

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 334 OF
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Monday, April 16, 2001

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Monday, April 16, 2001 at 5:00 p.m. in the Board Room, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Ms Wendy M. Cecil-Cockwell (In the Chair)
Mrs. Mary Anne V. Chambers, Vice-Chair
Dr. Robert J. Birgeneau, President
Ms Jennifer Carson
Professor W. Raymond Cummins
Mr. Brian Davis
Professor Vivek Goel
Ms Naana Afua Jumah
Dr. John P. Nestor
Dr. Joseph L. Rotman
Mrs. Susan M. Scace
Mr. John Tory

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Ms Cristina Oke

Regrets:

Professor Brian Langille
Mr. Gerald A. Lokash

In Attendance:

Professor Jack Carr, Chair, the Academic Board
Mr. Amir Shalaby, Chair, the Business Board
Professor Adel S. Sedra, member, the Governing Council, and Vice-President and Provost
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Deputy Provost
Ms Georgina Gray, Acting Director, Office of the President

The Chairman welcomed Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council, to the meeting, and explained that Mr. Charpentier was unavailable due to illness.

The Chairman noted that consideration of items 1 and 2 would take place *in camera*, pursuant to section 28 (e) and 33 of *By-law Number 2*, as well as a portion of the President's Report.

The Board Chairs, Professor Sedra and Professor Tuohy were invited to remain.

1. Senior Appointments

The Executive Committee considered a recommendation from the Vice-President and Provost for a senior appointment.

Following discussion,

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration

The Vice-President and Provost's recommendation for a senior appointment.

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT, pursuant to section 38 of *By-law Number 2*, the senior appointment be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

The Executive Committee then considered a recommendation from the President for a senior appointment.

Following discussion,

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration

The President's April 16, 2001 recommendation for a senior appointment.

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT, pursuant to section 38 of *By-law Number 2*, the senior appointment be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

2. External Appointments

(a) University of Toronto Press Board

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

- (1) THAT Mr. Roger P. Parkinson be appointed as the Chair of the University of Toronto Press Board for one year until the next annual general meeting of UTP members in November 2001; and

2. **External Appointments** (cont'd)

(a) **University of Toronto Press Board** (cont'd)

- (2) THAT Mr. S. Robert Weiss be appointed as a voting member and director of the University of Toronto Press Board until the next annual general meeting of UTP members in November 2001.

(b) **Innovations Foundation**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT Mr. Gary D. Goldberg be appointed as Chair of the Board of the Innovations Foundation until the next annual meeting.

3. **President's Report**

The President briefed the Committee on two personnel matters.

THE COMMITTEE MOVED INTO CLOSED SESSION.

4. **Reports of the Previous Meetings**

Report Number 332 of the Executive Committee meeting held on February 26, 2001 and Report Number 333 of the Executive Committee meeting held on March 22, 2001 were approved.

5. **Business Arising from the Reports of the Previous Meetings**

(a) **Faculty of Law**

A member asked for an update on the situation at the Faculty of Law. Professor Sedra replied that all the students involved had been interviewed by the Dean, and that the Dean would be writing to the Provost in due course regarding the outcome of the interviews. Professor Sedra also commented that the fact-finding committee chaired by University Professor Emeritus Peter Russell was carrying out its work and that its report was expected in early May. He noted that the University of Toronto Faculty Association was continuing grievance proceedings and questioning the authority of the President and the Provost to determine the facts of the situation.

(b) **Elections**

Mr. Dobbs reported that Mr. Charpentier had met with the University Registrar regarding special students, and that a written report was expected in due course.

5. Business Arising from the Reports of the Previous Meetings (cont'd)**(b) Elections** (cont'd)

A member asked that a written estimate of legal costs for pursuing leave to appeal the judicial review decision regarding the election of part-time undergraduate students to the Governing Council be provided for the April 26 meeting of the Governing Council. The President noted that a substantial proportion of the legal costs incurred by the University were the result of responding to legal actions undertaken by other groups.

6. Accountability: Reviews of Academic Programs and Units

The Chairman noted that, in June 1999, the Executive Committee had approved an Accountability Framework for the Reviews of Academic Programs and Units. She explained that the role of the Executive Committee was to ensure that the review process had been carried out appropriately and to raise any major unresolved issues for the administration's attention.

Professor Tuohy provided an overview of the review summary process. She indicated that the first volume of reviews dated July 1999 cleared the backlog of reviews that had resulted from the previous panel review process which had proved to be unwieldy and unworkable. The two volumes dated October 2000 and January 2001 summarized the reviews carried out under the *Raising Our Sights* planning process and using the Guidelines that had been issued as a companion document to the *Raising Our Sights* document. The administrative response to the most recent reviews reflected the approved plans and requested allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund which had been approved by governance.

Professor Tuohy highlighted four recurring themes in the reviews: faculty renewal, graduate student financial support, undergraduate curriculum, and space needs. She stated that these concerns were being addressed: divisions had received allocations for academic positions based on the requests in their academic plans; recommendations from the Orchard Task Force on Graduate Student Financial Support were being implemented; curriculum reviews were being conducted in the Faculties of Arts and Science, Applied Science and Engineering, and Medicine, and a President's Council on Undergraduate Education was being formed; and space requirements were being overseen by the newly-appointed Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the Reports of the Review of Academic Programs and Units for 1995-96 to 1997-98 and for 1998-99 – 1999-2000 (Volumes 1 and 2) be placed on the Agenda for the April 26 meeting of the Governing Council.

A member noted the omission of the Review of the Division of Science at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM). Professor Tuohy replied that, as the academic plan of UTM had not yet been approved, the review summaries of UTM Divisions had not yet been brought forward.

A member asked what the expected time cycle of reviews would be. Professor Tuohy indicated that the cycle of reviews would likely correspond to the cycle of academic planning, and take place every five years.

6. Accountability: Reviews of Academic Programs and Units (cont'd)

A member indicated that there seemed to be no consistency in student involvement in the reviews. Professor Tuohy agreed to look into the guidelines for reviews and, if necessary, raise this issue with Principals and Deans.

A member requested clarification of a comment regarding leave for pre-tenure faculty. Professor Sedra explained that other research institutions had provisions for such leave, but that such leave was not provided at the University of Toronto since the tenure clock (the normal period preceding consideration for tenure) was only five years, while leave was earned after six years. The President added that, at leading research universities in the United States, the tenure clock was usually seven or eight years.

7. Minutes of the Governing Council Meetings held on March 8, 2001 and March 27, 2001

The Committee received for information copies of the minutes of the Governing Council meetings held on March 8, 2001 and March 27, 2001.

8. Business Arising from the Governing Council Meetings**a) Funding of Higher Education**

The President proposed that, in response to a member's request, Dr. Sheldon Levy would make a brief presentation to the Governing Council on April 26 on the funding requirements of higher education in Ontario. The President also noted that the senior administration was having a retreat this week to consider the University's response to various funding scenarios. Professor Sedra indicated that briefing notes on the funding of higher education had been prepared for members of the Governing Council and would be provided at the April 26 meeting.

b) Report on the Status of Women Office

At the March 8 meeting of the Governing Council

On motion duly made and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the President evaluate the budget for the Status of Women Office to determine if sufficient resources exist for the Office to meet its stated objectives and, if not, that he increase the funding to 100%, and

THAT the President report back on this matter at the next meeting of the Governing Council.

A letter on this issue from the members of the Governing Council representing student constituencies was placed on the table.

The President reported on the results of his review of the resources available to the Status of Women Office. During the period 1984 to 1997, the staffing of the Status of Women Office had been two full-time equivalents (fte). Other equity offices were also created during that time period. In 1997, when the administrative units were required

8. Business Arising from the Governing Council Meetings (cont'd)**b) Report on the Status of Women Office** (cont'd)

to implement significant budget cuts, the staff of the Office was reduced to one fte, and it had been hoped that efficiencies would result from devolving some responsibilities to other existing offices. However, the efficiencies had been limited, since other offices had also been required to reduce staff complement.

Given the unique needs of the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses, a stronger presence of the Status of Women Office would be useful. However, it would be premature to address that issue until the scope of enrollment expansion is determined.

In the interim, recognizing that the devolution of responsibilities had been limited, the President would recommend to the Planning and Budget Committee that an allocation be made would allow the administrative assistant position be increased from .5 to one fte, to allow the Office to be open every day. In addition, the Status of Women Officer's appointment would be increased from 50% to as much as 80%, depending on the preference of the incumbent. It would be expected that the Status of Women Officer would retain a partial faculty or administrative staff appointment.

A member expressed concern at the expectation that the Status of Women Officer retain a partial appointment in addition to the duties of the office. The President stated his strongly held belief that all academic administrators should continue to pursue their academic interests while serving as administrators, and that the Status of Women Officer position should be no more than .8 fte.

9. Academic Board: Item for Confirmation

(Arising from Report Number 105 of the Academic Board (March 29, 2001))

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED

THAT the revised Woodsworth College constitution be approved.

10. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council**(a) Item 3: Tuition-Fee Schedules, 2001 – 2002**

(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Business Board (April 2, 2001))

Mr. Shalaby explained that the tuition fee schedules fell into two categories: fees for publicly funded programs and those for self-funded programs. The fees were set in the context of the tuition fee policy and the policy on student financial support. The University's intention was to set fees at the level required to ensure quality programs, then to provide student aid to maintain accessibility.

The fee increases for publicly funded programs followed the pattern established last year. The increases in the regulated programs were limited to 1.96% and applied to most Arts and Science programs as well as Architecture, Music, Nursing, Undergraduate Education, Physical Education, Physical Therapy, and Occupational Therapy. The increase in almost all other programs was 5%. The two programs with the most substantial fee increases were the undergraduate program in Law and the Master of Business Administration (MBA).

10. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(a) Item 3: Tuition-Fee Schedules, 2001 – 2002** (cont'd)

Mr. Shalaby explained that tuition fees for self-funded programs were set at the level required to enable each program to recover at least its direct costs. Most increases in self-funded programs were 5% or less. The increase in fees for the University of Toronto Schools and the Institute of Child Study's laboratory school included the second phase of a levy that was adopted last year to pay for facilities renovation and expansion. The highest fee programs include the Executive MBA and the Doctor of Pharmacy, in which the majority of students were sponsored by their employers.

A member noted that the number of employers sponsoring students in the Executive MBA program appeared to be declining.

A member indicated that the provision of financial support to doctoral stream graduate students in the amount of \$12,000 plus tuition, as recommended by the Orchard Task Force, was still not the reality. Professor Sedra replied that the Orchard Task Force recommendations would be implemented for most divisions in September 2001. While the University had allocated substantial additional funding, it would be unable to provide funding packages to all doctoral stream graduate students at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT). Funding would come from a variety of sources, including teaching assistantships, grants, fellowships, and research assistantships.

A member asked if more Master's students would be employed as Teaching Assistants. Professor Sedra replied that each Department would assemble funding packages, using the resources available to it.

A member requested additional documentation to confirm that the proposed increases in the Faculty of Law and the Rotman School of Management were following the terms of the tuition policy with respect to such variables as market conditions and fees in comparable programs at other universities. Professor Sedra undertook to provide such documentation.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposed tuition-fee schedules for publicly funded programs for 2001-02 be approved.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposed tuition-fee schedule for self-funded programs for 2001-02 be approved.

10. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(b) Item 4: Budget Report 2001-02**

(Arising from Report Number 105 of the Academic Board (March 29, 2001) and Report Number 111 of the Business Board (April 2, 2001))

Professor Carr stated that the Planning and Budget Committee had spent several meetings discussing the budget guidelines and assumptions and sent the budget forward with strong support. He noted that debate at the Academic Board was focused on the establishment of an endowment for graduate student support, tuition fees, rising utilities costs and the effects of budget reductions on departmental infrastructures.

Mr. Shalaby reported that the Business Board had reviewed the budget and accepted the assurances of the President and the Provost that, while there were a number of items that remained unknown, such as the amount of the provincial operating grant and funding for enrolment expansion, there was more potential for positive developments than for negative developments. The Business Board concurred with the recommendation of the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposed Budget Report for 2001-02 be approved.

(c) Item 5: Capital Project: Sidney Smith Hall, Patio Enclosure – Users' Committee Report

(Arising from Report Number 105 of the Academic Board (March 29, 2001))

Professor Carr explained that this project would provide space to accommodate student activities.

A member observed that, while additional space was necessary, he was not convinced that 'cramming' in more space in this way was the best use of funds.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendations:

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Sidney Smith Hall Patio Enclosure be approved in principle to accommodate student activities including food facilities, lounge space, study space and club space;
- (ii) THAT the project scope as described in the Users' Committee Report be approved, at a total cost of \$1,647,000 including furnishings for the east enclosure (\$400,000 to be from ancillary services contingent upon a new food service being present) and an equal cost for the west enclosure; and,

10. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council**(c) Item 5: Capital Project: Sidney Smith Hall, Patio Enclosure – Users' Committee Report (cont'd)**

- (iii) THAT the project be recommended for implementation at such time as funding has been identified and becomes available.

(d) Item 6: Capital Project: Sidney Smith Hall, Infill Project – Users' Committee Report**University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation**

(Arising from Report Number 105 of the Academic Board (March 29, 2001))

Professor Carr explained that this project would provide additional space for the Departments of History and Political Science.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendations:

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Sidney Smith Hall Third Floor Infill Project be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the project scope as described in the Users' Committee Report, to construct approximately 670 gross square metres, be approved at an estimated cost of \$2,164,000;
- (iii) THAT phase 1 be recommended for implementation with funding of \$455,000 from the Faculty of Arts and Science, \$100,000 available for the construction of the seminar room, and \$1,289,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund, with phase 2 recommended to proceed when the source of additional funding of \$320,000 is identified; and
- (iv) THAT an allocation of \$1,289,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund be approved.

(e) Item 7: Capital Project: Bahen Centre for Information Technology – Link to Koffler Student Services Centre**University Infrastructure Investment Fund Allocation**

(Arising from Report Number 105 of the Academic Board (March 29, 2001))

Professor Carr indicated that this project would provide a convenient indoor link between the two buildings.

A member asked whether this was a good use of the University Infrastructure Investment Fund. Professor Sedra replied that it was an appropriate use of the Fund. The link would join two

10. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(e) Item 7: Capital Project: Bahen Centre for Information Technology – Link to Koffler Student Services Centre
University Infrastructure Investment Fund Allocation** (cont'd)

buildings with a high level of student traffic. The linking of buildings had proven highly beneficial for the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering.

A member noted that changes to the scope of the Bahen Centre for Information Technology project had been recommended for approval at several meetings this year, and expressed concern about the escalating cost of the project. Professor Sedra replied that the project was being built in stages, rather than being tendered as an entire project. The member also expressed the concern that the constant changes in the design of the project might not produce the best use of the space.

A member commented that it was not clear in the documentation where the link would be located and who would use it. The member also asked if the link had been included in the original Users' Report. Professor Sedra replied that a link had been included in the Users' Report, but the design at that time would have resulted in a higher cost and increased disruption during construction.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendations:

- (i) THAT a link between the Bahen Centre for Information Technology (BCIT) and the Koffler Student Services Centre be included in the scope of the BCIT project;
- (ii) THAT an additional \$750,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund be allocated to the project.

(f) Item 8: Academic Transitional Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Law
(Arising from Report Number 105 of the Academic Board (March 29, 2001))

Professor Carr noted that the Faculty of Law had a current shortfall in private donor funding for two projects that were ready to commence.

A member asked about the likelihood that the funds would be raised. Professor Sedra replied that the Faculty had enjoyed great success in its fundraising, and the Dean had given his assurances that the funds would be raised and the loan repaid. Professor Sedra also noted that, following the discussion at the Academic Board, he had informed the Dean that interest would be charged on the loan.

10. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(f) Item 8: Academic Transitional Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Law** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

THAT an allocation of \$850,000 be approved from the Academic Transitional Fund to the Faculty of Law as a loan to be repaid by the Faculty over the next three years.

(g) Item 9: Capital Project: Botany Greenhouse Relocation – Users' Committee Report
(Arising from Report Number 105 of the Academic Board (March 29, 2001))

Professor Carr explained that this proposal called for the relocation of greenhouse functions from the greenhouses at the corner of College and University to the Earth Sciences Building.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendations:

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Relocation of the Botany Greenhouse be approved in principle; and,
- (ii) THAT the project scope as identified in the Users' Committee Report be approved at a cost of \$6,065,810 with funding of \$2,760,800 from each of the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and the Ontario Innovation Trust (OIT), and the remainder of \$544,210 to be funded as a secondary effect from the Pharmacy Building Project.

(h) Item 10: Capital Project: Woodsworth College Residence – Change in Scope University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation
(Arising from Report Number 105 of the Academic Board (March 29, 2001))

Professor Carr explained that this proposal would create a basement that would accommodate video and film storage for the University of Toronto Library.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendations:

- (i) THAT the change of scope in the Woodsworth College Residence of 1,315 nasm be approved;
- (ii) THAT an allocation of \$1,360,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund be approved.

10. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)

- (i) **Item 11: School of Graduate Studies: Disestablishment of the Institute of Medical Science**
Faculty of Medicine: Re-establishment of the Institute of Medical Science
Academic Priorities Fund and Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocations
 (Arising from Report Number 105 of the Academic Board (March 29, 2001))

Professor Carr reported that this proposal would move the Institute of Medical Science from the School of Graduate Studies to the Faculty of Medicine.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendations:

- (i) THAT the Institute of Medical Science be disestablished as an academic unit in the School of Graduate Studies and re-established as the Institute of Medical Science in the Faculty of Medicine, effective May 1, 2001; and
- (ii) THAT an allocation of \$120,000 in base from the Academic Priorities Fund and of \$25,000 in base from the Enrolment Growth Fund to the Faculty of Medicine for the Institute of Medical Science be approved.
- (j) **Item 12: School of Graduate Studies: Disestablishment of the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology**
Faculty of Arts and Science: Re-establishment of the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology
 (Arising from Report Number 105 of the Academic Board (March 29, 2001))

Professor Carr reported that this proposal would move the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology from the School of Graduate Studies to the Faculty of Arts and Science.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

THAT the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology be disestablished as an academic unit in the School of Graduate Studies and re-established as the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology in the Faculty of Arts and Science, effective May 1, 2001.

- (k) **Item 13: University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Nursing**
 (Arising from Report Number 105 of the Academic Board (March 29, 2001))

Professor Carr commented that this allocation would permit much needed renovations to the administrative areas of the Faculty of Nursing.

10. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(k) Item 13: University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Nursing**
(cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

THAT an allocation of \$354,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for renovations to the Faculty of Nursing Building be approved.

11. Reports for Information

The Committee received the following Reports for information:

Report Number 105 of the Academic Board (March 29, 2001)
Report Number 110 of the Business Board (February 19, 2001)

The complete Report Number 111 of the Business Board (April 2, 2001) was placed on the table. Report Number 97 of the University Affairs Board was not available.

12. Report of the President

The President reported briefly on the following matters.

(a) Funding for the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (CCBR)

The President informed Committee members that the University had received a total of \$10.8 million in new funding for this project - \$5.4 million from the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and a matching amount from the Ontario Innovation Trust (OIT). The additional funding was intended to compensate for the escalation of construction costs in the Toronto area.

(b) Media Strategy

The President reported that he was working with Dr. Sheldon Levy and Ms Sue Bloch-Nevitte to develop a strategy to seek more positive media coverage of the University.

He described the meeting he and Ms Bloch-Nevitte had attended with the Toronto Star Editorial Board during which Editorial Board members expressed some surprise at the facts conveyed by the President with respect to certain issues which had not received balanced coverage in the press.

A member noted the negative press surrounding the lawsuit launched by retired female faculty represented by the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA) for retroactive salary increases and consequent pension increases. The President indicated that he was unable to speak publicly about this situation as negotiations were proceeding with UTFA.

13. Other Business**a) Requests to Address the Governing Council**

The Chairman informed the Committee that two requests to address the Governing Council on tuition fees had been received to date. It was noted that representatives of both groups had spoken to the Business Board on this topic. The Committee discussed the possibility of allowing different groups to speak for varying lengths of time, with the recognized student groups – Students' Administrative Council (SAC), the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS), and the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) – being allotted five minutes, if they requested speaking privileges, and other groups briefer time slots. It was noted that the two groups who had requested speaking rights represented subgroups of graduate students, and it was suggested that they be requested to provide written remarks.

Committee members referred to the policy approved in 1995 which stated that requests from non-members to address the Governing Council will be granted 'after consideration of such matters as the relevance of the intervention to the agenda item, whether the members already possess the information being offered, the length of the agenda, the number of speaking requests and the maintenance of good relations with and fulfillment of obligations to official campus groups representing staff and students'.

After lengthy discussion, it was agreed that the Chairman would make a decision regarding speaking requests closer to the date of the meeting, in the light of all requests received.

b) Order of the Agenda

At the suggestion of the Chairman it was agreed that the order of the agenda items for the April 26 meeting of the Governing Council would be substantially the same as the order of the Executive Committee agenda.

c) Awareness of Student Financial Aid Policy

A member commented on her recent experience interviewing potential National Scholars. Two-thirds of the students she had interviewed were not considering applying to the University of Toronto because of concerns about tuition fees and the cost of living in the city. These students appeared to be unaware of the University's financial aid policy. She suggested that the financial aid policy be highlighted more prominently in student recruitment initiatives.

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Secretary

Chairman

April 17, 2001