

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 431 OF
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Monday, June 14, 2010

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Monday, June 14, 2010 at 5:00 p.m. in the Boardroom, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch, Chair
Dr. Alice Dong, Vice-Chair
Professor David Naylor, President
Mr. Ryan Campbell
Mr. Ken Davy
Ms Judith Goldring
Professor Ron Kluger
Mr. Joseph Mapa
Mr. Timothy Reid
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Janice Stein

Non-Voting Member:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry Mulhall, Secretary
Mr. Anwar Kazimi

Regrets:

Mr. P.C. Choo
Dr. Gerald Halbert

In Attendance:

Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost, and Office of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity^{*}
Professor Vivek Goel, Former Governor; Vice-Chair, Task Force on Governance^{**}
Ms Joeita Gupta, Member of the Governing Council
Mr. Christopher Lang, Director, Office of Appeals, Discipline, and Faculty Grievances^{*}
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles, Chair, Academic Board and Member of the Governing Council
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost, and Member of the Governing Council
Mr. Richard Nunn, Chair, Business Board and Member of the Governing Council
Dr. Rose Patten, Former Chair of the Governing Council; Chair, Task Force on Governance^{**}
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh, Chair, University Affairs Board and Member of the Governing Council

^{**} In attendance for agenda item 6.

^{*} In attendance for agenda item 14.

Vary the Agenda

It was agreed to vary the order of the agenda to consider the following *in camera* item at the outset of the meeting. This had been requested by the Board of Directors of the Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre in order to allow the Board to commence its Annual General Meeting once the Committee had completed its consideration of the item.

The Committee moved *in camera*.

16. External Appointments

(b) Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT, subject to approval by the Board of Directors of the Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, the following individuals be re-appointed to the Board of Directors of the Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, for terms effective June 14, 2010 to continue until the 2011 Annual General Meeting of the Corporation, or until their successors are appointed:

Mr. David Agnew
Mr. Carey Diamond
Mr. David A. Leslie

THAT, subject to approval by the Board of Directors of the Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, the current terms of appointment of the following individuals as members of the Board of Directors of the Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre continuing until the 2012 Annual General Meeting of the Corporation, be revised to continue until the 2011 Annual General Meeting of the Corporation, or until their successors are appointed:

Ms Teri E. Brown
Mr. Phillip Crawley
Ms Pamela Griffith-Jones
Ms Susan M. Scace

The Committee returned to closed session.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 430 (April 29, 2010) of the Executive Committee was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the report of the previous meeting.

3. Minutes of the Governing Council Meeting

Members received for information the Minutes of the Governing Council meeting held on May 13, 2010.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Governing Council Meeting

The Chair reported that a speaking request had been received related to a matter reported in the Minutes of the Governing Council meeting of May 13, 2010. The Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) had asked to address the Council at its meeting on June 24, 2010 regarding the Munk School of Global Affairs, referred to in the Minutes under the Report of the President. With the agreement of the members of the Committee, the Chair declined the request. The naming of the School had been deliberated and approved by the Committee on Namings, and the President's Reports at the April 29, 2010 meeting of the Executive Committee and the May 13, 2010 meeting of the Governing Council had also addressed this matter. It was therefore unnecessary to add further discussion of the matter to what was already a lengthy agenda for the Governing Council meeting on June 24th.

There was no other business arising from the minutes of the Governing Council meeting.

5. Report of the President

(a) G20 Summit

The President reported that the University had decided to restrict access to buildings on the St. George Campus during the upcoming G20 Summit, from 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, June 23 through Sunday, June 27, 2010. This decision had not been made lightly, given the University's values, including its commitments to freedom of speech and assembly. Rather it had been made advisedly in light of significant logistical and security challenges, particularly once G20 organizers had decided to move the official protest area from Trinity Bellwoods Park to Queen's Park, in the centre of the downtown campus. It was expected that protest activity would overflow onto the University campus raising serious concerns for the safety of students, staff, and faculty. The most recent G20 Summit, in Pittsburgh in September 2009, had resulted in violence, property damage, and confrontations between protesters and police on the campus of the University of Pittsburgh.

The University remained committed to maintaining freedom of expression and assembly, and its faculty, staff, and students were free to take part in protest activity. The campus would remain open to pedestrians and cyclists. The cancellation of events and activities on campus, including the relocation of the Governing Council meeting on June 24th, would be inconvenient. However, the safety of the University community remained the first priority.

(b) Expense Reporting

The President noted that there was a trend that was gaining momentum nationally and provincially to require public sector employees to report travel and hospitality expenses. In that light, his intention was to post online within the coming weeks his expenses incurred in his duties as President. It seemed that tighter rules regarding transparency and accountability in this area were inevitable. The rationale was in part legitimate, but the creation of an accountability industry for political reasons was regrettable.

(c) Program Fee Update

As part of the President's Report at the Governing Council meeting on June 24, 2010, the Faculty of Arts and Science would provide a report on the implementation of its new Program Fee. Professor Mark McGowan, Chair of the Program Fee Monitoring Committee, would provide a brief presentation outlining the membership, mandate and current activities of the Committee.

5. Report of the President (cont'd)**(d) June Convocations**

The Chancellor continued his remarkable record of participation at every Convocation ceremony, and would attend a total of twenty-four during June of 2010. The President also thanked Governors for their participation and contributions which were much appreciated, especially by the graduating students. On a personal note, he found the convocation season a very enjoyable and uplifting period of the year, and he encouraged any Governors who had not yet done so to take part in some of the ceremonies.

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

The Chair introduced the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Task Force, and thanked them and the other Task Force members for their many months of hard work. Dr. Patten thanked the Committee for the opportunity to provide an update on the Task Force's final report. The original plan had been for the Executive Committee, at its current meeting, to consider the report for endorsement and forwarding to the Governing Council for final approval at the meeting of June 24, 2010. However, as the report was being finalized, it had been determined that a further few weeks were needed to refine its recommendations. The Chair and the President had agreed to the following modified approach. The Task Force would hold one further meeting on June 17, 2010 for the final sign-off to the report. The Governing Council would be informed of the modified schedule at its meeting on June 24, 2010. The Task Force would formally submit its report to the Chair and President on June 28, 2010, in keeping with its original commitment to do so by the end of June 2010. Consultation sessions on the report would be held with the Board Chairs and Vice-Chairs in early September, and thereafter with the various estates of the Governing Council. A Special Meeting of the Executive Committee would be held in early October, during which the report would be formally presented and considered in detail before being forwarded to the Governing Council for its consideration. An information session for Governors would be held prior to the October Governing Council meeting, likely during the third week of October. Finally, the report would be formally presented to the Governing Council at its meeting on October 28, 2010, and its recommendations would be considered for approval.

In response to a question it was clarified that consultation on the report with governors would occur by means of the informal consultation or information sessions, rather than a formal meeting of the Council. Approvals would occur at the October 28, 2010 Council meeting. Consultation with the Executive Committee could also occur in September. Professor Goel noted that the modified approach, delaying governance consideration of the report to October, was intended specifically to allow more time for consultation. The Task Force was not wedded to a firm schedule, and the Chair of the Governing Council could make modifications to it as necessary. The President clarified that the report submitted on June 28, 2010 would be in its final form. Subsequent sessions with the Executive Committee and other groups would be for consultation on the report, rather than its further modification.

Dr. Patten and Professor Goel provided the Committee with a brief overview of the structure of the report, referring members to the table of contents that had been distributed. The report had two major sections, the Executive Summary and the Detailed Recommendations. The Executive Summary included background information, strategic findings, a description of the approach that had been taken to break down the complexity of the task, as well as an overview of the recommendations, distinguishing between those for immediate and those for future implementation. The Detailed Recommendations section began at the strategic level and moved to the operational. They were intended to: set the tone by means of specific principles and a mandate for good governance; improve the conduct of meetings; ensure the quality of governors, through appropriate expectations, attributes, and ethical conduct; and strengthen oversight and accountability by means of enhanced agendas (avoiding duplication and increasing delegations), improved use of governors' time, and increased efficiency of deliberations. The overall finding of

6. Briefing on the Report of the Task Force on Governance (cont'd)

the report was that governance at the University was strong. The specific recommendations were intended to make it even more robust, and they reflected directions in which the governance system was already evolving.

Among the specific matters that arose in discussion were the following. It was confirmed that the report addressed the topics of the identification, selection, election, orientation, and evaluation of governors. The Task Force had considered the type of voting system used in Governing Council elections, but had decided not to recommend the introduction of an alternate system. Such a matter could be taken up by the Elections Committee. The Task Force was satisfied that its report and recommendations complied fully with the *University of Toronto Act, 1971* and other relevant legislation, and it referenced the key principles contained in that legislation.

7. Item for Confirmation by the Executive Committee

(a) Constitution: Innis College

(Arising from Report Number 168 of the Academic Board [June 2, 2010] - Item 5)

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that the constitution of the Innis College Council had last been revised more than ten years previously. The proposed revisions were relatively minor and, were intended to clarify terms and to reflect current language conventions within the University. Minor changes in Council membership had also been made. The amended Constitution had been approved by the Innis College Council on April 19, 2010.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED THE DECISION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

THAT the amended Constitution of Innis College, which was approved by the Innis College Council on April 19, 2010, be approved.

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

8. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council

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

(Arising from Report Number 168 of the Academic Board [June 2, 2010]- Item 6)

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

Among the highlights of Professor Regher's presentation had been the following. The proposed approval process for undergraduate and graduate programs would include the following: an administrative review; broad consultation within the University and with external constituencies when appropriate; consideration by University governance bodies; submission to the Quality Council for approval; and approval by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities and accrediting bodies. The process for program closures would be unchanged, and such closures would be noted in an annual report to the Quality Council. Deans would become

8. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(a) Policy on Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units (cont'd)**

responsible for commissioning reviews of their divisions, and would have discretion to bundle multiple cyclical reviews of existing programs, if appropriate, for increased efficiency. If necessary, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs could request a one-year follow-up on programs where areas of concern had been identified during the reviews. In the case of significant problems or deficiencies, the Dean or the Vice-Provost would have the authority to halt admission to a program until there was evidence that the quality concerns had been addressed. Following discussion, the Academic Board had recommended approval of the *Policy*.

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

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

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

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

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

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that the *Policy on Endowed Chairs, Professorships, Lectureships and Programs* had last been amended in 1997. The Division of University Advancement and the Office of the Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life had reviewed the *Policy* and had identified sections that required updating. Among the proposed revisions to the *Policy* were the following: the inclusion of provisions for the establishment of limited term chairs, professorships, distinguished scholars, and program initiatives that would allow the use of expendable funds; amendments to the appointment and review process for endowed or limited term chairs and professorships; and the replacement of stated minimum funding amounts with appropriate minimum thresholds that would be set and reviewed periodically based on the financial needs and advancement realities of the University. During discussion, the Board had been informed that while the *Policy* indicated that the appointment of a Chair was normally for a five-year term renewable once, most agreements with donors were open-ended with respect to the term of a Chair.

8. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(b) Policy on Endowed Chairs, Professorships, Lectureships and Programs: Revision (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

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

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

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

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

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

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

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

be revised to read

the Agenda Committee is responsible for establishing the Nominating Committee

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

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

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

8. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(c) Tribunal Selection Committee: Expanded Scope and Name Change (cont'd)**

be revised to read

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

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

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

be revised to read:

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

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

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

be revised to read:

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

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

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

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

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

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

The first option was to renovate the existing building which housed the Faculty of Dentistry at 124 Edward Street. The building was in poor condition, and even with extensive renovation and

8. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(d) Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report for an Oral Health Science Complex (cont'd)**

construction of an addition, there would still be insufficient space to accommodate all of the planned facilities. The Project Planning Committee had therefore determined that the outcome of such an approach would be sub-optimal, and costing for the option had not been carried out.

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

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

The President reiterated the comments that he had made at the Academic Board meeting regarding this interim project planning report. Though there was an identified need for improved facilities and more space for the Faculty of Dentistry, the proposed project was a very expensive one, and there was not currently sufficient financing in place to allow it to proceed. A blend of revenue sources would be required, as the University was not prepared to fund the project largely with debt financing. The interim project planning report had clarified the scope of the project as well as the options that were available, and would assist greatly with fundraising efforts. At present the project was not an urgent capital or borrowing priority for the University.

A member asked whether consideration had been given to the possibility of constructing the new oral health science complex at either the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) or the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM). The Vice-President and Provost responded that this option had not been considered extensively given the large clinical system operated for underserved members of the public by the Faculty in central Toronto, as well as its close relationships with the downtown teaching hospital system. The President added that the specialized clinics operated by the Faculty in the downtown research hospitals could not be replicated in either Scarborough or Mississauga. There were also compelling reasons for the Faculty to remain in close proximity to the University's other health science faculties, with which it cooperated extensively. He added that the Faculty's clinics were very expensive to operate, representing an annual cost to the University of approximately \$5 million. There was a strong need for greater government support for this clinical system which provided high quality services to members of the public who lacked the means to pay for dental care.

A member asked whether consideration had been given to the possibility of proceeding with the proposed project at a potentially much reduced cost to the University by means of a public-private partnership. The President responded that there continued to be debate about the merits of such partnerships in the university sector. In his opinion the marginal advantages of the so-called P3 approach depended largely on the type of facility under construction. For the proposed oral health science complex, a P3 approach might have some advantages for the clinical facility, but would not likely be appropriate for the specialized labs that would need to be constructed. In any case, the University's current efforts were focussed on defining the scope of the project, rather than considering construction and operating options.

8. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(d) Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report for an Oral Health Science Complex (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

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

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

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

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

The Chair noted that the Business Board would consider the execution of this capital project at its meeting on June 17, 2010 before it proceeded to the Governing Council for final approval on June 24, 2010. Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that the proposal recommended the relocation of the Department of Family and Community Medicine from 263 McCaul Street to 500 University Avenue. There had been rapid growth in the programs offered by the Department, and in 2008 it had been temporarily assigned additional space in the Banting Building. The total space requirement for the Department was approximately 1,260 nasm. 500 University Avenue had been identified as the most appropriate location because the required space was available there, and because the current occupants were the Faculty of Medicine’s rehabilitation sciences departments. Were the project approved, space at 263 McCaul Street would not be released. A small portion of the Department’s activity would remain there, and the remainder of the space would be used by the Faculty of Medicine. The estimated total project cost was \$3,500,000, with \$3,000,000 to be funded by the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care, and \$500,000 to be provided by the Department. No questions had been asked by members of the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

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

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

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

8. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)

- (f) **Faculty of Medicine: Proposal to Establish the Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (DCCBR) as an Extra-Departmental Unit:A**
(Arising from Report Number 168 of the Academic Board [June 2, 2010]- Item 11)

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

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

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

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

- (g) **Faculty of Law and School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Global Professional Master of Laws (G.P.L.L.M.) Program**
(Arising from Report Number 168 of the Academic Board [June 2, 2010]- Item 12)

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

8. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)

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

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

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

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

9. Revised Governing Council and Executive Committee Meeting Dates, 2010-11

The Secretary stated that three unanticipated scheduling conflicts had arisen following approval of the 2010-11 meeting dates at the previous meeting of the Executive Committee, and the motions before the Committee for approval contained the adjustments that were necessary. In addition to the initial meetings of the Executive Committee and Governing Council, the Governing Council Orientation would also be held on September 8, 2010.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the Executive Committee meeting scheduled for Thursday, September 16, 2010 (time TBD) be rescheduled to Wednesday, September 8, 2010 (time TBD);

THAT the Governing Council meeting scheduled for Thursday, September 16, 2010 (time TBD) be rescheduled to Wednesday, September 8, 2010 (time TBD);
and

THAT the Executive Committee meeting scheduled for Monday, October 18, 2010 at 5:00 p.m. be rescheduled to Friday, October 15, 2010 at 12:00 p.m.

10. Summer Executive Authority

The Secretary noted that each June the Governing Council was asked to delegate to the President the authority to take any necessary actions on its behalf during the summer months. During 2010, the Summer Executive Authority period would be briefer than in recent years, given that there was a meeting of the Governing Council scheduled for September 8, 2010.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED to the Governing Council:

1. THAT until the next regular meeting of the Governing Council or its appropriate committee or board, authority be granted to the President for:

10. Summer Executive Authority (cont'd)

- (i) appointments to categories 2¹ 3² and 5³ of the *Policy on Appointments and Remuneration* approved by the Governing Council of the University of Toronto, dated May 30, 2007;⁴
 - (ii) approval of such additional curriculum changes as may arise for the summer and September 2010; and
 - (iii) decisions on other matters the urgency of which does not permit their deferral until the next regular meeting of the Governing Council or its appropriate standing committee or board.
2. THAT all actions taken under this authority be approved by the Chair of the Governing Council prior to implementation and reported to the appropriate committee or board for information.

11. Reports for Information

Members received the following reports for information:

- (a) Report Number 168 of the Academic Board (June 2, 2010)
- (b) Report Number 181 of the Business Board (April 26, 2010)
- (c) Report Number 157 of the University Affairs Board (April 20, 2010)
- (d) Report Number 158 of the University Affairs Board (June 1, 2010)
- (e) Report Number 20 on Namings

12. Date of the Next Meeting

Members were reminded that the next regular meeting of the Executive Committee was scheduled for Thursday, June 24, 2010 at 3:00 p.m., to be held on the campus of the Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre.

13. Other Business

There were no items of other business for consideration in closed session.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT, pursuant to sections 28 (e) and 33 of *By-Law Number 2*, consideration of items 14-17 take place *in camera*, with the Board Chairs, Vice-Presidents, and Special Advisor to the President admitted to facilitate the work of the Committee.

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

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

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

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

In Camera Session

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

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the recommendation for expulsion contained in the Memoranda from the Secretary of the Governing Council dated June 14, 2010, be placed on the agenda for the June 24, 2010 meeting of the Governing Council; and

THAT pursuant to Sections 38 and 40 of By-Law Number 2, these recommendations be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

15. Committee for Honorary Degrees: Membership

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT the recommendation from the Academic Board concerning the membership of the Committee for Honorary Degrees for 2010-2011 be endorsed and forwarded to the Governing Council for approval; and

THAT pursuant to Section 38 of By-Law Number 2, the recommendation be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

16. External Appointments

(a) Hart House Board of Stewards and Finance Committee

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT Mr. Kenneth Davy be appointed to the Hart House Board of Stewards for a one-year term, from July 1, 2010 until June 30, 2011, or until his successor is appointed; and

THAT Mr. Paul Lindblad be re-appointed to the Hart House Finance Committee for a one-year term, from July 1, 2010 until June 30, 2011, or until his successor is appointed.

(b) Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre

Considered by the Committee at the outset of the meeting.

16. External Appointments (cont'd)

(c) University Health Network

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT Professor Catharine Whiteside and Professor Cheryl Regehr be re-appointed to the Board of Trustees of the University Health Network for one-year terms, from July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011, or until their successors are appointed.

(d) West Park Healthcare Centre

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT Professor Luc De Nil be proposed to the Nominating Committee of the Board of Governors of the West Park Healthcare Centre for re-appointment to the Board for a one-year term, with his appointment to continue until the 2011 Annual General Meeting, and until a successor is appointed.

(e) University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation

It was agreed to add the words “in her capacity as Vice-President, Business Affairs” to the motion.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT Ms Catherine J. Riggall, in her capacity as Vice-President, Business Affairs, be approved and nominated as Chair of the Board of Directors of the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation, effective June 25, 2010, and continuing until her successor is elected.

17. Senior Appointment

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation for a senior appointment contained in the memorandum from the President dated June 14, 2010.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT, pursuant to Section 38 of *By-Law Number 2*, the recommendation for the senior appointment be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

The Committee returned to closed session.

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Secretary
June 18, 2010

Chair