

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Thursday, April 16, 2009

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, April 16, 2009 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
Professor C. David Naylor, President
Professor Varouj Aivazian
Ms Diana Alli
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell
Professor Brian Corman
Mr. Ken Davy
Mr. Grant Gonzales
Dr. Gerald Halbert
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson
Mr. Joseph Mapa
Professor Michael R. Marrus
Professor Cheryl Misak
Mr. Gary P. Mooney
Mr. George E. Myhal
Professor Ian Orchard
Mr. Jeff Peters
Professor Doug W. Reeve
Mr. Timothy Reid
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth
Ms Maureen J. Somerville
Mr. Oliver Sorin
Mr. John David Stewart

Ms Rita Tsang
Dr. Sarita Verma
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the
Governing Council

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry T. Mulhall
Ms Alison Webb

Absent:

Mr. David Asper
Mr. P.C. Choo
Dr. Claude S. Davis
Ms Susan Eng
Mr. David Ford
Ms Judith Goldring
Professor William Gough
Ms Shirley Hoy
Mr. Joseph Koo
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles
Mr. Geoffrey Matus
Ms Florence Minz
Mr. Richard Nunn
Miss Anna Okorokov
Ms Melinda Rogers
Mr. Larry Wasser
Mr. W. David Wilson

In Attendance:

Mr. Andrew Agnew-Iler, Member-Elect of the Governing Council
Ms Joeita Gupta, Member-Elect of the Governing Council
Ms Margaret Kim, Member-Elect of the Governing Council

In Attendance: (cont'd)

Mr. Gregory West, Member-Elect of the Governing Council
Dr. Robert Bennett, Former Member of the Governing Council
Mr. Terry Buckland, Former Member of the Governing Council
Ms Oriel Varga, Former Member of the Governing Council
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement and Chief Advancement Officer
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Professor Paul Young, Vice-President, Research
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic
Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
Mr. Daniel Atlin, Assistant Vice-President Government, Institutional and Community Relations
Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President, Student Life
Dr. Tim McTiernan, Assistant Vice-President, Research, and Executive Director of the
 Innovations Group
Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning
Mr. Rob Steiner, Assistant Vice-President, Strategic Communications
Mr. Adam Awad, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council (SAC)
Professor Steven Bernstein, Munk Centre for International Studies
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students
Professor Joseph Desloges, Principal, Woodsworth College
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Ms Meghan Gallant, Secretary, Graduate Students' Union (GSU)
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget
Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Ms Denise Gray, Associate Registrar, Innis College
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning
Ms Anne Lewis, Manager, Student Accounts
Professor George Luste, President, University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA)
Ms Bryn MacPherson, Director, Office of the President and University Events
Ms Margaret McKone, Executive Director, Munk Centre for International Studies
Ms Penny Millen, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS)
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel, Office of the President
Ms Vanessa Parlette, Social Sciences Divisional Steward, Canadian Union of Public Employees
 (CUPE) Local 3902
Ms Neena Saloiya, APUS
Ms Laurie Stephens, Director, Media Relations
Ms Meredith Strong, Director, Office of the Vice-President, University Relations
Ms Sara Suliman, Vice-President, External, GSU
Ms. Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Mr. Paul Tsang, Executive Member and Trustee, Steelworkers (USW) Local 1998

1. Chair's Remarks

(a) Respectful Conduct

The Chair welcomed members and reminded them that the meeting was being broadcast on the web. He noted that there was a rather noisy rally occurring outside the building, but that the Council intended to continue to conduct its business. He added that the Council's Rules of Order were designed to support the orderly transaction of business, to enable respectful debate among members, and to ensure that all members' views could be heard and presented fairly and openly. It was his duty as Chair to maintain an environment in which such proceedings could occur. However, both members and guests also had a duty to ensure that these intentions were respected, and that meetings were conducted with courtesy and mutual respect.

(b) Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair

The Chair expressed his appreciation, and that of the Vice-Chair, to Council members for their continued support. Both had been acclaimed to their current positions for the period July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010.

(c) Election of the Chancellor

The Chair also offered special congratulations on behalf of the Council to the Honourable David Peterson, for his re-election to the role of Chancellor of the University for a second three-year term from July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2012.

(d) Governing Council Election Results

Congratulations were also in order for the following current members who had been re-elected to the Governing Council: Ms Diana Alli, Mr. Ryan Campbell, Mr. Kenneth Davy, Professor William Gough, Professor Ellen Hodnett, Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles, and Mr. Olivier Sorin. The Chair also congratulated and welcomed the following individuals who had been newly elected as members of the Council and would begin their terms on July 1, 2009: Mr. Andrew Agnew-Iler (Undergraduate Student), Mr. William Crothers (Alumni), Professor Janice Gross Stein (Teaching Staff), Ms Joeita Gupta (Part-time Undergraduate Student), Mr. Adam Heller (Undergraduate Student), Ms Margaret Kim (Undergraduate Student), Mr. W. John Switzer (Alumni), and Mr. Gregory West (Graduate Student).

(e) Speaking Requests

The Chair noted that five speaking requests had been granted to the following individuals: Mr. Adam Awad, Vice-President, University Affairs, SAC; Ms Meghan Gallant, Secretary, GSU; Ms Vanessa Parlette, Social Sciences Divisional Steward, CUPE 3902; Ms Neena Saloiya, APUS; and Mr. Paul Tsang, Executive Member and Trustee, Steelworkers Local 1998. Mr. Owen Leach of the Toronto Parents of Black Children had also requested speaking rights, but instead had been asked to provide a written submission. No submission had been received.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting of March 4, 2009

The minutes of the meeting of March 4, 2009 were approved.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

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

4. Report of the President

At the request of the Chair, and in light of the length of the agenda, the President deferred his report to the following meeting.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval

(a) School of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Arts and Science: Master of Global Affairs Program

Professor Marrus reported that this proposal was for the establishment of a two-year professional Master of Global Affairs (M.G.A.) Program to be offered by the School of Global Affairs within the Faculty of Arts and Science. The program would involve the cooperation of a variety of departments, disciplines, and divisions including Management, Law, and Public Policy and Governance, and had received the full support of the Academic Board. A member noted that the program's acronym M.G.A. could be easily confused with that of a Master of Business Administration (M.B.A.), and recommended that it be known by its full name of Master of Global Affairs to avoid such confusion.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the establishment of the proposed Master of Global Affairs (M.G.A.) Program within the Faculty of Arts and Science be approved to commence September 2010.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 161 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B".

(b) School of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Arts and Science: Graduate Centre for the Study of Drama: Disestablishment in the School of Graduate Studies and Establishment in the Faculty of Arts and Science

Professor Marrus noted that this proposal was similar to others which had come forward recently where centres within the School of Graduate Studies were being moved to faculties with which they enjoyed synergies. Consultation had indicated that the natural home for the Graduate Centre for the Study of Drama was the Faculty of Arts and Science. The main administrative change would be that the Director of the Centre would in future report to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science rather than the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)

(b) School of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Arts and Science: Graduate Centre for the Study of Drama: Disestablishment in the School of Graduate Studies and Establishment in the Faculty of Arts and Science (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Centre for Study of Drama be disestablished as an academic unit in the School of Graduate Studies and reestablished as an extra-departmental unit A (EDU:A) within the Faculty of Arts and Science, effective May 1, 2009.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 161 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C".

(c) Student Records: *Statement Concerning Changes of Student Personal Information in Official Academic Records*

Professor Marrus reported that the proposed *Statement* was intended to simplify the process by which registrars and other University staff could respond to student requests to change their names on academic records.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed *Statement Concerning Changes of Student Personal Information in Official Academic Records* be approved, effective for the May 2009 Summer Session, replacing the *Policy on Names on Official Student Academic Records and Corroborative Documents* (approved on January 9, 1986).

Documentation is attached to Report Number 161 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D".

(d) Student Financial Support: Report of the Vice-Provost, Students – January, 2009

The Chair drew members' attention to the Report of the Vice-Provost, Students on Student Financial Support that had been provided for information as context for the consideration of the Tuition Fee Schedules and Budget Report. Governance responsibility for student financial support resided with the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, which had received the Report at its March 3, 2009 meeting, and had raised no concerns.

(e) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2009-10

The Chair noted that the Tuition Fee Schedules and the Budget Report would be introduced by a single presentation provided by the Vice-President and Provost, and the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)

(e) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2009-10 (cont'd)

Professor Misak introduced the items by noting that tuition fees would remain a pillar of the University's efforts to provide a high quality education to its students. The institution was facing a very challenging financial situation, and yet it had maintained its student aid commitments, and would be allocating an extra \$5-million to the neediest students in the upcoming year. The upshot of the budget report was that expenditures would outstrip revenues, despite concerted efforts to reduce costs and to increase revenues, and as a result a budget deficit would be required.

Professor Zaky provided a presentation on both the Tuition Fee Schedules and the Budget Report ([the PowerPoint slides are attached hereto as Appendix "A"](#)), noting that the University's overall budget situation as well as its policy framework provided the context for the proposed Tuition Fee Schedules.¹

Mr. Myhal reported that the Business Board had recommended approval of the Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs at its meeting on March 23, 2009. The Board had also received the Enrolment Report, which had indicated continuing, strong enrolment. In addition, it had received the Report on Student Financial Support and had been assured that the University continued to adhere to its Policy that no student offered admission should be unable to enter or complete a program due to the lack of financial means. The Board had been convinced that the proposed tuition fee increases were necessary to enable the University, particularly in the current financial circumstances, to continue to offer students a first-class educational experience.

A member expressed his concern that students who changed from full-time to part-time status, often for personal reasons beyond their control, were no longer eligible for the University's financial guarantee. Such students had to rely on the Noah Meltz bursary program which only covered costs for tuition fees, books, and transportation, but not for living expenses. He advised that the University implement a financial guarantee that would provide adequate funding to cover the full costs of university education for students regardless of their course load. The Provost responded that the University provided a variety of supports to students who experienced problems in the personal lives in order to assist them to continue their studies and to succeed. The Noah Meltz program had been put in place in order to provide financial assistance to students in the greatest need.

A member stated that he was not opposed to tuition increases in principle, but that they needed to be fair and should not hinder accessibility. Quality should not be the only goal of the University. In previous years he had asked why no adequate data had been provided concerning student debt

¹ The following Reports detail similar presentations provided on the Budget Report and Tuition Fees Schedules at Board and Committee meetings preceding the meeting of the Governing Council: Report Number 130 of the Planning and Budget Committee (February 25, 2009) (<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Planning+and+Budget+Committee/2008-2009+Academic+Year/r0225.pdf>); Report Number 173 of the Business Board (March 23, 2009) (<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Business+Board/2008-2009+Academic+Year/r0323.pdf>); Report Number 161 of the Academic Board (March 26, 2009) (<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Academic+Board/2008-2009+Academic+Year/r0326.pdf>).

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(e) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2009-10 (cont'd)**

loads from private sources, and the response had been that it was too difficult to collect. However, the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering had attempted to do so with some success, and he urged the University as a whole to do so as well. He also had concerns that tuition revenue from international students provided a net subsidy of domestic students. The Provost noted that it was the case worldwide that international students were expected to pay much higher levels of tuition than domestic students. Another member expressed agreement that data regarding debt loads from private sources would be very useful to track over time. Similarly, it would be useful to try to track levels of part-time employment by students, and the impact this had on their educational experience. Such data would be useful in lobbying the Provincial Government for enhanced levels of operating funding.

In response to a question, the Provost clarified that it was hoped that the University would not have to make use of the entire proposed deficit of \$45-million, and that this was a maximum amount.

The Chair invited Mr. Adam Awad, Vice-President, University Affairs of the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) to address the Council. In his view the funding model for universities was broken and unsustainable, since each year tuition fees continued to rise, and public funding of universities was replaced by private funding. Tuition rose faster at the University of Toronto than at any other Canadian university, and yet it had one of the lowest rankings in terms of its student experience. The University needed to maintain both accessibility and the quality of its teaching and research for the long term. He urged members both to vote against the Tuition Fee Schedules and to demand sustainable funding from the Provincial Government that would maintain public access to post-secondary education.

Ms Meghan Gallant, Secretary of the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) addressed the Council at the invitation of the Chair. She urged members to vote against the tuition increases that averaged 4.3%, but were much higher for students in some programs and for international students. In her view, the University's accessibility policy, since it applied only to those offered admission, did not address the self-selection that occurred among potential applicants who chose not to apply because they considered tuition levels to be too high. Higher undergraduate tuition fees led to higher levels of student debt which in turn decreased the likelihood that students would pursue graduate studies. Higher graduate tuition fees forced more graduate students to pursue paid employment, which had a negative impact on the time required to complete programs and on completion rates. Guaranteed funding packages for graduate students were not large enough, and budget constraints were leading to cuts in scholarship and conference travel funding. Ms Gallant concluded by stating her view that high tuition levels were disproportionately shutting out potential graduate students from lower socio-economic backgrounds and foreign countries, thereby reducing diversity among graduate students.

The Chair invited Ms Vanessa Parlette, the Social Sciences Divisional Steward of the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) Local 3902 to address the Council. She stated that her Local opposed tuition increases which shifted the University's financial burden onto students. She reiterated many of the views expressed by the previous speaker regarding the negative impact of

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)

(e) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2009-10 (cont'd)

higher tuition fees on debt levels, graduate program completion rates, and the student experience. Of particular concern were large class sizes where students had little interaction with faculty members. She urged members to vote against the fee increases which were an attack on both the quality of education and on accessibility.

Ms Neena Saloiya of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) addressed the Council at the invitation of the Chair. APUS believed that the implementation of flat fees in the Faculty of Arts and Science would harm the reputation of the University. They were also being imposed against the wishes of the University's largest stakeholder group, its students. The Noah Meltz bursary program was inadequate, and part-time students needed access to the University's financial guarantee. For some part-time students, the combined impact of tuition increases and flat fees would far exceed the 5% tuition increases allowed by the Provincial government. Instead of spending \$260-million on proposed elite athletic facilities, the University should decrease tuition levels and increase funding for student access programs.

The Chair invited Mr. Paul Tsang, an Executive Member and Trustee of the Steelworkers (USW) Local 1998 to address the Council. He stated that the USW's position on post-secondary education rested on the principles of accessibility, quality, and accountability. Higher tuition levels exacerbated the existing inequities regarding accessibility in the post-secondary system. Both students and institutions were in a financial crisis, and reliance on endowment funding was not a sustainable solution. Rather, increased public funding for public universities was the answer. This would allow tuition fees to be lowered while student grants were increased. Educational quality was currently compromised as a result of inadequate funding from the Provincial government. Educational quality resulted more from an institution's human element, that is the calibre of its faculty and staff, than from its facilities and infrastructure. Finally, decreased tuition fee levels would increase public trust in the University and enhance accountability.

A member commented that, in his view, none of the speakers had presented realistic options aside from simply forgoing the increased revenue that would be generated by tuition increases. He urged them in future to propose alternative courses of action that could be debated constructively. For example, one might propose that the University borrow more, but it could be argued that it would be imprudent to take on excessive levels of debt. Alternative options might be to buy fewer books for libraries, to freeze faculty salaries, to terminate administrative staff, or to abolish tenure, but these would have a negative effect on the quality of education. The University already lobbied the Provincial and Federal governments extensively for increased funding for post-secondary education, and would surely welcome ideas and assistance in that regard. Given the severe financial challenges faced by the University, it was unrealistic simply to oppose tuition increases without proposing alternative courses of action.

A member commented that he knew of many former high school classmates who had been qualified to attend university, but had not done so for financial reasons. He was proud that he would soon complete his undergraduate degree, but dismayed that he was the only member of his family to attend university. He urged members to vote against the proposed tuition increases, to work together to find ways to make university education more accessible, and to lobby governments for increased funding for post-secondary education.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(e) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2009-10 (cont'd)**

A member commented that students would not necessarily oppose tuition increases if they thought that they were receiving something in return. In contrast, budgets were being cut, conference travel funding was being reduced, and classes were getting larger. The member understood that approximately 50% of the University's expenses were related to maintenance, library, and faculty salary costs. He recommended that more be done to contain costs in those areas, rather than placing the onus on students to alleviate the University's financial challenges by means of tuition increases. Faculty and staff should also be asked to make sacrifices.

Professor Misak responded to the highlights of the various questions and comments that had been raised. She agreed with the need to lobby governments for enhanced funding, and the University would continue to make this a priority. She did not agree, however, with the view that the system was broken. Rather, Canada as a whole, and the Greater Toronto Area specifically, enjoyed high post-secondary education participation rates. The University had high retention and graduation rates, and its excellent students on the whole enjoyed great success in their post-University careers and lives. Research contained in the University's Performance Indicators Report indicated that tuition increases had not had a negative effect on retention and graduation rates.

Professor Misak also begged to differ with the statement that the proposed tuition increases were drastic. Rather they were compliant with the tuition framework of the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities; they were near the median of such increases across Canada; and they were below the median of increases throughout North America. The quality of education was not in decline at the University, and concerted efforts were being made to maintain and enhance that quality in the face of serious financial challenges. Increased tuition fees were only one part of the University's response to the financial situation. Cost containment measures were being imposed across the institution, including to library and maintenance budgets. Negotiations were underway with the University of Toronto Faculty Association with the goal of controlling salary costs. Finally, Professor Misak noted that the proposed implementation of a program fee in the Faculty of Arts and Science would not be under consideration until the following meeting of the Governing Council. However, she added that such fees were in place at many universities across Ontario and Canada.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Tuition-Fee Schedule For Publicly Funded Programs in 2009-10, as described in Professor Misak's March 6, 2009 report to the Business Board, and the tuition fees in 2009-10 and 2010-11 for the special programs identified in Tables B2 and C2 of Appendices B and C of the report, be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 173 of the Business Board as Appendix "A".

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)

(f) Tuition Fee Schedule for Self-Funded Programs, 2009-10

Ms Vosburgh reported that the Business Board had also recommended approval of the tuition fee schedule for self-funded programs. These programs received no government funding, and their fees were set to recover at least their direct costs.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the tuition-fee schedule for self-funded programs for 2009-10, a copy of which is attached to Professor Misak's March 6, 2009 memorandum to the Business Board as Table 1, be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 173 of the Business Board as Appendix "B".

(g) Long Range Budget Guidelines 2009-10 to 2013-14 and Budget Report for 2009-10

Professor Marrus reported that the Academic Board had received a detailed presentation on the Budget from Professor Zaky. A thorough discussion had followed before the Board had recommended the Budget for approval. He noted that a member of the Board had asked whether sufficient steps were being taken by the University to reduce its expenses, and Professor Misak had responded that all divisions across the institution were engaged in the process of containing costs.

Ms Vosburgh reported that the Business Board was responsible for advising the Governing Council on the financial prudence of the budget plan. This was a matter of particular importance for the upcoming year when a potential \$45-million deficit was being proposed. The Business Board had received a full and careful presentation on the budget from Professor Misak and Professor Zaky. It had also received a detailed evaluation from the President, who had assured the Board that the assumptions about revenue and expense were reasonable and prudent, and that the risk involved was being managed effectively. The Board had accepted the necessity of a budget deficit, and that the plan to eliminate the deficit over five years was reasonable and could, with some difficulty, be achieved.

A member asked to make an amendment to the motion in order to introduce an examination of the Noah Meltz bursary program for part-time students into the long range budget process. At the request of the Chair, the Secretary clarified that an amendment was not in order for a comprehensive motion such as that under consideration. The member's comments, rather, would be most appropriately considered as advice to the Administration, and recorded in the Minutes for that purpose.

A member expressed his concern that the budget allocation for student aid would be essentially flat for the upcoming year, and that there would be only a marginal increase over the long range period to 2014. In his view, if the need for student aid was the driver, the student aid allocations in the budget would be inadequate. If the budget allocations were the driver, the University would be sacrificing accessibility. The Provost agreed that it was difficult to predict the requirements for

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(g) Long Range Budget Guidelines 2009-10 to 2013-14 and Budget Report for 2009-10 (cont'd)**

need-based student aid. However, an extra \$5-million had been allocated for the upcoming year, and there would be an assessment to determine whether this would be sufficient. Another member expressed his concern that there would be a reduction in merit-based scholarships in upcoming years, and that this form of student aid did not seem to be receiving the same protection during a period of budget constraint as were need-based aid and endowed professorial chairs. The Provost agreed that merit-based aid was very important, and though need-based aid had been prioritized in the budget, it was not expected that there would be a significant reduction in merit-based aid.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Budget Report, 2009-10, which includes the long-range budget projection for 2009-10 to 2013-14 and the budget for 2009-10, be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 161 of the Academic Board as Appendix "E".

6. Policy on Presiding Officers for Convocation: Revision

The President reported that this recommendation was for a revision to the *Policy on Presiding Officers for Convocation* that would allow Vice-Presidents who were members of the University's teaching staff to serve as presiding officers at convocation ceremonies in specific circumstances. The rationale was to allow greater sharing of responsibilities among the senior officials of the University for presiding at the 31 annual convocation ceremonies.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the revised *Policy on Presiding Officers for Convocation* be approved, effective immediately, replacing the existing Policy approved by the Governing Council on May 30, 2007.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 421 of the Executive Committee as Appendix "A".

7. Reports for Information

Members received the following three reports for information:

- a) Report Number 161 of the Academic Board (March 26, 2009)
- b) Report Number 173 of the Business Board (March 23, 2009)
- c) Report Number 421 of the Executive Committee (April 6, 2009)

8. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for **Wednesday May 20, 2009**, at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber at the University of Toronto at Mississauga.

9. Question Period

There were no questions for members of the senior administration.

10. Other Business

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

May 15, 2009