



UNIVERSITY OF  
**TORONTO**

## **Standing Committee on Recognition**

### **Terms of Reference**

#### **0. Preamble**

In the administrative response to the *Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Principles to Guide Recognition and Commemoration* (hereafter, the *Report*), the University accepted the Principles and Recommendations articulated by the Advisory Committee. Among those recommendations, Recommendation [1], Step [1] provided for the establishment of a “diverse, representative, and knowledgeable *Standing Committee*” to implement the University’s process for considering possible de-recognition. These terms of reference govern that committee’s creation and function.

#### **1. Membership**

##### *Chair*

The Chair of the Standing Committee on Recognition (hereafter, the *Committee*) shall be appointed by the President and Vice-President & Provost of the University of Toronto.

##### *Composition*

The *Committee*’s members shall be appointed by the President and Vice-President & Provost and shall be drawn from the University’s faculty members, staff members, student body, and alumni community. Every effort shall be made to include representation from each of those estates. The *Committee* shall normally be composed of 8-10 members.

##### *Terms*

Faculty, staff, and alumni members are appointed to terms of two years with the possibility of renewal. Student members are appointed for terms of one year (so as not to preclude students in their final year of study) with the possibility of renewal.

## **2. Rules and timelines**

The *Committee* may set its own rules, procedures, and timelines, subject to the following parameters:

2.1 The *Committee*, including any *ad hoc* committee the *Committee* strikes, meets *in camera* and its deliberations should be regarded as confidential or privileged.

## **3. *Ad hoc* committees**

As contemplated in the *Report* and detailed in the Function and Process section below, the *Committee* may strike *ad hoc* committees.

### *Chair*

The Chair of any *ad hoc* committee must be a member of the *Committee*.

### *Composition*

The membership of *ad hoc* committees shall be appointed by the *Committee* under the delegated authority of the President and Vice-President & Provost.

The *Committee* may appoint its own members (all or some) to any *ad hoc* committee it strikes (in addition to the *ad hoc* committee's Chair).

### *Terms*

*Ad hoc* committees cease to exist once their task has been completed.

## **4. Function and process**

The Standing Committee on Recognition is responsible for reviewing proposals to “de-recognize” a person, institution, company, movement, or similar entity honoured or commemorated by the University of Toronto in an act of naming or in the awarding of an honorary degree. In this context, potential ‘de-recognitions’ include: removing the name of a building, scholarship, program, or other element of the academic landscape; and rescinding an honorary degree. The *Committee* may also recommend adding public-facing context (“contextualization”), for example in the form of a plaque, installation or other means for explaining the complex history associated with an honoree.

The *Committee* will carry out this review according to the following process.

### *Proposals for de-recognition*

Any member of the University or external community may initiate a review by submitting a proposal for de-recognition to the *Committee*. A proposal for de-recognition must be made to the *Committee* in writing.

Proposals must make a good *prima facie* case for why a particular recognition should be de-recognized. To make a good *prima facie* case, a proposal must:

[4.1] argue that the legacy of a namesake or degree holder is fundamentally at odds with the mission and values of the University (following Principle [1] in the *Report*);

[4.2] support its argument with evidentiary sources that are clear (following Principle [1.1] in the *Report*);

[4.3] argue that any purported egregious behavior is known with reasonable certainty to have occurred (following Principle [1.1] in the *Report*).

#### *The Committee's initial review*

The *Committee* will review a proposal submitted to it 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 and make recommendations.

The *Committee* will judge a proposal insufficient to pursue further if, in the *Committee's* view, the proposal has not made a good *prima facie* case. The *Committee* will base this judgement on a consideration of the *Report's* Principle [1] and its subclauses, and the degree to which it meets conditions [4.1] to [4.3] above.

If the *Committee* judges a proposal insufficient to pursue further, it will inform the proposal's author(s) and the President and the Vice-President & Provost of its decision. No further action is required.

#### *Proceeding to an ad hoc committee*

If the *Committee* judges that a proposal has made a good *prima facie* case, the *Committee* will strike an *ad hoc* committee to undertake further investigation and make recommendations on how to proceed. Those recommendations will be governed by the following provisions, as stipulated in the *Report*.

[4.4] The *ad hoc* committee will be guided in its deliberations by the *Report's* Principle [1] and its subclauses.

[4.5] If the *ad hoc* committee determines that a de-recognition is warranted, it will be guided by the *Report's* Principle [2]. That is, it should consider a full range of potential remedies, including de-naming or rescinding an honorary degree. Given the University of Toronto's educational mission, and recognizing the guidance provided in the *Report*, it is anticipated that the *ad hoc* committee will recommend contextualization as the most common outcome of the de-recognition process.

[4.6] Guided by the *Report's* Principle [3], the *ad hoc* committee should pay special attention to those requests for de-recognition that would acknowledge the oppression of Indigenous peoples and advance the imperative work of reconciliation. The *ad hoc*

committee should be mindful that, as the *Report* makes clear, “[t]his in no way diminishes the University’s duties towards other historically marginalized communities.”

*The ad hoc committee’s recommendations*

The *ad hoc* committee will recommend a course of action to the *Committee*, which will deliberate on the recommended course of action before deciding on any confidential recommendation to transmit to the President and Vice-President & Provost.

If the *ad hoc* committee’s recommendation includes some form of de-recognition, the President and Vice-President & Provost will share the recommendation with the body that originally conferred the recognition in question, following the *Report’s* Principle [4].

November 24, 2023