Board of Governors Meeting Agenda
Thursday, October 10, 2019
7:00 PM in Room 256, St. Paul’s University College
Dial 1-844-209-1811. Participant code #379496
WiFi (eduroam) Username: stp07@uwaterloo.ca Password: $JPE0KRg

1. Opening Remarks of the Chair
   a. Welcome Zoë Lawrence (STPSU President)
2. Approval of the Agenda [DECISION]
3. Conflict of Interest Declaration, if any
4. Approval of the Minutes of the June 20, 2019 meeting* [DECISION]
5. Business arising from the minutes of June 20, 2019
6. Presentation: Debt & Swap – Mann/Steinmann [INFORMATION]
7. Principal’s Report* [INFORMATION]
8. Advancement Report* - Loo [INFORMATION]
9. Report of the Executive Committee
   a. Executive Committee Minutes of June 6, 2019* [INFORMATION]
10. Report of the Finance & Investment Committee
    a. Investment Report* - Siim [INFORMATION]
11. Report of the Audit Committee
12. Report of the Building & Property Committee
    a. Residence Improvements* [DECISION]
    b. Graduate Building Upgrades* [DECISION]
13. Report of the Governance Committee
    a. Proposed W7 – Whistleblower Policy* [DECISION]
    b. Revised Policy B8 – Appointment, Tenure and Promotion* [DECISION]
    c. Revised Territorial Acknowledgement* [DECISION]
14. Other Business
    a. Board Meeting Schedule 2020-2021* [DECISION]
15. In-Camera Session with Board members
    a. Principal’s Review – Foerster, Siim [INFORMATION]
16. Adjournment [DECISION]

*Denotes material included with agenda  **Denotes material distributed at meeting
Notice of Motions

1. Motion to approve the Agenda.
2. Motion to approve the minutes of the Board of Governors Meeting of June 20, 2019.
3. Motion to approve in principle the strategy of converting Green Wing singles into doubles.
4. Motion to approve an appropriation of $20,000 to create model double rooms for the refurbishment of the East and West Wing doubles.
5. Motion to approve the appropriation of $22,000 from the operating surplus for the development of a Fitness Centre and a Children’s Room.
6. Motion to approve Policy W7 – Whistleblower Policy.
7. Motion to approve revisions to Policy B8 – Appointment, Tenure and Promotion
8. Motion to approve the revised Territorial Acknowledgement.
9. Motion to approve the 2020-2021 Board Meeting Schedule.
10. Motion to adjourn the meeting.

*Denotes material included with agenda  **Denotes material distributed at meeting
Minutes of the St. Paul’s University College Board of Governors Meeting on
Thursday, June 20, 2019
7:00 p.m. in Room 256, St. Paul’s University College

ATTENDEES:  Rod Barr, Gary Foerster (Chair), Peter Frick, Cheryl Maksymyk, Tracy Mann, Rick Myers,
Olutoyin Odeyemi, David Romagnoli, Bob Rosehart, Julia Salvini, Brad Siim, Brenda
Simpson, Bill Watson

REGRETS:  Jeff Casello, JP Gladu, Mariah Smith, Wendy Zufelt-Baxter

GUESTS:  Mike Steinmann

MINUTES:  Charlene Hone

1.  Foerster welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2.  **Motion to approve the agenda as amended. (Siim/Simpson-Carried)**

   Approved changes to meeting agenda:
   - Move Item #12 following Report of the Audit Committee
   - Add in-camera session following Report of the Governance Committee

3.  Board members were asked to declare any conflicts of interest they might have in relation to the
    items on the agenda. No conflicts were declared.

4.  **Motion to approve the minutes of the Board of Governors Meeting of April 18, 2019 as presented
    (Watson/Barr-Carried)**

5.  Executive Committee minutes of April 4, 2019 were presented for information purposes.


   Brendan explained that GreenHouse was formerly known as a residence where students launched
   ventures. It has now become a parent brand for three separate programs: Discovery Labs (broad
   student engagement), Workplace Innovation Program (helping students work through a problem
   they would like to solve), and Innovators in Residence (helping students achieve a business plan for
   their product idea).

   There is a new focus on building entrepreneurial competencies, and they have worked hard to
   streamline how students measure success and their progress in the program. Course credit is
   available if students choose (SVENT 225/SVENT 325).

   GreenHouse has a strong position on UW campus and is in a good working relationship with
   Velocity, and each of the six faculties.

   Brendan to forward slides from presentation for distribution to Board members.
7. The Principal’s Report was included in the meeting package for review. Myers highlighted a few areas of interest:

   a. St. Paul’s received a surprising water bill from the City of Waterloo. We had not yet been charged for water usage for the Green Wing since Phase 5 has been operational. This will mean an additional $40K/year on our water bills going forward.

   b. Human Rights program – delays in processing transfer credit agreement with Essex. The agreement has now been finalized and has to go through Senate. It will not reach approval until January, meaning that we cannot start to recruit for the program in the fall as we had originally hoped.

   c. On June 18, Peter Frick and Rick Myers met with Amanda McKenzie, Director, Quality Assurance (Academic Programs) to discuss the idea for the Bachelor of Indigenous Entrepreneurship (BIE) program. It went very well, and we are anticipating strong support from UW.


   As we progress with the BIE, we have known from the outset that it created a need for additional facilities, and an opportunity to secure resources for the College. At this stage we are anticipating roughly 30-45 graduates per year, and this will require facilities to accommodate.

   The Executive Committee felt that it would be prudent to move forward with a feasibility study to determine whether the idea has traction.

   Motion for the Board to authorize the administration to carry out a feasibility study for a Phase 6 building, at a cost of up to $75,000, subject to approval of the Executive Committee (Rosehart/Barr-Carried)


   The Audit committee met in May to review the auditors approach for 2019. The fees haven’t changed. The committee will meet again in September to review the results of the audit.

10. Motion to approve the hiring of a new faculty position for the Human Rights program. (Siim/Barr-Carried)


   Watson reviewed our constituting documents and noted that they do not indicate one way or another that regular Board meetings are open or closed (see Article 4.8). The AGM (see Bylaw 1-8.8) on the other hand is restricted to Board members only.

   Foerster proposed the following addition to the Board Handbook, effective October 2019:
The regular meetings of the Board of governors are open to students, staff, faculty and the general public. The Board has the right to move in camera for the discussion of sensitive matters. Minutes of regular Board meetings are posted on the College website.

Motion to approve the proposed addition to the Board Handbook re: Open Board Meetings. (Barr/Mann-Carried)

12. In-camera session.


Maksymyk reminded members of the opportunity to participate in various National Indigenous People’s Day events.

14. The meeting was adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

Notice of Motion Passed:

Meeting of the Board of Governors on June 20, 2019

1. Motion to approve the agenda as amended (Siim/Simpson-Carried)

2. Motion to approve the minutes of the Board of Governors Meeting of April 18, 2019 as presented (Watson/Barr-Carried)

3. Motion for the Board to authorize the administration to carry out a feasibility study for a Phase 6 building, at a cost of up to $75,000, subject to approval of the Executive Committee (Rosehart/Barr-Carried)

4. Motion to approve the hiring of a new faculty position for the Human Rights program. (Siim/Barr-Carried)

5. Motion to approve the proposed addition to the Board Handbook re: Open Board Meetings. (Barr/Mann-Carried)

Approved without amendments by the St. Paul’s University College Board of Governors on October 10, 2019.

Signed, ______________________________ Secretary of the Board Date: _____________________

Signed, ______________________________ Chair of the Board Date: _____________________
A College like ours is – and ought to be – a unique place of work. We have a mission that transcends expansion and profit. We have a scale that fosters close personal ties and permits shared responsibility. In a workplace like ours, all of the employees should have a strong sense that our College is their College.

For that kind of feeling to flourish, it’s essential that all employees of the College have an understanding of, and an appreciation for, our key activities. To that end, we have embarked on a new program of professional development. For now, we are calling it “mission-based professional development.”

Professional development is normally focused on the enhancement of the specific knowledge and skills that a given employee uses in his or her work. Our initiative is quite different. It’s focused on ensuring that all employees – whatever their specific responsibilities – will have a good appreciation of key College priorities such as Indigenous issues, social innovation, International Development, student mental health, and refugee matters. If successful, the initiative should serve to strengthen commitment to our mission, break down silos, and build a stronger sense of team-work among our staff.

The initiative began in August with a staff trip to the Woodland Cultural Centre to learn about Indian Residential Schools. It proved to be a revelation for many of our employees. In September, staff learned about the social innovation eco-system in Waterloo with presentations from The Conrad Centre, The Kindred Centre for Peace Advancement, Velocity, Communitech, and The Working Centre. Later in the semester we will have “Lunch and Learn” presentations from faculty experts. John Abraham will talk about new challenges in international development work. Peter Frick will talk about the significance of our namesake, St. Paul. And Dr. Chris Anderson from Laurier will talk about the growing refugee crisis.

The staff who are helping to coordinate this initiative (Charlene Hone, Anne Filion, Steve Prentice, Shawn Tucker) have expressed an interest in creating some kind of system for recognizing participation in the program. We’ve agreed to give that idea more thought once we’ve successfully delivered a term of activities.

I am pleased to present you with a summary of major developments at the College since our meeting in June.
1. **Academics**

1.1 **Equity Targets**  
Board members who were with us in February of 2018 will recall that three of the colleges have a major problem with their equity teaching targets. We have received a report on our equity teaching for 2018-2019 and the numbers are disappointing: we are now at less than 50% of our target. We continue to believe that once we are able to fully roll out our new programming—especially the Human Rights Minor—we should be able to meet our targets. Discussions with the new Dean of Arts suggest that the issue will not be on the table immediately, but probably will be in the future.

1.2 **Bachelor of Indigenous Entrepreneurship**  
The equity issue has had a major impact on our other major academic initiative. We had hoped to offer the BIE program outside of the Equity Agreement, as we do with INDEV. The Provost has determined that any new programming offered by any of the colleges will have to be routed through the Equity Agreement. In other words, no opportunity for new revenues for new programs until we are fully delivering on our existing commitments. Our academic team is now working on a new strategy to bring forward an Indigenous Entrepreneurship program through the existing Equity Agreement framework.

2. **Advancement**

2.1 **Distinguished Alumni Awards**  
The Principal’s Advancement Advisory Committee has made selections for the 2019 Distinguished and Young Alumni Awards. We are pleased to announce that Rod Barr (BA ’69) and Winnie Lam (BASC ’00) have been selected for the Distinguished Alumni Award, while Rachel Thompson (BSC ’15) and Richard Yim (BASc ’16) have been selected for the Young Alumni Award. All are very worthy recipients. Rod is an obvious choice for his distinguished career and for his many years as a donor and volunteer to STP and UW. Winnie leads the sustainability practice for Google’s data centres, has helped World Wildlife Foundation raise millions of dollars and is a very active member of her community in Silicon Valley. Rachel and Richard are both young alumni of GreenHouse and are founders and CEO’s of Marlena Books and Demine Robotics respectively.

2.2 **Golf Tournament**  
The 12th Annual St. Paul’s Masters took place on Friday August 23 and we welcomed approximately 120 golfers and 30 additional volunteers for a great day of fun and fellowship on the greens. The tournament grossed about $52,500 which is an increase of approximately $5,000 over last year. This was due to a better turnout of golfers but that also means some expenses went up and the overall net was slightly more than $30,000 which is about $2,500 more than last year. This was the final year that funds raised will be directed to the Shape the World Campaign.

2.3 **Alex Foto Memorial Award**  
Hannah Tellier and Zack Ahmed were selected as this year’s recipients for the Alex Foto Memorial Award. This was the third year we were able to
give out this award for students in 4th year INDEV to help cover costs of their overseas field placement and the first year we could give two awards of $1,000 each. This endowment was created 5 years ago in response to the sudden and tragic death of INDEV student Alex Foto.

2.4 Stanley Knowles Lecture This year’s lecture will be delivered by our Chancellor JP Gladu on the topic of Economic Reconciliation on October 30. We are doing well with registration so far and expect a turnout of approximately 250. Board members are strongly encouraged to attend!

3. Finances

3.1 Fall Occupancy Our undergraduate and graduate residences are both at 100% occupancy for the Fall semester. This makes two consecutive Septembers at full occupancy.

3.2 2019-2020 Forecast Current forecast shows approximately $300K net income increase over budget, primarily due to a stronger than expected summer season, full occupancy in September, and higher than expected occupancy for January.

3.3 Audit The 2018-2019 audit has been completed and went well. No material issues or deficiencies were identified.

4. GreenHouse

4.1 Fall Enrolments GreenHouse has 32 “innovators-in-residence” including 12 senior students and 20 first-year participants. There are approximately two dozen students in the Workplace Innovation stream, working within 7 organizations: Centre for Innovation in Campus Mental Wellness, St. Paul’s University College, KidsAbility, MS Society, Lupus Canada-Alberta, Environment Canada, and the Local Health Integration Network.

4.2 Fall Events Three major events are in the works for this semester. On October 8, GreenHouse will host a Health Discovery Lab in partnership with Community Support Connections, Schlegel Villages and MS Society. In late November, there will be a Discovery Lab focused on the theme “The Future of Volunteering.” Partners are the Volunteer Action Centre and Reception House, with others in process. Finally, the Fall Social Impact Showcase will take place on December 5th from 4:00 to 5:30. Board members are warmly encouraged to attend.

4.3 Federal Economic Development Agency Grant GreenHouse, in partnership with Innovation Guelph and the Guelph Small Business Centre, will be providing support to women-led ventures in Waterloo-Wellington. Over the next 3 years, GreenHouse will be receiving $300,000 to deliver training and support to 60 women-led social enterprises. More on the program can be found here: https://innovationguelph.ca/rhyze-ventures/
4.4 **Youth Employment and Skills Strategy Program**  Two funding proposals were submitted under this federal grant. The first proposal, is in partnership with the Volunteer Action Centre. GreenHouse will provide innovation training to high school youth within VAC’s EPYC program and provide opportunities for GreenHouse students to serve as peer leaders. If funded, this $770,000 project will start in April 2020 and run til March 2023. The second proposal is co-led by GreenHouse and the Waterloo Indigenous Student Centre and will involve preparing young people (in particular Indigenous Youth and Youth with disabilities) for the future of work via youth-led innovation placements that offer beyond entry-level work experience. If funded, this $1.9 million project, will start in April 2020 and run until March 2023.

5 **Personnel**

We are pleased to welcome *Landon Jennings* as the new Advancement and Alumni Relations Assistant. Her first big project was to bring the 12th Annual St. Paul’s Masters to a successful conclusion and she did a fantastic job of hitting the ground running. Landon is taking over tasks related to event planning, database management and has already proven herself to be a great fit with the rest of the STP team.

*Emma Roy*, who was covering for Stephanie Horsburgh’s maternity leave, left the College in early September for an attractive permanent post elsewhere. We thank her and wish her well! We have engaged co-op student *Emma Cheeseman* to cover off the remainder of the leave. Stephanie will return in January.

*Shawn Johnson* has resigned his position at the WISC in order to pursue further studies in photography. His replacement is *Chloe Blair*, who graduated from UW in 2018 with a degree in Fine Arts. Chloe was a regular student participant at the WISC during her undergraduate days.

6 **Residence and Student Life**

6.1 **Fun Fair**  On September 15th the Dons and the Student Union hosted the first annual St. Paul’s Fun Fair which was well received by students and staff. We hope to build this event up over time and make it a major College activity that brings together students, staff and alumni.

6.2 **Student Refugee Program**  In August, we welcomed our new SRP student, Aliny Sibomana. She is registered in the Public Health program. There are major changes coming to the program due to the Ford government’s requirement for online opting out from non-academic fees. For about fifteen years, the non-residence component of the program has been funded by a $1/semester levy paid by all UW undergrads. Even if that level of funding were to continue, it would no longer cover the costs of the program. The various stakeholders in the program (including STP) agreed to raise the fee to $4.95. We anticipate an opt-out rate of at
least 30%, but even at 50%, the new levy will leave the program in a better financial state going forward.

6.3 Residence Upgrades Our East Wing and West Wing doubles have in most respects been untouched since they were built in the 1960s. We have begun an initiative for a comprehensive refurbishment of these 80 rooms. A recommendation will be coming to the Board from the Building and Property Committee.

6.4 Fitness Room We have identified an opportunity to create fitness facilities that will serve our graduate residents, our undergrad residents and our staff. We believe the provision of opportunities for exercise are an important (and hitherto neglected) part of student and staff wellness. The Building and Property Committee has approved our proposal and will be forwarding a motion to the Board requesting funding for the initiative.

7. Waterloo Indigenous Student Centre

7.1 Pow-wow The 2019 Pow-wow took place on September 28. Due to rainy weather, attendance was lower than last year, but the event was still very successful. We were pleased to see Tracy Mann there! I should note that our Pow-wow was selected as the 2019 winner for “Best Festival” in the Waterloo Chronicle Readers’ Choice Awards.

7.2 Artwork We have purchased a set of four large prints by Norval Morrisseau for installation on one of the walls in the North Wing. Chloe is preparing text about Morrisseau, and about each of the prints, to install alongside them. This is the first step in a longer-term initiative to make the corridors of the of the North Wing a space for learning about Indigenous culture and issues. The plan is to gradually acquire a good collection of prints of significant works, or original pieces by emerging artists.

Respectfully submitted

Dr. Richard Myers
Principal
Advancement and Alumni Relations activities for Fiscal Year ending April 30, 2019

Submitted to the Board of Governors, October 3, 2019 by Stephen Loo, Director of Advancement and Alumni Relations

Fundraising results (cash in + pledges)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Fund Designation</th>
<th>FY 18-19</th>
<th>FY 17-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GreenHouse</td>
<td>$176,500</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape the World Campaign</td>
<td>$104,000</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>$41,500</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res Life + Other</td>
<td>$42,500</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Awards</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total all designations</strong></td>
<td><strong>$383,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$323,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These figures are different than those reported in audited financial statements (development and scholarship accounts). Some amounts get deferred and some grant revenue does not flow through the development accounts.

Stats on giving for FY 18-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Corporations &amp; Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Raised</strong></td>
<td>$147,000</td>
<td>$236,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Donors</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of alumni who gave</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># new donors (no gift in previous 10 years)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># monthly donors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># staff and faculty who gave</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># board + former board who gave</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all relationships lead to asks and not all asks result in donations. In the last fiscal year we began developing relationships and in some cases submitted asks to the following companies and foundations which did not result in gifts. (amounts in parenthesis are the approximate ask amount)

Astley Foundation ($25,000), Bell Canada Let’s Talk Community Fund ($27,000), BDO, DeBeers, Honda Canada Foundation ($12,000), Keen Footwear, Kitchener Waterloo Community Foundation, Lyle S. Hallman Foundation, MNP, RBC & RBC Foundation ($180,000), Steele Family Foundation, TD ($50,000), United Church of Canada Foundation

Other Advancement and Alumni Relations activities in FY 18-19

Engaged approximately 700 alumni, friends and upper year students through 15 different events that were planned by Advancement

Took a lead role in the work to build community and internal culture of philanthropy by organizing the staff United Way campaign and Christmas season giving and volunteering

Attended/planned events or held donor meetings in Vancouver, Fort St. John, Ottawa, Kingston, Toronto, London, Mississauga and Halifax
Executive Committee Meeting
Minutes of Thursday, June 6, 2019
8:00 AM – 9:00 AM
St. Paul’s University College

ATTENDEES:  Rod Barr, Gary Foerster (Chair), Richard Myers, Bob Rosehart, Brad Siim, Brenda Simpson
MINUTES:  Charlene Hone

1. Foerster welcomed committee members to the meeting.
2. Foerster requested the addition of an in-camera session following ‘Other Business’ to discuss HR issue.
   Approval of the meeting agenda as amended (Myers/Rosehart– carried)
3. Committee members were asked to declare any conflicts of interest they may have in relation to the items on the agenda: no conflicts were declared.
4. Executive Committee minutes from April 4, 2019 were included for information.
5. Draft Board minutes from April 18, 2019 were included for information.
   Action: Hone to revise the minutes with the recommendations below:
   a. Correct spelling of ‘Baxter’ in #2
   b. Re-word #6c- branding is ‘to’ the benefit...
   c. Re-word #7- last paragraph, second sentence...‘and’ rather than ‘but’
6. The Committee reviewed the draft agenda for the June 20, 2019 Board of Governors Meeting.
   The president of the Student Council may make an appearance but is not prepared to present anything at this time
   GreenHouse presentation will explain how the program has evolved
7. Other Business
   a. The Faculty position for the new Human Rights program will require Board approval.
      Action: Hone to add a motion to the June Board agenda.
   b. In order to accommodate a new Bachelor of Indigenous Entrepreneurship (BIE) program, St. Paul’s may need to spend a bit of money to do preliminary work on facilities. Myers suggests a consultation with the Indigenous Place-Making Council to assist us in developing buildings (i.e. teaching and office space, new space for WISC, housing, etc.) and outdoor spaces for the program. Discussions with them have already taken place to explore this concept, but a formal study would require Board approval to move it forward.
      UW is gearing up for a major capital campaign. Myers and Stephen Loo, Director of Advancement & Alumni Relations met with the campaign manager to discuss this idea and
they were enthusiastic. As they articulate their vision for the campaign, they are keen to see us come through on our end.

Action: Hone to add a tentative motion for approval at the June Board meeting pending further discussions on June 11.

8. In-camera session.

9. Meeting adjourned at 8:40 a.m.
St. Paul’s University College

Investment Report Date: August 31, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Reported Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Mandate Market Value (CAD)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$4,124,110.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term Mandate Market Value (CAD)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$2,602,923.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Market Value (CAD)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$6,727,033.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Rate Of Return</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Market Index*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YTD: 11.54%</td>
<td>1 Year: 5.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Equity %</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Cash, Cash Equivalents &amp; Fixed Income %</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Equity % as a % of Equity</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>39.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return as of August 31, 2019

* Market Index is comprised of 25% S&P/TSX Composite, 25% S&P 500 Index, 50% Dex Bond Universe
Proposal for Overhaul of Undergraduate Residences
Prepared by: Rick Myers, Principal

1. Background
The College has approximately 270 beds for undergraduate residences. About 160 are double rooms in the East and West Wings, built in the 1960s and largely untouched since then. About 40 are single rooms on the top floor of the West Wing, added fifteen years ago. 76 are elite “super singles” in the new Green Wing. These rooms have a similar size footprint (approx. 200 sq. ft) with 150 sq. ft. reserved for living space and 50 sq. ft. for an ensuite washroom. For reference, a double room at Ron Eydt Village is 170 sq. ft. and a single room at Village 1 is 93 sq. ft.

2. Challenges
Staff have identified a number of challenges in our undergraduate housing activities.

- There is a marked disparity in the way we house students; the majority are in old doubles with furniture from the 1960s; a significant minority are in elite accommodations that are the most luxurious at UW.
- We now have over one hundred first-year students in single rooms. Singles can be an impediment to building the kind of community we value. Moreover, research demonstrates that students in doubles tend to do better academically and to have better retention rates. Single rooms tend to be favoured by students with social anxieties which, due to all single rooms being physically located in the same areas of the building, can create distinct communities with a higher propensity for self-isolating behaviour.
- While we continue to fill the old double rooms, we are increasingly hearing comments from prospective students and families about how dated they are. We clearly have to invest in our assets or at some point they will begin to lose value.
- Board members have articulated a concern that we do not provide opportunities for upper-year students to return to the College (except as dons or GH students). Staff agree that it would be desirable to have more upper-year students to serve as mentors and to provide leadership to the residence community.

3. The Proposal
We have developed a proposal to provide an integrated solution to the four problems described above. The linchpin of the proposal is to convert about 60 of the “super-singles” into double rooms. (One floor will be left as super-singles for GreenHouse, and a number of others will remain super-singles for our dons.) These double rooms will continue to be very attractive because they are new and have private washrooms. The proposal has many advantages.

- The creation of 60 additional beds has the potential to generate an extra $330k of revenue per year for the College.
- New revenues from the Green Wing can be used to fund a complete refurbishment of the East and West Wing doubles. Assuming a budget of $1m for that project, the additional revenues from the Green Wing could pay for the project in four years. After that, the additional revenues would simply flow into the general coffers of the College.
• Converting the Green Wing to doubles and upgrading the doubles in the East and West wings will more or less eliminate the disparity in the way we house students

• The addition of 60 beds may allow us to use many of the singles on the top of the West Wing to lure students back for a second or third year at the College while continuing to meet our commitment to UW to provide 80% of our beds for first-year students.

• Almost all of our first-year students would now be in double rooms. That isn’t necessarily their preference, but it will be better for them and better for the College community. Based on the past performance of the College in recruitment, we are confident that we can attract students to live in residence without needing to rely on the Super Single washrooms. This is in part due to the strength of our various Living-Learning Communities. Additionally, any beds not filled through the 100% Guarantee can be filled with Upper Year students or converted back into premium Super Single rooms relatively easily.

4. Implementation

On November 2, we host the annual Fall Open House for students who are interested in coming here for September of 2020. If it is our intention to convert the Green Wing from singles to doubles effective September 2020, we need to make that decision now. For a major step like this, it would be appropriate to ask the Board for its approval in principle.

**MOTION:** That the Board give its approval in principle to the strategy of converting Green Wing singles into doubles.

The conversion will require an investment in additional furniture next summer. The funds for that furniture can be built into next year’s budget and drawn from the surplus revenue created by the additional beds.

Whether we go forward with the Green Wing conversion or not, we clearly have to carry out upgrades to the 1960s double rooms. A working group has been examining what the upgrades should be. Board members should know that our old doubles have a unique layout, with tall armoires separating each room into a study side and a sleeping side. Our students quite like this layout. We are inclined to think that the best approach is to keep and refurbish the old armoires, while replacing and repainting everything else. The alternative would be to remove everything and then furnish the rooms with the same kind of modular furniture used in most other residences. This choice is a significant one and should be made only after extensive consultation with our students. For that consultation to be accurate and meaningful, we need to show students what the two alternatives would actually look like. Our proposal is to have a contractor set up two “model rooms” in January that we can use to consult with students and other members of the community before making a final decision.

**MOTION:** That the Board approve an appropriation of $20,000 to create model double rooms for the refurbishment of the East and West Wing doubles.

Our contractor believes that if we have a decision on what we want by mid-February, it will be possible to proceed with the refurbishment of all of the East Wing doubles in May and June of 2020. The financial planning for the project would come under next year’s budget. West Wing doubles would be tackled in May-June of 2021.
Proposal for the Creation of a College Fitness Centre
Prepared by: Rick Myers, Principal

1. Background
The Graduate Building has three “lounge” spaces. The sixth-floor lounge has been set up as a games room, with a ping-pong table and a fussball table. It gets almost no use. The fifth-floor lounge has a full kitchen and access to a balcony. It is used as a party/special events room. The third-floor lounge has been given a dual purpose. It includes a play space for toddlers, with a small library and a few toys. It also has a couple of old fitness machines.

At a recent meeting, residents indicated a desire for improved fitness facilities. They also noted that the practice of combining fitness space with play-space for toddlers makes the third-floor lounge unusable for either purpose.

2. Proposal
Given that the sixth-floor games room is hardly used, (and that we have identical equipment in Watson’s), it makes sense to convert that space into an enhanced playroom for toddlers. The children will be safer if there is no fitness equipment in their play-space, and we believe that a dedicated space can be equipped at little cost through the judicious purchase of second-hand toys and books.

The College would then be able to dedicate the entire third-floor space to a quality fitness centre. The room has space for five or six cardio machines and a multi-purpose weight-training machine. By a great stroke of fortune, there is a public washroom located beside the entrance to this lounge that can easily be converted into a change-room. It already has a toilet and a sink and there is ample space to include a shower.

A fitness room of this scale would be sufficient to serve not only the residents of the grad building, but our undergraduate residents as well. Even better, the addition of a change-room with a shower will make the room attractive to members of staff who might like to access the space over their lunch-break, or before/after work. The change-room will also be useful for encouraging staff to come to campus by bike instead of driving their cars.

3. Budget
The estimated cost of this project is $22,000 (including a $2,000 contingency). That sum will cover:

- Repainting of third-floor and sixth-floor lounges
- Purchase of cardio equipment and weight-training equipment
- Installation of a shower in the washroom and a water fountain in the exercise room
- Installation of a television in the exercise room
- Fobbing the exercise room door
- Purchase of additional toys and books for the children’s room.

MOTION: That the Board approve the appropriation of $22,000 from the operating surplus for the development of a Fitness Centre and a Children’s Room
Purpose:

St. Paul’s University College requires all governors and employees to observe high standards of ethics in the conduct of their duties and responsibilities. Representatives of the College are expected to practice honesty and integrity in fulfilling their responsibilities and to comply with all applicable laws and regulations relating to the College’s activities. It is the responsibility of all employees, representatives and volunteers to make disclosures when appropriate.

This policy provides a mechanism for reporting allegations of serious wrongdoing and describes how St. Paul’s will investigate such reports. The purpose of the policy is to provide direction for making disclosures; to facilitate the investigation of disclosures; and to protect those who in good faith make disclosures. It is intended to encourage and enable employees and others to raise serious concerns within St. Paul’s prior to seeking resolution outside St. Paul’s.

Definitions:

The Whistleblower

For the purpose of this policy the “whistleblower” is meant to be any director, employee, contractor, subcontractor, agent, volunteer, vendor, donor, or member of the general public who has reported a whistleblower incident.

Whistleblower Incident

A “whistleblower incident” is defined as a concern related to the College’s financial or operational matters. For greater clarity, whistleblower incidents are intended to include, but are not limited to, the following:

- “Side deals” or “under the table” dealings with contractors for personal benefit;
- Receiving personal kickbacks or significant gifts (over $100) from contractors or vendors, which could create bias in the tendering process;
- Fraudulent recording or reporting of revenues, or lack thereof;
- Fraudulent classification of assets and/or liabilities;
- A deliberate disregard or circumvention of College policies motivated by personal benefit
- Embezzlement of College assets by an individual or group of individuals;
- An act or omission that creates a substantial and specific danger to the life, health or safety of persons or to the environment;
- Gross mismanagement or omission or neglect of duty; and
- Violation of any law or regulation

No Retaliation:

No person who, in good faith, reports a violation of the Policy shall suffer harassment, retaliation or adverse employment consequence.
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Reporting Violations:

Violations should be discussed with the Principal. If the concern is with the Principal, the report should be made to the Board Chair through a letter sent to the Board Chair c/o the Administrative Assistant in an envelope marked CONFIDENTIAL and delivered to the Board Chair.

The Principal or Chair of the Board is responsible for investigating and resolving all reported complaints and allegations concerning violations of this policy. The Principal shall report on complaints, investigations and resolutions to the Chair of the Board.

Acting in Good Faith:

Anyone filing a complaint concerning a violation or suspected violation of the Policy must be acting in good faith and have reasonable grounds for believing the information disclosed indicates a violation of the policy. Any allegations that prove not to be substantiated and which prove to have been made maliciously or knowingly to be false will be viewed as a serious disciplinary offense.

Procedure for Reporting:

Reports of violations or suspected violations will be kept confidential to the extent possible, consistent with the need to conduct an adequate investigation.

The report should provide clear and detailed information about the alleged wrongdoing, including places, person(s) involved, witnesses, and dates (if known) so that a reasonable investigation can be conducted. Reports should be made to either the Principal or Board Chair.

Handling of Reported Violations:

The Principal or Board Chair will notify the sender and acknowledge receipt of the reported violation or suspected violation within five business days of the Principal or Board Chair receiving the report. All reports will be promptly investigated and appropriate corrective action will be taken if warranted by the investigation.

It should also be noted that the seriousness, complexity and timeliness of a disclosure may impact the method, resources and speed with which a disclosure is reviewed and/or investigated, and resolved.
Revisions to Policy B8 – Appointment, Tenure and Promotion

At St. Paul’s, the procedures governing the appointment process for full-time faculty are laid out in the Board’s Appointment, Tenure and Promotion Policy. The current procedures are problematic in several important respects.

1. The responsibility for hiring is lodged with the Principal’s Advisory Committee on Appointments (PACA). One would expect that the PACA advises the Principal, but it is actually chaired by the Principal. Normal practice elsewhere is to have such committees chaired by a Department Head (or in the case of a small institution, by the Academic Dean). The committee then advises the Principal by providing the Principal with recommendations.

2. The current policy stipulates that membership on the committee is restricted to tenured faculty members of St. Paul’s, and UW faculty from relevant programs. Apart from the Principal and the Dean, we currently have no tenured members of faculty (although we do have three non-tenured members of faculty). Practice elsewhere permits non-tenured faculty to serve on such committees.

3. The current policy does not assign anyone with responsibility for ensuring that the hiring process is equitable.

This past year, the College ran a search for a faculty appointment in International Development. Using the procedures from the current Board policy, the Committee was chaired by the Principal and included the Academic Dean and two faculty members from Environment; but the rest of our faculty members were excluded from the process. That is not a healthy situation. Because there is an exceptionally high degree of trust between our faculty and our administration at this point, the process worked this time, but there is clearly a need to reform the process and make it more consistent with the general norms of academic self-governance.

The College will likely proceed with a full-time faculty appointment in Human Rights next year. That appointment should not be run under the current process. The Principal and the Academic Dean have drafted language describing new procedures that are more consistent with prevailing norms. That draft has been discussed, revised and officially endorsed by the St. Paul’s Academic Council. On behalf of the Academic Council, and the senior Administration, I recommend that the Board amend its Appointment, Tenure and Promotion Policy so as to include a new Section IV on Appointment Procedures, as drafted below.

Richard Myers
Principal
IV  Appointment Procedures for Full-Time Faculty

Approval to Hire. When the Academic Dean has identified a need to make a full-time faculty appointment, the Dean shall make a request in writing to the Principal for approval. If the request is for a tenure-track position, or for a defined-term position lasting longer than twelve months, the Principal will seek financial approval from the Board before proceeding to launch the search.

Principal’s Advisory Committee on Appointments. Once all requisite approvals have been granted, the Principal shall form a hiring committee known as the Principal’s Advisory Committee on Appointments (PACA). The Academic Dean will chair the committee. In addition to the Dean, the Principal will appoint at least two members of the full-time staff with relevant academic credentials to serve on the committee, and at least one full-time faculty member of an appropriate University of Waterloo department, school, institute or similar academic unit including AFIW faculty. It is the Principal’s responsibility to ensure that the committee has reasonable gender balance.

Procedures. All full-time faculty vacancies must be advertised nationally and must follow prevailing norms and rules with respect to equity and immigration status. It is also expected that advertisements will describe the unique character of St. Paul’s and the expectation that faculty members be active members of the College.

The normal expectation is that three finalists will be brought to campus for day-long interviews. The Principal shall meet with the PACA in order to review its proposed shortlist of finalists. It is the responsibility of the Principal to ensure that the shortlist respects the principles of employment equity.

It is the responsibility of the PACA to ensure that candidates are warmly welcomed and properly supported during their visit. The campus visit must include a teaching presentation, a research presentation, an opportunity for the candidate to meet informally with staff and an opportunity to meet with the Principal.

On behalf of the PACA, the Academic Dean will present the Principal with its ranking of the finalists. If the Principal has concerns about the ranking, he or she shall meet with the PACA to discuss them. If no consensus is reached, the Principal has the right to declare a failed search, but the Principal may not substitute his or her ranking of the candidates for that of the PACA.

Negotiating a Contract. It is the responsibility of the Principal to develop and negotiate a contract for the preferred candidate. The Principal must obtain the approval of the Board Chair and Vice-Chair for the draft contract before signing on behalf of the College.
The existing text from the current *Appointment, Tenure and Promotion Policy* is provided below.

**Appointment (Hiring) Procedures.** The need for a new or replacement appointment, including a research appointment, will be identified by the Dean in consultation with the Principal. The determination of need shall take into account the views of the head/Dean of the relevant department and/or Faculty of the UW. Proposals for new or replacement appointments will be brought to the Board of Governors for approval.

For each appointment made, there shall be a Principal’s Advisory Committee on Appointment (PACA) consisting of three members. 1) The Principal, *ex officio*; 2) at least one probationary term or tenured faculty member of the College, and 3) between one and three members of the faculty of the UW or the University Colleges, chosen in a manner acceptable to the faculty of St. Paul’s. The PACA will assess candidates for probationary or tenured appointments or regular definite-term appointments that carry a duration of two years or longer.

Where possible, care should be taken to ensure representation of both men and women on hiring committees. Advertisements should be developed by the PACA and placed in the usual university publications (e.g., University Affairs, CAUT Bulletin) and, normally, in professional journals relevant to the discipline(s)/field(s) under consideration. Advertisements should encourage applications from women and other underrepresented groups, and should not define the position so narrowly as to limit, unreasonably, the pool of candidates. Advertisements should also include the contemplated rank, legal and immigration requirements. The pool of candidates should not be restricted to those answering advertisements; the PACA should, by oral invitation and personal correspondence, encourage qualified external applicants. Internal candidates, throughout the College, should also be encouraged to apply for and participate in open competition for the vacancy.

Copies of advertisements for academic vacancies will be forwarded from the Principal’s office to appropriate contact persons at other Canadian universities.

It is the responsibility of the Dean to provide each candidate who is interviewed with information on nominal salaries in the College, consistent with that candidate’s rank and experience. Every candidate who is offered a position has the right to discuss salary arrangements with the Principal and Dean. In addition, the Principal and Dean are expected to discuss with successful candidates matters such as expectations, terms/conditions of appointment, and the normal process through which faculty members are re-appointed and considered for tenure, and to provide them with a copy of the St. Paul’s ATP.

Members of the PACA should ask candidates only those questions that relate to bona fide position or occupational requirements. Enquiries which could reveal an applicant’s birthplace, ancestry, marital status, family status, age, religion, record of offences or handicap are forbidden under Human Rights legislation. If such questions are asked of a prospective appointee, and if he/she were unsuccessful in obtaining the position, he/she could use that as the basis of a discrimination claim.

The Principal takes into account the views of the PACA in deciding which candidate to recommend to the Board of Governors for appointment. Appointments with tenure or of definite term greater than 2 years require the approval of the Board of Governors. All appointments are reported by the Principal to the UW Senate for information.
Policy on APPOINTMENT, TENURE and PROMOTION (hereafter “ATP”)

St. Paul’s University College (hereafter “St. Paul’s” or the “College”) is a residential teaching college founded by members of the United Church of Canada and affiliated with the UW (hereafter “UW” or the “University”). The College motto is Crescens Dei Scientia -- "Increasing in the knowledge of God" -- taken from Colossians 1:10. The motto signals the College belief that academic freedom is consistent with commitment to the historic articles of the Christian faith as set out in the Basis of Union of the United Church of Canada. Academic freedom means the freedom to study, teach, publish and debate, independently of current opinion, subject to commonly accepted scholarly standards. The right to academic freedom carries with it the duty to use that freedom in a responsible and ethical way. Specifically, and without limiting the generality of the above, academic freedom entitles all faculty members to freedom in carrying out their activities, in pursuing research and scholarship and in publishing or making public the results thereof, and freedom from institutional censorship. Academic freedom does not require neutrality on the part of the individual. Academic freedom makes commitment possible, and carries with it the duty to use that freedom in a manner consistent with the scholarly obligation to base scholarship and teaching on an honest search for knowledge.

I. HIRING -- FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

St. Paul’s is committed to hiring the best possible faculty members. This must be done within the context of budgetary considerations, academic programs and College priorities. To this end, the College is committed to hiring practices with respect to all categories and types of appointments that are fair and open, and are seen to be so.

II. CATEGORIES OF APPOINTMENT

Note: Titles such as 'Professor Emeritus' and 'Distinguished Professor' are honorary and do not describe appointment categories.

A. Regular Appointments

Regular appointments to the faculty may be on a full- or a fractional-load basis and are made in the ranks of

* Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Lecturer.

Appointments in the professorial ranks are of three types -- definite term, probationary term or tenured. Appointments of Lecturers are of two types -- definite term or continuing.

Regular appointments are twelve-month appointments, which carry an obligation for scholarly activity (teaching and scholarship [research]) and College service for the full year, except for one month’s vacation, exclusive of statutory holidays.

**Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors** are normally assigned formal teaching duties for two of the three terms in which the College operates, but are expected to engage in scholarship, supervise students as required, and contribute to administration throughout the year. During the term when formal teaching duties are not assigned, these faculty members are expected to increase their scholarly activities. In special circumstances, an individual faculty member and the Principal may arrange a different assignment of responsibilities. Any such arrangement should be documented.

**Lecturers’** duties are normally limited to teaching and service and are assigned for all three terms in which the College operates. Prospective appointees to the faculty may be hired as Lecturers, pending completion of academic requirements (normally, a doctorate) and prior to being appointed as Assistant Professors; in those cases, duties will be as described in the preceding paragraph.
Fractional-load appointments carry the same distribution of responsibilities as do full-load appointments, but the total commitment of time to the College is not as great.

Faculty members on full-load appointments may wish to have their workloads reduced either temporarily or permanently. Such a fractional-load appointment may be of interest to an individual who wishes to devote increased time to family affairs for a period of her/his career without interrupting that career. It may also be attractive to a faculty member who wishes to decrease the time devoted to academic life in the few years before retirement, while still participating in various facets of that life.

Fractional-load appointments can be made at any fraction of the total load -- normally between 50% and 100% -- that corresponds to a practical assignment of College duties. Faculty members may be appointed to the College on a fractional-load basis either temporarily for a specified period or for the entire term of appointment.

- Whether the fractional-load is temporary or permanent shall be specified in the letter of appointment.
- Unless specified in a letter of appointment, arrangements to move from a full-load to a fractional-load appointment (and vice versa) are made by mutual consent of the faculty member and the Dean in consultation with the Principal.

These arrangements should be documented in a formal agreement between the faculty member and the College.

A Reduced Workload arrangement is a special fractional-load appointment with respect to participation in UW pension and benefits plans (Ref: UW Policy 59). Extension of the program is subject to approval by the Canada Revenue Agency.

Annual Reviews. Each faculty member on regular appointment participates in an annual review of her/his performance; such reviews must form part of any reappointment or tenure consideration.

B. Other Appointments

All appointments to these categories are for definite terms, and may be full time or part time, as specified in the letter of appointment.

1. Visiting Appointments
   Visiting appointments carry the titles
   • Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Lecturer
   and, normally, are for not longer than one year.

2. Adjunct Appointments
   Adjunct appointments carry the titles
   • Adjunct Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Lecturer
   in which the rank is determined according to similar criteria of scholarship as for regular faculty. These appointments are made to persons outside or inside the College who are qualified to carry some specific responsibility within an academic unit for teaching, scholarship, or the supervision of students.

3. Research Appointments
   Research Appointments carry the titles
   • Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, Assistant Research Professor
   In which the rank is determined according to similar criteria of scholarship as for regular faculty. These appointments are made to persons outside or inside the College who are qualified to carry on a research project that the College wishes to support as relevant to its academic role at the University or in support of the University’s academic mission. Research appointments normally are made for a definite term of no
longer than 3 years and may be renewable. Such appointments are normally “status only”, i.e., without remuneration.

4. Special Appointments
For special appointments the normal ranks are not used. The titles given (e.g., Visiting Critic, Clinical Associate, Writer-in-Residence, Resource Person) are expressive of the functions performed.

5. Overload Appointments (Sessional Lecturers)
An individual already appointed in one of the other categories and who is asked to take on specific duties additional to her/his normal responsibilities, may be given an appointment such as a sessional appointment.

6. Part-Time Appointments
Part-time appointments may be made in any of the ranks. A part-time appointment in the professorial ranks is distinguished from a regular appointment on fractional or reduced load in that the part-time appointee has a more limited range of responsibilities than a regular faculty member. These responsibilities are specified in the letter of appointment.

C. Cross and Joint Appointments
The terms ‘cross’ and ‘joint’ applied to appointments denote administrative arrangements. Joint appointments refer to faculty members whose responsibilities lie in two or more academic units (e.g., the College and the University) to such an extent that these units share salary and other expenses. A cross appointment does not involve cost sharing, but it identifies a faculty member who has a formal association with the academic work of a UW department or of another University College.

III. TYPES OF APPOINTMENTS

A. Definite Term Appointments
Definition. A definite-term appointment is an appointment for a contractually limited period of time.

Length and Number of Terms. A definite-term appointment is for any period up to four years. There is no limit on the number of definite-term appointments for faculty members who are not on regular appointments. For those who do hold regular appointments, no further definite term appointments can be made beyond the fourth year; however, they may be considered for probationary appointments in the professorial ranks, or continuing appointments as Lecturers.

Reappointment Notification. The Principal or designate should make every effort to notify each faculty member holding a definite-term appointment of less than one year's duration about the prospects for reappointment early enough to permit that member to investigate other opportunities. Faculty members with appointments of less than one year may request, in writing, notification concerning reappointment on or after the midway point in their contracts. The Dean in consultation with the Principal shall respond in writing within one week.

For faculty members with appointments of one year or more, the Dean in consultation with the Principal or designate shall notify individuals no less than six months before the end of their contracts with regard to renewal.

Dismissal. Recommendations to terminate definite-term appointments before the contractual termination date will be considered by the same procedures as outlined for the dismissal of a tenured faculty member (see policy on Discipline).

B. Probationary-Term Appointments
Definition. A probationary-term appointment is a regular appointment in the professorial ranks for a contractually limited period of time. A faculty member on a probationary-term appointment is entitled to formal consideration
for reappointment and tenure. A probationary appointment is offered only if a permanent position is available, and then only if the candidate seems very well qualified for a long-term career in the College.

**Approval to Hire.** When the Academic Dean has identified a need to make a full-time faculty appointment, the Dean shall make a request in writing to the Principal for approval. If the request is for a tenure-track position, or for a defined-term position lasting longer than twelve months, the Principal will seek financial approval from the Board before proceeding to launch the search.

**Principal’s Advisory Committee on Appointments.** Once all requisite approvals have been granted, the Principal shall form a hiring committee known as the Principal’s Advisory Committee on Appointments (PACA). The Academic Dean will chair the committee. In addition to the Dean, the Principal will appoint at least two members of the full-time staff with relevant academic credentials to serve on the committee, and at least one full-time faculty member of an appropriate University of Waterloo department, school, institute or similar academic unit including AFIW faculty. It is the Principal’s responsibility to ensure that the committee has reasonable gender balance.

**Procedures.** All full-time faculty vacancies must be advertised nationally and must follow prevailing norms and rules with respect to equity and immigration status. It is also expected that advertisements will describe the unique character of St. Paul’s and the expectation that faculty members be active members of the College.

The normal expectation is that three finalists will be brought to campus for day-long interviews. The Principal shall meet with the PACA in order to review its proposed shortlist of finalists. It is the responsibility of the Principal to ensure that the shortlist respects the principles of employment equity.

It is the responsibility of the PACA to ensure that candidates are warmly welcomed and properly supported during their visit. The campus visit must include a teaching presentation, a research presentation, an opportunity for the candidate to meet informally with staff and an opportunity to meet with the Principal.

On behalf of the PACA, the Academic Dean will present the Principal with its ranking of the finalists. If the Principal has concerns about the ranking, he or she shall meet with the PACA to discuss them. If no consensus is reached, the Principal has the right to declare a failed search, but the Principal may not substitute his or her ranking of the candidates for that of the PACA.

**Negotiating a Contract.** It is the responsibility of the Principal to develop and negotiate a contract for the preferred candidate. The Principal must obtain the approval of the Board Chair and Vice-Chair for the draft contract before signing on behalf of the College.

**Length and Number of Terms.** Faculty members may serve a maximum of six years in full-time probationary-term appointments (or a prorated longer period if the appointment is at fractional-load, to a maximum of eight years). The six-year maximum would normally be made up of two three-year terms.

With the exception noted below, service beyond the sixth year (or the prorated period) is possible only if tenure has been granted.

**Reappointment Considerations.** Normally, consideration during a first probationary term appointment will be for appointment to a second probationary term. Consideration during a second probationary term must be for
A recommendation to renew the first probationary term appointment must be for a sufficient period of time to allow the candidate to be in the fifth year of probationary status before being considered for tenure.

It is recognized that granting of Tenure presumes a measurement of the candidate's actual performance, whereas in the case of the renewal of a probationary term, judgements in some areas may have to be made on the basis of the candidate's potential.

It is the duty of the Principal to ensure that each faculty member on a probationary-term appointment is notified in writing regarding reappointment at least twelve months before the expiration of the current probationary term. Should this deadline not be met, the faculty member is entitled to a one-year extension of the current probationary term, even if this results in a total of more than six years of service on probationary-term appointments (or eight years if the probationary terms were not full time).

A recommendation not to renew a first probationary-term appointment at St. Paul's is dealt with in the same way as a recommendation not to grant tenure.

**Dismissal.** The recommendation to terminate a probationary-term appointment before the contractual termination date is dealt with in the same way as the recommendation to dismiss a tenured faculty member.

C. **Tenured Appointments**

Tenure is granted only to faculty members on regular appointments, full or fractional load, in the ranks of Associate Professor or Professor.

Specifically excluded from the tenure provisions of the Policy are all faculty members holding visiting, research, adjunct, special and part-time appointments. Also excluded are academic administrative appointments that may be held by faculty members.

Tenure granted to a faculty member on fractional load entitles that person to a tenured appointment at the same fractional load. Any subsequent change in the load must be by mutual consent of the individual and the College.

D. **Continuing Appointment of a Lecturer**

A faculty member in the rank of Lecturer may be considered for a continuing appointment in that rank. Notification of consideration would take place by the end of the third year. The decision must be made in time to give the faculty member proper notice as indicated in the 'Reappointment Considerations' section above.

The Principal may decide to grant a continuing appointment as a Lecturer to a faculty member holding that rank. The Principal will consult the Academic Dean and inform the Board of the decision providing reasons that document the suitability of the candidate including annual performance reviews. The Principal will convey her/his decision to the candidate and, in the case of a negative recommendation, will provide reasons, in writing.

The recommendation to terminate the continuing appointment of a Lecturer is dealt with in the same way as the recommendation to dismiss a tenured faculty member.

IV. **TENURE -- DEFINITION, PURPOSES, TENURE & PERFORMANCE**
Definition of Tenure. Tenure is meant to provide institutional support for academic freedom (see the Article on Academic Freedom in the Memorandum of Agreement between the University and the Faculty Association). The pursuit and dissemination of knowledge and the attainment of understanding through scholarship and teaching, which are essential functions of a university or college, occur best in an atmosphere in which free inquiry and discussion are fostered. Free inquiry may at times bring a faculty member into conflict with church, society, governments or the University itself. Tenure provides security of employment against pressures that might arise from such conflicts, in the belief that the University, society at large and church benefit from honest judgments and independent criticisms rendered by scholars who are free from fear of possible consequences that might arise from giving offence to powerful individuals or groups.

Tenure provides stability for both individual faculty members and the University. Tenure provides a faculty member with an environment conducive to long-term scholarly work. The University, for its part, is assured of a continuing group of teachers and scholars committed to the University, around which it can plan and from whom it can draw its academic leadership.

Professional Conduct. Academic freedom carries with it the duty to use that freedom in a responsible and ethical manner, and to refrain from actions that prevent others from pursuing their legitimate activities. All faculty members are expected to conduct themselves in relations with colleagues, staff and students across the University in such a way as to promote the academic well-being of all concerned. Faculty members should avoid denigrating the character and professional competence of others, and should pass judgment on the work of colleagues only in the proper academic forums. Further, they should refrain from actions that prevent others from pursuing their legitimate activities and should strive to be helpful, readily contributing their time and expertise for the overall benefit of the academic community.

Tenure and Performance. The College expects all faculty members, tenured or not, to maintain high standards of quality in all aspects of their university work. To this end, the College exercises judgements on individual performance.

Performance in all areas of a faculty member’s academic responsibilities is a proper matter for College judgements and these judgements, made with the greatest possible care and fairness, are reflected in decisions regarding salary, promotion, reappointment, tenure and dismissal. An important step in arriving at these judgements is the individual's annual performance review.

Tenured faculty members have already demonstrated their capability to contribute to the academic work of the College. Therefore, in reviewing their performance the College looks for evidence of accomplishment rather than for potential.

V. CONDITIONS FOR THE GRANTING OF TENURE

Consideration on Initial Appointment. Initial appointments with tenure are unusual. When made, they will normally be at the rank of Professor or Associate Professor.

Consideration after Service. Faculty members may serve a maximum of six (6) years in full-time probationary appointments (or a prorated longer period if the appointment is at fractional load, to a maximum of eight years). As noted in III.B. above, the six-year maximum would normally be made up of a three-year term followed by another three-year term. Service beyond the sixth year must be in a tenured appointment, except in the case where the College fails to reach a decision on tenure twelve (12) months prior to the expiration of the current probationary term. In such a case, the individual is automatically entitled to a one-year extension of contract on a definite-term appointment pending the College's decision.

Ordinarily, individuals are considered for tenure during the fifth year of full-time service in probationary contracts at St. Paul’s College. Approved leaves of absence count neither toward service nor as breaks in continuity.

In exceptional cases (e.g., individuals who have relevant experience elsewhere) candidates may be considered for tenure before the fifth probationary year. Such an earlier consideration may not proceed unless both the
appointee and the College Tenure and Promotion Committee (TPC) are in agreement, the TPC has made a brief preliminary review of the case that is favourable to the appointee, and it requests in writing and receives permission in writing from the Principal to proceed.

An appointee who is being considered early may withdraw her/his tenure case at any stage during the tenure review. He/she must then wait until the fifth year of probationary service for tenure consideration.

If a candidate who is being considered during her/his fifth probationary year withdraws the tenure case, her/his current contract shall be allowed to run its course and the candidate will not be entitled to further consideration for tenure at St. Paul's College.

**Guidelines for the Granting of Tenure.** Following the original appointment, the Principal has a responsibility to discuss the annual performance of appointees with them each year. Admittedly, with new appointees, much of the early assessment of their performance may have to be in terms more of evidence of potential ability to meet the standards required for tenure than of actual performance, but these standards are still the ones by which to judge. Similarly, recommendations to reappoint faculty members to second probationary terms will be based, in large part, on their performance and potential in relation to these standards.

The College expects all faculty members to maintain high standards in all aspects of their university work. To this end, the College exercises judgement on performance in the basic areas of a faculty member's academic responsibilities: teaching, scholarship, and service. Such judgements must be made with the greatest possible care and fairness as they are reflected in decisions regarding salary, reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

**VI. STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE**

**A. In Teaching**

The purpose of teaching is to facilitate learning. Thus, effective teaching draws the strands of a field together in a way that provides coherence and meaning, places what is known in context, lays the groundwork for future learning, and opens the way for connections between the known and the unknown. High quality teaching is a very important goal of the College.

Candidates for tenure will have their teaching judged by their peers, who will use all the evidence available to them.

With regard to a candidate's performance in the classroom, the reviewers will look for signs of the following:

- effectiveness in conceiving and developing courses appropriate to College needs
- conscientiousness in preparation
- effectiveness in organizing subject matter (and revising it in the light of developments in the field)
- effectiveness in presenting subject matter to students
- fairness in setting and grading of assignments and examinations, an ability to stimulate student interest and scholarship, and a willingness to encourage the free exchange of ideas between teacher and students.
- Availability to students outside the classroom.
- Student evaluations are an important part of the evidence regarding quality of teaching.

In the grading of students' work, it is expected that candidates will be not only fair in their evaluation but also thorough and helpful in their comments.

At all times, candidates will respect the integrity of their students, carefully avoiding any exploitation of them for their private advantage, maintaining a strict confidentiality about their students' personal lives and political and religious views, commenting on academic progress and providing judgements on character only to appropriate
persons and only in appropriate circumstances and, of course, always being as fair and objective as possible when acting as external referees.

B. In Scholarship

Teaching at the university level is informed and enriched by the research and scholarship of the faculty. The College expects its regular faculty members to be active participants in the evolution of their disciplines and professions, to keep academic programs and courses current with developments in their fields, and to communicate both their discoveries and their commitment to scholarship and research. Wherever possible and feasible, faculty members are expected to seek external funding to support their scholarly work.

Scholarship may take several equally valuable forms. One is the discovery of new knowledge, which may differ from discipline to discipline, and includes the generation of new concepts, ideas, principles, and theories. A second form involves the innovative co-ordination, synthesis or integration of knowledge. This type of scholarship seeks and promotes understanding in a broader context by organizing knowledge in a new and useful way, by illustrating new relationships between the parts and the whole, by relating the past in a new way to the present or future, or by demonstrating new and significant patterns of meaning. Scholarship may also be observed in new and useful applications. Indeed, significant new applications of knowledge to the problems of society represent important scholarly contributions. Novel applications may take many forms, such as creative writing, design, and the fine and performing arts.

Although any of these scholarly activities may be carried out on a confidential basis, the expectation of the College is for communicated scholarship. In general, only work that is accessible for peer review or professional adjudication can be considered for performance reviews, tenure or promotion. Regardless of the discipline and type of scholarship, the key ingredients are the originality, quality and impact of the scholarly work.

Faculty members are expected to meet the ethical standards for scholarship in their particular fields of endeavour; to observe the University’s guidelines and policies with respect to ethical conduct in research; and more generally, to act with integrity, truthfulness, and honesty in the conduct and communication of their scholarly work.

C. In Service to the College, the Profession, and the Community

Faculty members have obligations to the College, and in some cases to a Faculty of Arts department, beyond the primary duties of teaching and scholarship. They have the responsibility to participate in the life of the College through appropriate involvement in student life programs, service on committees and in academic administrative posts, provided such service is consistent with their primary duties and their own abilities.

Consequently, with respect to Service, candidates for tenure will be judged primarily, but not exclusively, on the quality of their contributions to College community life, committee and administrative work.

Valuable service that only professors can provide can also be contributed to groups outside the College. Consequently, any voluntary service to professional or community organizations which candidates for tenure may have contributed will be taken into account, as will community service that is related to their scholarly activities.

Whenever the opportunity arises (without interfering unduly with prior professional duties), members of the professoriate should be ready to contribute their expertise to the solution of academic problems outside of their immediate areas, and should likewise be willing to assist their colleagues in the arrangement and management of seminars, colloquia, and conferences. Tenure committees will accordingly look to these and similar activities as evidence of the willingness and inclination of tenure candidates to become constructive and helpful members of the academic community.

D. PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT
Insofar as possible, reviewing bodies will base the assessment of candidates for tenure on evidence that is first-hand and direct. It will vary in kind for each of the three categories:

- **For Teaching**
  
  Evidence on the quality of teaching done by candidates for tenure should be gathered from as many sources as practicable. It is the candidate's responsibility, in consultation with the Principal, to create a teaching dossier to provide documentary evidence regarding teaching.

  Classroom performance may be judged in terms of preparation, organization of subject matter, currency of course material, presentation skills, ability to stimulate student interest and scholarship, suitability of assignments and examinations, and willingness to provide individual feedback and help outside the classroom. Student course evaluations are an important source of information, but they should be supplemented with peer evaluation of teaching skills, course content, and course materials.

  Committees charged with making decisions or recommendations concerning tenure will consider all this evidence, being careful to take into account not only the varying abilities to assess accurately of those who have made assessments, but also the varying degrees to which they have had opportunity to assess accurately.

- **For Scholarship**
  
  The College committee charged with assessing a candidate's tenure file will scrutinize and evaluate representative examples from the various forms in which candidates for tenure have expressed their scholarship. In addition to examining the work themselves, committees must seek advice from other competent authorities on campus, and from external referees who are at arm's length from the candidates and the College.

  High quality contributions to the synthesis of knowledge (e.g. books, monographs, articles) and to non-traditional forms of scholarship (e.g. artistic displays and performances, innovative design) can provide direct evidence of effective scholarship. Consulting reports and planning documents that are accessible to peer review may also be submitted as evidence of a candidate's scholarly contributions.

  Other evidence of activity and standing as a scholar includes supervision of student research, invitations to present "keynote" addresses, election to and awards received from professional and disciplinary societies, service as a referee for journals and granting councils, and membership on government or professional committees.

  The primary assessment of quality, originality and impact is made by referees and by the College TPC (defined below) on the basis of examining examples of the candidate's work. Other less direct indicators include the rigour of the review processes for journals and conferences in which the candidate has published, the standards of publishing houses for books, and the extent to which other scholars have made reference to the work. In areas such as the fine and performing arts, similar information may be derived from the prestige of exhibitions and performances to which the candidate has contributed, professional reviews, and the receipt of awards or prizes.

  The committees and evaluators will be concerned not so much with the amount of the scholarship as with the depth of understanding and degree of scholarly competence it demonstrates. The committees will also be very much concerned with assessing the likelihood of the candidates continuing their scholarly activity after receiving tenure.

- **For Service**
  
  Statements should be secured from those who have personally observed the work that candidates for tenure have performed or the contribution they have made in some or all of the following areas:

  - Community life activities at the College
The tenure committee will then assess these statements so as to determine, as far as possible, the quality of the service the candidates have rendered.

- **Emphasis**

So that the TPC and persons involved in making decisions about tenure may have sufficient information with which to assess the performance and potential of candidates for tenure, the assessment made of each candidate by the TPC should state clearly, and in detail, what evidence the assessment has been based on, what criteria have been applied to that evidence, the evaluation made of the candidate in each of the three categories, and the emphasis given to each category.

A candidate’s performance and potential will be evaluated with particular attention to scholarship and teaching. Performance will have to be strong in these two categories, with satisfactory performance in service. If the College TPC finds that performance is less than strong in either teaching or scholarship, but still wishes to recommend that tenure be granted, it will have to make a case in detail, showing how and why it would be to the advantage of the College to make the candidate a permanent member of this particular academic community. In such a case, it is assumed that the candidate’s service is exemplary.

**VII. PROCEDURES FOR THE GRANTING OF TENURE**

**A. College Tenure Committee**

In the case of a promotion or tenure decision, the Principal shall appoint a College Tenure and Promotion Committee (TPC). If for some reason the appointment of such a committee is impractical, the Principal, with the consent of the candidate, shall request of the Dean of Arts of the University of Waterloo (or other Dean as appropriate) that the appropriate committee of the relevant University Faculty/department be established to deal with the matter provided that faculty representation from the College is included on the committee.

The College TPC shall consist of 5 members: 1) The College Academic Dean. 2) a member of the St. Paul’s faculty holding a regular appointment. 3) three members of the faculty of the UW or the University Colleges, one of whom shall chair the TPC. The member from St. Paul’s cannot be one whose case is to be considered.

In selecting faculty members for a TPC, the Principal shall consult the candidate and such other persons he or she deems appropriate for suggestions. The selected faculty member from the University or University Colleges shall be someone who will be sensitive to the academic environment of the College. A list of potential faculty members of the committee drawn from the College, the University and University Colleges shall be presented to the candidate who will be allowed to comment on the suitability of any of those on the list. The Principal will then form the committee from the list to meet the requirements outlined above and the candidate will be notified of the committee membership.

Members of the TPC shall declare any conflict of interest in a particular case and absent themselves from Committee meetings dealing with the case. It would be desirable if such conflicts of interest could be anticipated at the time the Principal is establishing the committee. If the Chair has a conflict, the Committee will appoint another of its members as a temporary Chair and communications with the candidate shall be through this temporary Chair.

Prior to the consideration of a case, the candidate may challenge, in writing, individual members of the Committee for bias, apprehension of bias or conflict of interest. The Committee, excluding the challenged member, will
consider the challenge. If it decides that the challenge is not well-founded, the entire Committee will proceed with consideration of the case for tenure or promotion as the case may be. However, the challenge becomes part of the record to be considered in any subsequent appeal. If the Committee decides that the challenge is well-founded, the challenged member shall be replaced by another faculty member. Of course, it would be desirable for candidates requesting tenure or promotion to consider and discuss potential grounds for challenge at the time of the Principal is consulting about committee membership.

In cases in which a candidate’s challenge results in the removal of a member of the Committee, the Principal will consult with the remaining members with a view to finding a replacement.

The granting of tenure to a probationary – term Assistant Professor carries with it the promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. For the purpose of the inaugural ATP policy all members of faculty as of January 2005 shall be granted tenure at their existing rank. After the policy has been approved by the Board of Governors, members of faculty below the rank of Full Professor may apply for promotion at the appropriate time.

B. Process for Tenure and Promotion

- **Interview.** The Principal shall invite each candidate to a personal interview to discuss the procedure to be followed and to provide information to the candidate. Each candidate will be asked to supply the TPC with a brief supporting her/his case for tenure or promotion as the case may be. This brief will be a primary document for all committees which review the candidate’s case and must include:
  
  A. A current curriculum vitae (recently revised) – each page signed and dated by the candidate.
  
  B. A complete listing of all courses taught and class sizes for the past five academic years, together with descriptions, outlines, tests, assignments, etc., for these courses.
  
  C. A listing of numbers of students taught or advised in independent study courses (with course descriptions), honours thesis projects, graduate level theses, etc.
  
  D. Results of all College (or Distance Education or other) course evaluations for the past five years.
  
  E. Specification of the strong area(s) of scholarly activity of the candidate.
  
  F. All materials relevant to an evaluation of performance in the area(s) of scholarly activity as feasible; for example, books, papers (published and in preparation), research reports, evaluations of field and/or clinical activities.
  
  G. A list of five to ten names of potential arm’s-length referees whom the candidate may wish to have evaluate the described scholarly activities. The candidate may ask for separate evaluations in relation to different aspects of the candidate’s scholarly activities. At least half of the referees listed must be external to the UW and its University Colleges.
  
  H. A list of all service activities in the College and related academic institutions, in the profession and in the non-academic community. The name and address of a person who can act as a reference for each, or most, activities should be provided.

**Annual Reviews.** The Principal shall provide the Committee with copies of all written assessments made of the candidate as part of annual reviews.

- **Tenure File.** A tenure or promotion file for the faculty member being evaluated will be prepared by the Committee and retained until the entire process, including any appeals or requests for reconsideration, has been completed. This file will include all of the evidence considered by the Committee and its assessment of the candidate’s performance in teaching, scholarship and service plus the recommendation or decision by the Committee on tenure or promotion. Reservations about the Committee’s recommendation expressed by any of its members shall be recorded in the file along with the basis for the reservations.
External Referees. Evaluations of a candidate’s scholarly contributions by external referees are sought in all tenure and promotion cases. At least three external letters must be obtained. Referees shall be sent copies of this policy, for information, and shall be asked to comment on the candidate’s scholarly accomplishments and compare them with the accomplishments of individuals recently receiving tenure at their own institutions or institutions of similar standing.

In addition to a list of possible external referees provided by the candidate, the Committee normally will suggest others. The Chair of the TPC should consult with the Principal and such other sources as may be useful about the pool of potential referees. The candidate must be notified of any names added to his or her list of possible referees. The candidate may challenge, in writing to the Committee, a potential referee for bias, apprehension of bias, conflict of interest or unsuitability. If the candidate and the Committee cannot agree on a common pool of possible referees, then in soliciting external reviews of the candidate’s scholarly work, the Committee must select at least as many referees from the candidate’s list as from its own list. Letters soliciting comments from referees shall be sent by the Chair of the TPC.

Informal contacts with potential external referees, by the Principal, any members of the Committee or the candidate are inappropriate.

Additional Information Sources. Persons other than those described elsewhere in this policy may comment, in writing, about a candidate’s qualifications or suitability for tenure or promotion. Any such information received by the Committee will be used as further evidence in the case. If such unsolicited material gives rise to significant reservations, the Chair shall inform the candidate in writing of the nature of the reservations in sufficient detail to allow the candidate to respond to them.

If a candidate has a cross-appointment and/or has a significant intersection with the work of a UW department or school, comment should be solicited from the relevant academic units of the UW.

Presentation by the Candidate. Before arriving at a recommendation, the Committee shall provide reasonable opportunity for the candidate to make a submission in person to describe, and to answer questions about, her/his teaching, scholarly works and contributions to the College and the wider community.

Reservations. In some cases significant reservations may be expressed in or to the Committee. The nature of such reservations and their basis must be clearly documented in writing in the tenure or promotion file. When such reservations arise, the Chair of the Committee shall inform the candidate in writing of the possibility of a negative recommendation. The candidate shall be informed of the nature of the reservations in sufficient detail to allow the candidate to respond to them. The Chair shall provide the candidate a copy of the assessment assembled by the Committee, including all letters of reference with the name of and any other identifying references to the author of the letters deleted unless the authors have expressly consented to be identified.

The Committee shall invite the candidate to respond in writing or by discussion with the full Committee, or both, within ten working days after being informed. In no case will a negative recommendation go forward unless the candidate has been informed as outlined above, and has had a reasonable time to respond.

Committee Recommendation. On the basis of its evaluations, the Committee will make a recommendation in writing to the Principal either for or against tenure or promotion as the case may be. The report must contain:

1. The written recommendation of the Committee together with a clear summary of its reasons for that recommendation;
2. Full copies of all letters of assessment, including annual reviews;
3. All material provided by the candidate to the Committee
4. The written comments of any member of the Committee having reservations about the recommendation of the Committee, including the basis for those reservations.

5. The numerical record of the votes taken.

If the Principal agrees with the majority of members of the TPC on a positive recommendation for tenure, he or she will notify the candidate in writing within 2 weeks of the TPC’s recommendation. Subsequently, the Principal will take the recommendation to the Board of Governors for approval.

In cases in which the Principal does not agree with the majority on a positive recommendation, the Principal will inform the candidate of the negative outcome and the reason for the decision. The Principal will wait a minimum of fifteen working days after notification has been given to the candidate before reporting the recommendation to the Board of Governors to allow the candidate an opportunity to launch an appeal or make a request for reconsideration.

In cases in which the majority of the TPC makes a negative recommendation, the Principal will inform the candidate of the outcome and the reason for the decision. The Principal will wait a minimum of fifteen working days after notification has been given to the candidate before reporting the recommendation to the Board of Governors to allow the candidate an opportunity to launch an appeal or make a request for reconsideration.

If at any time in the process the candidate withdraws her/his application for tenure, this fact alone will be reported to the Board of Governors.

- **The Principal’s Role.** The Principal has the final authority to make recommendations concerning tenure and promotion. Nevertheless, in all instances, the Principal will consider the recommendations from the majority of the TPC very seriously and will ground tenure and promotion decisions in both the letter and spirit of this policy. The preceding should be taken to imply the requirement that the Principal may decide to withhold tenure or promotion following a positive recommendation by the Committee but may not grant tenure or promotion following a negative recommendation by the Committee.

**VIII. PROCESS FOR RECONSIDERATION AND APPEALS**

Following notification by the Principal of a recommendation against tenure, the candidate may launch an appeal or make a request for reconsideration within fifteen working days. Normally, a request for reconsideration must be accompanied by some new and substantial information which had not previously been available to the Committee. Appeals can be made only on the grounds of failure to adhere in a material way to the procedures detailed in this policy.

- **Appeals or Requests for re-consideration of Negative Tenure Decisions by the Principal.** If the Principal decides against tenure or promotion, the candidate may appeal in writing to the Chair of the TPC within fifteen working days of being informed of the negative decision. Upon receipt of a tenure or promotion appeal, the Chair of the TPC will arrange for the case to be re-examined by a Review Committee comprising a nominee of the candidate, a nominee of the Principal, and a third member agreed on by the two nominees and who is chosen by the two nominees from among the UW faculty members of the College’s Board of Governors or from such faculty members who have previously been on the College’s Board of Governors. This third member shall Chair the Review Committee.

- Normally the nominees chosen by the candidate and the Principal shall be or shall have been tenured associate or full professors at the College, the UW or one of the University Colleges and in the candidate’s discipline or a closely related discipline.

- If the nominees of the candidate and the Principal cannot reach agreement on the third member, the Chair of the TPC will select the third member from the present or former UW faculty members of the Board. Failing that the Chair of the TPC will choose the third member from present or former faculty.
members from an appropriate department of the UW. Failing that the Chair of the TPC shall ask the Chair of the College’s Board of Governors to be the third member.

- The Review Committee members shall not have had any prior connection with the tenure or promotion case under review.

- The Review Committee will examine the case from the beginning, hear the faculty member, and the members of the TPC and otherwise determine its own procedures. The burden of proof shall be on the candidate to demonstrate that the criteria for an appeal and for tenure or promotion have been met. Tenure and promotion must be earned by good performance, and shall not be awarded on the basis of procedural irregularities.

- The Review Committee shall decide on the basis of the evidence submitted to it whether the criteria for tenure in this document have been met, and shall present its majority recommendation, accompanied by a detailed written explanation, to the candidate and to the Principal. This recommendation is binding on the candidate and the College.

***************
Revised Territorial Acknowledgement

St. Paul’s has, for a number of years, been using the following territorial acknowledgement:

We acknowledge that we located on the traditional territory of the Neutral, the Anishinaabe, the Haudenonee peoples. The University of Waterloo is situated on the Haldimand Tract, land promised to Six Nations, which includes six miles on each side of the Grand River.

This wording was not developed by the College itself but was suggested to a staff member by someone from Six Nations. It has never been formally adopted by the Board. It is problematic in a variety of ways.

There is agreement at both the Board level and at our Indigenous Advisory Circle (IAC) that the College should develop its own official territorial acknowledgement. At the Board’s direction, Brenda Simpson and I consulted with external experts and with the members of the IAC. The IAC has now developed and endorsed the following “made at St. Paul’s” wording for consideration by the Board as an official College territorial acknowledgement.

We acknowledge that our College is situated on lands deeply connected to Indigenous peoples who have historically lived, and who currently live, in this territory. We recognize these lands have always been the source of learning for Indigenous peoples. As an institution of higher learning, we acknowledge the importance of this relationship between land, learning and knowledge and are committed to seeking ways to enhance our learning environment through these practices.

I can speak to the specific advantages of this text over the previous one when we meet.

Richard Myers
Principal
June 14, 2019
BOARD OF GOVERNORS, AGM & COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEDULE

All Board and Committee meetings will be held at the College, 190 Westmount Road North, Waterloo, unless otherwise stated.

Board
Board meeting dates are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 20, 2020</td>
<td>February 18, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 16, 2020</td>
<td>April 15, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 18, 2020</td>
<td>June 17, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8, 2020</td>
<td>October 14, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGM
The AGM will be held immediately after the conclusion of the October Board meeting.

Committees
Executive Committee meetings are held from 8:00 AM to 9:00 AM at the College, 190 Westmount Road North, Waterloo, Ontario, unless otherwise stated.

Executive Committee meeting dates are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 6, 2020</td>
<td>February 4, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2, 2020</td>
<td>April 1, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4, 2020</td>
<td>June 3, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24, 2020</td>
<td>September 30, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finance & Investment Committee meetings are held at the College, 190 Westmount Road North, Waterloo, Ontario, unless otherwise stated.

Tentative Finance & Investment Committee meeting dates are as follows (for information only, subject to change):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 23, 2020</td>
<td>January 21, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 19, 2020</td>
<td>March 18, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 21, 2020</td>
<td>May 27, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17, 2020</td>
<td>September 16, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Audit Committee meetings are held at the College, 190 Westmount Road North, Waterloo, Ontario, unless otherwise stated.

Tentative Audit Committee meeting dates are as follows (for information only, subject to change):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 7, 2020</td>
<td>May 6, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 3, 2020</td>
<td>September 2, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governance Committee meetings are held prior to the start of the Board meeting at the College, 190 Westmount Road North, Waterloo, Ontario, unless otherwise stated.

Tentative Governance Committee meeting dates are as follows (for information only, subject to change):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 20, 2020</td>
<td>February 18, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 16, 2020</td>
<td>April 15, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 18, 2020</td>
<td>June 17, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8, 2020</td>
<td>October 14, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building & Property Committee meetings are held at the College, 190 Westmount Road North, Waterloo, Ontario, unless otherwise stated.

Meeting dates are determined based on the activities of the College, not less than once per calendar year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 20, 2020</td>
<td>February 18, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 16, 2020</td>
<td>April 15, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 18, 2020</td>
<td>June 17, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8, 2020</td>
<td>October 14, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>