



**FOR
DISCUSSION**

PUBLIC

CLOSED SESSION

TO: Executive Committee

SPONSOR: Sandra Hanington, Vice-Chair of the Governing
CONTACT INFO: Council
governing.council@utoronto.ca

PRESENTER: Same as above
CONTACT INFO:

DATE: October 22, 2025 for October 27, 2025

AGENDA ITEM: 11(a)i

ITEM IDENTIFICATION:

Notice of Motion for Reconsideration

ISSUE SUMMARY:

A member of the Governing Council (“Governor”) has proposed the following motion (the “Proposed Motion”) for inclusion in the November 6, 2025 Governing Council agenda:

Since October 7, 2023, there has been a reported 600% increase in antisemitic hate crimes in the City of Toronto, including numerous documented and undocumented incidents on our campuses.

Be it resolved that the Governing Council of the University of Toronto unequivocally condemns acts of antisemitism on our campuses. We extend our sincere apology to the University’s learners, faculty, and staff for all antisemitic incidents that have occurred at the University since October 7, 2023.

The Governor has been advised that as this is a matter that has been previously decided by the Executive Committee on December 3, 2024, the Proposed Motion would be added to the agenda of the Executive Committee as a Motion for Reconsideration pursuant to Section 31(e) of *By-law Number 2*.

Procedurally this means that the Executive Committee must first decide whether to reconsider the matter, given that it has previously and recently been decided. A two-thirds majority of the Committee must vote in support for the matter to be reconsidered. If the Motion for Reconsideration is supported by Executive Committee, then the Committee can consider the Proposed Motion and whether to endorse and forward it to the Governing Council for inclusion

on the November 6, 2025 Governing Council agenda. The vote on the endorsement and forwarding of the Proposed Motion requires a majority to carry.

JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:

Pursuant to Section 50 of *By-law Number 2*,

“The agenda for each regular meeting [of the Governing Council] shall be prepared by the Executive Committee and shall set forth the items of business to be discussed at that meeting.”

Pursuant to Section 22 of *By-Law Number 2*,

“All substantive motions, including reports of committees, must be received by the Secretary at least ten days in advance of the day of the meeting at which it is proposed they be considered, unless the Executive Committee waives this requirement. Such motions shall be considered by the Executive Committee for inclusion on the agenda, or other action as it deems appropriate, and the Executive Committee shall report to the Governing Council at its next regular meeting the action that it has taken with respect to such motions.”

Pursuant to Section 31(e) of *By-law Number 2*,

“No matter decided by a committee under the authority of a resolution of the Council or referred to the Council and confirmed by it under the provisions of clause (d) of this section may be considered again by the committee or by the Council within 12 months of the committee meeting at which the matter was decided or of the Council meeting at which the action of the committee was confirmed, as the case may be, unless a motion for reconsideration is carried by a two-thirds majority of the members of the committee or the Council present and voting at a meeting thereof.”

Pursuant to Section 32(b) of *By-Law Number 2*,

“Unless otherwise expressly provided herein or by resolution of the Council, all questions that come before any committee of the Council shall be decided by a majority of the committee members present and voting and in the case of an equality of votes, the question shall be deemed to be decided in the negative.”

Pursuant to Section 1 of the *Mandate of Governance* (October 28, 2010)

The *Principles of Good Governance* form the basis on which the mandate of governance is based. The three primary functions of governance are:

- approval – governance *approves* specific policies, plans or projects according to established procedures.

- oversight –governance receives a wide variety of reports and information through which it *monitors the quality and substance of institutional leadership and decision-making*.
- advice – governance is consulted and *provides input*, sometimes in confidence, on proposed initiatives at various stages of development.

Pursuant to Section 1 of the *Principles of Good Governance* (October 28, 2010)

Subject to applicable laws, University governance must be guided by excellent principles of good governance in relation to stewardship and public accountability, and at the same time recognize the unique nature and characteristics of the academic community or institution, including:

- the fundamental autonomy of universities, coupled with the essential responsibility for public accountability;
- the need to respect the academic mission of excellence in teaching and research;
- the importance of ensuring that academic freedom and responsibility are respected;
- the need to be seen to be accountable – through transparency – to all parties interested in and supporting the University;
- the desire for meaningful and objective stakeholder participation in governance; and
- the diversity and broad representation of governors.

Role of the Governing Council

Further to the *Mandate of Good Governance*, the role of the Governing Council is to approve specific policies, plans or projects according to established procedures, provide oversight, and provide advice.

GOVERNANCE PATH:

1. Executive Committee [for discussion] (October 27, 2025)

PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:

On December 3, 2024, the Executive Committee considered a motion brought forward by a member of the Committee for inclusion on the December 19, 2024 Governing Council agenda. The motion was as follows:

The Governing Council of the University of Toronto condemns the acts of antisemitism that occurred at the encampment as well as ongoing antisemitism on its campuses. We advise the

administration to implement strategies to effectively protect students, faculty and staff from this form of discrimination.

Following deliberation by the Executive Committee, the motion was defeated. The broad consensus was that the Committee should uphold the mandate of Governing Council as an oversight body that holds the University to account, but does not make statements on its own behalf as a governing body. An excerpt of the December 3, 2024 meeting report is attached as Appendix A.

The Committee's December 3, 2024 decision aligned with, and reiterated, a position it had taken on October 28, 2024 with respect to a series of similar motion requests. An excerpt of the relevant portion of the October 28, 2024 meeting report is attached as Appendix B.

HIGHLIGHTS:

Proposed Motion

The Governor has proposed the following motion for consideration by the Governing Council at its meeting of November 6, 2025 (the "Proposed Motion").

Since October 7, 2023, there has been a reported 600% increase in antisemitic hate crimes in the City of Toronto, including numerous documented and undocumented incidents on our campuses.

Be it resolved that the Governing Council of the University of Toronto unequivocally condemns acts of antisemitism on our campuses. We extend our sincere apology to the University's learners, faculty, and staff for all antisemitic incidents that have occurred at the University since October 7, 2023.

Reconsideration as Prerequisite to Considering the Proposed Motion

As the Proposed Motion is a matter that has been previously decided under agenda item 10, Other Business at the December 3, 2024 meeting of the Executive Committee, before considering the Proposed Motion, the Executive Committee must first vote on whether the matter should be reconsidered by the Executive Committee ("Motion for Reconsideration").

The Governor was requested to provide any additional information regarding any developments or changes since December 3, 2024 that would support a Motion for Reconsideration.

The Governor has provided the following information:

"To the Executive Committee,

While I recognize that the subject matter of antisemitism at the University of Toronto is a similar theme to my previous motions, the current motion addresses the rise and

antisemitism and includes an apology to the members of the University of Toronto who have been subjected to this vile and growing form of hatred on our campuses.

There have been a growing number of hateful statements and acts by both staff and students at the University of Toronto towards Jews.

One U of T professor publicly posted that the CBC was being "harassed by Zionist funders" in order to explain why they refuse to engage with her.

Another U of T professor publicly reposted dozens of blood libels from horrific anti-semites including suggesting that rabbis will harvesting people's organs for profit.

A former fellow of OISE uses the term 'Jewish supremacists' to describe Jews.

Another graduate student who was featured in a U of T publication in the last two years stated that "there is no peace until Jewish supremacy is eradicated worldwide."

Another professor has openly violated the university's policy on academic boycott by writing to an Israeli professor declining to have them spend a sabbatical at the University of Toronto because they were Israeli.

Most recently a number of Hillel students had to be escorted off of the UTM campus by police for their own protection while another group of students were holding a rally called 'Honouring Our Martyrs' on October 7th, the very day that a 1200 predominantly Jewish Israelis were slaughtered by Hamas terrorists. It's unacceptable and it has to be addressed not just by the administration, but by the board. The very highest level of the university must speak out against antisemitism has one strong voice."

Possible Outcomes

Two outcomes are possible following the vote on the Motion for Reconsideration:

1. A Two-Thirds Majority Supports the Motion for Reconsideration

If a two-thirds majority supports the Motion for Reconsideration, the Committee may consider the Proposed Motion.

A second vote would then be taken to endorse and forward the Proposed Motion to the Governing Council for inclusion on the November 6, 2025 agenda. Support of the majority of the Committee is required pursuant to section 32(b) of *By-Law Number 2*.

2. Less Than a Two-Thirds Majority Votes in Favour and the Motion is Decided in the Negative

If less than a two-thirds majority of the Executive Committee supports the Motion for Reconsideration, the Motion is decided in the negative. No further consideration of the Proposed Motion will take place.

RESOLUTION:

Be It Resolved,

THAT the matter previously decided under agenda item 10, Other Business, of the December 3, 2024 Executive Committee meeting be reconsidered by the Executive Committee.

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED:

Appendix A - Excerpt of the Report of the Executive Committee Meeting of December 3, 2024.

Appendix B - Excerpt of the Report of the Executive Committee Meeting of October 28, 2024.



APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

EXCERPT - REPORT NUMBER 553 OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Tuesday, December 3, 2024

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto,

Your Executive Committee reports that it held a meeting in the Chairs' Boardroom, on Tuesday, December 3, 2024, with the following members present:

PRESENT: Anna Kennedy (Chair), Sandra Hanington (Vice-Chair), Meric Gertler (President), Donald Ainslie, Vikram Chadalawada, Robert Cooper, K. Sonu Gaing, Indi Gopinathan*, Mark Lautens, Joanne McNamara, Cameron Miranda-Radbord, Mary-Agnes Wilson

*remote attendance

REGRETS: Grace Westcott, Jovan Bursac

SECRETARIAT: Sheree Drummond (Secretary of the Governing Council); Miranda Edwards (Recording Secretary)

IN ATTENDANCE: Douglas McDougall (Chair, Academic Board); Ann Curran (Chair, UTM Campus Council), Rajiv Mathur (Chair, Business Board), Trevor Young (Vice-President and Provost), Kelly Hannah-Moffat (Vice President, People Strategy, Equity & Culture), Scott Mabury (Vice-President, Operations and Real Estate Partnerships & Vice-Provost, Academic Operations), Kristin Taylor (University Counsel & Chief Legal Officer), Bryn MacPherson, (Assistant Vice-President, Office of the President & Chief of Protocol), Nadina Jamison (Chief Strategy Officer, Office of the President), Leora Jackson (Legal Counsel), Chris Lang (Director, Appeals, Discipline, and Faculty Grievances), Karen Bellinger (Associate Director, Appeals, Discipline, and Faculty Grievances)

Pursuant to sections 28 (e) and 38 of By-Law Number 2,

consideration of items 11 to 14 took place *in camera*.

...

10. Other Business

The Chair invited the member who had brought forward a motion to be considered by the Committee for inclusion on the agenda of the next Governing Council meeting to speak briefly to the reasons for this request. The member responded to indicate that he was also giving notice of a motion to amend the By-Law. The Secretary noted that By-Law revisions were usually brought to the Governing Council following a governance review process. The Chair asked the member to speak to the motion that he had submitted in advance. The motion was as follows:

The Governing Council of the University of Toronto condemns the acts of antisemitism that occurred at the encampment as well as ongoing antisemitism on its campuses. We advise the administration to implement strategies to effectively protect students, faculty and staff from this form of discrimination.

The member stated that the Governing Council was responsible for policies of the University and for setting the tone of the University. The member indicated that a statement against antisemitism by the Governing Council would send a meaningful message to Jewish students, faculty and staff, and would set a tone for the broader University community. He said that while the University had been working on antisemitism, in his view the situation was only getting worse.

In the discussion that followed, a member acknowledged the work being done by the University to combat antisemitism but expressed concern about the characterization of governors in the press as antisemitic. The member indicated support for the motion as it would allow the Governing Council to publicly affirm its rejection of antisemitism. Other members commented that while they were also disturbed by the characterizations in the media, they did not share the view that the way to address this was through a statement of the Governing Council. In their view, doing so would be superfluous in light of the statements condemning antisemitism that had already been issued by the University. There was broad consensus that the Committee should uphold the mandate of Governing Council as an oversight body and that as such it should hold the University to account. It was noted that the motion passed by the Executive Committee at its last meeting reflected this approach as it had required reporting by the administration on its activities and initiatives to combat antisemitism.

In response to a member's question about the practical effect of the motion on the actions of the administration, the President emphasized that combatting antisemitism was already a high priority. The Provost reiterated that the University administration held itself accountable to governance oversight and had committed to increasing its reporting on antidiscrimination programs to this Committee and to Governing Council. He also acknowledged that there was still more to be done to combat antisemitism.

In response to the President and Provost's remarks, most members agreed that the motion would have little to no practical effect. Several members stated that the motion seemed performative and that it was disrespectful to the administration and to other members who had addressed the matter previously. A member also expressed concern about making a statement that only addressed one aspect of a complex matter and that this was not appropriate in light of the University's diverse community. There was general agreement that the University's existing antidiscrimination initiatives demonstrated that the University was already committed to addressing this issue.

The President acknowledged that coming out of the experience of the encampment, the University was working to ensure that people felt U of T was welcoming to everyone. He noted that while the Ontario Superior Court of Justice had ruled that the case had not been made that the behaviour engaged in by individual members of the encampment was antisemitic, it was clear that many community members had experienced antisemitism in proximity to, or as a result of, the encampment. The University acknowledged this harm and its responsibility to address it. He pointed to the most recent step of developing a draft *Guide to Law and Policy regarding Antisemitism and Anti-Israeli Discrimination at the University of Toronto*, to help better recognize and respond to these issues on campus, and that this was one of the many actions being taken. He emphasized that as the Chief Executive Officer he stood resolutely against antisemitism, that he had repeatedly condemned it and would continue to do so, and that the University would continue to take clear actions to address it.

A member commented that he was opposed to hate against any group and that he was disgusted by actions of violence and hateful language, and that those who crossed the line should feel the full force of the law. He further added that in his view the University had been correct in not acting on the encampment until it had received a court injunction. He said that other institutions had looked to the University's injunction for guidance with their own encampments.

Another member expressed the view that governors' fiduciary duty was not in line with the motion, noting that his constituency did not have a single view and that while he would expect that there would be broad support that antisemitism should be rejected, the broader matter was more complex. He said the focus should be on awareness of the actions that were being taken by the University. A member further added that these actions were more effective than a motion or making any other statement. Throughout the discussion, members repeatedly condemned antisemitism and expressed concern and empathy for Jewish members of the University community.

In her concluding remarks, the Chair acknowledged the personal importance of combatting antisemitism to the member who had brought forward the motion, and the importance of this to the University. She observed that while members acknowledged the importance of addressing antisemitism, based on the discussion there was broad consensus that the motion should not be brought forward to the Governing Council. She said that it was the responsibility of the Governing Council to ensure that the University had the appropriate policies and procedures in place, that it had initiatives ongoing or underway to address and combat antisemitism, and that the Council should monitor the progress of these. She emphasized her own categorical rejection of antisemitism. She also noted that members had been clear in their condemnation of antisemitism, had expressed their support for the University's antidiscrimination efforts, and had confirmed the importance of Governing Council's oversight role of this important work. She said that the lack of support for placing the motion on the agenda should not be misunderstood.

The member who had brought forward the motion requested that the motion be put to a vote.

The motion was duly moved and seconded.

That the following motion be endorsed and forwarded to the Governing Council:

The Governing Council of the University of Toronto condemns the acts of antisemitism that occurred at the encampment as well as ongoing antisemitism on its campuses. We advise the administration to implement strategies to effectively protect students, faculty and staff from this form of discrimination.

There were two votes in support and ten votes in opposition. The motion was defeated.

The Committee moved *In Camera*.

...



APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

EXCERPT - REPORT NUMBER 552 OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Monday, October 28, 2024

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto,

Your Executive Committee reports that it held a meeting in the Chairs' Boardroom, on Monday, October 28 2024, with the following members present:

PRESENT: Anna Kennedy (Chair), Sandra Hanington (Vice-Chair), Meric Gertler (President), Donald Ainslie, Jovan Bursac, Vikram Chadawada, Robert Cooper, K. Sonu Gaind, Indi Gopinathan, Mark Lautens, Cameron Miranda-Radbord, Grace Westcott

REGRETS: Joanne McNamara, Mary-Agnes Wilson

SECRETARIAT: Sheree Drummond (Secretary of the Governing Council); Gina DeVeaux (Committee Secretary)

IN ATTENDANCE: Bruce Kidd (Professor Emeritus, University Ombudsperson), Douglas McDougall (Chair, Academic Board); Ann Curran (Chair, UTM Campus Council), Geeta Yadav (Chair, University Affairs Board), Rajiv Mathur (Chair, Business Board), Trevor Young (Vice-President and Provost), Scott Mabury (Vice-President, Operations and Real Estate Partnerships & Vice-Provost, Academic Operations), Kristin Taylor (University Counsel & Chief Legal Officer), Bryn MacPherson, (Assistant Vice-President, Office of the President & Chief of Protocol), Nadina Jamison (Chief Strategy Officer, Office of the President), Leora Jackson (Legal Counsel), Chris Lang (Director, Appeals, Discipline, and Faculty Grievances), Karen Bellinger (Associate Director, Appeals, Discipline, and Faculty Grievances), Carmelle Salomon-Labbé (Associate Director, Appeals, Discipline, and Faculty Grievances),

Pursuant to sections 28 (e) and 38 of By-Law Number 2,
consideration of items 12 to 17 took place *in camera*.

...

IN CAMERA SESSION

12. Notices of Motion

The Chair advised members that two governors had provided notice of motions to be considered by the Governing Council at its meeting on November 7, 2024. She indicated that the role of the Executive Committee was to determine whether such motions should be placed on the agenda or indicate some other action it deems appropriate.

In the discussion that followed, it was determined that given the mandate of governance it would not be appropriate for the motions to be endorsed and forwarded to the Governing Council. In addition, it was noted that the matters the motions spoke to were already addressed in existing policies and practices of the University and in some cases were also a matter of compliance with the law. It was also noted that the University should maintain institutional neutrality.

A member, and author of one of the motions, expressed his disappointment that the motion that he had proposed would not be going forward to the Governing Council.

Based on commitments made by the President and the Vice-President and Provost in the discussion, the Chair proposed a motion for consideration that would be consistent with the mandate of governance.

On a motion duly moved, second, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE RESOLVED

THAT the administration provide periodic updates to Governing Council on its activities and initiatives to combat antisemitism including,

1. the development of an operational definition of antisemitism that is consistent with the mission of an academic institution,
2. the work on the review and likely proposed revisions to the Statement on Prohibited Discrimination and Discriminatory Harassment, and,
3. ensuring compliance with Bill 166 (Strengthening Accountability and Student Supports Act, 2024).

The Chair indicated to members that she would report in her Chair's Remarks at the start of the next Governing Council meeting the action that the Committee had taken with respect to the proposed motions.

...