

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 169 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

October 7, 2010

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, October 7, 2010 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles, Chair	Professor Christopher Damaren	Professor Angelo Melino
Professor David Naylor, President	Professor Karen Davis	Professor Matthew Mitchell
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost	Mr. Ken Davy	Mr. Liam Mitchell
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost, Academic Operations	Professor Joseph Desloges	Professor David Mock
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost Academic Programs	Ms Caroline Di Giovanni	Ms Carole Moore
Professor Varouj Aivazian	Professor Suzanne Erb	Professor Carol Moukheiber
Professor Catherine Amara	Professor Meric Gertler	Professor Amy Mullin
Professor Cristina Amon	Professor Robert Gibbs	Professor Linda Northrup
Professor Dwayne Barber	Professor Avrum Gotlieb	Mr. Jeff Peters
Mr. Justin Basinger	Professor Rick Halpern	Mr. Shakir Rahim
Mr. Hanif Bayat-Movahed	Ms Emily Holland	Dr. Susan Rappolt
Professor Ronald Beiner	Mrs. Bonnie Horne	Professor Jeffrey Rosenthal
Ms Patricia Bellamy	Ms Cathy Hughes	Professor Lock Rowe
Professor Katherine Berg	Professor Ira Jacobs	Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Ms Annie Claire Bergeron-Oliver	Ms Jemy Joseph	Miss Priatharsini Sivananthajothy
Professor Parth Bhatt	Professor Alison Keith	Ms Helen Slade
Professor Phil Byer	Ms Min Hee (Margaret) Kim	Professor Richard Sommer
Professor Will Cluett	Professor Christina Kramer	Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth
Professor David Cook	Mr. Kent Kuran	Ms Lynn Snowden
Professor Alister Cumming	Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk	Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Gerald Cupchik	Professor Jim Lai	Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Professor Gabriele D'Eleuterio	Ms Cecilia Livingston	Professor Romin Tafarodi
	Professor Michael Luke	Mr. Daniel Taranovsky
	Professor Heather MacNeil	Professor Wendy Ward
	Professor Henry Mann	Mr. Gregory West
	Dr. Thomas Mathien	Mr. Dickson Yang
	Professor Douglas McDougall	

Regrets:

Professor Derek Allen	Professor Charles Deber	Professor Sioban Nelson
Professor Maydianne Andrade	Professor Miriam Diamond	Professor Julia O'Sullivan
Professor Jan Angus	Professor Darryl Edwards	Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Jan Barnsley	Mr. John A. Fraser	Professor Ito Peng
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin	Professor Alan Galey	Ms Judith Poë
Professor Denise Belsham	Professor Russell Hartenberger	Professor Ato Quayson
Ms Marilyn Booth	Professor Ellen Hodnett	Professor Yves Roberge
Professor Terry Carleton	Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard	Professor Seamus Ross
Professor Sujit Choudhry	Dr. Nancy Kreiger	Professor Sandy Smith
Professor Brian Corman	Mr. Rishi Maharaj	Professor Richard Sommer
Professor Elizabeth Cowper	Professor Roger L. Martin	Dr. Roslyn Thomas-Long
Mr. Tyler Currie	Professor Mark McGowan	Professor Njoki Wane
Mr. Shaun Datt	Professor Faye Mishna	Dr. Donald A. Wasylenki
	Professor Mayo Moran	Professor Catharine Whiteside
	Professor Michelle Murphy	Professor Charmaine Williams

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity	Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
---	--

Secretariat:

Ms Mae-Yu Tan

In Attendance:	Dr. Anthony Gray, Special	Ms Gillian Morrisan, Assistant
Ms Joeita Gupta, member of the	Advisor to the President	Vice-President, Divisional
Governing Council	Professor Peter Lewis, Assistant	Relations and Campaign
Mr. Steve Bailey, Director,	Vice-President, Research	Mr. Gavin Nowlan, President of
Office of Space Management	Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal	the Arts and Science
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office	Counsel, Office of the	Students' Union
of the Vice-Provost, Students	President	

In this report, item 7 is recommended to the Governing Council for approval. The remaining items are reported for information.

1. Welcome and Orientation

The Chair welcomed new and continuing members to the first meeting of the Academic Board for 2010-2011. She introduced Professor Varouj Aivazian, the Vice-Chair of the Board; and Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost and the Board's senior assessor. The Chair noted that the President, who was in attendance, was a voting member of the Board. Professor Misak introduced the voting and non-voting assessors who were present. The Chair then introduced the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak and Professor Doug McDougall, and the Chair of the Planning and Budget Committee, Dr. Avrum Gotlieb. She noted that the Vice-Chair of the Planning and Budget Committee was Professor Miriam Diamond, and the Senior Chair of the Academic Appeals Committee was Ms Kate Hilton. The Chair encouraged members to make an effort to get to know some of their colleagues who also served on the Board.

Governance Structure

The Chair said that, in considering the role of the Academic Board, it was helpful to understand the structure of the University's central governance. She explained that the Governing Council, which was established by the University of Toronto Act, 1971, was the governing body that oversaw the academic, business, and student affairs of the University. Governing Council was composed of fifty elected and appointed members from administrative staff, alumni, government appointee, student, and teaching staff constituencies. The Council had three Boards that reported to it: the Business Board, the University Affairs Board, and the Academic Board, and Governing Council members were appointed to serve on each of the three Boards, together with non-Governing Council members.

The Chair stated that the Academic Board was the largest of the Governing Council's Boards and Committees, with 122 members. Like the Governing Council, the Board was also composed of elected and appointed members from the administrative staff, alumni, government appointee, student, and teaching staff constituencies. Its membership was designed to represent the academic diversity of the University, with each academic division being represented by its head and at least one elected member of its teaching staff.

1. Welcome and Orientation (cont'd)

The Role of the Standing Committees of the Board

The Chair said that the Academic Board had four standing Committees: the Agenda Committee, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, the Planning and Budget Committee, and the Academic Appeals Committee, and members of both the Academic Board and the Governing Council served as members on the committees. She noted that the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Academic Board served as Chair and Vice-Chair of the Agenda Committee. The majority of “items for approval” that required the Board’s consideration came from the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Planning and Budget Committee. Examples of such items from the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs included the establishment of new academic programs, amendments to University-wide policy in academic matters, and policy on research. Examples of approval items from the Planning and Budget Committee included the University operating budget and guidelines, capital projects, and enrolment plans and policies. When items for approval were forwarded to the Board by either of the two committees, the Committee Chair presented the recommendation to the Board, highlighting the key points of the discussion that occurred at the Committee meeting. The Board was then normally asked to make a recommendation for approval of the proposal to the Governing Council. In general, the Board did not have final authority to approve proposals, because it was not composed of a majority of Governing Council members – a requirement contained in the *University of Toronto Act*.

The Chair stated that the standing committees thoroughly discussed every item for approval, and that discussion was recorded in the Committee minutes. She encouraged members to read the minutes, which were distributed to Board members in advance of the Board meeting, in order to gain an understanding of the relevant issues and questions that were raised at the Committee level. The Chair said that members of the Board were welcome to attend meetings of the standing committees; the meeting schedules were available from the website of the Office of the Governing Council. It was most effective for members to raise issues on matters under consideration at the level of governance at which they were first introduced, rather than later in the governance process. Members could submit to the Board or Committee Secretary in advance of a meeting, questions that they wished to raise at a meeting, so that the administration had an opportunity to obtain any necessary information in order to be able to respond fully to the question at the meeting. The Chair emphasized that this did not mean that questions could not be raised at the meeting if they had not been submitted in advance. She stated that questions were most welcome, and she encouraged members to participate freely in discussion of items at Board meetings.

Academic Board Procedures

The Chair noted that, in addition to items for approval brought forward from the standing committees, on occasion, items for approval were brought forward directly to the Academic Board. Such matters included amendments to divisional constitutions, policies on the nature of academic employment, policies and procedures with respect to academic discipline, and name changes of academic units. As the Board’s senior assessor, the Provost would normally introduce and explain such items.

The Chair said that members of the Board were expected to act in the best interests of the University of Toronto and not as an agent of a particular constituency. The Board had an obligation to ensure that the University was strengthened by the decisions that it made.

1. Welcome and Orientation (cont'd)

Academic Board Procedures (cont'd)

Members were asked to review meeting documentation in detail in advance of each meeting and consider any questions or comments that they might want to raise at a meeting.

The Chair stated that she expected Board meetings to be conducted in an atmosphere of respect, collegiality, and civility. She asked members to avoid procedural wrangling at meetings as it did nothing to advance the consideration of the Board's business. At times it might be necessary to continue discussions offline, provided that did not interfere with the decision making process. During meetings, members were asked to stand and introduce themselves when invited by the Chair to speak, as that would allow members to become familiar with each other and would assist the Secretary in preparing the minutes. Members were also asked to sign the attendance sheet provided outside the door of the Council Chamber prior to each Board meeting.

Invited by the Chair to comment, Professor Misak reiterated that, although it was helpful for the administration to receive questions in advance of Board meetings so that the necessary data could be gathered, questions should still be raised freely during the Board's discussion. If complete responses could not be provided at that time, they would be presented at the subsequent Board meeting.

A member asked whether it was mandatory for members to stand while addressing the Board, as his disability affected his balance. The Chair responded that the member would not be required to stand while speaking during meetings.

Governance Portal

The Chair then spoke about the upcoming implementation of the governance portal. In November, 2009, the Secretary of the Governing Council had consulted with the Executive Committee on a proposal to establish a "governance portal" to support the work of the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees. The intent in introducing the portal had been threefold:

- (1) to improve members' on-line access to both public and confidential governance documentation in support of their responsibilities;
- (2) to create efficiencies in the Secretariat, using administrative staff time more effectively; and
- (3) to reduce paper consumption and mailing/courier expenses related to agenda package distribution, while enhancing timeliness of distribution.

With the positive feedback of Executive Committee members, the Office of the Governing Council had proceeded to investigate available options, including both in-house and from external vendors. Diligent Board Member Services Inc. had since been engaged to implement Diligent Boardbooks (DBB) as the governance portal. Through the use of DBB, members would be able to read meeting documentation online, print selectively from an agenda package, or print the materials in their entirety. Members would be contacted by a Diligent representative to arrange a time for their one-on-one online introduction and training session.

1. Welcome and Orientation (cont'd)

Governance Portal (cont'd)

The session, which used a “screen sharing” approach, would normally last less than thirty minutes, and subsequent “24/7/365” technical support would be available to all members. It was expected that the training sessions for all members would be completed by October 22nd, and the implementation of the portal would occur over cycles two and three. At that point, paper copies of agenda packages would no longer be provided to members. The Chair closed by expressing the importance of receiving feedback from members as they began to use the portal, in order to make enhancements as needed.

Speaking Request

The Chair announced that one speaking request had been received and granted for the meeting. At the appropriate point in the agenda, she would call on Mr. Gavin Nowlan, President of the Arts and Science Students' Union to address the Board.

2. Approval of Report Number 168 of the Meeting held on June 2, 2010

Report Number 168 of the meeting held on June 2, 2010 was approved.

3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the Report of the June 2, 2010 meeting.

4. Reports Number 164 (June 2, 2010) and 165 (September 28, 2010) of the Agenda Committee

The Chair spoke about the role of the Agenda Committee, stating that the Committee met approximately two weeks prior to each Board meeting to set the agenda for the meeting. In doing so, the Committee determined the readiness of items of business for submission to the Academic Board and the documentation that should accompany each proposal. The Chair said that the minutes from the Agenda Committee meetings were submitted to the Board for information.

Academic Administrative Appointments

The Agenda Committee had delegated authority from the Academic Board to consider and approve recommendations for academic administrative appointments. Normally those recommended appointments were considered at each meeting. However, on occasion there was need due to time constraints for the Committee to consider and vote on recommendations by email ballot between scheduled meetings. The Chair referred to the academic appointments, listed on pages two to four of Report Number 165, that had been approved by the Committee over the summer, as well as those, listed on pages six and seven, that had been approved at the Committee's September 28th meeting.

Striking Committee of the Academic Board

The Chair explained that another responsibility of the Agenda Committee was to appoint the Board's Striking Committee, which was in turn responsible for recommending the non-Governing Council student, administrative staff, and alumni members to the Board, along with

4. **Reports Number 164** (June 2, 2010) **and 165** (September 28, 2010) **of the Agenda Committee** (cont'd)

Striking Committee of the Academic Board (cont'd)

other appointments for which the Board was responsible. The majority of the Striking Committee's work was conducted each May, when it prepared its annual report considered for approval at the final Board meeting of the year in June. The list of Board members who had been appointed by the Agenda Committee to the 2010-2011 Striking Committee was listed on page 6 of Report Number 165. The Chair thanked Helen Slade, Daniel Taranovsky, and Justin Basinger for volunteering to serve on the Striking Committee this year. Recalling the work the Striking Committee had completed in the spring, she explained that many applications from individuals interested in participating in the governance of the University had been reviewed. Thanks to the efforts of the Striking Committee, the applications had been carefully considered, and suitable individuals had been appointed to various governance bodies.

Nominating Committee for the University Tribunal and the Academic Appeals Committee

The Chair then drew members' attention to page 6 of the Report, which listed the 2010-11 membership of the Nominating Committee for the University Tribunal and the Academic Appeals Committee that the Agenda Committee had appointed. She recalled that, at the June 2nd meeting, the Academic Board had recommended the formation of a Nominating Committee that would recommend to the Board the appointment of the chairs of the University Tribunal who would guide academic discipline hearings, and the appointment of the chairs of the Academic Appeals Committee. The Board's recommendation had been approved by the Governing Council on June 24, 2010. In cycle 2, at the Board's next meeting on November 25th, members would have an opportunity to learn more about the academic discipline and academic appeals processes. The Chair expressed her sincere thanks to members of the Nominating Committee for their service.

Review of Reviews

The Chair explained to the Board that one of the critical functions of the Board and the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) was oversight of the process under which academic units and programs within the University were reviewed. External reviews were commissioned on a regular basis, normally when the term of a Chair of a department or a Dean of a division was drawing to a close. Those reviews, together with the administrative responses, were carefully examined by the AP&P. Such a "review of reviews" had occurred on September 21st, and the Agenda Committee would also discuss that important item at its meeting of November 17th. If the Committee determined that any findings from the reviews should be brought to the attention of the Board, Part I of the Annual Report of the Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, 2009-2010, would be discussed at the November 25th Academic Board meeting.

5. Report of the Vice-President and Provost

(a) Fiscal Climate

Professor Misak provided some context for the University's financial situation at the beginning of the 2010-2011 academic year. She recalled that the past few years had been difficult economically for both public institutions such as the University as well as for individuals. There were indications that the financial climate would continue to be turbulent. Given the economic environment, there were currently limited funds available for universities both in Canada and worldwide. At the same time, there was regular criticism of universities expressed by the media.

Another factor contributing to some uncertainty felt within the University community was the recent provincial initiatives requiring public-sector employers and employees to work towards wage restraint.

Professor Misak reported that the University had been engaged in discussions with the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA) with respect to faculty wages and benefits. The terms of a two-year arbitrated award would be made public on Tuesday, October 12, 2010. Although Professor Misak was unable to comment on the specifics of the arbitrator's decision, as it was confidential, she did note that it would have some impact on the University's finances in the coming year.

(b) Fundraising Campaign

Professor Misak said that, given its constrained resources, the University would turn increasingly to its benefactors who had provided significant support over the past decades. A very productive and positive half-day retreat had recently been held with the Principals and Deans to discuss strategies for the University's upcoming fundraising campaign. Professor Misak stated that she would continue to update the Board about the campaign as appropriate.

(c) Planning Projects

Professor Misak flagged two projects that might be brought forward to the Board for consideration later in the governance year, following appropriate consultation and discussion. The first was a proposal to relocate the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design from 230 College Street to 1 Spadina Crescent. Associated with that project was a second project involving a possible new site for the Student Commons at 230 College Street. That site was an ideal setting for the Student Commons, as it consisted of an independent building that would not require significant alterations prior to occupation. The administration had been consulting with the student unions about the possible use of the 230 College Street site, rather than the originally identified Site 12 located on Devonshire Place, and the unions were beginning to engage their membership about the project.

A member noted that the student unions had agreed to contribute to funding the building of the Student Commons through a student levy, a decision with which he disagreed. He asked whether that levy would be reduced or eliminated if the Student Commons were to be located in an existing building which would be less expensive than a new building. Professor Misak

5. Report of the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)

(c) Planning Projects (cont'd)

informed the member that discussions were at an early stage. She reiterated that the project was not currently being brought forward to the Board for consideration; she simply wanted to alert members to the type of dialogue that was occurring.

The Chair commented that such reports from the Provost were valuable in updating the Board on developing issues. Members could remain apprised of subsequent developments before the matters were brought to the Board by reading the minutes of the Board's standing committees.

6. Feedback from 2009-2010 Academic Board Members

The Chair informed members that, at the final Board meeting of the 2009-10 year, members had been asked, for the first time, to provide feedback about their experiences of having served on the Board. Two reminders had been sent, resulting in a response rate of 30% (37 of the 122 members completed the online form). The Agenda Committee had discussed at length the feedback that had been provided, and it had been decided that it would be informative for the Board to hear about some of the recurring points.

A number of respondents had expressed interest in having an educational component incorporated into Board meetings on a regular basis. The Agenda Committee had agreed that that would be a worthwhile initiative, and it would strive to provide such a component whenever possible.

In general, members had indicated that they felt that the Board was functioning very well, and they had expressed satisfaction with the amount of time allotted for the introduction and discussion of the Board's main areas of responsibility. Academic discipline policy and procedures and the University's budget report and budget guidelines had been identified as two areas where greater time for the introduction and discussion could perhaps be allocated.

Satisfaction with the written material that was provided to the Board had been expressed by the majority of respondents, with a few members indicating a neutral response. Although members had felt they had sufficient material, there had been a reluctance to ask questions. The Chair acknowledged the formality of the Council Chamber and the large size of the Board itself, and she said that it was understandable that some members might not be comfortable speaking in such a setting. She reiterated that she welcomed participation, particularly from members who did not usually share their thoughts at the Board meetings. There was genuine interest in learning of members' views on issues considered by the Board.

Overall, members were happy with the way in which meetings were conducted and felt they were carried out in an effective and efficient manner. There had been repeated comments on the survey that some interventions by members of the Board who spoke frequently on procedural matters and matters not specific to the agenda items being considered, were less helpful than others. The Chair said that she would try to focus the Board's discussion and remind members when comments strayed into areas that were the purview of the Business Board or the University Affairs Board.

A member observed that proposals brought forward for approval were invariably passed by the Board. The Chair explained that such an outcome was actually an indication that

6. Feedback from 2009-2010 Academic Board Members (cont'd)

governance was functioning well, and Board members should not feel that they were failing to do their job because matters were approved. She said that proposals were brought forward to the central administration after much work and consultation had occurred within the originating academic divisions. The proposals were then vetted further by central administrators, then by the planning groups of the Board's standing committees, then by the committees themselves, and then by the Agenda Committee. Therefore, by the time the proposal was brought to the Board, it was expected to be of such calibre that it should not be necessary to send it back for further revision or consideration. The role of the Board was essentially one of oversight, to ensure that the necessary processes had taken place.

The Chair commented that the Agenda Committee had been very pleased to discover that many members had found the opportunity to learn more about the University to be the most valuable aspect of Board meetings. She encouraged members to speak with their peers and colleagues about the Board meetings and the discussions about agenda items that occurred.

Lastly, the Chair thanked members for having answered the 2009-10 survey and noted the Agenda Committee's intention to run the survey again in June, 2011 at the end of the governance year.

7. Policy on the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto

The Chair said that the proposal for the *Policy on the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto* had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) at its meeting of September 20, 2010. If recommended by the Academic Board, the proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on October 28th.

Dr. Gotlieb introduced the proposal¹, which had been included in the agenda package distributed to members of the Board, and he highlighted the discussion that had occurred at the P&B meeting². He noted that, in response to questions from members, Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students, and Mr. Steven Bailey, Director, Office of Space Management, had informed the Committee that the new *Policy* clarified the principles for the rental of space across the tri-campus structure and supported the administration in exercising discretion for the use of space.

Among the matters that arose in questions and discussion were the following.

a) Room Bookings by Profit-Making Organizations

In response to questions regarding whether or not profit-making organizations would be permitted to book space under the proposed *Policy*, Professor Misak noted that it was not feasible, given the University's limited resources, to determine in advance of every space booking made by a group whether or not the group was a "profit-making" organization. Mr. Bailey elaborated, stating that, in determining whether or not University space should be made available to a group, staff considered the purpose for which the space would be used, rather

1

<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Academic+Board/2010-2011+Academic+Year/a1007.pdf>

2

<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Planning+and+Budget+Committee/2010-2011+Academic+Year/r0920.pdf>
57283

7. *Policy on the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto* (cont'd)

a) Room Bookings by Profit-Making Organizations (cont'd)

than focusing on the nature of the organization. The University reserved the right to refuse booking requests from groups that wished to use campus space for commercial activities.

b) Rental and Associated Charges

Referring to Section III, Other Charges, of the *Procedures for the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto* that accompanied the *Policy*, a member expressed opposition to University discretion in requiring that campus police be present at an event. Professor Misak stated that, in general, efforts were made to minimize attendance by campus police at student-sponsored events. However, the administration had a responsibility to ensure the safety of the campus. There were occasions on which the University determined that authorized security or additional security was required at an event. When such an event was sponsored by an external group, it was appropriate to require that security costs be borne by the group booking the event.

A member asked for clarification of additional costs referred to in the *Procedures* that might be charged to student users. Mr. Bailey stated that over and above the rental charge and security costs, users would be required to pay any relevant additional costs, such as charges for arranging access to buildings that were opened outside of their normal hours of operation. He noted, however, that there were a number of buildings on campus for which such charges were not necessary.

c) Procedures for the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto

In response to a question from a member about the circumstances under which the University might refuse a booking request in accordance with the *Policy*, Mr. Bailey explained that there were concerns about activities that were contrary to the intended use of campus space. The University's priority was for room bookings that contributed to its academic mission of teaching and scholarship. On occasion, classrooms, which were intended for instructional purposes, had been found to have been used for other purposes, causing undue wear and tear on the space. In such cases, the University could refuse a booking request from an organization, as stated in Section IV of the *Procedures* (page 3). Mr. Bailey noted that a similar concern for maximizing the University's resources had prompted the booking condition that organizations refrain from taking food or beverages into classrooms, lecture theatres or auditoria. The administration recognized that University members had to seek nourishment when possible during their busy schedules; however, caretaking costs resulting from food and drink being consumed in academic spaces also had to be considered.

A member asked whether an appeal process existed for groups whose booking requests were denied. Mr. Delaney said that concerns should first be directed to Mr. Bailey, as Director of the Office of Space Management, then to Ms Elizabeth Sisam, the Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning, and ultimately to the Provost, if necessary.

Responding to inquiries from members, Mr. Delaney clarified that only approval of the proposed *Policy* was being sought from the Board. The *Procedures* was an administrative document that would evolve and would be updated over time. A member commented that, in

7. *Policy on the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto* (cont'd)

c) *Procedures for the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto* (cont'd)

carrying out its role of oversight, it was appropriate for the Board to ensure that administrative procedures were consistent with approved or proposed policies.

d) Principles Outlined in the *Policy*

A member endorsed the principle stated on page 2 of the *Policy* that "...the provision of University space for activities or events does not in any way imply that the University itself has expressed or condoned the views which may be expressed."

Invited by the Chair to address the Board, Mr. Gavin Nowlan, President of the Arts and Science Students' Union, acknowledged that the proposed *Policy* helped to clarify a number of points with respect to booking University space. Noting the priorities for the temporary use of academic space outlined on pages 2 and 3 of the *Policy*, he expressed the hope that booking requests submitted by student course unions would be given fair consideration, as the activities organized by the unions served an important role in the academic life of the University. Professor Misak assured the Board that many student course union activities would be viewed as "academic" for the purposes of the *Policy*. Nonetheless, she said that the *Policy* had been designed to provide a framework for practices with respect to space bookings at the University; there were many grey areas regarding what counted as academic and what did not, and discretion would have to be used in the application of the *Policy*.

A member of Governing Council in attendance expressed dissatisfaction with the consultation process that had occurred during the development of the proposed *Policy*. While the relevant offices at the University of Toronto Mississauga, University of Toronto at Scarborough, and the Division of Student Life on the St. George campus had provided input on the *Policy*, in her view, there did not appear to have been sufficient consultation with the relevant stakeholders. The member challenged the statement in the *Policy* that the University's lands and buildings were private property. The member also pointed to the contributions of community organizations, who could in the past, under the *Policy for the Allocation of Rooms - Extracurricular Booking*, obtain "sponsorship" of their event and perhaps pay a lower rental fee than that charged to external groups. Such arrangements did not appear to be provided for under the proposed *Policy*. The member said that, as a public institution, the University should be accessible to members of the public. Professor Misak replied, pointing to the impressive diversity of uses for which University space was employed. The proposed *Policy* was intended to encompass a multitude of uses. Professor Naylor then responded, rejecting the member's assertions about the nature of the University's property. He stated that the lands and buildings of the University of Toronto were indeed the private property of the University as an independent non-profit entity. That independence was integral to institutional autonomy and academic freedom. The University was, of course, publicly-assisted, responsive to public priorities and interested in the public welfare. But it was not an arm of government, and community groups could not simply claim free access to space on campus. He understood that student groups might want to sponsor community events on campus so that community groups could avoid paying usual charges. However, the fairness issue then recurred. One student group might believe a given community group should be subsidized, while others would not. Financial implications also had to be considered, particularly in the current constrained fiscal climate.

7. Policy on the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the *Policy on the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved, effective immediately, replacing the *Policy for the Allocation of Rooms - Extracurricular Bookings* approved on June 1, 1988.

8. Items for Information**(a) Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority**

The Chair reported that three items had been approved under the Governing Council's Summer Executive Authority that would have normally have been considered by the Board for approval. They had dealt with matters of individual appointments.

(b) Calendar of Business for 2010-11

The Chair said that the Board's Calendar of Business contained a list of annual items planned to come before the Board over the course of the year. The Calendar was part of a consolidated Governing Council Calendar of Business that was available on the Governing Council website. The online version of the Calendar was updated each Friday afternoon, reflecting any changes that were made. The Chair explained that the initial Calendar that was prepared each summer incorporated annual items that were presented to the Board during the governance year. However, at that time, it was not always possible to determine when other items of business might be ready for consideration, and that was one of the reasons that changes to the Calendar occurred throughout the year.

(c) Appointments and Status Changes

The Chair stated that the Appointments and Status Changes Report was a regular report that was provided for information to the Board.

(d) Report Number 138 of the Planning and Budget Committee (September 20, 2010)

The Chair noted that Report Number 138 of the Planning and Budget Committee had been made available electronically to members on October 4th, and copies had been placed at the door.

There were no questions arising from the reports.

9. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Board was scheduled for Thursday, November 25, 2010, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber

10. Other Business

The Chair noted that members were responsible for shredding any confidential documentation received as part of their agenda packages. Alternatively, members were welcome to leave confidential material behind in the Council Chamber and the Secretariat would arrange for their disposal.

The Board moved *in camera*.

11. Quarterly Report on Donations - May 1, 2010 – July 31, 2010

Members received this report for information. There were no questions.

The Board returned to open session.

The Chair thanked members for their attendance at the Board meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Secretary
October 10, 2010

Chair