

Recognition and De-recognition at the University of Toronto: Principles and Process

Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on
Principles to Guide Recognition and Commemoration

March 11, 2023



DEFY
GRAVITY

Recognition and De-recognition at the University of Toronto: Principles and Process

Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Principles to Guide Recognition and Commemoration

Preamble

Recognitions and commemorations on our campuses are significant: when the University names a building or a scholarship, or awards an honorary degree, it not only confers an honour, it also expresses its values. The act of recognizing or commemorating a person or an entity by name calls forth their accomplishments and implicitly celebrates those accomplishments as exemplifying some aspect of the University's values. In this way, recognitions and commemorations help bring the University's ideals to life, enriching our academic community.

However, when an act of recognition or commemoration calls forth accomplishments that conflict with the University's values – or, indeed, when we fail to celebrate the diversity of our community – we contribute to a kind of harm to our community and mission. Recognitions and commemorations at the University of Toronto should manifest its values, reflect its diversity, and celebrate meritorious accomplishments and distinctions. Deliberating about recognitions and commemorations is a natural part of the University's evolution, an ongoing attempt to elucidate our history, promote understanding, and become an academic community that fully lives up to the values it embraces.

The Terms of Reference¹ of the *Presidential Advisory Committee on Principles to Guide Recognition and Commemoration* (hereafter, the *Committee*) ask it for advice about the principles that should underpin the University's future commemorations and to make recommendations for how to proceed when the University discovers that a commemoration clashes with the University's values. The *Committee* is not charged with deciding particular cases. The questions before the *Committee* are: how and under what conditions should the University undertake de-recognitions such as de-naming, re-naming, rescinding an honorary degree, and explaining the morally complicated history of an honoree (something we call 'contextualizing')? How should the University proceed with future recognitions and commemorations? The University's values are central to these questions.

¹ Attached to this Report as Appendix 1.

The University of Toronto's Values

In its deliberations, the *Presidential Advisory Committee on Recognition and Commemoration* has been guided by the values articulated in the University of Toronto's foundational documents. Among these is the *Statement of Institutional Purpose* (October 15, 1992)² which sets out the University's responsibility to its community:

The University of Toronto is dedicated to fostering an academic community in which the learning and scholarship of every member may flourish, with vigilant protection for individual human rights, and a resolute commitment to the principles of equal opportunity, equity and justice.

The *Statement of Institutional Purpose* commits the University to two additional core values which have special significance for the *Committee's* work. They are:

Respect for intellectual integrity, freedom of enquiry and rational discussion.

Promotion of equity and justice within the University and recognition of the diversity of the University community.

The University's commitment to equity and justice, as well as the importance of celebrating the community's diversity, means that the University of Toronto, situated as it is in Canada with its history of oppression of Indigenous peoples, must be especially alert to recognitions and commemorations relevant to Indigenous peoples. This in no way diminishes the University's duties towards other historically marginalized communities, nor does it restrict the scope of wrongs to those affecting communities, as opposed to individuals.

Beyond the University's foundation documents, two sets of other documents are particularly relevant for the *Committee's* work: the *Policy on Naming*, and the *Terms of Reference and Guidelines* for the Committee for Honorary Degrees.

The *Policy on Naming* (1996)

The University's *Policy on Naming*³ contains guidelines for naming elements of the University's physical and academic landscape as well as provisions for removing names. The *Policy* specifies terms for the duration for which names shall remain in place:

² <https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/secretariat/policies/institutional-purpose-statement-october-15-1992>

³ <https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/secretariat/policies/naming-policy-october-24-1996>

Where a building or a part thereof or a facility has been named, the University will continue to use the name so long as the building, part or facility remains in use and serves its original function.

The Policy also sets the standard for removing names:

no naming will be approved or (once approved) continued that will call into serious question the public respect of the University.

The Committee for Honorary Degrees

The Terms of Reference for the Committee for Honorary Degrees⁴ explains that, in awarding honorary degrees, the University seeks

... to recognize extraordinary achievement in community, national or international service and to honour those individuals whose accomplishments are of such excellence that they provide, through example, inspiration and leadership to the graduates of the University.

Neither the Terms of Reference nor the Guidelines for the Committee for Honorary Degrees⁵ explicitly invoke the University's fundamental values. The documents are also silent on the possibility of rescinding an honorary degree.

While the *Committee* has not been expressly asked to make formal recommendations for the revision of existing policies, it makes a number of suggestions for improvements or clarifications to existing policies.

As the University of Toronto evolves with respect to its recognitions and commemorations, both the nature of future recognitions and the possibility of de-recognitions, in light of new relevant information, need to be considered.

On the question of de-recognition

Principles to guide de-recognition

Any process of de-recognition (such as de-naming, rescinding an honorary degree, or adding context/educational material to a recognition) must be grounded in the University's values. It will inevitably rely upon fallible human understandings of norms and judgments of saliency. Decisions will often be made under conditions of partial information, contested views, shifting mores over the course of time, and controversy. The past is especially vague, partly hidden, and hard to decipher, but decisions about

⁴ <https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/system/files/import-files/hdtdor3659.pdf>

⁵ <https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/governance-bodies/committee-honorary-degrees/guidelines-committee-honorary-degrees>

the present can also be fraught. People and history are rarely neat and tidy. Detailed and complex deliberations will often be required.

The University community does not shrink from difficult deliberations. It aspires to get things right in even the most complex contexts. With respect to historical judgments, while we cannot expect those in the past to share all aspects of our current and best moral standards, the *Committee* rejects the idea that these judgments are entirely relative to time and place. Enslavement, genocide, Antisemitism, racism, and misogyny, for instance, are not only wrong now, but they were wrong wherever and whenever they occurred.

Of course, not every kind of wrong will warrant de-recognizing a person or entity. Take, for instance, an offhand expression against a group, of a sort generally made at a particular time and place. Such expressions were (and still are) wrong, but they would not meet the necessarily high bar for removing a name from a building or scholarship.

The University community requires a legitimate, consistent, and transparent process that will enable it to navigate the formidable ethical challenges and complexities it faces with respect to de-recognition. It must be centred on principles, including the principle of due process. In what follows, the *Committee* sets out principles recommendations for such a process, keeping in mind that it must be aligned with the governance structure of the University.

Principle [1] The basic condition for de-recognition is that a formally constituted, knowledgeable, diverse, and sufficiently sizable committee judges the legacy of a namesake or degree holder to be fundamentally at odds with the mission and values of the University.

In making this judgement, the following condition must be met:

[1.1] the evidentiary sources must be clear and the purported egregious behavior must be known with reasonable certainty, based upon a careful consideration of the evidence.

A case for de-recognition is stronger when:

[1.2] the person in question's actions or beliefs, which are now regarded as morally deplorable, were objectionable or advocated against even at the time of naming or conferring;

[1.3] the argument for de-recognition is salient to the recognition; that is, the argument for derecognition rests on the very qualities for which the recognition was conferred.

Principle [1.3] marks the idea that the act of recognition itself is important in providing the context for the recognition and hence for considering any de-recognition. What was

the purpose of the recognition? What is the connection between what is being named and whom it is being named for? The University's Lester B. Pearson International Scholarships, for example, are named in recognition of Pearson's accomplishments as a Nobel Peace Prize winning international leader. The University usually recognizes someone for *something* – the recognition is not a celebration of the *entirety* of the person. The context is important: it focuses the recognition. Here lies one reason for the importance of remedies that contextualize or explain what the University recognized a person for, while acknowledging that other aspects of the honoree may be ethically problematic.

Indeed, education and understanding are at the very heart of the University of Toronto's mission. The University should take the opportunity, when considering a de-recognition, to acknowledge problematic aspects of its history by bringing them to light and providing educational opportunities around them. The process of de-recognition should be guided by the aim to understand our history more fully and to make the University's educational mission a vital part of any de-recognition. A plaque, an installation, or another kind of tool for raising awareness can contextualize, explain, and integrate the University's history rather than glossing over or invalidating it. The University should seize the opportunity to correct and enhance our understanding of our complex past. This means that, when considering a de-recognition, the first remedy to consider should be contextualizing the recognition, making public the moral complexity and problematic nature of the recognition. The *Committee* frames this idea as a principle:

Principle [2] The University should consider a full range of remedies, including de-naming and rescinding an honorary degree, when it has been determined that a de-recognition is warranted. But, given our educational mission, the *Committee* expects most de-recognitions to be contextualizations.

The University's processes of recognition and commemoration are important opportunities to further the work of reconciliation as outlined by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada and as affirmed by the University's response to the Commission, *Answering the Call Wecheehetowin*, and the calls to action it announced. The University bears a special responsibility in this regard. This is also an important principle:

Principle [3] While there are many kinds of wrongs that might form the basis of a strong case for de-recognition, special attention should be paid to those de-recognitions which would acknowledge the oppression of Indigenous peoples and advance the imperative work of reconciliation.

The above principles are expressed in terms of the University's values, rather than in terms of public respect, as set out in the *Policy on Naming*. In the *Committee's* view, it is important for the University's decisions on recognition and de-recognition to be based upon the University's values, rather than upon the more vague idea of 'public respect'.

Suggestion [1]: The University reconsider the standard for renaming articulated in the *Policy on Naming*; in particular, that the grounds for approval (or continuation) of a naming be based on the mission and values of the University, rather than ‘public respect’.

Similarly, in the *Committee’s* view, the honorary degrees process should include reference to the University’s values as playing an important part in the recognition – and, potentially, de-recognition – process.

Suggestion [2]: The University review and revise the Terms of Reference and / or the Guidelines for the Committee for Honorary Degrees to include reference to the University’s fundamental values, as they are addressed at the outset of this Report. The Terms of Reference and / or Guidelines should also note that honorary degrees may be rescinded.

The formal process for de-recognition

The *Presidential Advisory Committee on Principles to Guide Recognition and Commemoration* recommends a process such as the one described below for institutional commemorations approved by the Governing Council (whether originating with the Committee for Honorary Degrees, the Committee for Naming, or some other body of the Governing Council).

The Committee notes that some recognitions and commemorations are made under the purview and authority of local divisions, departments, or colleges – for instance, when a department commissions a portrait. In such cases, de-recognitions should remain local matters, decided by local policies or protocols. While the principles and process outlined in this document are appropriate and employable in local contexts, the *Committee* is not suggesting that local decisions about de-recognition go through the institutional process. However, a local entity might request that a proposal for de-recognition go through the institutional process.

The process for institutional de-recognitions should adhere to two general procedural principles.

Principle [4] The final decision-making body for de-recognitions should be the body that conferred the recognition in the first place. For institutional recognitions and commemorations that body is Governing Council and its entities, including the Committee on Naming and the Committee for Honorary Degrees.

Principle [5] The University of Toronto’s process for presenting, considering, and implementing de-recognitions is itself significant and must be grounded in its core values. Among these are the importance of deliberation, freedom of inquiry, scholarly expertise, civil discourse, and intellectual integrity. These constitutive features of the University should drive the evaluation of proposed renamings, rescindings, or contextualizations. That is, a process in which the University considers a de-

recognition should be rigorous, consistent, and informed by expertise and evidence based on careful scholarly research.

Principle [4] and Principle [5] represent the *procedural* foundation of a process for de-recognition. Principles [1-3] represent the *substantive* foundation for such a process. Together, these principles motivate and inform the Committee's recommended *Process for De-recognition*.

Recommendation [1]: The *Committee* recommends the following *Process for De-recognition* in those circumstances in which Principle [1] and its subclauses [1.1] to [1.3] are largely fulfilled.

Step [I] A diverse, representative, and knowledgeable *Standing Committee on De-recognition* should be established, drawing on the University's resources of faculty, staff, students, and alumni. Because of the importance and the academic nature of the *Standing Committee's* job, its membership and chair should be set by the administration, namely, the Provost and President. There should be term limits, replacement of members who take leaves, and its membership should be confirmed annually. The *Standing Committee* should meet as needed.

Step [II] A proposal for de-recognition must be made to the *Standing Committee on De-recognition* in writing and must make a good *prima facie* case for why a particular recognition should be de-recognized.

Step [III] The *Standing Committee on De-recognition* will review the proposal and arrive at one of two decisions: it will either judge the proposal insufficient to pursue further, or it will initiate an investigation to determine the appropriate course of action. The *Standing Committee on De-recognition* will base its review on a consideration of Principle [1] and its subclauses.

Step [IV] In the event that the *Standing Committee on De-recognition* judges the proposal insufficient to pursue further, it will inform the proposal's author(s) of its decision.

Step [V] When the *Standing Committee on De-recognition* initiates an investigation, it will inform the Chair of the relevant decision-making body. The *Standing Committee* will then form an ad hoc committee to conduct a full investigation. The ad hoc committee should be diverse, representative, and knowledgeable, drawing on specific expertise and representation given the nature of the case. The *Standing Committee on De-recognition* may use all or some of its members as the ad hoc committee to ensure continuity and consistency, and to avoid duplication of effort. The ad hoc committees should have the ability to consult as necessary and bring relevant voices to the deliberation.

Step [VI] After conducting a careful inquiry, guided by Principle [1] and its subclauses, the ad hoc committee will recommend a course of action (for instance,

no action, contextualization, de-naming, or rescinding an honorary degree) to the relevant decision-making body (or its delegate) which, in turn, will make the final decision. The decision will be communicated to the proposal's author(s).

Note: Steps [III-VI] should be done in as timely a manner as is consistent with care and due process.

Note: Deliberations of the Standing Committee should be regarded as confidential.

On the question of recognition

Questions of recognition and commemoration are not only about the past and the present, but also about the future. In addition to Recommendation [1] concerning the process for de-recognitions, the *Committee* makes the following additional recommendations to inform future recognitions:

Recommendation [2]: The University should pay close attention to wrongs against historically marginalized groups, particularly as those wrongs were (and are) reflected on its campuses. The University should seek out opportunities to recognize and commemorate the full range of its history, diversifying its institutional narratives, and expanding the reach of its recognitions and commemorations to better reflect our community.

Recommendation [3]: In keeping with the University's commitment to embracing Indigenous presence and to fostering reconciliation, future recognitions and commemorations should pay special attention to opportunities to celebrate Indigenous history, language, and continued presence in the Toronto region.

Recommendation [4]: The University should expand its approach to naming by considering recognizing and commemorating not just individuals, but discoveries, important contributions to public life, social movements, and similar phenomena. The University should enliven its recognitions by bringing neglected aspects of our history into light.

The University of Toronto's *Policy on Naming* stipulates that, for buildings, parts of buildings, and facilities, names are given in perpetuity: "the University will continue to use the name so long as the building, part or facility remains in use and serves its original function". The University already has a great number of time-limited named chairs, scholarships, and programs, that are named as a result of expendable gifts or sponsorship agreements. Building on this tradition of limited-term namings can enhance the range and diversity of our recognitions.

Suggestion [3]: The University should consider building term limits into a greater number and variety of its namings, including spaces and buildings.

Conclusion

The *Committee's* Terms of Reference ask the *Committee* to articulate general principles to guide the University's thinking and actions with respect to institutional recognitions and commemorations, both as the University looks back at past recognitions and as it looks forward towards future recognitions.

The University's recognitions and commemorations, new and continuing, announce the University's values. They say something about the kind of university the University of Toronto is and the kind it aspires to be. Recognitions and commemorations are thus matters for celebrating and for reflecting on the values they call forth.

The *Committee* recognizes the trust it has been given in being asked to help guide the University's approach to recognitions and commemorations. It is honoured to offer its Report as part of the broader University community's effort to live up to its fundamental values. The principles, recommendations, and suggestions the *Committee* presents in this Report are based on those fundamental values and, the *Committee* believes, will help advance them. The University's commitment to foster "an academic community in which the learning and scholarship of every member may flourish," and its dedication to "the principles of equal opportunity, equity and justice" have inspired the *Committee's* work and informed our deliberations. It is our hope that this Report – and the ongoing conversations about recognition and commemoration in which we have been privileged to take part – will help the community shape the University of Toronto into an even better place.

Appendix 1

TERMS OF REFERENCE Presidential Advisory Committee on Principles to Guide Recognition and Commemoration

OVERVIEW

Universities around the world, along with other institutions, are reckoning with the challenge of addressing their complex and sometimes troubling histories, including the recognition of individuals through the naming of buildings and programs, the awarding of honorary degrees, and the like. As time passes and our values change, or as we learn more about some of those we have recognized in the past, institutions must reckon with those we have honoured whose deeds or behaviour may now be considered objectionable or abhorrent.

Recently, we have made explicit and implicit commitments in the work done by the Truth and Reconciliation Steering Committee, the Task Force on Anti-Black Racism and other such initiatives to have our commemorations, including buildings, street names, and honorary degrees, align with our values.

As the University approaches its Bicentenary in 2027, enhancing and strengthening inclusive excellence is a key institutional priority, recognizing that U of T's contributions to the advancement of knowledge are inextricably linked to its ability to welcome and leverage ideas, talent, experiences and perspectives from all backgrounds. This is an especially appropriate time to review how we acknowledge historical injustices in our history of commemoration.

As a first step in responding in a thoughtful and prudent way to individual cases, there is a clear need to articulate general principles that can be used to guide our thinking and actions with respect to how we commemorate members of our community and their distinguished contributions. Such principles will be particularly helpful as we consider troubling questions about recognition of past, historical figures. They will also be useful in guiding future decisions on commemoration and naming.

PURPOSE

The Presidential Advisory Committee on Principles to Guide Recognition and Commemoration will be responsible for articulating principles to inform decisions on commemoration and naming, including the conditions under which the names of historical figures ought to be no longer associated with the University's buildings, programs, or other elements of the physical and academic landscape.

Once these general principles have been articulated, they can be employed to guide decisions about individual namings, de-namings or re-namings.

To inform its work, the Advisory Committee should consult broadly across the University of Toronto to seek input and advice from our community.

MEMBERSHIP

Chair

The Chair shall be appointed by the President of the University of Toronto.

Composition

The Advisory Committee, appointed by the President, shall be composed of approximately 12-14 members drawn from the following University estates: faculty, staff, students, and alumni.

TIMELINE

The Advisory Committee will submit its report to the President early in 2023, ideally no later than March 31st.

REPORT

The final report of the Advisory Committee should include a set of principles and guidelines to inform University decisions and actions. Where possible, it should also make recommendations regarding appropriate processes (including appropriate responsible bodies) depending on the type of recognition – building naming, honorary degree, etc. In addition, it should indicate whether any revisions to existing policies and guidelines are required.

The Committee's report will be submitted to the President. The President will take the recommendations of the Advisory Committee under consideration and these will inform the subsequent use, by the administration and by governance, of the general principles identified by the Committee. The report will be brought forward to the Governing Council for information.

Appendix 2

The Consultation Process

The *Committee* undertook an extensive consultation process as part of its mandate and throughout its deliberations. The *Committee* heard and considered a wide variety of views and opinions. This Report has benefitted tremendously from the consultation process and the *Committee* is grateful for the many thoughtful contributions from our community.

In October 2022, an online *Request for Feedback and Guidance* form was set up, accessible via the Office of the President's website and the University of Toronto *Consultations* website. The form was available from October 25, 2022, to January 31, 2023. It is included with this Report in Appendix 3.

Invitations to respond to the online form (and to share it widely) were issued to a broad range of stakeholders, including equity group leaders and student society leaders, with special efforts to reach Indigenous leaders (as well as Indigenous faculty, staff, and students). Information about the *Presidential Advisory Committee on Principles to Guide Recognition and Commemoration*, the process it was undertaking, as well as invitations to participate were shared via the Provost's Digest, UofT News, the Bulletin Brief, and the Alumni Newsletter, the UTSC Daily Update, and UTM Express. All faculty, staff, and alumni had access to the online form and an opportunity to complete it. Local Indigenous groups were invited to participate, and the heads of all federated colleges and universities were also notified. The Committee received 102 completed forms.

From November to January, a series of online consultation meetings were arranged for those who had identified themselves in the *Request for Feedback and Guidance* form as interested in participating. Four such sessions were convened and were attended by alumni, students, faculty, and staff.

As part of its deliberative process, the *Committee* also undertook specific consultations with key internal stakeholders related to governance and naming processes.

Detailed Summary of Consultations

Individuals who indicated on the feedback and guidance form that they were willing to be contacted by the *Committee*, were invited to a virtual consultation session with the Chair of the *Committee* (and other committee members who were available to attend).

Invitations to complete the Request for Feedback and Guidance form were sent broadly to the UofT Community and included the following specific groups:

INTERNAL

- The University's senior administration, including the President and Vice-Presidents, Deans, Principals, Academic Directors, and Chairs.
- Indigenous representatives
- UofT Equity Groups
- Office of Indigenous Initiatives (student, staff and faculty mailing list)
- First Nation Student Society
- Five main Student societies (UTSU, UTGSU, UTMSU, SCSU, APUS)
- SGS Graduate Student newsletter
- Governing Council (Governors)
- CAO listserv
- Alumni listserv
- Provost's Digest
- Bulletin Brief
- UTSC Daily Update
- UTM Express
- Story @UofT News

EXTERNAL

- Local First Nations
 - Six Nations of Grand River
 - Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation
 - Métis Nation of Ontario
- Heads of Federated colleges/universities

Virtual in-person consultations with the Chair (one-hour sessions)

- November 25, 2022
- January 5, 2023
- January 6, 2023
- January 30, 2023

Consultations done directly with the *Committee* or Chair:

- Sheree Drummond, Secretary of Governing Council
- Christopher Lang, Director, Office of Appeals, Discipline, and Faculty Grievances
- Shannon Simpson, Senior Director, Indigenous Initiatives

Appendix 3

REQUEST FOR INPUT AND GUIDANCE

Introduction

Universities around the world, along with other institutions, are reckoning with the challenge of addressing their complex and sometimes troubling histories, including the recognition of individuals through the naming of buildings, the awarding of honorary degrees, the creation of student scholarships, and so on. As we learn more about some of those we have recognized, questions can arise as to the appropriateness of certain commemorations and as new opportunities for naming and commemoration arise, we can think about how best to reflect the diversity of our community.

The task of *The Presidential Advisory Committee on Principles to Guide Recognition and Commemoration* (hereafter the *Recognition Committee*) is to articulate principles to guide the University of Toronto on these important matters. While it is not within the mandate of the *Recognition Committee* to consider individual cases of, for instance, namings, de-namings, and re-namings, a process for doing so will evolve from the work of the committee.

Request for Your Input and Guidance

To engage as many university members as possible, the *Recognition Committee* is inviting the community to express their thoughts by completing a questionnaire. It consists of four queries, which can be answered in brief or at greater length (maximum 4000 characters per question), as well as a prompt to participate in further ways.

The Recognition Committee looks forward to receiving our community's insights. Your help will inform the recommendations that will be submitted to the University's senior leadership.

The Committee will complete its review in January.

Privacy

This Request for Input and Guidance is conducted by the *University of Toronto Presidential Advisory Committee on Principles to Guide Recognition* and is governed by Ontario's Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA). It is designed to collect only the minimum amount of personal information necessary for the Committee's work. The raw data we collect will be de-identified at the point of collection, unless you explicitly indicate that you are willing to have the committee follow up with you by providing your email address below. Only members of the *Recognition Committee* will have access to data collected as part of this Request for Input and Guidance and all data collected will be stored, encrypted, protected, and later destroyed

in accordance with FIPPA and appropriate technical standards. If data are included in any report issued by the Committee, they will be in aggregate form and de-identified or anonymized.

You are under no obligation to take part in this request for input and advice. Your participation is completely voluntary. If you have any questions or require further information, please contact recognition.committee@utoronto.ca.

We thank you for your participation and support.

Terms and Conditions

1. I understand the terms and conditions of this survey and hereby consent to participate
 - Agree
 - Do not agree

Request for Input and Advice

In the questions below, please share any information as you are comfortable (e.g. about yourself and your background) that will help us understand and provide deeper context to your responses where you think it will be relevant to do so.

2. Are you a:
 - Student
 - Staff
 - Faculty
 - Librarian
 - Alumni
 - Other
3. In your view, for what reasons should a commemoration/recognition/naming be granted by the university?
4. In your view, for what reasons should a commemoration/recognition/naming be rescinded or disassociated from the university?
5. What do you think are the key principles, and the relative importance of them, that should guide commemoration/recognition/naming decisions at the university?
6. Please share any additional comments and suggestions

Thank you for your submission. If you prefer to present a longer non-anonymized (individual or group) submission, please sent it to recognition.committee@utoronto.ca.

7. If you are willing to have the committee follow-up with you, please enter your email address here

Appendix 4

The members of the Advisory Committee

- **Cheryl Misak**, *University Professor and Professor of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts & Science (Chair)*
- **Jason Bazylak**, *Associate Professor, Teaching Stream, Dean's Advisor on Indigenous Initiatives, Mechanical & Industrial Engineering, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering (on leave and not on the committee from January 2023).*
- **Tad Brown**, *Counsel, Business Affairs and Advancement, University Advancement*
- **Darlee Gerrard**, *Coordinator, Engineering Outreach Office, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering*
- **Jodie Glean**, *Executive Director, Equity, Diversity & Inclusion (on leave and not on the committee from January 2023)*
- **Gary D. Goldberg**, *Former Alumni Governor*
- **Edward Jones-Imhotep**, *Associate Professor and Director, Institute for the History of Philosophy of Science & Technology, Faculty of Arts & Science*
- **Sonia Kang**, *Associate Professor of Organizational Behaviour and Human Resource Management, and Special Advisor on Anti-Racism and Equity, University of Toronto Mississauga; Rotman School of Management*
- **Pamela Klassen**, *Professor and Chair, Department for the Study of Religion, Faculty of Arts & Science*
- **Danielle Kwan-Lafond**, *Assistant Professor, Teaching Stream, Department of Sociology, University of Toronto Scarborough*
- **Mayo Moran**, *Professor, Faculty of Law, and Provost and Vice-Chancellor of Trinity College*
- **Nakanyike Musisi**, *Associate Professor and Acting Chair, Department of History, Faculty of Arts & Science*
- **Jerico Raguindin**, *Undergraduate student, Public Policy & Sociology, Faculty of Arts & Science*
- **Douglas Sanderson**, *Associate Professor, The Prichard Wilson Chair in Law & Public Policy, Decanal Advisor on Indigenous Issues, Faculty of Law*
- **Stephen Wright**, *Professor and Chair, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, Faculty of Arts & Science*
- **Riley Yesno**, *PhD candidate, Department of Political Science, Faculty of Arts & Science*