

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**JANUARY 21, 2010**

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL held on January 21, 2010 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, University of Toronto.

**Present:**

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch ( In the Chair)  
Dr. Alice Dong (Vice-Chair)  
The Honourable David R. Peterson,  
Chancellor  
Professor C. David Naylor, President  
Mr. Andrew Agnew-Iler  
Professor Varouj Aivazian  
Ms Diana A.R. Alli  
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell  
Mr. P. C. Choo  
Mr. William Crothers  
Dr. Claude S. Davis  
Mr. Ken Davy  
Professor William Gough  
Ms Joeita Gupta  
Dr. Gerald Halbert  
Mr. Adam Heller  
Ms Shirley Hoy  
Ms Min Hee (Margaret) Kim  
Professor Ronald H. Kluger  
Professor Christina E. Kramer  
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles  
Mr. Joseph Mapa  
Ms Florence Minz  
Professor Cheryl Misak  
Mr. George E. Myhal  
Mr. Richard Nunn  
Professor Ian Orchard

Professor Doug W. Reeve  
Mr. Tim Reid  
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein  
Mr. Stephen C. Smith  
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth  
Mr. Olivier Sorin  
Professor Janice Gross Stein  
Mr. John David Stewart  
Dr. Sarita Verma  
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh  
Mr. Greg West

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier  
Mr. Anwar Kazimi  
Mr. Henry Mulhall

**Absent:**

Ms Judith Goldring  
Professor Ellen Hodnett  
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh  
Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson  
Mr. Geoffrey Matus  
Mr. Gary P. Mooney  
Ms Melinda Rogers  
Miss Maureen J. Somerville  
Mr. W. John Switzer  
Ms Rita Tsang  
Mr. W. David Wilson

**In Attendance:**

Mr. Jeff Peters, former Member of the Governing Council and President, Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS)  
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity  
Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement and Chief Development Officer  
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs  
Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations  
Mr. Rob Steiner, Assistant Vice-President, Strategic Communications  
Dr. Tim McTiernan, Assistant Vice-President, Government, Institutional and Community Relations  
Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources  
Professor Cristina Amon, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering  
Mr. Adam Awad, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council (SAC)  
Mr. David Berliner, Campus Agricultural Project  
Mr. Michael de Angelis, Director of Events and Catering, Hart House  
Dr. Louise Cowin, Warden, Hart House  
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students  
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost  
Ms Deanne Fisher, Director, Student Life Programs and Communications  
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget  
Ms Nora Gillispie, Office of the President  
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President  
Ms Clara Luke, Campus Agricultural Project  
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost, Academic Operations  
Ms Bryn MacPherson, Executive Director, Office of the President and University Events  
Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 38 AND 44 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2 OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, ITEMS 1, 11 AND 12 ON THE AGENDA WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

**1. Senior Appointment**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved,

That David Naylor's term as President of the University of Toronto be extended for three years, from July 1, 2010 continuing to June 30, 2013, subject to such terms and conditions of appointment as are approved by the Senior Appointments and Compensation Committee; and

That, with the concurrence of Dr. Naylor and the Executive Committee of Governing Council, a further extension of up to two years, concluding on June 30, 2015, be negotiated by the Chair of Governing Council, subject to such terms and conditions of appointment as are approved by the Senior Appointments and Compensation Committee.

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL MOVED INTO OPEN SESSION.

**2. Chair's Remarks**

The Chair welcomed the members and guests to the meeting. He reported on the decision that the Governing Council had made *in camera*. He read the motion that had been moved and carried to reappoint Dr. David Naylor as President. He congratulated the President and expressed the pleasure of the Council on his decision to continue.

The Chair noted that one speaking request had been granted for Mr. Adam Awad, Vice-President University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council (SAC). A second request had been received from the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS). It was related to an exchange between members regarding a procedural ruling. With the advice of the Executive Committee members, the speaking request had not been granted. APUS had been informed that any further communication on this matter was to be in writing.

A member made a motion that an additional speaker from APUS be allowed to speak to the Governing Council on a procedural matter. The motion was seconded and defeated.

**3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting of December 10, 2009**

The Chair advised the members that a correction had been made to Item 6 of the minutes of the previous meeting. The dates for the Report of the University Ombudsperson should have been recorded as July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009.

Further, the Chair said that he had just received a request for a change, or changes, to the minutes of the December 10, 2009 meeting. The approval of the report of the meeting was, therefore, deferred to the next meeting while the request was considered.

**4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**Item 5(e) Capital Project Planning Report for the UTSC South Campus Data Centre**

The Chair said that a member had requested information about the consultation that had occurred with the Office of the Chief Information Officer in the development of the project. The member had been contacted and relevant information had been provided.

**Item 6 Report of the University Ombudsperson (July 1, 2008 – June, 30, 2009)**

The Chair advised the Council that further to a question raised at the previous meeting by a member about the progress of a matter pertaining to the assessment and refund of incidental fees, a response had been received from the administration. As had been reported at the meeting, the then Vice-Provost Planning and Budget Professor Safwat Zaky, had struck a committee to examine various aspects of how tuition and ancillary fees were assessed for part-time students. That committee was to review the issues raised by the Acting Ombudsperson. The committee had not issued a final report before Professor Zaky had ended his term and it had not yet been reactivated. The review of policies and procedures regarding tuition and ancillary fees had been handed over to the Vice-Provost Students who was working with the Office of Student Accounts. The review was not yet complete so the Office of the Vice-Provost was not yet able to report back fully.

**5. Report of the President**

**(a) Student Presentation – Campus Agricultural Project**

The President invited Mr. David Berliner, a recent graduate in Environmental Science and Human Biology, and the current sustainability coordinator at Hart House; Mr. Adam Awad, Vice-President, University Affairs (SAC); and Ms Clara Luke, an undergraduate student in English and Environmental Studies at University College, to give a presentation on the Campus Agricultural Project. The President acknowledged the presence of Dr. Louise Cowin and Mr. Michael de Angelis, from Hart House.

In the course of the presentation, the three guests informed the members that the Campus Agricultural Project was an umbrella organization that united various student groups interested in growing food on campus. Its advisory board was composed of students, faculty, staff and various community partners. The purpose of growing food on campus was related to furthering the understanding of food security and sustainable systems – both environmentally and economically. In addition to providing nutritious food, the students viewed the project as a means to reimagining the community’s relationship with the built environment. The venture allowed students to engage and build technical gardening skills and transferable project management skills. It also provided co-curricular learning with the University as a “living lab”. Guidelines had been put in place for the continuity of long term projects, and student groups had been given the autonomy to pursue independent partnerships within the project. The members were shown slides of the sites used for the project. These included a rooftop vegetable garden on Galbraith Building; Hart House Farms on the east side of the building and the Hart House Ornamental Garden; the Hart House Farm plots; and a First Nations students’ garden. The students concluded the presentation by providing the members with some progress indicators for the project to track its success. A total of 200 square metres had been used to grow produce and over 1000 volunteer hours had been logged. The budget for the project went towards staffing. Partnerships had been developed with a school and a local food network. The project was looking for funding from a range of sources including government and researchers.

In the discussion that followed, the student presenters advised the members that partnerships continued to be built across the campuses. A member congratulated the presenters for being fine ambassadors for the University and for their forward thinking. Another member advised the Council of some of the other similar proactive initiatives on campus, and of the contributions of those who had pioneered such projects. The discussion concluded with a member’s encouragement that the project build more networks across the campuses.

**5. Report of the President (Contd.)**

**(b) Awards and Honours**

The President drew the members' attention to the Awards and Honours list that was included in the agenda package. The President expressed his interest to speak about two particular honours, one of which was not on the list given to the members.

The first of these was the Rhodes scholarship awarded to Ms Erin Fitzgerald, a fourth year student at the Faculty of Arts and Science studying International Relations and Political Science. Ms Fitzgerald was a member of the University Affairs Board and the former president of the Hart House Debating Club. In addition to being the chair of the G8 Research Group, Ms Fitzgerald was the editor-in-chief of *The Attaché Journal of International Affairs*. Ms Fitzgerald also studies karate and competes internationally.

The President then drew the attention of the members to six faculty members who were among the 57 new appointments to the Order of Canada. The six faculty members were (i) Professor Mel Cappe, alumnus and holder of an honorary doctorate, former Clerk of the Privy Council, who taught part-time in the School of Public Policy and Governance; (ii) Professor Emeritus Bernard Goldman, a distinguished cardiac surgeon who was a pioneer in pacemakers among other areas; (iii) Professor Patrick Gullane of otolaryngology, a world-renowned head and neck surgeon; (iv) Professor Jeffrey Lozon, an adjunct faculty member in health policy, management and evaluation, and former Chief Executive of St. Michael's Hospital; (v) Professor James Orbinski of the Dalla Lana School of Public Health, a senior fellow at the Munk Centre for International Studies who had been chosen by his colleagues some years ago to accept the Nobel Peace Prize on behalf of Doctors Without Borders; and (vi) Professor Patricia Parr, a distinguished composer at the Faculty of Music. The President extended his congratulations to these colleagues on their recognition.

The President advised members that TVO's *2010 Big Idea Best Lecturers Competition* had been announced with 350 nominees. Of the 20 finalists, three were faculty members at the University. As a point of interest, the President noted that staff in his office had conducted research that showed between 40 to 45% of the nominees were teaching, had taught or had studied at the University of Toronto.

**(c) Undergraduate Mission and Recruitment**

The President next commented on a major priority: the undergraduate mission and the undergraduate experience. Despite the limited resources that were available, there were incremental improvements and positive changes that had been made possible through the creativity of faculty, staff and students. With the central administration, the President acknowledged the contributions of Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students, Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations, and their respective teams.

The goal of the University, the President continued, was to attract the strongest students – nationally and internationally. The University had tended to be local-global in its

**5. Report of the President (Contd.)**

**(c) Undergraduate Mission and Recruitment**

undergraduate enrolment base, and needed to position itself as more of a national resource. To showcase the opportunities available to undergraduates, work had been completed on an overhaul of the Viewbook (the University's general recruitment publication); a new virtual tour; and renovation of the University's website. In addition to these measures, the University's presence at the Ontario Universities Fair had been markedly improved. A strong online campaign had been put in place to showcase the undergraduate experience. While the out-of-province applications were still being tallied, one encouraging result was an increase in the first choice applications from Ontario high school students. This increase was likely in the region of 8 per cent whereas the increase system-wide was about 2.7 per cent. The first choice applications for the University represented 39 per cent of the total growth across the province. While enrolment pressures were expected to be higher in the Greater Toronto Area because of demographics, the University of Toronto had shown a substantially larger gain than other universities in the GTA. While thanking the faculty, staff and students for their efforts, the President cautioned that this momentum needed to be maintained.

**(d) Government Relations**

Turning to the topic of government relations, the President said that a period of uncertainty lay ahead. Federally, it appeared that the stimulus period was drawing to a close. In advocacy, there had been a concerted effort by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada emphasizing the need for funding aimed at basic and applied research driven by scholarly priorities. The University had pushed for the expansion of graduate scholarships, and asked for student aid programs to be renovated in the post Millennium Scholarship era.

The President noted that universities, hospitals, and granting councils had finally pulled together and reached a consistent position, i.e., granting council funding needed to rise and that there was an urgent need for the proportion of indirect cost coverage to rise as well. The latter coverage was especially important to research-intensive institutions such as the University of Toronto. The University allocated \$74 million last year to subsidize the institutional costs associated with federal operating grants –additional funding that, if provided by the federal government on a basis consistent with the US and UK/European precedents, could enable more investment in the undergraduate experience.

As with the federal budget, it was not clear where the provincial government policies were headed. This was a matter of concern for the University because enrollment growth of 2.7 per cent in the system this year without corresponding growth in the funding envelope would compromise the quality of education. He reminded the members of the problem of so-called unfunded BIUs (basic income units) or proration. Explaining this, the President said that unfunded BIUs resulted when growth occurred in the system but

**Report of the President**

**(d) Government Relations (Cont'd)**

the funding envelope remained the same or grew at a slower rate. In effect, universities that grew faster would get more money, but the marginal yield would fall for all institutions, as the envelope was spread over an ever-increasing number of students. This perverse system of incentives meant that per-student funding would be driven down and quality would suffer. The University was already at risk for a loss of \$16 million due to unfunded past growth. This and many other issues meant that the University was going to be working closely with the Council of Ontario Universities to encourage some prudent investment in post-secondary education, notwithstanding the difficult revenue picture for the Government of Ontario.

On a positive note, the President reported, the University had seen a tremendous demand for graduate growth. There had initially been some inflexibility from the Government in allowing some inter-conversion between the doctoral and masters spaces. However, the Government had now accepted the need for a system of conversion, and this would allow the University to be more responsive to changing patterns of student demand.

**(e) Honorary Degrees**

The final topic of the President's address was related to the issue of honorary degrees. The President acknowledged the capable work of the Chancellor and the Committee for Honorary Degrees who he said did exemplary work that involved difficult decisions among extraordinarily meritorious individuals. The President then read the list of honorees and their brief citations.

Richard M. H. Alway

For his long and distinguished service to the University of Toronto, as well as his exceptional contributions to Canadian cultural and community organizations.

Mary Anne Chambers

For her exemplary role in public and community service, and in particular her outstanding contributions to the University of Toronto.

Ian Hacking

For his groundbreaking scholarly contributions to philosophy, as well as to the humanities, sciences and social sciences more broadly.

Lawrence Hill

For his contributions to Canadian literature, in particular through his exploration of race relations and humanitarian concerns.



**5. Report of the President (Cont'd)**  
**(e) Honorary Degrees**

John Manley

For his outstanding record of contributions to Canada, through service in public office, and the development of public policy in support of research, technology and innovation.

Preston Manning

For his transformative contributions to Canadian politics and public policy, as well as his advocacy for science, technology and innovation.

Hazel McCallion

For her remarkable contributions to public life, in particular through her transformative leadership of the City of Mississauga, as well as her unwavering support for the University of Toronto at Mississauga.

Charles S. Pachter

For his outstanding artistic achievements, as well as his contributions to our understanding of contemporary Canada.

Marie Sanderson

For her scholarly contributions as a physical geographer, and her pioneering leadership in advancing the role of women in her field.

Dorothy Shoichet

For her outstanding community service, in particular in support of the arts and education.

Scott D. Tremaine

For his scholarly contributions to the field of astrophysics, and his administrative leadership in support of Canadian and international science.

In concluding his report, the President expressed his gratitude to the members for the approval of these honorary degrees.

There were no questions for the President.

## **6. Performance Indicators for Governance: Measuring UP (2009)**

The Chair noted that this document was a major element of the University's accountability efforts and consisted of a series of measures of institutional achievements across a wide variety of indicators. It was being presented to the Council for information and discussion.

Professor Misak began her address by borrowing a phrase used earlier in the meeting by the student presenters, suggesting that it was perhaps better to look at the measures outlined in the report as progress indicators. The measures were designed to track the University's progress towards its aims and to see whether it was staying true to its values. Each year the University had added to, and adjusted, the measures – usually in response to the input provided by the Governors or from other members of the community. There were a few new indicators in the report. A more detailed version of the report was available through the website of the Office of the Vice-President and Provost<sup>1</sup>.

Some of the indicators highlighted in Professor Misak's presentation suggested that the University had done very well in the 'Research Rankings by Discipline' measure. The indicators showed that the University performed well in all its disciplines, while its peers in Canada ranked highly only in a few select disciplines. Publications and citations were strong, with new measures including the research done in the social sciences. During the period 2004-05 to 2008-09, the University's share of the Canadian Institute of Health Research (CIHR) funding was 21.4%, even though its faculty made up 7% of the total. Since its inception in 1998, 19.1% of the funding from Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) had been channeled to the University. Overall, the University had received 15.3% of the funding allocated by the granting councils.

Professor Misak said that space was a significant problem at the University of Toronto at Mississauga and at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, and that the St. George campus was not immune to this pressure. New capital funding that had been received the previous year would go some distance in improving the space inventory. The University would continue its lobbying efforts for more capital funding.

Addressing the issue of access, the report looked at the parental income of the 2008-09 first year students receiving OSAP funding in direct entry programs. It compared the figures of the University's students with students from all other Ontario universities. From the data, Professor Misak was pleased to report that the University was successful in terms of student access and socio-economic diversity. In addition, retention and graduation rates remained strong even when there had been tuition increases.

---

<sup>1</sup> Performance Indicators 2009 Comprehensive Inventory is available at : [http://www.utoronto.ca/about-uoft/measuring-our-performance/performance-indicators-main/performance\\_indicators\\_2009/PI2009\\_complete.htm](http://www.utoronto.ca/about-uoft/measuring-our-performance/performance-indicators-main/performance_indicators_2009/PI2009_complete.htm)

**6. Performance Indicators for Governance: Measuring UP (2009) (Cont'd)**

Next, Professor Misak turned her attention to the undergraduate instructional engagement in arts and science courses across the University's three campuses in 2008-09. This particular measure was prompted in large part by queries from members of the Governing Council. The measure provided information on the number of the University's most accomplished professors who taught undergraduate courses. According to Professor Misak, the University probably stood out nationally in terms of not offering standard teaching releases to its Canada Research Chairs (CRC), endowed chairs and University Professors.

In the discussion that followed, a member said that he had taken the opportunity to read the longer version of the report. The report was more detailed and comprehensive when compared to previous years. The measures used in the report aligned with the *Towards 2030* framework that had been put in place. The member added that some of the sections in the report had been mentioned at previous Governing Council meetings but had not been discussed in detail. Referring to the 'Undergraduate Instruction Engagement' on page 28 of the report, the member said that this was an important pilot, or first step, in trying to measure this specific area in a meaningful way. The member quoted a section from the Statement of Institutional Purpose of October 15, 1992, wherein the University had committed to ensuring that teaching and counseling of undergraduate students was to be the normal obligation of every member of the faculty. In his view, by including the undergraduate instruction engagement in its performance measures, the University had held itself to account to the mission statement and had shown leadership. The member concluded his remarks by asking, notwithstanding the small size of the pilot project, it would have been helpful to know the reasons why 8 of the 98 tenured faculty had not taught, given the University's policy. Also, only 9 of the 98 tenured faculty in the sample had taught a first year course – this did not appear to be entirely consistent with the *Towards 2030* framework which looked at enhancing the student experience.

Professor Misak replied that there were a range of reasons why some faculty members had not taught in the year that the study was done. These included, but were not limited to, teaching extra courses the previous year while filling in for an ill colleague; having extraordinarily heavy graduate supervision, etc. Similarly, decisions that were made to put the best instructor in a given class were not based merely on whether the instructor was an endowed chair, university professor or CRC recipient. Indeed, some of the best instructors were not in this category. Overall, the decisions had been made in every department taking into account several considerations.

A member who identified himself as a teacher wanted to see the engagement of the teaching academy reflected in future surveys and spoke to the granting councils' policy of giving awards to take professors out of teaching – this was detrimental and was a Canadian phenomenon. The University faculty had a commitment towards teaching as laid out in its policy.

**6. Performance Indicators for Governance: Measuring UP (2009) (Cont'd)**

A member expressed her concerns about student access information being limited to OSAP recipients only. She questioned the reliance on OSAP loans as a measure of access. Students were required to start repaying their loans once their status changed to part-time. This often resulted in a financial hurdle and there was no way to track these students. She expressed the opinion that students with higher student debt were from racialized families. According to the member, racialized students had to stay longer at the University and ended up paying more in fees and ancillary fees.

Another member referred to the graduate survey charts on page 33 of the report. He pointed out that even though the University had the best faculty in the country, when it came to supporting students with dissertations, the University did only slightly better than its Canadian peers and less so when it came to opportunities for graduate students to publish. Perhaps, he said, the faculty were doing more of their own research and had invested less time in graduate students. The data presented was for national publications. However, in the member's view, graduate students had done quite well internationally, particularly in Europe. In the member's view, the results of the students' satisfaction survey for graduate students did not necessarily represent the overall experience of graduate students.

A member suggested that the University needed to enhance its efforts in improving the experience of international students. The University needed to expand its measure of student experience by including measures such as food services, accessibility and student group involvement, to get a more tangible perspective. Professor Misak responded that these were progress indicators only and that it was important to recognize that the implementation of new initiatives would require additional funding. The University was focused on its goals and more data would be collected and provided in future.

Referring to the opportunities available to graduate students to publish, a member suggested that perhaps it would be better to separate the four graduate categories in future to get a better idea of this measure. Life sciences were funded more than social sciences and had more opportunities to publish.

Professor Misak said that print copies of the detailed report would be available from her office by request.

The Chair called the discussion to a close noting that individuals who still wished to pursue particular matters could speak with the Provost.

**7. Reports for Information**

Members received the following reports for information:

- a. Report 178 of the Business Board (December 14, 2009); and
- b. Report 427 of the Executive Committee (January 11, 2010)

**8. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded the members that the next meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, February 25, 2010 at 4:30 p.m.

**9. Question Period**

There were no questions for members of the senior administration.

**10. Other Business**

At this point, the Chair invited Mr. Adam Awad to address the Council in relation to the cancellation of the Governing Council meeting in October 2009.

Mr. Awad wondered about the efficacy of the Governing Council in addressing the concerns of the students. He expressed his concern that the largest University in the country had cancelled the Council meeting in October for lack of business. Mr. Awad stated his perception that Governing Council was a rubber stamp. While he realized that the Governing Council was not a space to have a dialogue, he did not believe there were no other places at the University where students could engage in debate about urgent and pressing issues such as flat fees. He did not believe that student had any real input in decisions as they proceeded through the various committees and boards of the Governing Council

In response to Mr. Awad's comments, a member expressed her concerns at the presence of uniformed police, the denial of speaking rights to APUS, and the ticket system that had been put in place for the meeting. Another member expressed his concern at having had the opportunity to attend a Governing Council meeting only in December, even though he had been elected effective the beginning of July. It was also suggested that members of the Governing Council engage in a town hall gathering, if meetings were cancelled, as this would provide members with more opportunities to exchange ideas in an open environment.

The Chair thanked the members for their comments.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 38 AND 40 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEMS 11 AND 12 WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN-CAMERA*.

**11. Report of the Committee to Review the Office of the University Ombudsperson**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved,

1. (a) THAT the Ombudsperson's Office continue its efforts to make members of the University aware of its services;
  - (b) that it investigate the possibility of inclusion, from time, to time of appropriate notices about the availability of its services on the student portal and in electronic newsletters including the *eBulletin* and newsletters distributed to students; and
  - (c) that the University and each of its academic divisions continue to cooperate in making information about the Ombudsperson's services prominently available to students by means of electronic communications as well as in academic Calendars and in paper handbooks and other appropriate communications.
2. THAT the Terms of Reference of the Ombudsperson's Office be revised to add the following section:

3.7. Complainants not to be penalized for making complaint. Persons who, acting in good faith, have filed a complaint or sought the assistance of the Office of the Ombudsperson or participated in an investigation/inquiry or made an effort to resolve a problem should be able to do so without fear of reprisal.

Accordingly, no supervisor or other person acting on behalf of the University shall:

- (a) dismiss or threaten to dismiss an employee;
- (b) discipline or suspend, or threaten to discipline or suspend a student or an employee;
- (c) impose any penalty upon a student or employee; and/or
- (d) intimidate or coerce a student or employee because that person, acting *bona fide*, has filed a complaint with, or participated in an investigation or inquiry by, the Office of the University Ombudsperson.

**11. Report of the Committee to Review the Office of the University Ombudsperson (Cont'd)**

3. THAT the Terms of Reference of the Ombudsperson's Office be revised to add the following paragraph to section 3.3:

Complainants who have provided written consent to an investigation or inquiry are reminded of the importance of confidentiality and encouraged to respect it in the interest of fostering an effective process.

**12 Senior Appointments**

**(a) University Ombudsperson**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved,

Subject to the approval of the terms and conditions of her appointment by the Senior Appointments and Compensation Committee,

That Professor Emeritus Joan E. Foley be re-appointed as University Ombudsperson, effective July 1, 2010 and continuing for a further three year term to June 30, 2013 and until her successor is appointed and takes office.

**(b) Vice-President, University of Toronto**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved,

That Professor Hargurdeep (Deep) Saini be appointed to the position of Vice-President, University of Toronto, concurrent with his appointment as Principal of the University of Toronto at Mississauga, for a five-year term beginning July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2015.

The meeting adjourned at 7:13 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

February 5, 2010