

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**Thursday, November 4, 1999**

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, November 4, 1999 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

Present:

Ms Wendy M. Cecil-Cockwell (In the Chair)	Ms Rose M. Patten
Mrs. Mary Anne V. Chambers, Vice-Chair	The Honourable David R. Peterson
Professor J. Robert S. Prichard, President	Mr. Kashif S. Pirzada
Professor Mary Beattie	The Honourable Robert K. Rae
Dr. Robert Bennett	Professor Wendy Rolph
Mr. Brian C. Burchell	Mrs. Susan M. Scace
Professor Jack Carr	Professor Adel S. Sedra
Dr. John R. G. Challis	Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones
Professor W. Raymond Cummins	Professor Ronald D. Venter
Ms Shruti Dev	Ms Nancy L. Watson
Dr. Shari Graham Fell	Dr. Alexander R. Waugh
Professor Vivek Goel	Ms Judith Wilson
Dr. Robert J. Kyle	Mr. Vilko Zbogar
Professor Brian Langille	
Mr. Gerald A. Lokash	Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Professor John T. Mayhall	
Professor Ian R. McDonald	
Professor Heather Munroe-Blum	<u>Secretariat:</u>
Dr. John P. Nestor	Ms Susan Girard
Mr. Elan Ohayon	Ms Margaret McKone
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange	
Mr. Jonathan Papoulidis	

Absent:

The Honourable William G. Davis	Professor Emmet I. Robbins
Ms Wanda M. Dorosz	Dr. Joseph L. Rotman
The Honourable Henry N.R. Jackman, Chancellor	Mr. Amir Shalaby
Mr. Paul V. Godfrey	Mr. Robert G. Spencer
Dr. Anne Golden	Mr. Terrence L. Stephen
Mr. Peter A. Herrndorf	Mr. John H. Tory

In Attendance:

Dr. Jon S. Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Development Officer  
Professor Michael G. Finlayson, Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources  
Mr. Robert G. White, Chief Financial Officer  
Professor Derek McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget  
Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Services  
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost, Students  
Professor Rona Abramovitch, Provost's Advisor on Proactive Faculty Recruitment, and Director,  
Transitional Year Programme  
Ms Susan Bloch-Nevitte, Director, Public Affairs

Mr. Stuart Budden, Treasurer and Director of Investments  
Professor Judith Globerman, Status of Women Officer  
Ms Margaret Hancock, Warden, Hart House  
Ms Allison Hudgins, University of Toronto Faculty Association  
Professor Ulli Krull, University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Mr. Matt Lenner, President, Students' Administrative Council  
Professor Robert McNutt, Principal, University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Mr. Kasi Rao, Director of the Office of the President and Director of Government Relations  
Ms Helen Simson, Convenor, Equity Issues Advisory Group, and Coordinator, *DISABILITY*  
Services for Students  
Ms Maureen Somerville, Chair, College of Electors  
Mr. Paul Tsang, President, Graduate Students' Union

During the course of the meeting, the Chairman welcomed the Chair of the College of Electors, Ms Maureen Somerville, and members of the College, who were in attendance to observe the meeting.

#### **99-11-01 Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on September 16, 1999**

A member observed that the minutes of the previous meeting had not recorded that the Chairman had declined to grant his request to question Mr. Joseph Ng, a non-member who had addressed Council.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the minutes of the meeting of September 16, 1999, be approved.

#### **99-11-02 Business Arising from the Previous Meeting**

##### ***(a) Item 4(a) – Notice of Motion: Tuition Fees***

The Chairman recalled that at the previous meeting, a member had given notice of the following motion:

THAT a University of Toronto Task Force be established to examine the abolition of fees for post-secondary education.

She reported that, following a request from the member, the Executive Committee had deferred its consideration of this motion to its next meeting on December 3, 1999.

##### ***(b) Item 6 – Report of the President: Investments – Information Request***

The Chairman noted that at the previous meeting, a member had requested information concerning possible University investments in Myanmar and East Timor. At that time, the President had indicated that he would look into the matter and that it might not be possible to provide such a detailed accounting. The President had also said that he would seek guidance from her as Chairman.

The Chairman continued that the President had discussed this request with members of the Executive Committee on October 25. It was agreed that if a display of these investments could be provided relatively easily, it should be done. If the information was not readily available, the President should only undertake the exercise, incur the expense and commit staff time on the instruction of the Governing Council.

**99-11-02 Business Arising from the Previous Meeting** (Cont'd)**(b) Item 6 – Report of the President: Investments – Information Request** (Cont'd)

She asked the President if he was prepared to report on the feasibility and availability of the requested information.

The President reported that he had consulted with the Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Robert White, who had advised that the University had no direct investments, nor any indirect investments through index funds, in any company based principally in Myanmar or East Timor.

He continued that there were lists of companies that undertook global business in various countries, including Myanmar and East Timor. He had requested that the Chief Financial Officer obtain a list of the Canadian companies and report, if the information was readily accessible, on those companies in which the University held investments and which did business in Myanmar or East Timor. It was the President's expectation that the University either held investments directly or indirectly through index funds in most of those Canadian companies which did business in the specified countries. He hoped to be able to report further on this matter at the next meeting of Council.

**(c) Item 1: Address by a Non-member: Mr. Joseph Ng**

A member noted that at the previous meeting, when he had attempted to ask a question of Mr. Ng, a non-member who had addressed Council, the Chairman had responded that this was not appropriate. The member said that in his opinion it was incumbent upon the members to engage the speakers in a discussion of the matters they raised. The Chairman responded that if the member wished to discuss the procedures of the Governing Council, it would be appropriate for him to do so under agenda item 8 - Other Business. The member commented that he believed the process raised was in fact opposite to governance procedures. He had several other matters to raise, which the Chairman also suggested were better dealt with under agenda item 8 - Other Business.

**99-11-03 Report of the President**

The President referred members to the outline of his report, which had been placed on the table. He welcomed questions from members on any aspect of his report.

**(a) Federal Government Relations**

At the previous meeting the President had provided members with his assessment of the outlook into the next decade. He believed this would be a very exciting and important period given new governmental investments for Ontario's public universities. He was extremely pleased to report an additional investment consistent with this view. The federal government had announced the creation of the *21<sup>st</sup> Century Chairs for Research Excellence* program. This was a signal moment in the evolution of the federal government's role in supporting higher education and research in Canada. Initially, 1200 chairs were to be committed, growing to 2000 chairs in a steady state. Funding would be provided in support of the salaries and benefits for chair holders as well as for a portion of the indirect costs associated with the chairs. This represented major progress on two of the University's principal concerns – that the University's researchers had been financially disadvantaged relative to their North American peers, and that there had been no recovery of indirect costs associated with research, a practice that was in direct contrast with research funding programs in the United States. Also encouraging was the fact that these chairs would be distributed based on research performance of each Canadian university. Criteria used would be the number of faculty per university funded by federal grants awarded by peer-review

**99-11-03 Report of the President** (Cont'd)

**(a) Federal Government Relations (Cont'd)**

competitions of the three national granting councils. In the President's view, this system of allocation was the most appropriate, encouraging excellence and performance. The President had extended the University's gratitude to the Government of Canada.

The President added that a concern of many universities relating to the new chair program would be the determination of whether chair holders would be required to undertake teaching as well as research. The position of the University of Toronto was clear on this matter: the holders of these chairs would do both. The University was advocating that university autonomy should be respected and that the terms and conditions of the chairs should, therefore, be determined by each university. The President was optimistic that this position would prevail.

The allocation of chairs would be as follows: 45% to disciplines covered by the National Science and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), 35% to disciplines covered by Medical Research Council (MRC), and 20% to disciplines covered by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). While the University would have preferred a larger allocation of chairs to SSHRC disciplines; this was nonetheless a significant commitment to the social sciences and humanities.

The administration was making plans to move forward and to integrate these chairs into the academic planning exercise. The administration would seek to use the chairs strategically to attract extraordinarily good junior and senior appointments. The cheques from the federal government were expected to arrive effective April 1, 2000.

The President characterized this as the single most positive announcement made by the federal government for universities over the past decade.

**Federal-Provincial Transfer Payments.** In the spring budget the University would seek an increase in federal-provincial transfer payments for post-secondary education. The President would appear before the Finance Committee in the House of Commons on Monday to press this case, as would many other presidents of Canadian universities.

**Expert Panels.** The Government of Canada had appointed a panel on the commercialization of university research. The University had been concerned in response to the position taken by the panel and was currently engaged in active debate of the issue.

The Government of Canada had recently announced the creation of a second expert panel under the Prime Minister's Advisory Council on Science and Technology. The mandate of this panel would be Canada's role in international science and technology. Professor Heather Munroe-Blum had been invited to serve as a member on this panel.

**Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR) Act.** A member commented that he had heard of the Act's approval earlier in the day by the House of Commons. He wondered if the President had received the legislation and what his reaction was. The President responded that he had not received the final legislation, although he had seen and been comfortable with the penultimate draft. In a phone conversation held earlier in the day between the President, the Deputy Minister and the head of the CIHR concerning the approval of the Act, neither had indicated that they were surprised by its contents. As well, twenty health sciences colleagues who had met earlier in the day, including Professor Heather Munroe-Blum and Professor John Challis, believed the process leading to the Act had gone quite well. The President planned to review the final document with his senior colleagues in the next few days.

**(b) Provincial Government Relations**

**Basic Strategy: Access and Quality.** The University's strategy in dealing with the provincial government continued to be as described at the previous meeting. The University would focus on government investments for two principal purposes: to ensure there was a place for every willing and qualified applicant and to ensure that the quality of experience offered to students was enhanced.

Since the last meeting of the Governing Council, a press conference of Ontario university presidents had been held. The group had authored a letter to the provincial government, a copy of which had been sent to members of Council.

A December announcement by the provincial government would indicate the magnitude of the transfer payment from the province to universities and colleges in Ontario. This would represent the first opportunity for new investments in higher education, the second would come in the Spring Budget of 2000. The University's expectations were substantial for the transfer payment and the budget. At present, however, the University was focussing almost exclusively on the transfer payments issue since it provided the government's commitments to the University's normal operating requirements.

**Throne Speech.** The provincial Speech from the Throne, held a few weeks previously, had addressed many of the University's major concerns. Specifically, it had indicated a priority for providing a place for every willing and qualified applicant to Ontario's universities. The University interpreted this commitment to include operating funds necessary to provide for this access. With respect to research, the provincial government had announced its appointment of Professor Heather Munroe-Blum to a study on how to increase the role of university-based research and encourage innovation across all disciplines within the province of Ontario. This announcement was extremely encouraging, not only because of the choice of Professor Munroe-Blum, but also because the inclusion of initiatives in the Throne Speech usually signaled a commitment to further action. The President hoped that this study would lead to positive implications for future transfer payments and budgets.

**Getting it Done.** As reported at the previous meeting, two working groups had been established to ensure that these priorities were implemented: the University Capacity Working Group (between the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities and the Council of Ontario Universities) and the University Research Working Group (between the Ministry of Science and Technology and the Council of Ontario Universities). Each working group was co-chaired by the Deputy Minister of the relevant Ministry and the President of the Council of Ontario Universities, with membership being drawn from representatives of other ministries as well from universities. The President, who was serving on both working groups as a university representative, believed the work of both groups was going extremely well and proceeding quickly. Given the convergence of the two working groups, he believed his participation in both to be useful.

**Capital Submission to the SuperBuild Growth Fund.** Following the recent announcement of a re-submission process, the University had submitted final applications in support of its top three capital projects: the Centre for Information Technology, the Health Sciences Centre Phase I, and the Munk Centre, a project for which the University had previously received partial government funding. The President was optimistic that the University would fare well in this competition. The University was actively developing its applications for the second submission of categories 1 (university projects) and 2 (joint university/college projects) later this month and in early December.

**(b) Provincial Government Relations (Cont'd)**

**Ontario Innovation Trust (OIT).** The University had been successful in receiving grants under the OIT. This program matched funds received by universities from the federal government's Canada Foundation for Innovation. At dispute was the issue of how many grants could be received under this program. The University was working with the province and the President was optimistic that there would be a positive resolution.

**Biotechnology Announcement.** The provincial government had very recently announced a new investment of funds in support of the biotechnology industry within the Greater Toronto Area. This initiative had been undertaken on the advice of Graham Strachan.

**(c) Campus Expansion**

In the coming week, the President, Provost, and Deputy Provost planned to release a discussion paper on the issue of campus expansion and growth. The paper would seek to identify the issues and engage the campus on how best the University should position itself on this critical policy matter. The document would be brought to the Planning and Budget Committee, the Academic Board and to the next meeting of the Governing Council. Following advice from governance and from the divisional level, the administration would formulate its recommendations and bring them forward to governance for approval.

The President believed that the province would make an announcement sometime this year or early next year articulating a process for the consideration of university growth. In the coming year, the matter would most probably be dealt with on an *ad hoc* basis. Major decisions concerning expansion and growth would take place the following year. This was a defining issue for the future of the University and the President hoped that the administration's discussion paper would help formulate discussion, raise the right questions, and engage the University community in the debate.

**(d) Employee Relations**

The administration was addressing a number of pressing matters within this area.

**Administrative Staff.** Professor Michael Finlayson continued to lead the negotiations with the United Steelworkers of America (USWA) for a first collective agreement. While this posed a number of challenging issues for many members of the University, the President believed the negotiations were proceeding well. The assistance of a conciliator would be sought to help find common ground. Professor Finlayson and his negotiating team were doing an excellent job in seeking agreement with their USWA colleagues.

**Teaching Assistants.** Negotiations had been ongoing with the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE), the representative of the University's teaching assistants; however, they had now reached an impasse. CUPE was holding a vote this week to seek a strike mandate from its members. If this mandate was received and acted upon, it was likely the union would be in a position to strike in early December. While the demands made by CUPE were so substantial that the administration had not been able to see its way to common ground, the administration would continue to seek a successful outcome. A recent letter authored by Professors Finlayson and Sedra had urged all members of the union to exercise their right to vote on the question of the strike mandate. This had been done for two reasons. First, the administration believed participation to be a good idea. Secondly, any decision reached would affect all members of the bargaining unit. As had been its position in the past, the administration would not permit any teaching assistant to undertake his/her duties during a strike. The President noted that some had

**(d) Employee Relations (Cont'd)**

been offended by this position; however, this was the position taken on previous occasions, and one which the President believed to be fair to all students.

A member asked if there was a contingency plan in place for the December examination period in the event of a strike by the teaching assistants. The President responded that Professors Finlayson and Sedra were actively engaged on this subject. A preliminary discussion had taken place at a recent meeting of the group of principals, deans, academic directors and chairs and the administration would make every effort to minimize disruption to students, including the writing of examinations. Inevitably, there would be disruptions in the event of a strike; however, the administration would seek to minimize these wherever possible.

The member asked if the administration's contingency plans would be made public. The President responded that the administration would certainly communicate directly with students affected by a strike.

**Other Unionized Staff.** The administration was also engaged in bargaining with each of its other thirteen employee unions. This process would be ongoing for the next few months.

**Dr. Olivieri.** The President noted that he had provided the Academic Board with a very detailed report on various issues relating to Dr. Olivieri and her colleagues. While members had not yet received the minutes of this meeting; the President referred to a detailed report of the matter that had appeared in a recent edition of *the Bulletin*.

**(e) Municipal Relations**

**Centre for Information Technology.** The President noted that during the development of the proposal to build the new Centre, it had been discovered that the University did not own the laneway that cut through the property on which the new Centre was to be built. With the assistance of former Premier Peterson and the City of Toronto, the transfer of land had been executed in an expeditious manner so as not to delay the proposed development. With its proceeds for this land, the City of Toronto was creating an endowed scholarship at the University of Toronto in honour of the late Dan Leckie, a devoted Councillor and active member of the community. The President believed this to be a very satisfactory resolution of the issue and he recorded his gratitude to Councillor Olivia Chow for working out the land acquisition so promptly and on such favourable terms.

Also pertaining to this project, the University had been dealing with the Historic Board, the City of Toronto, and the residents' association regarding 44 St. George Street, a listed property with Heritage Toronto, located in the far northeast corner of the site. The University was working to develop a plan that would preserve the vast majority of the building inside the atrium for the new Centre, similar to the architecture used for the Hockey Hall of Fame and BCE Place. Agreement had not yet been reached with all the parties concerned; however, the administration was working hard to achieve a satisfactory resolution.

There had also been concerns expressed about 40 and 42 St. George Street; however, acceptable resolutions had been reached.

The University's goal would be to proceed with the project with an aim to its opening for September 1, 2001.

---

**99-11-03 Report of the President** (Cont'd)**(e) Municipal Relations** (Cont'd)

**Graduate/Second-Entry Residence.** Controversy had arisen concerning an architectural element of the residence currently under construction on the northeast corner of Spadina and Harbord Streets. The residence, which had been designed by Thom Mayne of the California firm, Morphosis in partnership with Toronto architect Stephen Teeple, was to add 450 much-needed beds for graduate and second-entry students. Although it was not yet fully constructed, the building had already been honoured with three architectural awards. At issue were safety concerns regarding an extended cornice that reached out across Harbord Street as a distinctive gateway to the campus. Specifically, concerns had been expressed that ice or snow would form on the steel cornice and fall on passing pedestrians and/or that mischief-makers might climb or hang banners from the cornice and in so doing, injure themselves. While the cornice was in full compliance with the building code; the University would hire an independent consultant to report on the safety of the cornice in light of the concerns safety raised. When completed, the report would be made public.

Also at issue was the design and aesthetics of the cornice, which some found unattractive. On this issue, the position of the University was that it would not be appropriate at this late stage to alter the design of the building, which had already been juried and celebrated across the architectural community in North America. The President noted that in contrast, many viewed this particular feature of the new residence as a landmark that would become one of the celebrated architectural features within Toronto. He noted that the passage of time would be the true test of the beauty of this architecture.

A member commented that the residence, originally scheduled for a September opening, remained under construction. Students who had been scheduled to move into the residence were housed at downtown hotels. The member asked when the residence would be ready for occupancy and what arrangements were in place to ensure that the affected students had a reasonable quality of student life. Also, what was the cost to the University of housing these students in the downtown hotels? In response to the member's first question, Miss Oliver noted that it was now expected that the first four floors of the residence would be ready for occupancy on December 15. The administration would take into consideration examination periods and the end of term in providing for students to move into the residence. She attributed the delays in completion to a lack of building materials, including windows, and the unavailability of drywallers, who found the two-story work more taxing than was available on other sites throughout the city. The administration had authorized monies for overtime payments as an incentive for drywallers to stay on the job and it would do everything in its power to ensure the first four floors were ready for December 15. Professor Orchard commented on the administrative initiatives to accommodate the displaced students. The administration had subsidized the difference between the hotel rates and the rents for the new residence. Students were permitted full access to all University services and had been provided with a 24-hour study space. Meal plans were in place and students received TTC passes to travel to and from campus. As well, a shuttle bus service had been established. He commended the collegial spirit of those students who had been displaced. The President noted that the cost to the University of the housing the students in the hotels was not known. He would endeavour to have this information available at or before the next meeting of Council.

**99-11-03 Report of the President** (Cont'd)**(f) Issues Raised at Executive Committee**

The President noted that he had discussed the following matters with the Executive Committee.

**Sweatshops.** At issue was whether University of Toronto licensing agreements with manufacturers for products that would bear the University's name (t-shirts, sweatshirts, etc.) should include conditions specifying minimum working conditions to be enjoyed by workers who were employed to create the products. This was an issue that had been prevalent across North American campuses. Dr. Jon Dellandrea had been charged with consulting with the relevant groups and developing a recommendation. The President expected a report from Dr. Dellandrea during the next few weeks, following which the administration would make a final decision and advise governance accordingly. He invited members who had views on the matter to contact him directly.

**Task Force on Tuition Fees for Medical Residents.** Dean David Naylor had set up a task force on fees for medical residents and it was now hard at work. The President recalled that this initiative had been undertaken following the University's decision to charge fees to medical residents.

A member noted from the Report of the Executive Committee that the administration had been meeting with deans of other Ontario medical schools, through the Council of Ontario Faculties of Medicine (COFM), to develop joint strategies to close the gap between the cost of residency programs and the revenues received. He indicated his strong support for this initiative and noted that the province's health care program was both a federal and provincial matter given federal transfer payments to the provinces for health care. The President commented that on the issue of training and supply of physicians, it was widely accepted that this was a provincial responsibility constitutionally as well as a matter of government operations. While it was true that there had been federal interest because of the unity of the health care system, in terms of financial issues, the University had to pursue the matter with the province. As members would recall, the University's concern was that currently the cost to University of educating its medical postgraduate trainees far exceeded funds received from the province for this purpose. The University had to close this gap in one of two ways: either the government would have to supply greater funding, or the trainees would be required to pay tuition fees. The University would pursue both strategies in partnership with other Ontario medical schools.

**Controversy Regarding a Speaker at Hart House Theatre.** The President recalled his earlier communication to members concerning a speaker, Mr. David Icke, who had been sponsored by a group that had rented the Hart House theatre. There had been calls to cancel the event because of the offensive nature of Mr. Icke's remarks, which had on previous occasions included anti-Semitism. Following consideration of the matter, the administration had determined that it should not engage in restraint, but rather that as a university it must give a fundamental priority to freedom of expression. The extent to which Mr. Icke's speech might violate Canada's hate laws was a matter for provincial and federal authorities. Similarly, the issue of Mr. Icke's eligibility for entry into Canada was a matter for immigration officials. The University had to support the principle of freedom of expression, no matter how offensive that expression might be. The administration had, therefore, not withdrawn permission to the sponsoring group to use the theatre.

A member agreed that freedom of speech was important. He commented that the event in question had been in closed session, with participants being charged a \$50 admission fee. The University had therefore profited from this arrangement, given the rental of its facilities. In contrast, there were members of the University community who were being denied their right to freedom of speech, including representatives of CIUT. How would the University ensure the

---

**99-11-03 Report of the President (Cont'd)****(f) Issues Raised at Executive Committee (Cont'd)**

right of all its members to freedom of speech? In response to the member's first point, the President noted that the University made its facilities available to groups external to the University at posted rates. Where facility usage was for University purposes, the rental rate was waived. Funds raised from room rentals were used to maintain facilities. In response to the member's question, the President noted that the University had a commitment to the overriding value of freedom of expression. He did not believe anything referred to by the member was inconsistent with this view. The particular reference to CIUT was irrelevant on this principle. He noted the presence of the President of the Students' Administrative Council, Mr. Matt Lenner, and complimented him for his leadership in trying to establish a sensible regime at CIUT, which provided for the participation of students and members of the community. While the process had been difficult, the President expressed his admiration for Mr. Lenner's steadiness under fire in ensuring the long-term health of CIUT.

**Varsity Stadium Site: Future Development.** The President had circulated a memorandum to members of the University community articulating the administration's views for the development of the Varsity Stadium site. The President warmly welcomed members' reactions to the memorandum.

**(g) Gairdner Celebration**

A three-day celebration of the 40th anniversary of the Gairdner Awards had taken place on campus, with attendees including Nobel laureates. The President offered his congratulations to Professor John Dirks, who had led the effort.

**(h) Homelessness**

The President drew attention to a recent report on homelessness, authored by Ms Margaret Hancock, Warden of Hart House, which had been distributed at the outset of the meeting.

**(i) Honorary Degrees**

The Committee for Honorary Degrees was nearing completion of its work for this year and would be bringing its recommendations to the next meeting of Council. Members who had nominations for the Committee's consideration were invited to submit them immediately.

**(j) Macleans' Rankings**

The annual ranking of universities by Macleans' magazine was due the following Sunday evening. The University of Toronto had ranked first in its category during the past five years and it was the President's hope that it would do so again this year. The President would send a fax to members of Council upon receipt of this year's rankings.

**(k) Convocations**

The President extended an invitation to members of Council to participate in the November convocation ceremonies.

**(l) Other Matters**

A member noted that he had many points to raise, which the Chairman noted were appropriately raised under other business. The member then asked about the University's involvement in

**99-11-03 Report of the President (Cont'd)****(1) Other Matters (Cont'd)**

CIUT. The President noted that the University had become involved last spring, at the request of the then President of the Students' Administrative Council, Mr. Chris Ramsaroop. The administration had agreed to provide assistance and had designated Mr. Jim Delaney as its key staff person on the matter. A two-person task force - Mr. Chris Ramsaroop and Ms Margaret Hancock - had been formed to recommend on the fate of the radio station. The task force had issued an outstanding report which called for the continuation of the radio station and made recommendations to achieve this. The Board of SAC had proceeded to work with the Board of CIUT to get the station back on track. The current President of SAC, Mr. Matt Lenner, had consulted with the President on how to protect the stations' license. At a general meeting, SAC had taken steps, to ensure the future of the station. The administration was in full support of this initiative and the President was cautiously optimistic that there would be a good resolution to the matter.

The member then indicated that he wished to ask additional questions of the President. The Chairman called upon Mr. Charpentier to clarify Council's rules of order. Mr. Charpentier noted that in the interest of time and given the length of the agenda, additional questions should, as the Chairman had indicated previously, be raised under the designated question period. While Council's By-law permitted members to speak for five minutes on any item, it was his interpretation that the President's report was in itself one item. If members had detailed questions on specific elements, these would be appropriately raised under other business.

**99-11-04 School of Graduate Studies: Proposal to Establish a Joint Master of Spatial Analysis (M.S.A.) Program**

Professor Mayhall reported that this proposal was for a joint master's program with Ryerson Polytechnic University and was Ryerson's first graduate degree. It would be housed in the Department of Geography at the University of Toronto. There was a Memorandum of Understanding on the administration of the program. He also noted that the proposal entailed only a modest redeployment of existing resources and no new long-term financial commitments.

In response to a question raised at the Executive Committee meeting about the name of the degree, Professor Tuohy explained that professional master's degrees covered specific areas of study such as the Master's of Forest Conservation and the Master's of Mathematical Finance. Spatial analysis had a long history in the discipline of geography and there was a trend toward computer-driven management of large data bases.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposal for the establishment of a joint Master of Spatial Analysis (M.S.A.) program, Department of Geography at the University of Toronto and the School of Applied Geography and the Centre for the Study of Commercial Activity at Ryerson Polytechnic University, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies dated March 16, 1999, and the draft Memorandum of Understanding on the administration of the joint Master of Spatial Analysis program dated April 20, 1999, be approved.

**99-11-05 School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Biotechnology (M. Biotech.) Program**

Professor Mayhall indicated that this was the second graduate program to be situated at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. It was a professional master's degree and the program included two four-month placements in the industry. The resource implications for this proposal have been dealt with in a previously approved one-time-only allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund.

The Chairman welcomed the Principal, Professor Robert McNutt, and Professor Ulli Krull.

A member said that there was not enough information about the program, particularly about the ethical content of the biotechnology courses, for him to be able to vote on the proposal. The President responded that the program and the courses had been established in accordance with University policies.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposal for a new Master of Biotechnology (M.Biotech.) program, based at the University of Toronto at Mississauga and administered through the graduate departments of Botany, Chemistry and Zoology by the School of Graduate Studies, effective May 1, 2000, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies dated May 28, 1999, be approved.

**99-11-06 Capital Project: Centre for Information Technology – Report of the Users' Committee**

Professor Mayhall reported that the Centre for Information Technology (CIT) was a new building in which it was planned to accommodate research priorities in the field of information technology and the expansion of the teaching programs in computer science and information technology areas in engineering arising from the Access To Opportunities Program (ATOP). The total project cost was estimated at \$88.1 million. The Centre would be built between St. George and Huron Streets, north of College Street, behind the Fields Institute and the Koffler Student Services Centre.

He said that ATOP, which required matching funding, would provide over \$10 million to support this expansion. The University would seek a further \$26.7 million in funding from the Government of Ontario's new SuperBuild Growth Fund. The third part of the motion called for an allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund. Any remaining amount of the cost would be borrowed, with the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering and the Faculty of Arts and Science agreeing to carry loan repayment, without any further draw on University funds.

A member asked when the University might know about its success under the SuperBuild Growth Fund. The President said that he did not know when the government would announce funding under this new program, however, he believed the project was very positively positioned and had been used by the government as an example of what the Fund was meant to support.

Another member expressed his concern that the activities to be housed in this building were tied to industry. He was concerned that the University's principles as an academic institution were not being upheld. He did not think it appropriate to name parts of the building after a for-profit business corporation.

---

**99-11-06      Capital Project: Centre for Information Technology – Report of the Users’ Committee (Cont’d)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Users’ Committee Report for the Centre for Information Technology, a copy of which is attached to Excerpt from Report Number 96 of the Academic Board as Appendix “D”, be approved in principle; and

THAT the project cost of \$88,136,578, funded as described on page 3 of Professor McCammond’s memorandum dated October 6, 1999, be approved; and

THAT an allocation of \$12,673,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund, \$10 million to provide quality improvement space and \$2,673,000 as the University’s contribution to the infrastructure costs of the Advanced Technology Research Facility, be approved.

**99-11-07      Capital Project: Centre for Information Technology - Garage**

Professor Mayhall presented the plan to build a 308 parking space garage beneath the CIT building at an estimated cost of approximately \$10.3 million. The Parking ancillary would use its capital reserve to fund the project, and secure long-term borrowing for the balance of the capital cost.

Mr. Burchell reported that the University Affairs Board’s discussion focussed on the long-term financing of the garage and its affect on the Parking ancillary’s budget; the displacement of users of the above-ground parking lot, currently located on the site for the new Centre for Information Technology; and the effect of the construction project on the surrounding streets, buildings and community.

A member asked whether this project would deplete the Parking ancillary’s reserve and, if so, would this present difficulties in financing future parking facilities. Miss Oliver said that there was currently approximately \$2.6 million in the reserve and the remainder of the cost of this project would be borrowed. There would be nothing left in the reserve. This would not, in her opinion, jeopardize future projects and the Parking ancillary would still be able to contribute \$700,000 annually to the operating budget. The President noted that this was a particularly expensive garage. Since it was being built in an area surrounded by buildings, the walls would need shoring. It was still sensible to build the garage.

The member asked the administration to consider the role of the Parking ancillary in the future. Would it be expected to break even or contribute to the operating budget? The President indicated that this question had been considered and the possibility of more efficient ways of providing parking had been reviewed, such as contracting out. The ancillary had been an important contributor to the budget. His instinct was to keep parking in-house and keep the contribution to the budget.

Another member commented that parking was not a top concern of some members of the University community. He would rather the funds were put to improving student space and providing space for cultural activities. He asked where the African student society, currently housed at 44 St. George Street, was being moved. The President noted that there was a by-law

**99-11-07 Capital Project: Centre for Information Technology – Garage (Cont'd)**

with the City which obliged the University to maintain a certain number of parking spaces. This garage was a necessary part of the plan to keep the University in compliance. Professor Orchard noted that there was not a specific answer to question about the student society at this time. He would be pleased to respond at a future date.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT a parking garage be constructed beneath the Centre for Information Technology, for a cost of \$10,280,000 plus bridge financing, funded from the Parking ancillary's capital reserve and long-term borrowing.

**99-11-08 Capital Project: Lash Miller Chemical Labs – Addition and Renovation**

Professor Mayhall noted that this was the third recommendation to be considered by the Governing Council about this project. This project was successful in the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) funding competition and the CFI provided the \$3.6 million needed to complete the project in the revised sequence as shown in Professor McCammond's memorandum.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Department of Chemistry proceed to complete the renovations identified in the Users' Committee Report in the revised priority sequence at a cost of approximately \$3.6 million, as described in Professor McCammond's memorandum dated October 7, 1999, a copy of which is attached to Excerpt from Report Number 96 of the Academic Board as Appendix "F".

**99-11-09 Enrollment Growth Fund: Allocations**

Professor Mayhall recalled that the Enrollment Growth Fund was created in the revised Budget for 1999-2000 from revenue generated by enrolment increases in the B.Ed. program, in Computer Science and in high demand areas in Engineering, under the Access to Opportunities Program. The funds were being allocated to the divisions involved to cover expenses associated with the increased enrolment.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the following allocations from the Enrollment Growth Fund, be approved:

\$719,000 in each of 1999-2000, 2000-2001, 2001-2002, and 2002-03, to OISE/UT for expenses associated with the B.Ed. program;

\$998,323 in base and \$505,000 in One-Time-Only to the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering for expenses associated with ATOP;

**99-11-09 Enrollment Growth Fund: Allocations** (Cont'd)

\$88,688 in base and \$120,000 in One-Time-Only to the University of Toronto at Mississauga for expenses associated with ATOP; and

\$1,153,177 in base and \$337,500 in One-Time-Only to the Faculty of Arts and Science for expenses associated with ATOP.

**99-11-10 University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocations**

Professor Mayhall introduced the two allocations from the UIIF that were being proposed. The first would refurbish a 40-year old student lab in Dentistry and the other would be used to renovate parts of St. Michael's College to accommodate the relocation of two of the language departments.

The President commented that several language departments had now been moved to better quarters in the federated universities, some in St. Michael's and others at Victoria. This was a direct dividend of an improved Memorandum of Agreement with the federated universities. In her report, President Runte of Victoria had made a similar comment. The President congratulated Professor Sedra and Dean Amrhein for conceiving and executing the plans to bring together the language departments in the federated universities, giving the departments better quarters and the federated universities an integral role in the Arts and Science programs.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the following allocations from the UIIF be approved:

\$99,000 from the UIIF for the refurbishment of a student laboratory in the Faculty of Dentistry; and

\$875,000 from the UIIF for the renovations at St. Michael's College to accommodate the relocation of the Departments of Italian and Slavic Languages and Literatures.

**99-11-11 Administrative Transitional Fund: Allocation**

Professor Mayhall reported that funding was requested from the Administrative Transitional Fund to cover four items in the Human Resources area including AMS system upgrades and courses, negotiation expenses, and publication costs.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT an allocation of \$125,000 from the Administrative Transitional Fund to the Human Resources Department in the portfolio of the Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources, be approved.

**99-11-12 Funds for Matching Programs**

Professor Mayhall noted that one of the most attractive features of the current fundraising campaign were the matching programs. However, more matching funds were needed to continue the programs. Three sources have been identified – the I'Anson Fund, the University's General Endowment and the savings from the employer pension contributions in 2002-03.

A member voiced his concern about using the savings from the employer pension contributions for this purpose. This was a large amount of funding. He wondered for what other priorities this funding could be used. Was this the best use? It could perhaps be used instead to build residences or to settle the pending strike of teaching assistants. He believed the competing uses of these funds should be discussed. The member suggested the motion be divided, that is, separating the last line from the remainder of the motion.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the motion be divided, separating the last line from the remainder of the motion.

The vote was taken. The motion failed.

The President elaborated on the use of the employer pension contribution savings. He explained that there would probably be a substantial surplus in the pension fund. The employer's contribution would be available to put into an endowment and used for matching purposes. This would, in effect, double the value of the funds. This use was being proposed in order to advance academic priorities. The items to be matched were the top priorities in the divisional academic plans. He believed that the matter had been debated. There was a list of the items that were eligible for matching. This proposal would be of significant benefit to the University. Professor Sedra commented that the funds were not being spent; they would be added to the endowment.

The member believed that the savings from the employer pension contributions had a connection with the employees of the University and that the funds should be spent to benefit the employees. He also pointed out the anomaly in the situation where the University had funding for this purpose and then reported that it has no funds to settle the teaching assistant strike. The President said that using the funds for matching programs was in the interest of the employees. It would create endowed chairs for the faculty. The other area that had reaped the benefits of matching was student support. He noted that improved benefits were part of negotiations. Under the current University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA) agreement, the faculty had obtained better benefits. He explained that compensation for teaching assistants was a base expense and using a one-time-only source of funds was not appropriate.

Another member said that this was an issue she had been concerned about for a long time. She said that the savings had been used in the past to benefit mainly one group. She referred to the Supplemental Retirement Arrangement that benefited mostly faculty. The current proposed use, endowed chairs, would once again benefit faculty. She had not seen any new administrative staff positions created because of endowed chairs. She would like to see the savings used to create better benefits for administrative staff. The President responded, noting that the pension contribution holidays enjoyed by the administrative staff had been funded by the surplus. He also noted that benefit negotiations had given disproportionate assistance to those who were less well paid. He believed that the savings had been used to benefit the administrative staff. Professor Sedra added that the University was an integrated entity. Using the savings to fund chairs would release money which could be used for other purposes. He suggested that Council would see some new administrative staff positions proposed in the allocation recommendations of the Academic Priorities Fund.

**99-11-12 Funds for Matching Programs (Cont'd)**

A member referred to the proposal to use the I'Anson Fund for endowed chairs. He wondered whether there was any requirement in the original bequest that would restrict the use of the funds or require recognition in the naming of the chairs. The President responded that the funds must be used in compliance with the terms of reference of the Fund. The funds would continue to be endowed and would be doubled through matching. It would continue to support the health sciences. He noted that all the health science deans supported the proposal. He did not have a view about the naming.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the transfer of the I'Anson Fund capital to support matched chairs in the Health Sciences, including Social Work, with the transfers to occur as the full external matching funding for each Chair is received, be approved; and,

THAT the following sources of funds to be used to provide matching support for chairs and other matching programs be approved:

The I'Anson Fund (\$18 million) to be used to provide matching for Chairs in the Health Sciences, including Social Work;

The University's General Endowment (\$27.6 million). As previously approved, the Academic Priorities Fund (APF) will continue to bear the cost to hold harmless the University's bottom line for any matches made under the New Matching Chairs program; and

Savings from the employer pension contributions in 2002-03 (\$18 million).

### **99-11-13      *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto***

Professor Mayhall recalled that the initiatives set out in *Raising Our Sights* placed additional residences high in the University's priorities. The companion document, *Student Housing: A Plan for the Next Phase*, quantified those requirements. Professor John Browne, Director of Residence Development, had drafted a report drawing together the known proposals for increasing residence capacity and examining the issues that expansion would entail. The report also identified potential sites for development to meet the residence needs. There had been full discussions of this document at the Committee and Board levels, both of which are reported in the Board's excerpt.

Mr. Burchell reported that the University Affairs Board had had a very good discussion of the plan, which included questions about the adequacy of the targets given anticipated enrolment growth, the kinds of residences being proposed (i.e. family, single or faculty), the provision of satisfactory student activity space and student services within new residences, and the desirability of the selected sites in their proximity to colleges, parking and campus services. The Board's concurrence with the plan was premised on the administration's commitment to ensuring new residences were affordable to students. Members had raised concerns regarding external noise due to possible proximity to busy traffic corridors and privacy issues within new residences. Miss Oliver had assured members that these issues were being looked at by the administration. Members of the Board had also noted a lack of reference within the plan to faculty housing.

**99-11-13**      *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto* (Cont'd)

This did not appear to be part of Professor Browne's portfolio, and members believed that this should be addressed concurrently and systematically, along side development for student residences.

Mr. Burchell continued that to ensure these issues were considered in a comprehensive way by the various users' committees that would recommend on individual projects, a set of users' committee guidelines had been developed.

In conclusion, Mr. Burchell noted that the Board had been very impressed by the work of Professor Browne and that it had unanimously concurred with the Academic Board's recommendation that the plan be approved.

A member noted that at the meeting of the Academic Board, he had asked that student representatives be added to the advisory committee. He thanked Professor Sedra for considering his request and responding so quickly. With respect to the sites chosen for residences, he had particular concerns with the site on the back campus and that beside the Robarts Library. He hoped the actual location of the residences would be discussed by the advisory committee. Professor Sedra responded that concerns had been raised about the site on Hoskin Avenue (back campus) with respect to green space. He said that any proposals would be developed in the context of the Open Space Plan. Concerns expressed about the Library site revolved around using the site for residences when the Library might need the space for its expansion. He had arranged a meeting among Professor Browne, Ms Moore, Chief Librarian, and Principal Merrilees of Innis College to discuss the matter. One suggestion had been that the Library use space under the residences. Once again, there would be a specific proposal for this site which would come through the levels of governance for approval.

Another member expressed his concern about the dwindling green space on the St. George campus. Was it necessary to use the back campus to achieve the goals of increasing residences spaces? He suggested the back campus had historic value the same as the front campus. The President said that the administration had looked at the proposed sites very carefully. The Principal of University College has indicated that building along Hoskin would be the most positive and imaginative use of the back campus to advance the sense of community and the life of the College. The residence would be built on the street and the current parking spaces and asphalt on the east side would be returned to green space. The net effect would be to enhance the green space and eliminate the snow dump site in the winter. Professor Kidd, Dean of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health, viewed the plan as an advance in the quality of the athletics facility. The plan was critical to the College in terms of increasing the percentage of students in residence. Other ways to accomplish this such as adding more floors to current residence buildings had been studied but the buildings were unable structurally to support more floors. A member who was chair of the College's fundraising campaign concurred with the President's remarks. New residences were very important to the College and the Hoskin space was the best space near the College. It would be a more creative use of the back campus and would avoid its use as an unsightly dump site in the winter. Another member hoped the University would resist the temptation to join the new residence to the old ones.

A member applauded the emphasis on student housing and asked whether physical accessibility would be addressed in the construction process. The President replied affirmatively. In response to another question, Professor Sedra indicated that three students, one representing each of the Students' Administrative Council, the Association of Part-time Undergraduates and the Graduate Students' Union, had been added to the membership of the Advisory Committee listed on the last page of the document. Community input would be obtained through liaison with City of Toronto councillors for the area.

**99-11-13**      ***Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto*** (Cont'd)

A member underscored the importance of provision for faculty housing, which would be important in hiring the best candidates. The President noted that the administration was very much in support of the view that faculty housing was a key issue. While the administration had not made faculty housing part of Professor Browne's mandate, this remained a priority for the University. The current graduate residence was being considered as a possible future site for this purpose. As well, Professor Michael Finlayson was independently working on faculty housing. This effort had not been slowed down by the plans to proceed with a 2500-bed expansion. There were currently 50 units for faculty in the north-west campus. Professor Finlayson would be working with the Provost to identify future need for faculty housing. The administration had implemented a strategy four years previously to provide housing for up to three years for new faculty and it would continue to explore the need for increased faculty housing as it went through its planning process. The administration was, therefore, in complete agreement on the need for increased faculty housing.

A member understood that this expansion was not due to the expected double cohort or demographics. He asked whether the University would be able to fill these planned spaces with current enrolment. The President believed the demand was there and that it would grow. Residences would be built at the periphery of the University's precinct and in a general form that could be transformed for external market if need be. This was financially prudent and also it was the form of housing students wanted. As enrolment increased, the University would build more residences.

A member asked that as the residences were planned, the need for student space be kept in the foreground.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the directions and priorities outlined in *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto*, dated October 8, 1999, a copy of which is attached to Excerpt from Report Number 96 of the Academic Board as Appendix "L", be endorsed; and

THAT, sites 4, 5, 12, 21, 26 and, subject to discussion with the City of Toronto, New College and University College, be approved as primary sites for residence development. In the case of site 21, the development of a student residence will not take place without the simultaneous development of a new Varsity Stadium and a renovated Varsity Arena.

**99-11-14**      **Investments: Governance and Management**

Ms Patten presented the proposal to form a new corporation to oversee the investment of the University's endowment, its pension funds, and certain other funds. The new company would be an ancillary operation of the University - like the University of Toronto Press Inc. or the Innovations Foundation - operating independently, but under the University's control. The University's investments would still be selected by external investment managers. The new company would determine the mix of stocks and bonds and other investments, within the bounds set by University policy. And it would hire, and monitor, and (if necessary) fire the external investment firms.

**99-11-14 Investments: Governance and Management (Cont'd)**

She noted that the new company would oversee the investment of something over \$3.5-billion. If returns could be improved, for example, by one half of 1% per year, that improvement would yield \$17.5-million per year. She suggested the new corporation would be more likely to achieve that added return for the following reasons:

- First, the staff responsible for investments would be enhanced. There would be more investment professionals and an incentive-based compensation scheme - possible in a separate corporation - would help attract and retain first-class people.
- Second, the new corporation would focus its efforts exclusively on investments. The other duties of the present Treasury Department would be re-assigned.
- Third, the professional staff would have a good deal more freedom of action to make decisions quickly, within established parameters, as required by rapidly changing conditions in the securities markets.

Ms Patten explained that the new corporation would have a Board to provide oversight. But that Board would be less involved in specific decisions. The corporation would remain fully subject to all relevant University policies. The role and responsibility of the Governing Council and the Business Board would be wholly unchanged. The Business Board would continue to review and approve the investment policies, review annual - or more frequent - reports, and monitor performance. The Executive Committee of Governing Council would appoint the Board of the new corporation. The President and Chief Financial Officer of the University, as well as two Governors or other Business Board members, would be on the Board. The corporation would be fully subject to any University directions concerning such topics as ethical investing. Decisions about payout rates from the endowment would continue to be made by the University.

Finally, she commented on the phrase in the motion, "essentially as set out." This enabled the administration to make changes to the detail, but not the basic aspects, of the By-Law and service agreement. The document now before Council contained a few such changes made after the Business Board meeting. Those changes were recommended by members of a Business Board working group.

A member raised a question concerning the scope of the Service Agreement between the Governing Council of the University of Toronto and the University of Toronto Investment Management Corporation, which was attached to the proposal as Appendix "D". This document indicated that the new corporation would "...dispose of and otherwise deal with lands, buildings, and other interests in real estate on behalf and for the benefit of the said Council". The member expressed concern that the new corporation would not only manage the University's endowment but also its real estate. The President responded that this provision would enable the new corporation to invest in real estate. Mr. White concurred, noting that this language was intended also to address any possible long-term wish of the University, which might in the future ask the corporation to play a role in real estate.

The member asked whether this was a transfer of authority for real estate from the Governing Council to the new corporation and whether this would pertain to lands currently owned by the University? The President responded that the service agreement would allow the new corporation to make direct real estate investments for endowment and pension funds on behalf of the Governing Council. As well, if lands were donated to the University in future, they could be transferred to the endowment and be managed by the new corporation. This was the sole purpose for having real estate listed as a responsibility of the new corporation. There were no plans at present to transfer any real estate currently owned by the University to the new corporation.

**99-11-14      Investments: Governance and Management** (Cont'd)

A member noted that proposal was substantive and represented a major decision. Given the lateness of the hour, he suggested that Council defer its consideration of the proposal to its next meeting. The President responded that his recommendation would be for Council to consider the proposal at this evening's meeting so that, if approved, the administration could proceed to recruit a new Chief Investment Officer and get the new corporation in place. The proposal had been considered very thoroughly by the Business Board over the course of its last two meetings and there was a substantive advantage to proceeding quickly. He welcomed any questions members had with respect to the proposal. The member responded that he did not believe the proposal to be as time sensitive as was the case with other proposals. In addition, the University had managed its investments very well to date. He asserted that further discussion should take place prior to Council's consideration of the proposal.

A member indicated his general support for the proposal. It represented an opportunity for the University to ensure investments consistent with its principles. The member noted that he had had a good discussion with Mr. Robert White and Mr. Robin Korthals concerning the proposal. One suggestion he had raised with them was for revisions to the University's statement on Social and Political Issues with Respect to University Investment, which covered the non-financial aspects of University investment. He volunteered to work with the administration on this in the near future.

It was duly moved and seconded to put the question.

The motion to put the question was carried.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposal to establish a University of Toronto Investment Management Corporation, the proposed By-Law Number 1 of that Corporation, and the proposed Service Agreement between the Governing Council of the University of Toronto and that Corporation, essentially as set out in Appendix "A" to the Excerpt from Report Number 101 of the Business Board, be approved.

**99-11-15      Reports for Information**

Members received the following Reports for information:

- Report Number 100 of the Business Board - September 13, 1999
- Report Number 87 of the University Affairs Board – September 28, 1999
- Report Number 318 of the Executive Committee - September 16, 1999
- Report Number 319 of the Executive Committee – October 25, 1999

**99-11-16      Date of Next Meeting**

The Chairman reminded members that the next meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for **Wednesday**, December 15, 1999 at 4:30 p.m.

**99-11-17 Other Business**

**(a) Request from a Member to Add an Item to Council's Agenda**

The Chairman noted that at its October meeting the Executive Committee had received a request from a member of Council to add the issue of physical accessibility to today's Governing Council agenda. After discussion, the Committee had agreed that, without a more clearly defined proposal for Council's consideration, the item should not be placed on today's agenda. The Committee had indicated that it would consider – at its December 3 meeting – a written submission that identified particular issues and described the outcome or action the member wished Council to consider.

**99-11-18 Question Period**

Members raised no additional questions.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chairman

December 2, 1999