

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 426 OF
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Monday, November 30, 2009

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Monday, November 30, 2009 at 5:00 p.m. in the Boardroom, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch (In the Chair)
Dr. Alice Dong, Vice-Chair
Professor David Naylor, President
Mr. Ryan Campbell
Mr. P.C. Choo
Mr. Ken Davy
Ms Judith Goldring
Mr. Gerald Halbert
Mr. Ron Kluger
Mr. Joseph Mapa
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Janice Stein

Non-Voting Member:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry Mulhall, Secretary
Mr. Anwar Kazimi
Ms Mae-Yu Tan

Regrets:

Mr. Timothy Reid

In Attendance:

Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Mr. Christopher Lang, Director, Office of Appeals, Discipline, and Faculty Grievances ¹
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles, Chair, Academic Board and Member of the Governing Council
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost, and Member of the Governing Council
Dr. Rose Patten, Former Chair of the Governing Council; Chair, Task Force on Governance ²
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh, Chair, University Affairs Board and Member of the Governing Council

Add to the Agenda

With the agreement of members, an item concerning a Committee Assignment was added to the agenda as Item 9.

¹ In attendance for agenda item #11.

² In attendance for agenda item #3.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 425 (October 7, 2009) of the Executive Committee was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the report of the previous meeting.

3. Task Force on Governance – Update

The Chair welcomed Dr. Rose Patten, Chair of the Task Force on Governance. He noted that its Terms of Reference provided for periodic updates to the Executive Committee. This would be the third such update, previous ones having been provided in January and June of 2009.

Dr. Patten referred members to the documentation that had been distributed in advance of the meeting. It was intended to inform the Executive Committee of the work that had been accomplished by the Task Force to date, and of what tasks remained to be completed in order to submit its final report to the Governing Council in June 2010. As had been stated on previous occasions, the Task Force did not anticipate the need to recommend major or radical changes, and did not intend either to abolish the unicameral governance structure or to amend the *University of Toronto Act*. Rather, it would likely produce a comprehensive list of refinements to current practise within the existing system of governance. Responsibility for the implementation of these refinements would be shared appropriately among the Chair and Members of the Governing Council, the Secretariat, and the administration.

A key focus of the Task Force's work in upcoming months would be the development of recommendations intended to reduce the duplication of tasks within the governance system. To this end it had recently completed a comprehensive mapping of all the major items of business that regularly came before governance, and the paths they followed through the structure. Each item would be assessed to determine whether it fulfilled the criteria of good governance, and whether it was being considered by the most appropriate bodies with the optimal representation from the various constituencies. Other refinements that were being contemplated would be intended to bring about improved efficiency in the completion of governance business, and would likely involve greater delegation of authority to subsidiary bodies in the system. Regarding tri-campus governance issues, the Task Force did not consider that it would be appropriate for it to make recommendations that anticipated particular organizational changes to the University's overall administrative structure. Rather, it would make suggestions for improvements to existing governance processes and structures without prejudice to future administrative changes.

The Chair expressed the support of the Committee for the work accomplished by the Task Force, and thanked Dr. Patten and its members for their efforts.

4. Report of the President

The President updated the Committee on a number of matters.

(a) University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation (UTAM) Review

The review was ongoing and proceeding well. The President was grateful to the members of the review committee for their efforts in this important process. He anticipated that the committee's report would contain useful recommendations which he would share with governance once he had prepared a response.

4. Report of the President (cont'd)

(b) Government Relations

The Federal government was currently soliciting input regarding research funding. In developing a response, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), the federal granting councils, and the large research intensive universities were cooperating closely. The focus of these advocacy efforts was to bring about an increase in the level of overall funding, including appropriate coverage of institutional costs of research at the 40% level, as well as improved post-doctoral support and student aid.

At the Provincial level, there was an awareness of government indebtedness, and of the likelihood of deficit budgets and the need for future spending restraint. However, this was combined with continued pressure for post-secondary enrolment growth. It would be very important to avoid unfunded enrolment growth or the pro-ration of funding for existing students. There was currently little indication that significant capital support would be provided in the short term to universities by the Provincial Government, despite the fact that important requests were outstanding. Longer term, it was critical to the University's plans that these capital projects be supported and completed. Similarly, the Government had so far not responded to requests by individual universities and the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) to reallocate doctoral student spaces to master's student spaces as part of the ongoing graduate expansion. This was a focus for ongoing discussions.

(c) Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)

The President reported that the University had accepted a recommendation by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS) to suspend admissions to the doctoral program in the History and Philosophy of Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE). The Provost added that this was the first time in recent memory that a graduate program at the University had received a 'not approved' rating in an OCGS review. The review had also recommended that the doctoral program in question be closed. The Office of the Vice-President and Provost had offered OISE assistance to address the implications of the review.

(d) University Rankings

The President updated the Committee on the University's standing in recent global rankings. As he had noted previously, the University had placed ninth among 621 universities worldwide for overall academic reputation in the *Times Higher Education – QS World University Rankings*. It had placed 11th globally in the rankings conducted by the Higher Education Evaluation and Accreditation Council of Taiwan (HEEACT) which measured publication productivity, impact and excellence. Similarly, Science Watch, which focused its measures on an institution's basic research output, had ranked the University 13th in the world. The SCImago Institutions Rankings (SIR), produced by a Spanish research group, had ranked the University 4th for research performance from 2003-07 among 2,000 international institutions and organizations. The Shanghai Jiao Tong Annual Academic Ranking of World Universities also focused on research output and quality and had placed the University first in Canada and 27th worldwide. In the Shanghai rankings, the University had fallen three places, and the ranking of most other Canadian universities had also slipped slightly in this survey, while a number of new Asian universities had improved their performance. Finally, the Globe and Mail University Report Card, which surveyed thousands of undergraduate students across Canada, had recently been released. Though the response rate was lower than ideal, the results were still significant. The University had scored well in a number of areas including faculty knowledge of their subject matter, library resources, quality of education, and institutional reputation. While the number of improved areas greatly outnumbered those where the institution had slipped, the University's overall results were mixed, and it was not gaining ground in some key areas involving the

4. Report of the President (cont'd)**(d) University Rankings (cont'd)**

student experience, including interaction between faculty members and students, and the quality of food services. In response, the University was carefully assessing the manner in which it delivered student services, and one outcome had been an administrative reorganization of the Division of Student Life on the St. George Campus.

(e) International Travel

The President noted that he had recently returned from a trip to India where, at the request of the Prime Minister of Canada, he had been a member of a higher education panel. The trip had allowed the opportunity for productive conversations with Canadian and Indian university presidents and other officials. Within the upcoming week the President would return to India as part of the Premier of Ontario's delegation to Delhi and Bombay. He would be giving a keynote address on higher-education, innovation, and clean / green technology, as well as moderating a panel discussion on innovation.

The Committee moved *in camera* and was briefed by the President on a public relations matter.

The Committee returned to closed session.

5. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council**(a) Non-Hospital Clinical Site Template Agreement**

(Arising from Report Number 164 of the Academic Board [November 12, 2009]- Item 6)

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, in her capacity as Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions, had identified the need for a template agreement for non-hospital clinical sites that was comparable to the existing hospital template agreement. This proposal was designed to ensure consistency across agreements with respect to definitions, and regarding issues such as responsibility for employment and academic matters. The proposed template agreement would avoid the need to create an individual agreement with each site on an annual basis. During discussion at the Academic Board meeting, a member had asked who would arrange for liability insurance coverage for students while they were on site, and had been assured that the University would assume responsibility for such arrangements. The Academic Board had fully supported this proposal.

A member of the Committee recommended that section XIII – Liability, Indemnification and Insurance, and section II.1 – Definitions and Interpretation, be compared for consistency and to ensure that the University was not liable for the actions of Staff Members with University appointments. The Provost agreed to refer the matter to legal counsel.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

- (1) THAT the proposed template for non-hospital clinical site agreements with the University of Toronto be approved, effective immediately;
- (2) THAT the Vice-President and Provost, or designate, be authorized to sign such agreements on behalf of the Governing Council, provided that the agreements conform to the approved template; and

5. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(a) Non-Hospital Clinical Site Template Agreement (cont'd)**

- (3) THAT the agreements signed under the provisions of this resolution be filed with the Secretary of Governing Council.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 164 of the Academic Board as Appendix “A”.

(b) School of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering: Master of Engineering in Telecommunications – Program Closure
(Arising from Report Number 164 of the Academic Board [November 12, 2009]- Item 7)

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that this self-funded, professional Masters degree program in Engineering in Telecommunications had been initiated in 1997, and that there had been 170 graduates in those ten years. However, as the result of changes in the industrial and economic climate, the program was no longer attracting students, and the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering had proposed that it be closed. Masters students would still have the opportunity to take many of the same courses, but there would no longer be a separate degree program. Both the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Planning and Budget Committee had considered this proposal, and the latter had been satisfied that there would be no financial implications for the Faculty or the University. No questions had been raised at the Academic Board meeting.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposal from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering and the School of Graduate Studies to close the Master of Engineering in Telecommunications (M.Eng.Tel.) program be approved, effective immediately.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 164 of the Academic Board as Appendix “B”.

(c) School of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Arts and Science: Master of Science in Applied Computing
(Arising from Report Number 164 of the Academic Board [November 12, 2009]- Item 8)

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that this was a proposal for a new professional Masters degree program in Applied Computing to be offered by the Department of Computer Science in the Faculty of Arts and Science. It would require two terms of course work and an eight-month industrial internship, and would be distinct from the Department’s research Masters program. The need for a professional graduate program had been determined through broad consultation with students and faculty across the University, and with market research involving potential employers in the industry. The internship would benefit not only students in the program but all students in the Department. Students on internships would continue to take at least one course, and they would bring back to the Department the benefits of the learning acquired through their internship experiences. Basic Income Unit (BIU) funding from the provincial government had been approved, and the Planning and Budget Office was comfortable, given the revenue and cost projections that had been carried out, that the proposed program would be self-funding.

During the discussion at the Academic Board meeting, a number of questions about the internship had been raised. Professor Craig Boutilier, Chair of the Department of Computer Science, had assured the Board that the Department possessed the necessary resources to assist

5. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(c) School of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Arts and Science: Master of Science in Applied Computing (cont'd)**

students in obtaining suitable placements, most of which would likely take place within the Greater Toronto Area in the short-term. In response to questions from a Board member, Professor Boutilier had stated that the calibre of the program and its students would be very high, and that the program would provide opportunities for its students to further strengthen their communication skills. Professor Boutilier had emphasized the value of the proposed program, noting that students would have the opportunity to work on the implementation and development of ideas on-site, work that doctoral-stream masters students were not typically able to perform during their programs.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the establishment of the proposed Master of Science in Applied Computing (M.Sc.A.C.) program within the Faculty of Arts and Science be approved, commencing September 2010.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 164 of the Academic Board as Appendix “C”.

(d) Capital Project: Utilities Infrastructure Upgrade for St. George Campus
(Arising from Report Number 164 of the Academic Board [November 12, 2009]- Item 9)

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that this proposed project was composed of three parts, all of which were necessary utilities infrastructure upgrades on the St. George campus. The first part would provide the Medical Sciences Building (MSB) with an individual electrical feed so that it could be removed from the existing electrical loop. This would provide future electrical capacity to the MSB and would also benefit the Sandford Fleming and the Galbraith Buildings. The second part of the proposed project involved the installation of an additional chiller at the southeast chiller plant. This need had developed as a result of internal growth requirements at the 15 buildings served by the facility. The third part of the project would involve upgrades to the water aeration system and emergency oil tanks at the central steam plant. The total project cost estimate was \$11.2 million, which would be provided partially through a loan and partially through the utilities budget.

At the Academic Board meeting, a member had asked whether alternative solutions to those proposed had been considered. Mr. Bruce Dodds, Director of Utilities, Facilities and Services, had noted that the University had considered deep lake cooling, an unconventional method of providing chilled water, but that the system was currently oversubscribed. Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services, had also pointed to the University's long history of sustainable energy projects. The Board had recommended approval of the project.

Professor Ripstein reported that the Business Board considered capital projects from the point of view of both value for money, and security of funding and financing. The Board had reviewed the project and had approved its execution, subject to Governing Council approval of its appropriateness.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

5. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(d) Capital Project: Utilities Infrastructure Upgrade for St. George Campus (cont'd)**

THAT the Utilities Infrastructure Renewal program of projects be approved, at a total cost not to exceed \$11.232 million, with funding as follows:

\$5 million from utilities infrastructure renewal funds and the balance as a loan to be repaid by increasing the annual utilities budget by \$720,000.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 164 of the Academic Board as Appendix “D”.

(e) Capital Project: Project Planning Report for University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) South Campus Data Centre
(Arising from Report Number 164 of the Academic Board [November 12, 2009]- Item 10)

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that the University of Toronto at Scarborough’s existing data centre was under-accommodating the current activities and necessary computer business systems on the campus. Since the construction of the data centre in 1997, there had been a significant expansion of the UTSC campus. With a 38% increase in space and a 97% increase in enrollment, there was a clear need for an expanded data centre. The proposed project, which was valued at \$3.9 million, comprised 182 square meters of new construction on the roof of the Academic Resource Centre. The project estimate and proposal included the cost of construction of the new facility as well as all new equipment that would be required for a new server room. Following the development of the new facility, the vacated space would be used to accommodate other academic activities. In consultation with Office of the Chief Information Officer, the proposed expanded centre would also be sized to accommodate additional facilities that might be required by the St. George and Mississauga campuses. In response to a question raised by a Board member, Professor Rick Halpern, Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean at UTSC, had acknowledged that the target completion date of January 30, 2010 had been optimistic; the project would likely be completed by late spring or early summer of 2010. Following Professor Halpern’s assurance that appropriate consultation regarding the project had occurred at UTSC, the Academic Board had expressed its support of the proposal.

Professor Ripstein reported that the Business Board had approved the execution of this project, subject to Governing Council approval in principle. In the course of the discussion, the Board had been assured that the University would take advantage of any economies that might be available through the joint purchasing of equipment for this project and for the St. George Campus.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the following recommendation be endorsed and forwarded to the Governing Council:

- (1) THAT the Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto at Scarborough Data Centre be approved in principle.
- (2) THAT the project scope, comprising new construction of 182 square meters at a total project cost of \$3,904,000.00 be approved with the full funding from the University of Toronto at Scarborough.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 164 of the Academic Board as Appendix “E”.

5. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(e) Capital Project: Project Planning Report for University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) South Campus Data Centre (cont'd)**

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT part (2) of the motion be amended to remove the words “of 182 square meters”.

The vote was taken to amend the main motion, and the motion was carried.

The vote was taken on the main motion, and the motion was carried.

(f) Election Guidelines 2010

(Arising from Report Number 154 of the University Affairs Board [November 3, 2009]-Item 6)

Ms Vosburgh reported that the *Election Guidelines 2010* required Governing Council approval because major amendments to policy and procedures were being proposed. Among these were the following. First, the campaign period had been shortened from 5 to 3 weeks, partly in response to feedback that students found it a burden to combine campaigning with their academic studies for such a lengthy period. Secondly, the number of required nominators had been reduced to 5 for all constituencies, in order to encourage greater participation in elections. Finally, revisions had been made to address practices with respect to assisting individuals with disabilities who might wish accommodation arrangements to facilitate their participation in the elections process.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the following recommendation be endorsed and forwarded to the Governing Council:

THAT the proposed *Election Guidelines 2010* be approved, effective immediately.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 154 of the University Affairs Board as Appendix “A”.

A member stated that he had two concerns regarding the proposed *Election Guidelines*. First, students in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering who took part in the Professional Experience Year Program (PEY) following their second or third year of undergraduate studies were consequently considered ineligible to participate in Governing Council elections. This occurred as result of the alternation of their registration status from full-time undergraduate student, to part-time undergraduate student during their PEY internship, then back to full-time undergraduate student for the balance of their program. They were thus prevented from fulfilling the requirement in the *Election Guidelines* that student Governors remain a member of the constituency from which they were elected. Secondly, though the member supported the reduction in the number of required nominators to 5 in order to encourage greater participation in elections, he had concerns that the existing voting procedures could be problematic if the number of candidates increased significantly. Students might be elected by fewer votes and consequently have weaker mandates, and the elections process could be more susceptible to the effects of block voting. He recommended that other voting procedures, such as single transferable voting, be considered.

5. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)

(f) *Election Guidelines 2010* (cont'd)

During discussion of the matters raised by the member, the following points were made. A member who was also a member of the Elections Committee reiterated that there had been a consensus among members of that body that it would be beneficial to reduce the number of required nominators in order to encourage participation in elections. The number of candidates was often quite small, and the Elections Committee had heard a representation from a part-time undergraduate student that it was a particular challenge in that constituency to obtain the required number of nominators. A member agreed that it was a challenge for part-time students to obtain nominators, but stated that the greater challenge was to generate interest among members of that constituency to become candidates. A member stated that one adverse outcome of the proposed reduction in the number of required nominators might be increased numbers of slates of candidates, and the election of slates by smaller numbers of voters. There was general agreement that such an outcome would be undesirable. The member recommended that advice be sought from expert faculty members regarding the potential negative effects of the proposed changes, and how they might be ameliorated by modifications to voting procedures. A number of members recommended that the ineligibility of PEY students be addressed.

The Secretary noted that the issue that had been raised regarding PEY students on internships was analogous to that of co-op students at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) on work terms. The *Election Guidelines* currently allowed the latter group to participate in elections as full-time undergraduate students, and they could be amended to afford the same accommodation to PEY students.

Following discussion, there was agreement to endorse and forward the proposed *Election Guidelines 2010* to the Governing Council on the following basis: (i) they would be amended as proposed by the Secretary in order to allow PEY students to participate in elections as full-time undergraduate students; (ii) the proposed reduction in the number of required nominators to 5 for all constituencies would be retained, on the grounds that lowering the threshold to secure candidacy could encourage greater participation in elections; and (iii) the Secretariat would consult a faculty member expert in the political science of electoral procedures, to provide advice to the Governing Council on the implications of reducing the number of required nominators to 5. The expert should also advise whether there was a voting procedure that could be instituted to ensure a fair outcome should the number of candidates in elections increase significantly.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the motion be amended to read:

THAT the proposed *Election Guidelines 2010*, amended in the manner described below be approved, effective immediately:

- (1) The addition of the italicized and underlined text below to the definition of “Full-Time Undergraduate Student”:

“Full-Time Undergraduate Student” means a Student registered at the University in a program of full-time study leading to a degree or post-secondary diploma or certificate of the University or in a program designated by the Governing Council as a program of post-

5. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)

(f) *Election Guidelines 2010* (cont'd)

secondary study at the University who is not registered in the School of Graduate Studies or the Toronto School of Theology. Full-Time Undergraduate Student status will be determined by the definition used in the Student's academic division. For the purpose of the Governing Council elections, Students at the University of Toronto at Scarborough who are registered in a work term *and Students registered in the Professional Experience Year Program*, will be considered to be Full-Time Undergraduate Students.

- (2) The addition to subsection 9.6(2)(a) of the italicized and underlined text and the deletion therefrom of the word, "and", in the manner shown below:

Section 9.6(2) – Members of a Student Constituency

- (a) In order to be eligible to be elected as a Student member of the Governing Council, an individual must:
- (i) be a Student within one of the five constituencies;
 - (ii) be nominated as a candidate by Students within the individual's own constituency; ~~and~~
 - (iii) remain a Student of this same constituency from the close of the nomination period to the time when all relevant election-related appeals and recounts, if any, have been finally disposed of, or, if there are no appeals or recounts, when winners have been declared elected (see exception below relating to Students enrolled in double degree programs); and
 - (iv) *not be a Student who is registered in the Professional Experience Year Program (PEY) and who will be interning under PEY from the month of September immediately following the elections to the month of May of the following year.*

The vote was taken to amend the main motion, and the motion was carried.

The vote was taken on the main motion, and the motion was carried.

6. Reports for Information

Members received the following reports for information.

- (a) Report Number 164 of the Academic Board (November 12, 2009)
- (b) Report Number 176 of the Business Board (September 29, 2009)
- (c) Report Number 177 of the Business Board (November 9, 2009)
- (d) Report Number 154 of the University Affairs Board (November 3, 2009)

The Secretary noted a revision to Report Number 164 of the Academic Board that would be incorporated in the version provided to the Governing Council in advance of its next meeting. After the first sentence on page three, the following sentence had been added: "She stated that, in her view, the Secretariat had not been fulfilling its commitments to which she and the Secretary of the Governing Council had agreed in the fall."

7. Date of the Next Meeting

Members were reminded that the next regular meeting of the Executive Committee was scheduled for Monday, January 11, 2010 at 5:00 p.m.

8. Other Business

There was no other business for consideration in closed session.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT, pursuant to sections 28 (e) and 33 of *By-Law Number 2*, consideration of items 9-12 take place *in camera*, with the Board Chairs, Vice-Presidents, and Special Advisor to the President admitted to facilitate the work of the Committee.

In Camera Session

Vary the Agenda.

It was agreed to vary the agenda to add the following *in camera* item.

9. Committee Assignment, 2009-10

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT Mr. John Switzer be appointed to the Audit Committee, effective immediately, until June 30, 2010.

10. Report Number 53 of the Committee for Honorary Degrees

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendations contained in Report Number 53 of the Committee for Honorary Degrees.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT pursuant to Section 38 and 40 of *By-Law Number 2*, the recommendations be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

11. Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters: Recommendations for Expulsion

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the recommendations for expulsion contained in the Memoranda from the Secretary of the Governing Council dated November 30, 2009, be placed on the agenda for the December 10, 2009 meeting of the Governing Council; and

THAT pursuant to Sections 38 and 40 of By-Law Number 2, these recommendations be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

The President, Vice-President and Provost, and Special Advisor to the President absented themselves.

12. Personnel Matter: Presidential Review

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THE Presidential review process and mandate as described in the Memorandum from the Chair of the Governing Council to the Executive Committee dated November 30, 2009.

The Chair stated that he would report on the review process during the *in camera* session at the Governing Council meeting on December 10, 2009.

The Committee returned to closed session.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Secretary
December 4, 2009

Chair