



SENATE MEETING AGENDA

Monday, June 5, 2017



SENATE MEETING AGENDA

Monday, June 5, 2017

THE COMMONS - POD 250

9:30 a.m. Light breakfast is available

10:00 a.m. Senate Meeting starts

1. Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum
2. Approval of Agenda
Motion: *That Senate approve the agenda for the June 5, 2017 meeting*
3. Announcements
- Pages 1-6 4. Minutes of Previous Meeting
Motion: *That Senate approve the minutes of the May 2, 2017 meeting*
5. Matters Arising from the Minutes
6. Correspondence
- Pages 7-12 7. Reports
 - 7.1 Report of the President
 - 7.1.1 President's Update
- Pages 13-17 7.2 Report of the Secretary
 - 7.2.1 Update on Senate and committee vacancies

- 7.3 Committee Reports
- Pages 18-54 7.3.1 Report #W2017-4 of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC):
M. Moshé
- 7.3.1.1 Law program proposal
- Motion:** *That Senate approve the law program proposal as described in the agenda package, contingent on approval by the Federation of Law Societies of Canada, and contingent on the establishment of a Faculty of Law at Ryerson*
- Pages 55-90 7.3.2 Report #W2017-4 of the Academic Governance and Policy
Committee (AGPC): C. Evans
- Pages 56-76 7.3.2.1 Policy 152: Graduate Student Academic Consideration and
Appeals
- Motion:** *That Senate approve the revisions to Policy 152 (Graduate Student Academic Consideration and Appeals), as described in the agenda package*
- Pages 77-84 7.3.2.2 Department Council Bylaws for Philosophy
- Motion:** *That Senate approve the Departmental Council Bylaws for Philosophy*
- Pages 85-90 7.3.2.3 Department Council Bylaws for Criminology
- Motion:** *That Senate approve the Departmental Council Bylaws for Criminology*
- 7.3.2.4 Update regarding Recommendation #2 in the
Ombudsperson's 2015-2016 Report on additional requirements to
pass a course
- Pages 91-113 7.3.3 Report #W2017-3 of the Curriculum Implementation Committee
(CIC): M. Moshé
- 7.3.3.1 DRAFT Policy 2: Undergraduate Curriculum Structure for
information. A formal revision will come to Senate for approval in
Fall 2017

8. Old Business

9. New Business as Circulated

10. Members' Business

11. Consent Agenda

11.1 Update on the 2014-2019 Academic Plan (*Our Time to Lead*) and from the Office of the Vice President Research and Innovation (OVPRI) See: http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2017/Academic_Plan_Update_June_2017.pdf

Pages 114-125 11.2 Senate Learning and Teaching Committee report

12. Adjournment



SENATE MINUTES OF MEETING			
Tuesday, May 2, 2017			
MEMBERS PRESENT:			
EX-OFFICIO:	FACULTY:		STUDENTS:
L. Barnoff	S. Benda	E. Kam	Y. Helmy
M. Bountrogianni	R. Botelho	L. Kolasa	E. Hysi
I. Coe	T. Burke	A. Mathews-David	M. Masood
T. Duever	D. Checkland	A. McWilliams	P. Santhanarasa
M. Lachemi	K. Church	L. Pine	
M. Lefebvre	P. Danziger	S. Rakhmayil	
S. Liss	Y. Derbal	C. Schryer	
J. Mactavish	H. Doshi	K. Venkatakrishnan	
M. Moshé	N. Eichenlaub	J. Zboralski	
S. Murphy	A. Ferworn		
D. O'Neil Green	J. Friedman		
P. Stenton	E. Harley		
S. Zolfaghari	R. Hudyma		
SENATE ASSOCIATES:			EX-OFFICIO STUDENTS:
A. M. Brinsmead			D. Lis
M. Zouri			A. Najibzadeh
REGRETS:		ABSENT:	ALUMNI:
C. Antonescu	M. Rodrigues	W. Fraser	
B. Ceh	R. Rodrigues	P. Gusciora	
C. Dowling	P. Sugiman	P. Haastrup	
C. Evans	J. Tiessen	K. Kumar	
C. Falzon	K. Underwood	A. Latchman	
R. Frankle	S. Wehbi	D. Mason	
C. Hack	J. Winton	A. Robb	
H. Lane Vetere		A. Wong	
N. Naghibi		F. Y. Zhang	
N. Piragic			

1. Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum
2. Approval of Agenda
Motion: *That Senate approve the agenda for the May 2, 2017 meeting*
A. McWilliams moved; M. Lefebvre seconded
Motion Approved.
3. Announcements - None
4. Minutes of Previous Meeting
Motion: *That Senate approve the minutes of the April 4, 2017 meeting*
D. Checkland clarified the issue he raised at the April meeting regarding the academic home for some Chang School certificates. He explained that certificate programs with primarily degree-credit courses are housed in academic departments, and those with primarily non-degree-credit courses are often housed in the Chang School.

D. Checkland moved; E. Hysi seconded
Motion Approved.
5. Matters Arising from the Minutes – None
6. Correspondence - None
7. Reports
 - 7.1 Report of the President
 - 7.1.1 President's Update

President Lachemi announced the following:
 - Congratulations to Dr. Denise O'Neil Green who was appointed Ryerson's first Vice President, Equity and Community Inclusion. Related to the announcement of this appointment, Ryerson has been voted one of Canada's best diversity and inclusion employers for the third consecutive year.
 - It was reported in Maclean's magazine that Ryerson was ranked among the Top 10 Best Engineering Universities and the Top 10 Best Business Universities in Canada. President Lachemi congratulated Dean Duever from FEAS and Dean Murphy from TRSM for these achievements. He also recognized the School of Interior Design, the Department of Psychology, the School of Social Work, and TRSM for renewals of their accreditation status.
 - Dean Falzon from FCAD and A. Saloojee, Assistant Vice President International, were recognized for their team's work in forging a new partnership with the Canadian University of Dubai.
 - Regarding the possible creation of a Law School at Ryerson, President Lachemi reported that a formal submission was made to the Federation of Law Societies of Canada on April 28, 2017. As well, a site visit has been conducted, the preliminary feedback from which was very positive. A full proposal is being prepared and will come to Senate in the near future.

- The provincial budget was announced last week. With no growth money for universities, Ryerson will keep its enrollment close to current levels for next year. For students, improvements to the OSAP program were announced, as well as new investment in Career Kickstart strategies.
- The 2017-18 Ryerson Budget was approved by the Board of Governors on April 27. President Lachemi noted that the budget is balanced, and provided some details about its implications for next year.
- The President noted that the process for revising the AAA policy is ongoing. He announced that a community town hall will be held on May 9, 2017 at 3:30 p.m. in POD 250 to discuss the policy revision. An email will be sent to all faculty members; comments can also be submitted to provost@ryerson.ca. The draft policy revision, entitled “Appointment of Academic Administrators: Rights and Obligations of Ryerson University Search Committee Members: Hiring Guide” was circulated in advance to members and will be posted on the Provost’s website.
- The 2017-18 funding formula is still a work in progress. More information will be provided at the next Senate meeting, if it becomes available.
- Ryerson is also still waiting for the provincial government to announce the next phase of the Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA) process; there will be more consultation with the Ryerson community as soon as possible.
- Regarding the proposal for a Ryerson site in Brampton, a meeting was held with the Ministry and another is scheduled for May. Ryerson has not been asked to provide a full proposal yet, so we are waiting for the government to notify us of next steps.
- Regarding a discussion raised at the previous Senate meeting, an investigation is underway regarding the event that took place on campus at which Ezra Levant was invited to speak. Further information is expected to be announced at the June 5 Senate meeting.
- Ryerson received a collection of historical books from McGraw Hill Ryerson – a donation worth an estimated 1 million dollars. President Lachemi thanked Chief Librarian M. Lefebvre and Rivi Frankle, Interim Vice President Advancement for their collaboration on this significant donation.
- Finally, President Lachemi reminded members about the upcoming Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences to be held at Ryerson from May 29-June 2. He encouraged Senators to volunteer and/or attend.

On behalf of the RFA, P. Danziger thanked President Lachemi for the opportunity to provide input on the AAA policy at the May 9 town hall.

7.2 Achievement Report

7.3 Report of the Secretary

7.3.1 Update on Senate election and vacancies. J. Turtle announced that Neil Thomlinson was nominated to replace D. Checkland on Senate. The remaining Senate membership vacancies, as well as the membership for AGPC and SPC, will be filled by the June 5 Senate meeting. The election for a Faculty of Science student representative on Senate will be re-run early in the Fall 2017 term.

J. Turtle welcomed the new student union representatives - Daniel Lis, Vice-President,

Education, RSU; and Arezoo Najibzadeh, Vice-President, Internal, CESAR.

7.3.2 Reminder about the next Senate meeting: MONDAY, June 5 at 10:00 a.m.

7.4 Committee Reports

7.4.1 Report #W2017-3 from the Academic Standards Committee (ASC): M. Moshé

7.4.1.1 Chang School Certificate in Gerontology: Review

Motion: *That Senate approve the review of the Chang School Certificate in Gerontology*

M. Moshé moved; Marie Bountrogianni seconded

Motion Approved

7.4.1.2 Chang School Certificate in Gerontology: Course Additions/Course Deletions; Revision to Certificate Name

Motion: *That Senate approve the course additions, course deletions, and name change for the Chang School Certificate in Gerontology*

M. Moshé moved; A. McWilliams seconded

Motion Approved

7.4.1.3 Chang School Certificate in Facility Management: Review

Motion: *That Senate approve the review of the Chang School Certificate in Facility Management*

M. Moshé moved; Marie Bountrogianni seconded

Motion Approved

7.4.1.4 Chang School Certificate in Facility Management:

Implementation of Certificate Review Recommendations

Motion: *That Senate approve the implementation of review recommendations for the Chang School Certificate in Facility Management*

M. Moshé moved; A. McWilliams seconded

Motion Approved

7.4.1.5 Chang School Certificate in Disaster and Emergency Management: Course Deletions; Course Additions

Motion: *That Senate approve the course additions and course deletions for the Chang School Certificate in Disaster and Emergency Management*

M. Moshé moved; E. Kam seconded

Motion Approved

7.4.1.6 Chang School Certificate in Energy Management: Course Deletions; Course Additions

Motion: *That Senate approve the course additions and course deletions for the Chang School Certificate in Energy Management*

M. Moshé moved; Tara Burke seconded

Motion Approved.

7.4.1.7 Chang School Certificate in Local Economic Development: Proposal

Motion: *That Senate approve the proposal for the Chang School Certificate in Local Economic Development*

M. Moshé moved; M. Bountrogianni seconded

Motion Approved.

7.4.1.8 For Information: Chang School Certificates – Revisions (March 2017; April 2017)

7.4.2 Report #W2017-3 from the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC):

M. Moshé, Vice Chair of AGPC

7.4.2.1 Update regarding the *ad hoc* Academic Policy Review Committee (APRC). The new Health Certificate, previously provided to Senate, has been finalized and there is a plan to pilot it in the Fall 2017 term. The committee has been working largely on articulating the grounds for academic consideration requests, including physical and mental health grounds, and compassionate grounds. The committee is also working with CCS regarding an automated, online system for the submission and processing of academic consideration requests, as well as academic standing and grade appeals. It is expected that this automation will result in a more timely and efficient process for students, staff and faculty. YSGS is working on revisions of Policy 152 (Graduate Student Appeals), which might come to Senate for approval at the June 5 meeting.

7.4.2.2 Update regarding Recommendation #2 in the Ombudsperson's 2015-2016 Report on additional requirements to pass a course. Policy 46 and Policy 127 require that such grading variations need Senate approval. This issue has been discussed at Academic Governance and Policy Committee, Senate Priorities Committee, and Academic Planning Group (i.e., Deans and Vice Provosts). An email explaining the process for obtaining Senate approval will be sent to Chairs, Directors and Deans in the next week or so. This process will bring the variations into compliance with Senate policies, with plenty of time provided for programs to do so.

7.4.3 Report #W2017-2 from the Curriculum Implementation Committee (CIC): M. Moshé

7.4.3.1 Update regarding timeline for the new omnibus curriculum policy (Policy 2)

The Committee has created a draft omnibus policy. It plans to submit it to Senate for information in June, and hopes to bring it for Senate approval in the Fall 2017 term.

D. Checkland commented that there will be new Senators in the Fall, so they will have to be brought up to speed with the issues when the revision comes to Senate for approval.

President Lachemi thanked M. Moshé and the members of APRC and CIC for their dedication and hard work.

8. Old Business - None

9. New Business as Circulated - None

10. Members' Business - None

11. Consent Agenda - None

12. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Ryerson University President's Update to Senate June 5, 2017



Thank you – As 2016-17 draws to a close, I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to all members of Senate for support and engagement in a year of transition, and continuing dedication to creative innovation, leadership and distinction.

Ryerson builders – On May 10th, I hosted breakfast for Ryerson employees with 30+ years of service; and on May 24th welcomed members of the 25-Year Club to the 2017 inductions. It was a privilege to deliver remarks on May 9th at the *MAC and Change* conference for the management and confidential (MAC) group; and to speak at *RU Engaged*, the Learning & Teaching Conference on May 18th. These vital occasions in the Ryerson calendar bring our community together in serving the Ryerson mission.

RYERSON BENEFACTORS

McGraw-Hill Ryerson Press Collection – The largest single donation of books ever received by the university library's Archives and Special Collections was announced on April 17th. The generous gift of almost 3,000 book titles and more than 2,000 archival materials, valued at nearly \$1 million, builds on a long-standing relationship between McGraw Hill and the Ryerson library, and repatriates a legacy of Canadian publishing history that will be available to scholars and students for learning and research.

APPOINTMENTS

Denise O'Neil Green has been appointed Ryerson's first vice-president, equity and community inclusion. The responsibilities of the new position are guided by the EDI values and priorities in the Academic Plan, and encompass areas such as strategic planning, inclusive curriculum and pedagogy; collection and reporting of EDI data; and offices and functions including education, awareness and outreach, human rights, accessibility, and Aboriginal initiatives, among others. The duties will build on her leadership since joining the university in 2012 as the inaugural assistant vice-president/vice-provost equity, diversity and inclusion (AVP/VP EDI), and her award-winning programs and community engagement championing understanding, progress and change in the areas of EDI in higher education.

Carol Shepstone has been appointed chief librarian effective September 11th, 2017 bringing to Ryerson extensive experience in academic and public libraries, archives and research institutes including Mount Royal University, University of Saskatchewan Libraries, the University of British Columbia (UBC) library system and the Museum of Anthropology at UBC. Serving as vice-chair of the Canadian Research Knowledge Network (CRKN), and vice-chair of the Council of Prairie and Pacific University Libraries (COPPUL), her research interests include organizational culture, perceptions of the value and impact of academic libraries, library building design, and intellectual property. She earned her bachelor of arts in Cultural Anthropology (Museum Studies) and her Master of Library and Information Studies from UBC, and is pursuing an LLM in intellectual property law from Osgoode Hall Law School.

CONGRATULATIONS –

Chancellor appointments announced this spring include Salah Bachir (Doctor of Laws *honoris causa* '15) at OCAD University; and Martha Billes (Doctor of Commerce '02) at the University of Guelph.

Siamak Hariri (Doctor of Architecture, *honoris causa* '16) received the prestigious RAIC Innovation in Architecture Award for the Bahá'í Temple of South America, which was also the Popular Choice winner in the Cultural-Religious Buildings & Memorials category of the *Architizer A+ Awards*.

Marie Bountrogianni, dean of The Chang School of Continuing Education, is being honoured with a 2017 Gabby Award by the Greek America Foundation, recognizing her contributions on behalf of refugees, minorities and people with disabilities; and her leadership championing lifelong learning.

Ann Cavoukian, Executive Director, Privacy and Big Data Institute, has been awarded the Meritorious Service Medal (M.S.M.) from the Governor General's Meritorious Service Decorations Division, for her work on creating and growing Privacy by Design.

Julia Shin Doi, General Counsel and Secretary of the Board of Governors, has been honoured with the Osgoode Hall Law School Alumni Gold Key (Public Sector), and the 2017 Award of Excellence from the Canadian Corporate Counsel Association – Ontario Chapter.

Pamela Palmater, Mi'kmaw citizen and member of the Eel River Bar First Nation, Ryerson Chair in Indigenous Governance, was awarded an honorary doctor of laws by the University of New Brunswick for social justice advocacy on behalf of Indigenous women and children.

Kamal Al-Solaylee won the 2017 Shaughnessy Cohen Prize for Political Writing for *Brown: What Being Brown in the World Today Means (to Everyone)*, awarded at the Politics and the Pen Gala in Ottawa; the book is also shortlisted for the 2017 Trillium Book Award to be announced June 20th.

Shelley Niro, a Toronto-based indigenous artist and member of the Six Nations Reserve, Bay of Quinte Kanien'kehaka (Mohawk) Nation, Turtle Clan, is the winner of the 2017 Scotiabank Photography Award; with her work exhibited at the Ryerson Image Centre now and at the 2018 Contact Photography Festival.

Patrizia Albanese, sociology, and **Dimitri Androutsos** and **Steven Zhang**, electrical and computer engineering, were among eight honorees at the 2nd Annual Leaders Circle Recognition Gala, recognized for showcasing Toronto as a global hub with partnerships that bring international meetings to the city.

Ella Dubinsky, psychology master's student, won the 3-Minute Thesis (3MT) competition at Ryerson, and both 3rd place and participants' choice at the provincial level for "Singing for Your Brain," research on using music to mitigate declines due to aging – and has advanced to the national finals.

Enactus Ryerson was named the 2017 Scotiabank EcoLiving Green Challenge National Champion for Project Pura, a partnership initiative in Gujarat, India that worked to improve water sanitation and grow entrepreneurship through the local manufacture and sale of ceramic water filters.

Five world premieres of films by Documentary Media graduates screened at Hot Docs 2017: *The Quiet Zone* (Daniel Froidevaux, MFA '11 and Elisa Gonzalez, MFA '11); *State of Exception* (Jason O'Hara, MFA '13); *DocX: Africville in Black and White* (Cyrus Sundar Singh, MFA '16); *Mermaids* (Ali Weinstein, MFA '14 and Caitlin Durlak, MFA '14); and *Take a Walk on the Wildside*, (Lisa Rideout MFA '13).

First-place was won by two Ryerson teams of engineering students at the 2017 Construction Institute of Canada National Student Bid Competition: for Most Professional bid (Karen Grubb, Benjamin Joyce, Yerin Chdi, Stephen Hewitt) and for Building Information Modelling (Victoria Staseff, Youhyun Chang, Simon Chen, Sebastian Van Niekerk), competing with 80 teams from 9 schools across Canada.

Future Cities Collective, a Ryerson-University of Toronto student collaboration, was declared the Grand Winner at the 4th annual U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Race to Zero Student Design Competition in Colorado, competing with 39 teams from 33 universities and four countries.

Ryerson Rams Robotics (R3) was among the teams selected for the finals of the University Rover Challenge (URC17) taking place June 1-3 at the Mars Desert Research Station (MDRS) near Hanksville, Utah. A record 82 teams from 123 countries spent the academic year designing and building the next generation of Mars rovers, with 36 teams from 7 countries selected to advance to the field competition.

Accreditation results advancing distinction for Ryerson professional education include:

- Ted Rogers School of Management business programs extended through 2021-2022 by the global Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB);
- The School of Interior Design has received professional accreditation renewal for six years from the Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA);
- The School of Nutrition Professional Masters Diploma in Dietetics (PMDip Dietetics) has received full accreditation from the Partnership for Dietetic Education and Practice (PDEP);
- The Ted Rogers School of Hospitality and Tourism Management is the first university-level program in Canada to receive the national SMART+Premium accreditation from Tourism HR Canada.

The Chang School of Continuing Education won Best Digital Recruitment Campaign by an Educational Institution at the 2017 TalentEgg National Campus Recruitment Excellence Awards, for the Fall 2016 digital advertising campaign.

SHAD @ Ryerson – On May 15th Ryerson welcomed the Rt. Hon. Governor General David Johnston, the Hon. Mitzie Hunter, Ontario Minister of Education, and Tim Jackson, SHAD President and CEO, on campus to announce Ryerson as the 13th university in Canada, and the first in the GTA, to join SHAD. High school students apply for a month-long summer experience living in residence at a host university, focusing on STEAM (science, technology, engineering, arts and math) learning and developing the capabilities and confidence to be leaders and change makers. SHAD was initiated at Ryerson by the Faculty of Science, Ted Rogers School of Management, Student Affairs, Brookfield Institute for Innovation + Entrepreneurship, Faculty of Engineering & Architectural Science and the Sandbox by DMZ.

OneEleven – On May 11th the grand opening of the new OneEleven space featured very special guests Prime Minister Justin Trudeau at a Tech Town Hall, and Mayor John Tory at an evening reception. The occasion introduced the first phase of a 250,000 square-foot expansion for OneEleven at Front Street and Blue Jays Way, increasing from a 15,000-square-foot space accommodating 14 companies to 50,000 square feet and 26 companies. The relocation also establishes a footprint for the development of the 'Union Park innovation district' being designed for the area by Oxford Properties. OneEleven was launched in 2013 in partnership with Omers Ventures to help high-growth startups scale their operations to compete on a global level, retaining Canadian talent and providing job opportunities.

Law School Submission – On April 28th Ryerson filed a formal submission for a new Juris Doctorate program to the Federation of Law Societies of Canada, proposing an innovative approach to legal education based on enhanced technology in legal practice, diversity in the profession, and access to justice. The planned curriculum includes mandatory courses such as technology innovation boot-camp, social innovation and the law, Indigenous law in Canada, legal innovation and the business of law, as well as perspectives on learning in a diverse community. The submission to the Federation constitutes one step in a process that will involve a formal request for approval to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance and the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development.

Zone Startups Calgary (ZSC) – GE Canada and Ryerson Futures Inc. have collaborated on the launch of an accelerator that will support the growth of industrial internet and energy-related startups in the oil and gas sector, power generation, big data, analytics, sensors, cyber security, visualization, imaging and other technology areas. Startups will receive support from the GE Customer Innovation Centre for market validation, customer opportunities and field trials, connection to mentors and advisors and prioritized access to Predix, GE's software platform for scalable, industrial enterprise solutions; and Ryerson Futures will help ZSC leverage the methodology used in Toronto and Mumbai in which 100 companies raised more than \$160-million in venture capital to fuel growth over the last three years.

FCAD Dubai – On April 26th Ryerson announced an international agreement between the Faculty of Communication and Design (FCAD) and the Canadian University Dubai (CUD) to develop a creative education hub in Dubai. Building on existing offerings in media and design, CUD will offer a new Creative Industries program beginning in September 2017, as a first step toward a CUD Faculty of Communication and Design in Dubai, with Ryerson’s FCAD collaborating to provide technical and curricular expertise and assistance in the recruitment of scholars from around the world. In addition, the two institutions will work with the city of Dubai to develop a Creative Incubator in the Dubai Design District.

The Fields Institute – Ryerson has built on an existing partnership by signing a Principal Sponsoring University (PSU) agreement with The Fields Institute, becoming the ninth university in Canada with this designation. The mission of The Fields Institute is to promote contact and research collaboration among professional mathematicians, and to broaden access and engagement with increasing numbers of users of mathematics around the world. Every year, the Fields Institute hosts over 4,000 visiting researchers, post-doctoral fellows, and students from across six continents with programs ranging from research seminars and public lectures to school outreach activities and start-up incubation.

Energy MOU – The Ryerson Centre for Urban Energy (CUE) has signed a five-year memorandum of understanding (MOU) with Jamaica-based Caribbean Energy Solutions Research Institute (CESRI) to advance collaboration on applied research, education, and training – including student exchanges and experiential opportunities for MSc, MPhil and PhD candidates from across the Caribbean and Canada – in association with the Science, Technology and Innovation Program of Global Affairs Canada, which profiles and supports Canadian research and development partnerships in sustainable development and smart technologies.

Science Rendezvous – The 10th year of Canada’s largest nation-wide science outreach festival this year partnered with the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council to launch the Science Odyssey showcase of Canadian innovation. Ryerson @ Yonge-Dundas Square offered activities, demonstrations and stage shows in robotics, water science, energy, engineering, architectural science, and more – and featured the first *Soapbox Science* in North America to celebrate women in science. An award-winning science outreach platform based on London Hyde Park’s *Speaker’s Corner*, *Soapbox Science* promises “No middle man, no powerpoint slide, no amphitheater – just remarkable women in science there to amaze you with their discoveries, and to answer the science questions you have been burning to ask.”

JAM Lab @ Africa – On April 13th Canada-based Journalists for Human Rights (JHR), announced its collaboration with the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, South Africa, Ryerson School of Journalism, Ryerson International, and the Brookfield Institute for Innovation + Entrepreneurship to develop an accelerator/incubator for African media entrepreneurship. The initiative takes its inspiration from media leaders such as *FrontPageAfrica*, *Code for Africa* and *Daily Maverick*, pioneering freedom of expression and credible journalism across Africa. The goal of the initiative, Ryerson’s first collaborative project with the Tshimologong Digital Innovation District at the University of the Witwatersrand, is to strengthen ecosystem sustainability by providing independent journalists with access to mentors, partnerships and entrepreneurial support.

Fashion Studies – The FCAD Centre for Fashion Diversity and Social Change is launching the first open access fashion journal focusing on research and creative work, seeking to reimagine the industry into a more inclusive environment for Canada’s greatest asset: diversity. Led by FCAD professors Ben Barry and Alison Matthews David, *Fashion Studies* will examine the relationship between fashion, diversity and social change with innovative work that invokes a critical study of fashion and its intersections with other industries. Available at no cost to readers or authors and published annually, *Fashion Studies* will feature hybrid work including academic papers, creative work and interviews, with acceptance based on a double-blind peer-review process. The Editorial Board includes scholars, creative practitioners and

curators from leading institutions around the world such as the Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences, Queen Mary University of London, Parsons the New School, London College of Fashion, the University of Sydney, LA County Museum of Art, Cornell University, University of California Davis, University of Alberta, Powerhouse Museum, OCAD University, Saxo Institute, King's College London, University of Hawaii at Manoa, NSCAD University, and the University of Manchester.

Open education resources (OER) – Ryerson and eCampusOntario are partnering to enhance and expand the planned eCampusOntario Open Textbook Library. The Ryerson team (Office of E-Learning, Ryerson University Library and Archives, Digital Education Strategies at The Chang School, Computing and Communications Services, Learning and Teaching Office) will manage the design and development of the open source technology platform, working with a consortium of higher education OER experts from: the Rebus Foundation; Ontario Council of University Libraries (OCUL); college Heads of Libraries and Learning Resources (HLLR); and the Ontario Colleges Library Service (OCLS). The Ryerson team will also collaborate with the University of Waterloo and Queen's University on a textbook authoring system and open education resource library. The project will significantly increase open access resources for students, and build Ontario leadership in OER creation and distribution.

From the President's Calendar

April 18, 2017: I was a member of an economic development panel at the International Higher Education Summit for Canadian and Pittsburgh universities hosted by David Finegold, president of Chatham University, discussing the role of higher education and government in sustainability and immigration.

April 19, 2017: Ryerson hosted a meeting and campus visit by the Hon. Karina Gould, Minister of Democratic Institutions.

April 19, 2017: I attended an event at the Canadian Club featuring remarks by the Hon. Ahmed Hussen, Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship.

April 20, 2017: Ryerson hosted the Hon. Scott Brison, President of the Treasury Board, and the Hon. Ahmed Hussen, Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship on campus to announce a pilot project on name-blind recruitment to help reduce unconscious bias in public service hiring.

April 20, 2017: I attended the 30th Annual Public Policy Forum Testimonial Dinner & Awards honouring contributions to good governance and public policy in improving our nation and the world.

April 22, 2017: The Hon. Navdeep Bains, Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, was the keynote speaker at the 21st Annual Sikh Centennial Gala honouring diversity and culture.

April 25, 2017: I met Ryerson benefactor Stephen Jarislowsky for lunch to discuss the Jarislowsky Chair in Democracy and related areas for further collaboration.

April 25/26, 2017: I attended the Universities Canada membership meetings in Montreal.

April 27, 2017: Ryerson met with Conference Board of Canada president and CEO Daniel Muzyka, and senior vice-president and chief economist Craig Alexander to discuss collaboration and programming.

April 27, 2017: The Canadian Civil Liberties Association (CCLA) Gala celebrated the extraordinary achievements of Canadians in all walks of life defending and upholding civil liberties in Canada.

April 28, 2017: I met with the Hon. Glen Murray, Minister of the Environment and Climate Change, to discuss areas where Ryerson can assist sustainability and Ontario government priorities.

April 28, 2017: Ryerson hosted the launch of the Scotiabank CONTACT Photography Festival with the Ryerson Image Centre as a hub and a venue for the annual event.

May 1, 2017: I was pleased to welcome a delegation led by Dr. Stephanie Fahey, CEO of Austrade, the Australian government agency promoting tourism, trade and investment, international education and research, on a tour of DMZ and a campus visit to discuss areas of interest.

- May 1, 2017:* I met with Matthew Godwin, associate director, university and provincial government relations, Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs (CIJA), as part of a continuing partnership on working together to advance student understanding and support.
- May 1, 2017:* I met with Sheldon Levy, Deputy Minister of Advanced Education and Skills Development, and Sheridan president Mary Preece, to discuss the infrastructure expansion project in Brampton.
- May 2, 2017:* Don Tapscott, CEO of The Tapscott Group and renowned strategist on organizational transformation, met with Steven Liss, vice-president research and innovation and with me on the continuing impact of technology on education, business and society.
- May 4, 2017:* Michael Benarroch was on campus for an early briefing and discussion in preparation for starting his role as Ryerson's new provost and vice-president academic on July 1st.
- May 4, 2017:* I was pleased to meet with the Hon. Patrick Brown, Leader of the Official Opposition in Ontario, to participate in a general discussion with colleagues about shared goals and initiatives.
- May 5, 2017:* The presidents of OCAD U, Ryerson, the University of Toronto, and York University met for a periodic breakfast to offer institutional updates and discuss GTA postsecondary issues.
- May 5, 2017:* Ryerson met with Toronto Financial Services Alliance (TFSA) representatives Janet Ecker, president and CEO, and Matt Hobbs, vice-president business development and marketing, to discuss support opportunities for research projects.
- May 8, 2017:* The Hon. Mitzie Hunter, Minister of Education, spoke at the Canadian Club on the Highly Skilled Workforce Strategy preparing students for a technology-immersive interconnected world.
- May 9, 2017:* I met with Tom Corr, president and CEO of Ontario Centres of Excellence, and John Ruffolo, CEO Omers Ventures and a member of the OCE Board of Directors, to discuss research innovation and support.
- May 10, 2017:* Ryerson welcomed Salim Bhatia and Amin Merchant of the Aga Khan Academies to discuss international partnership and student opportunities.
- May 11, 2017:* I met with Dr. Samir Sinha, Director of Geriatrics in the Sinai Health System, and co-chair of the National Institute on Ageing Advisory Board, to discuss partnership and initiatives.
- May 11, 2017:* Peter Bowie, former chief executive of Deloitte China and previously chair of Deloitte Canada, met with Ryerson to discuss international opportunities and collaboration.
- May 11, 2017:* Clyde Wagner, president and CEO, Civic Theatres Toronto, met with Ryerson to share ideas on the potential for working with the Faculty of Communication and Design.
- May 15, 2017:* I toured the very impressive Ryerson exhibit on OCE Discovery opening day.
- May 16, 2017:* I met with Sean Conway, Hydro One Distinguished Research Fellow, Centre for Urban Energy and Chair, Premier's Highly Skilled Workforce Expert Panel, to discuss experiential learning.
- May 16, 2017:* At the 2nd Annual Ryerson Honorary Doctorate Gala, we were very pleased to host our upcoming 2017 recipients, their guests and members of the community.
- May 18, 2017:* I welcomed a CASE International UK/Australia delegation on a Canadian campus tour to learn about fundraising and alumni relations; and to discuss partnership opportunities.
- May 18, 2017:* I was joined by Janice Winton, VP administration and finance, and Saher Fazilat, AVP facilities management and development, in a meeting with Dan Casey, Ted Dowbiggin and Maria Athanasoulis of Cresford Developments to discuss opportunities for capital projects.
- May 18, 2017:* Ryerson met with the Hon. Reza Moridi, Minister of Research, Innovation and Science to introduce our new VPRI Steven Liss and to discuss Ryerson goals and government priorities.
- May 18, 2017:* It was a privilege to attend the YWCA Women of Distinction Awards, celebrating Board Chair Janice Fukakusa for exemplary leadership and celebrating the achievements of all honorees.

**Report of the Secretary
June 5 2017**

RE: Senate agenda item 7.2.1: Update on Senate and committee vacancies

On behalf of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee, the following nominations are brought to Senate. According to the Senate Bylaw: "Other nominations may be made from the floor of Senate, provided the person nominated is eligible and consents to the nomination. A person who is not present may only be nominated if that person has given prior permission to the Secretary of Senate."

For the Senate vacancies, the nominees are:

1. For an FCAD Chair/Director: Ian Baitz, Chair, School of Graphic Communications Management
2. For an FCAD faculty member: Sholem Dolgoy, School of Performance

For the Senate Priorities Committee (SPC) vacancies, the nominees are:

1. For a Vice Provost, Dean or Chief Librarian: Marcia Moshé, Interim Vice Provost Academic
2. For a faculty member: Neil Thomlinson, Politics

For the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC) vacancies, the nominees are:

1. For a Chair/Director representative from Senate: Ian Baitz, Chair, School of Graphic Communications Management
2. For an FCAD faculty representative from Senate: Sholem Dolgoy, School of Performance

SENATE COMMITTEES – 2017-2018

ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE AND POLICY COMMITTEE (AGPC)				
2017-2018				
16 MEMBERS				
	NAME	POSITION	TERM EXPIRES	TERM #
EX-OFFICIO				
Provost and Vice President Academic (Chair)	*Michael Benarroch			
Vice Provost, Academic (Vice Chair)	Marcia Moshé, Interim			
Vice Provost, Students	Heather Lane Vetere			
Registrar	Charmaine Hack			
Secretary of Senate (non-voting)	John Turtle			
SENATORS				
	Tom Duever	Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Architectural Science	2018	1
	Eric Kam	Faculty, Arts	2019	3
	Samantha Wehbi	Faculty, Community Services	2018	1
	*Sholem Dolgoy	Faculty, FCAD	2019	1
	Robert Hudyma	Faculty, TRSM	2018	1
	Andrew McWilliams	Faculty, Science	2019	3
	Krishna Kumar	Faculty, FEAS	2019	2
	Anne-Marie Brinsmead	Chang School Program Director	2019	4
	*Ian Baitz	Chair, Graphic Comm. Mgt.		
	Vacant	Graduate Student Senator	2018	1
	Vacant	Undergraduate Student Senator	2018	1
	Vacant	Undergraduate Student Senator	2018	1

Composition:

There shall be *ex officio* members, and members selected in accordance with the provisions of Articles 3.2.2. and 3.3.2 of the Senate bylaw, as follows:

- the Provost and Vice President Academic, who shall serve as Chair;
- the Vice Provost Academic, who shall serve as Vice Chair;
- the Vice Provost, Students;
- the Registrar;
- one (1) Dean;
- one (1) faculty Senator per Faculty, no more than one of whom may be a Chair/Director;
- one (1) Participating Associate from the Chang School;
- one (1) Senator who is a Chair/Director;
- two (2) undergraduate student Senators; and
- one (1) graduate student Senator.

Terms of Reference:

- to propose, oversee, and periodically review Senate bylaws, policies and University procedures regarding any matter within the purview of Senate, except those matters for which responsibility is specifically assigned, in this Bylaw, to the SRCAC;
- to recommend to Senate the establishment of Policy Review Committees, each mandated by Senate to undertake a periodic review or special review of an existing policy or policy area; to ensure that such Review Committees draw substantially on appropriate experience and expertise in the policy area (i.e., from those who serve, or who have recently served on an existing Senate Standing Committee); and to ensure that appropriate co-ordination with other existing policies occurs by, when necessary, having a Policy Review Committee report to the AGPC rather than directly to Senate;

- to propose new Senate policy in areas when and where the absence of policy is demonstrably necessary or prudent, and to propose, when advisable, the formation of a special task force or sub-committee to draft such policies;
- to request reports from other University committees, sub-committees or departments whose business has an academic policy dimension, or a substantial effect on the academic mandate or performance of the University; and
- to bring forward to Senate a list of nominees to constitute an Annual Nominating Committee in accordance with Article 3.2.2.2 of this Bylaw.

SENATE PRIORITIES COMMITTEE (SPC)				
2017-2018				
12 MEMBERS				
	NAME	POSITION	TERM EXPIRES	TERM #
EX-OFFICIO				
President (Chair)	Mohamed Lachemi			
Vice Chair, Senate (Vice Chair)	Alex Ferworn			
Provost and Vice President Academic	*Michael Benarroch			
Deputy Provost & Vice Provost, University Planning	Paul Stenton			
Secretary of Senate (non-voting)	John Turtle			
ELECTED SENATORS				
	Steven Murphy	Dean, Ted Rogers School of Management	2018	1
	*Marcia Moshé	Interim Vice Provost Academic	2019	1
	*Neil Thomlinson	Faculty Senator	2019	1
	Krishna Kumar	Faculty Senator	2018	1
	Dave Mason	Faculty Senator	2019	4
	Andy McWilliams	Faculty Senator	2018	1
	Eno Hysi	Graduate Student Senator	2018	2
	Vacant	Undergraduate Student Senator	2018	1

Composition:

- the President, who shall serve as Chair;
- the Vice-Chair (who is the Vice-Chair of Senate if that office is held by a faculty member; or is elected by Senate from among elected faculty Senators if not);
- the Provost and Vice President Academic;
- the Vice Provost, University Planning;
- one (1) Dean elected by and from the Deans;
- one (1) member elected by and from the Vice Provosts, Deans and Chief Librarian;
- four (4) members elected by and from the faculty Senators (including the Librarian Senator);
- one (1) undergraduate student Senator elected by and from all student Senators; and
- one (1) graduate student Senator elected by and from all student Senators.

Terms of Reference:

- to take responsibility to formulate, in consultation with the Secretary, the agenda for each Senate meeting, together with supporting documentation;
- to select, for at least two (2) Senate meetings per year, topics of importance and interest to the Ryerson community, and relevant to the responsibilities of Senate:
 - such topics shall be open for discussion in Committee of the Whole for an extended period, not normally to exceed one hour;
 - the SPC shall notify Senate in advance of such topics and arrange for their presentation;

- to bring to the attention of Senate, and to consult with Senior administration regarding, emergent issues facing the University and, when appropriate, to recommend to Senate the referral of such issues to a Standing Committee, or to recommend to Senate the creation of an *ad hoc* Committee to address such an issue, or to recommend some other course of action;
- to review the state of the University's overall finances and priorities with respect to their impact on academic programs and activities, and to present to Senate at least annually a report on these matters, identifying, where appropriate, priority areas where some action or change is thought desirable, and to consult with and advise the Provost during the annual budget development process with respect to academic priorities in light of the Academic Plan;
- to represent Senate in meetings, to be established on a regular basis that is mutually agreeable, with the Board of Governors (or a designated committee thereof) to discuss matters of mutual concern; to report back to Senate on the nature of, and any outcomes from, such meetings;
- to explore the implications and sustainability of the creation of new Faculties and/or Departments/Schools, and to advise Senate accordingly; and
- to act on behalf of Senate, if needed, during the summer months, and to report to Senate at the first meeting of the following Session any actions taken on its behalf.

REPORT OF ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE**Report #W2017-4; June 2017**

In this report the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) brings to Senate its evaluation and recommendation on the following item:

- **Proposal for a Juris Doctor Program**

A. PROPOSAL FOR A JURIS DOCTOR PROGRAM**1. INTRODUCTION****1.1 Changes in the Legal Profession**

The second half of the twentieth century has been called the gilded age of Canadian legal education, with the country's law schools attracting a constantly expanding pool of applicants at a time when the demand for legal services and the average salaries for graduates were both gradually rising while methods of practice stayed relatively static.¹ The last decade and a half has seen a new set of trends, with the legal profession entering a phase of transformative and sometimes disruptive change caused by the information revolution that is affecting so many aspects of contemporary society. As consumers of legal services in Canada gain more and more access to new information and technology-based solutions, they have acquired more and more power.

In a trend that many have called a crisis in the traditional billable hour model, newly empowered clients are demanding more information on services, more ongoing involvement in decision-making and more expansive explanations of the risks and potential outcomes of various legal strategies, and generally better value for money from legal professionals.² Consumers of legal services have become increasingly reluctant to pay more than the value that these young lawyers are adding by reviewing documents and performing other high volume, routine work. Instead, individuals and businesses are increasingly seeking value-added strategic advice from specialized legal professionals that is grounded in their unique circumstances.

One sign of the domestic impact of these trends is the significant shortage that exists in the supply of articling positions, especially in Ontario. For example, a recent study by two Ryerson researchers shows that in 2011 a full 91% of the province's law firms did not provide articling positions, and that 10% of law school graduates (15% in the case of visible minority graduates) could not find articling positions.³ This shortage led to the creation of Ryerson's LPP pilot project as the Law Society of Upper Canada explored various means to address the problem, but the articling shortage is merely one aspect of a far larger set of challenges.

The Canadian Bar Association recently participated in the publication of a report *Do Law Differently* that catalogues these challenges in a Canadian context. In the report's words: "Almost everything about career choices and employment options for new lawyers is in flux. The career paths that previous lawyer cohorts reliably anticipated, and profitably enjoyed, for the last several decades have already begun to narrow, or even, in some places, to close completely."⁴ *Do Law Differently* highlights four main causes of this flux:

- the liberalization of market regulation which has made it easier for non-lawyer legal service providers to compete directly for some types of work traditionally carried out by lawyers;

¹ Holloway, Ian. "A Canadian Law School Curriculum for This Age," *Alberta Law Review*, 3:3, 2014, p. 788.

² *Ibid.*, p. 16.

³ Levin, Anver & Asher Alkoby. "Barriers to the Profession: Inaction in Ontario, Canada and its Consequences," *Oñati Socio-Legal Series*, 2013, p. 583.

⁴ The Canadian Bar Association & Jordan Furlong. *Do Law Differently: Futures for Young Lawyers*, 2016, p. 9. This report was commissioned by the Canadian Bar Association Young Lawyers under the auspices of the Canadian Bar Association Futures Initiative.

- the role of process improvements and technological advances that have made the virtual delivery of legal services a reality and resulted in straightforward legal tasks becoming increasingly automated and more efficiently completed;
- the entry of new players in the market has changed competitive pressures on lawyers, with consumers increasingly seeking to minimize costs by accessing a variety of legal service providers for different tasks; and
- access issues are coming to the fore, with the bulk of the legal needs of Canada's population remaining unmet due to barriers of cost.⁵

To best respond with a new Juris Doctor program that builds these shifts into the content of legal education, the curriculum must change. So too must assessment methods and pedagogy, as well as the way technology is incorporated into the educational experience.

1.2 Addressing the Societal Need for a Law School of a Different Kind

Legal professionals are fundamentally problem solvers. But with the legal information revolution that is underway they will require a broader skillset to effectively address the range of emerging, multi-dimensional opportunities and challenges that Canadians face. Exposing law students to the perspectives of other professionals at an early stage will enable them to better integrate their services with those of other professionals throughout their career. And legal education can help instill in students an entrepreneurial approach to service delivery that will enable them to better meet client expectations.

Throughout internal and external consultations, it was found that the idea of offering solution-focused education of future leaders in the legal profession resonates very widely. Internally, colleagues spoke of the importance of a law school at Ryerson being integrated into other schools and departments and being built on the unique strengths of the university. External respondents recognized the importance of locating such a Juris Doctor program at Ryerson, how advantageous it would be to have such a program in a location that can conveniently serve the entire Greater Toronto Area and beyond, and how beneficial such a program would be for Ontario. They also appreciated that it would be another important component of the university's commitment to community engagement and city building.

The societal need for a law school of a different kind can be broken down into the following three elements:

- promoting affordability and access to justice for communities and end consumers of legal services;
- ensuring better access to the profession, for reasons of equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI); and
- providing legal training that ensures law school graduates have the transferable skills to be truly career-ready.

Affordability of Legal Services

Access to justice has become a serious challenge within Canada's legal system – so much so that a significant portion of Canadians with a legal problem have no idea where to turn. According to the Law Society of Upper Canada's National Action Committee report on Access to Justice in Civil and Family Matters, "over 20% of the Canadian population takes no meaningful action with respect to their legal issues," and, "[o]f those who do not seek legal assistance, between 42% and 90% identify cost – or perceived cost – as the reason for not doing so."⁶ The result has been either a lack of action on justiciable

⁵ This topic is increasingly the subject of empirical research in a provincial setting. See, for example, The Ontario Civil Legal Needs Project Steering Committee. "Listening to Ontarians," (2010), and Macfarlane, Julie. "The National Self-Represented Litigants Project: Identifying and Meeting the Needs of Self-Represented Litigants" at http://www.lsuc.on.ca/uploadedFiles/For_the_Public/About_the_Law_Society/Convocation_Decisions/2014/Self-represented_project.pdf

⁶ Access to Family and Civil Justice: A Roadmap for Change, Action Committee on Access to Justice in Civil and Family Matters, October 2013, p. 4.

problems or consumers' use of the services offered via other avenues (such as paralegals or accountants) in an attempt to seek solutions. Affordability can be achieved only when the rising efficiencies that are being made possible through new forms of legal process management are translated into more cost-effective market options available to the bulk of Canadians.

The proposed program will address affordability by giving students the tools to deal proactively not just with technological innovation but with access to justice issues and social innovation as well – these areas being ones in which Ryerson has expertise as it has extended its model of entrepreneurial innovation to the area of social entrepreneurship.⁷ Students will study subjects relevant to this societal need in:

- a second-year module focusing on social innovation (Social Innovation and the Law);
- in required bootcamps dealing with the foundations of professional development (Ryerson Law School Bootcamp) and technology and process innovation (Technology and Innovation Bootcamp);
- in the use of digital tools such as Excel in analyzing taxation issues and financial statements (Financial Bootcamp);
- in coding and its legal uses (Coding Bootcamp);
- in the personal skills needed for working in diverse contexts (Emotional Quotient/Cultural Quotient Bootcamp); and
- in various second-year modules that provide guidance in customizing the legal supply chain in new and innovative ways – especially the module dealing with the practical aspects of working in law (The Business of Lawyering), the skills needed in legal project management, legal analytics and legal process engineering (Legal Innovation), and the evaluation of possible ways of overcoming barriers to justice (Access to Justice Solutions).

Access

In addition to making the most effective use possible of the opportunities inherent in technology, entrepreneurialism and innovative approaches to delivering legal services, access involves several important elements: incorporating a commitment to EDI, and forging long-lasting partnerships with Canada's Indigenous peoples.

(i) Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

Also critical to enhancing access will be making the profession more diverse, not only in terms of its ethno-cultural make-up, but also in life experiences, perspectives, and an ability to integrate with other disciplines.

The legal profession has not kept pace with the increasing diversity of Canada's population which is arguably contributing to access challenges. Consumers often look for professionals who share their language and experience but struggle to locate them; as a result, many do not, or cannot, access the services that they need.

As the gateway to the legal profession, legal education programs have a central role to play in promoting diversity. Law schools can offer programs which appeal to a representative sample of Canadian society and expose all students to the diverse needs and perspectives of different Canadian communities. Moreover, law schools can play an influential role in reducing barriers to professional practice by offering experiential learning opportunities and ongoing support for alumni. According to a survey conducted by the Law Students' Society of Ontario, "Students expressed views that the

⁷ An intriguing example of this focus recently in action was the Social Good Hackathon held on the Ryerson campus. See Jesse Winter, "Young Coders Were Given 24 Hours to Solve Local Charities' Tech Challenges," Toronto Star, March 31 2017.

profession, its regulator and academics were ‘out of touch’ and elitist and were excluding future lawyers that come from backgrounds that the profession needs the most.”⁸

Ryerson has shown a deep and abiding commitment to EDI. This commitment is embodied in the university’s student recruitment, innovative curricular offerings, faculty hiring and supports for community engagement. Ryerson has a rich tradition of outreach to diverse student communities seeking pathways to professional career advancement, and the university continues to introduce innovative programming to extend this outreach. Similar forms of outreach will inform the recruitment strategies of the Ryerson Law School, with special attention to what the LSUC’s Equity Advisory Group (EAG) Working Group has referred to as “the intersectional nature” of the barriers that candidates from diverse backgrounds often face.⁹

This is especially crucial given that the proposed program places such emphasis on the technological aspects of the emerging market for legal professionals. Technological proficiency (especially involving coding) and digital literacy within the legal profession are highly male-dominated. Part of Ryerson’s EDI mandate with respect to the Juris Doctor program will be to engage in a rebalancing of the gender dynamic, graduating female graduates who can excel in these areas.

(ii) Partnerships with Indigenous Peoples

Ryerson is establishing an ever-expanding range of courses in Indigenous topics throughout its curriculum as well as Indigenous-focused credentials such as The Chang School’s new Certificate in Aboriginal Knowledges and Experiences. The university also has a range of partnerships with Indigenous communities due to the work of Ryerson Aboriginal Student Services and the Centre for Indigenous Governance. A partnership with the First Nations Technical Institute through the Department of Politics and Public and Administration and the School of Social Work enables FNTI students to complete Ryerson certificates and degrees.

These various partnerships will be extended through the establishment of the Ryerson Law School, given an infusion of Indigenous issues throughout the Juris Doctor program’s curriculum. These include the incorporation of a mandatory course in Indigenous Law, as well as through concerted efforts to attract Indigenous students to the program, and making use of the fact that Ryerson’s Toronto location, on the traditional territories of the Mississaugas of the New Credit, is in close range to various First Nations.

Career Readiness

In the current market for legal services, career-readiness means a change-management focus that allows graduates to adapt to sectoral shifts, as exemplified by the fact that a third or more of the lawyer members of the Law Society of Upper Canada now work in contexts other than the traditional legal firm.¹⁰

How to be prepared to accept change? Through an education that stresses change management, the essential nature of skills associated with digital literacy, and the acquisition of transferable skills in addition to the traditional competencies and skills associated with a law degree. It is this type of integrative education that must be at the heart of any new law program proposal.

⁸ Just or Bust? Results of the 2014 Ontario Law Students’ Tuition, Debt and Student Financial Aid Experiences, 2014, p. 45.

⁹ LSUC EAG Working Group. Submission in Response to the Developing Strategies for Change: Addressing Challenges Faced by Racialized Licensees Consultation Paper, 2015, p. 2.

¹⁰ The Law Society of Upper Canada. Annual Report Performance Highlights 2010, p. 7.
http://LSUC_Performance_EN_Annual_Report_2010.pdf.

One of the most influential sets of recommendations concerning the sort of law education that is required, as law programs move away from traditional methods of legal training, is the Carnegie Foundation's 2007 report *Educating Lawyers*:

To build on their strengths and address their shortcomings, law schools should offer an integrated, three-part curriculum: (1) the teaching of legal doctrine and analysis, which provides the basis for professional growth; (2) introduction to the several facets of practice included under the rubric of lawyering, leading to acting with responsibility for clients; and (3) exploration and assumption of the identity, values and dispositions consonant with the fundamental purposes of the legal profession. Integrating the three parts of legal education would better prepare students for the varied demands of professional legal work.¹¹

The program's innovation-focused approach will equip graduates with the real-world skills and competencies needed to meet the present and future needs of consumers of legal services. A list of some of the mandatory courses to be offered at the Ryerson Law School demonstrates the different approach to training between Ryerson and existing Ontario law schools:

- Technology Innovation Bootcamp
- Financial Bootcamp
- The Business of Lawyering
- Social Innovation and the Law
- Coding Bootcamp
- Legal Innovation
- IP and Privacy
- Access to Justice Solutions
- Professional Placement

A set of required courses provides a grounding in issues related to access to justice and social innovation that will make the Ryerson program distinctive in terms of core curriculum. These mandatory courses include:

- Ryerson Law School Bootcamp
- Indigenous Law in Canada
- Social Innovation and the Law
- Advocacy and ADR
- Legal Innovation
- Access to Justice Solutions
- Emotional Quotient//Cultural Quotient Bootcamp

1.3 Key Elements of the Ryerson Juris Doctor Program

The FLSC's 2012 report, which recommends a shift in Canadian legal education towards problem-solving, analysis, and application in its competency requirements has been used in analyzing the extent to which its list of general competencies will be met by our graduates to ensure their practice-readiness with a change-management focus.¹² We have also noted the FLSC's contention that law schools can do more to prepare graduates by introducing additional opportunities to practise the application of skills. The 2012 report recognises the importance of doctrinal learning, but stresses the need to blend theory and practice.

Ryerson acknowledges and respects the important work of the law schools that now educate law students. However, Ryerson proposes a different kind of law school that trains lawyers differently. The ten guiding principles are as follows:

(i) Focus on Curricular Innovation

The proposed program's curriculum will provide added value with an orientation towards practice readiness and change management. This mandate requires students to engage critically with the substantive content of law, the way it is currently practised by legal actors in various types of

¹¹ Sullivan, William et al. *Educating Lawyers: Preparation for the Profession of Law*, 2007, p. 8.

¹² Federation of Law Societies of Canada. *National Entry to Practice Competency Profile for Lawyers and Quebec Notaries*, September, 2012.

organizations, and the ways that current practices might evolve with the increased utilization of technology.

From a curricular perspective this will require an expansion in the range of competencies taught to students. While still highly valued today, time-honoured competencies need to be supplemented with new ones as societal expectations as well as the role of articling in the profession change. Competencies already identified for the future include data management, emotional intelligence, entrepreneurial spirit, financial literacy, network building, process improvement, strategic thinking (beyond being a good tactician) and technological proficiency.¹³ The program will also feature in-depth coverage of new fields such as cyber-crime, social innovation, legal entrepreneurship, and technologically-based legal functions such as eDiscovery.

Significant attention will also be paid to issues relating to ethics and professionalism. Our treatment of these topics takes into account the evolution in how the competencies related to this subject matter are increasingly being infused into legal education. In recent decades, there has been a shift away from a dependence on lecture-based instruction towards a more immersive approach involving case studies and problem-based simulations. Associated with this trend is a growing recognition that ethics and professionalism not only require a mandatory course – a required course which we have placed in the first semester of our program to ensure that students are introduced to the topic from the very start of their studies – but must be integrated throughout the curriculum. In line with this trend, care has been taken to incorporate key elements of ethics and professionalism in a number of courses in addition to the mandatory ethics and professionalism course.

With these added required competencies comes a need for an expansion of the mandatory portion of the overall program. In combination with the incorporation of professional placement into the core curriculum, only one semester out of the five remaining semesters will incorporate any elective courses, with all of the coursework in the other four semesters, including the five bootcamps, being required.

(ii) A Rethinking of Content Delivery and Assessment Methods

The mode of delivery in much of the coursework will feature collaborative co-teaching between faculty and practitioners. This expansion of the practitioner's role beyond that of "guest lecturer" also reflects Ryerson's commitment to providing practical education and integrating collaboration with the community.¹⁴

We also envision a partial shifting away from the 12-week lecture-based course.¹⁵ This will be accomplished in a variety of ways:

Bootcamps - All semesters except the professional placement semester will begin with a compulsory one-week bootcamp that deals with subject-matter deemed to be essential to professional success, with all but the last bootcamp taught simultaneously by a two practitioners in separate sections.

First year - The first two semesters of the program will feature collaborative co-teaching between faculty and practitioners in all courses. Three courses in each semester – in contract law, torts law and property law in the first semester and in criminal law, constitutional law and administrative and

¹³ This list is adapted from the new proficiencies cited in Do Law Differently, pp. 17-19.

¹⁴ The potential advantage of co-teaching models in legal education that utilize practitioners is an area that has received considerable attention in recent years, especially in the US. For a Canadian observer's summary of these recent trends, see Doug Ferguson, "Integrating the Profession in Experiential Legal Education," *Slaw*, June 30th, 2015.

¹⁵ The research on intensive modes of delivery in post-secondary settings suggests that its learning outcomes are comparable to those using conventional delivery methods, with some studies even showing intensive modes of delivery to be more effective. See W. M. Davies, "Intensive Teaching Formats: A Review," *Issues in Educational Research*, 16(1), 2006 p. 10.

http://fbeunimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/634303/Davies1.pdf

regulatory law in the second semester – will be taught for six hours each week, in two lecture-style sections of 75 students each, with the first five hours taught solely by the faculty member and the sixth hour taught by a practitioner in three breakout sections of 25 students each. The other four courses in these semesters – in legal research and writing, ethics and professionalism, foundations of law and legal methods, and Indigenous law – will have two hours a week handled by the faculty member in lecture-style sections of 75 students each, and the third hour devoted to breakouts of 25 students overseen by practitioners that will involve a variety of activities stressing group based applications. The Indigenous law course’s mandatory nature reflects Ryerson’s deep commitment to addressing the recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in relation to legal education. As for its placement in the curriculum, it has been positioned in the first year in order to maximize the opportunity to weave foundational material to the topic of Indigenous peoples throughout the program. This is in conjunction with building Indigenous issues into the rest of the curriculum, including other courses, bootcamps, and professional placements.

Second year - The third and fourth semesters of the program will feature discrete two-week modules of content and associated practice, each representing a separate course, in the form of group work, role-playing and simulation that will also incorporate an online component for the presentation of knowledge. For each module, faculty will oversee 30 hours of class time, in two separate sections of students, during the weekday mornings of the two-week period. In the afternoons the focus will move to seven-member student firms to engage in the module’s practice portion. This portion will be overseen by mentors who will guide and assess the work of each firm. The immersive techniques involving simulated practice to be used here will be modeled on the resources developed in the LPP program.

Third year - The fifth and sixth semesters of the program will feature one semester of professional placement and in the other semester a mandatory EQ/CQ bootcamp as well as five electives.

Forms of assessment will also be transformed. A considerable body of empirical literature suggests that assessment is most effective if designed around competency-based learning outcomes, with multiple assessments – quizzes, exercise and group projects in addition to tests and exams – that provide students with an opportunity to gauge their understanding of basic competencies and learning outcomes in ways that the traditional 100 percent final exam does not allow.

(iii) Incorporation of Legal Technology

An important study of the legal profession identifies five specific technologically related trends currently operating in the legal profession:

Growth of AI and QLP - Artificial intelligence (AI) has already breached the walls of the legal profession, from predictive coding in litigation, to automated due diligence in transactional law, to IBM-Watson-assisted engines of mass data analysis.

General counsel as legal supply chain and legal process manager - The “convergence of technology, analytics, outsourcing, and procurement [has] allowed entrepreneurially minded individuals to develop new and more efficient methods to help deliver solutions to clients.”¹⁶

Emergence of process efficiency as a competitive advantage - In contrast to the past when substantive legal expertise was the main competitive distinguisher, process is taking on a greater role.

Expanding role of start-ups - So-called ‘apps for justice’ have begun providing solutions to legal problems encountered by the consumers of legal services. In 2009 there were 15 legal technology startups on the website AngelList. Four years later there were over 400.

¹⁶ Katz, Daniel Martin, “The MIT School of Law? A Perspective on Legal Education in the 21st Century,” University of Illinois Law Review, October 22, 2014, p. 1441.

A growing concern with access to justice and the affordability of legal services - Given issues related to affordability, entities such as LegalZoom and Rocket Lawyer are delivering some form of legal service or legal information products to help millions of people solve their specific legal problem. Law school graduates need to be closely aware of the trend and of the ways that it might be harnessed in beneficial ways.

The various elements of technological expertise that students will need in the program will be introduced in the Technology Innovation Bootcamp scheduled in the first week of the second semester as well as the Coding Bootcamp scheduled in the first week of the fourth semester. One reason for spending two concentrated weeks on technology in this way is to ensure an appropriate bridge for any students who enter the program without a substantial background in the use of technological tools. In addition, various projects throughout the proposed program, especially in several first-year courses and second-year modules, will require students to utilize a range of technological resources and, in the case of the final module taken in the second year, assess possible solutions to barriers to justice as well.

On January 31, 2017, the Federation of Law Societies of Canada issued a Consultation Report¹⁷ which sought comment on, among other things, a draft amendment to the Model Code of Professional Conduct. If adopted, the proposal would add Canada to the list of 27 states in the United States that have adopted the duty of technology competence.¹⁸

(iv) Attention to Communications and Relationship-Building Skills

It is essential that lawyers have the means to communicate and build relationships effectively and to integrate these skills into their understanding of the principles of ethics and professionalism. Through its client file simulation exercises as well as its other experiential learning elements, the program will emphasize this set of important skills, both in the context of person-to-person interaction as well as more impersonal settings such as via social media. The emotional quotient/cultural quotient bootcamp offered in the third year of the program will be particularly useful in solidifying these skills.

(v) The Building of Mentorship Relationships

As the legal profession changes, so does the need for students to have the chance to interact with experienced practitioners who can provide them with the practical advice they need in shaping their educational experience as well as making the transition to their career. Peer mentorship and other forms of informal mentorship are a key part of any student's law school experience. The program will directly address these issues by ensuring that students at the Ryerson Law School have the chance to build these relationships during all three years of study. Each student in the program will be assigned to a practitioner-mentor using a system similar to the one pioneered in the LPP, with seven students attached to one mentor in each year of the program.

(vi) An Alignment with Existing Ryerson Strengths, including Law-Related Areas

Providing accessible, relevant, intellectually rigorous and career-ready postsecondary education has been Ryerson's touchstone from the very beginning. The Ryerson experience is multi-faceted. It emphasizes basic and applied research, creative endeavours and scholarly activities that respond to real-world problems in community, government, and the private and not-for-profit sectors. It is built on programs designed to be relevant to changing careers, professions and scholarly disciplines, with considerable opportunities for research and experiential learning. Graduates go on to make significant contributions in their fields of practice and in broader society. Deep connections and partnerships with leading institutions,

¹⁷ Federation of Law Societies of Canada, Model Code of Professional Conduct, Consultation Report, January 31, 2017, available online at:

<http://flsc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Consultation-Report-Draft-Model-Code-Amendments-for-web-Jan2017-FINAL.pdf>

¹⁸ <http://www.lawsitesblog.com/2017/03/another-state-adopts-duty-technology-competence-canada-may-also.html>

community agencies, industry, government and professional practices drive program and research relevancy.

The university has forged a reputation for being innovative and entrepreneurial, and is now acknowledged to be a global leader in supporting and fostering innovation. This includes successfully launching Canada's first legal incubator, while developing an innovative lawyer transition training pilot project in the form of the Law Practice Program. The proposed program will be infused with new energy, ideas and approaches, but just as importantly, will build on these existing strengths. Ryerson has a core complement of exceptional faculty members willing to lead the development of the law school and shape the innovative approaches associated with starting the school.

For example, the major in Law and Business offered by the Ted Rogers School of Management is one of the few B. Comm. programs of its kind in Canada. Members of the Department of Criminology possess expertise in a broad range of legal areas, such as transnational approaches to anti-terrorism, irregular migration, refugee protection, international and European human rights law, sovereignty and constitutionalism, criminal and international criminal law, etc. There are also several other Ryerson research areas and associated institutes, centres and zones whose experience will be key in the implementation of this program.

(vii) An Educational Reach Across the GTA and Beyond

Fully 85% of Ryerson University's undergraduates are from the Greater Toronto Area – 40% from the “905 Belt” (i.e. Halton, Peel, York and Durham) and 45% from the City of Toronto. This proposal is being submitted at a pivotal juncture in Ryerson's vision for its reach within the GTA, given the University's recently announced proposal for an expansion to Brampton. This proposed new facility would provide the potential for the Ryerson Law School to provide some of its offerings – in particular, perhaps some of the intensive bootcamp and module sections – in a location that can significantly extend its regional reach, while drawing on the considerable expertise and potential student populations in the Brampton area.

(viii) A Progressive Social Justice-Oriented Emphasis

The GTA and surrounding area represents not the limits of Ryerson's reach and ambition but it does ground the institution's deep connection to community. Ryerson is known for bringing together cultures, ideas and passions to foster creativity, understanding and achievement in an environment where issues of EDI as well as social justice are continually stressed in all aspects of its operations. This commitment is well exemplified by the ongoing outreach and research of Ryerson's CAW-Sam Gindin Chair in Social Justice and Democracy, the Jack Layton Chair, the Jack Layton Leadership School in Social Justice, Activism and Community, the Diversity Institute and the Centre for Indigenous Governance. The new law school will forge links with these and other existing Ryerson entities as part of its own outreach and recruitment efforts.

In addition to its outreach to diverse communities within an urban context, Ryerson has shown a commitment to forging partnerships with Indigenous communities by developing comprehensive programs in collaboration with institutions such as the First Nations Technical Institute. This commitment will extend to the new Juris Doctor program, as the program responds to the recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission by doing the utmost to attract Indigenous students, infusing Indigenous issues throughout the curriculum, and incorporating a mandatory Indigenous law course for all students in the program.

The focus on ethics will also be explicitly infused throughout the rest of the program. The inclusion of a mandatory first year course, Ethics and Professionalism, will explore the tensions that arise from balancing professional role-based obligations and organizational expectations with the public interest.

(ix) Incorporation of elements of the Legal Innovation Zone and the Law Practice Program

The Legal Innovation Zone (LIZ) is Canada's first legal incubator. After just a year, it is already incubating 19 companies, has contracted innovation for hire, and has launched a four-month family reform initiative to build a prototype as part of its goal to help develop a 21st century justice system. The experience gained by launching the LIZ will be utilized in devising the curriculum, especially those parts geared to the entrepreneurial aspects of legal service in today's fast-changing profession.

The Law Practice Program (LPP) was originally established by the Law Society of Upper Canada as a three-year pilot alternative to traditional articling licensing, and awarded to Ryerson because of its unique approach. The practising bar supports the program through mentoring, expert input, training program development and delivery, and work placements. Between its inception in 2014 and its current third year, hundreds of candidates have benefitted from the new opportunities this alternative has created, with excellent post-completion employment results.

(x) A Commitment to Uncompromising Quality

Ryerson is committed to uncompromising quality, defined broadly, which will be evident throughout the program, including through the following policies and procedures:

Admissions: We believe that a well-qualified, diverse and inclusive group of applicants exists. We anticipate that the transformative nature of Ryerson Law School's proposed program combined with the uniqueness of its admission process will extend the potential range of applicants. In addition to the usual requirement for past academic excellence, Ryerson will publicize the fact that it welcomes applications from students who demonstrate technological proficiency, past entrepreneurial activities, problem solving, community engagement, social innovation and/or the ability to overcome adversity due to a range of possible factors.

Faculty: Full-time faculty members will be expected to possess significant academic credentials in law (likely doctorates in law or equivalent), and/or come to Ryerson as well-respected lateral hires from top-tier law schools throughout Canada and internationally. Importantly, Ryerson will attract leading legal scholars who are innovative and creative. The same standards that govern full-time faculty hires will apply to cross-appointments to the law school from within Ryerson, while practitioners will be hired from the large and impressive pool of experienced professionals within the GTA.

1.4 Estimating Student Demand

The Ryerson Law School will undoubtedly be able to attract qualified applicants for a variety of reasons:

- The new law school will aspire to be different.
- The school will be the smallest in Ontario with the exception of Lakehead, with its particular focus on Indigenous matters and Northern Ontario.
- While the population of Ontario has doubled in the past three decades, only one new law school – Lakehead, has started since the establishment of numerous Ontario law faculties in the late 1950s and 1960s. Ryerson would be able to attract applicant numbers that put it in the same league as the other law schools in the province – i.e. ratios of registrants to applicants in the 5% to 14% range – simply given the existing regional demand for law school seats.
- Ryerson has the highest ratio of any university in the province per undergraduate slot.
- There has been a significant increase in the numbers of internationally trained law candidates who are seeking membership in the Ontario Bar. This group includes both candidates who have emigrated to Canada and Canadians who have pursued a law degree outside of Canada with the intention of practising within the country.

- Between 2005 and 2014 the ratio of internationally trained law candidates to those from Ontario law schools applying for licensure in the province rose from 7% to 37%.¹⁹
- About 35% of the approximately 600 internationally-educated candidates for licensing in Ontario are Canadian-born and received their law school education outside of Canada and returned to become licensed in Ontario. In other words, more than 200 Canadians return annually from law schools abroad. To put this in context, the Ryerson Law School will admit only 150 students into first year law.
- Ryerson's admission criteria will consider a variety of criteria, including an online interview, which will encourage and attract a broader pool of applicants.

1.5 Estimating Labour Market Demand

Authorities have had significant difficulties in the past in estimating future labour market demand. A report by the Canadian Bar Association's Legal Futures Initiative cites what it calls the lack of data on the Canadian profession:

There is limited data available on the profession in terms of services offered, pricing, profitability, incomes, and cost structures. There is mostly anecdotal information on client needs, preferences, and satisfaction, and on access to legal services more generally. The legal profession has little information on emerging competitors and their business specifics, including marketing and pricing strategies. There is also limited information on the demographics of the profession, its diversity, individual career expectations, and attitudes towards various working arrangements (full-time, part-time, consultants).²⁰

In terms of employment, the Council of Ontario Universities, in a survey of Ontario university graduates, found law graduates from 2010 had an employment rate two years after graduation of 93.9%.²¹ A recent study of regulated professions in Ontario commissioned by the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) found a much lower rate of employment for graduates from 2010 three years after graduation, with a rate of 73% for Ontario law graduates.²² Such statistics, which tend to use definitions parallel to those applied by Statistics Canada in its Labour Force Survey, need to be treated with caution. As the HEQCO study of regulated professions in Ontario notes:

The LFS is, however, of limited value in assessing labour market outcomes for professional degree holders as it does not account for educational qualifications or the individual's intended occupation. In other words, it does not provide insight as to whether the individuals hold a position that they are trained for or whether they are underemployed.²³

Once account is taken of how many graduates are working in jobs closely allied to their area of study, the statistics for graduates in regulated professions are reduced. The same HEQCO study estimates that the employment rate for 2010 Ontario law graduates three years after graduation who are employed and working in an area closely related to their field of study is 61%.²⁴

¹⁹ These statistics are taken from

http://www.fairnesscommissioner.ca/index_en.php?page=professions/law_society_of_upper_canada

²⁰ CBA Legal Futures Initiative. *Futures: Transforming the Delivery of Legal Services in Canada*, August 2014,

http://www.cba.org/CBAMediaLibrary/cba_na/PDFs/CBA%20Legal%20Futures%20PDFS/Futures-Final-eng.pdf

²¹ Council of Ontario Universities. *University Works: 2014 Employment Report*, February, 2014, p. 23.

http://COU_University_Works_report_-_February_2014.pdf

²² This contrasts to rates of 92% in nursing, 90% in engineering and architecture and 76% in education. Prism Economics and Analysis. *Labour Market Trends and Outlooks for Regulated Professions in Ontario*, Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario, 2016. p. 16.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

²⁴ This compares to 90% in nursing, 59% in architecture, 55% in engineering and 50% in education. *Ibid.*, p. 17.

Based on a comparison of demand and supply, the HEQCO study estimates that there will be 1.6 newly licensed lawyers in the province for each practising position that opens up between 2015 and 2025, due both to retirement replacement and GDP growth.²⁵ The study estimates that over the coming decade there will be approximately 29,500 law school graduates in Ontario. According to the HEQCO study, the likely effects are:

This will most probably result in a rising number of law school graduates not practising law. They will likely find opportunities in other professions or leave the province to find legal work elsewhere. Another, more positive outcome may be that new graduates will create their own jobs. New technology enables small firms and sole practitioners to access new and larger markets. Innovation and cultural shifts may also change how legal services are provided or lead to entirely new types of services.²⁶

In other words, the study concludes, these trends will likely lead to a shift away from conventional forms of practice. In 2010 the Law Society of Upper Canada estimated that fully half of its lawyer members were situated in Metropolitan Toronto. In terms of employment, 23% of LSUC members classified themselves as sole practitioners, 20% as partners, 18% as associates, 16% were affiliated with government, 4% were employees, 2% were in education, and the remaining 18% were in a range of pursuits, including both the corporate and non-profit sectors.²⁷ These figures provide some indication of where demand for new Ontario legal graduates is concentrated at the moment, as the proportion of the profession that is in-house grows, while the representation of those who are in small firms or are sole practitioners rises as well.²⁸

What can be stated with virtual certainty is that, as the legal services market continues to undergo disruptive change, new opportunities will arise for those with the skills and perspective to take advantage of these changes. In the words of a new US study of legal business models:

What is ultimately needed . . . is a broader reimagining of the overall model for legal service delivery, one that includes paraprofessionals, technologists, information specialists, process managers, and others – in addition to lawyers – as part of an integrated system for the delivery of legal services. This is the model that has evolved in medicine, also driven by the dual objectives of improving outcomes and quality of service while reducing costs. Such a redesigned approach to legal services – combined with a pricing model based on outcomes (results) rather than inputs (recorded time) – could significantly improve both the competitiveness and profitability of those law firms willing to take these issues seriously.²⁹

And, not inconsequentially, such changes, when they occur in the Ontario legal services market are likely to have the major advantage of enhancing access to justice.

It is important to note that of all of the estimated 29,500 law graduates entering the Ontario profession over the 2015-2025 period, only an estimated 560 (or less than 2%) would have graduated from the

²⁵ According to the study, the cumulative number of graduates, both from Ontario and elsewhere, between 2015 and 2025 is projected to be 29,500, with 12,700 positions opening up in the province, producing a cumulative excess supply of 16,800 positions. According to the HECQO study, these excess supply conditions in the province appeared after 2009 as Ontario law schools collectively undertook a significant increase in enrollments at the same time as the supply of graduates from outside underwent its own substantial increase. *Ibid.*, pp. 49-50.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

²⁷ The Law Society of Upper Canada. Annual Report Performance Highlights 2010, p. 7.
http://LSUC_Performance_EN_Annual_Report_2010.pdf

²⁸ Just as suggestive are the figures from the same year on the age distribution of the Society's lawyer membership, which show that over 40% of the membership is over aged 50 or over, with under 33% under the age of 40. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

²⁹ Georgetown Law and Thomson Reuters. 2017 Report on the State of the Legal Market. Peer Monitor Series. Centre for the Study of the Legal Profession at Georgetown University Law Centre and Thomson Reuters Legal Executive Institute, p. 17.

Ryerson Law School. In other words, the overall increase in law school graduates in Ontario created by establishing the Ryerson Law School will be insignificant.

The delivery model that the Ryerson Law School graduates will be trained to apply will ensure that they will be among those best positioned to deal with the transformation of the market for law school graduates that is already underway.

During the development of this proposal, Strategy Corp Incorporated (SCI) was commissioned by Ryerson to undertake a Labour Market Survey. Their working hypothesis was the following: “To better meet the labour market needs inside and outside of the legal industry, legally trained professionals will require different attributes than the legal professionals of 20 years ago. The market is changing and tomorrow’s graduates will need to be creative and skilled problem solvers, strategic planners, and process managers with the financial literacy, technological competency, and entrepreneurial spirit to compete in tomorrow’s economy.” SCI interviewed 52 legal and non-legal employers across a variety of industries.

The outcome of these interviews is series of themes whose ramifications have obvious alignment with the principles espoused in this submission in relation to the defining features of the proposed program:

- There are roles for legally trained professionals outside of legal positions, but students are not always made aware of these opportunities.
- Traditional legal education effectively teaches students how to think and solve problems, and this skill set is viewed favourably by non-legal positions.
- Industry experience and industry knowledge are seen as positive differentiators during the hiring process.
- Employers dislike the propensity of legally trained professionals to provide mere analysis rather than advice.
- Practical skills training is identified as a gap in legal training.
- There is an appetite to integrate practical training into the law school context.
- The legal field is changing and there will be fewer traditional law positions.
- Technological aptitude is essential for new lawyers.
- Integration of equity, diversity and inclusion in legal training will make for more well-rounded professionals.

2. THE PROPOSED PROGRAM

2.1 Academic Administration

Ryerson’s Juris Doctor program will be housed in a new law faculty, becoming the seventh faculty at Ryerson University.

2.2 Admission to the Program

The program will admit a well-qualified cohort of 150 students per year. Applicants will require at least a three-year undergraduate degree, although students who have completed two years of undergraduate study with high academic and other performance may be considered as a means of enhancing access. Applicants will be required to submit a portfolio consisting of traditional components such as the application itself, a personal statement addressing certain criteria, resume, transcripts, a letter of recommendation/evaluation, and the results of the Law School Admission Test. In addition, applicants will be expected to complete an online interview. Attention will be paid to matters such as technological proficiency, past entrepreneurial activities, problem solving, community engagement, social innovation and/or the ability to overcome adversity in all its many forms.

It is of paramount importance that, right from the start, the profile of our incoming classes represents the program’s abiding commitment to EDI. This will be reflected in several aspects of the proposed admissions process:

- EDI-Related Recruitment Initiatives - The active recruitment of applicants from underrepresented communities will be key. The Ryerson Law School recruitment process will draw on best practices around EDI in legal recruitment, with admissions representatives visiting community groups, high schools and other relevant organizations to explain the benefits of law as a career path and outline the distinctive mandate of the Ryerson Law School. In addition, consultations are ongoing with ethno-racial law associations, with these associations being asked for their assistance in promoting the Ryerson Law School in their respective communities. The intent is to have them work with admissions officials in reaching out to students in both high schools and universities to encourage them to go to law school.
- LSAT and GPA - In fidelity to our vision to encourage applications from persons with diverse backgrounds, relevant life and work experiences, community affiliations, passion for justice, and openness to technological innovation, predetermined minimum GPAs or LSAT scores will not initially be set. The holistic candidate selection process will ensure that all successful candidates will be especially qualified, outstanding and exemplary with respect to the traits, aptitudes, and values which animate the program. Only once admissions officials have had time to develop admissions standards based on the candidate pool applying to the program will any figures be published, and then only as informational class profiles rather than set minimum values. Instead, the assessment process will reflect an ongoing effort during each admissions cycle to ensure that EDI factors are being fully taken into account.
- Online Interview and Personal Statement - It will be made clear to applicants that both the online interview and written personal statement are an essential part of their application packages. The technical aspects of the online interview process will be managed by an outside provider (this is already occurring for some of the most prominent law schools using this option in the USA). Candidates will receive the interview link and then will have an estimated 10 to 15 minutes to complete three or four questions carefully written to encourage a discussion of EDI and its personal ramifications to the applicant. A similar philosophy will govern the choice of topics applicants will be asked to elaborate on in the personal written statement as well as the structure of the mandatory rubric used by all assessors.
- Review and Assessment - The proposed admissions process will be carefully tailored and holistic, taking into account many individual factors. The initial review of applicant packages, including the online interviews, will be carried out by one to two experienced admissions support staff hired on four to six month contracts each year. They will use a formal rubric in reducing the total number of complete applicant files to a certain number that will then be passed on to an admissions committee.

In the absence of designated cut-offs, at least in the first year of the program, significant attention will be paid to ensuring transparency to applicants in terms of how admission decisions are made. One way to do so is to make public the general criteria that will be used to assess the content of the online interview and personal statement. Besides an applicant's performance in their previous studies as well as their LSAT score, five criteria will be utilized: (1) relevant work experience, including any technology-related skills gained; (2) volunteer activities, including evidence of a commitment to social justice and/or the development of cultural/emotional competencies; (3) personal accomplishments that the applicant deems to be noteworthy, (4) personal factors that the applicant wishes to mention, especially those that reflect attempts to overcome adversity, and (5) career aspirations, including what particular career paths as a legal professional currently appeal and why.

It will be explicitly stated to applicants that these five criteria will be viewed through the lens of the program's four underlying principles:

- Increasing access to justice for Ontarians and Canadians;

- Innovation and entrepreneurship;
- Equity, Diversity and Inclusion; and
- Sound academic grounding.

An admissions committee, composed of faculty members and also, eventually, alumni and student representatives, will formalize the individual components, set the percentage ranges used to weight each of these five criteria as well as to weight the GPA and LSAT scores. It needs to be stressed that all involved in reviewing files – both the contract reviewers and members of the admissions committee – will have appropriate training.

This envisioned process will require the technical support of the Registrar's Office, especially in regard to transmission of data from OUAC to Ryerson. All of this process will be overseen by a Coordinator of Law School Admission, an Admissions Assistant & Advising, and the Associate Dean Students. As far as admissions for 2018 are concerned, the lead times necessary to register the program as a formal part of OUAC process dictate that an alternative process will have to be devised involving both OUAC and the Registrar's Office.

2.3 Grading, Promotion and Graduation Requirements

The curriculum exhibits a progressive structure. All courses in the first two years of the program are mandatory and there are no specific course prerequisites. Completion of Year 1 is a requirement to enter Year 2, and completion of the first two years is a requirement to enter Year 3. If individual courses are failed, the student would need to complete a set assignment or exam to pass. As long as Policy 46 is in place, students may also be given "probationary" or "required to withdraw" status, depending on their overall performance in any semester.

Devising a grading and promotion policy in the context of a professional program such as a JD degree is a complex matter. The program will begin by utilizing Ryerson's GPA Policy 46, with the intention that once permanent administrators and staff are hired there will be a committee set up to take a formal scan of current sector norms and devise a policy that both reflects these norms as well as being infused by the distinctive aspects of the Ryerson Law School mandate.

2.4 Learning Outcomes

The proposed program will ensure its graduates are well-prepared to contribute positively to the profession and society. The Ryerson Law School's program has fourteen intended learning outcomes which are based on the four pillars of the law school:

- (i) Increasing access to justice;
- (ii) Stimulating innovation and entrepreneurship;
- (iii) Promoting equity, diversity and inclusion; and
- (iv) Providing a sound academic grounding with innovative pedagogy – and address the knowledge, skills and values we expect our graduates will have developed by the time they have graduated from the JD program.

The fourteen learning outcomes are:

1. *Knowledge of the Canadian Legal System* - Describe and apply principles of the constitutional law of Canada, including the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, human rights principles, Aboriginal rights and Indigenous traditions, key principles of common law and equity, the administration of law in Canada, the legislative and regulatory system, and statutory construction and interpretation.
2. *Knowledge of Canadian Substantive Law* - Describe and apply principles on Canadian substantive law including private and public law, corporate and commercial law, family law, wills and estates, evidence, rules of procedure, and alternative dispute mechanism procedures.

3. *Knowledge of Ethics and Professionalism* - Outline the principles of ethical conduct, professional integrity and the respectful treatment of participants in the legal process.
4. *Ethics and Professionalism Skills* - Recognize, critically analyze, and make reasoned decisions about ethical issues based on the highest standards of professionalism.
5. *Oral and Written Communication Skills* - Communicate clearly, use language suitable to one's purpose and audience, craft well-reasoned and accurate legal arguments, and appropriately elicit information from clients.
6. *Analytical Skills*- Identify, research, and analyze legal issues, and craft legal solutions that are most appropriate to the context and effectively meet the needs of clients.
7. *Research Skills* - Identify legal issues, select relevant sources and methods, and apply legal reasoning and argument techniques using both primary and secondary resources in a range of fields.
8. *Client Relationship and Management Skills* - Strategically manage client relationships appropriate to client circumstances.
9. *Practice Management Skills* - Demonstrate a basic understanding of business fundamentals and manage professional responsibilities such as managing time, files, finances, and the delegation of tasks.
10. *Technology Related Skills* - Assess technological solutions to legal issues, identify the relevant tools used to conduct data analytics, and apply digital literacy in a range of legal contexts.
11. *Awareness Skills* - Recognize the emotional impact of words and actions, adapt to differing cultural perspectives, and relate one's own professional goals to societal needs and the public interest.
12. *Change Management Skills* - Identify and apply appropriate methods to facilitate stakeholder transition of legal practice to the use of new technologies, new processes, or other shifts in modes of operation.
13. *Autonomy and Professional Capacity Skills* - Exercise initiative, personal responsibility and accountability in personal and group contexts, and manage learning in changing circumstances.
14. *Social Innovation Skills* - Modify or develop new strategies, procedures, and activities to help break down barriers to justice and make legal services more affordable.

These learning outcomes have been mapped to the degree level expectations (DLEs). The outcomes have been developed to align with the FLSC's *Recommended Requirements for a Canadian Common Law Degree*. The learning outcomes, methods of delivery, and assessments have also been directly mapped to all the program's required and elective courses.

2.5 Mapping of Learning Outcomes (LOs) to Required and Elective Courses

First Year

The knowledge-based learning outcomes most stressed in the first year are LO1, covered at a foundational level in every first year course except the two bootcamps, and LO2, covered at a foundational level in Legal Research and Writing, Fdns. of Law and Leg. Methods, and Indigenous Law in Canada and at a proficiency level in the first semester's private law courses and the second semester's public law courses. LO3 has foundational coverage in the introductory bootcamp, Legal Research and Writing, Fdns. of Law and Leg. Methods, and Criminal Law. In addition, LO3 has proficiency-level coverage in the Ethics and Professionalism Course, given the course's central focus on this learning outcome.

The skills-based learning outcomes most stressed in the first year are LO4, LO5, and LO6. All three outcomes have at least foundational coverage in every first year course while proficiency-level coverage occurs in Ethics and Professionalism, Fdns. of Law and Leg. Methods and Criminal Law for LO4; in Fdns. of Law and Leg. Methods for LO5, since this course builds on the communications skills covered at a foundational level in the first semester courses; and in the Technology Innovation Bootcamp and Fdns.

of Law and Leg. Methods for LO6, since both of these courses feature assignments incorporating an intensive analytical component.

Coverage of the other skills-based learning outcomes LO7 to LO14 is scattered throughout the first year courses:

- LO7 has foundational coverage in the introductory bootcamp, Fdns. of Law and Leg. Methods, Criminal Law and Indigenous Law in Canada, since these courses feature assignments in which independent student research is highlighted;
- LO8 has foundational coverage in the introductory bootcamp and Legal Research and Writing and proficiency-level coverage in Ethics and Professionalism and Fdns of Law and Leg. Methods, since all of these courses help set the stage for the explicitly applied practice based assignments in second year;
- LO9 has foundational coverage in both the introductory bootcamp and Legal Research and Writing and proficiency-level coverage in Fdns. of Law and Leg. Methods;
- LO10 has foundational coverage in the three private law courses and three public law courses, given the introduction in these six courses of some of the technological methods used in contemporary legal practice. It has proficiency-level coverage in the Technology Innovation Bootcamp given the bootcamp's intensive treatment of the nuts and bolts of legal technology;
- LO11 has foundational coverage in the year's two bootcamps and proficiency-level coverage in Ethics and Professionalism and Fdns. of Law and Leg. Methods;
- LO12 and LO14 have foundational coverage in the first year's two bootcamps and Ethics and Professionalism; and
- LO13 has foundational coverage in the two bootcamps.

Second Year

The first two learning outcomes are broadly represented in the second year. For LO1, proficiency-level coverage occurs in all this year's intensive module courses except for the process-focused modules Legal Innovation and Access to Justice Solutions. For LO2, proficiency-level coverage occurs in all the year's bootcamps and modules with the exception, again, of Legal Innovation and Access to Justice Solutions, as well as excluding the Business of Layering and Social Innovation and the Law. For both LO3 and LO4, proficiency-level coverage occurs in all third semester courses except for the Financial Bootcamp and Civil Procedure. In the fourth semester it has the proficiency-level coverage in the ethics-related modules Advocacy and ADR and Access to Justice Solutions. LO5 and LO6 have proficiency-level coverage in all second year courses. LO7 proficiency-level coverage applies to all second year modules except for the Business of Layering.

The second year, with its intensive practice-focused modules, is where the learning outcomes LO8 to LO14 receive most coverage:

- LO8 has proficiency-level coverage in all second year courses except for the Business of Lawyering and the Coding Bootcamp;
- LO9 has foundational coverage in the third semester courses except for Social Innovation and the Law and it has proficiency-level coverage in all fourth semester modules except for Legal Innovation;
- LO10 has proficiency-level coverage in the Business of Lawyering, Social Innovation and the Law, Legal Innovation, and Access to Justice Solutions;
- LO11 has foundational coverage in Social Innovation and the Law, Advocacy and ADR, and Access to Justice Solutions; and
- LO12, LO13 and LO14 all have proficiency-level coverage in the Business of Lawyering, Social Innovation and the Law, the Coding Bootcamp, Legal Innovation, and Access to Justice Solutions.

Third Year

The two required courses, Professional Placement and the EQ/CQ Bootcamp, cover many of the outcomes at a proficiency level. Some of the outcomes are covered at a specialization level in the electives.

- LO1 has specialization-level coverage in all third year elective courses except for Advanced Legal Solutions;
- LO2 has specialization-level coverage in all third year elective courses except for Global Civil Society, Inter-Disciplinary Law, Immigration Law, Law and Injustice, and Advanced Legal Solutions;
- LO3 has proficiency-level coverage in the EQ/CQ Bootcamp and specialization-level coverage in Global Civil Society, Environmental Law, Children and the Law, Immigration Law, and Law and Injustice;
- LO4, LO5, and LO6, the skills-based outcomes, are all heavily represented in the third year courses, both required and elective. Each of these outcomes has proficiency-level coverage in the Professional Placement and the EQ/CQ Bootcamp and specialization-level coverage in all third year elective courses;
- LO7 has proficiency-level coverage in the Professional Placement and specialization-level coverage in all third-year elective courses;
- LO8 has proficiency-level coverage in the Professional Placement and the EQ/CQ Bootcamp;
- LO9 has proficiency-level coverage in the Professional Placement;
- LO10 has specialization-level coverage in Advanced Legal Solutions;
- LO11 has proficiency-level coverage in the Professional Placement and the EQ/CQ Bootcamp and specialization-level coverage in Inter-Disciplinary Law and Law and Injustice;
- LO12 and LO14 have no coverage in third year courses; and
- LO13 has proficiency-level coverage in the Professional Placement and the EQ/CQ Bootcamp.

2.6 The Curriculum

First Year

In the first year, career readiness will be achieved by contextualizing the *Recommended Requirements for a Canadian Common Law Degree* in coursework that reflects how legal actors use tools of private and public law interchangeably. Classes will introduce students to a contextualized view of the principles of public and private law and guide them through the application of jurisprudence in practical settings. Students will gain an understanding of the broader social context behind rules of professional ethics and be introduced to basic concepts in file management, communication and interviewing. There will also be a mandatory course in Indigenous Law in Canada.

Second Year

The second year will feature substantive learning with simulated practice. An immersive approach will prepare students for the type of focused learning expected of legal advisers in a variety of organizational roles. At the same time, mentored practice will allow students to use newly acquired knowledge for client and user needs, especially those clients who may need help to determine whether they have a legal problem and then help in identifying it and seeking appropriate help. Much of the substantive knowledge will be introduced with key topics organized thematically. The aims of this thematic element include (1) fostering an appreciation of inclusive culture and diversity within the legal profession and society, (2) providing hands-on experience with the technological tools used in various areas of law, (3) thinking innovatively about problem-solving, and (4) learning specific transferable skills and knowledge associated with business management and client retention.

Third Year

The third year will incorporate a semester of elective courses, as well as a semester featuring a mandatory placement. The placement will see students undertake the supervised responsibilities of a lawyer. Typical placements will include legal clinics run by Ryerson, law firms, sole practitioners, governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, corporations, and not for profit organizations.

Bootcamps

Students will be required to take a series of five week-long bootcamps:

- (1) **Ryerson Law School Bootcamp** – The Ryerson Law School Philosophy; Career Planning; Networking/Mentoring; Leadership Coaching; Personal Development Project
- (2) **Technology Innovation Bootcamp** – The Evolution of Legal Technology; AI and QLP; Data Analytics and their Uses in Law; Technology Assisted Review (TAR); Understanding Regulatory Technology
- (3) **Financial Bootcamp** – Taxing Essentials; Financial Statements – Balance Sheets and Income Statements; Financial Statements – Cash Flows; Financial Statement Analysis; Tying it All Together with Cases and Current Events
- (4) **Coding Bootcamp** – Introducing HTML and CSS; Learning Python; Data Analytics Project; The Legal Technology Assessment
- (5) **Emotional Quotient and Cultural Quotient Bootcamp** – Developing Self-Awareness; Teamwork and Trust-Building; Working Effectively Across Cultures; Understanding the Client Relationship; EQ/CQ Implementation Project

The topics covered in the bootcamps connected with technology and finance (i.e. the Technology Innovation Bootcamp, the Financial Bootcamp and the Coding Bootcamp) are not meant to provide full subject area proficiency, but are designed to expose the students to potential technological and financial issues in legal practice, so that they are able to recognize them, if and when such issues arise. These bootcamps are therefore about “issue identification,” rather than substantive solutions, which are often better provided by non-legal staff (i.e. IT or accounting experts). The familiarity with these issues will then be reinforced – not technically, necessarily, but contextually – at several points later in the program.

There will be no waivers or challenge credits offered for the bootcamps. We do not expect students will have taken the topics covered in these courses in a legal context. The intention is that all students travel through the mandatory courses in the program as a cohort. Students always learn new concepts and ideas, and peer learning is strengthened when there are varied skill levels in the same class.

2.7 Delivery Methods

With the exception of the bootcamps in each year of the program, the courses in each year are distinguished in the following ways:

- The first year courses incorporate both faculty-taught lectures and practitioner-taught sessions throughout the semester;
- The second-year courses are in the form intensive modules that again involve co-teaching of faculty members and practitioners, but now with the faculty members overseeing the lecture time in the mornings and practitioners overseeing the completion of various practice-oriented assignments completed by student ‘firms’ during the afternoons; and
- The third year electives are each taught by a single instructor, who may be a faculty member or a practitioner.

The combination of these various forms of delivery year by year has been chosen to maximize the innovative aspects of the school's pedagogical method, through combining substantial and practical components of practice, emphasizing experiential learning, and working with innovative technologies and processes.

2.8 The Curriculum in Academic Calendar Form

1st SEMESTER

Required:

JUR XXX Ryerson Law School Bootcamp (first week of class)

JUR XXX Legal Research and Writing

JUR XXX Contract Law

JUR XXX Torts Law

JUR XXX Property Law

JUR XXX Ethics and Professionalism

2nd SEMESTER

Required:

JUR XXX Technology Innovation Bootcamp (first week of class)

JUR XXX Fdns. of Law and Leg. Methods

JUR XXX Criminal Law

JUR XXX Constitutional Law

JUR XXX Adm. and Reg. Law

JUR XXX Indigenous Law in Canada

3rd SEMESTER

Required:

JUR XXX Financial Bootcamp (first week of class)

JUR XXX The Business of Lawyering

JUR XXX Business Law

JUR XXX Family Law

JUR XXX Civil Procedure

JUR XXX Social Innovation and the Law

4th SEMESTER

Required:

JUR XXX Coding Bootcamp (first week of class)

JUR XXX Advocacy and ADR

JUR XXX Wills and Estates

JUR XXX Legal Innovation

JUR XXX IP and Privacy

JUR XXX Access to Justice Solutions

5th & 6th SEMESTER

Half of the class takes the placement in the 5th semester with the coursework taken in the 6th semester. The other half takes the reverse order.

REQUIRED:

JUR XXX EQ/CQ Bootcamp (first week of class)

JUR XXX Professional Placement

PROFESSIONAL ELECTIVES: Five courses from Table I

Table I			
JUR XXX	Global Civil Society and the Law	JUR XXX	Immigration Law
JUR XXX	Real Estate Law	JUR XXX	Criminal Procedure
JUR XXX	Labour and Employment Law	JUR XXX	Tax Law and Practice
JUR XXX	Advanced Corporate Law	JUR XXX	Evidence
JUR XXX	Inter-Disciplinary Lawyering	JUR XXX	Law and Injustice
JUR XXX	Environmental Law	JUR XXX	Advanced Legal Solutions
JUR XXX	Children and the Law	JUR XXX	Private International Law
		JUR XXX	Public International Law

2.9 Course Descriptions

JUR XXX: Ryerson Law School Bootcamp This intensive five-day bootcamp gives incoming Juris Doctor students the opportunity to learn about Ryerson University and the Ryerson Law School, as well as the legal profession. Students begin to lay the foundation for professional development and success by engaging in career planning, networking and mentoring. They are also introduced to leadership strategies and tools, culminating with a personal development project.

JUR XXX: Legal Research and Writing This course introduces students to the sources of law, fundamental principles and basic architecture of the Canadian legal system, legal research methods, relevant social science research methods and the impact of theoretical principles on substantive principles of Canadian law. The course provides a comparative look at legal research resources from the perspective of their potential strengths and weaknesses for practitioners.

JUR XXX: Contract Law Contract law provides a creative opportunity to clarify expectations and interests in a legally enforceable way. Working with real contracts from diverse sources, students are trained in contract fundamentals (formation, performance, breach, and remedies) and are introduced to the use of contracts in a variety of legal areas. Students apply these principles both in reviewing and drafting contract clauses and to critically assess emerging topics such as electronic, “smart” and self-executing contracts.

JUR XXX: Torts Law Tort law deals with the apportionment of responsibility for harms caused by individuals, companies and government. This course examines intentional and unintentional wrongs, and the central role that recovery and damages play in redress. Students learn to recognize wrongs and how to anticipate, avoid or address legal risk. They apply these principles in reviewing and drafting pleadings, and explore how principles of responsibility are challenged by non-human actors (e.g. AI, autonomous vehicles).

JUR XXX: Property Law Property law deals with ownership, possession, and control of tangible and intangible interests that offer value to individuals, companies and the state. Students analyze competing claims to various types of assets, and are introduced to the economic, moral and other arguments used to support those claims. They are given the opportunity to apply these principles in cases involving the infringement of property rights and explore comparative views of concepts of property in Indigenous law.

JUR XXX: Ethics and Professionalism Legal ethics and professionalism explores the tensions that arise domestically and internationally from balancing professional role-based obligations, organizational expectations and the public interest. Students consider behaviour and responsibilities generated by rules of professional conduct and situate legal professionals in a broader societal context. They learn to recognize and address ethical dilemmas they encounter in various practice settings, including novel challenges arising in technologically-mediated environments.

JUR XXX: Technology Innovation Bootcamp This intensive five-day bootcamp is an opportunity to explore and experience through workshops and seminars some of the technologies and innovative business practices that can help a lawyer succeed in the age of the consumer. It initiates the process whereby students gain the necessary skills and understanding of the innovative processes to successfully compete and thrive in a marketplace being rapidly disrupted by technology, consumer expectations and globalization.

JUR XXX: Fdns. of Law and Leg. Methods This course introduces students to foundational and influential theories of law (e.g. positivism, natural law, legal realism, law and economics, and critical perspectives: feminist theory, critical race theory and critical legal studies) as well as to effective communication and application of research results through a variety of written and oral communication and dispute resolution tools.

JUR XXX: Criminal Law Criminal law attempts to balance societal protection and the rights of the accused in both national and international settings. This course deals with the principles and processes of criminal defence and prosecution. Students learn and/or experience bail hearing, preliminary inquiries, judicial conferences, disclosure, and jury selection. There is a focus on issues related to equity, diversity and inclusion in the criminal justice system, particularly the intersection of criminal law with Indigenous culture.

JUR XXX: Constitutional Law Constitutional law is the supreme law of the nation state and the authority with which other laws and government actors must comply. Students learn about the powers and responsibilities of different levels and types of government as well as protecting and guaranteeing the rights of legal persons. Students have opportunities to work with ministerial briefs, governmental memoranda, factums and pleadings for landmark constitutional litigation cases, including Indigenous land claims, historical wrongs and competing rights.

JUR XXX: Adm. and Reg. Law-Issues in administrative law and regulatory law are commonly encountered, due to their influence on everyday interactions between individuals and government entities. Regulatory law covers delegated rule-making, policy development and adjudication. Students learn about regulatory practice and principles of judicial review, as well as how to provide advice to individuals and corporations on complex rules, regulations, procedures, permitting, applications and enforcement. The role of the compliance function and rise of “RegTech” are also explored.

JUR XXX: Indigenous Law in Canada This course highlights the impact of Canadian laws on Indigenous peoples, including their complex relationship with Canada’s constitution. Traditional Indigenous legal systems and customs, and how these are practised in a modern context, are studied, along with the legal struggles of First Nations, Inuit and Metis within federal, provincial and territorial contexts. Students examine relevant legislation, regulations and case law and gain experience with by-law making, impact benefit agreements, revenue sharing agreements, and ownership structures.

JUR XXX: Financial Bootcamp The purpose of this intensive five-day bootcamp is twofold. First, it covers topics related to taxation and finance statements. Second, it provides extensive practice in using Excel as a financial tool. Students gain a sufficient understanding of these subjects to give them confidence in continuing to use them and learn with them as they proceed through their law school experience. The course provides the basic financial acumen to start their own business or legal practice.

JUR XXX: The Business of Lawyering Exposure to the realities of professional practice is a foundational requirement of legal education. This module concentrates on preparing students for multiple professional contexts and developing associated skills, such as collaboration, networking, billing, accounting methods, client relationships and file management, as well as furthering their understanding of the application of ethical standards to the changing practice of law.

JUR XXX: Business Law Using a transactional approach to business structures, students work with a simulated client file from idea through execution to potential problem areas. The module focuses on documents, processes and issues related to financing, liability, governance and operations, both in bricks-and-mortar and e-commerce businesses. Students draft and review documents (e.g. articles of incorporation, bylaws, shareholder/partnership agreements, confidentiality clauses and purchase and sale agreements). Challenges of applying traditional legal concepts to digital businesses are also explored.

JUR XXX: Family Law This module deals with major issues in family law including divorce and separation, child custody and access, division of property, continuing support, and the intergenerational ramifications of family law. It addresses techniques for conducting intake interviews, issue spotting and developing a theory of the case. Various

processes for disputes, such as negotiation, use of collaborative law, mediation, arbitration and litigation are addressed, including the impact of these processes on all parties to the case.

JUR XXX: Civil Procedure This module provides hands-on practice-based exposure to the Rules of Civil Procedure through interactive exercises, which include drafting and preparing pleadings and motion materials. These activities are designed to ensure students properly understand the difference between pleadings and evidence, and how to properly construct a claim with consideration efficiency and effectiveness. The module also includes practical applications of eDiscovery using the Sedona principles and the Electronic Discovery Reference Model (EDRM) framework.

JUR XXX: Social Innovation and the Law Societal change is demanding innovation in the delivery of legal services, interaction with clients and the development of new technological tools. In this module the emphasis is on recognizing who is the client, identifying problems and generating multi-faceted solutions. Students gain reinforcement in basic concepts in file management, communication and interviewing, problem recognition, data analytics, and knowledge generation software. They are also introduced to the fundamentals of design thinking.

JUR XXX: Coding Bootcamp This intensive five-day bootcamp focuses on several coding languages. Students gain a quick overview of HTML and CSS, the backbones of all websites, and spend time learning the fundamentals of Python, now widely used for applications in data analytics. After gaining basic proficiency in this program, students use it to complete a group project. They are also introduced to tests that help them assess their own proficiency in the fundamentals of legal technology.

JUR XXX: Advocacy and ADR This module introduces students to a diversity of processes for advocacy and alternative dispute resolution, including negotiation, mediation, third-party neutral evaluation, mini-trials, and judicial settlement conferences. Students explore questions of fit between the type of a dispute and choice of resolution process, critically assessing potential reforms designed to ensure access to affordable legal services. The potential for new technologies to contribute to online dispute resolution strategies is also addressed.

JUR XXX: Wills and Estates This module covers the basic legal principles and rules of succession and estate planning. Students come to appreciate the intersections between this field and the areas of trust, insurance, and tax as well as health law issues such as capacity and decision-making. They examine wills and estate documents and, through simulated client interactions, gain experience in engaging in conversations around estate planning including asset identification, designating powers of attorney and related matters such as digital rights upon death.

JUR XXX: Legal Innovation in today's legal environment encompasses technological, business and social innovation. This module focuses on developing skills in legal project management, legal analytics, and legal process engineering while allowing students to apply these skills in a project that stresses one or more of the three types of innovation mentioned above while gaining their Six Sigma yellow belt. The goal is to enhance students' capacity and ability to evoke change in the delivery of legal services.

JUR XXX: IP and Privacy This module discusses the private and public legal frameworks governing piracy, copyright and trademarks, as well as privacy and cyber-crime in Canada and other jurisdictions. Current issues and problems related to privacy such as online commerce, social media, cyber-bullying, the workplace, national security, law enforcement, genetics, health care and freedom of information are analyzed to understand the role of privacy in an increasingly data-driven world.

JUR XXX: Access to Justice Solutions In this module, students learn to identify barriers to justice and critically evaluate solutions. Using a comparative approach, international solutions (including in other sectors e.g. access to health, access to banking) are explored and global similarities identified. Students distill this learning into a toolbox of approaches which, using an emphasis on accessible technology, they then use to develop local solutions to make legal services more affordable for individuals and organizations of limited means.

JUR XXX: Professional Placement Students participate in a semester-long placement to further develop and apply practice-ready skills essential for success. There will be a variety of settings: private practice, in-house legal department, government or legal clinic. During the placement, students participate in regular professional development sessions connected with the program, submit reflective assignments and engage in facilitated discussions highlighting the skills and training they have gained.

JUR XXX: EQ/CQ Bootcamp Living and working in a global, multicultural and diverse context demands an awareness of the impact of emotions and cultural outlook on our work. In particular, being able to recognize and understand the impact of one's own emotions and identifying and addressing cultural biases is critical to the success

of all projects. In this intensive five-day bootcamp, Juris Doctor students explore and experience vital emotional and cultural competencies for optimal personal and group success.

JUR XXX: Global Civil Society and the Law This course will look alternative sources of law in a global context including beyond the state. Students will be challenged to examine how legally-trained professionals navigate the space between formal and informal processes for rule generation and application. The course will examine grievance mechanisms and the processes of conflict resolution. Skills acquired include project management, campaigning and advocacy, networking and communication through social media and writing policy briefs and media releases.

JUR XXX: Real Estate Law This course analyzes the legal requirements imposed by the Registry Act, the Land Titles Act, land and title insurance, and how these requirements shape the lawyer's role in helping clients navigate the issues surrounding title to land. Also examined are the major changes in real estate practice due to technology and the fact that it is essential to understand the process that technology has replaced so that practitioners can ensure successful outcomes for their clients.

JUR XXX: Labour and Employment Law The forces of globalization, technological change, organizational restructuring, and the expansion of capital markets continue to transform the nature of work and the role and power of labour market actors. The course reviews the common law and statutory rules pertaining to employment in both unionized and non-unionized settings. It explores the scope of the law, and how the rights and responsibilities of employees, employers and unions are construed, and are evolving, in the "new economy".

JUR XXX: Advanced Corporate Law This course tracks the life cycle of a Canadian corporation from incorporation, organization, structure, governance, mergers and dissolution. Students acquire the understanding and background to ensure that they have the ability to incorporate a Canadian company, address critical issues around structure, governance requirements and the ultimate merger and dissolution of companies, and are able to review due diligence issues that arise in this process.

JUR XXX: Inter-Disciplinary Lawyering Professionals are increasingly being asked to collaborate across conventional disciplinary borders. This course analyzes the practical challenges facing these collaborative groups as they work through multi-faceted issues that involve expertise in areas within and beyond the law, such as business, technology, science, medicine, social work and psychology. Students will learn how to identify and integrate relevant expertise from such areas to solve complex legal problems using skills of communication, networking and teamwork.

JUR XXX: Environmental Law Students reconcile the objectives of environmental protection with local advocacy. Through non-traditional (including Indigenous) approaches to environmental education, they learn to be advocates by coming to understand how to support policies and legislation that require making difficult policy choices about protection. Students work with national and provincial legislation, the common law and regulatory prosecution related to air, land, and water, conservation, biotechnology and extractive industries to study the legal effect of these policy choices.

JUR XXX: Children and the Law This course deals with how childhood is conceptualized, constructed and regulated through statutory, common law and social science frameworks. It addresses issues surrounding conception, such as multiple parenthood, biological vs. non-biological parents, the role of Assisted Reproductive Technologies (ART) and their impact on parentage. It also deals with domestic and international adoptions, child protection, criminal justice, child labour, childhood and diversity, education, participation and empowerment, and the impact of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

JUR XXX: Immigration Law This course explores historical, economic, policy, and human rights factors framing the theory and practice of immigration law in Canada and the role that lawyers play in the administration of both domestic and international immigration regimes. Topics examined include inland processing, refugee determination hearings, inadmissibility determinations, detention reviews, removals, and humanitarian and compassionate considerations. Students will also examine jurisprudence produced through the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, judicial review, and significant international and comparative decisions.

JUR XXX: Criminal Procedure This course begins with a survey of the source and limits of police investigative powers, focusing on the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and motions for the exclusion of illegally obtained evidence. The course examines pre-trial processes, including bail, (non-) disclosure, crown and judicial conferences, and election and plea (bargaining) before moving on to jury selection, trial procedure,

examination/cross-examination of witnesses, and sentencing. Attention is also paid to appeals and select specialized court proceedings.

JUR XXX: Tax Law and Practice This course introduces tax principles in the Income Tax Act, as they pertain to four major types of taxpayers/entities: individuals, corporations, trusts, and partnerships. Topics covered include residency, employment and business income/deductions, capital transactions, dividends, the theory of integration, corporation-specific transactions (rollovers and reorganizations), and civil & criminal penalties. Also included is an overview of international tax principles (tax jurisdiction, tax treaties, transfer pricing, and e-commerce). In addition, application of AI in tax is addressed.

JUR XXX: Evidence This course imparts the basic principles of evidence law in the civil and criminal context, including hearsay and its exceptions, as well as relevant implications of opinion, character, and expert evidence. Students learn about the distinctive ways that legal processes treat matters of evidence and the connections between rules of evidence and rules of civil and criminal procedure. They also look at the growing role of electronic evidence and the use of social media as evidence.

JUR XXX: Law and Injustice Law is often implicated in injustice, rationalizing inequalities, domination, cruelty, and neglect. And yet, marginalized groups continue to turn to law as an instrument of social change, sometimes successfully. This course explores the nature and experience of injustice through its tense relationship to law. Relying on a mixture of theoretical perspectives on law as well as experiential learning modules, it equips students to think about law and justice in creative ways.

JUR XXX: Advanced Legal Solutions This project-based course builds on the thinking and skills developed in Access to Justice Solutions during fourth semester. Students break into teams to develop and refine a solution to a challenge set by outside organizations and subject-matter experts. After building a prototype of their solution, the student teams participate in a pitch session in front of external experts, law firms, government and community representatives who assess the feasibility of their work.

JUR XXX: Private International Law Students explore the international context for relationships between private parties across jurisdictions. In doing so they gain an introductory understanding of the origin of and responses to conflicts of law and the role of international dispute resolution processes, while engaging in analysis of issues relating to topics such as merchant law, jurisdiction, and human rights. They also have opportunities to apply their learning through preparation of an international dispute resolution file, and related activities.

JUR XXX: Public International Law This course sheds light on the international legal system governing the rights and obligations of sovereign states in their interactions with one another and with non-state entities, such as international organizations and non-state actors. Students learn how international law is generated, the distinctive elements of international legal reasoning, and the manner in which international law interacts with domestic (particularly Canadian) law through legal reasoning, treaty negotiation, custom as well as “soft law.”

3. THE FACILITIES PLAN

The temporary Ryerson Law School space (Stage 1) and the new permanent space will reflect Ryerson’s commitment to fostering student-centered pedagogical approaches to legal education. Both spaces will be configured in a way that facilitates group-based learning while still allowing individual students the opportunity to work on their own.

3.1 Stage 1

In the first phase of its development, the Ryerson Law School will be housed on the fourth floor (with some use of the third floor) of the Podium building (POD), which will be repurposed to temporarily accommodate the first two cohorts of students in 2018-19, 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. This space is being made available as Ryerson’s Daphne Cockwell School of Nursing relocates to the Daphne Cockwell Health Sciences Complex, which is expected to be complete by July 2018.

The rollout of the program in Fall 2018 depends on space availability. If the space in POD is not ready in time for the Fall 2018 start, the new law school will require a space-related contingency plan. This would likely involve the use of rented space.

3.2 The New Space

It is anticipated that the Ryerson Law School will be housed in a brand new state-of-the-art facility designed with the needs of both students and faculty in mind to provide an optimal learning environment. Research on law school facilities in Canada and the United States indicates that for the size of law school being proposed there is an adequate number of classrooms, lecture halls, break out rooms, team-learning spaces, and other related facilities. All teaching and learning spaces will be fully equipped with the latest technology – they will be smart teaching and learning spaces.

Once approval is granted for Ryerson to establish a law school, negotiating will begin for the new space with development partners in the vicinity of the university. Time is of the essence but Ryerson's recent record with respect to construction and with respect to integrating the university in the surrounding cityscape demonstrates a capacity to achieve timely, efficient results.

4. THE LAW LIBRARY PLAN

Ryerson's Legal Knowledge Centre and Commons (LKCC) will be an innovative, student-centred facility that supports the Juris Doctor program's teaching, learning and research needs in multi-faceted ways. Its collection development policy will reflect the program curriculum, and it will have sufficient staff to provide services that support the pedagogical and research requirements of both students and faculty.

The LKCC will be integrated into the overall learning experience of students. It will build on the traditional academic skills and knowledge that have always been at the heart of legal education by helping to develop:

- an ability to use innovative and entrepreneurial approaches to develop better legal solutions – including an awareness of how modern business techniques and technology can lead change;
- the interpersonal and leadership skills necessary to lead and succeed, whether working in teams, with other disciplines or across jurisdictional boundaries; and
- the skills needed to work nationally and globally both inside and outside the legal profession.

The LKCC will be in keeping with trends throughout academic libraries worldwide, and will be supplemented by substantial access to resources in virtual space as well as new ways of using library spaces. Acquiring and maintaining both print and virtual collections including solutions-based software to support the innovative approach that is central to the Ryerson Law School's program, the LKCC will be an integral part of an active law school dedicated to experiential learning. And it will be an important support to the ongoing scholarship required by, and central to, the work of the school's faculty, students and administration.

Subject to final determination in a feasibility study as to which is better, the LKCC will be temporarily housed in either the current Ryerson Library and/or the Student Learning Centre. The facility will have sufficient space to house the print collection, including core reference materials and course reserves. The LKCC facility will also provide ready access to electronic resources. This will include computer stations for individual students as well as large screen monitors for student "firms" to work at and on which to view legal resources from around the country and internationally as a team.

To fully maximize the use of all these resources, the LKCC will be staffed by Information Professionals and student research assistants. It will have its own Head Law Librarian and library staff who will be there to meet the needs of faculty and students.

5. FACULTY AND STAFF

5.1 Teaching and Mentorship

Once the program is fully implemented, the curriculum will be delivered by 15 tenure-stream members as well as a number of part-time practitioners whose work represents a total of 4.6 relevant full-time equivalents and 22 mentors.

Practitioner Teaching - Delivery of the bootcamps will be by practitioners. In the first year, the six courses Contract Law, Torts Law, Property Law, Criminal Law, Constitutional Law and Adm. and Reg. Law will run in 12 sections each employing a CUPE member to teach three breakout hours per week. Meanwhile the other four first year courses will run in a total of 8 sections, each employing a practitioner to teach three breakout hours a week. In the second year, seven practitioners will deliver three hours a week during a semester. In the third year, one practitioner will deliver a section of the electives in each semester.

Mentorship - The role of mentors in all three years will be conceptually separate from practitioner teaching, although in the second year the practitioners involved in teaching will serve in a dual capacity. In all three years, mentors will oversee 21 students per semester.

5.2 Administration and Staff

(a) **The Dean's Office** will comprise the Dean; an Assistant to the Dean; a Continuing Legal Education Coordinator; a Director of Alumni Relations, Marketing & Communications; an Administrative Support staff member; an Associate Dean of Facilities, Finance & HR; a Finance Administrative Assistant; and a Coordinator of Facilities, Finance & HR.

(b) **The Student Services Office** will comprise an Associate Dean, Students; an Assistant to the Associate Dean; an Admissions & Recruitment Coordinator; a Program Director; two Assistants; a Career Development Director; and two Placement Coordinators.

(c) **The Information Technology unit** will comprise an IT Technical staff member and a Webmaster/Social Media Assistant.

(d) **The Legal Knowledge Centre and Commons** (initial staffing plan) consists of a Head Law Librarian, a law librarian, and four library support staff.

6. PEER REVIEW REPORT

REVIEWER: W. Brent Cotter, Q.C, Professor of Law and former Dean, College of Law, University of Saskatchewan

INTRODUCTION

I was engaged to conduct an external peer review of the Proposed Law School and Juris Doctor Program at Ryerson University. For the purposes of this review I received materials from Ryerson University, made a one day site visit to Ryerson to meet with proponents of the proposal and University leaders, tour the University and proposed facilities for the law school, and to provide comments and feedback on the proposal and to provide a well-informed basis for the peer review.

A. OBJECTIVES

i) Consistency with Institutional Mission

While the documents prepared to describe and support Ryerson's proposal to establish a law school focus predominantly on the case for a new law school at Ryerson, and less on the philosophy and goals of Ryerson University as a whole, my own familiarity with Ryerson University, the meetings with University leaders and aspects of the law school proposal identify clearly the type of University Ryerson is and seeks to be. The 2014 Ryerson University Academic Plan describes the university's Vision in the following terms:

Ryerson's Vision

Ryerson will be Canada's leading comprehensive innovation university, recognized for its high-quality career-related and professional bachelor, master's and doctoral programs and relevant scholarly, research and creative activities. It will be a global leader in interdisciplinary, entrepreneurial zone learning. Ryerson's students, graduates and faculty will contribute significantly to Ontario's and Canada's social, cultural and economic well-being.

Ryerson will provide students with the best learning experience, leading to great careers and engaged graduates who enable change. The university, through the sustained work of faculty and staff, is continuing on a transformative path to meet the changing needs of students and helping to shape Canada's future generation of change-makers and advocacy leaders, innovators and entrepreneurs.

The proposal for the establishment of a law school at Ryerson is fully consistent with this Vision and has clearly been developed with a Ryerson-specific law school in contemplation. The program focuses significantly on a program of education and training for law students that will prepare them for career opportunities in ways that will be responsive to an evolving world that will require graduates to have career-ready legal skills and the ability to adapt to multidisciplinary, entrepreneurial, advanced technology environments. Throughout the proposal this mission is at the forefront of the proponents' conception of a new law program at Ryerson. It is fully consistent with the Institution's Mission and Academic Plans.

ii) Clarity and Appropriateness of Program Requirements

This proposal is in some respects unique to Ryerson's own extensive experience in the development of a 'program'. Since "law" as a separate academic discipline does not presently exist at Ryerson University, the proponents have had to develop a new program borrowing from the expertise in other moderately comparable programs at Ryerson as well as the approaches adopted at other Canadian and US law schools, all with an eye to Ryerson's own unique mission. All of this occurs in the context of an understandable desire to ensure that the program also meets the requirements of the legal profession so that its graduates will be able to pursue legal careers. This has required the designers of the program to meet a variety of goals in the design of the program.

In this work, the Originating Committee has also been attentive to the balanced model of legal education advocated by the influential 2007 Carnegie Foundation Report on Legal Education, in which its authors argue for a combination of rigorous academic study, the learning of practical lawyering skills and the development of character in accordance with the ethical norms of the profession.

The approach has been to ensure that all or nearly all of these 'constituencies' expectations are met. This has meant that the Program Requirements of the Federation of Law Societies are satisfied, ensuring that graduates will be able to enter the Canadian legal profession. It has also meant that the program is interwoven with significant practical learning opportunities, designed to strengthen students' skills in areas relevant to the future of law, as the proponents rightly envision. In full fidelity to the University's vision, the proposed program advances career readiness and, in particular, career readiness associated with a world in which law and the delivery of legal services will be dramatically different from the present models. A significant component of this latter objective is a full-term placement of senior students in a work environment.

As well, the program, consistent with Ryerson's educational approach, is integrative '*across courses*', strengthening the pedagogical linkages within the program as a whole. The proposal does this better than any existing curriculum within Canadian legal education.

One of the consequences of this need to meet multiple objectives – the legal profession's requirements, the Ryerson vision of career-ready graduates, and an integrated program, all within an orientation toward the future of law, has resulted in a more limited set of optional or elective course offerings than is available at Canadian law schools of similar size. This does not compromise the program requirements but does impose limits on the flexibility available to students with respect to their learning choices at the margins of the program. This limitation may be able to be moderated over time with the addition of new options for students, but this should be done with attention to Ryerson's mandate in order to avoid the

development of a smorgasbord of course offerings that could undermine the highly co-ordinated nature of the Originating Committee's proposed curriculum.

The program's requirements and learning outcomes are clearly in line with Ryerson's own Degree Level Expectations.

iii) Appropriateness of Degree Nomenclature

The Juris Doctor degree is a sui generis nomenclature within North American universities. Historically delivered through a program that was not a direct entry degree program, it was nevertheless referred to as a Bachelor of Laws degree (LL.B). In the last decade, all Canadian common law schools have amended their degree nomenclature to the J.D. nomenclature to better reflect the non-direct entry nature of their programs, comparable to the programs at US law schools and to acknowledge the fact that nearly all entrants into the program possess at least one university degree. While the JD language is an anomaly, it is now the standard across common law Canada and is appropriate for Ryerson's proposed program.

B. ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

The adequacy and appropriateness of Ryerson's proposed Admission Requirements for the JD program should be assessed in two somewhat interrelated contexts. First, will there be a demand for the program sufficient to attract a significant number of high quality applicants of the kind that Ryerson sees as its target market? Second, are the admission requirements sufficiently rigorous to ensure that the candidates who are admitted to the program will be capable of succeeding in the program?

With respect to the first question there is substantial evidence that the demand for an opportunity to study law in common law Canada, in Ontario and in Toronto is very high. Ryerson has done extensive research on this point to ensure itself that the applicant pool will be large and strong. Canada continues to have a high demand:supply ratio when it comes to JD programs, at or near the highest in the common law world, and this demand is likely to continue for the foreseeable future. The level of demand is consistent across the country, and the relatively slow growth in law school places in the metropolitan Toronto area, over the last 20 years, when compared to its significant population growth, virtually assures Ryerson of a large and well qualified applicant pool. Two other features of Ryerson's approach supplement this. First, Ryerson is intending to keep law school tuition below the Ontario law school average and well below the tuition level of the two other Toronto law schools. While the tuition cost of a law school education at Ryerson will still be high, the University will be at a competitive advantage over other proximate law schools, a factor in attracting applicants to its program. Second, Ryerson proposes to undertake an extensive, holistic approach to candidate selection, a proposal that exceeds the commitment of any other Canadian law school with respect to candidate selection. While this is a demanding undertaking and difficult to sustain, the approach alone will attract many candidates, a number of whom will be the types of candidates that Ryerson's proposal targets. There is no doubt that there will be a large pool of qualified applicants for first year places at Ryerson's law school.

With respect to the second question – quality of students – Ryerson proposes to rely on the standard admissions criteria – Grade Point Averages and Law School Admission scores – but significantly supplemented by more subjective criteria – personal statements, examination of applicants' personal histories and in particular the requirement of an on-line applicant interview. The latter initiative – unique among existing Canadian law schools – has the potential, if done well, to enable Ryerson to attract qualified candidates who are also closely aligned with Ryerson's mission for the law school – an orientation to law practice for the people, post-modern approaches to law, an orientation to career-ready graduates and a commitment to attracting a law student population that is more representative of the community. Provided that attention is paid to candidates with sufficient intellectual ability – the study of law is intellectually rigorous – the additional criteria incorporated into its 'holistic' process will enhance

its admissions approach and potentially make a meaningful contribution to efforts to make the legal profession more representative and more responsive to the legal needs of ordinary Canadians.

Taken together, this approach to Admissions will put in place more than adequate admission requirements.

C. STRUCTURE

This criterion is closely tied to the Program proposed by Ryerson, which is reviewed in the following section. With respect to the Program Structure in general, Ryerson proposes a JD degree program of three years' duration, with predominantly in-person learning, that is the equivalent attendance of six semesters of law school education. This is the national standard, and is part of the Federation of Law Societies' 'National Requirement' for the JD degree to be recognized in Canada's common law provinces, thereby enabling graduates to enter the post-law school pipeline to qualify as practicing lawyers. The proposed program borrows from law school programs in the US that are beginning to emphasize practical learning imbedded in the JD program itself, including a concentrated placement in one semester of the final year of law school. This requirement makes the Ryerson program different from than most Canadian law school curricula, where such placements or experiential learning opportunities are optional for students. Ryerson has intentionally designed its program to link its classroom learning with these placements and experiential learning opportunities and in this respect it is both carefully thought out and sound. That said, it is likely that the details of this more imaginative structure to its program will require modification to ensure that it fully achieves its objectives.

In my opinion, while this approach is different from most law schools, the structure is sound. Many other Canadian law schools are evolving their programs in this direction and the proposed Ryerson program is only slightly ahead of the curve among those law schools who are seeing the need to more fully integrate academic legal education with hands-on experience.

D. PROGRAM CONTENT

The question of Program Content needs to be considered in the context of two complementary objectives that a Ryerson Law School curriculum must meet. First, the originators of the Ryerson law school proposal are determined that Ryerson will educate law students differently in order that they will 'do law differently'. This requires that the program content be designed to reflect this orientation. Hence there is significant emphasis on the use of mentors in regular courses, emphasis on the link between law and justice, emphasis on the link between law and technology and the requirement that students be exposed to law in real world contexts through placements and experiential learning. Second, there is the need – an imperative for the Ryerson program to be credible and in demand – that the program meet the minimum curriculum requirements of the Federation of Law Societies so that the JD will be accredited, enabling its graduates to pursue legal careers in common law Canada. This means that the Ryerson program must offer courses in all required subject areas required by the Federation. The Federation requirements draw heavily on three Carnegie Foundation's three orientations – academic learning, learning in real life contexts and reflective professionalism. Ryerson's proposal explicitly embraces this orientation, so there is no philosophical divide between the Ryerson proposed program and the Federation's requirements.

But the more that must be done within the three-year program, the less space there is for anything else, and the less room for error. Subject to three observations and recommendations I set out below, in my opinion Ryerson's program content meets its two thematic objectives, and the program proposal is sound, and it will meet Federation requirements.

Observations and Recommendations

1. The program proposal that I was asked to review placed nearly all of the substantive academic learning in the first-year program, along with two perspectives courses and the Professional

Responsibility requirement. Associated with this approach, and important to Ryerson's objectives, one hour per week of each course would be a more practical engagement with a practicing lawyer mentor, dedicated to an examination of the ways in which the academic subject matter has real world application. One of the consequences of this organization is that it provides limited – perhaps truncated – time for students to learn and digest the content of several foundational courses. In addition, law schools generally conceive of the first-year substantive law courses as a central place in the curriculum to assist students in developing the skill of rigorous academic analysis, one of the three Carnegie Foundation themes. My recommendation – shared with the Originating Committee – is that adjustments to this structure should be made to provide greater teaching time for these foundational courses. This might require that some be moved to the second year of study, or that some non-substantive law courses be consolidated.

2. Associated with the first recommendation, I suggest that the engagement of practicing lawyer mentors be incorporated more gradually into the first-year program. The opportunity for students to engage with lawyers who are committed to enhancing students' learning experiences is wonderful. But for meaningful engagement, it will be important that students know 'a bit of law' first. This learning will take a period of some weeks, and the mentored learning will be enriched if students have digested some law before this engagement with mentors. My recommendation is that the use of the mentors begin to take place part way through each course and, if feasible, be increased from that point forward as each term proceeds. This will make the engagements more valuable for the students and more fulfilling for the instructors.

3. One of the common occurrences associated with the evolution of law school curricula is the gradual expansion of elective course offerings, usually associated with the academic interests of the professors. This is generally a benefit to students, provided that the set of offerings does not evolve into a smorgasbord that results in a loss of focus for the overall program. This is particularly important for Ryerson's program, designed as it is with some very specific pedagogical objectives in mind. It will be important, going forward, that the gradual development of new offerings in its program be disciplined, and as consistent as possible with the law school's vision and objectives.

E. MODE OF DELIVERY

As noted, the program will be delivered in ways that are largely consistent with those of existing Canadian common law schools. This includes the equivalent of a three-year law program, with primarily in-person classroom and seminar sessions, over the course of most of the three-year program. Ryerson's proposal differs in two significant ways from most other Canadian law programs in its mode of delivery. While all or nearly all JD programs in Canada provide some linkages between classroom learning and the practice of law, Ryerson intends to do this in a comprehensive, strategic way, beginning in the first term of law school and continuing, in various forms, throughout the curriculum. Second, the program builds in a required 'Professional Placement' term for all students in the third year. With the exception of Lakehead University, where such a placement is required to fulfil its approval as an equivalent to the Law Practice Program, I am unaware of any other Canadian law school program that take this approach – a full term required placement.

These unique aspects of the program require significantly greater effort in building partnerships, obtaining commitments from many practicing lawyers and ensuring that adequate and consistent assessments of students are in place. Ryerson is confident that these components will be able to be achieved, and considerable efforts have already been made to do so. This will enable the program to meet its more visionary objective of 'doing law school differently'. And it offers the potential to launch a law school program that could become a model for others who wish to link more closely the academic and law practice dimensions of legal education.

The proposed Mode of Delivery of the JD program is sound.

F. ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING AND LEARNING

The assessment of students will largely follow the approaches used at other Canadian law schools. There is a clear intention to move away from the use of 100% final examinations in most or all courses. While Ryerson will undertake this to a greater extent than other Canadian law schools, it is consistent with the trend in Canadian legal education. It is also consistent with Ryerson's objective of weaving academic and practice components of learning into each course, commonly requiring assessment of multiple components of a course. The assessment of student achievements in placements is also a challenge, but law schools have faced this challenge for at least the last generation and have found ways of adequately assessing student performance. Given Ryerson's strong commitment to the incorporation of professional placements in its program, I am confident that it will ensure adequate assessment of student performance in these areas.

My understanding is that the assessment of teaching will be undertaken within the rubric that presently exists at Ryerson, including rules and regulations of the University and as articulated in collective agreements, which will apply to the professoriate at Ryerson's law school.

G. SUPPLEMENTARY OBSERVATIONS

i) Physical Premises

I would add this comment, which is perhaps associated with 'Mode of Delivery'. While law schools are becoming increasingly technological, there is still a great need for a physical presence for the law school. This presence includes the basics of a law library, reasonable proximity to classrooms where law is taught, a central administration of the law school where services for law students can be accessed, and a locus where students can engage with and learn from one another. As a new law school, Ryerson has the basics in place on a temporary basis to meet these physical requirements. These requirements are adequate temporarily, but only barely so. Most of Canada's law schools, including newly established law schools, have or have acquired - within a short time after their establishment - separate self-enclosed physical premises in which the law school functions. Ryerson's university footprint is unique in Canada and does not easily lend itself to a 'greenfield' development for the physical premises of its law school. But it will be important to ensure that adequate physical premises that the law school can call home are put in place in a timely way. The Proposal sets out the time frame within which this will be achieved. In my view, it is important that Ryerson commit to meeting this timetable. This will be important for the identity that Ryerson imaginatively contemplates for its law school and will help to ensure that it will garner respect as a very good law school - a law school for the future.

ii) Initial Program Leadership and Founding Faculty

As with any new program, it will be critical that the founding leadership and faculty be fully committed to the vision and objectives that form the foundation of Ryerson's new law school. There is a strong magnetism toward standard conceptions of legal education, evolving as they are, and it will be important for Ryerson to select law school leadership and faculty who embrace the contemplated objectives, champion them and build the program in ways that best achieve them, not only initially but over the long term. Those new law schools that did so and remained true to their vision over the long term have been successful; those who did not do so tend to be less successful.

iii) The Quality of the Submission

The proposal to establish a new professional degree program is a challenge for any University. This is partly because the proposal must satisfy the institution's requirements, as well as the unique vision an institution may have for its students - as Ryerson does - a vision that may not always fit into the standard conception of a professional program. As well, the program must meet the professional requirements for

such programs, established by external professional bodies, in order that its graduates will be able to become qualified to work in the professional discipline.

As a consequence, Ryerson, and the proponents of the Proposal, have set for themselves an unusual and difficult task. My reading of the Proposal and my site visit have satisfied me that they have delivered on this task in a remarkable way. Significant background work has been undertaken to make the case for the need of a law school in the metropolitan Toronto area. Research has been undertaken on ways in which new models of legal education may better serve the needs of citizens in the future. A series of consultations with various 'communities of interest' has been undertaken. All of this background work is of exceptional quality and comprehensiveness.

A program has been carefully designed to ensure compliance with the legal profession's requirements while at the same time advancing the Vision of Ryerson and the objectives of a program that will prepare graduates of the program to address society's legal needs of the future. Physical facilities have been identified for the home of the law school, initially on a temporary basis and ultimately at a permanent location. While the task of fulfilling these objectives lies ahead, the Proposal is an impressive roadmap for its achievement.

H. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Ryerson is proposing the establishment of a law school that builds upon the solid academic traditions of existing law school programs, but contemplates a different, supplementary objective – a focus on the future of law practice, and a model of educating law students that will prepare them for that future, all within the context of Ryerson's own vision.

The Proposal makes the case for, and advances a sound model of, the achievement of this vision of a 'different' law school. It proposes a model of a law school for which there is room within the constellation of legal education in Canada, and in Toronto specifically.

Subject to a few qualified observations noted above, it is my view that the proposal meets all of the requirements of Ryerson's Academic assessments, and should receive approval.

7. ORIGINATING UNIT'S RESPONSE TO THE PEER REVIEW REPORT

The Peer Review report is structured using the six evaluation criteria mandated by the University's Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Program: Objectives, Admission Requirements, Structure, Program Content, Mode of Delivery, and Assessment of Teaching and Learning.

Objectives

The one significant qualification Dr. Cotter makes in this section is with respect to electivity: "One of the consequences of this need to meet multiple objectives – the legal profession's requirements, the Ryerson vision of career-ready graduates, and an integrated program, all within an orientation toward the future of law, has resulted in a more limited set of optional or elective course offerings than is available at Canadian law schools of similar size. . . This limitation may be able to be moderated over time with the addition of new options for students, but this should be done with attention to Ryerson's mandate in order to avoid the development of a smorgasbord of course offerings that could undermine the highly co-ordinated nature of the Originating Committee's proposed curriculum." The Committee notes this qualification, and undertakes to do its best to provide support and encouragement to future administrators of the program to maintain fidelity to the curricular vision, and especially to ensure that the evolution of curricular offerings does not dilute or depart from that vision.

Admission Requirements

Dr. Cotter states, “there is substantial evidence that the demand for an opportunity to study law in common law Canada, in Ontario and in Toronto is very high. Ryerson has done extensive research on this point to ensure itself that the applicant pool will be large and strong.” He also spends some time discussing both the standard and non-standard aspects of the proposed admissions process, paying particular attention to our proposal for a mandatory online interview of all applicants. “The latter initiative,” Dr. Cotter notes, “unique among existing Canadian law schools – has the potential, if done well, to enable Ryerson to attract qualified candidates who are also closely aligned with Ryerson’s mission for the law school.”

Structure

In analyzing the structure of our proposed program, Dr. Cotter spends some time discussing the required semester-long placement in the program, which reflects what is being done in a variety of law schools in the US, where placements or other experiential learning opportunities are mandatory. Dr. Cotter voices general approval for this route. He goes on to voice a minor qualification: “That said, it is likely that the details of this more imaginative structure to its program will require modification to ensure that it fully achieves its objectives.” The committee interprets this statement to mean that the exact specification of the placement course, as currently outlined in our proposal, may need continual refinement once students are actually enrolled, given the need to ensure that students’ placement experiences satisfy the intended role of this curricular component in the overall aims of the program. The Committee notes this qualification, and will ensure that future administrators of the program are aware that it has been made at this juncture in the program’s development.

Program Content

Dr. Cotter’s three recommendations are as follows:

- i) “The program proposal that I was asked to review placed nearly all of the substantive academic learning in the first-year program . . . One of the consequences of this organization is that it provides limited – perhaps truncated – time for students to learn and digest the content of several foundational courses.” On this point, he concludes: “My recommendation – shared with the Originating Committee – is that adjustments to this structure should be made to provide greater teaching time for these foundational courses.” On this first recommendation, the committee was able to take Dr. Cotter’s remarks made during his visit into account, and we have substantially restructured the delivery of the six first year courses – Contract Law, Torts Law, Property Law, Criminal Law, Constitutional Law and Adm. and Reg. Law – by expanding the student contact hours per week from 3 to 6.
- ii) His second recommendation is related to the first. “I suggest that the engagement of practicing lawyer mentors be incorporated more gradually into the first-year program. . . My recommendation is that the use of the mentors begin to take place part way through each course and, if feasible, be increased from that point forward as each term proceeds. This will make the engagements more valuable for the students and more fulfilling for the instructors.” In terms of this second recommendation, the Committee undertakes to relay to the administrators of the program the possible pedagogical advantages of ‘back-loading’ the practitioner-led breakout hours in all ten of first year courses. As implied by Dr. Cotter, this change will not necessarily affect the total number of hours that practitioners are employed in any course, merely shifting the timing of these hours during the term
- iii) His third recommendation returns to a qualification he has already made in the first section of the report. “One of the common occurrences associated with the evolution of law school curricula is the gradual expansion of elective course offerings, usually associated with the academic interests of the professors. This is generally a benefit to students, provided that the set of offerings does not evolve into a smorgasbord that results in a loss of focus for the overall program. This is particularly important for Ryerson’s program, designed as it is with some very specific pedagogical objectives in mind. It will be

important, going forward, that the gradual development of new offerings in its program be disciplined, and as consistent as possible with the law school's vision and objectives." For our response to Dr. Cotter's third recommendation, see our comments in the Objectives section above.

Mode of Delivery

In this section Dr. Cotter emphasizes the connections between learning and professional practice. "While all or nearly all JD programs in Canada provide some linkages between classroom learning and the practice of law," he notes, "Ryerson intends to do this in a comprehensive, strategic way...Second, the program builds in a required 'Professional Placement' term for all students in the third year...These unique aspects of the program require significantly greater effort in building partnerships, obtaining commitments from many practicing lawyers and ensuring that adequate and consistent assessments of students are in place. Ryerson is confident that these components will be able to be achieved, and considerable efforts have already been made to do so."

Assessment of Teaching and Learning

With regard to assessment of students, Dr. Cotter notes that "it will largely follow the approaches used at other Canadian law schools. There is a clear intention to move away from the use of 100% final examinations in most or all courses. While Ryerson will undertake this to a greater extent than other Canadian law schools, it is consistent with the trend in Canadian legal education." The committee members are grateful for the recognition of the need for, and desirability of, innovation in student evaluation and assessment.

Concluding Observations

Dr. Cotter makes several concluding observations: one on the prospective physical space for the law school on the Ryerson campus, the second on founding leadership and faculty of the law school and the third dealing with the submission itself. In terms of the first two observations, the originating committee defers to the Dean of Record to discuss the commitments Ryerson is making, both with respect to physical space and to the nature of the founding leadership of the proposed law school. On the third observation, the committee members would like to express appreciation for Dr. Cotter's thoughtful, supportive and encouraging evaluation.

8. RESPONSE OF DEAN OF RECORD (Dr. Anver Saloojee)

In my capacity as Dean of Record of Ryerson's proposed Juris Doctor program, I would like to thank Dr. Cotter for his assessment of the program proposal and for the wide-ranging report he provided in his role as peer reviewer. In responding to his report, I have taken note of the Originating Committee's responses which cover the points related to the six evaluation criteria outlined in Ryerson's Policy 112: Objectives, Admission Requirements, Structure, Program Content, Mode of Delivery, and Assessment of Teaching and Learning.

In this letter I will concentrate on the one issue covered in this list where the Committee's response involved a substantive change to the proposal. I will also focus on two comments Dr. Cotter made in his supplementary observations. In both these cases, the Originating Committee members viewed the comments as being outside their purview.

The one response made by the Committee which involves a significant amendment to the proposal was with respect to the student contact hours associated with six core first-year courses – (1) Contract Law, (2) Torts Law, (3) Property Law, (4) Criminal Law, (5) Constitutional Law and (6) Adm. and Reg. Law. In the original version of the proposal provided to Dr. Cotter, all of these courses was presumed to run in two sections of 75 students each for three student contact hours a week during 11 weeks of a 12 week semester. Given the co-teaching model used in the first year of the program, this would have meant utilizing a tenure-stream faculty member in each section to teach two of the weekly student contact

hours and a practitioner to oversee breakout groups of 25 students in the third hour. Dr. Cotter recommended, and the Committee accepted, an increase from three to six student contact hours for each of these courses, which means utilizing the tenure-stream faculty member to teach an average of five of these weekly hours in each section and the practitioner to oversee breakout groups, again of 25 students, in the sixth hour. (Dr. Cotter suggested that the division of hours per week might change throughout the semester, with the practitioner's hours being concentrated near the end of the semester.) As Dean of Record, I concur with this change. I note that the alteration does not affect costing, since for RFA workload purposes each of these sections (now a total of six rather than three student contact hours per week) is still considered to be a single course.

In Dr. Cotter's supplementary observations, he comments on the timely provision of adequate physical premises:

Ryerson's university footprint is unique in Canada and does not easily lend itself to a 'greenfield' development for the physical premises of its law school. But it will be important to ensure that adequate physical premises that the law school can call home are put in place in a timely way. The Proposal sets out the time frame within which this will be achieved. In my view, it is important that Ryerson commit to meeting this timetable. This will be important for the identity that Ryerson imaginatively contemplates for its law school and will help to ensure that it will garner respect as a very good law school – a law school for the future.

Speaking on behalf of Ryerson and its administration, I note that the University takes very seriously the commitment it is making to provide first temporary facilities for the initial incoming years of students and then a permanent home that is fully in keeping with the innovative nature of the program. If for whatever reason the current plans for temporary space in the Podium building for the September 2018 start prove to be unworkable, other space (possibly rental) will be found in time for the arrival of faculty, staff and students. The permanent premises that will then be created to replace the temporary facilities will be a major addition to the Ryerson campus. These premises will include sufficient offices, classrooms, lecture halls and library to give the law school a distinctive place on the Ryerson campus.

Dr. Cotter's second advisory comment in his supplementary observations deals with the founding leadership and faculty of the law school:

As with any new program, it will be critical that the founding leadership and faculty be fully committed to the vision and objectives that form the foundation of Ryerson's new law school. There is a strong magnetism toward standard conceptions of legal education, evolving as they are, and it will be important for Ryerson to select law school leadership and faculty who embrace the contemplated objectives, champion them and build the program in ways that best achieve them, not only initially but over the long term. Those new law schools that did so and remained true to their vision over the long term have been successful; those who did not do so tend to be less successful.

As soon as the requisite approvals have been acquired, Ryerson's Provost has committed to appoint an Interim Dean as a formal decanal search for the inaugural Dean begins. It will be the responsibility of both the Interim Dean and inaugural Dean, in tandem with the Provost and President, to form committees to carry out the initial tenure stream faculty hiring as well as initiating the hiring of staff, beginning with two Associate Deans and Head Law Librarian in addition to staff members in charge of recruitment and admissions. Because of the inaugural Dean's pivotal role in the entire process of creating the Ryerson Law School, considerable consultations will take place both within Ryerson and in the broader community to find the exceptional individual who can carry forward the distinctive mandate of the Ryerson Law School and turn it into reality.

9. ASC EVALUATION

The Academic Standards Committee (ASC) recommends that a periodic program review be completed within five (5) years of the implementation of the program.

Recommendation:

That Senate approve the law program proposal as described in the agenda package, contingent on approval by the Federation of Law Societies of Canada, and contingent on the establishment of a Faculty of Law at Ryerson.

Respectfully Submitted,



Marcia Moshé, Chair for the Committee

ASC Members:

Charmaine Hack, Registrar

John Turtle, Secretary of Senate

Marcia Moshé, Chair and Interim Vice Provost Academic

Denise O'Neil Green, Assistant Vice President/Vice Provost, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

Anne Marie Singh, Faculty of Arts, Criminology

Anne-Marie Lee Loy, Faculty of Arts, English

James Nadler, Faculty of Communication & Design, Creative Industries

Wendy Freeman, Faculty of Communication & Design, Professional Communication

Thomas Tenkate, Faculty of Community Services, Occupational and Public Health

Annette Bailey, Faculty of Community Services, Nursing

Medhat Shehata, Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science, Civil Engineering

Donatus Oguamanam, Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science, Mechanical & Industrial Engineering

Vadim Bostan, Faculty of Science, Chemistry & Biology

Yi Feng, Ted Rogers School of Management, Finance and Accounting

Jim Tiessen, Ted Rogers School of Management, Health Services Management

Jay Wolofsky, Library

Linda Koechli, Chang School of Continuing Education

Dalia Hanna, Chang School of Continuing Education

**Report #W2017-4 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC): C. Evans
June 5, 2017**

1. For approval:
 - a) Draft Revision of Policy 152: Graduate Student Academic Consideration and Appeals
 - b) Departmental Council Bylaws for Philosophy
 - c) Department Council Bylaws for Criminology
2. Update regarding Recommendation #2 in the Ombudsperson's 2015-2016 Report on additional requirements to pass a course

Respectfully submitted,

C. Evans, Chair, Interim Provost & Vice President Academic
On behalf of the Committee:

M. Moshé, Interim Vice Provost Academic
H. Lane Vetere, Vice Provost Students
C. Hack, Registrar
J. Turtle, Secretary of Senate
T. Duever, Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Architectural Science
E. Kam, Faculty of Arts, Director, Learning & Teaching Committee
C. Schryer, Chair, Communication & Design
A. McWilliams, Faculty, Science
K. Kumar, Faculty, Faculty of Engineering & Architectural Science
A.M. Brinsmead, Chang School Program Director
W. Fraser, Undergraduate Student Senator
A. Latchman, Undergraduate Student Senator
P. Haastrap, Yeates School of Graduate Studies Student Senator

June 5, 2017
Notes for the Proposed Revision of
Policy 152: Graduate Student Academic Consideration and Appeals

Attached are the proposed *interim* changes to Policy 152: Graduate Student Academic Consideration and Appeals. These changes were recommended for approval by the Yeates School of Graduate Studies (YSGS) Program and Planning Committee (PPC) on March 9, 2017; YSGS Council on April 3, 2017; and the *ad hoc* Academic Policy Review Committee (APRC) on April 18, 2017. They were subsequently “tweaked” with minor formatting and wording changes, and the revised policy draft approved by AGPC at its May 11, 2017 meeting. If approved at the June 5 Senate meeting, it is expected that the changes will be implemented in Fall 2017.

Policy 152 had minor modifications implemented in September 2016, and is now one of five policies currently under review by the Academic Policy Review Committee (APRC). The review of all five policies is not going to be completed in time for implementation by Fall 2017, but more immediate, *interim* revisions to Policy 152 were deemed necessary, given that YSGS has undergone recent structural changes that render the current policy inconsistent with other operations; it is expected that further changes will be made as part of the APRC’s ongoing review. The current changes ensure Policy 152 better fits the needs of the current decentralized structure of graduate education, as recommended by the Task Force on Graduate Education Administration and Delivery in the following excerpt:

Section II.7.5 A Review of Policy 152 should be undertaken to create a parallel appeals process for graduate and undergraduate students. Namely we propose that graduate appeals go first to the program, then the relevant Faculty, and finally to the Senate Appeals Committee. Appeals from graduate students in interdisciplinary programs will continue to be submitted to YSGS. (2014)

The proposed revisions are a result of extensive consultations spanning close to two years with Graduate Program Directors, the advisory group to the YSGS Associate Dean, YSGS staff, graduate student focus groups, the RSU Student Issues and Advocacy Coordinator, the CESAR Student Rights Coordinator, other student representatives, and of course the APRC. In the drafting of these revisions, commitment was made to increasing fairness, clarity, transparency, and efficiency.

The primary changes include the decentralization of the handling of second-level appeals to the academic Faculties, a removal of panels/hearings at the second level, the incorporation of wording to reflect milestone-based appeals, and the removal of the alignment with the Statutory Powers Procedure Act at the second level (which mostly applies to the conduct of panel hearings).

RYERSON UNIVERSITY

SENATE POLICY 152: GRADUATE STUDENT ACADEMIC CONSIDERATION AND APPEALS

Revision Approval Date: DRAFT (June 2017)

Revision Implementation Date: September 1, 2017

Policy Review Date:

Responsible Office: Vice Provost & Dean, Yeates School of Graduate Studies

RYERSON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE STUDENT ACADEMIC CONSIDERATION AND APPEALS POLICY

1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF POLICY

2. GOALS AND PRINCIPLES

3. DEFINITIONS

4. ACADEMIC CONSIDERATION

4.1 GENERAL REGULATIONS

4.2 ALTERNATE ARRANGEMENTS

4.2.1 Accommodation for Missed Examination and/or Assignment: Religious Observance

4.2.2 Accommodation for Disability

4.2.3 Alternate Arrangements for Missed Examination and/or Assignment: Health or Compassionate

4.2.4 Arrangements for Inability to Complete Term Work in More Than One Course

4.2.5 Advance Consideration of Academic Standing

4.3 GRADE REASSESSMENT

4.3.1 Regrading of Work

4.3.2 Calculation Error

4.4 COURSE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

5. ACADEMIC APPEALS

5.1 APPEALS DURING THE TERM

5.2 GROUNDS FOR COURSE GRADE APPEALS

5.2.1 Prejudice

5.2.2 Health

5.2.3 Compassionate

5.2.4 Course Management

5.2.5 Procedural Error

5.3 APPEAL OF ACADEMIC STANDING

5.4 ACADEMIC APPEALS REGULATIONS

5.5 ACADEMIC APPEALS

5.5.1 Program Level Appeals

5.5.2 Faculty Level Appeals

5.5.3 Senate Appeals Committee Level Appeals

6. DISMISSAL OF APPEALS

6.1 Circumstances for dismissal

6.2 Dismissal at the Program Level

6.3 Dismissal at the Faculty Level

6.4 Dismissal at the Senate Appeals Committee Level

1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF POLICY

This Policy provides the process by which graduate students may seek academic consideration. It is expected that requests for academic consideration will be made as soon as circumstances arise. The policy also describes the grounds and process by which students may appeal when they believe the academic consideration provided is not appropriate or when they have been unable to informally resolve course-related issues with their instructor. (For purposes of this document, “instructor” shall mean any person who is teaching a graduate course or supervising a graduate student at the University.) The University is responsible for dealing with student appeals fairly and must adhere to the timelines established in this policy.

Students should refer to University publications (on the YSGS website and the Senate website) for detailed information on the various types of academic consideration that may be requested; necessary documents such as appeal forms, health certificates and forms for religious accommodation; and procedural instructions. Students are responsible for reviewing all pertinent information prior to the submission of a formal academic appeal. Incomplete appeals will not be accepted. Students are responsible for ensuring that a formal appeal is submitted by the deadline dates published in the calendar, and must adhere to the timelines established in this policy.

All issues regarding academic standing should be referred to the Graduate Program Director (GPD), or GPD Designate, of the student’s program. (See section 5.2 on Grounds for Appeal of Academic Standing.) The Academic Appeals process reflects decision-making in an academic environment and, as such, cannot be equated to decision-making in the judicial system. The principles of natural justice and fairness will apply to all decisions made. This policy applies to all Ryerson graduate students pursuing academic consideration or academic appeals within a course or as part of milestone attainment at the University.

2. GOALS AND PRINCIPLES

Ryerson University is committed to promoting academic success and to ensuring that students’ academic records ultimately reflect their academic abilities and accomplishments. The University expects that academic judgments by its faculty will be fair, consistent and objective, and recognizes the need to grant academic consideration, where appropriate, in order to support students who face personal difficulties or events. Academic consideration is the general name given to a number of different alternate arrangements that may be made, dependent upon the circumstances and what is appropriate for both the students and the University, such as the extension of a deadline for an assignment, re-scheduling or re-weighting of an exam or assignment because of missed work, the assignment of an INC or the permission to continue on provisional standing. It should be understood that students can only receive grades which reflect their knowledge of the course material.

3. DEFINITIONS

- 3.1 Course includes graduate milestones, comprehensive examinations, major research papers, major research projects, research or thesis proposals, dissertations as well as the research and associated writing carried out towards any of these at the graduate level.
- 3.2 Chair is the Chair of a Department unless otherwise specified.
- 3.3 Director is the Director of a School.
- 3.4 Graduate Program Director (GPD) includes Associate Chairs of graduate Programs
- 3.5 Dean is the Dean of a Faculty/School (including the Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies).
- 3.6 Dean of Record is a Dean named by the Provost and given decanal authority over an interdisciplinary program.
- 3.7 Associate Deans of a Faculty/School are appointed according to Board policy and have a range of Faculty-wide responsibilities assigned by the Dean.
- 3.8 Faculty/School is an overarching academic unit, headed by a Dean, that may comprise Departments or Schools or be structured according to a specific function (e.g., the Yeates School of Graduate Studies or The Chang School of Continuing Education).
- 3.9 Department/School is an academic unit, headed by a Chair or Director, resident in a Faculty, that has responsibility for the delivery of academic programs.
- 3.10 Faculty Member includes all current tenure stream and limited term faculty members represented by the Ryerson Faculty Association (RFA).
- 3.11 Instructor includes all individuals who are teaching a graduate course or supervising a graduate student at the University.
- 3.12 Student/Graduate Student is an individual currently registered in a graduate program at Ryerson University leading to a graduate degree or professional master's diploma.
- 3.13 Staff are administrative employees of the University.

4. ACADEMIC CONSIDERATION

4.1 GENERAL REGULATIONS

- 4.1.1 It is the student's responsibility to notify and consult with either their instructor or Graduate Program Director (GPD), depending on the situation, as soon as circumstances arise that are likely to affect academic performance.
- 4.1.2 It is the student's responsibility to attempt to resolve all course related issues with the instructor as soon as they arise, and then, if necessary, with the GPD. Failure to do so may jeopardize the success of an appeal made at a later date.
- 4.1.3 When issues are not resolved with an instructor, or when a student does not receive a timely response from an instructor, the GPD must be contacted for assistance if the student wishes to pursue the matter further before filing a formal appeal.
- 4.1.4 An appeal may be filed only if the issue cannot be resolved appropriately with

- the instructor or GPD (see section 5.2 on **Grounds for Course Grade Appeal**).
- 4.1.5 It is the instructor's responsibility to respond when students raise concern for grading or course management issues.
 - 4.1.6 If the GPD is the instructor for a course in which an accommodation or alternate arrangement is being requested and the matter cannot be resolved, the student should request that the Faculty Dean appoint an appropriate replacement to act as GPD in the process.
 - 4.1.7 It is the GPD's responsibility to be accessible to discuss matters that cannot be resolved between the instructor and the student.
 - 4.1.8 Students who do not receive their final grades because of outstanding debt to the University, risk missing the deadline for filing an appeal. Grades will not be officially released to students with outstanding debt.
 - 4.1.9 Students who are appealing their withdrawn standing may continue in their program and shall be registered in courses on the basis of a provisional contract until the standing appeal is resolved. Students must pay all appropriate fees. If the appeal is denied and they remain withdrawn, they will be given a full refund of the fees charged for the program in which they enrolled that semester.
 - 4.1.10 Students shall be given supervised access to their graded work or final exam, and be permitted to review that work for a reasonable length of time in order to prepare the required explanation for a re-grading request.
 - 4.1.11 If academic concerns are not resolved with the instructor or with the GPD, students should consult the specific directions and forms for details on the filing of appeals. These may be found at the Senate or YSGS websites. (See section 5.4 for **Academic Appeals Regulations**.)
 - 4.1.12 Appeals not filed by the published deadlines will normally not be accepted. In extenuating circumstances, students or university administrators may request that an extension be provided by a GPD, Faculty Dean or Designate, or the Secretary of Senate, depending upon the level. (See Section 6).
 - 4.1.13 It is the student's responsibility to maintain updated contact information with the University to ensure that all information related to grades, standings and appeals are properly received. Ryerson program students are required to maintain a Ryerson email address (see Policy 157: Establishment of Student Email Accounts for Official University Communication).

4.2 ALTERNATE ARRANGEMENTS

4.2.1 Accommodation for Missed Examination and/or Assignment: Religious, Aboriginal and Spiritual Observance

Students must have filed the necessary forms for accommodation of religious, aboriginal or spiritual observance as required by Policy 150: Accommodation of Student Religious, Aboriginal and Spiritual Observance.

4.2.2 Accommodation for Disability

Students who have approved accommodations with Academic Accommodation Support (formerly the Access Centre), must activate the sending of an accommodation letter via AAS' online system to each of their instructors outlining their approved accommodation(s) for each course. This should be done as early as possible, prior to a graded assignment, test or exam and/or the earliest stages of the research work as possible, according to Academic Accommodation Support Policies and Procedures (see section 6 and Policy 159: Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities).

4.2.3 Alternate Arrangements for Missed Examination and/or Assignment: Health or Compassionate

- 4.2.3.1 Students shall inform relevant instructor(s) (via email whenever possible) in advance when they will be missing an exam, test, or assignment deadline for health or compassionate reasons. When circumstances do not permit this, the student must inform the instructor as soon as reasonably possible. Alternate arrangements may include the setting of a make-up test, transferring the weight of a missed assignment to the final examination or extending a deadline.
- 4.2.3.2 Alternate arrangements are based upon the severity of the circumstances and the amount of work missed. Generally, employment commitments will not constitute grounds for academic consideration; however, employment-related issues may be considered as one element of a more complex request for an alternate arrangement.
- 4.2.3.3 Students who are either not offered an alternate arrangement or who do not accept the alternate arrangement offered by an instructor, may consult with the GPD. If, after this consultation, they still do not accept the alternate arrangement offered, they must document their concern in writing to the GPD and abide by the arrangement to the extent possible. If the test or assignment for which an alternate arrangement has been made becomes a point of contention in the final course grade, the student may appeal the final course grade at the end of the term, on the original health or compassionate grounds. (See section 5.3 on **Grounds for Course Grade Appeals.**)
- 4.2.3.4 Instructors will determine if health documentation is required for an alternate arrangement based upon the length of the condition and the amount and type of the work missed and affected. In the case of illness, a Ryerson Health Certificate, or a letter on letterhead from an appropriate regulated health professional with the student declaration portion of the Ryerson Health Certificate attached, is essential for an appeal based on health grounds. The Ryerson Health Certificate and guidelines can be found on the Yeates School of Graduate Studies and the Senate web sites.

The University may seek verification of health claims.

- 4.2.3.5 It is recognized that compassionate grounds may be hard to document. Nonetheless, students should present as much documentation as possible. For example, a death certificate or notice from a funeral home would be appropriate documentation in the case of a death.
 - 4.2.3.6 All faculty and staff are required to exercise discretion and adhere to the principles of confidentiality regarding any documentation received.
 - 4.2.3.7 Normally, a student who missed a final exam will be given an “incomplete” (INC) and given a make-up exam as soon as possible within the completion period specified on the INC form.
 - 4.2.3.8 Unless an “incomplete” (INC) grade is applicable, the instructor cannot grant extensions beyond the final date for submission of grades as part of an academic consideration.
 - 4.2.3.9 Once an alternate arrangement is accepted, it is final unless subsequent events interfere with the fulfillment of that alternate arrangement, and the grade in the course may not be appealed based upon an allegation of the original arrangement being unfair.
- 4.2.4 Arrangements for Inability to Complete Term Work in More Than One Course:
- 4.2.4.1 Students who are unable to complete their term work in more than one course, due to circumstances that arise during the semester, should consult with their GPD as soon as possible. Failure to do so will jeopardize the ability to provide consideration and to launch a future appeal.
 - 4.2.4.2 When seeking alternate arrangements, students must submit supporting documentation to their GPD, who should advise students as to what to do on a course-by-course basis as soon as possible. Suggestions may include completing the work in some courses, dropping some courses, requesting extensions of deadlines or requesting grades of “incomplete” (INC). A copy of the suggested arrangement will be kept on record in the program office.
 - 4.2.4.3 Each of the student’s instructors must receive an email from the GPD informing him/her that the student will be requesting an alternate arrangement and, if the student requests, the arrangement that has been suggested. Students must contact each instructor to verify that the suggested arrangement is acceptable to the instructor. Instructors should not require documentation to support the request for an alternate arrangement, as an assessment has already been made.
 - 4.2.4.4 While it is advisable for students to discuss dropping a course with the instructor, courses may be dropped at the time of the consultation with the GPD. The GPD must inform the involved faculty member that the student has dropped the course. If the drop deadline has passed, approval from the Associate Dean, YSGS will be required to drop a course.

4.2.5 Advance Consideration of Academic Standing

If, during the semester, students experience health or compassionate circumstances, which may later affect their academic standing, it is the students' responsibility to bring the situation to the attention of the GPD at the earliest possible time.

4.3 GRADE REASSESSMENT

4.3.1 Regrading of Work

4.3.1.1 At any time during the semester, students who believe that an assignment, test or exam, either in whole or part, has not been appropriately graded must first review their concerns with their instructor within ten (10) working days of the date when the graded work is returned to the class. It is an instructor's responsibility to return graded work in a timely manner. Grades not questioned within this period will not be reassessed at a later date.

4.3.1.2 An instructor may require a written request for regrading, stating why the work warrants a higher grade. It is not acceptable for students to request a higher grade without justification based on the merit of work.

4.3.1.3 If there is a concern about work returned during the final week of classes, or a final exam or paper, there may not be an opportunity to review the grade with the instructor or to have the work remarked prior to the assignment of a final grade for the course. In that case, a meeting with the instructor should be scheduled as soon as possible.

4.3.1.4 If an instructor does not agree to review the work, does not provide sufficient rationale for not reviewing the work, or does not respond to the student within five (5) working days, the student may consult the GPD who should assist in resolving the issue and who may initiate a formal reassessment at the earliest possible opportunity. (See section 4.3.1.6).

4.3.1.5 It is recognized that there are assignments that do not lend themselves to independent re-evaluation, such as presentations or performances. Therefore, these may not be reassessed.

4.3.1.6 Reassessment of work by someone other than the instructor

4.3.1.6.1 If a student does not accept an instructor's regrading of the work and wishes to request a formal regrading, he/she must submit specific and detailed reasons, in writing to the GPD as to why the original grade was inappropriate, including any evidence from course notes, textbooks, etc. Asserting that the work deserves more marks or that the student disagrees with the mark is not

sufficient support for the reassessment. If the GPD determines that a reassessment is not warranted, he/she may deny that reassessment, and inform the student, in writing, of the reasons and of the right to appeal that decision on the grounds of Procedural Error (See section 5.2.5).

4.3.1.6.2 Students shall be given supervised access to any graded work that has not been returned or to their final exams, and be permitted to use that work for a reasonable length of time in order to prepare the required explanation for the re-grading request.

4.3.1.6.3 The instructor will provide to the GPD the grading scheme utilized in evaluating the work.

4.3.1.6.4 Either the student or the instructor must provide the original graded assignment, test or exam in question to the GPD.

4.3.1.6.5 A clean copy of the work, with all grading notations deleted indicating the student number but not name, must be provided to the GPD. If it is a paper or assignment, or a test that has been returned to the student, the student must supply the copy. If it is an exam that has not been returned to the student, the instructor must supply the copy.

4.3.1.7 The work will be remarked in its entirety by a qualified person other than the original instructor, as determined by the GPD. Partial remarking is not permitted.

4.3.1.8 If remarking within the University is not possible, another mechanism for reassessment of the material should be arranged. This may include submission to an external assessor.

4.3.1.9 A reassessment may result in the grade remaining the same, being raised or being lowered, and the reassessed grade becomes the official grade for that work. The revised grade cannot be subsequently appealed. If reassessment of the work was not done or has not been done in keeping with this policy, then the grounds of the appeal is Procedural Error (see section 5.2.5).

4.3.2 Calculation Error

4.3.2.1 If a student believes that there has been a miscalculation of a grade due to an omission, improper addition, etc., the student must contact the instructor to resolve the issue within ten (10) working days of the date when the graded work is returned to the class (or individual in the case of independent work). It is an instructor's responsibility to return graded work in a timely manner. Grades not questioned within this period will not be recalculated at a later date.

4.3.2.2 If a recalculation is not done within five (5) working days of the request or

the student disagrees with the result, the student must consult with the Graduate Program Director to assist in resolving the issue as soon as possible.

4.3.2.3 The grade for the assignment may be higher, lower or the same as the original grade, and the reassessed grade becomes the official grade for that work. The revised grade cannot be subsequently appealed.

4.3.2.4 If recalculation was not done or was not in keeping with the policy, then the ground of the appeal is Procedural Error (see section 5.2.5).

4.4 COURSE MANAGEMENT ISSUES (Including Milestone Management)

Students who have concerns about how a course is taught or managed should normally first consult with the instructor as soon as the concern arises. Likewise, a student who has concerns with how their milestone progress is being managed should first consult with their supervisor as soon as the concern arises. If they feel that the matter cannot be discussed with the instructor or if the matter cannot be resolved, students should consult with the Graduate Program Director. Failure to do so may jeopardize an appeal.

5. ACADEMIC APPEALS

Academic Appeals are reserved for issues related to grades or academic standings that could not be resolved with an instructor or a GPD. Students will only receive grades which reflect their knowledge of the academic material. With the exception of Procedural Error, no new grounds may be introduced at subsequent levels.

Academic appeals for graduate milestones are handled in the same way as they are for courses.

5.1 APPEALS DURING THE TERM

Appeals may be initiated at any time during the term by following the process below.

5.2 GROUNDS FOR COURSE GRADE APPEALS

There are five grounds that may be considered for a grade appeal: Prejudice; Health; Compassionate; Course (Milestone) Management; and Procedural Error.

5.2.1 Prejudice

5.2.1.1 Claims of prejudice are limited to prohibited grounds as defined by the Ontario Human Rights Code (e.g. race, sex, sexual orientation, disability, etc.). Students who believe their grade has been adversely affected by another form of personal bias or unfair treatment may appeal under the ground of Course Management.

5.2.1.2 Students must consult with the Human Rights Office (formerly the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Office) if filing an appeal on the grounds of prejudice. The Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Policy is available on the Ryerson

website. The Human Rights Office will do an assessment and make a recommendation to the GPD before the appeal will proceed. This may result in a delay in the appeals process.

5.2.1.3 If the Human Rights Office determines that there is insufficient evidence to support a claim of prejudice on a prohibited ground and the student wishes to proceed on the basis of personal bias or unfair treatment, an appeal may then be filed on the ground of Course Management.

5.2.1.4 If, during the course of any level of appeal, it is determined that there is a claim of prejudice on a prohibited ground, which was not investigated by the Human Rights Office, it will be referred to that Office and the decision will be delayed until that office has assessed the claim and made a recommendation.

5.2.2 Health

5.2.2.1 If a physical and/or mental health condition occurs during the term, it is expected that students who need an alternative arrangement for meeting academic obligations will submit appropriate documentation for work that is missed, and will make alternate arrangements for either a single course or for all courses in that term (See section 4.2 on Alternate Arrangements.) Alternate arrangements are based upon the severity of the circumstances and the amount of work missed.

5.2.2.2 Students must submit a fully completed Ryerson Health Certificate, or a letter on letterhead containing all of the information required by the health certificate, signed by an appropriate regulated health professional for the applicable period of time. The documentation should explain the duration of the health condition and the impact of the health condition on the student's ability to perform during that period. Where circumstances do not permit this, the students must inform the instructor as soon as reasonably possible. The University may seek further verification of health claims.

5.2.2.3 Students must submit applicable health documentation within two (2) working days of when they are able to return to classes and studies. Documents not submitted within this period will only be accepted under exceptional circumstances.

5.2.3 Compassionate

5.2.3.1 Appeals may be filed on Compassionate grounds when there are events or circumstances beyond the control of and often unforeseen by the student, that seriously impair that student's ability to meet academic obligations. Instructors should have been informed of these circumstances as soon as they affected a student's ability to complete their work so that alternate arrangements could be made. Failure to have done so may jeopardize the appeal. Alternate arrangements are based upon the severity of the circumstances and the amount of work missed. Generally, employment commitments will not constitute grounds for academic consideration; however, employment-related issues may be considered as one element of a more complex application for consideration.

5.2.3.2 While it is recognized that compassionate grounds may be hard to document,

items such as relevant travel documents, death certificates or notices from a funeral home, letters from counselors, therapists, or religious or community leaders would be appropriate documentation. It is advisable that students provide as much documentation as possible. Where circumstances do not permit this, the student must inform the instructor as soon as reasonably possible.

- 5.2.3.3 Students must submit applicable documentation within two (2) working days of when they are able to return to classes and studies in order to receive consideration for that work. Where circumstances do not permit this, documentation must be submitted as soon as reasonably possible.

5.2.4 Course Management (including Milestone Management)

- 5.2.4.1 Appeals may be filed on the ground of Course/Milestone Management when students believe that a grade has been adversely affected because an instructor or supervisor has deviated significantly from the course management policies or supervision procedures of the program or YSGS or from the course outline, or has demonstrated personal bias or unfair treatment.
- 5.2.4.2 Students should have brought course/milestone management issues to the attention of the instructor and/or the Associate Chair/GPD when the concern arose. Failure to have done so may jeopardize the appeal.
- 5.2.4.3 Students must provide the course outline or supervision agreements when it is relevant to their appeal, must detail where the deviation occurred and must explain how their academic performance was affected.

5.2.5 Procedural Error

- 5.2.5.1 Appeals may be filed on the ground of Procedural Error when it is believed that there has been an error in the procedure followed in the application of either this policy or any applicable policy of the University. Appeals granted on this ground will rectify the procedural error.
- 5.2.5.2 Where students claim that an academic regulation or policy was improperly applied or not followed, they must reference both the policy and the alleged error, and explain how this procedural error has affected their academic record. This may include such things as a failure to recalculate a grade or remark an exam, or when a response deadline has been missed.

5.3 APPEAL OF ACADEMIC STANDING

Since Academic Standing is determined by students' academic performance, students must provide substantive reasons why their current standing is not appropriate. Standing appeals are generally based on health or compassionate grounds or procedural error. Requests for changes must have supporting documentation attached. Students should normally have consulted with the Graduate Program Director (GPD) as soon as the situation that affected their academic performance arose.

- 5.3.1 In appeals based on health grounds, students will be required to submit documentation for the applicable period of time. The documentation should explain the duration of the health condition and the impact of the health condition on the students' ability to meet academic obligations during that period.
- 5.3.2 Appeals may be based on compassionate reasons when there are events or circumstances beyond the control of and often unforeseen by the student, that seriously impair a student's ability to meet academic obligations. Instructors or GPDs should have been informed of these circumstances as soon as they affected a student's ability to complete their work so that alternate arrangements could be made. Failure to have done so may jeopardize the appeal. (See section 5.2.3 on employment related concerns.)
- 5.3.3 Appeals may be based on Procedural Error when it is believed that there has been an error in the procedure followed in the application of either this policy or any applicable policy of the University.

5.4 ACADEMIC APPEALS REGULATIONS

- 5.4.1 Each GPD or designate shall respond to student appeals.
- 5.4.2 The Dean or Dean's Designate will respond to Appeals at the Faculty level.
- 5.4.3 The Senate Appeals Committee shall hear appeals at the Senate level.
- 5.4.4 In cases involving a graduate student and an Undergraduate or a Continuing Education course in which he or she may be enrolled, Policy 134: Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals will prevail.
- 5.4.5 In some situations, appeals may be dismissed (not accepted) at the Faculty or at the Senate levels (see section 6).
- 5.4.6 Anyone who chairs an Appeals Committee at any level may not serve on an Appeals Committee at any other level.
- 5.4.7 Conflict of Interest: A member of an Appeals Committee or Panel should not have had any prior involvement with the case. A member of a Hearing Panel, a student or an instructor (appellant and respondent) must disclose any conflict of interest, if known, no less than five (5) working days before the hearing. Unless the conflict of interest is resolved, the Committee or Panel member shall be replaced. If either party raises a conflict of interest regarding any Panel member(s) once the hearing has begun, the Hearing Panel will judge the validity of the conflict and will decide on whether the Panel member may sit on the appeal. The Panel member(s) that is challenged may offer a statement but may not take part in the Panel's decision on the conflict. If the Panel member with the conflict is excused and there is no quorum, the Hearing shall be adjourned and a new hearing scheduled with a new Panel member.
- 5.4.8 Burden and Standard of Proof: In an Academic appeal the onus is on the student to show that the original decision was incorrect. The standard of proof in all decisions shall be "a balance of probabilities." This means that, in order for students to be granted their appeals, they must show the Panel that it is more likely than not that the original decision was incorrect.

- 5.4.9 All individuals who have responsibility for deciding appeals, including GPDs, members of Appeals Committees, and all Appeals Officers shall be required to attend training session(s) conducted by the Office of the Secretary of Senate prior to making any appeals decisions.
- 5.4.10 Statistics on the type, grounds and outcome of appeals must be reported to the Secretary of Senate at the end of each term.

5.5 ACADEMIC APPEALS

5.5.1 Program Level Appeals

- 5.5.1.1 All appeals at the Program level must be filed by the deadline stated in the Graduate Calendar using the forms (and instructions), available on the YSGS and Senate websites, or from YSGS or graduate program offices. Deadlines may be extended if grades are not posted in a timely manner. However, students must have inquired by the deadline stated in the graduate calendar if a grade is missing.
- 5.5.1.2 Appeals will normally be submitted in person to the graduate program office. Fax or email submissions will only be accepted where prior arrangements have been made, to ensure that the appropriate person receives the appeal. Original documents must follow by mail. All documents to be presented as evidence must be attached to the appeal.
- 5.5.1.3 Students who have attempted to have work reassessed or grades recalculated and have not had the matter resolved prior to the appeal deadline, or who have not yet received a response from an instructor or a GPD, and who wish to appeal, may submit a formal appeal on the ground of Procedural Error by the deadline. This appeal may be withdrawn at a later date if the issue is resolved.
- 5.5.1.4 Students who wish to appeal a final course grade must first consult with the instructor and/or GPD. Students who wish to appeal an academic standing must first consult the GPD. This consultation must occur as soon as possible after their grades and/or notice of academic standing are posted, allowing enough time to meet the deadline for the last date to appeal.
- 5.5.1.5 If a student appeals only an academic standing, it will be deemed that the grade(s) upon which the academic standing was based have been accepted.
- 5.5.1.6 If a student has initiated more than one appeal, the GPD shall determine whether the various appeals should be heard concurrently or sequentially. If the appeals are heard sequentially, then the grade appeal must be heard first.
- 5.5.1.7 If a grade appeal is delayed because there is an unresolved reassessment or recalculation, the related standing appeal may also be delayed.
- 5.5.1.8 If an appeal of a charge of academic misconduct is related to a concurrent grade or academic standing appeal, the misconduct appeal will be heard first, and the decision, if relevant, forwarded to the appropriate program. As per Policy 60: Academic Integrity (available on the Senate website), a grade of "DEF" may be assigned while a misconduct charge is under investigation.
- 5.5.1.9 Appeals of final grades submitted as a result of completing an "incomplete" (INC)

are often posted during next term (rather than at the end of that term), depending on the requirement for completion stated on the INC form. An appeal of such a final grade must be filed within ten (10) working days of the posting of the new grade. Students are responsible for periodically checking for the posting of the grade.

5.5.1.10 The program is not required to consider an appeal of an academic standing if the grade appeal was denied and it was the sole basis of the standing appeal or if the grade appeal was granted and the standing is automatically changed as a result.

5.5.1.11 The program must respond to the student in writing within ten (10) working days of the receipt of the appeal, whether the appeal was granted or denied. The letter must clearly state the basis on which the decision was reached. Students should indicate if they wish to pick up the decision in person or have the decision emailed, faxed or sent by mail. If the appeal decision is mailed, it will be deemed to have been received by the fifth working day following the postmark date on the envelope. Fax and email responses will be deemed to have been received on the date sent. Students are responsible for contacting the program if they have not received a response in the specified time period.

5.5.1.12 Decisions

5.5.1.12.1 The GPD or designate may not award a numerical grade, or require any action contrary to a University policy or collective agreement.

5.5.1.12.2 The GPD or designate may:

5.5.1.12.2.1 deny the appeals

5.5.1.12.2.2 grant the appeal

5.5.1.12.2.3 grant or deny the appeal in part, subject to conditions, or attach any conditions to any decision. If the student does not accept the conditions attached, the appeal will be considered to be denied.

5.5.2 Faculty Level Appeals

5.5.2.1 Appeals must be filed within ten (10) working days of receipt of the decision at the Program level and must be complete. Forms and Instructions found on the YSGS website must be utilized. Except for Procedural error, the grounds for an appeal should be the same as those claimed at the Program level.

5.5.2.2 Grade Appeals are filed with the Faculty in which the course is taught and Standing Appeals are filed with the student's program Faculty. If the course or program is not tied to a specific Faculty, it is to be filed with the Vice Provost & Dean of YSGS.

5.5.2.3 Appeals will normally be submitted in person during business hours. Fax or email submissions will only be accepted where prior arrangements have been made, to ensure that the appropriate person receives the appeal. Original documents must follow by mail or in person.

5.5.2.4 All documents to be presented as evidence must be attached to the appeal. This includes all documentation from the previous level of appeal. Failure to provide all documentation previously submitted, or the alteration of documentation

previously submitted may result in a charge of academic misconduct as per Policy 60. It must also include a letter stating where the decision of the GPD is disputed. If it does not, the Dean may dismiss the appeal.

5.5.2.5 If students do not proceed within the timeline stipulated, the appeal will be considered terminated. Withdrawn students will be removed from their courses once the time for the appeal has expired without an appeal being launched.

5.5.2.6 Dean or Dean's Designate¹ Responsibility:

5.5.2.6.1 Appeals not submitted within ten (10) working days of the date of the decision letter from the GPD will normally not be processed. The Dean or Dean's designate will not process incomplete appeals. Documentation must include all documents submitted to the Graduate Program and the decision letter. It must also include a letter from the student indicating where the decision of the GPD is in error. If it does not, the Dean or Dean's designate may dismiss the appeal.

5.5.2.6.2 While appeals are normally submitted in person, the Dean or Dean's designate may agree to accept the appeal via fax, mail or email. Original documents should be submitted in person at a later date.

5.5.2.6.3 The Dean or Dean's designate must respond to the student in writing within ten (10) working days of the receipt of the appeal. If the Dean or Dean's designate is unable to respond to a student in that time because they are unable to get necessary information, the student must be notified of when they are to expect a decision.

5.5.2.6.4 The Dean or Dean's designate may engage in a confidential and fair consultation process if deemed necessary. (5.5.2.7);

5.5.2.7 Consultation Process:

5.5.2.7.1 Consultation required must be applied fairly and confidentially.

5.5.2.7.2 The Dean or Dean's designate may consult with both the appellant and the respondent for clarification.

5.5.2.7.3 If further consultation is required the Dean or Dean's designate has the option of engaging both a graduate student from another graduate program and an RFA member that is a YSGS member. These individuals should have no conflict of interest in the appeal.

5.5.2.7.4 Appeal materials must be shared equally with both the faculty member and student consultant.

5.5.2.8 If the Dean or Dean designate fails to respond to a student's appeal within the stipulated time period, and there has been no prior agreement between the student and the decision maker to extend the time period, the student is permitted to proceed directly to the Senate Appeals Committee.

5.5.2.9 In some situations, appeals may be dismissed (not accepted) at this level (see section 6).

¹ Dean's designate would normally be the Associate Dean with graduate responsibility within the Faculty.

5.5.2.10 The Dean or Dean designate must respond to the student in writing within ten (10) working days of the receipt of the appeal. The letter must clearly state the basis on which the decision was reached. Students should indicate if they wish to pick up the decision in person or have the decision emailed, faxed or sent by mail. If the appeal decision is mailed, it will be deemed to have been received by the fifth working day following the postmark date on the envelope. Students are responsible for contacting the office of the Dean if they have not received a response in the specified time period. Copies of the decision must be sent to the instructor, the GPD, the Administrative Co-ordinator, YSGS, the Registrar and the Secretary of Senate.

5.5.2.11 Decisions:

5.5.2.11.1 The Dean or Dean designate may not award a numerical grade, or require any action contrary to a University policy or collective agreement.

5.2.1.1.1 The Dean or Dean designate may:

5.2.1.1.1.1 deny the appeal

5.2.1.1.1.2 grant the appeal

5.2.1.1.1.3 grant or deny the appeal in part, subject to conditions, or attach any conditions to any decision. If the student does not accept the conditions attached, the appeal will be considered to be denied.

5.5.3 Appeals to the Senate Appeals Committee

5.5.3.1 Students must submit an appeal to the Secretary of Senate within ten (10) working days of receipt of the Faculty Level response. Forms and instructions for the filing of Appeals can be found at the YSGS or Senate websites, or are available from the office of the Secretary of Senate. Appeals will normally be submitted in person. Fax or email submissions will only be accepted where prior arrangements have been made, to ensure that the appropriate person receives the appeal. Original documents must follow. All documents to be presented as evidence must be attached to the appeal.

5.5.3.2 The Secretary of Senate shall:

5.5.3.2.1 review the appeal to determine if it is complete and is within the deadline;

5.5.3.2.2 Immediately, forward the appeal to the GPD. The GPD shall, upon receipt, inform the Secretary of Senate who shall be the respondent. The respondent shall reply to the appeal in writing to the Secretary of Senate within five (5) working days of receipt, including any documents to be submitted as evidence. A copy of the relevant course outline(s) must be submitted for all grade appeals, and where possible, student's grades in each component of the course. The Registrar must also receive a copy of the appeal.

5.5.3.2.3 establish a Hearing Panel of the Senate Appeals Committee and appoint a Hearing Panel Chair; (See section 5.4.7 for regulations on Conflict of Interest.)

5.5.3.2.4 determine if the student's academic record is pertinent to the appeal;

5.5.3.2.5 determine, in consultation with the Chair of the Hearing Panel if, given the grounds of the appeal, it is necessary to call the instructor and/or the GPD

- to be present;
- 5.5.3.2.6 schedule a hearing based upon the availability of the student and the instructor or GPD. Both parties must receive at least ten (10) working days notice of the date, time and place of the hearing. An appeal may be scheduled with less than ten (10) working days notice with the written agreement of both parties; and
- 5.5.3.2.7 forward all of the submissions for the appeal, including a copy of the student's academic record where relevant, to: all members of the Hearing Panel; the GPD and any instructors who will be attending the hearing; the Registrar; the student; and the student's advocate, if any. Students must receive appeals information related to their Hearing from the Secretary of Senate either in person by prior arrangement or by e-mail. It will be deemed that the information has been received on the date it was picked up or e-mailed.
- 5.5.3.3 All Hearings shall be conducted in accordance with the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act (SPPA)*. A copy of the SPPA is available for review in the office of the Secretary of Senate.
- 5.5.3.4 Hearing Regulations:
 - 5.5.3.4.1 The respondent in the appeal shall be accompanied, when possible, by relevant faculty who shall attend to respond to any relevant questions.
 - 5.5.3.4.2 Both parties may bring witnesses, who shall normally be present at the hearing only while giving testimony. Students may bring one representative or advocate (including legal counsel) at this level.
 - 5.5.3.4.3 Unless the committee is informed of an emergency situation, if either party, a representative, or advocate, or witness fails to attend the Hearing, the Appeals Committee will proceed in their absence.
 - 5.5.3.4.4 The Hearing Panel may adjourn the Hearing when it is required for a fair process.
 - 5.5.3.4.5 Appeal hearings are not open to the public due to privacy and confidentiality issues.
 - 5.5.3.4.6 In order to provide advice on the process and information on a student's academic record, the Secretary of Senate may be present at the Hearing.
- 5.5.3.5 Decisions
 - 5.5.3.5.1 The Hearing Panel may not award a numerical grade, or require any action contrary to another University policy or collective agreement.
 - 5.5.3.5.2 The Hearing Panel may
 - 5.5.3.5.2.1 deny the appeal.
 - 5.5.3.5.2.2 grant the appeal
 - 5.5.3.5.2.3 grant the appeal in part subject to conditions. If the student does not accept the conditions attached, the appeal will be considered as denied.
 - 5.5.3.5.3 A decision will be issued by the Senate Appeals Committee Panel to the Secretary of Senate within five (5) business days of the panel hearing, and the student will be notified by the Secretary of Senate within ten (10) business days.
 - 5.5.3.5.4 Decisions of the Senate Appeals Committee are final and binding.
 - 5.5.3.5.5 Based upon matters arising at the Hearing, the Hearing Panel may make recommendations on procedural or policy matters to the Secretary of Senate

who may share it with the pertinent offices.

6. DISMISSAL OF APPEALS

6.1 Circumstances for dismissal

- 6.1.1 Normally, submission past the deadline and incomplete submissions will not be processed. These are not considered dismissed appeals, and there is no further action. In extraordinary circumstances, including documented mental health issues, deadline extensions can be granted.
- 6.1.2 Incomplete submissions, or submission forms improperly completed.
- 6.1.3 Missing an exam and/or assignment for religious observance (Section 4.2.1): If a student did not file appropriate forms at the beginning of the semester or as soon as the final exam schedule is posted, cannot appeal at a later date based on religious observance (see Policy 150: Accommodation of Student Religious, Aboriginal and Spiritual Observance).
- 6.1.4 Regrading (Section 4.3.1) or Recalculation (Section 4.3.2): Grade re-assessments are not grounds for an academic appeal. Students are required to review grade concerns with the instructor within ten (10) working days of when the graded work is returned to the class or by the appeal deadline if it is a final exam or paper. If the instructor does not agree to review the work or does not respond within five (5) working days, a student should consult the GPD. The only appeal permitted regarding quality of work is if the re-assessment of the work was not done or has not been done in keeping with the policy. The ground for this type of appeal is Procedural Error (Section 5.2.5). There is no appeal of the new grade received – it may go up or down or remain the same.
- 6.1.5 Prejudice (Section 5.2.1) – if the Human Rights Office has found that there has been no prejudice on a prohibited ground, continuation on the ground of prejudice will be dismissed.
- 6.1.6 Health (Section 5.2.2) – Documentation must be submitted within three (3) days of a missed test, exam or graded assignment deadline, or as soon as reasonably possible. It is expected that students will consult with an appropriate regulated health professional at the time of their illness. Appeals can be dismissed if the health certificate is not submitted in a timely way, if it does not cover the period of time in question, or if there is no health documentation submitted with an appeal based on health grounds.

6.2 Dismissal at the Program Level

- 6.2.1 Only appeals which are not filed by the deadline date found in University calendars, or which are not complete or filed on the appropriate forms may be dismissed (not accepted) at the Program Level.
- 6.2.2 If there are extenuating circumstances (health/compassionate) that prevent a student from meeting the deadlines, a student may request an extension from the GPD. Supporting documentation may be required.
- 6.2.3 Students should be notified in writing of the dismissal of the appeal.

6.2.4 There is no further appeal unless it is based on Procedural Error (5.2.5)

6.3 Dismissal at the Faculty Level

- 6.3.1 If an appeal is dismissed (not accepted) at the Faculty level, the Dean or designate, must give the student written notice of the intent to dismiss the appeal and the reasons for the dismissal.
- 6.3.2 Students have five (5) working days to provide a written response as to why the appeal should not be dismissed, addressing the reasons stated in the notice of intent to dismiss.
- 6.3.3 If the student responds, the Dean or designate should forward all documents to Senate to be reviewed by a panel of the Senate Appeals Committee, which will decide if the appeal will be dismissed or proceed.
- 6.3.4 The Secretary of Senate will inform the Dean and the student of the decision in writing.
- 6.3.5 There is no further appeal unless it is based on Procedural Error.

6.4 Dismissal at the Senate Level

- 6.4.1 If an appeal is dismissed (not accepted) at the Senate level, a student must be given a written notice of intent to dismiss the appeal and the reasons for the dismissal.
- 6.4.2 Students have five (5) working days to provide a written response as to why the appeal should not be dismissed, addressing the reason stated in the notice of intent to dismiss.
- 6.4.3 If the student responds, the documentation will be reviewed by a panel of the Senate Appeals Committee, which will decide if the appeal will be dismissed or proceed.
- 6.4.4 The student will be informed in writing of the decision.
- 6.4.5 There is no further appeal.

BYLAW

Department of Philosophy Departmental Council

Approvals

Philosophy Department: February 17, 2017

AGPC: May 11, 2017

Senate:

1. Definitions

- 1.1. "Chair" means the Chair of the Department Council (DC), unless otherwise stated.
- 1.2. "Council" or "DC" means Department Council, unless otherwise stated.
- 1.3. "Department" means the Department of Philosophy, unless otherwise stated.
- 1.4. "Department Chair" means Chair of the Department of Philosophy at Ryerson University, unless otherwise stated.
- 1.5. "Dean" is the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, unless otherwise stated.
- 1.6. "DEC" means Departmental Evaluation Committee as defined by the collective agreement between the Board of Governors and the Ryerson Faculty Association
- 1.7. "DHC" means Department Hiring Committee as defined by the collective agreement between the Board of Governors and the Ryerson Faculty Association
- 1.8. "faculty" (lower-case "f") means all faculty (tenured, tenure-track, and limited term) whose primary appointment is to the Department.
- 1.9. "Faculty" (upper case "F") means the Faculty of Arts unless otherwise stated.
- 1.10. "GPD" or "Graduate Program Director" means the Director of the MA Program in Philosophy unless otherwise stated.
- 1.11. "CLAC" means Contract Lecturer Appointments Committee as defined by the collective agreement between the Board of Governors and CUPE Local 3904
- 1.12. "student" means a student who is enrolled in one of the undergraduate, graduate, or certificate programs offered by the Department.
- 1.13. "UPA" means Undergraduate Program Administrator
- 1.14. "UPD" means Undergraduate Program Director.
- 1.15. "YSGS" means the Yeates School of Graduate Studies.

2. Mandate

- 2.1. Students, faculty and staff are partners in the functioning of the Department. The Philosophy Department also houses and administers academic matters regarding Music courses at Ryerson. Department Council is the principal mechanism for bringing together these constituencies to identify, discuss and resolve matters of mutual concern.
- 2.2. The specific mandate of the Departmental Council is:
 - 2.2.1. to develop, recommend, and maintain all policies relevant to the Department – and the operation of the programs and courses for which it is responsible – within the context of general University policies;
 - 2.2.2. to contribute actively to the operation and long-term planning of the Department through the creation of committees, working groups, and other mechanisms as deemed appropriate;
 - 2.2.3. to provide an arena for debate, discussion, and the dissemination of information on matters pertinent to the Department and the programs for which it is responsible;
 - 2.2.4. to ensure the undergraduate and certificate programs remains current and relevant to enable the continued satisfaction of the program's objectives; and

- 2.2.5. upon recommendation of its Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, to recommend curriculum changes to the Academic Standards Committee of Senate as appropriate.

3. Authority of Council

- 3.1. The Council will operate in the spirit of policy adopted by the Ryerson Senate, in particular, Policy #45: *Constitutional Provisions for Department/School Councils*.
- 3.2. Without prejudice to any policy of the Ryerson Senate, the authority of the Philosophy Departmental Council embraces the following additional principles:
 - 3.2.1.1. Council will not take action on any matter that would violate the *Ryerson University Act*, any policy of Senate, or any collective agreement negotiated between the Board of Governors of Ryerson University and any of its employee groups; nor shall Council take any action which infringes upon the powers of the Philosophy Graduate Council; and
 - 3.2.1.2. Council will not enter into debate or take action on any matter that would violate Ryerson University's and/or statutory confidentiality requirements in respect to students, faculty, or staff, or on matters of a contractual nature.
- 3.3. Council does not have the authority to override decisions made by Departmental committees that do not formally report to it. Council does, however, have the authority to discuss such decisions and to provide advice, save in cases precluded by considerations of confidentiality and/or contractual requirements, as specified above. The determination of such restrictions is the responsibility of the Department Chair. The Council is advisory to the Department Chair on matters that are contractually the responsibility of the Chair.

4. Membership of Council

- 4.1. The Departmental Council shall be comprised of the following:
 - 4.1.1. all tenured, tenure-track, and limited term faculty whose primary appointment is to the Department;
 - 4.1.2. all priority-of-consideration sessional instructors within the Department;
 - 4.1.3. one (1) member chosen by and from the other sessional and part-time instructors teaching Philosophy for the Department;
 - 4.1.4. one member chosen by and from the instructors teaching Music courses under the auspices of the Department;
 - 4.1.5. all administrative staff of the Department (non-voting);
 - 4.1.6. two (2) students elected by and from any of the first three years, and two (2) students from the fourth year, of the Philosophy (BA) program, with such students named by the students by the end of September in each academic year;
 - 4.1.7. one (1) student elected by and from the students in any of double major BA programs in which Philosophy is one of the majors.

- 4.1.8. one (1) Graduate Student elected by and from the students in the Masters program.
- 4.2. Meetings of the Department Council are generally open to all faculty, instructors, visiting scholars, post-doctoral fellows, staff and students whose primary affiliation is to the Department. Any of these may speak to the Council at the ruling of the Chair.

5. Chair of Council

- 5.1. The Chair of Council will be elected by and from Council members for a one (1) year term, normally at the Fall meeting of Council, and shall serve until a successor is elected.
- 5.2. The Chair of Council is responsible for:
 - 5.2.1. calling and conducting meetings;
 - 5.2.2. setting the agenda of all meetings;
 - 5.2.3. maintaining a written record of Council decisions, actions, and recommendations, and ensuring that a copy of these records is kept on file within the Department; and
 - 5.2.4. ensuring that Council decisions and directions are carried out.
- 5.3. The Chair of Council is a member, *ex officio*, of all Council committees.
- 5.4. The Chair of Council is entitled to vote on all matters under consideration by Council or its committees.
- 5.5. The Chair of Council may designate another member of Council to act in her/his stead on an interim basis.
- 5.6. There is no limit on the number of terms that may be served by a Council Chair, provided that an election is held each year.

6. Meeting Procedures: Council and Committees

- 6.1. Council shall meet formally at least twice a year as a full Council unless the Chair determines that there is not sufficient council business to call a meeting.
- 6.2. Standing and *ad hoc* committees will meet at the call of the Committee Chair.
- 6.3. Notices of meeting will normally be distributed – in either hard-copy or electronic form – at least three (3) working days in advance of the meeting.
- 6.4. Quorum is fifty per cent (50%) of the full membership of the Council or its Committees provided that:
 - 6.4.1. a majority of the members present are faculty members of the Council;
 - 6.4.2. there is a minimum of 1 filled student position (combined total of 4.1.6 and 4.1.7) and a minimum of 1 student present (this condition is waived in case of an extraordinary meeting in Spring or Summer term);
 - 6.4.3. faculty members on leave are entitled to participate fully, but will not be counted in the membership complement upon which the quorum calculation is based unless they chose to participate; and

- 6.4.4. sub-committees advancing recommendations only are not bound by the quorum requirement.
- 6.5. There shall be no proxy or absentee voting, but the meeting will decide for each meeting where the issue arises whether to allow participation via teleconference, Skype or some other remote access technology.
- 6.6. Tied votes will be deemed lost.
- 6.7. Decisions are normally made by a simple majority of voting members present at a meeting, however:
 - 6.7.1. a decision to amend the Bylaw of the Department Council requires a two thirds (2/3) majority of voting members present at a meeting, and can be taken only after written notice – including the text of the proposed amendment(s) – has been provided to all members of Council at least three (3) working days in advance of the meeting; and
 - 6.7.2. in very exceptional circumstances, decisions may be taken outside of meetings through ballots distributed electronically or in physical form to all members.
- 6.8. All matters of procedure not specifically addressed in this Bylaw shall be governed by the provisions of *Bourinot's Rules of Order*.

7. Standing Committees of Council

7.1. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

7.1.1. Mandate:

The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is the Council's chief instrument to ensure the integrity, currency, and relevance of the curricula of the courses and undergraduate programs administered wholly (e.g. the Philosophy BA and Minor[s]) or jointly (e.g. the Double Majors and Arts and Contemporary Studies Philosophy Option) by the Department, as well as other Philosophy, Music and Chang school course offerings. Courses and curricular structure are considered by Department Council based on the recommendation of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. The Committee will:

- 7.1.1.1. As needed, educate and update the department council on the BA Philosophy structure, requirements and course planning process;
- 7.1.1.2. monitor the curriculum of undergraduate programs on an ongoing basis to ensure that it continues to satisfy the objectives of the program;
- 7.1.1.3. recommend to Department Council any reviews and/or revisions that it may deem necessary; coordinate such reviews and revisions; and in respect to proposed revisions, ensure compliance with the University's approval process;
- 7.1.1.4. take leadership to coordinate the Department's response to the requirements of Periodic Program Reviews (see Senate Policy #126: *Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs*) and the procedures that flow therefrom;

- 7.1.1.5. respond to queries, requests, or proposals from any constituency within either program or within the University when these bear upon the program curricula;
 - 7.1.1.6. monitor the syllabi of the courses for excessive duplication of concepts or readings.
- 7.1.2. *Composition:*
- 7.1.2.1. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is chaired by the Department Chair or her/his designate.
 - 7.1.2.2. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee shall be established each year consisting of at least two (2) tenured or tenure-stream faculty members plus other members as specified by council annually.

7.2. Faculty Affairs and Leaves Committee

- 7.2.1. The Faculty Affairs Committee shall consider applications for leave as required by the collective agreement between the Ryerson Faculty Association and the Board of Governors and make recommendations to the Dean. The Committee will inform Council of its recommendations.
- 7.2.2. This Committee consists of all tenured and tenure-track faculty whose primary appointment is to the Department, and is chaired by the Department Chair or her/his designate.

7.3 Student Awards Committee

- 7.3.1 There shall be a Student Awards Committee established every year that shall review student performance in the undergraduate programs and nominate students from those programs it deems worthy for various Ryerson internal student awards. The Committee shall inform Council annually of awards students receive based on the Committee's recommendations.

7.3. Appeals and Standing Committee

- 7.3.1. *Mandate: To adjudicate and respond to grade and standing appeals submitted to the Department in accordance with Senate Policy #134.*
- 7.3.2. *Composition:*
 - 7.3.2.1. The Appeals and Standing Committee is chaired by the Chair or the Undergraduate Program Director or her/his designate.
 - 7.3.2.2. The Appeals and Standing Committee shall be established each year consisting of at least two (2) tenured or tenure-stream faculty members plus other members as specified by council annually.

8. Other Council Committees

- 8.1 The Department Council or any of its standing committees may constitute, from time to time, additional committees (as standing or ad hoc) to address specific topics. Membership, Chair, Terms of Reference, and a reporting relationship of such *ad hoc* committees will be determined at the time the committee is constituted.
 - 8.1.2 Members will hold office until the report of the committee has been received by the body that created it, or until such time as the *ad hoc* committee has been dissolved.

9. Departmental and Other Committees

The following committees are not committees of Department Council, but may, at their discretion, report on their activities for information only.

9.1. Departmental Evaluation Committee (DEC)

This committee is governed by the collective agreement between the Board of Governors and the Ryerson Faculty Association.

9.2. Department Hiring Committee (DHC)

This committee is governed by the collective agreement between the Board of Governors and the Ryerson Faculty Association.

9.3. Graduate Program Council(s)

Departmentally-based and interdisciplinary graduate programs are governed by their own Program Councils, with bylaws approved pursuant to Senate Policy.

9.4. Contract Lecturer Appointments Committee (CLAC)

This committee is governed by the collective agreement between the Board of Governors and CUPE Local 3904.

Program Advisory Council(s) (if any)

Alumni Groups or Committees (if any)

Department of Criminology

DEPARTMENT COUNCIL BY-LAWS

Approved by Department Council: April, 2017

Approved by AGPC: May, 2017

1. Definitions

In keeping with Ryerson's Policy 45 on *Governance Councils*, definitions and composition of Council are set out as follows:

Department Council: Consultative and collegial body responsible for academic matters specific to the Department and its programs.

Chair: Chair of Council

Department Chair: Chair of the Department of Criminology

Faculty members: All RFA faculty members

CUPE Instructors: All CUPE 1 Instructors

Students: All Criminology program students; Section 1.3.b in policy #45 states: All students currently registered in Liberal Studies/Breadth Electives and Professionally Related courses offered by the Department of Criminology.

Staff: Department of Criminology Administrative Staff

Dean: Dean of Arts

2. Mandate

2.1 Faculty, administrative staff, sessional instructors and students work collectively to ensure the smooth functioning of the Department of Criminology. The Criminology Department Council is the principal mechanism for bringing together these constituencies in a forum for the identification and discussion of matters of mutual concern. Composition of the Department Council shall take into consideration issues of social and cultural diversity. In forming the committees of the Council, the Department will likewise take into account areas of academic specialization as well as the academic rank of faculty members. Both are in accordance with the Ontario Human Rights Code (sect 5 [1]).¹

2.2. The mandate of the Departmental Council is to:

2.2.1 Develop, recommend and guide the implementation of policies relevant to the Department of Criminology;

2.2.2 Approve curricular and academic plans for the Department;

¹ The Ontario Human Rights Code under "Employment" (section 5(1) reads: Every person has a right to equal treatment with respect to employment without discrimination because of race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, age, record of offences, marital status, family status or disability. R.S.O. 1990, c. H.19, s. 5 (1); 1999, c. 6, s. 28 (5); 2001, c. 32, s. 27 (1); 2005, c. 5, s. 32 (5).

2.2.3 Contribute to the functioning and long-term planning of the Department through committees and working groups as deemed appropriate by Council members;

2.2.4 Provide a forum for respectful discussion and for the sharing of information on matters pertinent to the Department and its programs.

3. Authority

The Council will operate in the spirit of policies adopted by the Ryerson University Senate, in particular Policy #45: Constitutional Provisions for Department/School Councils.

Without prejudice to any policy of the Ryerson Senate, the authority of the Council will embrace these additional principles:

3.1. The Council will not enter into debate or take action on any matter that would violate the Ryerson University Act, or any policy of Senate.

3.2. The Council will not enter into debate or take action on any matter that would violate Ryerson University's and/or statutory confidentiality requirements in respect to students, faculty or staff, or on matters of a contractual nature.

3.3. The Council does not have the authority to override decisions made by other Committees that do not report to it. The Council does, however, have the authority to discuss such decisions and to provide advice, except in cases precluded by considerations of confidentiality and/or contractual requirements, as specified above. The Council is advisory to the Department Chair on matters that are contractually the responsibility of the Department Chair.

3.4. In the event of a disagreement between the Council and the Dean of Arts, the disagreement will be referred by the disputants to the Vice President, Academic. In the event of continuing disagreements, the matter shall be reported to the President for action.

4. Membership

The Department Council shall be comprised of:

4.1 Department Chair

4.2 All RFA faculty (including Limited Term Faculty)

4.3 Up to two representatives from Canadian Union of Public Employees' bargaining Unit (CUPE) whose primary appointment is to the Department;

4.4 All administrative staff of the Department as *ex officio* members

4.5 Students according to the following breakdown:

4.5.1 Up to three undergraduate or graduate Criminology Program students.

4.6 Student representatives will be sought as follows: at the beginning of each academic year (and prior to the first meeting of the Department Council), student representatives will be elected by and from students in the Department's undergraduate and graduate programs. If the number of student candidates exceeds student positions on Council, the Council Chair or designate will hold an election;

5. Chair of Department Council

5.1 The Chair of the Department Council will be elected by and from the faculty members for a one year term, normally at the last meeting of the faculty before July 1.

5.2 The responsibilities of the Chair are as follows:

5.2.1 Call and chair Council meetings, in consultation with the Chair of the Department;

5.2.2 Set and circulate the agenda of meetings, in consultation with the Chair of the Department;

5.2.3 Maintain a written record of Council decisions, recommendations and actions, ensuring that a copy of these records is kept on file with the Department Administrator.

5.3 In the absence of the Chair, an RFA faculty member will chair the meeting.

6. Council Procedures

6.1 Council shall meet at least twice during the academic year once in each of the Fall and Winter terms.

6.2 All members are expected to attend Council and, where relevant, committee and sub-committee meetings.

6.3 Any Council member may attend a meeting of any committee, of which they are not formal members, as a non-voting participant.

6.4 Notices of meeting will normally be distributed at least three (3) working days in advance of the meeting.

6.5 All faculty members of Council, except the Chair, are voting members.

6.6 The Chair will cast a vote in the event of a tie.

6.7 Quorum is fifty per cent (50%) of Council's full membership and the majority of the members present must be faculty members.

6.7.1 Faculty members on leave will not be counted in the quorum calculation unless present at the meeting either personally or via such other media as Council may permit;

6.8 Except for straightforward procedural matters, decisions are made by secret ballot and are normally decided by a simple majority of voting members present at a meeting.

6.9 Decisions may be taken outside meetings through ballots distributed electronically or physically to all members.

6.10 A decision to amend the Bylaws of the Department Council requires a two-thirds (2/3) majority of voting members present at a meeting, and can be taken only after written notice, including the text of the proposed amendment(s), has been given to all members of Council at least three days before the meeting.

6.11 Matters of procedure not specifically addressed in this Bylaw shall be governed by the provisions of Bourinot's Rules of Order.²

7. Standing Committees of Council

7.1 Committee members work collegially and strive toward consensus in their recommendations. However, minority reports may be attached to recommendations.

7.2 All members of committees, with the exception of the Chair of the Department, will serve one-year renewable terms.

7.3 Membership will normally be from July 1st of one year to June 30th of the following year. RFA faculty committee members and committee chairs will normally be selected at the last Faculty meeting prior to July 1.

7.4 Curriculum Committee

7.4.1 The Curriculum Committee shall meet at least once during the academic year, at the end of the Winter term and after the final exam period.

7.4.2 The Curriculum Committee is the Council's central instrument to ensure the integrity, currency and relevance of the curriculum of the undergraduate program and all other courses administered by the Department of Criminology.

7.4.3 The Curriculum Committee will monitor the curriculum of the Criminology BA Program, and Liberal Studies/breadth electives and Professionally-Related courses to ensure that they meet the objectives of the curriculum

² Available at: http://www.ryerson.ca/content/dam/senate/agenda/bourinots_rules.pdf

7.4.4 The Curriculum Committee shall recommend to Department Council any review and/or revisions that it may deem necessary, coordinate such reviews and revisions, and in respect to proposed revisions, ensure compliance with the University's approval process.

7.4.5 Membership will comprise the Department Chair; the Undergraduate Program Director; at least two faculty members, the Program Administrator, and one Criminology program student representative.

7.4.6 The Committee will elect a Chair from its membership who will be someone other than the Chair of the Department.

8. Ad hoc Committees

8.1 The Council may constitute ad-hoc committees to address specific topics.

8.2 Membership of ad-hoc committees will be determined at the time the committee is constituted. In some situations a student perspective would be useful. In cases where confidentiality is a concern membership would be restricted to faculty members.

8.3 Members will hold office until the report of the committee has been submitted to, and accepted by, the Council or until such time as the ad-hoc committee has been dissolved

8.4 The Council may establish sub-committees or working groups as needed.

9. Voluntary Nature of Service and Terms of Office on Committees

9.1 Membership of all committees and sub-committees is a valued aspect of collegial governance and is recognized as an important contribution to the service of the department and the University.

Ryerson Curriculum Implementation Committee Report for Senate Meeting on June 5, 2017

The purpose of this report is to apprise Senate of the work the Curriculum Implementation Committee (CIC) has done during the Winter 2017 term and to present, for community feedback and discussion, a draft undergraduate curriculum policy. The CIC's prior work, since its reactivation in April 2016, is summarized in its September 14, 2016 and January 31, 2017 updates to Senate.

During the past term, the CIC's work focused on seven elements of its mandate as it further elaborated the draft of Policy 2: Undergraduate Curriculum:

1. to solidify the guiding principles underlying the policy's new curricular structure;
2. to refine the proposed curriculum model;
3. to determine how open electives might best be integrated into Ryerson's course registration system;
4. to propose guidelines concerning the use of liberal studies courses as open electives;
5. to propose an amendment to the liberal studies governance structure;
6. to provide a full specification of curricular elements, including standard definitions of key curricular terms; and
7. to consolidate all Senate curriculum policies into one consistent omnibus policy.

Draft Undergraduate Curriculum Structure Policy

The new draft policy, appended to this report, incorporates all three elements of the committee's recent work. Its main features are as follows:

1. Highlighting of Guiding Principles The guiding principles of Ryerson's curriculum structure, as outlined in the draft policy, are drawn from Ryerson's unique mission and aims, its Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations as part of the University's Institutional Quality Assurance Process, and its core values, as outlined in the University's academic plan, *Our Time to Lead*. Further, the principles include consideration of equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI), considerations of Indigenous culture and traditions, and a focus on student choice.

2. Refinement of the Proposed Curriculum Model As a means of promoting student choice, the draft policy's proposed curriculum model reflects an evolution of Ryerson's tripartite curriculum, maintaining three broad categories of study while providing students with the ability to define their own educational paths. The table below compares the current tripartite model with the proposed model after these various refinements.

Current Model	Proposed Model
Professional Studies 50-75%	Core Studies 60-75%
Professional-Related Studies 10-40%	Open Electives 10-25%
Liberal Studies 8-20%	Liberal Studies 15-20%

Core Studies: In the proposed model, the category “professional studies” has been renamed “core studies” to reflect the diversity of Ryerson’s current undergraduate programs, many of which prepare students for a range of careers rather than for a single professional path. Core studies in the current model include courses considered foundational and integral to the primary area(s) of study. Unlike professional courses in the current model, core courses in the proposed model may include those provided by a teaching department with expertise in the subject matter that the program department has recognized as integral to the program area. As an example, in the BSW Social Work program, POL101/102, PSY 102/202, and SOC111/112 are all required in first year, and these would be part of core studies and would be considered as such in the calculation of program balance.

Open Electives (OEs): In the current model, professionally-related courses “...develop an understanding of the theoretical disciplines upon which the career field is based, or which synthesize the diverse elements of professional study” (Policy 124). These courses are determined by the program department and, in most cases, provide students with only a limited choice of offerings outside students’ professional studies. They include courses that lead to select minors deemed by the program department to be most relevant to the students’ primary area of study.

In contrast, open electives in the proposed model provide students with the ability to make their own choices related either to their career paths or to their personal interests. Students may choose open electives that are outside their core area or gain additional depth in their core area of study. These courses also enable students to pursue any minor offered by Ryerson. Open electives are thus the main “choice category” in the proposed model.

Liberal Studies: As the third category in the tripartite curriculum model, liberal studies remain unchanged in the proposed model, with one exception. The definition has been expanded to explicitly include science courses. The italicized words in the definition have been added: “Liberal studies, as a category, develop students’ capacity to understand and critically appraise the social, cultural, *natural and physical context* in which they will work as a professional and live as an educated citizen.”

3. Introduction of Open Electives In 2013, an open elective pilot was launched and an open elective table was created, based on a survey that requested all programs to select a list of potential open electives from the courses they teach. Courses have been added to the table since then, with the open elective table now including more than 1000 courses.

Moving forward, the CIC recommends that the open elective table be replaced with a structure in which open electives would include all degree-level courses, except those identified as liberal studies courses and those courses specifically excluded by Program or Teaching Departments/Schools. In contrast to the current open elective table, such a system has distinct advantages for students, including maximizing student choice, as outlined in the table below.

Open Elective Table versus Open Electives

Description	Open Elective Table	Open Electives
Actual/true open elective choice/experience is provided	No	Yes
Student course requirements can display by Faculty in AA Report	No	Yes
Courses not used to satisfy program core requirements automatically default to count as open electives	No	Yes
Courses needed as prerequisites will be part of student choice	No	Yes
Courses required to complete a minor will be part of student choice	No	Yes
Course directives no longer required to move 'one-off' course choices to the open elective table	No	Yes
Program limits (restrictions) can be applied	Yes	Yes
Course requisites can effectively manage student progression	Yes	Yes
Student Enrolment Experience	Same	Same

4. Liberal Studies Courses and Open Electives In deciding which courses should be eligible for use as open electives, the CIC recommends that liberal studies courses be excluded. . The feedback we received – from our survey of open elective pilot programs as well as broader consultations with the university community – revealed a widespread concern that the inclusion of lower level liberal studies would lead to the possibility that some students might fulfill all of their open elective requirements with a range of these lower level courses. The exclusion of lower-level liberal studies courses addresses this concern. The recommendation that upper-level liberal studies courses also be excluded is driven primarily by logistical considerations. Because liberal studies courses are scheduled in special bands to ensure their wide availability, students may find it easier to timetable upper level liberal studies courses than they would many other open electives. Without some constraint, large enrolment shifts might then occur between Faculties, and because the large bulk of liberal studies courses are offered by the Faculty of Arts, this might end up privileging what are mostly Arts courses within the constellation of open electives. However, in cases where students cannot access or timetable other open electives, the use of course directives will allow their Program Departments/Schools to direct upper-level liberal studies courses to fulfill open elective requirements.

5. New Liberal Studies Governance Structure For historical reasons and by Senate policy, the Dean of Arts currently chairs the Liberal Studies Council, the university-wide committee with the authority to recommend to Senate the approval of new liberal studies courses. The Dean of Arts also chairs the Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee, which makes recommendations to the Council regarding the approval of new liberal studies courses.

The CIC proposes that the Academic Standards Committee be given responsibility for recommending to Senate the approval of new liberal studies courses. The Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee, chaired by the Vice Provost Academic (or designate), would then make its recommendations to the Academic Standards Committee. The proposed composition of the Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee includes representatives from each of the six Faculties, the Chang School, and students.

6. Full Specification of Curricular Elements At present, some curricular elements, such as concentrations and minors, have separate Senate policies. The draft omnibus policy incorporates these separate policies. Other curricular elements, including over 40 curricular terms, are formally defined for the first time.

7. Combination of Current Senate Policies Adoption of the draft policy would rescind a total of 12 Senate policies that address some aspect of Ryerson's undergraduate curriculum structure. A few of these policies (e.g., Policy 148: Minors and Policy 149: Concentrations) have been integrated completely into the draft policy. Other Senate policies are obsolete. All current liberal studies regulations now outlined in six separate Senate policies are integrated as well.

Next Steps

Three additional steps are required before the CIC's mandate is complete:

1. Consultations Most importantly, consultations must be carried out with faculty, staff and students on the draft of Policy 2: *Undergraduate Curriculum* and its various provisions. The aim is to have these consultation finished in time for the draft policy and associated recommendations to be brought to the October 2017 Senate meeting.

2. Implementation Plan The CIC foresees developing a comprehensive implementation plan. Phase 1 will involve the proposed no-table open elective system. Since every course (except liberal studies) in this system would be an open elective unless otherwise designated, this phase would require all Departments and Schools to conduct a course requisite review of all their undergraduate courses to determine the precise nature of any restrictions that may be applied. Phase 2 will involve establishing timelines for undergraduate programs in all Faculties to revise their curricula in accordance with the proposed new model. The CIC is consulting with the Registrar's Office to establish timelines for implementing Phase 1 and Phase 2.

3. Additional Recommendations The CIC also foresees drafting additional recommendations on a range of issues relating to open electives including: a) ways to ensure optimal access to open elective courses, b) the role of academic advising in assisting students to choose open elective courses, and c) other resources that might help accomplish the same task.

**RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE****UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM STRUCTURE****Policy Number: 2****Policy Approval Date: DRAFT (May 2017)****Next Policy Review Date****Responsible Committee or Office** Provost and Vice President Academic

1. PURPOSE OF POLICY

This policy describes the curriculum structure of all Ryerson undergraduate degree programs.

2. APPLICATION AND SCOPE

This policy applies to existing and – together with Policy [#112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs](#) – to proposed Ryerson undergraduate degree programs. For certificate programs, refer to Senate Policy [#76: Development and Review of Certificate Programs](#).

3. DEFINITIONS

See Section 9: Glossary

4. GOALS AND PRINCIPLES

The overarching goals of Ryerson's undergraduate degree programs and their curriculum structure are built into its legislated objects, its mission and aims, and its Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs). The curriculum policy of the University will reflect those overarching goals, while taking account of how this framework has been evolving in keeping with broader trends in post-secondary education and Canadian society.

4.1 Ryerson's Objectives

The University's objectives are set out in the [Ryerson University Act \(1977\)](#), Article 3, as follows:

The objects of the University are:

- 1. the advancement of learning, and the intellectual, social, moral, cultural, spiritual, and physical development of the University's students and employees, and the betterment of society;*
- 2. the advancement of applied knowledge and research in response to existing and emerging societal needs and in support of the cultural, economic, social, and technological development of Ontario; and*

3. *the provision of programs of study that provide a balance between theory and application and that prepare students for careers in professional and quasi-professional fields.*

4.2 Ryerson's Mission

Ryerson is known for its mission to provide career-relevant education and must ensure sufficient rigour and depth to serve this mission. The "Mission and Aims" of the University are formally set out in Senate Policy #[103: Mission and Aims of Ryerson University](#), which has also been approved by the Board of Governors. The "mission" is defined thus:

The special mission of Ryerson University is the advancement of applied knowledge and research to address societal need, and the provision of programs of study that provide a balance between theory and application and that prepare students for careers in professional and quasi-professional fields. As a leading centre for applied education, Ryerson is recognized for the excellence of its teaching, the relevance of its curriculum, the success of its students in achieving their academic and career objectives, the quality of its scholarship, research and creative activity and its commitment to accessibility, lifelong learning, and involvement in the broader community.

For the detailed "aims," refer to Policy #103.

4.3 Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs)

The Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs), established by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) and endorsed by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), are part of Ryerson's [Institutional Quality Assurance Process](#) (IQAP, Senate [Policy #110](#)) and establish a framework for defining the attributes of a Ryerson graduate both generally and on an individual program basis.

4.4 Principles

Based on the overarching goals described above, the following are the basic principles that underlie Ryerson's curriculum policy.

4.4.1 Alignment with UDLEs

The curriculum should ensure that students meet the educational objectives laid out in the Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations, included here as Appendix 1.

4.4.2 Breadth and Depth of Knowledge

Ryerson's goal is to produce graduates who are well-rounded, both intellectually and in other ways, with a breadth as well as a depth of knowledge, and who have learned to think critically and communicate clearly, both orally and in writing. Graduates will gain transferable skills and the ability to work effectively with others to solve complex problems and contribute to the betterment of the community.¹

¹ As noted in [Policy #103](#), Ryerson aims to "provide its students an educational experience of high quality, fostering in them knowledge and skills, critical enquiry, ethical standards, creativity, commitment to lifelong learning, a capacity to make an early and sustained contribution to their chosen field and to be effective problem solvers."

4.4.3 Program Quality and Currency

The University is committed to ensuring that all programs achieve and maintain the highest possible standards of academic quality. The strengthening and nurturing of existing programs includes, but is not restricted to, reviews and revisions conducted under the auspices of Senate Policy #126 or #127² that respond to external developments in professions, scholarly fields, and society at large, as well as taking account of interdisciplinary links with other subjects and relevant international perspectives.

4.4.4 Provision of Multiple Curricular Opportunities

While it is recognized that there are sometimes constraints on curriculum (such as external accreditation requirements), students should be provided with, and encouraged and supported to take advantage of, multiple curricular opportunities in order to meet their own educational goals.

4.4.5 Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

Ryerson will continue to make post-secondary education more inclusive. The curriculum in programs should take account of the diversity of Canadian society, not only to ensure the inclusion of all students in the educational process but as a means to enrich the curriculum.

4.4.6 Indigenous Peoples

In the development and implementation of curriculum at Ryerson, consideration will be given to the recommendations of the *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada* (2015) to increase student knowledge and capacity on the histories and experiences; cultures and languages; residential school legacies and current realities of Indigenous peoples in Canada.

4.4.7 Dealing with Emerging Trends

Ryerson students should be encouraged to play an active role in their learning – including, but not restricted to experiential learning – to give them the skills required to deal with emerging trends as they build careers, enter various professions or launch their own ventures.³

5. PROGRAM STRUCTURE

An undergraduate degree program normally consists of 40 one-term degree level courses, or the equivalent.⁴

² [Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs](#)
[Policy 127: Curriculum Modifications: Graduate and Undergraduate Programs](#)

³ As noted in [Policy #103](#), “Ryerson’s programs should reflect excellence and commitment to teaching that encourages students to play an active part in their learning; a curriculum of core courses and electives which offers the breadth and depth required to appreciate society’s broader issues and problems, and the understanding and knowledge necessary for professional leadership; academic programs which combine theory and practice, directly connected to their professional fields, that anticipate and respond to emerging trends and future societal need; interdisciplinary studies and international perspectives; and activities and support systems that enhance success and well-being of the whole student.”

⁴ An undergraduate degree program will normally comprise a minimum of 120 course hours. These course hours are the total number of contact hours that equate to the norm of a 40 course, four-year program.

Upon completion of an undergraduate degree program, the student's primary area(s) of study (their "major", or where applicable, their double major) is noted on the academic transcript and on the graduation award document.

To achieve its goals, the curriculum structure of all Ryerson undergraduate degree programs is based on three broad categories of study, which are defined by their objectives and supported by their regulations.

5.1 Core Studies

5.1.1 Objectives

Core studies provide students with both depth and breadth of knowledge of either a single area of study, or of two disciplinary or interdisciplinary areas of study, establishing an essential knowledge base for a career or further study in the area(s). Core studies comprise the primary area(s) of study which includes the student's "major" (or, where applicable, "double major").

5.1.2 Regulations

- 5.1.2.1 Core studies are defined by the Program Department/School and are approved by Senate.
- 5.1.2.2 Core studies include required courses considered foundational and integral to the program area(s).
- 5.1.2.3 Core studies include courses provided by any Teaching Department with expertise in the subject matter being delivered, which the Program Department has identified as integral to the program area(s).
- 5.1.2.4 There may be choices offered within the core studies of a program. The courses that comprise such choices are referred to as core electives.

5.2 Open Electives

5.2.1 Objectives

The open electives category provides students with the opportunity, based on their career path or their personal interests, to choose courses outside their core or to gain greater depth and breadth within their core. Open electives also allow students to earn a Minor.

5.2.2 Regulations

- 5.2.2.1 Open electives include all degree-level courses **except those identified as liberal studies courses**⁵ and those courses specifically excluded by Program or Teaching Departments/Schools as follows:
 - 5.2.2.1.1 Program Department(s)/School(s) may prevent⁶ their students from using courses that are too closely related to the content of core courses in their program;
 - 5.2.2.1.2 Program Department(s)/School(s) may prevent⁶ their students from using introductory level core elective courses; and/or
 - 5.2.2.1.3 Teaching Department(s)/School(s) may prevent enrolment in a specific course by permitting enrolment only of those students

⁵ **Upper Level** liberal studies courses may be directed, by the student's Program Department, to satisfy open elective requirements.

⁶ "Prevent" includes, but is not restricted to, the application of restrictions, exclusions, or antirequisites.

for whom it is a core required course (which may include students in their own program).

- 5.2.2.2 Students must meet all pre-requisite requirements.
- 5.2.2.3 Program Departments/Schools and Teaching Departments/Schools must negotiate, and agree upon, any restrictions that are applied. If the Program and Teaching Departments/Schools cannot agree, the matter will be referred to the Vice Provost Academic, who will decide operational matters and may refer academic matters to the Academic Standards Committee of Senate.
- 5.2.2.4 Restrictions on any other basis than those listed in 5.2.2.1 above require the approval of Senate on the recommendation of its Academic Standards Committee.
- 5.2.2.5 All restrictions should be based on sound and verifiable grounds including resource availability (including available teaching faculty), class size limitations (e.g. for studio and lab-based courses), and the presence of non-academic criteria (e.g. the submission of portfolios) within the program's admission requirements.
- 5.2.2.6 In order to maximize student choice of open electives among a wide range of subject areas, Teaching Departments/Schools in all Faculties have a responsibility to offer their courses as open electives to non-program students, within the limits posed by academic and fiscal responsibility and other constraints. Teaching Departments / Schools also have a responsibility to ensure an appropriate number of seats in their open electives courses.

5.3 Liberal Studies

5.3.1 Objectives

Liberal studies are intended, as a category, to develop students' capacity to understand and critically appraise the social, cultural, natural, and physical context in which they will work as a professional and live as an educated citizen. Liberal studies are also intended to develop skills in critical thinking, analysis, and written communication. Liberal studies courses, to the maximum degree feasible, provide a means by which students from a variety of programs may meet to share perspectives on the subject area being studied.

5.3.2 Regulations

- 5.3.2.1 Liberal studies are courses in disciplines outside students' core area(s) of study.
- 5.3.2.2 Students in all Ryerson programs, except those in the Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science,⁷ are required to complete at least six (6) liberal studies courses to fulfil the requirements of the liberal studies category.
- 5.3.2.3 Courses used to satisfy the requirements of the liberal studies category cannot simultaneously satisfy the requirements of any other category.

⁷ The Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science obtained the approval of the Academic Standards Committee and Senate for a variation from the minimum requirement. FEAS programs require two lower level liberal studies and two upper level liberal studies, one of which must be chosen from a select list of liberal studies courses.

- 5.3.2.4 Liberal studies courses are offered at two levels, lower and upper.
 - 5.3.2.4.1 Lower level liberal studies courses are intended for first- and second-year students. Normally, they will be introductory or survey courses.
 - 5.3.2.4.2 Upper level liberal studies courses are more focussed and intellectually demanding, with the standards of evaluation reflecting those that should prevail at the advanced undergraduate degree level.
- 5.3.2.5 The number of liberal studies courses required at each level varies by program, but must conform to one of two patterns: three lower level and three upper level courses, or two lower level and four upper level courses. The choice of pattern, and the placement of the liberal studies course requirements within the program structure, are the responsibility of the Program Department/School. Students in any given program must adhere to the pattern of their program to fulfil their liberal studies requirement.
- 5.3.2.6 All liberal studies courses must include a substantial writing component designed to foster critical thinking that:
 - 5.3.2.6.1 requires the student to carry out an analysis of the assignment's subject, and make and justify an evaluative, comparative or explicatory judgment;
 - 5.3.2.6.2 comprises one or more individually-written assignment(s) that is/are completed out of class;
 - 5.3.2.6.3 totals at least 1200-1500 words at the lower level and at least 1500-2000 words at the upper level; and
 - 5.3.2.6.4 has a combined weight of at least 25-35% of the student's final grade in the course.
- 5.3.2.7 The quality of student work expected in the liberal studies writing component must reflect the level of the course.
- 5.3.2.8 The instructor is expected to provide commentary on the clarity of organization, logic, syntax, and grammar of student writing, and explicitly indicate that such attributes will form part of the basis upon which the assignment will be evaluated.
- 5.3.2.9 In addition to the mandatory writing component, liberal studies courses may include a variety of other methods of assessment (e.g., in-class, essay-type and multiple-choice testing, final examinations, field work, class presentation and debates, and assessments of student contributions to class discussion).
- 5.3.2.10 Upper level liberal studies courses may be substituted for lower level liberal studies requirements, but lower level liberal studies courses may not be substituted for upper level requirements.
- 5.3.2.11 Normally, there will be no restriction on the number of liberal studies courses a student may select from any one discipline.
- 5.3.2.12 Specific liberal studies courses, due their close relation to a program's core studies, cannot be taken for liberal studies credit by students in that program.

- 5.3.2.13 Restrictions will normally be determined by the Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee (LSCC), but may be recommended by either Program or Teaching Departments/Schools. Between meetings of the LSCC, the Chair of the Committee may impose exclusions made necessary by curriculum modifications.
- 5.3.2.14 Program Departments/Schools may not prescribe, either directly or by prerequisite structure, specific liberal studies courses for credit in the liberal studies category.
- 5.3.2.15 The liberal studies curriculum, within the limits imposed by academic and fiscal responsibility, will maximize choice among a wide range of subject areas.

6. PROGRAM BALANCE

There must be an appropriate program balance among the three categories of studies. For program design and evaluation, the following program balance ranges are standard and the calculation is **based on the total number of one-term degree level courses**, or the equivalent, in the program.

Core Studies	60%-75%
Open Electives	10%-25%
Liberal Studies	15%-20%

The Academic Standards Committee of Senate may, in exceptional circumstances and without prejudice, recommend to Senate the approval of deviations from the above.

7. CURRICULAR ELEMENTS

The following outlines the definitions and policies for curricular elements that may be part of a student's program of study and where their achievement is noted on the student's Official Transcript. The curricular elements listed below must be approved by Senate, as per the requirements for a Category 3 Minor Modification outlined in the Procedures section of Senate Policy [127: Curriculum Modifications: Graduate and Undergraduate Programs](#).

7.1 Concentration

7.1.1 Description

A Concentration is a Senate-approved curricular element that provides students the opportunity to develop in-depth knowledge representing a sub-specialization or emphasis within the core of a degree program or major. Courses for a Concentration are selected from the core elective courses offered to students within their degree program or major. Concentrations are optional.

7.1.2 Regulations:

- 7.1.2.1 A Concentration curriculum consists of at least six, specified/prescribed one-term core elective courses offered to students within their degree program or major.
- 7.1.2.2 Core required courses of the degree program or major may not be included in the course count/defined structure of a Concentration.
- 7.1.2.3 The completion of a Concentration cannot be made mandatory.

- 7.1.2.4 Earning one Concentration will not increase the number of courses required to graduate.
- 7.1.2.5 Where it is possible, a student may complete more than one Concentration; however, no individual course can be applied to satisfy the requirements of more than one Concentration.
- 7.1.2.6 Course substitutions are not permitted.
- 7.1.2.7 Completion of a Concentration is subject to availability of courses.
- 7.1.2.8 Completion of the degree, with the addition of more than one Concentration, may require the completion of extra courses. Additional fees may also be incurred.
- 7.1.2.9 Students must complete all courses in a Concentration prior to graduation from their program of studies.
- 7.1.2.10 Restrictions [e.g., grade variations on individual courses; a minimum Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA) requirement for completion of the Concentration] are not permitted.
- 7.1.2.11 Any course used to satisfy a requirement of a Concentration cannot also be used to satisfy a requirement of a Minor.
- 7.1.2.12 Students must declare a Concentration(s) at a time specified by their program.
- 7.1.2.13 Completion of a Concentration is noted on the academic transcript, but not on the award document.

7.2 Co-operative Education

7.2.1 Description

Co-operative education is a Senate-approved program that allows students to gain work experience in business, industry, government, social services, and professions, before they graduate. Work terms normally occur between the students' second and fourth academic years.

7.2.2 Regulations

- 7.2.2.1 One co-op work term consists of a 16 week (4 month), full-time (35 - 40 hours per week), paid work experience related to a student's area of study.
- 7.2.2.2 Students must successfully complete at least 3 and a maximum of 5 work terms (depending on the program) to fulfil their co-op requirements.
- 7.2.2.3 As part of the work term requirements, students must complete a work term report and be given an evaluation of their performance by the employer.
- 7.2.2.3 Normally, admission to a co-op program is competitive. Students are selected for co-op based on their CGPAs and other non-academic criteria, such as interviews and/or a written statement.
- 7.2.2.4 Students must have a Clear Academic Standing and meet the stated minimum CGPA at the end of second/third year. To remain in a co-op program, students must maintain a Clear Academic Standing and a minimum CGPA as required by their department/school, or receive Departmental/School approval.

7.3 Double Major

7.3.1 Description

A Double Major is a Senate-approved program with a curricular focus in two areas, offering both breadth and depth within the areas of study.

7.3.2 Regulations

- 7.3.2.1 A Double Major curriculum comprises core studies in two disciplinary or interdisciplinary areas of study.
- 7.3.2.2 The core studies in each discipline or interdisciplinary area in a double major are defined discretely by the appropriate Program Departments/Schools.
- 7.3.3.3 Students may be admitted directly into a double major program in Year 1 or may apply to transfer to a double major program for Year 2.
- 7.3.3.4 To be accepted into a double major program, students must meet the academic requirements specified by both Program Departments/Schools. The requirements may include the completion of specified courses with a minimum final grade and/or a minimum CGPA.
- 7.3.3.5 Additional regulations for a double-major program may be Faculty specific.

7.4 Minor

7.4.1 Description

A Minor is a Senate-approved curricular element that provides an opportunity for students from multiple programs to explore a secondary area of undergraduate study, either for personal interest beyond their degree program, or as an area of specific expertise related to their degree program that will serve their career choice(s).

7.4.2 Regulations:

- 7.4.2.1 Courses in a Minor have a coherence based on discipline, theme and/or methodology, as determined by the program offering the Minor.
- 7.4.2.2 A Minor curriculum consists of six one-term, degree-level courses which may be core, open elective, and/or liberal studies.
- 7.4.2.3 Course substitutions are not permitted.
- 7.4.2.4 All students are eligible to pursue any Minor except those that are specifically excluded by their program department or by the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) of Senate. Exclusions may be applied when the subject area of the Minor is too closely related to the core studies of a program.
- 7.4.2.5 Where it is possible, a student may take more than one Minor. However, an individual course may only be used to satisfy the requirements of one Minor.
- 7.4.2.6 It is acknowledged that scheduling issues such as course availability may prevent individual students from being able to access all the courses in a specific minor in the same time frame as they are completing the requirements for their degree.
- 7.4.2.7 Any course used to satisfy a requirement of a Minor cannot also be used to satisfy a requirement of a Concentration.

- 7.4.2.8 The completion of a Minor may require the completion of courses additional to those in a student's program. Additional fees may also be incurred.
- 7.4.2.9 Students must complete all courses in a Minor prior to graduation from their program of studies.
- 7.4.2.10 Completion of a Minor is noted on the academic transcript, but not on the award document.

7.5 Optional Specialization⁸

7.5.1 Description

An Optional Specialization is a Senate-approved program that provides an opportunity for students to enrich and augment their studies by focusing on a specific area of interest in addition to their degree program requirements.

7.5.2 Regulations

- 7.5.2.1 An Optional Specialization curriculum comprises a defined set of distinct degree level courses.
- 7.5.2.2 At least some of the courses in an Optional Specialization must be completed in addition to degree program requirements.
- 7.5.2.3 No course substitutions will be permitted in the completion of an Optional Specialization nor can courses unique to the Optional Specialization be used to fulfil the requirements of a degree program.
- 7.5.2.4 Students must be officially registered in an Optional Specialization.
- 7.5.2.5 Students may be required to achieve a minimum CGPA for all courses in the Optional Specialization to earn this special designation
- 7.5.2.6 Students must have a Clear Academic Standing in their program of studies to register and continue in an Optional Specialization. Additional academic criteria may be required.
- 7.5.2.7 Non-academic criteria may be required to register in an Optional Specialization.
- 7.5.2.8 Students must complete all courses in an Optional Specialization prior to graduation from their program of studies.
- 7.5.2.9 Completion of an Optional Specialization is noted on the academic transcript, but not on the award document.

7.6 Other

Any curricular element not covered by this policy will conform to the framework established by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance.

⁸ Unlike the Optional Specialization described here, *Optional Specializations in Zone Learning* are external to the student's degree program, and require the successful completion of a single non-credit course (CEDZ-100) over a specified number of terms.

8. AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

8.1 Senate

The highest academic authority of the University, Senate has the authority over all curriculum matters as outlined in the [Ryerson University Act](#), the [Senate Bylaw](#), and Ryerson policies, including Senate's [Institutional Quality Assurance \(IQAP\) policies](#).

8.2 Provost and Vice President Academic

Has overall responsibility for this policy and any operating procedures that may be adopted from time to time.

8.3 Vice Provost Academic (VPA)

Has administrative responsibility (together with the Registrar) for actions taken under the authority of this policy. Without restricting the generality of the foregoing, the VPA will lead the development of any operating procedures that may be required, will resolve disputes between Program Departments/Schools and Teaching Department/Schools as per Section E.2(b)3 of this policy; and will chair the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) and the Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee (LSCC).

8.4 Registrar

The operational units of the Office of the Registrar have primary responsibility for the day-to-day interpreting and application of the policy. The Registrar will consult with the VPA and the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) as required to ensure that the intent of the policy is met in its implementation.

8.5 Academic Standards Committee of Senate (ASC)

Has the authority to interpret this policy and make recommendations to Senate about program curricula, including justifiable exceptions, based on the general principles as outlined above.

8.6 Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee (LSCC)

Provides recommendations to the ASC on proposals for new liberal studies courses and other matters concerning the liberal studies curriculum.

The LSCC reports directly to the ASC, is chaired by the Vice Provost Academic (or designate), and consists of the following members:

- 8.6.1 Two representatives from each Faculty (Arts, Communication and Design, Community Services, Engineering and Architectural Science, Science, Ted Rogers School of Management) appointed by their respective Dean.
- 8.6.2 Two student representatives appointed by the Vice Provost Academic following a transparent process that is publicly announced.

8.6.3 One Chang School representative appointed by the Dean of the Chang School.

Between meetings of the Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee, the Chair of the Committee may impose exclusions made necessary by curriculum modifications.

8.7 Department/Program/Faculty Councils

The responsibilities of Department/Program/Faculty Councils are as specified by Senate Policy #45: [Governance Councils](#) and by their individual bylaws.

8.8 Dean of Arts

The Dean of Arts has primary responsibility for the administration of Liberal Studies course offerings.

9. GLOSSARY

The following nomenclature related to curriculum appears in various University documents.

Academic Year	For the purpose of this policy, the academic year is normally comprised of a Fall term and a Winter term.
Accreditation	see <i>Professional Accreditation</i>
Antirequisite	Courses that contain similar content and therefore cannot both be used toward fulfilling degree requirements. See related terms: <i>Co-requisite, Course, Prerequisite</i>
Bachelor's Degree	An academic credential awarded upon successful completion of an undergraduate degree program.
Billing Units	The measure used to calculate undergraduate tuition fees.
Certificate-Level Course	A graded course that may be used to fulfil only Certificate requirements (i.e., is not part of an Undergraduate Degree Program). See related term: <i>Degree Level Course</i> .
Collaborative Program	An academic program offered by Ryerson in collaboration with an Ontario College partner (or partners). See related terms: <i>Degree Completion Program, Joint Program, Program, Undergraduate Degree Program</i>
Concentration	A Senate-approved set of courses within the core of a degree program or major, which is completed on an optional basis. See related terms: <i>Double-Major, Major, Minor, Optional Specialization</i>
Co-operative Education Program	A program that alternates periods of academic study with periods of paid work experience in business, industry, government, social services and the professions.
Core Elective Course	A course that provides choice in the core studies of a program.
Core Required Course	A course that must be completed by all students in a program.

Core Studies	<p>Core studies provide both depth and breadth of knowledge of either a single, or of two disciplinary or interdisciplinary areas of study. They establish an essential knowledge base for a career or further study in the area. Core studies include core required courses and may include core elective courses.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Core Required Course, Core Elective Course, Elective Course, Liberal Studies, Open Elective, Major</i></p>
Co-requisite	<p>A course that must be successfully completed before, or concurrently with, another course.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Antirequisite, Course, Prerequisite</i></p>
Course	<p>The smallest formally recognized academic unit of study approved for inclusion in one or more programs, which has a unique course code, title and description recorded in the annual Ryerson calendar.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Course Count, Course Hours, Credit Course, Non-credit Course, Degree Level Course, Certificate-Level Course</i></p>
Course Code	<p>A unique alpha-numeric identifier. The letters identify the academic area in which the course is resident, while the digits indicate whether the course is a one- or two-term course. The digits do not necessarily indicate course level.</p>
Course Count	<p>A numeric value assigned to each individual course, based on its course hours, and reflecting its value relative to the 40 courses normally making up a program. For example, a one-term degree level course will normally have a course count of one.</p> <p>Exceptions to the standard course counts are noted in the Ryerson undergraduate calendar.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Course, Course Hours</i></p>
Course Hours	<p>The weekly course contact hours associated with a given course which may include lecture, seminar, studio, tutorial, and laboratory hours and such activities as internship, and independent study.</p> <p>A one-term degree level course is normally a minimum of 36 contact hours (3 hours per week for 12 weeks).</p>
Course Weight	<p>Course academic value is a combination of the Grade point average points assigned to a course, the course count assigned to the course and the number of academic terms (course length) assigned to the course. Normally, for example, the GPA points assigned to a course of 1.0 and the course count of 1.0 will also align with the terms (course length) of 1 academic term.</p> <p><i>Note: there are exceptions to this relationship.</i></p>
Credit Course	<p>A graded course that constitutes partial fulfilment of certificate, diploma or degree requirements.</p> <p>See related term: <i>Non-credit Course</i></p>

Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA)	<p>A cumulative average calculated as an indicator of overall academic performance. Calculated as the sum of the cumulative products of GPA weights and earned grade points, divided by the sum of the cumulative GPA weights, and rounded up to the next higher second decimal place.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>GPA Weight, Term Grade Point Average (GPA)</i></p> <p>See also Policy #46: Undergraduate Grading, Promotion, and Academic Standing Policy (“the GPA policy”).</p>
Curriculum	<p>The prescribed plan of study, approved by Ryerson Senate.</p> <p>See related term: <i>Undergraduate Degree Program</i></p>
Degree Completion Program	<p>An undergraduate program in which students are admitted to an advanced level of a program based on completion of a public college diploma program.</p> <p>(Replaces “<i>direct entry</i>” or “<i>post diploma degree completion</i>” program).</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Bachelor’s Degree, Collaborative Program, Program, Joint Program, Undergraduate Degree Program</i></p>
Degree Level Course	<p>A graded course that constitutes partial fulfilment of the requirements of an undergraduate degree and/or certificate and/or diploma.</p> <p>See related term: <i>Certificate Level Course</i></p>
Degree Level Expectations	<p>The knowledge and skill outcome competencies that reflect progressive levels of intellectual and creative development. Degree level expectations are established by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-President (OCAV’s) and are expressed in Ryerson’s Institutional Quality Assurance Process policies.</p>
Degree Program	<p>See “Undergraduate Degree Program”</p> <p>See also Policy #112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs</p>
Double Major	<p>A Senate-approved program with a curricular focus in two areas offering both breadth and depth within the areas of study.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Concentration, Major, Minor, Optional Specialization</i></p>
Elective course	<p>A course that is not specifically required within a program of study, providing the student with some choice within the category. Elective courses may be core, open, or liberal studies.</p> <p>See related terms: <i>Core Course, Course, Liberal Studies, Open Elective</i></p>
Faculty / faculty	<p>When capitalized, an academic unit consisting of teaching departments/schools and established by Senate and the Board of Governors. The head of a Faculty is the Dean.</p> <p>Non-capitalized, the term ‘faculty,’ for the purpose of this policy, refers to the academic teaching staff of the University.</p> <p>See also Senate Bylaw.</p>

GPA Weight	See Policy # 46: Undergraduate Grading, Promotion, and Academic Standing Policy (“the GPA policy”).
Honours	A Senate-approved undergraduate degree designation.
Joint Program	A program of study offered by two or more universities or by a university and a college or institute, in which successful completion of the requirements is confirmed by a single degree document. See Policy # 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs
Liberal Studies	Courses that are in disciplines outside students’ core area(s) of study that develop students’ capacity to understand and critically appraise the social, cultural, natural, and physical context in which they will work as a professional and live as an educated citizen. See related terms: <i>Core Course, Core Studies, Course, Elective Course, Open Elective</i>
Major	The primary focus of study within a degree program, offering both breadth and depth within a discipline, area of study, or interdisciplinary subject area. See related terms: <i>Concentration, Core Studies, Minor, Optional Specialization</i>
Minor	A Senate-approved set of degree-level courses with coherence based on discipline, theme and/or methodology. A Minor is distinct from the student’s major and is completed on an optional basis in partial fulfilment of the requirements of a degree. See related terms: <i>Concentration, Core Studies, Major, Optional Specialization</i>
Non-credit Course	A course which cannot be used to fulfil any certificate, diploma or degree program requirements. See related term: <i>Credit Course</i>
Open Elective	Degree level courses students may choose related either to their career paths or their personal interests. Open electives allow students to experience subject matter outside their core area(s) of study(ies), to earn a Minor, and/or to gain greater depth or breadth within their core studies. Students may satisfy open elective program requirements with any course for which they meet enrolment eligibility – with some exceptions. See related terms: <i>Core Course, Core Studies, Course, Elective Course, Liberal Studies</i>
Optional Specialization	An optional Senate-approved set of distinct degree-level courses that students must successfully complete, where at least some courses in the optional specialization are completed in addition to the student’s degree program requirements. See related terms: <i>Concentration, Double Major, Major, Minor</i>

Optional Specialization in Zone Learning	An optional specialization, external to the student's degree program, that requires the successful completion of a single non-credit course (CEDZ-100) over a specified number of terms.
Post-baccalaureate Program	Requires the completion of a bachelor's degree program for admission. Post-baccalaureate programs normally lead to a second bachelor's degree, a certificate, or a professional credential.
Prerequisite	A requirement, usually a course, that must be successfully completed prior to be eligible to enrol in another course. See related terms: <i>Antirequisite, Co-requisite</i>
Professional Accreditation	Review at the provincial, Canadian or international levels by professional bodies of some university programs.
Program	A balanced sequence of courses leading to the general intellectual development of the individual, and to the acquisition of knowledge and skills related to a discipline, career, profession, etc. See related terms: <i>Collaborative Program, Degree Completion Program, Joint Program, Undergraduate Degree Program</i>
Program balance	The percentage of a program drawn from each of the three categories of courses—core, open elective, and liberal studies—in a program. See related terms: <i>Core Course, Core Studies, Liberal Studies, Open Elective</i>
Program Department	The academic unit (department/school) responsible for the development, delivery and administration of one or more programs. See related terms: <i>Faculty, Teaching Department</i>
Semester	See <i>Term</i>
Senate	Subject to the approval of the Board of Governors with respect to the expenditure of funds, Senate has the power to regulate the educational policy of the University including, but not restricted to, making recommendations to the Board with respect to the establishment, change or termination of programs and courses of study, schools, divisions and departments; and determining the curricula of all programs and courses of study, the standards of admission to the University and continued registration therein, and the qualifications for degrees, diplomas and certificates of the University. See also Ryerson University Act , Article 10.
Specialization	See <i>Optional Specialization</i>
Teaching Department	The academic unit (department/school) responsible for the development, delivery and administration of a course. See related terms: <i>Program Department, Faculty</i>

Term	A teaching term is 12 weeks, except for Bachelor of Engineering programs, which have a 13-week term. Students are evaluated and awarded credits for successful completion of enrolled courses at the end of each term.
Term Grade Point Average (GPA)	A term average calculated as an indicator of overall academic performance. Calculated as the sum of the term products of GPA weights and earned grade points, divided by the sum of the term GPA weights, and rounded up to the next higher second decimal place. See also <i>Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA)</i> , <i>GPA Weight</i> . See also Policy #46: Undergraduate Grading, Promotion, and Academic Standing Policy (“the GPA policy”).
Undergraduate Degree Program	The complete set and sequence of courses, combination of courses, or other units of study, research and practice prescribed by the University for the fulfilment of a baccalaureate degree. Degrees are granted for meeting the established requirements at the specified standard of performance consistent with the University’s Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs). See also Institutional Quality Assurance Policies (#110, #112, #126, #127) for a baccalaureate/bachelor’s degree: honours. See also <i>Collaborative Program</i> , <i>Degree Completion Program</i> , <i>Joint Program</i> , <i>Program</i>

10. RESCINDS

Adoption of this policy rescinds the following Senate Policies:

- Policy #7: Procedures for the Preparation, Submission and Approval of Academic Proposals (1975)
- Policy #14: Liberal Studies: Development of a Tripartite Curriculum (1977)
- Policy #33: Program Balance (1977)
- Policy #35: Degree Programs Policy (1982)
- Policy #44: Liberal Studies in the Ryerson Curriculum (1986)
- Policy #64: Change to the Composition of the Liberal Studies Committee (1989)
- Policy #74: New Structure for Administration of Liberal Studies at Ryerson (1991)
- Policy #107: Revision of Liberal Studies Policy (1994)
- Policy #109: Implementation of Liberal Studies Policy (1995)
- Policy #124: Professionally-Related Studies in Tripartite Curriculum (1996)
- Policy #148: Minors Policy (2015)
- Policy #149: Concentrations Policy (2016)

11. APPENDIX 1

UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS

EXPECTATIONS	BACCALAUREATE/BACHELOR'S DEGREE: HONOURS <i>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:</i>
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A developed knowledge and critical understanding of the key concepts, methodologies, current advances, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline overall, as well as in a specialized area of a discipline; b. A developed understanding of many of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines; c. A developed ability to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Gather, review, evaluate and interpret information; and ii. Compare the merits of alternate hypotheses or creative options, relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline; d. A developed, detailed knowledge of and experience in research in an area of the discipline; e. Developed critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline; f. The ability to apply learning from one or more areas
2. Knowledge of Methodologies	<p>An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; b. Devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods; and describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship.
3. Application of Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Develop lines of argument; ii. Make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; iii. Apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the discipline; iv. Where appropriate use this knowledge in the creative process; and

3. Application of Knowledge cont'n'd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. The ability to use a range of established techniques to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and information; ii. Propose solutions; iii. Frame appropriate questions for the purpose of solving a problem; iv. Solve a problem or create a new work; and c. The ability to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources
4. Communication Skills	The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.
5. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge	An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and ability, and an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits to knowledge and how this might influence analyses and interpretations.
6. Autonomy and Professional Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The exercise of initiative, personal responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts; ii. Working effectively with others; iii. Decision-making in complex contexts; b. The ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline and to select an appropriate program of further study; and c. Behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.

Report of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

Ryerson University

May 2017

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
SLT Committee Members, 2016-2017	3
Deliberations of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee	5
1. E-Learning.....	5
2. Student Learning Support	6
3. Course Management Policy Initiatives	7
a. Examinations.....	7
b. Course Outlines.....	8
c. Alternative Assessments	9
4. Annual Learning & Teaching Conference	10
5. University-Wide Teaching Awards	11

Introduction

The purpose of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC) is to advise Senate on select university-wide issues related to the promotion of an effective and comprehensive educational environment.

General Purpose: The SLTC advises Senate on select university-wide issues through the lens of learning and teaching. The committee may initiate activities that address specific issues, or develop and make academic policy recommendations to Senate where appropriate.

Reporting: The SLTC reports directly to Senate regarding its regular business. It directs to the AGPC recommendations regarding policy changes or changes to its terms of reference or composition.

Composition: Thirty-three (33) members include: seven (7) Teaching Chairs, one from each Faculty and one from the Library; five (5) appointees of the Vice Provost, Academic; four (4) appointees of the Vice Provost, Students; seven (7) student representatives, one from each Faculty, one from the School of Graduate Studies, and one from The Chang School; seven (7) representatives from the Learning and Teaching Office, including one from the Digital Media Projects Office and one from the G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education; the Vice Provost, Students (1) (ex-officio); the Director of the Learning and Teaching Office (1) (ex-officio, non-voting); the Secretary of Senate (1) (non-voting); and the Vice Provost, Academic (1) who shall serve as chair.

SLT Committee Members, 2016-2017

Marcia Moshé, Interim Vice Provost, Academic (Chair)

Heather Lane Vetere - Vice Provost, Students

Denise O'Neil Green - Assistant Vice President/Vice Provost, Equity and Community Inclusion

Eric Kam - Director, Learning & Teaching Office (non-voting)

John Turtle - Secretary of Senate (non-voting)

Appointees of the Vice Provost, Academic

John Paul Foxe - Director, Academic Integrity

Katherine Penny- Curriculum Quality Assurance

Anne Johnson - Chemistry & Biology

Beth Stewart

Rona Abramovitch - Senior Advisor to the Provost

Appointees of the Vice Provost, Students

Christina Halliday - Director, Student Learning Support

John Austin - Executive Director, Student Affairs

Marc Emond - Manager, Academic Accommodation Support

Learning & Teaching Office

Lauren Wilson - Manager, Teaching & Learning

Michelle Schwartz - Instructional Design and Research Strategist

Curtis Maloley – Educational Developer

Tunu Sodhi - LTO English Language Support Specialist

Amira Rezkalla - Program Assistant

Gosha Zywno - Faculty Associate, UTDP

Restiani Andriati - Manager, Digital Media Projects Office
Paola Borin – Curriculum Development Consultant

Faculty Representation

Stephen Want - Arts, Psychology (Teaching Chair)
Wendy Freeman - Communication & Design, Journalism (Teaching Chair)
Samantha Wehbi - Community Services, Social Work (Teaching Chair)
Medhat Shehata - Engineering & Architectural Science, Civil Engineering (Teaching Chair)
TBA - Science (Teaching Chair)
Don Kinder - Library (Teaching Chair)
Nenita Elphick - Chang School (Teaching Chair)
Alan Kaplan - Ted Rogers School of Management (Teaching Chair)

Students

Monica De Vries, TRSM

Deliberations of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

The Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLT) met on four occasions during the 2016-2017 academic year. There were five key discussion themes:

1. E-Learning
2. Student Learning Supports
3. Course Management Policy Initiatives
 - a. Examinations
 - b. Course Outlines
 - c. Alternative Assessments
4. Annual Learning & Teaching Conference
5. University-Wide Teaching Awards

1. E-Learning

Dr. Wendy Freeman, Director of e-Learning, provided the committee with a substantial overview of e-Learning at Ryerson. Dr. Freeman notes that teaching at Ryerson falls along a broad spectrum, from 100% online to 100% in-class. The SLT committee discussed the different definitions of e-Learning that exist, but noted how each of these definitions have elements in common, such as, but not limited to, online courses, online supports, online materials, distance learning, flexible learning, and access to good broadband and internet skills. e-Learning can fall along a continuum of classroom-based and online learning formats, synchronous or asynchronous, but to be effective it must follow best design practices for engagement. Most importantly, all online learning experiences must be designed to be fully accessible to all learners.

Many Ryerson courses follow a blended learning format, combining online and in-class learning. Some examples of blended teaching methodologies at Ryerson include virtual office hours, video lectures, online quizzes, online discussions, collaborative group work online using Google Drive, and recording guest speakers for future classes. The flipped classroom model is another example of blended learning that is occurring more frequently at Ryerson. In the flipped classroom, students work through course content online, and class time is used entirely for active learning. This format can be effective in both large and small seminar classes. For example, Dr. Mary Foster in the School of Business Management used flipped learning in a relatively large marketing course. Students in the flipped version of the course still found it very engaging. Other flipped classrooms at Ryerson presently include general chemistry, introductory physics, marketing, critical thinking in business, academic writing and research, introduction to professional communication, accounting, language learning and some STEM courses. In general, results have shown that grades were improved in the flipped sections. Many students report enjoying flipped classrooms because they receive more coaching in an active classroom environment.

Student Learning Support (SLS) is a supporter of active learning in the classroom; however, the SLS team finds that students may need more direction from their professors. With regard to e-learning, SLS recommends carefully designed online experiences, short online video lectures, and in general, an approach where there is significant course design choice. SLS agrees that lectures are and will always be a significant part of teaching, and providing students in an online course with a collection of short instructional video lectures can make that course more robust and enjoyable for students. SLS notes the cost of producing online videos can be an issue and suggests looking for shared online course funds from sources such as eCampus Ontario grants or the LTO's Learning and Teaching Enhancement Fund.

The SLTC noted that the initial investment of time and money required by e-learning may be a significant disincentive for some faculty. The committee concluded by suggesting the creation of a newsletter to highlight faculty work around e-learning and other teaching techniques. The committee also notes the potential savings of the e-learning model. Some blended courses do not require final exams, which is a space saver for the school. However, the committee suggested studying virtual proctoring as a solution to the associated problems of off campus testing.

2. Student Learning Support

Dr. Christina Halliday, Director of Student Learning Support (SLS), provided an update on SLS, their move to the new Student Learning Centre (SLC), and how they are using their new space. SLS has now been in the SLC for 1.5 years, and Dr. Halliday noted that the SLC has been packed with students—mostly undergraduate students—from the moment it opened. The committee watched a new promotional video for SLS that is shown in the SLC elevator. Dr. Halliday believes the SLC has benefited Ryerson students who use the new facilities.

One of Student Learning Support's goals is to eliminate the stigma of using the supports they provide. The SLS team is trying to increase SLS accessibility and build a welcoming peer support community that is safe for students. This is being done in part by offering the following supports in one contained space at the SLC:

- SLS offices, workshop spaces, and open study space for students
- One-on-one support
- Academic Accommodation Support
- English Language Support
- Writing Support
- Math Support

The SLS has some new and unique programs since moving to the SLC. These include: Long Night Against Procrastination; Graduate Write-a-thon; Dissertation Coaching; Writing Groups; Portage; one-stop reception; and an on-call facilitator to help students immediately when they connect with the SLS.

Dr. Halliday noted a significant increase in student participation in SLS supported learning groups since the unit moved to the SLC. Students have commented that the SLC is a place where students are engaged and ready to work and learn either alone or in groups. SLS has been using surveys to solicit feedback from undergraduate and graduate students regarding SLS services and space. These results will be reported in future SLTC meetings.

Dr. Halliday highlighted some of the challenges currently experienced by Academic Accommodation Support and the Test Centre. The Test Centre administrated 19,000 accommodated exams and 2,000 missed/make up exams last year. In general, Ryerson has a high number of final exams compared with other Ontario universities. SLS plans to research forms of assessment other than the traditional final exam.

There has also been a 38% increase in international students at Ryerson University. SLS plans to study international student growth, the impact and opportunities of international students and how this group can be supported through SLS. Studies indicate that international students are more vulnerable as they take the time to become acclimatized to Canada and our academic culture.

However, in general, SLS is proud to report Ryerson is becoming known provincially and nationally as a very accessible university.

3. Course Management Policy Initiatives

a. Examinations

Michelle Green, Special Projects and Final Examinations Coordinator, updated the SLTC on recent changes to the examination policy. First, Ryerson will no longer be using MTCC and will be moving final exams to the Mattamy Athletic Centre. Special Projects and Final Examinations will be partnering with Student Affairs for additional support for students. Greater attention has been paid to the student and invigilator experience, student mental well-being, and to streamlining exam administration. Since there are so many academic and campus stakeholders, Michelle has initiated an external review of all midterm and final examination procedures.

Discussion with faculty and students revealed the MTCC was too far from campus and students felt out of their comfort zone. In addition, Ryerson administration was never able to select final exam days; it depended on the availability of the MTCC. At the MAC, Ryerson can distribute exams over a two-week period. The arena can hold 610 students, the court can hold 420 students, and the concourses can accommodate 128 students on each side.

During consultations, students also expressed how worried they were about leaving their property at the front of the room during final examinations. Therefore, Michelle has implemented new procedures to improve student mental well-being. Bags can now be stored under desks. Coats are allowed on the backs of chairs. Hats and accessories are allowed, but subject to inspection and discretion. For example, baseball hats must be worn backwards. No watches are allowed but the time will be visible on scoreboards. Michelle has rolled out new exam procedures in the fall semester—first at the MAC as a pilot project—to test for wider feasibility.

To streamline exam administration, Ryerson is experimenting with moving to a more efficient model of identical exam slots. This past fall semester, the available examination lengths were either two or three hours. An external review revealed that 90% of schools use their tiered classrooms for exams. Therefore, Ryerson will also be using tiered classrooms, previously only used for midterm examinations, for final exams. However, Ryerson will not be using DSQ classrooms, which will be held strictly as a contingency measure. To assist faculty, the LTO has compiled and distributed a guide to best practices and strategies for invigilating final exams.

Another new area of examination procedure under review centers on invigilation and invigilators. Michelle and her team have created an invigilator training handbook and advanced training for invigilators is available within each department and faculty. Improved training for faculty and staff is also being offered. Invigilator training for site coordinators will include increased awareness of civility and mental health. Group interviews were developed in collaboration with the Career Centre and used to hire invigilators. Efforts have been made to improve the invigilator experience, including adding time for breaks in compliance with employment standards, and providing invigilators with new vests with pockets to hold pens and pencils. To improve the department/faculty experience, Ryerson will now require the names of invigilators beforehand and real-time invigilator attendance will be provided to departments.

Michelle and her team will be considering scheduling software and other future initiatives including a formal, published examination policy review, support for departmental assistants, faculty and contract lecturers, an examination of the need for midterms versus final examinations,

streamlining make up exams, and an analysis of examination submission and attendance technology.

b. Course Outlines

Dr. John Turtle, Secretary of Senate, discussed the changing nature of course outlines and many of the myths associated with course outlines. For example, he has overheard rumors that students in a lecture may—by a two-thirds vote held by the instructor—change the content of a course outline. This is false. The policy actually states students have to be alerted to changes by as many channels as possible. If assignments have already started, students must have the option to complete the old assignment posted. Currently, there is a Word document faculty can use as a template to structure their course outline.

A proposed automated system to create custom course outlines would be ideal. This custom course outline generator could be auto-populated by a template and a multi-layer process could be agreed upon to ensure the outline has the correct information required by the university, Academic Integrity, Academic Accommodation Support, and each faculty, department and course. This proposal would also need integration with RAMSS and D2L. Although there is concern that the outline could be too long, the course outline template could be accessible with a decision tree interface to add different parts to the course outline as needed.

This proposal could solve the largest problem in course outlines presently, which is student and faculty requests for more information to be provided in the course outline on course management policy and how individual courses fit into a program of study. Students have also expressed the desire to receive course outlines before classes commence, and for an archive of course outlines to be available in a system other than course shells in D2L.

Part of this discussion began as an issue on Soapbox, specifically “Why do we not get our course outlines earlier i.e. before the first day of class?” The course management policy currently states that the course outline should be ready by the first week of class. Faculty are often concerned that they will need to make a change and will not be able to if they release their course outline early. TRSM has run a pilot project to have generic course outline templates available for all of its sections. All the course outlines are housed in TRSM and can be requested by a student before classes start.

Ryerson’s Curriculum Implementation Committee would like to provide more information on open elective courses. As of this report, Ryerson has 990 courses on the open electives table. According to survey results, students want more information about open elective courses than that provided in the 75-word calendar description. The Academic Standards Committee, which reviews all course outlines for a program’s periodic program review, has found that university policies are often stated incorrectly or are outdated. There is no consistency in course outlines, even within departments. The committee pointed out that software solutions could create a course outline that auto-populates. Administrators could enter in relevant information that would be standard across all course outlines and then faculty could enter their course specific information. Faculty would be unable to change policies and phrasing in this solution. Often the feedback received from new faculty is that they want a template even just as a starting point. The committee also pointed out that because course objectives are outlined and aligned to the program learning outcomes, the need to auto-populate the learning objectives in course outlines may be a priority for the university.

The Registrar’s Office gets requests for old course outlines for transfer credits. Thus, an excellent idea would be an archive of past course outlines searchable by year, course and professor. The

committee notes standardized course outlines for electives are impractical. From an administrative point of view, in appeals, course outlines are often used and if the policy is stated incorrectly in the course outline, there are major problems. Contract lecturers may get policies wrong if they work with several schools. However, in the Chang School, course outlines are templated and archived, a practice that should not be altered.

Even though faculty members are required to submit their course outlines to their department, it does not always happen. Often in program reviews, there is not a complete list of course outlines for the courses being taught in a program. A complete set of outlines is usually available for accredited programs, as governing bodies require course outlines to maintain accreditation. Some faculty are concerned about students “shopping” for courses and accommodations. If multiple sections have different assessments, students may try to find a section with assessments they prefer. The committee asked if we should be trying to limit student shopping for courses, as they would be doing it either way in the first two weeks. Is this not considered academic freedom for students?

If software is to be developed to handle the templating and archiving of course outlines, there are some very important issues. Namely, the user experience for faculty and contract lecturers needs to be taken into account. The new course outline system would have to maintain an easy to use interface and be simple for users. The Secretary of Senate already sends out a Microsoft Word template at the beginning of each semester, but not every instructor receives this email, they may be hired too late in the year or the email may be sent out too late.

c. Alternative Assessments

This discussion was led by Charmaine Hack, John Turtle, Paola Borin, and Eric Kam, and centered on the need to rethink the midterm and final exam framework. Ryerson suffers from a lack of space for final exams and the easy solutions, such as late night or early morning final exams are stressful for students. The question posed is whether it is necessary for courses to have a one-hour final examination? The overwhelming answer across the faculty is negative and the new final examination framework will phase out one-hour final exams scheduled during the exam period. They will be done at the end of the term during class.

Nationally, the topic of reworking exams into alternative assessments is very active, but there is not much work currently being done at Ryerson on the subject. Ryerson’s large growth in the number of classes and the number of students is not sustainable right now with the current final exam model. In addition, course management policy creates issues when dealing with group work and the prohibition on testing/final assignments before final exams (i.e. having both a final exam and a final assignment). Other alternative assessments not covered by current policies include rules and regulations around take-home exams that are due during the final exam period. Many faculty argue alternative assessments pose some issues with accredited programs (i.e. FEAS programs), but the SLTC argued that this should not be a problem.

The reality is final exams can be very difficult to mark, especially when they are scheduled at the end of the exam period. Final exams can sometimes cause a backlog in academic integrity cases. It was suggested that moving the study week to the end of the semester could alleviate some of the stress felt by students between the end of term and the final exam period. However, the committee mostly agreed this would not be practical since this midterm break already alleviates stress for students during the semester. The study week in the fall semester is really designed for first year students to get some breathing room to reflect on how they are doing on their courses. Is it possible to not schedule study week on statutory holidays, so that classes on Mondays do not

sacrifice two classes per semester? The committee agreed to revisit this issue in the next academic year.

Learning objectives are important in the discussion of new assessment mechanisms. Aligning learning objectives to assessments may be a good start to determine if the new assessment format is appropriate. For example, is a final exam format necessary in all courses? Data reveal that the number of final exams has increased overall, with a substantial increase in the number of exams administered by Academic Accommodation Support. Accommodation requests that require private exam rooms are not sustainable within current trends. In addition, Schools/Departments often make arbitrary rules for make-up exams. There needs to be a single system in place.

There needs to be more education and outreach to Schools/Departments to ensure that their policies do not contradict university policies. An example is courses in which students must pass the final exam to pass the course regardless of their overall grade in the course. The issue of grading variations within a course is being discussed by the Academic Governance and Policy Committee. The issue will be on the Senate agenda soon. When School/Department policies are inconsistent with university policies, the result is an increase in grade appeals and in complaints to the Ombudsperson.

Group work also needs to be well thought out and planned. Training for group work for students is not always built into the course. Training in successful group work may not be in the curriculum but is definitely a skill needed in the real world. There are services around the university, and group work training for faculty can be addressed in LTO workshops on student well-being and through live-actor simulations offered by the Interpersonal Skills Teaching Centre. The SLT committee decided to reopen this discussion in the next academic year.

4. Annual Learning & Teaching Conference

The SLTC decided to use 2017 as a year for change for the previously named Faculty Conference. Last year, the conference had 660 registrations, a new record, and the committee hoped to build off this past success. The title, Faculty Conference, implies that the event is for Ryerson faculty, but this is counterintuitive to creating a community of practice. You do not have to be teaching faculty to be engaged in teaching, learning and pedagogy. In order to be more inclusive, it was decided to rename the annual conference **Ryerson's Learning & Teaching Conference**.

There was some concern that the Faculty Conference is a well-known and established brand and any new name would need a big announcement to signify the name change. The committee noted that the name change would be viewed positively by CUPE instructors who do not see themselves represented under the current name. The question was: How do we rebrand the conference and still maintain faculty attendance? It was suggested that we could use a tagline such as "for faculty and educators" or use a disclaimer such as "Formally known as..."

It was noted that other universities such as UOIT, McMaster, and Guelph open up their faculty conferences to the external community. Thus, there is the potential to open the conference to partner institutions and other GTA universities. The committee recommended against converting the conference into an Ontario-wide conference, which may or may not be an event under STLHE.

The committee discussed the main purpose of the conference, and although there was no single answer, some ideas were suggested. The conference is meant to create a community of practice in learning and teaching. The conference should not charge internal community members, but may

charge externals. The conference requires a cost analysis of external invitations. For example, Mount Royal University holds a teaching and learning symposium costing \$425, but it is held at Banff. The committee argued the conference should focus on the Ryerson community but be open to external guests (who could be asked to pay a fee for the lunch).

Key issues discussed -

1. Should the conference be open to students?
2. Should the conference be advertised to graduate students and have student panels?
3. What is the role of Student Affairs?
4. What is the theme for the afternoon panel?
5. Who is the best keynote?
6. How should the committee define student engagement?

The committee brainstormed titles for this year's conference theme and decided on **RU Engaged: Learning, Teaching and Student Engagement**.

This year's conference will experiment with a new format, with 50, 25 and 10-minute presentations grouped into topic areas. The committee will ask for help with reviewing the proposals and grouping them. The Ryerson Learning and Teaching Conference is on May 18, 2017.

5. University-Wide Teaching Awards

Michelle Schwartz, Instructional Design and Research Strategist and Teaching Awards Coordinator at the LTO opened a discussion on the Provost's Interdisciplinary Teaching Award. This award has not been as popular as the Provost's Awards for Experiential and Innovative Teaching, potentially due to some inconsistencies in the criteria and the ambiguity of its goals. Therefore, Michelle wanted to rework the Interdisciplinary Teaching Award description based on feedback she has received from faculty either nominated for awards or curious about whether they are worthy of the award, and from adjudicators charged with selecting a winner.

At the beginning of the year, the description for the award read as follows

The Interdisciplinary Teaching Award recognizes a Ryerson educator or a group of educators who have made contributions to advancing teaching and learning at Ryerson with a particular focus on Interdisciplinary teaching and on students' Interdisciplinary learning and who have an outstanding teaching record.

Michelle proposed the following modifications, which are currently under review –

The Interdisciplinary Teaching Award recognizes a Ryerson educator or a group of educators with outstanding teaching records, who have made contributions to advancing teaching and learning at Ryerson with a particular focus on interdisciplinary teaching. This can include working collaboratively across schools/departments, developing curricula with a multidisciplinary approach, or teaching and learning contributions in an interdisciplinary program.


The criteria for the award are also currently under review and a new set of guidelines for the Provost's Interdisciplinary Teaching Award will be ready for the next awards cycle, opening in the fall.

The committee also provided feedback on the overall requirements for the university-wide teaching awards (Chancellor's, President's, and Provost's Awards). The committee suggested that a lack of guidance provided to nominators meant that many of the supporting materials were being included without context, and thus made it difficult for the content to be assessed. The lack of a maximum number of supporting letters also led many nominators to submit as many as possible, which has been a burden on the adjudication committee. Based on suggestions made at SLT, the following changes will be made to the guidelines:

1. Once a nomination is selected to move forward by the Faculty Awards Committee, the nominator will be able to edit the nomination brief they previously submitted to provide references and context to the material that will be included in the final package.
2. A maximum number of letters has been set for each award.
3. Instructions have been included for nominators asking them to provide meaningful descriptions to any supporting materials.

Michelle Schwartz also reviewed updates being made to the Awards Nomination Portal to improve the user experience both for nominators and adjudication committees.

Respectfully Submitted,



Marcia Moshé, Interim Vice Provost Academic
Chair of the Committee
May 22, 2017