

SENATE MINUTES OF MEETING

Tuesday, May 5, 2020

Via Zoom Video Conference

MEMBERS PRESENT:

EX-OFFICIO:	FACULTY:		STUDENTS:
L. Barnoff	R. Adams	J. Neil	M. Arif
M. Benarroch	D. Androutsos	R. Noble	Z. Bokhari
D. Cramb	S. Benvie	S. Rakhmayil	S. Donato-Woodger
G. Craney	T. Burke	H. Rollwagen	H. Elsayed
T. Duever	D. Checkland	S. Sabatinos	M. Moghaddas
C. Falzon	K. Dermody	I. Sakinofsky	K. Nguyen
C. Hack	M. Dionne	M. Tiessen	K. Park
G. Hepburn	A. Ferworn	J. Tiessen	V. Prevost
M. Lachemi	N. George	M. Vahabi	D. Salman
S. Liss	M. Green	N. Walton	H. Shahid
K. MacKay	R. Hudyma	A. Yazdani	J. Spagnuolo
D. O'Neil Green	E. Ignagni		
C. Searcy	L. Lavallée		
C. Shepstone	A. McWilliams		EX-OFFICIO STUDENTS:
D. Taras	R. Meldrum		J. Rodriguez
D. Young	A. Miransky		S. Sanith
S. Zolfaghari	P. Moore		

SENATE ASSOCIATES:

ALUMNI:

J. Dallaire	N. Di Cuia
M. Zouri	S. Rattan

REGRETS:

ABSENT:

C. Bradish	A. Bailey
A. M. Brinsmead	D. Bitondo
D. Brown	O. Karp
A. El-Rabbany	J. Kewal
R. Kucheran	K. Kumar
J. McMillen	
I. Mishkel	
P. Sugiman	

1. Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum
2. Land Acknowledgement
"Toronto is in the 'Dish With One Spoon Territory'. The Dish With One Spoon is a treaty between the Anishinaabe, Mississaugas and Haudenosaunee that bound them to share the territory and protect the land. Subsequent Indigenous Nations and peoples, Europeans and all newcomers have been invited into this treaty in the spirit of peace, friendship and respect."

3. Approval of the Agenda

Motion: *That Senate approve the agenda for the May 5th, 2020 meeting.*

A. McWilliams moved; G. Hepburn seconded

Motion Approved.

4. Announcements - None

5. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Motion: *That Senate approve the minutes of the April 7th, 2020 meeting.*

A. McWilliams moved; T. Duever seconded

Motion Approved.

6. Matters Arising from the Minutes -

Regarding the matter of registration access for students who are registered in the FNTI program, which starts the last week of August - the Provost stated that he is working with University Business Services to work on a solution as to whether those students could either come in to campus for one day and receive access to all the services they need, including the OneCard.

7. Correspondence - None

8. **Reports**

8.1 Report of the President

8.1.1 President's Update

The President Reported:

- 1) Mitch Frazer, Board Chair, has been appointed Chancellor of Ontario Tech University. He will step down as Chair of the Board at the end of June. We have already started the process of selection for a new Chair and we will update Senate as move forward.
- 2) The Search for Provost has been put on hold due to COVID-19 until sometime in June or until we develop a new process.
- 3) On April 30th, Ryerson and RSU entered a new agreement that enhances our relationship. The new provisions are centered on accountability and transparency. This will create a solid foundation for a positive work relationship and a shared

- approach for supporting students.
- 4) Budget 2020/2021 – This pandemic has created significant uncertainty in the budget process. Last week we presented a balanced, preliminary plan to the Board that includes a prudent amount of assumed risk to allow us to deal with the current situation as it evolves.
 - 5) Navitas - The Board approved that Ryerson can enter into an agreement with Navitas. The partnership will add a new additional pathway for international students into select Ryerson undergraduate programs.
 - 6) **COVID-19 Activities Slide Presentation Highlights**
 - a) **Goals:**
 - Protect our students, faculty and staff by limiting the potential spread of the virus;
 - Ensure our students can successfully complete their academic year and continue with online courses in the Spring and Summer, and that essential SRC activity continues
 - Work with our partners and government to come up with innovative solutions to help address the challenges resulting from the pandemic
 - b) **Planning for the future:** Two new groups have been created:
 - Scenario planning working group** - Providing critical advice on how best to deal with the current uncertain environment and advance the university's strategic goals.
 - Opportunities working group** - Working across Ryerson to identify opportunities and key partnerships to advance the university, and creating strategies to support new opportunities
 - c) **Supporting Students and faculty:**
 - Spring/Summer courses online increased by 183% in online enrollment compared to last year
 - Ryerson Student Relief Fund – there were 4000 applications within 4 days of the portal opening (\$3M issued). Individual Faculties have also supported students with bursaries. University Advancement have reached out to members of our community and our Ryerson Alumni community for help and have raised \$300,000 which will be used to support students.
 - Ryerson International assisted the return of nearly 200 faculty and students on international trips, exchanges or placements.
 - d) **Community engagement** – We conducted a Virtual Town Hall for Staff (May 1) and about 1300 people attend; faculty will be May 7 and a date will be scheduled for the student town hall.
 - e) **Supporting Ryerson's SRC Community** –
Lab2Market-Health

- New national program led by Ryerson and Dalhousie to accelerate health innovation
- Support graduate students, postdoctoral fellows and researchers with the tools and expertise needed to bring health solutions to market faster

f) SRC Innovation –

- **University researchers** have submitted more than 50 applications through programs such as the Ontario Together portal, Rapid Funding calls and the Roche Canada COVID-19 Innovation Challenge (including making N95 masks).
- **National Institute on Ageing** has submitted a proposal for three integrated projects related to the nursing and retirement home sector and virus transmission and mitigation.
- **Biomedical Zone** is working with NEXT Canada on a call to entrepreneurs to collaborate on solutions to the COVID-19 pandemic.
- **DMZ** launched #HackTheCurve: national tech challenge calling on Canadian innovators to develop innovative technology to help flatten the pandemic's curve.

g) Working with Government – We continue to actively participate in discussions with the Mayor of Toronto, Provincial and Federal governments and Ryerson submitted a proposal of how we can contribute to economic recovery focuses on leveraging the expertise and track record of various centres.

h) Supporting healthcare –

- **The Creative Technology Lab at FCAD** has secured supplies needed to continue producing face masks, head pieces and plastic shields (from the Minister of Economic Development). St. Michael's Hospital is distributing those masks made by our technology lab workers to frontline workers who are dealing with the COVID-19 patients.
- **The School of Fashion** is sewing 4,000 masks to be delivered to Toronto Hospitals.
- **Department of Chemistry and Biology** labs have donated 79,000 medical gloves, goggles and gowns to Michael's Hospital, Sunnybrook Hospital and Women's College Hospital
- **Daphne Cockwell School of Nursing** gathered thousands of N95 masks, gowns, gloves, hand sanitizer, wipes and more and delivered to St Michael's Hospital and Scarborough Health Network- Rouge Valley. The department has even donated hospital beds from their state-of-art labs.

i) Next steps – We have started developing initial plans for the potential return to work. We have too many external factors that will influence the decision as to what type of format we have and how we transition back to work.

8.2 Communications Report – included in the agenda.

8.3 Report of the Secretary

8.3.1 Senate Elections Update

The Secretary of Senate reported:

- 1) There are three new Senators attending tonight's Senate:
Ian Sakinovsky, RFA; Janet Rodriguez, CESAR; and Siddhanth Satish, RSU.
- 2) Three nominations were received for Vice Chair of Senate: Lynn Lavallée, Andy McWilliams, and Ravi Ravindran. An email will be sent to all elected Senators regarding voting process. Once the Vice Chair is determined, then the SPC membership will be finalized.

8.4 Committee Reports

8.4.1 Report #W2020-4 of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC): K. MacKay

8.4.1.1. Admission changes to the First Nations Technical Institute (FNTI) program – FCS School of Social Work

Motion: *That Senate approve the admission changes to the First Nations Technical Institute (FNTI) program – FCS School of Social Work.*

K. MacKay moved; Lynn Lavallée seconded.

Motion Approved.

8.4.1.2. Certificate review for Fundraising Management – Chang School

Motion: *That Senate approve the certificate review for Fundraising Management – Chang School.*

K. Mackay moved; G. Hepburn seconded

Motion Approved.

8.4.1.3. Certificate review for Health Informatics – Chang School

Motion: *That Senate approve the certificate review for Health Informatics – Chang School.*

K. MacKay moved; J. Tiessen seconded

Motion Approved.

8.4.1.4. Certificate modifications to Health Informatics – Chang School

Motion: *That Senate approve the certificate modifications to Health Informatics – Chang School.*

K. MacKay moved; G. Hepburn seconded
Motion Approved.

8.4.1.5. New Certificate in Urban Agriculture – Chang School

Motion: *That Senate approve the new Certificate in Urban Agriculture – Chang School.*

K. MacKay moved; D. Taras seconded
Motion Approved.

8.4.1.6. For information: G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education Certificate Revisions

- i. Certificate in Fundraising Management: Course Addition - Elective
- ii. Certificate in Leadership in Organizations: Course Addition - Elective
- iii. Certificate in Publishing: Changes to course descriptions and prerequisite

8.4.2 Report #W2020-4 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC):
M. Benarroch

8.4.2.1. Provost's Update – Provost Benarroch had no updates.

8.4.2.2. Policy 167: Academic Consideration (replacing part of Policy 134: Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals and part of Policy 152: Graduate Student Academic Consideration and Appeals)

Motion: *That Senate approve Policy 167: Academic Consideration (replacing part of Policy 134: Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals and part of Policy 152: Graduate Student Academic Consideration and Appeals).*

K. MacKay moved; A. McWilliams seconded
Motion Approved.

8.4.2.3. Policy 168: Grade and Academic Standing Appeals (replacing part of Policy 134: Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals and part of Policy 152: Graduate Student Academic Consideration and Appeals)

Motion: *That Senate approve Policy 168: Grade and Academic Standing Appeals (replacing part of Policy 134: Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals and part of Policy 152: Graduate Student Academic Consideration and Appeals).*

K. MacKay moved; N. Di Cua seconded

Comments/Questions:

- C. This is a very important policy because students are going through a process that can be extremely intimidating. The Glossary, page 63 of the agenda, the definition of “Advocate”: In the past, in Policy 134, the advocacy of the student rights coordinators from CESAR and RSU has been vital to accelerate the process and make it objective and fair. What it says in this definition in Policy 168, “A University approved individual acting on behalf of a student ..”, we would like to recommend, “A University recognized representative from CESAR or RSU acting on behalf of the student... (everything else remains the same)”.
- A. The mover explained this language came to the forefront as we found ourselves in a recent situation with RSU. This is to provide an opportunity potentially in the future to have additional advocates identified and also it should be that as unions representing the students change, then the policy doesn’t need to change. We had the hiatus with the Ryerson Student Union, it was problematic to have the actual name of the student body in the policy. This is in essence to provide more flexibility so that students can be represented.
- C. M. Lachemi – We will be having a new body representing graduate students. I think that the language was also to make sure that we are open to those changes. From the students’ perspective, it is important to have an advocate to represent them and for graduate students it is also very important.
- C. The policies will always be changing. This is a Friendly Amendment. We understand that CESAR and RSU are still a union and they represent the students. If you leave the university as the sole decision-maker on who can support and guide the students, it is one sided. If you want to include other people you can say a representative from RSU, CESAR or any other future groups. I understand Graduate students probably are coming on board, so that would cover that. We just would like to have a very clear language as it was in Policy 134 to say a representative from RSU and CESAR.
- Q. M. Lachemi – My understanding is that you want to make a Friendly Amendment. I will have to go back to the mover and seconder and ask for their opinion.
- A. The mover responded that it is a glossary so this could be part of the procedures versus the policy. That aspect of being more definitive, we could put in the procedures.
- C. M. Lachemi - My understanding is that procedures are not necessarily approved by Senate.
- C. The mover agreed that the procedures section does not require approval at Senate. They are there for the information of Senate. Then if a new graduate student union or association comes up, it is more fluid that way.
- Q. M. Lachemi – Let me ask if it is okay with moving this to the procedure section?
- A. Procedures is like a guide. The policy is actually the way in which students go through this very difficult process; especially for CESAR students. We have a lot of international

students. English is not their first language. RSU and CESAR student unions are a very valuable asset, not just for students, but also for faculty and others involved in the process to help them streamline the process.

- C. M. Lachemi – I do not think anybody is challenging to not have RSU or CESAR advocates. I think we are trying to ensure that a specific situation like we dealt with in the last couple of months, we do not want students to be without support. Senate has debated this. The idea was to provide flexibility for student Senators to advocate in case there is a problem with RSU. You provided your motion for the Friendly Amendment and I asked the mover if she is OK with the Friendly Amendment, if not, I will be asking Senators to vote on that.
- A. Mover – Yes, we find it problematic if only these associations are named and students are left without advocacy support in a particular situation. Again, it is a glossary and if we want to put it in there we could do that, but there has to be an opening for additional advocacy beyond just the two.
- C. M. Lachemi – We have a motion and if you don't agree with the Friendly Amendment, then I'll ask Senators to decide on the motion.
- C. M. Benarroch – I would like to speak against the Friendly Amendment. I think the way it is written now, it is very inclusive and it allows for the RSU and CESAR, which are the main providers of the advocates to be able to provide that. I think this is just a way to allow for situations that may require some flexibility to be there. We saw this as very problematic in the last round and would not be usual for universities to set up the arrangements in the way that it used to be. I am in favour of how it is written right now.
- C. I see both sides of this argument. Is there a common ground? I know it is not the intention that the university is going to vet and approve every single student advocate individually instead of a group of advocates, however, it could be read that way. When it defines an advocate as a University approved individual, I wonder if we can add a sentence at the end of that without saying a RSU or CESAR advocate acting on behalf of the student. Could we add a sentence that says something along the lines of: "typically this would be a student representative group, currently it is CESAR or RSU..."
- Q. This is just a question on the policy in general and how it's moving forward to online submission. I'm just wondering what the process will look like specifically right now as we move forward with COVID-19 and as students want to submit appeals this semester; how soon online portals will be up and what the process looks like for that?
- A. So far, we have TRSM, FEAS and FoS already online for appeals and Faculty of Arts will be online within the next few days. So that leaves a few Faculties that we haven't gotten to yet. For those Faculties, students have been advised on the Senate website to email all appeals - if it's at the department level - it should go to the Chair/Director; if it's at the Faculty level - it should go to the Dean; and if it's at the Senate level - it should go to senate@ryerson.ca. Details are available on the Senate website and we will continue to roll out the online appeals.

- C. I think it's the wording, "University approved" that does not lend itself to student democratic autonomy, which we want to ensure. I agree that perhaps the wording could be changed to ensure there would be democratic autonomy for the students.
- C. This could work because what another Senator was saying is that we can have some sort of compromise just making sure that CESAR and RSU are mentioned as they are currently the representative for students. It would make more sense to have them mentioned explicitly, and include some acknowledgement that there might be a future organization that could be doing this representation for the time being.
- C. Recognizing that RSU and CESAR advocates are the ones that are currently university approved. I have seen the importance of these roles and I've even seen the titles change over the years causing difficulty. I think the place for the actual acknowledgement of RSU and CESAR is not in the policy that requires Senate approval but it is in the procedures where we can say the advocate including those that represent students from RSU and CESAR. This is the appropriate place for it, rather than talking about it in the glossary of the policy that will have to keep coming back if there are changes.
- C. Whether or not it is intentional, I think at first glance the definition of advocacy is troubling. I think there should be some reference in there to RSU and CESAR as it was in the previous policy.
- C. Given the campaign that the administration ran against the RSU just a short while ago and the fact that we were told that the RSU was out in no uncertain terms, if I were an RSU delegate to Senate I wouldn't not be feeling good about anything that removes names. I would suggest to have the names of any official party that defends the rights of students including the new graduate student union, and I think that is only fair given the way they've been treated in the past.
- C. We need a listing of the specific groups who we have now and the capacity to add or replace if there are problems. Rather than wait on this as wordsmithing is hard to do on the spot, that we approve this policy now and then anyone who wants to come up with a slightly amended wording that would list the actual groups that are here but give the capacity to appoint others.
- C. The definitions of RSU and CESAR advocacy coordinators are already in the procedures only in a few places in the current Policy 134 and that is the place that is being suggested through this process. It says that "the student may consult with an advocate, e.g. from RSU or CESAR who may represent them at a hearing." Based on the current Policy 134, it is outlined only in procedures, we could ensure that it is in these procedures. I would be happy for people to be involved in rewording by June Senate.
- C. M. Lachemi proposed working with RSU and CESAR to make the language inclusive and specific to RSU and CESAR and any other group that is formed in the future.
- C. Happy to have this as part of the policy, but not the procedures. We can always amend the policy. The wording that I would suggest is "a University recognized representative from CESAR

or RSU or from other university recognized student group”.

When the graduate student group is formed that would stand. This would be a signal of goodwill and a clear message that there was a hiatus, but we do recognize the student unions.

- C. M. Lachemi – We are trying to get a compromise. We have a solution presented saying let’s ask Senate to approve the motion if the Senate is not happy with the motion, they can reject the motion. Also we will work on language for the procedures that will be acceptable to all.
- C. I am representing 14,000 students from CESAR, so I would like to remove the Friendly Amendment, and make a strong amendment. If people want to decide on having RSU and CESAR named, it is important to recognize these and other student groups. I would like to move this motion and I would like to see if I have a seconder.
- C. M. Lachemi –You are presenting a new motion and no longer a Friendly Amendment. My role is to make sure that we can proceed with the work of Senate so I can see a compromise for a Friendly Amendment. If you want to have a second motion, that is your right.
- A. I would like to do that.
- C. M. Lachemi – So you are moving a second motion. Can you explain?
- C. What I am moving is an amendment to the definition of advocate on page 63. Change the first part of the sentence for the following: “a university recognized representative from CESAR or RSU, or any other recognized student group...” to be in the Policy.
- A. Ferworn seconded.
- C. M. Benarroch – I think that there is a problem with “a student recognized group” because there are many sub student groups that are recognized through the RSU. I like the idea of approving the Policy today and working on the wording for June. We need to get the wording right and we can consult with RSU and CESAR before we bring it back to Senate.
- C. The wording for recognized advocate representative would be specifically for those groups who are advocating for students and is inclusive enough and does not erase student unions from this policy.
- C. M. Lachemi - If you say recognized student groups, who are those students?
- A. A recognized advocate representative from CESAR, RSU or from any future group. Or let’s just leave it at CESAR and RSU and it can be adjusted later on in a year or two, then the additional union can be added. Right now my goal is to have the wording as “a university recognized advocate representative from CESAR or RSU”.
- C. M. Lachemi – In this case, you are proposing that you are accepting this just to RSU and CESAR”
- A. Yes

- C. M. Lachemi – So your amended motion is to exclude anybody, but CESAR and RSU? Are you limiting this to CESAR and RSU?
- A. The university is excluding RSU and CESAR. My motion is not to exclude anyone but just to have RSU and CESAR named as it was in the previous policy.
- C. M. Benarroch – There was a motion on the floor. There was an amendment to the motion when A. Ferworn seconded it. And now it is changed again. I don't know what's on the floor.
- A. M. Lachemi – My understanding is that the new motion is to be very specific in terms of advocacy and that advocacy can be done only by RSU and CESAR at this time. That's my understanding.
- C. I appreciate what is trying to be done by identifying other recognized student groups. In previous discussions we thought about the university setting up another independent office to provide advocacy for students so we didn't have a backlog (even before any hiatus started) – we have been discussing this at the Senate level. I would be very concerned if we left restricted only student groups. I do understand that the advocates employed by the RSU and CESAR are critical to student advocacy.
- C. I'm sensing in the tone that people don't trust that we will get back to this very quickly to add CESAR and RSU in there, and I understand their position. I think if we are going to pass this one way or another, we need to revisit it. It is clearly something that is concerning people and needs to be addressed. Let's try to get through what we can tonight but put a time limit on when this will happen, so we can begin to build some trust back up.
- C. Both M. Benarroch and the Secretary of Senate mentioned that we can do this by next month. I don't think this is a big deal to come up with wording that can include what everyone wants. This became a problem a couple of months ago because of the hiatus with RSU and then there was a backlog. You can amend a policy relatively quickly in small ways but not instantly. You have to wait for a Senate meeting. And what we want is to get this new policy passed and ready to go and then amend it next month. We can come up with wording that will get the unions what they want and still give the administration capacity to add or replace if for some reason we're back on another hiatus. I am willing to work on that and we can come up with wording very quickly, but if we try to do this on the floor, I think we will end up with mistakes.
- C. Is it an issue to acknowledge RSU and CESAR as well as acknowledge any possible future advocate groups? Why can't we exclusively acknowledge RSU and CESAR and then also we open the possibility of other groups that can advocate for students?
- C. M. Lachemi – I think that is exactly what others have said, inclusive language and we do not exclude RSU and CESAR but that also gives us the flexibility in case we have issues. I think the purpose of doing this is that we protect students, and I don't see from the administration side any desire to control the process. We just want more flexibility.
- C. I wonder if there is a way of having that come to next meeting? Is there a way of putting it under

Members Business so someone will bring it back to the next meeting so there's some teeth to it.

- A. M. Lachemi – Yes, it will be brought to the next meeting.
- C. It seems clear to me that this piece of work is not ready to go. I suggest we all withdraw our motions, work on the wording and bring it back to the next Senate meeting.
- Q. M. Lachemi asked the mover: how urgent is the initial motion to be adopted by Senate?
- A. It could be ready for the next Senate meeting in June with the amended wording but I would be loathed to hold up the entire policy for this. I would prefer to approve it and provide the commitment to Senate to come back in June with the proper and amended wording to this glossary definition. We can be explicit about RSU and CESAR, but not exclusively RSU and CESAR as advocates for the appeals process.
- C. As a student representative, we've indicated we would come back to this next month with amended wording. I think we should continue with the process so it can get out to students faster. As long as we show there is dedication to rewording it and ensure there is inclusivity, I think we should continue with the process today.
- Q. M. Lachemi – I think there is a commitment from a number of Senators to work on the language that will be acceptable and present it at the June meeting. Are you still pushing to get your amended motion or do you wish to go back to the initial motion, asking for a vote with the intent to come back to Senate with the new wording?
- A: If we have a specific commitment to come back with this motion on June 2nd and we can reword the policy, I will withdraw the motion to amend the wording and we can vote on the main motion to be tabled.
- Q. M. Lachemi – To be tabled or to be approved?
- A. No, to be tabled. That is what was said by another Senator.
- C. M. Lachemi – I am referring to the other Senators who suggested voting on the initial motion.
- A: Let's table the motion. I'm just following with what a Senator said.
- Q. M. Lachemi – So the motion is changed from Friendly Amendment to Table the Motion on Policy 168?
- C. I didn't hear a motion to table. There was a motion to amend, then to withdraw the motion to amend. A suggestion to table was made but that is not a motion. We have a motion on the floor, so someone could make a motion to table.
- Q. Is that possible with the second motion on the floor, did you just say that you need a motion to table the original motion?
- A. Yes, if you wish to make a motion to table without discussion, then we can vote on that.
- C. I then make the Motion to Table (the original motion).

Motion to Table Original Motion 8.4.2.3 – Policy 168

A. Ferworn moved; J. Rodriguez seconded

Motion to Table Original Motion 8.4.2.3 – Policy 168 was Defeated.

Vote on Original Motion – Agenda Item 8.4.2.3 – Policy 168 (including commitment to rewrite the Glossary Section definition of advocate on page 63 of the Senate Agenda, to be inclusive of advocacy, including RSU and CESAR.)

Original Motion 8.4.2.3 – Policy 168 was Approved.

M. Lachemi thanked D. Checkland and others who committed to work with D. Bell and K. MacKay with input from RSU representative and CESAR representative to coordinate rewriting of this section.

8.4.2.4. Update to the Graduate Program Council – Biomedical Engineering Bylaws

Motion: *That Senate approve the update to the Graduate Program Council – Biomedical Engineering Bylaws.*

C. Searcy moved; N. Di Cuia seconded

Motion Approved.

8.4.3 Report #W2020-1 of the Scholarly, Research and Creative Activity Committee (SRCAC): S. Liss

8.4.3.1. Retire Policy 153: Non-Competitive Agreements (SRCAC)

Motion: *That Senate approve retiring Policy 153: Non-Competitive Agreements.*

S. Liss moved; A. McWilliams seconded

Motion Approved.

8.4.3.2. Revised Policy 154: Signing of Applications and Agreements in Support of Scholarly, Research and Creative Activity (SRCAC)

Motion: *That Senate approve the revised Policy 154: Signing of Applications and Agreements in Support of Scholarly, Research and Creative Activity.*

S. Liss moved; N. Di Cuia seconded

Motion Approved.

8.4.4 Report #W2020-3 of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council (YSGS): C. Searcy

8.4.4.1. Major Modifications for the Biomedical Physics graduate program (MSc/PhD)

Motion: *That Senate approve the Major Modifications for the Biomedical Physics graduate programs (MSc/PhD).*

C. Searcy moved; S. Zolfaghari seconded

Motion Approved.

8.4.4.2. Major Modifications for the Master of Business Administration (MBA) program

Motion: *That Senate approve the Major Modifications for the Master of Business Administration (MBA) program.*

C. Searcy moved; N. Di Cuia seconded

Motion Approved.

8.4.4.3. Major Modifications in Master of International Economics and Finance (MA) program

Motion: *That Senate approve the Major Modifications for the Master of International Economics and Finance (MA) program.*

C. Searcy moved; S. Zolfaghari seconded

Motion Approved.

8.4.4.4. For information: 1 Year PPR Follow Up:

- i. Master of Business Administration (MBA)
- ii. Environmental Applied Science and Management (MASc, PhD)
- iii. Film and Photography Preservation and Collections Management (MA)

9. Old Business - None

10. New Business as Circulated - None

11. Members' Business - None

12. Consent Agenda:

12.1. 2019-2020 OVPRI Annual Report to Senate

https://www.ryerson.ca/senate/senate-meetings/agenda/2020/OVPRI_AnnualReport_to_Senate_2019_2020.pdf

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.