

BOARD OF GOVERNORS
Governance, Nominations & Human Resources Committee (GNHR)

Thursday, January 27, 2022
2:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
[Videoconference](#)
+1 587-687-2100 PIN: 756671944

Members: Maria Saros (Chair), Laura Elliott, Mitch Frazer, Francis Garwe, Kathy Hao, Kori Kingsbury, Steven Murphy, Dietmar Reiner, Trevin Stratton

Staff: Jamie Bruno, Becky Dinwoodie, Lori Livingston

AGENDA

No.	Topic	Lead	Allocated Time	Suggested Start Time
	PUBLIC SESSION – 2:00 p.m.			
1	Call to Order	Chair		
2	Agenda (M)	Chair		
3	Conflict of Interest Declaration	Chair		
4	Chair's Remarks	Chair		
5	President's Remarks	Steven Murphy	10	2:05 p.m.
6	Governance:			
6.1	Strategic Discussion: Community Engagement* (D)	Becky Dinwoodie	25	2:15 p.m.
6.2	Development of Board Governance EDI Strategy: EDI Statement* (M)	Chair	10	2:40 p.m.
7	Human Resources			
7.1	Pension Governance Review Findings Report* (U)	Jamie Bruno	15	2:50 p.m.
8	Consent Agenda (M):	Chair	5	3:05 p.m.
8.1	Minutes of the Meeting of October 21, 2021*			
9	Policy (for written feedback):			
9.1	Procedures to Prevent and Address Discrimination and Harassment By or Against Students*			
10	Other Business	Chair		
11	Adjournment (M)	Chair		3:10 p.m.
	BREAK		10	

No.	Topic	Lead	Allocated Time	Suggested Start Time
	NON-PUBLIC SESSION (material not publicly available)			3:20 p.m.
12	Call to Order	Chair		
13	Conflict of Interest Declaration	Chair		
14	Chair's Remarks	Chair	5	
15	President's Remarks	Steven Murphy	10	3:25 p.m.
15.1	Durham College Engagement* (U)			
16	Human Resources			
16.1	Labour Relations & Human Resources Update (U)	Jamie Bruno	20	3:35 p.m.
17	Nominations			
17.1	Board Leadership Succession (D)	Dietmar Reiner	5	3:55 p.m.
17.2	Board Recruitment* (D)	Becky Dinwoodie	10	4:00 p.m.
18	Consent Agenda (M):	Chair		4:10 p.m.
18.1	Minutes of the Meeting of October 21, 2021*			
19	Other Business	Chair		
20	In Camera Session (M)	Chair	10	4:15 p.m.
21	Termination (M)	Chair		4:30 p.m.

Becky Dinwoodie, Secretary



Governance, Nominations & Human Resources Committee (GNHR)

Strategic Discussion: Community Engagement

Date: January 27, 2022

By: Becky Dinwoodie, Associate University Secretary & Judicial Officer

Strategic Discussion: Community Engagement

- Pre-pandemic, the Board had been considering how to strengthen engagement with the university's internal stakeholders.
- Examples of Board engagement with internal stakeholders include:
 - attendance at university events (e.g. Campus Cup, Pow Wow, significant announcements, etc.)
 - The Board has also invited student groups to present to the Board and heard from a local community group with respect to the Student Sexual Violence Policy.
- Included on GNHR's work plan for this year was considering the development of a Board social media strategy in order to strengthen community engagement.
- We thought it would be an appropriate time for the committee to discuss how the Board could strengthen community engagement generally.



Strategic Discussion: Community Engagement

Goals of Community Engagement:

- Promote transparency
- Educate the community about the role and work of the Board
- Strengthen communication
- Raise the profile of the university, which could contribute to: [governor recruitment](#), [student recruitment](#), [developing new partnerships](#), [advancement of the university](#)

These goals align with the university's strategic priorities of [Telling Our Story](#) and [Partnerships](#).



Strategic Discussion: Community Engagement

Previous Suggestions:

- host an annual Town Hall to hear directly from the university's internal community
- End of Year BBQ hosted by the Board of Governors and Academic Council for all internal community members (Board and Council members to serve the food/drinks in shifts and “host” tables to eat with community members)

Additional Suggestions for Consideration:

- Leverage governors' preferred social media platforms (e.g. LinkedIn, Twitter) to amplify university announcements, research of the university, good news stories, etc.
- Leverage existing university social media channels to profile individual governors and the work of the Board to improve community understanding of the Board and its role





Strategic Discussion: Community Engagement

What are the committee's thoughts about the additional suggestions?

What are other ways the Board can strengthen community engagement?





COMMITTEE REPORT

SESSION:

Public

ACTION REQUESTED:

Decision
 Discussion/Direction

TO: Governance, Nominations and Human Resources Committee (GNHR)

DATE: January 27, 2022

FROM: Becky Dinwoodie, Associate University Secretary and Judicial Officer

SUBJECT: Draft Board of Governors Statement on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI Statement)

COMMITTEE MANDATE:

- In accordance with its Terms of Reference, one of GNHR’s responsibilities includes periodically reviewing the policies of the Board and its committees and making recommendations to the governing body or administrative department for development and revision when appropriate.
- GNHR has developed a draft Board EDI Statement and it is being presented for the committee’s recommendation for approval by the Board of Governors.

BACKGROUND:

- Concurrent with the COVID-19 crisis, we have also been witnessing a crisis of racism, hatred and violence across North America. Equity, diversity, and inclusivity are fundamental values that define our institution.
- In order to demonstrate the Board’s commitment to systemic change to organizational structures that continue to marginalize communities, one of the Board’s priorities is to develop a governance EDI strategy for the Board. This is in addition to the Board’s oversight of EDI initiatives at the university.
- The Board commenced its work on developing a Board Governance EDI Strategy last year. GNHR is the committee responsible for overseeing this initiative and advising the Board accordingly.
- As part of the Board’s initial work on this, the Board of Governors had a professional development session dedicated to EDI before its meeting in February 2021 and GNHR had discussions focused on EDI during each of its meetings last year.

- As it started this process, the Board acknowledged the important work that has already begun at the university, including the President's Equity Task Force Report.

Summary of key takeaways from GNHR EDI discussions:

- The institution should be a leader in this area for the broader community;
- Board recruitment process should be reviewed and updated in order to bolster EDI considerations;
- The Board should work to ensure its composition reflects the community it serves;
- Requires Board to commit to ongoing professional development with respect to EDI;
- Important for the Board to be thoughtful in its work and avoid making merely symbolic statements;
- Consider updating the Board's annual practices assessment to incorporate EDI-focused questions; and
- EDI should be incorporated into the Board's decision-making processes.

Working Group:

- In order to assist GNHR with this work, a working group consisting of several members of GNHR and other external governors met in July to prepare a draft Board EDI statement for the committee's review.
- The working group members are:
 - Maria Saros, Chair of GNHR
 - Kevin Chan
 - Stephanie Chow
 - Francis Garwe
 - Kori Kingsbury
 - Roger Thompson
- The working group was guided by the key takeaways from the discussions of GNHR and the Board.
- The draft Board EDI statement was reviewed by GNHR at their October meeting and is being presented for the Board's review and feedback.

FEEDBACK FROM THE BOARD:

- The draft statement was presented to the Board for review and feedback at their meeting on December 9, 2021.
- A summary of the Board's comments follows:
 - great work on the EDI statement;
 - since the EDI statement was developed before the community consultations for the presidential renewal, it might be helpful to have a look at the community feedback to determine whether there is anything further to incorporate into the statement;
 - it is great that the statement includes an acknowledgment of friendship with Indigenous people - is there room for a statement that captures the Board's commitment to supporting and advancing relationships with Indigenous communities?
 - the statement accurately reflects the Board's role – support, foster and monitor advancement of EDI programs at the university; the Board also commits to supporting the work of reconciliation;

- the Board is embarking on this journey together with the university;
 - How will the Board actualize the commitment? Suggestion to include a section in Board reports on how the proposal advances EDI;
 - Is the statement trying to be too specific by listing the groups and will that inadvertently leave someone out?
 - suggestion to add “and other equity deserving groups/communities” to the statement;
 - the statement is not carved in stone and can be updated as needed – it is a living and breathing document;
 - it might be helpful to make it explicit in the statement that it is an evolving document and will be reviewed; and
 - this is crucial work – the section in the statement about university culture is extremely important.
- The statement has been updated to incorporate the key comments from the Board and is being presented today for recommendation.

NEXT STEPS:

- The statement will be presented to the Board for approval on March 10, 2022.

MOTION for CONSIDERATION:

That the Governance, Nominations and Human Resources Committee hereby recommends the Board of Governors EDI Statement, as presented, for approval by the Board of Governors.

SUPPORTING REFERENCE MATERIALS:

- blacklined updated Board EDI Statement

Commitment to EDI:

The Ontario Tech University Board of Governors acknowledges and is grateful for the friendship of the people of the Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation on whose traditional lands the university's campus is located. The Board is committed to equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) and to removing barriers for the groups most likely to experience them, including: Indigenous persons; persons with a disability; Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, Queer, 2-spirit, Non-Binary (LGBTQ2+) persons; racialized persons; ~~and women~~women; and other equity deserving groups. This includes a commitment to advancing reconciliation and fostering relationships with Indigenous communities.

The Board's Role:

The Board will support and foster the advancement of EDI programs and initiatives at the University and is committed to incorporating EDI in its decision-making and recruitment practices.

University Culture:

The Board commits to fostering an inclusive culture at Ontario Tech University. The Board believes EDI is at the heart of the university's mission of *technology with a conscience*, and engages regularly with university leadership on the progress against Ontario Tech's EDI strategy.

Board Decision-Making:

The Board commits to incorporating EDI in the performance of its duties and its decision-making processes to ensure the Board is reviewing matters through an EDI lens.

Board Recruitment:

The Board will pursue recruitment strategies that enable it to broaden the EDI of the Board when recruiting governors.

Board Composition:

The Board is committed to incorporating EDI in its governor appointments and to ensuring that Board members reflect the communities the university serves.

Board Education:

The Board approaches its role in advancing EDI as a journey that requires regular engagement with the university community and an open mindedness to continually seek out new knowledge and perspectives. The Board is committed to providing continuous learning for governors to ensure its policies reflect best practices for diverse recruitment. The Board will incorporate EDI learning in its professional development programming for governors.

As the Board's EDI journey evolves, so too will this statement. The Board will regularly review and update this statement to ensure it reflects the Board's increased knowledge and improved understanding of EDI best practices.

DRAFT



COMMITTEE REPORT

SESSION:

Public
 Non-Public

ACTION REQUESTED:

Decision
 Discussion/Direction
 Information

Financial Impact Yes No

Included in Budget Yes No

TO: Governance, Nominations and Human Resources Committee (GNHR)

DATE: January 27, 2022

FROM: Jamie Bruno, Chief Transformation Officer

SUBJECT: Pension Governance Review Findings Report

COMMITTEE MANDATE

In accordance with GNHR’s Terms of Reference, the committee is responsible for oversight of the university’s human resources policies, strategies and plans, including the university’s pension plan (Plan).

The Senior Administration Sub-Committee (SASC) is a sub-committee of the Senior Leadership Team. The SASC exercises overall responsibility for the proper administration of the Plan and administration and investment of the Fund. As set out in its Terms of Reference, SASC is responsible for ensuring that the appropriate policies for the governance of the Plan and Fund are in place and reports to GNHR as necessary or required.

The SASC is providing an update to GNHR on the results of a pension plan governance review in order to help GNHR fulfill its mandate of overseeing the university’s pension plan.

BACKGROUND & RATIONALE:

In spring 2021, the University initiated an external compliance review of the pension plan governance framework and our current practices versus the Canadian Association of Pension Supervisory Authorities (CAPSA) governance guidelines.

The University retained McCarthy Tetrault to collect and review the University's current decision-making and governance practices as it applies to the Registered Retirement Plan (the "Plan") for employees at Ontario Tech and to analyze these practices in light of industry best practices.

The previous Governance Review was presented to GNHR in 2014 with a promise to review the plan after five years, which is best practice. In light of COVID pandemic, we extended the timeframe slightly to summer 2021.

The overall assessment and findings were:

- The University's pension governance is very strong and consistent with best practices.
- The Plan governance structure is generally sound and does not contain gaps or overlaps.
- Ontario Tech University has done an "excellent job of setting up an effective and appropriate pension governance system that addresses its fiduciary duties under the Pension Benefits Act and also responds to many of the Principles in the CAPSA Governance Guidelines".
- In addition, the fiduciary governance framework addresses its legal and regulatory responsibilities in an effective, prudent and pro-active manner.

SUPPORTING REFERENCE MATERIALS:

- Pension Findings Report - Presentation



Pension Findings Report

GNHR – January 27, 2022

Objective

The purpose of this Pension Findings Report is to:

- provide an overview of the analysis and methodology used by McCarthy Tetrault;
- share a summary of the assessment and findings presented;
- identify the recommendations provided, and;
- recognize progress to date to address these recommendations and highlight any outstanding recommendations not yet completed.









Executive Summary of the Pension Review

- In spring 2021, the University initiated an external compliance review of the pension plan governance framework and our current practices versus the Canadian Association of Pension Supervisory Authorities (CAPSA) governance guidelines.
- The University retained McCarthy Tétrault to collect and review the University's current decision-making and governance practices as it applies to the Registered Retirement Plan (the "Plan") for employees at Ontario Tech and to analyze these practices in light of industry best practices.
- The review concluded that the University has done an "excellent job of setting up an effective and appropriate pension governance system" and the fiduciary governance framework "has addressed its legal and regulatory responsibilities in an effective, prudent and pro-active manner".



Overview of Pension Review Methodology

- The scope of the external review and analysis included the following:
 - A review of specified Plan documents relevant to governance;
 - An examination of the Plan's governance organizational chart and related role and responsibility documents;
 - A review of the Plan in the context of governance best practices;
 - An analysis of findings in light of the documentation presented and consideration for that documentation in relation to other pension fund clients;
 - A summary and presentation of findings.

Component Reviewed:	Review Process:	Overall Assessment:	
Governance Structure	Reviewed Plan governance structure against key principles.		The University has done an excellent job of setting up an effective pension governance system that addresses PBA and CAPSA Governance Guidelines.
Legislative Compliance	Reviewed Plan against pension legislation and regulations applicable to the Plan		The GNHR Annual Report on Plan compliance noted no compliance issues for 2020.
Funding	Reviewed funding provisions of Plan against pension legislation/regulations applicable to the Plan		No issues with funding model were identified.
Performance of Board and Governance of Delegates	Reviewed performance management against governance policy, legislative requirements, and industry guidelines		The documents identified appropriate self-assessment and review.
Investment of the Pension Fund	Review policies and compliance with PBA, YTA and Cap guidelines.		Regular investment monitoring takes place.
Performance of staff and third-party service providers	Reviewed performance against policy, legislation and industry guidelines		Board checklists were reviewed and meet expectations.



Overall Assessment and Findings

- The University's pension governance is very strong and consistent with best practices.
- The Plan governance structure is generally sound and does not contain gaps or overlaps.
- Ontario Tech University has done an “excellent job of setting up an effective and appropriate pension governance system that addresses its fiduciary duties under the Pension Benefits Act and also responds to many of the Principles in the CAPSA Governance Guidelines”.
- In addition, the fiduciary governance framework addresses its legal and regulatory responsibilities in an effective, prudent and pro-active manner.




Recommendations

- While assessment and findings confirmed a sound administrative and governance structure for the University Defined Contribution Plan, a series of recommendations to enhance the overall plan framework were provided.

Recommendation	Status:
Develop and introduce an annual performance review/self-evaluation process	Completed as part of Annual Governance Review Checklists
Identifying when the entity is exercising administrative functions versus when it is exercising sponsor functions	Completed as part of Annual Governance Review Checklists
Marking the date of preparation or adoption and/or revision on all materials	Completed as part of Annual Governance Review Checklists
Ensure pension governance needs are taken into account during the formulation of corporate governance policies and procedures	Completed as part of Annual Governance Review Checklists
Develop a Service Provider Selection and Review Policy	Completed as per the Procurement of Goods and Services Policy
Ensure that key issues are addressed and communication delivered directly to members via email and by letter post	Completed as part of Annual Governance Review Checklists



Recommendation	Status:
Ensure members understand who they can contact with questions, and also to whom they can escalate if their concerns are not addressed	Included as part of all communication materials
Review of the Plan website content or structure in regard to how information is made available to members	Completed on an annual basis and ad-hoc
Develop and introduce a standardized orientation process for new members	Completed and provided for new P&B Committee members
Develop and introduce education sessions	Completed – Sun Life provides education sessions in the Spring and Fall
Consider adopting these policies in keeping with FSRA policies A300-200 and A300-450	Compliant as per Records Classification and Retention Schedule
Risk Management Policy	Pension governance forms part of the University's Annual Risk Registry
 Pension governance program would benefit from integration with corporate governance and risk management	Included as part of annual consultation with Risk Management Office

Recommendation	Status:
Develop Terms of Reference	Board to approve Terms of Reference for spring 2022
Creating an electronic governance resource	HR Action item for summer 2022

Current Practice – no change

- Ontario Tech has decided not to make changes for the following:
 - Developing a standardized succession policy and a robust skills matrix for Board Members
 - A matrix is already in development and will be forwarded to the USGC Office as part of an overall skills matrix review in March 2022





BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Governance, Nominations & Human Resources Committee (GNHR)

Minutes of the Public Session of the Meeting of October 21, 2021

2:00 p.m. – 3:40 p.m., Videoconference

- Members:** Maria Saros (Chair), Laura Elliott, Mitch Frazer, Kathy Hao, Kori Kingsbury, Steven Murphy,
- Regrets:** Francis Garwe, Dietmar Reiner, Trevin Stratton
- Staff:** Jamie Bruno, Sarah Cantrell, Cheryl Foy, Barb Hamilton, Krista Hester, Lori Livingston, Brad MacIsaac, Krista Secord
- Guests:** Chelsea Bauer (FA), Mike Eklund (FA), Christine McLaughlin (FA), Jordyn Perreault-Laird (OCUFA), Hannah Scott (FA)

1. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

2. Agenda

The Chair noted that item 16.2 will be deferred until the Board meeting.

Upon a motion duly made by L. Elliott and seconded by K. Kingsbury, the Agenda was approved as amended.

3. Conflict of Interest Declaration

None.

4. Chair's Remarks

The Chair thanked the university community for a gradual and safe return to campus. Work continues to ensure the Board is as effective and engaged as possible. She hopes everyone had an opportunity to review the material in advance of the meeting, as they will be discussing several important topics, including the continued work on the EDI statement.

5. President's Remarks

The President welcomed everyone to the start of another Board year. He discussed the start up and reported it has been a smooth and safe transition. He shared that his conversations with students have the same themes: they are happy to be back on campus and they feel very safe when on campus. He is hearing similar comments from faculty and staff. This provides a good basis for thinking about how we move forward together as a community. The university took a prudent approach as it was uncertain as to what the fourth wave was going to look like and it is promising to see that vaccinations seem to be working on flattening and even reducing the curve.

The President emphasized the importance of discussing what the university will look like in a post-COVID era. He has been holding consultations with Academic Council and other groups. He has no doubt that the university will come out of it with a strong value proposition. The community has rallied during the pandemic and he is proud of what we have been able to achieve. He noted that we will have a better idea of what that will look like next September. The goal is not to get the model perfect in September 2022 but to start a journey that never ends.

The President also discussed the opportunity to change the model of how we are working. There are people across the region who are interested in being part of the university's story but distance poses an obstacle. They are also thinking about what leadership will look like in this era. We are all looking for a more humane way to live and still accomplish a lot. While the model is not a perfect one, the university has made great strides and will continue to work to improve it. Focus continues to be on the space and IT side of things.

The Chair agreed that the university should not lose what is working well. There was a question about whether the Board would be returning to in-person meetings next fall. The President advised that the Board will be receiving a survey about the effectiveness of virtual, in-person, and hybrid meetings. The governors' feedback will be collected and will help guide how we move forward.

6. Governance

6.1 GNHR Terms of Reference Review

B. Dinwoodie provided an overview of the committee's terms of reference, which is an annual standing item for the first committee meeting of the year. It provides the committee members with an opportunity to refamiliarize themselves with the committee's mandate. A member inquired whether the committee's work on EDI needs to be incorporated into the terms of reference. There was a discussion about the process to update the terms of reference. C. Foy clarified that it would be advisable to wait until the full Board has an

opportunity to discuss the EDI statement and whether GNHR should be responsible for EDI work or whether it should be assigned to a smaller group.

6.2 Strategic Discussion: Future of Work

J. Bruno delivered a presentation on the Future of Work at the university. He provided an overview of the consultations that have been taking place. He welcomed the committee's advice on additional ways to set us up for success as we move forward and their feedback on the efforts that are already under way. J. Bruno explained that the university leadership was consulted to explore the necessary locations of the work being delivered (occasionally on campus (2 days or less) or primarily on campus (3 days or more)). He reported that the majority of positions only need to be on campus occasionally. He stressed that the consultation was focused on the position as opposed to individual employees. Further, the discussion is independent of costs.

J. Bruno advised that this work is being done in conjunction with space planning. He is having regular discussions with B. Maclsaac, which are focused on maximizing space usage as opposed to space reduction. He also discussed the importance of trying to understand the reasons for people leaving the university. Accordingly, metrics will be collected through exit interviews.

Questions and comments from the committee included:

- Support for grounding it at the position level as opposed to individual based – are there any positions that can be done completely remotely?
 - J. Bruno advised that they do not anticipate positions that will be completely off campus; while a position may not necessarily be held to a weekly schedule, almost every position is looking at some time on campus.
- Any consideration being given to allow employees flexibility by having days be activity based as opposed to day based (e.g. need to attend campus for meetings)? This would provide employees with the flexibility to avoid traffic or avoid using public transit.
 - J. Bruno confirmed that this is being considered and it is a long-term consideration.
- Would think that there would be a number of faculty who enjoy the remote work flexibility. For those who prefer to work remotely, is an alternate physical location up for consideration?
 - J. Bruno advised that external partners have been consulted to review the circumstances that need to exist for this possibility; the current thought is that staff should be available to attend campus as need be.
 - He advised that they must also take into consideration the different legislation that might apply to staff working outside of the province/Canada.

- Will there be changes to the footprint for office space and any reduced costs coming out of it? How does this align with the planning for students returning to campus?
 - Short-term focus is on repurposing space; the intent is not to lose the footprint of physical space but rather looking at opening it up for other purposes; they are always looking for new space for student learning and study space.
- Suggestion for metrics to involve student feedback on their experience given the importance of social activity on campus to students.
- Consultation with all stakeholders will be the key to success – once the program is in place, important to consider equity implications – ensure that people feel included in the organizational dynamic.

The Chair noted that the hybrid experience has not been positive as people participating virtually struggle to feel included and there is a natural vibe for those meeting in person. She also commented that she feels confident that it is being approached in a well thought out way.

6.3 Development of Board Governance EDI Strategy: Draft EDI Statement

The Chair provided an overview of the development of the EDI statement. She noted that there are not many other institutions where the Boards have started this type of work. The Chair reviewed the questions included in the accompanying report and invited the committee's feedback on the draft EDI statement.

The committee had the following comments:

- In a hybrid/remote environment, the land acknowledgment might differ depending on where people are participating from; accordingly, should provide some flexibility.
- Great to have such a statement when start work as governors; referred to the key takeaways, particularly ensuring that as a Board, members are reflective; the actions that come out of the philosophical statements will be most important;
- the assessment conducted at year end will help governors think about what we have accomplished as a Board coming out of our commitment to EDI; commended the work done by the working group.

The Chair confirmed that the draft statement will go to the full Board in December for consultation.

6.4 Update of Board 3-Year Governance Plan

C. Foy highlighted the governance accomplishments that have been made under the existing 3-year governance plan. She highlighted that the 2018-2020 governance plan was the first governance plan for the university. Much work has been done to enhance bicameral governance and enhance the role of Academic Council. C. Foy commented that it was timely that H. Scott and M. Eklund are in attendance, as they were involved in the by-law review, which formed a big part of the governance plan. She congratulated the committee and staff on the work that has been accomplished. She provided an overview of the potential priorities proposed in the report. She noted that we demonstrate leadership as a university with our commitment to good governance and it is important to consider how we continue that work.

The following is a summary of the committee's feedback on the proposed priorities:

- Opportunity to do more formal/informal joint events with Academic Council (AC) – opportunity to educate more governors on the work of AC.
 - S. Murphy commented that informal opportunities are also important for relationship building and getting to know each other; he affirmed that L. Elliott's participation as a member of AC has been invaluable and that they are also looking for a Board liaison from AC.
 - the Chair added that informal gatherings would be a great opportunity as they would help build a sense of collegiality.
- Support the proposed priorities. Why was the improvement of Board engagement/effectiveness limited to the incorporation of technology as Board effectiveness goes beyond technology?
 - C. Foy clarified that the priorities can be updated to reflect that it goes beyond technology.
- L. Elliott confirmed that her participation in AC and the blended learning discussions have been hugely beneficial to her understanding of faculty concerns and issues they face; anything we can do to further develop the relationship between AC and the Board would be hugely advantageous; in light of the committee's previous discussion, the priorities should be done through the lens of EDI – what does this mean from an EDI perspective? Important to ensure that the Board focuses on EDI learning as there is much to be learned about equity, Indigenous culture, etc.
- If prioritize professional development, EDI should be at the top.
- The Chair agreed with including a review of the Board's skills matrix as there are a number of new governors and a changing landscape.

C. Foy confirmed that the priorities would be updated and presented to the Board for feedback

6.5 Board Engagement: Board PD work plan 2021-2022

C. Foy provided an overview of the proposed PD work plan. Based on the committee's discussions during the meeting, more EDI topics will be developed. This is the proposed schedule and it can be filled out as the committee would like. The committee supported the cybersecurity topic. The committee also supported keeping the sessions to 30 minutes as they feel it will encourage attendance. A suggestion was also made that a session focused on helping governors understand the academic landscape would be helpful (e.g. What are new trends emerging post-COVID across the sector).

7. Policy:

7.1 Workplace Violence Policy Review

J. Bruno advised that this was the final step in disentangling various policy documents, as set out in the accompanying report. There was a discussion regarding the recent news of sexual assaults occurring during orientation parties at other institutions. C. Foy clarified that the Student Sexual Violence Policy is distinct from this policy.

Upon a motion duly made by K. Kingsbury and seconded by L. Elliott, the Governance, Nominations and Human Resources Committee unanimously approved the following motions:

- (a) That the Governance, Nominations and Human Resources Committee hereby recommends the Policy Against Violence in the Workplace, as presented, for approval by the Board of Governors*
- (b) That the Governance, Nominations and Human Resources Committee hereby approves the Procedures Against Violence in the Workplace, as presented.*

8. Consent Agenda:

8.1 Minutes of the Meeting of May 27, 2021

8.2 2022 Board Election Process

Upon a motion duly made by L. Elliott and seconded by K. Kingsbury, the Consent Agenda was approved as presented.

9. For Information:

9.1 By-laws Implementation Update

9.2 Benefits Plan Amendment

10. Other Business

11. Adjournment

There being no other business, upon a motion duly made by L. Elliott, the public session adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Becky Dinwoodie, Secretary

DRAFT



COMMITTEE REPORT

SESSION:

Public

ACTION REQUESTED:

Decision
 Discussion/Direction
 Information

Financial Impact Yes No

Included in Budget Yes No

TO: Governance, Nominations and Human Resources Committee (GNHR)

DATE: January 27, 2022

FROM: Andrew Sunstrum, Director, Human Rights Office

SUBJECT: Procedures to Prevent and Address Discrimination and Harassment By or Against Students – Written Consultation

COMMITTEE MANDATE:

- Under the University’s Act, section 9 (1), the Board of Governors has the power: “to establish academic, research, service and institutional policies and plans and to control the manner in which they are implemented”. The university’s Policy Framework is a key institutional policy that delegates the Board’s power, establishing categories of policy instruments with distinct approval pathways.
- In accordance with its Terms of Reference, one of GNHR’s responsibilities is the establishment of human resources policy instruments.

Request: We are asking for GNHR’s consideration of and comments on the draft procedures.

BACKGROUND/CONTEXT & RATIONALE:

The Secretariat plays a significant role in advancing the strategic objective of creating a sticky campus. This work is done with a focus on initiatives to improve the culture within which students learn and employees work. Several years ago, the Secretariat began to focus on how the university improves its culture by increasing its capacity to manage conflict and promote respect. The university established the Respectful Campus Policy (“RCP”) to communicate the University’s Human Rights responsibilities and obligations

in a central document that applies to all University Members. In addition, the RCP places a greater emphasis on preventing harassment and discrimination by addressing disrespect and microaggressions and placing greater emphasis on informal dispute resolution processes such as mediation. While the principles and obligations described in the RCP apply to all University Members (with the exception of workplace harassment), the dispute resolution procedures for employees and students will remain separate. The Procedures to Prevent and Address Discrimination and Harassment by or Against Employees were approved in 2021 and the corresponding student procedures are now ready for review and approval.

ALIGNMENT WITH MISSION, VISION, VALUES & STRATEGIC PLAN:

- This policy instrument supports the university's values of integrity and respect by demonstrating the university's commitment to establishing a safe, inclusive, and equitable culture at the institution.
- By promoting a respectful, inclusive, and equitable culture at the university, this policy documents also supports the strategic pillar of creating a "sticky campus". If we want the university community to want to spend time on campus, they must feel protected and be familiar with their various rights, roles, responsibilities and obligations as they relate to preventing and responding to all forms of harassment and discrimination. We must also move toward more constructive ways of resolving disputes earlier and in less adversarial ways.

CONSULTATION:

- Policy Advisory Committee (Consultation - September 2021)
- Ontario Tech Student Union (Consultation - December 2021)
- GNHR (Consultation - January 27, 2022)
- Academic Council (Consultation – February 2022)
- Online Consultation (Consultation – February 2022)
- GNHR (Approval – March 2022)

Consultation Comments and Response

Respectful Campus Procedures (for Students)

- We received feedback suggesting correction of minor typos and to clarify certain language.
- **Response:** revisions were made as suggested.
- We received feedback suggesting that the procedures should make clear how students can raise concerns related to alleged disrespectful behavior, including microaggressions.
- **Response:** Revisions were made to clarify that allegations of disrespect and/or microaggressions can be made directly to a Person of Authority.

NEXT STEPS:

- Comments from pending consultations including those from Academic Council will be considered and a revised draft brought forward for approval to the Governance, Nominations and Human Resources Committee (March 31).

SUPPORTING REFERENCE MATERIALS:

- Procedures to Prevent and Address Discrimination and Harassment By or Against Students – Written Consultation

Classification Number	<i>To be assigned by Policy Office</i>
Parent Policy	Respectful Campus Policy
Framework Category	Legal, Compliance and Governance
Approving Authority	Governance, Nomination and Human Resources Committee
Policy Owner	General Counsel
Approval Date	DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION
Review Date	
Supersedes	

PROCEDURES TO PREVENT AND ADDRESS DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT BY OR AGAINST STUDENTS

PURPOSE

1. The purpose of this procedure is to establish a dispute resolution framework for the prevention and handling of Student-based Reports of alleged breaches of the Respectful Campus Policy (*the Policy*); ensuring the University effectively addresses and responds to these Reports consistent with legislative obligations.

DEFINITIONS

2. For the purposes of these Procedures the following definitions apply:

“Administrative Fairness” means that the procedures used in the investigation and decision-making processes adhere to the following elements:

- The Complainant, if any, is given a full and fair opportunity to raise allegations and provide relevant and material evidence in support of those allegations;
- The Respondent knows what the allegations are and receives enough information to provide a meaningful response;
- The Respondent is given a full and fair opportunity to defend against the allegations and provide relevant and material evidence rebutting those allegations;
- The parties receive adequate notice of the nature of the proceedings and of the issue to be decided.
- The parties have a right to an impartial decision maker and freedom from bias
- The decision maker is required to consider all of the relevant evidence and information pertaining to a specific case.
- The decision-making processes run in a timely fashion
- The parties have a right to a support person and/or representation during dispute resolution meetings; and
- The parties are provided the reasons for the decision.

“Balance of Probabilities” means an investigative standard that must be met to determine whether a violation of policy has occurred based on a finding that “it is more likely than not” that the offence at issue was committed by the Respondent. This is a lower standard than beyond a reasonable doubt, but more than mere suspicion.

“Complainant” refers to an individual who is alleged to have experienced a breach of the Policy.

"Discrimination" is a distinction, without lawful justification, whether intentional or not, which has the effect of denying benefits to, or otherwise disadvantaging, an individual on the basis of a Protected Ground (defined below). Discrimination may involve direct actions that are

discriminatory on their face, or it may involve rules, practices or procedures that appear neutral, but have the effect of disadvantaging one or more groups of people.

"Discriminatory Harassment" means engaging in a course of vexatious comment or conduct, against a University Member based on any Protected Ground, that is known or ought reasonably to be known to be unwelcome. Discriminatory Harassment may include, for example, taunting or mocking someone's race, ridiculing an individual's disability or targeting others with sexual, gender-based or homophobic slurs.

"Disrespect" is behavior that falls short of Harassment, but nevertheless has harmful impacts on the campus environment, e.g. rude, inconsiderate and passive aggressive behavior. Disrespect, if left unaddressed, can escalate to Harassment or Discrimination.

"Extenuating Circumstances" means circumstances outside of an individual's control that result in delays in the dispute resolution processes described in this procedure. Extenuating circumstances include, but are not limited to, having multiple witnesses, difficulty in scheduling interviews, availability of resource persons or materials, time of year, involvement of law enforcement or existence of a judicial hearing, or other circumstances that may arise through the course of the investigation.

"Harassment" for the purposes of this procedure Includes Discriminatory Harassment (with the exception of sexual harassment, which is addressed under the University's Student Sexual Violence Policy and Procedure) and Reprisal (defined below). Harassment normally includes a series of incidents but can be one severe incident which has a lasting harmful impact on the individual.

"Interim Measures" means temporary measures designed to prevent additional breaches of the Policy and/or to protect the safety of the Complainant or others. Interim Measures may be instituted at any point following a Report and prior to a determination being made. Interim Measures take into consideration the severity of the allegations and the varying risks associated with the potential for subsequent policy breaches. Examples of interim measures include, but are not limited to, a no-contact order, trespass or restricted access order, suspension, exclusion from athletic or other extra-curricular activities, limiting access to services or facilities, or other safety measures.

"Investigation" means a part of the Dispute Resolution Process in which the University conducts a systematic inquiry into alleged breaches of the Policy.

"Investigator" means an individual who has the required training and experience to conduct a fair and objective Investigation.

"Mediation" is a structured process in which parties in dispute are assisted by a third-party to discuss a dispute and attempt to arrive at a mutually agreeable resolution. Mediation is a voluntary process and can only proceed if all parties involved agree to participate. Depending on the circumstances, mediation may result in a signed agreement summarizing the agreed upon terms of settlement.

"Person(s) of Authority" includes any person who has charge of a workplace, authority over another Employee or authority in the administration of education. Anyone who supervises an

Employee at Ontario Tech University is a Person of Authority. For the purposes of this procedure, Faculty members, and Faculty Leadership (e.g. Deans, Associates Deans, etc.) are also considered Persons of Authority vis-à-vis their relationship to students.

"Protected Ground(s)" are the Grounds contained in the Ontario Human Rights Code under which individuals are protected against discrimination and harassment. Students are protected under the following Grounds: "race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, age, marital status, family status and disability."

"Report" refers to a Reported violation of the Respectful Campus Policy by or against a Student.

"Reprisal" is a form of Harassment that includes retaliation, coercion, dismissal, threats or intimidation of anyone who in good faith: raises complaints or concerns, exercises their rights, or participates in a remedial process under the Policy.

"Respect" is a standard of interpersonal communication and behaviour characterized by self-restraint and consideration for others.

"Respondent" refers to anyone who is alleged to have engaged in a breach of the Policy.

"Student" means an individual who is currently registered in any course or program of study at Ontario Tech, or who was registered as a Student at the time of the alleged breach of the Policy.

"Support Worker" means a trained and registered Mental Health Counsellor in Student Mental Health Services assigned responsibility for providing support for Students who have experienced, are accused of or have witnessed a breach of the Policy.

"University Member" means any individual who:

- is employed by the University or holds an appointment with the University, including paid, unpaid and/or honorific appointments ("**Employee**");
- is registered as a student, in accordance with the academic regulations of the University; and/or
- Is otherwise subject to University policies by virtue of the requirements of a specific policy (e.g. Booking and Use of University Space) and/or the terms of an agreement or contract.

"Working Days" means all weekdays, excluding statutory holidays and University closure dates as indicated on the University website.

SCOPE AND AUTHORITY

3. The University Secretary and General Counsel is the Policy Owner. The Policy Owner is responsible for overseeing the implementation, administration, interpretation and application of these Procedures.
4. This Procedure applies to Reports made by or against Students. This Procedure necessarily overlaps with other University procedures that are concerned with preventing and addressing incidents of Harassment and Discrimination. Ontario Tech University will administer the overlap according to the following principles:

- 4.1. Reports brought forward by a University Student involving a Respondent who was, at the time of the incident(s), acting in the capacity of a University Employee, including a Respondent who was a Student acting in the capacity as a University Employee (e.g., Teaching Assistants), will proceed under this procedure in conjunction with the Employee procedures.
 - 4.2. Reports brought forward by a University Employee involving a University Student who is accused of a breach of the Policy will also proceed under this Procedure in conjunction with the Employee procedures.
 - 4.3. Allegations of student sexual violence, including alleged incidents of sexual harassment involving a Student, will be handled in the manner prescribed under the [Student Sexual Violence Policy and Procedures](#).
 - 4.4. Students who wish to challenge a grade because of alleged Harassment or Discrimination are expected to make use of the grade appeal and reappraisal procedures as a first step. At the conclusion of the grade appeal and/or reappraisal process, the Student may elect to file a report under this procedure if they remain dissatisfied. In such instances, the Human Rights Office will review the information and evidence gathered during the grade appeal and/or reappraisal process to determine whether any outstanding allegations warrant further action under this Procedure.
 - 4.5. Where an individual, other than a University Member, is alleged to have engaged in a breach of the Policy against a Student, the Office of Campus Safety will consult with Members at risk, and other Members if necessary, to determine and implement reasonable measures to protect the health and safety of its Students. Because the University does not have the jurisdiction to compel statements from members of the general public, or to impose sanctions upon them, it will not normally conduct a formal Investigation in such cases.
5. This Procedure is a mechanism for alternative dispute resolution. It does not preclude Complainants from pursuing resolution through external resources and processes, including those offered through the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario. However, The Human Rights Office may not accept a complaint or may halt dispute resolution processes under this procedure if a complainant decides to pursue external processes on the same or similar matter.
 6. **Notice:** All notifications required under these Procedures will be delivered by email to a ontariotechu.net or ontariotechu.ca account, as applicable.
 - a) Emails will be deemed received by a Student one (1) Working Day after they are sent. All Ontario Tech Students are required to monitor their ontariotechu.net accounts regularly, including during examination periods.
 - b) A Student's failure to monitor their email account will not give rise to any right of appeal under these Investigation Procedures.

PROCEDURE

This Procedure assumes that a centralized process is necessary to ensure uniformity and fairness in dealing with alleged violations of the Respectful Campus Policy involving Students. It is intended to provide a framework that protects confidentiality and ensures that, as far as

possible, the initiation and pursuit of a formal report will not be an intimidating experience. Accordingly, the emphasis is on informal resolution, using facilitation and negotiation, save where the nature of the matter necessitates a more formal resolution process. The university intends that the existence of this document should help create an environment that nurtures and supports the work of all University Members.

7. **Confidentiality:** Complaint information and evidentiary details will be kept confidential, except under the following circumstances:
 - The Complainant chooses to proceed with a formal Report, in which case information will be shared only to the extent necessary to achieve Administrative Fairness, and as otherwise required by law;
 - Information is received suggesting there is a clear risk of harm, including self-harm, to the Student or other individuals;
 - Reporting is required by law (e.g., the suspected abuse or neglect of someone under 16 years of age, which will be reported to the Children's Aid Society, or reporting is required by a regulatory body); and
 - Information is required for a police investigation, or for litigation purposes.
8. **Timeliness:** All efforts must be made to ensure that proceedings are handled in an expeditious manner. Timeframes, where specified, may be subject to an extension only as a result of Extenuating Circumstances.
9. **Safety is Paramount:** Ontario Tech University has an overriding obligation to protect the safety of all University Members. When a University Member is at risk of imminent harm, we reserve the right to respond appropriately, independent of a Complainant's and/or Respondent's course of action under this Procedure.
10. **Support Services:** [Student Life](#) has appropriate mental health support services for Students who experience Harassment and Discrimination or to assist Students who are involved in dispute resolution processes described in this Procedure.
11. **Right to a Support Person(s).** Complainants and Respondents who attend an interview or meeting under this procedure may be accompanied by a support person or legal representative. The role of a support person is to provide moral support. Individuals who choose to attend an interview with a support person must choose a support person who is not otherwise connected to the matter under Investigation (i.e. a witness or fellow Complainant) and will notify the Human Rights office of their support person's name at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. During an investigative interview, a support person will not be permitted to make legal submissions or arguments on behalf of the individual, or to disrupt the interview. In any event, individuals who are being interviewed must answer the interview questions themselves.
12. **Reprisal:** Any Reprisal, or expressed or implied threat of Reprisal, for making and pursuing a Report under this Procedure is itself considered a breach of the corresponding Policy. Any individual experiencing Reprisal may file a Report, and that Report will be processed under this procedure.

PREVENTATIVE MEASURES

13. **Range of Dispute Resolution Options:** Several options to resolve Human rights concerns are available for Complainants. Informal approaches can foster prompt resolution and prevent escalation; particularly when concerns are raised expeditiously. These are opportunities for parties to resolve a dispute, ensure the campus is free from Harassment and Discrimination and address broader issues that caused or contributed to the dispute.
14. **Talk to the person about their behaviour:** Where appropriate, Complainants are expected to make good faith efforts to attempt to resolve matters themselves before filing a Report. If a person feels they are experiencing a breach of the Policy, they should immediately make known to the person responsible that the conduct is unwelcome or offensive. It is important that this message be clear and unambiguous. When presented with a legitimate concern, University Members are expected to make reasonable adjustments to their behaviour to resolve the matter. If addressing the person responsible could lead to safety risks, or is not appropriate, Complainants may pursue other resolution options outlined in these procedures.
15. **Talk to a Person of Authority:** incidents of alleged disrespect may be raised to a person of authority if attempts to resolve the behaviour directly with the individual are not successful.
16. **Consultation:** Students may benefit from having expert information and advice before deciding how to proceed with a human rights concern. Students can confidentially consult a representative of the Human Rights Office for more information about Human Rights and Dispute Resolution options. Consultations are confidential and can provide information, coaching, and referrals to assist Complainants.

REPORTING

17. **The Reporting Process**
Incidents of Harassment and/or Discrimination should be promptly reported to the Human Rights Office, and no later than one (1) year after the last incident of alleged Harassment or Discrimination.

Step 1 – Submitting a Report

- 17.1. Student may initiate a “Report”, and the corresponding “Reporting Process”, by completing the Report form that is available from the Human Rights Office.
- 17.2. The University may initiate an Investigation under these Investigation Procedures without a formal written Complaint if the situation represents an immediate risk of harm to an individual or individuals or there is evidence to suggest the existence of systemic issues.

Step 2 – Interim Measures

- 17.3.** Upon receiving a Report, the University will immediately determine whether Interim Measures are necessary, considering the severity of the allegations, and the potential risks to University Members. Interim Measures will be implemented where reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances. Person(s) of Authority, the Complainant, Respondent, the Office of Campus Safety or any other relevant stakeholder, may be consulted on a confidential basis, to determine appropriate Interim Measures.

Step 3 – Assessment

- 17.4.** The Human Rights Office will review the Report and determine if the conduct alleged in the Report would amount to Discrimination or Harassment. This determination will be based on an assumption that all of the alleged facts were true. The Human Rights Office may meet with any person to assess the nature and validity of the Complaint. Meetings will be conducted in a sensitive, confidential and tactful manner.
- 17.5.** If the allegations set out in the Report would not, if true, amount to Discrimination or Harassment, the Human Rights Office will respond to the individual submitting the Report in writing, usually within 30 days, advising that the Report has been reviewed, and that the information provided does not support an allegation of Discrimination or Harassment. The individual submitting the Report will also be advised that the Human Rights Office may reconsider the Report if additional and significant information is provided. If there is another process or resource at the University that would be more appropriate for the subject matter of the Report, the individual will be advised of this alternative process. Complaints that do not meet the requirements for a formal report under relevant policy, but nevertheless describe behaviours that are contrary to the University's values, (e.g. rude, disrespectful, antagonizing behaviour) may be referred to the applicable Person of Authority for appropriate follow-up or may be eligible for the informal resolution processes described in this procedure at the discretion of the Human Rights Office.
- 17.6.** If, on the other hand, the information provided would, assuming the alleged facts were true, support a finding that Discrimination or Harassment had occurred, the below dispute Resolution options will be considered.

Step 4 – Informal Resolution

- 17.7.** A Complainant may choose to pursue an Informal Resolution at any time. Where appropriate, an informal resolution process can be pursued if the Complainant and Respondent consent to an informal resolution process being pursued and to its format.
- 17.8.** Examples of Informal Resolution processes may, depending on the circumstances, include: communicating to a Respondent that the behaviour is unwelcome and must stop; meeting with a university official to discuss the ways in which future occurrences of the disclosed incident can be prevented; training or education for

individuals and groups; and Mediation or other alternative dispute resolution processes.

- 17.9.** The informal resolution process may result in one of the following outcomes:
- a.** If the Complainant is satisfied by the actions taken through the Informal Resolution process, the Human Rights Office will prepare a written summary of the resolution and the Complainant will confirm acceptance in writing. If accepted, the Report will be deemed resolved.
 - b.** If no satisfactory resolution is achieved, the Complainant may consider pursuing a Formal Resolution.
- 17.10.** Once an informal resolution process has commenced, an Investigation may be delayed for a maximum period of 30 calendar days, after which, unless a resolution has been reached, the Investigation will proceed.

Step 5 – Investigation

- 17.11.** An Investigation will be conducted if informal resolution options are not appropriate in the circumstances or were not successful in resolving the dispute. Every effort will be made to conclude an investigation within thirty (30) days following the receipt of a formal report. The purpose of an Investigation is to: gather evidence and witness statements; weigh the evidence; make findings of fact based on the evidence; and produce an Investigative report. In an investigation under this Procedure, the Investigator must make a determination having weighed the evidence on a Balance of Probabilities that either: (1) a policy breach occurred; or (2) a policy breach did not occur.
- 17.12.** The Human Rights Office will ensure an Investigation process that is appropriate in the circumstances and that complies with Administrative Fairness requirements.
- 17.13.** The Investigator will advise the Respondent in writing that a Report has been received and that they are the subject of an investigation of a Report. This notice will, at minimum, be delivered to a ontariotechu.net or ontariotechu.ca email account, as applicable. The notice will: (i) advise that an investigation is being initiated, (ii) contain a brief summary of the allegations, and (iii) indicate they will be contacted by the Investigator for a meeting in due course. The notice will also provide contact information for Support Services, and will indicate that the Respondent has the right to be supported and accompanied by their legal counsel and/or other support.
- 17.14.** The Investigator will keep all information obtained during an Investigation confidential, and all relevant documents, including electronic documents, will be kept securely.
- 17.15.** At any point during the Investigation, the Investigator may set meetings with any individual to obtain further information. The Investigator also has access to any document or piece of evidence they deem necessary to complete a thorough investigation. University Members, therefore, are required to cooperate with formal resolution processes commenced under this procedure.

- 17.16. At a minimum, the Investigator will make reasonable attempts to meet with the Complainant and the Respondent and provide them with the opportunity to submit written or other documentary evidence relevant to the case.
- 17.17. The Investigator may also choose to seek information from other witnesses, taking care to ensure that they are given a reasonable opportunity to understand the allegations and provide relevant information.
- 17.18. During the course of the investigation, the Investigator will keep the Complainant and Respondent apprised of the status of the investigation and the expected time to completion.

Step 6 – Determination & Corrective Action

- 17.19. Based on all available evidence, the Investigator will determine whether there has been a violation of Policy, weighing the evidence on a Balance of Probabilities. The Investigator's determination will be reported in an Investigative Report. The Complainant and Respondent will receive a copy of a report summarizing the investigation findings.
- 17.20. In the event that the Investigation found a breach of policy, the Investigator will make recommendations to adequately resolve the inappropriate behavior.
- 17.21. The Human Rights Office will ensure that the results of the investigation are brought to the attention of, and reviewed by, the Provost's Office. The Provost's Office will be responsible for implementing the investigator's recommendations. Where the investigation report identifies that a Student has breached the policy, decisions on appropriate disciplinary sanctions will be made by the Provost's Office pursuant to the Student Conduct Policy. Refer to the Student Conduct Policy for more information about the decision-making process and for details about the review and/or appeal mechanisms that are available to Students.

MONITORING AND REVIEW

- 18. These Procedures will be reviewed as necessary and at least every three years. The General Counsel, or successor thereof, is responsible to monitor and review these Procedures.

RELEVANT LEGISLATION

- 19. Ontario Human Rights Code

RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES & DOCUMENTS

- 20. Student Conduct Policy
- Fair Processes Policy
- Student Sexual Violence Policy
- Respectful Campus Policy
- Accommodation Policy

DRAFT