

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

MAY 13, 2010

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL held on May 13, 2010 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, University of Toronto at Scarborough.

Present:

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch (In the Chair)
Professor C. David Naylor, President
Mr. Andrew Agnew-Iler
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell
Mr. William Crothers
Mr. Ken Davy
Professor William Gough
Ms Joeita Gupta
Dr. Gerald Halbert
Ms Shirley Hoy
Ms Min Hee (Margaret) Kim
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles
Mr. Joseph Mapa
Professor Cheryl Misak
Mr. Richard Nunn
Professor Ian Orchard
Mr. Tim Reid
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Ms Melinda Rogers
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Mr. Olivier Sorin
Mr. John David Stewart
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh

Secretariat:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier
Mr. Anwar Kazimi
Ms Cristina Oke

Regrets:

Ms Diana A.R. Alli
Professor Varouj Aivazian
Mr. P. C. Choo
Dr. Claude S. Davis
Dr. Alice Dong
Ms Judith Goldring
Mr. Adam Heller
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Professor Christina E. Kramer
Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson
Mr. Geoffrey Matus
Ms Florence Minz
Mr. Gary P. Mooney
Mr. George E. Myhal
The Honourable David R. Peterson
Professor Doug W. Reeve
Professor Janice Gross Stein
Mr. W. John Switzer
Ms Rita Tsang
Dr. Sarita Verma
Mr. Greg West
Mr. W. David Wilson

In Attendance:

Mr. Nick Kuryluk, Member-Elect of the Governing Council
Mr. Jeff Peters, Member-Elect of the Governing Council and President, Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS)
Ms Oriel Varga, Former Member of the Governing Council
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement and Chief Development Officer
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Professor Franco Vaccarino, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning

In Attendance (cont'd):

Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost, Academic Operations
Mr. Andrew Arifuzzaman, Chief Strategy Officer, UTSC
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Professor Rick Halpern, Vice-Principal Academic and Dean, UTSC
Mr. Christopher Lang, Director, Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances
Ms Lesley Lewis, Assistant Dean, UTSC
Ms Kim McLean, Chief Administrative Officer, UTSC
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel, Office of the President
Ms Carole Moore, Chief Librarian, Robarts Library
Ms Kim Richard, Director of Human Resources, UTSC
Professor John Scherk, Vice-Dean Undergraduate, UTSC

1. Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) campus, and noted that it was a pleasure to spend time at UTSC, particularly at this time of expansion and renewal. He added that he was looking forward to Professor Vaccarino's remarks, and to hearing about UTSC's activities and initiatives in the months ahead.

The Chair invited the President to make his report.

2. Report of the President

The President stated that, in light of the full agenda and the presentation from Professor Vaccarino, he had elected to postpone the traditional student presentation until the final GC meeting in June

a) Awards and Honours

The President drew the attention of Governors to the list of faculty, student, and staff awards and honours that had been included in the agenda package, and highlighted two of the awards.

Professor Bálint Virág of the Graduate Department of Mathematics and Computer and Mathematical Sciences at UTSC had won the 2010 Coxeter-James Prize. Professor Virág held the Canada Research Chair in Probability and he was the third UTSC mathematician to win the prestigious Prize. The President explained that the Coxeter-James Prize was awarded each year by the Canadian Mathematical Society in recognition of outstanding research contributions by a young mathematician.

The President noted that Ms Deborah Sinclair, a PhD student at the Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work, had been presented with the YWCA Woman of Distinction award in the social justice category at a ceremony on May 12, 2010. She had been honoured for her continuing and pioneering work combating violence against women. Ms Sinclair had graduated with a B.A. from UTSC over 30 years ago and had just returned to the University to complete her PhD.

The President congratulated Ms Sinclair and Professor Virág.

2. Report of the President (cont'd)

b) Canada Excellence Research Chairs

The President explained that the results of the Canada Excellence Research Chairs would be officially announced on May 17, 2010¹ and he provided the Council with a preview. He reminded Governors that the Canada Excellence Research Chairs program was a new federal initiative to attract top researchers to Canada and to foster the development of research programs in the key areas of environmental sciences and technologies; natural resources and energy; health and related life sciences; and information and communication technologies. The government had set aside \$10 million over seven years for each of nineteen Chairs. The Chairs had been awarded through a two-phase competitive process. In Phase 1, universities had competed for the opportunity to establish chairs in priority research areas. Forty proposals had been whittled down to nineteen on the basis of peer reviewed excellence. In Phase 2, a short list of universities had been invited to recruit to fill a portion of the 19 Chairs, based on their success in the peer review process.

The President noted that the University's allotment had been four, the highest in Canada. The University had actively recruited to fill the Chairs, and would be welcoming two new faculty members – one in Integrative Biology, one in Structural Neurobiology. However, in two instances, the University's offers had been met by stronger counter-offers from major private institutions on the east coast of the United States. McGill University had been recruiting for two positions but had also been out-bid on both accounts. These unfilled positions were re-allocated back to the pool, and benefitted other Canadian universities. Alberta's allocation, for example, rose from two to four positions.

The President commented that the process had demonstrated that demand for world-class talent was fierce and it was increasingly difficult for Canadian institutions – even those with world-class research strengths – to compete with the large private institutions in the United States. However, the results had been good for Canada and good for the University of Toronto. The President expressed the University's thanks to the Federal government for these investments in research excellence.

c) Federal Review of Research Funding

The President reminded Governors that the federal government had announced a review of research funding structures and agencies. This review was critically important, well overdue, and hugely welcome. The University was eager to play a role, and there were indications that the University would have an opportunity to do so.

The President informed members of two recent appointments to funding agencies. Mr. John McDougall, an engineer from Alberta who had previously served as CEO of the Alberta Research Council, had been appointed as the fourth president of the National Research Council of Canada (NRC). Dr. Gilles G. Patry, Professor of Civil Engineering and past president of the University of Ottawa, had been appointed as President and CEO of the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI). Both appointments, the President reported, were auspicious.

¹ <http://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/ic1.nsf/eng/05563.html>

2. Report of the President (cont'd)

d) Provincial Government

The President expressed the University's appreciation for the provincial government's proposed updating of the Ontario Student Assistance Plan (OSAP) and the introduction of 1,000 new graduate scholarships. However, he also noted the University's concern over aspects of the Ontario Budget designed to implement compensation controls in the broader public sector. The University worried that such measures, though well-intentioned, may have unintended negative consequences with respect to equity, retention, and recruitment. The University was working closely with the government to ensure fairness as the various measures are implemented.

A second concern of the University was the pension solvency test. In five other provinces, solvency tests had been abolished for universities. In Ontario, a number of universities were required to conform to solvency rules that would cost each university tens of millions of dollars. The cost to the system would be on the order of \$6 billion over a decade or less, equal to the amount invested in post-secondary education by the provincial government during the period of hectic growth and system enhancement under *Reaching Higher: The McGuinty Government Plan for Postsecondary Education*.

e) Canada Centre for Global Security Studies / Munk School of Global Affairs

The President noted that, on April 29, 2010, the Federal Government had announced funding of \$25 million towards the new Canada Centre for Global Security Studies at the Munk School of Global Affairs. The Munk School of Global Affairs had been established with a \$35 million gift from Peter and Melanie Munk that had been matched in 2008 by a \$25 million capital contribution from the Government of Ontario.

The President extended his appreciation to Trinity College which had been the first home to the Munk Centre on the St. George campus, and would remain integral to the Munk School of Global Affairs as the School expanded.

f) Convocation season

The President concluded his report by announcing the official opening of the University's Convocation Season. The first of this spring's twenty-four convocations was scheduled for Wednesday, June 2 when graduates from the Faculty of Medicine would receive their degrees. Governors would be receiving information about the convocation schedule and were encouraged to attend the convocation ceremonies as their schedules permitted.²

The President concluded by expressing the gratitude of the University to the Chancellor for his generous commitment to convocation. He noted that the Chancellor was unable to be at the Governing Council meeting as he was being honoured with the Learning Partnership Award at the Metro Toronto Convention Centre. The President also remarked that the Award was well deserved.

g) Discussion

A member asked whether there was any news concerning the proposed Ontario Online Institute. The President replied that no additional information was available, but noted that a number of issues had to be addressed, including whether the Institute would have degree granting status, how courses would be posted and monitored, and how credit clearance would be handled.

² <http://www.convocation.utoronto.ca/dates/2010.htm>

3. Vice-President and Principal's Remarks

Professor Vaccarino welcomed members and guests to UTSC and provided an overview of the UTSC Master Plan by means of a powerpoint presentation, attached hereto as Appendix A. The key points of the presentation included the following.

- The context of the Master Plan included:
 - challenges and opportunities related to growth;
 - UTSC had received a \$70 million grant from the Federal Knowledge Infrastructure Program in support of the Instructional Centre that was currently under construction.
 - New athletic facilities would be constructed for the Pan-American games being held in Toronto in 2015.
 - strategies for attracting top students to UTSC;
 - increasing the profile of the UTSC campus;
 - enhancing the student experience ;
 - building on regional opportunity and creating a regional hub.
- In 2009, a visioning exercise was conducted by UTSC that involved various stakeholders.
 - Several principles emerged from that visioning exercise, including:
 - supporting the Academic Mission;
 - shaping a distinctive reputation and profile;
 - providing high standard facilities;
 - facilitating a vibrant campus life;
 - maximizing transportation options;
 - designing a great campus.
- Drivers for the Master Plan included:
 - the Instructional Centre, which would increase institutional space by 25%;
 - maximizing the potential of athletics facilities to enhance the student experience and strengthen links with the community;
 - maximizing the planned investments in light rapid transit (LRT) to enhance regional connectivity and integrate transit on the UTSC campus;
 - integrating the LRT into North and South campuses in a new right-of-way;
 - improving pedestrian access to integrate North and South campuses;
 - rerouting of Military Trail to connect the North and South campuses and create a strong pedestrian route to the new Pan Am facility;
 - enhancement of natural and programmatic connections to the Ravine.

3. Vice-President and Principal's Remarks (cont'd)

- A Transit strategy was a major component of future development:
 - the Sheppard East line was approved and under construction;
 - discussions with the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) and Metrolinx concerning the creation of a loop down from Sheppard to create a link with the Pan Am facilities were ongoing;
 - UTSC was receiving strong support from the TTC, City of Scarborough, and Metrolinx.
- UTSC had been engaging in a series of stakeholder meetings and discussions to confirm Master Plan directions.
 - The Master Plan had set a high bar that addressed the aspirations of *Towards 2030*.

In response to a question from a member, Professor Vaccarino said that UTSC was seeking partnership opportunities and thinking about mixed use for the campus.

A member asked whether the current athletics fee would be revoked when the new facilities were operational. Professor Vaccarino replied that work was being done on the operational plans. The current athletics fee would continue to support the existing facilities.

The Chair thanked Professor Vaccarino for his presentation.

Speaking Requests

Before considering the items for approval, the Chair informed members that three speaking requests had been received for the meeting and had been considered by the Executive Committee. The first of these requests had been received from CUPE 3902 and was related to the language courses at UTSC. With the advice of the Executive Committee, the request has been declined. CUPE 3902 already had addressed this topic at the Governing Council meeting on April 8th and had been advised that the issue was not before governance, but was a matter for the administration. Any comments were appropriately addressed to the Office of the Dean and Vice-Principal (Academic) at UTSC, or to the Office of the Vice- President and Provost.

The Association for Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) had submitted a speaking request concerning business arising from the Governing Council meeting of April 8, 2010, with regard to tuition fee increases and financial aid programs for part-time undergraduate students. This request was not granted. APUS had been advised that they already had addressed these matters at the last Governing Council meeting, and that further questions or comments were best addressed to the Office of the Vice-President and Provost. APUS also had submitted a request to comment on the proposed establishment of the departments of English and Philosophy at UTSC and had been requested to provide its comments on this matter in writing.

4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting of April 8, 2010

The minutes of the meeting of April 8, 2010 were approved.

5. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

A member noted that, at the previous meeting, the Governing Council had neglected to congratulate Mr. Petch on his re-election as Chair for 2010 – 11. Members acknowledged the Chair's re-election with applause.

A member expressed concern about remarks in the minutes of the meeting of April 8, 2010. A member raised a point of order and suggested that the member provide her comments to the Chair in writing. The Chair invited the member to send him a written submission concerning the minutes.

6. Items for Governing Council Approval

(a) University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC): Establishment of a Department of English and a Department of Philosophy

(Arising from Report Number 167 of the Academic Board [April 21, 2010- Item 5])

Professor Lemieux-Charles stated that recent external reviewers of the Department of Humanities at UTSC had noted that the present structure of this complex department, which housed a range of disciplines, was no longer optimal. It had become clear that the needs of the teaching staff and students would be better supported through three separate academic units. Extensive consultations regarding the proposed establishment of a new Department of English and a Department of Philosophy had taken place within UTSC, as well as across the three campuses. The proposed structure would strengthen the disciplines, enabling an improvement of the teaching and research missions of all three departments. The changed structure, however, would not affect the curriculum or the delivery of the academic programs. If the proposal was approved, UTSC would reallocate funds within its existing operating resources to accommodate the departments.

Following the presentation of the proposal, a Board member had noted that the external reviewers had provided four possible departmental models in their report and asked to what extent the reviewers' recommendations would be taken into consideration by the University. Professor Misak had replied that the member was correct in observing that this was the first phase in the establishment of an appropriate structure within UTSC, and she added that the process would continue over the next few years.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposal dated April 5, 2010 to establish a Department of English and a Department of Philosophy in the University of Toronto at Scarborough, be approved, effective July 1, 2010.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 167 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "A"](#).

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

(b) Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Renovation of the Innis College Town Hall
(Arising from Report Number 167 of the Academic Board [April 21, 2010 – Item 6])

Professor Lemieux-Charles informed members that the proposal was for the renovation of the Town Hall and adjacent areas within Innis College on the St. George Campus. The proposed project, which would entail a total of 514 net assignable square metres of renovated space, was composed of five aspects. These included:

- clear identification of the St. George Street entrance as the Town Hall entrance;
- delineation of the Town Hall lobby area;
- renovation of the Town Hall itself;
- expansion of the projection booth;
- renovation of the washrooms located beneath the Town Hall in the basement of Innis College.

In addressing the Academic Board, the Principal of Innis College, Professor Janet Paterson, had emphasized the dire need for the renovation of the Town Hall. She had explained that the proposed renovations were critical to meeting the needs of the Cinema Studies undergraduate and graduate programs and noted that the Hall served as a community venue for more than 300 events each year, in addition to being the College's primary classroom.

The total cost of the project would be \$3.2 million dollars, subject to the receipt of funding. Innis College was aware that funding might take some time to procure, due to the need to attract donors and the current economic environment. However, the fund-raising campaign for this project had been designated as a high priority by the Faculty of Arts and Science.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the Project Planning Report dated February 2010 for the renovation of the Innis College Town Hall (312 nasm) and adjacent areas (202 nasm) on the St. George campus at the University of Toronto be approved in principle; and
2. THAT the project scope as identified in the Project Planning Report be approved in principle at a cost of \$3.2 million subject to the receipt of funding.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 167 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "B"](#).

(c) Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Robarts Library Pavilion
(Arising from Report Number 167 of the Academic Board [April 21, 2010 – Item 7])

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that the proposed pavilion had been part of the original plans when the library was first constructed. However, due to budgetary constraints, it had not been built at that time. The University was now ready to move forward with this project which would consist of a new five-storey pavilion of 5,540 gross square metres, to be located along Huron Street. It would be built over the existing loading dock and would connect through to the existing floors 2 to 5.

In February 2010, a private commitment of \$15 million had been identified to begin work on the Pavilion. The total cost of the project was estimated at \$38.59 million, and construction would proceed once the remainder of the funding had been confirmed. The new pavilion would provide a mixture of formal and informal workstations and approximately 1,000 spaces for students. The pavilion and a café seating at grade would be designed to permit operation independently of the Library, allowing for extended hours.

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

(c) Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Robarts Library Pavilion (cont'd)

A student member of the Board had congratulated Ms Carole Moore, Chief Librarian, on the proposal, stating that additional study space was desperately needed by the students on the St. George campus. The student had said that the proposed late-night café in the Library would be a welcome facility that would enable students to study in a more comfortable environment during the evening, and she had concluded by thanking Russell and Katherine Morrison for their donation.

Mr. Nunn stated that, subject to the approval of Governing Council, the Business Board had authorized spending of up to \$1-million for the project. That would enable the initiation of architectural design. Subject to the receipt of full funding, the Board had approved execution of the project.

He noted that there had been lively discussion in the Board concerning the project. A member had urged that the project should go further in order to meet a shortage of private carrel space for graduate students. The problem was that the project was limited by the funding available and yet to be raised. The Chief Librarian had advised the Board that the space in the new pavilion would likely be more attractive to undergraduates, but it might increase the space available to graduate students in the upper floors containing the book-stacks.

A member spoke positively about the project but expressed his concern that no additional carrel space for graduate students had been provided. He indicated that he had spoken with Ms Moore and Ms Sisam and had encouraged them to identify space that could be used to expand carrel space. A member commented that in his view the design was brilliant and allowed flexibility for the use of space. President Naylor thanked the members for their comments and advised them that he and the Provost were reviewing space use in the Robarts precinct.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Robarts Library Pavilion be approved in principle;
2. THAT the project scope, comprising new construction of 3325 nasm (5540 gsm) at a total project cost of \$38.59 million be approved in principle;
3. THAT \$1.0 million of the funding in hand be accessed to initiate schematic architectural and structural design work; andhgtr
4. THAT construction of the Pavilion proceed once the remainder of the funding has been confirmed.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 167 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "C"](#).

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

(e) Policy with Respect to Workplace Harassment

(Arising from Report Number 181 of the Business Board [April 26, 2010 – Item 4d])

Mr. Nunn explained that the *Policy with Respect to Workplace Harassment* arose from recent amendments to the Ontario *Occupational Health and Safety Act*. The *Policy* was brief and set out definitions that conformed to those in the *Act*. It advised employees where they should turn if they had been harassed and set out penalties.

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

e) Policy with Respect to Workplace Harassment (cont'd)

Mr. Nunn reminded members that the University already had in effect a *Guideline on Civil Conduct*³. That *Guideline* represented the University's more detailed program to deal with workplace harassment. It set out examples of unacceptable, and acceptable, conduct, and defined the processes for complaint.

A member asked whether there were any aspects of the proposed policy that would run counter to the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*⁴. At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Moate replied that nothing in the proposed policy would be in conflict with the *Act*. A member commented that, in her view, the proposed *Policy* was minimalist and could have gone a lot further. It was her understanding that there had been no consultation with students and limited consultation with staff in the development of the *Policy*. At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Hildyard replied that, while the *Policy* was minimalist, the *Guidelines on Civil Conduct* were quite detailed and could change as needed with time and experience. During negotiations, there had been extensive discussion with employee unions on this topic.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed *Policy with Respect to Workplace Harassment*, a copy of which is attached to Professor Hildyard's memorandum of April 14, 2010, be approved, with effect from June 15, 2010.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 181 of the Business Board as [Appendix "A"](#).

(f) Policy with Respect to Workplace Violence

(Arising from Report Number 181 of the Business Board [April 26, 2010 – Item 4e])

Mr. Nunn noted that a slightly revised version of the proposed *Policy* had been placed on the table. The only revision was to include the telephone numbers of the campus police on all three campuses. The *Policy with respect to Workplace Violence* also arose from recent amendments to the *Ontario Occupational Health and Safety Act*. The University was developing a detailed guideline to implement the *Policy*. The guidelines would be in place by June 15, when the amended legislation came into effect, and would be forwarded to the Business Board for information.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed *Policy with Respect to Workplace Violence*, a copy of which is attached to Professor Hildyard's memorandum of April 14, 2010, be approved, with effect from June 15, 2010.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 181 of the Business Board as [Appendix "B"](#).

³ <http://www.hrandequity.utoronto.ca/Assets/news/civility.pdf?method=1>

⁴ http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/statutes/english/elaws_statutes_90f31_e.htm

7. Reports for Information

Members received the following reports for information:

- (a) [Report Number 167 of the Academic Board \(April 21, 2010\)](#)
- (b) [Report Number 181 of the Business Board \(April 26, 2010\)](#)
- (c) [Report Number 156 of the University Affairs Board \(April 20, 2010\)](#)
- (d) [Report Number 430 of the Executive Committee \(April 29, 2010\)](#)

8. Date of Next Meeting

Members were reminded that the next meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for **Thursday, June 24th, 2010 at 4:00 pm.**, 30 minutes earlier than the usual meeting time, in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

9. Question Period

A member asked whether the University was reviewing the death of a construction worker at UTSC. At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Hildyard replied that the worker had been employed by a contractor, not by the University. The Ministry of Labour and the contractor were involved in discussions concerning the accident. It was her understanding that the Ministry had made no judgment against anyone as this was deemed a tragic accident.

The member asked who would be responsible for covering the costs of toxic abatement for the proposed UTSC Sports and Recreation Complex. At the invitation of the Chair, Ms Riggall replied that the costs, which had not yet been determined, would be part of the project cost.

The member asked whether the program fee that was being implemented by the Faculty of Arts and Science would result in a tuition increase that was greater than the 5% average increase allowed by the provincial government. Professor Misak replied that program fees were not regarded as tuition fees by the government.

The member commented that, in the introduction section of the external review of the UTSC Department of Humanities⁵, the reviewers noted that they had met with fifteen students. She asked if there had been other consultations with students. A member replied that the reports of review committees were thoroughly discussed at divisional council meetings. At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Vaccarino stated that he had been briefed on the review, and was satisfied that due process had been followed.

A member requested reassurance that French language and Classical Studies programs at UTSC would not be adversely affected by the establishment of the Departments of English and Philosophy. Professor Misak replied that the UTSC programs were evolving but that there was no reason to anticipate a negative effect on French language or Classical Studies programs at this time.

A member requested an update on the Transition Year program at the next meeting of the Governing Council.

⁵ <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=6927>

10. Other Business

a) National Association of University Board Chairs and Secretaries (NAUBCS)

The Chair informed members that one hundred Chairs and Secretaries from across Canada had attended the NAUBCS conference that had been held in Toronto from April 29 to May 1, 2010, and congratulated the Secretary on the organization of the conference.

b) Acknowledgement of Volunteer Contribution

A member expressed his appreciation for the contributions of Mr. Hans Fischer, Head Coach of the Varsity Blue's Nordic Ski team. Mr. Fischer, a graduate student, had devoted thousands of hours as a volunteer coach of the team for the past five seasons.

c) Follow-up to previous Governing Council meeting held on April 8, 2010

A member raised the issue of police presence at meetings of the Governing Council that had been referred to by the Chair during his Report on Consultations at the meeting held on April 8. Two members raised points of order and encouraged the member to respect the Chair and to allow the Governing Council to continue with the agenda.

d) Thank you

The Chair thanked Professor Vaccarino and the staff at UTSC for their work in preparing for the Governing Council meeting. He invited those present to join Professor Franco Vaccarino at a reception at the Ralph Campbell Lounge at the conclusion of the meeting.

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 11 and 12 WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

11. Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters: Recommendation for Expulsion

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the President's recommendation for expulsion, as outlined in the memorandum and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated April 21, 2010, be confirmed.

12. Board and Committee Assignments

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposal from the Chair for Boards and Committee assignments for 2010-11 be approved.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

May 20, 2010