council funds, Law Foundation of Ontario).
- A cost-sharing agreement with the Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching for the Law Teaching Fellowship.

The Lab will operate in conformity with Policy 143, particularly s. 4.2.2 which establishes the allocation of indirect costs for Faculty Research Centres.

The Lab's finances will be managed through a cost centre within the School of Law.

Annual Budget and Work Plan

The Director shall submit to the Dean an annual budget and work plan by June 30th each year. Prior to May 31 of the same year, the Director shall have circulated drafts of these documents to the Membership and Advisory Board with an opportunity to provide feedback.

The Director on July 1 shall implement the budget and work plan submitted that year.

Closure

Notice of Discontinuation

In the event that the Lab is to be discontinued, the Director will issue a formal notice to the Dean, the Membership, the Advisory Board, and the Office of the Vice-President, Research and Innovation with the proposed date of closure. The notice will set out the reasons for discontinuation and a detailed timeline for winding down the Lab's activities, which will normally be over at least 12 months. The Director will ensure that all external partners, funders, and stakeholders are notified in a timely manner.

Disposition of Assets Upon Closure

Physical assets acquired through Lab funds will remain the property of TMU and be transferred to the Lincoln Alexander School of Law or reallocated as appropriate. Digital assets – research databases, the Lab's website, publications, digital tools – will be archived by the Law Library or transferred to an appropriate TMU unit to ensure continued public access. Physical research assets such as books will be offered first to TMU Libraries and after that to the Lincoln Alexander School of Law. Intellectual property produced through the Lab's activities will be governed by TMU's intellectual property policies. Any remaining financial assets will be returned to their source in accordance with the terms under which they were provided.

Costs Related to Closure in Final Year of Operation

The budget for the Lab's final year of operation will include provisions for: support for affected staff during transition; legal and administrative costs associated with dissolving contracts and compliance obligations; archiving and records management; and communication costs associated with notifying stakeholders.

Probationary Year and First-Year Milestones

The Lab acknowledges the one-year probationary period required by Policy 144, s. 5.1.8. The Lab's first annual report will report against the milestones below and form the basis of the first-year review.

Governance and Administration

- Constitute the founding Membership from those whose CVs are included in this proposal.
- Establish the Membership Council, Membership Committee, and Grants Committee.
- Establish the Lab's cost centre and the governance, financial, and reporting practices required by these Terms and by Policy 144.
- Secure an initial office presence.

Advisory Board

- Appoint the initial Board in consultation with the Dean – including the Dean's appointee and the ex officio CELT representative – and convene its first meeting within the year.

Programs

- Through the Grants Committee, establish the criteria for the allocation of teaching funds.
- In concert with the CELT, establish the process and selection criteria for the Law Teaching Fellowship

Research

- Establish the Lab's research program.
- Hire at least one student RA.

Partnerships and Funding

- Secure the startup fund from the Law School.
- Advance one or more external funding applications and cultivate partnerships in consultation with University Advancement. Given external competition timelines, the first-year milestone is credible applications advanced and a path to fiscal viability demonstrated, rather than stable funding in hand.

Evaluation Metrics

The Lab will assess its progress annually against the objectives set out above and the renewal criteria in Policy 144, s. 5.3.4, which requires that a Research Centre's impact be demonstrated "over and above what would have been accomplished by individual faculty members." The measures fall into four areas:

Research

- Publications, working papers, and commissioned reports on the integration of legal education, tracked cumulatively.
- External research applications submitted and awarded, and the funding secured relative to the Lab's own investment.
- The number of law schools engaged in developing model curricula and competency pathways for the Integrated Practice Curriculum.
- Non-traditional research outputs: model curricula and teaching toolkits published on the Lab's website, documentary and digital media productions, digital tools, and policy briefs or submissions to regulators and professional bodies.

Pedagogical Innovation

- Law Teaching Fellowships awarded and disbursements made through the fund for teaching innovation administered by the Grants Committee; the number of teaching innovations supported, the number of distinct educators who have developed them, and the number of students reached by them, tracked cumulatively across Canadian law schools; the proportion of funded projects carried into published Scholarship of Teaching and Learning; participation in the Lab's education and training programming, disaggregated by graduate students, new law professors, adjunct instructors, and established professors; the status of the postdoctoral fellowship in legal pedagogy and its research output; the number of law schools establishing a Fellowship or fund of their own on the Lab's model; and uptake of the Lab's teaching innovations by instructors at the School of Law and beyond.
- **Dialogue and partnership:** Convenings hosted – including meetings of the working group on institutional capacity, the annual conference, and the program of exchanges and visitations – and the number of Canadian law schools and legal educators participating in them, tracked year over year; collaborations formed across disciplines at the University, among IPC and other law schools, and with the profession and its regulators; progress toward a recurring national meeting on legal education, including in partnership with the Canadian Association of Law Teachers.
- **Capacity and viability:** Growth in Membership and Associate Membership across Canadian law schools and legal studies programs; students and personnel engaged, including Research Assistants, a research associate, and a coordinator as funding permits; the diversity and growth of revenue sources – contributions from Canadian law schools, philanthropy, and external grants – relative to the Lab's initial startup fund; equitable participation in the Lab's funded programs; and progress toward stable, multi-year funding.

Appendix A: Budget

Expenditure

- **Research:** JD research assistants, research associate, scholarship of law teaching support, commissioned research, postdoctoral fellowship contribution.
- **Knowledge dissemination:** Engagement with profession and other stakeholders, annual conference; exchanges and visitations among Canadian law teachers.
- **Operations:** Meetings, reserve fund, office expenses, personnel costs.

Revenue Sources

- Lincoln Alexander School of Law
- Philanthropy
- External Grants
- Annual Conference
- Cost Recovery

A budget table is available upon request.

Appendix B: List of Proposed Members

Members

- David Sandomierski, Associate Professor, Lincoln Alexander School of Law
- Simon Wallace, Assistant Professor, Lincoln Alexander School of Law
- Basil Alexander, Assistant Professor, Lincoln Alexander School of Law
- Edward Bécharde-Torres, Assistant Professor, Lincoln Alexander School of Law
- Hilary Cameron, Associate Professor, Lincoln Alexander School of Law
- Jake Effoduh, Assistant Professor, Lincoln Alexander School of Law
- Graham Hudson, Associate Dean (Academic) and Professor, Lincoln Alexander School of Law
- Alex Mogyoros, Assistant Professor, Lincoln Alexander School of Law
- Jennifer Orange, Interim Associate Dean (Academic) and Associate Professor, Lincoln Alexander School of Law
- Nam Jin Yoon, Head Law Librarian, TMU

Associate Members

- Leanne Shafir, Director, Experiential and Clinical Legal Education, Lincoln Alexander School of Law
- Spiros Vavougios, Assistant Dean, Student Programming and Equity, Lincoln Alexander School of Law
- Lisa Landrum, Professor, Department of Architectural Sciences, TMU
- Lorella Di Cintio, Chair and Professor, Interior Design, TMU
- Marcin Kedzior, Professor, Faculty of Media, Creative Arts, and Design, Humber College
- John McMinn, Professor, University of Waterloo School of Architecture
- Adrien Habermacher, Professeur agrégé, Université de Moncton Faculté de droit

Appendix C: CVs of Proposed Members

Available upon request.