SENATE MINUTES OF MEETING
Tuesday, November 3, 2020
Via Zoom Video Conference

MEMBERS PRESENT:

EX-OFFICIO:	FACULTY:		STUDENTS:
L. Barnoff	R. Adams	S. Sabatinos	L. Armstrong
D. Brown	S. Benvie	J. Saber	G. Carter
D. Cramb	T. Burke	I. Sakinofsky	N. Chen
G. Craney	D. Checkland	J. Schmidt	M. Hickie
T. Duever	M. Dionne	T. Schneider	F. L. Kakar
C. Falzon	S. Farshadfar	D. Scofield	S. Maitman-Markowski
C. Hack	A. Ferworn	N. Thomlinson	K. Park
G. Hepburn	N. George	M. Vahabi	H. Ramzan
R. Iannacito-Provenzano	J. Girardo	A. Valeo	D. Salman
M. Lachemi	E. Ignagni	I. Young	J. Sekhon
K. MacKay	L. Kolasa	H. Zarrin	S. Slonim
J. McMillen	L. Lavallée		J. Spagnuolo
D. O'Neil Green	E. Liberda		
C. Searcy	A. McWilliams		
C. Shepstone	P. Moore		
P. Sugiman	J. Neil		**EX-OFFICIO STUDENTS:**
D. Taras	R. Noble		J. Rodriguez
D. Young	D. Oguamanam		S. Sanith
S. Zolfaghari	H. Rollwagen		

SENATE ASSOCIATES:	ALUMNI:
A. M. Brinsmead	N. Di Cuia
J. Dallaire	S. Rattan
R. Kucheran	
N. Ponce de Leon Elphick	

REGRETS:	ABSENT:
C. Bannis	G. Bramesfeld
L. Escandon	
S. Liss	
I. Mishkel	
Y. Mistry	
R. Ravindran	
C. Thompson	

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 November 3, 2020 meeting.*

McWilliams moved; N. George seconded.
Motion Approved.

4.   Announcements - None

5.   Minutes of the Previous Meeting
Motion: *That Senate approve the minutes of the October 6, 2020 meeting.*

A. McWilliams moved; D. Scofield seconded.
Motion Approved.

6.   Matters Arising from the Minutes - None

7.   Correspondence - None

8.   Reports
8.1   Report of the President
8.1.1 President's Update

The President reported:
1) Changes to in-person activity on campus in response to the latest COVID-19 restrictions announced by the government of Ontario. We have further scaled back in terms of in-person activities on campus. The Mattamy Athletic Centre and the Ryerson Image Centre are both closed temporarily until November 7, but we will evaluate and continue to rely on the advice of government and public health agency in planning next steps. You have seen today that the government has provided an update about the situation in Toronto and Peel Region. They have released some of the sections in the Peel Region but in Toronto they maintain the same level. We will keep the community informed about any changes in activities.

2) Update on a series of meetings I had with faculty from different departments and units: I continue to be grateful to the entire Ryerson community for stepping up and responding to the challenges we face in this particular time. Faculty members, in particular, are doing an excellent

job to continue the work of the university with teaching, research, creative work, service leadership and so much more. I look forward to working with you as we continue to develop outstanding academic programs to our students. Over the past few weeks, I have been holding informal meetings with faculty and other groups/departments to listen to their experiences and discuss how we can all support each other. We have had great conversations and we will continue to hold those discussions for the remainder of this term. I'm really encouraging community members to reach out to my office if they wish to have meetings within their units. My virtual door is open so I'm inviting departments to reach out to me.

3) Launch of Strategic Vision: Last week you all received a copy of the Strategic Vision and I hope you had the chance to review it. I hope it's inspiring our community towards our journey to 2030. I look forward to working with you as we continue to develop our university. We will introduce the vision for the community on November 12, 2020 at 11:00 a.m.

4) Fall convocation ceremony on November 17 at 10:00 a.m. This is going to be a virtual ceremony and I encourage you to attend and celebrate with our graduates.

5) Update about the Search for the next Provost: The search is progressing well, the committee has identified top candidates and we are going through the process to ensure that we recommend the best candidate for the role and for Ryerson at this time. Just a reminder that the committee will make a recommendation to me and I will take that recommendation, if I agree with it, to the Board for approval. The position of the Provost is the responsibility of the Board for such approvals.

6) Update on Egerton Ryerson task force: We had announced at the beginning of this semester that we would put a task force together to work with the community about the relationship that we have as an institution around the legacy of Egerton Ryerson. I am pleased to announced that the task force will be co-chaired by our Elder and Senior Advisor on Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation, Joanne Dallaire, and the Chair of the Department of History, Catherine Ellis. I think it's important to work with two perspectives – the historical aspect of it but also the connection with relation to Indigenous peoples. We have a number of Ryerson community members, including faculty, staff and students, and also alumni in addition to some from Senate joining the task force. We are in the process of finalizing the composition of the task force and we will share it with the community in the next few days. The idea here is for the task force to have extensive consultations with our community, gather input and feedback and provide a recommendation to the University about our relation to Egerton Ryerson. Internally, we have two offices which will be supporting the task force – the VP Equity and Community Inclusion, Denise O'Neil Green, and VP Research and Innovation, Steven Liss, who will provide executive leadership to this initiative.

7) Update on the external expert panel on safety: We shared with the community the composition of the panel, five external experts that will be doing the consultation and will offer their recommendation to Ryerson about the best model for safety and security on our campus. The work of the panel has been going very well. They have completed two tours around campus – one during the day and the other during the evening. They have also had two meetings with our

executive group and they will start extensive community consultations very soon. The consultations of both panels will be inclusive and we will ensure that we reach out to anyone who will be interested to provide input to both panels. That will be through zoom meetings or written submissions to make sure that nobody will be left behind in terms of getting their feedback.

8) The Government of Ontario will be releasing their budget this week on Thursday. On October 15, 2020, I was invited to present to the Minister of Finance as part of the budget consultation. As the Provincial Government is finalizing their budget, I urged them to consider making critical investment in post-secondary education institutions like ours. The responsibility of the government to our sector has not been great so far.

9) Update about a fire that occurred last night on Gerrard between Church and Mutual: We know that a number of our students reside there. I'm asking our Vice Provost Students, Jen McMillen, to give an update about the situation and how Ryerson is also supporting our students that may have been affected by this fire.

    J. McMillen – We have become aware of the fire late overnight and, over the course of the day, we've been reaching out and contacting students that we know to be residents of the building. We've sent out communication via social media and we are working with the Red Cross and the emergency management office of the City to ensure we have as complete a list as possible, as well as asking any students that we do get into contact with to share the information with their colleagues and friends that are in the building, who have not heard from us. We are indicating to students that if they left the building: first and foremost, the building has been declared by the City as safe, students are able to return and access their units. Some are choosing not to as they feel that the condition of the building is not one in which they want to stay, due to smell of smoke, etc. We are offering temporary residence accommodation for students who come forward to us and we are able to accommodate them overnight and for the next little period of time. Any students who are impacted can contact studentcare@ryerson.ca. We are also telling students that the SLC is a place that they can go and staff there are greeting and supporting students. We can get them wi-fi, computers as well as other referrals. Tomorrow, we will start the support plan which includes talking about all of our counselling resources, academic consideration and how we can facilitate with that as well as any longer-term counselling. We are asking faculty who hear of any student in distress to let us know and of course apply any consideration they may be able to in terms of any academic events that students may have missed or be under prepared for because of the significant fire. Typically, that building is occupied 50 to 70% by Ryerson students.

8.2 **Communications Report –** included in the agenda

8.3 **Report of the Secretary**
8.3.1 Membership Updates
D. Bell updated Senators of two new members: John Girardo, who replaced Mary Green as RFA Senate representative; and Farokh Laqa Kakar, Civil Engineering, Yeates School of Graduate Students.

8.4   **Committee Reports**
8.4.1 Report #F2020-2 of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC): K. MacKay

8.4.1.1. Reduction in co-op work-term requirements from four to three for the School of
        Occupational and Public Health – Occupational Health and Safety co-op program, and
        Public Health and Safety co-op program

Motion: *That Senate approve the reduction in co-op work-term requirements from four to three
        for the School of Occupational and Public Health – Occupational Health and Safety co-op
        program, and Public Health and Safety co-op program.*

K. MacKay moved; C. Searcy seconded.

Q: What is the logic to changing the work-term sequencing where there are five opportunities
      for students to get work terms to the proposed four? Although not everybody gets five work
      terms, but maybe some students do and it is a great financial benefit and potentially
      professional benefit in those particular circumstances.
A: When we are looking at other comparative programs within post-secondary institutions, the
      majority of them follow the same format of a standard one extra work term required. So, if
      there are four required courses, we have five, so that it gives students an extra chance to
      find a work term and, similarly, if there are three required courses then the standard is there
      is one extra. Also, we find from the students in our program that once students actually
      collect their three or four required work terms, the majority of them don't bother doing the
      extra one – they got what they needed and they decide to move forward and then graduate.

 Motion Approved.

8.4.1.2. Removal of MWF113 from the Post Baccalaureate Program for Health Professionals
        (PBHP)

Motion: *That Senate approve the removal of MWF113 from the Post Baccalaureate Program for
        Health Professionals (PBHP).*

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

8.4.1.3. Admissions changes to the Disability Studies degree program

Motion: *That Senate approve the admissions changes to the Disability Studies degree program.*

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

8.4.1.4. Changes to the Minor in Disability Studies

Motion: *That Senate approve the changes to the Minor in Disability Studies.*

K. MacKay moved; C. Searcy seconded.
Motion Approved.

8.4.1.5. New Minor in Innovation and Zone Learning

Motion: *That Senate approve the new Minor in Innovation and Zone Learning.*

K. MacKay moved; A. McWilliams seconded.

Q: A faculty Senator stated that they are actually in favour of zones in general, but has some concerns about this proposal. The motion is from extra to degree credit which is what the original zones proposal asked for and received from Senate in 2013. It was clearly stated in that proposal and reiterated at that meeting that the experience in zones was not for credit towards a degree. We are now making the move to credit towards a degree by turning it into a minor and I think we need a rationale for that. I am just asking for a justification for the move to academic especially since the assurance was given in 2013 that there was this limitation. The zones proposal, when it came forward, was thought to be under-described by many people, questions were invited, some of which were answered at the meeting and many others submitted questions that the Vice Provost Academic at the time, Chris Evans, brought answers to in the October meeting.

I think it's an important move, but I say this knowing that there is no strict definition as to what counts as academic. I am asking for a rationale to begin with. It's especially important since the creation of the zones was not-towards-degree equivalent credits that goes on transcripts. We've never gotten a report on the zones. There's never been a periodic review, or if there is, it doesn't come to Senate, even though these are the things that are approved by Senate. People may not be aware of what happened at the 2013 Senate meeting. There are specific questions as well. So, for instance, you become a member of one of these zones, are you then in both the optional specialization or in zone 100 or 200, or you have to make a choice at some point? None of that is in here to specify what the relation is. So, can students get credit for the minor and the extra degree specialization? The extra degree specialization takes up to four terms. Are there four terms only or are they open-ended or longer? I don't know what a stream means here. It looks like a sorting move to put people into potential groups who have similar sorts of interests. Do you progress from that stream or, are you always in that stream? Some of the streams seem to be defined in ways that look like there is a lot of academic content presupposed that it is developed or applied in the stream, others do not. My concern here is for a rationale from a move to credit from non-credit and why that's important since the students already have access to the zones under the motion approved at the October 2013 meeting.

A: This is about a minor in innovation zone learning and there are basically a number of existing credit courses that are part of the minor and then two additional experiential learning courses that would be added as new courses.

A: There are a few reasons why there is an interest to see the interaction with the curriculum. Part of this is a direction from senior administration from the Provost and the President to find ways to grow and a lot of what we are seeing is student demand and student requests. We've conducted interviews with a lot of the students who are in the zones and a lot of them are people who are taking five, six or seven courses in addition to their zone activity, and they find the zone activity related to the lessons they are learning in the degree program. We wanted to find a way to connect this directly with the curriculum and also make space for them for the lessons they are learning.

The second problem we encountered in these interviews is one of equity of access. Not all students can make space for an extra-curricular or co-curricular activity in addition to their course work, caring for their kids or seniors, commuting, and part-time jobs. We found that students were desperate to find more ways to find this but they were not all able to equally access this. I want to address your question about the academic integrity of this. Does it count as what might be in the course work? Yes, the majority of these are existing courses. There are two new courses proposed on this, and they are modeled very much on the kind of capstone course that are in a lot of degree programs. They allow you to focus on an individual project, but you have a lot of interaction with a mentor, a faculty member who is hired and is teaching according to academic standards as approved by the curriculum committee of the school. So, these two new courses, the zone courses, are governed under existing academic structures. They are governed by, in this case, jointly Computer Science and RTA. We are housing the two new courses within RTA. The hiring is done by that school entirely in accordance with all CUPE rules. The curriculum committee has supervision of the actual content of those courses to guarantee the integrity of this, and the content in terms of personal growth, a lot of this is based on the needs that we are finding that students have and the professional skills that are in these degree programs. So, there are a number of courses across RTA that focus on these kinds of skills and some of these are in the table of optional course towards this minor.

A: A lot of what we've seen is that it provides an opportunity to increase equity of access to the zone program and activities. Overall, what we've seen is that the interest is not coming just from students who are already in the zones only to get credit for it, but we have students who are coming to us who haven't been zone members previously and are interested. There are students that want to participate in this but need a way that they can find the time to do it, and especially with our students commuting as they have been under normal circumstances finding the time just to do work, therefore, finding the time to do that outside of their courses is very difficult. I think also we welcome the opportunity to bring the rigor and the structure to some of this that we do within the minor. We fully expect what we're offering here will meet all those academic standards within the structures that exist and we see that as a beneficial addition. I welcome the opportunity to come back to Senate and talk more about what we are doing within the zones and take questions on it. I think you'd be quite pleased to see what work has been happening.

C: Student's work in the zone but they don't have the construct of entrepreneurialism. They are focused on the particular project that they are trying to build, and I see this minor as putting structure around other supportive aspects of a sound curriculum that will support these students and make it more productive going forward and to make it more of an overall

discipline for them rather than just 'I worked on this project and I got some credit for that'.

Q: I don't think anyone has addressed the relationship to the optional specialization where students are getting credit for both of them, and is it two years, four terms, or is it shorter?

A: Based on the lessons we have had over the last seven years of running this, we haven't seen the uptake of the optional specialization that we would like to see, and it's not because students are not doing multiple terms, they are doing the four terms that are required, they are just not bothering to apply to get the designation on their transcript. We do see this minor as a way of structuring their experience in a way that makes sense to the outside world. Optional specialization might not be a term that employers will be as familiar with, but minor has weight. It is possible to do both because the structures are different, the courses you require to do the zone minor are all degree courses, the courses needed to do the optional specialization are the CE and the 100 course that's not a degree course, so theoretically, it is possible to do both.

C: I am for this offering; it's a great idea. However, the groundwork for including zones as an accountable body to Senate has not been done. Because the questions were never answered in their entirety, Senators, at the time, had no real idea what the zone was, and that continues to be the case now. So, if they are not accountable to Senate, I am not sure why we're hearing this. Now, again, this is a great idea, so RTA and Computer Science have better ways for students to learn. I find it somewhat dubious for saying equity of access; you have to apply to be in a zone, what happens if you can't get in? The real gist of the problem is that zones have no real standing in Senate, and I'd like someone to describe what a zone is, and how a zone is accountable to the Senate at Ryerson?

C: President Lachemi – We have two concepts – zone and zone learning. I just want to make sure that we are clear about what we are discussing. The question you ask is about Zones. Zone learning is the one that we are discussing.

C: Zones are co-curricular and provide opportunities to shape initiatives from the ground. Zone learning is interfaced with traditional academic programs (classes, coursework) as it exists with no change to zone learning being itself an academic body. We have another way of doing this where students in the zones might do a project with a class, e.g. the music den as part of the trans-media zone involved in music is a course called Business of Music and the instructor of that course who is a CUPE hire, has his students enrolled and do projects that are strategy documents for the company sector. It's an interface between zone learning and project-backed interface, it's actually done through an existing course with existing curriculum. That's really the way we're considering this minor as well.

C: We have lots of good, strong connections between zone activities and courses and programs that are using access to these zones, whether it's courses that may be tapping into a zone or start-up companies that they come to a course that the students in the course can use as examples of what they can be working on and take those on and interact there. There are opportunities for student placements with either start-ups or working within the zones in that way, and this connection between the zones and faculties has been critical to building the connection with the students as well. The students look to the faculties for guidance or information on what they should be doing and sought recommendations from faculty members in the zones. Zones continue to do what they intended from the original plan, they provide space for incubation of ideas and start-up opportunities; they provide access to

leadership; they connect very much to the outside world. All those zones are open to the outside community and that provides the university with another strong way that they interact, whether they are industries or organizations in the communities.

C: President Lachemi: You mentioned that you would be more than happy to come to Senate with a presentation. I think we need to have that. Regardless of what happens with the motion that we have today, I think we need to have the discussion. Maybe this is a good discussion to have as a Committee-of-the-whole.

C: I would like to reiterate I'm actually all for this proposal, Science and RTA, that would be very useful and zones are fine with me. However, I do agree that we do need to have a committee-of-the-whole discussion to start, resulting, probably, in some kind of sub-committee that formerly ties the zones into some formal definition of Senate policy, because until we have that, I will be asking and I believe some other people will be asking exactly the same questions the next time something like this happens.

C: President Lachemi asked Senators to send their questions to the Secretary of Senate. This will enable the SPC to prepare the discussion and presentation to Senate. The idea of the committee-of-the-whole discussion will be taken to SPC for approval before it comes to Senate.

C: I want to revisit the concept of the optional specialization relationship because something that was said struck me as more of a reason to make sure we know what the relationship is. That was specifically about people not applying for the optional specialization and the fact that it wasn't recognized. The minors also have to be applied for at graduation, so what efforts were made to try and make sure that it is noted on their transcript? What efforts were made to ensure that the students knew they had to apply for the optional specialization in zone learning and because they have to be a member of the zone to be able to pursue courses like the two that are proposed? Should there be a barrier between those students that do have the minor compared to those who have the optional specialization so that we can differentiate how students participate in the zones?

C: President Lachemi suggested these comments and questions come into consideration when we have the discussion at Senate.

Q: As a student I have participated in a zone and do appreciate the importance of zones to students. Will there be a cost to students when they take it as a minor as it was free for me? Is it actually becoming more accessible for them if there is a cost?

A: There is no cost for students to be involved in the zones themselves. There are sometimes desk fees to external community members depending on some of the differences in the zones. You are right, there would be a cost because now if they are using up one of their existing course credits for this, then regular tuition is charged. The difference that we do see is the ability of time to focus. We talked about accessibility of access, it's accessibility of time that we are addressing here. If someone is able to pay their tuition, given all the structures that they are having difficulty, then it fits within that if someone is not able to meet their tuition requirement that is a question under accessibility of access, but that is a university-wide question.

C: I just want to make a few comments in total support of this proposal. The whole concept of zones, it was there in 2013 when we reminded everybody that what it was about was co-curricular, nimbleness, innovation, disruption and figuring things out and that has to be

protected. It's not about the zones offering education here, it's about the educational unit using the zones to offer opportunities that are needed. I highly recommend it because I know for us these zones have been instrumental in shaping the way FCAD is and the way we consider education in all the schools.

C: In 2013, I remember I was part of this story where we had a whole series of questions and note that not all the questions got answered. We're establishing a kind of new trajectory and we are doing it without having the underpinnings in the place first. We should have consideration of the issue of academic control of zones. It is something that needs to be under control. Senate either is or isn't responsible for it. If it is, these things should be subject to the same kinds of reviews and periodic program reviews that all of the other academic programs of the university are subject to, and if they are not, then how do we justify them being academic in nature. We have a double standard here, one that is highly regulated, in terms of doing periodic program reviews and having these be reported back to Senate every time. I would really like to have those things answered before we approve a minor.

C: I think this is a good idea to invite questions/comments. It would be useful if people like Richard and John got the summary of the questions and responses that Senators gave at the October 2013 meeting and that they would accompany the agenda as an addendum for people to catch up on what was answered and what wasn't answered and why. Finally, when it is indicated that it is the academic units using the zones, I am puzzled. There is a social ventures zone, supervised by the Dean, Faculty of Arts. What do they have to do with social ventures and any knowledge of that for hiring. I don't understand, and I want to understand.

C: This minor proposal has gone through both levels of our curriculum committee and our school council and I can guarantee that RTA is properly vetted and supervised, and I also want to point out that for many of our students this is a great opportunity to extend what they're already doing in their curriculum.

C: Many universities do review their minors along with their program reviews and it may be an opportunity for us to do something similar as part of quality assurance procedures.

C: Minors are declared by students upon graduation, so, in essence, delaying this motion wouldn't actually affect somebody wanting to graduate because they will have the time within their program to do their courses. This is a minor which is part of the program, it is within our quality assurance policies. Minors are reviewed so it meets all of our policy requirements. I want to reassure Senators that what Academic Standards Committee brought forward is within the purview of Senate to consider.

Q: President Lachemi asked the chairs of Computer Science and RTA about the importance of timing for this motion?

A: Chair of Computer Science: The actual timing of creating a minor is not that critical, however, the creation of the course in zones 100 and 200 is highly critical because students would need to be registered in them. So, if that doesn't get approved in time for this year's calendar then that would postpone by a year the possibility of someone actually registering for the minor. I suppose the possibility would be to amend the motion to just create the courses but they would have no home. So that is my concern if this is postponed.

A: Chair of RTA: We have already done the approvals, processing would have to be revisited, so that doesn't seem like a good use of our time. I think that the pressing matter is the student interest and demand and I think that meeting that interest in demand is critical.

C: I do move to table this motion. I don't understand the governance structure and I would vote against it tonight even though I think it is an excellent idea.

Motion to Table Motion 8.4.1.5:
P. Moore moved to table; M. Dionne seconded.

C: Speaking as a Dean, and what I see is an unusual move within Ryerson for two Faculties to come together and produce something innovative.,I think the zone part of it is a bit diversionary because we have a larger issue with accountability with Senate and so on, but there is sufficient structure, rigor and oversight to me with the two Faculties and there is sufficient innovation that I would not want to see it diverted and punished. It's very rare at Ryerson to see these sorts of thing come forward and I would prefer in my own way to think of it as going for a minor between two Faculties.

Motion to table Motion 8.4.1.5 Approved.

C: President Lachemi – We need to do some homework and come back to Senate. The discussion about the zones and zone learning has to take place. Also, we will share the questions that were asked in 2013 with the team and we will discuss it at SPC and bring it back to Senate.

8.4.1.6. New Minor in Cyberstudies

Motion: *That Senate approve the new Minor in Cyberstudies.*

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

8.4.1.7. Removal of the standing variation in the Urban and Regional Planning degree program

Motion: *That Senate approve the removal of the standing variation in the Urban and Regional Planning degree program.*

K. MacKay moved; N. Di Cuia seconded.
Motion Approved.

8.4.1.8. New Concentration in Video Game Design for the RTA Media Production degree program

Motion: *That Senate approve the new Concentration in Video Game Design for the RTA Media Production degree program.*

K. MacKay moved; N. George seconded.
Motion Approved.

8.4.1.9. Reduction from 41 to 40, in the total number of courses required for the Bachelor of Commerce in Hospitality and Tourism Management degree program

Motion: *That Senate approve the reduction from 41 to 40, in the total number of courses required for the Bachelor of Commerce in Hospitality and Tourism Management degree program.*

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

8.4.1.10. Reduction from 45 to 40, in the total number of courses required for the Bachelor of Commerce in Retail Management degree program

Motion: *That Senate approve the reduction from 45 to 40, in the total number of courses required for the Bachelor of Commerce in Retail Management degree program.*

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

8.4.1.11. Eight new course proposals for addition to the Liberal Studies elective tables

Motion: *That Senate approve the eight new course proposals for addition to the Liberal Studies elective tables.*

K. MacKay moved; L. Lavallée seconded.
Motion Approved.

8.4.1.12. Curriculum modifications to the Juris Doctor program

Motion: *That Senate approve the curriculum modifications to the Juris Doctor program.*

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

8.4.1.13. For information: 1-year follow up reports for Periodic Program Reviews: Architectural Science & Mathematics and Its Applications.

8.4.2 Report #F2020-2 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC): S. Zolfaghari

8.4.2.1. Interim Provost's Update

The Interim Provost Reported:

1) Update on review/search process for dean, Faculty of Arts, and search for dean, Faculty of Community Services: Elections and appointments have been finalized for the review/search committee for the dean, Faculty of Arts, and search committee for dean, Faculty of Community Services. We announced the committee compositions of these committees on October 27 and we are now in the process of scheduling the first meeting of each one.

2) Enrolment Update: The domestic target was 8,760, and there were 8,936 confirmations, while the international student target was 1,333, and there were 1,120 confirmations. Overall, the figures stand at 10,056 confirmations, compared to a targeted 10,093 — within 0.4%. International enrolments to the first year of degree programs were up by 13.5% over last year, with China, India, Vietnam, United States and South Korean being the top five countries represented by country of citizenship.

C: President Lachemi recognized the efforts of the enrolment team and the Planning Office for doing this job. They encountered difficult circumstances because of CODIV-19. I can share with Senate that many of our sister universities in the province are experiencing huge decline in enrolment because of COVID-19. I give credit to the team for their dedication, hard work and support for our students.

8.4.2.2. Retirement of Policy 156: Removal of Students from Field Placements/Practicums (K. MacKay)

Motion: *That Senate approve the retirement of Policy 156: Removal of Students from Field Placements/Practicums.*

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

8.4.2.3. Amendment to Policy 60: Academic Integrity – definition of advocate (K. MacKay)

Motion: *That Senate approve the amendment to Policy 60: Academic Integrity – definition of advocate.*

K. MacKay moved; A. McWilliams seconded.

C: I would like to make an amendment to the motion to separate the actual definition of Advocate from the rest of the proposed changes in sections 5.5, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3 10.5 of Policy 60 and table the other amendments for later discussion.

C: President Lachemi asked to provide Senators with a rationale for this amendment.

C: We want to keep the definition of Advocate which we agreed to last June, and include the RSU and CESAR. We can work on the language just as we did back in June to work with the appropriateness of the language so that it is clear for any student reaching out to this policy. When students look at policy and search for the word Advocate without it being qualified that it's from RSU or CESAR, they may just go through the whole process and then it would be to their detriment to realize that they have missed the deadline, they did not read the policy correctly; they unknowingly will be going wrong rather than using professional support, someone who is very well versed and experienced in how to manage and navigate the policy and how to support the student. We do this because there are a lot of people involved in this process, instructors, staff, faculty, and whenever students do not receive the proper support, there is chaos and more stress.

C: Suggested that it can include "see section…" which would refer the reader back to the definition of Advocate.

C: What we want is actually more clarification on this language. I am very sorry that the student union has to present this request/amendment clarification at this stage at the Senate because in this policy both names of the student unions have been removed. The persons doing this work did not approach us for any discussion about this. There should be something to clarify that every time the word 'advocate' shows up, if you want to put in parentheses (see definition) you could also put in parentheses (RSU or CESAR) either one is the same, but I don't want to see the names of our institutions deleted because it seems to me that slowly they keep pushing us out, don't include us in the conversations, now they're taking away our names and tomorrow we may not exist.

C: Maybe there's a misunderstanding. At section 3.2, the definition of Advocate is what was agreed to last Spring in the other policy (Policy 168) and it does mention those names. You can always refer back to the definition – you haven't been dropped out. We are just simplifying the wording. It's just a matter of wording it in such a way to make it flow more easily and still be perfectly accessible to students. In referencing back to the definition with CESAR and RSU, I don't see what the problem is once of course we have something leading back to the definition.

C: I just wanted to assure the Union and Senate that there was no intention to not consult with respect to this because it was using the definition that the working group came up with last year (in which CESAR and RSU were consulted) and insertion of that into Policy 168, so it was a follow-up of that into this policy. There are no changes. I would reiterate the point that this is the benefit of having definitions inside of policies so that every time a particular term is mentioned in the policy, it means the same thing every time and it doesn't need explanation. It's a tidying up of the document and we had said in June that we would make the definition that the working group came up with for Policy 168 consistent in other policies.

C: I appreciate the suggestion but want to make sure that when the students navigate they get proper reference. We work very hard to have full-time student advocates, knowledgeable and available, so the students have the best outcome, but also everyone in the process doesn't get entangled with a student who doesn't know how to navigate this and miss the deadlines. We feel that as a student union, we want what is best for the student and every time Ryerson says we are here for inclusion and the student, we are exploited. We hear two different languages. I would like everybody to remember what happened in June, and this definition of advocate is not what the group assigned worked on. They worked on it

separately. They did not include us, we had to fight to be included. That's why at every step there was not the common courtesy to say, 'hey we're going do this change and take your name away'. If the clarification is to a reference to the definition to advocacy, then that's OK.

C: Our Academic Integrity Office works to update their communication to ensure that students are aware of advocacy as they administer the policy as well.

C: It sounds like there is a miscommunication somewhere along the way. As someone who has been involved in the revision processes of Policy 60 and Policy 168 and the advocate process for many years, our whole emphasis was to actually try to entrench as best as we could that the advocates should be from RSU and CESAR for reasons that they know what they are doing. There have been no additional meetings that have been going on behind the scenes. This was something that we all worked on after this was brought to us several months ago to update the definition for advocate so it's consistent everywhere. It is not that anything has been changed after, or that people were trying to slide something through. We had both RSU and the CESAR student advocates as part of the Policy review process as well, so I do want to make the point that there was no excluding anyone, and in fact it was quite the opposite.

Friendly Amendment to Motion 8.4.2.3 to include "as defined in section…" after each indication of Advocate.

Motion Approved.

C: President Lachemi clarified that we have two organizations providing advocacy for students (CESAR and RSU) and that there will be a new organization formed to represent graduate students.

8.4.2.4. For information: Update on Open Electives (K. MacKay and C. Hack).

9.   Old Business - None

10.   New Business as Circulated - None

11.   Members' Business –

C: Proposal from Senator Riley Kucheran – In informal conversations with my students and colleagues, we have agreed that COVID-19 has placed immense pressure on our time. A task that might have taken an hour pre-pandemic, takes hours or days in virtual formats. We are working evenings and weekends. Our wellbeing and the academic quality of courses have suffered. I would, therefore, propose that the Academic Planning Group explore an emergency reduction of the course term length from 12 to 11 weeks and add an additional reading week in the Winter term. I know this might be a daunting administrative hurdle in such a short timeframe to change the academic calendar, but Ryerson is innovative, nimble and bold and I believe this would enhance our reputation as a leading university that cares for our students and community. I would also suggest that SPC explore a committee-of-the-whole discussion on specific time-management strategies in recognition that their hands might be tied financially.

C: President Lachemi: The committee-of-the-whole discussion, we would be happy to include this in the next SPC meeting. The reduction of the number of weeks per term is the responsibility of Senate. APG can discuss this. I can tell you that I was in the Fashion department today and I indicated that 2/3 of our students at Ryerson are in accredited programs. It's not just the decision of the leadership or Senate, but also, we have the framework for many of the programs which follow accreditation guidelines. When Senators were part of the discussion when we reduced the number of weeks per term from 13 to 12, Engineering was not able to do it because of their accreditation program. The other concern is the time. We are in November and you are asking this to be done by January. I think it is important to have this discussion, but we have to do our homework.

12. Consent Agenda - None

13. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 7:23 p.m.