SENATE MINUTES OF MEETING
Tuesday, December 4, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT:

EX-OFFICIO:	FACULTY:		STUDENTS:
L. Barnoff	D. Androutsos	V. Magness	N. Allou
M. Benarroch	C. Antonescu	D. Mason	B. Baum
M. Bountrogianni	R. Babin	A. McWilliams	N. Chen
D. Cramb	A. Bailey	A. Miransky	J. Circo
G. Craney	S. Benda	P. Moore	A. Jagayat
I. Crookshank	T. Burke	S. Rakhmayil	F. Khan
T. Duever	D. Checkland	R. Ravindran	R. Kucheran
C. Falzon	Y. Derbal	P. Shannon	J. Marriott
C. Hack	K. Dermody	S. Sabatinos	S. Rattan
M. Lachemi	M. Dionne	N. Thomlinson	
K. MacKay	S. Dolgoy	J. Tiessen	
J. Mactavish	A. El-Rabbany	M. Tiessen	
C. Shepstone	R. Hudyma	M. Vahabi	
P. Sugiman	C. Kular	N. Walton	**EX-OFFICIO STUDENTS:**
D. Taras	K. Kumar	A. Yazdani	R. J. Allick

SENATE ASSOCIATES:		ALUMNI:
A. M. Brinsmead		C. Tam

REGRETS:	ABSENT:
D. Brown	S. Faruqi
S. Liss	E. Ignagni
J. Makuch	A. Rahunathan
S. Mehmood	A. Sharma
R. Meldrum	J. Zboralski
I. Mishkel	
D. O'Neil Green	
A. Saloojee	
S. Zolfaghari	
M. Zouri	

1. Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum

   Land Acknowledgement:
   President Lachemi read the Land Acknowledgement.

2. Approval of the Agenda
   Motion: *That Senate approve the agenda for the December 4, 2018 meeting*

   A. McWilliams moved; M. Bountrogianni seconded
   Motion approved.

3. Announcements
   There were no announcements

4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
   Motion: *That Senate approve the minutes of the November 6, 2018 meeting*

   A. McWilliams moved; N. Walton seconded

   Comments:
   M. Dionne commented that there should be more detailed reporting in the minutes about what happens as oppose to an expanded agenda. For example, there was a spirited discussion about the Urban Health proposal agenda item at the last meeting and critique and constructive criticism about that proposal. We don't need to name every single one verbatim but some commentary needs to be made that Senate did its job. Agendas were read, questions were asked and commentary addressed and this should be included in the minutes.

   M. Dionne also stated that at the end of the minutes the discussion got shut down by protestors when we were talking about Freedom of Expression. We were not allowed to speak around the table with opposing views - an affront to democracy. They did not allow open discussion of our own Senate. We weren't allowed to enforce our own bylaws of Senate and rules and procedures, and the minutes are written in a way as if some weather system came through. People would want to know that we can't get business done at the University if random groups shout us down. I am happy to have a conversation with people with opposing views but that is not how democracy goes forward.

   President Lachemi asked the Secretary of Senate to elaborate more for historical things and indicated that for future it is important to insert these comments.

   M. Dionne: It is up to the will of Senate if minutes are sent back and approved next time or we approve in principle. My personal feeling is Senate would like to see more accurate minutes so I choose to defer.

   D. Mason pointed out an error in item 7.4.3.2 about a statement attributed to him. He said he will gladly provide the correct statement to the Secretary of Senate.

Motion to Defer the minutes of the November 6, 2018 meeting to include amendments:
V. Magness moved; M. Dionne seconded
Motion to defer approved.

M. Dionne also complimented D. Bell for doing a wonderful job and loves that we're getting the agenda sent out on time.

5. Matters Arising from the Minutes - None

6. Correspondence - None

7. Reports
7.1 Report of the President
7.1.1 President's Update

Highlights:

President Lachemi gave an update on consultations with Senate concerning the Freedom of Expression Statement. He provided an update on some items from the last Senate meeting. He remarked on the presence of student protestors partway through the last Senate meeting, which caused the meeting to be adjourned early. This protest made the motion surrounding the Freedom of Expression Statement challenging. When the last meeting was adjourned, in keeping with Senate rules, all previous motions related to the proposed statement were closed. In consultation with the President's Office team and the co-chairs of the sub-committee that worked on the revised statement, the decision was made to not return the revised statement to Senate at this point. President Lachemi then recognized the hard work of the sub-committee that worked to create the thoughtful and well-developed statement. However, as highlighted by our colleagues and faculty members near the end of the last Senate meeting, there is a need for further consultation with the Ryerson community so that the statement may better reflect their views. Provost Benarroch has been asked to commence the process of consultation with faculty members and the Interim Vice-Provost, Students (I. Crookshank) has been asked to consult with students.

President Lachemi also stated that there have been two meetings with Senators in which the consultation process has been discussed and the need to involve Senators. In addition, the decision was made to introduce some changes to Senate. The use of technology, i.e. iClickers for voting at Senate meetings was in use at the meeting for the first time. It is important to have Senate be productive and fulfill its mandate. Senators also received an email sent on December 3, 2018, from the Secretary of Senate, regarding the operational changes. Changes are not meant to silence people but rather measures taken because we need Senate to be in an environment that is positive and we want to provide Senators with ways to do that.

Provost Benarroch and Interim Vice-Provost Students, I. Crookshank, spoke to the plans for consultations.

Provost Benarroch stated that he would begin the process of consulting with faculty, while I. Crookshank will lead the consultations with students. He stated that he has met with R. Babin and three of the four faculty members who are not members of Senate that spoke at the last Senate meeting, to hear their views and concerns about the Freedom of Expression statement. He asked Deans and the Chief Librarian to organize within their Faculties/Department an opportunity for him to come and speak with faculty and potentially students to hear other views from across the university. Consultations will likely take place in January and February. Once this feedback has been collected, it can then be decided as to what the next steps should be and to inform Senate and the Ryerson community of these decisions.

I. Crookshank met with student Senator R. Kucheran and the plan moving forward is to work with student Senators to involve them in the consultation process broadly with students. The plan is to work with targeted student groups who have expressed interest in this topic. The intent is to gather feedback on both a large and small-scale basis in order to gain a broad depth of feedback. Another decision that I. Crookshank and Provost Benarroch announced was to be more public about decisions surrounding the framework for students, faculty, and staff so that they remain both informed and involved.

Provost Benarroch stated that the RFA has invited him to speak to their members, and the Provost invited other faculty members and Senators to contact him if necessary on how we can be inclusive in this consultation process.

R. Babin offered some topics that the RFA would like addressed. He stated that the RFA has had extensive discussion on this at the Representatives Council. He stated that these individuals represent all of the schools and departments at Ryerson. The RFA has identified four issues that have already started to be addressed and that these concerns have been made public.

President Lachemi then recognized and welcomed K. MacKay who is the new Vice-Provost Academic. He also thanked M. Moshé, outgoing interim Vice-Provost Academic, for her leadership. She has worked on very significant academic policies and learning and teaching initiatives in this role for the past three years. He stated that her work will have lasting positive effects on Ryerson from this role and previous leadership roles.

President Lachemi also recognized the new Vice Provost, Students (Jen McMillen) who will take on this role on Monday, December 10. He thanked interim Vice-Provost, Students (I. Crookshank) for the important work he has done and commended his commitment to Ryerson and students in everything he did in this role.

Also recognized were; Rivi Frankle, Assistant Vice-President of Development, who received a Lifetime Achievement Award for her piece at the Association of Fundraising Professionals; Sarah Henstra, a faculty member from the Department of English, who received a 2018 Governor Generals Literary Award for Fiction in English.

President Lachemi noted the accomplishments of our athletic teams: Men's Hockey, Men's and Women's Basketball teams, and the Women's Volleyball team.

He thanked past President Sheldon Levy and his wife Tracy for their contributions to Ryerson. The SLC was renamed in their honor: Sheldon & Tracy Levy Student Learning Centre.

President Lachemi then gave an update on the Law School proposal. He stated that a letter has been sent to the Minister requesting a meeting to continue the dialogue and that he is awaiting a reply. He emphasized the importance of working towards the implementation of the Law School and that Ryerson is not giving up on this effort. President Lachemi also stated that an approval by the government is not a requirement at this time because all of the approvals needed are acquired through three different governing bodies. An important aspect of these approvals, however, is aimed at allowing eligibility of OSAP funding for students.

At this point, there is no update on the Brampton campus. The Chang School is planning to run a number of programs in the winter term from Brampton. Ryerson is also working hard to establish a National Centre for Cyber Security and will continue to update the community on these efforts.

President Lachemi ended his updates by discussing access to education. A video was presented, which showed the efforts that have been made at Ryerson to ensure that Ryerson is accessible to students.

D. Mason stated that, regarding President Lachemi's update on the Law School and Brampton campus, he understood that these projects were supposed to cost nothing to other departments or cause no impact on other aspects of the university. However, it now seems that there are going to be transfers from other departments into the Faculty of Law, which will inevitably have an impact on those departments. He asked how this is going to be built in as there is obviously going to be a financial effect from this. Likewise, with Brampton, he stated that he recently attended a CAUT meeting (Canadian Association of University Teachers) and he was told that Ryerson was in fact going to be building on the Brampton campus. As Ryerson is still awaiting the financial support of the government, this plan to build means that the university's financial resources are being used. Due to this, D. Mason asked how we are going to uphold the earlier promise not to affect other departments while we do things without any government support.

President Lachemi asked that the first question which was previously asked by the former president of the Faculty Association, be directed to Provost Benarroch. He stated that he is sure the Provost will respond similarly to when Peter was here as President. In regards to the feasibility of the school, the position is the same, but he stated that the Provost can give more details on that aspect.

Addressing Ryerson's building at the Brampton campus, he stated that this was news to him. He stated that Ryerson has not, and will not be spending any money to build at the Brampton campus. The space needed to house the National Centre for Cyber Security, and the Chang School was offered by the city of Brampton. He then stated that there was funding from the previous government to establish the campus that was approved, including funding for the land, but this has since been cancelled by the current government and therefore Ryerson has halted plans to expand at this time.

M. Benarroch then stated that there is some misinformation surrounding Ryerson and the Brampton campus largely born from an article in the Brampton newspaper that implied Ryerson was going ahead with its original plans. However, Ryerson is only going ahead on some small projects there as was mentioned, which does not include a building. In terms of the Law School, Ryerson is reworking the budget. M. Benarroch stated that there were always two budgets for the Law School, one of which included government support and the other without the support. Both were break-even budgets in the sense that the revenue that is coming in will be the revenue used to finance the Law School. There is the possibility that current faculty members would move either as cross-appointments or current appointments and possibly that faculty members would want to be in the Law School and apply for positions there. We have made the commitment that all those positions would be back-filled at the same rank to those departments. He stated that a meeting was just held with deans, chairs, faculty members, and Ron Babin from the RFA to discuss how this process would work. Ryerson is still committed to, when the Law School is launched, have it be fully cost-recovered.

D. Mason stated that it is very interesting to hear how presidents at other universities inform their Senates. In particular, he stated that one of his colleagues was told that they would be putting in a small building on one of the other satellite campuses to establish a foothold, similar to the Chang School's effort.

President Lachemi interjected to state that the situation at York University is quite different from Ryerson's as their project had been approved a long time ago and their university spent $20,000,000 in Markham. He stated that it was important to clarify the two aspects.

D. Mason stating that, in regard to the change in process to Senate procedures, it sounds a little Orwellian. He understands that it is important to function as a Senate. The communication of what Senate had just sent to Senators made it sound like anybody who wanted to attend a Senate meeting had to reserve in advance, However, he stated that his understanding was that the public areas were open until room capacity. So, if a similar communication is being sent to the university at large, it is important to emphasize that we are attempting to continue to function as Senate but without restricting access or transparency. It is only if they are going to be speaking to a particular issue that we want to reserve a place. The way the current communication was composed made it seem as though only people who reserved a place at the meeting in advance could attend - I don't think this was anyone's intention. When communicating, we should think of someone who is not a Senator, and how they might be reading it.

President Lachemi thanked D. Mason for his comments. He stated that what was communicated with Senators has nothing to do with silencing people's views in regard to open discussion for the Freedom of Expression Statement. The information regarding reserved seats is just to ensure that sufficient seats are reserved for members speaking at Senate so that all matters on the given agenda may be conducted. Limited seats will be reserved for those invited to attend Senate but we are not limiting access to Senate. President Lachemi concluded by stating that he believes it is important to have a platform for people to express their views in a respectful manner as many Senators felt very intimidated by the behavior of protestors at the last meeting. We give a platform to anyone who wants to express their views on Freedom of Expression.

S. Rakhmayil stated that at the last Senate meeting, many Senators left due to the presence of protestors, however, he feels that this should not have happened, and asked why didn't we call security to have them removed so we could complete the business of Senate.

President Lachemi replied by stating that, especially because the views being raised were surrounding the Freedom of Expression, it is very important to create a platform where these concerns can be raised. We put rules in place to address these behaviours. He stated that he, as President of Ryerson, cannot see himself penalizing students for expressing their views even if they are not always respectful.

7.2 Communications Report – as presented in the agenda

7.3   Report of the Secretary
7.3.1 Annual Nominating Committee Constituted. D. Bell provided the names of members of this committee:

D. Bell stated that, in terms of the Report of the Secretary, the Annual Nominating Committee was constituted as per the Senate bylaws and shall be created each fall. The committee's membership will be reported to Senate. The committee's membership includes: Tom Deuver, Anne-Marie Brinsmead, Richard Meldrum, Naomi Chen, Simran Rattan, and Donna Bell.

7.3.2 Update on student Senator position – TRSM

D. Bell stated that there was a vacancy in the TRSM student representative category and that position was then given to the second runner-up from the original Senate elections. D. Bell then welcomed Brian Baum back to Senate.

7.4 Committee Reports
7.4.1 Report #F2018-2 of the Academic Standards Committee - (ASC): M. Benarroch

7.4.1.1 TRSBM Law and Business Co-op Resequencing Proposal

Motion: *That Senate approve the TRSBM Law and Business Co-op Resequencing Proposal as described in the agenda package.*

A. McWilliams moved; V. Magness seconded

M. Benarroch stated that this motion is to adjust the timing for when students in the Law and Business Major can apply for the Co-op Program. It is consistent with how the other programs in the school are done. It is intended to move entry in the Co-op Program from the end of first year to second year. It would allow students to take courses in the area of law and business and would make them better prepared to enter and be more competitive in Co-op placement. He directed any further questions people might have to representatives from TRSM in the gallery.

B. Baum asked whether this would limit the number of spaces for students.

C. MacDonald responded that it is only a matter of timing and will not affect the number of Co-op terms, they would just have taken more law courses and have more law experience.

Motion approved.

7.4.1.2 School of Nursing Course Grade Variations

Motion: *That Senate approve the School of Nursing Course Grade Variations as described in the agenda package.*

N. Walton moved; D. Mason seconded

M. Benarroch stated that, while nursing already has current standing variation of a C or higher for all Nursing courses, this is related specifically to students' ability to demonstrate satisfactory performance in the evaluation of clinically-related skills. There are five courses in which this motion is being requested for. The focus of these courses is hands-on nursing skills which can be assessed through assignments and evaluation of students work which can be 'satisfactory' or 'non-satisfactory'. The accreditation of the Baccalaureate program requires that students demonstrate their ability to implement the standards and practices throughout their nursing education. We have people from the school to answer any questions.

Motion approved.

7.4.2 Report #F2018-2 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC):
M. Benarroch

7.4.2.1 Academic Policy Review Committee (APRC) update: D. Bell

D. Bell stated that the 2018 report summarizes the findings of the two pilots that APRC initiated during the 2017-18 academic year. The first pilot was the Academic Consideration Request online system and the recommendations are:
1) that the undergraduate students in all programs be required to submit the requests for academic consideration based on health grounds via the online system. As an update, there are currently four Faculties on board, with plans to include another two over the winter term.
2) that students' uploaded documentation be accepted without requirement of submitting the original hard-copy document to the program office. This will be piloted in winter, 2019.
3) that the online system should be expanded to allow students to request academic consideration based on compassionate grounds as well as religious, Aboriginal, and spiritual observance. This will be undertaken once all Faculties are on board with the ACR system.

In terms of the recommendations for the second pilot on self-declarations:
1) In defined circumstances, verification documentation should not be required for students seeking academic consideration due to extenuating circumstances.
2) The use of health certificates and if adopted self-declarations be monitored over the next two years as more Faculties join the ACR online system.

3) Schools, departments, and Faculties be encouraged to develop strategies to address the inappropriate use of requests for academic consideration either through health certificates or if adopted self-declarations.

D. Bell then stressed that the important thing the APRC will produce for community consultation and feedbackis a discussion paper that outlines the various models for self-declarations and the advantages and disadvantages of each.

7.4.2.2 Senate Bylaws Update

D. Checkland stated that originally it was stated that the proposals for the bylaws would be brought forward at this meeting for consideration. There are ongoing consultations with regards to the issue of making formal Indigenous representation on Senate and how to do that. He then stated that they are awaiting a meeting with the Aboriginal Education Council to discuss this so that it may be incorporated into the bylaws. Ideally, the new bylaws should be voted on by the January Senate meeting because the elections for next year's Senate take place in mid-February. Some minor concerns regarding procedural changes have been made and this will also be addressed in the package that will be produced for the January meeting.

7.4.3 Report #F2018-1 of the Curriculum Implementation Committee (CIC): C. Hack

7.4.3.1 Policy #2 Undergraduate Curriculum Structure – C. Hack spoke to this report.

Motion: *That Senate approve the minor revisions to Policy #2 Undergraduate Curriculum Structure as described in the agenda package.*

C. Hack moved; A. McWilliams seconded

C. Hack stated that in the meeting that took place on November 5, 2018, the Curriculum Implementation Committee voted in favour of recommending to the Academic Governance and Policy Committee minor changes to Policy #2: Undergraduate Curriculum Structure glossary. CIC recommends a revised definition of degree completion program as well as the addition of terms, direct entry program, and reach-back course. Degree completion programs are distinct from direct entry programs and reach-back course is a standard term used in offers of admission. The proposed changes were brought forward by the Registrar's Office as points of clarification to help in understanding the different modes of entry into different types of program structures. The proposed change to the definition of degree completion program starts with the current definition as an undergraduate program in which students are admitted to either an advanced level of a program or to a specifically-designed, discrete program based on the completion of a public, often Ontario, college diploma program. Other admissions criteria may be required. The proposed definition is a move to an undergraduate program in which students are admitted to specially-designed discrete program based on the completion of a public, often Ontario, college diploma program. Other admissions criteria may be required. This is really a separation of the definition into two parts so that it can be better understood. The new addition to the glossary, as proposed, is for the direct entry program definition which would be a post-secondary degree pathway based on the completion of a public, often Ontario, college diploma program. Other

admissions criteria may be required, and entry is into year three of a four-year program. In some cases, reach-back courses may be assigned. Following that, the reach-back course is defined as a course from year one or two of a four-year program that may be assigned to a direct entry student.

Motion approved.

7.4.4 Report #F2018-1 of the Scholarly Research and Creative Activity Committee
7.4.4.1 Policy #144 Research Centres

Motion: *That Senate approve Policy #144 Research Centres as described in the agenda package.*

K. MacKay moved; V. Magness seconded

K. MacKay stated that this is a review of Policy #144 on Research Centres that was initiated last Spring through the Senate SRC Advisory Committee. A working group was struck, and this policy was approved in the year 2000 and since then there has been an acceleration of SRC at Ryerson and a proliferation of research centres on campus. Updates to the policy required the acknowledgement of a lack of awareness and adherence to the current policy, a need for increased transparency and accountability across the creation operation, a review of centres, and to improve communication surrounding Policy #144. An extensive two-phase consultation process started in the spring with a working group was held as well as town halls, online survey, website, and so forth. The working group took that feedback, developed a draft, and this update was posted for the fall. Then a second round of consultations took place in a similar fashion and, following this additional feedback, the policy was redrafted once again and brought to the SRCAC Committee who's unanimously recommending its approval. K. MacKay then stated that the summary of these proposed changes is contained within the agenda packages and that the focus is moving to the new template. The inclusion of values and principles help to emphasize the transparency and the notion of reciprocity across research centres and the university. It also allows for a more transparent process not unlike the process for new program creation, similar to Policy #112, and an enhanced role of the Senate SRCAC committee to ensure less duplication and more open communication regarding the creation, review, and operation of centres.

Motion approved.

8. Old Business - None

9. New Business as Circulated - None

10. Members' Business

Motion: *That the Senate of Ryerson University hereby expresses its deepest thanks to Dr. Marcia Moshé for the integrity, care, collegiality, and innovation she daily demonstrated in her three years as Interim Vice-Provost Academic, and wishes her all the very best in her future endeavours.*

D. Checkland moved; T. Burke seconded

D. Checkland first brought forth the motion that Senate at Ryerson University hereby expresses its deepest thanks to Dr. Marcia Moshé for the integrity, care, and collegiality, and innovation she daily demonstrated in her three years as Interim Vice-Provost, Academic and wishes her all the best in her future endeavors.

Provost Benarroch stated that he was fortunate enough in his first year and a half here to work with Marcia. He indicated that one of the things he knew about Marcia is that when she said something was ready for Senate, it was ready. That kind of confidence in somebody was important and he expressed that he learned a lot from her about structures and curriculum at Ryerson and fully supported this motion.

President Lachemi also spoke in support of this motion and stated that in terms of quality of work, Marcia set the bar very high for all to follow.

Motion approved.

D. Checkland raised a second issue. He indicated it came out of issues that Michelle raised in the minutes. Senate makes suggestions for people to adopt or not but the time could come that a faculty member may think these are not suggestions, and need action to be taken. What would happen if Senate agreed with that for example – put forward amendment to approve Program X – accept conditionally on X being done. What is the process if that were to happen? Would it go back to the appropriate school and then go through the Academic Standards Committee all over again, or they make the changes and then go back to Senate? It would be important to know.

Provost Benarroch replied that, though he does not have a complete answer to this, whatever body approved it before it came to Senate, approved it in that fashion. Then, if a change is made at Senate, it would have to go back to that department for approval and then, he believes, it would have to go back to the given committee. Some Senators have chosen to deem some changes as minor modifications that do not have to go back to the committee and believed that Ryerson's Senate could decide if they wanted to do something similar. We should have a discussion about whether it has to go back.

R. J. Allick replied that as a representative from members of The Continuing Education Students' Association of Ryerson (CESAR), the currently vacant student Senator seats available to Chang School students will be occupied for the new year prior to the next election term (2019-2020); and said incoming student Senators for 2018-2019 term, whose seats have been empty for a significant amount of time, their roles and responsibilities should not include motions that had been from 2018 as it would affect their transition into their new Senator positions.

President Lachemi clarified that students are staying on Senate until the end of the academic year, and even if the election is taking place as early as February, students' stay for the academic year.

D. Mason commented that what could be done in a motion such as this, is to go beyond, go further than provisionally and conditionally accepting something; to lay out the path that it has to take to proceed.

D. Mason raised a concern that Ryerson is a member of The Chamber of Commerce (OCC). He explained that the OCC was vocally against Bill 147, a Bill that made significant steps to approve equity and labour generally. The OCC was actively opposed to that Bill and was actively in favour of Bill 148 which, repealed most of those progressive policies. He further indicated he was concerned that as we are a social justice oriented organization can we justify being a member of a lobbying group that is so obviously not. D. Mason asked what are we doing to distance ourselves from this position and have we considered leaving the OCC?

President Lachemi explained that the OCC has 60,000 members with different levels of membership, and Ryerson has the lowest membership tier which entitles the university to very few benefits. These include free or early registration for some of the chamber events and monthly newsletter. At this level of membership, Ryerson is not permitted to shape the OCC policy agenda though Ryerson is concerned about the position they are taking. There are a number of units at Ryerson that benefit from this membership; such as the Diversity Institute in Ted Rogers School of Management and Magnet. Magnet is the link to facilitate job opportunities for our own students and also students in post- secondary education. This is the reason why we are members in this organization.

D. Mason replied that in comparison to what Ryerson gets out of this partnership, the OCC gets a fair deal of benefits as it allows them to say that Ryerson is a member which implies that Ryerson is supportive of them and no one knows we are at the lowest level of membership and do not impact policy. Therefore, he suggested that Ryerson seriously consider the cost benefit of this partnership. Important you mention students – as they are the people who will suffer the most from rollbacks. He requested that we should seriously look at this and that he will await some response, but failing a reasonable response, he will provide a notice of motion to change this policy one way or another.

S. Rakhmayil expressed that he has been using iClicker technology for the last six years in classes. He advised members on the proper way to use this devise. He stated that they should wait for the post to open before they click to vote. The check mark on each person's screen means their vote was accepted. He stated that this change to iClickers is long overdue.

S. Faruqi, stated that he was in agreement with D. Mason's concerns regarding Ryerson's relationship with the OCC and that Ryerson should make a public statement - maybe not leave the OCC but at least show that we are opposed to what the chamber has been in support of.

President Lachemi indicated that we will look into this and get back to Senate on this matter.

J. Circo spoke on behalf of student Senators and thanked President Lachemi, D. Bell, L. Stewart and all Senators for their hard work on Senate.

11. Consent Agenda

D. Mason stated that, in regards to updating technology, perhaps the Senate agenda could include, instead of page numbers on the side, a direct link to the page. Senate is working on this and hopes to have it in effect for the next Senate meeting.

President Lachemi thanked members for their commitment to Senate and the important work they do, and wished all a wonderful Holiday Season. He wished the students good luck with their exams, and also faculty who will be marking exams in time for the deadline.

11.1 Course Changes
https://www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2018/Course_Change_Forms_December_2018.pdf

Faculty of Arts: Arts (Common Platform); Arts & Contemporary Studies; Economics; Languages, Literatures & Cultures; Philosophy; Politics & Public Administration; Sociology

Faculty of Communication & Design: Creative Industries; Fashion; Graphic Communications Management; Image Arts; Interior Design; Journalism; Professional Communications; RTA New Media; RTA Media Production; RTA School of Media; RTA School of Performance (Acting/Dance); RTA School of Performance (Production); RTA Sports Media

Faculty of Community Services: Child & Youth Care; Disability Studies; Nutrition; Social Work; Urban & Regional Planning

Faculty of Science: Chemistry & Biology; Computer Science; Mathematics; Medical Physics

Faculty of Engineering & Architectural Science: Electrical & Computer Engineering

Ted Rogers School of Management: Accounting (Co-op Option); Business Management; Entrepreneurship & Strategy; Finance; Hospitality & Tourism Management; Information Technology Management; Real Estate Management

12. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 6:20pm.