

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

JUNE 24, 2010

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL held on June 24, 2010 at 4:30 p.m. in the Main Ballroom, Vaughan Estate, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre.

Present:

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch (In the Chair)
The Honourable David R. Peterson, Chancellor
Professor C. David Naylor, President
Ms Diana A.R. Alli
Mr. Andrew Agnew-Iler
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell
Mr. P. C. Choo
Mr. Ken Davy
Ms Judith Goldring
Professor William Gough
Ms Joeita Gupta
Dr. Gerald Halbert
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Professor Christina E. Kramer
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles
Mr. Joseph Mapa
Professor Cheryl Misak
Mr. Gary P. Mooney
Mr. Richard Nunn
Professor Ian Orchard
Professor Doug W. Reeve
Mr. Tim Reid
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Miss Maureen J. Somerville

Mr. Olivier Sorin
Professor Janice Gross Stein
Mr. John David Stewart
Mr. W. John Switzer
Ms Rita Tsang
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh
Mr. Greg West

Secretariat:

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

Regrets:

Dr. Alice Dong
Professor Varouj Aivazian
Mr. William Crothers
Dr. Claude S. Davis
Mr. Adam Heller
Ms Shirley Hoy
Ms Min Hee (Margaret) Kim
Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson
Mr. Geoffrey Matus
Ms Florence Minz
Mr. George E. Myhal
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Ms Melinda Rogers
Professor Elizabeth Smyth
Mr. W. David Wilson
Dr. Sarita Verma

In Attendance:

Mr. Jeff Peters, Member-Elect of the Governing Council and President, Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS)
Ms. Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Ms Rivi Frankle, Assistant Vice-President, Alumni and Stakeholder Relations
Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President, Student Life
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost, Academic Operations
Professor Cheryl Reghr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs

Ms. Adrienne Davidson, The G8 Research Group
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Ms. Erin Fitzgerald, The G8 Research Group
Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Mr. Christopher Lang, Director, Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances
Mr. Shiva Logarajah, The G8 Research Group
Professor Mark McGowan, Principal, University of St. Michael's College
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel, Office of the President
Mr. Pierre Piche, Controller and Director of Financial Services
Mr. Sam Plett, The G8 Research Group
Ms Laurie Stephens, Director of Media Relations and Stakeholder Communications
Ms Meredith Strong, Director of the Office of the Vice-President, University Relations

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 38 AND 44 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2 OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, ITEMS 13 TO 15 ON THE AGENDA WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

1. Chair's Remarks

(a) Welcome

The Chair welcomed the members and guests to the meeting. He indicated that there were a number of items on the agenda and stated that his intention was to ensure that a good discussion of the items took place within a reasonable time. With this goal in mind, he requested members to be succinct and focussed in their remarks so that all those who had relevant points to make could do so.

(b) Speaking Request

The Chair noted that a speaking request had been received from the Association of Part-Time Students (APUS): it was related to the Munk School of Global Affairs. With the advice of the Executive Committee, the request had been declined. The Chair said that the naming of the School had been deliberated and approved by the Committee on Namings, and the President's Report at the Governing Council meeting of May 13, 2010 had included an update on funding. Therefore, any further discussion on this matter was unnecessary.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting of May 13, 2010

The minutes of the May 13, 2010 meeting 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

(a) **Student Presentation – The G8 Research Group**

The President began his report by introducing the members to a student group – the G8 Research Group. The President introduced: Ms Erin Fitzgerald, Chair; and three Co-Directors of Compliance Studies - Ms. Adrienne Davidson, Mr. Shiva Logarajah, and Mr. Sam Plett, all of whom had graduated with their undergraduate degrees earlier in the month

Ms Fitzgerald informed members that the G8 Research Group was founded in 1987 through the Munk School of Global Affairs. The G8 Research Group was organized to monitor the commitments made by the G8 countries each year. Since 1996, the organization had produced annual compliance reports that had gained international recognition. The compliance project monitored twenty-four commitments made by the G8 members each year. The commitments were monitored on a three-point scale: a positive one was awarded for full compliance; a zero indicated that compliance was in progress; and a negative one denoted non-compliance, or failure to achieve the target to which the group member had committed. Over the year under consideration, the average compliance score for the group was 0.53. Canada, along with the

4. Report of the President (cont'd)

(a) Student Presentation – The G8 Research Group (cont'd)

European Union, had ranked third on the compliance scale. Commitments made with respect to the world economy, climate change, development and security were among the factors studied.

In 2004, an expanded dialogue studies unit was founded to monitor the relationship between the G8 and the G5 (China, India, Brazil, Mexico and South Africa). It was hoped that the dialogue studies unit would be expanded with a view to forming a G20 research group. The civil societies studies unit of research project monitored the relationship between the G8 members and civil society groups such as Oxfam. Members of the group attended the G8 and G20 summits and wrote reports and analyses for international media, based on compliance scores and objectives set by individual countries.

In the discussion following the presentation, Ms Fitzgerald added that the research group was involved in producing communiqués and analyses on the G8 conference that was taking place outside Toronto. The reliability and assessment of the compliance scores were measured through an extensive stakeholder feedback process. The reports produced were sent to government agencies and civil society groups for their input with respect to objectives and compliance. In this process, for example, Canada had scored high on overseas development but low on its trade commitments in 2009-2010. The President thanked the presenters on behalf of the Governing Council.

(b) The Program Fee Monitoring Committee for the Faculty of Arts and Science.

The President called on Professor Misak, Vice-President and Provost, to introduce Professor Mark McGowan, Principal, St. Michael's College and the Chair of the Program Fee Monitoring Committee. Professor McGowan began by introducing the members of the Committee. He said that the Committee included stakeholders within the Faculty of Arts and Science, and its members had been selected for their ability to assess the relevant data that would form the report to the Faculty. The committee consisted of: Karel Swift (University Registrar); Glenn Loney (Registrar, Faculty of Arts and Science); Cheryl Shook (Registrar, Woodsworth College); Linda White (Professor, Department of Political Science); Corey Goldman (Senior Lecturer, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology); Mirella Pasquarelli Clivio (Professor, Department of Italian Studies); Gavin Nowlan (Student, University College), Jesse Chisolm-Beatson (Student, Trinity College) and Peng Yu (Student, New College).

Professor McGowan informed members that the Committee had a two-year mandate and aimed to work on three broad areas:

- Longitudinal numbers from 2009-10 and 2010-2011 cohorts, directly affected by the program fees, compared with 2007-08 and 2008-09 cohorts.
- Six specific streams within the Faculty of Arts and Science (ranging from Humanities to Commerce) in order to assess the effect of program fees on the variety of programs in which students were registered within the Faculty.
- Domestic fees and international fees, to identify any issues that may have arisen as a result of the implementation of the program fees.

4. Report of the President (cont'd)

(b) The Program Fee Monitoring Committee for the Faculty of Arts and Science. (cont'd)

Among the areas that the Committee would examine included questions pertaining to:

- student course loads at the beginning and end of the academic year;
- what effect, if any, course load has on the grade point average;
- the relationship between the program fee and accessibility, specifically looking at students with recorded permanent disabilities who were exempt from program fees;
- the effect of program fees, if any, on the question of whether students had transferred to the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) where course fees, rather than program fees, were applicable; and,
- qualitative studies based on the overall effect of program fees from information provided by the office of the registrars, e.g., changes in the patterns of course registration, the use of Math and Writing Centres, etc.

The Committee expected to report its preliminary findings to the Faculty of Arts and Science Council in fall 2010 and later at a future meeting of the Governing Council.

In the discussion that followed, Professor McGowan added that the Committee would examine data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) to obtain information on the effect of program fees on student participation in extra curricular activities on the and student experience. It was recognized that the Committee would be required to devise ways of canvassing students in the 2009-10 and 2010-11 cohorts about their University experience. The Committee also expected to look at quantitative data with respect to the students accessing financial aid and accessibility services.

A member thanked and commended the administration for the informative preliminary report.

(c) The Transitional Year Program

At the President's invitation, Professor Misak informed members that the Transitional Year Program (TYP) was a full-time access program for students who had been unable to complete secondary school due to financial problems, family difficulties, or other complicating circumstances. The normal length of the program was one year. However, as of 2000, a special two-year option was made available for students with disabilities. The TYP had a special focus on black and aboriginal students and was well-regarded in those and other communities.

The TYP provided students with the opportunity to qualify for admission to degree-level studies in the Faculty of Arts and Science. Students took specially-designed preparatory courses as well as one full Arts and Science credit. Those students who succeeded and were admitted to the Faculty of Arts and Science, received 2.5 credits in recognition of their TYP studies.

On average, the TYP graduated 71% of its students into the Faculty of Arts and Science and on average, 25% of its students had graduated with degrees. Students in the TYP were eligible for financial aid through the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP), grants from the University, and specially-endowed University funds. All TYP students received aid from at least one, usually two, and often three of these sources.

4. Report of the President (cont'd)

(c) The Transitional Year Program (cont'd)

In 2000, the TYP faculty complement had been 9.15 FTE (full time equivalent) and in 2009-2010 stood at 6.6. Professor Misak explained that the decline reflected changes in faculty category and compensation, not a budget reduction. In fact, the operating budget for the TYP started at \$824,000 in 1999-2000 and would be \$1.4 million in 2010-11.

The TYP was one of two access and bridging programs for the Faculty of Arts and Science. However, the Program had started as a provostial initiative and remained administered from the Provost's Office. A recommendation had been made for the TYP to officially become a part of the Faculty of Arts and Science. The first reason for the recommendation was academic. The Program was designed in way that allowed its students to move into the Faculty of Arts and Science. Therefore, it made academic sense to have the students, faculty members and the academic program more closely integrated with the students' eventual destination. The second reason had to do with the strengthened and improved student services available to students registered at the Faculty of Arts and Science. The Faculty of Arts and Science had an outstanding part-time access and bridging program: the Millie Rotman Shime Academic Bridging Program, which accepted 600 to 800 students annually. The Faculty of Arts and Science had a robust registrarial and academic advisory structure that was unavailable to small units like the TYP. If the specialized student services were pooled, it would improve services available to all students enrolled in bridging programs in the Faculty of Arts and Science. The idea was to have a coherent suite of Arts and Science bridging programs, each maintaining its own important identity and strengths. This would also serve as an effective fundraising initiative.

In the discussion that followed, Professor Misak noted that the length of time taken to complete a degree by students who had completed the TYP varied depending on their registration for part-time or full-time studies. Students registered in the TYP were required to pay program fees. The TYP brought in limited revenue and, therefore, the University Fund was presently its major source of funding. The Millie Rotman Shime Academic Bridging Program and TYP each attracted different constituencies. There was no intention to enhance, say, the Millie Rotman Shime Academic Bridging Program at the expense of the TYP or vice versa.

Awards and Honours

The President drew the attention of the members to three recipients of the prestigious Killam Research Fellowships in 2010 – Professor Eugenia Kumacheva (Chemistry), Professor Frank Kschischang (Electrical and Computer Engineering) and Professor Andreas Mandelis (Mechanical and Industrial Engineering). He also noted that Mr. Greg West, a governor and a doctoral candidate in Psychology, was one of two UTAA Graduate Scholars.

Concluding his report, the President thanked the Chancellor, governors, faculty and staff members, who had participated in the convocation ceremonies. He also acknowledged Professor Ian Orchard's contributions to the University; Professor Orchard was due to retire from his position as Vice-President and Principal, UTM. Professor Orchard was recognized by the Governors with a sustained round of applause.

5. Briefing on the Report of the Task Force on Governance

The Chair began by acknowledging the efforts of Dr. Rose Patten (Chair) and Professor Vivek Goel (Vice-Chair), and members of the Task Force on Governance for their efforts, as the Task Force neared the completion of its work. He advised members that even as the Report on the Task Force on Governance was being finalized, it was determined that a further few weeks were needed to refine its recommendations. In the Chair's opinion, this was a reasonable request, given the importance of the review. With this in mind, the Chair stated that he and the President had agreed on a modified approach that would permit the full and appropriate presentation of all aspects of the Task Force's work. The Task Force would formally submit its report to the Chair and President on June 28, 2010, in keeping with its original commitment to do so by the end of June 2010. Consultation sessions on the report would be held with the Board Chairs and Vice-Chairs in early September, and thereafter with the various estates of the Governing Council later in September. A Special Meeting of the Executive Committee would be held in early October, during which the report would be formally presented and considered in detail before being forwarded to the Governing Council. An information session for Governors would be held prior to the October Governing Council meeting. Finally, the report would be formally presented to the Governing Council at its meeting on October 28, 2010, and its recommendations would be considered for approval.

There was no further discussion on this item.

6. Items for Governing Council Approval

(a) *Policy on Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units*
(Arising from Report Number 168 of the Academic Board [June 2, 2010] - Item 6)

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs had provided a presentation at the Academic Board meeting on both the *Policy* and the draft University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP). The former required governance approval, while the latter had been provided for information. The proposed revisions to the *Policy* reflected recommendations from the Province's Quality Assurance Framework, as well as recommendations arising from the discussions which had occurred at two meetings of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

Among the highlights of Professor Regehr's presentation had been the following. The proposed approval process for undergraduate and graduate programs would include the following: an administrative review; broad consultation within the University and with external constituencies when appropriate; consideration by University governance bodies; submission to the Quality Council for approval; and approval by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities and accrediting bodies. The process for program closures would be unchanged, and such closures would be noted in an annual report to the Quality Council. Deans would become responsible for commissioning reviews of their divisions, and would have discretion to bundle multiple cyclical reviews of existing programs, if appropriate, for increased efficiency. If necessary, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs could request a one-year follow-up on programs where areas of concern had been identified during the reviews. In the case of significant problems or deficiencies, the Dean or the Vice-Provost would have the authority to halt admission to a program until there was evidence that the quality concerns had been addressed. Following discussion, the Academic Board had recommended approval of the *Policy*.

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

(a) Policy on Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units (cont'd)

During the discussion at the Executive Committee held on June 14, 2010, a member noted that questions had been raised during governance consideration of the Reviews of Academic Programs and Units in recent years, regarding the adequacy of follow-up mechanisms. He recommended that an additional protocol concerning follow-up audits be added to the list of protocols on page 2 of the cover memorandum. The Vice-President and Provost stated that follow-up was central to the new review process. Accountability for follow-up would reside within the University rather than with the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies. Such follow-up was a specific responsibility of the recently-created position of Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, and it included monitoring for reoccurrences of similar concerns within successive reviews.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed *Policy on Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units* be approved, replacing the *Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs and Units*, approved by the Governing Council on February 21, 2005, with effect immediately upon ratification of the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance. At that time, proposals for related governance Terms of Reference revisions will be brought forward to governance for consideration.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 168 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B".

6 Items for Governing Council Approval

(b) Policy on Endowed Chairs, Professorships, Lectureships and Programs: Revision (Arising from Report Number 168 of the Academic Board [June 2, 2010]- Item 7)

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that the *Policy on Endowed Chairs, Professorships, Lectureships and Programs* had last been amended in 1997. The Division of University Advancement and the Office of the Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life had reviewed the *Policy* and had identified sections that required updating. Among the proposed revisions to the *Policy* were the following:

- The inclusion of provisions for the establishment of limited term chairs, professorships, distinguished scholars, and program initiatives that would allow the use of expendable funds; amendments to the appointment and review process for endowed or limited term chairs and professorships.
- The replacement of stated minimum funding amounts with appropriate minimum thresholds that would be set and reviewed periodically based on the financial needs and advancement realities of the University.

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

(b) *Policy on Endowed Chairs, Professorships, Lectureships and Programs:* Revision (cont'd)

During discussion, the Board had been informed that while the *Policy* indicated that the appointment of a Chair was normally for a five-year term renewable once, most agreements with donors were open-ended with respect to the term of a Chair.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed *Policy on Endowed and Limited Term Chairs, Professorships, Distinguished Scholars and Program Initiatives* be approved, effective immediately, replacing the *Policy on Endowed Chairs, Professorships, Lectureships and Programs* which was approved by the Governing Council on February 10, 1997.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 168 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C".

(c) *Tribunal Selection Committee: Expanded Scope and Name Change*
(Arising from Report Number 168 of the Academic Board [June 2, 2010]- Item 8)

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that the proposal under consideration was for the creation of a nominating committee that would make recommendations for the appointment of both the Chairs of the University Tribunal and the Chairs of the Academic Appeals Committee. The goal was to establish a disciplined and transparent process that would ensure the recruitment and appointment of highly qualified individuals to serve in these important roles.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. That the following part of Section 3 of the Terms of Reference of the Agenda Committee:

the Agenda Committee is responsible for establishing the Tribunal Selection Committee which recommends the appointment of the Senior Chair, the Associate Chairs, and the co-chairs of the University Tribunal.

be revised to read

the Agenda Committee is responsible for establishing the Nominating Committee

for the University Tribunal and the Academic Appeals Committee, which recommends the appointment of the Senior Chair, the Associate Chairs, and the co-chairs of the University Tribunal, and the appointment of the Senior Chair and the Chairs of the Academic Appeals Committee.

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

(c) Tribunal Selection Committee: Expanded Scope and Name Change (cont'd)

2. That footnote 2, in Section 3 of the Terms of Reference of the Agenda Committee:

The Tribunal Selection Committee shall be composed of a teaching staff, a student and a lay member or former member of the Academic Board or Governing Council, and a President's designate, at least two of whom will have appropriate legal knowledge.

be revised to read

The Nominating Committee for the University Tribunal and Academic Appeals Committee shall be composed of a teaching staff, a student and a lay member or former member of the Academic Board or Governing Council, and a President's designate, at least two of whom will have appropriate legal knowledge.

3. That the following part of Section 5.2.6 (c) of the Terms of Reference of the Academic Board:

The Academic Board appoints the following: iii the Senior Chair, Associate Chairs and co-chairs of the University Tribunal, on the recommendation of the Tribunal Selection Committee.

be revised to read:

The Academic Board appoints the following: iii the Senior Chair, Associate Chairs and co-chairs of the University Tribunal, and the Senior Chair and Chairs of the Academic Appeals Committee, on the recommendation of the Nominating Committee for the University Tribunal and Academic Appeals Committee.

4. That footnote 5, in Section 5.2.6 (c) of the Terms of Reference of the Academic Board:

The Tribunal Selection Committee is established annually by the Agenda Committee.

be revised to read:

The Nominating Committee for the University Tribunal and Academic Appeals Committee is established annually by the Agenda Committee.

5. That these changes be reviewed by the Academic Board in the 2011-12 governance year.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 168 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D".

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

(d) Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report for an Oral Health Science Complex

(Arising from Report Number 168 of the Academic Board [June 2, 2010]-Item 9)

The Academic Board had been informed that this was a proposal for the creation of a new Oral Health Science Complex that would include modern facilities for classrooms and teaching labs, a clinical facility, facilities for the Dental Research Institute, and a Dental Museum. The intent of the proposal was to clarify the University's options and to determine how best to proceed, carefully exploring fundraising rather than financing avenues. The Project Planning Committee for the capital project had determined that 19,600 net assignable square metres (nasm) would be required to accommodate such a complex, and it had considered three options.

The first option was to renovate the existing building which housed the Faculty of Dentistry at 124 Edward Street. The building was in poor condition, and even with extensive renovation and construction of an addition, there would still be insufficient space to accommodate all of the planned facilities. The Project Planning Committee had therefore determined that the outcome of such an approach would be sub-optimal, and costing for the option had not been carried out.

The second option was to construct a new building at 88-112 College Street, known as Site 14. Though Site 14 was well situated in the health science precinct, the approximate total cost of \$325 million to construct a new building at that location was judged to be too great, and the option had not been recommended.

The final option was to purchase and renovate an existing building within the vicinity of the campus. The estimated cost to modify a building to meet the needs of the Faculty was \$165 million. Acquisition costs would be in addition to that amount; however, the operating costs would be less than those for a newly constructed building. Following discussion of the three options that had been considered, the funding sources for the proposed project, and the nature of the Dental Museum, the Board had recommended approval of the proposal.

A member expressed his surprise that the membership of the Project Planning Committee did not include anyone from outside the Faculty of Dentistry. Professor Lemieux-Charles responded that the Faculty of Dentistry was part of the health professions grouping at the University and worked collaboratively with other faculties and the teaching hospitals. In addition, the Faculty operated a dental health clinic and collaborated with the Dalla Lana School of Public Health. The document presented was focused on a new building and did not look at the Faculty's extensive collaborative and inter-disciplinary activities. A member commented that the Faculty of Dentistry had been in its current location since 1959, a location that had no attachment to the University. In his opinion, it was important to raise funds to enable the Faculty to move closer to the St. George campus.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Interim Project Planning Report for an Oral Health Science Complex, dated April 26, 2010, be approved in principle to accommodate the activities and functions described and to facilitate the necessary fundraising related to the proposed project.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 168 of the Academic Board as Appendix "E".

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

(e) Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Relocation of the Department of Family and Community Medicine

(Arising from Report Number 168 of the Academic Board [June 2, 2010]-Item 10)

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that the proposal recommended the relocation of the Department of Family and Community Medicine from 263 McCaul Street to 500 University Avenue. There had been rapid growth in the programs offered by the Department, and in 2008 it had been temporarily assigned additional space in the Banting Building. The total space requirement for the Department was approximately 1,260 nasm. 500 University Avenue had been identified as the most appropriate location because the required space was available there, and because the current occupants were the Faculty of Medicine's rehabilitation sciences departments. Were the project approved, space at 263 McCaul Street would not be released. A small portion of the Department's activity would remain there, and the remainder of the space would be used by the Faculty of Medicine. The estimated total project cost was \$3,500,000, with \$3,000,000 to be funded by the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care, and \$500,000 to be provided by the Department. No questions had been asked by members of the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the Project Planning Committee Report for the relocation of the Department of Family and Community Medicine to 500 University Avenue, dated April 15, 2010, be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope as identified in the Project Planning Report be approved at a Total Project Cost of \$3,500,000 with funding as follows:

Ministry of Health – Long Term Care:	\$3,000,000
Department of Family and Community Medicine	\$ 500,000

Documentation is attached to Report Number 168 of the Academic Board as Appendix "F".

(f) Faculty of Medicine: Proposal to Establish the Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (DCCBR) as an Extra-Departmental Unit:A

(Arising from Report Number 168 of the Academic Board [June 2, 2010]- Item 11)

The Academic Board had been informed that the Faculty of Medicine was proposing the establishment of the Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research as an Extra-Departmental Unit:A (EDU:A). This designation would allow the Centre to have primary faculty appointments and to offer programs. This step had been recommended by an external review in 2009 as a means of strengthening an already world-class teaching and research unit. Following consultations, agreements had been revised to establish the Faculties of Medicine and Applied Science and Engineering as primary partners, and the Faculties of Arts and Science and Pharmacy as associate partners of the Centre. The Director of the DCCBR would report to the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, and would be supported by an executive committee representing all of the partner faculties. Agreements had been reached on all funding responsibilities, and there would be no impact on the University's central budget. The proposal had been approved by the Faculty of Medicine's Council in March 2010. At the Academic Board meeting, a member had asked whether

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

(f) Faculty of Medicine: Proposal to Establish the Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (DCCBR) as an Extra-Departmental Unit:A (cont'd)

there were plans to hire faculty if the proposal were approved. The Dean of the Faculty of Medicine had explained that a core teaching staff already existed within the Centre. Faculty had been hired for the Centre since its inception and had been granted tenure in the Banting and Best Department of Medical Research.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (DCCBR) be established as an Extra-Departmental Unit:A (EDU:A) teaching and research entity, effective July 1, 2010.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 168 of the Academic Board as Appendix "G".

(g) Faculty of Law and School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Global Professional Master of Laws (G.P.L.L.M.) Program

(Arising from Report Number 168 of the Academic Board [June 2, 2010]- Item 12)

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that this was a proposal for the establishment of an innovative graduate program for practicing legal professionals who represented companies and institutions that conducted business across national borders. Students would be expected to develop a broad international perspective and a high-level understanding of international laws, legal issues, and institutions. The proposed program would be offered over three consecutive academic sessions, requiring one calendar year for completion. Courses would be held in the evenings and on weekends to enable students to maintain their work commitments. The program's academic requirements and rigour would be consistent with both the Faculty of Law's other master's-level programs and with professional master's level programs offered elsewhere in the University. The Planning and Budget Office had reviewed the proposal and was working towards final approval of the tuition fees with the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities. The resources required to offer the program would be provided by a combination of tuition fees and Basic Income Unit (BIU) revenue generated by student enrolment. It was expected that the program would be self-funded within the first two years and would not need to draw on central University resources.

In response to a question, Professor Misak noted that the graduates of the program would specialize in the practice of global international law.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed Global Professional Master of Laws (G.P.L.L.M.) program, as described in the proposal from the Faculty of Law dated April 12, 2010, be approved, with enrolment commencing in September, 2011.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 168 of the Academic Board as Appendix "H".

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(h) Audited Financial Statements for the Fiscal Year Ended April 30, 2010**
(Arising from Report Number 182 of the Business Board [June 17, 2010]- Item 2)

Mr. Nunn reported that the Audit Committee had reviewed the financial statements at two meetings, with the external auditors in attendance at both. The Committee had concluded that the statements provided a full and fair disclosure of the University's finances. The Business Board had also received a substantial presentation on the statements and had recommended them to the Governing Council for approval. Mr. Nunn highlighted five items from the financial statements:

- The University's bottom line for 2009-10, a year of relatively good returns on the investment markets, had been a small net income of \$45.4-million.
- In the operating fund alone, there had been a substantial reduction from the anticipated cumulative deficit of \$50.5 million to \$2.1 million. This was a result of timely year-end grants received from the Government of Ontario. However, given the revenue projections and the spending allocations in the 2010-11 budget, the deficit reduction program would have to continue at a rate of \$11 million per year.
- At the 2007 year-end, the University's endowment had been the beneficiary of a substantial level of reserves that provided inflation protection and allowed for fluctuations in market returns. In the meltdown in 2008-09, the reserves absorbed the majority of the losses incurred during that year. Nevertheless, the value of the endowment was reduced to an amount close to the original contributions to the endowment. In 2009-10, the markets were considerably stronger and the endowment pool had earned a positive return of almost 15%. The outcome was an encouraging start on the endowment recovering its value as it grew from \$1.29 billion to \$1.44 billion. That was a result of: donations and grants of almost \$24 million; transfers into the endowment; and investment returns of \$126 million, after \$63 million payout to the various purposes supported by endowed funds. The reserve for the preservation of capital (against the effects of inflation and market fluctuations) was re-established at a value of \$124.5 million. However, that still fell \$192 million short of restoring the endowment pool to its inflation-adjusted value. It was expected that more time and prudent investment would be required to restore the full inflation protection and to build up the reserve to cope with future market fluctuations. Additionally, some individual endowed funds, established when the market values were high, remained low even when compared to their original contributed value.
- External borrowing at the year-end had amounted to \$525.9 million. The University's maximum external borrowing capacity, as defined in the Borrowing Strategy, was 40% of net assets smoothed over the previous five years. The Strategy also permitted up to \$200 million of internal borrowing, from the University's Expendable Funds Investment Pool. The maximum external borrowing (including the net assets recorded in the last financial statements) was \$771.5 million. The Governing Council had approved a further tranche of borrowing amounting to \$200 million, which would bring the total external borrowing to \$726 million. The borrowing amounted to 27% of the net assets smoothed over five years. The addition of the \$200 million tranche would lead to borrowing amounting to 38% of the smoothed net assets – still within the 40% limit set out in the Borrowing Strategy.

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

(h) Audited Financial Statements for the Fiscal Year Ended April 30, 2010 (cont'd)

- The financial statements did not show the University's liabilities were close to \$1 billion for employee future benefits that had been earned but not as yet brought into the financial statements. This was being done gradually over time. There were also obligations to perform deferred or pending maintenance amounting to an estimated \$380 million. It was noted at the Business Board that there were also assets not fully valued in the financial statements, prepared according to the required accounting principles. Land and buildings were valued at their cost minus building depreciation. Those assets were probably more than \$2 billion more valuable than shown in financial statements. However, the obligations represented real costs that would have to be met at some point, and the University had no plans to sell land or building to meet those costs.

A member asked a whether the debentures shown in the statement between 2030-46 were extendable at any time. Ms Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs, replied that this was not the case.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the University of Toronto audited financial statements for the fiscal year ended April 30, 2010 be approved.

(i) External Auditors: Appointment for 2010-11

(Arising from Report Number 182 of the Business Board [June 17, 2010]- Item 3)

Mr. Nunn reported that the Audit Committee and the Business Board had recommended the re-appointment of Ernst & Young as external auditors for both the University and its pension plans. The auditors attended all meetings of the Audit Committee, and the Committee was satisfied that they were performing well. Ernst & Young had been the University's auditors for many years, but the partner in charge of the audit had been rotated on a regular basis to ensure independence. There had been a substantial discussion of this issue at both the Audit Committee and the Business Board, but both bodies had concluded that engaging auditors with a thorough knowledge of the complexity of the University represented, on balance, the best course of action.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

- 1) THAT Ernst & Young LLP be re-appointed as external auditors of the University of Toronto for the fiscal year ending April 30, 2011; and
- 2) THAT Ernst & Young LLP be re-appointed as external auditors of the University of Toronto pension plans for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2011.

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

(j) Business Board Terms of Reference: Revisions

(Arising from Report Number 182 of the Business Board [June 17, 2010]- Item 8)

Mr. Nunn reported that the proposal was one part of a package to revise the governance and oversight of University and pension-fund investments. The overall objective was to transfer that responsibility from the independent expert University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation (UTAM) Board back into the University. A new and smaller UTAM Board would be responsible for matters of governance of the UTAM corporation. That Board would consist of four *ex officio* members (the President of the University; the Vice-President, Business Affairs; the Chief Financial Officer; and the President of UTAM) plus a representative of the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA), the last position having been mandated by an arbitration award. A new, expert advisory committee would provide advice to the University on investment matters.

This was the first of two proposals; the second would recommend the establishment of a Pension Committee for governance and oversight of the pension fund. The establishment of a Pension Committee had also been mandated by the award of the arbitrator following discussions with UTFA. Mr. Nunn noted that, as was the case with any Governing Council Committee having authority to make decisions on behalf of the Council, the majority of the Pension Committee members would be members of Council. The University was currently in discussions with UTFA and the unions about the terms of reference for the Pension Committee. The second proposal would include further amendments to the terms of reference of the Business Board to take into account the role of the Pension Committee. It would also include amendments to the terms of reference of the Audit Committee.

Under these new arrangements, the Business Board would review and consider for approval the return targets and risk tolerances for the University funds, including the endowment funds. Those targets involved the fundamental trade-off between seeking the best possible return and seeking the greatest possible safety for the funds. The Business Board would then also review from time to time the asset mix to be used for the University funds and the pension fund. Approval of that asset mix would be within the authority of the President of the University for University funds and the proposed Pension Committee for the pension fund. The President and the Pension Committee would also be responsible for oversight of investment strategy for the two funds. Mr. Nunn reiterated that the overall objective was to bring responsibility and accountability for investment matters back into the University. He added that many of the required changes had been approved by the UTAM Board and by the Business Board, subject to Governing Council approval.

The specific matter under consideration that was being recommended for Governing Council approval was the first phase of the changes to the Business Board terms of reference: These changes would: (1) make the Board responsible for the establishment of return targets and risk tolerance for the University funds; (2) make the Board responsible for the review but not approval of the asset allocation for University funds and pension funds; and (3) make the President and his administration (with the advice of the expert Investment Advisory Committee) responsible for the asset allocation for the University funds and for review of the asset allocation for the pension fund.

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

(j) Business Board Terms of Reference: Revisions (cont'd)

Mr. Nunn added that one of the questions that had arisen in discussion at the Business Board meeting had been the extent to which investment decision-making could legally be delegated to UTAM. The Vice-President, Business Affairs had arranged for the matter to be reviewed by the University's senior legal counsel, who had consulted expert external counsel. The Business Board had been assured that the proposal was appropriate under the *University of Toronto Act*, the *Trustee Act* and the *Pension Benefits Act*.

In the discussion that followed, a member commented on the increasing importance on the ability to vary asset allocation. With regard to the timelines of the establishment of the Pensions Committee, Ms Riggall said that the next meeting with the arbitrator and the Faculty Association was scheduled for September 8, 2010. Changes to the terms of reference of the Business Board and the Audit Committee would be required. These and the terms of reference for the Pension Committee would have to be approved at the Governing Council. At least nine or ten members of the Governing Council would be needed for the Pension Committee. It was hoped that the Committee's term of membership would be finalized during the 2010-11 academic year but the timing would be affected by consultation with employee group.

A member sought further information on the composition of the Pensions Committee. Ms Riggall stated the composition of the Pensions Committee, as awarded by the arbitrator, was to include nine members of the Governing Council, three members of UTFA, one retiree member of UTFA and three representatives of other employee groups. The University had been in discussion with representatives of the unions to decide on representation of the employee groups. In addition, the University had over one thousand non-unionized employees who should be represented on the Committee. If the size of the Committee would be greater than sixteen, it would allow for the unionized staff to have three members and have an additional member to represent non-unionized staff. This would then entail adding an additional member from the Governing Council as the By-Law required that the majority of the Committee be composed of members of the Governing Council.

In closing, the Chair acknowledged the efforts of the administration and commended the Vice-President, Business Affairs, the Chief Financial Officer and her team in preparing and presenting the financial statements in such a timely fashion.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed amendments to section 5.1 of the Business Board Terms of Reference (Financial Policy and Transactions), shown in Attachment 1 to Ms Riggall's memorandum of May 14, 2010, be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 182 of the Business Board as Appendix "C".

7. Summer Executive Authority

The Chair reminded members that each June, the Governing Council was asked to delegate to the President the authority to take any actions necessary on its behalf during the summer months. Proposals for approval were normally discussed with, and had the support of, the relevant Board or Committee Chair, or, in the Chair's absence, the Vice-Chair. Supporting documentation was reviewed by the Chair of the Governing Council, who then countersigned the individual authorizations. In the fall, a report on approvals under Summer Executive Authority was made to each Board. Items which were not regarded as urgent were held for consideration in the usual manner in the fall.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. THAT until the next regular meeting of the Governing Council or its appropriate committee or board, authority be granted to the President for:
 - (i) appointments to categories 2¹ 3² and 5³ of the *Policy on Appointments and Remuneration* approved by the Governing Council of the University of Toronto, dated May 30, 2007;⁴
 - (ii) approval of such additional curriculum changes as may arise for the summer and September 2009; and
 - (iii) decisions on other matters the urgency of which does not permit their deferral until the next regular meeting of the Governing Council or its appropriate standing committee or board.
2. THAT all actions taken under this authority be approved by the Chair of the Governing Council prior to implementation and reported to the appropriate committee or board for information.

8. Reports for Information

The Governing Council received items for information in the following three reports:

- (a) Report Number 168 of the Academic Board (June 2, 2010)
- (b) Report Number 158 of the University Affairs Board (June 1, 2010)
- (c) Report Number 431 of the Executive Committee (June 14, 2010)

¹ Category 2 includes the positions of Vice-President, Secretary of the Governing Council, and University Ombudsperson, which are subject to the approval of the Governing Council.

² Category 3 includes the positions of Deputy Provost, Associate and Vice-Provosts, Chief Financial Officer, Senior Legal Counsel and Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council, which are subject to the approval of the Executive Committee, and are reported for information to the Governing Council.

³ Category 5 includes the head of Internal Audit (approved by the Business Board) and the Warden of Hart House (approved by the University Affairs Board).

⁴ Approval of Academic Administrative Appointments until the next regular meeting of the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board shall be approved by electronic ballot and shall require the response of at least five members of the Agenda Committee.

9. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next meeting of the Governing Council and the Orientation Session for members was scheduled for Wednesday, September 8, 2010. Details would follow closer to the date.

10. Question Period

A member said that, in her opinion, the scheduled closure of the St. George campus during the week of the G20 summit was an affront to academic freedom and that the University had an obligation to remain open as a public space. She expressed her concern about the shorter examination period that resulted from the campus closure. The member said the issue of the rescheduling of exams had not been addressed in a satisfactory manner by the University and that students had other work commitments. In this regard, the member highlighted the concerns of students registered with Accessibility Services. The member then asked about the staff members who were required to report for work during the campus closure and whether they would not be entitled to time off in lieu of those days. Casual staff would not receive any compensation due to the University closure for circumstances beyond their control. The member sought reassurance from the administration that any student, staff or faculty member required to be on campus during the closure would not be harassed, intimidated or criminalized by the police. Another member commented that the rationale of the closure had not properly been communicated to the faculty and staff.

In response, Professor Misak informed the Council that her office had not received any complaints related to the deferral of exams and noted that the University would look into communication with faculty and staff to clarify any ambiguities. The President disagreed with the member's view that the closure of the campus for two working days was an affront to academic freedom. He added that members of the University's community had the freedom to express their opinion on the G20 summit in any manner that they wished appropriate. The President cited the case of the University of Pittsburgh where violent confrontations had occurred during a previous summit. He added that it would not have been prudent to have kept a campus open alongside a designated protest area for the summit. Extensive efforts had made with regard to accommodating students with deferred exams, and also those in residence. He acknowledged the contribution of Student Services in this regard. Many members of staff continued to work from their homes during the closure. The President acknowledged the temporary disruption of the income stream for casual staff, but that any loss of opportunities for casual staff could be mitigated as the relevant work would remain to be done once the University reopened. He added that it would be untenable to guarantee an income stream for casual staff in advance. The University would continue with its efforts to be fair and reasonable employer.

A member requested that data pertaining to suicide rates at the University be tracked, analyzed and reported. The member said that he had researched this topic for some of the University's peer institutions like the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and the University of Michigan. Suicide rates at institutions varied in relation to factors including gender and year of study among others. It was important to verify the effectiveness of the University's efforts in the prevention of suicide. Related to his query, the member stated that there was a six-week wait for students who needed to have access to Counselling and Psychiatric Services (CAPS) at the University. The member expressed his concern that Psychiatric Services had set the consultation limit to twenty hours for each student, whereas the limit had been thirty-five hours five year earlier. Once students reached the set limit, they were referred to doctors outside of the University environment. This was inconvenient for students because external doctors were not necessarily familiar with the bureaucratic expectations of

10. Question Period (cont'd)

the institution for the purposes of accommodation. The Ontario Health Insurance Plan (OHIP) covered the cost of psychiatric consultation but, in the member's view, the University needed to prioritize its efforts to provide additional space to CAPS.

Professor Misak replied, stating that the issue of suicide was vitally important to the University. The University had been engaged in a major reorganization of Student Services in the previous twelve months. A full report on the initiatives taken in this regard would be presented to the Governing Council at a later meeting. A member stated that experienced registrarial staff provided much-needed support to faculty members who had to deal with students needing assistance with mental issues.

11. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

12. Closing Remarks

The Chair thanked all members of the Governing Council, as well as its Boards and Committees, for their generous contribution of time and effort to the important work of governing the University over the past year. The Chair extended particular thanks to those members of the Council who were completing their terms on June 30th.

Andrew Agnew-Iller

Mr. Agnew-Iller had served a one-year term on the Governing Council as a full-time undergraduate representative. He was a thoughtful and well-prepared member of the Academics Appeal Committee and the Business Board. The Chair thanked Mr. Agnew-Iller and wished him luck in the next phase of his academic career.

Ryan Campbell

Ryan Campbell was completing an impressive third term as a full-time undergraduate member of the Governing Council. During that time he had served extensively on the following Boards and Committees: Planning and Budget, Academic Policy and Programs, Academic Appeals, the Discipline Appeals Board, the Academic Board, as well as the Executive Committee. Always an engaged member, his thoughtful comments and questions had clearly articulated the student perspective on issues, while also bearing in mind the broader, longer-term interests of the University.

Claude Davis

Dr. Davis was completing the maximum nine years as a Government Appointee on the Council, during which time he had taken on a number of key leadership roles. He had served on all three Boards, and his eight years on the University Affairs Board included one year as Vice-Chair, and three as an outstanding UAB Chair. In the latter role, he was also a regular attendee at meetings of the Executive Committee where his interventions were constructive and insightful. Dr. Davis's good judgment and thoughtful approach to matters had made him a particularly valuable member of both the Committee to Review the Office of the Ombudsperson, as well as the Task Force on Governance. The Chair thanked Dr. Davis for his exemplary service and noted that his presence would be missed.

12. Closing Remarks (cont'd)

Ken Davy

Mr. Davy had been a dedicated member of Governing Council for the past three years. As a representative of the University's part-time undergraduate students, he had always carefully evaluated issues under consideration and expressed his views. His diligence in serving on a range of governance bodies over the years and in 2010-11 was especially appreciated given his many other commitments including part-time studies, family, and running a business. While thanking Mr. Davy for his ongoing support, the Chair extended his encouragement to Mr. Davy's as he progressed towards the completion of his undergraduate program.

Adam Heller

Mr. Heller had completed a one-year term as a full-time undergraduate professional faculty student representative on the Council. He had served on the Academic Appeals Committee, the Academic Board and the University Affairs Board. The Chair wished Mr. Heller the very best for his academic pursuits.

Min Hee (Margaret) Kim

Ms Kim, a full-time undergraduate student in the Faculty of Arts and Science, had completed a one-year term on the Governing Council. She had been a committed and engaged member of the Committee on Academic Policy & Programs, the Academic Appeals Committee and the Academic Board. Her probing questions, encouraging comments, and gracious demeanour would be missed on the Council. On a positive note, Ms Kim would continue to serve governance in 2010-11 as a co-opted student member of a number of the bodies on which she served during 2009-2010.

Joel Kirsh

Dr. Kirsh was completing six years of dedicated service as an elected teaching staff member of the Governing Council. During that time he had served on all three Boards as well as on the Academic Appeals Committee, and he was recently appointed as a member of both the University Tribunal and the Discipline Appeals Board for 2010-2011. To each of these bodies he had made a valuable contribution, always providing carefully reasoned interventions during their deliberations. In his day job, Dr. Kirsh was a Professor of Pediatrics in the Faculty of Medicine, and a Pediatric Cardiologist at the Hospital for Sick Children.

Ron Kluger

Professor Kluger had served as a member of the Governing Council for three years. During that period, he had been an active and highly engaged participant, seeking additional information when necessary in order to make informed decisions. As a member of the Elections Committee and the Academic Appeals Committee, Professor Kluger had regularly made himself available in order to hear many difficult cases, often on fairly short notice. The Chair commented that Professor Kluger's lively observations and comments during discussions would be missed.

12. Closing Remarks (cont'd)

Stefan Larson

Stefan Larson served for three years as an alumnus member of the Council. Reflecting his academic background (a PhD in Biophysics from Stanford) and his business pursuits, he had taken an interest in both the academic and administrative sides of governance, serving on the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and also on the Business Board. Outside of governance, his advice on various governance matters was extremely helpful. While wishing him well in his future work, the Chair expressed his hope that Dr. Larson would continue to be connected to his the University - his alma mater.

Geoffrey Matus

Geoffrey Matus had served on the Governing Council since 2005, bringing with him his expertise in law and investments and his extensive record of service as a director –including as a director of several public-sector organizations: the Canadian Opera Company, the Mount Sinai Hospital and the Baycrest Centre. Mr. Matus had been a member of the Business Board throughout his service on the Governing Council, and he had been Vice-Chair of that Board for the past three years. His contributions to the work of that Board had been many. They included the proposal of its existing practice of grouping its agenda items around a central theme for each meeting to enable the Board to consider those matters more thoroughly and deeply when they appeared. Mr. Matus had been serving as the Chair of the Interim Board of UTAM – the University’s asset management corporation – while the new arrangements for governance and oversight of investments were being considered, and it was hoped, said the Chair, that he would continue to contribute his expertise in that area.

Ian Orchard

Ian Orchard, Vice-President of the University and Principal of the University of Toronto, Mississauga, had served as one of the two Presidential Appointees on the Governing Council for three years. That service, however, only represented Professor Orchard’s most recent contribution to Governance at the University. The Chair reminded members that Professor Orchard had served as Vice-Provost, Students before taking up his role at U.T.M. In that capacity, he was senior assessor to, and guiding light of, the University Affairs Board. He also served at that time as an assessor to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

Doug Reeve

Professor Reeve had been a teaching staff member of the Governing Council since 2007-08. For three years Professor Reeve had served on the Committee for Honorary Degrees, the Academic Board, and two of its standing committees – the Agenda Committee and the Academic Appeals Committee. All of this while chairing the Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry Department. Professor Reeve’s insight and advice had been most beneficial to the Council.

12. Closing Remarks (cont'd)

Stephen Smith

Mr. Stephen Smith had been an alumnus member of the Governing Council for six years. He had brought to his service on the Governing Council his years of experience as a senior member of the legal community, as a member of the investment community and as a leader in the voluntary sector – Mr. Smith was a past-Chair of the Board of the Orthopedic and Arthritic Hospital. He had served on the Business Board and the Planning and Budget Committee. He had taken on other assignments as well: member of the Senior Appointments and Compensation Committee and member of the Task Force on Governance. He had, throughout his membership of the Governing Council, served on the Elections Committee and since 2006 served as its Chair – a very important assignment that took full advantage of his legal skills and general good judgement.

Alice Dong

Dr. Alice Dong, Vice-Chair, had been a member of the Governing Council for nine years. Dr. Dong was a physician who had for many years been a consultant in the area of occupational medicine. The Vice-Chair of Council was an ex officio member of all of the Boards and standing committees. Nevertheless, at various stages of her service on Council, Dr. Dong had also served on the Academic Appeals Committee, the Committee for Honorary Degrees, the Senior Appointments and Compensation Committee, and the Elections Committee as well as the Business Board. The Vice-Chair of the Governing Council had many other roles. These included, for example, presenting proposals on behalf of the Executive Committee. However, there were many roles that members did not see: providing advice in the meetings of the Chair, the Vice-Chair and the President that preceded many of the meetings of the Governing Council and the Executive Committee. The Chair said that Dr. Dong's advice and good judgement had been respected and appreciated. During 2009-2010, she had chaired the Committee to Review the Office of the University Ombudsman – a committee that did its work very efficiently and produced a report that was broadly accepted. The Governing Council was very grateful for Dr. Dong's quiet but effective leadership.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 38 AND 40 OF BY LAW NUMBER 2, ITEM 13 TO 15 WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN-CAMERA*.

13. *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 June 15, 2010 for June 24, 2010, be confirmed.

14. *Committee for Honorary Degrees: Membership*

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposal for membership on the Committee for Honorary Degrees, 2009-2010, as recommended by the Academic Board and outlined in the memorandum from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated June 16, 2009, be approved.

Administrative Staff

Mrs. Bonnie Horne, Librarian

Lay Members

Mr. Harvey Botting

Mr. Geoff Matus

Mr. Thomas Rahilly

Students

Mr. Grant Gonzales (full-time undergraduate student, Faculty of Arts and Science)

Ms Jemy Joseph (graduate student, Institute of Medical Science)

Teaching Staff

Professor Gary Crawford, UTM (Department of Anthropology)

Professor Miriam Diamond, Faculty of Arts and Science (Department of Geography)

Professor Thomas Keymer, Faculty of Arts and Science (Department of English)

Professor Elizabeth Smyth, OISE/UT (Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning)

15. Senior Appointment

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT Ms Catherine Riggall's appointment as Vice-President, Business Affairs ending June 30, 2010, be extended to December 31, 2011, with a possible further extension of up to six months at the discretion of the President, subject to the approval of the terms and conditions of the appointment by the Senior Appointments and Compensation Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

August 23, 2010