

**SENATE MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**Tuesday, December 1, 2020**  
**Via Zoom Video Conference**

<b>MEMBERS PRESENT:</b>			
<b>EX-OFFICIO:</b>	<b>FACULTY:</b>		<b>STUDENTS:</b>
L. Barnoff	R. Adams	T. Schneider	L. Armstrong
D. Brown	T. Burke	D. Scofield	C. Bannis
D. Cramb	D. Checkland	N. Thomlinson	N. Chen
G. Crane	M. Dionne	C. Thompson	M. Hickie
T. Duever	L. Escandon	M. Vahabi	F. L. Kakar
C. Falzon	S. Farshadfar	A. Valeo	S. Maitman-Markowski
C. Hack	A. Ferworn	I. Young	Y. Mistry
G. Hepburn	N. George	H. Zarrin	K. Park
R. Iannacito-Provenzano	E. Ignagni		H. Ramzan
M. Lachemi	L. Kolasa		J. Sekhon
S. Liss	L. Lavallée		J. Spagnuolo
K. MacKay	A. McWilliams		
J. McMillen	P. Moore		
I. Mishkel	J. Neil		
D. O'Neil Green	R. Noble		
C. Searcy	D. Oguamanam		
C. Shepstone	R. Ravindran		
P. Sugiman	H. Rollwagen		<b>EX-OFFICIO STUDENTS:</b>
D. Taras	S. Sabatinos		J. Rodriguez
D. Young	I. Sakinovsky		S. Sanith
S. Zolfaghari	J. Schmidt		
<b>SENATE ASSOCIATES:</b>			<b>ALUMNI:</b>
A. M. Brinsmead			N. Di Cuia
J. Dallaire			S. Rattan
<b>REGRETS:</b>		<b>ABSENT:</b>	
G. Carter		S. Benvie	
R. Kucheran		G. Bramesfeld	
J. Saber		J. Girardo	
		N. Ponce de Leon Elphick	
		D. Salman	
		S. Slonim	

## **Committee-of-the-Whole Discussion:**

### **Racism - How do we balance EDI being a top priority but also the need for academic freedom?**

Guest Speakers: Jim Turk and Sanjay Ruparelia

Closing Remarks: Denise O'Neil Green

L. Lavallée, Vice Chair of Senate, introduced the speakers and topic.

#### **Jim Turk:**

I'll lay the groundwork with a brief description of Academic Freedom, what it is and what it is not; what are its limits and how they are contested, and then we want to discuss some cases.

Academic Freedom in the context of the mission of the university is to educate students and to advance knowledge. To do this, it requires the university to be a protected space – a space in society where there is virtually unlimited opportunity to consider, explore, examine, analyze, evaluate ideas theories and viewpoints in order to come to some better understanding of them.

Starting in the last 19<sup>th</sup> century and into the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, there was a concerted attack on academics with displeased wealthy donors, powerful interests and as a result routinely faculty members were fired at the behest of those people when they contacted the Board of the university. That led John Dewey, philosopher and psychologist, and a group of American professors in 1915 to form the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). This was the first activity developed statement on the 1915 Declaration of Academic Freedom, which was the foundational statement on Academic Freedom which has been understood in Canada and the United States since.

- Discussed the case of Harry Crowe, professor of History at United College, University of Winnipeg. He spoke out quite critically about the religious context of United College and how faculty and others were doing things for the church. The president of the university got a hold of this letter and fired him. This caused great controversy and was on the front pages of newspapers around the country. The Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT), set up its committee of inquiry and asked its vice president, who was a law professor of the University of Toronto, Bora Laskin, to head up this inquiry. Out of that came a clear conception of Academic Freedom.
- The 1915 Declaration on the American Association of Professors, CAUT policy, the UNESCO Recommendation on the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel was a document adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO by 150 countries in 1997, which has a clear articulation of what Academic Freedom is, and that's adopted internationally.

The Ryerson Faculty Association Collective Agreement recognizes all four aspects of Academic Freedom.

- The first is Freedom to Teach, which means not only freedom to use your best professional judgement of the course but also freedom to decide what you're teaching and subsequent methods of practice.
- Second element is freedom of research, scholarship and creative work, which is to ensure that you are able to use your best professional judgement on what you do your research on, how you do your research, and collegial restrictions such as requirements to do your work ethically; where your freedom to publish is not restricted by donors or university administration or other outside interests.
- The third aspect of Academic Freedom is what's called intra-mural Academic Freedom. That's the freedom to express your views about any aspect of what's happening with the university, positively or negatively. It gives you academic freedom to comment on any aspect of your work in the university and how it functions.
- The fourth aspect of Academic Freedom is what's called extra-mural Academic Freedom. That is the freedom to exercise your right as a citizen without sanctions by your employer; i.e, you could be engaged in civil disobedience protests, you may be arrested, it does not protect you from outside activities, but the university cannot sanction you for exercising your rights.

These four parts of Academic Freedom, which includes all the faculty who are in the RFA, is very explicitly protected re language and since Canada has the highest-rated unionization of faculty than any country in the world, it's over 95%, virtually everybody has these aspects of protecting their academic freedoms. Nevertheless, it limits academic freedom.

First of all, academic freedom should not be confused with freedom of expression. In many ways, academic freedom is more than freedom of expression. One example, if you are a professor of biology, you are perfectly free to stand on the corner of Dundas and Yonge and advocate for understanding our origins as to creations but you can't teach that as a science to first-year biology course. You don't have the academic freedom to do that because academic freedom is restrictive partly by disciplinary norms. If you are an astrologist, you can't teach astrology as science, you can't teach creations as biology. Disciplinary norms themselves are subject to conversations and disagreements, so they provide the broad jurisdiction framework but they still can be challenged. You are also constrained by collegial governance, i.e. we recognize that our Faculties and Departments have the right to collegially dictate what courses are offered and what curriculum is designed and within those frameworks you have the freedom to decide how you are going to teach one course material over another but that's another set of restrictions.

The third set of restrictions are basic ethical and pedagogical types of restrictions. You have the academic freedom to tell a person who puts forward an idea that you think it's too flippant, but you do not have the academic freedom right to choose to. If a student asked to be called by a gender-neutral pronoun, then you have an obligation to do that, not to confront, or mock the student or

treat them badly. These are established in law and academic freedom does not give you the right to discriminate against somebody, or to threaten violence, it does not give you the right to violate the collective agreement. These are limits to academic freedom.

On the topic of Racism, how do we balance Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) within the parameters of academic freedom? Academic freedom is an essential protection to make EDI possible. We cannot have effective conclusion boasting equity without academic freedom in the university.

**Sanjay Ruparelia:**

What is the relationship between EDI and Academic Freedom? I think of it as sort of a framework in two different ways. On the one hand, Academic Freedom is the cardinal principle of the university in the pursuit of knowledge, truth and understanding. Truth is what defines the study and the knowledge that we do. EDI provides the conditions of possibility of academic freedom. So, if you have practices of inequality or inequity, if you suppress diversity of thought and perspectives and experience; if you exclude, then clearly the conditions of true academic freedom are deeply restricted. My understanding to that question is to say that historically, universities, for all the good they have done in society, there have been many cases where they have been institutions of privilege, of social exclusion, ethnic, racial and gender homogeneity. In that sense, EDI is really crucial if you really believe that the pursuit of knowledge and understanding is going to be most facilitated by having everybody participate in a critical dialogue including all these barriers and restrictions and deficits that inhibit the potential dialogue.

This is the process that we see in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Formal restrictions have faded away in universities but actual practices that are barriers to participation and inclusion parity up to today. I think that EDI is really creating the possibility through academic freedom – maximum academic freedom.

On the other hand, I think a lot of the cases that we read about in the papers and we have to struggle with in our own institutions and society in Canada and elsewhere, is to say that are there other circumstances or cases in which claims that invoke (I'm not saying that they invoke correctly) EDI might inhibit or restrict academic freedom. Critics of EDI say that it certainly corrects speech codes, inhibits academic freedom or "institutions", think of the campaigns against the naming of school buildings or institutions. Prescriptions on our curricula should be taught restrictions on academic freedom and I think that those are the cases where we really have a lot of controversy; and against that I would say that what always has to be balanced are certain ideas of institutions that are being advanced, are they hostile? Are they demeaning? Are they worse to the sort of conditions that allow students and faculty to be full equal participants in the dialogue. I don't think that general rules help us in any of this in the same way we think about law or morality. We have a set of principles but we have to apply them to cases because details matter and context matters

and specificity matters. What constitutes a reasonable restriction on academic freedom or a reasonable commitment to advancing EDI? What is considered offensive speech or controversial speech versus hate speech? You only have to consider some of the cases in Canada in the last couple of years. I think that's where the discussions have to take place. There is no general rule that will resolve those, we just have to take them case by case.

**Jim Turk:**

You and I agree completely on your last point. Generally, everyone is in favour of freedom of expression or most of our Charter of Rights unless and until they come across circumstances when they find an expression is offensive or when it comes to something troubling. But I do want to go back to something you said, that academic freedom has been restricted or suppressing diversity.

**Sanjay Ruparelia:**

When is a claim or act in the name of academic freedom a threat or a challenge to EDI so that in a sense it's unjustified? And conversely, for those who are worried about this balance on the other side is when is a commitment to EDI a threat to academic freedom? Those are the questions that mirror each other.

**Jim Turk:**

Another aspect of that is, when is academic freedom a method of helping to achieve EDI? I dealt with academic freedom issues when I was Executive Director of CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers) for 16 years. A significant portion of the academic freedom cases were around using academic freedom to defend the rights of marginalized faculty who were under attack -their academic freedom was under attack. We had numerous cases of indigenous academics when they were coming up for tenure or for promotion who were denied their promotion or tenure because their work depended on indigenous knowledge and the claim was that we don't recognize indigenous knowledge; and we challenged that successfully on academic freedom realms, saying that these academics were using their best professional judgement drawing out this knowledge. They would challenge the people in the area of studies, whether it be gender studies, queer studies or Black studies.

**Sanjay Ruparelia:**

Having spent most of my career in the United States before coming back to Canada and joining Ryerson, my understanding of academic freedom was very contested and very crucial as a principle to uphold in cases where faculty, scholars, students were taking positions that were critical of governments or states or corporations that they felt were responsible for upholding or pursuing social justice.

- Joseph Massad is one example of many scholars from Palestine and the Palestine cause, who were very critical of Israel and its policies in the West Bank territories and the United States government. This was a case in the early 2000s in which a number of donors and outsiders said that he was spreading politics of hate.
- Rashid Khalidi who came in as the Edward Said chair of Policy Studies at the University of Columbia. When he was appointed, there was a campaign against him and headlines saying that he was a professor that was deeply critical of the Israel government policy, but he was also deeply critical of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) itself and the accords. Those are cases where academic freedom absolutely is a cardinal principle precisely because it is not simply to be critical and to dissent from official government policy, but particularly, in this case, of scholars who are from countries themselves who are suffering injustices to speak up on their behalf.

**Jim Turk:**

You gave these examples about Columbia which happened 15 or 16 years ago, but there are two cases very much like that in Toronto as we speak.

- Human rights scholar who did a lot of work in the Middle East, who was chosen to be the head of the human rights program at the University of Toronto Law School, a well-paid donor from a family who has given millions to the university, and a judge in Canada, called the dean and objected and the offer was withdrawn.
- Faisal Bhabha, who is a professor of Law at Osgoode Hall, was on the panel that the Centre at Ryerson put together on the proposal by the Ontario Government re the international holocaust remembrance alliance definition of antisemitism. We had discussion about two pretty strong pro-Israeli advocates and two critics. A public campaign by B’Nai Brith was made against Faisal and it was demanded that he be prevented from teaching human rights law which was a specialty of the former vice chair of the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal. The president of the university (York) refused to publicly respond to that demand or to defend Faisal.
- Just yesterday, a Black professor of Law at the University of Alberta was singled out by representatives of the Kenyan government including some of his key staff who mocked him on twitter because of his criticisms of how the government has dealt with the pandemic and he was treated that way as a Black scholar. No White scholar of the university has been treated this way. The association is launching a grievance in his defence.

**Q:** I am wondering about your thoughts: when anti-racism happens in the institutions, we have mechanisms to deal with them, often times academic freedom is a factor in that. Can you comment at all about the processes we have in place in our institutions to deal with issues related to anti-racism (as you know, it’s a complaints-driven process and everything becomes

silent at that point, but when academic freedom plays a role in this) – do you have any thoughts on this?

**A:** Jim: There is work that may be done by an academic that clearly is outside the boundaries of what any discipline would recognize as legitimate academic work, so that loses any academic freedom defence. What gets more difficult is where a person's work, what many of us would view as racist or terrible, is brought within interdisciplinary grounds, in other words the person gets grants and does research and peer review journals. In which case, we deal with things in the university not by throwing people out or by criticizing, ridiculing, showing their faults thereof. It depends on the nature of what's happening

**A:** Sanjay: That's the one thing that's so troubling today is that what I think is an abuse of the principle of academic freedom to justify or defend racist ideas or expression of them. In the States again, the examples I can give is there is an American thinker, Charles Murray, who, many years ago, wrote a book that was debunked. It was called the Bell Curve and it purported to say that there was some relationship between race and intelligence. This was a book that gained a lot of notoriety in American conservative circles. About two years ago, a student organization at Middlebury College of the American Enterprising Student -a right of centre section thinktank based in Washington. The students invited Murray to come and talk on the campus of Middlebury University. This was not a professor or the university that invited him, but it was an autonomous student organization inviting somebody who had views which were debunked and scorned, but nonetheless invited him to come and speak. There was a lot of outrage by many other students who protested the fact that he should not be speaking on campus whatsoever. In fact, it became a violent incident in the sense that it became physical. So that's a case of how should we deal with that? Should he have been invited or not? Did the students have the right to invite him or not? The question for me becomes is the expression on these ideas simply controversial, offensive or hostile to those in this case, Black students, and other minorities. Actually, it is an injury to their sense of self, their dignity and standing because he's making comments about their capabilities. I think a case like that personally for me is where judgements come to play, is it merely controversial, it is offensive, or is it injurious to the kinds of conditions that we need to have, a dialogue that includes all equal standings.

**Jim Turk:**

I think you raised two sets of thinking. First of all, I think it's important for universities in their procedures to be very clear with the distinction between speakers who are invited as part of an academic event to speak in class, at commencement and at centres, as opposed to groups who may rent space on campus. The university is not a hotel or a conference and there's no obligation to rent space to anyone. So in your example when it's an academic group of professors, I will argue that the university should protect their right to speak. Let's say that Murray was invited to speak at a centre or a class, then the issues you raised can be very difficult ones because his views are

deeply offensive. But if we started splitting everyone whose views are deeply offensive to some parts of our community given the diversity of our community which we hope will become more diverse, who can we have? Can the fact that if we have somebody like me who's pro-choice, giving a talk, there'll be members of our community who see abortion as murder, genuinely feel that morally. Do they have the right to say this deeply offends me? Can we block them? Conversely, I don't care to hear a pro-life speaker, I don't care to see their side, I'd rather not be there. Do I have the right to say that I find that disgusting that he can compare abortion to a holocaust – it's morally reprehensible. We get into very difficult matters and I believe Sanjay and I are not going to propose answers to these. We are trying to identify problems that we, as a community, are trying to address. The boundary lines are shifting and are determined collegially and collectively.

L. Lavallée – You're so right Jim, that the boundary lines are shifting and we had a similar circumstance when George Elliott Clarke was invited to speak at the University of Regina. What shut that down was public outcry. The university was going to let it go ahead. This was an individual who was supporting the work of a poet who murdered an indigenous woman, Pamela George. The poetry was about missing and murdered indigenous women and girls and he was in jail for 4 ½ years for the murder of Pamela George. The university really drew the line in the sand and allowed him to speak, but it was he who ultimately withdrew. So academic freedom did protect his right to be able to bring a murderer's poetry to the university.

**Q:** I want to ask a question about the internal effects of concern about these issues? Some of the things that come up within the university have to do with policies. What are we going to do about this? There seems to be people expressing to me in other forums, and I get a sense of it too, it's very hard to actually discuss policies that are dealing with these issues and have genuine disagreements without being thought to be infringing on somebody's freedom or being a racist. So the internal discussion, and that happens in classrooms too, it's an issue that people are saying that they do not get into those issues because of the possibilities of these kinds of things.

**A:** Jim: It's such a cliché to say we're in deeply polarized times, and how we increase the polarization in the sense that we now have so many sources of contact that we can stay largely within our comfort zones and we have a substantial proportion of content directed at us by the algorithms of Google, Facebook and Twitter. The idea of having open discourse without polarizing them is harder than ever. We see particularly a large version of this in American politics right now. The challenge of the university is being in an environment where increasingly we're trying to treat everything as binary whereas it's the nuance, it's the complexity that makes most things interesting. How do we open that up? – I guess that's what you're asking

Sanjay: I agree with Jim. It's that sense of being afraid or uncomfortable about whether you can talk about certain things or to disagree itself is worrying. If you believe that university is a place where you want to have exchange of views, there's going to be disagreements and sometimes



intense disagreements. On the other hand, I do think that for all of us who have been where you doubt your rights and ability to speak freely about certain things, my sense is that if you belong to communities who have been marginalized or subordinated, you're always trying to fit in. That's not to diminish their concern but that concern has been democratized. So those who have had all sorts of privileges are equally conflicted as they do not want to say the wrong thing. One example, is the use of the "N" word, and then they are sanctioned very severely. Some will say that I said that I made a mistake, I apologize, they might even try to defend it as some sort of pedagogical purpose, but this is a heavy-handed sanction – that's what they'll feel. And lots of people who belong to the Black and indigenous community will say that we felt like that almost all the time. If we say something that is critical of a group or a community that has more power in society, we have been effectively sanctioned or our standing in that conversation has diminished right away.

- C:** I wonder if the speakers would comment on the recent case at the University of Ottawa when the professor used the "N" word in class. While they apologized for the specific incident, 34 professors rallied to support them and defend the use of it as a tool for education debating academic freedom. The university president refused to outright ban the use of the word saying that there is a need for the professor's to have freedom of expression.
- A:** Jim: There is a lot of comment we see over the use of the "N" word going on right now in Canada. Two of them at the University of Ottawa, where the word was used as an example of what sociologist inferred as a use of this cumbersome jargon. Subversive resignification of how words are reclaimed. So what do we make of those epithets, and do we distinguish between using the epithet or commenting on the epithet. We need to have more discussion. There is an African-American legal scholar in the United States on quoting epithets in the classroom and observed that the "N" word is really objected to because of its toxic association with lynching but there are other words that have toxic association like KKK, Nazi, Auschwitz, genocide, rape, but avoiding invocation of the "N" word is precisely its association with lynching and violence; yet we allow some and not others. How do we have the discussion without referring to text that contain it?
- C:** We are here talking about academic freedom; who are the academics? How were they raised? What kinds of privileges do they have? We see Ryerson and most of the academics are white and privileged. Most of the people who make the policies to tell those academics what's right and what's wrong are not the racialized people. So how can they possibly understand if the senior administrators make the rules out of sheer preservation – the preservation of power. They don't want to yield power to folks who don't look like them. If we are here talking about racism we are really doing a disservice of the context we are living right now, which is specifically about anti-black racism, which is happening right now at Ryerson, and also anti-indigenous racism, we hear it everyday. So how can we actually change academic freedom when those who

set the rules of what academic freedom is are usually not those who are at the receiving end of the racism?

**A:** Sanjay: I think the general point being made is actually true. I think that's what the task force against racism at Ryerson is trying to do. What concrete steps we need to take? Who are our faculty, students, staff, etc? How do we create that diverse community in the first place that is very cognizant of these questions of injustice – these realities of injustice? I'm a little uncomfortable with the idea that the purpose is to exclude. I think of my own field of study – certain democracies which is what I studied and teach – while there are all kinds of institutions that were created when our democracies were extremely restrictive and exclusionary but in the design of those institutions – some of them are designed in ways that they continue to exclude and marginalize communities, but in other ways those institutions were quite radical in that they granted everyone equality and the people who designed those institutions often came from the upper echelons of society at that time and were privileged in many different kinds of ways, and yet they could have a radical idea and belief in equality. When we think of the relationships between our institutions, our policies and these outcomes that we are grappling with, it's more complex and it's not that institutions we've created and the policies we have might continue to marginalize and produce inequalities but I'm concerned that people may think that all institutions and policies have that effect because, as with most things, there are multiple purposes and motivations behind them.

#### **Closing Remarks:**

Denise O'Neil Green - What I wanted to share with Senate are some other considerations to think about versus pitting EDI, Racism against Academic Freedom - I would just encourage my colleagues to begin to think about the changing landscape that we're in the middle of given what happened this Summer with the murder of George Floyd and more or less an awakening that people are coming to a knowledge of how a system that they weren't even privy to finally they had an opportunity to see upfront, and thinking about that within a context of many different public organizations and public goods like universities.

When we talk about EDI at Ryerson, it's three different things:

- **Equity** is about the fair and just treatment of all community members through the creation of opportunities and the removal of barriers to address historic and current disadvantages for under-represented and marginalized groups. And what we will get to first see is that we are not thinking about just simply a mosaic of people with different hues, but going back to a few points that were mentioned earlier, it's really about valuing and respecting the diversity of knowledges and world views and experiences that come from the membership of those different groups and the contribution that diversity can truly make to our organizations and to our communities.

- **Diversity** entails recognizing the resourcefulness of all world views and not privileging just one world view, and I would just pose that the concept of academic freedom was formulated under a particular world view and formulated in the context of universities really being here to serve specific populations.
- **Inclusion** - Now that universities are becoming more diverse and have become more so, they are struggling with these different tenets because, if we really think about inclusion, it is about disrupting an old system. It's about disrupting a system that traditionally did not include racialized people, did not include Black people, Black scholars, Black excellence. So I'll just close with this. Consider what Ryerson would be like if we focus not just on EDI or Racism or for Freedom of Expression, but if we look at the organization from the aspect of being human-rights-centred and recognizing everyone's dignity and humanity, how would that change the way we interpret Academic Freedom or Academic Expression whether it be in a classroom or in other kinds of setting. I know this is a very complicated subject and a lot that can be said, but I just wanted to table those thoughts.

---

### Senate Meeting:

---

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 December 1, 2020 meeting.*  
  
A. McWilliams moved; R. Ravindran seconded.  
**Motion Approved.**
4. Announcements - None
5. Minutes of the Previous Meeting  
**Motion:** *That Senate approve the minutes of the November 3, 2020 meeting.*  
  
N. Thomlinson moved; C. Falzon 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) Lockdown Measures – Minor Adjustments

Update on the University's response to Toronto's move to grey "lockdown" level restrictions. Changes to our current model as a result of the move to "lockdown" are limited with few minor adjustments:

- Any in-person course activities that can be moved to a virtual format are no longer offered in-person
- Students who are participating in any form of experiential learning have moved to remote working environments
- SRC activities have been deemed essential by the provincial government, so SRC activity at Ryerson continues, following existing safety protocols
- Communal student study spaces in the Library, the SLC and the DCC will be restricted and our fitness facilities are closed
- Virtual services and resources remain available to students, faculty and staff
- Essential services employees continue to have permission to work on campus. Other staff and faculty are asked not to come to campus unless necessary. And, remote work has been extended until at least the end of April 2021.

The current 28-day restriction period will end just before the university closes for the mid-year break. We will continue to monitor updates from our province and keep the community informed.

2) Mental Health and Fatigue – Prioritizing Wellbeing

Over the last few weeks, I have held small group meetings with over a dozen departments and have met with over 200 faculty members. I heard about many of the challenges that faculty are experiencing. Some of the main themes that came up were:

- burnout
- decreased SRC productivity
- limited access to labs and experiential-learning opportunities for students
- concerns about academic integrity, and
- concerns for pre-tenure faculty, and the numerous challenges that are disproportionately affecting female identified faculty.

Based on what we heard, we are introducing additional supports for faculty and contract lecturers.

I heard that additional resources are required for further TA/GA support. This academic year, the university has invested an additional \$2.5M in TA/GA support for faculty members. I encourage faculty to work with chairs and deans to access funding for further support where it is needed.

I also heard about the need for technical support. There are several resources available such as the Remote Teaching website from the Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching and D2L Brightspace support.

It's important to me that wellbeing remains a key priority for the university. As the pandemic will continue to impact our lives for some time, I am implementing additional Ryerson Recharge days for all employees:

- The university will close for a mental health day on Tuesday, February 16, extending the Family day long weekend to four days, and Staff have been granted an additional Recharge day to use before April 30, 2021.

In addition, in the weeks ahead, we will share details on a series of new initiatives to better support you academically. These will include:

- Expanding faculty reimbursement guidelines, including expanding guidelines for how the Professional Expense Reimbursement Fund (PERF) is used
- Funding to support additional costs related to remote learning and teaching. There will be a one-time allocation of up to \$500 per instructional faculty member
- Funding to support CUPE contract lecturers who are teaching remotely will be made available to the unions (to be managed by them)
- Re-distributing some of the Test Centre's funding currently allocated for on-site test invigilation towards hiring a temporary team that will modify supports for faculty and students in a remote environment
- Introducing three new roles to improve key links in the Academic Accommodation Support chain
- Professional development opportunities on best practices for remote teaching and learning.

I hope these new initiatives will help alleviate some of the pressures during these difficult times.

### 3) Strategic Partnership with SOTI – Aerial Drone and Robotics Research

Update you on a new strategic partnership with SOTI – a business mobility and Internet of Things firm. SOTI has invested \$20 million in Canada's technology ecosystem to fund its new aerospace division. The new division will focus on advanced aerial drone and robotics research.

Through a multi-year collaboration, Ryerson's aerospace expertise will support SOTI's research and development of aerial drone technology. SOTI will support a research chair in this field and provide real-world experience in applied aerospace technology for Ryerson students. This collaboration will create new opportunities for our researchers and students to work on cutting-edge projects through enriched learning experiences, internships and scholarships.

4) Famed Photographer Ed Burtynsky – Donating his Archives to Ryerson

A great news update ... Award-winning Canadian photographer and Ryerson alumnus Edward Burtynsky has donated his archives to Ryerson. Burtynsky is regarded as one of the world's most accomplished contemporary photographers. His works are included in the collections of over 60 major museums around the world. His iconic images have brought worldwide attention to the impacts of human industry on the natural landscape.

The first installment donated to Ryerson is of 142 images of Burtynsky's early work. Each annual donation will add another chronological stage of Burtynsky's career to the RIC's holdings until his entire career is represented. With the archive, Ryerson will hold the largest institutional collection of his work. This donation is a remarkable gift to the Ryerson Image Centre, and to us all.

A slideshow was presented.

5) Fall Graduation Celebration

On November 17, Ryerson held a virtual graduation celebration for over 2,100 fall graduates. Honorary Doctorate recipient Mohamad Fakih delivered a special address.

We also worked with NexTech AR Solutions, a company founded by Ryerson alumnus Paul Duffy, to create a one-of-a-kind AR 360-degree portal of the Student Learning Centre. Graduates and special guests were able to virtually walk through the portal and browse each faculty to see highlights from the year, congratulate graduates and take pictures.

6) Egerton Ryerson Task Force

We have recently announced the membership of the Egerton Ryerson Task Force. It will be co-chaired by Joanne Dallaire and Catherine Ellis. The 14 members, which include faculty, students, alumni, external experts, form a balanced and strong task force and I look forward to their recommendations. Community consultations will begin shortly.

7) Strategic Vision

On November 12, we launched the Ryerson Strategic Vision, with a special presentation and panel discussion. The strategic vision is a foundational document for Ryerson, informed by community consultations and aligned with our other key strategic plans.

The strategic vision and recording of the panel discussion are on the President's website.

A short video regarding the Strategic Vision, prepared by Ryerson's Central Communications and Marketing teams, introduced the vision.

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

8.3 **Report of the Secretary** - None

8.4 **Committee Reports**

8.4.1 **Report #F2020-3 of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC): K. MacKay**

8.4.1.1. **Modifications to Concentrations in Language and Intercultural Relations - Faculty of Arts**

**Motion:** *That Senate approve the modifications to Concentrations in Language and Intercultural Relations – Faculty of Arts.*

K. MacKay moved; N. George seconded

**Motion Approved.**

8.4.2 **Report #F2020-3 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC):**

**S. Zolfaghari**

8.4.2.1. **Interim Provost's Update**

**The Interim Provost Reported:**

1) **Navitas Update:**

- I want to provide you with an update on progress towards the launch of the Navitas program – called Ryerson University International College or RUIC (pronounced R-U-I-C).
- As previously reported, two pilot programs were selected in consultation with the Deans of the Ted Rogers School of Management and the Faculty of Arts. The RUIC program will feed into Business Management program and 'Undeclared' Arts.
- Marketing began in October and we are expecting a small pilot of about 25 students in Winter 2021.
- RUIC is planning to offer three courses from the Chang School's inventory for this Winter.
- Under the agreement, RUIC is required to use Ryerson Instructors for all academic courses. The Instructor Services Agreement with RUIC is in final review with our legal teams and selection for instructors will follow the Chang School process.
- As was reported in September, we have begun the first step in the Governance Process and the Academic Advisory Committee met for the first time in November. The Committee is chaired by the Vice Provost Academic and includes representatives from the participating faculties. RUIC was represented by its Chief Operating Officer and members of the RUIC Implementation Team. Over time, membership will be expanded to include course coordinators from participating departments as well as the Principal and coordinating team from RUIC.

- The Committee discussed the pilot programs, confirmed courses for the Winter semester and discussed reporting for Senate which, among other things, will include student demographics, grade distribution by course, and retention rates.
- We will report back on the Winter semester towards the end of the Academic term.

2) **Winter Break**

- This will be our final meeting for the semester for 2020, and I would like to acknowledge the tremendous efforts you have all made during the last several months. Dealing with the impact of the COVID 19 virus at home, on campus, and within our communities, has been challenging for all of us. Our winter break is a few short weeks away and I hope you will take the time to be with those closest to you to recharge and come back refreshed and ready to face the challenges that the winter semester will bring. My very best wishes to you and your family, and above all be safe and well.

**Q:** There is a petition by students asking if they can use the “CRD”/”Non-CRD” for the Fall term.

**A:** S. Zolfaghari – This option was offered last Winter 2020 at the beginning of the Pandemic.

We’ve had many discussions around this and many supports have been put in place, e.g. extensions for students to submit work in consultation with departments and a decision was made to not offer this option since that term.

**8.4.2.2. Revise Policy 168: Grade and Standing Appeals to include the Faculty of Law (K. MacKay)**

**Motion:** *That Senate approve the motion to revise Policy 168: Grade and Standing Appeals to include the Faculty of Law.*

K. MacKay moved; N. Di Cuia seconded.

**Q:** Will the Faculty of Law students be represented by RSU or Graduate Students’ Union when it becomes available?

**A:** This is being worked out and we will get back to you about this.

**Motion Approved.**

**8.4.2.3. Revise Senate Bylaw #1 to include a Faculty of Law Student Senator (D. Checkland)**

**Motion:** *That Senate approve the motion to revise Senate Bylaw #1 to include a Faculty of Law Student Senator.*

D. Checkland moved; D. Taras seconded

**Motion Approved.**

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

An initiative with respect to Policy 2 to increase choice in electives for students. C. Hack thanked Faculties who assisted and those who are now entering into this.



**Q:** This is mostly a review of the format. Has there been an opportunity to review the content? Since the 'calls to action', what is being done to include indigenous content in curriculum?

**A:** This particular initiative is separate and distinct from what you're asking. There is variation in terms of how much work is done. The program reviews coming to Senate will show this review of the curriculum. There is an inventory of courses on campus that currently has indigenous content.

M. Lachemi – Proposed that the Truth and Reconciliation Committee Strategic Plan Working Group make a presentation to Senate about the work that they have undertaken so far, including indigenous involvement.

9. Old Business - None

10. New Business as Circulated - None

11. Members' Business - None

12. Consent Agenda - None

13. Adjournment

President Lachemi -

As this is the last Senate meeting of the year, I want to wish you all a wonderful Holiday Season. My best wishes for a healthy and joyous Season. I look forward to continuing our work in the new year.

Meeting adjourned at 6:59 p.m.