

SENATE MINUTES OF MEETING

Tuesday, May 4, 2021

Via Zoom Video Conference

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

**Committee-of-the-Whole Discussion:
Initial Consultation on Proposed School of Medicine**

The Vice Chair of Senate, L. Lavallée, chaired this section of the meeting.

S. Liss presented the topic.

It is my pleasure to be here today to discuss the approach that we are taking to apply for the proposed school of medicine, to hear your feedback and to answer your questions. In addition to the material distributed in advance of the meeting, we will be making a brief presentation before we transfer to questions and guided discussions from Senators.

I will share a rationale for the proposed Ryerson School of Medicine, an overview of the planning committee, and how we are undertaking this work, including the proposed timelines and information on how to participate in the consultation process that we will be undertaking this Spring.

The province provided Ryerson with a \$1M planning grant to establish a business case for a medical school. Building from Ryerson's SRC Health Strategy, the proposed Ryerson School of Medicine will lend itself to community-based care while offering training for a diverse network of future healthcare professionals for the health challenges of tomorrow. Ryerson is well positioned to build the support transformation in healthcare. We are known for innovation in curriculum and in practice. We attract talent from diverse backgrounds and we focus on culturally-respectful approaches. We have established a commitment to meeting local needs and then embedding this into professional practice and, most importantly, we have a history of looking at problems differently and challenging the status quo.

This is not about creating a traditional medical school. Ryerson can offer a new approach to medical education in Ontario. Our school of medicine will be committed to focusing on community, such as: primary care and the social factors that determine health, provide more culturally-respectful and sensitive care to communities, and using innovation and technology that can address issues sooner and more effectively; providing future doctors with the skills to work with networks of healthcare and the fostering of better patient outcomes, and focusing on supporting seniors as our aging population grows.

Brampton is one of the fastest growing cities in Canada, largely due to immigration. As a result of that growth, it is proportionally underserved in healthcare. We see COVID's high rates of occurrence in that region and the pandemic amplified significant cracks in the healthcare system across the province and with respect to the issues in Brampton. Ryerson and Brampton have worked well together and continue to do so. You will see from many of the President's reports to Senate, Ryerson and Brampton have had partnerships successfully, and we know each other. Brampton presents the opportunity for Ryerson to address a real need in regards to healthcare. The medical school will not only build upon the healthcare system in the City of Brampton but

will also create space for a diverse pool of talent to thrive in commercial healthcare and other like sectors.

What would a medical school do for Ryerson? The benefits go far beyond Brampton and the GTA. It opens up opportunities to play a much wider role in our community, country and the world. It creates learning and career opportunities for our faculty, staff, alumni, future students and graduates. The School of Medicine also has the potential to increase Ryerson's competitiveness and provide greater opportunity for partnerships and relationships within the broader community of healthcare organizations. I know that many of you have questions about what this will mean for existing programs, departments and areas of study. We want to hear from our Ryerson community and use the comments we receive to help shape the planning process which will be shared with all Ryerson community members, as well as a feasibility study, which is a business-case proposal that we will take to the provincial government. We have a bold vision.

Planning for a school of medicine is an ambitious and challenging endeavor that will take years to realize. Planning will be a multi-year process with many opportunities to listen, learn and co-create. The most frequently asked questions that we see in the consultation kick-off is 'when will the school of medicine be opening?', and the answer the President gave was that the plan will take 18-24 months. After the plan is developed, there are multiple steps to getting approvals and accreditation. The first step will be about 12-24 months after the full approval from the province. The creation of a new medical school impacts all aspects of the university and in recognition of that, we have formed the School of Medicine Planning Committee that consists of broad representation from across the institution including all the Faculties as well as the administrative offices, to guide Ryerson's approach to the proposed development in a strategic and coordinated manner.

The Planning Committee is guided by a [Terms of Reference](#), which is attached as part of the Senate agenda background materials, and is part of the Senate's and the Board of Governors' approval processes including [Senate Policy 112](#), which governs the Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs. The Planning Committee will oversee the process for the School of Medicine development, consultation and approval, to ensure that the University is making coordinated decisions for program development, resource allocation and external regulatory compliance. The Planning Committee serves as a committee-of-the-whole with members participating in sub-committees that will operate in parallel. The structure allows to report quickly and strategically to engage partners, develop proposed curriculum and academic program, and create a comprehensive Letter of Intent for the business case. The Planning Committee will work together with partners in Ryerson and Brampton community members to design a school of medicine that's in line with Ryerson's values; it serves societal needs with intentional approach to Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, and a goal to creating access.

As seen in the Terms of Reference, the Planning Committee has four dedicated sub-committees, which will operate in parallel to assist with the approval process including an Academic Program Development Committee, chaired by Marcia Moshe, that will lead the drafting of the Letter of

Intent and be responsible for reports to Ryerson Senate and the associated quality assurance councils and regulatory bodies. The other three sub-committees are a Feasibility Study Committee, Partnership and Community Relations Committee, and an Executive Steering Committee. As we are all in the preliminary planning stage, the Interim Provost has named me as the Dean of Record for this initiative. No decisions have been made regarding whether the School of Medicine will be a stand-alone school like the Chang School, the Yeates School of Graduate Studies, or the Lincoln Alexander School of Law. Those decisions will be made as we work through the planning process and considerations, and we welcome community feedback to help us make those decisions.

The first phase of the initial internal consultations is underway and will run from now until June 18, 2021. During this initial consultation phase, we have designed engagement tools to be inclusive of people wherever they are and make them available for an extended two-month period as we realize how busy everyone is. We launched a webinar on April 23 where the President shared his vision for the proposed School of Medicine and I described the planning process. The recording is available on the website for those who did not have a chance to see it live. There are two ways for community members to participate in the Spring consultation – first is to complete an online questionnaire, which will be available to the Ryerson community until June 18. The second way to participate is to attend a Zoom community engagement session. We will also be hosting weekly one-hour sessions from May 6 to June 14 for the Ryerson community. A total of six community engagement sessions will be held during the course of the Spring, the dates and times of these sessions are listed below. In these one-hour sessions, I will provide an overview of the planning process and vision for the School, using interactive technology. Participants will be invited to share their feedback in real time and there will also be an opportunity for questions and answers. If you are interested in attending one of the weekly community engagement sessions, I encourage you to please sign up through the link provided - [Sign-up at: https://www.ryerson.ca/brampton/school-of-medicine/](https://www.ryerson.ca/brampton/school-of-medicine/)

Engagement Sessions:

Thursday, May 6	-	10:00 to 11:00 am
Monday, May 10	-	10:00 to 11:00 am
Tuesday, May 18	-	2:00 to 3:00 pm
Thursday, May 27	-	2:00 to 3:00 pm
Wednesday, June 2	-	1:00 to 2:00 pm
Thursday, June 10	-	6:00 to 7:00 pm

We will share the feedback and what we have learned from these consultations, which will help form the next round of consultations. The second round of community consultation sessions will take place in the Fall 2021. There will be an opportunity to share what we heard in the Spring, our initial feedback as incorporated in the planning process and to allow for deeper engagement on the substance of the proposal.

We have prepared five questions that we've shared with you in advance to guide the remainder of today's discussion.

Questions to Guide Senate Committee-of-the-Whole Discussion

1. What core values and principles should guide the development of Ryerson's proposed School of Medicine?
2. Equity, diversity, and inclusion are core values for Ryerson University. In what ways could Ryerson be bold and innovative in developing a diverse, equitable, and inclusive School of Medicine?
3. What impact do we want Ryerson School of Medicine graduates to have on their communities and on healthcare? What are the pressing healthcare challenges they need to be ready to address?
4. What kinds of challenges do you anticipate for Ryerson during the School of Medicine proposal development process? How might we navigate these challenges?
5. Given the global COVID-19 pandemic, your knowledge of Ryerson, and your own interest in the School of Medicine, if you had three wishes for a Ryerson School of Medicine, what would they be?

C: It has to do with EDI - the discipline that I'm in, the social determinants of health are really being looked at right now, and especially from an Indigenous perspective rather than speaking to behavioural risk factors or things that people are doing to compromise their own health; it's actually placing the mirror on the practitioner. There are Indigenous physicians across Canada who are really talking about educating future doctors and nurses about putting the mirror on themselves with respect to recognizing how the stereotypes they hold impact the health of the people that they are working with.

C: I wanted to add as a core value, student advocacy and the ability for students to be present in the decision-making committees.

A: S. Liss – We are in the earliest of stages of setting up the process. Of course, the initial work with students ensures that the appropriate academic representation for feedback is in place. In particular areas, students were informed, students in health programs at Ryerson, particularly with regards to their experience with professional practice, what they see as a future in terms of healthcare, and how they see a curriculum for training physicians through the training program and including their view through the respective programs. I know there is a tremendous amount of interest with admission and admission criteria, particularly with respect to diversity, equity and inclusion, which will be very important to those discussions as well. We can certainly look at ways to populate our working groups and activities appropriately and at the same time we believe that students are a very important part of those discussions to capture their perspectives.

Q: With respect to earlier comments regarding communities, and to the core value, you want to make sure you serve the communities that are underserved right now. What communities have we targeted already and how will we find out what they need out of a breaking-the-mold medical school that we are trying to build and is proposed here?

A: There are stages with respect to laying out for an external consultation process with key stakeholders and communities. We are working very closely with Jennifer Grass' team and there has been a commitment with respect to supporting our external stakeholder engagement and working with community groups, particularly represented in communities like Brampton, but at the same time, making sure that we are working with our equity-seeking groups across our university as well, and also in the wider community. It is absolutely an essential part in the key component of the consultation exercise, not just the stakeholders and community-based health units, hospitals, partners and other organizations, but also with representatives of key communities including immigrant communities in underserved areas of the region. That is so important in helping to guide the direction and focus of the curriculum and orientation of training - the way in which we are engaged in those communities throughout the establishment of the school and also systematically throughout the program when it's up and running. There are very unique models and opportunities to learn from around the world, particularly the United States, about community engagement and representative of the diversity that's needed to ensure a successful vibrant medical school not just in the formation of the school. It will be interesting to hear feedback from the community on ways in which we might be able to do this better or differently or hear some examples of community engagement.

Q: Are you going to release publicly who you have engaged with? Will that be on the website?

A: Yes, this will be available on the website as well as updates and reports.

C: I was just thinking about when our group discussed the Law School last year, we were saying that one of the options of the Law School should be to take Ryerson's innovative approach, especially in the judicial arena, and apply it to documents. For example, we all know that during COVID, we all have to work from home and keep socially distanced; it's very important to be able to sign documents electronically. I think it would be interesting if this school emphasizes the use of digital documents and records (diagnostic imaging, etc.). This could enable people to avoid physically going to hospitals or medical centres to drop off or receive documents from medical practitioners. Medical results can be submitted online for doctors and patients to access.

A: Digital technology is very important on a number of fronts and from a learning perspective with respect to aspects of our curriculum, and training program, particularly with respect to students who will be working in community-based health units. Digital technology might be assistive to the training trajectory and will be an important conversation in some of the program development; incorporating some of our digital technology insights and looking at it as part of preparing practitioners for the future around digital. Certainly, this includes sufficient knowledge and background in issues of privacy, cybersecurity, and the technology itself regarding artificial intelligence. We are able to draw expertise across our campus as well as insights from others on this and so these are very important considerations and an opportunity to think about the curriculum and program in a specific way with regard to healthcare delivery in the community.

C/Q: I'm addressing questions 1 and 2 regarding interests. The students in the new medical school, when it eventually happens, making sure that those students are properly represented and they have a voice, that they are part of the same student structures that exist at Ryerson and that they have the same student representation. The new medical school should contain student advocacy and student representation. Similarly, for collegial governance, faculty members in the medical school should be members of the faculty association and should be active in the Senate. How do you ensure that faculty there will be involved in the whole Ryerson faculty association?

A: We appreciate your perspective and the value of composition with respect to the role of students while they are in the program, their contribution and their engagement across the university, and the role of faculty as well will be considered.

Q: Regarding Question #4 – How will this impact faculty, not just the Faculty of Community Services that has a School of Nursing, that, I imagine might go into the School of Medicine, but is that a potential challenge in the future? What does that mean for the Faculty of Community Services? Has that been addressed yet?

A: We are very much in the preliminary stages and no decisions have been made regarding whether the School of Medicine should stand alone, like Chang, Yeates School of Graduate Studies or the Lincoln Alexander School of Law. As we explore the feasibility study and take into consideration accreditation, we will welcome community feedback, including the role of existing Faculties. We will also work with the Senate Priorities Committee (SPC) which has a mandate to explore the implications and sustainability of the creation of new Faculties and departments/schools and/or reconfigurations of our current compliment of schools and Faculties.

C/Q: I'm not sure how the structure is ultimately going to be. Will medical students travel back and forth between Brampton campus and Toronto? Will they do all their training in Brampton and, if that is the case, how do we ensure that those students will still be part of the Ryerson community and not have a disconnect?

A: Not jumping too far ahead, it's likely the entire program will be based in Brampton. Keep in mind that Western University has a medical campus in Windsor; the Academy of Medicine – University of Toronto; McMaster, Waterloo, and many other instances. I think it's an important consideration. I will point out that in terms of commuting back and forth, the linkages between Brampton and downtown Toronto are there and the infrastructure to support that movement. We have a presence in Brampton already – experiential learning and training of our healthcare professionals in nursing and social work, and other areas like the Rogers Cybersecure Catalyst. It's not an isolated area, but your point is well-taken. We understand the pride and connection to communities as well. There will be connections to research and opportunities for medical students to participate in biomedical science, technology, or collaborate with researchers across our university on our main campus. There are many ways to think of the intersections and ways to engage and create that connection. We wouldn't be the only institution with a campus or medical school separate from the main campus.

Q: Congratulations on being given the task. I just want to know how much leveraging we will be doing on the previous two-year effort to create a Brampton campus. You seem to have hired a lot of people to work on that initiative. Clearly, there must be a lot of paperwork. Are we going to be re-using some of that, and how will that work? The Faculties were engaged in that and we asked a series of questions about faculty involvement. Do you have access to that information or is that something that's in the past and we have to do this all over again?

A: We will certainly draw on many elements of our connections to Brampton including the planning for the university campus prior to the election, so that experience and information we've built upon to advance the discussions that are currently underway with Brampton – the Rogers Cybersecurity Analyst, professional training of our healthcare, etc.

C: Just a follow-up with that, there is a lot of infrastructure placed in Brampton. There doesn't appear to be much of a linkage to any of that at the moment to Ryerson. Admittedly, there is a pandemic going on, but one of the flaws that was obvious from the planning for the last time we tried to engage with Brampton is that there wasn't complete buy-in. If I could suggest something, it would be to actually have real engagement with the actual stakeholder in this. You cannot just do this on your own and run off and make a medical school. I'm concerned that it may end up being the same exercise as we ended up with the previous provost, where we didn't accomplish anything and we blamed it on the government but it actually had a lot to do with us. So, I'm encouraging you to do a better job.

A: I appreciate this and there's a lot to be learned, and we are also very sensitive to some of the experiences of previous efforts including that of York University. To your point about the transparency and openness and engagement with the external stakeholders, whether it's the community or government, the expectation is to do this differently with a higher expectation with respect to the outcomes. From the outset, we have been very open in public and we also have resources that we didn't have in establishing the university campus, the resources to support the community engagement. We will focus on the necessary pieces to support the work of community relations and the work we're doing on campus with respect to the Letter of Intent, external stakeholder engagement and the consultation process, as well as our recruiting in professional services to help with this – so we'll have considerable expertise in this and do it right.

Q: Regarding Question #4: A challenge could be providing high-quality education beyond the computer. Given the long-term government cuts to funding for education, I'm wondering if there is a plan to get funding given the current funding crisis, and perhaps a joint lobbying approach that the university might be taking.

A: There are many dimensions to raising funds to establish a new school. This includes University Advancement. We're seeing that playing out in the Lincoln Alexander School of Law and it's an evolution from the start of the first year of operation. There are other aspects of this as well in that it's a multi-departmental area of responsibility including

Ministry of Health. It's a two-phase process with not only the feasibility study and presentation to the province, but it's also the province's commitment across both the necessary resources to establish the increased number of residency placements, and to support an increase cohort of medical student spaces in medical schools. It has to come with all sorts of other financial commitments to make this happen. The expectation is that we are having to put a lot of effort into the multiple number of government departments that are involved and also working with hospitals and partnerships and collaborations with community health units to build the appropriate business case and identify all the resource requirements. This will be all monies that the government will have to have in place to do this. We feel strongly that with many of the challenges in the healthcare system brought on by the pandemic, there is a strong desire not only to bring back healthcare, but also to build back healthcare differently with a sizeable commitment. We saw some of that reflected in the budget including expansion and resources for the OSLER health system in Brampton and Peel Region. There is a lot of work to do and there are multiple stakeholders who have to be in place before we can successfully launch the school. That's a very critical piece as well. Anything that we will be doing within the university, the Vice President Advancement particularly with respect to initiatives to resources for student support, will enhance our ability for a medical school and at the forefront of our medical education, as well as supporting access, inclusion and diversity. Yes, there is always a risk, but clearly the government has made healthcare a significant priority and has made investments to ensure the healthcare system for the future.

C/Q: Regarding Question #2 – The Department of Biology is undergoing a very targeted search for Indigenous faculty members in Science, and it is very difficult to locate the individuals that are both interested and have the appropriate background. It is going to be that way with the School of Medicine as well if we do not have a plan in the creation of the medical school, not just to service students once they're at Ryerson, but to identify and encourage underserved communities to engage in the kind of background they need to get into the programs at university that will take them down the path to the medical school. I wonder if you have any plans as to how we incorporate outreach into the importance of our new way?

A: It is again very early days, we're learning, we're gathering information, we're talking to other organizations and learning from other medical schools, not only in Canada but across North America. What we've also heard is that while there is a significant focus on admission with respect to pathways to medical education and barriers that might exist by virtue of one part of the system and process, it's important that where we might be more focused on is looking systematically and with an ongoing effort with regards to community engagement in the pipeline of talent diversity and, at the same time, looking at it systematically through the medical program in terms of supporting students of diverse background to post-graduate pathways and opportunities as well; particular with respect to individuals who go back to work in the communities they come from. We're also sensitive to our foreign trade professionals and the many barriers and access concerns they have to practice and how they can fulfil our tremendous need at the same

time. I'm talking about very talented, well-trained and very competent individuals. Part of this approach is also to look at a pathway in the medical program foreign trained professionals. We have a very unique way of bringing forward a faculty complement that will allow us to draw diversity and different perspectives than to focus on other medical schools and to be complementary, not competitively positioned with regard to other medical schools necessarily either. There's another way of looking at this and that's the governance structures are shaped and wound around a medical school and I think there are some very interesting ways in which we can look at how our values and principles are represented in our governance structures - not just merely as something on the side of one's desk that they're responsible for making sure that they incorporate and enable, but also to really look at the key leadership rules within a governance structure in the School of Medicine that is oriented to those values, visions and principles, and around diversity, equity and inclusion, and community engagement. There is still a lot to learn and to draw from, but we are taking a very strong global perspective on this as well with respect to the professional service from whom we hope to bring some of that expertise and dynamic changes in how medical school education and how medical schools are organized as well.

C: Just to emphasize a point that people are moving beyond the social determinants of health and I think that's a way that the Ryerson School of Medicine can be bold and innovative.

C: Part of the reason for asking this question has to do with recent experience at another university. One would expect at some point, you will need capital resources to build. The worry about capital resources, the experience at Laurentian sort of drove home the worry. Over-ambitious capital spending seems to be part of what triggered their problem. I just wanted to flag it more than ask a question. Capital spending is one of the things that looks like a potential danger to some of the other things in the university if it's not done really well.

C/Q: I heard earlier that you are thinking of bringing the Daphne Cockwell School of Nursing to the Brampton campus. If that's the case, does it mean physically, and what happens to the new school that was built downtown, and how do you repurpose that?

A: I didn't mean to imply that this was in the plan. I think that the notion that professional practice and opportunities for that part of the training regarding students could be coming downtown. The other side of this precludes the possibility of a mix of the nursing program – a cohort of nursing students in Brampton. Nothing is off the table necessarily, but no one is proposing that the School of Nursing be moved to Brampton.

C/Q: I heard mention of a professional service firm, so I wanted to ask what that firm is? What will they be helping with? and whose members these students will be - CESAR, RSU or members of another union?

A: Proposals through procurement is a process. This is a fairly large undertaking through a multi-phase approach. We are still in the process of receiving the proposals from the

proponents who are seeking to take on this work, and so we hope to have this concluded by the end of May. We're waiting for the deadline to close and we will evaluate and select the firm. There are a number of firms who have experience in healthcare practices and work in that area. We're interested in all students. The intent is to be inclusive. We are aware that there may be Chang School students who are interested in enrolling in this school as well.

- C: We have covered quite a bit of ground today, which included not repeating past mistakes, inclusion of Indigenous faculty, and diversity, equity and inclusion, etc. What I want to say is that proper record-keeping and quality of training are very important. The currency is very important. EDI is very important. You have to make sure that foreign-trained physicians be trained to fit in our system. The quality of training is very critical and that should be very much in the picture.
- C: Regarding the EDI piece, specifically for Indigenous medical students, there has been a movement across all medical schools to have more Indigenous students come in but there hasn't been as many graduates of medical schools who are Indigenous. So much more is needed than simply to have a quota or an access program. I would hope that Ryerson School of Medicine would stand behind the commitment to reconciliation, the commitment to the land acknowledgements that we do on a regular basis and really think critically about how we truly design access for Indigenous entry into this medical school. It means that we have to look at our admissions process; just like we have to look at the pipeline to Indigenous scholars, we have to look at a pipeline for Indigenous students to want to feel welcome here. We can look at what other universities have done. Other universities have had an access program – University of Manitoba has had one for the medical school for the last 30 years, but the number of graduates has not been as great as you think it would be. Something has to happen here that is different and resources/money have to be placed into that.
- A: This is a very important perspective to help us inform how we approach this. To your point, the number of graduates is also about looking at it systematically across all under-represented groups – Indigenous peoples for sure. That includes working in the communities and the opportunities and pathways to success to entry, not only that, but success through the program and following graduation as well and throughout their careers. We will be seeking your guidance and the guidance of others, and importantly, making sure that we have the right voices and lens on this as we are unfolding the program and installing those values.

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 May 4, 2021 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 April 6, 2021 meeting.*

G. Hepburn moved; T. Duever 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. Honorary Doctorate Recipients

I am very pleased to share with you the diverse group of people being honoured with Ryerson Honorary Doctorate degrees at our convocation ceremony in June. Thank you to everyone involved in preparing the honorary doctorate nominations, and the Awards and Ceremonials Committee for its work. It has been a pleasure to connect with the nominees, who have responded with enthusiasm and pride in accepting the honour.

Each of the honorees were given the option to proceed with a virtual ceremony or wait until we could resume ceremonies in person. They have all chosen to accept their degrees virtually in June.

The following list of recipients is an outstanding group covering a wide range of fields and achievements:

- **Donette Chin-Loy Chang** - Philanthropist
- **Silvio DeGasperis** - Co-founder and co-owner, TACC Group of Companies
- **Mitch Frazer** - Former Chair, Ryerson Board of Governors
- **Emmanuelle Gattuso** - Philanthropist
- **Gregory Regis** - Retired Justice, Ontario Court of Justice
- **Tanya Talaga** - Journalist; author
- **Malala Yousafzai** - Education activist; youngest Nobel Prize laureate

2. Convocation Ceremonies

Our Spring Convocation Ceremonies will be held virtually on June 22 to June 24.

It is a special time for our students and their families and there is always a great atmosphere of celebration. If you can, I encourage you to join and celebrate with our graduates.

3. Lincoln Alexander School of Law Naming

This Thursday, May 6, we will celebrate the official naming of the Faculty of Law as the Lincoln Alexander School of Law at Ryerson University. This will be the Faculty's inaugural year-end celebration. I hope you will be able to join and celebrate this momentous occasion.

4. Planning for Fall

As I shared at the last meeting, planning for the Fall term is continuing. There are extensive variables that will need to be addressed and many unknowns. We appear to be making progress with vaccinations, but infection rates remain high. While many details continue to evolve, at this time we are optimistic that we will be able to safely open our campus to some degree in the Fall.

As always, the safety and wellbeing of our faculty, students and staff is our top priority. We continue to monitor provincial regulations. Our goal is to share details about what the Fall semester will look like by June 9 so that faculty have time to prepare and students have adequate time to make plans.

5. 2021-22 Budget

The 2021-22 budget was approved by the Board of Governors. This has been a challenging budget year with many difficult decisions. We presented a balanced budget that aims to manage uncertainty while remaining focused on the future.

I want to recognize all of you for the work that you have done in preparing your budgets for 2021-22. It has been a challenge, which you faced with determination and commitment to our institution.

6. Vaccine Clinic at the DCC -- Photos

I'd like to share a few photos from the COVID-19 Vaccine Clinic at the Daphne Cockwell Complex. The vaccine clinic is opening this week to serve the community in partnership with Unity Health Toronto.

7. School of Fashion Update

As you may know, over the weekend, the Chair of the School of Fashion posted content to the School's official Instagram account commenting on the personal post of Suzanne Rogers. The School of Fashion is a department within the Faculty of Communication and Design, and part of the university. Sharing the post on the official Ryerson School of Fashion social media account implied that the statement had been approved and endorsed by the university, which was not the case. It was only a matter of hours between the post, and the follow-up from the School of Fashion. I don't believe that this is a sufficient amount of time to appropriately consult with our community on how to proceed.

At Ryerson, we encourage discussion and debate about important topics. We encourage people to express their views and we listen. We are in an inclusive, consultative culture. At the university, we do not immediately point fingers and/or rush to judgement, especially on social media. My position from the beginning of all this was very clear. We do not manage university affairs on social media. We reach out to people to engage in dialogue. That is our responsibility. It is the responsibility of undertaking our due diligence.

In hindsight, I wish we had all paused to have a proper dialogue and a better understanding of how we could have worked together to accomplish our goals of fostering and supporting diversity. That said, Ryerson University is a very safe space for the critical exploration of ideas, and for the debate of ideas including those that may be controversial that threaten vested interests. Ours is a safe space where the university's policies and practices are open and transparent and clearly subject to criticism. I say safe because academic freedom and freedom of expression are always protected in our university and we are committed to the protection of both academic freedom and freedom of expression. Ryerson is fully committed to the core principles of academic freedom and freedom of thought and expression. The academic freedom of faculty members has not, and will not, be compromised. Ryerson University faculty are free to teach, to carry out scholarly research and creative activities, and to discuss and criticize both the University and wider society and they should feel encouraged to do so. However, academic freedom does not allow the use of official University channels to disseminate unauthorized messages.

The views of a faculty member or even a group of faculty members, while immensely valuable and respected, do not constitute the views of the university. That is why we asked the School of Fashion to remove its initial statement from an official university account. We wanted the time

and opportunity to gather the facts; gather information; exercise due diligence – these are the things we must do as a university. If we govern or manage the university on social media, we will make mistakes. I am sure every member of the Ryerson community who might conceivably be embroiled in controversy would want us to accord them the same opportunity.

Based on the homework that we have done and reaching out to people involved in this, today, Suzanne Rogers shared a statement with the University that I want to share with you. This is the first time I'm sharing this because we received this statement today and we will be able to share it with the School of Fashion after this meeting.

"I have always believed in equality, diversity, inclusiveness, and respect for all, and I have worked to that end all my life. They are important in all aspects of society, especially in fashion. I have been honoured to do a small part to help some fashion students and alumni get a chance to learn, create and have some help to start a business in Canada. The Suzanne Rogers Fashion Institute, at Ryerson University, is a true reflection of diversity in Canadian fashion.

I do not have any kind of relationship with Donald Trump, good or otherwise. I had never met him before that night. Our family's interaction with President Trump was mere seconds at the end of a dinner, as we were leaving. No political statement, on any policy, was intended by the photograph. Taking and posting it was done without considering the false assumptions and implications that would be made about my personal beliefs. I regret that my actions caused anyone to question my values or commitment to the communities and causes my family and I hold so dear."

Tomorrow, I will be meeting with the members of the School of Fashion to continue a dialogue on this matter. We share the same values, we only differ in our approach. We will be helping also to launch a meeting for Suzanne Rogers Fashion Institute members, something that we all agree is needed.

I wanted Senators to get this update and after this meeting, we will be sending the same message to Board members. I will keep you posted as this develops.

Comments/Questions:

- Q: About the vaccination centre, international students as well other people are having difficulty booking a vaccination appointment because we need a health card number. I'm wondering if there is some way that you can collaborate with Unity Health so that Ryerson students could use their Ryerson student number to make it easier to access the vaccination. We're getting different advice and getting the go-around.
- A: The Vice Provost Students offered to look into this and get back to the international students.
- C: There are clinics that are accepting people without OHIP cards. There is a possibility.

C: President Lachemi – If you know of any around campus and can provide their contact information, we will make sure that we share this with our international students.

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

8.3 **Report of the Secretary**

8.3.1 Senate Elections Update

- The Secretary of Senate welcomed three new Senate members: Maddy Fast, President, CESAR; Kelly Train and Shawn McFadden, CUPE, non-voting members.
- The Vice Chair of Senate for 2021-2022 will be Andrew McWilliams.
- Faculty membership for AGPC and SPC has been completed for 2021-2022. These committees will be included in the June Senate Agenda. All student positions will be filled once we come back in September.

8.4 **Ombudsperson Report:** K. Addo

https://www.ryerson.ca/senate/senate-meetings/agenda/2021/Ombudsperson_2019_2020_AnnualReport.pdf

This past year has been a year like no other. Similar to other departments at Ryerson, the office has had to pivot to working remotely in mid-March following the declaration of the pandemic. COVID has taken its toll on staff, students and faculty. A poll conducted by the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations reported that students and faculty are struggling with social isolation, stress and a lack of institutional support. No one has been spared. With the recent news of greater access to vaccine, hopefully, when we meet again next year, it will be in person.

I would be remiss if I didn't take this opportunity to thank my colleagues, Assistant Ombudsperson Ayesha Adams and Gemma Kerr, for their hard work and contributions to the office.

Highlights accompanied by a slideshow:

1. The top complaint concerns handled by the office: The key complaint categories remain similar to those of previous years - with academic advice, academic appeals, academic misconduct and conduct issues accounting for the most common types of complaints handled this year.
2. Slide addresses how the 457 complaints received last year were resolved.
3. Intervention describes the steps taken by the office to assist the students to resolve their concern. This can be done through clarifying information or using alternative resolution techniques, such as facilitation, mediation or more commonly, diplomacy. Intervention can involve conducting a fairness review or investigation.
4. We received the most complaints or contact from full-time undergraduate students.
5. We analyze complaints received for things or trends that have systemic or system-wide implications, and they form the basis of our recommendations.
6. This past year, we made three recommendations to the university based on our analysis, including: ensuring that decisions made by the university adhere to applicable policies

and procedures; timeliness of decisions and dealing with unreasonable complaining conduct.

7. On several occasions last year, we observed that the university made decisions that did not appear to be in accordance with, or authorized by the applicable policy at the expense of the student. Where a policy is silent or ambiguous as to how it applies to a specific situation, we recommended that consideration should be given to interpreting the policy broadly so as not to unfairly disadvantage the student.

In its response, the university confirmed that it is committed to ensuring that the decision-making follows its policies and procedures as they are written. Further, it agreed to work with the Office of the Ombudsperson to resolve any issues or ambiguities brought to its attention.

8. Concerns about timeliness of decisions is not a recent trend. My predecessor, Nora Farrell, described a similar concern in her 2016-2017 report. At that time, she suggested that staff make every effort to be responsive to reasonable requests for assistance in a timely and appropriate manner. This year, we handled more than a few cases where students experienced unreasonable long delays before receiving a response from the university.

One element to procedural fairness which speaks to how a decision is made, considers whether the decision was made in a reasonable time. Untimely responses can make a stressful situation more worrisome for some students especially when those requests may be time-sensitive.

In response to our recommendation, the university explained that it is exploring the implementation of additional communication resources to ensure students have access to the information they need in a timely manner. The university is also exploring the creation of a response toolkit to be provided to Faculties for their use.

9. We have seen situations where students may not be satisfied with the decision or response to a complaint, who then resort to inundating staff with emails or phone calls, making excessive demands or being rude. The university has a responsibility to protect its staff against unreasonable behavior. In its good practice framework, the Office of the Independent Adjudicator, an organization that investigates student complaints throughout their post-secondary institutions in Wales and England, suggests that it is good practice for schools to have policies in place: setting out the expectations that students, their representatives, and staff members should act reasonable and fairly towards each other. They recommend that these policies and procedures set out the type of behavior that would be considered unacceptable and the circumstances in which the students' access to staff or procedures might be restricted, and they would include a requirement to inform the student of a decision to restrict access. It should also include situations where a student may have a valid complaint but presents it in a manner which is considered inappropriate.

We recommended that the university considered developing policy and procedures that deal with unreasonable complaints and behavior.

In response, the university explained that it is in the process of reviewing and updating its Policy 61, Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct, which is scheduled for approval at today's meeting. The review committee was also committed to continuing procedures

that require decision-makers to inform students of decision or issues under the Code, including the penalties assigned, its duration, as well as other feedback provided by our office.

10. In our office, more than half of the academic misconduct complaints handled by the Ombudsperson were received during the last four months of the term, i.e. between March and June 2020. The Academic Integrity Office has also reported a significant increase in the number of academic misconduct suspicions brought forward, compared to last June. It's too early to say if this trend is primarily due to the move to online instruction in mid-March, heightened awareness by instructors or if this trend will continue. What is clear, however, is that this is not unique to Ryerson. My Ombudsperson colleagues across the country are also reporting a similar trend and the office will continue to monitor this situation over the coming months.

11. Progress made concerning the Ombudsperson's 2018-2019 recommendations: Last year, the office recommended that the university and CSCI which operates the HOEM residence, work towards aligning the appeal processes so that it uses the same criteria in escalation process for addressing key withdrawal requests and violations of the housing and residence Life Community Standards.

The university agreed with our recommendation to amend the appeal process, with the caution that HOEM will also need to be aligned since it was not fully within the university ability to do so. That said, it agreed Student Housing and Community Care will undertake a review of existing agreements to determine if the appeal processes between Ryerson's own buildings and HOEM should be aligned.

Unfortunately, since the release of last year's report, CSCI, the owners of HOEM, and Ryerson have revised the operating agreement for the 2020-2021 academic year. The parties agreed that CSCI will be fully responsible for all administrative aspects of the operations. The university will continue, however, to ensure, through the information available on the Housing and Residence Life website that it is clear that HOEM is not Ryerson-owned and that all administrative aspects and decision-making are managed through HOEM staff.

12. The other recommendation made last year were related to the fee appeal process managed by the Registrar's office.

We recommended that the university formalize the practice of allowing the student to request reconsideration of their unfavourable fee appeal decision so that the practice is available to all students. We also recommended that the university develop criteria under which a student would be permitted to request reconsideration.

The university has established a second-level fee appeal process and the Registrar's website has been updated with information about the revised appeal process, along with the criteria which students need to follow to apply for a second-level appeal.

Comments/Questions:

C: One of the things that struck me regarding the quantitative data, the report suggests that over the last five years we have grown in size tremendously. In the last 10 years, I think between graduate and undergraduate students, we doubled in the number of students, and yet our concerns reported to the Ombudsperson's office has stayed flat, and you

might argue, have gone down a little bit. If you look more closely, the only place that complaints have appreciated is the recovery of fees. The other interesting thing is the constituency from which we see the greatest increase over the last 10 years, is from parents contacting the Ombudsperson's office. Many more complaints stayed the same or even leveled off a little. I appreciate that your responsibility as Ombudsperson is to suggest systemic issues and problems and suggest ways that we can do better. We should always strive to do better, and when it comes to things like timeliness, we are all swamped but I understand that although it is difficult, we have to do better. I'm glad that there is movement toward a different recognition that just because a student has a complaint, it doesn't absolve them from responsibility for acting with civility either. The first recommendation, I'm still not quite exactly clear if it is a systemic issue. Is there a good-news story here that we can take away from the data over the last 5-10 years, or last year?

- A. One of the first comments that you made about the number of the complaints dropping from previous years, I think that last year was a little bit of an unusual year. I suspect that when we look at the data we have currently, we are sort of trending quite above what we saw last year, so I think our numbers will probably be around what they have been for the last 3- years prior to last years. In terms of good-news stories, one of the things that I'm seeing in my short period of time here is the number of people in terms of faculty or staff who reach out to our office or to me specifically to ask or consult about various issues that they are dealing with, or to get advice on how to handle a matter or questions on whether or not it's appropriate to refer somebody to our office. That's a good-news story that people see us as more than just an entity when things may go wrong, that we can act as a resource to provide assistance to staff, faculty and anyone within the university community that might have interest and contact in the university.

The other thing that has happened in the office, and I can speak of a recent association that we've had with Yeates School of Graduate Studies. We were involved in the Graduate skills program that ran this past January and March. The Associate Dean Nancy Walton and myself presented a workshop on conflict resolution. I think there are more opportunities for the office or myself to talk about what we do and how we can be of assistance to staff. The other thing that I would like to stress is that because somebody raises a concern or there is a complaint, it's not necessarily a bad thing. I think really what is important is how the recipient responds, and whether they use it as a learning opportunity or a catalyst for change. The way I look at it, it's not always in a negative way.

In terms of your comment about the first recommendation not really being a systemic issue or failing the see the system thread, the examples that I included in that summary is that from time to time there are situations or circumstances where decisions are made by decision-makers that it might not be clear that they were authorized to make the decisions that they do and have done, but they do so anyway because it doesn't actually prevent them from doing so, and I believe that, in many cases, is to the detriment of the student. I think there should be an effort made to make sure that decisions are following

the rules, policies and procedures are set out and if there are circumstances where situations are less clear, I don't think it should give the university the ability to just to say, "we're doing it anyway". I know my predecessor had developed a fairness checklist, which I think has a lot of really good information and reminders for people when they are making decisions, and I think it would be helpful to just keep that in mind as a resource.

C: I would agree that the number of interactions that your office has is not indicative of the number of issues. I think once people reach your office, cases have heightened dramatically and you might deal with one case of something that is indicative of a larger systemic issue. If we can somehow promote students going to the Ombudsperson's office when there are challenges, it's one way that we can really look at having the impact of the systemic issues in the university because a lot of times when we go to various offices, there is confidentiality that is imposed, which really stops and puts the brakes on any progress with respect to addressing systemic issues, so your office and your report can do that for us.

8.5 Committee Reports

8.5.1 Report #W2021-4 of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC): K. MacKay

8.5.1.1 Periodic Program Review for Accounting and Finance – Ted Rogers School of Management

Motion: *That Senate approve the Periodic Program Review for Accounting and Finance – Ted Rogers School of Management.*

K. MacKay moved; N. Di Cuia seconded.

Motion Approved.

8.5.2 Report #W2021-4 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC):
S. Zolfaghari

8.5.2.1 Interim Provost's Update

1. Updates to the Provincial Emergency Declaration and stay-at-home order

Further to the Premier's announcement on April 16, 2021 regarding additional measures to address the COVID-19 pandemic, post-secondary institutions continue to be subject to requirements and applicable regulations.

● In-person Teaching and Instruction

All public health units remain in the Shutdown zone of Stage 1. No in-person teaching or instruction may be provided, unless both of the following conditions are met:

- (1) the subject matter of the teaching or instruction requires that it be taught in-person, such as but not limited to clinical training or training related to a trade, and

(2) if it is provided in accordance with certain physical distancing and capacity limits.

- **People Entering Ontario from Québec or Manitoba**

The government also announced that it is restricting travel into Ontario from the provinces of Manitoba and Québec. In addition to people traveling for work, people travelling from Manitoba or Québec to attend a school or post-secondary institution in Ontario are also permitted to travel into Ontario. Additionally, people transporting post-secondary students to/from school are permitted to travel into Ontario from Manitoba or Quebec.

- **International Education**

No changes have been made with respect to the arrival of international students for those institutions that have provincially approved international readiness plans and that have been identified on the federal government's Designated Learning Institution list.

- **Student Residences**

Student residences can remain open, subject to certain conditions.

- **Laboratories and Research Facilities**

Businesses and organizations that are open must ensure that any person who performs work for the business or organization conducts their work remotely, unless their work requires them to be on-site at the workplace. Employers are responsible for determining whether or not the individual's work requires attendance at the workplace. Research facilities should review the applicable rules and regulations for requirements and measures applicable to their operations.

2. Fall 2021 Planning

In planning for Fall 2021, we continue to consider a number of return-to-campus course delivery options. As mentioned in our past meetings, there are many factors to consider as we review our options, such as the areas that would benefit most from in-person instruction, the technology needs of faculty and students, and the evolving public health advice. Given the many variables and unknowns, Ryerson must continue to be flexible in its approach to planning for Fall and will be prepared to pivot if necessary.

8.5.2.2 Revised Policy 61: Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct (J. McMillen)

Motion: *That Senate approve the revised Policy 61: Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct.*

J. McMillen moved; A. McWilliams seconded.

Policy 61 is the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct, which are policy and procedures that addresses challenging student non-academic behavior. Our goal is always to educate and respond to

these situations in a fair, proportionate and reasonable way. Tonight brings a conclusion to a two-year review process. Policy 61 was due for review, having not been reviewed in a major way since 2011. Throughout the process, it has been overseen by a Senate committee that has been made up of faculty, student and staff representation that met over 14 times during the course of the review. Members from CESAR, RSU, student and faculty Senators were committee members along with others. Two meetings were held specifically with student members of the committee and there were 240 Ryerson community members who attended two rounds of community consultations (town hall meetings), which were held in person in the first round and virtually in the second round, as well as members of stakeholder groups, such as student societies and the Ombudsperson. The policy has also been updated to adhere to the Senate Policy Framework. The significant goal of this work was to ensure that the procedures were student-friendly, accessible and transparent, that they promote principles of harm-reduction and Good-Samaritanship that they promote an EDI lens to the work that we do, and lay out a process that is supportive, provides increased procedural fairness and is sufficient for both decision-makers and community members. The procedures are included within this document. Based on the nature of this policy, they are often intertwined given how complex the issues are. As needs related to individual cases continue to evolve, we will continue to ensure that our procedures are updated as we implement the policy and work to ensure that we are doing this with the best interest of students and the community.

The Code offers a framework for establishing and maintaining community standards in accordance with the principles of procedural fairness and with deep regard to competing interests and values, such as freedom of expression that may appear to come into tension with each other at times. Each complaint that comes under the code is carefully reviewed with regard to the nature of the circumstances of the misconduct in question, the parties involved and all other relevant factors.

Motion Approved.

8.5.2.3 Waiving of residency requirements for graduation as stipulated in Policy 46 Section 2.5. c., that requires students to complete a minimum of 50% of their program at Ryerson University on a one-time only, exceptional basis for Midwifery students transferring from Laurentian University to Ryerson in 2021, due to the unforeseen and sudden closure of the Laurentian program. Contingent upon the Ministry providing the funding to Ryerson to assume half of Laurentian's students (K. MacKay & C. Hack)

Motion: *That Senate approve the waiving of residency requirements for graduation as stipulated in Policy 46 Section 2.5. c., that requires students to complete a minimum of 50% of their program at Ryerson University on a one-time only, exceptional basis for Midwifery students transferring from Laurentian University to Ryerson 2021, due to the unforeseen and sudden closure of the Laurentian program. Contingent upon the Ministry providing the funding to assume half of Laurentian's students.*

K. MacKay moved; N. George seconded.

Midwifery Education program is part of the consortium in Ontario. Only three universities offer Midwifery education (McMaster University, Ryerson University and previously Laurentian). It is a separately funded program and this motion is to assist, particularly, the upper-year students who will transfer to Ryerson to receive the final part of their education and receive their degree. The contingency aspect of it was with respect to negotiation with the Ministry with regard to the consortium agreement and the splitting of the Laurentian funds between McMaster and Ryerson University to take these students. I believe that this is very likely to occur so this motion was put in place to be prepared because the timeline is very short.

Comments/Questions:

- Q: The date seems to limit the admission to Ryerson to just this coming term and you said upper-year students, is that only 4th year students? What about the possibility that some students, for various reasons, might take a year off, and still want to complete it in a subsequent year? With that date in the motion, that looks like that would be ruled out now.
- A: That's probably true. My reference to upper-year students is because of the residency requirements, if they come in as a third-year cohort from Laurentian, that doesn't become a policy issue. It's for students who have completed the majority of their education at another university and so, hence my reference to that aspect of the policy. As the students come in, if they transfer in to Ryerson's Midwifery program, we will retain them all the way through.
- Q: Part of the problem might be that when and if we go back to live classes, these people will have to relocate.
- A: My understanding is that the government wants to have a temporary solution. I think by next year, they will find another partner in the North to launch another institution. The first key components are location and geography; and the second is the French component since Laurentian is the only institution that is offering this program in both English and French.
- A: We would have up to 45 students who are continuing as Laurentian transfer to Ryerson and the reference to 2021 is because we are transferring then now. The intent is that the students need to declare that they would like McMaster or Ryerson and they are being divided up. They may currently be continuing their 1st, 2nd, 3rd or 4th year, so the residency becomes an issue in particular for students who have completed two years at Laurentian and are coming here and for the students who have gone beyond that 50% - maybe they finished their 3rd year. We are also taking new students into year 1. Laurentian is on the verge of releasing offers of admission to new students and those new students are also being divided between McMaster and Ryerson. We're taking students at all levels and maybe some letter of permission activity where some of the 4th year students may choose to stay as Laurentian students. Midwifery here has agreed to take them in as special students so they access the courses or the clinicals they need to graduate. The reference to 2021, this is what we all agreed to help with and to create as seamless a process as possible. There are a small number of students who actually started a placement yesterday, between 7-10, who are here for the Spring, the rest will join in the Fall.
- C: While CESAR supports efforts being made to accommodate Laurentian's Midwifery students, we would be remiss not to also mention how we got here. The underfunding crisis impacting public colleges and universities has had devastating impacts for students and workers in the North who

have seen Laurentian University shut vital programs like Midwifery, Indigenous studies and Francophone language courses. Ryerson is not immune to funding cuts across the province and we've seen how students at our university bear the brunt of these cuts with continuously rising costs for international students. It is not acceptable that students pay for 55% of the university's operating budget while the university is only funded by 38% from government grants. This is an unsustainable funding strategy and that we need to prevent more situations like Laurentian's insolvency is to see a joint lobbying approach between the university, students and workers that calls for greater government investment and a national plan for fully funding post-secondary education. In the spirit of that collaborative lobbying approach, Ryerson's all-union campus coalition released a statement in response to Laurentian's situation calling for that greater investment, which we shared with our elected representatives, and we are calling on the university to join in our lobbying efforts.

- Q: Faculty are really feeling hard-pressed with the current student enrolment and we're increasing students. Will Ryerson be providing additional faculty?
- A: The whole funding for Midwifery goes directly to cover the expenses of the program. The initiative came out of the department. They wanted to help, at least to rescue those students. The funding that the government will provide is going to support this. There is no guarantee that this funding will go beyond one year. That's the commitment that we have today.
- C: I'm concerned that we do not have the faculty resources or the procedurals to get them. There is a concern that in a sense, rescuing Laurentian and taking the consorting money, we are redirecting the problem somewhere else. We may be jeopardizing chances of recovery in Laurentian and the fact that McMaster and Ryerson are in support of this suggest they are not wired in that way. This may not be the strategically sound thing to do in the long term, as in a sense we are giving in to this current trend. Government underfunding of universities are a huge concern. Student unions, faculty associations and professional associations, unions have all spoken out against the government's stinginess and lack of insight, but university administrations, including Ryerson, appear to have remained silent. Who's going to come to aid of universities if we don't speak up?
- A: President Lachemi - I can guarantee you that we are not silent about this situation. Lobbying the government and working with other organizations is one of the top priorities that the sector has, not just Ryerson, but the Council of Ontario Universities. You may have seen in the media the release by the COU about the importance of providing funding to the university sectors.

Motion Approved.

8.5.3 Report #W2021-2 of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council (YSGS): C. Searcy

8.5.3.1 New program proposal for the MSc in Occupational and Public Health (C. Searcy)

Motion: *That Senate approve the new program proposal for the MSc in Occupational and Public Health.*

C. Searcy moved; R. Ravindran seconded.

Comments/Questions:

- C: The work that has been done is tremendous and I applaud the committee that work together to make it such a strong document. I wonder if there is any comment on whether we believe that the government will be responding to the appropriate graduate student funded spaces. I don't think we should stop expanding. This is another level of pressure that we need to add on. I wonder if the number of student positions would accompany the ultimate approval by the government.
- A: At this point, SMA 3 governs the total number of spaces and there is no projection for additional spaces at this time. However, when spaces were allocated last, there was criticism from the government that we didn't have enough programs in the pipeline to help funding move forward. So our strategy to date was to expand those programs and have them ready to go so that when the government was able to fund and find more spaces, then we would be ready to go with additional programs and I think that's what today's proposal is in effort of.

Motion Approved.

8.5.3.2 Periodic Program Review for the MPC in Professional Communication (C. Searcy)

Motion: *That Senate approve the Periodic Program Review for the MPC in Professional Communication.*

C. Searcy moved; N. Di Cuia seconded.

Motion Approved.

8.5.3.3 Periodic Program Review for the MA in Immigration and Settlement Studies (C. Searcy)

Motion: *That Senate approve the Periodic Program Review for the MA in Immigration and Settlement Studies.*

C. Searcy moved; R. Ravindran seconded.

Motion Approved.

8.5.3.4 For Information – One-year Follow-up Reports for:

- i. International Economics and Finance (MA)/Economics (PhD)
- ii. Philosophy (MA)
- iii. Applied Mathematics (MSc)
- iv. Urban Development (MPI)
- v. Mechanical and Industrial Engineering (PhD/MASc/MEng)
- vi. Public Policy and Administration (MA)

9. Old Business - None

10. New Business as Circulated - None

11. Members' Business

- 1) A reminder to Senate that the deadline for participating in the Standing Strong Task Force consultation is on May 16.
- 2) Q: Now that the RGSU is officially in place, is there a timeline when we will be reviewing their inclusion in the revision of Senate policies, and if CESAR can be included in these conversations?
A: Any policy revision such as this will be reviewed over the summer.
- 3) D. Checkland - Firstly, before I make this motion, I would like this motion to be considered as a motion today. Those of you know the bylaws, a motion did not go out with the package and it's typically treated as a Notice of Motion and dealt with at the next meeting in order to give members time to consider it. I would ask that members vote to waive that and deal with it as a hortative motion before you today. Not that it is exactly urgent, but it's timely.

There are three kinds of motions that are in order.

- 1) Substantive Motions – about matters that fall within Senate's responsibilities or powers to deal with.
- 2) Procedural Motions – such as a motion to table; to take off the table; to return
- 3) Hortative Motions – are motions where Senate wishes to express its opinion on some matter that does not fall within its powers.

Motion: *Whereas the application of the federal Company's Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA, 2014) to the recent financial "insolvency" of Laurentian University has resulted in drastic cuts to programs and staff (academic and non-academic) which seem not to have taken into account academic matters central to Laurentian's institutional goals and long-standing commitments;*

And whereas the Company's Creditors Act's statement of purpose, focused as it principally is on "the protection of capital", and protection of shareholder's interests, is inappropriate as the basis for addressing a financial crisis of a university;

And whereas it is unclear whether this Act of Parliament was ever intended to be applied to the university/post-secondary educational sector;

And whereas it is imperative that further uses of this Act in the university/post-secondary sector be prevented;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Senate of Ryerson University hereby asks, indeed implores, Ryerson University's senior administration and Board of Governors to take action, in concert with other universities or alone, and consistently with prudential concern for the well-being of Ryerson University, to

attempt to persuade Parliament to remove universities from the purview of the Company's Creditors Arrangement Act.

C/Q: President Lachemi: I support your motion and I will encourage Ryerson to do everything possible to avoid procedures that happened at Laurentian University. What is the urgency for Senate to approve this motion today versus next meeting? I am committed from today to work on it, but we need to give Senators time to reflect on this new motion. If you bring a motion and you ask them to vote at the end of the day, personally, there will not be time to reflect on this and vote properly.

A: D. Checkland - I don't think there is urgency, but there is timeliness. I also don't think it should be contentious since it's not an action that we take but rather to ask you to do something. I'm happy to withdraw that part of it and treat this as a Notice of Motion if that's the will of Senate. I will withdraw it. However, I would ask any of my colleagues that if I'm unable to do so, that another Senate member continue to move it forward.

A: The only thing that's a little bit urgent is that if there is a Members' Bill that has been introduced in the House of Commons. This could possibly happen before the next Senate meeting.

C: President Lachemi – I'm committing to supporting this. David is asking for two things; for the management of the university to support this and also for the Board of Governors to support this as well. My only suggestion is process, nothing else. I can leave it up to Senators to decide if we put it on the agenda for next meeting.

Q: You indicated that this will go to the Board of Governors, so what is the timing of that motion going forward to the Board?

A: President Lachemi - The next Board of Governors will take place at the end of June.

C: The reason for voting on it is to have it on the record that this was asked. It is a concern of the academic community and not just the administration. I'm hoping this is happening in many other universities as well. This will do nothing to help Laurentian particularly, but it might stop it from happening again. I withdraw the request for today and we will do it next Senate.

C: President Lachemi – We have this as a Notice of Motion for the June meeting.

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.