

Questions submitted by Senator Jones for the September 25, 2012 Senate meeting

- 1. Question for the Principal concerning Justice Iacobucci's advice to Senate.** Would the Principal please explain to Senate when it might expect to receive the legal advice of Justice Iacobucci concerning the relative authorities of Senate and the Board of Trustees over decisions that have both financial and academic impacts?

- 2. Question for the Principal concerning Strategic Mandate Agreements.** In early August, the MTCU sent the executive officers of Ontario colleges and universities a directive to file Strategic Mandate Agreements, or SMAs, with the Ministry by 30 September. As OCUFA's Mark Rosenfeld has [explained](#), these will apparently be used for purposes including allocation of resources and "differentiation" of Ontario's institutions of post-secondary education. Would the Principal please explain to Senate how he views the agenda behind this directive, and how he intends to respond?

- 3. Question for the Provost concerning commercial advertisements on campus.** Floor-to-ceiling advertisements for corporations including Apple, Bell Canada, and Target have recently appeared in Mac-Corry, and perhaps in other campus buildings. This is an issue of interest to Senate since it is apt to compromise the academic credibility of the institution. I submit that it is wrong for an institution of public education to run commercial ads in its educational space or in connection with its academic mission because this confers the public institution's educational authority (purchased by decades of public funding and merited by principled academic conduct) on ads that bring monetary profit to private investors--and moreover because it does so at the cost of undermining that very authority in its more proper support of actual education. Hosting commercial ads implies, and indeed publicly proclaims, that the University is reliant upon private corporations for its support. It implies that the University's scholarly and pedagogical endorsement is open for purchase by those with the money to buy it. This is very apt to discredit the institution as a centre of disinterested academic teaching and learning, whatever its actual academic practice may be. Endorsement decisions by a publicly funded educational institution should therefore be based only on academic criteria, not on ability-to-buy. Would the Provost please respond to this position and explain to Senate the decision to use our University's public educational name and spaces to support corporate advertising and private profit?