

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

December 10, 2009

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL held on December 10, 2009 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, University of Toronto.

Present:

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch (Chair)

Dr. Alice Dong (Vice-Chair)

The Honourable David R. Peterson, Chancellor

Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and
Provost

Mr. Andrew Agnew-Iler

Professor Varouj Aivazian

Ms Diana A.R. Alli

Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell

Mr. P. C. Choo

Mr. William Crothers

Mr. Ken Davy

Ms Judith Goldring

Professor William Gough

Ms Joeita Gupta

Dr. Gerald Halbert

Professor Ellen Hodnett

Ms Min Hee (Margaret) Kim

Professor Ronald H. Kluger

Professor Christina E. Kramer

Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson

Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles

Mr. Joseph Mapa

Mr. Geoffrey Matus

Ms Florence Minz

Mr. Richard Nunn

Professor Ian Orchard

Professor Doug W. Reeve

Professor Arthur S. Ripstein

Ms Melinda Rogers

Mr. Stephen C. Smith

Miss Maureen J. Somerville

Mr. Olivier Sorin

Professor Janice Gross Stein

Mr. W. John Switzer

Dr. Sarita Verma

Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh

Mr. Greg West

Mr. W. David Wilson

Secretariat:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier,

Secretary of the Governing Council

Ms Mae-Yu Tan,

Assistant Secretary of the Governing
Council

Mr. Henry Mulhall,

Assistant Secretary of the Governing
Council

Absent:

Dr. Claude S. Davis

Mr. Adam Heller

Ms Shirley Hoy

Dr. Joel A. Kirsh

Mr. Gary P. Mooney

Mr. George E. Myhal

Professor C. David Naylor

Mr. Tim Reid

Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth

Mr. John David Stewart

Ms Rita Tsang

In Attendance:

Mr. Jeff Peters, former Member of the Governing Council and President, Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS)
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations
Professor Peter Lewis, Associate Vice-President, Research
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost, Academic Operations
Dr. Tim McTiernan, Assistant Vice-President, Government, Institutional and Community Relations
Ms Gillian Morrison, Assistant Vice-President, Divisional Relations and Campaigns
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources
Mr. Shahed Al-Haque, *Leaders of Tomorrow*
Professor Cristina Amon, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering
Mr. Garvin De Four, Office of the Ombudsperson
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Professor Greg Evans, Co-Chair, *Leaders of Tomorrow*, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering
Professor Emeritus Joan E. Foley, Ombudsperson
Ms Marina Freire-Gormaly, *Leaders of Tomorrow*
Ms Nora A. Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Dr. Magdalena Golezdzinowska, Member, College of Electors
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Ms Victoria Hurlihey, Member, College of Electors
Mr. Christopher Lang, Director, Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances
Mr. Tim Legeault, *Varsity Newspaper*
Ms Bryn MacPherson, Executive Director, Office of the President and University Events
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel, Office of the President
Ms. Deborah Peart, *Leaders of Tomorrow*
Mr. Shonith Rajendran, *Varsity Newspaper*
Ms Anne Simpson, Coordinator, *Leaders of Tomorrow*
Ms Meredith Strong, Director of the Office of the Vice-President, University Relations
Ms Angela Tran, *Leaders of Tomorrow*
Ms Katie Wolk, APUS

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2 OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, ITEMS 11, 12, AND 13 ON THE AGENDA WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

1. Remarks by the Chair and the Secretary of the Governing Council

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the first meeting of the Governing Council of the governance year. The Chair announced that Professor Cheryl Misak, the Vice-President and Provost, would be representing the President, who would not be in attendance as he had just returned that afternoon from an official visit to India.

The Chair advised that the meeting was being broadcast via live audio webcast in accordance with usual practice, so members and invited speakers were asked to address the Governing Council via microphones which fed the webcast.

At the Chair's invitation, Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, the Secretary of the Governing Council informed members that elections would be held in 2010 to fill vacancies on the Governing Council and on the Academic Board as of July 1, 2010. Elected student members would serve one-year terms, while all other elected members would serve three-year terms. Nominations would be accepted for the three alumni vacancies on the Governing Council between noon on January 8, 2010 and 4:00 p.m. on February 5, 2010. Nominations for the one administrative staff, four teaching staff, and eight-student vacancies on the Governing Council and 17 teaching staff vacancies on the Academic Board would be accepted between noon on January 8, 2010 and 5:00 p.m. on January 22, 2010. Mr. Charpentier urged members to encourage their colleagues to participate in the elections and advised that the Deputy Returning Officer would be available to respond to any questions.

Mr. Charpentier indicated that the guidelines for the election process had undergone revisions, which required Governing Council approval. Accordingly, the *Election Guidelines 2010* was placed on the meeting agenda as item 5(f).

2. Minutes of the Meeting of June 23, 2009

The minutes of the meeting of June 23, 2009 were approved.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

In response to a member's request for clarification, Mr. Charpentier stated that Summer Executive Authority granted by the Governing Council to the President at its last meeting extended there from to the next regular meeting of the Governing Council. He also indicated that all decisions had been reported to the Executive Committee (Report 425 of the Executive Committee – October 7, 2009.)

In response to a member's inquiry, Professor Misak confirmed that office space for the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS) would be forthcoming, which was consistent with the commitment she had made at the previous meeting. She indicated that her office had reviewed the correspondence submitted by APUS, which detailed the attributes that would be desired for its office space, including a garden. Professor Misak assured the member that her office had been working hard to secure office space for APUS and would be contacting APUS in the near future to provide further details.

There was no other business arising from the previous meeting.

4. Report of the President

Before delivering the President's Report on his behalf, Professor Misak indicated that, in keeping with the University's tradition of beginning meetings of the Governing Council with student presentations, her address would be preceded by a presentation about the Leaders of Tomorrow Program (LOT) offered by the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering. As a preface to the student presentations, Ms Annie Simpson, the Student Leadership Development Coordinator of LOT, detailed some highlights of the program, noting that the program had experienced rapid growth in recent years and that there was higher enrollment demand for LOT than could be accommodated. During their presentations, the three student presenters recounted their learning experiences as students in the program and how the skills and confidence they gained through the program facilitated their leadership achievements, including starting a campus club, designing devices to assist people with disabilities, and assuming extraordinary responsibilities at a professional internship. At the conclusion of these presentations, Professor Misak encouraged members to review the LOT annual report that had been distributed and asked members to pay particular attention to the impressive list of student awards and honors contained therein.

Professor Misak then began the report on behalf of the President. With respect to the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation (UTAM), she advised that UTAM, as the manager of the University's pension funds, endowment, and investments was undergoing a review.

Professor Misak then advised that the University was coordinating a response with other university and colleges to secure increased research funding from the federal government, which was seeking input on research funding. The University was also advocating for greater post-doctoral support and improved student aid. At the provincial level, Professor Misak expressed the administration's concern about the size of the government debt, which could lead to underfunding in the future and would be problematic given the pressure of enrollment growth, particularly of undergraduate students. The University would also continue its efforts to secure provincial funding for capital expenditures.

Professor Misak expressed confidence that the provincial government would ultimately approve the University's continued request for flexibility in allocating funding and student enrolment between master degree and doctoral degree programs, given support from the Council of Ontario Universities and the strong arguments in favour thereof. One compelling argument was the significant demand for professional masters programs, which provided students with excellent employment prospects and could be completed over a relatively short duration. The President intended to reiterate these and other supporting arguments to the Premier's Office and would keep members apprised of developments.

Professor Misak then discussed the University's national and international rankings. In general, the University received many favourable rankings, and was considered by one respected survey to be in the same league as Stanford University, University of Cambridge, University of Oxford, and University of California, Berkeley. The University's standing in the *Globe and Mail's* annual Canadian University Report improved, although the Report revealed that enhancements were required in the areas of student experience, campus food services, and faculty-student

**4. Report of the President
(Cont'd)**

interactions. Professor Misak noted that the University was already implementing initiatives to address student experience-type concerns, including new teaching, research, and study spaces at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). Such efforts would continue and progress would be reported to the Governing Council.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval

(a) Non-Hospital Clinical Site Template Agreement

Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles, the Chair of the Academic Board, advised that the Academic Board had supported the Faculty of Medicine's proposed template agreement with non-hospital clinical sites, which was comparable to the existing template agreement with hospitals. The proposal was designed to ensure consistency across agreements with different sites, with respect to definitions and issues such as responsibility for employment and academic matters. The template would obviate the need to create an individual agreement with each site. Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that, during discussions at the Academic Board, Professor Catherine

Whiteside, the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine and Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions, advised that the University would be responsible for liability insurance coverage for students while they were at the non-hospital clinical sites under the terms of the template agreement.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

- (i) THAT the proposed template for non-hospital clinical site agreements with the University of Toronto be approved, effective immediately;
- (ii) 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
- (iii) 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**

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that both the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Planning and Budget Committee had recommended approval of the proposal of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering to close the Master of Engineering in Telecommunications degree program. The Academic Board concurred with the recommendations of these Committees. The program was introduced in 1997, was self-funded,

**(b) School of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering:
Master of Engineering in Telecommunications – Program Closure
(Cont'd)**

and graduated 170 students during its 10-year tenure. However, due to changes in the industrial and economic climate, the program no longer attracted students. Many of the courses that were part of this program would still be available through other programs even after the cancellation of this degree program.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

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

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that the Academic Board had supported the proposal for a new professional Master of Science of Applied Computing program that would be offered by the Department of Computer Science in the Faculty of Arts and Science. The program would entail two terms of course work and an eight-month industrial internship. The need for such a professional graduate program had been determined through broad consultation with students and faculty across the University and excellent market research involving potential employers in industry. The Basic Income Unit (BIU) level of funding from the government had been approved and the University’s Planning and Budget Office was satisfied that the proposed program would be self-funding given revenue and cost projections. Questions and concerns raised at the Academic Board relating to the caliber of students, value of the program, the internship, and impact on other research-based master programs were addressed to the Academic Board’s satisfaction by Professor Craig Boutilier, Chair of the Department of Computer Science.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

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”.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval

**(d) Capital Project: Utilities Infrastructure Upgrade for St. George Campus
(Cont'd)**

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that the Academic Board had recommended approval of all three parts of the proposed utilities infrastructure upgrade for 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 loop. This would provide electrical capacity to MSB and would also benefit the Sandford Fleming Building and the Galbraith Building, which had been sharing a loop with MSB. The second part would entail adding an additional chiller at the southeast cooler plant, which was required because of internal growth requirements of the 15 buildings served by the facility. The third part would involve upgrades to the water aeration system and emergency oil tanks at the central steam plant. The total project cost was estimated to be \$11.2 million, which would be financed through the utilities budget and a loan. Professor Lemieux Charles added that Mr. Bruce Dodds, Director of Utilities, Facilities and Services, had advised the Academic Board that a more environmental chilled water alternative for a portion of the proposed upgrade had been explored, but the unconventional option had ultimately been discounted.

Mr. Richard Nunn, the Chair of the Business Board, reported that the Business Board had reviewed the proposed upgrade; approved its execution, subject to approval by the Governing Council of the project overall; and was satisfied that the price of the project and the sources of funding were appropriate.

A member expressed her concern at the University incurring additional debt for some projects that were, in her opinion, of low priority during an economic downturn. In response, Ms Cathy Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs, assured the member that the loan would not have a major impact on the University's operating budget.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

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 UTSC South Campus Data Centre

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that the Academic Board had recommended approval of the proposed construction of a new data centre atop the roof of the Academic Resource Centre at UTSC. The existing data centre had been under-accommodating the activities and computer

(e) Capital Project: Project Planning Report for UTSC South Campus Data Centre (Cont'd)

systems on the campus. Since the construction of the existing facility, the campus had undergone significant expansion, with a 38% increase in space and a 97% increase in enrollment, so the need for a larger facility was apparent. The \$3.9 million project estimate included the cost of construction of the new facility as well as all new equipment that would be required for the new server room. The Office of the Chief Information Officer (CIO) was consulted during the planning stages to ensure that the expanded centre would be sized to accommodate additional information technology facilities that might be required in the future by the St. George Campus and UTM.

Mr. Nunn reported that, subject to Governing Council approval of the overall project, the Business Board approved its execution. Mr. Nunn added that the Business Board had been assured that the University would exploit any economies of scale that might arise through the purchase of equipment for this project jointly with other similar University expenditures.

In response to a member's question concerning the involvement of the Office of the CIO in the planning process of this project, Professor Misak advised that Mr. Robert Cook, the CIO, oversaw the information technology services for all three campuses of the University and Professor Lemieux-Charles explained, it was her understanding, based on discussions at the Academic Board, that the Office of the CIO had been involved in the Project Planning Committee.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

- (i) THAT the Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto at Scarborough Data Centre be approved in principle.
- (ii) THAT the project scope, comprising new construction 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".

(f) *Election Guidelines 2010*

In introductory remarks, the Chair advised members that the University Affairs Board and the Elections Committee had both recommended that the Governing Council approve the proposed *Election Guidelines 2010* included in members' agenda packages for use in the 2010 Governing Council and Academic Board elections. Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh, the Chair of the University Affairs Board, added that Governing Council approval of the *Guidelines* was required this year, given that major amendments to policies and procedures were proposed. These included the attenuation of the campaign period to three weeks to address student feedback that the five-week campaign periods of past years were too onerous given students' academic commitments; the

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

reduction in the number of nominators required for all constituencies to five to encourage greater participation in the elections; and the addition of provisions relating to accommodation arrangements to facilitate participation in the elections by individuals with disabilities. The Chair then invited Mr. Charpentier to elaborate on two important issues raised during discussion of the *Guidelines* at the Executive Committee, the highlights of which were summarized in the cover memorandum that members had received as part of their agenda packages.¹

The premise of the first issue raised at the Executive Committee was that engineering students on work internships arranged through the Professional Experience Year Program (PEY) at the time of the nomination period should be eligible to participate in the Governing Council elections as full-time undergraduate students, notwithstanding that they were classified as part-time undergraduate students. This seemed reasonable to the Executive Committee given that PEY students were normally registered as full-time undergraduate students immediately before and after their internships and PEY students were similar to co-op students at UTSC, who were eligible to participate in the elections as full-time undergraduate students.

The second issue related to the proposal in the *Guidelines* to reduce the number of nominators required to secure candidacy to five across all constituencies. Mr. Charpentier reminded members that, in past years, administrative staff, teaching staff, and students were required to secure 20, 10, and 20 nominators, respectively, to become candidates in the Governing Council elections. Teaching staff and librarians were required to secure 3 nominators to become candidates in the Academic Board elections. Support for the proposal was based primarily on the expectation that reducing the number of nominators required would make it easier for individuals to secure candidacy, meaning greater participation in the elections. However, there was a possibility that the proposal could lead to an excessive number of candidates, who could be elected with fewer votes, potentially making the election process more susceptible to the effects of block voting.

Mr. Charpentier reported that the Secretariat had consulted a faculty member expert in electoral procedures with respect to the second issue at the request of the Executive Committee. The faculty member advised that there appeared to be no compelling reason to reduce the number of nominators required, given the number of candidates in past years. The faculty member suggested that, if so inclined, however, the number of nominators required could be reduced on a trial basis for a year.

Following Mr. Charpentier's report, Ms Vosburgh made the motion printed in the agenda relating to the *Election Guidelines 2010*, subject to an amendment which would have limited the proposed reduction in the number of nominators required to secure candidacy to the elections in 2010 and would have imposed a requirement that the reduction and any implications arising there from be assessed before elections in 2011. The motion was subsequently seconded.

¹ The cover memo is available on the website of the Office of the Governing Council at: <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=6607>.

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

The Chair then invited comments from members. A member, who also served on the Elections Committee, explained that the reduction in the number of nominators required to secure candidacy was initially proposed to mitigate the challenges part-time undergraduate students experienced in their efforts to identify and secure nominations from their peers. He emphasized that the Elections Committee invested a considerable amount of time deliberating the proposal and concluded that the higher threshold number of nominators required in previous years represented an unnecessary obstacle. A part-time undergraduate student member remarked that this was particularly evident with respect to part-time undergraduate student candidates, who had been acclaimed rather than elected in recent years. She added that the less onerous threshold would also benefit students with disabilities and students with busy family lives.

With respect to whether the proposal should include undergraduate students, two perspectives were highlighted during discussions: A higher threshold number of nominators was appropriate for full-time undergraduate students seeking candidacy, given that nominators could be identified and secured more readily relative to students who only attended university part-time and the process of securing nominators would also serve to promote the elections, encouraging participation. Lowering the threshold number of nominators would benefit full-time undergraduate students who commuted to and from the University and did not have the benefit of close student interactions associated with residing on campus, but who could nevertheless make meaningful contributions as members of the Governing Council.

A member stated that Co-op students registered at the University of Toronto at Scarborough were considered as full-time and that this was consistent with the principle that full-time students would vote for other full-time students and would run for full-time positions. Treating PEY students on work internships as full-time undergraduate students for election purposes was a different issue, in the member's view. Some students returning from their PEY placement may not re-register as full-time. In addition, there were broader implications that should be considered, including whether such treatment was consistent with *The University of Toronto Act, 1971* and whether other students in analogous circumstances would lobby for similar treatment. The member added that the proposed changes would disenfranchise some other groups on campus who were in similar situations. The member suggested that the matter be referred to the University Affairs Board to consider. Another member underscored the need to ensure that PEY students were eligible to participate in the elections as full-time undergraduate students, noting that approximately half of the undergraduate students within the Faculty of Applied Science arranged internships through PEY prior to their final years of undergraduate studies. If left unamended, the member noted, the proposed *Election Guidelines* would thwart participation on the Governing Council by such students in their final years.

The Chair then invited comments from Mr. Jeff Peters, the President of APUS, who had submitted a speaking request prior to the meeting. Mr. Peters supported the proposed reduction in the number of nominators required to secure candidacy, but expressed reservations about the treatment of PEY students as full-time undergraduate students, given that such treatment had not been considered by the University Affairs Board. He urged that the matter be referred to the

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

University Affairs Board for consideration.

Referring to the time limit to which Mr. Peters was asked to adhere, a member stated that she was offended with the Chair's behaviour towards the invited speaker stating that in her view, he should be given more time. A member commented that he took offence to the Chair's behaviour being called into question in such a manner, adding that in his view the Chair had authority as Presiding Officer to rule on points of order and to call to order anyone who was speaking.

Prior to the vote on the *Guidelines*, a member, who previously identified himself as also being a member of the Elections Committee, acknowledged the significance of the second issue identified by the Executive Committee and suggested that the Elections Committee could engage in further deliberations provided that it received direction and guidance on the issue.

Following this discussion, members were asked to vote on a revised motion and approved the *Election Guidelines 2010*, in the form recommended by the Elections Committee and University Affairs Board, thereby approving the reduction in the number of nominators required to secure candidacy across all constituencies and declining to treat PEY students as full-time undergraduate students. Members agreed that the issues canvassed at the meeting should be scrutinized by the Task Force on Governance, whose mandate included the examination of the election and selection process of members of the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed *Election Guidelines 2010*, in the form recommended by the University Affairs Board, be approved, effective immediately.

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

6. Report of the University Ombudsperson (July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2009 and Administrative Response

The Chair invited Professor Joan Foley, the University Ombudsperson, to present the annual written Report of the University Ombudsperson, which had been prepared in accordance with the provisions of Terms of Reference of the Office of the Ombudsperson. Both the Report and the Administrative Response had been included in members' agenda packages.

Professor Foley explained that the Office of the Ombudsperson reported directly to the Governing Council so as to ensure independence from the administration. This arrangement was

**6. Report of the University Ombudsperson (July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2009 and Administrative Response)
(Cont'd)**

consistent with the Ombudsperson's mandate to facilitate the resolution of complaints as a neutral arbiter. The overarching mission of the Office of the Ombudsperson was to assess the fairness of the circumstances, which formed the bases of the office's involvement. This assessment might result in recommendations for a review of policies or procedures. The matters at issue sometimes cut across several portfolios of the administration, in which case it was helpful if one office could be identified as taking the lead in policy review.

Professor Foley stressed that the administration was not obliged to accept recommendations from the Office of the Ombudsperson, but the administration did provide an annual response. She was pleased that the administration had accepted the two recommendations in this Report. She noted that implementation can take time, and that a status report on matters from recent years is included for the information of governors.

In conclusion, Professor Foley advised that the Report of the University Ombudsperson would be made public on the office's website following the meeting.

Referring to page 13 of the Report, a member inquired about the status of guidelines that had been drafted in response to Professor Foley's advice to the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity, regarding the need to implement a clear process for addressing discrimination on prohibited grounds within the University. Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, the Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources, advised that the final draft had been circulated to a number of bodies for review and the guidelines would be implemented following this process.

A part-time undergraduate student member suggested that the Office of the Ombudsperson compile user statistics, so that the proportion of part-time students could be determined. The Chair invited the member to submit her suggestion to the Office of the Ombudsperson in writing.

The member also inquired about the administration's progress vis-à-vis the recommendation that Professor Foley's predecessor made in the 2006-07 Report of the Ombudsperson. In that Report it had been suggested that the University examine its policies governing the assessment and refund of incidental fees. Existing policies could potentially lead to unfair results, particularly with respect to part-time students. Professor Foley responded that she had no information beyond what she had reported in the annual Report. She elaborated that the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget, Professor Safwat Zaky, who had preceded the Vice-Provost, Academic Operations, Professor Scott Mabury, had referred the recommendation to a committee he had convened to examine various aspects of how tuition and ancillary fees were assessed. However, the committee's work had not been completed by the end of June. The Chair stated that the administration would follow up on the matter.

7. Reports for Information

Members received the Calendar of Business for 2009-2010 and the following reports for information:

- (a) Report Number 164 of the Academic Board (November 12, 2009);
- (b) Report Number 175 of the Business Board (June 18, 2009);
- (c) Report Number 176 of the Business Board (September 29, 2009);
- (d) Report Number 177 of the Business Board (November 9, 2009);
- (e) Report Number 154 of the University Affairs Board (November 3, 2009);
- (f) Report Number 424 of the Executive Committee (June 23, 2009); and
- (g) Report Number 425 of the Executive Committee (October 7, 2009).

The Chair noted that the Calendar of Business for 2009-2010 was posted on the website of the Office of the Governing Council and would be updated throughout the year. A member reminded that correspondence that she had sent in relation to the Academic Board meeting of November 12, 2009 should be included as an appendix to Report Number 164.

8. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next regular meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, January 21, 2010 at 4:30 p.m.

9. Question Period

There were no questions for members of the senior administration.

10. Other Business

A member expressed disapproval that the sixth annual Israeli Apartheid Week event would once again be held on University premises, which appeared to contradict the University's public statement that it was neither sponsoring nor endorsing the event. In her view, the event was inconsistent with academic freedom, as the name of the event itself was factually inaccurate, inflammatory, and sowed hate and condemnation rather than invited meaningful scholarly research and dialogue. She suggested that the University should distance itself from the event, as it was important for an institution with the University's stature to demonstrate moral leadership.

Professor Misak advised that the University monitored such events and intervened when necessary to ensure balanced debate and that discourse was respectful of all members of the community.

Other members concurred that the name of the event was offensive, but it was noted that banning the event could potentially generate publicity that would raise the profile of the event.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEM 12 WAS CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

11. Report Number 53 of the Committee for Honorary Degrees

On individual motions duly moved, seconded, and carried

It was Resolved

THAT first five and last eight recommendations contained in Report Number 53 of the Committee for Honorary Degrees be approved.

THAT the Chancellor and the President be empowered to determine the degree to be conferred on each candidate and the date of the conferral.

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

On individual motions duly moved, seconded, and carried

It was Resolved

THAT the President's recommendations for expulsions, as outlined in the memoranda and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated December 3, 2009 for December 10, 2009, be confirmed.

13. Personnel Matter: Presidential Review

The Chair briefed members on the details and timeline of the Presidential review process that the Executive Committee had initiated. At the conclusion of the review process, the Executive Committee would report their recommendations to the Governing Council at the next meeting.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chair invited members to the annual reception for members of the Governing Council, which was held at the Campbell Conference Facility located within the Munk Centre for International Studies immediately following the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

January 10, 2010