

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

OCTOBER 28, 2010

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL held on October 28, 2010 at 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, University of Toronto.

Present:

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch (In the Chair)
Mr. Richard Nunn (Vice-Chair)
The Honourable David R. Peterson, Chancellor
Professor C. David Naylor, President
Ms Diana A.R. Alli
Professor Philip H. Byer
Mr. P. C. Choo
Mr. William Crothers
Professor William Gough
Ms Joeita Gupta
Dr. Gerald Halbert
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Ms Shirley Hoy
Mr. Kent Kuran
Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles
Mr. Joseph Mapa
Professor Emeritus Michael Marrus
Ms Natalie Melton
Professor Cheryl Misak
Mr. Gary P. Mooney
Mr. George E. Myhal
Mr. James Yong Kyun Park
Mr. Jeff Peters
Mr. Tim Reid
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Ms Priatharsini Sivananthajothy
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Mr. Olivier Sorin
Mr. W. John Switzer
Ms Rita Tsang
Professor Franco J. Vaccarino
Dr. Sarita Verma
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh
Mr. Greg West
Mr. W. David Wilson

Secretariat:

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

Regrets:

Professor Varouj Aivazian
Professor Robert L. Baker
Ms Judith Goldring
Professor Christina E. Kramer
Ms Florence Minz
Ms Melinda Rogers
Professor Janice Gross Stein

In Attendance:

Dr. Rose Patten, former Chair, Governing Council; Chair, *Task Force on Governance*
Dr. Alice Dong, former Vice-Chair, Governing Council
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer
Ms Cathy Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Professor Hargurdeep (Deep) Saini, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto
Mississauga (UTM)
Professor Peter Lewis, Associate Vice-President Research
Dr. Tim McTiernan, Assistant Vice-President, Government, Institutional and Community
Relations
Ms Gillian Morrison, Assistant Vice-President, Divisional Relations and Campaigns
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost, Academic Operations
Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
Mr. Steve Bailey, Director, Office of Space Management
Mr. Peter Cen, University of Toronto Peer Tutoring (UTPT)
Mr. Ting Cong, University of Toronto Peer Tutoring (UTPT)
Mr. Garvin De Four, Assistant Ombudsperson
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students
Dr. Andrew Dicks, University of Toronto Peer Tutoring (UTPT)
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Professor Emeritus Joan Foley, University Ombudsperson
Ms Maria Galvez, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council (SAC)
which operates as the University of Toronto Students' Union (UTSU)
Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost, Office of the Vice-
President Human Resources and Equity
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Dr. Jane Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of Vice-President and
Provost
Mr. Christopher Lang, Director, Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances
Mr. Adrian Leung, University of Toronto Peer Tutoring
Ms Bryn Macpherson, Executive Director, Office of the President
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel, Office of the President
Mr. Kwanza Msingwana, Association of Part-Time Students (APUS)
Mr. Anton Neschadim, Executive At-Large, Graduate Students' Union (GSU)
Mr. Gavin Nowlan, President, Arts and Science Students' Union (ASSU)
Ms Danielle Sandhu, Vice-President, Equity, Students' Administrative Council (SAC) which
operates as the University of Toronto Students' Union (UTSU)
Ms Laurie Stephens, Director of Media Relations and Stakeholder Communications
Ms Meredith Strong, Director of the Office of the Vice-President, University Relations
Ms Susan Troung, University of Toronto Peer Tutoring (UTPT)
Ms Grayce Yuen, University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union (UTMSU)
Ms Linda Wang, University of Toronto Peer Tutoring (UTPT)

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 12 AND 13 ON THE AGENDA WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING *IN CAMERA*

1. Chair's Remarks

(a) Welcome

The Chair welcomed the members and guests to the meeting. He indicated that the meeting had a full agenda, and requested members to be succinct and focused in their remarks.

(b) Presentation to Dr. Alice Dong

The Chair welcomed back the former Vice-Chair, Dr. Alice Dong. Dr. Dong had been unable to attend the Governing Council meeting on June 24, 2010 – which would have been her final meeting. The Governing Council could not recognize her contributions formally at that time.

The Chair noted that Dr. Dong had been a member of the Governing Council for nine years, and as Vice-Chair of the Council, she had been an *ex officio* member of all its Boards and Committees. 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. Dr. Dong's advice and good judgement had been respected and appreciated in her various roles. During 2009-2010, she had chaired the Committee to Review the Office of the University Ombudsman – a committee that did its work efficiently and produced a report that was broadly accepted. The Governing Council was very grateful for Dr. Dong's quiet and effective leadership.

The Chair said that it was customary to make a presentation to the Vice-Chairs of the Council at the end of their term of service. In recognition of her dedicated and distinguished service as Vice-Chair of the Governing Council from 2007 to 2010, the Chair presented Dr. Dong with a memento – her own University of Toronto chair.

Members acknowledged the presentation with applause.

(c) Speaking Requests

The Chair noted that speaking requests had been granted for the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union (UTMSU); the University of Toronto Student Union (UTSU); the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) and the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS). The request from the GSU had been submitted after the meeting of the Executive Committee but, in this instance, an exception had been made and the request had been granted. A late request from the EFUT – The French Club had been declined. It was related to item 6 (b) – Policy on the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto. The Chair indicated that he had invited the representative from EFUT to provide his views on this matter to members in writing. A joint statement from the EFUT and the Muslim Students' Association was placed on the table for members.

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

The minutes of the September 13, 2010 meeting were approved.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

4. Report of the President

(a) Student Presentation

The President began his report by introducing members of a student group – the University of Toronto Peer Tutoring (UTPT) : Ms Linda Wong, President and third year undergraduate student (Physiology and Neuroscience); Mr. Peter Cen, past President and graduate student (Biotechnology); Mr. Ting Cong, Vice-President (Administration) and undergraduate student (Immunology and Chemistry); Ms Susan Troung, alumnus and former Vice-President (Operations); Mr. Adrian Leung, former Vice-President (Operations) and undergraduate student (Pharmacy); and Dr. Andrew Dicks, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Chemistry, Faculty Advisor for UTPT, and a recipient of the President’s Teaching Award in 2009.

The students informed members of the Council that UTPT had started as an initiative on the St. George campus in an organic chemistry class in 2003. The goal of UTPT was to be an “academic matchmaker” and provide academic assistance free of cost to students in undergraduate and graduate programs. Tutors were selected through an interview and screening process to ensure academic standards. Prospective tutors were trained by Dr. Dicks and matched with tutees. Most members of the UTPT Executive Committee were tutors who relied on an extensive database to match tutors and tutees. Since its inception the program had grown to include 108 tutors who provided assistance in a broad range of programs. The UTPT had received recognition from ULife and the University of Toronto Student Union. The UTPT program provided tutors with important teaching experience, and the opportunity to strengthen communication and leadership skills. The tutors also gained a better understanding of their own field of study by participating in the program. The program had received positive faculty support and future plans included its expansion to other campuses.

The President thanked the presenters on behalf of the Governing Council.

(b) Awards and Honours

The President drew the members’ attention to the Awards and Honours list that was included in the agenda package. Five faculty members had been named to the Order of Canada – Professor Emeritus Mladen Vranic (Physiology); Professor Emeritus Stephen Clarkson (Political Science); Ms Mary Jo Haddad (adjunct faculty member in the Department of Health Policy, Management, and Evaluation and CEO of Sick Kids Hospital); Professor Walter Rosser (Family and Community Medicine); and Professor Kue Young (Dalla Lana School of Public Health). Six faculty members had been elected to the Royal Society of Canada – Professor Jill Matus (English), Vice-Provost Students; Professor Arthur Ripstein (Law and Philosophy); Professor Stewart Aitchison (Electrical Engineering); Professor Harry Ruda (Materials Science and Engineering); and Professor John Carling Roder (Molecular Genetics).

The President congratulated all the inductees.

4. Report of the President (cont'd)

(c) University of Toronto Faculty Association Arbitration and Pension

The President provided members with an update on the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA) arbitration award and on the state of the pension plan. The details of arbitrator Martin Teplitsky's decision were made public on October 12, 2010. Mr. Teplitsky had awarded across the board (ATB) increases of 2.25% for each of the two years from July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2011. When factors such as professional allowances and the timing and distribution of the increases were included, the real cost was 2.47% per year. The increases were retroactive, and in addition to the 1.9% merit pay increases (PTR) that had already been awarded. The President explained that the total of 4.37% was above the existing rate of inflation and outside the framework recommended by the provincial government in its compensation restraint legislation. The provincial government had recommended that, for at least two of the following five years, bargained or negotiated contracts include no net compensation increases. Groups not subject to collective bargaining or negotiations had had their compensation frozen. UTFA had presented a case for ATB increases of 3.5% in each of the two years, as well as approximately fifteen benefit improvements and pension augmentations that would have resulted in a total increase in cost of approximately 26% over the two years. The President noted that the arbitrator's award would significantly add to the fiscal pressures faced by the University. The University could not anticipate a significant increase in revenue to meet the costs of the award. No additional funding was expected from the provincial government, and the tuition framework remained in effect. An increase in funds could come only through growth and the basic income units (BIUs) continued to be undervalued. Growth solely for the sake of increased funding was not a viable option. The arbitration award would cost the University approximately \$37 million for the two year period, representing an increase in compensation of 9.2%. From a cash flow perspective, the arbitration award represented an increase in expenditure of approximately \$51 million over the two year period. The President emphasized that the University's faculty and librarians were exceptional. In ordinary times, the institution would not be as concerned about the increases even though these were above the rate of inflation. The faculty and librarians needed to be compensated in accordance with an intensely competitive market place. The problem was that the University was not operating in ordinary times. Peer institutions in the U.S. faced a similar situation. Salary enhancements continued at a rapid pace only in private institutions in that country.

The President also expressed his concern that the arbitration award had allowed for no increases in employee contributions to the pension plan. Even though the University had a good pension plan, under the existing contribution rates it could not be sustained. This was not because of the deficit in the pension plan. Rather, it was because of the value of the benefits in relation to the contributions. The provincial government had proposed to amend the *Pension Benefits Act* (PBA) to provide Ontario universities with solvency relief on a temporary basis. However, the provincial government expected universities to negotiate with their respective pension plan members to develop a strategy to create a stable and sustainable base for the pension plan. The arbitration award was not in line with the provincial government's emphasis on higher employee contributions to the pension plan. The alternative was to raise employer contributions, but this would translate to an increased dependence on students' tuition fees and government operating grants, with benefits accruing to faculty and librarians. The government had indicated that public funds were not to be used to service the contribution shortfalls in the pension plans. The University's concern was that a failure to raise employee contributions would result in withdrawal of the solvency relief measures. The University would be obligated to make larger upfront solvency payments that would add to its existing financial pressures. In the President's opinion, an increase in employee contributions was similar to a positive mortgage and a way to

4. Report of the President (cont'd)

(c) University of Toronto Faculty Association Arbitration and Pension (cont'd)

amortize the issue of shortfalls over a period. This would result in a more stable and sustainable plan. If this issue was not addressed, future faculty, staff, and students would be burdened unfairly with payments to the plan. Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity and her staff would be returning to the bargaining table with UTFA to start work on an agreement for the period beginning July 1, 2011. It was hoped that recent settlements at other provincial institutions, changes in the pension contributions in many other institutions across the country, a low rate of inflation the province's compensation framework, and the results of the last round of arbitration, might provide a context in which the University and UTFA would find their way to a fiscally responsible and sustainable agreement.

(d) Rankings

The President commented that the "rankings and report cards" season had begun, and that analyses would be generated and posted on the relevant sections of the University's website. He cautioned that ranking results needed to be seen objectively, however strong the temptation might be to rely exclusively on a single number which could be misleading and unreliable. The results, however, consistently indicated the outstanding performances of the University. It was all the more remarkable that the University's sustained excellence had been achieved in a climate of fiscal difficulties, especially when Ontario had the lowest per capita funding for higher education of any province in Canada. Some of the rankings of the University highlighted by the President included:

- *SCImago Institute Rankings (SIR)* – 4th
- *Higher Education Evaluation and Accreditation Council of Taiwan (HEEACT)* – 11th
- *Times Higher Education* – 17th
- *QS World University Ranking* – 29th

Closer to home, the annual *Globe and Mail Canadian University Report* attested to the University's advances in a number of areas related to the student experience. The President acknowledged that these improvements had been achieved thanks to the work of the University's faculty, students, and staff, and he extended his thanks for their continuing efforts. At the same time, the *Report* noted several areas where additional improvements were necessary and the President reported that a number of initiatives were underway to address them. Information received from the *Globe and Mail Canadian University Report* and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) was closely monitored by the University. The administration continued to work with the Council on Student Experience (CSE) to develop and implement strategies to improve student experience. Key investments had been made in buildings and facilities – with new instructional space at UTSC and UTM scheduled to open in March 2011.

4. Report of the President (cont'd)

(e) Campus Events

The President ended his report by informing members that the University had hosted the Toronto and Mississauga editions of the CIBC Run for the Cure. The Chancellor had been the Honorary Chair of the Toronto run. Over 20,000 people had visited the St. George campus in connection with this event. The University's faculty, students, and staff had raised more than \$110,000 and won the Ontario University Challenge. Nationwide, the CIBC Run for the Cure had raised over \$33 million in 2010, and thousands had participated. The President thanked the organizers for their efforts in making the event a success.

The University had also welcomed the Dalai Lama for a symposium on Cognitive Science, Mindfulness and Consciousness at the Multi-Faith Centre.

A member added that the United Way Campaign at the University was moving steadily towards its target of raising \$1 million in 2010.

5. Report of the University Ombudsperson (July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010) and Administrative Response

The Chair welcomed Professor Emeritus Joan Foley, University Ombudsperson, to the meeting.

He reminded members that the University Ombudsperson was responsible to the Governing Council, through its Chair. Section 5.1 of the Terms of Reference of the Office stated that "the Ombudsperson shall make a written annual report to the Governing Council and through it to the University community"

The administration had prepared its response to the Report, and both documents had been included in the agenda package for the meeting.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Emeritus Foley commented that there was much to celebrate about the University as illustrated by its rankings, the success of the members of its community and the achievements of its alumni. It was, however, important to remember the fragile human element – with its inherent shortcomings – that made up the University community. Errors could be made, and difficulties in communications, stress, and other factors could contribute to an escalation of problems. The Office of the Ombudsperson was a conduit in providing resolution to differences that arose within the community, even without any authority to solve problems. In some cases, the written consent from the complainant allowed the Office to provide advice to various individuals and/or officies. Critically, where there was more intervention the outcome was almost always positive, and it allowed the administration to work towards systemic improvements. Professor Foley ended by highlighting two specific areas where the Office had been active. The first of these was in dealing with requests from individuals who had disabilities. The administration had continued to respond to such concerns. Related to this was the University's progress towards implementing the new student information system capable of meeting the needs of students with disabilities more efficiently.

5. Report of the University Ombudsperson (July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010) and Administrative Response (cont'd)

A member expressed her approval as the Report highlighted the concerns of students with disabilities, specifically with the reweighting of examinations as a substitute for make-ups for missed tests. This practice could help some students while having the unintended consequence of disadvantaging others. According to the member there was a parallel to where this practice was used in the Governing Council elections. In the member's opinion, a cap on expenses for attendant care hours disadvantaged student candidates with disabilities standing in the Governing Council elections. The member added that because the cap was applicable only to students with disabilities, it placed candidates who did not require attendant care at an advantage. The member requested an update on the progress on the survey of the accessibility of buildings on the St. George campus, and on the efforts at fundraising to improve accessibility. Another member was of the opinion that Accessibility Services were over-worked and understaffed. According to the member, students with disabilities were the sole experts on their conditions and needs and, in the member's view, it was offensive for students with disabilities to claim accommodation requests through Accessibility Services.

(Secretary's Note: The Elections Committee approved upto 28 hours per week towards attendant care expenses for candidates with disabilities participating in the Governing Council elections. This was based on the nature of the task at hand (i.e. campaigning) and in accordance with the Ontario Human Rights Commission's (OHRC) Policy and Guidelines on Disability and the Duty to Accommodate. See Report Number 156 of the University Affairs Board (March 6, 2010) p. 6).

6. Items for Governing Council Approval

(a) Report of the Task Force on Governance and the Chair's Response to the Report (Arising from Report Number 433 of the Executive Committee [October 6, 2010])

The Chair began by acknowledging the individuals who had worked on the *Report* with dedication for nearly three years. He said that the governors owed a debt of gratitude to former Chair, Dr. Rose Patten and to Professor Vivek Goel who had served as Chair and Vice-Chair respectively, of the *Task Force*. Under their leadership, the *Task Force* had produced a thorough and thoughtful *Report*. In addition, Dr. Patten and Professor Goel had kept the governors informed with various oral and written reports, beginning with the *Phase 1 Report* at the conclusion of the *Towards 2030* planning process.

Several members of the *Task Force* continued to serve on the Governing Council. These included Mr. P.C. Choo; Professor William Gough; Professor Emeritus Michael Marrus; Professor Arthur Ripstein (who had been a member of the *Phase 1 Task Force*); and Mr. David Wilson.

Members had received copies of the *Report* and the *Chair's Response*, along with a summary of the recommendations. Members had been also sent an additional communication in response to comments and questions raised in an earlier information session for governors. An important element of the communication was clarification of "approval in principle" in the context of the *Report*.

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

(a) Report of the *Task Force on Governance* and the *Chair's Response to the Report* (cont'd)

The Chair said that “in principle” ensured approval of the broad parameters within which the implementation was to occur. The operationalization of the principles, however, required input of relevant parties to work through various steps that needed to be taken. In some instances, with additional work and information, governance would be asked to consider more fully-developed or refined proposals or changes to the original approval.

In the case of the *Report* of the *Task Force on Governance*, “in principle approval” was being sought with the expectation that, under the auspices of the Implementation Committee, various proposals would be brought forward for future consideration following further discussion within and input to the Committee – for example, revisions to the By-law, to Board or Committee terms of reference or to policy.

Since August 2010, the Chair, Dr. Patten, and Professor Goel had met with groups of governors to discuss elements of the *Report*, the *Report* itself and the *Chair's Response*. The Chair thanked those who had participated in the sessions for their thoughtful advice.

The Chair invited Dr. Patten to provide an introduction to the content of the *Report* and its recommendations. Dr. Patten began by thanking Dr. Goel and the other *Task Force* members for what she described as a long, challenging and productive journey.

Six broad themes had been identified in the *Phase 1 Report*. These were:

- Oversight and accountability – the quality of the Governing Council’s meeting agendas.
- Overlap/duplication, deficiencies, ambiguities – Board and Committee mandates.
- Delegated authority for academic divisions – lack of clarity, inconsistency
- Delegated authority in the tri-campus context – levels of oversight and accountability, and redundancy.
- Quality of governors – experience mix and representation.
- Roles of and appropriate interfaces between governors and the administration.

Dr. Patten said that the *Task Force* was of the opinion that, though in need of improvement, the governance served the University well – the system was not broken. There was nothing compelling for the University to move away from the unicameral system or from the representation of the five estates – faculty, staff, alumni, students and Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council (LGIC) appointees. The *Task Force* had found no persuasive argument to recommend the *University of Toronto Act* be opened – though the *Task Force* would not have hesitated from making such a recommendation had it been necessary. The *Task Force* had engaged in widespread consultations, and had adopted a principles-based approach to define effective governance at the University.

In broad terms, the *Task Force's* work focused on the importance of – the quality of governors and the quality of Governing Council agendas. The *Task Force* outlined identification; election or selection; orientation; education; and evaluation of governors; and, with respect to these factors, the unique needs of each the estates. Commonly-repeated themes related to the quality of Governing Council agendas. The *Task Force's* recommendations, therefore, were intended to ensure that the Governing Council’s primary engagement remained on the strategic direction of the University and on the optimum use of its Boards and Committees. It was understood that a redistribution and rebalance of responsibilities would be required to achieve this.

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

(a) Report of the *Task Force on Governance and the Chair's Response to the Report* (cont'd)

Dr. Patten stressed three fundamental recommendations of the *Task Force* - Principles of Good Governance; Mandate of Governance; and Expectations and Attributes of Governors and Key Principles of Ethical Conduct. The twenty-nine other, primarily operational, recommendations arose from these fundamental recommendations. Many recommendations would codify good practices that had evolved over time, and many built on existing practices. Some recommendations were intended for immediate adoption and implementation. Others would require further, detailed work and were to be implemented in the future.

Mr. Nunn commented that the Implementation Committee would be composed of Board Chairs and Vice-Chairs, as well as administrative staff and student representatives. The Committee would reflect the responsibility of governors for governance. The review process had been initiated by governors and subject to the approval of the *Report*, governors would be responsible for the implementation of the recommended improvements.

A governor, who had been a member of the *Task Force*, hoped the *Report* would receive support. In his opinion, however, two open questions remained unanswered for the consideration of the Implementation Committee and beyond. The first related to tri-campus matters. The *Task Force* had been limited in its scope of dealing with tri-campus governance. Any resolution of the matter would have to emerge from decisions on the University's administrative structure with three unique campuses. The second matter dealt with the work of the Governing Council. A core feature of the *Task Force's* recommendations was the idea of the removal of duplication. The purpose was to ensure that the Governing Council was able to engage in matters of strategic deliberations. In the member's view, the existing size and structure of the Governing Council was not conducive to strategic decision-making. The Implementation Committee would have to address this matter as it reviewed the recommendations.

In the course of discussion, members expressed their support for the *Report* and thanked Dr. Patten and the members of *Task Force* for their work. A number of questions for clarification and other points were raised by members.

A number of members commented on Recommendation 21 of the *Report*. A member concurred with the *Report's* call for the enhanced role of the Boards and Committees to allow for the Governing Council to deliberate on broad strategic matters. The member asked whether increased responsibility for the Executive Committee would be treated as a change in the Terms of Reference of the Executive Committee. How would the Implementation Committee establish the criteria whereby matters of strategic or broad institutional importance would be brought forward by the Executive Committee for Governing Council approval? What were the processes by which governors could bring issues of strategic importance to the Governing Council? Another member sought further clarification related to the delegation of authority to the Executive Committee on the closure of academic units. Would the Implementation Committee consider whether or not the Executive Committee would deal with the matter of the closure of academic units? In the opinion of one member, the delegation of more authority to the Executive Committee amounted to bicameral governance. Another member expressed the view that had Recommendation 21 been adopted earlier, it could have led to the approval of the establishment of the School of Global Affairs or major capital projects without Governing Council consideration. Members of were of the opinion that the size of the Executive Committee, consisting of fourteen members, could be a limiting factor in the extensive discussion of important matters.

6. Items for Governing Council Approval

(a) Report of the *Task Force on Governance* and the *Chair's Response to the Report*

A member began her comments on the Report by reflecting on whether the responsibility of governance lay with the members of the Governing Council, or with the broader University community. In the member's opinion, the Report inappropriately placed this responsibility exclusively on the members of Governing Council. The member asked about the criteria used for the selection of the membership of the Implementation Committee. Commenting on some of the recommendations of the Report, the member expressed her dismay at Recommendation 3 of the Report wherein demonstrators and protestors were referred to as noisy and potentially disruptive at meetings. The member stated her view that this description was not objective and did not acknowledge meeting procedures that, in her opinion, restricted the participation of the community members in governance.

In the opinion of the member, Recommendation 10 of the Report, which dealt with matters of the Elections Committee, was a means of stifling dissent and amounted to the censorship of the candidates' campaign statements. The member alleged that the Elections Committee would interfere and decide on the type of candidates suitable for election. It was the understanding of the member that under the recommendations of the Report, the Elections Committee would report to the Executive Committee and not the University Affairs Board. As the Executive Committee met in closed session, this practice would remove the opportunity to discuss election matters in an open and transparent forum.

The member expressed her reservation on Recommendation 32 of the *Report* that dealt with the potential for on-line voting by the Governing Council under particular circumstances. The member stated that on-line voting could not be scrutinized and, hence, compromised the accountable and transparent functioning of the Council. In the member's opinion, there had not been enough consultation with University community in the preparation of the Report.

A member enquired whether the approval of the motion could be deferred till there was further opportunity for members to analyze its contents, and for opinion to be solicited from stakeholders within the community. Referring to visibility and transparency, another member queried whether the *Task Force* had reflected on the issue of diversity of the membership on the Governing Council. The member asked whether the issue of governors being drawn from outside the GTA, and the need to reflect the external membership closer to the student body at the University, had been discussed by the *Task Force*.

Adding to the discussion, a member stated that in the *Governance Principles* section of the *Report*, there was a statement that "The requirements for independence of all Governors [is to be met] consistently met." It continued "Independence must be understood in the context of the representation by all estates." The member said that it had been explained to him that "independence" in this particular statement of principles was used in the Oxford Dictionary sense of "individual liberty of thought." However, the *Report* had not included in its governance principles the critical second meaning of "independence" as contained in the Oxford Dictionary, which was a most important omission. "Independence" also meant "the fact of not depending on another" or "the condition of being independent." A person who was "dependent" was someone who "depends on support" from someone or some body. The *Report* should have emphasized explicitly both fundamental definitions.

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

(a) Report of the *Task Force on Governance and the Chair's Response to the Report* (cont'd)

During the course of the discussion, the Chair invited the Secretary to respond to issues raised by the members. Mr. Charpentier said that any proposal for changes to the Terms of Reference of the Executive Committee would be brought forward by the Implementation Committee, first to the Executive Committee and then to Governing Council as is the normal process for any Terms of Reference change. Following consideration by the affected body, the proposal is considered by the Executive Committee, which makes its recommendation to the Governing Council. As part of such a process, the proposal would outline the criteria for the approval of items by the Executive Committee and for forwarding to the Governing Council. The Implementation Committee would consider the appropriateness of items for decision at the level of the Executive Committee and make its recommendations to the Executive Committee. There would be no change to the process in place for the introduction of items for discussion. Items were normally brought forward by the administration for governance approval. Any governor could also present ideas for discussion through the Chair of the relevant governance body. Finally, the agenda planning groups of governance bodies made decisions to bring forward items of business.

Dr. Patten added that the discussion of the *Report* by governors had provided a strong base for the Implementation Committee to begin its work. Governance at the University worked in two ways. The President and his team of administrators worked to develop and bring forward matters in the best interests of the University. The Governing Council was accountable for the oversight of that leadership. On the matter of conduct at meetings, Dr. Patten acknowledged the principles of freedom of speech and enabling input for deliberations. However, it was equally important for the Council to be able to conduct its work in a focused manner while dealing with the volume of input to debates. The Committees and Boards of the Governing Council were established for the effective delegation of decision-making processes. On the subject of elections, the *Task Force* had agreed on the principle of providing exposure to a large section of the University community and to encourage greater participation in the elections process. Mr. Nunn added that as the Implementation Committee moved forward, recommendations would be made about the selection process to identify potential candidates. The development of the matrix of requirements for governors would address the factors such as diversity, necessary knowledge and skills. The Chair added that the process of the education of governors, beginning with orientation, would lead to a common understanding of governors' collective responsibility for accountability and transparency.

The Chair invited Ms Maria Galvez to address the Council on behalf of the UTSU. Ms Galvez said many in the University community disagreed with the *Chair's Response to the Report* that the University was governed well and the unicameral system need be revisited. In fact, there was a need to restructure. In her view, the University had engaged in a number of "top down" decisions. In Ms Galvez's opinion, there had been little consultation with the relevant stakeholders and dissent had been silenced. The Chair had ended meaningful discussions on critical matters. It was the responsibility of the electorate to decide on the attributes of their representatives. The screening of candidates by governors was akin to a hiring process and contrary to the principles of elections. Candidates needed to be selected by the voters in their constituency and not through a matrix of skills developed by the Council. The Council only needed to promote the elections to the broad University community. The delegation of the oversight of the review and approval of academic plans to Councils and their divisions was a threat to the efficacy of the Governing Council and reduced the aspect of oversight. The recommendation to delegate more authority to the Executive Committee was anti-democratic and

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

(a) Report of the *Task Force on Governance and the Chair's Response to the Report* (cont'd)

a privatization of the decision making process. The recommendation for on-line voting was problematic, according to Ms Galvez, claiming that studies indicated that the results of such voting practices were compromised and, moreover, not all members had equal access to the use of internet facilities. In closing, Ms Galvez urged the Council to refer the *Report* back to the individuals of the University community for their input.

Next, the Chair invited Mr. Anton Neschadim to address the Council on behalf of the GSU. Mr. Neschadim began by commending the *Task Force* on the tabling of the *Report*. The GSU had provided its input to the *Task Force* but was disappointed as this input had been used selectively. According to Mr. Neschadim, matters related to the adoption of a senate system as opposed to the existing unicameral system had not been debated sufficiently by the *Task Force*. In order to address equity concerns, the GSU wanted greater student representation on the Governing Council. The *Report* was silent on the need for consultation with student groups and stakeholders such as CUPE 3902. In his view, the current practice of consultation was selective and was not necessarily representative of the student groups. There was a need to engage the wider University community on important matters through the use of "town halls" and surveys. The establishment of the Implementation Committee was a step in the right direction. However, the membership of the Committee needed a greater student body component and representation from non-governors. The University community had not been given enough opportunity to discuss the *Report*. Mr. Neschadim suggested the *Report* be tabled at a future date in order to allow the reaction of stakeholders who would be affected by its implementation. The GSU would be prepared to provide its written analysis of the *Report*.

There were no further comments from Governors. In response to a suggestion from a member, the Chair said that, coincidental with the meeting of the Implementation Committee, a further information session on the *Report* would be arranged for members.

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

(a) Report of the *Task Force on Governance* and the *Chair's Response to the Report* (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved:

- (a) THAT the Report of the Task Force on Governance, dated June 22, 2010, be approved in principle.
- (b) THAT the following recommendations identified for immediate implementation in the Report be approved, effective immediately: Recommendations 1 to 7, Recommendation 9, Recommendations 11 to 15, and Recommendations 22 to 30.
- (c) THAT the establishment of an Implementation Committee be approved to oversee and coordinate implementation of the following recommendations identified for future implementation in the Report:

Recommendation 8,
Recommendation 10,
Recommendations 16 to 21,
and Recommendations 31 and 32.

- (d) THAT the following mandate of the Implementation Committee be approved:

The Implementation Committee is to oversee and coordinate implementation of the Task Force's recommendations, ensuring appropriate participation among the relevant bodies of governance, administrative offices and the Secretariat. Its first task, in consultation with the Executive Committee and relevant offices, is to prepare an implementation plan. The plan will outline anticipated timing for those matters which can proceed in due course without further action by the Governing Council and will also identify those matters for which additional detailed proposals will be developed for the Governing Council's consideration. As part of the plan, it is expected that the Committee Chair will provide periodic updates to the Executive Committee.

The Chair again thanked Dr. Patten and members of the *Task Force* for their efforts on the *Report*. He also thanked the members of the Implementation Committee in anticipation of their work on the recommendations outlined in the *Report*.

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

(b) *Policy on the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto*
(*Arising from Report Number 169 of the Academic Board [October 7, 2010]*)

Professor Lemieux-Charles said that the *Policy for the Allocation of Rooms – Extracurricular Bookings*, which dated from June, 1988, was an atypical University policy in that it had contained a combination of principles and specific operational guidelines. The Governing Council approval of a new *Policy on the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto* was sought and the *Procedures* document accompanying the *Policy* was provided for information only.

The proposed *Policy*, outlined the overarching principles by which space was to be used and assigned for temporary use. The *Procedures* outlined the process for booking space, the rental rates, reasons for refusals of bookings, conditions of use, and also a requirement to use a standard 'Facilities Request Booking Form.'

The Academic Board had held a full discussion of the proposed *Policy*. Professor Lemieux-Charles highlighted some of the main points considered at the meeting. Members had discussed in detail, aspects of the *Procedures*, which was an administrative document. The Provost had emphasized that the *Procedures* document would evolve and would be updated over time. In fact, the *Procedures* had been revised following the Academic Board meeting to incorporate feedback provided by Board members. One of the amendments included the addition of some introductory text stating that the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students would monitor, review, and amend the *Procedures* from time to time as appropriate for the implementation of the *Policy*.

During the Board's discussion, questions had been raised by a member regarding whether or not profit-making organizations would be permitted to book space under the proposed *Policy*. Mr. Steve Bailey, Director of the Office of Space Management, informed the Board that the University reserved the right to refuse booking requests from groups that wished to use campus space for commercial activities. In determining whether or not to grant a booking request, staff would consider the purpose for which the space would be used, rather than the nature of the organization. In response to a question about whether an appeal process existed for groups whose booking requests were denied, Section IV.4 of the *Procedures* was added following the Board meeting. The revised *Procedures* stated that a written request for a review of a refusal may be first made to the director of the relevant booking office and then to the Office of Vice-President and Provost, which would make a final decision on the matter. Members of the Board also asked questions about the charges associated with room bookings. In response to a question, Professor Misak stated that, in general, efforts were made to minimize attendance by campus police at student-sponsored events. However, on some occasions, the University might determine that authorized security or additional security was required at an event. In instances when such an event was sponsored by an external group, it was appropriate to require that security costs be covered by the group booking the event.

Mr. Gavin Nowlan, President, Arts and Science Students' Union, had addressed the Board and had expressed his 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. In response to Mr. Nowlan's comments, the Provost had Section I.4. of the *Procedures* added to specify that curriculum-related activities of constituent groups within student societies, such as course unions and departmental academic societies, would normally be considered to be included in the type of University-related events granted priority for the temporary use of academic space. A list of such activities in descending order of priority was

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

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

contained in Section 3 of the *Policy*. A member of the Governing Council who was in attendance said that there had not appeared to be sufficient consultation with relevant stakeholders, and the member challenged a statement in the *Policy* that the University's lands and buildings were private property. The member had also commented that student sponsorship of events held by community organizations did not seem to be provided for under the *Policy*. Professor Misak replied, pointing to the impressive diversity of uses for which University space was employed. Professor Naylor also responded that the lands and buildings of the University of Toronto were indeed the private property of the University as an independent non-profit entity. Referring to the matter of student sponsorship of community-organized events, Professor Naylor noted that an issue of fairness needed to be considered. Although one student group might believe a given community group should be subsidized, another student group might disagree. In addition, financial implications needed to be considered, particularly in the context of a constrained fiscal climate.

The Academic Board had indicated its support for the proposed *Policy*.

In the discussion that followed, several members addressed the Council.

A member said that there was confusion and misinformation about the *Policy*, for though it was being forwarded for governance approval, the practices and procedures were under the purview of the administration. According to the member, the procedures outlined in the *Policy* limited the space for the assembly of students. A modern university was defined as a community of scholars and teachers, a space from where novel ideas grew. The roots of recent historic global events could be traced to the universities of Paris, Beijing, and earlier at Bologna. Students at universities needed free space to discuss ideas and to push the boundaries of academic freedom. In the member's opinion, the *Policy* was a violation of the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. The University needed to stand up for the voices of the oppressed. Members were urged to take a position to remind the University that the cherished ideals of a liberal progressive society needed protection.

According to some members, the *Policy* unfairly targeted small student groups, unions and societies that did not have the resources to cover the costs associated with the presence of campus police at the events. They alleged that some student groups had been charged \$500 to cover the cost of campus police at events, even though the presence of campus police was not required at such events. They suggested that in some instances, student organizations had been unaware of charges till after their event. For student organizations with small memberships and limited budgets, such charges were prohibitive. The limited financial resources available to student groups were better spent to improve student experience and not for redundant police costs. In a member's opinion, the *Policy* threatened to result in the University being ranked last in terms of student experience.

Members expressed their concern about the apparent lack of consultation with student groups in the framing of the *Policy*. In the opinion of a member, substantial changes were proposed in the revised *Policy* under the guise of an update. The administration had not provided sufficient information on the consultation process at the meetings of the Academic Board or the Planning and Budget Committee.

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

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

A member expressed agreement with updates to the Procedures outlined in the *Policy*. However, he suggested future revisions to Procedures be made in consultation with students groups and requested a report on the consultations to be tabled at a meeting of the Council later in the year.

In response to the comments from members, Professor Misak said that the ideals of freedom of speech lay at the heart of the University. The Office of the Vice-President and Provost regularly received calls from various sources to close or to prevent events held at the University. The response to that advice remained the same - it was not the policy of the University to curb free speech or to censor the activities of groups. The University had not denied space to any group on the basis of that group's political leanings. The University had a duty to ensure a safe environment, and it would continue to ensure that student groups were not charged for the presence of campus police at events except in extraordinary circumstances. However, the University would continue its practice to charge external groups for security when such groups rented space on University property, and when the presence of security was warranted. The Office of Space Management had advised Professor Misak that the last time a student group had been assessed for security costs was for an event held in 2007, though those costs were ultimately paid by the Provost's Office.

The Provost noted that the *Policy* had not been recently developed. Rather, it was an update and codification of the existing University practices. In response to requests for further involvement of interested stakeholders, Professor Misak suggested a working group be established to seek further input on the Procedures.

Mr. Jim Delaney informed the Council that the administration had updated the *Policy* based on input received from student bodies over many years on a variety of space-related issues. Students had expressed the need for clarity with regard to conditions that would warrant additional charges for the use of space. External groups were advised in advance of events of charges related to the presence of campus police. In some instances, though, an internal group had booked an event for an external group. In those instances, the external rates applied and any additional costs related to the events had also been passed on to the group. Mr. Delaney reiterated that the *Policy* reflected the practices on the use of space at the University.

The Chair invited Mr. Kwanza Msingwana to address the Council on behalf of APUS. Mr. Msingwana said that APUS condemned the proposed *Policy*. In his opinion, the University's intention was to revise the *Policy* because of safety concerns and this was an attempt to silence dissent. The actions of the University undermined the legitimate activities of student groups, unions and their larger community allies. He added that APUS was concerned about the long-term implications of the *Policy* because groups such as the Ontario Public Interest Research Group (OPIRG) had been charged for security at an event when it had not been requested or needed. The practice of charging groups for security threatened their ability to continue. According to Mr. Msingwana, revisions to the *Policy* were influenced by the events at York University. APUS firmly believed in the right of student groups to exercise their democratic rights as defined by the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. The University was moving away from its commitment to freedom of speech and was not setting a progressive example to other institutions. The University closure during the events of G20 was an example of such a practice. APUS' view was that there had not been sufficient consultation on the revisions to the *Policy*.

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

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

Next, the Chair invited Ms Grayce Yuen to address the Council on behalf of the UTMSU. According to Ms Yuen, the revision of the *Policy* was not an update but an overhaul. Students had not been consulted on the implication of the revisions to the *Policy*. Ms Yuen expressed her concern at the clause in the *Policy* related to the University reserving the right to refuse space to a for-profit organization. According to Ms Yuen, this practice was problematic from a UTM perspective because there was a lack of space on that campus. Student groups had to compete with corporate organizations for space to host events. Student groups added value to their events by extending invitation to external groups. The removal of the sponsorship clause would take away this ability, and project the student groups as profit-making entities.

The Chair invited Ms Yuen to forward her comments to Ms Misak.

Finally, the Chair invited Ms Danielle Sandhu to address the Council on behalf of the UTSU. Ms Sandhu reminded members of the University's *Statement of Institutional Purpose* referred to notions of community, equal opportunity, and the protection of human rights as an integral aspect of education. The proposed *Policy* was contrary to the ideals espoused in the *Statement of Institutional Purpose* because, if approved, it would have an extensive and detrimental effect on student experience. In Ms Sandhu's opinion, the fees for the rental of campus space were high and student groups were forced to use expensive campus catering for events. The University attempted to curtail critical dialogue by denying student groups space on the premise of health and safety concerns. Organizers were forced to pay for campus security for events such as the Israeli Apartheid Week. The decision by the University to close the campus during the G20 summit had highlighted its complicity in the stifling of dissent. There was a lack of agency for students to participate in critical dialogue. Ms Sandhu said that over 150 campus groups had signed a petition to oppose the proposed *Policy*. The petition called for the striking of a working group to revisit the *Policy* following consultations with all affected stakeholders.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved:

THAT the *Policy on the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto* be approved, effective immediately, replacing the *Policy for the Allocation of Rooms -- Extracurricular Bookings* approved on June 1, 1988.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 169 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A".

At this point, non-members in the Council Chamber began to speak loudly, preventing the members of Council from speaking. The Chair asked the disruptive guests to desist, reiterating that they were interfering with the meeting. However the non-members continued to obstruct the meeting by speaking and chanting loudly, so that members could not be heard.

In view of the behaviour of unruly individuals, the Chair declared a recess consistent with his authority under section 47 of By-Law Number 2.

The recess was called at approximately 7:05 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 7:15 p.m.

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

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

The Chair called the meeting to order. A student member informed the Chair that a majority of the student members had met with Professor Misak during the adjournment. As noted earlier, Professor Misak had agreed to strike a working group, through the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students. The working group would prepare a report on consultations with regard to the *Policy* and *Procedures*. This report would be presented to the Governing Council at a later date. Professor Misak confirmed this agreement.

(c) Pension Committee: Establishment and Terms of Reference and Corresponding Revisions to the Terms of Reference of the Business Board and the Audit Committee

Mr. Nunn said that the proposal for the establishment of a new Pension Committee had been recommended for approval by the Business Board. The new Committee would assume the Governing Council's responsibility as legal administrator of the pension plans, a responsibility carried by the Business Board. The establishment of the Committee would require corresponding amendments to the terms of reference of both the Board and its Audit Committee. The proposal emerged from lengthy negotiations with the UTFA, including an award from an arbitrator. There were also discussions with unions representing administrative staff and with members of the non-union staff, as well as other, extensive consultations.

While the proposal reflected the outcome of consultation, negotiations, and arbitration, it clear, and importantly, reflected good governance of the pension plans. The proposal was supported by the University's administration, which was committed to its successful implementation. The majority of members of the new Committee would be members of the Governing Council – for two reasons. First, the University bore the financial risk of funding the pension plans. Secondly, the *University of Toronto Act* permitted the Council to delegate its authority in non-academic matters to a committee only where the majority of that Committee consisted of Council members.

Mr. Nunn stressed that the Pension Committee would not have a role in determining the terms of pension plans, that is the benefits paid or the contributions made by plan members and by the University. Those matters would continue to be determined through the budget process and, where applicable, collective bargaining. The proposal would also not take from the Council its responsibility as sponsor and administrator of the pension plans; it would simply move oversight of that responsibility from the Business Board to a dedicated Pension Committee. The Business Board, in carrying out its responsibility for overseeing the financial health of the University, would continue to receive the annual financial report on the pension plans as well as any proposals to amend the terms of the plans.

The proposal was also considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting on October 15th, and that Committee approved an amendment to the composition of the Governing Council membership of the Committee. Under the amendment, the eleven Council members on the Committee would all be either alumni or Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council (LGIC) appointed governors. The rationale for the amendment was that the other nine members of the teaching staff and administrative staff, and having the eleven Governing Council members of the Committee from the external estates would provide overall representation more equivalent to that provided on the Business Board.

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

(c) Pension Committee: Establishment and Terms of Reference and Corresponding Revisions to the Terms of Reference of the Business Board and the Audit Committee (cont'd)

A member questioned the rationale of the exclusion of administrative staff and teaching staff governors from the Pension Committee. He noted that the Pensions Committee was not a sub-committee of the Business Board and, therefore, its membership did not need to reflect the composition of that Board. Mr. Charpentier responded that the Governing Council was assigning the responsibilities that were currently under the purview of the Business Board. In response to a question about the composition of the non-governors on the Pensions Committee, Professor Hildyard informed the members that the order from the arbitrator had been changed to include four members from the administrative staff group on the Committee – three on the recommendation of unionized staff and one from the non-unionized staff group. The proposed Terms of Reference of the Pensions Committee reflected the change.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved:

- (a) THAT the proposal to establish a Pension Committee, as a Committee with delegated authority from the Governing Council and reporting to the Governing Council, be approved;
- (b) THAT the Terms of Reference of the Pension Committee, a copy of which is attached to Appendix “A” of Report 434 of the Executive Committee as Attachment 1, be approved;
- (c) THAT the amendments to the Terms of Reference of the Business Board, as described in Attachment 2 to Appendix “A” of Report 434 of the Executive Committee, be approved; and
- (d) THAT the amendments to the Terms of Reference of the Audit Committee, as described in Attachment 3 to Appendix “A” of Report 434 of the Executive Committee, be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 434 of the Executive Committee as Appendix “A”.

7. Reports for Information

Members received the Calendar of Business for 2010-2011 and the following reports for information:

- (a) Report Number 169 of the Academic Board (October 7, 2010)
- (b) Report Number 183 of the Business Board (September 27, 2010)
- (c) Report Number 159 of the University Affairs Board (September 28, 2010)
- (d) Report Number 433 of the Executive Committee (October 6, 2010)
- (e) Report Number 434 of the Executive Committee (October 15, 2010)

8. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next regular meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, December 16, 2010 at 4:30 p.m.

9. Question Period

The Chair deferred the Question Period till the Governing Council meeting of Thursday, December 16, 2010.

10. Other Business

The Chair deferred the items under Other Business till the Governing Council meeting of Thursday, December 16, 2010.

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

11. Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters: Recommendations for Expulsion
(Arising from Report Number 434 of the Executive Committee [October 15, 2010])

The Chair deferred the matters under the item till the Governing Council meeting of Thursday, December 16, 2010.

A motion to vary the agenda for the Council to consider item 13 before considering item 12 was moved, seconded and carried.

13. Board Chair and Vice-Chair, Appointments, 2010-2011

The Chair informed members that the Chair and the Vice-Chair of the Academic Board had to step down from their positions as result of a change in circumstances and additional responsibilities. The Chair recommended Professor Ellen Hodnett be appointed the Chair of the Academic Board and thanked Professor Lemieux-Charles as she had agreed to serve as Vice-Chair of the Board. The Chair thanked Professor Aivazian for his dedicated service as Vice-Chair of the Board.

13. Board Chair and Vice-Chair, Appointments, 2010-2011 (cont'd)

Members were informed that Mr. John Stewart had resigned from the Council for personal reasons.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the appointment of Professor Ellen Hodnett as Chair of the Academic Board, effective October 29, 2010 and continuing until June 30, 2011; be approved; and

THAT the appointment of Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles as Vice-Chair of the Academic Board, effective October 29, 2010 and continuing until June 30, 2011, be approved; and

THAT the appointment of Mr. John Switzer as Vice-Chair of the University Affairs Board, effective October 29, 2010 and continuing till June 30, 2011, be approved.

12. Task Force on Governance – Appointment of the Implementation Committee

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

Mr. Richard Nunn (Vice-Chair, Governing Council) – Chair
Professor Ellen Hodnett (Chair, Academic Board)
Ms Shirley Hoy (Vice-Chair, Business Board)
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles (Vice-Chair, Academic Board)
Mr. John Switzer (Vice-Chair, University Affairs Board)
Ms Elizabeth Vosburgh (Chair, University Affairs Board)
Mr. David Wilson (Chair, Business Board)
Mr. P.C. Choo (Administrative Staff Governor)
Professor William Gough (Teaching Staff Governor)
Mr. Greg West (Student Governor)
Ms Shree Drummond (Assistant Provost, Assessors' Liaison)
Mr. Louis Charpentier (Secretary of the Governing Council) – Secretary

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

November 23, 2010